IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA IN AND FOR PASCO COUNTY CASE NO. 2014CF5586CFAXWS

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

-VS-

ADAM MATOS,

Defendant: :

PROCEEDINGS: MOTIONS

BEFORE: HONORABLE MARY M. HANDSEL

Circuit Judge

DATE: October 27th, 2017

PLACE TAKEN: Pasco County Government Center

7530 Little Road

New Port Richey, FL 34654

REPORTED BY: Maria A. Fortner, RPR

Notary Public

State of Florida at Large

Administrative Office of the Courts Court Reporting Department West Pasco Judicial Center 7530 Little Road New Port Richey, FL 34654 Tel. (727) 847-8156 Fax: (727)847-8159

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA:
4	BRYAN SARABIA, ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNEY CHRISTOPHER LABRUZZO, ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNEY Office of Bernie McCabe, State Attorney Sixth Judicial Circuit, Pasco County 7530 Little Road New Port Richey, Fl 34655
5	
6	
7	
8	APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT, ADAM MATOS:
9	, and the second se
10	DEAN LIVERMORE, ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER NICHOLAS MICHAILOS, ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER DILLON VIZCARRA, ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER WILLIAM PURA, ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER Office of Bob Dillinger, Public Defender
11	
12	Sixth Judicial Circuit, Pasco County 7530 Little Road
13	New Port Richey, Fl 34655
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	II

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S THE COURT: You may be seated. 2 3 All right. We're here on our last hopefully pretrial for Mr. Matos. Case Number 14-5586CF. 5 We're set to begin the jury trial on Monday. 6 State, are you ready? 7 MR. LABRUZZO: Yes, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: All right. Defense, are you going 9 to be ready on Monday? MR. LIVERMORE: I think so. You're never 10 11 totally ready. 12 THE COURT: Right. I know. Well, the only 13 reason, there was the issue of the subpoenas not 14 going out timely. I believe that's been resolved. 15 State, correct? 16 MR. LABRUZZO: Mr. Sarabia is going to give 17 you the best most up-to-date. As far as I'm aware 18 it has been, but I'm going to defer to him. 19 THE COURT: All right. He's talking with 20 someone there. 21 And just for the record, Mr. Matos is present 22 with his attorneys, and the State is here. 23 The Defense was aware or was made aware of the 24 issue with the subpoenas? Yes or no? 25 MR. LIVERMORE: Yes. I heard about it

yesterday, yes.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SARABIA: And, Judge, I would note in this courtroom on this record I had put on the record multiple times that we are only making sure that the witnesses we want are subpoenaed and if their witnesses --

THE COURT: We haven't gotten there.

MR. SARABIA: All right.

THE COURT: I'm going to go there, I promise.

But I just want to make sure for the State's purposes the witnesses that you need to call, that you want to call, that you believe you're going to call, all of your subpoenas have either been served or the people have agreed to appear without a subpoena.

MR. SARABIA: Correct.

THE COURT: We don't have any subpoena issues on your witnesses. So you're good?

MR. SARABIA: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So, however, because of the way we have it set up in the Sixth Circuit, we have an agreement between the State and the Defense and the Court also agrees to it, that any subpoena that's served by the State is a reciprocal subpoena

and that will be held so the Defense can call those witnesses, if necessary, without issuing your own subpoenas. It saves the taxpayers of our circuit money.

So because the way it occurred in this case, is there anyone that the Defense needs to make sure a subpoena is served to? Because what happened was because of the subpoenas not going out in a timely fashion, my understanding is that the State gave the Sheriff's Office, or whoever, a list of their most critical witnesses and they made sure that those people were served. Do I have that correct?

MR. SARABIA: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: And they're trying to serve everybody else, but those were the ones that no matter what, you wanted to get served, and they were done by yesterday.

MR. SARABIA: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So is there anyone on the State's witness list that the Defense needs to make sure a subpoena was served to so that they can be held on standby for this trial? Defense?

MR. MICHAILOS: Judge, I've already talked to Mr. Sarabia on the phone. I gave him names of some officers.

MR. SARABIA: He indicated Detective McInnes.

I've confirmed with Detective McInnes is going to
be available, and Detective Pelletier I'm told was
also available.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MICHAILOS: My concern that I related to Mr. Sarabia on the phone is if something were to happen at trial; for instance, something we can't foresee, a witness takes the stand, testifies differently than what we anticipated — and there's so many witnesses in this case, so it's hard to pinpoint each and every one and which was interviewed by which law enforcement officer — and then we as the Defense would like to call that officer for impeachment purposes in our case and chief, and that person is not subpoenaed or not available, that's something that would be unanticipated.

THE COURT: Well, that would happen no matter if the subpoenas went out timely or untimely, because the problem is is that they're only going to confirm, i.e., call the witnesses that they believe they need to make sure that they're available.

From what I understand the Sheriff's Office

took service, even though it wouldn't be under the rules timely, for every single one of their law enforcement officers. Do I have that correct?

MR. SARABIA: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: The rule says they have to have service five days before trial. They waived that requirement and they were assured that any deputy who's on the witness list, that subpoena they accepted, correct?

MR. SARABIA: Correct.

THE COURT: And you haven't had any indication that any of those witnesses are unavailable?

MR. SARABIA: We knew in advance when we set this date that there were some specific dates within the time period certain law enforcement officers we were going to have issues with.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SARABIA: Those have not been a problem for us. Lieutenant Ross I know in particular he is not available, I think, after the 13th; Detective Cougill is not available on the 9th, things of that nature.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SARABIA: But all the other witnesses, yes, there's some period of time in which we

believe that all of them are available.

THE COURT: Okay. And therein lies the issue.

I think in any trial with this many subpoenas, the

State sends out the subpoenas and they serve and

confirm the people that they want to call.

At this point, because you can't give us any specific witnesses other than the two we just issued, we'll do the best we can; but that has nothing to do with the timelessness of the subpoenas, if that makes sense to you.

I mean, if we would have sent them out on time, you would have the same issues that you have whether we sent them out on the right day or the wrong day. But the Sheriff's Office did accept all of the subpoenas for their law enforcement officers even though it was less than five days to the start of the trial.

MR. MICHAILOS: Okay. I didn't understand it. Sort of like a technicality.

THE COURT: Correct.

MR. MICHAILOS: I thought perhaps a number of them weren't served. So, yeah, that makes it better.

THE COURT: No. The only technicality would be that the rule requires, because we've changed

the way service --

MR. MICHAILOS: But they're waiving that. But they're waiving that.

THE COURT: They waived that.

MR. MICHAILOS: Okay.

THE COURT: They accepted service for all of their deputies even though there's less than five days to the trial date, correct?

MR. SARABIA: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. And I believe that was an agreement between the Clerk, the State Attorney and the Sheriff, Sheriff Nocco.

And they just informed me -- I have no personal knowledge of this. They just called me and told me this, that they went out yesterday at 6:30 in the morning I believe it was -- members of State Attorney's Office, the Sheriff's Office, deputies, civil division -- and served all of the subpoenas that were civil in nature, not law enforcement subpoenas.

All the other ones that were law enforcement subpoenas, at least to the Sheriff's Office, they accepted service and agreed that they would accept service even though it was less than five days to the trial date. So that's the best I can say.

So for the two that you mentioned, State, any issue with them, their time? Are they available throughout the time of the trial, the two that Mr. Michailos gave you?

MR. SARABIA: My understanding is definitely on Detective McInnes. I'll have to confirm that there are no problem dates with Detective Pelletier.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SARABIA: Because Detective McInnes, I guess, I confirmed that since I talked to defense counsel. Detective Pelletier I had confirmed a while ago.

THE COURT: Okay. That they were available for when you thought you needed them?

MR. SARABIA: Right.

THE COURT: So if you can just call. And by my understanding, and I've heard this from both sides kind of on the side, that the State believes that their last witnesses availability and when they will testify is November 15th.

MR. SARABIA: Correct.

THE COURT: So the State will have their last witness to testify on November 15th. So the Defense should be ready with any of their witnesses

or any of their evidence starting on the 15th. So given that timeframe, does the Defense believe that they're ready? Was there any of those subpoenas that were yours? That was my problem, the Defense's. Did you have any of your own subpoenas?

MR. MICHAILOS: No, Judge. Any subpoenas we would have had, I think we served personally from our office.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So will you be ready with your witnesses starting on the 15th, if you have any? I'm not making you call any. I'm just saying if you had some, will they be ready on the 15th?

MR. MICHAILOS: They will be, Judge.

