Case # 05-2012-CF-035337-AXXX-XX Page 1001 Document Page # 439 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA 2 CASE NO: 05-2012-CF-035337-AXXX-XX 3 4 5 STATE OF FLORIDA, ORIGINAL 6 Plaintiff, 7 vs. 8 BRANDON LEE BRADLEY 9 Defendant. 10 11 VOLUME VI OF VIII 12 TRANSCRIPT OF DIGITALLY RECORDED JURY SELECTION 13 14 JUDGE: HONORABLE MORGAN REINMAN 15 February 24, 25, 26, 27, and DATE TAKEN: March 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16 17, 2014 17 Moore Justice Center PLACE: 2825 Judge Fran Jamieson Way 18 Viera, Florida 32940 19 Diane Lynch REPORTED BY: Court Reporter 20 21 22 RYAN REPORTING 23 REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS 24 1670 S. FISKE BOULEVARD ROCKLEDGE, FLORIDA 32955 OFFICE: (321)636-4450 FAX: (321)633-0972 25

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

		_		Page 1003
1	I	I N	DEX	
2				
3	FEBRUARY 24, 2014 QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE	כוייי	1	4:2 40:17
4	QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE FEBRUARY 25, 2014			74:17
5	FEBRUARY 26, 2014	— r	25	103:8 450:14
6	QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE FEBRUARY 27, 2014			1452:1 779:7
7	QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE			782:25 820:18
8	MARCH 6, 2014 QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE			856:23 893:15
9	QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE			918 <b>:</b> 5 944 <b>:</b> 9
10	MARCH 7, 2014 QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE			972 <b>:</b> 9 972 <b>:</b> 15
11	QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE MARCH 10, 2014			1007:13 1040:22
12	QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE			1040:22 1041:1 1067:11
13	MARCH 11, 2014			1097:11 1096:14 1096:18
	QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBER MARCH 13, 2014			1189:3
14	QUESTIONING OF JUROR NUMBE			1189:7 1219:7
15	MARCH 14, 2014 MARCH 17, 2014			1262:15 1370:23
16				
17				
18				
19	•			
20	·			
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

recommendation does not have to be unanimous. In other words, each juror is entitled to his or her own vote, the jury doesn't have to agree, you can disagree.

JUROR NUMBER 124: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Okay. And that's the point. Do you

At the penalty part -- and you don't get to the

penalty part unless there's a finding of first degree

murder. At the penalty part of the trial, the jury's

making a recommendation to the Court, but that

understand that you have the right to your own opinion, your own vote, and to have that vote accepted and respected by the other members of the jury?

JUROR NUMBER 124: Yes, sir.

MR. MOORE: And you have the right not to be browbeaten or intimidated -- you don't seem like the type to succumb to that -- but you have the right not to have people demand that you defend that decision or justify it.

JUROR NUMBER 124: Correct.

MR. MOORE: And, on the other side of that coin is, you have the obligation to extend that courtesy to other members of the jury.

JUROR NUMBER 124: Yes, sir.

MR. MOORE: Now, do you recall the judge telling

you that the jury's recommendation for life or death is given great weight?

JUROR NUMBER 124: Yes, sir.

MR. MOORE: Do you understand -- do you have a concept of how significant the jury's recommendation is?

JUROR NUMBER 124: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Whatever it thinks the sentence should be, how significant that is, how essential that is, to the Court's determination of a sentence?

JUROR NUMBER 124: Yes, sir.

MR. MOORE: Now, let me give you an example of what it would be like. If you took an airline pilot who flies form LaGuardia airport to Paris, he has the technical ability and the skill to get there, but without a co-pilot and a navigation system, GPS, and being able to look out the window, and maps, he's not going to get there. And so that's how significant the jury's recommendation is to the Court's decision about sentencing. It's not a situation where the judge can just say, well, that's nice, and then do whatever she wants to do. Do you understand how significant --

JUROR NUMBER 124: Yes, sir.

MR. MOORE: In other words, you can't just say, well, I don't have to worry about it because the judge

will do the right. I don't think you take it that way, but I just want to make sure that you understand how important your recommendation is.

JUROR NUMBER 124: I do.

MR. MOORE: All right. Can I have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 124, you are still being considered as a potential juror in this case. I am going to release you for today, release you for Monday. What I'm going to have you do is, go downstairs, they're going to -- tell them you've been released from Judge Reinman's room courtroom, that you're supposed to come back, and they're going to give you a phone number. You call that phone number between 1:00 and 5:00 on Monday, and they're going to give you further information about when to report. That way -- we're not sure how long this process is taking, that way you're not sitting around the courthouse, waiting for us to call you in to speak with us.

During this recess, you much continue to abide by your rules governing your service as a juror. Any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 124: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. You can downstairs and get that phone number. Thank you, sir.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 124 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, voir dire selection was had which was not requested to be transcribed.)

THE COURT: Okay. We'll bring in Juror Number 125.

THE COURT DEPUTY: Yes, ma'am.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 125 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 125, good afternoon. The first thing I want to say is, thank you for being here, thank you for your patience with us. We know that it's been a long, probably not too exciting process for you, ours has been more exciting, but ours has been long as well, I assure you. We are trying to get through this process as quickly as we can, but there are certain things that we have to do, so it is a slow process. The other thing, it's been difficult to estimate time, how long it will take. Sometimes it's quick, sometimes it's not, and I'm the person that makes that estimate; and to tell you the truth, I don't think I've done a very good job with

it, so I do apologize if you've been waiting, and I thank you for being patient with us.

The other day when I spoke with you, we talked about rules that govern your service as a juror.

Those rules 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 125: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I just to clarify that you can tell people where you're at and when you're here, I'll be here, I expect to be back at this time, I should done be done by 5:00, that kind of thing. What you can't discuss is why, the why you're here, what case

it is, what the charges are, and what's happened in the courtroom. Now, if you get released as a juror, once you get released as a juror, you can discuss it with whoever you wish. But as long as you're being considered as a potential juror, and if you do become a juror, then those rules remain in effect.

Okay. Now I want to talk about your knowledge of the case prior to coming here. Do you know anything about this case, either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussion with anyone else, or from the media, including radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or newspapers?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

THE COURT: Okay. You don't know anything about the case?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Haven't heard anything on -- because it's been on the news, so you haven't heard anything on the radio, television, things of that nature?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No. I'm a realtor, and I work late hours. I don't pay attention to the news.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have -- do you watch news on a regular basis?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I do not, no.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 125: I don't have cable, so the 1 2 TV's not on that much. THE COURT: Okay. So sounds like most of what 3 4 you do is work. 5 JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Is it going to be a problem 6 being here for this length of time with this case? 7 JUROR NUMBER 125: No. 8 9 THE COURT: You can do that? 10 JUROR NUMBER 125: It -- I mean, it'll affect future business, but not bad enough to affect me, no. 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then, the next 13 question I'm going to ask you is, what are your views 14 about the death penalty? JUROR NUMBER 125: I don't have strong views one 15 16 way or the other. I've never been in a position where 17 it was on me in any capacity to have that decision put 18 on me, so --THE COURT: Well, if someone were to say, are you 19 for it, or opposed, it sounds like you would --20 21 JUROR NUMBER 125: I would say I don't know. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MR. MOORE: Say what? JUROR NUMBER 125: I don't know. I don't have a 24

strong position one way or the other.

25

THE COURT: Have you ever thought about it before? Thought about where your position would be on that? Had any discussions about it?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I've heard other people discuss, but because I didn't have -- you know, there's been other opinions put out there, but I didn't have a strong position one way or the other. I don't -- if anything, I don't feel it's my position to be the judge on someone else's life.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 125: So I would weigh that heavily. But being for it or against it strongly one way or the other, I guess it would be a case-by-case basis. I don't really know.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to talk to you a little generally about the process, and the attorneys are going to be more specific. The first part of the trial, called the guilt phase, if the jury returns a verdict of guilty to count one, and count one is the only count that this pertains to, and count one is first degree murder, if there's a guilty verdict to count one, first degree murder, then we proceed to a second phase.

The second phase is called the penalty phase. In the penalty phase, you are instructed as a juror to

make a recommendation to the judge, which would be me, to make a recommendation of a penalty; and the penalties are death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. Now, I instruct you that you would have to consider both of those penalties as -- I instruct you that you would have to consider both of those as your job as a juror. Do you think you could consider both?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: So do you think that you could consider death as a possible penalty if the jury finds the defendant guilty of count one, murder of the first degree?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I would think so, based on the facts in the case.

THE COURT: Okay. You're going to get instructions on how -- to help you in that consideration, about what aggravating circumstances are, and then there's mitigating circumstances, and you go through a weighing process, and then that assists you in helping with your verdict. What we ask you is to consider both possibilities. Obviously, the ultimate decision, or the ultimate recommendation, that you're going to make to the judge is yours. You get to determine how much weight you want to give to

2.4

the aggravating circumstances and how much weight you want to give to the mitigating circumstances, and then you make the recommendation to the Court. What we ask you to do as part of your job as a juror is to consider both possible penalties. Can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I would have to say yes. I mean, it's part of the process and, I feel, our duty.

THE COURT: Some people say, no, in this type of situation I would always -- that would be a death penalty to me. Other people say, in this type of situation, I could never vote for the death penalty. So what we ask you to do, in order to be a juror, is to consider both possibilities. Can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 125: I feel I could.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 125: That's what we're requesting. All right. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Juror Number 125, good afternoon. Now, the Court asked you, could you consider both penalties, and you indicated that, yes, you could. My question to you, and I'm going to go into the process here in just a little bit, but if you feel that it's justified, beyond could you just

consider both, could make a recommendation to the Court of the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I would -- the reason why I say yes is because I don't have a strong opinion one way or the other. So my answer would be yes.

MR. BROWN: So there's nothing in your makeup, your beliefs, thought process that just prohibits you from being in a position where you could make that recommendation? Nothing keeps you from making that recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Right.

MR. BROWN: Okay. The process that we have, the way that this would work is, first, if you're selected, you go back and deliberate and decide what verdict to return in this case. Is the defendant guilty of first degree murder, is he guilty of a lesser-included charge, or if he's not guilty. The only way the death penalty comes into play is if the jury comes back with a verdict of first -- guilty of first degree murder. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. BROWN: So if you come back, obviously, not guilty, then there's no sentencing. If you come back with a lesser, such as second degree murder, the death penalty's off the table, the sentencing is entirely up

to the Court, and at that point, you, as a juror, have fulfilled your obligations. So we only get to the second phase if the jury comes back with guilty of first degree murder. And there is no automatic death penalty. There are two ways for the State to prove first degree murder, one is felony murder, the other one is premeditated murder. Both carry the same — both are first degree murder, just two different ways we can prove it. Neither one is an automatic death penalty. Regardless of which way we get there, we can get there both ways, you go through the same process for the sentencing recommendation. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. BROWN: If we get to that penalty phase, what gets conducted is, you'll hear additional evidence as a jury, we reconvene, hear the additional evidence, and Her Honor will give you a new set of instructions. Then you'll go back to deliberate. In those instructions, the first part of that, what she's going to tell you is, you look at what are called aggravating circumstances. She's going to give you a list of those that apply in this case. An aggravating circumstance is a statutory list, and those are circumstances which may increase the gravity of the

crime or the harm to the victim. And it's to that list, those aggravating circumstances that you look to to determine whether or not the death penalty is justified. That's what you use, those aggravating circumstances.

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

Now, the State has to prove those to you beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. the same standard of proof for the guilt phase that applies to us in the penalty phase for those aggravating circumstances. So if you look at that list of aggravators, and you say, the State has not proven any of those, then your recommendation has to be life, because you found no aggravation. however, you look and you say, the State's proven at least one, we may have proven more, it's going to be a list, I expect it will be more than one, it may be three, four, five, but if we've proven at least one, or more than one, we may have proven the entire list to you, then you look at those that we've proven and ask yourself, do these justify the death penalty? And, again, if your answer is no, then your recommendation has to be for life. If your answer is yes, these aggravating circumstances, in your mind, justify the death penalty, we go to the next step of the process, and that's where you consider the

mitigating factors, mitigating circumstances.

If you recall, the Court covered some of this with you yesterday, but she did throw an awful lot at everybody in a condensed period of time. The mitigating circumstances are those that, basically, come from the defendant, himself, his life, his background, his character, things of that nature. You'll hear evidence, and there's a burden of proof for mitigation, but it's a lower standard than for the aggravators. The standard of proof for the mitigation is to the greater weight of the evidence. So it's a burden of proof for both, just lower for the mitigation than it is for the aggravators. Any questions thus far?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Obviously, if something's not been proven in aggravators or mitigators, you disregard it. You take what's been proven, and you have to consider all of it, and the Court's going to tell you that you go through a weighing process. Now, in your lifetime, in your personal life or professional life, have you had to make some key, critical decisions? What was your answer?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Most of us have.

JUROR NUMBER 125: I thought the next question was you were going to ask what they were.

MR. BROWN: No, no. I probably will at some point, but not what we're here for today. When you've had to make those decisions, did you try to look at all the factors involved?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Of course.

MR. BROWN: Right. And you considered everything you could think of, right?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Of course.

MR. BROWN: And when you looked at those factors, some factors you looked at were pretty darn important to your decision-making process, right?

JUROR NUMBER 25: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And you gave those factors great weight, right?

JUROR NUMBER 25: Absolutely.

MR. BROWN: Other things, you considered, you looked at, and said, you know, this really, as I look at this, isn't really that important, it didn't have much effect on you, and you gave it very little weight, right?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Right.

MR. BROWN: And you kind of weighed all the factors, the pros and cons, and you came to a

decision.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 125: Right.

MR. BROWN: It's the same process, the judge is going to tell you, you go through for this process. You take those aggravators, and you weigh them against the mitigating factors, the mitigating circumstances, and it's a weighing process. Now, she's not going to tell you how much weight you give to each factor. there's no magic circumstance of, aggravating circumstance number one you give this amount of weight, mitigating circumstance number one you give this amount of weight. You're not going to hear that from the Court. That's a decision you, as a juror, have to make, and you make it individually. disagree, you may give circumstance one great weight to, the next one give no weight; the juror right next to you may be flip-flopped and feel differently. you decide how much weight to give to each circumstance.

The only thing we ask, and that we can ask from you today, is that you're going to consider what's been proven. And like in your own personal decisions, you consider everything, and it's the same thing here, if it's brought to you, would you at least consider it, consider all the aggravators, consider all the

mitigators. Nobody's going to ask you for a commitment as to how much weight you're going to give to anything, because you don't know. Right?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Right.

MR. BROWN: And until you hear everything, you don't know how much weight you're going to give anything. So we can't ask you — it wouldn't be fair to ask you how much weight, but it's the fact that you'll consider and go through that weighing process. Now, when you go through that weighing process, weighing the aggravators versus the mitigators, if you find that the mitigation outweighs the aggravation, the Court's going to tell you that you have to make a life recommendation. If, however, you find it the other way, that the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation, then you're in a position where you're legally justified to make a recommendation to the Court for the death sentence.

Now, the Court's not going to tell you, well, if the State proves A, B, C, and D, that you must recommend death. You're not going to hear that from the judge. What she's going to tell you is, in fact, that you're never required or obligated to recommend the death penalty. Okay?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Okay.

MR. BROWN: But you are required to do is go through that weighing process, and follow the steps to get there. And when you weigh it, basically, if you find the mitigators outweigh the aggravators, you recommend life. If you find that they do not outweigh the aggravators, that they're still on top, and that you feel at that point, after you weighed them, that those aggravating factors still justify the death penalty, that's when you can recommend the death penalty. Any questions about that process?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Not right now, no.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Well, if you have any questions of us, now is the time to ask.

JUROR NUMBER 125: I don't.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Because we can't answer questions once we get done with this voir dire process. So do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Do you feel comfortable with that process?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Given that process, knowing that you're going to get the list of aggravators, you're going to get the mitigation evidence, but that you have to determine the weight, do you feel

comfortable in making that type of decision?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And if you find that the State's proven aggravating factors, you weigh them with the mitigation, you find the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation, and you feel the death penalty is justified, can you return a recommendation of death?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I believe so, yes. As long as the process proves it needs to be done, yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. And, again, it's not a matter of that it's going to prove, it's that it's justified to you. The Court's not going to say, if the State proves --

JUROR NUMBER 125: If it's justified to me, yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. The Court's not going to tell you, if the State proves this, then you must return death.

JUROR NUMBER 125: I understand.

MR. BROWN: That's why it's a recommendation on your behalf that you're making to the Court. Do you feel comfortable in that?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Now, do you come to court today -- you may not have had this, because you've indicated you've not really given this much thought,

but do you have any notion in your mind of, well, you know, under maybe this circumstance, or this second circumstance, the death penalty would be justified, and, in my mind, I've just limited it to these two circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Some people may come in and say, you know, in the case of a mass murderer, I could recommend death, but shy of that, I could never do it. Do you fall into that category at all?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Okay. You understand, of course, as we talked about, the Court's going to give you that list of aggravators. Those are the things that you look at, legally you're allowed to look at, that can justify the death penalty.

JUROR NUMBER 125: Okay.

MR. BROWN: Are you open to the list the Court's going to give you?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I am.

MR. BROWN: And open to look at those, consider them, and follow her instructions?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. I can't go down the list with you right now, but I just want to make sure that, you

know, you're going to be close-minded and say, well, unless it's one of these two things, and these one or two things, that's it, I'm not going to consider any more.

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

The next area that I want to cover, MR. BROWN: and I do this with each person that comes in, so I'm not trying to pick on you or anything, but we ask a lot of our jurors, in any case, much less a case of this magnitude, to not only sit through the whole process, make the decision of guilt or -- whether the person's guilty or not guilty, but then, if you come back with first, come back and make a recommendation of life or the death sentence. So my question to you is, knowing that you only get to that second phase by returning a verdict of first degree murder in the first place, if you come back second degree murder, you don't get to that second phase, you're not going to be put in that situation of having to make that decision, knowing that that's kind of a shortcut, an easy way out, would that affect your deliberation at all?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No. No.

MR. BROWN: Were you going to add something to that?

23 24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

2

MR. BROWN: Okay. You understand the concern that we have, and that's why I bring it up.

4

3

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

5

6

MR. BROWN: Okay. So you would agree that justice would be that you return the verdict that the evidence proves?

7

8

9

JUROR NUMBER 125: That's what I was going to

say, yes.

10

MR. BROWN: So you can assure us that if the State of Florida proves to you first degree murder,

12

11

can you return that verdict?

13

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

14

MR. BROWN: No further questions, Your Honor.

15

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the defense?

16

MR. MOORE: Good afternoon. When you were asked

17

about your position on the death penalty, your

18

response was that you didn't have one, which is not

19

unusual. I take it -- I think you indicated you've

20

never given it any thought outside of hearing people

21

talking about it, but you've never felt that you had

22

to take a position on it before. But, of course, now

23

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yeah.

you do have to take a position on it.

24

25

MR. MOORE: And the position that you had taken,

which is kind of like a spontaneous, on the spot 1 2 3 4 5 6 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 about it. 16 category. 17 18

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

thing, which you're being put upon to state what your position is, and, of course, you're being asked to make a life or death decision. We ask your position for that reason. And, you know, a lot has been thrown at you, but I got a feeling you can handle it; and so if I were to ask you, okay, now that we have established to the best of your ability where you stand with respect to the death penalty, what it sounds to me like is that if there's a "for" column, I'm for it, death penalty arm, I'm against -- we're just talking generally, we're not talking about in this case specifically, but just generally across the board, like you're listening to your friends talk Anyway, so I would put you in the "for" You're not against it, so you'd have to be in the "for" category, with reservations, or qualifications. Would that be accurate?

MR. MOORE: Can you think of reasons -- right on the spot here, and you may not have any, can you think of reasons why you would be in the "for" column? would you be for the death penalty, as opposed to against the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Severe enough cases.

MR. MOORE: Ma'am?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Severe enough cases.

\_

MR. MOORE: Can you think of cases, any that come to mind, where you say, you know, that kind of case -- maybe a specific case you've heard of on the media, television news, ones that are the worst tend to get the highest profile -- where you would say, yeah, I don't know anything about it, but I know what the charge is, and I would say death is appropriate in that case? Have you ever had that reaction to hearing a news report about a murder case?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Watching a movie.

MR. MOORE: A movie, okay.

JUROR NUMBER 125: Extreme circumstances.

MR. MOORE: Okay. But I'm talking about something you might have seen on television or read in the paper, which I know you're working around the clock, so you don't have the luxury of indulging in those media outlets so much; but, I mean, we're bombarded, whether we want to be or not, on the Internet, TV, newspapers, it's out there, it's in your face. And so can you think of cases that you've heard of, maybe the last 10, 15 years, where you say, yeah, death is appropriate in that case? Just because of the nature of the case, what little you know about it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

\_\_\_

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 125: I guess -- I can't think of a situation where I did it, I did have that thought process, in that respect.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Nothing specific. In asking you questions, it's not black or white. You know, it's not like your answer's going to be, to whatever the question is, a yes, or it's going to be a no. Ιt might be, I don't know. Because this is stuff you haven't thought about before, and you have to think about it now. And, especially if you're on the jury, you've got to take a position on some life or death issues. But in this phase, at this stage, we ask you questions, and maybe if you're told, you have to say -- you have to be able to vote for death, you have to be able to vote for life, can you? Some people can say, yes, I can do either one; some people, the best thing to do is say, I don't know. So if that's your answer, then that's what we want to hear. Okay?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Okay.

