

	1	INDEX				
	2	Witness	Direct	Cross	Redirect	Recross
	3 FOR	FOR THE STATE				
	4 Bari	bara Ann Buckhannon	9	33		
:	Lake	Lakesha Buckhannon 34/84 103				
•	5 10	104 Hearing		64		
7	Nath	Nathan Simmons		136	141/147	146
8	Benj	Benjamin Young		161	166	
9	Leer	Leervin Hill 168 17		179		
10	EXHI	EXHIBITS:			Ident.	Evid.
11	S-21	Photographc			4	
12	S-22	Diagram-Map of City	1		4	
13	S-23	S-23 Diagram-McGuire Housing Development				
14	S-24	Photograph			4	
15	S-25	Photograph			4	
16	S-26	Photograph			4	
17	S-27	Photograph			4	
18	S-28	Photograph			4	
19	S-28	Photograph			4	
20	S-29	Photograph			4	
21	S-30	Photograph			4	
22	8-31	Photograph			4	
23	S-32	Photograph			4	
24	s-33	Photograph			4	
25	S-34	Photograph			4	

EXHIBITS: Ident. S-35 Statement of Nathan Simmons S-36 Statement of Benjamin Young D-1 Statement of Lakesha Buckhannon D-2 Statement of Nathan Simmons

Colloguy 1 (S-21, S-22, S-23, S-24, S-25, S-26, S-27, S-28, S-29, S-30, S-31, S-32, S-33, S-34 marked for Identification.) 2 3 THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Aronow. MR. ARONOW: Your Honor, Patricia Copling and Gary 5 Copling are both witnesses to this case. Patricia Copling had 6 appeared previous to the actual start of testimony. She was personally served by my investigator, Joseph Forte. She was 7 made aware of the fact she was a witness to this matter and she 8 has been absent since this trial has begun. THE COURT: I'm sorry, she was what? 10 MR. ARONOW: She was made aware of the necessity of 11 her testimony and she has absented herself since the beginning, 12 13 of the actual trial's beginning. If you recall, I had asked your Honor to admonish her and I was going to allow her to be 14 present during the trial despite the fact she was a witness and 15 she saw fit not to reappear and we sent her -- we sent Gary 16 17 Copling Jr. --18 THE COURT: Let me ask you before we move on to him. 19 As far as Patricia Copling is concerned, what day was she 20 issued a subpoena, what day was it returnable? 21 MR. ARONOW: Was returnable the 21st. At the beginning of the trial she was advised her testimony was needed 22 during the trial. And I issued a subpoena every day, 23 24 continuing every day of the trial. 25 THE COURT: I understand that. And what about the

- :

. .

1 / W.

Colloquy

other witness?

3 1

MR. ARONOW: And Gary Copling, Jr. to my understanding has not appeared at all despite having had a subpoena sent to

him by regular mail which was not returned and Sergeant Forte advised me he hand-delivered a copy of the subpoena and Patricia Copling, she advised him she knew his whereabouts and would make sure he got it.

THE COURT: So was he every personally served?

MR. ARONOW: No.

THE COURT: He was served by leaving the subpoena -- MR. ARONOW: With his mother and we sent a subpoena

regular mail which was not returned.

THE COURT: All right. As to Gary Copling, Jr.,
though it's permissible to leave a subpoena with a member of

the household over the age of 14, but I'm not persuaded that the mother is a member of his household. Obviously, they don't live at the same address.

MR. ARONOW: No.

THE COURT: Well, I think the circumstances are different for the two people. A bench warrant can be executed and that can result in Patricia Copling being held in a secured setting, I have no objection to. Gary Copling Jr., I'm a little bit less comfortable that he was served properly. So when the subpoena is returned as to him, he should not be detained in any type of holding facility. He should be brought

Colloguy in the courtroom. But a warrant is issued as to both. 1 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, I do not represent the 2 Copling family obviously. The only thing I can indicate for 3 the record is that Patricia Copling was here the 21st. I don't 5 know what she was informed by the Prosecutor on that day or anything else. I just -- it is the defendant's mother and I 6 would hate to see her have to be held. However, I guess if she 7 appears, she can explain why she has not been here yet. 8 MR. ARONOW: It's highly irregular of a mother in a 9 double homicide to just disappear after evidencing such a 10 11 strong desire to be here on previous times. 12 THE COURT: Correct. I am satisfied, therefore, that 13 a bench warrant for the apprehension of both of them should issue and therefore a bench warrant will be issued for Gary 14 15 Copling, Jr. and Patricia Copling. 16 Is there a request that they be 24-hour bench warrants 17 or daytime or what? 18 MR. ARONOW: Well, Judge, quite frankly, if they turn 19 themselves in, I don't have a problem with them just coming in 20 during the daytime. But limiting us only to daytime only means 21 they can hide by night or disappear by day and remain by night. 22 THE COURT: Suppose they're picked up at 4:30 in the afternoon, what are you going to do with them? They'll be 23 jailed overnight. 24 25 MR. ARONOW: We'll make arrangements to contact the

Colloguy emergent judge or your Honor. THE COURT: To do what? What would the request be at 2 3 that point? MR. ARONOW: The request will be -- well, your Honor, 4 quite frankly, if we only served them to reappear, I'm not 5 confident they will reappear. THE COURT: There is an entire statute to covers that, that's the material witness statute, and that is the statute 8 under which I'll be proceeding and that statute doesn't allow 9 10 you to incarcerate either of them. 11 Let me get the statute because that's what we need to -- I'll be right back. 12 13 (Pause.) 14 (Defendant enters courtroom.) THE COURT: The procedures which govern this 15 application are set forth in New Jersey Statute 2C:104-1 and 16 the statutes which follow. Essentially the statute provides 17 that the Court may issue a bench warrant for the apprehension 19 of a material witness. That warrant is of a different sort than the usual bench warrant issued for a defendant. The 20 person apprehended is entitled to a hearing immediately upon 21 the warrant being executed. The person is to be brought before 22 the Court. Counsel is to be appointed and if the Court is not, 23 then the emergent duty judge is to be notified and under no 24 circumstances should the person be held in jail. The person

Colloguy must be held in a nonrestrictive environment. 2 MR. ARONOW: I just spoke to Assistant Prosecutor 3 Wynne, Judge, we would be willing to put them up in a hotel if need be. THE COURT: I'm not going to issue the regular type of 5 bench warrant because I'm concerned that would be misunderstood 6 and these witnesses may then be housed in the jail and clearly 7 that would be contrary to the statute. So if you present me 8 with a proper order tailored to the facts of this particular situation, in other words, if it complies with the statute, 10 I'll be glad to sign it, but I don't want to issue a regular 11 bench warrant. 12 MR. ARONOW: I just instructed my investigator to go 13 look for them since it's still daytime hours. 14 THE COURT: Then we're ready to bring the jury in. 15 MR. ARONOW: Yes. 16 (Jury enters courtroom at 9:40 a.m.) 17 THE COURT: Ladies and gentleman of the jury, good 18 morning. 19 THE JURY: Good morning. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Aronow, the State may call its next 21 22 witness. MR. ARONOW: Thank you, your Honor. The State will 23 24 call Barbara Buckhannon to the stand. THE COURT: Ms. Buckhannon, good morning. If you 25

B. Buckhannon - Direct would come forward to your left and be sworn. BARBARA ANN BUCKHANNON, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN. THE COURT: You may proceed. 5 MR. ARONOW: Thank you, your Honor. 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ARONOW: Would you state your name for the record, please? 7 8 Barbara Ann Buckhannon. 9 Barbara, in January of 1995 where did you live? 10 2726 Cramer Street, Camden, New Jersey. 11 And, Barbara, did anyone live with you at that time? 12 Yes, my daughter Lakesha Shamone Buckhannon. 13 And how old was Lakesha back then, approximately two 14 years ago? 15 Eighteen. And did you know or do you know a Kirby Bunch, Jr.? 17 Yes, I do. 18 And how did you know him? He's my daughter's stepbrother, my daughter's half-brother. 19 20 And did you have any relationship with him? 21 Yes. 22 Would you describe that relationship? We were real close. He called, called me mom. 23 24 Did Kirby Bunch, Jr. have a nickname that he went by? 25 Yes, K.C.

B. Buckhannon - Direct 10 1 And approximately how old was Kirby in January of 1995? 2 3 He was 19. Barbara, have you ever been convicted of a crime? 4 5 Yes. 6 Q And what was that crime? 7 Thait by deception. And when was that? 8 9 In 1995. What kind of sentence did you receive for that crime? 10 11 Probation. 12 I'm going to show you what was previously marked $\mathbb{S}\text{--}2$ for Identification and I'm going to ask you if you recognize 13 the person that's depicted in that photograph? 14 15 Yes. 16 And who is that? 17 That's Kirby Bunch, Jr. 18 K.C.? 19 Mm-hmm. 20 Q Is that a yes? 21 Yes, it is. Do you know a person by the name of Gary Copling, Jr., 22 23 Barbara? 24 Yes. 25 And how is it that you knew Gary Copling, Jr. Q

```
B. Buckhannon - Direct
                                                          12
has identified Dennis Copling.
         Now, Barbara, calling your attention to Tuesday,
January 17th, 1995, did you see Gary Copling, Jr. on that day?
    Yes, I did.
         And what were the circumstances of you seeing Gary
Copling, Jr. on that Tuesday, January 17th?
    He visited my house.
         And which house was that?
    2726 Cramer Street, Apartment B.
         And did he do anything when he came to your house?
    Yes, he sat around and we talked for a while and then he
walked my dog -- my daughter's dog.
        And what kind of dog did your daughter have?
    A white pitbull.
      Do you know approximately when your daughter got that
dog?
   She got it in -- she got it for a Christmas present from
her boyfriend.
```

From Christmas from the year before?

THE COURT: Meaning only a few weeks?

And approximately what time did Gary come over for the

Yeah, the Christmas from the year before.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yes. Yes.

About 11:30, 11 o'clock, 11:30.

2

6

7 8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

23

24

25

dog?

B. Buckhannon - Direct 14 Well, because that's when I will be back home. When he 1 came for the dog, he was leaving so I let him take her. 2 3 Did Lakesha allow him to take the dog? 4 Yes, she left it up to me and I let him take her. 5 Did Lakesha have problems with Gary getting the dog on that particular day? 6 7 Yeah, she did. Why is that? MR. LEINER: Objection, your Honor, calls for hearsay. 9 10 Let me ask you this. THE COURT: Sustained. 11 Did you say anything to Lakesha with reference to Gary 12 having the dog that day? 13 14 Yeah, I told -- I, I shouldn't let the dog go. 15 And why did you feel that way? I can't really answer that. I just -- I don't know. 16 17 Were you -- you allowed him to have the dog? 18 Mm-hmm. Is that a yes? 19 Q 20 Yes. And did Gary Copling to your knowledge return the dog 21 on January 17th, 1995? 22 23 Yes. 24 Gary returned the dog? 0 He returned the dog and he came back later on that night 25

B. Buckhannon - Direct 15 and took the dog. Okay. And when did he come back? About later on that night, about 10 o'clock that night. And what happened with respect to Gary and the dog eventually? He said he was robbed for the dog. He didn't come back with the dog. MR. LEINER: Objection, your Honor, hearsay. Without reference to what Gary may have said, dld there come a time when Gary did not return the dog? Yes. Did there come a time when you saw Gary after he had the dog ultimately that night? Would you repeat that question, please? Sure, I'm sorry. You indicated that Gary at one point brought th€ dog back and then took the dog again; is that

correct?

19 Q Is that a yes?

20 A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

Q And what I'm asking you, after the second time, did
you see the dog and Gary again on that night?

23 A No, no.

Q And was Lakesha home the entire night?

25 A No.

- B. Buckhannon Direct
- 1 Q Where was Lakesha, do you know?
- 2 A School.
- Q And did Lakesha come home at some point in time on the
- 4 night of January 17th, 1995?
- 5 A Yes.
 - Q Approximately what time did she come home?
- 7 A Around 8, 7:30, 8 o'clock.
- 8 Q Would you describe Lakesha's reaction when the dog was
- 9 not returned that particular night?
- 10 A Upset.
- Q When you say upset, was she screaming and yelling
- 12 upset or how was she upset?
- 13 A She was crying.
- 14 Q And what occurred with respect to Lakesha that you are
- 15 personally aware of that night after the dog was not returned?
- 16 A She went to call her -- she went -- we went to call her dad
- 17 to see if -- to get in contact with her brother so she could
- 18 get her dog back.
- 19 Q Who was her dad?
- 20 A Kirby Bunch, Sr.
- 21 Q How was she going to try to get in touch with her dad?
- 22 A She called over her grandmother's.
- Q What is the grandmother's name?
- 24 A Dorothy Bunch.
- 25 Q Did you have anything to do with any of the events

2

3

6

17th?

24

25

Still on the 17th.

Yes, we were still together.

B. Buckhannon - Direct 19 Did they leave you at any point in time? Yes, they left me. 3 And did you have anything to do with anything else that happened on January 17th, 1995? 4 5 No. Were you present when anything else happened on 6 January 17th, 1995? 7 No. Calling your attention to January 18th, the following 10 day, 1995, did you have occasion to be with any of the same 11 people? Yes. 12 13 Q Who? Lakesha and Latisha. 14 And where were you with them? At 2808 Mitchell Street. 16 And who's house is that? 17 My sister Christine. 18 And how was it that you came to be at your sister 19 Christine's house? 20 21 Well, we always, you know that's my sister, we always go 22 there and visit. 23 Was your sister home at the time that you were 24 visiting? 25 Yes.

- B. Buckhannon Direct
- A Inside.
- 2 And how did you come to see Dennis?
- 3 A He came to the person's house we were at.
- 4 Q Okay. Did he come inside?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q And would you describe Dennis' demeanor or attitude?
- 7 A He was upset.
- 8 Q And when you say he was upset, what led you to believe
- 9 that he was upset?
- 10 A The way he was talking when he came in the door.
- 11 Q And what specifically do you recall him saying?
- 12 A He wanted to know what happened with his brother.
- 13 Q Okay. And his brother being?
- 14 A Gary Copling.
- Q And did he say it the way you and I are discussing it
- 16 | right now?
- 17 A No.
- 18 Q How did he discuss it? How did he describe it?
- 19 A He was angry. He wanted to know what had happened with his
- 20 brother.
- Q Okay. And did anyone talk to him at that time?
- 22 Without reference to what they said, did anybody attempt to
- 23 talk to him?
- 24 A Yes.
- Q Did you attempt to talk to him?

- B. Buckhannon Direct
- A Yes.
- Q What did he say to you?
- 3 A I was just trying to explain to him what had happened.
- 4 Q Based upon what you were told?
- 5 A Right.
- 6 Q And what was Dennis' reaction to what you were saying?
- 7 A He didn't have no reaction. He didn't want to hear
- 8 anything I had to say.
- 9 Q And would you describe what he said to you in response
- 10 to what you said?
- 11 A No, he just like ignored me over -- he just like ignored me
- 12 and was talking to my niece.
- 13 Q When you say your niece, who's that?
- 14 A Latisha.
- Q What did he say with respect to Latisha?
- 16 A I can't say word for word for word, but he was upset. He
- 17 wanted to know what happened to his brother, what happened.
- Q So what he was saying was directed then to Latisha and
- 19 not to you?
- 20 A Yes.
- Q Where was Lakesha at this point?
- 22 A She was standing in the house.
- Q And can you describe how Dennis was dressed that
- 24 evening?
- 25 A All I remember he had a black leather jacket. That's all I

B. Buckhannon - Direct

1 remember

Q Okay. And was he talking with Latisha the way you and

3 I are talking or was he using the same mannerisms that were you

4 explaining to me earlier?

5 A He was using the same mannerisms that I was explaining to 6 you earlier.

7 Q Did anything happen with Dennis and Latisha at the

8 house?

9 A They went outside. He asked her to come outside.

10 Q And did you say anything to Latisha before she went

11 outside?

12 A I told her don't go outside.

13 Q And why is that?

14 A I mean, how angry, that he was upset you know, so I just

15 didn't want her to go outside.

Q With respect to Latisha, did she ultimately go

17 | outside?

18 A Mm-hmm.

19 Q Is that a yes?

A Yes.

20

Q And could you hear any of the conversation that was

22 taking place outside?

23 A No.

Q Did something happen between -- or did Dennis do

25 anything after Latisha went outside?

A Well, I didn't see him do anything when he went outside, but I know I only go by hearsay.

Q Without reference to hearsay, what other people said, did you do anything that night with respect to Dennis Copling?

A Yes, I left out of 2808 and I went to call the police.

Q And why did you leave 2808 to call the police?

A Because I was scared, I was upset, I was scared, um, I was told that Dennis had a gun.

MR. LEINER: Objection, your Honor. May we approach? THE COURT: Objection sustained.

(Sidebar discussion on the record.)

THE COURT: Mr. Leiner.

MR. LEINER: Your Honor, I would ask the jury to disregard anything of that nature. That's the whole issue in this case, I mean for identification, everything else. And for only hearsay testimony, Mr. Aronow indicated he would admonish this witness not to offer any hearsay testimony. We told him right before he came in. I don't know if this witness is going to continue testifying, needs further instruction outside the presence of the jury or not. Things like this have very serious impact on the jury.

