person acts knowingly with respect to his conduct if he is aware that his conduct is of that nature.

Since knowincly is a state of mind and cannot be seen and can only be determined by inferences from conduct, words or acts, it is rarely susceptible of direct proof. Therefore, it is not necessary that witnesses be produced by the State to testify that the defendant said he knowingly did something. His knowledge may be gathered from his acts and his conduct and from all he said and did at the particular time and place and from all of the surrounding circumstances reflected in the testimony.

I'd ask you now, ladies and gentlemen, if you would please recall and consider that which I have just instructed you as to the reaning of possession under the law.

The third element is that the defendant had possession of the weapon under direcumstances not manifestly appropriate for such lawful uses as it m. have. The State has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant's possession of the ax was uncer circumstances not manifestly appropriate for such lawful uses as it may have.

It is not necessary for the State to prove that the defendant formed an intent to use that object as a weapon. It is, however, necessary for the State to prove that it was possessed under such circumstances that a reasonable person would recognize that it was likely to be used as a weapon; in other words, uncer circumstances where it imposed a likely threat or harm to others.

You may consider such things as the surrounding circumstances, size, shape a condition of the object, the nature of a concealment, the time, place and actions the defendant when it was found in his possession to determine whether or not object was manifestly appropriate for a lawful use.

The defendant may not be found co.

of this offense of unlawful possession

have. The State has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant's possession of the ax was uncer circumstances not manifestly appropriate for such lawful uses as it may have.

It is not necessary for the State to prove that the defendant formed an intent to use that object as a weapon. It is, however, necessary for the State to prove that it was possessed under such circumstances that a reasonable person would recognize that it was likely to be used as a weapon; in other words, under circumstances where it imposed a likely threat or harm to others.

You may consider such things as the surrounding circumstances, size, shape a condition of the object, the nature of a concealment, the time, place and actions the defendant when it was found in his possession to determine whether or not object was manifestly appropriate for a lawful use.

The defendant may not be found co.

of this offense of unlawful possession

weapon unless the State has proven each element of this offense beyond a reasonable doubt. If the State has failed to prove any element beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

Ladies and gentlemen, the verdict must represent the considered judgment of cach Juror. In order to return a verdict, it is necessary that each Juror agree thereto. Your verdict must be unanimous.

It is your duty as Jurors to consult with one another and to deliberate with a view to reaching an agreement, if you can to so without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but do so only after an importial consideration of the evidence with your fellow Jurors.

In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if convinced it is erroneous, but do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow Jurors or for the

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

weapon unless the State has proven each element of this offense beyond a reasonable doubt. If the State has failed to prove any element beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

> Ladies and gentlemen, the verdict must represent the considered judgment of each Juror. In order to return a verdict, it is necessary that each Juror agree thereto. Your verdict must be unanimous.

It is your duty as Jurors to consult with one another and to celiberate with a view to reaching an agreement, if you can co so without violence to irdividual judgment. Each of you must cecide the case for yourself, but do so only after an importial consideration of the evidence with your fellow Jurors.

In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if convinces it is erroneous, but do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow Jurors or for the

mere purpose of returning a verdict.

You are not partisans. You are judges, judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to ascertain the truth from the evidence in this case.

As I just indicated, since this is a criminal case, your verdict must be unanimous. All twelve Jurors deliberating must agree. You should decide the case on the evidence without any bias, prejudice or sympathy, and without reference to any suspicion or conjecture.

Lacies and gentlemen, as to the possible verdicts in this case, I have prepared a possible verdict sheet which you will have with you during the course of your deliberations, but if I may now, I would just like to go over that with you.

1. State your verdict with respect to the guilt or inrocence of the defendant on the first count charging him with purposely or knowingly causing the death c: or serious bodily injury resulting in the ceath of Clarence McKillen.

Guilty or not guilty.

23 24

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

mere purpose of returning a verdict.

You are not partisans. You are judges, judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to ascertain the truth from the evidence in this case.

As I just indicated, since this is a criminal case, your verdict must be unanimous. All twelve Jurors deliberating must agree. You should decide the case on the evidence without any bias, prejudice or sympathy, and without reference to any suspicion or conjecture.

Lacies and gentlemen, as to the possible verdicts in this case, I have prepared a possible verdict sheet which you will have with you during the course of your deliberations, but if I may now, I would just like to go over that with you.

1. State your verdict with respect to the guilt or inrocence of the defendant on the first count charging him with purposely or knowingly causing the death c: or serious boaily injury resulcing in the ceath of Clarence McMillen.

Guilty or not quilty.

I note for you only if you find the defendant quilty of purposely or knowingly causing the death of Clarence McMillen answer the following question:

129

1A. The defendant committed the killing by his own conduct.

Yes or no.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I wish to instruct you now that the words by his own conduct means that the State is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the killing took place by the defendant's own actions.

2. State your verdict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the second count charging him with causing the death of Clarence McMillen during the commission of the crime of robbery.

Cuilty or not guilty.

3. State your vergict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the third count charging him with robbery.

Guilty or not guilty.

3A. If your verdict with respect

23 24 25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

16

10

30

21

.

r

u

25

I note for you only if you find the defendant guilty of purposely or knowingly causing the death of Clarence McMillen answer the following question:

1A. The defendant committed the killing by his own conduct.

Yes or no.

I wish to instruct you now that the words by his own conduct means that the State is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the killing took place by the defendant's own actions.

 State your verdict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the second count charging him with causing the death of Clarence McMillen during the commission of the crime of robbery.

Cuilty or not guilty.

 State your versict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defenceron the third count charging him with robbery.

Guilty or not quilty.

3A. If your verdice with respect

Question Fo. 3 above is guilty, put a check mark next to one of the following, which will assist the Court in designating your finding.

First degree, second degree.

4. State your verdict with respect to the quilt or innocence of the defendant on the fourth count charging him with possession of a deadly weapon; to wit, an ax, with the purpose to use it unlawfully against another.

Guilty or not guilty.

5. State your verdict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the fifth count charging him with unlawfully possessing a weapon; to wit, an ax.

Cuilty or not guilty.

The attorneys wish to be heard?

FF. DeF/2IO: No, your Honor.

MR. BCVINO: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Will the Clerk please of

good enough to select the four Alternate Jurors.

If I ray, just one minute, and I

11

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

14

16

10

11

12

13

1

17

18

20

22

23

10

11 12 13

> 14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21 32 23

24 25 Question to. 3 above is guilty, put a check mark next to one of the following, which will assist the Court in designating your finding.

First degree, second degree.

4. State your verdict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the fourth count charging him with possession of a deadly weapon; to wit, an ax, with the purpose to use it unlawfully against another.

Guilty or not guilty.

5. State your verdict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the fifth count charging him with unlawfully possessing a weapon; to wit, an

> Guilty or not guilty. The attorneys wish to be heard? F. DeF/210: No. your Honor. MR. BCVINO: No. Juoge.

THE COURT: Will the Clerk please oc good enough to select the four Alternate Jurors.

If I may, just one minute, and I

think I explained it to you before, but perhaps I want to explain it to you so you understand what we are coing. I think I probably did, but I still want to explain it to you.

It's at this time of the case where the Clerk will select four of you not to participate in deliberations. The remaining twelve Jurors will deliberate and decide the case.

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

However, the four Jurors who are selected, as with all Alternate Jurors, you still will have an important part in this case, and you still will remain with us until the conclusion of the case.

THE COURT CLERK: When I call your name, please step down from the jurybox. Juror Mo. 12, Cheryl Chee.

Juror So. 16, Pertha Rodriquez Rameriz.

THE CCURT: Excuse me. If you we just be good enough to be seated right the first row there.

THE COURT CLERK: Juror No. 10, ichael Lyle.

think I explained it to you before, but perhaps I want to explain it to you so you understand what we are doing. I think I probably did, but I still want to explain it to you.

It's at this time of the case where the Clerk will select four of you not to participate in deliberations. The remaining twelve Jurors will deliberate and decide the case.

However, the four Jurors who are selected, as with all Alternate Jurors, you still will have an important part in this case, and you still will remain with us until the conclusion of the case.

THE COURT CLERK: When I call your name, please step down from the jurybox.

Juror No. 12, Cheryl Ghee.

Juror Yo. 16, Fertha Rodriquez Rameriz.

THE CCURT: Excuse me. If you we just be good enough to be seeted right the first row there.

THE COURT CLERK: Juror No. 10, tichael Lule.

Juror Fo. 4, Carrie Abbott.

THE COUFT: Swear the Officer,
please?

(Officer sworn.)
THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Diggs, you are the Forelady of the Jury. I will ask the Officer to give you the possible verdict sheet.

In addition, ladies and gentlemen, you will have with you that yellow pad and a pencil if you need that during the course of your deliberations, and you will have with you in the juryroom all of the exhibits that have been admitted into evicence.

I would ask that the attorneys would te good enough now to review the exhibits to rake sure that we have all of them in proper order before I ask the Jury to retire and celiberate.

Also, I wish to advise you we think we have found a place that would be a lot cooler and comfortable than our juryroom. We have an empty courtroom up on the niner floor, so you know where you are coing.

 19

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

24

23

Juror Fo. 4, Carrie Abbott.

THE COUPT: Swear the Officer,
please?

(Officer sworn.)
THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Diggs, you are the Forelady of the Jury. I will ask the Officer to give you the possible verdict sheet.

In addition, ladies and gentlemen, you will have with you that yellow pad and a pencil if you need that during the course of your deliberations, and you will have with you in the juryroom all of the exhibits that have been admitted into evicence.

I would ask that the attorneys would be good enough now to review the exhibits to rake sure that we have all of them in proper order before I ask the Jury to retire and celiberate.

Also, I wish to advise you we think we have found a place that would be a lot cooler and comfortable than our juryroom. We have an engty courtroom up on the nintfloor, so you know where you are going.

The Twelve Jurors who will be deliberating will retire to that room, and as soon as you retire there, I will have the Officer take your lunch order also, but that room should be a lot more comfortable than our juryroom, hopefully more comfortable than our courtroom.

133

So, if the attorneys would be good enough to review the exhibits.

MR. BOVINO: I'm satisfied, Judge.

FR. DeFAZIO: No problem.

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

15

20

21

22

23

25

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, I would ask you if you would be good enough to retire with the Officer to commence your deliberations.

(Jury leaving courtroom at 12:26 p.m.)

THE COUPT: Officer, would you be good enough to take the evidence directly up to the Jurous and cope back.

The four remaining Jurors are not going to go home. You can stay here for a few minutes, Officer, if you wish.

"s. Abbott, "r. Lyle, Ms. Rodriguer,
Pameriz ---

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

16

15

20

21 22

23

24

25

The Twelve Jurors who will be deliberating will retire to that room, and as soon as you retire there, I will have the Officer take your lunch order also, but that room should be a lot more comfortable than our juryroom, hopefully more comfortable than our courtroom.

So, if the attorneys would be good enough to review the exhibits.

MR. BOVINO: I'm satisfied, Judge.

FR. DeFAZIO: No problem.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, I would ask you if you would be good enough to retire with the Officer to commence your deliberations.

(Jury leaving courtroom at 12:26 p.m.)

THE CCUPT: Officer, would you be good enough to take the evidence directly up to the Jurors and come back.

The four remaining Jurors are not going to co home. You can stay here for a few minutes, Officer, if you wish.

"s. Abbott, "r. Lyle, Ms. Rocriquez, Pameriz ---

MS. RAMERIZ: Pameriz.

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

31

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: --- I's. Ghee, you are what we call the Alternate Jurors.

As I indicated just before, you are still playing a very important part in this case because it could well be for some unknown reason, illness or otherwise, you maybe called upon to go into the juryroom and to deliberate and decide this case.

It doesn't happen often, but it does happen. It has happened on many occasions during the past years. So, I am going to give you some instructions, and I know I have been repeating myself, but it's still important that all four of you achere to instructions.

You will not discuss this case with anyone, do not discuss this case amono yourselves, and do not allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence, and co not read any newspaper articles concerning this case.

The Officer will find a convenier place for you to retire to also. Okav? We'll take your lunch order also.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

11

12 13

14

17

16 15

20

21

22

23

25

MS. RAMERIZ: Pameriz.

THE COURT: --- Fs. Ghee, you are what we call the Alternate Jurors.

As I indicated just before, you are still playing a very important part in this case because it could well be for some unknown reason, illness or otherwise, you maybe called upon to go into the juryroom and to deliberate and decide this case.

It doesn't happen often, but it does happen. It has happened on many occasions during the past years. So, I am going to give you some instructions, and I know I have been repeating myself, but it's still important that all four of you adhere to instructions.

You will not discuss this case with anyone, do not discuss this case amono yourselves, and co not allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence, and co not read any newspaner articles concerning this case.

The Officer will find a convenier place for you to retire to also. Okay? We'll take your lunch order also.

(Alternate Jurors leaving courtroom at 12:30 p.m.)

(The hearing recessed for lunch and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COUPT: Gentlemen, as I advised you informally, we have a note from the Jury which reads as follows: What conditions are necessary to convict the defendant on the third charge of robbery:

It would appear to the Court that the Jury is asking for the elements of the offense. It's my intention to instruct tre Jury again as to the elements of the offense of robbery, and then also indicate to them they consider not only that which ! just instructed them, but everything else that I instructed them previously.

Any objection to that? IE. DePAZIC: No your Honor. THE CCURT: One other thing, if I may.

Judge ! alsh's juryroom is now available. It's an outside juryroom. 17: air conditioning is working very well over ,

12

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

26

21

22

may.

23

24

25

(Alternate Jurors leaving courtroom at 12:30 p.m.)

135

(The hearing recessed for lunch and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COUPT: Gentlemen, as I advised you informally, we have a note from the Jury which reads as follows: What conditions are necessary to convict the defendant on the third charge of robbery:

It would appear to the Court that the Jury is asking for the elements of the offense. It's my intention to instruct the Jury again as to the elements of the offense of robbery, and then also indicate to them they consider not only that which: just instructed them, but everything else that I instructed them previously.

Any objection to that?

FE. DeFAZIO: No your Honor.

THE COURT: One other thing, if I

Judge talsh's juryroom is now available. It's an outside juryroom. 1to air conditioning is working very well over

there. So, that may be a lot more convenient, and it will be more convenient for the Jurors and for the Court officers.

Any objection to that?

NR. DeFAZIO: No, your Honor. THE COURT: May we have the Jurors

ke'll mark this note C-5.

(Note marked C-5 in evidence.)

(Jury entering courtroom at 2:33
p.m.)

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and the Alternate Jurors.

THE COURT: Just a couple more minutes, ladies and gentlemen, until the other Jurors arrive.

(Alternate Jurors entering courtroom.)

THE COURT: Would you please be coenough to come all the way over here? MS. PAFERIZ: Ch, sure.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the dury:
have your note which reads as follows:
that conditions are necessary to convithe defendant on the third charge of
robbery.

there. So, that may be a lot more convenient, and it will be more convenient for the Jurors and for the Court officers. Any objection to that? MP. DeFAZIO: No, your Honor. THE COURT: May we have the Jurors and the Alternate Jurors. ke'll mark this note C-5. (Note marked C-5 in evidence.) (Jury entering courtroom at 2:33 p.m.) THE COURT: Just a couple more minutes, ladies and gentlemen, until the other Jurors arrive. (Alternate Jurors entering courtroom.) THE COURT: Would you please be co enough to come all the way over here? MS. PAFERIT: Ch, sure. THE COURT: Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the dury: have your note which reads as follows: That conditions are necessary to convithe defendent on the third charge of rcbbery.

1

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

135

21

22

23

24

25

It appears to the Court you are requesting for me to instruct you again as to the elements of the crime of robbery. I will do so at this time.

Under the third count of the indictment, the defendant is charged with the crime of robbery.

The third count reads as follows:

"And further present on the date, place and jurisdiction set forth in the first count herein, the said Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard, in the course of committing a theft, did inflict bodily injury upon Clarence Yckillen by use of a ceacly weapon; to wit, an ax, contrary to the provisions of N.J.S. 2C:15-1."

The pertinent part of the statute on which this count is based reads as follows:

"A person is guilty of robbery if, in the course of committing a cheft, he inflicts bodily injury or uses force upon another."

In order for you to find the defendant quilty of robbery, the State is recuired to prove each of the Iollowing

It appears to the Court you are requesting for me to instruct you again as to the elements of the crime of robbery. I will do so at this time.

Under the third count of the indictment, the defendant is charged with the crime of robbery.

The third count reads as follows:

"And further present on the date,

place and jurisdiction set forth in the

first count herein, the said Leonard Stone,

also known as Joshua Leonard, in the course

of committing a theft, did inflict bodily

injury upon Clarence McMillen by use of a

ceacly weapon; to wit, an ax, contrary to

the provisions of N.J.S. 2C:15-1."

The pertinent part of the statute on which this count is based reads as follows:

"A person is quilty of robbery if, in the course of cormitting a cheft, he inflicts bodily injury or uses force upon another."

In order for you to find the defendant quilty of robbery, the State is recuired to prove each of the Idllowing elements beyond a reasonable doubt;
firstly, that the defendant was in the
course of committing a theft and, secondly,
that while in the course of committing that
theft, the cefendant inflicted bodily
injury or used force upon another.