MR. MOORE: So don't answer based upon what you think we expect or want to hear. Okay?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Okay.

MR. MOORE: Judge Reinman gave a preliminary instruction, you'll get a more thorough instruction later, if you're on the jury; but the preliminary

instruction pointed out that the judge has to give great weight to the jury's recommendation on life without parole or death. How do you take that? I mean, how do you see the role of the jury versus the role of the judge? When you consider that the judge has to give great weight to the jury's recommendation.

JUROR NUMBER 125: How I see it?

MR. MOORE: Yeah. How significant do you think the jury's recommendation is to the judge's sentence?

JUROR NUMBER 125: It's very significant. It's very important.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Some people think, well, I'm not that concerned about it, because the judge will do whatever she's going to do, she'll do whatever she thinks is the right thing, and so our verdict isn't that important. But you seem to realize, which is correct, it's accurate, the significance, the importance, of the jury's recommendation to the judge's sentence, the sentence imposed by the judge. The judge cannot arrive at a sentence without your recommendation. It's impossible. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes. I think it's right.

MR. MOORE: Ma'am?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I think it's right, our system.

MR. MOORE: Okay. This is first exposure to it,

I quess. Is it?

JUROR NUMBER 125: For being in it, yes.

MR. MOORE: Have you ever studied it?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

MR. MOORE: Take a civics course, or anything like that?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I'm not sure. (Unintelligible).

MR. MOORE: Haven't looked at it in depth, like you are right now.

JUROR NUMBER 125: Right. Yes.

MR. MOORE: Let me ask about mitigating -- well, before I get to that, in the deliberation process, we -- as we are now, we're speaking hypothetically about what if we get to this point, what if these circumstances exist, what do you think your responsibility is. It's all hypothetical. We're not saying that we're going to get there, but we are saying, if we do get there, then, hypothetically, what would you do. So we're dealing with things hypothetically, it's kind of confusing, but that's the best we can do. One thing that isn't hypothetical is, if you're on the jury, you could be a part of the process, a very significant part of the process, that

could lead to that human being, that man, Mr. Bradley, being sentenced to death and being executed. So this isn't a hypothetical discussion in that respect, it involves him.

JUROR NUMBER 125: Right.

MR. MOORE: Okay. And so if you are a member of the jury, you get past, let's say, the verdict in what we call the guilt/innocence phase, where, here are the charges, jury, what do you think, guilty or not guilty. And let's say the jury finds for first degree murder, finds guilt of first degree murder, which is necessary to get to the penalty phase. Then, at the penalty phase, hypothetically, the State presents and proves beyond a reasonable doubt several aggravating circumstances. What are they? You don't know what they are, but we're just talking hypothetically here. They are essential for you to consider the death penalty.

Now, at that point, let's say, hypothetically, the State has proven several -- every aggravating circumstance there is, and let's say the defense hasn't proven any mitigating circumstances, based upon what you've heard, what do you understand are your options at that point as a juror? What would be your next steps, or what other steps could you take at that

point? The State has proven multiple aggravating circumstances, and no mitigating circumstances have been proven, and you're sitting in the jury room, you've reached this point, what are your choices at that point? What do you think?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Can you shorten that up just a little? I --

MR. MOORE: I know, it's a lot, it is. Are you feeling, then, under those circumstances, that you have to vote for death?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I feel like I would be asked to consider it.

MR. MOORE: Exactly right. So that's my point.

I just wanted to make sure that you understand that.

JUROR NUMBER 125: That's what I understood, based on --

MR. MOORE: Great. Some people don't. They think if aggravating circumstances are proven, they outweigh the mitigating circumstances, then you have to vote for death. But, you know, you realize, because I think you indicated that, you're never required to vote for death, ever, under any circumstance. They can prove every aggravating circumstance in the world, and there be a complete absence of mitigating circumstances, and you're never

required to vote for death. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes. That's what I

2

understand.

3

4

Ma'am? MR. MOORE:

5

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes, that's what I understand.

6

MR. MOORE: Okay. Life without parole is always on the table, it's always an option, right.

7

JUROR NUMBER 125: Right.

9

10

11

8

MR. MOORE: What is your understanding of what life without parole means? Do you think that, you know, maybe he'll serve a few years, somebody who's sentenced to life without parole, and then he'd get out, or maybe get probation, or some kind of

12 13

(unintelligible). What do you think?

15

14

JUROR NUMBER 125: (Unintelligible) parole. have no idea.

16 17

18

MR. MOORE: That's kind of an unfair question. But let me just tell you this, because this is important, and I want to know if you accept this.

20

19

Life without parole means that a person who's

21

sentenced to life without parole dies in prison.

22

There is no release for that person, except through

23

death. Do you accept that? Yes. That's what it seems to

JUROR NUMBER 125:

24 25

me, I've just heard so many different things, I really

2

wasn't sure.

3

4

6

5

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

There's no question about it, there should not be any question in your mind. Do you accept that without question? JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes. MR. MOORE: Let me ask you about types of

MR. MOORE: I know. Well, that's a for sure

mitigating circumstances that you may hear and to ask if you would be open to considering these potential mitigating circumstances. If you heard through qualified experts that there has been the existence of mental illness on Mr. Bradley's part, would you consider that, potentially, as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I don't know.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Have you known people who had mental health issues?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

MR. MOORE: Ever known anybody who is mentally ill, schizophrenic, had to be Baker Acted, hospitalized for mental illness?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Known anyone personally, no.

MR. MOORE: Known of such people?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I couldn't give you a name,

no.

MR. MOORE: Okay. I'm not asking you -- no, no names. I'm not asking for names. But you indicated one reference was movies, you seen portrayals of mentally ill people. Do you think that mental illness is a human condition, you think it actually exists, or do you think it's something made up?

JUROR NUMBER 125: I think it exists.

MR. MOORE: Do you think it's a choice? Do you think mental health is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

MR. MOORE: Do you accept that some people struggle with mental health issues that they don't choose to have?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Correct. Yes, I believe that.

MR. MOORE: So if you were to hear evidence and testimony from qualified experts that there, in fact, had been mental illness on the part of Mr. Bradley, would you be open to considering that as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. MOORE: If you heard from a qualified expert that Mr. Bradley has shown to have brain injury or brain damage, are those circumstances that you would be open to considering as potentially mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. MOORE: Do you -- have you ever known anybody

who has struggled with drug addiction?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

Do you believe that's a choice? MR. MOORE: addiction versus --

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes and no.

MR. MOORE: Well, let me make a -- let me refine that a little. I'm not talking about just drug use, I'm talking about drug addiction.

JUROR NUMBER 125: The addiction, no, I don't think it's a choice. It's a choice to start, yes; but if you were born into it, no.

MR. MOORE: Or once one takes it and becomes addicted, then, at that point, do you believe at the point that person's addicted, that that's a choice? The addiction part.

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

If you heard evidence of drug abuse MR. MOORE: or drug addiction, would you be open to considering that as potentially mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yeah. I believe so. Being that they don't have a choice in the addiction, just like they don't have a choice in the mental illness.

MR. MOORE: Okay. How about if you heard evidence of abuse or -- emotional or physical abuse as

23

24

25

a child, is that -- are those circumstances you would consider, potentially, as mitigating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Now, you heard this, but, you know, how much registers, who knows, so let me just remind you. Maybe it's up here (indicating). Aggravating circumstances have to beyond a reasonable doubt, the State's got to prove them by this standard, beyond any reasonable doubt. Mitigating circumstances do not have to be proven by us to that high standard, it's to the greater weight of the evidence, or reasonably convinced. It's a much lower standard. Do you accept that, do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Do you understand that the mitigating circumstances don't just come from, potentially, the defendant's background and circumstances of his life, but also circumstances of the case, itself? They could lend themselves to your finding mitigating circumstances. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And you're not limited by any list with -- in contrast, aggravating circumstances, there will be a finite number of those, and you can't consider anything else as aggravating circumstances

other than what's on the list that may be given to you. Mitigating circumstances, wide open, anything related to the defendant, background, circumstances of the case, maybe things that you think of that the lawyers don't think of. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Do you -- well, at the guilt/innocence phase, where you're asked to find -- return a verdict of guilty or not guilty of the underlying criminal charges, the jury must return a verdict which is unanimous; in other words, all must say guilty, or all must say not guilty. But if we get to the penalty phase, which means the jury has found guilt of first degree murder, to get to the penalty phase, the verdict does not have to be unanimous, you can disagree as a jury. You can have 11-1, or 6-6, or 3-9, so there does not have to be unanimity in the penalty phase. Do you understand that?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Now I do.

MR. MOORE: Okay. There's no reason why you should have, because that's the first time I think you've heard of that.

JUROR NUMBER 125: Uh-huh.

MR. MOORE: Okay. But the point I'm making is, you have the right to your individual vote, and you

have no obligation to change your vote to agree with other jurors in the penalty phase. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And so you have the right not to be browbeaten or intimidated by others who think you disagree, that they disagree with you, who think you should agree with them; and you don't have to justify your position, you don't have to explain or justify the position you take. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And the other side of that coin is, you have an obligation to extend that courtesy to the other members of the jury, not try to beat them down because they don't agree with you. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 125: Yes.

MR. MOORE: I believe that's all I have. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 125, you are still being considered as a potential juror in this case. You are being released today, you're not going to have to report back on Monday. But what I'm going to have you do is, go downstairs, talk to the jury clerk, and they're going to give you a phone number.

Call that phone number between 1:00 and 5:00 on Monday, and they'll give you further information.

Most likely, it won't be Tuesday you'll return, but possibly thereafter.

During this break, you must continue to abide by the rules governing your service as a juror. Like I talked about before, don't talk about the case. Don't conduct any independent research regarding this case. Don't read any newspaper articles or look at any television or hear any radio about the case. Any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 125: No.

THE COURT: Okay. You can go downstairs and get that phone number, and they'll send you on your way. Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 125 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, voir dire selection was had which was not requested to be transcribed. Following voir dire, court was in recess for the day, 3/7/14; thereafter, court was reconvened on 3/10/14 and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: We can bring in Number 136.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 136 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

5 6 7

8

9

10 11 12

14

13

15

16

17

19

18

20 21

22

24

23

25

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, Juror Number The first thing I want to do is thank you for being here, thank you for being patient with us with regard to this process. We know it's a long process for you, it's a long process for us. It is a necessary process, so we do appreciate you being patient.

When I talked to you before, I implemented some Those rules became in effect at that time, so rules. I'm going to talk to you about what you know since that time about this case, and then I'm going to talk to you about what you knew prior to that. implemented those rules, have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 136: I have not.

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

JUROR NUMBER 136: Ever? Or since --

THE COURT: Since those rules.

JUROR NUMBER 136: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 136: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 136: No.

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now I'm going to talk about what you knew prior to those rules coming into effect. Do you know anything about this case, either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussion with anyone else, or from the media, including radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or newspaper?

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what information you believe you know, and when you would have heard that.

JUROR NUMBER 136: I remember when it happened, hearing it on the news. I don't necessarily know specifics, but I know that the officer was shot and killed.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 136: Other than that, I don't really know other information.

THE COURT: Okay. And how would you have heard that information?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Just in the news.

THE COURT: Would it be on television, or reading the newspaper, or --

JUROR NUMBER 136: Television.

2

3

THE COURT: I want to tell you that there's no right or wrong answers in here. We just ask you to be as complete, as honest, and as frank as possible.

4 5

JUROR NUMBER 136: Okay.

6

7

THE COURT: So don't be afraid to tell us something if there's something that you think we need to know.

8

9

JUROR NUMBER 136: Okay.

10

11

THE COURT: What's your news habits? How do -do you watch news regularly, or what do you do with
regard to watching the television, when it comes to

13

14

15

12

JUROR NUMBER 136: I usually catch the 11:00 news at night before I go to bed, and then that's it. I

16

have an iPad, I have a computer, but I normally don't check out anything, unless something is happening and

18

17

it makes the news.

news?

19

20

sit there -- like me, I turn on the 11:00 news, but by

THE COURT: Okay. So at night -- I mean, do you

JUROR NUMBER 136: I'm probably not really into

21

about 11:07, I'm done. I mean, do you watch the whole

22

thing, do you -- how does that work for you?

23

it. It's probably more like background music, or

24

25

background noise. I could be doing something like

paying bills or cleaning up in the kitchen or something like that.

THE COURT: Okay. So you don't sit down and actually listen to it from -- some people just sit there from --

JUROR NUMBER 136: No. I'm not glued to it.

THE COURT: Okay. Even at 11:00, you're still

doing other things.

JUROR NUMBER 136: I'm still doing other things, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask to do in this case, and you have to tell us whether you can do this, 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? Can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes, I can.

THE COURT: Okay. What if you're going to deliberations, and deliberations happen at the end, and you have heard the evidence in the case, and you think to yourself, you know, I remember hearing something on the news, I never heard that in this courtroom, no one ever testified to that, and that never came before me as evidence, can you set that

2 3

4

5 6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19 20

2.1

22 23

2.4

25

aside and not consider that in your deliberation? JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Because that's a process we have to ask you to go through. Can you do that? JUROR NUMBER 136: I think so, yes.

THE COURT: Now I'm going to change subjects on you, and I ask this in a general way, but what are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 136: That's pretty broad. My views just, like, for or against, or --

THE COURT: I want you to answer it anyway you feel like you need to answer it.

JUROR NUMBER 136: I think it would be very difficult for me to decide if someone should get the death penalty. I'm a Christian, and I sort of believe that God is the only one with that power.

THE COURT: Okay. You think there's any circumstances you can think of that the death penalty might be appropriate? And we realize that people probably haven't thought about this prior to coming in here, it's not a daily dinner conversation, we understand that, but we do need you to think about it, think how you feel about it for today.

JUROR NUMBER 136: If there were any circumstances, I would think that it would have to be

2.

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

-- a death would be involved, they committed a murder.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me tell you -- I'm going to give you, kind of, a general overview about the process. We have the first part of the trial, which we call the guilt phase. In the guilt phase, if the jury returns a verdict of guilty on count one, and it only pertains to count one, count one first degree murder, then we move into a second phase, called the penalty phase.

In the penalty phase, you would be asked, as a jury member, to make a recommendation to the Court of either death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. And we give you -- I give you instructions on how to weigh that and consider that. But, to be a juror, you have to be -- you have to consider both penalties. There would be -- in order to get to that stage, there would have to be a guilty verdict on the first degree murder charge. So would you be able to consider both possible penalties as I would instruct you to do so?

JUROR NUMBER 136: I would be able to consider it, yes.

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

2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 136: I am that opposed, no.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm going to allow questions by the State.

Thank you, Your Honor. Juror Number MR. BROWN: 136, good morning.

JUROR NUMBER 136: Good morning.

MR. BROWN: Let me ask you, and I know your questions, you kind of -- your answers were going to both sides of the death penalty, so to speak. probably not something you've given much thought before coming in here.

JUROR NUMBER 136: That's correct.

MR. BROWN: So I'm going to ask you this general question, and then I'm going to go through the steps and the process were you would get to that point. But my first general question is, if you feel that it's appropriate, can you vote for a penalty of death?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

The process of how you get MR. BROWN: Okay. there, as the Court talked about when you all were here back last Thursday, I'm going to try to go through some of that with you some more, because I know she did throw an awful lot at you in a compressed period of time. The first step is, the jury has to come back with what their verdict is in the guilt

phase, whether or not the defendant's guilty of first degree murder, guilty of a lesser charge, or not guilty. The death penalty only applies if the jury comes back with a verdict of guilty of murder in the first degree. If you come back with something lesser, such as second degree murder, then the death penalty's off the table, the sentencing is entirely with her.

Now, as far as first degree murder, the State can prove it one of two ways, by either premeditated murder, or what's called felony murder. And either one will get the jury to first degree murder, and then to the next step of considering the death penalty.

And in either case, it doesn't matter which theory, the death penalty is not automatic, there's no, if you convict him of this, it's an automatic death penalty.

There isn't any of that.

If the jury comes back with a verdict of first degree murder, we would proceed to the second phase of the trial, which is, we would reconvene, you would hear additional evidence, the Court would give you her final set of instructions, you would go back to deliberate. In the final set of instructions, the first thing the Court's going to tell you to look at is what's called aggravating circumstances. And she would give you a list, could be as few as one, in this

case I suspect it to be several, could be four, five, or so on, and it's to those aggravating circumstances that you look to, to determine whether or not the death penalty is justified.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And as she mentioned last Thursday, that list of aggravating circumstances, it's a statutory list, and it's circumstances which tend to, or may, increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim. you look at those aggravating circumstances, and the first question will be, has the State proven any of If you find the State has not proven any of them, then your verdict has to be a life recommendation, because you would find there's no aggravation in this case. If you feel, and if you find, that the State's proven at least one, you may find we've proven more than one, you may find that we've proven all that are listed, you look at those and you say, do these justify the death penalty? your answer is no, then you would make the recommendation of life. If your answer is yes, you move to the second step of the process, and that's where you would look at what is called mitigating circumstances, or the mitigation.

And, as the Court told you, that's evidence that basically stems from the defendant, his life, his

background, character, things of that nature. And it's proposed to mitigate, or to suggest, the penalty of life, as opposed to the death penalty. Now, the aggravating circumstances, I may have already covered this, have to be proven to you beyond and to the exclusion of any reasonable doubt. Same burden as in the guilt phase. The mitigation circumstances have a burden as well, it's a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. So either the aggravation and mitigation, if something's not proven, you disregard it. What the Court's going to tell you is, you find the aggravation that has been proven, you find the mitigation that's been proven, and you go through a weighing process.

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

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Most people have. When you've made those decision, did you try to look at all the factors involved, and consider everything that was involved?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And some of those factors you looked at and considered, you found to be pretty darn

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

important in your decision, and you gave those factors
great weight, right?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Uh-huh.

MR. BROWN: Other factors you looked at, you considered them, but you looked at them and said, you know, this isn't that important to this decision, and you gave those factors very little weight. Right?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Uh-huh.

MR. BROWN: The Court's going to tell you, you go through that same type of process here. You take those aggravators that have been proven, and you take the mitigation that's been proven, and you go through a weighing process. And you determine how much weight to give each aggravator, and to each mitigator. The Court's not only you can determine that weight. going to tell you, aggravator one gets "X" amount of weight, mitigator one gets "Y" amount of weight. No one can tell you. We may suggest in our arguments how much weight, but you determine how much weight to give everything. The only thing that the Court's going to require of you is that you go through that weighing process. Now, we can't ask you at this point how much weight you're going to give to this type of aggravator, or this type of mitigator, because you don't know. You haven't heard the evidence, you

haven't heard them, and how do you decide how much weight if you don't know much about anything. But the key is that you will consider what's been proven.

You may, in your mind, say, well, that type of factor, I may not give a lot of weight to, but as long as you're going to consider it, you determine the weight. And a juror right next to you may have a different opinion on how much weight. But it's a personal decision you make. You may give great weight to the first, little weight to the second, the person right next to you, may do the exact opposite. But it's a decision you have to make on how much weight.

So you go through that weighing process, consider everything, you determine the weight, and the Court -the next step is, the Court's going to tell you, if
the mitigation outweighs the aggravation, then your
recommendation has to be for life. If you find that
the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation, then
you're in a position where you legally are justified
to recommend to the Court the recommendation of death.
Now, the Court's not going to tell you, if the State
proves A, B, C, and D, that you must return a
recommendation of death. In fact, what she's going to
tell you is that you are never obligated or required
to return that recommendation. What you must do is go

through that weighing process. If you find we've proven aggravators, then you must go through that weighing process. So you must go through that weighing process. So you would weigh that. If the mitigation evidence outweighs, it's a recommendation of life. If the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation, then you look at it and say, is the death penalty still justified? And if you feel that it is, that's when you recommend a sentence of death. Do you understand the process?

JUROR NUMBER 136: I do.

MR. BROWN: Any questions about that?

JUROR NUMBER 136: No.

MR. BROWN: Do you feel confident that you can go through that process?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Now, is there anything that -- I know you talked about your religious beliefs earlier, is there anything about that that would prohibit or keep you in any manner from going through this process, and if you find that it was justified, making a recommendation for the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 136: No, I don't think there is anything.

MR. BROWN: The next topic that I want to cover

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-- and I ask this of each person, so it's not that I think that you may do this, but I bring it up to make certain each person is aware, either for themselves, or if they see it happening if they're selected. we talked about, if the jury comes back with a lesser charge, something other than first degree murder, then the death penalty's off the table, you don't come back that second time and hear the additional evidence. the concern is that in some way you'd be sitting back there and think, you know, I really don't want to be in the position to have to make that recommendation, so if I come back with second degree murder, I avoid that whole process. Seeing that process and what the State's concern is, do you think in any way that would affect -- that line of thinking would affect your deliberation at all?

JUROR NUMBER 136: No.

MR. BROWN: Would you agree that justice in this case, or in any case, would be to return the verdict that the evidence proves?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And if it's proven to you first degree murder, can you return that verdict?

JUROR NUMBER 136: I can.

MR. BROWN: Okay. And if we establish the

aggravation to you, you feel that it's not outweighed by the mitigation, and the death penalty is justified, can you return a recommendation of death?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. BROWN: No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the defense?

MR. MOORE: Good morning. When you're asked to state your position, it may seem to you like you have to fit into a yes or no category, either, yes, I can, or, no, I can't.