And just for the record, Judge, obviously there's never a point where attorneys feel they're a hundred percent ready for trial, we did have previous motions to continue in this case. I know Mr. Dillon [sic] had asked for a five-month extension. I thought that was maybe — we didn't need that much time, but I clearly thought we needed more than the continuance you did give us. And for the record, you denied our continuance but granted Hurricane Irma's continuance.

THE COURT: And that was brilliant.

1 MR. MICHAILOS: Okay. 2 THE COURT: That was a brilliant move on my 3 part. MR. MICHAILOS: Right. So we're doing 5 everything possible to be as ready as can be. 6 We're not going to have any problems as far as 7 calling witnesses on those dates. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. MICHAILOS: But I just don't want to put 10 on the record that --11 THE COURT: You're waiving any argument you 12 have that you're not ready? 13 Yes. MR. MICHAILOS: 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. MICHAILOS: Yes. Thank you. 16 THE COURT: I'm not saying that you're giving 17 up your previous request. I've denied it. 18 hurricane facilitated a continuance and we're ready 19 on the 30th. 20 I haven't heard any new reason for a 21 continuance, but I'm more concerned that your 22 witnesses who you believe you might call -- I'm not 23 making you call any. You don't have to do 24 anything. You're the defense and you can sit there 25 and read the newspaper and do nothing. But if

1 perhaps you were going to call some witnesses, I wanted to make sure that the timeframe that would 2 3 be time for your case would be the 15th and later, that that was okay with any witnesses that you 5 might have? 6 MR. MICHAILOS: It is, Judge. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Livermore? Well, I'm concentrating on 8 MR. LIVERMORE: 9 penalty, and I have witnesses ready for the 20th --10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. LIVERMORE: -- is what I was told was the 12 I just wanted to make sure. 13 That hasn't changed. THE COURT: 14 MR. LIVERMORE: Because we've got people 15 flying in from other places. 16 I do not intend to make anyone go 17 forward with any of their witnesses penalty 18 phase-wise before the 20th. We had all agreed that 19 that would pretty much be the start. Unless for 20 any reason we finish on the 16th, and on the 17th 21 the State's ready with their penalty phase 22 witnesses, maybe we'd move it up. 23 MR. LIVERMORE: I understand. 24 THE COURT: But normally we need a day for

doctors to talk to people.

25

MR. LIVERMORE: There aren't going to be any.

THE COURT: Okay. So they're not going to call any doctors.

So are you calling doctors?

MR. LABRUZZO: Dr. Palma, if we decide to call him.

THE COURT: Okay. Dr. Palma is coming in the beginning of the case. And you might call --

MR. LABRUZZO: He could also testify in the penalty phase.

THE COURT: I understand. So I mean if we get to the point where we can move forward with penalty phase, I'm not going to make you accelerate when it is that your witnesses are available. I'm not going to say either call somebody or sit down, you know, rest. We're not going to have any of that.

Don't worry about that.

State?

MR. LABRUZZO: Judge, since we're talking about timeframe -- and during the preparation of witnesses, the State's done the best job that I think that we can as to gauging when we're calling witnesses -- I would say at the beginning of this case we anticipated November 2nd, which is the Thursday, next Thursday, as far as the first day of

actual testimony, assuming a three-day jury selection.

Now, as the conversations between the State and the Defense and the Court have developed over time, maybe three days was a bit aggressive. I'm thinking maybe we'll be able to do it in a little bit shorter than the time set. That being said, we've prepared a number of our witnesses to be ready on the 2nd for the first day of testimony.

THE COURT: So what you're saying is the 1st might be an off day?

MR. LABRUZZO: Well, I'm not saying that.

Well, there could be opening statements, there

could be other things that could be maybe

accomplished on that day, but the large bulk of

witnesses that we started to create this timeline

of people to come in, we've all anticipated the 2nd

as being really the date that we would start.

MR. SARABIA: Is the Court going to work with us on timing?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SARABIA: Okay.

THE COURT: Yes. I will work with you on timing. I don't have anything else to do. It's not like if I don't make you do something, I can do

something else. So I completely understand in a trial that has this many witnesses and this many victims and this many things going on, that there may be days that the jury gets a short day, which they will probably thank me for.

So I have no problem if Wednesday is one of those short days. I would hope that it is, because they will be here a long time on Monday and a long time on Tuesday if we get it in on Monday and Tuesday. So Wednesday if we only did opening statements starting at 11:00 or after lunch or something like that where they're only here a couple hours on that day, I think they would like that. So I don't have any problem with that.

It's going be a long time for the jurors to get selected. Jury selection is going to take as much time as it takes, and the people who get selected will probably be the people that were here that started on Monday.

There's probably going to be some people in the jury that come at 8:00 on Monday morning, and so that means that's been a long two days where I'm not going to let them have their cell phone and they're not going to be able to surf the — you know, they're going to need a day off probably.

MR. SARABIA: In that regard, I want to check with the Court, I'm anticipating testimony on the 2nd, which is Thursday; and the 3rd, which is Friday; and then the following week I think is the 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th, that's Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. Not Friday because it's Veterans Day. And then come back the following Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SARABIA: I think that since we have to finish on Wednesday, we should definitely have time that all of our testimony will be done by then.

THE COURT: Okay. So given that timeframe that we just went over, you believe that you can get it in in that timeframe?

MR. SARABIA: Yes. I think we may have some dead time in there.

THE COURT: That's fine.

Mr. Michailos.

MR. MICHAILOS: You had said something about Fridays off, Judge. Is that just Veterans Day?

Are we on for Friday of next week?

THE COURT: Right now we are scheduled to have trial on the 3rd. The 3rd is the day that we are going.

MR. MICHAILOS: Okay.

THE COURT: The 10th is Veterans Day, it's closed, so we won't be there. And then the 17th I'm using as a flex day.

MR. MICHAILOS: Okay.

THE COURT: The Bench and Bar conference is that day down in St. Pete. So I actually left that day as a deliberation day for the jury. As you all both well know, once the jury starts to deliberate, they cannot break. So I would have to, you know, find hotels for them. So what I intend to do is not start deliberations in the afternoon.

So let's say we finish on the 16th. I would send them home, bring them back on the 17th, and instruct them on the 17th to begin deliberations.

Same thing on penalty phase. I will bring them back in the morning, instruct them — and we're going to need some time to go over that. That's a whole other issue. We're going to need a day anyway to go over jury instructions — and then have them begin to deliberate as early as in midmorning as I can get so to try to stop the issue of having to, you know, put them up in a hotel.

MR. LABRUZZO: Judge, the Court's not asking, but the State would put on the record now that we

would waive any sequestration of the jury both guilt or penalty phase.

THE COURT: Defense?

MR. LABRUZZO: That's something obviously that they would need to think about. But as far as the State's concerned, we'd waive any issues, any request to sequester the jury during the guilt deliberations or penalty deliberations.

THE COURT: I think in guilt, you both can waive. I think in penalty phase, you can't waive; but I'll research that issue.

MR. LIVERMORE: I just don't know the answer to that.

THE COURT: I'll research it. I think in the guilt phase, you can waive it. But I don't think in the penalty phase, you can waive it. But I'll look. I'll go double-check that.

MR. LABRUZZO: Okay.

THE COURT: One, I will find the answer out; and then, two, of course, you guys keep waive, and then if you all wanted to waive, it would have to be on the record with your client's approval, of course. But, you know, I really find that if you give people a whole day, they can usually work through their issues. If you try to throw them out

at 4:00 in the afternoon, they tend to have a much harder time trying to resolve any issues of the jury.

But I'm just saying I will do that so that even if you did waive sequestration, I would try to get them to have their decision and not have to send them home and come back, because that causes issues and people could talk to them or contact them. Even though I tell them not to do that, sometimes they don't have any, you know, control over that. So if they leave, it always causes issues just to make a decision.

Mr. Sarabia.

MR. SARABIA: The only other thing that I can think of to address is the motion regarding the child witness.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SARABIA: At this point we do not intend to call him. Although, I think he did remarkably well in the deposition and is much more communicative, there are challenges in the way that he communicates that I don't think would be easy to deal with at this stage, and we made the decision we are not going to call him. So I think that that will settle that issue.

THE COURT: So at this point, because the State is indicating they are not calling the child witness, I will not rule on that. If for any reason the State decides that they will call the child witness, then we would have to take the time in order for me to hear that motion. It is still in the court file and it doesn't become important until you're going to put the witness on the stand.

So if you're not going to put the witness on the stand at this point, there's no reason for me to have a big hearing and get into what happened at the second deposition and the testimony and those kinds of things. So right now we'll just table that motion, and unless the State changes their mind and tells me they are going to call the child, it's a moot point. Okay?