As I have said, the State must first prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was in the course of committing a theft. In this connection, you are advised that an act is considered to be in the course of committing a theft if it occurs in an attempt to commit the theft, during the commission of the theft itself or in immediate flight after the attempt or commission.

Theft is defined as the unlawful taking or exercise of unlawful control over property of another with purpose to corrivation thereof.

I have used the phrase with purpose. You may hear me use that phrase or the word purposely again. I shall now explain what that means.

A person acco purposely with respict

ш

•

elements beyond a reasonable doubt;
firstly, that the defendant was in the
course of committing a theft and, secondly,
that while in the course of committing that
theft, the cefendant inflicted bodily
injury or used force upon another.

As I have said, the State must first prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was in the course of committing a theft. In this connection, you are advised that an act is considered to be in the course of committing a theft if it occurs in an attempt to commit the theft, during the commission of the theft itself or in immediate flight after the attempt or commission.

Theft is defined as the unlawful taking or exercise of unlawful control over property of another with purpose to corriva him thereof.

I have used the phrase with purpose. You may hear me use that phrase or the word purposely again. I shall now explain what that means.

A person acts purposely with respirat

to the nature of his conduct or result thereof if it is his conscious object to engage in conduct of that nature or to . cause such a result.

In addition to proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was in the course of committing a theft, the State must also prove beyond a reasonable doubt that while in the course of committing that theft the defendant inflicted bodily injury or used force upon another.

The phrase bodily injury means
physical pain, illness or any impairment of
physical condition. Force means any decreof physical power or strength used against
a victim even though it entailed no pain or
bodily injury and leaves no mark.

A section of our statute provide: that robbery is a crime of the second degree, except it is a crime of the firdegree if the robber is armed with or use or threatens the use of a deadly weapon.

In this case, it is alleged that :-- cefercant was armed with and used a commerce while in the course of committer

noly,

irst

ing a

ng

over

vorc

24

1

2

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

13

to the nature of his conduct or result thereof if it is his conscious object to engage in conduct of that nature or to . cause such a result. 139

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In addition to proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was in the course of committing a theft, the State must also prove beyond a reasonable doubt that while in the course of committing that theft the defendant inflicted booily injury or useo force upon another.

The phrase bodily injury means

Physical pain, illness or any impairment of

physical condition. Porce means any degra
of physical power or strength used against

a victim even though it entailed no pain of

bodily injury and leaves no mark.

A section of our statute provide: that robbery is a crime of the second degree, except it is a crime of the firdegree if the robber is armed with or use or threatens the use of a deadly weapon.

In this case, it is alleged that ...
cefercant was armed with and used a comwearon while in the course of committer

the robbery. In order for you to determine the answer to this question, you must understand the meaning of the term deadly weapon.

A deadly weapon is any firearm or other weapon, device, instrument, material or substance which, in the manner it is used or intended to be used, is known to be capable of producing death or serious bodily injury or in which the manner it is fashioned would leave the victim reasonably to believe it to be capable of producing ceath or other serious bodily injury.

Serious bodily injury means bodily injury which creates a substantial risk of ceath or which causes serious injury, permanent disfigurement or protracted loss or impairment of a function of any bodily member or organ.

The cofencant may not be found quiltof this offense of robbery unless the State
has proven each element of this offense
beyond a reasonable doubt. If the State
has failed to prove any element beyond a
reasonable coubt, then you must find the

the robbery. In order for you to determine the answer to this question, you must understand the meaning of the term deadly weapon.

A deadly weapon is any firearm or other weapon, device, instrument, material or substance which, in the manner it is used or intended to be used, is known to be capable of producing death or serious bodily injury or in which the manner it is fashioned would leave the victim reasonably to believe it to be capable of producing ceath or other serious bodily injury.

Serious bodily injury means bodily injury which creates a substantial risk of ceath or which causes serious injury, permanent disfigurement or protracted loss or impairment of a function of any bodily member or organ.

The cofercant may not be found quilt of this offense of robbery unless the State has proven each element of this offense beyond a reasonable doubt. If the State has failed to prove any element beyond a reasonable coubt, then: you must fine the

defendant not quilty.

I would ask you now, ladies and gentlemen, not only to consider that which I have instructed you again at your request as to the elements of the offense of robbery, but to consider all of the law that I instructed you previously as to not only the elements of each offense, but as to all the law that I instructed you previously with regard to a presumption of innocence, burden of proof and my definition of reasonable doubt.

So, please consider everything that instruct you now and I did before. I as you now if you would be good enough -- it may say this first. We have now a jury: right across the hall, which is an outsi. juryroom, I should say. It's an outsice juryroom. I think it will be a lot more comfortable.

I understand the air conditionin working there, and it will be more comfortable for you, and I would ask "c: retire to that juryroom and continue ye. deliberations, please.

21 22

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

23

25

24 25

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

defendant not quilty.

I would ask you now, ladies and gentlemen, not only to consider that which I have instructed you again at your request as to the elements of the offense of robbery, but to consider all of the law that I instructed you previously as to not only the elements of each offense, but as to all the law that I instructed you previously with regard to a presumption of innocence, burden of proof and my definition of reasonable doubt.

So, please consider everything that instruct you now and I did before. I as you now if you would be good enough -- it may say this first. We have now a jury confight across the hall, which is an outside juryroom, I should say. It's an outside juryroom. I think it will be a lot more comfortable.

I understand the air conditioninworking there, and it will be more comfortable for you, and I would ask you retire to that juryroom and continue you deliberations, please. (Jury leaving courtroom at 2:40 p.m.)

(The hearing recessed and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, as I incicated informally in chambers, I have a note from the Jury which just says verdict.

We will mark that C-6 in evidence, please.

(Note marked C-6 in evidence.)

THE COURT: Thank you. Officer, may
we have the Jurors and the Alternate
Jurors, please.

(Jury entering courtroom at 3:24 p.r.)

Alternate Jurors?

(Alternate Jurors entering courtroom.)

THE COUPT: Madam Forelady and Lacies and Centlemen of the Jury: I have your note which reads as follows -- which says versict.

I would ask the Clerk of the Court to please take the verdict. Proceed.

THE COUPT CLERK: Please answer and

1 12 13 14 p.r.) 15 16 THE COUPT CLERK: Please answer to to

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Jury leaving courtroom at 2:40 p.m.) (The hearing recessed and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.) THE COURT: Gentlemen, as I incicated informally in chambers, I have a note from the Jury which just says verdict. We will mark that C-6 in evidence, please. (Note marked C-6 in evidence.) THE COURT: Thank you. Officer, may we have the Jurors and the Alternate Jurors, please. (Jury entering courtroom at 3:24 THE COUPT: Officer, so we have the Alternate Jurors? (Alternate Jurors entering courtroor.) THE COUPT: Madam Forelady and Lacies and Centlemen of the Jury: I have your note which reacs as follows -- which says veroict. I would ask the Clerk of the Court to please take the verdict. Proceed.

142

when I call your name. THE COURT CLERK: Dorothy Diggs. MS. DIGGS: Here. THE COURT CLERK: Dorothy Teniuch. MS. TENIUCH: Here. THE COUPT CLERK: Percy Benton. MR. BENTON: Here. THE COURT CLERK: Lorraine Burke. hs. BURKE: Here. 10 THE COURT CLERK: Carol McKoy. 11 FS. McKOY: Here. 12 THE COUPT CLERK: Sharon Smith. 13 MS. SMITH: Here. 14 THE COUPT CLERX: Philomena Carlock. 15 "S. CARLCCK: Here. 16 THE COURT CLERK: Noreen Hanner. 17 VS. PATTON: Here. 18 THE COURT CLERK: James Gullis. 19 FF. GULLIS: Here. 20 THE COLET CLIRK: Janice Padilla. 21 MS. P. DILLA: Here. 22 THE COURT CLERK: Gloria Povlas. 23 IS. POVIAS: Here. 24 THE CCURT CLERK: Luz Pivera. 25 ME. RIVEPA: Here.

1 when I call your name. THE COURT CLERK: Dorothy Diggs. MS. DIGGS: Here. THE COURT CLERK: Dorothy Teniuch. MS. TENIUCH: Here. THE COUPT CLERK: Percy Benton. RR. BENTON: Here. THE COURT CLERK: Lorraine Burke. hs. BURKE: Here. 10 THE COURT CLERK: Carol McKey. 11 FS. McKOY: Here. 12 THE COUPT CLERK: Sharon Smith. MS. SMITH: Here. 13 14 THE COUPT CLERX: Philomena Carlock. 15 MS. CARLCCK: Here. 16 THE COURT CLERK: Noreen Hannon. 17 FS. FATTON: Here. 18 THE COURT CLERK: James Gullis. 19 FF. GULLIS: Here. 20 THE COURT CLIRK: Janice Padilla. 21 MS. P. DILLA: Here. 22 THE COURT CLERK: Gloria Povlas. 23 ts. POVLAS: Here. 24 THE COURT CLERK: Luz Fivera. 25 ME. FIVEPA: Here.

142

143

THE COURT CLEPK: The Alternates, Carrie Abbott. MS. ABEOTT: Here. THE COUPT CLERK: Michael Lyle. MR. LYLE: Here. THE COURT CLERK: Sharon Ghee. MS. GHEE: Here. THE COURT CLERK: Bertha Rodriguez. MS. PAMERIZ: Here. 10 THE COURT CLERK: Madam Forelady, 11 please rise. Fave you reached a verdict? 12 MS. DIGGS: Yes, we have. 13 THE COURT CLERK: Is it a unanincus 14 verdict? 15 ME. DIGGS: Yes, it is. 16 THE COUPT CLERY: Please state your 17 verdict to the Court. 18 1. State your vercict with respect 19 to the guilt or innocence of the defendar 20 on the first count charging him with 21 purposely or knowingly causing the deatr 22 or serious bocily injury resulting in the

death of Clarence AcMillen.

Cuilty or not quilty?

'S. DICCS: Cuilty.

23

24

THE COURT CLEPK: The Alternates, Carrie Abbott. MS. ABEOTT: Here. THE COUPT CLERK: Michael Lyle. MR. LYLE: Here. THE COURT CLERK: Sharon Ghee. MS. GHEE: Here. THE COURT CLERK: Bertha Rodriguez. MS. PAMERIZ: Here. THE COURT CLERK: Madam Forelady, 11 please rise. Fave you reached a verdict? 12 MS. DIGGS: Yes, we have. THE COURT CLERK: Is it a unanirous verdict? 15 ME. DIGGS: Yes, it is. 16 THE COUPT CLERY: Please state your 17 verdict to the Court. 18 1. State your vercict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendan 20 on the first count charging him with 21 purposely or knowingly causing the deatr 22 or serious bocily injury resulting in to-23 death of Clarence AcMillen. 24 (uilty or not guilty? 25 S. DICCS: Cuilty.

1	THE COURT CLERK: Madam Forelady, on
2	your finding of guilty on Count 1, do you
3	find the defendant committed the killing by
4	his own conduct? Yes or no?
5	MS. DIGGS: Yes.
6	THE COURT CLERK: State your verdict
7 .	with respect to the guilt or innocence of
8	the defendant on the second count charging
9	him with causing the death of Clarence
10	McMillen during the commission of the crime
11	of robbery.
12	Cuilty or not guilty?
13	MS. DICGE: Not guilty.
14	THE COURT CLEPK: State your versict
15	with respect to the quilt or innocence of
16	the defendant on the third count charging
17	his with sothery.
18	Cuilty or not guilty?
19	MS. CTGCS: Guilty.
20	THE COURT CLERK: Madan Forelady, on
21	your fincing of quilty to Count 3, do you
22	find first degree or second degree?
23	'S. DICCS: Second degree.
24	THE COUPT CLEPK: State your versice
15	with respect to the quilt or innocence c:
1	

THE COURT CLERK: Macam Forelady, on your finding of guilty on Count 1, do you find the defendant committed the killing by his own conduct? Yes or no? MS. DIGGS: Yes. THE COURT CLERK: State your verdict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the second count charging him with causing the death of Clarence McMillen during the commission of the crime of robbery. Cuilty or not guilty?

ME. DICGE: Not guilty. THE COURT CLEPK: State your versict with respect to the quilt or innocence or the defendant on the third count charging his with cobbery.

145

Cuilty or not guilty?

MS. DIGGE: Guilty.

THE COURT CLERK: Medan Forelady, on your fincing of guilty to Court 3, do you find first cearee or second degree?

MS. DIGGE: Second cegree.

THE COUPT CLEPK: State your versict with respect to the guilt or innecence of

the defendant on the fourth count charging him with possession of a deadly weapon; to wit, an ax, with the purpose to use it unlawfully against another.

> Guilty or not guilty? MS. DIGGS: Guilty.

THE COURT CLEPK: State your verdice with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the fifth count charging him with unlawfully possessing a weapon; to wit, an ax.

> Guilty or not guilty? MS. DIGGS: Guilty.

THE COURT: Please be seated. hr. Fovino, co you wish the Jury polled? MR. BOVINO: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Will you please poll :. Jury as to each quilty verdict. That we. be the first count, third count, fourth

count and fifth count, please.

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT CLERK: Then I call you: name, please state I agree or disagree each count.

On the first count, state your veroict with respect to the guilt or

17

19 20

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

1

21 22

23 24

the defendant on the fourth count charging him with possession of a deadly weapon; to wit, an ax, with the purpose to use it unlawfully against another. Guilty or not guilty? MS. DIGGS: Guilty. THE COURT CLEPK: State your verdict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the fifth count charging him with unlawfully possessing a weapon; to wit, an ax. Guilty or not guilty? MS. DIGGS: Guilty. The COURT: Please be seated. hr. Fovino, co you wish the Jury polled? MR. BOVINO: Yes, Judge. THE COURT: Will you please poll :. Jury as to each quilty veroict. That we. be the first count, third count, fourth count and fifth count, please. THE COURT CLERK: Then I call you: name, please state I agree or disagree each count. On the first count, state your veroict with respect to the quilt or

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

16

19

20

22

23

25

1	innocence of the defendant on the first
2	count charging him with purposely or
3	knowingly causing the ceath of or serious
4	bodily injury resulting in the death of
5	Clarence McMillen.
6	Derothy Diggs?
7	MS. DICGS: I agree.
9	THE COURT CLERK: Dorothy Teniuch?
9	MS. TEMIUCH: I agree.
10	THE CCURT CLERK: Percy Benton?
11	MP. BENTON: I agree.
12	THE COUPT CLERK: Lorraine Burke?
13	S. BURKS: I agree.
2.6	THE COUPT CLERK: Carol &ckoy?
15	is. KefCY: I agree.
16	THE COUPT CLERK: Sharon Smith?
17	MS. SMITH: I agree.
18	THE COURT CLEPK: Philomena Carlock?
19	FS. CAFLOCK: I agree.
20	THE CCUFT CLERK: Noteen Pannon?
21	FS. HAPPON: I agree.
22	THE COURT CLERE: James Cullis?
23	IR. GUILIS: I acree.
24	THE COUPT CLERK: Janica Pacilla?
25	is. PADILIA: I agree.

innocence of the defendant on the first count charging him with purposely or knowingly causing the ceath of or serious bodily injury resulting in the ceath of Clarence McMillen.

Dorothy Diggs?

MS. DICGS: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: Dorothy Teniuch?

MS. TENIUCH: I agree.

THE CCURT CLERK: Percy Benton?

MR. PENTON: I agree.

THE COUPT CLERK: Lorraine Burke?

MS. BURKE: I agree.

THE COUPT CLERK: Carol McKoy?

MS. McFOY: I agree.

9

10

11

12

13

24

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COUPT CLERK: Sharon Smith?

MS. SMITH: I agree.

THE COURT CLEPK: Philomena Carlock?

MS. CAFLOCK: I agree.

THE CCUPT CLERK: Noreen Perron?

FS. HAPPON: I agree.

THE COURT CLERE: James Cullis?

UR. GUILIS: I acree.

THE COUPT CLERK: Janica Pacilla?

is. PADILIA: I agree.

23

24

25

THE COURT CLERK: Gloria Povlas? MS. POVLAS: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Luz Rivera? MS. RIVERA: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: On 3, state your verdict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the third count charging him with robbery. Dorothy Diggs? MS. DIGCS: I agree. THE COURT: Excuse me. The verdict rendered indicate by agree or disagree. THE COURT CLERK: I lost you, Judge. THE COUPT: On the finding of guilty to the third count, please indicate whether you agree or oisagree. THE COURT CLEPK: Dorothy Diggs? MS. DIGCE: I acree. THE COURT CLERK: Dorothy Teniuca? ts. TITIUCH: I agree. THE COUIT CLEPK: Percy Benton? FR. BENTCK: I agree. THE CCURT CLERK: Lorraine Burke? f'S. BUPKE: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Carol McKey?