JUROR NUMBER 136: Right.

MR. MOORE: But that is not accurate. Because there may be a third category, which is, I don't know. You know, if you're asked, can you do this, can you vote for life without parole, for example, can you set aside what you see in the media. Some people feel like, well, they expect me to say I can, I better say I can. I'm not implying that you would, but what I'm saying is, as adults, we don't like to seem unsure. We like to be able to think that we can take a position and not be fuzzy about it. Follow me?

JUROR NUMBER 136: I do.

MR. MOORE: So if you're, in your heart of hearts, you think your answer is, I can't say I can, I can't say I can't, I just don't know, I have doubts,

then that's an appropriate answer if that's the answer for you. But it doesn't reflect on your intelligence or anything else, it may be you would be a great juror in a different case, but in this case, maybe it would be best if you not be on this case. And so when you're asked, for example, can you vote for death, what is being asked there is, can you also vote for life without parole? It's not -- the State Attorney's not saying, will you do that? Nobody's asking you to commit you can, you don't know enough at this point, you don't know enough of the law, you don't know any of our facts, other than just what you see in the media, which doesn't mean that they're facts in this So you're not being asked to commit to what you will do, but just your ability to go that direction, or that direction. Do you see what I'm saying? Uh-huh. JUROR NUMBER 136:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOORE: So when you're asked, can you vote for death if you think it's appropriate, how about the other side, can you vote for life without parole if you think it's appropriate?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: All right. And as far as the media is concerned, do you have an opinion at this point as to the guilt of Brandon Bradley based upon what you've

seen and heard in the media?

2

3

information. Honestly, I don't.

4

MR. MOORE: Did you -- have you seen a picture of

5

Mr. Bradley on TV or in the newspaper?

6

JUROR NUMBER 136:

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

church.

JUROR NUMBER 136: I don't know.

JUROR NUMBER 136:

the death penalty?

So let me ask now about your involvement in the

MR. MOORE: Does your church have a position on

I presume you do belong to a church?

T do.

MR. MOORE: And just to kind of bring the focus on this case a little bit, we're not -- we talk about these things hypothetically because we're trying to find out, you know, how fair you think you could be, how impartial you think you could be; but one thing that is not hypothetical is that if you're on this jury, you will be a part of a process which could result in Mr. Brandon Bradley being sentenced to death and being put to death. So just to keep the focus on that, we're not talking about some abstract out there, are you for the death penalty or against it, we're talking about this case, that human being right over there.

JUROR NUMBER 136: No. I don't know enough

MR. MOORE: Well, before you stepped into this courtroom and started being bombarded with these questions, can you say whether or not you ever thought about the death penalty to the extent where you had a position, or knew you didn't have one?

JUROR NUMBER 136: I would say that I didn't have a position one way or the other. But I heard about it on the news when it applied to something else, or someone else, and it didn't phase me, I didn't think about it. I just -- it was just something that (unintelligible).

MR. MOORE: All right. Well, if I were to arbitrarily put you in -- I would say there are two categories we could put you in, one is, you're against -- some people say, I'm against it; some people say, I'm actually for it; some people say, well, I think in certain circumstances, it's appropriate. Those people -- and I think you're one of those that would be in the "for" category. Do you accept that? Is that accurate? You may not be a 10 on the scale from 1 to 10, but you're not against it, is what you're saying. We're not talking about this case now, we're talking about in general.

JUROR NUMBER 136: Understood. I'm probably not a 10, but I'm not against it. So --

MR. MOORE: Well, let's -- let me ask, if we put a scale down in front of you with 0 being you're against it, or you have no position on it, and 10 being you're strongly in favor of it, where would you put yourself on it?

JUROR NUMBER 136: I'd probably be a 5. Just a little wishy-washy on it.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Can you think of types of homicides, first degree murder -- all murders involve a death, but not all first degree murders are punishable by death, that's what this whole process is about. Can you think of types of first degree murders where you would say, you know, that's a death penalty case? You know, it might involve a child, might involve serial murderers, you could probably come up with a short list. So what kind of a list would you come up with if you were --

JUROR NUMBER 136: Probably one that involves a child.

MR. MOORE: How about one involving a police officer?

JUROR NUMBER 136: I guess, yes.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Would you think --

JUROR NUMBER 136: A child would be a definite for me, as a mother.

MR. MOORE: So let's just talk about that hypothetical. That's not this case of course. In that situation, would it be difficult, if not impossible, for you to vote for life without parole?

JUROR NUMBER 136: In a case like that?

MR. MOORE: Yes, ma'am.

JUROR NUMBER 136: I would find it hard, yes.

MR. MOORE: Okay. And how about in a case involving a police officer, would you find it difficult, if not impossible, to vote for life without parole?

JUROR NUMBER 136: It's still wrong, but it would not have the same impact on me as a child.

MR. MOORE: What if, and you will, if you're a member of this jury, you see photographs of Deputy Pill after her death, and you see a videotape of her being shot, which led to her death, do you think -- it's horrible to think about, but that's what the jury will see, if you're a member of the jury, you'll see that, do think that you could then go on, assuming, hypothetically, that the jury finds Mr. Bradley guilty of first degree murder of Deputy Pill, would you then be able to engage in the weighing process, do you think? Or do you think that it would just be so horrific to see those things that it's all over at

that point for you?

JUROR NUMBER 136: I think that I could weigh the process. Listen to the facts and weigh everything out.

MR. MOORE: Do you understand that at no point are you required to vote for death?

JUROR NUMBER 136: I understand that, yes.

MR. MOORE: In fact, the only mandatories in the penalty phase are that you shall seek to find if the State has established at least one aggravating circumstance beyond a reasonable doubt. That's the level of proof that the State has to prove aggravating circumstances. That's a mandatory. And then, if you find that the mitigating circumstances outweigh the aggravating circumstances, you shall vote for life without parole. Those are the only "shalls" in this whole process. But at no point is a death recommendation mandatory or required, and at no point is life without parole off the table. It's always there, if that is your choice. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: What do you think life without parole means? What do you think the reality of life without parole is, in terms of the time the person serves for a life without parole sentence?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Until death in prison.

7

6

8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOORE: Yes, ma'am, it is. Do you accept that -- and when I tell you, because it's the law, that if a person is sentenced to life without parole, that person will die in prison, there is no possibility of getting out of prison, do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Let me ask about potential mitigating circumstances. Now, let me reiterate, because you can't hear this too many times, I don't think, because this is all new to you, but the burden of proving -the level of proof the State has to put forth to establish an aggravating circumstance is beyond a reasonable doubt; but for mitigating circumstances it's reasonably convinced, or a greater weight of the evidence, slightly more than 50 percent. But it's a different burden, and the State has a greater burden, much greater burden. And the list of aggravating circumstances are the only ones you can consider as aggravating circumstances. On the other hand, mitigating circumstances can come -- there's no limit to them. Anything related to the defendant's background, circumstances of the case, things of that It could be something that the lawyers don't nature.

even bring up, whatever you consider mitigating, the mitigating circumstances, to the greater weight of the evidence, which is that burden we have to establish. But it can come from any source, you're not limited by a list. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: If you were presented with evidence from qualified mental health experts, psychologists, psychiatrists, that sort of expert, that Mr. Bradley suffered from mental illness, would be open to considering that, potentially, as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Do you believe -- on the issue drug abuse and drug addiction, do you believe that drug addiction is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 136: A choice -- the addiction?

MR. MOORE: Yes, ma'am.

JUROR NUMBER 136: No.

MR. MOORE: If you were presented with evidence of drug abuse or drug addiction, would you be open to considering that, potentially, as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: If you were presented with evidence

from qualified experts that Mr. Bradley suffered from brain injury or brain damage, is that something that you, potentially, could consider as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And if you were presented with evidence of childhood abuse, physical and emotional, is that something you'd be open to considering as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: In the first part of the trial, the guilt/innocence part, where you're asked to -- you're presented with the charges, criminal charges, and you're asked as a jury to return a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the verdict has to be unanimous; that is, everybody on the jury has to agree, either guilty, or not guilty. And then if the jury returns a verdict of guilty of first degree murder, you go on to the second phase, the second part of the trial, the sentencing part, and, at that part, your verdict does not have to be unanimous. It could be 12-0, it could be 6-6, it could be 3-9; but there's no requirement of unanimity at the sentencing part of the trial. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And the point is, you have the right to your own individual vote, however you arrive at it. Meaning, this whole weighing process, that's a guideline, okay, that's to help guide you, to get you there, to reach your vote, whatever it is. But you do not have to agree with other jurors.

You don't have to justify your position to other jurors. You have the right not to be intimidated or browbeaten because you don't agree with other jurors. Do you accept that? That's your right.

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And you have to extend that courtesy to the other members of the jury, where if they don't agree with you, that's their vote, that's their right, they have the right to vote the way they want. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 136: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Can I have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. MOORE: I believe that's all I have. Thank you, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 136, thank you again for being patient with us for this process. You are still being considered as a possible juror in this case; however, I am going to release you for today.

What I'm going to have you do is, report downstairs to the jury assembly room, they're going to give you a phone number to call, we're going to ask you to call that number this afternoon between 1:00 and 5:00, and they're going to give you further instructions about when to report. It won't be today. It possibly won't be tomorrow.

During this recess, you must continue to abide by your rules governing your service as a juror. Do not discuss this case with anyone. Do not -- avoid reading newspaper -- anything about the case. Avoid seeing television, radio, or Internet comments about the trial. Don't conduct any research. Now, you can tell people that you're here, that you're here for jury duty, what time, you just can't talk about why you're here, what case, what the charges are, what happens in the courtroom, things of that nature. When you get released as a juror, you're free to talk about whatever you wish. These rules continue to remain in effect while you're being considered as a possible juror and if you become a juror.

Any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 136: No.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. We'll have you go downstairs, get that phone number, and call this

afternoon. Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 136 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, voir dire selection was had which was not requested to be transcribed.)

THE COURT: Okay. We'll go ahead and bring in Number 147.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 147 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 147, good
afternoon. First of all, I want to thank you for
being here, thank you for being patient with us with
regard to the process. It is taking a long time.
It's a long time for you all, it's a long time for us,
but we're doing the best that we can to get through it
as quickly as possible.

When you were here, I believe it was last
Thursday, I talked about some rules that came into
effect. Those rules started as of that time, so I'm
going to ask you as of that date. Have you read or
been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or
articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

THE COURT: Have you seen or heard television,

radio, or Internet comments about this trial?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Now I'm going to talk to you about what you may have known about this case prior to that date. Do you know anything about this case, either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussion with anyone else, or from the media, including radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 147: A little bit, yes.

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

JUROR NUMBER 147: All I know is, I believe it happened in Melbourne, I believe a police officer was the victim. I don't really know much about it.

THE COURT: Okay. How would you have gained that information?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Hearing it on television.

2

THE COURT: Okay. Would that have been at the

3

time that the event occurred?

4

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

5

THE COURT: I just want you to know, in here

6

there's no right or wrong answers. You can say

7

whatever you feel is appropriate to the answer.

8

can say anything that you feel is inappropriate, just

9

as long as you're frank, honest, and complete.

10

JUROR NUMBER 147: Okay.

11

THE COURT: Okay. No one's trying to trick you,

12

no one's trying to make you say one thing over

13

another, what we're trying to do is just get the

14

information that you have; and sometimes, to be quite

15

honest, we have to pry it out of you a little bit.

16

just to say -- but just tell us what you think we need

17

to know, and then if we don't think it's enough, we're

18

going to ask you more questions. JUROR NUMBER 147: Okay.

20

19

THE COURT: So if you could be as specific as

21

possible about what information you learned.

22

JUROR NUMBER 147: A shooting. A young man was,

23

I guess, was a suspect, or -- I'm not sure if there

24

was more than one. It was in Melbourne. A police

25

officer was killed. I don't know -- I think -- I

believe she was shot.

THE COURT: Okay. And you say -- did you hear anything about this case being set for trial, that we were picking jurors, or anything like that?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

THE COURT: Did you ever see a picture of Mr. Bradley, did you ever see him on the news?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No, I didn't.

THE COURT: Did you read any newspaper articles about the case?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Were you, in your mind to kind of fix any type of an opinion as to the guilt or the innocence of the defendant?

JUROR NUMBER 147: I don't really think I thought that much of it that I would assume someone was either guilty or innocent.

THE COURT: Okay. So it wasn't something that you were discussing with other people, or they were discussing with you?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

THE COURT: What we ask you to do, if you can serve and be a juror in this case, if you could set aside anything that you may have learned about the case, serve with an open mind, and reach a verdict

based only on the law and the evidence presented in this trial, in this courtroom. Do you think you could do that?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What if, at some point in the trial, you go to deliberate, and you're thinking to yourself, you know, I never heard this -- I heard this information on the news, but I never heard this come into evidence in the courtroom, nobody ever mentioned that, that was -- I never heard that. Are you going to be able to set aside that information that you learned somewhere else and not consider it in your deliberations?

JUROR NUMBER 147: I believe that I would, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to switch gears on you, what -- and I ask this very generally, what are your views with regard to the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 147: I don't really have any strong feelings for or against. I believe it's there for a purpose, you know, it's -- like, I don't really -- I don't really have any feelings for or against. I couldn't say I'm all for it, or all against it, or --

THE COURT: Okay. Is it something that -- and we know that many times we're asking you questions about things that maybe you've never even thought about

before. Is it something that you've thought about before, is it something you've discussed before?

JUROR NUMBER 147: I probably have discussed it in general.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 147: But that's -- that's my feelings, I don't really -- I believe there's probably certain reasons why it is enforced, you know, it is used; but I also believe there's probably good reasons why it's not. You know, in certain cases maybe, it's the right thing to do; and, in certain cases, maybe it's not.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to tell you a little bit about the process, and then the attorneys will be more detailed about the process. The first part of the trial is what we call the guilt phase. In the guilt phase, you heard the charges the other day, count one is first degree murder, if the jury returns a verdict of guilty to count one, first degree murder, then, and only then, because it's not applicable to the other three counts, we move onto what we call the penalty phase. In the penalty phase, you, as a juror, will be instructed to hear evidence of aggravating circumstances and mitigating circumstances, and you'll be asked to make a recommendation to the Court, to me,

of a possible penalty of death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. Now, you've already heard that the charge is first degree murder, so it's presumed if we move into the penalty phase that there is a guilty verdict on count one, first degree murder, because that's the only way we get to the second phase.

In that second phase, are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for first degree murder?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

THE COURT: So you would -- if I instructed you that you had to consider life in prison without the possibility of parole as a possible penalty as well, would you be able to consider that?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Just so you know, no one in here is going to ask you to say what you would do. You haven't heard any of the evidence, so no one can do that. But when we talk, the attorneys and myself are going to say, can you consider this, can you at least be open-minded enough to hear everything and then make your decision. So let's say the State returns a verdict -- I mean, let's say the jury returns a verdict of guilty to count one, premeditated

murder in the first degree, are you of the opinion that death is the only appropriate penalty for premeditated murder in the first degree?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you -- I know the State will go more in detail about how you go through the process of getting to -- to help you in making your decision, but do you have any questions or concerns about your ability to do that?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

THE COURT: I note that you were sick and so you wanted to be called out of order; are you not feeling well? They said that you weren't feeling well and that you wanted to be called out of order.

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

THE COURT: No?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No. Not that I know of. I didn't say that.

THE COURT: It says, "she hasn't been feeling well since Friday."

JUROR NUMBER 147: That -- can I explain

something?

2

3

5

4

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24 25 THE COURT: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 147: When I came in, a woman and I had different numbers, our numbers were switched, it may have been a mistake in that. We switched our numbers back, it's the right name with the right number now. But she may have been the one that said she wasn't feeling well.

MR. MOORE: Could we approach, make sure we're dealing with the person we think we're dealing with?

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

They switched their numbers back? MR. MOORE: but I don't want to mean, this should be ask her name in open court.

MR. BROWN:

that's what I have. MR. PIROLO:

MR. BROWN: that's who it's supposed to be.

See if she remembers who she MR. LANNING: switched with.

MR. PIROLO: I think we first --

THE COURT: Well, I can't put them on the record, that's the problem.

MR. LANNING: The number, see if she remembers 1 2 the other person's number. THE COURT: All right. You know what, I'm going 3 to ask --4 MR. BROWN: Her to step forward? 5 (Thereupon, the benchside conference was briefly 6 concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:) 7 THE COURT: We don't want this to be on the 8 record, so I'm going to ask you to step up to the 9 bench. You get to pretend you're an attorney. 10 (Thereupon, a benchside conference was had before 11 12 the Court, with Juror Number 147 present, out of the hearing of any other parties present in the courtroom 13 as follows:) 14 THE COURT: Okay. Can you tell us your name? 15 JUROR NUMBER 147: 16 THE COURT: And your number's 147. 17 JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes. When I came in this 18 morning, it was 148. 19 THE COURT: So you switched with 20 JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes. 21 THE COURT: So if you have any prior information 22 -- I don't know if you do, I didn't -- it would be 23 different. Okay. So maybe it's 148 that's not 24

feeling well.

JUROR NUMBER 147: I would say so, yes. Because it wasn't me.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to have you be seated. Thank you.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 147 was seated, and the benchside conference proceeded as follows:)

MR. MOORE: Judge, while we're up here, I'm just -- when the Court asks about whether they could vote for life or death on first degree murder, and then asks whether they could vote for life or death on premeditated murder, like it's -- you know, I know they can go two ways with this, but that's what he's charged with, so I'd ask the Court to just limit the question to, could you vote life or death on first degree murder, not distinguish the two.

THE COURT: Before I was doing premeditated and you all objected, so I just changed it to first degree murder; but then, later on, they were -- the jurors were kind of saying, well, if it's premeditated, it would be different. So I was just going that extra step. I'll be happy not to do that, and let you all do it. But, I mean, I did find that that was happening, and so that's why I went the extra step.

MR. BROWN: We're good. Yeah.

THE COURT: I mean, I'll be happy not to do it.

1 MR. MOORE: Okay. THE COURT: If you want me not to do that, I'll 2 just say first degree murder. I don't do it in every 3 case, I only do it if I think they might have an issue 4 with it. I was just trying to get more information 5 out there for you all. 6 7 MR. MOORE: Nevermind then. THE COURT: I'm happy not to do it though. 8 do -- I'm happy to let you guys do it. MR. MOORE: Happy, really? 10 THE COURT: Yeah, happy's not probably the 11 12 correct word. MR. MOORE: I understand. 13 THE COURT: I'm willing. I'm willing. 14 MR. MOORE: Okay. That's all right. 15 MR. LANNING: You're doing fine. 16 THE COURT: Okay. That's great. That's 17 wonderful. We're happy. 18 (Thereupon, the benchside conference was 19 concluded and the proceedings were had as follows:) 20 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Questions by the 21 22 State?

23

24

25

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Juror Number 147, good afternoon. Let me go over -- first, I'm going to go over the process that you have to go through if

you're selected to get to the position where you can make your recommendation, and I'm going to ask you some questions concerning that.

As the Court told you between last Thursday and the conversation she's had with you today, the first step is that the jury would have to return, in the guilt phase, a verdict; and in order to proceed to the second portion of the trial, the verdict would have to be guilty of first degree murder. If it's anything lesser, such as second degree murder, then sentencing is entirely to the Court; and, obviously, if it's not guilty, then there is no sentencing to be done, period.

So to get to the point where the jury returns a verdict of first degree murder, a guilty verdict of that, there are two ways the State can prove that, one is premeditated murder, the other is what's called felony murder. Those terms will be explained to you, and you'll have all the instructions. But if the State can prove first degree murder under either theory, we may actually end up proving both things, but if the jury returns that verdict of first degree murder, then we would reconvene, you hear additional evidence, Her Honor would give you additional jury instructions, and then you would go back and

deliberate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first issue with her instructions, she's going to tell you to look at what are called aggravating circumstances, and as she told you last Thursday, it's a statutory list, and it's circumstances which may increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim. You'll have a list, I expect it to be more than one, three, four, five, six, but you'll have a list, and it's to that list, and only that list, that you can look to to justify and to support the death penalty. And she's going to -- the first question from her will be, in the instructions, has the State proven at least one, or more than one, of those aggravating circumstances beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. So the same burden that you'll get for the guilt phase applies, carries over, to the aggravating circumstances.

If you find that the State has not proven any, then, obviously, your recommendation has to be life, because you will have found no aggravation in this case. If you find the State's proven at least one, and you may find, like I said, that we've proven more than one, you look at those aggravating circumstances that we've proven, and ask yourself, do these justify

the death penalty? If your answer is no, then your recommendation is life. If your answer is yes, these aggravating circumstances justify the death penalty, you move on to the next step of the process, which is to look at mitigating circumstances.

I don't know if you recall when the Court spoke about that, but those are things concerning the defendant, his life, background, character, things of that nature. That would be presented to you as evidence. Now, there's a burden of proof for those, but it's a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence, but still a burden of proof. So you would take aggravating circumstances that have been proven, mitigating circumstances that have been proven, and the Court's going to tell you to go through a weighing process.