MR. MICHAILOS: Can I bring something up related to that? It's sort of a side issue, but it's related to the child.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MICHAILOS: And I have had discussions with Mr. Sarabia, so I'm confident that he's in agreement with this, but I just want to put it on the record so there's no misunderstanding.

In the beginning of the investigation of this

case CPI was involved trying to place the child with relatives, and at one point they conducted a medical examination; and attempted to do a forensic interview, which was not successful, obviously.

But during the times of that interview, the child was observed playing with toys, and several different unprofessional conclusions were drawn by some of these people with regard to how the child was playing with certain dolls and maybe he'd seen something and was acting that out.

I think that's clearly inadmissible, because we have no interpreter that could interpret such toy play, and I think it be prejudicial. I think we're in agreement with that, but I just want to put that on the record. I would think that no CPI is going to come here and testify as to the child, you know, hitting mommy doll or daddy doll and uttering certain things.

THE COURT: Well, that would be child hearsay.

MR. MICHAILOS: Right. Right.

THE COURT: And they haven't done any motion to --

MR. SARABIA: We do not intend to do any of that.

THE COURT: Okay.

1 MR. SARABIA: We're not going to call the witnesses from CPT who interviewed the child, nor 2 3 do we intend to reference any of that. THE COURT: Okay. MR. SARABIA: Other than the fact that there 5 6 was a child and that he did exist and was present, 7 I doubt we will list the --8 THE COURT: Or what he did or what he didn't 9 do, what he said, none of that's coming in? 10 MR. SARABIA: Correct. 11 THE COURT: And in this particular case the 12 child is found with the defendant when the 13 defendant is arrested, correct? 14 MR. SARABIA: Correct. 15 THE COURT: So that particular fact I would 16 assume might come out? 17 MR. MICHAILOS: Right. 18 THE COURT: But anything that he did or said, 19 that's not coming out, correct? 20 MR. SARABIA: Correct. 21 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything else 22 about that? 23 Nothing else about that. MR. SARABIA: 24 THE COURT: Did everybody receive a copy of my 25 memo about what we're going to do on Monday the

1 30th and Tuesday the 31st in reference to the jury? Did everybody get that? State, did you get that? 2 3 MR. MICHAILOS: Yes. MR. SARABIA: We did receive a copy. 5 THE COURT: All right. 6 MR. SARABIA: I think we left it in our 7 office. THE COURT: A little change in that is that 8 9 Dr. O'Neil has asked to be the person who swears 10 the jury on the 30th when they are brought up to 11 Courtroom 3-B. So Dr. O'Neil will come in, she'll 12 swear the jury. During the swearing part of the 13 jury, they're asked five specific questions. 14 Now, I'll note this is exactly what is 15 normally done every day here when jurors come in. 16 The only difference is I'm taking a hundred of them 17 into a room as opposed to them being with the whole 18 group downstairs. So there's nothing that's 19 different than would normally be done with jurors 20 in any case. I'm just taking a hundred of them 21 out, doing the same thing, just in a different 22 room. 23 But the questions that are asked are: 24 "Are you over 18?

Are you a citizen of the United States?

25

Are you a resident currently of Pasco County? 1 Do you have a driver's license or a Florida ID 2 3 card?" Those are the four things that you have to 5 have to even sit as a juror. 6 Then also is asked: 7 "Are you presently under prosecution for a 8 crime anywhere? 9 Have you ever been convicted of bribery, 10 forgery, perjury, or larceny?" 11 Probably it will tell them that includes grand 12 theft. 13 "Have you ever been convicted of a felony? 14 And if you have 'yes,' have your civil rights been 15 restored? And if you don't know, raise your hand." 16 "Are you the governor?" I think I know what 17 he looks like, but I'm just saying. 18 "The lieutenant governor?" I'm not so sure 19 what he looks like. 20 "A member of the governor's cabinet? "The Clerk of the circuit court?" Since 21 22 she'll be asking this question, I'm sure it's not 23 her. 24 "Or a judge, or currently a grand juror, or

any other elected official?"

25

So we're going to ask that.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

"Have you ever been determined to be mentally incapacitated?"

So those are the questions that are going to be asked to the panel that are brought up, the hundred.

What I intend to do is if anyone gives an answer to any of those questions that might make them not qualified to sit, I'm going to immediately, before they fill out the additional questionnaire, which we're going to get to in a minute, bring them over here and resolve that fact.

Because there's no reason to sit over there and fill out a questionnaire if they're not a resident of Pasco County, if they're 17, if they're They're not eliqible to sit as a convicted felon. a juror, so there's no reason to even go forward.

Does anyone have a problem with that? MR. LABRUZZO: No, Your Honor. Not from the State.

THE COURT: Okay. So they will be immediately brought over if I feel, based on their answers, they would be unqualified to even be examined as a juror in this case.

So that's the only change in my memo, because

I went over that we were going to, you know, take the regular questionnaire and we were going to do the supplemental questionnaire.

But when the Clerk went ahead and showed me the questions that they normally ask, they said: We're still going to ask these questions. I didn't realize they asked these questions. So I wanted to add that to what I was going to do and let you know that we were going to bring them over right away.

I'm not going to excuse any of the hundred jurors that are brought up unless they are brought over here and it's on the record in front of everybody. Okay? So even if I think, oh, yep, they're not qualified, I'm going to bring them over here.

You guys are going to have a list of a hundreds names. They're not going to be in any specific alphabetical order as far as I know.

There's just going to be a list of the hundred people that are in that room. They're not in any seating order over there. They're literally just a hundred people. So you can just mark through that person before we even start to lower your group.

Then immediately after they are sworn in, their original questionnaire that they give to the

Clerk will come to you just like normal. Okay? So you can already start working on questionnaires, the normal questionnaires.

Then they are going to be given the supplemental questionnaire, if we have one, which we're going to talk about in a minute -- you all got one -- and they're going to be told to start working on that.

They're going to have 30 minutes to finish that, but if they finish sooner, just raise their hand. As soon as ten are gathered, Pauline will come in and start making copies of them and bring them to you. So you're going to get them in groups of ten to be brought over to you. If at any time, as we bring either the original questionnaires or the supplemental questionnaires, someone wants to speak to one of the jurors, I need to know their name and I will bring them over immediately.

MR. LIVERMORE: Based on the answers to the questions.

THE COURT: Based on the answers to the questions.

So if you see it and they say, you know, I'm a Jehovah's witness, I can't sit in judgment and I could never find for the death penalty, bring them

over right away. We don't have to wait until everybody is done.

So either from the original questionnaire or the supplemental questionnaire, you immediately see an issue, we'll bring that person over right away to see if we need to keep them. And that way we try to move it in a little bit quicker fashion than waiting for a hundred people to finish it and then you guys look at a hundred questionnaires. If we can just keep moving along.

And I know I have quite a few Assistant State
Attorneys on this case and I have quite a few
Assistant Public Defenders on this case, so I'm
going to ask that not everyone has to be involved
in this. We're going to have people that that's
their job. I mean, we're not going to have to have
conferences going on on either side to make
decisions? Yes? No?

MR. LABRUZZO: We will work our best, Judge, to limit the amount of conversations. We have a number of people that are going to be assisting us in the courtroom.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LABRUZZO: We've made arrangements for that.

THE COURT: I see. We've got a lot of people over there; we've got a lot of people over here.

So I'm just saying that if you can't decide, wait until we bring them all over. Okay? I'm not going to stop you from asking questions when the whole panel gets here, nor am I going to stop you from asking to approach the bench with any one juror when they get over here. Okay?

I think we're all going to kind of see the questions that need to be addressed right away and we'll be moving along as quickly as possible. But, again, we don't have to answer every single question before we bring the panel over here. You still can approach the bench, if you guys are going back and forth on that one, just approach. It's not a problem.

I'm just trying to stop from having each individual juror come up to the bench. When we bring the jurors over to speak to you as a whole, I'm going to have them sit in the second row over there; the defendant will be here (indicating). So the good thing about the way we're doing it is the defendant will be present for the individual voir dire of the juror. Okay?

But once we get everybody in here, if we come

to the bench, I don't know what we're going to do about the defendant. I don't know if you guys want to waive his presence. We'll have to figure something out there.

MR. MICHAILOS: We will. We'll discuss that.

THE COURT: Okay. I have clipboards, I have
pens for the jurors, I have all that.

I have been told that there is going to be a pool camera in the courtroom and we're going to lay some cable down this afternoon for that pool camera, and I believe we're going to keep it where I normally keep it, which is over there in that corner over there.