I would just request that there not be an instruction to the jury at this time, but at least something be done if this witness is going to continue with her testimony like this because her testimony is filled with hearsay and things of that

B. Buckhannon - Direct And did Mark Winston have any nickname that you're aware of? 2 No. I'm going to show you a photograph which has been marked S-18 for Identification and ask you if you recognize the 5 person in that photograph? 6 Yes, this is Mark. 7 Mark Winston? Mm-hmm. Did there come a time when Dennis left 2808 Mitchell 10 11 Street? Yes. 12 And do you remember whether that was before or after 13 Lakesha and Latisha left? Before. How long before? 16 About a half-hour before. 17 Did Dennis Copling leave before or after the police 18 arrived? 19 Before. 20 And approximately how much before? 21 Say about 45 minutes. 22 I'm going to show you what's been marked S-22 for 23 Identification and ask you how long have you lived in the City 24 of Camden? 25

L. Buckhannon - Direct

- 1 A Camden.
- 2 Q Do you know Kirby Bunch?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q Junier?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q And who's Kirby Bunch, Jr.?
- 7 A Our brother.
- 8 Q And do you know Latisha Fair?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q And who's Latisha Fair?
- 11 A My cousin.
- 12 Q Do you know Gary Copling?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q How do you know Gary Copling?
- 15 A He's a friend of the family's.
- 16 Q Do you know Dennis Copling?
- 17 A Yes.
- 13 Q How do you know Dennis?
- 19 A He's a friend of the family.
- 20 Q In January of 1995, did you own a dog?
- 21 A Yes.
- Q What kind of dog was it?
- 23 A A white pitbull.
- 24 Q And when did you get that dog?
- 25 A For Christmas of '95.

```
L. Buckhannon - Direct
                                                               36
              195?
         '94, I'm sorry.
              And did Gary Copling have anything to do with that
  3
    dog?
  4
        Yes.
 5
 6
              Prior to January 17th, 1995, what was Gary's
 7
    involvement with the dog?
       He was training it.
             And where -- did he come to 2726 Cramer Street in
    order to get the dog?
10
11
       Yes.
             And on January 17th, 1995, were you home at some point
12
13
    in time?
        When he came to get the dog?
14
             Yes.
        Yeah, I was there.
16
17
             And did he come and get the dog?
18
        Yes.
             And did you want him to have the dog on that
19
20
    particular day?
21
       No.
22
        Q
           And why is that?
      I don't know why. I just didn't want -- I just didn't want
23
24
   him to have the dog that day.
25
            And did you have a conversation with your mother?
```

L. Buckhannon - Direct 37 Yes. And as a result of that conversation, did Gary -- was Gary allowed to take the dog that day? 3 Yes. And did you have to be anywhere on January 17th, 1995 5 after Gary took the dog? 6 I had to be at school in Camden High at night classes. 7 And did you go to school on January 17th, 1995? 8 Yes. 9 And approximately what time did you leave for school? 10 Maybe quarter to five. 11 And did you, did you return from school to 2726 Cramer 12 Street? 13 Yes. And approximately what time was that? 15 Maybe 9:30, quarter to 10. 16 And had you seen or did you see Gary Copling with your 17 dog at that approximate time? 18 No. 19 Did you wait for Gary to bring the dog home? 20 Q 21 No. What did you do? 22 23 I went looking for him. Okay. And who was with you? 24 I was alone when I went to look for him. 25

L. Buckhannon - Direct And where did you go to look for him originally? 1 2 28th and Mitchell Street. And why did you go to 28th and Mitchell? 3 Because that's where, where he usually be. Does anyone live at 28th and Mitchell? 5 He was at Michele Butler's house. 6 And who is that? 7 She's just somebody from the neighborhood. 8 Okay. And did you see Gary at Michele Butler's house on January 17th, 1995? 10 Yes. 11 And about what time was that? 12 Like 10:30. 13 And did you have any conversation with Gary at that approximate time? 15 Yes. 16 Q And did Gary have the dog? 17 No. 18 And based upon what Gary told you, what did you do? 19 After, after he --20 Well, without reference to what he said, what did you 21 22 do? I went to the phone booth and I called my aunt's house. 23 And what's your aunt's name? 24 25 Queen.

L. Buckhannon - Direct 1 And where does she live? On Westminster -- Berwick, Berwick Street. 2 In Camden? 3 In McGuire Gardens. 4 5 Apartments? 6 Yeah. 7 And why did you call Queen? I was calling to see if my brother was there. 8 And your brother, Kirby Bunch Jr.? 9 Yes. 10 Does Kirby go by a nickname? 12 K.C. And did you get in contact with Kirby as a result of 13 talking through your aunt's house? 14 When I called there, he wasn't there. 15 Q Okay. What did you do next? 16 Then I called my grandmom's and he wasn't there either. So 17 my dad told me to -- I could find him on Westminster Avenue. So I went around there. He was there. 19 Was he with anyone? 20 21 Yes. 22 Who was he with? I believe his name is Nate. 23 24 Is he a friend of Kirby's? 25 Yes.

Okay. And were you present when your brother Kirby

25

L. Buckhannon - Direct 41 and Gary had a fight? 1 2 Yes, I was. 3 And who else was there? Nate, Latisha Fair, and myself. 4 5 And how did you find Gary that night? 6 He was at this lady name Marie's house and we knocked on 7 the door and he was there. And what happened next? My brother knocked on the door and he asked for him. And 10 he came to the door, he told him to step outside. Who told who to step outside? 11 K.C. told Gary to step outside. 12 13 Did Gary comply? Did he come outside? 14 Yeah, he came outside. What happened next? 15 They started fighting. He talked to him, asked him about 16 17 the dog. 18 Q K.C. asked Gary about the dog? 19 Ves. 20 Without reference to what he said, there was a fight 21 after that? 22 Yes. 23 And was anybody involved in the fight other than K.C. 24 and Gary Copling? 25 No, no.

L. Buckhannon - Direct 43 1 Q Did K.C. grab a hold of him by the neck? 2 No. 3 What did K.C. do? Q 4 He was just kicking him and hitting him. 5 Was Gary on the ground at that point? 6 Yes. 7 Q And was K.C. saying things to Gary? 8 No. 9 Did there come a time when they stopped fighting? Q 10 Yes, when Gary started to run. Okay. And did Gary ultimately get away? 11 12 Yes. Did K.C. chase after him? 13 0 14 Mm-hmm. 15 And then what happened? 0 16 Nothing. THE COURT: What was your answer, yes or no? 17 18 THE WITNESS: Yes. 19 And then what happened? 20 He didn't catch him. He started running, I don't know where he went, but he started running. So then K.C. came back 21 around to the corner. He got back in the, in the car and he 22 took Latisha and me back to 2728 Cramer, sat there for like 15 23 minutes and my brother told me he would see me the next day and 24 25 I didn't.

L. Buckhannon - Direct 44 He would see you the next day about what? He was coming to see me the next day. 2 Okay. Approximately what time was it when you got 3 dropped off by your brother K.C.? 4 Maybe like about 11:30, 12 o'clock, 12:30 somewhere around 5 there. It's your testimony that Nate didn't touch Gary? Q No. 8 Latisha didn't touch Gary? Q 9 No. 10 And you didn't touch Gary? 11 Q 12 No. The only one that touched Gary was K.C.? 13 Q That's the only one. 14 And that Gary ran away ultimately? 15 Mm-hmm. 16 On January 18th, the next day, 1995, did there come a 17 time when you saw Dennis Copling? 18 19 Yes. Could you point out Dennis in the courtroom, if he's in the courtroom? 21 Right there. 22 And what color clothing is he wearing? 23 Green. 24 MR. ARONOW: Let the record reflect she's identified 25

L. Buckhannon - Direct

1 the defendant.

THE COURT: The record will reflect that.

Q Can you describe the conditions when you saw Dennis
Copling on January 18th, 1995? Let me ask you this: Where

5 were you on January 18th, 1995 when you saw Dennis?

6 A Um, I was at Marie Covin's house.

7 Q And who's that?

8 A She's a distant cousin.

9 Q And was there anyone else with you at Marie Covin's

10 house?

11 A It was my mom, Barbara, and Latisha, it was Maria, her

12 seven kids and that's it.

13 Q Does Latisha have any kids?

14 A Yes.

15 Q How many?

16 A She has one son.

17 Q And was he there?

18 A Yes.

19 Q How old was he?

20 A He was about one at the time I believe.

21 Q And how old are Marie's kids approximately?

22 A They range from like 23 to like about maybe eight months.

Q And approximately what time did you see Dennis Copling

24 on that night?

25 A Between, between six and seven, around that time.

L. Buckhannon - Direct 46 1 And where were you specifically inside of 2808 Mitchell when you say saw him? 2 I was sitting in the living room. 3 And where was Latisha and where was your mom? My mom was sitting down also. Latisha, as Dennis was 5 coming in, talking to her, she was going out with him. She was 6 7 just --Can you describe how Dennis was reacting or how he was 8 acting when he came in? 10 He was -- he was, he was real upset. 11 Okay. And what -- did you hear him say anything when he came in? 12 13 Mm-hmm. Did your mother attempt to talk to him? 14 Q 15 No. Did he say anything to you, to Latisha or to your 17 mother? Yeah, he says, yeah. 18 19 What did he say? 20 He said to Latisha he wanted to speak to her and --21 Did he say why? 22 No. 23 Did he say anything that would lead you to believe why 24 he was there? 25 No.

L. Buckhannon - Direct (Sidebar) 48 in his pocket? MR. LEINER: Objection, your Honor, calls for 2 speculation. THE COURT: The objection is sustained. Let me ask you this: Lakesha, prior to January 18th, 5 1995, had you ever seen Dennis Copling with a gun? 6 7 Yes. Q And when? MR. LEINER: Objection, your Honor. Can we approach? 9 10 THE COURT: Would you step down, please. 11 (Sidebar discussion on the record.) MR. LEINER: I object to the relevance of the question 12 and the answer, your Honor. We're talking about events that 13 were reported by the State to have taken place on January 18th. 14 As of right now, no one is going to identify, no one has testified yet whether or not he had a gun on the 18th, let alone the relevance of the testimony is that he had a gun on prior occasions. 18 What I'm saying is, your Honor, that the issue here is 19 the 18th and any testimony she's willing to offer in regard to 20 21 a prior date is not relevant. MR. ARONOW: Certainly is relevant, Judge. Mr. Leiner 22 23 is on notice that both Lakesha and Latisha Fair, that the defendant was observed prior to this occasion to have $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ 24 25 firearm. That clearly is relevant to whether or not he had the

L. Buckhannon - Direct (Sidebar)

ability to possess a firearm. It's clearly relevant with respect to the belief whether he was armed on that particular day.

Your Honor sustained the objection with respect to my question perhaps because I was premature with respect to setting a foundation as to how she would know why she believed that. It's pure speculation, but I think based upon the fact that she know that the defendant had a firearm in the past and that it was in the recent past, it's clearly admissible with respect to his motive, his opportunity to have a gun. It's not being offered as evidence that he's a bad person or had committed a crime on previous occasions. It's being offered to demonstrate the fact that he had the ability to obtain a firearm and he could have been in possession of a firearm on January 18th, 1995.

MR. LEINER: The issue here, your Honor, is not could have. The issue is whether or not he had one. If someone is prepared to come in and testify to the fact that he had one on that particular day, that's fine. All this does is circumvent that element, well, he had one on a prior occasion, he could have had one that day. That gives rise to speculation in the jury's mind. Speculation cannot be part of their deliberation. I clearly think it's highly prejudicial under the circumstances.

THE COURT: You have a lot more with this witness, I'm

assuming?

2

15

16

18

19

20

25

MR. ARONOW: Yes.

THE COURT: Evidence is relevant under Evidence Rule

4 401 whether he had a tendency in reason to prove or disprove

5 any fact of consequence to the determination of the action.

6 And the evidence is not being offered to show that he acted in

an unlawful way on a prior occasion by possessing a gun. The evidence is offered instead to prove that he had the

9 opportunity to commit this offense because he, in fact, had a
10 weapon and provided that the time frame is reasonably close to

January 18th, 1995, I am satisfied that if somebody had a gun

12 at an earlier occasion, it has a tendency in reason to
13 establish that on a given date he also possessed that same gun

14 is the evidence.

The objection on the basis of relevance is overruled provided that it's within the reasonably recent past.

17 How recent was it?

MR. ARONOW: On the 16th.

THE COURT: Two days before?

MR. ARONOW: Two days before.

21 THE COURT: The objection is clearly overruled. You

22 may proceed.

23 (Sidebar discussion concluded.)

24 BY MR. ARONOW:

Q Lakesha, before there was a break, I had asked you

L. Buckhannon - Direct 51 whether you had ever seen Dennis Copling with a gun. Do you recall that question? 3 Yes. And you indicated that you had; is that correct? Q 5 Yes. Approximately when with relationship to January 18th 6 Q had you seen Dennis Copling with a gun? 8 With relation to January 18th? Yeah. How -- did you see him with a gun on January 10 18th? 11 No. 12 Did you see him with a gun on January 17th? Q 13 No. When did you see him with a gun? 15 I'm not sure what the date was. 16 Q Okay. But it was maybe like a couple weeks before then when he 17 was in Michele's house and the gun was in a chair that I was 18 sitting in and I was told not to sit there because the gun was 19 there. But after I already sit in where the gun was, that's 21 when the gun was moved. 22 Okay. And you saw the gun? Is that a yes? 23 Yes. 24 Can you describe it? It was just -- I'm not sure what kind of gun it was, but it 25

20

21

23

24 25

1 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, the testimony is substantially different than what was represented by the Prosecutor in this matter with regard to the gun. We were 3 supposed to hear testimony on the 18th. Dennis Copling possessed a gun and saw -- this witness was supposed to testify 5 she saw Dennis Copling possess this gun. I objected to that as being relevant. However, now we have a scenario where several weeks before she's in a particular place, the gun is at a particular site. She's told not to sit there and Dennis Copling moves that gun. That is highly prejudicial under the 10 circumstances. It does not tend to prove the offering of the 11 State in regard to what he offered in opposition to my 12 objection and it's just highly prejudicial. All it is proof of is that Dennis Copling was near a gun where other people were, 15 the gun was present and he moved it. We argued many legal theories. However, the further the circle is that we draw 16 around this particular weapon on a prior occasion, the more 17 highly prejudicial it becomes. The less probative it becomes. 18

I would suggest to your Honor this testimony, clearly, clearly its probative value is substantially outweighed by its prejud@cial value.

THE COURT: The Court would certainly agree the testimony was markedly different from what was represented at sidebar that it would be. If I had realized it would be of this character, I wouldn't have allowed it.

-

.

MR. ARONOW: Judge, it think the witness is mistaken.

I think it will come out with another witness' testimony,
number one, and I was surprised to hear a couple weeks because
my understanding is it was a lot more recent than that.

THE COURT: I do agree that any person can move a gun for the safety of somebody who is about to sit on the gun. It doesn't mean that is the person's gun, that it can be any person's.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ ARONOW: That's why I asked if it was his gun and she said it was.

MR. LEINER: I didn't hear that testimony.

THE COURT: I didn't hear that either. I'm going to ask for a read back.

MR. LEINER: Quite frankly, your Honor, the Prosecutor may be surprised because it's his witness. He should know before offering a highly volatile piece of evidence like that what this witness is going to say. I think, your Honor, I have a real problem with this at this point and I don't know how to cure it. I don't know whether it highlights it more, but I, I think clearly unless something is shown, the jury should be instructed to disregard the entire portion of, the portion of testimony. I don't know quite how to put it right now.

THE COURT: Let's take it one step at a time. Let me ask the reporter to read back the very last question or two questions and answers asked of the witness.

(The portion of testimony was read by the reporter from page 52, lines 9 to 20.)

3 4

THE COURT: Clearly the witness never stated that he said the gun was his.

5

MR. ARONOW: Well, your Honor --

THE COURT: She answered in a way that's non-responsive. You asked her if he said that the gun was his and she simply answered that he picked the gun up and moved it, but she never said, yes, he said the gun was his.

9

10

MR. ARONOW: What I would recommend, Judge, putting her back on the stand outside the presence of the jury and eliciting other information from her so we can know where it's going.

11 12 13

> THE COURT: I believe that's the proper way to proceed and if she can re-enter the courtroom, you may ask her under oath.

14 15

16 17

If you would resume the witness stand, Ms. Buckhannon.

18

(The witness resumes the stand.)

19 20

MR. ARONOW: On a side issue, Judge, I believe Patricia Copling is here so I think that matter has been

21

resolved.

THE COURT: Very good. Thank you.

23

THE COURT: We're outside the presence of the jury

24

and, Mr. Aronow, you may continue.

25

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ARONOW:

104 Hearing - L. Buckhannon - Direct

5

- Q Lakesha, I'm going to bring you back to the time when you indicate that you almost sat on a gun. Did Dennis say the gun was his that night?
- 4 A No, but he moved it.
 - Q Okay. Did he -- was anyone else present at that time?
- 6 A It was a whole lot of people in our house. It was like a
 7 little party that we just had every, you know like every day we
- 8 just come and chill. Dennis wasn't usually there, but he was
- 9 there this day.

5

- 10 Q Okay. And did anyone else tell you not to sit in that
 11 seat or it was Dennis?
- 12 A It was Dennis.
- Q And what did Dennis do with it after he picked it up and moved it?
- 15 A I'm sure -- I'm not sure he put it in his coat or side or 16 where, but he had the gun on him.
 - Q So he placed the gun on his person somewhere in his coat, on his side?
- 19 A Yeah, yeah.
- 20 MR. ARONOW: Your Honor, I think that issue has been
- 21 clarified.