Now, have you ever had to make any key, critical, important decisions in your life?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

THE COURT: When you've made those decisions, do you try to look at and consider all the factors that are involved?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And you look at those factors, some of them are pretty darn important, you give them great

weight in making your decision, right?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Other factors, you look at, you consider, but you determine that they don't have much importance, and you give them very little weight,

right?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

MR. BROWN: But you kind of go through and you weigh what's important, what isn't, and come to your conclusion. That's how most of us make decisions. She's going to tell you it's the same process here. You go through, if it's been proven, you have to consider it, but you determine how much weight to give, how much weight to give to an aggravator, how much weight to give to a mitigator. The judge isn't going to tell you, aggravator one carries "X" amount of weight, mitigator one carries "Y" amount of weight. You're not going to get that. Now, the attorneys, we may suggest to you in arguments how much weight, but, ultimately, it's your decision, and you make it personally as a juror.

The juror sitting right next to you may have a different opinion. You may give something great weight, that one may give it little, and vice versa. But it's a personal decision that you make, and you

determine how much weight to give to each aggravator and to each mitigator. So you weigh the aggravation versus the mitigation, and if you find that the mitigation outweighs the aggravation, then your recommendation has to be life. However, if you find that the mitigators do not outweigh the aggravators, then you're in a position where you're legally justified in recommending to the Court a sentence of death.

The Court's not going to tell you, if the State proves A, B, C, and D, that you must return a death recommendation. She's not going to tell you that. In fact, what she's going to tell you is that you're never legally required or obligated to return that death recommendation. There's no mandate that you have to do that. She is going to require that you go through the weighing process, that you consider it, and that you weigh it. And after you weigh it, if you find the aggravators justify the death penalty, you weigh it against the mitigation, if the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravating factors, and after that weighing process, you still feel the death penalty is justified, that's when you can make that recommendation.

Any questions about that process?

2.1

JUROR NUMBER 147: Not so far.

Okay.

2

MR. BROWN: Kind of have a handle on the whole aggravators, mitigators, and weighing it?

4

3

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

MR. BROWN:

5

the State of Florida has proven certain aggravators,

With that, if you find that

6 7

at least one, if not more than one, aggravator, and

8

you feel after you've weighed them against the

9

mitigators, that the aggravators justify the death

10

penalty, can you -- I'm not asking -- at this point,

11

you don't know what you will do, you don't know what's

12

involved, but if you find the aggravators justify the

13

death penalty, can you return a recommendation of

14

death?

15

16

believe that that was the right way to go, I would say

JUROR NUMBER 147: If I heard and saw enough to

MR. BROWN: Now, do you come in with any notion

17

yes.

18

of, or idea, that, well, maybe in this circumstance, 19

20

or these couple of circumstances, I could return a

21

death penalty -- people will come with, you know, a

22

mass murderer, serial killer, but if it's not one of

23

these circumstances, then, in your mind, death would

24

not be appropriate.

JUROR NUMBER 147: I don't think I really have an

--

idea of, you know, what would make me say yes over what would make me say no.

MR. BROWN: Okay. So you'd be open -- as I indicated, the Court's going to give you the list of the statutory aggravators that may justify and can be used -- the only thing that can be used to justify the death penalty, are you open to that list she's going to give you?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Okay. And one of the reasons why I ask that is, some people come in and their theory is, well, if it's one of these two things, I don't care what other aggravators there may be, if it's not A or B, then that's it, I wouldn't do it.

JUROR NUMBER 147: Right.

MR. BROWN: Obviously, the law is that you have to consider all the aggravators that are proven.

Now, is there anything in your background, religious beliefs, moral beliefs, philosophical beliefs, family history, whatever it may be, that causes you any unnecessary anxiety, troubles, concern over having to be put in that situation, and, ultimately, making a life or death recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

MR. BROWN: Able to do it?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 147: Like I said, if I found that was the right way to go, yes.

MR. BROWN: Now, the last topic I want to cover, and I ask this of every person, but as I talked about a few minutes ago, if the jury returns a verdict of a lesser-included, such as second degree murder, then you bypass -- you wouldn't come back for that second process, you wouldn't have to make a life or death recommendation, because the death penalty's off the table and it's entirely up to the Court. The question I put forward, and, basically, it's more expressing concern, is that in some way, knowing that you can shortchange your obligation, or bypass that second stage by saying, well, the State of Florida has proven first degree, but I really don't want to be faced with that decision, so I'm simply going to return a verdict for second. Would you let that in any way influence your verdict?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No. Absolutely not.

MR. BROWN: Do you understand -- would you agree that justice is to return the verdict that the evidence proves?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes. Absolutely.

MR. BROWN: And if the evidence proved to you first degree murder, can you return first degree

murder?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

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

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the defense?

MR. LANNING: Good afternoon. Juror 147, if
there were a scale, a score for the death penalty, in
general, with 0 being no support for the death
penalty, if this were my country, there would be no
death penalty, and 10 being very strong support for
the death penalty, it should be given more frequently,
is there somewhere within that scale that you would
place yourself?

JUROR NUMBER 147: I think I'm right in the middle of that. I don't -- I would say 5, right in the middle of the scale.

MR. LANNING: You indicated that there are probably good reasons for and good reasons against, can you think of some good reasons for it?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Well, what I meant was, like, I'm sure there's good reasons that we use that as a punishment, I guess.

MR. LANNING: I'm sorry?

JUROR NUMBER 147: There's good reasons why it's there for punishment purposes. And, you know, good

reasons why it's not used in certain circumstances. I
wouldn't really know -- I couldn't really say, myself,
what would be something to give, you know, the death
penalty.

MR. LANNING: Would -- for first degree murder, would life in prison without parole also be an appropriate sentence?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

MR. LANNING: In your mind, do you have any doubt that life in prison without parole actually means that?

JUROR NUMBER 147: What do you mean?

MR. LANNING: In years past, we had a life with parole, that ended years ago; and life without parole actually means life without parole, they die in prison. There are people who still believe, this guy's going to get out some day, and I just want to make sure --

JUROR NUMBER 147: Okay. So what you're saying is, when you say life without parole, you mean there's no chance -- there's no chance --

MR. LANNING: No.

JUROR NUMBER 147: Okay. Now I'm clear on that, yes.

MR. LANNING: All right. Now, you heard the

instructions about this weighing process. And you heard Mr. Brown paraphrase that, explain to you the various steps that you go through. Now, as you sit here at this point, what's your understanding -- this is a test, but it's not a pass or fail -- what's your understanding at this point as to what you are to do, assuming there's been a conviction of first degree murder, there are aggravating circumstances, the aggravators outweigh any mitigation that's been presented, what's your understanding at this point of what you are to do?

2.0

JUROR NUMBER 147: I don't know if I can jump to a conclusion not knowing anything else. I don't think I feel comfortable saying even that I would -- I guess what we would have to do as a jury would be to look at it, and then all of us come to a decision on what we all agree with.

MR. LANNING: In the actual instructions, you do the weighing individually. You make your own decisions about the weight to be given any aggravation, the weight to be given any mitigation, and whether to recommend life or death. I mean, it's not a -- it's not unanimous. If you get to the penalty phase, it's by majority vote, so each person's

individual decision is critical.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But -- so it sounds to me like, even assuming the aggravation outweighs any mitigation, you still, at this point, did not say, well, I'm supposed to give death, or I'm supposed to give life. Is that right?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Right.

MR. LANNING: You pass. Because the instructions -- there's nothing in the instructions that says, once you get to that point, that you should recommend death, or shall recommend death, or must recommend Even once you get to the end of the process, all that's happened is, you got a permission slip from the Court to recommend death if you chose to.

Also, there's nothing in the instructions that require jurors to justify their opinions. Some things you can't justify in words, it's just -- I mean, I'll know it when I see it, it's my decision, and you're being told that you get to make the decision. go back into the jury room, and there's six people saying, what's wrong with you, tell me why. And you look them in the face and say, I don't have to, here's the instructions, I've got the written packet, show me where it says I have to tell you anything.

Some evidence that you may hear during this case, it's -- by statute, you're limited to make the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recommendation of death by the aggravating circumstances that are presented. You can't go beyond consideration of those aggravating circumstances for a death recommendation. One of those -- one area that you may hear is called victim impact evidence. instruction is, "You've heard evidence about the impact of this homicide on family, friends, community The evidence was presented to show of the decedent. the victim's uniqueness as an individual and the result of loss of the decedent's death. However, you may not consider this evidence as an aggravating circumstance. Your recommendation to the Court must be based on the aggravating circumstances and the mitigating circumstances." Now, the victim impact evidence can be pretty emotional, you've got friends and family talking about the impact of their death. Do you think you can follow the Court's instruction that that evidence cannot be considered as aggravating circumstances?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

MR. LANNING: Do you have an idea at this point what mitigation evidence is? In general?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Not really.

MR. LANNING: Okay. Reasons, and it can be anything, not to impose the sentence of death. A

person's youth, you know, they're young and inexperienced at the time, is that something that would be important to you to know when weighing a life and death decision?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Would that be an important fact for me to know?

MR. LANNING: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 147: Oh, absolutely. Yes.

MR. LANNING: What about possible evidence of mental illness from a mental health professional? Say the defense presented evidence of experts that you believe, based on their testimony, to be qualified experts that Mr. Bradley suffers from mental illness, is that something you could give consideration to as mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 147: It's an important fact.

MR. LANNING: Okay. What about evidence that indicated brain damage from qualified experts? Are you familiar with MRI?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Uh-huh.

MR. LANNING: What about PET scan?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

MR. LANNING: Would that evidence -- could you give consideration to that evidence as potentially mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 147: I think all of those things would have to be looked at, yes.

MR. LANNING: Now, how about evidence of drug addiction? Microphones don't pick up nods.

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes.

MR. LANNING: But, you know, some people consider such evidence -- they say, I couldn't consider that as potentially mitigating. I don't care what the Court instructs me, I could not consider that. What's your opinion?

JUROR NUMBER 147: I would definitely consider that. That's something that's going to change who you are as a person, so it definitely has to be something that is considered.

MR. LANNING: What about if evidence were presented of a history of child abuse when they were growing up? Is that something that you would consider?

JUROR NUMBER 147: Yes. It's also something that changes you as a person, so yes.

MR. TANNING: Would you agree that the person is -- the person's comprised of their history?

JUROR NUMBER 147: To a point, yes.

MR. LANNING: There will likely be evidence of photographs from the scene and autopsy that are very

graphic in nature, as well as a video of the event that took place, it's graphic. Would you have any concerns about your ability to view that evidence and remain fair and impartial?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

MR. LANNING: Can I have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. LANNING: The judge, part of her instructions were that she would have to give great weight to the jury's recommendation, what do you think that means?

JUROR NUMBER 147: She would have to see what the jury came back with, and decide -- in my opinion, decide if that's what she thinks is the right choice.

MR. LANNING: Do you think that she would lightly disregard a jury recommendation?

JUROR NUMBER 147: No.

MR. LANNING: I can assure you she wouldn't. The jury's recommendation is crucial to her, she can't make a decision without the jury recommendation.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Number 147, you are still being considered as a potential juror in this case. I am going to release you for today. In fact, you're going to get released through Thursday -- I mean, through Wednesday for sure. Thursday morning, I'm

going to ask you -- what's going to happen is, you're going to go downstairs, you're going to tell them you got released from my courtroom, that you need to call back, and they're going to give you a phone number. That number's going to tell you to call between 9:00 and 11:00 on Thursday morning. Chances are you might come back Thursday afternoon, chances are you might come back Friday. We're not sure, we're not sure how long this process is. If the process is going real slow, you might come back later, but that's what we're hoping.

2.1

During this recess, you must continue to abide by your rules governing your service as a juror. Do not discuss this case with anyone. Do not read anything about the case. Avoid television, radio, and Internet comments about the case. Do not conduct any independent research. Now, you can tell people that you're coming to the Brevard County Courthouse, that you're under consideration to be a juror, what hours you need to be here, but you can't tell them what the case is about, can't tell them what the charges are, and you can't tell them what's happened in court so far. Now, later on, if you are released, when you are released, you can tell people whatever you want to tell them, it's up to you. But during this process,

2

and if you get selected as a juror, you must abide by these rules.

3

Any questions or concerns?

4

JUROR NUMBER 147: Not at this time, no.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. If you'll go with

5

the court deputy, stop downstairs, get that

6 7

information, and you'll be on your way.

8

(Thereupon, Juror Number 147 was escorted out of

9

the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, voir

10

dire selection was had which was not requested to be

11

transcribed. Following voir dire, court was in recess

12

for the day 3/10/14; thereafter, court was reconvened

13

3/11/14 and the proceedings were had as follows:)

14

THE COURT: Okay. Let's bring in 156.

15

(Thereupon, Juror Number 156 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings

17

16

were had as follows:)

18

156. The first thing I want to do is thank you for

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, Juror Number

1920

bring here, thank you for being patient with us with

21

regard to this process. When I spoke to you last

22

Thursday, I talked about some rules governing your

23

service as a juror. Those rules kind of came into

24

effect at the time I announced them to you, so I'm

25

going to ask you about those rules since that time.

Since I imposed those rules, have you read or been exposed to reading newspaper headlines and/or articles relating to this trial or its participants?

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

about your knowledge of the case prior to coming here, and I'm going to talk to you about some other issues. In your responses this morning, just so you know, this is your opportunity to tell us information about you, there are no right or wrong answers. What we ask you to do is to be complete in your answer, to be honest, and to be frank. We like to have a yes or no answer to the questions, but we understand that sometimes the appropriate response is, I don't know, and that

response is acceptable, too, if you don't know. Okay. 1 2 JUROR NUMBER 156: Okay. 3 THE COURT: So do you know anything about this 4 case, either from your own knowledge, rumor, by 5 discussions with anyone else, or from the media, 6 including radio, television, Internet, electronic 7 device, or newspaper? JUROR NUMBER 156: 8 Yes. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what information you believe you know about this case. 10 11 JUROR NUMBER 156: Well, I know when it first 12 happened, about the shooting at all. But that's about 13 it. 14 THE COURT: Okay. So you know there was a 15 shooting, and do know it was a deputy? 16 JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes, I do. 17 THE COURT: Okay. So that would have -- you knew 18 about that information at the time of the event? 19 JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 20 THE COURT: How did you know about the 21 information? 22 JUROR NUMBER 156: From the television. 23 THE COURT: From watching the news on television? 24 JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

THE COURT: And since that time, have you heard

anything else about the case? 1 2 JUROR NUMBER 156: No. THE COURT: Any other specifics about what you 3 heard about the case? 4 JUROR NUMBER 156: 5 No. THE COURT: Specific information. 6 7 JUROR NUMBER 156: Just what the TV -- just what 8 they said on the news. THE COURT: Okay. Because there's been some news 9 coverage, so did you watch it many times, or did you 10 just see it a few times, or did you see it one time? 11 12 JUROR NUMBER 156: I saw it once or twice, that's 13 it. THE COURT: Okay. Did you ever see a picture of 14 Mr. Bradley on TV? 15 JUROR NUMBER 156: 16 No. THE COURT: Okay. Tell me about your general 17 news local news watching habits. Do you have any 18 19 habits with regard to watching local news? 20 JUROR NUMBER 156: No. I just put it on if I stay up long enough. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Because some people say, from 22 5:00 to 6:00 every night, I sit down, I watch, you 23 24 know, both the local and the national news. Some

people say, I may turn it on, I may not. Some people

say it's on the TV, but they're doing other things while it's on the TV. Do you have any regular habits with regard to watching the news?

JUROR NUMBER 156: No. If it's on, I'll sit and watch it for a while, but I don't watch it a certain time of day.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any impressions about this case at this time?

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Any impressions about the guilt or the innocence of the defendant?

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Can you set aside anything 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 156: I think I can, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll tell you that when you say, "I think I can," that's a way that people speak, people say that frequently, and we don't know if that means, Judge, I may be able to do it, I may not be able to do it, or if it's just a form of speaking. So when you say, "I think," or something like that, we're probably going to ask for a more of a commitment to

7 | 8

that. So are you confident that you would be able to set aside anything that you may have heard before?

JUROR NUMBER 156: I'd say yes.

THE COURT: What if you're in the -- you're deliberating this case, and the case is completed, and you're back in the jury deliberation room, and you say, boy, I remember some information now that I heard about the case, but that never came in as evidence in the case, I never heard it in the courtroom, a witness never testified to that, I never saw any exhibits or anything with regard to that, would you be able to set aside that information and not consider it in your deliberations?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you say, I remember the judge telling me if I didn't hear it in the courtroom, I'm not supposed to consider it? Can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes, I would.

THE COURT: Okay. Now I'm going to switch subjects on you. I ask this as kind of an open-end question, and I do that on purpose. What are your views about the death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Well, I believe in it, but it depends on the case. It depends on circumstances.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me tell you -- I'm going

to explain, briefly, the process that we go through, the State and the defense may explain that more in detail. But, generally, there's the first phase of the trial, and it's called the guilt phase. And I talked a little bit about this with you on Thursday. The guilt phase, if the jury returns a guilty verdict on count one, and that's for first murder, if there's a guilty verdict on count one, then, and only then, do we proceed to a second phase, which we call the penalty phase.

In the penalty phase, you'll hear evidence of aggravating circumstances and mitigating circumstances, and I give you some detailed instructions, I gave you some of those the other day, about how to weigh the different circumstances and assist you in coming to a recommendation to the Court. But I will instruct you that the jury needs to make a recommendation to the Court of a possible penalty for the guilty verdict on the first degree murder charge. The possible penalties for you to consider are death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. Now, would you be able to consider both possible penalties in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, are you of the opinion that

death is the only appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree?

3

2

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

4

5 de

6 l

О

7

8

Ü

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

2021

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. And would you consider both death and the life in prison without the possibility of parole as an appropriate penalty for murder in the first degree?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Any reservations about that?

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

THE COURT: Any concerns at this time?

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the State?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. Juror Number 156, good morning. Let me go a little bit with you through the process of what a juror has to do to get to that stage of the trial where the death penalty's in consideration. I know what I'm going to cover the judge covered with you in the group Thursday morning, but it was several days ago, and she did throw a lot of information at you in a condensed period of time.

So as she mentioned, you get to that position if the jury returns a verdict of first degree murder. If the jury returns a lesser charge conviction, such as second degree murder, sentencing is entirely to the Court, the death penalty's off the table. Obviously, if the jury comes back not guilty, then there is no sentencing at all. So the jury comes back with a guilty verdict of first degree murder. Now, there's two ways the State can prove first degree murder, one is premeditated, the other is what's called felony murder. And those terms will be explained to you at a later date. But if either way results in a first degree murder conviction, then the death penalty's under consideration.

Then we would reconvene, you would hear additional evidence, and the Court would give you a new set of instructions. And in those instructions, the first thing she's going to tell you to examine are what are called aggravating circumstances. Now, if you recall, she told you it's a statutory list of circumstances which may increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim. And those are the circumstances, and that's what you look at, and only that, to determine whether or not the death penalty is justified. I think when you used the term "in certain circumstances," those are the circumstances you look at.

Now, the State of Florida, we have to prove those

to you, and it's the same burden of proof as proving if somebody's quilty, it's beyond and to the exclusion of any reasonable doubt. So if you find that we failed to prove any of those, then, because there aren't any aggravators or special circumstances, your recommendation would have to be life. If you find that we've proven at least one, and I expect the list to be several, maybe three, four, five, if you find we've proven at least one, you may find we've proven more than one, you may find that we've proven all that's on the list, then you ask yourself, based on that list that's been proven, do these aggravating circumstances justify the death penalty? If your answer is no, then your recommendation would be life. If the answer is, yes, these circumstances justify the death penalty, you move on to the next step of the process.

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

And, if you recall, the Court talked to you about mitigating circumstances. Those are circumstances that come based on the defendant's life, background, character, experiences, things of that nature. There's a burden of proof for those, it's a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. There's still a burden of proof, but it's less than beyond a reasonable doubt. And just like with

4 5

1

8

6

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

19

20

1.8

21

22

23

24 25

aggravating circumstances, if one of those isn't proven, you disregard it. The key is, as long as it's been proven, you have to consider it. The judge is going to tell you that you consider everything that's been proven, and then you go through a weighing process.

Now, in your life, have you had to make, at some point along the line, some key, critical, important decisions?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And when you made those decisions, did you try to look at all the factors that would be involved?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Tried, yeah.

MR. BROWN: To the best of your ability. those factors you looked at, you found to be pretty darn important to your decision, right?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. BROWN: So you gave those great weight. Other factors you looked at, and you said, you know, this really, in the grand scheme of things, isn't that important, and you gave it very little weight. Right?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yeah.

MR. BROWN: Same process the judge is going to tell you to go through here. You've got to weigh the

22

23

24

25

1

various aggravating factors versus the mitigating factors, the mitigating circumstances, and you go through a weighing process. Nobody here can tell you -- you know, the judge is never going to tell you how much weight to give to each aggravator, or to each mitigator. She's not going to say "X" amount of weight to aggravator one, give "Y" amount of weight to mitigator one. That's a decision that you, as a juror, have to make. And it's an individual decision, the juror right next to you may give a different amount of weight in their analysis; but you have to make that. And you may look at things and say, that's something I'm going to give little weight to, or you may look at it and say, that's something I'm going to give great weight to. And, at this point, no one's going to ask you how much weight you would give to something, because there's no way for you to tell, because you don't know -- you haven't heard everything, and you don't really know how much weight you're going to give. It's all in perspective to everything else. Fair?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. BROWN: But what we need to know is that you're willing to consider what evidence we present to you, and then you determine the weight. And it's

entirely up to you, and you determine that when you go back and deliberate.