THE COURT CLERK: Gloria Povlas? MS. POVLAS: I acree. THE COURT CLERK: Luz Rivera? MS. RIVERA: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: On 3, state your verdict with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant on the third count charging him with robbery. Dorothy Diggs? 10 MS. DIGCS: I agree. 11 THE COURT: Excuse me. The verdict 12 rendered indicate by agree or disagree. 13 THE COURT CLERK: I lost you, Judge. 14 THE COUPT: On the finding of guilty to the third count, please indicate whether 15 16 you agree or oisagree. 17 THE COURT CLEPK: Dorothy Diggs? 18 MS. DIGCS: I acree. 19 THE COURT CLERK: Dorothy Teniuca? 20 is. TITTUCH: I agree. 21 THE COUIT CLEPK: Percy Benton? 22 FR. BENTON: I agree. 23 THE CCURT CLERK: Lorraine Burke? 24 PS. BUPKE: I agree. 25 THE COURT CLERK: Carol McKey?

1	MS. MCKOY: I agree.
2	THE COURT CLERK: Sharon Smith?
3	AS. SMITH: I agree.
4	THE COURT CLERK: Philomena Carlock?
5	MS. CAPLCCK: I agree.
6	THE COURT CLERK: Foreen Hannon?
7	FS. HANKON: 1 agree.
8	THE COUFT CLERK: James Gullis?
9	F.P. GULLIS: I agree.
10	THE COURT CLERK: Janice Pacilla?
11	MS. PADILLA: I agree.
12	THE COUPT CLERK: Gloria Povlas?
13	MS. POVL/S: I agree.
14	THE COURT CLERK: Luz Rivera?
15	ES. RIVERA: I agree.
16	THE COURT CLERK: On your juilty of
17	Count 3 and your fincing of second degree,
16	do you agree or disagree.
19	THE COURT: As to the Forelacy's
26	indication.
21	THE COUPT CLEPK: Dorothy Diegs?
22	MS. IIGGS: I agree.
23	THE COUPT CLERK: Lorothy Toriuca
24	FS. TENIUCH: I agree.
25	198 COUFT CLEARLY Fercy Benton?

MS. MCECY: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Sharon Smith? MS. SKITH: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Philomena Carlock? MS. CAPLCCK: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Foreen Hannon? MS. HANKON: I agree. THE COUFT CLERK: James Gullis? EF. GULLIS: I agree. 10 THE COURT CLERK: Janice Pacilla? 11 MS. PADILLA: I agree. 12 THE COUPT CLERK: Gloria Povlas? 13 MS. POVLIS: I agree. 14 THE COUPT CLERK: Luz Rivera? 15 US. RIVERA: I agree. 16 THE COURT CLERK: On your guilty " 17 Count 3 and your finding of second degree, 18 do you agree or disagree. 19 THE COURT: As to the Forelagy's 20 indication. 21 THE COUPT CLERK: Dorothy Diccs? 22 MS. IIGGS: I agree. 23 THE COUPT CLERK: Lorothy Toriuca 24 FS. TENIUCH: I agree. 25 THE COUFT CLERKS. Percy Besten?

150 MP. BENTON: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Lorraine Eurke? 2 MS. BURKE: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Carol McKoy? MS. McKOY: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Sharon Smith? FS. SMITH: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Philomena Carlock? MS. CARLOCK: I agree. 10 THE COURT CLERK: Noreen Pannon? 11 I'S. HANNON: I agree. 12 THE COURT CLEPK: James Gullis? 13 P. GULLIS: I agree. 14 THE COUFT CLERK: Janice Pagilla? IS. PADILLA: I agree. 15 16 THE COUPT CLERK: Gloria Povlas? 17 ys. PCVLAS: I agree. 18 THE COUPT CLERK: Luz Fivera? 19 MS. PIVERA: I agree. 20 THE COUFT CLERK: On 4, state your 21 verdict -- I'm sorry. On your verdict on 22 Count 4 of the guilt or innocence of the defendant charging him with possession of a 23 24 deadly wearon; to wit, an ax, with the 25 purpose to use it unlawfully against

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

another, your finding of guilty, do you 1 2 agree or disagree. Dorothy Diggs? MS. DIGGS: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Corothy Teniuch? MS. TENIUCH: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Percy Benton? MR. BENTON: I agree. 9 THE COURT CLERK: Lorraine Burke? 10 MS. BURKE: I agree. 11 THE COURT CLERK: Carol McKoy? 12 MS. McKCY: I agree. 13 THE COURT CLERK: Sharon Smith? 14 MS. SMITH: I agree. 15 THE COURT CLERK: Philomena Carlo: : 16 FS. CAPLCCY: I agree. 17 THE COURT CLEPK: Noreen Fannon? 18 MS. PANYON: I agree. 19 THE COURT CLERK: James Gullis? 20 MR. GULLIS: I agree. 21 THE COURT CLERK: Janice Padille? 22 MS. PADILLA: I agree. 23 THE COURT CLERK: Gloria Povlas? 24 "S. PCVIAS: I agree. 25 THE COURT CLERK: Luz Divera?

another, your finding of guilty, do you 1 2 agree or disagree. 3 Dorothy Diggs? MS. DIGGS: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Corothy Teniuch? MS. TENIUCH: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Percy Benton? MR. BENTOM: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Lorraine Burke? 10 MS. BURKE: I agree. 11 THE COURT CLERK: Carol McKoy? 12 MS. McKCY: I agree. 13 THE COURT CLERK: Sharon Smith? 14 MS. SKITH: I agree. 15 THE COURT CLERK: Philomena Carlos 16 YS. CAPLCCY: I agree. THE COURT CLEPK: Noreen Fannon? 18 MS. FANFOM: I agree. 19 THE CCURT CLERK: James Cullis? 20 MR. GULLIS: I agree. 21 THE COURT CLERK: Janice Padille? 22 MS. PACILLA: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Gloria Povlas? "S. PCVIAS: I agree. THE COURT CLERK: Luz Divera?

23

24

25

THE COURT CLERK: 5, on your finding 2 3 of guilty with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant in this count charging him with unlawful possession of a weapon; to wit, an ax, on your finding of guilty, do you agree or disagree. Dorothy Diggs? MS. DIGGS: I agree. 10 THE COURT CLERK: Dorothy Teniuch? 11 MS. TEFIUCH: I agree. 12 THE COUPT CLERK: Percy Benton? 13 FP. BEUTOM: I agree. 14 THE COURT CLEPK: Lorraine Burke? 15 MS. BURKE: I agree. THE COUPT CLERK: Carol hckoy? 16 17 MS. McKOY: I agree. 18 THE COURT CLERK: Sharon Smith? 19 AS. SMITH: I agree. 20 THE COURT CLERK: Philomena Carlock? 21 FS. CAPLOCK: I agree. 22 THE COURT CLERK: Noreen Hannon? 23 MS. HAMMON: I agree. 24 THE COURT CLERK: James Gullis? 25 AR. CUILIS: I agree.

MS. RIVEPA: I agree.

MS. RIVEPA: I agree.

152

THE COURT CLERK: 5, on your finding of guilty with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendant in this count charging him with unlawful possession of a weapon; to wit, an ax, on your finding of guilty, do you agree or disagree.

Dorothy Diggs?

MS. DIGGS: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: Dorothy Teniuch?

MS. TEFIUCH: I agree.

THE COUPT CLERK: Percy Benton?

FP. BEHTON: I agree.

THE COURT CLEPK: Lorraine Burke?

MS. BURKE: I agree.

THE COUPT CLERK: Carol hckoy?

MS. McKOY: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: Sharon Smith?

MS. SMITH: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: Philomena Carlock?

MS. CAPLOCK: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: Noreen Hannon?

MS. HAMPON: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: James Gullis?

MR. CULLIS: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: Janice Pacilla?

PS. PACILLA: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: Gloria Povlas?

MS. POVLAS: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: Luz Rivera?

MS. PIVERA: I agree.

THE COURT: Will the attorneys come

to sidebar, please?
(The following occurred in the

presence of, but out of the hearing of the Jury.)

THE CCUPT: Just on a time factor, it's twenty-five after three now, and we have two motions that are outstanding and still pending with Nr. Bovino, which should be heard prior to us proceeding.

I'll hear those first thing in the morning, but I wanted to fine out from you timewise it it will cause -- now much time you need to get ready on the other part of the case.

P. BOVINO: I am going to try to ce prepared by temorrow morning, Judge. I con't know if I am going to be able to get in touch with two witnesses that I plane...

15

۰

11 12

13

14 15 16

17

20

22

24

25

24

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT CLERK: Janice Pacilla?

PS. PACILLA: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: Gloria Povlas?

NS. POVLAS: I agree.

THE COURT CLERK: Luz Rivera?

MS. PIVERA: I agree.

THE COURT: Will the attorneys come

THE COURT: Will the attorneys com to sidebar, please?

(The following occurred in the presence of, but out of the hearing of the Jury.)

THE CCUPT: Just on a time factor, it's twenty-five after three now, and we have two motions that are cutstanding and still pending with Nr. Bovino, which should be heard prior to us proceeding.

I'll hear those first thing in the morning, but I wanted to fine out from you timewise it it will cause -- how much time you need to get ready on the other part of the case.

P. BOVINO: I am going to try to ce prepared by temorrow morning, Judge. I con't know if I am going to be able to get in touch with two witnesses that I plants.

I have to check that tonight.

I would say probably some time tomorrow morning I should be ready. Ropefully late tomorrow morning or by lunch time.

THE COURT: Mr. Defazio?

MP. DeFAZIO: I have no problem civing Kr. Bovino all the time he neecs. I don't plan on calling any witnesses unless I have to call rebuttal for some reason.

THE COURT: I would suggest we do this, if there is no objection.

I will excuse the Jurors until elever o'clock tomorrow morning, so that we're not having them waiting around for an extended period of time, so they are available tor us if we wish to proceed, but I want to make it clear, Ar. Bovino, if you need further time tomorrow to prepare, I'm not saying we are going to start at eleven. The door is open for whatever time you need.

IR. EOVINO: Ckay.

TF. DeFA7TO: Pine. No problem 0; that, Judge.

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have to check that tonight.

I would say probably some time tomorrow morning I should be reacy. Hopefully late tomorrow morning or by lunch time.

THE COURT: Mr. DePazio?

MP. DeFAZIO: I have no problem civing Mr. Bovino all the time he neecs. I don't plan on calling any witnesses unless I have to call rebuttal for some reason.

THE COURT: I would suggest we do this, if there is no objection.

I will excuse the Jurors until elover o'clock tomorrow morning, so that we're no: having them vaiting around for an extended period of time, so they are available tor us if we wish to proceed, but I want to make it clear, ir. Bovino, if you need further time tonorrow to prepare, I'm no: saying we are going to start at eleven. The door is open for whatever time you need.

"F. DeFATIO: Pine. No problem w: that, Judge.

(The hearing resumed in the presence and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, as I explained to you curing the Jury selection process, there may be a second part of this case, and there will be a second part of the case based upon the verdict that was rendered.

So, I am going to excuse you now for the day until tonorrow, but I will excuse you until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning, at which time you come right into our courtroom here if you would, please.

I'd say all the ladies and gentlemen who deliberated and also the four Alternate Jurors, please return here at eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

I am going to instruct you again. It's important that you aghere to my instructions. Do not discuss this case with anyone at this phase, do not -- I know you discussed the case in your deliberations, but we are going into another part, a second phase.

Picht now do not discuss this case

IR. FOVINO: Ckay.

23 24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

(The hearing resumed in the presence and hearing of the Jury."

> THE CCURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, as I explained to you curing the Jury selection process, there may be a second part of this case, and there will be a second part of the case based upon the verdict that was rendered.

So, I am going to excuse you now for the day until tonorrow, but I will excuse you until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning, at which time you come right into our courtroom here if you would, please.

I'd say all the ladies and gentlemen who deliberated and also the four Alternate Jurors, please return here at eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

I am going to instruct you again. It's important that you achere to my instructions. Do not discuss this case with anyone at this phase, do not -- I know you discussed the case in your deliberations, but we are going into another part, a second phase.

Picht now do not discuss this case

A 1973-89-T4

FIRST COPY OF

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - HUDSON COUNTY (CRIMINAL) IND. NO. 1369-85

APP. DIV. NO. TRANS, FILED

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, Complainant,

TRANSCRIPT

٧. LEONARD STONE,

PROCEEDINGS VOLUME IX Paper william

Defendant.

REC'D APPELLATE DIVISION

and sounty Court House Jersey City, New Jersey

DEC & 1986 7-C Wath kin?

Date: May 20, 1986

Clurk BEFORE:

CHARLES J. HARRINGTON, JR., JSC, and a Jury

APPEARANCES:

EDWARD J. DeFAZIO, ESQ., For the State of New Jersey

SALVATORE BOVING, ESQ., For the Defendant

FILED APPELLATE DIVISION

NOV 28 1990

Winifred A. Handel, C.S.P. Hudson County Court House Jersey City, New Jersey

mece for

24

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Giren

A 1973-8914

FIRST COPY OF

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - HUDSON COUNTY (CRIMINAL) IND. NO. 1369-85

TRANS. FILED

APP. DIV. NO. A - 5529 - 85 T4

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, Complainant,

TRANSCRIPT

٧.

OF PROCEEDINGS VOLUME IX

LEONARD STONE,

Defendant.

Noy 28 1990

APPELLATE DIVISION

DEC 8 1986 2-C

lace: Hadde County Court House Jersey City, New Jersey

Date: May 20, 1986

BEFORE:

CHARLES J. HARRINGTON, JR., JSC, and a Jury

APPEARANCES:

EDWARD J. DeFAZIO, ESQ., For the State of New Jersey

SALVATORE BOVING, ESQ., For the Defendant

FILED APPELLATE DIVISION

NOV 28 1990

Hamer &

Winifred A. Handel, C.S.P. Hudson County Court House Jersey City, New Jersey INDEX

Nitness Direct Cross

GEORGIA JAMES:

Mr. Bovino 44
Mr. DeFazio - 49

NITHER DIRECT CIQUE
GEORGIA JAMES:
Mr. Bovino 44 Mr. DeFazio - 49

(The hearing resumed out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Good morning.

2

10

11

13

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

MR. DeFAZIO: Good morning, your Honor.

MR. BOVINO: Good morning.

THE COURT: It's my recollection from reviewing the papers that have been filed, Mr. Bovino, you have two motions outstanding, one addressed to Aggravating Pactor 1, if I may call it, and one to the third or the last aggravating factors.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, before I begin with that, I think these aggravating factors now have to really be examined in light of the verdict and the Prosecutor's summation.

As I understand, I think it's 2616at 97 N.J., maybe Monturi and even the that Mr. Defazio cited in the beginning the case, State_Y__Hammond maybe ---

MR. DeFAZIO: State_V__Moore.

MR. ECVINO: Not that. The one the defense has a right to a hearing.

*

se

. .

0.

14

15

16

17

18

21

1 (The hearing resumed out of the 2 presence of the Jury.) THE COURT: Good morning. MR. DeFAZIO: Good morning, your Honor. MR. BOVINO: Good morning. THE COURT: It's my recollection from reviewing the papers that have been filed, Mr. Bovino, you have two motions outstanding, one addressed to Aggravating Pactor 1, if I may call it, and one to the third or the last aggravating factors. MR. BOVINO: Judge, before I begin with that, I think these aggravating

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

light of the verdict and the Prosecutor's summation.

As I understand, I think it's Research at 97 N.J., maybe Monturi and even the that Mr. DePario cited in the beginn:

factors now have to really be examined in

HR. Defazio: State_v_Mannond maybe ---

MR. ECVINO: Not that. The one the defense has a right to a hearing.

Spotwood.

MR. DeFAZIO: Spotwood. I'm sorry.

MR. BOVINO: That I am entitled to

know what factors the State would rely on

in establishing each of the aggravating

factors.

As I indicated yesterday after summations, I felt that the State's position had shifted. Their opening and closing was not the same. They had alleged a robbery and murder during the course of the robbery.

They then -- Mr. DePazio then shifted, as I said yesterday, to a murder which took place because of something that the Jury would know or could get from the nuances in the case, that there had been a change in the relationships of the parties, somebody else was coming in to take over the house perhaps.

I asked the Court to charge
manslaughter and the Court ruled not or re
summation, but on my arguments of the car
before, and again, I guess, at this time;
am stuck with the verdict. Whether the
verdicts are consistent or not, I guess.

 MR. DeFAZIO: Spatwood. I'm sorry.

MR. BOVINO: That I am entitled to

know what factors the State would rely on

in establishing each of the aggravating
factors.

As I indicated yesterday after summations, I felt that the State's position had shifted. Their opening and closing was not the same. They had alleged a robbery and murder during the course of the robbery.

They then -- Mr. DeFazio then shifted, as I said yesterday, to a murder which took place because of something that the Jury would know or could get from the nuances in the case, that there had been a change in the relationships of the parties, somebody else was coming in to take over the house perhaps.

I asked the Court to charge

manslaughter and the Court ruled not or re
summation, but on my arguments of the cay

before, and again, I guess, at this ti-r:

am stuck with the verdict. Whether the

verdicts are consistent or not, I guess.

that would be reviewed by some other authority at some time.

When we come to the aggravating fact now of the murder to escape detection, there is no factors, there is no evidence that the State can point to to say that this is an aggravating factor.