There is supposedly some group that's going to live stream the trial from the pool camera. So there's not more than one camera. We're going to have one camera. Whatever they want to do with the feed that comes from that camera is none of my business. The pool camera is my pool camera and it's going to be run just like a normal pool camera.

I believe that we may have people from the St. Pete Times here. I haven't had any indication of whether they issued to have a camera person here, you know, whether they want to take pictures.

I haven't heard from them yet, but I do normally 1 allow them to have one person take pictures if they 2 3 want, but they're usually pretty discreet and sit in the front row. 5 Based on the memo that I have filed in this 6 case and provided to both of you, does anybody have 7 a problem with the way the jurors are going to be 8 handled in the first hundred group? State, any 9 problems? 10 MR. LABRUZZO: And, I'm sorry, Judge. Can you 11 repeat that first part. THE COURT: Do you have any problem with my 12 13 memo? 14 MR. LABRUZZO: No, Judge. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Anything you see that, oh, 16 I don't want that to happen or that's not going to 17 work? 18 The only thing that I MR. LABRUZZO: No. 19 would add -- and I know we previously discussed it 20 when you mentioned that we were going to use a 21 document like this, I just ask that it be filed in 22 the court file. 23 THE COURT: It's already filed.

Perfect.

THE COURT: So, Defense, any problems with the

MR. LABRUZZO:

24

25

1 memo that I laid out on how we're going to do the first hundred and then the reserve? 2 3 MR. LIVERMORE: Subject to my motion for individual, no. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MR. LIVERMORE: I understand. And we'll do 7 our best, Judge. 8 THE COURT: Okay. So in this memo we talk 9 about these supplemental questionnaires. So we're 10 moving on. I don't have that. Have you all gotten 11 together and come up with what you believe we're 12 going to do? 13 MR. LIVERMORE: Judge, not quite. Not quite. 14 MR. LABRUZZO: And it's kind of the State's 15 issue. Mr. Livermore dropped off a copy from the 16 front desk to my office. I've expressed my 17 objections and ready to kind of, you know, lay 18 those out on the record. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Can I have a copy? 20 MR. LIVERMORE: What I did was, I did one that 21 has a lot of the questions on the Clerk's 22 questionnaire. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 MR. LIVERMORE: And then I did one that 25 doesn't have the questions.

THE COURT: I'd rather have the one that doesn't.

MR. LIVERMORE: Okay.

THE COURT: Because you're going to have the original one.

MR. LIVERMORE: Right. I got a copy from the Clerk yesterday.

THE COURT: And I will tell you, we had a hearing on a questionnaire on another case that I have pending that's coming up for trial, and the one thing that we put in the heading of that questionnaire that I think you might like that's not here is date of birth.

We do not ask them for their date of birth on the regular questionnaire, because all we ask them is how old they are. So in my past life as a State Attorney, I was constantly trying to do math to try to figure out if this person was the person based on their age. If we just ask for their date of birth, it makes running the person so much easier.

MR. LABRUZZO: I didn't get a chance to express that; but as far as an addition to this question, the State would be asking that we include the date of birth of the prospective juror.

MR. LIVERMORE: We do have all their date of

births, though, on the list. Yeah, we do. 1 MR. LABRUZZO: Yes. It's on the list. 2 So now 3 you can cross-reference 700 to that. THE COURT: Right. 5 MR. LIVERMORE: All right. 6 MR. LABRUZZO: If you want to just look at it. 7 THE COURT: Well, how about we put the date of 8 birth and we make sure we're talking about the same 9 person? 10 MR. LIVERMORE: Yes. 11 THE COURT: So any problem with that? We can 12 add date of birth in there? 13 MR. LIVERMORE: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Okay. So, State, do you have it 15 in front of you now, their proposed sample 16 questionnaire? 17 MR. LABRUZZO: I do. Yes, Judge. And we're 18 working off the one with the least amount of 19 questions? 20 THE COURT: Correct, yes. 21 MR. LABRUZZO: Got it. 22 THE COURT: So what is it that you have an 23 issue with? 24 MR. LABRUZZO: Judge, we would object to 25 question Number 7: Do you have strong feelings

1 about the criminal justice system? If so, what are they? 2 3 Yes. Why are we asking that THE COURT: question? I don't even know if they know what the 5 criminal justice system is. 6 MR. LIVERMORE: We have the sovereign citizens 7 and others and it just helps ferret those folks 8 out. 9 THE COURT: I think if they were a sovereign 10 citizen, they won't respond to my request for them 11 to arrive here at the courthouse, because, you 12 know, I'm not a meaningful person to them. 13 MR. LIVERMORE: Yes. I understand. 14 THE COURT: I agree. We'll take that out. 15 You know, that's really not necessary. 16 What's the next one? 17 MR. LABRUZZO: Judge, the State would object 18 to question Number 9, and it may dovetail into the 19 other motion in limine that's been filed. 20 question states: "You may be expected in the 21 course of this trial to view photographs of the 22 deceased victims which are unpleasant. How do you 23 feel about this?" 24 THE COURT: I'm okay with that question.

mean, what I expect is people to write, you know, I

25

might faint at the sight of blood or something. I think everybody is going to say, well, I don't want to do that.

I don't think anybody wants to do that. And I think that's a question you can follow up with, that they understand they're going to have to do that. What are you trying to get at with the question?

MR. LIVERMORE: If somebody is going to have a strong opinion before they even see it, and I'm just trying to ferret it out.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know. What's a strong opinion? Of course you're going to have a strong opinion. I have a strong opinion. I don't like looking at pictures with people with blood.

MR. SARABIA: None of us like that.

THE COURT: So the real question should be ——
I don't have a problem with the statement: That
you may be expected in the course of the trial to
view photographs of the deceased victims, period.
Because we all understand they're going to be
unpleasant. There's no reason reiterating what we
all know.

I'm trying to think of the question that would normally come out.

MR. SARABIA: This is also a question that's 1 easy to address in voir dire. 2 3 THE COURT: Yeah. That's really one we can go over in a group. 5 MR. SARABIA: And frequently asked. 6 THE COURT: We don't need this for individual 7 voir dire. I think everybody is going to agree. I expect somebody is going to ask this question? 8 9 MR. LABRUZZO: It's on my list of questions to 10 ask. 11 So it's going to get asked THE COURT: Okay. 12 and I'm not sure we need that in advance. 13 Okay. What other one do you have a problem 14 with? 15 MR. LABRUZZO: Judge, the next objection would 16 be as to Number 15. My objection is not that we're 17 asking the question about the amount of time, it's, 18 I quess, the way it's phrased. 19 Mr. Sarabia had a suggestion, and his 20 suggestion was: Do you have any scheduling 21 conflicts that would prevent you from serving as a 22 juror between October the 30th and November the 23 22nd, 2017? 24 THE COURT: I have no problem with the way

this is worded other than I like the dates in there

25

only because a lot of people don't think in terms 1 So how about, the trial in this case may 2 3 last for four weeks, and put from October 30th through November 22nd, right? 5 MR. LABRUZZO: I think that was the date that 6 we gave. 7 THE COURT: And we're putting in "may," it may 8 last that long. 9 MR. LABRUZZO: Right. 10 THE COURT: And, "Would you be able to serve 11 on this trial and give it your full attention?" 12 have no problem. Why don't we just put the dates 13 in there. 14 MR. LIVERMORE: That's fine. 15 This question is helpful for us THE COURT: 16 because people are going to say they can't, and 17 we're going to ask them questions and they may end 18 up still being able to. 19 That's why I'm not really MR. LABRUZZO: 20 objecting to the substance of it. I just wanted to 21 put in some different language, but I agree with 22 the Court. 23 The question is fine if we can THE COURT: 24 just put in from 10/30 to 11/22.

MR. SARABIA: And one difficulty there, Judge,

25

is that does straddle Veterans Day. There may be people who have plans on Veterans Day.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SARABIA: And may not realize it.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SARABIA: Okay.

THE COURT: And we're going to say, what's your problem? And they're going to say, you know, I'm a veteran and I'm going to be in the parade.

MR. SARABIA: Okay.

THE COURT: That's okay. That day is off.

MR. SARABIA: So them answering, no, isn't that we're not going to talk to them, it's just that we know there's an issue.

THE COURT: Correct. And the other issue is a lot of people probably are going to say, I have kids and I need to get them to school or I need to do this and I need to do that.