So then you go through this weighing process. The Court's going to tell you, if you weigh the aggravators and the mitigators, and you find that the mitigation outweighs the aggravation, then your recommendation has to be life. On the flip side, if you find the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation, then you're in a position where you're legally justified in recommending to the Court the death penalty.

Now, she's going to tell you -- or what she's not going to tell you is that if the State proves A, B, C, and D, that you must return a recommendation of death. In fact, what she's going to tell you is that you're never required, or obligated, to return that recommendation of death. When you get to that point, what she's going to require is that you do that weighing process. After you weigh them, if you find the mitigation does not outweigh the aggravation, and at that point you feel that the aggravation justifies the death penalty, that's when you can recommend the death penalty. Do you understand the process?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes, I do.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Any questions about it?

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

2

MR. BROWN: Okay. Do you feel comfortable in your ability to go through that process?

4

3

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

5

MR. BROWN: Okay. And with process, can you

6

fairly consider both penalties?

7

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes, I can.

8

MR. BROWN: Do you come into court with any ideas

9

or notion or concept of, well, these one or two things

10

might be aggravating circumstances -- people would

11

say, like, a mass murderer -- but beyond that, I'm not

12

going to consider any other aggravating circumstances?

13

Are you limited to just one or two situations, or are

14

you open to the circumstances which the judge is going

15

to give you on that list? Would you be open to the

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes, I would.

16

1718

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

19

questions. Thank you.

20

THE COURT: Okay. Questions by the defense?

21

MR. MOORE: Good morning. Let me ask a little

22

bit more about your -- what you remember from the TV.

23

I took from what you said that most of what you

24

learned about this case was from watching TV, news

25

coverage?

list?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 1 MR. MOORE: And what you were told when you came 2 3 into the courtroom. JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 4 MR. MOORE: You said you heard that a deputy had 5 been shot and killed. Do you recall anything about a 6 motel or property or things taken from the motel? 7 JUROR NUMBER 156: I don't know about the 8 robbery. I don't remember anything about the hotel. 9 But I do remember about the shooting, and then the 10 That's about it. chase. 11 MR. MOORE: And the chase. Do you recall 12 anything about the deputy, Deputy Pill, pulling over a 13 car, and during that stop, being shot? 14 15 JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 16 MR. MOORE: Do you recall if there was more than one defendant involved? 17 JUROR NUMBER 156: I think there were two. 18 MR. MOORE: Do you recall anything about the two 19 20 defendants? JUROR NUMBER 156: Not much, no. 21 MR. MOORE: Do you recall --22

and the officer was shot.

23

24

25

MR. MOORE: Okay. Do you recall anything about

JUROR NUMBER 156: Just that the gun was pulled,

1 who had the gun and who shot the deputy? 2 JUROR NUMBER 156: The driver had the gun, I 3 believe. MR. MOORE: Do you recall whether the driver was 4 5 a man, or a woman? JUROR NUMBER 156: Man. MR. MOORE: Black, or white? 8 JUROR NUMBER 156: I don't know. 9 MR. MOORE: Do you recall what the gender, the sex, of the other defendant was? 10 11 JUROR NUMBER 156: Female. MR. MOORE: Okay. So you recall there was a man 12 13 and a woman involved. 14 JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 15 MR. MOORE: And the man was the driver. 16 JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 17 MR. MOORE: And the man shot the deputy. JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 18 19 MR. MOORE: Now, when you watch the news, you 20 probably don't believe everything you hear, like most adults, however, you come to rely on and trust to a 21 22 certain degree the news that you hear. Is that 23 accurate, do you think, for you? JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 24

MR. MOORE: Do you think that the news coverage

25

that you recall of the deputy being shot and killed, 1 do you think that that was correctly reported? 2 JUROR NUMBER 156: I believe it was. 3 MR. MOORE: Do you have any reason not to believe 4 5 that? JUROR NUMBER 156: No. 6 MR. MOORE: Do you believe that suspects were arrested? 8 JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 9 MR. MOORE: Do you believe that one was a man and 10 one was a woman? 11 JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 12 MR. MOORE: Any doubt about that in your mind 13 from what you heard on the TV? 14 15 JUROR NUMBER 156: No. MR. MOORE: Do you believe that the man shot the 16 deputy? 17 JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 18 MR. MOORE: Any doubt in your mind about that? 19 20 JUROR NUMBER 156: No. MR. MOORE: All right. Do you -- you say you 21 didn't see a picture of Mr. Bradley? 22 JUROR NUMBER 156: No. 23 MR. MOORE: He was the male defendant, yes? 24 JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes. 25

MR. MOORE: Obviously. So at this point, what are your feelings, what's your opinion, based upon what you've heard, as to his guilt?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Right now, I have no opinion.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Do you think that the news coverage you heard, you recall, which you, to a degree, believe, do you think any part of that's incorrect?

JUROR NUMBER 156: It could be. They've been wrong before.

MR. MOORE: Well, okay, but about the things -- about the deputy being shot and killed.

JUROR NUMBER 156: Well, that's fact.

MR. MOORE: And suspects being arrested.

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: The one of the shooter being male, do you think that's probably more likely than not accurate and true?

JUROR NUMBER 156: I'd say it was accurate.

MR. MOORE: You know, I don't want you to feel like you're getting picked on; but, still, we're talking, and as we talk, we're learning that there's more information that you recall. What I'm getting at is, how much would that affect your impartiality?

And, you know, one of the responses you gave when the

judge asked if you could set that aside, you said, "I 1 would say yes." Now, I hear that a couple different 2 ways, one way is, that that's just a matter of 3 speaking, like that's just something you say, and 4 there's no meaning behind it. Another way that I 5 would question you about is, when you say, I would say 6 7 that I could inside, I hear a "but" in there. Like, 8 but maybe I can't totally put it aside.

Do you follow what I'm saying?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOORE: Okay. You see why that would be a concern, right?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yeah.

MR. MOORE: Remember, the judge said, I mean, there's maybe a yes answer, yeah, I can put it aside. Some people say that because that's -- yeah, absolutely, no question about it. Other people say, I cannot put it aside, there's no question about that. Then there's this other middle ground, which is, I don't know, I can't say, or maybe even have some doubts about whether I can put it aside. You see what I'm saying?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yeah.

MR. MOORE: So when you say the words to all of here that, I would say I could put it aside, I'd say

yes, which category would that fall in? Is that a yes without any doubt, without question, or is that a, well, I can't say 100 percent?

JUROR NUMBER 156: I would say yes. I could put it aside.

MR. MOORE: Without a doubt?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Without a doubt.

MR. MOORE: On the subject of the death penalty, is that something that you had thought about and maybe formed an opinion about before you came into court as part of this jury selection process?

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

MR. MOORE: Have you ever discussed it casually with friends, or -- you know, subjects come up, you know, like abortion, death penalty, and those kind of things come up in general conversation. Not every day, but throughout one's life, you run into situations where those come up. Has that ever come up in your conversations?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And so, as you sit here, I would put you in one of two columns, one is, I'm against the death penalty; and you're not in that column, because you said that under certain circumstances you could support the -- you could vote for death.

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yeah.

...

MR. MOOF

JUROR NUMBER 156:

MR. MOORE: Can you think of reasons why you would be in the for the death penalty column instead of against? In other words, what are reasons that you can think of why there should be a death penalty? I'm not talking about in this case --

JUROR NUMBER 156: Right. Any case.

MR. MOORE: Generally speaking. You're in the, and I think you would agree, you're in the "for" category, under certain circumstances. What are reasons why you would be for it?

JUROR NUMBER 156: If a person kills somebody, they don't care about it, and no concern whatsoever.

MR. MOORE: No remorse, is that what you're saying?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Correct.

MR. MOORE: Well, can you think of extreme cases of -- you know, if we watch the news, we all can think of a few of those, where you would say, you know, I don't know -- I don't know all the circumstances, but what I've heard makes me tend to think that is a case where that guy or gal should get the death penalty. Can you think of cases like that?

Yes.

MR. MOORE: And what kind of cases would those be

for you?

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 156: What do you mean?

MR. MOORE: Well, mass murders, torture and murders of children.

JUROR NUMBER 156: Oh, yeah, definitely.

MR. MOORE: No question there.

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Would those be cases where you would, without -- you would just shut off what you heard, as part of a jury, and convict the person of whatever it is, like torture and murder of a child, your ears would be closed in mitigation?

JUROR NUMBER 156: No, they wouldn't be closed. I would listen to everything, and weigh the odds. Like I said, it depends on the case.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Well, I note on your information sheet that you know law enforcement officers.

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Now, how is that going to affect you in this case, which involves the death of a police officer in the line of duty?

JUROR NUMBER 156: (Unintelligible).

MR. MOORE: All right. Well, now let's talk about the process which has been described to you by

the judge, and Mr. Brown has gone over that process as well. My question is, what is your understanding at this point of what your options are, what your choices are, when you get to this -- if you get to this point? Now, all of this is very hypothetical, right?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Right.

MR. MOORE: Except for one thing. The one thing that isn't hypothetical is the fact that if you're chosen to be on this jury, you will be a part of a process which could result in Mr. Brandon Bradley, that human being, 24-year-old man, being sentenced to death and being executed. There's nothing hypothetical about that, that is a fact, and you could be a part of that process. So in the back of your mind -- front of your mind, and in all your responses to these questions, we need to put it in that context. This isn't just a casual, general conversation in the abstract, this is reality.

JUROR NUMBER 156: Right.

MR. MOORE: If you, as a part of the jury, returned a verdict of guilty of first degree murder -- that's hypothetical, I'm not going to say it will happen, but if it does -- then you would go to the penalty phase; and if you, as a jury, find that the State has proven an aggravating circumstance beyond a

reasonable doubt, maybe several of those, at that point, what do you believe your choices will be? I'm not asking you to predict what you're going to do, but I'm asking you to tell me what you think you can do under those circumstances. Do you understand my question?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yeah. It could be either life in prison, or the death penalty.

MR. MOORE: Okay. That's exactly right. So, you know, the point I want to make, which I'm sure you understand, you appear to understand is, life without parole is never off the table, ever. You can vote for that even if you, as a jury, find multiple aggravating circumstances and no mitigating circumstances, hypothetically speaking. You weigh and you balance and, I mean, there's just lots of aggravating circumstances, you can still vote for life without parole. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: On the other hand, if you find that the State has not proven an aggravating circumstance beyond a reasonable doubt, death is off the table. Or if you do find aggravating circumstances, but you find mitigating circumstances outweigh those, the death penalty's off the table. But in contrast to that,

JUROR NUMBER 156:

life without parole is never off the table, it's always an option, always. Unless you decide otherwise, but it's always on the table.

Do you understand -- I mean, you don't understand, you have no way of knowing this, so I'm going to tell you what life without parole means.

What's your concept of what that means? What do you think?

JUROR NUMBER 156: There's no chance of getting out.

MR. MOORE: Okay. That's a fact. That's the law. A person sentenced to life without parole dies in prison. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Without question?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: That's the law. Now let me ask you about types of mitigating circumstances you may hear, to see if you would be willing to consider them, or not, without telling me what your consideration would be, just that you're open to considering these things as mitigating circumstances. Have you known anybody in your lifetime who has been mentally ill, suffered from mental illness?

No.

2

choice?

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. MOORE: Do you think mental health is a

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: You think that a person, let's say, who's a paranoid schizophrenic chooses to be that way? JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

MR. MOORE: So do you see how people who are mentally ill may not choose to be that way? JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: If you heard testimony from qualified experts that Mr. Bradley suffers from mental illness, is that something that you would be open to considering, potentially, as a mitigating circumstance?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes, I would.

MR. MOORE: Let me ask about drug addiction, as opposed to just drug use. Do you think that drug addiction is a choice?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Could be, yeah.

MR. MOORE: Do you see how drug use would certainly be a choice, but drug addiction may be a different situation from drug use, as far as suffering from that, having to deal with that? Well, do you think that some people who are addicted to drugs struggle with that addiction?

JUROR NUMBER 156: They do.

MR. MOORE: Okay. You see how it may be more difficult for some than others to get rid of that addiction, or maybe even impossible for some people?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: If you heard testimony, heard evidence, of drug abuse or drug addiction by Mr. Bradley, is that something that you would, or would not, be open to considering as --

JUROR NUMBER 156: I'd be open to consider anything.

MR. MOORE: Well, you know, we're going through this to see how you feel about these things. How about physical or emotional abuse of Mr. Bradley as a child, is that something you would be open to considering?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: If you heard testimony from qualified experts of brain damage or brain injury of Mr. Bradley, is that something that you would be open to considering as potentially mitigating?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Let me explain a couple of differences between what we call the guilt/innocence phase and the penalty phase. Of course, in the

21

22

23

24

25

1

quilt/innocence phase, you're deciding guilt or innocence of the charges. The big difference is, the penalty phase, different issues, you're deciding what the sentence is going to be, Mr. Bradley's fate, basically. At the quilt/innocence phase, where you're presented with the charges of -- the primary one being, but not the only one, first degree murder, you, as a jury, must arrive at a verdict unanimously; that is, all the members of the jury must say guilty, or all the members must say not guilty, or guilty of some lesser charge, such as second degree murder or manslaughter. But it has to be unanimous, whatever your verdict is. And if the jury unanimously finds guilt of first degree murder, you go to the penalty phase. You don't go to the penalty phase without that finding.

And at the penalty phase, each juror is entitled to his or her own vote; in other words, it doesn't have to be unanimous. It could be 11-1, it could be 9-3, it could be 6-6, it could be 7-5. But each juror is entitled to his or her own vote at the penalty phase. Do you understand?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And you are not obligated to defend your position. If others want you to persuade you to

join their position, you have the right to vote the way you think you should vote, and you don't have to justify your position. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes, I do.

MR. MOORE: And the other side of that is, you have a responsibility to accept the votes of other members of the jury, they get a choice just like you do, and their choice deserves the same respect that yours does. So you don't have to be subjected to being intimidated or browbeaten because you don't -- are not agreeing with others; and, likewise, you're not to gang up on somebody because they don't agree with you. Do you accept that?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes, I do.

MR. MOORE: On the position that you have expressed for, I think, the first time, that you are for the death penalty, with qualifications, if we look at your support of the death penalty as being on a scale, with 0 being no support, or you're against it, or 10 being you're absolutely in favor of it, where -- what number would you give yourself?

JUROR NUMBER 156: I'd say about an 8.

MR. MOORE: Okay. So you are way more in favor than against?

JUROR NUMBER 156: Yes.

MR. MOORE: No further questions.

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 156, you are still being considered as a potential juror in this case. What I am going to have you do is, go downstairs and report to the jury assembly room. They're going to give you a phone number to call, we're going to have you call back this Thursday, between 9:00 and 11:00. You may be reporting Thursday afternoon, you may be reporting Friday. With all due respect, it may take longer, and you may be reporting past that time, but that's our goal, to try to have you report back by the end of the week.

During this break, you must continue to abide by your rules governing your service as a juror.

Specifically, do not discuss this case with anyone else. Now, in fairness, you can tell people, your family members, people that need to know, that you're at the courthouse, you're serving jury duty, that you have to be here from this time to this time; but what you can't tell them is what case, what the charges are, what's happened in the courtroom, things of that nature, the specifics of your jury duty. Once you're released as a juror, you're allowed to tell anyone anything you choose to do so, that'll be up to you.

But at this time you're still under those rules.

Don't talk to anyone about the case. Avoid reading newspaper headlines and articles relating to the trial and its participants. Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio, or Internet comments about the case. And do not conduct any research yourself.

Any questions or concerns?

JUROR NUMBER 156: No.

THE COURT: Okay. If you'll report downstairs,
I'll appreciate it.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 156 was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, voir dire selection was had which was not requested to be transcribed.)

THE COURT DEPUTY: All rise.

(Thereupon, the venire of Jurors 160 through 212 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Brevard County Courthouse. My name is Morgan Laura Reinman, and I am one of the Circuit Court judges here in the 18th Circuit, and I am the judge presiding over the jury trials in this courtroom. Specifically, let me welcome you to the Criminal Division of the Circuit

Court. I realize that you are here involuntarily, and perhaps you would rather be anyplace else right now, but please know that all of us here appreciate your coming to serve. For our system of justice to work, it is essential that citizens like yourself be willing to come and work with us. Juries are one of the things that separate us from other countries, where people don't have the privilege of having juries determine the outcome of cases. Service on a jury panel affords you an opportunity to be part of the administration of justice by which the legal affairs and liberties of your fellow men and women are determined and protected.

The Court realizes that service on a jury panel is not always convenient. I will make every effort to see that your time is not wasted. We do estimate that this trial will go through the first week of April, April 4th. That's our estimate, but possibly could go a little longer. This is an estimate, like I said, April 4th, but I must admit that this case could take longer.

Let me pause here to say that most criminal trials in this circuit are over in just a couple of days. It is rare for one to go past even a week.

Every now and then, one comes along which requires me,

2.1

as the judge, to recruit and draft members of this community to be jurors to hear a case of some length. This happens to be one of those cases. Simply put, we need your help. We recognize that serving on a jury for approximately five weeks or so can present a hardship for some of you, and I will give you a chance to tell me if there are things in your life that you think could keep you from serving. Some of these, we may be able to work around. But please understand that your definition of a hardship may not meet the legal definition of a hardship, and I am required to follow what the law says.

Having said that, to the extent that we can accommodate your concerns, we will try to do so.

Obviously, this is an important case. We would like to have all of you volunteer for service. But please understand if that is not possible, you may have to be drafted even though it can prove to be an inconvenience. Let me give you some examples of hardships: If you are scheduled for surgery, that could be a good excuse; if you are seriously ill or have a medical or mental condition that would keep you from serving as a juror, that would be good cause; if you are the sole caretaker of a mentally or physically disabled relative, that might be good grounds; if you

are going to be evicted from your home or go seriously in debt if you miss five weeks of work, and your employer won't pay for you to be here, we'll listen to those sorts of issues; if you are a full-time student, that might be good cause. However, the fact that you or your boss feel that you are indispensable to your job may not be enough. We're going to have to hear the facts a little bit more and make a decision on a case-by-case basis. Basically, the reason for being excused has to border on severe.

Just so you know, there will be no court on March 24th and 25th. The hours that we generally work are from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and we break every one and a half to two hours, and we take an hour to an hour and a half break for lunch.

Now, I am going to go row by row, I am going to go ahead and ask you this question, because this is an important question. I'm going to ask you other questions as well, but at this time I'm just asking about hardship. I'm going to talk about any medical conditions that you may have in just a few moments, we'll talk about other issues as well. We're going to ask you a lot of questions, but the first question I'm going to talk about is this hardship issue about the length of the trial. Now, I do go row by row, we go

by numbers. So anyone in the first row, does the schedule as I have presented it to you present a hardship to you? Anyone in the first row? And if you do, if you'll raise your hand. Number 162, yes, sir?

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

(Thereupon, voir dire selection was had which was not requested to be transcribed.)

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to tell you one of the rules of jury service, make sure you use the restroom before you come in here, because I heard there's people that need to use the restroom. gone an hour and ten minutes, I like to go longer than that before I take -- we can't take a break every hour and ten minutes. So I am -- after I do this, I am going to take a brief recess. And, also, it's difficult with this many people, getting everyone out and everyone in, so that takes, in and of itself, ten I am going to give you a break when we get minutes. done, but make sure -- before you come in here, even if they tell you I'm saying to come in, tell them you need to use the restroom. Make sure you use the restroom before you come in here, that's kind of a general rule of jury service, just so you know.

Okay. Now, if you hear your name, you are released from consideration as a juror in this case.

If you hear your name, I want you to -- or your number

-- I need you to go downstairs, report to the jury assembly room, and they're going to take your badge and give you further information, and then most likely release you. For those that I'm releasing, I want to thank you for being here, thank you for your service,

thank you for being willing to come here and serve.

Okay. I'm going to go through the numbers at this time. Number 162, 167, 168, 169, 173, 179, 182, 186, 194, 191, 197, 201, 202. Now, if you did not hear your name and you want me to consider a hardship, and I haven't released you at this time, what that means is, we want you to check and get some further information for us. Also, it may mean that we want to question you a little further about the information that you provided. So you still have an opportunity for us to hear you with regard to your issue, but we want to check a little further and ask you some questions regarding that.

Okay. At this time, I will take a break. I'm not going to give you a long enough break to go downstairs, with all due respect, I have some things I want to get through today. If I can get through some of this today, then you might not have to come back tomorrow, or might not have to come back for the next couple days; but you're going to have to let me get

through some things so that we can do that. So let's take a -- so we're going to take a brief break so you can go to the restroom. We're going to do it until five minutes until 3:00. There's restrooms at the end of this hall, and if those are full, you can just go right down the stairs and there's restrooms on the end of the next hall, and there's restrooms at the end on each floor, two, three, and four, in case those restrooms are busy.

During this break, you must not -- you don't know what the case is about, but you don't discuss this case with anyone, don't talk about your jury service; and when you come back, I'm going to give you more information about the case. Yes, ma'am?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can we call, like, our employers to find out if we do get paid for the --

THE COURT: If you need to make those phone calls, I'm not sure I'm going to get to you today, but you could do that. I don't think I'm going to get to you today, you're probably going to have to come back another day. Yes, sir?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What if we know we have a conflict?

THE COURT: I asked about that -- if it's a hardship --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not a hardship, a conflict with the case.

THE COURT: I'm going to talk to you individually about that. I don't want to discuss those issues in front of other jurors.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No problem. Thank you.