17

- THE COURT: Not to the Court's satisfaction to be
 honest with you, because the fact he then took possession of it
- 24 doesn't mean it was his in the first place. He may have just
- 25 | felt it was dangerous for a gun to be sitting there and picked

104 Hearing - L. Buckhannon - Direct

2

17

21

22

23

24

25

57

it up with the intention of returning it to its rightful owner.

I think this is a highly potentially prejudicial piece 3 of evidence if the gun was not his. If the jury is lead to 4 believe that it was based on this type of evidence, that's very 5 prejudicial. If she had said that the gun was his and that he so stated or if there was another witness who said that he said the gun was his, but merely exercising control over the gun, I don't think is sufficient under the circumstances, particularly since we dealing with a time period not two days before which 10 is what I previously understood, but instead two weeks befor ?. 11

So, I'm willing to hear further argument, but at this 12 point I'm not inclined to allow this testimony and I am 13 inclined to tell the jury to disregard it. But perhaps I'm 14 misconstruing the evidence. I'll be glad to hear your 15 16 argument.

MR. ARONOW: The State would argue that someone who is 18 the only person that she testified to who doesn't sit there out 19 of a room full of people and he's the one that gets up and moves the gun. 20

THE COURT: I don't know what happened before. There could have been, you know it's speculative, there could have been any number of circumstances which would have allowed the defendant to know that the gun was there without it being his gun. And without more, it could as easily been the gun of

anyone else in the room.

MR. ARONOW: Judge, the fact that this man had the ability to possess it, obviously no one else said that's my gun or something along these lines.

THE COURT: They wouldn't have it once he moved it, what would have been the point? The evidence has to be, in order for it to be relevant, it would have a tendency in reason to prove that on the day in question he had possession of a gun and if the only evidence is that on an occasion two weeks prior to that he moved a gun off of a chair, is that the point?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ ARONOW: And place it either in his jacket or in his waistband.

THE COURT: That's how he placed it in his jacket or his waistband, but we don't know where it came from. I think the situation would be different if she had seen him take it out of his pocket as though he owned it, but simply putting it in his waistband I don't think proves that it was his gun. It just means on occasion he exercised control over it. Also I'm concerned that it was two weeks prior. If these events had happened two days before, that might also influence me, but at this point we had conduct that is ambiguous and we have it occurring two weeks prior to the day in question.

Under those circumstances, unless there's more testimony that this witness has about the events that occurred two weeks before, unless there is something else, I am going to

104 Hearing - L. Buckhannon - Direct 59 sustain the objection. You can ask her other questions if you 2 wish. BY MR. ARONOW: 3 Lakesha, when you indicate it's about two weeks, do you know exactly when it was in relationship to when your brother was killed that you saw the gun? No. Latisha Fair was there? Q 8 No. 9 At that time? 10 0 11 No, she wasn't there, no. MR. ARONOW: Okay. Nothing further, Judge, with 12 13 respect to that issue. MR. LEINER: Your Honor, can I just briefly question 14 the witness in regard to strictly that issue? 15 THE COURT: I'm prepared to rule. I don't think --16 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, I have another issue. 17 THE COURT: It's the State that has to lay the 18 foundation. I don't think the State has done it, so if there 19 is another issue, we will get to that in a moment. 20 Under the circumstances for the reasons I explained a 21 few moments ago, the objection is sustained. The issue becomes 22 having to deal with the issue of the jury and I, I believe the 23 proper way to do that, unless there is an objection, Mr. 24 Leiner, would be for me to tell the jury that the testimony

104 Hearing - L. Buckhannon - Direct

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

60

they heard about the gun being on the chair two weeks ago or two weeks prior to January 18th, 1995 should be entirely disregarded. If you would prefer a different instruction, I'll be glad to consider it.

MR. LEINER: Your Honor, my concern is that once the bell has been rung, it's very difficult to unring that bell again. I'm not sure that an instruction is going to be sufficient in regard to this issue, especially in light of the testimony of the prior witness in blurting out she heard Dennis had a gun. Now this witness comes in and testifies about something that occurred several weeks before that, and I have this witness' statement and I don't see anything in regard to that in her statement. But I do have a concern about that. I'm not sure it is sufficient and I don't know what the answer is at this point. I think it's a very critical piece of testimony that links this person to a gun well beyond what the State has offered so far and my understanding can't offer a particular, particular murder weapon in this case or a particular weapon in this case was never found and now to link this defendant with a gun under those circumstances that were described, I think is highly prejudicial at this point. THE COURT: Well, the Court has sustained the

THE COURT: Well, the Court has sustained the objection, so I think to ignore it and pretend that I had not sustain the objection would be --

MR. LEINER: No, your Honor, I agree, I agree. I

104 Hearing - L. Buckhannon - Direct 61 don't know -- as I said in the beginning, I'm not sure what the 2 answer is here. THE COURT: Well, there are two alternatives. I can 3 give a forceful instruction or I can declare a mistrial. I'm not going to declare a mistrial. I believe that the alternative is to give a forceful instruction. MR. LEINER: I anticipated that. That's why I did not request an instruction. I request that an instruction be 8 9 given. THE COURT: I would give that instruction and at this 10 point we'll take a recess of about 15 minutes. MR. LEINER: Thank you, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. 13 (Recess.) 14 THE COURT: It occurred to me that the testimony ended 15 rather abruptly with the witness' statement that he put the gun 16 in his pocket. If he kept it in his pocket for a prolonged period of time or if he left the house with it still in his 18 pocket that may change my evaluation of the probative versus 19 the prejudicial balance and it may lay enough of a foundation 20 since the definition of relevance is any evidence having a 21 tendency in reason to prove a fact. You may recall the witness 22 23 for the Rule 104(a) hearing and ask her those questions. 24 (Witness resumes the stand.) 25 THE COURT: We continue to be outside the presence of

104 Hearing - L. Buckhannon - Direct

the jury. Mr. Aronow, you may attempt to lay a further foundation.

MR. ARONOW: Thank you, your Honor.

CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ARONOW:

Q Lakesha, I'm bringing you back to the night when you're talking about almost or sitting on the gun. Do you remember that, what we were talking about?

A Yes.

3

5

9

10

11

Q Your testimony was that Dennis picked up the gun and you couldn't remember whether he put his pocket in his jacket pocket or his waistband; is that correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Did Dennis keep the gun the rest of the night?

14 A Yes, yes --

15 Q Go ahead. What were you going to say?

16 A They was playing cards around the table.

17 Q Who was that?

18 A Him and three other guys, everybody was playing cards or

19 whatever.

20

25

Q Okay.

And he was on the other side of the table, so I couldn't
see whether or not he put the gun in his waist or his pocket or
where, but he had the gun because he moved it from where I was

24 sitting.

Q And you're indicating with your right hand, you're

104 Hearing - L. Buckhannon - Direct 63 using your right hand to show what he was doing? 2 No, I'm just --You're just talking about what he was doing? 3 4 Yeah. Q Okay. 6 He was sitting on the other side of table so I couldn't see 7 whether he put it in his waist or his pocket. 8 But he moved the gun from --Yes, I was sitting on the couch against the window. He 9 moved the gun from underneath the pillow. Where he put it at, 10 11 I don't know. Okay. But somewhere on his person? 12 13 Yes. How much longer were you there? 14 I was there for like maybe a couple hours. 15 Couple hours in addition to that? 16 17 Mm-hmm. Did he ever take the gun out again and put it anywhere 19 else? 20 No. 21 Did he keep it the entire time? 0 22 Yes. 23 THE COURT: Did you see him leave or did you leave 24 before he left? 25 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think I left before he did.

104 Hearing - L. Buckhannon - Cross THE COURT: Was there any further -- or did anybody 1 2 talk to him about the gun? THE WITNESS: No. 3 THE COURT: Did anybody ask him for the gun? 4 THE WITNESS: No, it wasn't a conversation about the 5 gun. THE COURT: There was never any conversation? 7 THE WITNESS: No, we're playing cards. We didn't pay 8 the gun no attention after he moved it. Q THE COURT: All right. Mr. Leiner, you may 10 cross-examine with respect to the foundation that has been 11 12 laid. MR. LEINER: Thank you, your Honor. 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LEINER: Ms. Buckhannon, you indicated that Dennis Copling sat 15 on the other side of the table at the card table after that? 16 17 Yes. So you couldn't see him at that point. You don't know 18 Q whether you -- you previously indicated you don't know whether he put it in his pocket or his waistband. Is it possible he could have handed it to someone else under the table? 21 No. 22 You said you were there for a couple of hours. Were 23 you in that room for a couple more hours? 24 25 Yes.

104 Hearing - L. Buckhannon - Cross 65 Did you ever go to the bathroom? 1 2 No. Did you ever leave at any time? Q No. You said there was lot of people there? Q 5 Yes. 6 Did you keep your eyes focused on Dennis Copling the 7 entire evening? 8 9 No. When did you first tell the Prosecutor about seeing 10 Q Dennis Copling with this weapon? 11 When I gave my statement. 12 When you gave your statement? 13 Yes. 14 When -- and you gave your statement to who? Q 15 To the Camden County Police Station. Was that a taped statement? 17 Yes, I believe. 18 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, can I have something marked 19 for Identification? 20 THE COURT: Certainly you may. It may be marked as 21 Defendant's Exhibit 1 for Identification. 22 (D-1 marked for Identification) 23 BY MR. LEINER: 24 Miss Buckhannon, I'll show you what's been marked D-1 25

for Identification. Is that your statement?

A Yes.

Q Could you find in that statement that you gave to the Prosecutor's Office where you stated the story you just told both here, outside the presence of the jury and in the presence of the jury in regard to that prior occasion when you saw Dennis Copling with the weapon?

A It's not in here.

Q Who did you tell about the weapon?

A Sergeant, what's his name, Lieutenant or Sergeant Forte.

THE COUPT: I'm going to stop you here because you're really getting into the type of cross-examination that would be before the jury and I think that cross-examination at this point should be limited to the foundation that was laid by the State and I think you're exceeding the parameters of Rule 104(a). I'm not saying deliberately, but you are.

MR. LEINER: I don't believe I've been notified. The Prosecutor indicated I was on prior notice about this particular story. There isn't anything in any statement or anything I've seen in discovery that indicates this particular story and scenario the way it happened.

THE COURT: But the Prosecutor's statement is not evidence. I'm only talking about evidentiary foundation, so I think you should confine your cross to the evidential foundation that was laid and disregard any statements by the

1 Prosecutor that you were on notice or not.

2 MR. LEINER: That's fine, your Honor. No further 3 questions.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. LEINER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll be glad to hear your argument, Mr.

Leiner.

MR. LEINER: Yes, your Honor. This whole story is a surprise to the defense and I think it's something that's very material. The Prosecutor indicates that it's not intended to prove anything other than the fact that he had the potential or possibility to get this particular weapon. However, one of the counts of the Indictment does read unlawful possession of a weapon for unlawful purpose. I think that goes directly to that issue and would cause the jury to speculate. I've had no notice of this particular incident in the way and in the manner it was described by this particular witness.

For that reason, on top of the highly prejudicial nature of the testimony, I would suggest to the Court that this portion of this witness' testimony should be stricken from the record and the jury should be instructed and admonished to disregard all portions of that testimony in regard to the weapon and where and when it was found at that particular time or when it was seen by this person, as she reports, on Dennis Copling on that prior occasion.

2

3

4

5

6

9

10 11

12

14 | 1 15 | w 16 | t 17 | t 18 | I 19 | w

20 21

23 24

25

THE COURT: So then you have two grounds for seeking exclusion of the evidence. One is it's not relevant and, secondly, that it is the result of a discovery violation.

MR. LEINER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Aronow.

MR. ARONOW: Well, number one, your Honor, Mr. Leiner had free access to all witnesses in this case, so there can't be an argument made that the State withheld discovery. The State provided Mr. Leiner with written discovery that there is, Judge, and, quite frankly, unless there are notes taken of a conversation that I or anyone else has with a witness, there is no discovery violation, number one.

Number two, I know as a matter of fact that Mr. Leiner indicated to me he had an investigator contact a number of witnesses. What witnesses were contacted I don't know. But told me that their stories were consistent with the discovery that was already in this case. And we have a statement from Latisha Fair which indicates, and perhaps I was mistaken to whether it was Lakesha or Latisha who said it, but clearly the statement of Latisha Fair indicates that she was aware the defendant had a Glock approximately one or two nights before this incident.

THE COURT: Had a what?

MR. ARONOW: Glock, that's a type of 9 millimeter semi-automatic handgun, Judge.

And, Judge, as far as that's concerned, there's absolutely isn't a discovery violation with respect to the State. Number two, the statement of Lakesha does say that he had his hand in his pocket like he always do when he got a gun and I think that by its very nature puts him on notice of the fact that Lakesha Buckhannon was aware of the fact that the defendant may have possessed a firearm and previously like he always do.

This would become a discovery violation if the State had spoken to this witness prior to her assuming the witness stand and learned that on a prior occasion she had seen the witness with a gun. If that information was then not provided to the defense, then that arguably would be a discovery violation because it would be evidence that the State would have been proffering without giving the defendant any notice of it so it would be aware that the State was aware this was going to be the testimony before this witness took the stand. If that's true, like I indicated, if there is no impediment to the defense talking to a witness to find out what they're going to say ahead of time, I don't know how that is a discovery violation.

THE COURT: It is a discovery violation because you know a fact you intended to prove and you haven't told the defendant what these facts are. Seems to me that would be make it a discovery violation. It's something you should have given

7

25

this defendant notice of. A defendant -- your argument is
anything that the defendant would have uncovered on his own is
not a discovery violation if you produce it in Court without
having told the defense and that's clearly not true.

MR. ARONOW: It's not Brady material, your Honor.

It's not exculpable material. I don't see that it is a discovery violation.

8 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, in the course of preparation for a trial, and especially one where the consequences are 9 great against my client, I think to have information come out 10 on the witness stand in regard to this, that statement, that 11 12 portion of this witness' statement in her statement she gave to 13 Detective Forte, you know had his hands in his pocket like he 14 always do when he has a gun, is clearly ambiguous, needs more explanation and is not indicative that she's going to tell this 15 16 story that she saw him at a prior occasion in a party with a gun where he picked up the gun, put it in his pocket and there 17 is a lot of information there. And to go through and say if 19 the investigator did talk to this witness and he came back and 20 said that this witness, his interview was consistent with the 21 statement she gave, that still doesn't mean there is not more 22 information that he didn't obtain from her and did not provide 23 to him, but did provide to the State and this is a critical issue in this case, your Honor. 24

THE COURT: The pertinent rule is Rule 3:13-3(c)(6)

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and under the rule, the State is obliged to provide the 2 defendant with names, addresses of any persons whom the 3 Prosecutor knows to have relevant evidence or information, including a designation by the Prosecutor as to which of those 5 persons may be called as witnesses.

6 Now, with regard to the obligation to turn over a signed statement, that obligation exists clearly as to a 7 defendant. And in addition, the State is obliged to turn over under Section 7 a record of any statements signed or unsigned by such persons. Such persons would include obviously witnesses and the defendant. So, the State therefore would have an obligation to turn over to the defendant any written statement of the witness. Obviously, that has been done. So the only question is whether the State had an obligation to in some way memorialize this subsequent conversation in the form of a writing or whether the State had an obligation to inform the defense orally before the witness took the stand.

Mr. Leiner, from what source would that obligation arise or come?

MR. LEINER: I believe it's a statement that was given. She indicated she gave it to the Prosecutor's Office at the same time she gave this particular statement and --

THE COURT: She doesn't say the Prosecutor's Office. She said the police and she said it was contained in her statement.

3

5

6

7

8

10

12

MR. LEINER: I'm sorry, I believe she indicated Sergeant Forte who's a member of the Prosecutor's Office.

THE COURT: That's true.

MR. LEINER: Therefore, they were in possession of this information, obviously knew that this witness was going to testify in regard to this because the Prosecutor was prepared with his questions in regard to that. And I think when you have a piece of testimony that is potentially as prejudicial, I can't keep in mind, your Honor, that everything that the Prosecutor introduces is going to be prejudicial. The test here is whether it's unduly prejudicial. I think it's also unduly prejudicial on my other objection.

13 However, where you have some piece of testimony that 14 links this person, my client to a gun on a prior occasion, that allows the jury to infer that he had a gun on the 18th and that 15 particular statement by this person was not provided to the 16 defense. I think it's clearly a violation in the whole sense 17 18 of unfairness with regard to that testimony in the ability for 19 me to prepare in regard to that testimony. For me to go out and speculate that any one of the numerous witnesses in this 20 case may have said something about a gun would be ridiculous. 21 I don't think the fact that I have an investigator available to 22 23 me should also shift the burden to me to speculate that they could come out and say anything other than what's in their 25 statement. And I think that it is misleading once you have a

 statement from someone and it's indicated to you this is the
person's statement, to come in and then tell a separate story
about a prior occasion that's not contained in this statement.

I think it's unfair surprise. I think it's a discovery
violation and I think it's highly prejudicial based on the fact
what this witness related and for those reasons I request that
this testimony be excluded and that the jury be admonished in
regard to it.

MR. ARONOW: I don't agree, Judge. Number one, there was no memorialization of this. It was a conversation. I can represent the first time I became aware of it was when I had come Lakesha into the Prosecutor's Office for purposes of telling her what's going to happen at this trial and trial prep.