The basis or the thrust of their attack yesterday was that this was a murder committed during a rage of some sort, a fury of some sort, and that the murder was, I would submit, spontaneous in nature, that there was this attack by Mr. Stone for whatever reason there was, and it was because of some sort of falling out.

There is no factors to point to that. Under the, I guess, it's MORE and a case cited in MORE. MORELLE perhaps, that there's got to be something more than just the average, ordinary murder.

I think if the State's thesis is now not really the robbery, but the attack of rage because of some falling out or argument, I think the State can't point to any factors. There is no factors to

that would be reviewed by some other authority at some time.

When we come to the aggravating fact now of the murder to escape detection, there is no factors, there is no evidence that the State can point to to say that this is an aggravating factor.

The basis or the thrust of their attack yesterday was that this was a murder committed during a rage of some sort, a fury of some sort, and that the murder was, I would submit, spontaneous in nature, that there was this attack by Mr. Stone for whatever reason there was, and it was because of some sort of falling out.

There is no factors to point to that.

Under the, I guess, it's Moore and a case cited in Moore, Monturi perhaps, that there's got to be something more than just the average, ordinary murder.

I think if the State's thesis is now not really the robbery, but the attack of rage because of some falling out or argument, I think the State can't point to any factors. There is no factors to

prove -- that they can rely on to prove this aggravating factor.

For that reason, I would ask that factor be dismissed.

THE COURT: You are addressing, so we have it clear, as I see in reviewing the papers -- there's three alleged aggravating factors. One, the murder was outrageous or wantonly vile, horrible, inhuman, that involved torture, depravity of mind or an aggravated battery to the victim. We'll call that number one.

Number two, the offense was committed while the defendant was engaged in the commission of or attempt to commit a robbery and, number three, the murder was committed for the purpose of escaping detection, apprehension, trial, punishment or confinement for another offense committed by the defendant or another.

You are commenting now --MR. BOVINO: I am directing now to
the third, to escape detection or
prosecution.

There is no factor the State can rely

prove -- that they can rely on to prove this aggravating factor.

For that reason, I would ask that factor be dismissed.

THE COURT: You are addressing, so we have it clear, as I see in reviewing the papers -- there's three alleged aggravating factors. One, the murder was outrageous or wantonly vile, horrible, inhuman, that involved torture, depravity of mind or an aggravated battery to the victim. We'll call that number one.

der

s.

at

Number two, the offense was committed while the defendant was engaged in the commission of or attempt to commit a robbery and, number three, the murder was committed for the purpose of escaping detection, apprehension, trial, punishment or confinement for another offense committed by the defendant or another.

You are commenting now --
MR. BOVINO: I am directing now to
the third, to escape detection or
prosecution.

There is no factor the State can rely

on to say this is what happened, as in the other cases, as in Moore, Monturi. I'm not sure if it's Monturi either.

MR. DePAZIO: Well, Judge, I
respectfully differ with Mr. Bovino. This
case, our case, is very similar to State.
Na_Modis.

First of all, as Mr. Bovino said, a verdict has been rendered. Within that verdict, this Jury found the defendant quilty of robbery period. As in Magra, this is a case where the victim and the defendant know one another and, in fact, in Magra they were neighbors.

The State maintains that based on the verdict, it could well be within the province of this Jury to determine that since there was this relationship between the parties, that the defendant killed Fr. McMillen so that he would not be arrested or that there would not be some sort of report to the police or whatever. That's for this Jury to decide.

MR. BOVINO: I think in Moore, Jucae, there was a clearly established burglary or

ing

or

on to say this is what happened, as in the other cases, as in Moore. Monturi. I'm not sure if it's Monturi either.

MR. DePAZIO: Well, Judge, I respectfully differ with Mr. Bovino. This case, our case, is very similar to State_

Pirst of all, as Mr. Bovino said, a verdict has been rendered. Within that verdict, this Jury found the defendant guilty of robbery period. As in Mggra, this is a case where the victim and the defendant know one another and, in fact, in Mggra they were neighbors.

The State maintains that based on the verdict, it could well be within the province of this Jury to determine that since there was this relationship between the parties, that the defendant killed Fr. McMillen so that he would not be arrested or that there would not be some sort of report to the police or whatever. That's for this Jury to decide.

MR. BOVINO: I think in Moore, Jucae, there was a clearly established burglary or

robbery at some prior time which is not evidence in this case, and certainly in the State relying on the Prosecutor's summation and his thesis in his summation, that this was an incident that happened not really for robbery, but because of some relationship, a severance of that relationship, that the acts are concurrent in time.

The original thesis was that it was an armed robbery and a murder committed during that robbery. Again, it would be concurrent in time. So, I think it differs from Mgggg.

As Mggrg says, every mere fact of the death is not sufficient to trigger the factor of this aggravating factor. It rust be something more than that, and there's nothing here that the State can rely or establish that.

MR. DeFAZIO: I disagree, Judge.

State_v_Moore is right on point with ...
case, my reading of it period. That's
I was checking into there.

In fact, it's eerily similar to

robbery at some prior time which is not evidence in this case, and certainly in the State relying on the Prosecutor's summation and his thesis in his summation, that this was an incident that happened not really for robbery, but because of some relationship, a severance of that relationship, that the acts are concurrent in time.

The original thesis was that it was an armed robbery and a murder committed during that robbery. Again, it would be concurrent in time. So, I think it differs from Again.

As Moore says, every mere fact of the death is not sufficient to trigger the factor of this aggravating factor. It rest be something more than that, and there's nothing here that the State can rely or establish that.

MR. DePAZIO: I disagree, Judge.

State_Ya_Moore is right on point with case, my reading of it period. That's a relative to the case, my reading into there.

In fact, it's eerily similar to

facts in this case. This is a question now for the Jury to determine based on their verdict.

If they didn't find a robbery -let's make something else clear since we
are making a record here. If they didn't
find a robbery, then we would be in a
completely different situation. This
constant reference to my summation and
trying to make it seem that the State was
reneging on a robbery theory is error, it's
a misconception, and it's something that is
confusing the issue here.

The Jury obviously was impressed enough with the facts to find Mr. Stone guilty of robbery beyond a reasonable doubt. As Mr. Bovino said, he's stuck with that.

I think Moore is right on point,

Judge, and I think it's a matter for the

Jury to decide.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: Not on that issue.

THE COURT: I think the record state.

not

he

in

the

n r.

s

cr

facts in this case. This is a question now for the Jury to determine based on their verdict.

If they didn't find a robbery -let's make something else clear since we
are making a record here. If they didn't
find a robbery, then we would be in a
completely different situation. This
constant reference to my summation and
trying to make it seem that the State was
reneging on a robbery theory is error, it's
a misconception, and it's something that is
confusing the issue here.

The Jury obviously was impressed enough with the facts to find Mr. Stone guilty of robbery beyond a reasonable doubt. As Mr. Bovino said, he's stuck with that.

I think Moore is right on point, Judge, and I think it's a matter for the Jury to decide.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: Not on that issue.

THE COURT: I think the record street

reflect the case that Counsel was referring to is State_of_New_Jersey_va_James__Craig_Adams_and_Daxid_Bostick, which was approved for publication on November 8, 1985.

The defendant's motion is addressed to Aggravating Factor No. 3. It's noted that the Jury found the defendant guilty of murder under the first count and also found the defendant guilty of robbery under the third count; however, found the defendant not guilty of felony murder as charged in the second count.

As Judge Newman in MOGIE stated, "In order to dismiss an aggravating factor before trial, the defendant must demonstrate that the evidence is clearly lacking to support it. The aggravating factors shall only be dismissed in the discretion of the Court and only on the clearest and plainest ground," citing State Value Cleary, 97 N.J. 132, 140 to 145 (1984).

This is an application made after trial. It appears clear to this Court that the Jury may reasonably find from the

12

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reflect the case that Counsel was referring to is State_of_New_Jersey_v__James__Craig_ Adams_and_David_Bostick, which was approved for publication on November 8, 1985.

The defendant's motion is addressed to Aggravating Factor No. 3. It's noted that the Jury found the defendant guilty of murder under the first count and also found the defendant guilty of robbery under the third count; however, found the defendant not guilty of felony murder as charged in the second count.

As Judge Newman in Moore stated, "In order to dismiss an aggravating factor before trial, the defendant must demonstrate that the evidence is clearly lacking to support it. The aggravating factors shall only be dismissed in the discretion of the Court and only on the clearest and plainest ground, * citing State_v._McCrary, 97 N.J. 132, 140 to 145 (1984).

This is an application made after trial. It appears clear to this Court that the Jury may reasonably find from the

evidence the third aggravating factor and, therefore, I'll deny the motion as to the third aggravating factor.

1

10 11

12

13

18

20

21 22

23

24

MR. BOVINO: As to the first factor, Judge, the wantonly vile, horrible, inhuman in that it involved torture, depravity of mind or aggravated assault of the victim, I would ask that be stricken.

There is no evidence here that the State can rely to show torture prior to the death of the victim, Mr. McMillen. No evidence to show depravity of mind.

I would rely upon the wording of State_v_Moore, State_v_Monturi, State_v_ Bass at 189 N.J. Super. 445, Godfrey_v_-Gaorgia, 446 U. S. 420, 100 Supreme Court, page 1759. Those words are very hard to define and describe.

There certainly is no evidence of torture, no evidence of depravity of mind, and all we have is the assault which causes the death.

The Doctor testified that death was not instantaneous. The person lived for some period of time because of the

coved

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

3

evidence the third aggravating factor and, therefore, I'll deny the motion as to the third aggravating factor.

MR. BOVINO: As to the first factor, Judge, the wantonly vile, horrible, inhuman in that it involved torture, depravity of mind or aggravated assault of the victim, I would ask that be stricken.

There is no evidence here that the State can rely to show torture prior to the death of the victim, Mr. McMillen. No evidence to show deprayity of mind.

I would rely upon the wording of State_Y_MODIST, State_Y_MODIS

There certainly is no evidence of torture, no evidence of depravity of mind, and all we have is the assault which causes the death.

The Doctor testified that death was not instantaneous. The person lived for some period of time because of the

aspiration of blood, but the period of time can't be determined.

12

There's nothing to indicate whether or not the person was or was not conscious from the time the first wound was suffered or inflicted until the person died, and any of those wounds could have inflicted or could have been inflicted with such force as to render the person unconscious.

So, I don't think that they really fit the definition of wantonly vile unless the Court were to say all murders were wantonly vile or outrageous or whatever wording is used in the statute.

THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DeFAZIO: Well, your Honor, once again, I believe that this is a jury question. They will have to determine based on the testimony and the evidence that has been admitted — those items which have been admitted into evidence, the photographs from the autopsy — they will have to determine whether this is a case where there was an aggravated battery or aggravated assault, if you will, or tortare

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

aspiration of blood, but the period of time can't be determined.

12

1

2

11

12

13

1.5

16

17

18

21

There's nothing to indicate whether or not the person was or was not conscious from the time the first wound was suffered or inflicted until the person died, and any of those wounds could have inflicted or could have been inflicted with such force as to render the person unconscious.

So, I don't think that they really fit the definition of wantonly vile unless the Court were to say all murders were wantonly vile or outrageous or whatever wording is used in the statute.

THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: Well, your Honor, once again, I believe that this is a jury question. They will have to determine based on the testimony and the evidence that has been admitted -- those items which have been admitted into evidence, the photographs from the autopsy -- they will have to determine whether this is a case where there was an aggravated battery or aggravated assault, if you will, or torture

on the victim which evidences depravity of mind.

Clearly, Judge, this is an issue. It's an issue of fact. It's an issue for the Jury to determine.

I think that the cases, Monturi, for example, says that the statutory language should be given its ordinary meaning, absent specific intent to the contrary. The attack upon Mr. McMillen could reasonably be viewed by this Jury as one that fits the criteria as presented in the statute.

Certainly we know from the testimony of the Medical Examiner that death was not instantaneous. She made it quite clear that he lived for some period of time because of this aspiration of blood, in fact, such an aspiration of blood that : went into the lungs and filled the lur . . besides the number of wounds to the facand head of the victim, and their obviferocity. We also have that indicia the victim was being choked with the of the ax during this ordeal.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

anv

1

2

3

11

12

13

15

16

17

20

21

on the victim which evidences depravity of mind.

Clearly, Judge, this is an issue.

It's an issue of fact. It's an issue for the Jury to determine.

I think that the cases, Monturi, for example, says that the statutory language should be given its ordinary meaning, absent specific intent to the contrary. The attack upon Mr. McMillen could reasonably be viewed by this Jury as one that fits the criteria as presented in the statute.

of the Medical Examiner that death was not instantaneous. She made it quite clear that he lived for some period of time because of this aspiration of blood, in fact, such an aspiration of blood that went into the lungs and filled the lure, besides the number of wounds to the fact, and head of the victim, and their obviderocity. We also have that indicia the victim was being choked with the second the ax during this ordeal.

Frankly, Judge, I think that based on what's been presented, a reasonable jury could find that aggravating factor to be in existence in this case.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

THE COURT: This is a motion by Counsel for the defendant to dismiss the first aggravating factor.

As indicated by the attorney for the defendant, such an allegation in the aggravating factors does not mean that there is an automatic aggravating factor.

However, there was evidence in this case where the Jury may reasonably find the elements of that factor, and as just indicated previously, an aggravating factor shall only be dismissed in the discretion of the Court and only on the clearest and plainest ground.

Based upon the evidence that was presented during the course of the trial, I will deny the motion to dismiss and, however, I will be instructing the Jury

5

7

8

10

11

13

14

16

18

19

21

23 24 25 Frankly, Judge, I think that based on what's been presented, a reasonable jury could find that aggravating factor to be in existence in this case.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

THE COURT: This is a motion by Counsel for the defendant to dismiss the first aggravating factor.

As indicated by the attorney for the defendant, such an allegation in the aggravating factors does not mean that there is an automatic aggravating factor.

However, there was evidence in this case where the Jury may reasonably fine the elements of that factor, and as just indicated previously, an aggravating factor shall only be dismissed in the discretion of the Court and only on the clearest and plainest ground.

Based upon the evidence that was presented during the course of the trial. I will deny the motion to dismiss and, however, I will be instructing the Jury

with regard to that factor or that aggravating factor insofar as what has to be shown by the State.

Anything else at this time?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I assume those
would be the only two factors the State
would rely on, since the felony murder was
a verdict of not guilty. That factor would
now be out.

MR. DeFAZIO: No.

1

13

15

16

17

18

19

THE COURT: Mr. DePazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: That's not correct at all. The State is going to rely on the three aggravating factors that they noticed to the defendant, including the robbery.

MR. BOVINO: That's not what the Jury said, Judge. The Jury said it was not a murder committed during the course -- murder during the commission of a robbery as contained in the statute.

They said it was a purposeful murder, not guilty as to the murder committed during the robbery and a separate robbery which, I would assume, based upon the State's argument, would precede by some

with regard to that factor or that aggravating factor insofar as what has to be shown by the State.

Anything else at this time?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I assume those would be the only two factors the State would rely on, since the felony murder was a verdict of not guilty. That factor would now be out.

MR. DeFAZIO: No.
THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio?

MR. DeFAIIO: That's not correct at all. The State is going to rely on the three aggravating factors that they noticed to the defendant, including the robbery.

MR. BOVINO: That's not what the Jury said, Judge. The Jury said it was not a murder committed during the course -- murder during the commission of a robbery as contained in the statute.

They said it was a purposeful murder, not guilty as to the murder committed during the robbery and a separate robbery which, I would assume, based upon the State's argument, would precede by some

period of time, however minimal or lengthy -- it would seem to me that the verdicts have already indicated that this is not a robbery and a murder committed at the same time during the commission of the robbery.

MR. DeFAZIO: Judge, I don't know what this Jury thought.

MR. BOVINO: We're stuck with the verdict, Judge. That's a reasonable interpretation of the verdict. Not guilty of felony murder.

MR. DePAZIO: That's an interpretation of the verdict. All right? We don't know what this Jury was thinking, and because we don't know for sure what they were thinking, once again, this is a question for them to decide.

Maybe this Jury thought that since they found a purposeful and knowing murder, then it wasn't necessary for them to then find a felony murder. I don't know. I don't know how sophisticated they are, but that's an explanation, too. That once they found the purposeful and knowing murder,

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

period of time, however minimal or lengthy -- it would seem to me that the verdicts have already indicated that this is not a robbery and a murder committed at the same time during the commission of the robbery.

16

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. DeFAZIO: Judge, I don't know what this Jury thought.

MR. BOVINO: We're stuck with the verdict, Judge. That's a reasonable interpretation of the verdict. Not guilty of felony murder.

MR. DeFAZIO: That's an interpretation of the verdict. All right? We don't know what this Jury was thinking, and because we don't know for sure what they were thinking, once again, this is a question for them to decide.

Maybe this Jury thought that since they found a purposeful and knowing murder, then it wasn't necessary for them to then find a felony murder. I don't know. I don't know how sophisticated they are, but that's an explanation, too. That once they found the purposeful and knowing murcer,

that they figured they didn't have to find the felony murder, but they did find a robbery.