THE COURT: So there's method to why I haven't asked you that question yet, but I will ask you that question outside the presence of the other jurors.

Yes, sir, 170?

JUROR NUMBER 170: I have a class schedule, because I go to college at Eastern Florida State on Mondays through Wednesdays.

THE COURT: Did you hear me when I said school, full-time student?

JUROR NUMBER 170: Well, I didn't know this was going to last all day, so --

THE COURT: In my little thing, I said full-time student. Okay, tell me about you being a full-time student.

(Thereupon, voir dire selection was had which was not requested to be transcribed.)

THE COURT: Okay. We're going to take a -we'll take a break until 3:00, be back here at 3:00.
Thank you.

7 8

(Thereupon, the venire was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, a break was taken in the proceedings. Following the break, proceedings were had which were not requested to be transcribed.)

THE COURT: So let's bring them in.

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

THE COURT: Please be seated. Okay. Number 176, what I'm going to ask you to do, if you can, is -we're going to ask you some questions individually in
a little while, and I'm going to ask you to see if you
could find -- if there's anyone you can find during
this break. I'm going to give some general
information to all of you, and then we're going to
talk to you individually; and I'm going to ask you
from the time that we recess until the time that you
come back, see if you can find anyone to help you with
picking up the kids after school. Okay?

JUROR NUMBER 176: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. As this time I would like to take a few moments to point out some of the court personnel that you will be seeing throughout the trial and what their duties are. I will also give you an

idea about what you are here to do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

First of all, I am the judge. You may hear people occasionally refer to me as the Court. My job is to maintain order and decide how to apply the rules of law to this trial. I will also explain various rules to you that you will need to know in order to do your job as the jury. It is my job to remain neutral on the issues of this case.

The staff attorney serves as the attorney for the judge and performs specific assignments by the Court, such as researching legal issues and drafting Court orders. The court deputies are in charge of security in the courthouse, and are also responsible for maintaining order in the courtroom and enforcing the Court's orders. They also have the charge and care of the jurors during the term of this trial. If any of you have a personal problem, or some other matter which you feel needs to be brought to the Court's attention, or to the attention of anyone involved in this trial, the proper person for you to speak to about that would be one of the court deputies. However, the court deputy cannot answer any of your questions about the case, only I can do that. deputy clerk serves as the Court's secretary in these proceedings and performs several important functions

for the Court, including preparing all necessary paperwork associated with this trial, and the numbering and handling of any exhibits involved in this trial.

Now, do any of you know me, the judge, or any of the court personnel that I've pointed out? And if you do, if you'll raise your hand.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me?

THE COURT: Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you repeat that question, please?

THE COURT: Do any of you know me, the judge, of any of the courtroom personnel who I have pointed out? (No response). Okay. The attorneys to whom I will introduce you to have the job of representing their clients; that is, they speak for their client here at this trial. They have taken oaths as attorneys to do their best in following the rules of their profession. Now, Mr. McMasters, if counsel for the State would please stand and introduce himself and your co-counsel.

MR. MCMASTERS: Good afternoon. My name is Jim McMasters, with me is Tom Brown, we're Assistant State Attorneys here in Brevard County.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Moore, if counsel for the

24

25

defense would please stand and introduce himself and everyone at the defense table, including your client.

MR. MCMASTERS: Yes, Your Honor. I'm Randy
Moore, my co-counsel is Mike Pirolo and Mark Lanning,
our client is Brandon Bradley, and we are being
assisted by Brooke Butler.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Do any of you know any of the attorneys in this matter or the defendant?

And if you do, if you'll raise your hand. Number 161, yes, sir?

JUROR NUMBER 161: I don't know your name, but acquaintances through (unintelligible) sports.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that through soccer?

JUROR NUMBER 161: That is correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So you know Mr. Pirolo through soccer.

JUROR NUMBER 161: That is correct.

THE COURT: Do you have a child who plays soccer?

JUROR NUMBER 161: I do.

THE COURT: Currently playing soccer?

JUROR NUMBER 161: I do.

THE COURT: Okay. Does your -- is it a girl?

JUROR NUMBER 161: No, it's not.

THE COURT: It's a boy. Okay. Does your son play on his child's soccer team?

JUROR NUMBER 161: No.

another soccer team.

this case?

2

3

THE COURT: Okay. Do you think -- so you know him from being at the field and maybe playing on

4

JUROR NUMBER 161: That is correct, Your Honor.

5

THE COURT: Okay. Do you think that would in any

6

way affect your ability to be fair and impartial in

8

9

JUROR NUMBER 161: No, ma'am.

10

THE COURT: Okay. If Mr. Pirolo is one of the

11

attorneys questioning a witness, or presenting a

12

would give him extra credit, or give his client extra

witness, do you think that would in any way -- you

1314

credit, because he's the attorney representing that

15

side of the case?

16

JUROR NUMBER 161: No, ma'am.

17

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for bringing that to

18

our attention. Anyone else? (No response). I see no

19

hands. I say that so in case I missed someone, they

20

can say, no, you missed me. Okay. I also say that

21

for purposes of the record.

22

begin to select in a few moments from among all of

23

you. The jury's job will be to decide what the facts

Last but not least is the jury, which we will

2425

are and what the facts mean. Jurors should be as

neutral as possible at this point, and have no fixed opinion about the case. At the end of the trial, the jury will give me a written verdict. A verdict is simply the jury's answers to my questions about the case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The last thing I want to do before we begin to select the jury is to explain to you the selection process and how it works. Jury selection is the part of the case where the parties and their attorneys have the opportunity to get to know a little bit about you in order to help them come to their own conclusions about your ability to be fair and impartial, so that they can decide who they think should be the jurors in this case. How we go about this is as follows: First, I'll ask you some general questions, which I have begun to do. Then, each of the attorneys will have more specific questions that they will ask of After they have asked all their questions, I will meet with them, and they will tell me their choices for jurors. Each side can ask that I exclude a person from serving on a jury if they can give me a reason to believe that he or she might be unable to be fair and impartial. That is what is called a challenge for cause. The attorneys also have a certain number of what are called peremptatory

challenges, by which they may exclude a person from the jury without giving a reason.

By this process of elimination, the remaining persons are selected as the jury. The questions that you will be asked during this process are not intended to embarrass you or unnecessarily pry into your personal affairs, but it is important that the defendant and the attorneys know enough about you to make this important decision. If a question is asked that you would prefer not to answer in front of the other jurors, please let me know, and we will address you privately, and you can give your answer just in front of the attorneys, the defendant, me, and the court personnel. Sometimes people say, Judge, I want to talk to you. You can't talk to me without the other persons being present as well. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions that will be asked of you. The only thing I ask is that you answer the questions as frankly and honestly and as completely as you can. You have taken an oath to answer all questions truthfully and completely, and you must do so. Remaining silent when you have information you should disclose is a violation of that oath as well. If a juror violates this oath, it not only may result in having to try the case all over

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

again, but may also result in civil and criminal penalties against a juror personally. So, again, it is very important that you be as honest and complete with your answers as you possibly can. If you don't understand a question, please raise your hand and ask for an explanation or clarification.

In sum, this is a process to assist the attorneys to select a fair and impartial jury. All the questions they ask you are for this purpose. If, for any reason, you do not think you could be a fair and impartial juror in this case, you must tell us. Now, from this group we are going to select 12 jurors and 3 alternates, a total of 15 individuals in this case. Obviously, most of you will not be selected. Please don't take this as an insult or any negative reflection on you. It is a matter of selecting jurors who can be fair and impartial in this particular case and with whom both sides can be comfortable.

The case set for trial on this date is the State of Florida versus Brandon Lee Bradley. It's case number 05-2012-CF-035337. In a few minutes, I am going to read to you the charges filed in this case. The charges are what brought us to court, but is not evidence in the case, and it is not to be considered as such. The evidence will be presented during the

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

course of this trial.

At this time I will read the charges. first degree premeditated murder of a law enforcement officer with firearm. In the County of Brevard, State of Florida, on March the 6th, 2012, Brandon Lee Bradley did unlawfully kill a human being, Deputy Barbara Pill, a law enforcement officer engaged in the lawful performance of a legal duty, by shooting Deputy Barbara Pill with a firearm, and said killing was perpetrated by Brandon Lee Bradley from a premeditated design to effect the death of Deputy Barbara Pill; and during the commission of said offense, Brandon Lee Bradley actually possessed a firearm, and further during the commission of said felony, Brandon Lee Bradley discharged said firearm, and as the result of the discharge, did inflict death upon any person.

Count two, robbery. In the County of Brevard,
State of Florida, on March the 6th, 2012, Brandon Lee
Bradley did take money or other property valued at
\$300 or more from the person or custody of another,
Andrew Jordan, Mohammad Malik, with the intent to
permanently or temporarily deprive said person of said
property. In the course of the taking, did use force,
violence, assault, or putting in fear.

Count three, fleeing or attempting to elude, high

speed or wanton disregard. In the County of Brevard, State of Florida, on March the 6th, 2012, Brandon Lee Bradley did willfully flee or attempt to elude a law enforcement officer in an authorized law enforcement patrol vehicle, with agency insignia and other jurisdictional markings prominently displayed on the vehicle, with siren and lights activated; and during the course of the fleeing or attempted eluding, did drive at high speed or in any manner which demonstrated a wanton disregard for the safety of persons or property.

Count four, resisting an officer with violence. In the County of Brevard, State of Florida, on March the 6th, 2012, Brandon Lee Bradley did knowingly and willfully resist, obstruct, or oppose an officer, or officers, Deputy Barbara Pill, of the Brevard County Sheriff's Office, in the execution of legal process, or the lawful execution of a legal duty, by offering or doing violence to the person of said officer, or officers.

Now, you have heard the name of the decedent in this case, did any of you know the decedent during her lifetime? And if you did, if you'll raise your hand.

Number 161, yes, sir?

JUROR NUMBER 161: I did not know her personally,

1 but I did know her sons. THE COURT: Her sons? JUROR NUMBER 161: Yes. 3 THE COURT: I believe -- and who are her sons? 4 5 JUROR NUMBER 161: Ryan and Jeremy. THE COURT: Okay. So you knew Ryan and Jeremy. 6 Do you know them now? 7 JUROR NUMBER 161: No. We used to work out at 8 the same gym. That was in '05. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Do you think that -- how close 10 11 of friends were you with -- I know sometimes you work in the gym and you say, hey, when you see --12 JUROR NUMBER 161: Yeah. That's essentially it. 13 14 I mean --THE COURT: Did you do anything personally with 15 16 them? JUROR NUMBER 161: No, ma'am. 17 THE COURT: Now, it is a possibility that one or 1.8 both of them may sit in on this trial once the trial 19 begins, do you think that would affect your ability to 20 serve? 21 JUROR NUMBER 161: No, ma'am. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Can you set aside that 23 relationship and be able to listen to -- make a 24

decision in this case -- what we ask you to do is make

25

a decision in this based on the evidence that you hear by way of witnesses who testify at the witness stand, evidence that's introduced, and the law as I instruct it. Can you do that?

JUROR NUMBER 161: I believe so, ma'am. I mean, they were more or less acquaintances, but I wanted to make you aware.

THE COURT: Okay. I saw one other hand. 164, yes, sir? Actually, it's 163. Sorry about that. 163, yes, sir?

JUROR NUMBER 163: I used to do for

THE COURT: You used to do what?

JUROR NUMBER 163:

THE COURT: Okay. Sometimes I don't know that

lingo.

JUROR NUMBER 163: I'm sorry. And I met her a few times at a couple accident scenes when we were directing traffic and stuff.

THE COURT: Do you think that would in any way affect your ability to serve?

JUROR NUMBER 163: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What I'm going to do is, I'm going to ask you -- when we first break, I'll talk to you during our first break with regard to that. Okay.

1 Anyone else? 180? 2 JUROR NUMBER 180: I didn't know her, I know the family know, the two boys and her husband. 3 THE COURT: You said you know the --4 JUROR NUMBER 180: Yes. 5 THE COURT: Okay. And how do you know them? 6 JUROR NUMBER 180: I've taken them out as a 7 result of this whole situation for -- to social 8 9 events. THE COURT: So you have socialized with them 10 since this occurrence? 11 12 JUROR NUMBER 180: Yes. THE COURT: Jeremy and Ryan? 13 JUROR NUMBER 180: No, the dad and Jeremy. 14 THE COURT: The father? 15 JUROR NUMBER 180: Yes. 16 THE COURT: Because I thought you said you knew 17 the boys and the father. 18 JUROR NUMBER 180: Just the one boy. 19 THE COURT: Okay. And who would that be? 20 JUROR NUMBER 180: Jeremy. 21 THE COURT: So you socialized with Jeremy and the 22 father since this event? 23 JUROR NUMBER 180: Yes. 24

THE COURT: Okay. How would you describe your

friendship with them?

JUROR NUMBER 180: I've taken them out to Magic games, and just taken them out, spent time with them. So I'm very familiar with the situation.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you think that would affect your ability to serve?

JUROR NUMBER 180: Absolutely. Although I would be happy to serve.

THE COURT: Okay. But I'm assuming that would make you biased in favor of the State.

JUROR NUMBER 180: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Did I get everyone in the jury box? (No response). Anyone on the left? (No response). Anyone on the right? (No response).

I am now going to have our deputy clerk read to you a list of potential witnesses who may be called to testify in the trial. Please listen carefully to the names, and see if you recognize any of them. Also, please understand that often many more names are listed as potential witnesses than are actually called at the trial. The potential witnesses in this case are as follows:

THE CLERK: Susan Adams; Daniel Allen; Danny
Roger Allen; Officer Ryan S. Allen, Melbourne Police
Department; Officer Jennifer Amneus, Melbourne Police

Department; Timothy L. Barker, II; Timothy L. Barker, 1 Sr.; Sergeant Brian Barnes, Melbourne Police Department; Lieutenant Bruce L. Barnett, Brevard 3 County Sheriff's Office; Leanne Bennett; Agent Harry 4 5 Bermudez, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Stephanie Betcher; Stephanie Bertolli; Tammy Elizabeth Brown; 6 Lisa Michelle Bryant; Agent Marlon D. Buggs, Brevard 7 County Sheriff's Office; Officer Johnny R. Bynum, 8 Melbourne Police Department; Kathleen Carper; Agent 9 10 Craig Carson, Brevard County Sheriff's Office in Rockledge; Catherine Carswell; Regina Carey; Sergeant 11 Dennis P. Casey, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; 12 Sergeant Michael P. Casey, Melbourne Police 13 14 Department; Crime Scene Technician Virginia M. Casey, 15 Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Deputy Brad A. Cervi, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Officer Nicole 16 Chapman, Melbourne Police Department; Officer Kevin 17 Cincimino, Melbourne Police Department; Sergeant Marc 18 Claycomb, Melbourne Police Department; Margaret Cline, 19 Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Andrew Colbert, 20 Melbourne Fire Department; Officer Charles Colon, 21 Probation and Parole; Officer Lisa Connors, Brevard 22 23 County Sheriff's Office; Deputy Brett Cook, Brevard 24 County Sheriff's Office; Officer Chad Cooper, Melbourne Police Department; Technician Stephanie 25

Cooper, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Lieutenant John A. Coppola, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Analyst Corey R. Crumbley, Florida Department of Law Enforcement; Officer Daniel Desormier, Melbourne Police Department; Arthur Dievers, III; Jeffery Jamie Dieguez, Sr.; Corporal Jason C. Diogo, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Deputy Bruce Downey, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Agent Frances H. Dufresne, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Raven Durousseau, R.N.; Officer Scott Dwyer, Melbourne Police Department; Keri Ellison; Officer Joseph Escher, Melbourne Police Department; Donna Ewing; Officer Edward P. Ferguson, Melbourne Police Department; Deputy Stephen J. Fernez, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Lieutenant Alexander A. Fishback, IV, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Deputy Travis Fitzgerald, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Sergeant Frank B. Flake, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Edward D. Flynn; Eric Theodore Flynn; Mark Allen Foster; Lisa Fortner; Bryon Scott Fox; Larry James Galvin, Jr.; Deputy Kirk Geweniger, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Terry Wayne Gibbs; Dr. Bruce Goldberger; Lieutenant Jeffery Todd Goodyear, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Detective Jack Gordon, Melbourne Police Department; Martha Gray; Michael Paul Gregg; Casey Greene; Agent Brian

25

Guilford, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Officer Greg Guillette, Palm Bay Police Department; Jamie Lee Hammond; Deputy John Hannigan, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Pamela C. Hansen; Richard Thomas Hansen; Officer Roy Havener, Melbourne Police Department; Ben Hay, Melbourne Fire Department; Officer Juanita J. Hazelett, Melbourne Police Department; Cherlyn Henley; Deputy Christopher Hendrix, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Dr. Mark Herbst; James Terry Henson, III; Hope Henson; Jeffery Scott Herring; Officer Dennis Higgins, Melbourne Police Department; Vernice Hobbs; Deputy Jessie Harold Holton, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Officer Cyril Hopping, Melbourne Police Department; Dennis Horn; Richard Huckabee, Medical Examiner's Office; Emilie Jill Huff; Russell C. Huff; Jeffery Humphries, Brevard County Fire Rescue; Dylan James, Melbourne Fire Department; Officer Robery Johnson, Melbourne Police Department; Caroline Jones; Andrew J. Jordan; Yves Joseph; Tsvetomila Kaneva; Officer John Kemper, Melbourne Police Department; Andria Michelle Kerchner; Pamela T. Kerchner; Richard Kerchner; School Resource Officer Wolfgang M. Kermer; Shirley King, King Reporting Service; Officer Brent Kleeberg, Melbourne Police Department; Corporal Joseph Klingler, Polk

County Correctional Facility; Officer Howard Koff, Melbourne Police Department; Officer Jeff Koeberl, Melbourne Police Department; Irma Porsue (phonetic); Deputy Jeffrey Krull, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Leslie Ann Lamb; Officer Charles Landmesser, Melbourne Police Department; Officer Blake Lanza, Melbourne Police Department; Corporal Terrance Laufenberg, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Shane Letch, Melbourne Fire Department; Julie Ann Long; Lieutenant Gary Loos, Melbourne Police Department; Officer Jesus Lopez, Melbourne Police Department; Perry Lopreato; Trista Lowman; Mohammad H. Malik; Jeffrey Markham, Melbourne Fire Department; Amy Mark; Robert William Marks; Agent Joseph Martin, Jr., Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Julie Martin; Agent Kevin McCann, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; Gina McCray; Brandon DeShawn McDade; Officer Ian McDaniels, Melbourne Police Department; Dave McGuiness; Deputy Linda S. McLoughlin, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Vanessa Mcnerney; Officer Kristen Meadows, Melbourne Police Department; William Leonard Metzer; Officer Derek Middendorf, Melbourne Police Department; Crime Scene Technician Jennifer Miller, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Officer Stephen Minich, Alliance Police Department; Robert Gregory Miranda; Christopher

Montesano; Deputy Stacy Moore, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Thomas Morrisette, Melbourne Fire Department; Brianna Morton; Thomas Bryan Murphy, Jr.; Keith Nelson; Detective Rory Nelson, Melbourne Police Department; Tony Nelson; Sergeant Dennis Nichols, Melbourne Police Department; Officer James O'Brien, Melbourne Police Department; Agent Daniel Ogden, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Dr. Jacqueline Olander; Officer Andrew Ortez, Melbourne Police Department; Sergeant Darryl Osborne, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Amanda Paige Ozburn; Officer Kevin Palmier, Melbourne Police Department; Mina Patel; Jeffery L. Patterson; Larry Pearson, Melbourne Fire Department; Deputy Terry Pelton, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Miguel Angel Perez, Melbourne Fire Rescue; Jeremy Pill, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Steven Pill; Mary Patricia Pittman; Officer Greg Pugesek, Melbourne Police Department; Lieutenant Renee Purden, Melbourne Police Department; Dr. Sajid Qaisar, Office of the Medical Examiner; Officer Jefferey Rau, Melbourne Police Department; Detective Angel Ready, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Agent Don Reynolds, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Agent Gregory Richter, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Detective Bonnie Rink, Melbourne Police Department; Sergeant

25

Sean Riordan, Melbourne Police Department; Sergeant Allie Roberts, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Ashley Roberts; Agent Kevin Roberts, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Deputy Paul Roman, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Officer Robin Romano, Melbourne Police Department; Andrew Russell; Technician Michael Ryle, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Deputy Christopher Sands, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Sergeant Carl Sangeleer, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Sergeant Christopher Sauro, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Agent Carl Rick Schmitt, Jr., Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Detective Michael Schneider, Melbourne Police Department; Jason Seaton; Eric D. Sellers; Officer Trevor Shaffer, Melbourne Police Department; Officer Howard Shelton, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Amanda Lacey Shetrone; Deputy Kevin Shields, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Gary Dale Shrewsbury, Jr.; Officer Amy Siewert, Florida Department of Law Enforcement; Deputy Wayne Simock, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Sergeant Clifton Daniel Singleton, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Dr. Susan Skolly; Gregory Bernard Smith, Jr.; Officer Brian Smith, Melbourne Police Department; School Resource Officer Stan Smith, Melbourne Police Department; Agent Michael Spadafora, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Deputy

Michelle Stafford, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; 1 Deputy Aja Stake, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; 3 Officer James Starr, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Agent Brian Stoll, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; 5 Officer Ron Streiff, Melbourne Police Department; Michael Sudlow, Brevard County Fire Rescue; Linda 6 Sullivan; Anthony Gus Summerford; Basia Taylor; 7 Tiffany Therese Taylor; Deputy Michael Thomas, Brevard 8 County Sheriff's Office; Deputy Albert Tolley, Brevard 9 10 County Sheriff's Office; Sergeant Cheryl Trainer, 11 Melbourne Police Department; Lisa Troescher; Deputy 12 James Troup, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; 13 Dr. Bartel Turk; Wilson Martin Valentin; Karen Vanderveen, with Wuesthoff; Corporal Victor Velez, 14 15 Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Jamie Lee Vigliotti; School Resource Officer Cheryl Wallschlager 16 17 (phonetic), Melbourne Police Department; Detective Robert Walters, Melbourne Police Department; Gerard 18 Joseph Weber, Sr.; Officer Christopher Weber, 19 20 Melbourne Police Department; Susan Wesley; Janet White; Officer Mike Whitright, Melbourne Police 21 22 Department; Andrew David Whittle; Alecia Williams; 23 Officer William Williams, Melbourne Police Department; Dale Elaine Woodby; Dr. Joseph Wu; Sergeant Randy 24 Young, Brevard County Sheriff's Office; Dr. Patricia 25

Zapf; Paul Louis Zarpaylic; Andrea Ziarno, Brevard 1 2 County Fire Rescue. 3 4 5 6 7 additional information? 8 9 10 Police guys. 11 12 them as --13 those guys. 14 15 16 v-cop? 17 18 19 them? 20 21 22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Are any of you related by blood or by marriage to any of the potential witnesses, or do you know any of them through any business or social relationships? Now, Number 161, I already talked to you. Number 163, any JUROR NUMBER 163: I know most of the Melbourne THE COURT: Okay. That's from the riding with JUROR NUMBER 163: Yeah, I did ride-alongs with THE COURT: Okay. How long did you work as a JUROR NUMBER 163: About four years. THE COURT: And how often did you travel with JUROR NUMBER 163: It all depended when they had openings in the car, I used to go. I used to go a lot with Mark when he'd go out, Wainright. THE COURT: Okay. So let's say --

JUROR NUMBER 163: And I know the investigator for the accidents, Romano.