THE COURT: Which I gather was sometime last week?

MR. ARONOW: Which was the 17th of January, and I did

not feel that it was my obligation to provide that information,

number one, because of the fact that they had Latisha Fair's

statement that talked about the fact that she'd seen the

defendant.

THE COURT: But that's a different witness, that's not this witness.

MR. ARONOW: My understanding, Judge, like I said, perhaps my understanding is incorrect, but my understanding was that there was a previous occasion when the defendant was

observed in possession of a firearm that was recent to this
shooting and that was evidenced by Latisha Fair's statement and
I believe that the paragraph that I referred to with respect to
Lakesha Buckhannon's statement also puts them on notice to the
fact that there had been previous instances when the defendant
may have been in a possession of a gun.

THE COURT: I don't think it really puts them on notice because if there had been an indication from you either orally to Mr. Leiner or in writing of a particular day, then Mr. Leiner would have sent out an investigator to find out whether other people who were present in the room had a different version of the incident in question or alleged incident, so I don't think that it puts him on notice.

Specifically let me also say that from the additional foundation that has been laid, I am satisfied that the evidence should now be permitted unless it is a discovery violation, so let me deal with the threshold issue first.

As I indicated earlier when we were at sidebar, the evidence is relevant if it has a tendency in reason to prove or disprove any fact of consequence to the determination of the action. And that has been interpreted to mean whether the evidence which is offered renders the desired inference more probable than it would be without the evidence, State versus Davis. And evidence is only irrelevant particularly in the context of circumstantial evidence if it lacks -- I'm sorry, if

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

it does not justify any reasonable inference as to the fact in question.

3 The bottom line is that even if the evidence by itself does not prove the material fact, as long as it has a tendency in reason to make it more likely that he had a gun on January 5 18th, then the evidence would be relevant. And after hearing the additional testimony from this witness, I'm satisfied that if the defendant picked up a gun that was on a chair, put it on 8 his person, kept it on his person for two more hours without 9 surrendering it to anybody else, I find that that evidence has 10 a tendency to prove on an occasion two weeks later the 11 defendant had the opportunity to possess a gun. So I find that 12 13 with this additional foundation I will now and I do now reconsider the sustaining of the objection and now the 14 15 objection is overruled because I find that the evidence is 16 relevant.

That therefore makes -- and you can step down if you'd like. You don't have to remain on the witness stand for this.

(Witness steps down.)

Therefore, the issue of whether there is a discovery violation and what should be done about it becomes a significant issue in this case and if there is anything further that either side would like to argue, I'll be glad to hear it and will recess for another few minutes so I can look into the issue a little more closely before ruling on the discovery

4

5

8

17

18

19

20 21

22

25

2 Anything further from the State?

MR. ARONOW: Nothing, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Leiner?

MR. LEINER: Nothing, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, we stand in recess for a little

while.

(Recess.)

104 Hearing - Colloguy

THE COURT: Counsel, I'm satisfied that under Rule
3:13-3(g), the State had a continuing duty to disclose other
information that it learned during the course of its pretrial
preparation and I specifically find that there was an
obligation on the part of the State to have informed the
defendant through his counsel that there would be testimony
produced through this witness that on an occasion two weeks
prior she saw the defendant with a gun in his presence.

Now, the fact that I have concluded that this is a discovery violation, and I conclude that it is, does not necessarily mean that the testimony should be excluded, that is one, excluded or precluded, precluded, that the preclusion of the testimony or the exclusion of the testimony is one of the many sanctions that the Court can impose. The Court is persuaded that the testimony is relevant and it would be unduly harsh to the State to preclude the evidence.

What I will do, however, is to give the defendant

23

24

25

every reasonable opportunity and I will bend over backwards to make sure that the defendant has every reasonable opportunity to meet this newly produced testimony. Specifically, you can cross-examine the defendant -- I'm sorry, the witness today on this issue, Mr. Leiner. I will require and will order that she 5 be made available so you can send an investigator out to 6 discuss this issue with her. You can recall her and cross-examine her during the State's case, if you wish. Moreover, you may seek to interview any of the other people who 9 were present at the time that this incident with the gun 10 allegedly occurred some two weeks prior and, hopefully, if you 11 intend to call any of them, I would hope that you would have 12 that done and completed, in other words, the investigation I 13 would hope, have that completed by the time your case, if any, 14 would open. But if not, I would consider the reasons why you 15 were unable to do that and I will consider granting you 16 additional time if there is any remedy that the defendant would 17 seek other than those and also I'm going to give a limiting 18 instruction as to the use of testimony other than what I have 19 alluded that there be a remedy or sanction that the defense seeks. 21

MR. LEINER: No, your Honor. The defense does seek the exclusion of this testimony based on the reasons previously given. And I think that when you couple the surprise with the limited use of the testimony, it becomes even more prejudicial

104 Hearing - Colloquy

and I seriously would request that your Honor reconsider this testimony under the 403 balance scale.

THE COURT: Let me tell you the reason why I'm not excluding it. If I were to exclude it, I would be making the assumption that -- let me put it in a different way. I should restore the defendant to the same position that he would have been in had the evidence been presented to him in advance of the witness taking the stand and to do that I should therefore give you the opportunity to meet that evidence and to pursue any additional witnesses and any additional cross-examination. But to exclude the testimony would I think serve no valid purpose other than to be a strong sanction against the State, but it would do more than simply restore the defendant to the status quo and it would give the defendant a distinct advantage that I don't think he is entitled to.

In other words, if the evidence is relevant than the State is entitled to produce it, the defendant should be afforded every opportunity to meet it, but I do not think that the discovery violation should result in the exclusion of the evidence. I should make every attempt to level the playing field and to give the defendant the opportunity to meet the evidence, the same opportunity he would have had if this evidence was turned over to him on January 17th, but I don't think excluding the evidence is the proper remedy because it is punitive and it tends to exclude relevant evidence and the

Court should not be excluding relevant evidence.

2 3

10

So, let me tell you what I believe the appropriate limiting instruction should be. When the jury returns, I will tell them that they have heard testimony that on a prior occasion some two weeks before January 18th, 1995, the defendant may have had a gun in his possession. The evidence that he may have had a gun in his possession on a prior occasion is not to be considered by them as proof that he

committed the crimes for which he is on trial here now.

Instead, the testimony about the gun two weeks prior is limited to the issue of whether or not the defendant had access to a 11 gun on a prior occasion. And I will further tell the jury that 12 even if they are satisfied that beyond a reasonable doubt the

defendant had a gun on a prior occasion, that does not make him 14 guilty of the crimes that he's on trial for today. And that 15 even if he had a gun on a prior occasion, if they find that 16 there's a reasonable doubt as to his innocence, they must find 17

him not guilty notwithstanding the fact that he may have had a 18 gun on a prior occasion. 19

Is there anything further that the defense would ask for in respect to a limiting instruction?

MR. LEINER: No, your Honor. Not to beat a dead horse, but given your instruction, I'm slightly uneasy with the relevance of the testimony. If they're not allowed to use this to show that he had a gun on January 18th, what relevance does

23 24 25

20

21

22

1 it have to these proceedings that he had access to a gun two
2 weeks prior to that?

THE COURT: No, the fact that he had a gun two weeks prior doesn't mean that they cannot consider that as evidence that he continued to possess the gun two weeks later. All that I am saying that they cannot do that. Just because he had a gun two weeks earlier doesn't mean that he is guilty of committing murder two weeks later. That is what the limiting instruction is.

MR. LEINER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Does the State wish to be heard on the limiting instruction?

MR. ARONOW: No, Judge, the State finds that satisfactory.

THE COURT: Why don't we bring the jury back.

MR. ARONOW: I think what I'm going to do is basically elicit the further testimony of Lakesha Buckhannon with respect to how long she saw the gun in possession and things of that nature.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ARONOW: Whether the limiting instruction --

THE COURT: No, that's where we differ.

MR. ARONOW: Okay.

THE COURT: I'm going to give the limiting instruction and you will continue and then I'll tell them they're about to

23

3

5

8

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

20

21

24 25

6 7

8

9

10

hear some other information about that.

2 Mr. Aronow, before, actually why don't you have 3 Latisha Fair --

MR. ARONOW: Lakesha Buckhannon.

THE COURT: Lakesha Buckhannon come in right now and I will talk to her about being available.

MR. ARONOW: You will hold the jury back?

THE COURT: We'll hold the jury back now.

 $\label{eq:will you just hold the jury outside for just one more second? Thank you.}$

If I can ask you to please resume the witness stand,

Ms. Buckhannon.

(Lakesha Buckhannon resumes the stand.)

14 THE COURT: In a moment we're going to be bring the jury back in. I have found and determined that the defendant 15 was not made aware in advance of the testimony that you have 16 just given about seeing the defendant with a gun two weeks 17 prior to January 18th and under our Rules of Court a defendant 18 19 is supposed to have an opportunity to know what all the 20 testimony is going to be so he can investigate it and challenge 21 it if he chooses to do so. So for that reason, you are going to be subject to being recalled as a witness and I regret any 22 inconvenience or upset that may cause to you. I realize that 23 this trial causes you some emotional upheaval and I understand 24 that and I'm sorry to keep dragging you back in so to speak, 25

Colloguy 28 but you can talk to Mr. Aronow and Mr. Leiner a little bit 2 later about when somebody will be talking to you. You should make yourself available, therefore, to be called back into Court if you receive notice from Mr. Leiner, the defense 4 attorney, that he intends to call you as a witness. You would 5 have to be. I want you to know what would happen potentially if you don't make yourself available. If you don't make yourself available to be recalled later, then the defendant has a right to ask me to strike the testimony that you have just given here about the gun two weeks earlier. If they don't have 10 11 a chance to meet that, they have the right to ask me to strike 12 the testimony that you've given. 13 Do you have any questions about what I've just told 14 you? 15 THE WITNESS: No. 16 THE COURT: No. Counsel, anything further on that 17 subject? MR. ARONOW: No. 18 19 MR. LEINER: No. 20 THE COURT: All right, we'll bring the jury back. (Jury enters courtroom at 11:54 a.m.) 21 22 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, before the mid-morning recess you had heard some testimony of what 23 24 this witness observed on an occasion approximately two weeks 25 prior to January 18th, 1995 and she told you that she observed

Colloguy

5

6

8

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

83

the defendant pick up a gun and move it off the chair. Let me
explain to you that there is a very, very limited purpose for
which you can consider that evidence.

You may consider that evidence only as establishing whether or not on a prior occasion the defendant had access to a gun. And if you find that the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that two weeks earlier the defendant had access to a gun, that does not mean that he committed these crimes some two weeks later. Instead, it's only offered to show that he had access to a gun two weeks earlier. That is the only purpose for which you can consider it and you can consider that along with all of the other evidence in the case to determine whether on January 18th, 1995, he also had access to a gun and may have had the opportunity to commit these crimes. But even if you find that he had a gun two weeks earlier, that does not make him guilty of these crimes. So that if you find that he had a gun two weeks earlier, if you also find there's a reasonable doubt as to his guilt, then you must find him not guilty even if you find that he had a gun some two weeks prior.

So again, the limited purpose for which this evidence is admitted is to show that two weeks earlier that he had access to a gun or had opportunity to have a gun some two weeks earlier. That does not make him guilty of the crimes at issue. Your consideration of whether or not he's guilty of

25

L. Buckhannon - Direct He put it on him. I don't know where, but he put it on 2 him. Like I said, he was on the other side of the table so I couldn't see where he was putting the gun, but he put it on 3 him. Where, I don't know. When you, when you say other side of the table, what 5 was happening at the table? Cards, they were playing cards. When you say who --8 Him and a couple other guys. I didn't remember who was 9 there. It was three other people that he was playing cards 10 with. 11 Okay. And when you say you can't, you couldn't see 12 him because of the table, what did you see in terms of his motions, what did you observe him do? 14 He stood behind the table and he had the gun in his hand. 15 Okay. 16 But then he sat down, so I couldn't see. 17 All right. What did you see? Did you see any 18 movement of his arms or anything like that? 19 20 Only that he was putting the gun somewhere. Okay. Like the way I'm sitting, this was right here. 22 Okay. And say I'm Dennis, what did the table look 23 24 like? A round, a round, you know, a triangle table, rectangle 25

L. Buckhannon - Direct shaped table and somebody on the other side and somebody here and somebody here. Okay. Somebody on each side of the table? Yes, and I couldn't, you know, I couldn't see because of the table. I couldn't see whether or not, you know, whether he was putting it here and whether he was putting it here. 6 Q What is here or here? What are you referring to? 7 Whether he was putting it in his pants, in his pocket, in 8 his jacket pocket. I don't know where. Somewhere on his person? 10 11 Mm-hmm. 12 Q Is that a yes? Yes. 13 Approximately how long after that took place were you 14 15 there at that place? 16 We was there for maybe like two hours. And did you at any time after Dennis picked up the gun 17 18 from the chair, did you at any time see him do anything else with the gun? 19 A No, I didn't see the gun no more that night. 20 With respect to calling your attention back to January 21 22 18th, 1995, you indicated that Dennis came in to 2808 Mitchell? Mm-hmm. 23 24 Q Is that a yes? 25 Yes.

L. Buckhannon - Direct 87 At the time that -- strike that. After the incidences occurred on January 17th, 1995? 2 Yes. 3 Do you recall going to the Camden Police Station? 0 4 5 Yes. Did you give a statement to anybody, a Camden police officer or an investigator from the Camden County Prosecutor's Office with respect to what had happened on January 17th and January 18th? 9 Did I give a statement? 10 Yes. 11 Yes, I did. 12 And I'm going to show you what's been marked D-1 for 13 Identification and take your time to look at that document. This is my statement. 15 That's the statement that you gave to the police? 16 17 Yes. Is there anywhere in this statement, without referring 18 Q to exactly what it says, is there anywhere in your statement, 19 look through the statement, that -- where you indicated what 20 Dennis specifically said that night on January 18th at 2808 Mitchell? 22 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, objection. May we approach? 23 THE COURT: The objection is sustained. 24 Q Is there -- I asked you a question with respect to 25

L. Buckhannon - Direct (Sidebar) what Dennis specifically said on January 18th, 1995; do you recall that question? Yes. Do you recall what Dennis specifically said on January 18th, 1995 about what he said when he came in? 5 Okay, when he came in, he wanted to speak to Latisha 6 outside. She was trying to tell him what happened the night 7 before. MR. LEINER: Your Honor, may I approach? THE COURT: You may. If I can ask you to step down 10 just for a moment and have a sit in the front. 11 (Sidebar discussion on the record.) 12 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, I couldn't see whether or not 13 this witness was reading this statement. Her eyes were down. 14 I'm not sure whether the State asked her. She never indicated 15 along those lines. I just want to clarify she was not. I couldn't see the statement itself. 17 MR. ARONOW: That wasn't my impression she was reading 18 as she was testifying. 19 MR. LEINER: I request until sometime that the 20 statement be removed from in front of her. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. ARONOW: Sure. 23 (Sidebar discussion concluded.) 24 25 BY MR. ARONOW:

L. Buckhannon - Direct Lakesha, you were testifying that Latisha was trying to explain to Dennis what had happened the night before? 2 Yes. 3 Without reference to what specifically she said, okay, what did Dennis say in response? 5 He asked her to step outside. 6 Okay. Did you hear Dennis say anything that night 7 with respect to your brother, Kirby Bunch? 8 Yes, yes. 9 What did you hear Dennis say? 10 That he was going to look for him, that he was going to 11 kill him and if we was there when he got back, he was going to 12 get us too, meaning Barbara --13 MR. LEINER: Objection, your Honor. 14 -- and myself. 15 MR. LEINER: -- to what the person meant. She 16 testified as to what he said. 17 THE COURT: The objection is overruled. Why don't you 18 lay a foundation for how she knows what he meant by the word 19 "us." 20 Lakesha, who else was in the room when Dennis said 21 Q that? 22 A It was Marie Covin and her seven kids, Latisha Fair, 23 Barbara Buckhannon, myself, Latisha's one year old son, he was one at the time, one or two years old and that's it, just us.

- L. Buckhannon Direct
- 1 A It was starting to get dark.
- Q And at some point in time -- how long was Dennis at
- 3 2808 Mitchell?
- 4 A Maybe 10, 15 minutes.
- Q And did he speak to Latisha before he left or did he by just leave?
- 7 A After he said what he said in the house, him and Latisha 8 went outside.
- 9 Q Before that, did you say anything to Latisha before he 10 went out the house?
- 11 A He asked her to go outside with him.
- 12 Q Why did you say to Latisha?
- 13 A I asked her not to go outside with him.
- 14 Q Why?
- 15 A Because I didn't want her to go out there with him.
- 16 Q Why?
- 17 A Because he kept saying he was going to get us. So if, if
- 18 she went outside with him, you know, why wouldn't he do
- 19 anything to her? But then I was thinking, you know, that since
- 20 they had, you know, relations before, that they was cool so he
- 21 probably would do nothing to her. But then I was just
- 22 worried. I told her not to go, but she went anyway.
- 23 Q And he had a conversation with Latisha outside?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q And was the tone of Dennis' voice any different from

L. Buckhannon - Direct

when he was in the house?

2 It was the same, loud.

Could you still hear him?

4 Yes.

8

5 Was he saying the same thing? Q

He was just trying to get, you know, trying to find my 6 brother. He was just trying to get there. He didn't want to 7

hear nothing. He didn't want to hear no explaining.