I'm already going to tell them, "You're not going to get here until 9:30, and we'll be out of here by 6:00." And so this is an easy way, instead of having to do it in front of the whole group, bringing people over and getting down to is there one day that you have a doctor's appointment that's in the morning, or this or that and the other

thing, and we can work through that in a quicker manner than normally.

So I don't have any problem. We're probably going to have people say, no, because I have this date this thing, and we'll figure out with all of us here whether that fits into our schedule or if that doesn't fit into our schedule. So if we can just put in, between October 30th to November 22nd, and we'll move on from there.

MR. LIVERMORE: In light of what you had said earlier, I imagine we can probably strike

Number 14, because that's kind of the same question there.

THE COURT: Right. Exactly. We're going to ask them before that.

MR. LIVERMORE: Right.

MR. LABRUZZO: Judge, my next comment would be on Question 16. I'm okay with the language, with the addition of the intersection of Hatteras and Old Dixie Highway.

For some reason I feel like when we talk about street names people may remember, oh, I remember being on that street and something happening. They may not realize that's Hudson or maybe that's another part of the county.

1 MR. LIVERMORE: That's fine. I don't have any 2 problem with that. 3 THE COURT: And where would you put it? MR. LABRUZZO: I would just say: Having 5 occurred between August the 28th, 2014 and 6 September the 1st, 2014, near the intersection of 7 Hatteras Drive and Old Dixie Highway, Hudson, 8 Florida. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Livermore, can you get that 10 in? 11 MR. LIVERMORE: That raises an issue. In an 12 earlier conversation you had indicated that you 13 were going to task your JA doing the final one, but 14 if that's not the case --15 THE COURT: No. She can, as long as you send 16 her -- if you send her a digital copy as soon as we 17 leave --18 MR. LIVERMORE: Okay. 19 THE COURT: -- you send it in an email, she 20 will put in these changes. Not a problem. 21 MR. LIVERMORE: Because I wasn't taking that 22 detailed of notes. 23 THE COURT: Well, that's no problem. 24 put it in. It's Hatteras Drive and Old Dixie 25 Highway, Hudson, Florida?

MR. LABRUZZO: Yes, Your Honor. 1 THE COURT: Okay. I got it. 2 3 The next comment or objection MR. LABRUZZO: by the State is Question 17: Did you form any 5 opinions about the case? Then please explain. 6 My only objection is isn't that why we're 7 having them fill out the first questions, to bring 8 them in to ask them this? 9 THE COURT: Right. We'll take 17 out. 10 MR. LIVERMORE: I have no problem with that. 11 THE COURT: That kind of just wastes our time. 12 If they say, yes, to 16, they're coming over and 13 they're going to explain to us all this. 14 MR. LIVERMORE: Right. 15 THE COURT: No reason sitting there writing a 16 book on that one. Got it. 17 MR. LIVERMORE: No problem. 18 THE COURT: And same thing with tell us in as 19 much detail as possible -- oh, this is the death 20 penalty question. 21 Okay. Go ahead. State? 22 MR. LABRUZZO: Judge, again, I don't have an 23 objection conceptually to asking a question about, 24 "What are your feelings about the death penalty? 25 Please explain." So if this is the language that

the Defense is requesting, I'm good.

THE COURT: Okay. But I will tell you, I had the same question in the other questionnaire I have. That's why I'm making a timeframe, because this question alone may cause people to, like, write on the back of your questionnaire. And I understand, once they get to that, you're going to want to question them anyway.

MR. LIVERMORE: Well, a solution to that would be Number 21. I know they're objecting to 21.

That's the old State Attorney, 1 to 10.

THE COURT: Why are you objecting to 21?

MR. LABRUZZO: I'm objecting to 21, because I believe that's a question that's most properly explained and asked during a discussion about what the law is. The Court is going to give them preliminary instructions about what the procedure is during the death penalty phase. And this question just kind of — yeah, exactly. So, you know, they're making a decision or coming up with their opinions without understanding what the law is.

THE COURT: Well, and I completely understand that.

MR. LABRUZZO: Right.

THE COURT: However, the idea of this question is you talk to people who circle 1 or they circle 10.

MR. LABRUZZO: Right.

THE COURT: You're going to go over this question again. Just because we ask this question does not mean you don't get to ask the question again.

MR. LABRUZZO: And I understand that. I just put a lot of weight into the instructions that the Court is going to give beforehand.

When people are sitting down, you know, early in the morning or coming up with these opinions, it may not be an opinion or something that would be accurate once they have an understanding of what the law is or have an opportunity to come to some sort of agreement.

So the question is going to get asked regardless if it's in here or not. The State's preference is that it would be asked and explained during a question and answer session or questioned by the State. Putting it in here, it just doesn't give the State or the Defense an opportunity to understand why they came to that.

Because if someone says, oh, I put 1 because I

was completely mistaken, I was totally wrong about what the question was, then we now have this inconsistency that we're going to have to rectify during a questionnaire, when then the — I'm sure either side, both State or Defense, depending on what the number they give, if they say that they're wrong about it, will open up to, well, Judge, you can't rehabilitate yourself from a 1 or a 10.

And if the person who answered the question and was under the mistaken beliefs or given an inappropriate opinion because they didn't understand the question, then we have to explore, well, what did you really mean? Did you understand all this? You know, having understood all this, does it change your mind?

I just see there to be a lot of ambiguity with some of the jurors when it comes to trying to come down. So when someone easily put in 10, and then when it is explained to them or they have time to think about it will say, oh, no, I'm really a 5.

Well, one of the sides are not going to be happy with that, even though their true understanding of how they feel of the death penalty may actually be a number other than what they put down. That's just my take on it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LIVERMORE: What it does is give us their preconceived notions and that's as important as what happens after it gets explained.

THE COURT: I'm going to let the question stand, because I agree with the Defense. When you say they put a lot of weight into my instruction, first of all, I can tell you that my instruction is not going to cause somebody to go from a 10 to a 5 automatically.

Now, you explaining the instruction to them, they may say, oh, yes, I understand what you're saying; that, you know, what I'm saying is if I think all the mitigators or aggravators are there and there's no mitigators, I would be a 10; but I'm going to listen to the instructions and I'm going to follow the law, and if that makes me a 5, then that makes me a 5.

I don't believe that you can strike someone just because they're a 10, because they wrote down 10. I mean, I've done lots of jury trials and lots of penalty phase trials where someone says they're a 1, and the Defense spends almost the entire time getting them to a 2, and then you can't strike them.

Because if they go to a 2, they'll say, well, you know, I guess if you killed little baby cats and stabbed everybody in the world and killed my mother, I would maybe think about giving some death. Oh, I make myself a 2, now you can't strike them because it's not a never. So it goes both ways.

MR. LABRUZZO: It does, Judge. But I would disagree with the Court. If someone were to circle 10 or 1, that is an automatic cause challenge.

You would say if someone votes automatically for death, that is not a cause challenge?

THE COURT: Not unless they're staying at 10 when you question them.

MR. LABRUZZO: I just want to get that on the record that if someone's an automatic for death, that's not a cause challenge?

THE COURT: Hold on. Stop right there.

That's not what they're saying. They're saying if they circle 10 on this piece of paper, that's not an automatic cause challenge.

If they come in here and say under every circumstance a hundred percent of the time I would impose death no matter what, they're going to cause challenge them. And if the person says never,

ever, ever will I ever impose death, if you put me on this trial, I don't care what you show me, I'm never imposing death, you're going to cause challenge them.

But after questioning, if you get somebody to go more towards the middle because they understand the law and what they're looking at, then they can say, well, I guess if the judge told me that and based on what she says and based on what you say, I could possibly, then you're going to have to bump them for some other reason.

MR. LABRUZZO: And I understand, Judge. We've obviously spent a number of minutes debating what the question says, and therein lies the problem the State has. What all the things that someone could consider in trying to answer this question is something I think is better done through questioning of the jurors in the panel.

THE COURT: But the problem is you're going to ask this question later, right?

MR. LABRUZZO: I am.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LABRUZZO: But it's a differently phrased question, one that is also in light of the law that the Court is going to be instructing them on. And

1 I'm going to respect the Court's ruling.

My next objection would be as to the actual language that's being used in here. We're talking about, and just for the record: "How would you rate your feelings, position, beliefs and opinions?" Which I think is ambiguous as to what we're actually asking for, because we don't know what we're asking for about the death penalty on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means the death penalty is never appropriate and 10 means the death penalty is always appropriate.

My objection would be as to rate your feelings, position, beliefs, opinions. So if we're going to pick one and that's what I'm limited to, I would just ask to say, "What is your opinion about the death penalty?" and then ask them — maybe it should say something, "In light of your opinions on the death penalty, please rate on a scale of 1 to 10 where you fall, where 1 means that the death penalty is never appropriate and 10 means that the death penalty is always appropriate.