THE COURT: A second degree robbery. MR. DeFAZIO: Second degree robbery. MR. BOVINO: Judge, that's speculation. We can infer a lot of things perhaps or try to interpret their verdict, but their verdict is one of not guilty. They didn't say they didn't vote on it. They said not guilty as to that count.

That means the elements have not been proven. The element robbery during the course of a murder was not proven. That verdict stands. You could never be brought to trial on that. That's jeopardy. They have decided those issues.

They clearly decided no murder at the time of the robbery as contained in the aggravating factor, that murder must be committed during the commission of the offense -- underlying offense of robbery and so forth and so on or the immediate flight thereafter.

That's how you charged them. You

that they figured they didn't have to find the felony murder, but they did find a robbery.

THE COURT: A second degree robbery.

MR. DeFAZIO: Second degree robbery.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, that's

speculation. We can infer a lot of things

perhaps or try to interpret their verdict,

but their verdict is one of not guilty.

They didn't say they didn't vote on it.

They said not guilty as to that count.

That means the elements have not been proven. The element robbery during the course of a murder was not proven. That verdict stands. You could never be brought to trial on that. That's jeopardy. They have decided those issues.

They clearly decided no murder at the time of the robbery as contained in the aggravating factor, that murder must be committed during the commission of the offense -- underlying offense of robbery and so forth and so on or the immediate flight thereafter.

That's how you charged them. You

asked for a separate verdict on that count.

It wasn't a verdict of if you find Count 1,
go to Count 2. It was Count 1, Count 2,

Count 3, Count 4 -- Count 4, and they said
not guilty. They didn't say we didn't
deliberate. They said not guilty. The
elements have not been proven.

MR. DeFAZIO: I don't think my explanation is any more speculative than Mr. Bovino's explanation.

MR. BOVINO: Except the Prosecutor is speculating, and at this point I have the strength of a verdict to sustain my position, that the verdict is one of not quilty. The elements were not proven by the State beyond a reasonable doubt.

I am not speculating. That is the fact. That is their verdict. Cannot to impeached or attacked through some speculation as to what they may have thought.

They didn't come back to ask for clarification. They entered a verdict as the verdict on the third count and thirst count. I'm stuck with those

asked for a separate verdict on that count.

It wasn't a verdict of if you find Count 1,
go to Count 2. It was Count 1, Count 2,

Count 3, Count 4 -- Count 4, and they said
not guilty. They didn't say we didn't
deliberate. They said not guilty. The
elements have not been proven.

MR. DeFAZIO: I don't think my explanation is any more speculative than Mr. Bovino's explanation.

MR. BOVINO: Except the Prosecutor is speculating, and at this point I have the strength of a verdict to sustain my position, that the verdict is one of not guilty. The elements were not proven by the State beyond a reasonable doubt.

I am not speculating. That is the fact. That is their verdict. Cannot to impeached or attacked through some speculation as to what they may have thought.

They didn't come back to ask for clarification. They entered a verdict as the verdict on the third count and first count. I'm stuck with those

verdicts, as I said, the State has received their verdict of not guilty, and that's the law of the case.

MR. DeFAZIO: I think it's a jury question, Judge. It's a question of fact. That's really ultimately what we are talking about. It's a question of fact.

THE COURT: What about Mr. Bovino's argument that the Jury, when they found the defendant not guilty of felony murder and, in fact, they were saying, well, the murder did not take place at the time of the committing of the robbery.

MR. DeFAZIO: Judge, first of all,

I'm not sure that that is the criteria by
which this aggravating factor is submitted
to the Jury.

The indictment alleges that on October 1, 1985, the same day that the murder took place, that the robbery took place, and the fact that the Jury has formathat this robbery and a purposeful and knowing murder took place some time on that date, obviously in the morning hours, would seem to indicate that this aggravating

verdicts, as I said, the State has received their verdict of not guilty, and that's the law of the case.

MR. DeFAZIO: I think it's a jury question, Judge. It's a question of fact. That's really ultimately what we are talking about. It's a question of fact.

THE COURT: What about Mr. Bovino's argument that the Jury, when they found the defendant not guilty of felony murder and, in fact, they were saying, well, the murder did not take place at the time of the committing of the robbery.

MR. DeFAZIO: Judge, first of all,

I'm not sure that that is the criteria by
which this aggravating factor is submitted
to the Jury.

The indictment alleges that on October 1, 1985, the same day that the murder took place, that the robbery took place, and the fact that the Jury has formathat this robbery and a purposeful and knowing murder took place some time on that date, obviously in the morning hours, would seem to indicate that this aggravating

factor could be found by them based on the facts presented.

I don't see the fact that they came back with a guilty -- with a verdict of not guilty on the felony murder precludes this submission on this aggravating factor.

I think it's a question of fact. I don't know -- I really don't know what else to say about it as far as their reasons for the verdict and what they were thinking. I don't know.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

THE COURT: We'll take a recess before I decide this motion.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, can I also inquire if the Court is going to have a charge conference as to the supplemental instructions?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BOVINO: Can we have that before we begin the next stage of the proceedings?

THE COURT: Certainly. I will give preliminary instructions to the Jury, and

ed

he

10 11 12

13

15 16 17

18 19

20

21 22

24

25

23

factor could be found by them based on the facts presented.

20

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't see the fact that they came back with a guilty -- with a verdict of not guilty on the felony murder precludes this submission on this aggravating factor.

I think it's a question of fact. I don't know -- I really don't know what else to say about it as far as their reasons for the verdict and what they were thinking. I don't know.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: No. Judge.

THE COURT: We'll take a recess before I decide this motion..

MR. BOVINO: Judge, can I also inquire if the Court is going to have a charge conference as to the supplemental instructions?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BOVINO: Can we have that before we begin the next stage of the proceedings?

THE COURT: Certainly. I will give preliminary instructions to the Jury, and and then after evidence is presented and you gentlemen have rendered your summations, I will give a final instruction.

MR. BOVINO: Thank you, Judge.

(The hearing recessed and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Anything further from either attorney?

> MR. DeFAZIO: No, your Honor. MR. BOVINO: No.

THE COURT: All right. This is a notion by the attorney for the defendant to dismiss the second aggravating factor alleging the offense was committed while the defendant was engaged in the commission of or an attempt to commit a robbery.

It is noted that the Jury rendered a verdict of guilty on the first count charging murder, either a purposeful and knowing murder, rendered a verdict of not guilty as to the second count charging felony murder, a verdict of guilty on the third count charging robbery in the second degree, and also finding the defendant

the

not

is

..

1

1

2

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

23

24

and then after evidence is presented and you gentlemen have rendered your summations, I will give a final instruction.

21

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BOVINO: Thank you, Judge.

(The hearing recessed and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Anything further from either attorney?

MR. DeFAZIO: No, your Honor.
MR. BOVINO: No.

THE COURT: All right. This is a motion by the attorney for the defendant to dismiss the second aggravating factor alleging the offense was committed while the defendant was engaged in the commission of or an attempt to commit a robbery.

It is noted that the Jury rendered a verdict of guilty on the first count charging murder, either a purposeful and knowing murder, rendered a verdict of not guilty as to the second count charging felony murder, a verdict of guilty on the third count charging robbery in the second degree, and also finding the defendant

guilty on the fourth and fifth counts as to possession of a weapon, the ax.

In State v. Moore, State of New_ Jersey v. James Moore, et. al., Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Essex County, Judge Newman held that "the alleged robbery of Hawthorne and the burglary of his apartment are clearly other offenses which occurred on the day of the murder. Therefore, they may be used to support Aggravating Factor 2C:11-3c(4)(f).

"In other words, this Court construes the other offense language to include the underlying crimes that may have been committed prior to or during the commission of the homicidal act itself."

It is noted that the statute referred to is the third aggravating factor alleged by the State in this case.

It would appear, and I so find, that the second aggravating factor is included within the third aggravating factor, and in fairness to the defendant, the second aggravating factor should be dismissed, and accordingly, the motion is granted and too

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a

guilty on the fourth and fifth counts as to possession of a weapon, the ax.

22

In State x. Moore, State of New-Jersey x. James Moore. et. al., Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Essex County, Judge Newman held that "the alleged robbery of Hawthorne and the burglary of his apartment are clearly other offenses which occurred on the day of the murder. Therefore, they may be used to support Aggravating Factor 2C:11-3c(4)(f).

"In other words, this Court construes the other offense language to include the underlying crimes that may have been committed prior to or during the commission of the homicidal act itself."

It is noted that the statute referred to is the third aggravating factor alleged by the State in this case.

It would appear, and I so find, that the second aggravating factor is included within the third aggravating factor, and in fairness to the defendant, the second aggravating factor should be dismissed, and accordingly, the motion is granted and tree

second factor is dismissed.

10

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Are we ready to proceed otherwise, gentlemen?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I'm not ready to proceed at this time. I have two witnesses that were supposed to be here at eleven o'clock. I haven't seen them yet.

THE COURT: Well, then, may I suggest we have an informal conference as to the instruction now, so that we'll be able to proceed.

(The hearing recessed and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

MR. DeFAZIO: Mr. Bovino received a call from his Investigator, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. (Pause)

MR. BOVINO: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: Gentlemen, let the record

reflect that we have had an informal conference this morning with regard to ... proposed charge by the Court at the commencement of the penalty proceedings.

I have also submitted to Counse: a copy of or the original of the proposible verdict sheet to be submitted.

second factor is dismissed.

Are we ready to proceed otherwise,
gentlemen?

1

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I'm not ready to proceed at this time. I have two witnesses that were supposed to be here at eleven o'clock. I haven't seen them yet.

THE COURT: Well, then, may I suggest we have an informal conference as to the instruction now, so that we'll be able to proceed.

(The hearing recessed and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

MR. DeFAZIO: Mr. Bovino received a call from his Investigator, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. (Pause)
MR. BOVINO: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, let the record reflect that we have had an informal conference this morning with regard to proposed charge by the Court at the commencement of the penalty proceedings.

I have also submitted to Counse: a copy of or the original of the proper possible verdict sheet to be submitted.

the Jury.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I believe we have copies made. Do we have a copy? Give it to the attorneys, please? Also we went over the proposed charge by the Court at the closing of the penalty proceedings.

24

Is there any objection thereto, gentlemen? Any requests?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, just as to the possible form of the verdict sheet, page 3 ---

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BOVINO: Page 3 of the verdict sheet, Judge, the bottom portion of the sheet.

The first part, does Aggravating
Factor 1 outweigh any one or more
mitigating factors, and does Aggravating
Factor 2 outweigh any one or more
mitigating factors.

The bottom sheet is aggravating factors and with all the mitigating factors. That seems to me that could be in inconsistent verdict. They could vote -- on the first two, and then on the thir.

3

23

ses

est

5

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16 17

18 19

21

25

the Jury.

I believe we have copies made. Do we have a copy? Give it to the attorneys, please? Also we went over the proposed charge by the Court at the closing of the penalty proceedings.

Is there any objection thereto, gentlemen? Any requests?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, just as to the possible form of the verdict sheet, page 3 ---

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BOVINO: Page 3 of the verdict sheet, Judge, the bottom portion of the sheet.

The first part, does Aggravating Pactor 1 outweigh any one or more mitigating factors, and does Aggravating Factor 2 outweigh any one or more mitigating factors.

The bottom sheet is aggravating factors and with all the mitigating factors. That seems to me that could be an inconsistent verdict. They could vote -on the first two, and then on the thir.

question they could vote yes.

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

It seems -- it's unclear to me the way it was explained to me in the charge conference, and the charge essentially will be made clear to the Jury, but the form is disturbing to me, Judge. I'm not sure if the form is clear.

MR. DeFAZIO: Judge, I think that the form follows the statute, and perhaps the statute isn't the model of clarity. That certainly is not your Honor's fault.

I think these questions have to be asked the way they are on page 3 in order to follow the appropriate law that's currently in effect.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Well, it's clear there is a conflict between N.J.S.A. 2C:11-3(c)(3) and N.J.S.A. 2C:11-3(c)(3)(a).

2C:11-3(c)(3) provides as follows: The Jury, or if there is no jury, the Court shall return a special verdict setting forth in writing the existence or

we

question they could vote yes.

It seems -- it's unclear to me the way it was explained to me in the charge conference, and the charge essentially will be made clear to the Jury, but the form is disturbing to me, Judge. I'm not sure if the form is clear.

MR. DeFAIIO: Judge, I think that the form follows the statute, and perhaps the statute isn't the model of clarity. That certainly is not your Honor's fault.

I think these questions have to be asked the way they are on page 3 in order to follow the appropriate law that's currently in effect.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Well, it's clear there is a conflict between N.J.S.A. 2C:11-3(c)(3) and N.J.S.A. 2C:11-3(c)(3)(a).

2C:ll-3(c)(3) provides as follows: The Jury, or if there is no jury, the Court shall return a special verdict setting forth in writing the existence or nonexistence of each of the aggravating or mitigating factors set forth in paragraphs four and five of the subsection. If any aggravating factor is found to exist, the verdict shall also state whether it outweighs beyond a reasonable doubt any one or more mitigating factors.

2C:11-3(c)(3)(a) provides if the Jury or the Court finds that any aggravatomg factor exists and that all of the aggravating factors outweigh beyond a reasonable doubt all of the mitigating factors, the Court shall sentence the defendant to death.

I might say that the form which was used and is being used by the Court is substantially the same form as the form suggested in the Judge's bench manual, and the Court was aware of the fact that there was a conflict in the -- apparent conflict in the statutes.

The Court is also aware of the fact that there is a proposed amendment of the statute, Bill S-1680, which, according to a newspaper article in the Star Ledger, on

nonexistence of each of the aggravating or mitigating factors set forth in paragraphs four and five of the subsection. If any aggravating factor is found to exist, the verdict shall also state whether it outweighs beyond a reasonable doubt any one or more mitigating factors.

2C:11-3(c)(3)(a) provides if the Jury or the Court finds that any aggravatoms factor exists and that all of the aggravating factors outweigh beyond a reasonable doubt all of the mitigating factors, the Court shall sentence the defendant to death.

I might say that the form which was used and is being used by the Court is substantially the same form as the form suggested in the Judge's bench manual, and the Court was aware of the fact that there was a conflict in the -- apparent conflict in the statutes.

The Court is also aware of the fact that there is a proposed amendment of the statute, Bill S-1680, which, according to a newspaper article in the Star Ledger, on

May 6, 1986, was passed by the Senate by 34 to 3 vote, and was being submitted to the Assembly.

I had my Law Secretary call the Clerk of the Assembly yesterday afternoon after the verdict was rendered in this case to see whether or not that bill was approved by the Assembly and signed by the Governor. My Law Secretary was advised telephonically that the bill is still in committee in the Assembly at this time.

For that reason, I did not amend the form since that proposed amendment is not the law at the present time.

Anything else, gentlemen?

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

MR. DeFAZIO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I understand, Mr. Bovino, you will have witnesses here at one-thirty?

MR. BOVINO: I hope so, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. We'll recess until one-thirty.

(The hearing recessed for lunch and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

May 6, 1986, was passed by the Senate by 34 to 3 vote, and was being submitted to the Assembly.

I had my Law Secretary call the Clerk of the Assembly yesterday afternoon after the verdict was rendered in this case to see whether or not that bill was approved by the Assembly and signed by the Governor. My Law Secretary was advised telephonically that the bill is still in committee in the Assembly at this time.

For that reason, I did not amend the form since that proposed amendment is not the law at the present time.

Anything else, gentlemen?

MR. BOVINO: No. Judge.

MR. DeFAZIO: No. your Honor.

THE COURT: I understand, Mr. Bovino, you will have witnesses here at one-thirty?

MR. BOVINO: I hope so, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. We'll recess until one-thirty.

(The hearing recessed for lunch and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Are we ready to proceed, gentlemen?

1

2

3

10

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BOVINO: Yes and no, Judge. I have one witness here. I anticipated two other witnesses.

I was unable to get in touch with them at lunchtime. It's my understanding just prior to lunch that they were on their way here, and they would be here by one-thirty.

My preference is not to open at this time and put on one witness, and then call the Jury in recess until later on this afternoon. I would ask your Honor to give me another maybe fifteen minutes to see or half hour to see if I can make contact with them to see if they are coming in or not.

I really don't prefer to split it oppiecemeal-type fashion. I want to have 'l my witnesses to go in sequence all at come.

THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: Whatever your Honor thinks best.

THE COURT: You have one witner: two others on their way?

11 12

13

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Are we ready to proceed, gentlemen?

28

1

2

10

13

14

15

16

17

20

MR. BOVINO: Yes and no, Judge. I have one witness here. I anticipated two other witnesses.

I was unable to get in touch with them at lunchtime. It's my understanding just prior to lunch that they were on their way here, and they would be here by one-thirty.

My preference is not to open at this time and put on one witness, and then call the Jury in recess until later on this afternoon. I would ask your Honor to give me another maybe fifteen minutes to see or half hour to see if I can make contact with them to see if they are coming in or not.

I really don't prefer to split it -p piecemeal-type fashion. I want to have "1 my witnesses to go in sequence all at com.

THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: Whatever your Honor thinks best.

THE COURT: You have one witnes: two others on their way?

MR. BOVINO: Hopefully on their way. I didn't speak to them. That was the message I got. They would try to be here by one-thirty.

THE COURT: Well, you know, I am trying to accommodate, but also the Jurors have been sitting since eleven o'clock.

May I ask then if you would call now, and I would prefer if we could start to get going within the next ten or fifteen minutes. If you could make some calls and see whether or not somebody may be on the way. If so, we can start.

MR. BOVINO: I'll try again, Judge.

THE COURT: If you would, please.

(The hearing recessed briefly and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

> THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, have you held an opportunity to reach out for your witnesses?

> MR. BOVINO: Judge, a phone call was made, I guess, about two o'clock. I have received no other information, except to: the person that was spoken to is the

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

21

23

25

MR. BOVINO: Hopefully on their way. I didn't speak to them. That was the message I got. They would try to be here by one-thirty.

THE COURT: Well, you know, I am trying to accommodate, but also the Jurors have been sitting since eleven o'clock.

May I ask then if you would call now, and I would prefer if we could start to get going within the next ten or fifteen minutes. If you could make some calls and see whether or not somebody may be on the way. If so, we can start.

MR. BOVINO: I'll try again, Judge.
THE COURT: If you would, please.

(The hearing recessed briefly and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, have you have an opportunity to reach out for your witnesses?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, a phone call was made, I guess, about two o'clock. I have received no other information, except traction person that was spoken to is the

husband of the witness, that he said that she didn't -- he didn't know where she was. I would only assume that she's on her way in.

Just for the purposes of the record, it's Mr. Stone's sister and mother who I am trying to bring in from New York City.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Bovino, would you have any problem proceeding at this time with the understanding that in the event the witnesses are not here and available, that I will carry the matter so you can present the witnesses?

10

11

12

13

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BOVINO: Thank you, Judge. I'll proceed with the witness who is here.

THE COURT: All right, Officers. May we have the Jurors and the Alternate Jurors. They will all be seated in their respective seats in the jurybox.

(Jury entering courtroom at 2:35 p.m.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, I'd like the Jurors seated in the jurybox. Please take your respective sears in the jurybox, please.

1

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

husband of the witness, that he said that she didn't -- he didn't know where she was. I would only assume that she's on her way in.

Just for the purposes of the record, it's Mr. Stone's sister and mother who I am trying to bring in from New York City.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Bovino, would you have any problem proceeding at this time with the understanding that in the event the witnesses are not here and available, that I will carry the matter so you can present the witnesses?

MR. BOVINO: Thank you, Judge. I'll proceed with the witness who is here.

THE COURT: All right, Officers. May we have the Jurors and the Alternate Jurors. They will all be seated in their respective seats in the jurybox.

(Jury entering courtroom at 2:35 p.m.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, I'd like the Jurors seated in the jurybox. Please take your respective seats in the jurybox, please.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Poll the Jury, please?

1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Jury polled; all are present.) THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, having found the defendant guilty of murder, you should put that issue aside. You now have the added responsibility of determining what penalty for that crime is to be imposed on this defendant.

Under the law exacted by our Legislature, the penalty may be either death or life imprisonment with no eligibility for parole for thirty years.

The Court imposes the sentence, but the decision as to what the sentence will be rests with you, the Jury.

To aid the Jury in making that decision, the Legislature in enacting the criminal code has set up a structure and procedure to be followed. Essentially it is this:

The law lists a number of specific factors, called aggravating factors, which, if proved by the State, would cause the Jurors to lean toward imposing the death

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

ke

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Poll the Jury, please?

(Jury polled; all are present.)
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of

the Jury, having found the defendant guilty of murder, you should put that issue aside. You now have the added responsibility of determining what penalty for that crime is to be imposed on this defendant.

Under the law exacted by our Legislature, the penalty may be either death or life imprisonment with no eligibility for parole for thirty years.

The Court imposes the sentence, but the decision as to what the sentence will be rests with you, the Jury.

To aid the Jury in making that decision, the Legislature in enacting the criminal code has set up a structure and procedure to be followed. Essentially it is this:

The law lists a number of specific factors, called aggravating factors, which, if proved by the State, would cause the Jurors to lean toward imposing the deatr

penalty.

1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The law also lists a number of other factors, called mitigating factors, which, if found by the Jurors, would cause them to lean away from the death penalty and toward life imprisonment.

32

If the State can prove no aggravating factor beyond a reasonable doubt, then the death penalty cannot be imposed. If, however, at least one aggravating factor is proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then the Jurors will have to decide if any mitigating factor or factors exist.

If there is a mitigating factor found, then the Jurors are to weigh the aggravating factor or factors against any mitigating factors found to exist to decide whether the penalty should be death or life imprisonment.

If the Jury finds that the aggravating factors do not outweigh the mitigating factors beyond a reasonable doubt, the death penalty will not be imposed.

The State will now present to you

penalty.

The law also lists a number of other factors, called mitigating factors, which, if found by the Jurors, would cause them to lean away from the death penalty and toward life imprisonment.

If the State can prove no aggravating factor beyond a reasonable doubt, then the death penalty cannot be imposed. If, however, at least one aggravating factor is proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then the Jurors will have to decide if any mitigating factor or factors exist.

If there is a mitigating factor found, then the Jurors are to weigh the aggravating factor or factors against any mitigating factors found to exist to decide whether the penalty should be death or life imprisonment.

If the Jury finds that the aggravating factors do not outweigh the mitigating factors beyond a reasonable doubt, the death penalty will not be imposed.

The State will now present to you

evidence bearing on the aggravating factors, the defense on the mitigating factors.

The State alleges aggravating factors are, firstly, the murder was outrageously or wantonly vile, horrible or inhuman in that it involved torture, depravity of mind or an aggravated battery to the victim.

Two, that the murder was committed for the purpose of escaping detection, apprehension, trial, punishment or confinement for another offense committed by the defendant or another.

The defendant alleges as mitigating factors, firstly, that at the time of the incident, the defendant was twenty-five years of age.

Secondly, that the defendant has resignificant history of prior criminal activity.

Thirdly, any other factor which -:
be relevant to the defendant's character of
record or to the circumstances of the
offense.

After all that evidence has been

men.

lty de.

of

is

.

h,

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

evidence bearing on the aggravating factors, the defense on the mitigating factors.

The State alleges aggravating factors are, firstly, the murder was outrageously or wantonly vile, horrible or inhuman in that it involved torture, depravity of mind or an aggravated battery to the victim.

Two, that the murder was committed for the purpose of escaping detection, apprehension, trial, punishment or confinement for another offense committed by the defendant or another.

The defendant alleges as mitigating factors, firstly, that at the time of the incident, the defendant was twenty-five years of age.

Secondly, that the defendant has re significant history of prior criminal activity.

Thirdly, any other factor which -.
be relevant to the defendant's character of
record or to the circumstances of the
offense.

After all that evidence has beer

presented, we will conclude as before with summations of Counsel and my charge to you as to the law.

Procedurally, you'll first hear an opening statement by the State, you'll hear an opening statement by the attorney for the defendant, the proofs will be submitted, as I just indicated, both attorneys will speak to you in summations, and then I will instruct you as to the law.

MR. DePAZIO: Your Honor, Judge Harrington, Mr. Bovino, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury:

Mr. DeFazio?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

22

23

24

25

As Judge Harrington has told you, we have now entered the second phase of this proceeding against the defendant, Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard. It is in this phase that you will determine what the penalty shall be for what he did on October 1, 1985.

The State comes before you with much trepidation. The State is fearful. The State is afraid not because you may give Leonard Stone 1164.

presented, we will conclude as before with summations of Counsel and my charge to you as to the law.

Procedurally, you'll first hear an opening statement by the State, you'll hear an opening statement by the attorney for the defendant, the proofs will be submitted, as I just indicated, both attorneys will speak to you in summations, and then I will instruct you as to the law.

Mr. DeFazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: Your Honor, Judge Harrington, Mr. Bovino, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury:

As Judge Harrington has told you, we have now entered the second phase of this proceeding against the defendant, Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard. It is in this phase that you will determine what the penalty shall be for what he did on October 1, 1985.

The State comes before you with ruch trepidation. The State is fearful. The State is afraid not because you may give Deconard Stone life.

but because if you follow the law, you might have to sentence Leonard Stone to death.

when you came here in this courthouse and you were questioned by the Judge, and some of you might have been questioned by the State, by myself, or by Mr. Boving, some of you said that you did not personally favor the death penalty, others said you were neutral, others said you might favor the death penalty, but all of you said, all of you said, that you would follow the law, and that you would put your personal feelings aside and follow the Judge's instructions based on the facts as as you found them in this case to the law.

You see, some Prosecutors might personally not favor the death penalty, like some Jurors do, but what you think personally, what we think personally, does not control what happens here. Whether I personally think Leonard Stone should be sentenced to life imprisonment or to death means absolutely nothing. We all must follow the law. That's the system we work

with o you

hear

10

ons, law.

> 13 14

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

23

25

but because if you follow the law, you might have to sentence Leonard Stone to death.

When you came here in this courthouse and you were questioned by the Judge, and some of you might have been questioned by the State, by myself, or by Mr. Bovino, some of you said that you did not personally favor the death penalty, others said you were neutral, others said you might favor the death penalty, but all of you said, all of you said, that you would follow the law, and that you would put your personal feelings aside and follow the Judge's instructions based on the facts as as you found them in this case to the law.

You see, some Prosecutors might personally not favor the death penalty, like some Jurors do, but what you think personally, what we think personally, does not control what happens here. Whether I personally think Leonard Stone should be sentenced to life imprisonment or to death means absolutely nothing. We all must follow the law. That's the system we work under.

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

So, ladies and gentlemen, it will be a most difficult task for all of you to try to set your personal feelings aside, apply the facts to the law. Most difficult.

Your Honor, Judge Harrington, read to you the aggravating factors that the State alleges. The first one has to do, in essence, with the nature of the attack, how savage the attack was, how brutal the attack was.

The second factor has to do with that you convicted Mr. Stone of another offense, and the State alleges that this murder, you could find -- that one of the reasons that this murder took place, one of the reasons, was that the victim was somebody who he knew and he had to kill him to avoid detection, and there are mitigating factors.

The State is going to submit -- what that means -- it doesn't mean the State gives up, because the State can't give up, because the State has an obligation to follow the law as you do.

11 12

13

14

15

16

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

under.

So, ladies and gentlemen, it will be a most difficult task for all of you to try to set your personal feelings aside, apply the facts to the law. Most difficult.

36

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

Your Honor, Judge Harrington, read to you the aggravating factors that the State alleges. The first one has to do, in essence, with the nature of the attack, how savage the attack was, how brutal the attack was.

The second factor has to do with that you convicted Mr. Stone of another offense, and the State alleges that this murder, you could find -- that one of the reasons that this murder took place, one of the reasons, was that the victim was somebody who he knew and he had to kill him to avoid detection, and there are mitigating factors.

The State is going to submit -- what that means -- it doesn't mean the State gives up, because the State can't give up, because the State has an obligation to follow the law as you do.

What that means is that the State is going to present or ask you to consider what you've already heard, the testimony that you have already heard in this case, and you heard all of it, and you were all very attentive to that. The State will ask you to look again at the various pieces of evidence that you have.

When you recount the pertinent testimony and look at the applicable things in evidence, you will make a determination whether these aggravating factors exist, you will make a determination whether any of the mitigating factors exist, and you are going to weigh them, and if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the aggravating factors outweigh the mitigating factors, you will have to do what the law requires.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: May it please the Court,

Mr. DeFazio, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The State is filled with trepidation. I'm filled with horror. It's not easy to

1 d

35

house

and

by

ers

of

your

es

th

rk

ry

to

.

going to present or ask you to consider what you've already heard, the testimony that you have already heard in this case, and you heard all of it, and you were all very attentive to that. The State will ask you to look again at the various pieces of evidence that you have.

What that means is that the State is

When you recount the pertinent testimony and look at the applicable things in evidence, you will make a determination whether these aggravating factors exist, you will make a determination whether any of the mitigating factors exist, and you are going to weigh them, and if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the aggravating factors outweigh the mitigating factors, you will have to do what the law requires.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino?

Mr. BOVINO: May it please the Court, Mr. DeFazio, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The State is filled with trepidation.

I'm filled with horror. It's not easy to

come back today. My theory has been rejected, and I have suffered the agony of defeat, as has Leonard Stone, but I don't question your verdict.

I told you initially, and I told you yesterday morning, your verdict is sacrosanct. You are judges. You are not partisans.

I'm fearful, too, that you may vote
the death of Leonard Stone perhaps when you
hear the evidence that will be produced
now.

The State says they rest their case, in effect. They won't present anymore evidence than what you've heard, and they'll ask you to consider the aggravating factors, whatever they mean, and however they are defined and described by Judge Barrington. I won't even attempt to describe what those words mean, but your stigges, will have to define those words.

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ask

of

ng

23 24

1

2

9

10

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

come back today. My theory has been rejected, and I have suffered the agony of defeat, as has Leonard Stone, but I don't question your verdict.

I told you initially, and I told you yesterday morning, your verdict is sacrosanct. You are judges. You are not partisans.

I'm fearful, too, that you may vote the death of Leonard Stone perhaps when you hear the evidence that will be produced

The State says they rest their case, in effect. They won't present anymore evidence than what you've heard, and they'll ask you to consider the aggravating factors, whatever they mean, and however they are defined and described by Judge Harrington. I won't even attempt to describe what those words mean, but you. is judges, will have to define those work your understanding and your satisfactic .

I don't believe there is a Jucco . a sentence and any Judge -- and you are - trained at judges. There's not one Ju

that finds sentencing an easy job. Judges have to balance the law with mercy, compassion, justice.

The Prosecutor says that you said you would uphold the law regardless of your personal feelings. I hope to show you now, whatever time I have to show you, that there is something that requires that Leonard Stone not be put to death, not be delivered to the execution.

I think we all, as a civilized society, cherish life. We try to prolong life. I'm sure the Prosecutor can make a very good argument that Mr. McMillen deserves life, he didn't deserve to die, and I don't say he deserved to die, but he was called by some maker to meet his day.

Now Leonard Stone is here, and you'll find out, as you have already found out. that Leonard Stone is twenty-five years of age, has one prior conviction for possession of a gun three or four years

I hope to have his mother come here to tell you something about his backer.... 2 3 4

his young years before he left home in 1978 when he was sixteen, seventeen or eighteen, lived with Mr. McMillen.

I hope to have his sister come in to tell you that my brother is not a bad person. There is some good in my brother. They probably will ask you to help save his life, don't kill him.

I hope to have a friend, Ms. James, testify that she knows Leonard for some period of time, as short as it may be, that she has been supportive of Leonard, and she hopes to remain supportive of Leonard, and she, too, will ask you not to kill this young man, this young boy, this person, whatever he was, that there is something good in this person, that thirty years in prison is a sufficient amount of punishment.

How do you decide punishment?

Revenge. I guess revenge is a very strong word. I guess people want revenge. They want to kill the murderer. Eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.

It's not that easy, and you will be

the judges. The buck will stop with you, and you'll have to live with that verdict.

I could say I did my best, whether it was good enough or not. You will say the lawyer didn't help us. The lawyer didn't give us anything to help Leonard Stone, and the State was convincing. So, it's not my fault that you are the judges. You will be the person who signs off, so to speak, and says Leonard Stone, you will face the execution.

We all, most of us -- we don't know where we are going to be when we are going to die, but you will decide that on a certain date, at a given hour, at a particular time, place, you have come one step closer to death. It's final; it's irrevocable.

Any questions you had yesterday when you decided this case, if you had questions, but I would submit in the ordinary course of life you would find, when you first attempt to decide this case, you have some people for and some people against, and some people say I really contact.

. 8

the judges. The buck will stop with you, and you'll have to live with that verdict.

I could say I did my best, whether it was good enough or not. You will say the lawyer didn't help us. The lawyer didn't give us anything to help Leonard Stone, and the State was convincing. So, it's not my fault that you are the judges. You will be the person who signs off, so to speak, and says Leonard Stone, you will face the execution.

We all, most of us -- we don't know where we are going to be when we are going to die, but you will decide that on a certain date, at a given hour, at a particular time, place, you have come one step closer to death. It's final; it's irrevocable.

Any questions you had yesterday when you decided this case, if you had questions, but I would submit in the ordinary course of life you would find, when you first attempt to decide this case, you have some people for and some people against, and some people say I really contains.

know what to do. I need some thought about this.

I have to convince myself one way or another because it's not a pleasant task. That's not a pleasant task. This is even more unpleasant, for you to deliver Leonard Stone at the age of twenty-five to the execution.

I say don't -- I didn't say don't do it. I say do what you must. Be a judge. I ask for your compassion. I ask for your mercy. I ask you to save his life, that thirty years in prison is a suitable alternative to the death penalty, and I ask you to consider the consequences. They are irrevocable, are irretrievable.

If there was a mistake -- I'm not saying there was. If there was a mistake, that mistake would be compounded. It's finalized.