THE COURT: What's his last name? 1 2 JUROR NUMBER 163: Romano. THE COURT: Okay. And when did you do that? 3 JUROR NUMBER 163: Up until three years ago. 4 THE COURT: You did it for four years up until 5 three years ago. 6 7 JUROR NUMBER 163: Right. Before that, I used to do marine patrol for Satellite Beach. 8 THE COURT: Okay. I don't think there was any 9 10 marine patrol --JUROR NUMBER 163: No. But I recognized a couple 11 12 people from Indian Harbour, like Lisa Fornier, and a 13 couple of the others. THE COURT: Okay. And you said as a volunteer 14 cop, you also met Deputy Pill. 15 JUROR NUMBER 163: Yes. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Do you think that would in any 17 18 way affect your ability to be fair and impartial in 19 this case? JUROR NUMBER 163: Yes, ma'am. 20 THE COURT: One of the things we ask you to do, 21 and I'm going to talk about that later in greater 22 length, is to -- we talk to you about how to weigh the 23 credibility of witnesses, I talk to you about that 24

first, and then I talk to you about that you have to

apply those same rules to law enforcement witnesses. Then, once you apply those rules, you can give them whatever weight you choose to in evaluating their testimony, but that you can't give law enforcement extra weight just because of their profession. I call it extra credit just because of their profession. You have to listen to their testimony first, apply the rules that I give you with regard to weighing the credibility of witnesses, and then you can determine what credibility or weight to give that testimony. Do you think that you would be able to -- I mean, do you think that you would give law enforcement witnesses extra credit because of their profession?

JUROR NUMBER 163: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. And, also, you think this would be a difficult case for you to sit on and be fair and impartial due to the fact that you know Deputy Pill?

JUROR NUMBER 163: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anyone else? I saw another hand. Number 166, yes, sir?

JUROR NUMBER 166: Greg Richter is a -- he's a family friend, our daughters are the same age, I got him on Facebook. And then I think Steve Fernez is one of his buddies, so we've been at some social functions

1 together.

THE COURT: And he's with Melbourne or --

JUROR NUMBER 166: Brevard County Sheriff's, I believe, or used to be. He's not currently in the country right now.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you think as a result of that relationship that that would affect your decision-making process in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 166: I would probably trust what he had to say more than anybody else.

THE COURT: Okay. Would it be -- I'm not sure if he's going to be called as a witness in this case or not, but if he was called as a witness, you would have issues -- you would accept his credibility more than other witnesses?

JUROR NUMBER 166: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Okay. What if he was not going to be a witness in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 166: Then it wouldn't be a problem.

THE COURT: Okay. And you said one of his friends -- what's one of his friend's names?

JUROR NUMBER 166: Steve Fernez, I believe.

THE COURT: What about if Deputy Fernez was called as a witness?

JUROR NUMBER 166: I don't know him as well, I'm

just trying to disclose everything. So I would 1 probably treat him like everybody else. 2 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anyone else? 165, 3 sorry I missed you. 4 JUROR NUMBER 165: I've worked with Dr. Bartel 5 Turk at Holmes Regional. 6 THE COURT: Okay. And what's the doctor's last 7 name? 8 JUROR NUMBER 165: Turk, T-U-R-K. 9 THE COURT: And how closely did you work with 10 11 him? JUROR NUMBER 165: I'm a bedside nurse, and he 12 13 was a trauma surgeon. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Did you work with him daily, or occasionally? 15 JUROR NUMBER 165: Occasionally. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Do you think that would in any 17 way -- if he was called as a witness, would that in 18 19 any way affect your ability to serve on this jury? JUROR NUMBER 165: I don't think so. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Would you weigh his testimony 21 the same as you would weigh the other witnesses, as I 22 instruct you later, or would you give him extra credit 23 because of your prior knowledge of him? 24

JUROR NUMBER 166:

The same.

THE COURT: Okay. 171?

JUROR NUMBER 171: I knew -- well, this was a long time ago, but I knew Cheryl Wallschlager (phonetic), she was my resource officer when I was in high school. That was many years ago, but -- I don't know her now, that was 14 years ago.

THE COURT: So you -- I mean, I would assume you knew who that was. Did you ever socialize with that officer?

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

THE COURT: Have you seen that officer any time recently?

JUROR NUMBER 171: No.

THE COURT: Now, if that -- is that a man, or a woman?

JUROR NUMBER 171: It's a woman.

THE COURT: If she was called as a witness in this case, could you treat her testimony the same and weigh it the same as you would weigh other witnesses?

JUROR NUMBER 171: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anyone else? Did I miss anyone? Anyone on the left hand side? Number 181, yes, ma'am?

JUROR NUMBER 181: I know Marc Claycomb.

THE COURT: And I can't remember if that's law

enforcement, or not.

JUROR NUMBER 181: Yes. Melbourne.

THE COURT: Okay. And how do you know him?

JUROR NUMBER 181: Socially. He's been at social gatherings and events through mutual friends.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that -- do you have a relationship -- do you see this --

JUROR NUMBER 181: No, I haven't seen him for a few years now.

THE COURT: Okay. If he was called as a witness in this case, could you weigh his testimony the same as you would weigh the other witnesses that were called?

JUROR NUMBER 181: I'd probably give him preferential treatment.

THE COURT: So you'd give him what I call extra credit?

JUROR NUMBER 181: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, if he was not a witness in the case, would you have that issue? Or would it be with Melbourne Police Department, or would it only be if he was called? Let's say another officer from Melbourne Police Department was called, could you weigh their testimony as I instruct you to weigh their testimony, or would you give everyone with the Melbourne Police

Department extra credit?

JUROR NUMBER 181: It's hard to say. I'd probably err on extra credit, because of being with the police department.

THE COURT: Okay. Because I'm going to instruct you -- I'm going to give you a big instruction on how to evaluate someone's testimony, and then I'm going to tell you that you can't give -- you have to evaluate law enforcement testimony the same as you would any other witness. Now, once you hear their testimony, if you use these factors I'm going to talk to you about and you determine that they're credible, then you can make that determination; but you can't give them extra credit just because of their profession. Do you think you could do that, or not do that?

JUROR NUMBER 181: Probably.

THE COURT: You could do that?

JUROR NUMBER 181: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 181: But not with Marc.

THE COURT: But not with Marc, okay. Okay. I appreciate that. Anyone else? Did I see another hand on the left side? Let's go to the right side. Any hands? I see 200, yes, ma'am?

JUROR NUMBER 200: I know Officer Ferguson.

THE COURT: Okay. And how do you know Officer 1 2 Ferguson? JUROR NUMBER 200: His family took a taekwondo 3 class, and my son was in the taekwondo class for three 4 years. So I knew him and the whole family. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Through that event? 6 JUROR NUMBER 200: They took a class -- the same 7 class that my son was in, so I (unintelligible). 8 THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was that? 9 JUROR NUMBER 200: My son stopped his taekwondo 10 this Christmas. 11 THE COURT: Okay. And so how long was your son 12 13 in taekwondo? JUROR NUMBER 200: For three years. And he's a 14 black belt, so he's (unintelligible). 15 THE COURT: Okay. So if Officer Ferguson was 16 called to testify in this case, could you treat his 17 testimony the same as other witnesses that my come 18 19 before the Court? JUROR NUMBER 200: Well, I trust his judgment, so 20 that would affect me. 21 THE COURT: So it would be difficult for you if 22 he was called in the case? 23 JUROR NUMBER 200: Yes. 24

THE COURT: You would give him what I call extra

credit?

JUROR NUMBER 200: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, he works for -- who does he work for? I can't remember if he's Brevard County, or Melbourne.

JUROR NUMBER 200: I think it's Melbourne.

THE COURT: Would you have that issue with other Melbourne Police Department officers, or only Officer Ferguson?

JUROR NUMBER 200: Only him.

THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else? I saw another hand. Number 205, yes, sir?

JUROR NUMBER 205: Yes, Your Honor, I'm familiar with Tom Morissette, a firefighter with Melbourne.

THE COURT: You know, I can see you have a uniform on, I cannot see what your uniform is, it's just too far away from me.

JUROR NUMBER 205: I'm a Cocoa Beach firefighter.

THE COURT: Okay. So you work with some of the other firefighting agencies?

JUROR NUMBER 205: Occasionally. We see each other more at social gatherings, everyone that works together in different jurisdictions.

THE COURT: Okay. So you know Tom Morissette.

JUROR NUMBER 205: I do.

THE COURT: Who else do you know? Anyone else? 1 No, no one else on the list. 2 JUROR NUMBER 205: 3 THE COURT: Okay. Now, how -- and are you friends with Tom Morissette? 4 5 JUROR NUMBER 205: More acquaintances. THE COURT: Okay. Have you been with him at 6 social settings? JUROR NUMBER 205: Yes, ma'am. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. Would that relationship in any 10 way affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case? 11 JUROR NUMBER 205: No, ma'am. 12 THE COURT: Okay. If he was called to testify, 13 14 would you -- could you weigh his testimony the same as 15 you would weigh the other witnesses, or would you be 16 partial towards his testimony? JUROR NUMBER 205: I would weigh it the same and 17 18 be impartial. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. Anyone else? 20 I'm sorry I missed you. 199, yes, ma'am? JUROR NUMBER 199: There's actually three on the 21 The first one is Andrew Colbert, I teach his 22 daughter. The second one is Cyril Hopping, with 23

Melbourne --

24

25

THE COURT: We can never say the first name

1 right.

JUROR NUMBER 199: Oh, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: No, we never say it right, you said it right. Okay. And I had to figure out that that was a man too. And who else?

JUROR NUMBER 199: And Kevin Palmier. I was born and raised here, so I heard lots of names that sounded familiar, but those are the three I know that I know.

THE COURT: Okay. Andrew Colbert, you teach his --

JUROR NUMBER 199: His daughter.

THE COURT: And how much contact have you had with him?

JUROR NUMBER 199: Just open house and e-mails, calling him (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. And what grade do you teach?

JUROR NUMBER 199: I teach second grade.

THE COURT: Is it a hardship for you to be here if you're a second grade teacher?

JUROR NUMBER 199: I get -- no. I didn't think so, but I don't know. It is a hardship, but not as hard as some of the other people I saw, or heard. I was hoping some other teacher would have raised her hand before me, so --

THE COURT: And you teach -- where do you teach?

JUROR NUMBER 199: I teach at 1 2 THE COURT: So they have to get a substitute teacher for the whole time that you're here? 3 JUROR NUMBER 199: Yes, ma'am. There have been 4 people in the past that missed extensive time because 5 of jury duty. 6 THE COURT: I mean, how do you feel about that, 7 is that something that you --8 JUROR NUMBER 199: It kind of gives me heart 9 palpitations, all the assessments I need to give for 10 11 the rest of the year. And it's just the crazy part of 12 the school year. 13 THE COURT: I don't think second graders take FCATs, is that --14 JUROR NUMBER 199: They don't. 15 THE COURT: Do they take any type of standardized 16 17 testing? JUROR NUMBER 199: It's not standardized, but 18 19 Brevard County loads them up good. THE COURT: But you're saying -- you're 20 21 responsible for their assessments? JUROR NUMBER 199: Yes. 22 THE COURT: You know what, you have to tell me 23 whether you think it's a hardship to be here. Do you 24

think it's a hardship for you to be here?

JUROR NUMBER 199: Well, if it's in the true timeframe -- well, I don't know, my principal's kind of -- but if it's in the true timeframe, we have spring break. It is a hardship, but, like I said, after I heard some other people, it's not as --

THE COURT: I'm going to put you on the list that you're going to check to see if this is a hardship.

JUROR NUMBER 199: Okay. Sounds good.

THE COURT: So why don't you ask your principal what they think of this.

JUROR NUMBER 199: Okay. Sounds good.

THE COURT: Okay. But you said you know -- you teach Andrew Colbert's daughter. And how do you know Cyril Hopping?

JUROR NUMBER 199: I grew up with him. I went to from when we were small, and his son also went through

I was not his teacher, but I was seeing him --

THE COURT: So you went to

JUROR NUMBER 199: I did.

THE COURT: That's a tradition.

JUROR NUMBER 199: It is. We don't leave home, us West Melbourners.

THE COURT: Okay. That's pretty cool. And then you know, I think you said --

JUROR NUMBER 199: Kevin Palmier. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. And how do you know him? 3 JUROR NUMBER 199: Our moms are actually best friends, so we're very, very close family friends. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. If any of those three were called as witnesses in this case, how would you feel 6 about them testifying? 8 JUROR NUMBER 199: I would have to say I would be 9 very partial to Kevin Palmier. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Because your moms are best friends. 11 JUROR NUMBER 199: Yes. 12 13 THE COURT: And you can't mess with the moms of 14 the world. 15 JUROR NUMBER 199: You can't. They're meddlers 16 too. 17 THE COURT: Okay. So that would put you in an 18 awkward position? 19 JUROR NUMBER 199: Absolutely. 20 THE COURT: Plus you would consider his testimony credible? 21 22 JUROR NUMBER 199: Absolutely. THE COURT: Okay. What about the other two? 23 24 Could you weigh them the same, or would that be difficult as well? 25

JUROR NUMBER 199: I think I could weigh them the 1 2 same. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anyone else? Did 3 I miss anyone on the right side? 211, yes, ma'am? 4 JUROR NUMBER 211: I'm not sure if the person 5 you're talking about is the same person I know, but I 6 only know him because he shops at my store. THE COURT: And what store is that? 8 JUROR NUMBER 211: Walmart Neighborhood Market in 9 10 Melbourne. THE COURT: So do you work there? 11 JUROR NUMBER 211: Yes, ma'am. 12 THE COURT: And you think you see him coming 13 14 there to shop? JUROR NUMBER 211: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Would that in any way affect your 16 ability to serve on this case? 17 JUROR NUMBER 211: I don't think so. 18 THE COURT: When you say, "I don't think so," 19 20 tell me what you're thinking. JUROR NUMBER 211: It won't. 21 THE COURT: Okay. But you see -- does he come in 22 there -- is that a law enforcement officer, do you see 23 him in there in uniform? 24

JUROR NUMBER 211: In his uniform, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What if he testified in this case, could you weigh his testimony the same as everyone else's?

JUROR NUMBER 211: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Did I miss anyone with regard to that question? 166, yes?

JUROR NUMBER 166: This isn't really regarding that question, but it's regarding the teachers, I'm a teacher as well. I proctor Florida Alternative Assessment for special ed kids.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NUMBER 166: We have three people licensed to proctor that in the school. We have a two-week window, and I have five students left. I didn't know if that qualified as a hardship or not, because they can force the other teachers to do it, the other two. But it will definitely be difficult for them to get everybody finished.

THE COURT: And where are you a teacher at?

JUROR NUMBER 166:

THE COURT: And is that -- do you have a class besides that, or do you just do the assessments?

JUROR NUMBER 166: Yes, I have class as well.

THE COURT: And what do you teach?

JUROR NUMBER 166: I teach one period of

profound, two periods of supportive, and two periods 1 of integrated science. 2 THE COURT: What is supportive, is that a science 3 class? 4 JUROR NUMBER 166: Supportive level is IQ between 5 50 and 70, profound is IQ under 50. 6 THE COURT: Okay. So you do -- I understand now. 7 And you're saying -- do they have other teachers to 8 9 teach that, or are you one of the only ones? JUROR NUMBER 166: There's three of us that are 10 licensed to proctor that alternative assessment, and 11 I'm one of them. 12 THE COURT: So the other two would have to make 13 up the slack? 14 JUROR NUMBER 166: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else? (No response). 16 Now, do any of you on the panel today know each other? 17 Anyone know each other? 161, who do you know? 18 JUROR NUMBER 161: It's Juror 200. 19 THE COURT: Okay. And how do you know her? 20 JUROR NUMBER 161: She works at (unintelligible) 21 22 my son's school. THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 200, where do you 23 24 work.

I work at

JUROR NUMBER 200:

School.

2

THE COURT: And what do you do there?

3

JUROR NUMBER 200: I'm the media assistant, and I

work in the aftercare.

5

4

THE COURT: Am I correct, is that the library?

6

JUROR NUMBER 200: Yes.

7

THE COURT: Okay.

So, like I would call, a

8

library specialist?

I'm an assistant.

9

JUROR NUMBER 200:

10

THE COURT: Okay. Juror Number 161, if you both

11

were called to be jurors in this case, could that

12

relationship in any way affect your decision-making

13

process?

14

JUROR NUMBER 161: I do not believe so. It's

15

just a familiar face.

16

THE COURT: Okay. Now, Juror Number 200, if you

17

were both chosen as jurors in this case, the fact that

18

you have an acquaintance with Number 161, would that

19

in any way affect your decision-making process?

JUROR NUMBER 200: Not really, no.

20

21

THE COURT: Pardon me?

22

JUROR NUMBER 200: I don't think so.

23

THE COURT: I'm going to take that as a no. You

24

said, "I don't think so," and -- because people say

25

that as kind of a form of speech; but it appears you

each other through the school.

3

2

JUROR NUMBER 200:

4

5

THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else? Did I miss anyone? Number 212, yes, sir?

No.

have no other relationship other than kind of knowing

6

JUROR NUMBER 212: (Unintelligible).

7

THE COURT: Okay. So Number 212 works with

Number 212, how often do you

8

work together?

Number 195 at

1.0

9

JUROR NUMBER 212: I see her every day

11

(unintelligible) on and off.

12 13 THE COURT: Okay. Number 212, if you were chosen as a juror and Number 195 was also a juror, would that in any way affect your ability to make an independent

1415

decision in this case?

other, would you --

16

JUROR NUMBER 212: I think so.

17

THE COURT: Okay. And tell me why you think so.

18

What we ask you to do is that you be able to make a

19

decision independent of the other person and that it

20

wouldn't affect your decision-making process. Like if

21

she wanted to vote one way, and you wanted to vote the

22

JUROR NUMBER 212: We would be independent, but

24

23

we may discuss (unintelligible).

25

THE COURT: Well, you can discuss the case with

each other as long as you discuss it with all the 1 other jury members present. You just couldn't discuss 2 it outside of the courtroom. You could discuss it 3 with each other after the trial. Number 195, have you ever associated with Number 5 212 outside of the courtroom? 6 JUROR NUMBER 195: No. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Do you think that would in any 8 way affect your ability to make an independent 9 10 decision in this case? JUROR NUMBER 195: No. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I could see where it might be 12 a little uncomfortable, but would it affect your 13 ability to make a decision? 14 JUROR NUMBER 195: No. 15 THE COURT: Number 212, do you agree? 16 17 JUROR NUMBER 212: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Yes? Number 212? 18 JUROR NUMBER 212: Yeah, not about this, but 19 conflicts? 20 THE COURT: Okay. Yes, sir? 21 22 JUROR NUMBER 212: One of my family members is a sheriff deputy in Orlando. 23 THE COURT: Okay. And what family member do you 24

have that's a sheriff deputy in Orlando?

1.3

JUROR NUMBER 212: My niece. She was just sworn in last year.

THE COURT: Okay. You know that this involves the death of a law enforcement officer. Does that cause you concern in this case?

JUROR NUMBER 212: Yes.

THE COURT: And what I instruct you is that -we're going to talk about the burden of proof and
about the State having to prove the case, but what I'm
concerned about is -- do you think that would make you
prejudiced or biased against the defense? Because
this case does involve the death of a law enforcement
officer,

JUROR NUMBER 212: Yes.