9 What did he say in regard to that?

10 What did he say?

11 When he said he didn't want to hear nothing, he didn't want to hear explaining, are those his words? What did he say? 12

He did not want to hear it. Then Latisha was telling him 13

14

15 Without reference to what she actually said, what was she talking about?

17 She was talking what had happened the night before which is 18 the 17th.

19 And is that when Dennis indicates he didn't want to 0

20 hear nothing? 21

No, he didn't say he did not want to hear anything. He was just like, you know, he just was, he wasn't trying to hear it. 22

He was not -- like he was overtalking her when she was trying 24 to explain, so he was, like he was going to go, go get him,

talking about K.C. and he left like 15, 10 or 15 minutes and he

L. Buckhannon - Direct

- A I walked.
- 2 Q With who?
- 3 A Latisha.
- 4 Q When you arrived at Westminster Avenue, did you see
- 5 the police officer that you spoke to earlier?
- 6 A Yes
- 7 Q Did you see the van again?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q Did you say something to him?
- 10 A I asked him why didn't he go when we told him because if he
- 11 would have went, then none of that would have happen, but he
- 12 say he had other calls.
- 13 Q I'm going to show you what's been marked S-21 for
- 14 Identification. Do you have recognize that photograph?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q And who's in that photograph?
- 17 A This is the eighth grade graduation picture. It's a school
- 18 friend, Jayme and Latisha and myself and Dennis.
- 19 Q Dennis Copling?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Do you know how this photograph came to be in the
- 22 possession of the police?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q How is that?
- 25 A January the 18th, we was asked to come to the police

L. Buckhannon - Direct (Sidebar) 96 station. I carried the photo album to show them the picture of Dennis and Gary and I gave them the picture. 2 You give the police that picture? 3 4 Yes. Did you have any other concerns about yourself 5 personally on January 18th, 1995 after you found out what 6 happened to your brother? I was scared, but I was like, I was just more in shock 8 about my brother. I didn't really care. What were you afraid of? 10 That he would come. 11 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, objection. 12 THE COURT: On the grounds of relevance? 13 MR. LEINER: Relevance. 14 THE COURT: I'll hear you at sidebar. 15 (Sidebar on the record.) 16 THE COURT: What's the relevance of her sentiments? 17 MR. ARONOW: Because she testified that he threatened 18 to come back and get them too if they were there when he came 19 20 back. MR. LEINER: The testimony has already been given. I 21 don't see the relevance to continue to ask her whether or not 22 she was afraid at that point, whether she's afraid today or 24 MR. ARONOW: I didn't ask her whether she was afraid 25

L. Buckhannon - Direct (Sidebar) 97 today. I asked that night. I think it is relevant because it's relevant to hear whether or not the person who was present and made threats was the person she had --3 THE COURT: She's not the jury. That's for the jury 4 to decide. Objection is sustained. 5 MR. LEINER: Just one other issue, your Honor, before it happens. With the last witness, Mr. Aronow presented a picture of the victim. Your Honor, in light of my previous objections and the fact we'll stipulate, I don't see any reason to make this witness anymore upset and get closer to the 10 11 witness impact by showing the picture of the victim so she 12 cries more. It's an issue that would only --THE COURT: Inflame the jury. 14 MR. LEINER: -- inflame the jury, yes. 15 MR. ARONOW: One more remark. I had indicated I 16 expected to ask Lakesha that fact. I had told her what I 17 intended to do. It was she who brought up the fact. She 18 wanted to do it. It was not my idea. I don't think it inflames the jury. Quite frankly, she's been through a lot and 19 if it's something that contributes to her peace of mind, it 20 certainly is an issue with respect to identification. I 21 22 thought I already presented the photograph of --THE COURT: Not to her, to her mother. 23 24 MR. ARONOW: I'm not going to do that, Judge. 25 THE COURT: Very good. It shouldn't be done because I

```
L. Buckhannon - Direct (Sidebar)
                                                              98
    don't think it adds anything to the proofs in the case, and all
    it does is engender more sympathy.
 3
             MR. LEINER: Thank you.
             (Sidebar conclude concluded.)
             THE COURT: Where is the witness?
 5
             MR. ARONOW: I think she's composing herself, Judge.
             THE COURT: Members of the jury, the objection to the
 8
    last question was sustained.
    BY MR. ARONOW:
 9
        Q
10
             Lakesha, do you know anybody by the name of Mark
11
    Winston?
12
    A Yes.
13
            And how do you know Mark Winston?
14
    A I just know him from the neighborhood and my brother's
15
    daughter's mom has a baby, baby brother Mark, that's how I know
16
    him from the streets.
17
        Q Do you know him by any other name other than Mark
18
    Winston?
19
      Malik.
20
        Q
            Is that his nickname?
21
      Yes.
22
             I'm going to show you what's been previously marked
23
   S-22 for Identification. Could you come down here for a
24
   second?
25
            (Witness steps down.)
```

L. Buckhannon - Direct Right on the side of her house, right on the side of her 1 2 house it happened. Okay. And where do you live or where did you live at 3 that time? On 2726 Cramer. 5 6 Do you have an idea in relation to Marie's house? 7 Maybe like around the corner. I live here. And where did K.C. live? Where? McGuire. 10 Where did you go to see him? 11 I went to my Aunt Queen's house in McGuire Gardens and then 12 to my grandmother's. And where are they in relation to this map? 13 14 (Witness indicating.) 15 Okay. You're pointing to the area that says McGuire 16 Gardens Apartments? 17 Yes. 18 And where did you see the police van again? Right here, on Westminster Avenue. 19 And -- okay. And that was the same night that Dennis 20 was there, that was the night that Dennis was at 2808 Mitchell 22 Street? 23 Yeah. 24 MR. LEINER: Objection, leading.

THE COURT: Your question should be rephrased. The

25

L. Buckhannon - Direct 102 objection is sustained. Do you recall whether Dennis Copling was at 2808 Mitchell Street the same night that your brother got killed? 3 A The same night? No, he was there -- no, he was there the 4 night before, the night before which was the 17th, my brother was killed the 18th. Right. Okay. When did this incident happen with Dennis Copling? 8 The 17th. 9 THE COURT: When you say this incident, what do you 10 mean exactly? 11 I'm not talking about the fight with Gary Copling. 12 I'm talking about when Dennis Copling came to where you, your mother, Latisha, and the kids were all at. What day was it? 15 Well, I'm asking is that the same night you went 16 looking for your brother? 17 18 Yeah. Okay. And that was down here? 19 Mm-hmm. 20 Yes? 0 21 Yes. 22 Okay. How did you get there? 23 Walked on foot. 24 With who, if anyone? 25

L. Buckhannon - Cross 103 Latisha and my mom. 1 MR. ARONOW: I have no further questions. 2 3 THE COURT: Mr. Leiner, you may cross-examine although we're going five minutes. 4 MR. LEINER: Thank you, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: You may resume the witness stand. 6 7 (Witness resumes stand.) CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LEINER: 8 Ma'am, the night that you said that Dennis Copling came to the house where your mother and Latisha Fair and Marie 10 were and all the kids were, you indicated that Dennis Copling 12 made certain statements in that house; is that correct? 13 Yes. 14 Q In fact, you said it was a rather loud tone of voice; 15 is that also correct? Yes. 17 Was your mother in the room when those statements were 18 made? I can't hear you. 19 20 Was your mother in the room when those statements were 21 made? 22 Yes. 23 And how close to Dennis Copling was she? 24 He was between the door -- all right, like where the, security guard is, whatever, like where he's sitting that would 25

L. Buckhannon - Cross 104 be Dennis and my mom would be like where the lady in the green 2 is. And where were you standing? 3 I was sitting on a couch next to my mom. 4 Next to your mother? 5 Mm-hmm. 6 Were you right next to your mother at the time? 7 Q Yes. 8 Was your mother also sitting? 9 Q 10 Mm-hmm. Dennis was rather loud when he was making these 11 comments; is that correct? 12 Yes. 13 So anything that Dennis would have said, your mother would have heard? 15 Yes. 16 Now, you indicated also in your testimony on a prior 17 occasion some several weeks before that incident you had seen 18 Dennis at that party; is that correct? 19 Yes, at -- yeah. 20 And you indicated that you went to sit down in a 21 particular location at that party on a chair or a couch? 22 On a couch. 23 On a couch. And was anyone else sitting on that 24 25 couch?

L. Buckhannon - Cross 105 No. You went to sit down and Dennis told you not to sit 2 there; is that correct? 3 Yes. 4 And then you tell us that Dennis picked up what 5 Q appeared to you to be a weapon; is that correct? 7 Yes. And then he went and sat around the other side of the 8 table; is that correct? 9 Yes. 10 How many other people were at the table? 11 Three. 12 Was there someone sitting, someone sitting opposite, 13 across from Dennis? 15 Yes. Q With their back to you? 16 17 Yes. And there were people sitting on the sides; is that Q 18 19 correct? 20 Yes. And you also indicated that you could not see what 21 Dennis Copling was doing at that point, could you? 22 23 No. In fact, it's true that your vision was somewhat 24 blocked in regard to Dennis Copling; is that true? 25

L. Buckhannon - Cross 106 Yes. You didn't see that gun anymore that night? 2 Q No. 3 And do you know whether or not you left before or 4 5 after Dennis Copling? Before. You weren't outside with Latisha and Dennis, were you? 8 No, I was in the house. 9 Did you stay seated at the couch? 10 Yes. And I think you indicated that -- how far away is the 11 12 couch from the front door? That would be the couch where the lady in the green is 14 sitting. Q Okay. And if -- where would the front door be? 15 16 Where the security guard is. 17 You mean the door to the courtroom? 18 Yes. And the door was closed? 19 20 It was like cracked. 21 Like cracked. It was wintertime, wasn't it? 22 Yeah. 23 0 Was it cold? 24 Kind of. 25 MR. LEINER: I have no further questions, your Honor.

Colloquy THE COURT: Any redirect? MR. ARONOW: No. THE COURT: Okay. You may step down. You are excused. At this point we'll take a luncheon recess and we'll resume at 1:40. Again, just a reminder not to discuss the testimony among yourselves in the meantime. We'll see you after lunch.

107

(Jury leaves the courtroom at 12:28 p.m.) (Luncheon recess.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Leiner.

MR. LEINER: No, I was just standing when your Honor came in.

14 MR. ARONOW: Judge, I indicated to Mr. Leiner before we begin with the next witness, who's going to be Nathaniel 15 Simmons, that the State anticipates and would elicit testimony 16 made by Mark Winston, also known as Malik, on the ground that 17 Malik was a co-conspirator to the murder and the Indictment, 18 even though under the 803(b)(5) hearsay exception doesn't require there even to be a count of the indictment charging 20 21 conspiracy, it's clear that the statements of Malik to the defendant are in furtherance of the conspiracy to commit murder 22 or certainly the conspiracy to commit a crime against Kirby 23 Bunch and that therefore the statements made by Malik should be admissible.

25

2

3

5

8 9

10

11 12

13

Simmons - Direct THE COURT: As what was, a statement against people --1 2 MR. ARONOW: It was a statement of a co-conspirator in the furtherance of a commission of a crime. 3 THE COURT: Under Evidence Rule --4 MR. ARONOW: (803(b)(5). 5 THE COURT: The jury is on its way now. I've been here for 10 minutes. Bring it to my attention. We'll take a break and I'11 deal with the issue at the break. 8 (Jury enters courtroom at 1:51 p.m.) 9 10 THE COURT: The State may call its next witness. MR. ARONOW: The State would call Nathaniel Simmons. 11 THE COURT: If you would please come forward to my 12 right and be sworn. 13 NATHAN 14 S I M M O N S, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN. 15 THE COURT: You may proceed. 16 MR. ARONOW: Thank you, your Honor. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ARONOW: 17 Would you tell the Court and jury your name again 19 please? 20 Nathan Simmons. 21 And in January of 1995 where did you live, Nate? 22 2126 Westminster. 23 And where is that? 24 McGuire Gardens. 25 And is that in the City of Camden?

Simmons - Direct 109 Yes. And whose place was that? My mom's. 3 And did you -- did you know a person by the name of 4 Kirby Bunch, Jr. in January of 1995? 5 Yes. 6 And how did you know Kirby? 7 Q I've been living there for awhile, from being out there. Did Kirby have a nickname? 10 K.C. And did you know a person by the name of Gary Copling, 11 Jr. in January of 1995? 12 13 Yes. And how did you know Gary? 14 From being around. 15 Same type of way? 16 Yes. 17 And did Gary go by a nickname that you're aware of? Q 18 19 No. With respect to Dennis Copling, did you know of a 20 Q Dennis Copling in January of 1995? 21 Yes. 22 And did you know about him in the same manner? 23 0 Yes. 24 Did you know a person by the name of Malik?

25

Q

Simmons - Direct 110 Yes. Did you know that person's real name in January of 3 1995? No. 4 You only knew him as Malik? 5 Q 6 Yes. 7 And how do you know that person? Q By seeing him around, around McGuire Projects a couple 8 9 times. 10 Around where you lived? Yes. 11 12 I'm going to show you a photograph which has been marked S-2 for Identification. Do you recognize the person 13 14 that's in that photograph? Yes. 15 Who's that? 17 K.C. Kirby Bunch, Jr. 18 0 19 Kirby Bunch, yeah. 20 I'm going to show you a person or a photograph marked S-18 for Identification. Do you recognize the person in that 21 22 photograph? 23 Yes. 24 Who's that? 25 Malik.

Simmons - Direct 114 At 2126 Westminster? 0 2 Yes. And I'm going to show you a group of photographs that 3 have been marked S-31, S-32, S-33, and S-34. Do you recognize 4 what's shown in the photographs? 5 Yes. 6 And what is shown in the photographs? Q 7 Project, McGuire Projects homes. 8 And -- okay. Any specific area of the McGuire 9 Projects do you recognize? 10 Yes. 11 And what specific area do you recognize? Q 12 My house and neighbor's houses. 13 Okay. And could you -- by looking, do you know how 14 far from the end of the building was your house? 15 Yes. How far was it? 17 Two doors down. 18 Okay. And so could you show where your house was? 19 Yes, third one. 20 Third one? 21 Yes. 22 Okay. So past two doors down? 23 Uh-huh. 24

And in S-31 for Identification which door would be the

25

Simmons - Direct 115 door to your house, the one closest to the right of the photo or the one closest to the left of the photo? Closest to the left. 3 How many total doorways are shown? One. 5 How many doorways? Q 6 7 No, two. On the photograph how many are shown? 9 Three. Okay. And yours is the furthest to the left? 10 Yes. 11 And the photograph that's been -- strike that. Does 12 the photograph, which is marked S-31 for Identification, does 13 that fairly and accurately show what the doorway to your house 14 looked like around January of 1995? 15 16 Yes. And do you know -- strike that. How many doors are 17 there to get into 2126 Westminster Avenue? 18 Two. 19 And do you know which door is shown in the photograph 20 which is marked S-31 for Identification? 21 22 Yes. Which door? Q 24 Screen door. What does that screen door enter into in the house? 25

Simmons - Direct 116 1 Kitchen. Kitchen? 2 Yes. 3 Would that be considered the backdoor or the front door? 6 Back. And I'm going to show you what's been marked S-32 for 7 8 Identification. Is that a different angle of the same building where 2126 Westminster Avenue is? Yes. 10 11 And does that also show where the doorway to your property was? 12 Yes. 13 And where, where's that in reference to the 14 photograph? 15 16 Two doors down from the end. 17 Which is the end, to the right or to the left? To the right. 18 19 So it would be -- it would be actually the third door up from counting from the right to the left? 20 Yes. 22 The house that's shown or the doorway that's shown in the left side of that photograph, where is that in relation to 23 24 your house, the two doorsteps that come together into one? A I don't understand. 25

Simmons - Direct 117 Do you know where the -- strike that. Next door to your house, if you were to come out of your house, 2126 Westminster, from the kitchen door, still standing on your back 3 step? 4 5 Uh-huh. If you were to look to your right? 7 Mm-iumm. 8 Are there additional --Q 9 Yes. 10 Q -- doors to your right? 11 Yes. You already said that your -- there are two more doors 12 down on your left-hand side; is that correct? 13 14 Yes. 15 Does that photograph, S-32 for Identification, show 0 both the residences to the right if you were standing? 16 17 Yes. And your threshold looking out and to the left? 18 Q 19 Yes. 20 Does that reasonably and accurately appear to resemble what that area of your house looked like in December of 1995? 22 Yes. 23 I'm going to ask you the same question with the photograph that's been marked S-33 for Identification. Is that 24 another view of the building that contains 2126 Westminster

119

1 A I don't know the name of it.

Q Okay. But there's a day care center there?

A Yes.

Avenue?

2

3

Q And if you were to look at these photographs, do any
these photographs here show you a view from Westminster

7 A The -- just -- yes.

8 Q Which photograph?

9 A 34, S-34 and S-32.

10 Q Okay. And where would Westminster Avenue be if you
11 were standing in the photographer's position taking those
12 photographs?

13 A Which one?

14 Q If you were -- if you were the person taking the
15 picture and you were standing, where would Westminster Avenue
16 be in relationship to where you would be looking if you took
17 that picture?

18 A From in front.

19 Q Okay.

25

20 A In the front of it. From the side I mean.

Q Okay. Where would the street be and where would the
-- you know what? Strike that. I'm going to show you what's
been marked S-22 for Identification. Can you come down a
second.