I only ask you for all of your wisdom, your compassion, and the guidance that you will get from someplace, whatever, whether it's Judge Harrington's instructions or from some divine

r it and be

41

u,

ct.

my

nd

10

1

2

10 11

12

9

13 14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

know what to do. I need some thought about this.

I have to convince myself one way or another because it's not a pleasant task. That's not a pleasant task. This is even more unpleasant, for you to deliver Leonard Stone at the age of twenty-five to the execution.

I say don't -- I didn't say don't do it. I say do what you must. Be a judge. I ask for your compassion. I ask for your mercy. I ask you to save his life, that thirty years in prison is a suitable alternative to the death penalty, and I ask you to consider the consequences. They are irrevocable, are irretrievable.

If there was a mistake -- I'm not saying there was. If there was a mistake, that mistake would be compounded. It's finalizec.

I only ask you for all of your wisdom, your compassion, and the guidance that you will get from someplace, whatever, whether it's Judge Harrington's instructions or from some divine

inspiration, whatever it maybe inside, to save Leonard Stone's life.

Thank you.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Defazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: Your Honor, the State would ask that you take judicial notice of the testimony that was produced at the trial, and the State would also reintroduce those articles that were marked into evidence, and the State would submit on same.

THE COURT: For the purpose ---MR. DeFAZIO: For the purposes of this hearing, correct.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVITO: No.

THE COURT: Then all of the exhicits that have -- that were admitted into evidence during the course of the trial . and hereby are marked the same exhibit: r the purpose of this hearing and will to considered by the Jury.

> Anything else, Mr. DeFazio? MR. DeFAZIO: No, your Honor.

out

or .

ard

do

sk

re

inspiration, whatever it maybe inside, to save Leonard Stone's life.

43

Thank you.

1

2

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

THE COURT: Mr. DePazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: Your Honor, the State would ask that you take judicial notice of the testimony that was produced at the trial, and the State would also reintroduce those articles that were marked into evidence, and the State would submit on same.

THE COURT: For the purpose --MR. DeFAZIO: For the purposes of
this hearing, correct.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVITO: No.

THE COURT: Then all of the exhibited that have -- that were admitted into evidence during the course of the trio: and hereby are marked the same exhibite of the purpose of this hearing and will to considered by the Jury.

Anything else, Mr. DeFazio? MR. DeFAZIO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino? MR. BOVINO: Georgia James. G E O R G I A J A M E S, 132 Wade Street, Jersey City, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BOVING: 8 Ms. James, you know Leonard here? 9 Yes, sir. 10 How long have you known Leonard? 11 Since the summer of 1983. Were you living at Wade Street in the 12 13 summer of 1983? No. I was living at 31 Martin Luther King 14 Drive. 15 How did it come about that you met 16 Mr. Stone, Leonard Stone? 18 I meet Leonard through my sons. I have 19 three sons. They was playing on the schoolground on Kennedy Boulevard right back from my house, and 20 Leonard was taking pictures and lifting weights it 21 22 the schoolground of the children on the block. to 23 my kids was out there.

So, later that week he asked them to constant

bowling with him, and so I wouldn't let them

11

16

18

19

20

21

22

24

G E O R G I A J A M E S, 132 Wade Street, Jersey City, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BOVING:

Ms. James, you know Leonard here?

Yes, sir.

How long have you known Leonard?

Since the summer of 1983.

Were you living at Wade Street in the

summer of 1983? 13

14 No. I was living at 31 Martin Luther King

Drive. 15

> 0 How did it come about that you met Mr. Stone, Leonard Stone?

17

I meet Leonard through my sons. I have three sons. They was playing on the schoolground on Kennedy Boulevard right back from my house, and Leonard was taking pictures and lifting weights at the schoolground of the children on the block. to

23 my kids was out there.

> So, later that week he asked them to co bowling with him, and so I wouldn't let them

James - direct

the first couple of times. They kept bugging me about it because I didn't know who he was, and they kept saying that he was -- he's a big guy, mama. He gonna take care of us.

I said, "No. I haven't met him. I have to met him first and see who he is, see if I like him.* So, after my son persisted pestering me to meet him, I finally met Josh, and one Sunday afternoon he came around, and my kids introduced me to him.

Since that time in the summer of 1983, have you had the opportunity to speak to Leonard or Joshua on other occasions?

11

13

14

20

21

22

23

Yes. Pe frequently took my kids bowling and out, you know, just took them out riding when he wasn't working. He was working at the Meadowlands at the time, and when he wasn't working, he would take up a lot of time with them and the other kids on the block, couple more kics, and my sons liked the sports and stuff, and he was into that. He liked, you know, lifting weights and stuff.

We had several family outings during the summer that we invited Josh to, and he would come. He was very respectful to my family, the kids, and the first couple of times. They kept bugging me about it because I didn't know who he was, and they kept saying that he was -- he's a big guy, mama. He gonna take care of us.

I said, "No. I haven't met him. I have to met him first and see who he is, see if I like him.* So, after my son persisted pestering me to meet him, I finally met Josh, and one Sunday afternoon he came around, and my kids introduced me to him.

Since that time in the summer of 1983, have you had the opportunity to speak to Leonard or Joshua on other occasions?

10

11

12

13

14

15

1€

18

19

20

21 22

23

Yes. Pe frequently took my kids bowling and out, you know, just took them out riding when he wasn't working. He was working at the Meadowlands at the time, and when he wasn't working, he would take up a lot of time with them and the other kids on the block, couple more kids, and my sons liked the sports and stuff, and he was into that. He liked, you know, lifting weights and stuff.

We had several family outings during the summer that we invited Josh to, and he would co-e. He was very respectful to my family, the kids, and James - direct

they all liked him. My fiance, he crazy about 2 him, too, and we just almost like adopted him like part of the family, because if we had something, 3

we automatically would call him and tell him he was invited.

Q Did you develop a close relationship as a result of these activities with your sons and family outings?

Yes.

Have you been able to communicate with Mr. Stone from the time of October 1 when this incident happened up until today?

Yes, sir. I talked to him several times 13 since then.

Q What was the purpose of your talking to him from October 1 up until now?

Just mainly to let him know that we was, you know, still his friends and, you know, that he could depend on us, we was behind him. 19

20 Do you have an opinion as to whether or not Leonard or Josh here has been an influence 22 on your children in any way?

Yes. I think he had a very good influence on my second son. He's fourteen years old now. At the time he was only about twelve when Josh

11

10

17

23

to

to

was

they all liked him. My fiance, he crazy about him, too, and we just almost like adopted him like part of the family, because if we had something, we automatically would call him and tell him he was invited. Did you develop a close relationship as a result of these activities with your sons and family outings?

Have you been able to communicate with Mr. Stone from the time of October 1 when this incident happened up until today?

Yes, sir. I talked to him several times 13 14 since then.

Yes.

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

11

Q What was the purpose of your talking to him from October 1 up until now?

Just mainly to let him know that we was, you know, still his friends and, you know, that he could depend on us, we was behind him.

Do you have an opinion as to whether or not Leonard or Josh here has been an influence on your children in any way?

Yes. I think he had a very good influence on my second son. He's fourteen years old now.

At the time he was only about twelve when Josh

James - direct

47

started taking up time with him, and he was running around with a gang, and Josh talked to him and got him away from that.

I didn't know that this was going on until Josh came home with him one day and sit down, and he was telling him in front of me what he had told him, because he was crying and upset, and Josh was telling him not to be with the wrong crowd and not to get involved in drugs and alcohol, because at twelve and thirteen years old, young boys, would try most anything.

Did you think that made a real impact on your son?

Yes, I think it did.

11

12

13

14

20

21

23

24

You say that you have discussed or Leonard has met your family and your fiancee. Have you had an opportunity to discuss Leonard's reputation or character with your boy friend, your fiance?

Well, we didn't really discuss his character. We discuss it when we first met hir, you know, as I wanted his opinion as to whether we should let him go -- the kids go with him, beca se my youngest son is by the man that I am living with now, and he said that he didn't find no

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

--

23

24

24

25

started taking up time with him, and he was running around with a gang, and Josh talked to him and got him away from that.

I didn't know that this was going on until Josh came home with him one day and sit down, and he was telling him in front of me what he had told him, because he was crying and upset, and Josh was telling him not to be with the wrong crowd and not to get involved in drugs and alcohol, because at twelve and thirteen years old, young boys, would try most anything.

- Q Did you think that made a real impact on your son?
- A Yes, I think it did.
- Q You say that you have discussed or Leonard has met your family and your fiancee. Have you had an opportunity to discuss Leonard's reputation or character with your boy friend, your fiance?
- A Well, we didn't really discuss his character. We discuss it when we first met him, you know, as I wanted his opinion as to whether we should let him go -- the kids go with him, becase my youngest son is by the man that I am living with now, and he said that he didn't find no

James - direct

reason why they couldn't go with him as long as he brought them home whenever we said at the time to bring home.

When we had the family outing, we go out to the beach, Josh would drive out to the beach in one of our cars with the kids, and he could take more of their friend with him, you know, and he got along with them fine.

- Q You understand that Josh was convicted of murder yesterday?
- A Yes, I do.
- Q You also understand that this Jury will now determine whether or not he should live or die?
- A Yes.

11

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

25

- O Do you think that there's a reason why Josh should live?
- A Yes, I do, because he's a good kid. We's very good, and I think he just need the opportunity to get hisself straightened out.
- Q If he was sentenced to time in prison, thirty years in prison, would you resupportive of Josh and communicate with him?
- For as long as I could, yes, I would.

MR. BOVINO: Thank you.

James - direct reason why they couldn't go with him as long as he brought them home whenever we said at the time to bring home. When we had the family outing, we go out to the beach, Josh would drive out to the beach in one of our cars with the kids, and he could take more of their friend with him, you know, and he got along with them fine. You understand that Josh was convicted of murder yesterday? Yes, I do. You also understand that this Jury 12 will now determine whether or not he should live or die? Yes. 0 Do you think that there's a reason why Josh should live? Yes, I do, because he's a good kid. Pc' very good, and I think he just need the opportunity to get hisself straightened out. If he was sentenced to time in prison, thirty years in prison, would you re-

supportive of Josh and communicate with him?

For as long as I could, yes, I would.

MR. BOVINO: Thank you.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

m

James - cross 49 THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DeFAZIO: Ms. James, how old are your sons? My oldest son is sixteen, my second son is fourteen, and my baby is seven. Q You first got acquainted with Josh because he got friendly with your two older boys? Yes. 0 So, that means they would have been fourteen and twelve back in -- around there? 10 11 Right. Q In 1983? 12 13 Right. 14 You said that they met up with Josh at the school yard of School 34? Yes. Kennedy Boulevard in Jersey City? 0 18 Yes. 19 You told us that Josh was there st the school yard taking pictures and lifting weights? 22 Yes. 23 Do you mean taking pictures of children or of the people that were around there

or ---

-7	-	 -	-	-	

THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio?
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DeFAZIO:

Q Ms. James, how old are your sons?

4 A My oldest son is sixteen, my second son is 5 fourteen, and my baby is seven.

Q You first got acquainted with Josh because he got friendly with your two older boys?

8 A Yes.

9 Q So, that means they would have been 0 fourteen and twelve back in -- around there?

11 A Right.

12 Q In 1983?

13 A Right.

C You said that they met up with Josh

15 at the school yard of School 34?

16 A Yes.

14

17

Q Kennedy Boulevard in Jersey City?

18 A Yes.

19 Q You told us that Josh was there at 20 the school yard taking pictures and lifting

21 | weights?

22 A Yes.

Q Do you mean taking pictures of children or of the people that were around there.

James - cross

50

A Well, he took pictures of my poodle. He took pictures of my son standing by some guy's car clowning around. He took pictures of the kids doing stunts, standing on their heads and stuff on the steps of the school.

Q So, he would be taking pictures of the children?

A Just anything. Just anything. He took all kinds of pictures.

10 Q You adopted him, you say? You
11 adopted him into your family, so to speak? You
12 got to know him?

13 A In other words, I trusted him.

Q You brought him to family affairs?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Since October 1, 1985, you said you 17 have spoken to Josh?

18 A Yes.

20

21

Q Did you talk about his case at all?

A No. I just wanted to know how he was doing.

Q Did you talk to him on the phone or did you see him at all?

A I talked to him on the phone.

Q You said that you noticed as a

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

Well, he took pictures of my poodle. He took pictures of my son standing by some guy's car clowning around. He took pictures of the kids doing stunts, standing on their heads and stuff on the steps of the school.

Q So, he would be taking pictures of the children?

Just anything. Just anything. He took all kinds of pictures.

You adopted him, you say? You adopted him into your family, so to speak? You got to know him?

In other words, I trusted him.

You brought him to family affairs?

Yes.

Since October 1, 1985, you said you 0 have spoken to Josh?

Yes.

Did you talk about his case at all?

No. I just wanted to know how he was doing.

Did you talk to him on the phone or did you see him at all?

I talked to him on the phone.

You said that you noticed as a

James - cross

mother -- you noticed that Josh apparently got along with these children? 2

Yes.

Do you know if he got along with other children besides your two older sons?

Yes. I know of one little young man that

lives on Jackson Avenue that used to be with Josh

a lot.

How old was that young man?

I think he's about fourteen now, fourteen 10

11 or fifteen.

MR. DeFAZIO: I have nothing further.

51

MR. BOVINO: I have nothing further.

THE COURT: You are excused. You may

step down.

(Witness excused.)

MR. BOVINO: Can we go to sidebar?

(The following occurred in the presence of, but out of the hearing of the

Jury.)

20 21

12

15

16

17

18

19

22 23

24 25

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Bovino? MR. BOVINO: Judge, I don't see anybody who I recognize as Mr. Stone's

mother or sister. So, I'd like to have a

couple minutes to get an update.

?

S

ar

50

on

11

mother -- you noticed that Josh apparently got along with these children?

Yes.

Do you know if he got along with other children besides your two older sons? Yes. I know of one little young man that lives on Jackson Avenue that used to be with Josh a lot.

9 How old was that young man?

I think he's about fourteen now, fourteen or fifteen.

> MR. DeFAZIO: I have nothing further. MR. BOVINO: I have nothing further. THE COURT: You are excused. You may step down.

> > (Witness excused.)

MR. BOVINO: Can we go to sidebar? (The following occurred in the presence of, but out of the hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Bovino? MR. BOVINO: Judge, I don't see anybody who I recognize as Mr. Stone's mother or sister. So, I'd like to have a

couple minutes to get an update.

THE COURT: Any objection? MR. DeFAZIO: No, Judge. You want to send them for coffee or something? THE COURT: Well, probably -- no. I think that it would better -- we'll play i by ear and see how Mr. Bovino makes out with regard to the witness.

What I am going to do is I am going to recess. We'll have the Jurors, the twelve deliberating Jurors, retire as we have all day -- retire to Judge Walsh's, and the other four Alternate Jurors returned to Judge Ryan's old outer chambers.

MR. DeFAZIO: Good.

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(The hearing resumed in the presence and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, we'll take a recess at this tire.

I would ask the four Alternate Jurers to retire to the room where you were earlier this afternoon, and the remaining twelve Jurors, if you would be good enough to retire to the juryroom across the hall.

The Officers will bring you over

20

21 22

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

3

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

THE COURT: Any objection? MR. DeFAZIO: No. Judge. You want to send them for coffee or something?

THE COURT: Well, probably -- no. I think that it would better -- we'll play i by ear and see how Mr. Bovino makes out with regard to the witness.

What I am going to do is I am going to recess. We'll have the Jurors, the twelve deliberating Jurors, retire as we have all day -- retire to Judge Walsh's, and the other four Alternate Jurors returned to Judge Ryan's old outer chambers.

MR. DeFAZIO: Good.

(The hearing resumed in the presence and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, we'll take a recess at this tire.

I would ask the four Alternate Jurces to retire to the room where you were earlier this afternoon, and the remaining twelve Jurors, if you would be good enough to retire to the juryroom across the hall.

The Officers will bring you over

there, which is a lot more comfortable than our juryroom.

(Jury leaving courtroom at 2:55 p.m.) (The hearing recessed briefly and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, have you had any contact with your witnesses?

MR. BOVING: Not since the last time I spoke to the Court.

At about, I guess, ten after three or so I was advised there was still no definite word as to where Mrs. Stone and the daughter was. I assume they were in transit. I haven't heard. My office hasn't received any communications back from them.

I can only say at this time, Jucir, I am not ready to proceed.

THE COURT: Do you wish the matter e carried until tomorrow morning?

MR. BOVINO: Yes, Judge. THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. DeFAZIO: No.

MR. BOVINO: The only thing I we

g

.

e.

23

12

13

14

17

19

21

there, which is a lot more comfortable than our juryroom.

(Jury leaving courtroom at 2:55 p.m.)

(The hearing recessed briefly and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, have you had any contact with your witnesses?

MR. BOVINO: Not since the last time I spoke to the Court.

At about, I guess, ten after three or so I was advised there was still no definite word as to where Mrs. Stone and the daughter was. I assume they were intransit. I haven't heard. My office hasn't received any communications back from them.

I can only say at this time, Juc. c. I am not ready to proceed.