MR. LIVERMORE: I put the four options in there because I wasn't sure which ones.

MR. LABRUZZO: No, I understand. I'm not trying to say you guys were trying to suggest all

1 of them.

MR. LIVERMORE: An "opinion" is fine. I have no problem with that.

THE COURT: Okay. You've said a lot, and I'm not exactly sure what you want the question to say. You're kind of speaking, you know, off the top of your head. So I have to type this up and my JA has to type this up. So what is it that you would like it to say?

MR. LABRUZZO: If we're going to have the question, I would like it to say, "Based on your opinions about the death penalty, please rate from a scale of 1 to 10 the following: 1 meaning the death penalty is never appropriate and 10 means the death penalty is always appropriate".

THE COURT: So 21 would read: Based on your opinions of the death penalty, on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means the death penalty is never appropriate and 10 means the death penalty is always appropriate, where do you fall? Where would you rate?

MR. LABRUZZO: "Where would you rate?" That's fine.

THE COURT: Okay. And anything else? Any other questions the State's requesting that aren't

1 in here? MR. LABRUZZO: No, Judge. No, Judge. 2 3 THE COURT: All right. So the changes that I have of the proposed sample questionnaire, on the 5 top it will go: Name, date of birth, juror number. 6 It will go 1 through 6. 7 And then Number 7 will be: Do you have any experience? That question. 8 9 Then Number 8 will be: Are you an expectant 10 mother? 11 9 will be: Have you reported as a juror 12 within the past year? 13 10 is: Are you a person 70 years or older? MR. LIVERMORE: Oops. I missed the "you". 14 15 THE COURT: "Are you." Got it. 16 11: Are you responsible? 17 12: The trial in this case may last for three 18 weeks, October 30th through November 22nd. Would 19 you be able to serve? 20 And then Number 13 will be: "The defendant, 21 Adam Matos, has been charged with four counts of 22 first-degree murder, which is alleged to have 23 occurred between August 27th, 2014, and 24 September 1st of 2014, near the intersection of 25 Hatteras Drive and Old Dixie Highway, Hudson,

1	Florida. Have you seen, heard, or read anything
2	about State versus Adam Matos? If, yes, please
3	explain."
4	That's the way we want it, right?
5	MR. LABRUZZO: Yes, Judge.
6	THE COURT: Then 14 will be: Please tell us
7	as much detail as possible.
8	15: Have you held this view?
9	Go ahead.
10	MR. LIVERMORE: Instead of what is now 18, I
11	thought we were doing 21.
12	THE COURT: Oh, okay. We're taking out 18.
13	MR. LIVERMORE: Right.
14	THE COURT: But do we want 19 to be behind 21?
15	MR. LIVERMORE: Yes.
16	THE COURT: So 21 will be 14.
17	Then 15 will be: Have you held this view?
18	And 16: And have your views on the death
19	penalty changed?
20	Are we okay with that?
21	MR. LIVERMORE: Yes, ma'am. I didn't know
22	about that last paragraph. That's been on some of
23	them.
24	THE COURT: All right. "The last paragraph
25	reads: You should not ask for anyone's help in

If you'd

completing the questionnaire unless you need help 1 reading the question or writing your answer. 2 3 answers must be your own. You should not talk to anyone about anything pertaining to your jury duty 5 from this point until the completion of the trial, 6 in which you will serve if you are selected". 7 Anybody have a problem with that? That sounds 8 good to me. 9 MR. LIVERMORE: Okay. I didn't know whether 10 you wanted to add that or not. 11 THE COURT: I'm going to tell them that about 12 One more time doesn't hurt. 15 times. 13 like me to put something about cell phones in there 14 for the 20th time, I'll tell that too. 15 MR. LIVERMORE: I think that probably covers 16 it. 17 THE COURT: I'm going to say, "If anybody 18 breaks the cell phone rule, I'm taking them all". 19 So I'm going to be using a little peer pressure on 20 the cell phone issues. So I'm going to let them 21 keep them only because a hundred cell phones starts 22 to be a little bit of a liability to the people 23 that have to hold them.

24

25

MR. LIVERMORE: I've seen the grimace on them. THE COURT: Yes. But I'm going to tell them

when they're in the jury box, I'm going to have their cell phone anyway, so they should get used to not having it anyway. So that's the other thing.

So if the Public Defender can have their staff email over this questionnaire as soon as possible, Pauline will make the changes, she will send you back when it's going to be done, and she's making the copies.

MR. LIVERMORE: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay?

MR. LIVERMORE: So we need to email her?

THE COURT: Yes. Email it over. And she can make the changes and then she can send it up to our printer so that she can get them printed. It looks like it's probably going to make two pages, which I really like. And then she'll attach them to the clipboard so that when they arrive they'll be all ready.

Again, when she gets ten, she's going to take those, she's making two copies for either side, and I get the original. So I'll have the original of what the person said, and both sides will have two copies. I know you have a lot of people. If you want extra copies, you're just going to have to go make copies yourself.

The clerk has asked if there's any way that when we begin the trial, the State Attorney could have a list at least daily of the evidence they intend to put in so that they can prepare their evidence list and make sure that, you know, everything is labeled correctly and so it comes in.

They may have dropped someone's name like Halkitis, that he always gave the list. I'm not making you live up to that expectation. But if daily, at least, if you have a list of what evidence you think you're going to put in, if you could give them a list with the numbers that you intend to make those individual pieces of evidence, it will go a lot easier.

The website that was on the Internet has been changed to reflect daily updates from the trial. So we moved it to another part, so when they open up the Clerk's website, State v. Matos isn't the first thing they see. And if they put it in and they go to the online site for this trial, it's going to begin with the jury instructions that we get.

All the stuff that was on there has been moved. It's still available to the people in the community, it's still available to anyone in the

1 press, but it takes at least four clicks to get I made it a little more difficult. That's 2 3 the best I could do, because it is a public record. So at least we'll be able to do that. All right. Other than those issues, State, is 5 6 there anything else we need to discuss now? 7 MR. SARABIA: A couple things we want to put 8 on the record, Judge. 9 Our blood spatter expert that we formerly had 10 on the witness list or I guess still do, Jerry 11 Findley, will be unable to testify due to health

issues. It came up since our last date.

We have replaced him with Anna Cox. The

Defense has done a deposition. But I wanted to put
that on the record. She is a newer witness. But

calling her.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We also anticipate calling the records custodians from Wells Fargo and from Sprint, although they have not given us the names of the person they are sending yet. So I wanted to put that on the record as well.

that all has gone through and we do anticipate

THE COURT: Okay. Any problems with that, Defense?

MR. MICHAILOS: Judge, real briefly. With

regard to the clerk's request of the list of 1 evidence -- and I know the State's not required to 2 3 do this, but we have been pretty cooperative and amicable, especially myself and Mr. Sarabia -- we were wondering, because there's 300 witnesses and 5 6 we're going to have binders spread all over the 7 place, and every time the State calls a witnesses, 8 you're probably going to hear a lot of clicking and 9 clacking and file review, if the State could be 10 kind enough to maybe daily give us an idea of what 11 witnesses will be called, that would be great. 12 know that it would not be binding on them, but I 13 think it would make our lives much easier with 14 regard to that. 15 MR. SARABIA: I'll try to work with 16

Mr. Michailos on that.

THE COURT: All right.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have asked the Defense MR. SARABIA: multiple times in the past few months for both trial dates. There are three witnesses in Kansas that we may or may not need, depending on how the Defense intends to proceed. They know who I'm talking about.

It would be easier for them and for us to schedule them in advance if we know that we are

going to need them. If the Defense believes that they are going to go that route, I would appreciate some indication ahead of time, because otherwise we could be scheduling flights and have another day where we're trying to figure out when to put on testimony.

THE COURT: Okay. Any problem with that?

MR. VIZCARRA: Judge, we have been discussing that, and we don't know at this point for sure which way we're going to go. So, you know, if he feels like he needs them, I would say that to make those plans.

I understand they're in Kansas. What I don't want to do is give false information and then trip up the State. That's not my intention. So in an abundance of caution, I would advise them to prepare accordingly.

I don't know. Like I said, some of these things are going to be consultation with the client and there are decisions based on how the case is going.

THE COURT: When will we have to call the Kansas people? Would it be rebuttal?

MR. SARABIA: Most likely I would expect it during rebuttal.