(Witness steps down.)

Simmons - Direct 120 Can you find Westminster Avenue on that map? 2 Right there -- oh, that's -- right here. Okay. And is that where the McGuire Gardens is? 3 Yes. 5 And do you know what other streets are around 2126 Westminster Avenue? Yes. What streets? 8 Q Boyd and Berwick. 9 Can you locate those on the map as well? 10 Here and here. 11 12 Are they're clearly marked Boyd and Berwick? 13 Yes. Do they appear to be accurately laid out the way you 15 understand the map of the City of Camden to be? Yes. 16 17 Q And from living in that area at that time? Yes. 18 19 Q How long did you live in that area? 20 About seven, six years. And where would 2126 -- where would the building be in 22 relationship to the map? If you could sort of stand along the side so the jury could see where you're pointing to. 23 Around about right here. 24 25 MR. ARONOW: Okay. Now, you can take your stand

Simmons - Direct 121 please. (Witness resumes stand.) 2 When you went to 2126 Westminster Avenue, did you stay 3 overnight there between January 17th and January 18th? Yes. 5 Q Was Kirby with you the entire time? 6 7 Yes. Was anybody else with you at some point in time on 8 January 18th, 1995? 10 Yes. Who was with you? 11 Benjamin Young. 12 And who's Ben Young? 13 Friend of mine. 14 Okay. And did there come a time when you, Kirby 15 Bunch, Jr. and Ben Young were all in 2126 Westminster Avenue 16 17 together? Yes. 18 And when was that? Do you recall when that was? 19 About, about nine. 20 Nine, what time? 21 22 9:00 o'clock, 9 p.m. 9 p.m.? 24 Uh-huh. 25 Had you been together earlier?

Simmons - Direct 122 1 Yes. 2 And when you went to 2126 Westminster Avenue together, what did the three of you do? 3 We just, we just watched t.v. and listen to the radio. 4 And where were you inside of 2126 Westminster Avenue? 6 In the living room. Okay. And in relationship to the kitchen door area 7 which you just described, how would one get to the living room 8 from that room? 9 You have to walk through the kitchen. 10 Okay. And then where? 11 And then through, through two doors. That's it. 12 Okay. And is the living room connected in any way to 13 14 the kitchen? Yes. 15 16 0 How? It's, it's right, right together. It's like as soon as you 17 go out the kitchen, you go out of the kitchen in the living 18 19 room. 20 And was there any kind of furniture or anything like 21 that in the living room? 22 Yes.

What kind of furniture was there?

Sofa and sofa bed and t.v.s and radio. That's it.

When you say radio, do you mean stereo or radio?

23

24

25

0

Simmons - Direct 125 Yes. And where is that? 2 In the front. 3 Okay. And what room does that enter into? 4 Living room. 5 The living room? 6 7 Yeah. MR. ARONOW: Okay. Now, go ahead, you can take your 8 seat again. 9 (Witness resumes stand.) 10 With respect to the evening of January 18th, 1995, did 11 anything happen while you, K.C. and Ben Young were in the 12 13 apartment? Yes. 14 What happened? We're sitting in there and Malik came in. He knocked on 16 the door, K.C. got up and opened the door and Malik came in. 17 He walked in the living room. Like Malik say, why you jump, 18 why you jump? 19 MR. LEINER: Objection, your Honor, hearsay. 20 21 THE COURT: Mr. Aronow. 22 MR. ARONOW: Your Honor, it's the State's position that it's the statement of a co-conspirator and would clearly 23 24 be admissible. 25 THE COURT: Under 803(b)(5) the objection is

Simmons - Direct 126 overruled. You may proceed. 2 What did Malik say? 3 Malik say, why you jump, why you jump, my young boy? Like why you jump my young boy? I said we ain't jump him. KC said 4 it's a fair fight. After that Malik say, well, you're going to 5 speak with his brother. Okay. Let me stop you right there. When K.C. was 8 with you in the living room, were you with Young? Yes. 9 10 Q There was a knock at which door? 11 The front. 12 And what happened with respect to -- Malik was allowed 13 in? 14 Yes. 15 Q And Malik was the person that you identified in that photograph? 16 Yes. 17 18 And can you describe how Malik was dressed? He had, had a blue goose down jacket and he had no hat. 19 20 Was he wearing anything over his face? 21 No. 22 0 Did you clearly know him as Malik? 23 Yes. 24 When Malik came in, can you describe his attitude and 25 demeanor?

Simmons - Direct Yes. He was kind of upset that he said we jumped his young 2 boy and he was --What's the word young boy mean? 3 Just little. 4 5 Is that a friend? Yes, his friend, but his young, his young friend. 6 7 All right. And with respect to the way he was acting, 8 how would you describe his temper? 9 He was mad. 10 Was he yelling or was he talking like you and I are? 11 He was yelling. 12 And did you or K.C. say anything at the time that he was talking? 13 14 Yes. MR. LEINER: Objection, your Honor, to what K.C. 15 said. It's clearly hearsay. 16 17 MR. ARONOW: Well, I'm not talking what K.C. said. 18 I'm asking if they said anything while Malik was talking. 19 That's not hearsay. 20 THE COURT: Without telling what was said, if you can answer that question yes or no. 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. 22 23 And it was you who said what? 24 I said we ain't jump Gary. 25 Okay. And did he say anything to you in response?

Q After he used the shut the "F" up, what else did he

He said turn down, told Ben turn down the radio.

Did he say that in the same type of tone?

22

23

24 25 say?

Simmons - Direct 129 1 Yes. 2 And did he say anything else with respect to anything 3 that happened after that? No. 5 Did you say something about talking to someone else's 0 brother? 6 Yes, oh, yeah, I said, well, you got to speak to his, his 7 brother. We do that. You got to speak to his brother. He said that two times. Then they walked in the kitchen. Gary --I mean Malik and K.C. walked in the kitchen together. 10 11 And did they go out of your sight at that point? Yes. 12 Did there come a time when you saw anything else after 13 Q that? 14 15 Yes. 16 And where were you looking from? From the hallway of my living room. 17 Okay. And where were you looking into? 18 The kitchen. 19 20 And did someone else enter 2126 Westminster? 21 Yes. 22 And how did that person get in? He, he -- the door was already open and he just opened the 24 door and came right in. 25 Okay. The one door was already opened and he just

Simmons - Direct 130 opened the other one? Yes. 2 Which one did he open? 3 Q The screen door. 4 And would you describe how this person was dressed? He had a black and white jacket with a black hoody, black 6 sweater and green pants and a mask. 7 What color pants? Q R 9 Green. And were those light or dark green? 10 Q 11 Dark. 12 And what else? And with a half-mask. 13 What's a half-mask? What does that mean? 14 Like just nose part was covered. 15 Okay. Nose and --16 17 Mouth. 18 You're pointing like this? 19 And the mouth. Okay. And had you ever seen a mask like that before? 20 21 Yes. And where did you see masks like that before? 22

In the stores and on the streets.

Any stores in particular?

Store on Federal, discount store, I don't know the name of

23

Simmons - Direct 131 1 it. Can you describe the mask other than the fact that it 2 Q covers your face? Is it a handkerchief for instance? 3 What's it made out of? 0 Made out of like foam, like foam rubber, something like 6 7 that. 8 A ski mask kind of thing? 9 Yes. 10 Q Did it go behind the person's head? 11 Yes. 12 Q And the person you said was wearing a hoody? 13 Yes. How was he wearing a hoody with reference to the mask? 14 He had the mask right here and then he had the hoody pulled 15 over towards his forenead. 17 So all you could see was eyes? 18 Yes. Could you tell the color of his skin? 19 Q 20 Yes. 21 Q What color? 22 Black. And could you tell approximately how tall this person 24 was? 25 Yes.

Simmons - Direct 132 How tall was he approximately? 1 About six, six-two, six-three. 2 And how would you describe the build of this 3 individual? 4 Kind of built. Kind of built. You have said that you had known Gary Copling prior to January of 1995; is that correct? 7 Yes. 8 And you said you have known Dennis Copling prior to 9 January of 1995; is that correct? 10 Yes. Did either of those two individuals fit that general 12 description? 13 Yes. 14 Q Which one? 15 Dennis. 16 Is Dennis bigger than Gary? 17 18 Yes. When this person came in, was anything said to K.C.? 19 Yes. 20 What was said? 21 He said why you jump my brother, said that a couple times, 22 and then K.C. -- well, why you jump my brother, and that was 23 25 K.C. said something in response?

Simmons - Direct 133 Yes. And when this person said why did you jump my brother, 0 2 did he do anything? 3 Yes, he started pulling out a gun from his inside pocket. And when you say he started pulling out a gun, where 5 did the gun come from? 6 In his inside pocket, inside pocket. 7 Okay. Of his clothing? 8 Jacket. 9 His jacket. And when you say inside, you mean from 10 11 within? Yes. 12 Can you describe the gun that you saw? 13 It was about, it was automatic, about that big. 14 Can you show the Judge how big you're talking? 15 THE COURT: Seven inches. And you stay it was an automatic. Do you know the 17 difference between an automatic and a revolver? 18 Yes. 19 It was definitely an automatic? Q 20 Yes. 21 What color was it? 22 Q 23 Black. Did K.C. do anything when this person pulled the gun? 24 Yes, he started struggling with him. 25

Simmons - Direct

Q And what happened next?

- 2 A Then I heard a shot and then I turned around and ran.
- 3 Q And what about Ben Young, what did he do?
- 4 A He ran too.
- 5 Q Did you hear anymore shots?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q Approximately how many?
- 8 A Four, four or five shots more.
- Q Were you still in the house at 2126 Westminster when
- 10 you heard shots?
- 11 A I was just getting out of the door and I ran when I heard
- 12 | the shot.
- Q Did you happen to see where Malik was when this person
- 14 came in with the gun?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q Where was Malik?
- 17 A He was behind K.C.
- Q When you say behind him, can you describe how he was
- 19 standing in relation to K.C.
- 20 A He was just standing there, just standing there.
- 21 Q Did you have an opportunity to see or did you
- 22 recognize the person who had their face covered and had the
- 23 hoody over the top of his head?
- 24 A No.
- 25 Q Now, have you ever been convicted of a crime?

Simmons - Direct 135 Yes. What crime were you convicted of? 2 CDS charge. 3 Possession with intent to distribute? 5 Yes. And when was that? 6 Q 195. 7 And did you receive a sentence as a result of that 8 Q charge? 9 Yes. 10 What sentence did you receive? 11 Three years probation. 12 And have you recently been arrested? 13 Yes. 14 And when did that arrest take place? 15 December of '96. 16 December of '96? 17 Yes. 18 Approximately a month ago? 19 20 Yes. And what was that charge for? 21 Receiving stolen property. 22 An automobile? 23 Q 24 Yes. And is that charge currently pending in Camden County? 25

Simmons - Cross 137 1 No. 2 You indicated to the Prosecutor a moment ago that the individual came in wearing a black ski mask and I think you indicated you could not recognize that individual; is that correct? 5 A Yes. 6 7 Q You didn't know who it was that came into the house, 8 did you? No. 9 10 Q You also described him as being how tall? About six-two. 11 About six-two. Do you remember giving the 12 13 Prosecutor's Office a statement in regard to this matter? 14 Yes. 15 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, if I can have this marked for 16 Identification. THE COURT: It will be marked Defendant's Exhibit 2 17 for Identification. 18 (D-2 marked for Identification.) 19 BY MR. LEINER: 20 21 Mr. Simmons, I want to show you what's been marked D-2 22 for Identification and I want to ask you if that's a transcript 23 of the statement that you gave to the police or Prosecutor's Office regarding this matter? 24 25 Yes.

Simmons - Cross

138

1 Q And that is your statement?

2 A Yeah.

3 Q And you recall answering those questions?

A Yes.

5 Q And was your statement true and accurate at the time ϵ you gave it?

7 A Yes.

8 Q I'd like to refer you to page 8 of that statement and
9 you were asked a question, the first full question at the top
10 of the page and the question is: All right, describe this

11 man. And were they asking you about the masked individual?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And how did you describe that person?

14 A Say about six-three, a little stocky.

15 Q So, it was your impression that the person that came
16 into the room that evening was very tall; is that correct?

17 A Mm-hmm.

Q Six-three and stocky is a pretty big individual, isn't

19 it?

21

22

25

20 A Yes.

Q Now, after Malik came in and he went back into the kitchen with K.C., you indicated that another individual had come in. Did you actually see him come in or hear him come in?

24 A Saw him come in.

Q You indicated also that after he talked to K.C. a

Simmons - Cross 140 Sitting on the couch. 1 2 And how far away from the doorway to the kitchen is 3 the couch? Not that far. Okay. How far away is the couch from the kitchen? 5 6 You could come from the kitchen into the -- in the living 7 room by just stepping in it. Where was Ben? Ben was on the couch the whole time? 8 9 Yes. Did you see an individual come from, from where you 10 11 were standing? Could you see anybody come in? 12 No. 13 So, after you see this gun come out, you turned to run because you knew there was trouble? 14 15 Yes. So, you don't stick around, you don't see anything 16 that actually takes place in the kitchen, do you? 17 18 No. 19 So, you don't know what happened in regard to the gun 20 or how it went off and what from anything you observed; is that 21 true? 22 A Yes. 23 One other individual -- when the other individual came in, the one with a mask on, was he speaking in the same tone as 25 Malik?

Simmons - Redirect 141 Yes. Was he shouting? 3 Yes. That individual did everything he could to conceal his 4 identity is that true? 5 Yes. 6 And other than seeing his eyes, you couldn't see any 7 Q other physical features in regard to that person; is that true? Yes. MR. LEINER: I have no further questions. 10 THE COURT: Redirect. 11 REDIRECT EXAMINATION MR. ARONOW: 12 Nathaniei, do you remember the date when you gave the 13 statement to the police? 14 Yes. 15 (S-35 marked for Identification.) 16 I'm going to show you what's marked S-35 for 17 Identification. Do you recognize that document? 18 Yes. 19 Is that the statement that you gave to the police? 20 Q 21 Yes. 22 Q After this incident happened? 23 Yes. THE COURT: Is that the same as D-2? 24 MR. ARONOW: Yeah, I could use D-2, either way. 25

Simmons - Redirect 143 Okay. 1 Q I just don't know what date. 2 Now, the statement that you gave to the police, Mr. 3 Leiner asked you if there were anywhere, and he pointed out to you, where you described the actual height of the individual; 5 is that correct? Yes. And that was on page 8; is that correct? Q Yes. 9 And your testimony was about six-three, stocky, a 10 little stocky? 11 Mm-hmm. 12 I'm going ask you to look at page 10. Q 13 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, may we approach? 14 THE COURT: I'd like to hear the whole question. 15 I'm going to ask you to look at page 10. Did the 16 police --17 THE COURT: I don't want, Mr. Simmons, I don't want 18 you to answer the question, just listen. 19 Did the police ask you for a description of Dennis 20 Copling in your statement? 21 Yes. 22 On the statement did you give the description of the 23 person who you saw? 24 THE COURT: I'll see you at sidebar. 25

.

--

(Sidebar discussion on the record.)

MR. LEINER: I would object, that this would be a prior consistent statement of the witness and therefore inadmissible unless there was a recent charge of fabrication.

I asked him only questions that deal with regard to that issue, was in regard to the masked person. I never asked him anything in regard to Dennis Copling's description that he may or may not have given. Therefore, I think it would be a prior consistent statement and would be inadmissible.

MR. ARONOW: Clearly not. His testimony was approximately six-one, six-two, so Mr. Leiner utilized the statement that the witness had said to the police on the date of the statement that he was six-three in an effort to show that it was wrong. I'm allowed to rehabilitate the witness to show that he was also asked the description of the defendant on the same date, he gave a similar description to identify the witness.

THE COURT: You would only be allowed to show that on a prior occasion he gave the statement saying that the masked person was six-two, not to show that Dennis Copling was a different height. That's not the same statement that was the subject of cross.

MR. LEINER: Now --

THE COURT: Cross-examination was limited to the height of the intruder, not the height of Dennis Copling.

Simmons - Redirect (Sidebar)

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

145

MR. ARONOW: And he cross-examined him to show, to demonstrate, I'm sure he's going to argue at some point in this trial, that he was wrong about his height description and general description of the person that committed this offense, your Honor. And clearly he give descriptions that were consistent with respect to the height of the perpetrator of this offense, the height of Dennis Copling in the statement. And clearly if you attack one, the other one becomes relevant with respect to the fact that he said that they are both the same size and build approximately. You can't cross-examine him on one and not expect us to be able to say --

THE COURT: That's true. The whole thrust of the testimony is going to show that Dennis Copling is not six-two or six-three. So, for that reason, I will allow it. The objection is overruled.

(Sidebar discussion concluded)

17 BY MR. ARONOW:

18 Q Do you recall the question, Nate?

A Yeah.

Q Okay. Was there a time when you give the police at the time you gave your statement a description of Dennis Copling?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And what was the description that you gave to the police?

24

25

had seen Dennis Copling?

Yes.