THE COURT: So would it be fair that you couldn't be fair and impartial against the defendant as a result of that?

JUROR NUMBER 212: I think so.

THE COURT: Tell me why you say, "I think."

JUROR NUMBER 212: Because, basically, I have strong opinions about law enforcement. Our family (unintelligible).

THE COURT: Okay. A lot of these things we're going to talk to you about independently, when we do our private session. That's one of the reasons I

haven't asked you that question at this time. Anyone 1 else that know each other? Is it 184? 2 3 JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes. THE COURT: Yes, ma'am? 4 JUROR NUMBER 184: I work at Corporation 5 also, and what I do is I repair computers, fix 6 computers, and I know I worked on his, that gentleman 7 8 over there, his computer. 9 THE COURT: Okay. JUROR NUMBER 184: It's been a while back. 10 THE COURT: Okay. So you know 212 from working 11 12 on his computer. 13 JUROR NUMBER 184: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Have you ever socialized with 14 15 him outside of the Corporation? JUROR NUMBER 184: No. 16 THE COURT: Do you think that relationship would 17 in any way affect your ability to serve as a juror in 18 19 this case? 20 JUROR NUMBER 184: No. THE COURT: Would you be able to make an 21 independent decision despite that relationship? 22 JUROR NUMBER 184: 23 Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else? I want to make 24

sure I didn't miss anyone. It's hard to see some of

your hands. Okay, no hands.

24

25

Now, as you have heard, the defendant is charged with murder in the first degree. Murder in the first degree is punishable by life in prison without the possibility of parole, or death. Now, because the death penalty may become an issue in this case, I want to tell you how it is tried. If the jury returns a verdict of quilty of murder in the first degree in this case, the jury will reconvene for the purpose of rendering an advisory recommendation as to which sentence, death or life in prison without the possibility of parole, should be imposed. hearing, evidence of aggravating and mitigating circumstances will be presented for you to consider. Then both the State and the defendant will have an opportunity to present argument for and against the death penalty.

Following those arguments, I will give you written instructions on the law that you are to apply in weighing those circumstances in making your recommendation. The final determination of which sentence should be imposed is my responsibility; however, under the law, I must give your recommendation great weight. Many people have strong feelings about the death penalty, both for it and

against it. The fact that you may have such feelings does not disqualify you to serve as a juror, as long as you are able to put those feelings aside and apply the law as I instruct you. In other words, you must be willing to be bound by your oath as a juror to obey the laws of this state in making your recommendation.

If the jury returns a verdict of murder in the first degree in this case, we will move into what is called the penalty phase, where you will be asked to then weigh the aggravating and mitigating circumstances presented, listen to the arguments of the attorneys, apply the law as I instruct you, and fairly consider both possible penalties before making your penalty recommendation. In a few moments, we will be questioning you -- some of you -- we're going to break you up into groups and call you on different days, but we will be questioning you individually about this issue.

Any evidence or argument at the penalty phase, if we were to reach it, is presented in order that you might determine, first, whether sufficient aggravating circumstances exist that could justify the imposition of the death penalty; and, second, whether sufficient mitigating circumstances exist that outweigh any aggravating circumstances found to exist. At the

conclusion of taking the evidence, and after argument of counsel, you will be instructed on the factors in aggravation and mitigation that you may consider. It will be helpful for you to be familiar with some definitions and rules initially.

An aggravating circumstance is a standard to guide the jury in making the choice between the alternative recommendations of life imprisonment without the possibility of parole, or death. It is a statutorily enumerated circumstance which increases the gravity of a crime or the harm to a victim. An aggravating circumstance must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt before it may be considered by you in arriving at your recommendation.

In order to even consider the death penalty as a possible penalty, you must first determine that sufficient aggravating circumstances have been proven. The State has the burden to prove each aggravating circumstance beyond a reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is not a mere possible doubt, a speculative, imaginary, or forced doubt. Such a doubt must not influence you to disregard an aggravating circumstance if you have an abiding conviction that it exists. On the other hand, if after carefully considering, comparing, and weighing all the evidence, you do not

have an abiding conviction that an aggravating circumstance exists, or if having a conviction, it is one which is not stable, but one which waivers and vacillates, then the aggravating circumstance has not been proved beyond every reasonable doubt, and you must not consider it in rendering an advisory sentence to the Court. It is to the evidence introduced in this proceeding, and to it alone, that you look for that proof. A reasonable doubt as to the existence of an aggravating circumstance may arise from the evidence, conflict in the evidence, or the lack of evidence. If you have a reasonable doubt as to the existence of an aggravating circumstance, you should find that it does not exist. However, if you have no reasonable doubt, you should find that the aggravating circumstance does exist, and give it whatever weight you determine it should receive.

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

A mitigating circumstance is not limited to the facts surrounding the crime. It can be anything in the life of the defendant which might indicate that the death penalty is not appropriate for the defendant. In other words, a mitigating circumstance may include any aspect of the defendant's character, background, or life, or any circumstance of the offense that reasonably may indicate that the death

penalty is not an appropriate sentence in this case.

A mitigating circumstance need not be proved beyond a reasonable doubt by the defendant. A mitigating circumstance need only be proved by the greater weight of the evidence, which means evidence which more likely than not tends to prove the existence of a mitigating circumstance. If you determine by the greater weight of the evidence that a mitigating circumstance exists, you may consider it established and give that evidence such weight as you determine it should receive in reaching your conclusion as to the sentence to be imposed.

If a penalty phase is required, then at the conclusion of the taking of the evidence, and after argument of counsel, you will be instructed on the factors in aggravation and mitigation that you may consider. The sentence that you recommend to the Court must be based upon the facts as you find them from the evidence and the law. If after weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances, you determine that sufficient aggravating circumstances exist, and that the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh the aggravating circumstances, or in the absence of mitigating circumstances, that the aggravating circumstances alone are sufficient, you

may recommend a sentence of death be imposed rather than a sentence of life in prison without the possibility of parole. Regardless of your findings in this respect, however, you are never compelled nor required to recommend a sentence of death.

If, on the other hand, you determine that no aggravating circumstances are found to exist, or that the aggravating circumstances are outweighed by the mitigating circumstances, or in the absence of mitigating circumstances, that the aggravating factors alone are not sufficient, you must recommend imposition of a sentence of life in prison without the possibility of parole rather than a death sentence.

Let me say at this time that all the definitions that I have talked about, and will talk about, will be given to you in a written form at the end of the case. I know that's a lot to comprehend at this time. Let me say at this time that the fact that I am talking about the death penalty is not to be taken by you as any indication one way or the other as to whether or not this is a case which justifies a death penalty. I am discussing it because it is a possibility. You are not to presuppose anything.

As you may have noticed, there are cameras in the courtroom. The media, including cameras, will be

2

3

4

5

6

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

24

allowed in the courtroom during these proceedings. However, the media is not entitled to your names or personal information, nor can they film or take pictures of any juror. You may also have noticed that you have been given a number to wear on the outside of your clothing. The number is actually the number of seat you are occupying. I want to be certain that we are recording the answers that you give us, and the number is acting as a cross-reference of your name and will assist us in creating an accurate record.

Now, this brings me to the next issue, which is your prior knowledge of this case. If you have any prior knowledge about this case, you will be asked to put 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 the trial. This is another issue that we will question you about individually.

Now, at this time, I need to have a bench conference with the attorneys.

(Thereupon, voir dire selection was had which was not requested to be transcribed.)

THE COURT: Okay. Number 175, we were going to ask -- we asked you to check to see if it was going to be an issue about you being here, talked about being

an electronic engineer and that you were booked for travel and had projects through May; were you able to find out some more information?

JUROR NUMBER 175: Well, no, Your Honor. I understood you to say you were going to call me or something, and then I would have some time, so I did not check anything.

THE COURT: Okay. We are going to have you come back then, and at that time do have that information.

JUROR NUMBER 175: I will.

THE COURT: Okay. We are going to have you come back, so you'll get a time before you leave here today, and bring that information then. Number 178, did you have an opportunity to check, or are you going to do that as well?

JUROR NUMBER 178: No, ma'am, I'm going to do that tonight.

THE COURT: Okay. And when you come back, have that information for us. And then the other one was 210, where's 210?

JUROR NUMBER 210: I have not checked yet.

THE COURT: Okay. When you come back, if you'll have that information as well.

At this time, I am going to release some jurors.

If you hear your name, once again, please don't take

that as any personal reflection on you, it's just a result of the answers that we've heard. Also, I need you to report to the jury assembly room downstairs, and they will give you further information. Mainly they're going to take your badge, thank you for being here, and send you on your way, but just tell them that you've been released from Judge Reinman's courtroom. Okay. If you hear your number, you'll be free to go. Number 163, 166, 199, 180, 200, 181, 212, and 176.

Now give me just a few moments. Okay. 160
through 175, we need you to report back at 8:30
tomorrow morning. Don't leave yet, because I'm going
to give you some other instructions. 177 through 189,
we need you to report Wednesday, tomorrow, at 1:15.
190 through 204, we need you to report at 8:30
Thursday morning. 205 through 211, we need you to
report Thursday at 1:15. Now, if you do make it into
what we call the second pool of jurors, this is not
the second pool, I expect you're going to be back here
Friday at 8:30, and then the case is going to start,
hopefully, either Monday or Tuesday of the next week.

During this recess, you must abide by your rules governing your service as a juror. Specifically -- now these are the rules that I'm putting in place, and

the first thing I'm going to ask you when you come 1 2 back is if you've abided by these rules. Specifically, do not discuss this case among 3 yourselves, or with anyone else, or allow anyone to 4 discuss it in your presence. Do not speak to the 5 lawyers, the parties, or the witnesses about anything. 6 7 You must avoid reading newspaper headlines and articles relating to this trial or its participants. 8 Avoid seeing or hearing television, radio, or Internet 9 comments about this trial. Do not conduct any 10 research regarding any matters concerning this case. 11 12 Now, what you can do is, you can tell people that you're serving jury duty at the courthouse, Brevard 13 County Courthouse in Viera, Florida; and you can tell 14 them what time you expect to be here. What you can't 15

Now, the deputies will have the numbers of when you're supposed to report back. So if you have any questions about when you're supposed to report back, they'll be outside, and they'll give you that information again if you didn't hear your numbers.

I'm going to do them really quick again, just so you hear it. Tomorrow at 8:30, 160 to 175; tomorrow afternoon, 1:15, 177 to 189; Thursday, 8:30 a.m., 190

do is talk about what case you're here for, what the

charges are, or what you've heard in the courtroom.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 to 204; Thursday at 1:15, 205 to 211.

Any questions or concerns? Okay. We'll be in recess.

JUROR NUMBER 188: I got a question.

(Unintelligible) about what you said about not watching news or talking to each other. I mean --

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to talk to you about that when you come back. If there's a violation -- with all due respect, I don't want you to talk about that in front of the other jurors, it may have a problem with my other jurors, so I have to discuss that outside the presence of the other jurors. I don't want this panel to have to be disqualified, with all due respect, so when you come back, I will discuss that with you as soon as I can. But those are your rules governing your service as a juror. When you come back, I'm going to ask you about those. If you tell me that you can't follow those rules, we will discuss that at that time.

Okay. Thank you. Court will be in recess.

(Thereupon, the venire was escorted out of the courtroom by the court deputy; thereafter, court was in recess for the day, 3/11/14. Court was reconvened on 3/12/14 and voir dire selection was had which was not requested to be transcribed; thereafter, court was

reconvened on 3/13/14 and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Let's start with 190.

(Thereupon, Juror Number 190 was escorted into the courtroom by the court deputy and the proceedings were had as follows:)

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, Juror 190. When we spoke the other day, I talked about some rules that came into effect governing your service as a juror. Those rules started at that time. So I'm going to ask you about what you've done 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 190: No.

JUROR NUMBER 190:

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

No.

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

JUROR NUMBER 190: And have you discussed this case with other jury members, or with anyone else, or allowed anyone to discuss it in your presence?

JUROR NUMBER 190: No.

2

3 4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This morning, I'm going to ask you THE COURT: some questions, then the State may ask you some questions, and the defense may ask you some questions. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions that are asked. What we ask you is to be honest, complete, and frank. Some people say, Judge, can I say this? Sometimes I have to prompt people to say things. You don't need to do that. There's no -like I said, this is your opportunity to talk to us. If there's something on your mind, you need to share it with us. Also, we'll be asking you questions, sometimes it solicits a response of yes or no. With all due respect, we want a yes or no answer, but I understand that sometimes you can't answer it yes or no, and it may be an, I don't know. And if that's true, then you need to answer it with, I don't know.

The first question I'm going to ask you is, do you know anything -- this is prior to coming to court. Do you know anything about this case, either from your own personal knowledge, rumor, by discussion with anyone else, or from the media, including radio, television, Internet, electronic device, or from the newspaper?

JUROR NUMBER 190: Do I know anything? THE COURT: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 190: Very little.

2

THE COURT: Okay. Tell us what information you

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25 know about the case.

JUROR NUMBER 190: Well, I moved from out of state about a year ago. And since I've been here, I knew something about a shooting. At the time I don't think I even knew if it was a male or female. And that was about it. And I knew that they were picking a jury, that was the one thing I did pick up.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you read that in the newspaper, or saw it on television?

JUROR NUMBER 190: I think it was on television.

THE COURT: Okay. What's your normal, kind of, local news watching or reading habits?

JUROR NUMBER 190: I watch the Today show.

THE COURT: Okay. And the Today show's on -- is that CBS? No, it's Channel 2. I think whatever Channel 2 is, is the Today show.

JUROR NUMBER 190: I'm not sure, I DVR it.

THE COURT: Okay. So you watch that. And there might be some snippets of news on that? I think they do a little local thing every once in a while. that --

JUROR NUMBER 190: They do what the local weather is, and -- there's not much local.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else that you do 1 2 regularly? JUROR NUMBER 190: As far as --3 THE COURT: Watching news. 4 JUROR NUMBER 190: Sitcoms, that kind of stuff. 5 THE COURT: Okay. So no other news -- I mean, 6 7 you watch --JUROR NUMBER 190: No, that's it. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. What about your newspaper reading habits, do you get the newspaper? 10 JUROR NUMBER 190: I do. 11 THE COURT: Is it Florida Today? 12 13 JUROR NUMBER 190: Yes. THE COURT: Do you read that? 14 15 JUROR NUMBER 190: Parts of it. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Did you read anything about 17 this case in the newspaper? JUROR NUMBER 190: I did not. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Bradley, have you seen him on TV 19 20 before? JUROR NUMBER 190: No. 21 THE COURT: Okay. So is fair to say that you 22 don't have -- I mean, it sounds like you really don't 23 know a lot of information about the case. 24 25 JUROR NUMBER 190: I really don't.

1 THE COURT: Okay. You know that there was this 2 case that involved the death of a law enforcement 3 officer. 4

JUROR NUMBER 190: Because you told me.

THE COURT: Okay. You learned that because I told you the other day.

JUROR NUMBER 190: Right.

THE COURT: Okay. What we ask you to do in order to be considered a juror in this case, can you set aside anything that you may have learned about the case, serve with an open mind, and reach a verdict based only on the law and the evidence presented in this trial, in this courtroom?

JUROR NUMBER 190: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you have any prefixed opinions or ideas about the case?

JUROR NUMBER 190: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: When you say, "I don't believe," that can be a form of speech, but it can also be that you're not sure, so tell me what you mean by that. lot of people say, I don't believe, I don't think, as a form of speech.

JUROR NUMBER 190: I can't think of anything, so I would have to say no.

Okay. Anything -- other than this is THE COURT:

22

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23 24

a serious case, anything about the charges or the case concern you at this time?

JUROR NUMBER 190: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Now I'm going to switch gears on you, get a little more serious. Tell me -- and I ask this in a very general way, I ask it this way on purpose, tell me what your views are about the death penalty.

JUROR NUMBER 190: I'm not against the death penalty. And I guess I would have to say what you told us yesterday, about how the law, basically, mitigates or -- I forget the other word.

THE COURT: Aggravates.

JUROR NUMBER 190: Aggravates. You can make a decision on what's appropriate, what the appropriate sentence is, based on those factors. So I think that helps a lot as far as -- as opposed to just making an arbitrary decision one way or the other.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me tell you -- I'm going to give you -- tell you something briefly about the process, and the attorneys are going to get more into the process.

There's the first phase of the trial, which is the guilt phase. In the guilt phase, if the jury, after deliberation, returns a verdict of guilty on count one, and it only pertains to count one, and count one is the first degree murder charge, if there is a guilty verdict on count one, then we proceed to a penalty phase. The penalty phase is where we talk about the aggravating circumstances and the mitigating circumstances, and we talk about that weighing process.

In the penalty phase, as a juror, I will instruct you to make a recommendation to me of a penalty of death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. Now, what I ask you as a juror, is to consider both penalties. No one here today is going to say, in this situation, what would you do, what recommendation would you make to the Court? No one's going to ask you that. What they're going to talk about today is, can you consider this, can you consider death, or life in prison without the possibility of parole. Because you don't know the facts, because you haven't heard the case, it'd be highly unfair to ask you what you would do. So when the attorneys talk to you, they're talking about if you would consider this, are you open to consider The ultimate decision is yours, as a juror, to make.

But what I ask you is, can you consider both

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2

3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

15

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

possible penalties? Do you think you could do that? JUROR NUMBER 190: Yes.

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

JUROR NUMBER 190: No.

THE COURT: Okay. You would be open to consider both possible penalties?

JUROR NUMBER 190: Yes.

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

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. Juror Number 190, good morning. I'm going to go through in a little bit of detail the process for a jury to consider death. know the Court gave some of this to you two days, but she did give you a lot of information in a compressed period of time, so I just want to go step by step through the process to make sure you understand it and don't have any questions about it.

First, as she talked about, obviously, for the jury to consider and to make a sentencing recommendation, the verdict would have to come back quilty on first degree murder. If it's a quilty verdict of a lesser charge, such as second degree murder, or something else, death penalty's off the

table, sentencing is entirely up to Her Honor; and, obviously, if it's not guilty, then there is no sentencing at all.

So the jury comes back guilty of first degree murder, and there's two ways for the State to prove first degree murder. There is what's known as premeditated murder, and the other is known as felony murder. And we may prove one, the other, or both in this case. Either way leads to a verdict of first degree murder, and then the death penalty is under consideration.

Now, you understand there is no automatic death penalty?

JUROR NUMBER 190: Right.

MR. BROWN: And it doesn't matter what the charge is, you know, it could be a mass murderer of 40 people, there's nothing automatic. You have to go through the process and consider and compare and weigh. What happens is, if the jury comes back guilty of first degree murder, we would reconvene, the jury would hear additional evidence, and the judge would give a set of instructions.

In those instructions, the first thing she's going to point you to is to look at and examine what are known as the aggravating circumstances. And if

you recall, she told you those are a statutory list of circumstances that may increase the gravity of the crime or the harm to the victim. And it's to those circumstances, and to those alone, that you look to to determine whether the death penalty is justified.

Now, we have to prove those to you beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. It's the same burden of proof as we have in the guilt phase. If you look at those aggravating circumstances, and you find that the State of Florida has not proven any, then your verdict has to be life, because you found there was no aggravation. Make sense?

JUROR NUMBER 190: Yes.

MR. BROWN: If you find that we've proven at least one, you may find that we've proven more than one -- I expect the list she's going to give you to be more than one, maybe three, four, five, six, and you may find we've proven them all -- you take whatever ones that you feel the State has proved, and you look at that group and ask yourself, do these justify the death penalty? If your answer is no, then, obviously, your recommendation is life. If your answer to that question is, yes, they do justify the death penalty, you move on to the second stage of the process.

That stage is where you examine what are called

mitigating circumstances. And if you recall when she spoke to you all as a group, those are the circumstances that come from the defendants life, background, character, things of that nature. And those have a burden of proof as well, it's a lower burden, it's to the greater weight of the evidence. And she's going to tell you to take those that have been proven, both the aggravators and the mitigators, you have to compare, and you have to weigh those.

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

JUROR NUMBER 190: Have I had to?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

JUROR NUMBER 190: Yes.

MR. BROWN: And when you've made those decisions, have you tried to look at the factors involved?

JUROR NUMBER 190: Like you said, I literally

made a list of pros and cons.

MR. BROWN: Right. And when you do that, obviously some of those, you look at and decide they're pretty darn important, right, and you give them a lot of weight, great weight. Others, when you're writing out your list and you examine all the factors, you look and say, this really isn't that important, and you give that very little weight,

right?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

JUROR NUMBER 190: Correct.

MR. BROWN: And that's how most of us make decisions, critical, important decisions. She's going to tell you it's the same process here. You go through, and you have to examine the aggravators and the mitigators, and you determine how much weight to give. She's not going to give you a chart that tells you, Aggravator A gets "X" amount of weight, Mitigator A gets "X" amount of weight. She's not going to tell you that. We, the attorneys, may suggest to you in our arguments how much weight you ought to give, but it's, ultimately, entirely up to you. And there's no standard as to how to assess that and how to give it That's a decision you, as a juror, have to make; and it's you, individually, that makes that decision. The juror right next to you may decide to give different weight to the same aggravator than you do, but to the same mitigator, maybe more or less. You have to make that decision.

21

22

23

24

25

(CONTINUED TO VOLUME VII)