THE COURT: So we wouldn't really need to know until — the tickets are going to be about the same cost because you're going to have to buy nonrefundable tickets if you buy them now or you buy them then. So why don't you just put the people on standby. We could also possibly talk about Skyping them in and not flying them in.

MR. SARABIA: And they are willing to fly. I just want to try and be as considerate to them as possible. I don't want to get them a ticket and then tell them, oh, we're not going to --

THE COURT: Tell them they wouldn't come until after the 15th, somewhere between the 15th and the 22nd. How about that? That's the best I can do.

And, again, if we needed to, you know, finish up a day and have them fly in overnight. They're coming in from Kansas. It's about a five-and-a-half-hour flight.

Mr. Michailos?

MR. MICHAILOS: With regard to the Sprint and Wells Fargo records, we've been agreeable with the State. We don't see there's any real reason to bring custodian of records in when under the law records could be authenticated and the State has given us notice for that.

1 THE COURT: You're good with stipulating that they don't need to bring a custodian in? 2 3 MR. MICHAILOS: Yes. But just for clarification, my understanding is the phone 5 records just deal with input times, times when 6 calls were made and received, and ingoing and 7 outgoing; that there's no actual voicemails or 8 audible audiotapes of any conversations or any text 9 messages. 10 THE COURT: We're just talking about tower 11 records, right? State? 12 MR. SARABIA: Not even tower records; but, 13 yes. Mr. Michailos is correct. The records that 14 we would be trying to introduce through Sprint 15 would be, yes, call logs. 16 THE COURT: Dates, times and numbers? Dates, 17 times, numbers? Dates, times, numbers? 18 MR. SARABIA: Correct. 19 THE COURT: No audio whatsoever? 20 MR. SARABIA: Correct. 21 MR. MICHAILOS: And I thought so, because 22 Mr. Sarabia has given us a heads up and the audio 23 he wants to introduce. But we'd hate to have a 24 surprise like that. So I'm not aware of any audio. 25 THE COURT: So they're waiving custodian as

long as it's just the records, the physical paper 1 records that we're talking about. 2 3 Does anybody think you have any biohazard material? 5 MR. SARABIA: Yes. 6 THE COURT: Okay. And how about weapons? 7 MR. SARABIA: Yes. 8 THE COURT: What are we doing on those? 9 MR. LABRUZZO: Well, as far as the firearms 10 that we intend on using, they're so rusted because 11 they were in the water, that we would not be taking 12 them out of the packaging that they're in. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Are they boxed in with the 14 zip ties? I can't see into the box well 15 MR. LABRUZZO: 16 enough to say if they're zip-tied or not. I don't 17 believe there's a zip tie. 18 MR. SARABIA: No, no, no. Those are the other 19 Those are the other weapons. weapons. 20 I understand. MR. LABRUZZO: 21 MR. SARABIA: The ones that we're going to 22 admit, I don't think that's the case. 23 MR. LABRUZZO: No. I understand. 24 MR. SARABIA: They're like just regular in a 25 box.

1 MR. LABRUZZO: They're not? MR. SARABIA: No. 2 3 MR. LABRUZZO: Well, there are a number of pieces of evidence that are --5 MR. SARABIA: There are weapons. We hope to 6 deal with them the same way we deal with weapons in 7 any trial. 8 THE COURT: Give them the weapons but not the 9 ammo. 10 MR. SARABIA: Correct. 11 THE COURT: Give them the ammo but not the 12 weapons. 13 MR. LABRUZZO: Correct. 14 MR. SARABIA: I don't know that we will be 15 admitting any ammunition. 16 THE COURT: Deputy Cleaver, do you think you 17 can handle that? 18 THE BAILIFF: Yes, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: He's got that. And the biohazard 20 stuff is going to stay in the bag or are we going 21 to pull it out and put it back? 22 MR. LABRUZZO: Well, if it's opened, it will 23 be put back in the bag. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. LABRUZZO: Nothing is going to stay out.

1	MR. SARABIA: We're just talking about blood,
2	right? Maybe not.
3	MR. LABRUZZO: Not just blood. I don't feel
4	comfortable telling the Court
5	MR. SARABIA: We'll need an expert to tell us
6	that.
7	MR. LABRUZZO: An expert will tell us what
8	exactly is on there.
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	MR. LABRUZZO: But it will be very limited.
11	THE COURT: So we might need an extra plastic
12	bag to put it in the bag.
13	MR. LABRUZZO: We have plastic bags. We've
14	got it all packed.
15	THE COURT: Okay. So we can take it out of
16	the plastic bag and then out of the regular bag,
17	because I assume they're in evidence bags?
18	MR. LABRUZZO: Yes.
19	THE COURT: And then we can put it back in the
20	regular bag and back in the plastic bag?
21	MR. LABRUZZO: Yes.
22	THE COURT: And we'll have lots and lots of
23	gloves?
24	MR. LABRUZZO: Sure.
25	THE COURT: Good. Okay.

Is

MR. LABRUZZO: We have specifically limited 1 the amount of items of concern. 2 3 THE COURT: Okay. All right. As long as we just make sure we have gloves and they're in 5 plastic bags, then we should be fine. 6 MR. LABRUZZO: Correct. 7 Judge, Defense filed Motion in Limine Number 8 I will let them argue it, but I want to make 9 sure we address it. 10 THE COURT: Motion in Limine Number Two? 11 it about the pictures? 12 MR. LABRUZZO: Yes. 13 It is, Judge. MR. VIZCARRA: 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. VIZCARRA: There's two sets of photographs 16 that I've been given. I did ask the State if they 17 had any more, to please provide them. I appreciate 18 giving us that ahead of time. 19 Bottom line, Judge, I did file a motion in 20 limine to exclude or edit the gruesome and 21 inflammatory photographs that were provided. 22 didn't provide a lot of case law, Judge, just the 23 one case, and it's C-z-u-b-a-k, Czubak v. State,

give that to you.

570 So.2d 925. If I can approach very briefly and

24

25

THE COURT: You may.

MR. VIZCARRA: I have given a copy to the State.

Your Honor, there are 56 photographs that I've been given from the Medical Examiner's Office, and I have filed objections to those that I thought should be excluded or otherwise edited. I don't know if you want to go through them, but the corresponding numbers on each one of them are indicated on my motion.

Judge, bottom line, first the Court has to find that they're relevant; secondly, that the relevance of the photographs do not outweigh unfair prejudice to the defendant.

In the *Czubak* case, Judge, which is a Zephyrhills --

THE COURT: Well, Counsel, let me stop you right there. I am not going to hear motions in limine about these photographs until after we pick the jury. We had a half an hour today. I didn't even know we had a motion in limine.

So you guys get together, decide if you're going to put those in. If you're going to put those in, I'll hear the motion about the photographs after we pick the jury. So we don't

need to be arguing about photographs today. We've got lots of other stuff. We've got to pick a jury first.

So hold off on that. And the State can look through what your motion is, and after we pick the jury, before we start with photographs being entered, I'll make sure that we have a big hearing on all the photographs. My understanding is the State's going to put everything on the Almo onto a screen, correct?

MR. LABRUZZO: Yes, Judge. We're waiting on a piece. Our plan, just for Defense, we will have the Almo set up over here. We'll have the big TV that will be able to be rolled out so that we can use it. It is easier than doing boards, because there would have been probably 70 boards. So we're going to use the Almo for projecting the TV, on the small TV. It will show on both the TV up there and the TV that will be down here.

THE COURT: Okay. And that may have an effect on my decision on what is overly gruesome. Because if we're going to blow up a pretty gruesome picture to 72 inches, it might be a lot more gruesome than regular. I'm not saying we can't.

MR. LABRUZZO: Right.

THE COURT: I'm saying I have to make a decision on not only the photograph, but the display of the photograph. If it's a certain type of photograph, I may only let you show it there and not --

MR. VIZCARRA: Judge, would it assist you to have a copy of the photographs beforehand or you just want to wait for that as well?

THE COURT: No. No. I expect that the State knows what photographs you're talking about.

MR. LABRUZZO: I do.

THE COURT: I want to bring them in.

MR. VIZCARRA: Okay.

THE COURT: My problem is, one, I don't even know that the State's going to introduce those photographs. They may agree with you on every one. If not, they can bring the actual photograph that they're going to show the actual jury and that's the photograph I want to talk about.

MR. LABRUZZO: Sure.

THE COURT: I don't want to talk about something that's on the DVD. I don't want to talk about something that's printed on this piece of paper.