Simmons - Recross, Re-redirect 147 But you based your estimate in regard to the 1 individual who came in to your house that night on your 2 observations; is that correct? 3 On my observation? 5 Well, what I mean by observation is when the individual came in the house, you saw him come in the house, 6 you testified to that; is that correct? Yes. So, when you gave your description to the police, you 9 based that on what you observed that evening; is that correct? 10 Yes. 11 12 Q And so when you told the police that the individual who came into the kitchen area with the mask on was six foot 13 three, you were basing that om your observations; isn't that 14 15 true? A Yes. 16 MR. LEINER: I have no further questions. 17 RE-REDIRECT BY MR. ARONOW: 18 And you were also basing the description that you gave 19 to the police on, Dennis Copling's description on your 20 observations; is that correct? 21 22 Yes. THE COURT: Any recross? 23 24 MR. LEINER: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Simmons, you may step down. You are 25

Colloquy 148 excused. Thank you. 1 MR. ARONOW: May I approach? 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 (Sidebar discussion off the report.) 4 THE COURT: Next witness is going to be here in just a 5 moment or two. This will not be our regular mid-afternoon, but we'll take a short break until he gets in the courtroom. 7 (Jury leaves the courtroom at 2:39 p.m.) 8 (Recess.) 9 SHERIFF'S OFFICER: Judge, is he to remain cuffed or 10 11 uncuffed? THE COURT: Depends upon, I guess -- is there any 12 reason why he could not be uncuffed if you stand right here 13 behind him or do you prefer him to be cuffed? Ordinarily 14 somebody who is in custody is cuffed in the courtroom. 15 SHERIFF'S OFFICER: I would prefer he was cuffed, but 16 if you tell me otherwise. 17 THE COURT: No, then he'll remain that way then. 18 MR. ARONOW: And he needs to be sworn. 19 THE COURT: We'll do that when the jury comes in. 20 I'll ask tucy to bring the Bible over. 21 (Jury enters the courtroom at 2:50 p.m.) 22 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the 23 State's next witness is already seated in the witness stand. 24 May I have the witness' name, please. 25

Young - Direct 149 MR. ARONOW: Benjamin Young. 1 THE COURT: Mr. Young, if you would please rise and 2 place your left-hand on the Bible and raise your right hand as 3 well as you can. BENJAMIN YOUNG, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN. 5 THE COURT: You may proceed. 6 MR. ARONOW: Thank you, your Honor. 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ARONOW: 8 Would you tell the Court and jury what your name is 9 Q 10 again? Benjamin Young. 11 And, Ben, where did you live in January of 1995? 12 I lived on Morris Street, 13 In the City of Camden? 0 14 Yeah. 15 And Ben, have you ever been convicted of a crime? Not -- yeah, now, now since, yeah. 17 Since January of 1995, is that what you say? 18 19 Recently have you been convicted of a crime? 20 Recently. 21 When were you convicted of a crime? 22 August 14. 23 Of what year? 24 '96. 25

Young - Direct 150 And were you just recently sentenced? 1 Yeah. 2 In January of this year? Q 3 4 Yes. And how long of a sentence did you receive? 5 6 Seven flat. 7 Seven flat? Yeah. 8 Seven years in New Jersey State's Prison, no period of 9 10 parole ineligibility? Yeah. 11 Do you know for what crimes you were given that 13 seven-year sentence? 14 Yeah. 15 Q What? Conspiracy. 16 Conspiracy to do what? 17 Armed robbery. 18 And any other charges? 19 20 A drug charge. 21 Okay. Anything else? 22 No, that's it. 23 Two drug charges? 24 Yeah. 25 Possession with intent to distribute drugs?

Young - Direct 153 side was the couch and on the left side was like a little bed, I mean me and Nate was sitting on the couch and K.C. was sitting on the bed. 3 And did something happen while the three of you were in the living room? 5 Somebody knocked on the door. Which door did someone knock on? 7 The back. And what room is directly adjacent to the back door? 10 Kitchen. And did anyone answer the door? 11 Yeah. 12 Who? Q 13 K.C. answered the door. 14 And did someone come in when K.C. answered the door? 15 Yeah. 16 Did you see that person? 17 Yeah. 18 And who was that person? 19 Mark Winston. 20 Okay. Had you known Mark Winston previous to January of '95? 22 I used to see him around. I ain't know him like that. 23 When you say you didn't know him like that, you didn't 24 consider him a friend of yours? 25

Young - Direct 155 Yeah, he was like, he was like, well, you're going to have 1 2 to speak to my man about that. 3 Okay. And did he say who that man was? 4 No. 5 What else -- did he say anything specifically about my 6 man? No, he was just like you're going to have to speak to my 7 man about, about that. 8 9 What happened after that? 10 That's when somebody else came in. 11 Did you see that other person? No, I didn't see the other person. 12 13 How do you know they came in? 14 Because when he came in, he hit like the front of the 15 stairs, it was like a metal part and it was lose, he hit that part. Then like on the wall you can see another shadow coming 16 17 in from the door. 18 Another shadow? 19 Yes. 20 The light was on in the kitchen? Yeah. 21 22 And approximately what time was this, do you recall? 23 I don't know what time. 24 Was it dark outside or light outside? 25 It was dark.

Young - Direct Was it evening or early morning, do you remember? 1 It was in the evening. 2 Of January 18th, 1995? 3 Yeah, I think so. 4 And where was Nate Simmons when this was all 5 6 happening? 7 He was on the couch. Was Nate Simmons closer than you to the kitchen? 8 No, I was closer to the kitchen. 9 Did Nate -- was Nate in a position to observe what was 10 going on in the kitchen from where you could see? 11 Yeah. Q Did you hear anything between K.C. and this person who came in? No. All I heard was, all I heard was K.C. saying hold, 15 hold, he was hold, hold, chill. 16 MR. ARONOW: Chill, C-H-I-L-L. 17 THE COURT: You're saying hold hold with a D? 18 THE WITNESS: Yeah, hold, hold. 19 And then what did you hear? 20 Then he was like chill, chill. Then that's when Nate had got up and he ran out the back door. Then I got up and that's 22 23 when I heard the shots. How many shots did you hear? 24 25 A When I got up, I heard one shot. When I got to the door, I

Young - Direct 157 heard like three more shots. Did you actually see anyone get shot? 2 No. 3 Once you got out the door, what did you do? 4 Q 5 I ran. When you saw Mark Winston, Malik, was he wearing 6 7 anything over his face? No. 8 Do you remember what kind of clothing he was wearing? 9 0 I remember he had on a black goose down jacket, coat. 10 And how big or how long was that jacket, do you Q 11 remember? 12 It was like three-quarter, three-quarter inch. 13 And K.C., do you recall what K.C. was wearing that 14 night? 15 No, no. 16 Do you recall giving a statement to the police in 17 reference to the circumstances surrounding this incident? 18 Yeah. 19 And did that take place approximately February 8th, 21 don't know exactly what date. 22 I'm going to --23 MR. ARONOW: Let's have it marked. 24 (S-36 marked for Identification.) 25

Young - Direct I'm going to show you what's been marked S-36 for 1 Identification. Do you recognize that? 2 3 Yeah. Q Is that the statement that you gave to the police? 4 5 Yeah. I'm going to ask you to read page 6 to yourself. 6 7 The whole thing? Yeah, take your time. 8 Like chill, Nate chill. 9 Do not read it out loud, just read it to yourself. 10 11 All right. 12 Have you had an opportunity to read that? Yeah. 13 14 Q Yes? 15 Yeah. Does reviewing that page of the statement refresh your 16 recollection with respect to anything that Malik may have said 17 18 19 MR. LEINER: Objection, your Honor. 20 -- to K.C.? MR. LEINER: I don't think the witness has ever indicated he needed his recollection refreshed. 22 23 THE COURT: That's correct, the last question that he was asked where he said he didn't remember was the clothing 24 that K.C. had on. I don't think he was ever asked this 25

Young - Direct 159 question. MR. ARONOW: No, he was asked, Judge -- can we 3 approach? THE COURT: Why don't you re-ask the question. It's not necessary to re-approach. Ask him the question to see 5 whether he remembers or doesn't remember. Do you recall what Malik said to K.C. after he first 7 came in, after Malik first came in? 8 What he said after he came in? 9 Yes. 10 He was like, like what's up? Why you jump my june-june? 11 THE COURT: Can you spell that word? What is that 12 word? 13 THE WITNESS: June-june, like he was saying like his 14 little son or something. 15 THE COURT: How do you spell that word? 16 THE WITNESS: June-june. 17 THE COURT: Okay. That helps. 18 BY MR. ARONOW: 19 And with respect to after that, did Malik say anything 20 with reference to the person coming in? 21 He just, what's like, well, you're going to have to speak. 22 I think he said you're going to have to speak to his brother 23 about that. Okay. 25 Q

Young - Direct 160 I mean --Do you recall using the word man, he got to talk to 2 his man or the man or something along those lines? 3 4 Do you recall him saying the word you got to speak to his brother? 6 Yeah, he said something like that. 7 8 And that was what K.C. said or -- correction, what Malik said in reference to the person that next came in the 9 10 door? Yeah, he was saying that to K.C. 11 Malik was? 12 Yeah. 13 Do you know Dennis Copling? 14 0 Yeah. 15 How do you know Dennis? 16 I used to be on 21st Street. I used to see him around that 17 18 19 Okay. Do you know Gary Copling? Yeah. 20 21 How do you know him? 0 Same thing. 22 23 How long did you know either one of them? 24 Since like, '92, '93. 25 So approximately two to three years prior to this

Young - Cross 161 incident? Yeah. 2 MR. ARONOW: I have no further questions of this 3 witness. 4 THE COURT: You may cross-examine. 5 MR. LEINER: Thank you, your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LEINER: 7 Mr. Young, you indicated that after Malik came into 8 the house and went back in the kitchen with K.C., that you 9 stayed in the living room; is that correct? 10 A Yeah. 11 And you didn't really see or hear anything that took 12 place in the room after that, did you? I ain't what? 14 Q You didn't see or hear anything that took place in the 15 kitchen after that, did you? 16 Yeah. 17 You saw what happened in the kitchen? Q 18 No, I heard. 19 Okay. You heard some shots later on; is that correct? 20 21 Yeah. And you heard some shots after you saw Nate Simmons 22 23 | run out the door? Yes. 24 Q You saw him running? 25

Young - Cross 162 Yes. 1 So you got up to run yourself? 2 Yeah. 3 Is that when you saw him running? 4 When I start getting up, that's when I heard the shot, you 5 know, but I never looked back. When I was going towards the 6 door, I heard more shots. 7 Now, you indicated that Nate was sitting on the couch 8 with you; is that correct? 9 10 Yeah. And is it a big couch, small couch? It was a love seat. 12 Love seat. So you guys were pretty close together; is 13 that correct? 14 Yeah. 15 Q Now, in that house is there a little hallway where you 16 can go from the living room to the kitchen? 17 It's right next to each other. Ain't no hall. Okay. Now, a moment ago when the Prosecutor asked you 19 what Malik said to K.C., you indicated that in your original 20 testimony that you have to talk to my man about that; do you 21 remember using those words? 22 23 Yeah. Q Yet a minute ago you said something about a brother? 25 Yeah.

163 Young - Cross You didn't know who he was referring to in either case, did you? No. You don't know whether it was the person coming in the 3 4 door or anybody else, do you? 5 It had to be the person coming in the door. But you didn't know that for a fact, did you? No, but it had to be the person coming in the door. Who 7 else it could have been? 9 But you didn't see anybody come in the door? 10 I seen a third shadow. 11 You had saw a third shadow? 12 Yeah, third shadow. 13 When did you see the third shadow? 14 After you got to speak to my man about that. 15 After you got to speak to my man about that? That's when I heard somebody hit the metal door when you 16 17 first come in the door. I'll going to refer you back to your statement and go 18 back to page 6 again. At the bottom of the page, page 6, the 19 question is: How did you know someone came into the kitchen? 20 21 Is that what that says? Yeah. And your response, your answer on top page of page 7: 23 24 Bacause I heard them?

164 Young - Cross Yeah. Do you know where in your statement where you say you 2 saw shadows or anything like that? 3 No. 4 Is it in your statement? 5 I don't see it in there. 6 You didn't say anything about seeing shadows? 7 What? 8 You didn't say anything to anybody before about seeing 9 any shadows? 10 Yeah, I do believe I did. 11 Did you say that too? 12 Whoever I was talking to. 13 Q Now, in regard to these convictions that you have, you 14 were just recently sentanced as the Prosecutor indicated; is 15 that correct? 16 Yeah. 17 And you have two drug convictions? 18 Yeah. 19 There are two separate incidents, are they, that you 20 were convicted for? Yeah. 22 And conspiracy to commit robbery, that's a separate 23 incident from the drug conviction, isn't it? 24 Yeah. 25

Young - Cross 165 And the possession to carry a firearm, that's another separate incident, is it not? 2 Yeah. 3 And were all those convictions handled right here in 4 Camden County? 5 6 A Yeah. And was the Camden County Prosecutor's Office involved 7 in the handling of your case? What you mean? 9 Well, did they prosecute you? 10 Yeah. 11 And you got one sentence in regard to that, didn't 12 Q 13 you? 14 Yeah. Was it four years or seven years? 15 Seven years. 16 Seven years flat? 17 Yeah. 18 A For all those you just got seven years; is that right? 19 Q 20 Yeah. And no parole ineligibility; right? 21 22 No. 23 MR. LEINER: No further questions. THE COURT: Any redirect? 24 25 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ARONOW:

Young - Cross 165 Q And the possession to carry a firearm, that's another separate incident, is it not? Yeah. 3 And were all those convictions handled right here in 4 Q 5 | Camden County? Yeah. And was the Camden County Prosecutor's Office involved in the handling of your case? What you mean? Well, did they prosecute you? 10 Q Yeah. 11 And you got one sentence in regard to that, didn't 12 Q you? Yeah. 15 Was it four years or seven years? 16 Seven years. Seven years flat? 17 0 Yeah. 18 A For all those you just got seven years; is that right? 19 Q 20 A Yeah. Q And no parole ineligibility; right? No. 22 A MR. LEINER: No further questions. 23 THE COURT: Any redirect? 24 25 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ARONOW:

Young - Redirect (Sidebar) 166 Ben, has everything you said here today been the 1. truth? 2 3 Yeah. MR. ARONOW: Nothing further. THE COURT: Anything else? Mr. Leiner, any other 5 questions. 6 MR. LEINER: No, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Young, you may step down and if you would follow the officer. 9 Are there any witnesses on behalf of the State? 10 MR. ARONOW: Mr. Hill, but we have something to 11 discuss of a legal nature prior to that witness, however. 12 THE COURT: All right. Why don't we do that at 13 sidebar. Let me see what's happening. Then I'll decide 14 whether to ask the jury to step out. 15 (Sidebar discussion on the record.) 16 MR. ARONOW: The next witness will be Leervin Hill, 17 L-E-E-R-V-I-N H-I-L-L, would be a witness, your Honor. The 18 photograph which has been previously identified as containing 19 the defendant, Lakesha Buckhannon, two of her three friends, 20 was a photograph that was utilized in part of the taking of his 21 statement, and that is what I believe was the basis of Mr. 22 Leiner's application for a Wade hearing. If you recall, when we initially started this matter, 24 Mr. Leiner indicated he had an argument to make with regard to 25

Sidebar 167 this. I also have an argument to make with respect to that, and your Honor would have to decide whether or not a hearing is necessary. If not, % understand that Mr. Hill is in the tunnel 3 waiting for us. THE COURT: I remember some vague reference to that a few days ago. I haven't heard it mentioned since. Why would 6 there be a need for a hearing? 7 MR. LEINER: Your Honor, I wasn't referring to this 8 particular witness. Mr. Queensbury was my concern. And if and when he's called to testify, I will, especially in light of the 10 statements --11 MR. ARONOW: That's fine. I was mistaken in that 12 regard. 13 THE COURT: So we can bring this witness right now? 14 MR. ARONOW: He's in the same situation as Mr. Young, 15 so I don't know how long it's going to take him to get up here. 16 He's in the tunnel, I understand. 17 THE COURT: Seemed to have taken about five minutes, 18 so we'll just have the jury go back for five minutes and then 19 we won't be taking any real breaks because this is something of 20 21 a break. Okay. (Sidebar discussion concluded.) THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the next witness, 23 just like Ben Young, is also in custody, so he's going to be 24 moved from the holding area into the courtroom and that takes a 25

Hill - Direct 168 few minutes. So rather than have you just sit here, I'll just ask you to go back to the jury room while he is moved from where he is in the courtroom and as soon as he is here, we'll be ready to start. (Jury leaves courtroom at 3:15 p.m.) 5 (Recess.) 6 7 (Jury enters courtroom at 3:30 p.m.) THE COURT: The next witness is seated in the witness stand. May I have your full name, please? THE WITNESS: Leervin Hill. 10 THE COURT: Would you spell that, please. 11 THE WITNESS: L-E-E-R-V-I-N H-I-L-L. 12 THE COURT: And would you please rise and place your 13 left hand on the Bible and raise your right hand as well as you 14 15 LEERVIN HILL, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN. 16 THE COURT: And you need to keep your voice up, if you 17 would, so either of the jurors down at the end can hear you. 18 Mr. Aronow. 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ARONOW: 20 Mould you give your name again, please? 21 Leervin Hill. 22 Leervin, have you been convicted of a crime? 23 Q 24 Yes. And what crime were you convicted of? 25

Hill - Direct 169 Drugs. Possession with intent to distribute? 2 Yeah. 3 Within a thousand feet of a school? 4 Q Yes. 5 And were you convicted an July 19th, 1996? Q 7 Yes. What sentence did you receive as a result of that 8 conviction? 9 Three year term. 10 Three year flat sentence in New Jersey State Prison? 11 12 Yes. Are you presently serving that sentence? 13 Yes. 14 Q That sentence -- that crime occurred after January 15 18th, 1995? 16 Yeah. 17 Q Did I or anyone negotiate your sentence in exchange for your testimony here today? 19 20 Q Do you know Kirby Bunch, Jr.? 21 Yes. 22 A Q Did you know him in January of 1995? 23 Yeah. Q Did you know him by any other name?