I want to see the picture that we're going to

show the jury and then we'll make a decision, 1 because I've seen too many bad colorings and then 2 3 we end up the picture is completely different than the motion or what's on that disk. 5 So all motions in limine reference photographs 6 we will address before they're shown to the jury. 7 Okay? MR. LABRUZZO: 8 Yes, Judge. 9 THE COURT: Anything else? 10 MR. LIVERMORE: I have one issue, Judge. 11 THE COURT: Sure. 12 MR. LIVERMORE: I've been talking to Chris, 13 whoever is -- and I can't pronounce his last name. 14 THE COURT: My IT quy? 15 MR. LIVERMORE: Yes. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. LIVERMORE: About Skype testimony. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. LIVERMORE: He says he needs an order from 20 the Judge. 21 THE COURT: Sure. 22 MR. LIVERMORE: Can I send an order? 23 THE COURT: Yes. 24 MR. LIVERMORE: Or do we need to do a motion? 25 THE COURT: State, who are you going to have

1 Skyped in as testimony? MR. LIVERMORE: This is strictly penalty. 2 3 THE COURT: Right. MR. LIVERMORE: Family members in 5 Pennsylvania. 6 THE COURT: Right. You don't have any problem 7 with that, do you? 8 MR. LABRUZZO: No, Judge. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. LABRUZZO: No objection. 11 So just send me an order. THE COURT: Yes. 12 That's what I thought. You said you were 13 doing mostly penalty phase. So when you raised 14 that, I assumed you meant some mitigation that you 15 want people to testify and not have to spend all 16 the money to fly them down or the inconvenience of 17 knowing which day that they're going to testify. 18 So as far as I'm concerned, as long as they're 19 live and we can cross-examine them on both sides, 20 Skype is fine with me. So whatever actual order he 21 needs, just send it on over and I'll sign it. 22 MR. LIVERMORE: Okay. 23 State, attached to this case law THE COURT: 24 was Defense's request for special instruction, the 25 admissions of photos. When am I going to read this

special instruction?

MR. VIZCARRA: Judge, contemporaneous with the photographs being admitted, you know, if you do decide to admit some of the photographs that are gruesome and inflammatory in nature.

THE COURT: Okay. State, look at their requested special instruction.

MR. LABRUZZO: I'm reading that right now,
Your Honor.

THE COURT: We'll talk about that when I talk about whether I'm going to admit the photographs.

I have one more thing. Mr. LaBruzzo, you said about the death penalty, blah, blah, blah, because the instruction that I will read them. I don't normally read them any special instructions, even in a death case, before I pick the jury. I mean, I read them the normal ones, but there's an instruction that you feel that I should read to the jury before —

MR. LABRUZZO: Well, Judge, I think it is -THE COURT: I mean, I've been known to read
reasonable doubt instructions as we go along or
this instruction or that instruction, but I don't
normally read an instruction -- I mean, if I'm
asked, then I will consider it, but I haven't been

1 asked.

MR. LABRUZZO: I understand.

THE COURT: It was in my mind. It was, like, in the back of my mind. And finally I'm, like, and so I looked through my instructions again. I was pretty confident of that. Is there an instruction you're going to want me to read?

MR. LABRUZZO: And, Judge, forgive me. It's maybe just because of the last trial that I was in.

It was my recollection that the Court explained to the potential jurors about the second proceeding, a penalty phase where there would be at least the discussion of the aggravator, the sufficiency, the eligibility, and then a verdict as it relates to what the nature of that proceeding was.

If there is not, if the Court doesn't -- I mean, I can tell you that I plan on addressing it, but I don't want to get caught in a situation where I'm instructing them on the law, because I believe that's the Court's province to instruct on that.

Maybe I can talk to Mr. Pura about how he feels about that.

THE COURT: Mr. Pura? I mean, I looked through all the instructions. I didn't go back to

my office where I have my death penalty book, but I don't remember there being an instruction I give before jury selection, but there might be.

I will find what I can find and have it. I mean, we're going to have some time while they're filling out the questionnaire to talk about what I'm going to say to them when they come over.

So I will re-research the issue, and if there's an instruction that I find or there's an instruction that either one of you would like me to read, I'd be happy to, but I need both sides to agree on it.

MR. LABRUZZO: Okay. That's fine. I'll talk to Mr. Pura about it.

THE COURT: I mean, I know you were just in a murder case in Clearwater, and I'm trying to figure out if the judge read an instruction that was requested of them or they believed that it was an instruction that was required of them.

MR. LABRUZZO: I don't think it was requested or required. I think that Judge Bulone instructed as to what the nature of that penalty phase would be about.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LABRUZZO: And in doing so says that the

State has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable 1 doubt that there's an existence of one or more 2 3 aggravators. THE COURT: So he basically read the 5 closing --6 MR. LABRUZZO: The preliminary instruction. 7 THE COURT: The preliminary instruction for 8 the second phase in jury selection. 9 MR. LABRUZZO: Yes. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Again, if there's anybody 11 who wants me to read any of the instructions before 12 we begin the questioning of the panel and they 13 think that would be helpful, I have no problem 14 doing that. 15 Like I said, I don't always read the 16 reasonable doubt instruction, but if questions 17 start up that I think people are starting to get 18 confused or they look like they're being confused, 19 I'll read it. 20 Mr. Pura, how do you feel about that? 21 I agree with you, Judge. That's MR. PURA: 22 fine. 23 This might be the right time to ask this: 24 Defense would ask the Court to consider allowing

Mr. Michailos, when it comes down to the Defense's

25

portion of the voir dire, to address the jury and 1 2 ask them any follow-up questions on the subjects 3 that you would have already asked them about, reasonable doubt, presumption of innocence, and 5 those things -- because you both are going to ask 6 them a bunch of questions, I don't expect that of 7 the whole panel being a lengthy process -- and then 8 allow me to step up as the second person, besides 9 Mr. Michailos, to step up and ask follow-up 10 opinions about their views on the death penalty. 11 THE COURT: That's fine. I don't have any 12 The State can do the same thing.

THE COURT: That's fine. I don't have any problem. The State can do the same thing. If they want to use two different persons to ask guilt phase and penalty phase questions, that's fine. Then you can watch him while he asks some questions to try to get a feel for them, that's fine. I mean, I don't have a problem with either side having two different people ask two different specific-type questions, that's not a problem.

State, you don't have any problem with that, do you?

MR. LABRUZZO: No, Judge.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I don't know if the State is going to do that, but that's regularly done by the Defense anyway. So that's not a problem.

1 Anything else?

All right. I'll look over some instructions that I might give the jury. If I do see some that I think would be helpful for them, I'll bring them on Monday and we'll, of course, talk about them. I'm not going to give them anything we don't all agree to. Okay?

MR. LABRUZZO: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: All right. We'll see you all on Monday.

Oh, just so you know, the defendant is going to be brought over at 8:00, I think. So I don't know what you're doing for clothes, but we won't need him until we get the first set of jurors over.

It could be pretty quick if we get some of the people answering some of those questions, like they stand up and say, I'm not answering this because I can't stay here the whole time and I'm not even bothering. You know, I might bring those over right away.

MR. LIVERMORE: We've been contacted by the Sheriff's Office. They have a bunch of clothes we're going to maybe try and work out some of that right now.

THE COURT: Okay. No problem. I think Deputy

1 Cleaver is going to be here Monday, right? THE BAILIFF: Yes, Your Honor. 2 3 THE COURT: And he's going to be in charge of the courtroom on Monday. So just get with him, and 5 he's going to be your point person, and he'll talk 6 to whoever he needs to talk to. Okay? All right. 7 We're good. 8 MR. MICHAILOS: So what time do we have to be 9 here Monday? 10 THE COURT: 8:30. 11 MR. MICHAILOS: And if the deputies can't have 12 him dressed out at 8:30, that's not -- he doesn't 13 have to be dressed out at 8:30. 14 MR. LIVERMORE: Right. 15 THE COURT: Once we say everybody is ready for 16 trial, I'll send him back to dress out. But I just 17 wanted his stuff here. Not like, oh, we've got to 18 go downstairs, and then we're going to figure out 19 what we're going to get him, because we may have 20 jurors ready by 9:00 to come in and talk. 21 (HEARING CONCLUDED.) 22 23 24 25

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA )
4	COUNTY OF PASCO )
5	
6	I, MARIA FORTNER, Registered Professional
7	Reporter for the Sixth Judicial Circuit, do certify that
8	I was authorized to and did stenographically report the
9	foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true
10	record.
11	DATED this 10th day of April, 2018.
12	
13	/S MARIA A. FORTNER MARIA A. FORTNER
14	Registered Professional Reporter
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	