Hill - Direct 170 K.C. In January of 1995, where did you live? North Camden. 3 And can you give us an area without reference to the 4 exact street address? 5 Third. 6 Third Street? Q 7 Yeah. 8 Did you know a person by the name of Malik? 9 10 Yeah. Did you know his real name? Q 11 12 No. Q Did you know Dennis Copling? 13 Yes. 14 In January of 1995? 15 Yes. 16 And how long had you known Dennis Copling? 17 For a minute. 18 Calling your attention to January 18th, 1995, did you 19 see Dennis Copling in the City of Camden? 20 21 Yes. Where did you see him? 22 26th Street. 23 26th Street. And is there a cross street? 24 High. 25

Hill - Direct 171 1 High. In the City of Camden? 2 Yeah. 3 Is there anything near that intersection? 4 Corner store. 5 And does that corner store go by any name? Pink Store. The Pink Store. Because it was painted pink? 7 Yeah. 8 The outside of the building was pink? 0 Yeah. 10 In January of 1995? 11 Q 12 Yeah. 13 And do you recall approximately what time of the day or night that you had gotten to the area of 26th and High? 14 Couldn't tell, it was kind of dark. 15 Do you recall when it was that you observed Dennis 16 Copling at 26th and High? 17 18 Like evening. 19 And do you recall where you were in the area of 26th and High when you saw Dennis Copling? I was on a corner. 21 And can you describe for me how it was that you saw 22 Dennis Copling on that particular night? 23 He was upset, he was mad. 24 25 He was mad?

Hill - Direct 172 Yeah. 2 Can you describe it without just describing him as being mad? What was he doing? What was he saying, if anything? He was just pacing back and forth, I'm going to fuck this 5 nigger up. Did he mention who that person was? 7 No, he just kept saying that. 9 Kept saying he was going to fuck this person up? 10 Mm-hmm. 11 Did he take a garment of clothing of yours? 12 My mask. 13 What kind of mask? 14 A face mask. 15 Can you describe it? Goes around here. 17 Goes around here. You're indicating the lower portion 18 of your face? 19 Yeah. 20 Does it cover your nose? 21 Yeah. 22 What color was it? Like brown and black. 24 Both colors, one side was one color? 25 Yeah.

Hill - Direct 173 It was either black or brown? 1 Yeah. 2 Was reversible? 3 Q Yeah. 4 What kind of material was the mask made out of? 5 I don't even know. 6 Was it cloth? Was it like clothing? 7 Like a sponge-type. 8 Like a sponge? 9 Yeah. 10 Did it have holes in it? Yeah. 12 Where? 0 13 On the mouth, in the nose piece. 14 Underneath the nose? 15 Yeah. 16 Q And the holes at the mouth was -- could you see, see 17 18 the mouth? No. 19 What kind of holes were they like? 20 Little holes. 21 Like in a phone? 22 Yeah. 23 So you could breathe through it? 25 Mm-hem.

Hill - Direct 174 Is that a yes? 1 Yes. 2 Did you see how Dennis Copling came to be at 26th and 3 High on that particular evening? Came walking. He was on foot? 6 7 Yeah. Was he with anyone else? Q No. 9 Can you describe, other than the fact that he took 10 your mask, can you describe the way he was dressed? 11 All black. 12 Was he wearing a jacket or a coat? 13 Leather coat. 14 Leather. What color was that? 15 Black. 16 What color were his pants? 17 Q Black. 18 What color were his shoes? 19 I think it was black, too. 20 And was he wearing anything on his head? 21 A hat. 22 What kind of hat? Timberland. And was that black too? 25

Hill - Direct 175 Black with gold writing. How did it come about that Dennis Copling took a mask 2 from you at 26th and High? 3 How did he what? 4 How did it happen? 5 He asked me could he get it. I said no. 6 And then what happened? 7 He grabbed it, so I walked off. 8 He grabbed it from around your neck? 9 Yeah. 10 How is it attached? 11 12 Like straps like. You could tear it apart and put it back together 13 again, velcro? 14 I guess that's what it's called. 15 Where did he go after that happened? 16 He just walked off. 17 Did you see him at the corner store? 18 19 Yeah. Did you have an opportunity to hear him say anything 20 elsa? 21 No. 22 How many times did he talk to you about what he was 0 23 going to do? 24 For a little bit.

Hill - Direct 176 1 When you say a little bit, more than once? Twice. The Dennis Copling that you saw on January 18th, 1995, 3 did he have any distinguishing features bodywise? Yes, something on his neck. 5 Something on his neck? Yeah. What was it? What did it look like? A raisin. Like a raisin. Was that something you could clearly 10 see when you approached him? 11 Yeah. 12 Is the person who approached you and took your mask on 13 January 18th, 1995 present in the courtroom today? 14 15 Yeah. 16 And where is he? Right there. 17 What color clothing is he wearing? 18 Green. 19 When he was talking about what he was going to do to 20 this person, did you take him seriously? No. 22 23 Q Did you laugh? 24 I ain't laugh around him. 25 Was anybody else with you?

Hill - Direct 177 1 Yeah. 2 Q Who? 3 Norty. How old was Norty in January of '95? 5 Thirteen I think. 6 Did he laugh? He was -- when he left, he just laughed. 7 8 Did you -- when this all happened, did you approach the police about what happened? 9 10 No. 11 How did it come about that you became involved in this 13 I was sitting in my car and he just ran down, came running 14 to the car. The police? 15 Q 16 Yeah, these undercovers. 17 And they located you? 18 On 26th. 19 26th and High? 20 Yeah. 21 Couple days later? 22 Mm-hmm. 23 Is that a yes? Q 24 Yes. 25 Did you see the person that you knew as Malik in the

Hill - Direct 178 area of 26th and High on January 18th, 1995? Came around earlier, I think earlier. 2 At the time that you saw Dennis Copling, had you seen 3 Malik? 4 No. 5 Do you know anybody by the name of Donny Parker, Q Fahim? No. 8 MR. ARONOW: Your Honor, I'd like the record to 9 reflect that he's identified the defendant Dennis Copling both 10 with respect to his appearance and I'd also like the Court to 11 acknowledge the fact that Mr. Copling has a distinguishing 12 birth mark on his neck. 13 THE COURT: When you say you would like the Court to 14 acknowledge, how would I do that, ask him to rise? 15 MR. ARONOW: Yes. 16 THE COURT: No way of knowing or seeing, this is 17 non-testimonial and it will be permitted. 18 Mr. Copling, if you would come forward a little bit 19 right in the middle here and turn your body so that you're 20 facing the back wall. Is what you're trying to demonstrate 21 visible to the jury? 22 MR. ARONOW: Could you turn to your left slightly? 23 BY MR. ARONOW: 24 Mr. Hill, the raisin, as you refer to it, can you see 25

Hill - Cross 179 that? Yeah. 2 And where is that on Mr. Copling? 3 Here. Left side of his neck? 5 Q Yeah. 6 MR. ARONOW: Indicating with his hands. Thank you. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Copling, you may be seated. 8 MR. ARONOW: I have no further questions of this 9 witness. THE COURT: Mr. Leiner, you may cross-examine. 11 MR. LEINER: Thank you, your Honor. 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LEINER: 13 Mr. Hill, you indicated on that particular day -- what 14 time again was that when you saw Dennis Copling on the 18th? 15 In the evening. 16 Early evening, late evening? 17 It was getting dark. 18 Getting dark. And you were with your friend Norty? 19 20 Yes. Where was Norty when Dennis Copling first approached 21 Q 22 you? 23 26th Street. 26th Street. And where was Norty in relation to you? 24 25 Next to me.

Hill - Cross

180

- 1 Q Next to you. Who's Norty again? What's his name?
 2 Norty what? Glass his last name?
- 3 A I don't know.
- Q You don't know if that's his last name. Can you
- 5 describe him?
- 6 A Short.
- 7 Q He's short. How long have you known Norty?
- 8 A For a long time.
- Q Long time. He's a friend of yours?
- 10 A Yeah.
- 11 Q Where does he live?
- 12 A I don't know where he live.
- Q You don't know where he lives. But Norty was with you
- 14 | that night; right?
- 15 A Yeah.
- 16 Q When you saw Dennis Copling and you said he was making
- 17 these comments, he didn't mention any names or anything, he
- 18 just was walking up and down; isn't that true?
- 19 A Yeah.
- Q And when he grabbed the ski mask, how did he grab it
- 21 from you?
- 22 A Just grabbed it like that.
- 23 Q I'm sorry?
- 24 A Like he just grabbed it like this.
- 25 THE COURT: Demonstrating from under the chin, pulling

Hill - Cross 182 Yeah. 1 And that was for possession of CDS in a school zone 2 with the intent to distribute; is that correct? 3 Yes. Could have gotten a lot more time for that offense, couldn't you? Yeah. In fact, you could have gotten a period of parole 8 ineligibility for that offense, couldn't you? 9 I guess. 10 MR. ARONOW: Your Honor, given the fact that it's only 11 being offered for the purposes of impeachment and given the 12 fact that there is absolutely no indication that the State 13 entered into any type of negotiation with the defendant or his 14 attorney, I don't know how that's possibly relevant. 15 THE COURT: Well, it's up to the jury to evaluate the 16 truthfulness and credibility of all testimony and, therefore, 17 for that reason the testimony is relevant and the objection is 18 overruled. BY MR. LEINER: 20 What did you do the rest of the night, Mr. Hill? 21 Road around. 22 You drove around. Until what time? 23 I don't know what time. Till I got tired. 24 Who were you driving with? 25

Hill - Cross 183 Norty. 2 Norty. Norty, the person you don't know his last name and you don't know where he lives, right? 3 Yes. A person who's been a friend of yours for many years? 5 Not many year. 7 You said a long time? 8 Yeah, but not many, however you saying it. Well, you tell me how long have you known him? 9 For like a while. 10 11 For a while. MR. LEINER: I have no further questions, your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: Any redirect? 14 MR. ARONOW: Nothing further. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Hill, you may step down, if you would 16 go out that way, thank you. 17 Are there any other witnesses today on behalf of the State? 18 19 MR. ARONOW: No, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: We're scheduled then for 9 o'clock 21 tomorrow morning in terms of the next witness? 22 MR. ARONOW: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, you are excused for 24 the day and we'll resume tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock and if I can ask you to come about 5 of 9 and again a reminder not to 25

Colloquy

3

5

8

10

19

20

21

22

23

24

read any newspaper accounts that may pertain to this case. Have a nice evening. See you in the morning. 2

(Jury leaves the courtroom at 3:45 p.m.)

THE COURT: Counsel, it's relatively early, it's a quarter to four. Is there any evidence issue or any ruling that either side can anticipate the Court would have to make tomorrow that we can now deal with today in the time that remains?

MR. ARONOW: Not that I can think of presently.

MR. LEINER: Your Honor, if I could just briefly ask the Court to indulge me in regard to an earlier ruling your 11 Honor made and I'm doing this to complete the record. Given 12 the nature of this case and potential penalty my client faces, 13 14 I just want to make the record clear. I understand your 15 Honor's ruling is what it is. I just like to point out a couple of things in regard to the previous testimony that was 16 admitted regarding the prior occasion when Mr. Copling, the 17 witness testified that she saw him with a weapon. 18

Your Honor has given me the opportunity to go out and investigate and then recall that witness if I so desire and I appreciate that. However, your Honor, there are certain things that we may not be able to do in that time span. First, your Honor, there is the issue because of the nature of the testimony and also the surprise going back now some two years later in reconstructing a potential alibi, we're not sure

Colloquy

20

21

22

23

24

25

185

exactly when that party would have taken place. We have very limited information in regard to witnesses, who else was there. So it's going to be difficult to construct it, that it's going to put my client in a position where he may be forced to testify in a sense because of the fact that this has been a surprise and it will make it very difficult on the defense to go out and combat this particular portion of the State's case. And I think it is critical, especially critical at this stage.

THE COURT: But bear in mind, even if you had been 10 made aware of this testimony by the State, the Prosecutor's 11 Office didn't become aware of it until January 17th, 1997, so I 12 don't know why we're talking about going back two years because 13 the discovery violation, as I understand it, is a violation 14 that's only been of 10 days duracton anyway. So even if there 15 had not be a discovery violation, you would still have the 16 problem you are describing. Even if you learned it on January 17 17th, you would still have to reconstruct something that 18 happened two years earlier. 19

MR. LEINER: Actually the testimony of the witness was that she told Sergeant Forte at the time she gave her statement which is almost two years ago. Sergeant Forte is an investigator with the Prosecutor's Office. The Prosecutor's Office had that information within their knowledge two years ago. Therefore, there is a span of two years.

Colloquy

This Prosecutor himself did not come into knowledge of that according to his representation. I have no reason to doubt Mr. Aronow. He's always been honorable and up front with me. However, your Honor, it's a bigger problem than just because the Prosecutor is trying the case finds out about it at a later date does not mean that the State has met their obligation. There are certain information that has to come to light, especially if the State is in possession of it for a long period of time and I think knowledge has to be imputed not to condemn or attack Mr. Aronow. However, the State had it in its possession. Their internal problems or reasons why this information was not related to Mr. Aronow is not Mr. Copling's problem. The problem arose with the fact that the witness took the stand and told, said she told Sergeant Forte about this two years ago when she gave her statement.

THE COURT: I don't recall her saying that she specifically alluded to the incident of two weeks prior. All that I recall her saying was in her statement she mentioned that he had his hand in his pocket like he always did whenever he had a gun in his pocket. So, I am not as persuaded as you appear to be that she was as explicit with Sergeant Forte two years ago as she was on the stand here. You may well be right, but I think you're interpreting her remark a little bit different than I am.

MR. LEINER: The reason I'm interpreting because I

Colloguy

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

22

24

25

187

asked her on cross-examination after I gave her her statement, I said that's not in your statement, did you ever tell anybody, 3 tell to Forte, and it was related both to the jury and outside the presence of the jury, and she says, yes, at that time I told that to Sergeant Forte. That leads me to believe and deduce I think from her own testimony based on my question in cross-examination that she did relay that particular story to Sergeant Forte at that time. That's why I'm bringing this up. I'm not speculating about what she meant in regard to that 9 10 statement. It was after I presented her with it on the stand, 11 she said it's not in the statement, that I asked her follow-up questions in regard to that. 12

MR. ARONOW: Obviously, the State doesn't agree.

Number one, Sergeant Forte was with me January 17th, 1997 when we spoke to Lakesha Buckhannon, and so obviously he was present at the time that she discussed it with me in preparation for her trial testimeny. We've already gone through the facts that the State doesn't believe that a discovery violation occurred. However, the State would certainly take the position that if a discovery violation occurred, it didn't take place between January 17th and now, not two years prior. I don't agree with Mr. Leiner's interpretation. I agree with your Honor, what I think Lakesha Buckhannon was indicating with respect to her knowledge of that circumstance and, Judge -- number one.

Number two, the defense is in possession of each and

Colloguy

every item of discovery that I'm aware of and if the item was not contained in a statement, your Honor, or contained in some other report of Sergeant Forte or whatever, then the State is going to presume that it was not mentioned to Sergeant Forte or it would have been in his report.

What issue that raises with respect to the credibility of Lakesha is ultimately up to the jury to decide, but I can't, based upon the ract that she had difficulty remembering other things today, quite expected, considering her problem with testifying and her emotional state, your Honor, it's the State's position that your Honor ruled and I respectfully disagree with your Honor's ruling because, your Honor, there wasn't a discovery violation.

THE COURT: You said that three times. I don't know how you can stand there and tell me there wasn't a discovery violation. I'm not going to get in a long discussion with you about it, but I don't understand how the State can say that. It is to me a blatant and clear discovery violation. Let's move on from there, but it was clear.

MR. ARONOW: Irrespective, your Honor, it's -- we're not talking about two years ago. We're only talking about 10 day ago and I don't see the grave prejudice that's being described by the defendant.

THE COURT: Well, at this point what we're talking about is conjecture. The defense is asserting now that there

Colloguy may be problems in reconstructing what happened two years ago. Until the Court is conclusively told that there is a problem of 2 reconstructing it, I don't see any basis for me to reconsider 3 the ruling that I've already made. So at this point nothing has changed from the way the situation was when I ruled earlier 5 today and I see no reason at this point to reconsider my 6 7 ruling. That is the ruling of the Court. MR. LEINER: Thank you, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: That completes this matter. 10 MR. LEINER: Good evening, your Honor. 11 (Court adjourned.) 12 ----13 CERTIFICATION I, Judy Gerstenfeld, C.S.R., License Number XI00370, an Official Court Reporter in and for the State of New Jersey, do 14 hereby certify the foregoing to be prepared in full compliance with the current Transcript Format for Judicial Proceedings and 15 my knowledge and ability.

Ours in fell the work 25,1997

Date is a true and accurate non-compressed transcript to the best of 16 17 18 Camden County Hall of Justice 19 20 21 22 23 24 25