THE COURT: Do you wish the matter .e carried until tomorrow morning?

MR. BOVINO: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. DeFAZIO: No.

MR. BOVINO: The only thing I we

like to state is that at the recess, I advised the Court in chambers with the Prosecutor that there is something brought to my attention that there is a case that originated in Florida concerning sequestration of the Jury once the death penalty portion begins.

If that's so, Judge -- I don't have the citation for that case. I am not familiar with the facts, but I would move for sequestration, if that has to be done, and ask the Court to sequester the Jury overnight.

THE COURT: Mr. Defazio?

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DeFAZIO: Well, if there's such a case, your Honor, I'm sure it's indigenous to the State of Florida.

Our statute and rules and case law doesn't indicate that there is any need for sequestration, and with this Jury I don'think it's necessary. They have followed all your instructions.

THE COURT: All right. On the application for a sequestration of the figure at this time, R. 1:8-6, entitled

han

like to state is that at the recess, I advised the Court in chambers with the Prosecutor that there is something brought to my attention that there is a case that originated in Florida concerning sequestration of the Jury once the death penalty portion begins.

If that's so, Judge -- I don't have the citation for that case. I am not familiar with the facts, but I would move for sequestration, if that has to be done, and ask the Court to sequester the Jury overnight.

THE COURT: Mr. Defazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: Well, if there's such a case, your Honor, I'm sure it's indigenous to the State of Florida.

Our statute and rules and case law doesn't indicate that there is any need for sequestration, and with this Jury I don'think it's necessary. They have followed all your instructions.

THE COURT: All right. On the application for a sequestration of the ...y at this time, R. 1:8-6, entitled

*Sequestration of Jury, * reads as follows:

A. Prior to instructing the Jury, the Jury shall not be sequestered in any action, civil or criminal, prior to the instructing of the Jury by the Court unless the Court in its discretion so orders on its finding that there are extraordinary circumstances requiring sequestration for the protection of the Jurors or the interest of justice.

B. "Following the Instructing of
Jury." Following the instructing of the
Jury by the Court and during the course of
deliberations, the Court may, in its
discretion, in both civil and criminal
actions, permit the dispersal of the Jury
for the night for meals and during other
authorized intermissions in the
deliberations.

Because of the nature of the case that has been before the Court, the Court is sensitive to the question of sequestration. However, it appears to this Court, and I so find, that the Jury has not been subject to knowledge it did not

*Sequestration of Jury, * reads as follows:

A. Prior to instructing the Jury, the Jury shall not be sequestered in any action, civil or criminal, prior to the instructing of the Jury by the Court unless the Court in its discretion so orders on its finding that there are extraordinary circumstances requiring sequestration for the protection of the Jurors or the interest of justice.

B. "Pollowing the Instructing of
Jury." Following the instructing of the
Jury by the Court and during the course of
deliberations, the Court may, in its
discretion, in both civil and criminal
actions, permit the dispersal of the Jury
for the night for meals and during other
authorized intermissions in the
deliberations.

Because of the nature of the case that has been before the Court, the Court is sensitive to the question of sequestration. However, it appears to this Court, and I so find, that the Jury has not been subject to knowledge it did not

receive in the courtroom and, therefore, the application for sequestration of the Jury be and hereby is denied.

I will excuse the Jury until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, could I ask for ten o'clock? Whatever arrangements have to be made hopefully will be accomplished by ten.

THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. DeFAZIO: No, your Monor.

THE COURT: There being no objection,
I will excuse the Jury until ten o'clock
tomorrow morning.

I would ask the Officer now to bring in all sixteen Jurors before the bench, please.

(Jury entering courtroom at 3:40 p.m.)

THE COURT: Would you just come across so we can put everybody across, if you would?

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, I will excuse you now until ten o'clock tomorrow morning, but I instruct you again

receive in the courtroom and, therefore, the application for sequestration of the Jury be and hereby is denied.

I will excuse the Jury until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, could I ask for ten o'clock? Whatever arrangements have to be made hopefully will be accomplished by ten.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. DeFAZIO: No, your Monor.

THE COURT: There being no objection, I will excuse the Jury until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

I would ask the Officer now to bring in all sixteen Jurors before the bench, please.

(Jury entering courtroom at 3:40 p.m.)

THE COURT: Would you just come across so we can put everybody across, if you would?

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, I will excuse you now until ten o'clock tomorrow morning, but I instruct you again

do not discuss this case with anyone, do not discuss this case among yourselves, and do not allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence, and I direct you do not read any newspaper articles concerning this case.

It's very important that you adhere to my instructions, and again I would ask you when you are now excused, if you would leave the courthouse directly, do not linger in the hellway.

When you come in tomorrow morning, the four Alternate Jurors, if you would be good enough to return to the room where you have been most of the day, and the twelve remaining Jurors, if you would be good enough to come right into our juryroom.

If it's uncomfortable when you arrive, I'll make other arrangements, but please come right into our juryroom here in this courtroom, please.

Have a nice evening.
(Jury leaving courtroom.)

do not discuss this case with anyone, do not discuss this case among yourselves, and do not allow anyone to discuss the case with you or in your presence, and I direct you do not read any newspaper articles concerning this case.

It's very important that you adhere to my instructions, and again I would ask you when you are now excused, if you would leave the courthouse directly, do not linger in the hallway.

When you come in tomorrow morning, the four Alternate Jurors, if you would be good enough to return to the room where you have been most of the day, and the twelve remaining Jurors, if you would be good enough to come right into our juryroom.

If it's uncomfortable when you arrive, I'll make other arrangements, but please come right into our juryroom here in this courtroom, please.

> Have a nice evening. (Jury leaving courtroom.)

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - BUDSON COUNTY AUG 20 1988 (CRIMINAL) IND. NO. 1369-85 TRANS. FILED APP. DIV. NO. STATE OF NEW JERSEY, Complainant, TRANSCRIPT REC'D PROCEED I NOWLLATE WE VOLUME X LEONARD STONE. Defendant. Budson County Court House Jersey City, New Jersey May 21, 1986 Date: BEFORE: CHARLES J. HARRINGTON, JR., JSC, and a Jury APPELLATE DIVISION DEC 8 1986 2 C APPEARANCES: EDWARD J. DeFAIIO, ESQ. 7 For the State of New Jersey FILED . SALVATORE BOVING, ESQ., for the Defendant PARST COPY OF Winifred A. Bandel, C.S.R. Hudson County Court House Jersey City, New Jersey

FIRST COPY OF

25

23 24

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 1973 - 8974 FIRST COPY OF SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - RUDSON COUNTY AUG 20 1986 (CRIMINA",) IND. NO. 1369-85 TRANS. FILED APP. DIV. NO. STATE OF NEW JERSEY, Complainant, TRANSCRIPT REC'D PROCEED I MOMELLATE UNIS VOLUME X 5 TON 28 LEONARD STONE, Defendant. Place: Budson County Court Bouse Jersey City, New Jersey Date: Nay 21, 1986 BEFORE: CHARLES J. HARRINGTON, JR., JSC, and a Jury REC'D' APPELLATE DIVISION DEC 8 1986 2- C APPEARANCES: EDWARD J. DePASIO, ESQ. 7 Clerk Por the State of New Jersey FILED . SALVATORE BOVING, ESQ., Por the Defendant NOV 28 1990 PARST COPY OF Winifred A. Bandel, C.S.R. Budson County Court House Jersey City, New Jersey

nd

INDEX Mitness Direct CEOSS LEONARD STONE: Page 16 LORMA STONE: Mr. Bovino 41 JOANNE IDA WILSON: Mr. Bovino INDEX OF SERIBITS Exid. C-8, note 92 C-9, note 94 C-10, verdict sheet 100

INDEX

Dicest

88912

LEOMARD STONE: Page 16

LORMA STONE:

Mr. Bovino 41
JOANNE IDA WILSON:

Mr. Bovino 42 -

Witness

INDEX_OF_EXHIBITS

	Exid
C-8, note	92
C-9, note	94
C-10, verdict sheet	100

(Jury entering courtroom at 10:40

(Jury leaving courtroom at 10:45

(The hearing resumed out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Before we proceed any further, I would like the defendant and his attorney to come forward, please.

Leonard Stone, the State has rested its case insofar as this part of the case is concerned and submitted to the Court and the Jury all of the evidence that was presented during the course of the trial, and they have rested in this part of the case.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Sir, there is no
obligation on your part to take the stand
in this matter on this part of the case.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE COURT: If you do take the stand, I advise you that as witnesses for the

THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do.

24

10

11

15

17

19

20

10

11 12

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

(Jury entering courtroom at 10:40)

(Jury leaving courtroom at 10:45 a.m.)

(The hearing resumed out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Before we proceed any further, I would like the defendant and his attorney to come forward, please.

Leonard Stone, the State has rested its case insofar as this part of the case is concerned and submitted to the Court and the Jury all of the evidence that was presented during the course of the trial, and they have rested in this part of the case.

Do you understand that, sir? THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do. THE COURT: Sir, there is no obligation on your part to take the stand in this matter on this part of the case. Do you understand that, sir? THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do. THE COURT: If you do take the stand,

I advise you that as witnesses for the

State were cross-examined by your attorney, if you do take the stand at this time, that you would be subject to cross-examination by the Assistant Prosecutor.

> Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

1

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

21

22

THE COURT: I advised you of your rights in the guilt portion of the trial. You were advised, and your attorney and you did confer, with regard to that there is a certified conviction of a crime as to you.

> Do you understand that, sir? THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Further, sir, do you understand that by advising you of your rights at this point, which are afforded to you under the Constitution; that is, your right to remain silent, I do not want it to be interpreted in any way as to a suggestion by me or an order by me or even a hint as to what you should or should not do.

> Do you understand that, sir? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand ::. THE COURT: I am merely explaining to

3

5

7

9

10

12

13

15

16

18

20

22

24

State were cross-examined by your attorney, if you do take the stand at this time, that you would be subject to cross-examination by the Assistant Prosecutor.

Do you understand that?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: I advised you of your rights in the guilt portion of the trial.

You were advised, and your attorney and you did confer, with regard to that there is a certified conviction of a crime as to you.

Do you understand that, sir? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Further, sir, do you understand that by advising you of your rights at this point, which are afforded to you under the Constitution; that is, your right to remain silent, I do not want it to be interpreted in any way as to a suggestion by me or an order by me or even a hint as to what you should or should not do.

Do you understand that, sit?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand :t.

THE COURT: I am merely explaining to

you your right at this juncture of the case before we proceed further.

Do you understand that, sir?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Bave you had enough time, sir, to confer with your attorney with reference to the question of whether you will testify or will not testify in this part of the case?

THE COURT: Do you understand, sir,

again, that there is no obligation on your part to take the stand in this part of the case?

13

15

17

1 9

20

testify?

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Do you understand it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. Yes.

THE COURT: Have you come to a

decision as to whether you will or will -ot

THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I will take :-e stand.

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, is there anything further that I should advise

you your right at this juncture of the case before we proceed further.

Do you understand that, sir? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Have you had enough time, sir, to confer with your attorney with reference to the question of whether you will testify or will not testify in this part of the case?

THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Do you understand, sir, again, that there is no obligation on your part to take the stand in this part of the case?

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Do you understand it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. Yes.

THE COURT: Have you come to a

decision as to whether you will or will not
testify?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I will take :-e stand.

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, is there anything further that I should advise :

client as to his rights at this time?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, initially, the fact that he has testified in the guilt proceeding, I don't believe the Judgment of Conviction is evidential at this point.

The verdict was established. I don't think -- I would ask the State to be prohibited from asking about that.

Additionally, I have had an opportunity to discuss Mr. Stone's testifying in this portion of the proceeding. He has not indicated to me what he wishes to testify to or what he wishes to state.

He just asked me if he would have the opportunity to speak freely to the Jury, whatever that may mean. I don't know. He didn't tell me what it was.

Based upon his conversations with me, I would advise Mr. Stone not to testify, and it's his decision, as your Honor has just instructed him, and if he wishes to make a statement to the Jury, I don't have any questions of him. I do not know what he wishes to testify to, and he has not

client as to his rights at this time?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, initially, the fact that he has testified in the guilt proceeding, I don't believe the Judgment of Conviction is evidential at this point.

The verdict was established. I don't think -- I would ask the State to be prohibited from asking about that.

Additionally, I have had an opportunity to discuss Mr. Stone's testifying in this portion of the proceeding. He has not indicated to me what he wishes to testify to or what he wishes to state.

He just asked me if he would have the opportunity to speak freely to the Jury, whatever that may mean. I don't know. He didn't tell me what it was.

Based upon his conversations with me,
I would advise Mr. Stone not to testify,
and it's his decision, as your Honor has
just instructed him, and if he wishes to
make a statement to the Jury, I don't have
any questions of him. I do not know what
he wishes to testify to, and he has not

told me what he wishes to testify to in this part of the proceeding. THE COURT: Mr. Stone, do you understand what your attorney said?

THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that your attorney has just indicated -- Mr.
Bovino has just indicated that his advice to you is that you not testify in this part of the case with regard to the penalty?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand that.

THE COURT: Enowing that your attorney has advised you not to testify, do you still wish to testify ---

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
THE COURT: --- in this part of the

case with regard to the penalty?

THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Is there anything else that you wish me to advise your client at

this time, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.
THE COURT: There was an application

that.

4

1

11

12

13

15

16

17

20

21

22

24

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

told me what he wishes to testify to in this part of the proceeding. THE COURT: Mr. Stone, do you understand what your attorney said? THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do. THE COURT: Do you understand that your attorney has just indicated -- Mr. Bovino has just indicated that his advice to you is that you not testify in this part 10 of the case with regard to the penalty? 11 Do you understand that? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand 13 that. 14 THE COURT: Enowing that your 15 attorney has advised you not to testify, do 16 you still wish to testify ---17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. THE COURT: --- in this part of the 19 case with regard to the penalty? 20 TRE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 21 THE COURT: Is there anything else that you wish me to advise your client at 23 this time, Mr. Bovino? 24 MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

THE COURT: There was an application

25

of

by Mr. Bovino with regard to the
certified -- no reference to the certified
conviction that was referred to, and I
don't recall offhand the number of the
exhibit.

MR. DeFAZIO: I might have it,
Judge. S-81 for identification.

THE COURT: I'll hear you, Mr.
DeFazio, on the application.

MR. DeFAZIO: If he takes the stand,
Judge, his credibility is subject to
attack. There's no exception to that.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr.

2

11

12

13

16

17

21

22

23

Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: No. Nothing on that.

THE COURT: The application to

preclude the State from -- in

cross-examination to refer to the certified

conviction S-81 is denied.

Yes, Mr. Bovino.

MR. BOVINO: I just want to check something.

THE COURT: Excuse me, Sergeant.

Court conferring with Court Officer.)

THE COURT: May we have the Jury.

by Mr. Bovino with regard to the certified -- no reference to the certified conviction that was referred to, and I don't recall offhand the number of the exhibit.

MR. DeFASIO: I might have it, Judge. S-81 for identification.

1

2

7

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: I'll hear you, Mr. Defazio, on the application.

MR. DeFAZIO: If he takes the stand, Judge, his credibility is subject to attack. There's no exception to that.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: No. Nothing on that.

THE COURT: The application to preclude the State from -- in cross-examination to refer to the certified conviction S-81 is denied.

Yes, Mr. Bovino.

MR. BOVINO: I just want to check something.

THE COURT: Excuse me, Sergeant.

Court conferring with Court Officer.)

THE COURT: Way we have the Jury.

Officer, please? All sixteen Jurors, please? Where is Mr. Bovino?

(Jury entering courtroom at 11 a.m.)
THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me, your
Honor -- your Honor ---

THE COURT: Just a minute, please.

THE DEFENDANT: My people is being harassed over here, you know. You know, they have no reason to mess my mother and my sister.

THE COURT: Sir, just a minute,

12

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

THE DEPENDANT: I want to know what's happening, why is they harrassing my mother and sister. Look, they have nothing to do with this case at all.

THE COURT: Sir, please be seated.

THE DEPENDANT: Okay?

THE COURT: Sir, please be seated, and I will hear you in a few minutes.

Please be seated, sir.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, I would ask you if you would be good enough to go with the Officer. We have found another juryroom which is much more

Officer, please? All sixteen Jurors,
please? Where is Mr. Bovino?
(Jury entering courtroom at 11 s.m.)
THE DEPENDANT: Excuse me, your
Bonor -- your Honor --THE COURT: Just a minute, please.
THE DEPENDANT: My people is being
harassed over here, you know. You know,
they have no reason to mess my mother and
my sister.
THE COURT: Sir, just a minute,
please.
THE DEPENDANT: I want to know what's

THE DEPENDANT: I want to know what's happening, why is they harrassing my mother and sister. Look, they have nothing to do with this case at all.

THE COURT: Sir, please be seated.
THE DEFENDANT: Okay?

THE COURT: Sir, please be seated, and I will hear you in a few minutes.

Please be seated, sir.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, I would ask you if you would be good enough to go with the Officer. We have found another juryroom which is much more

convenient right on this floor down at the end of the hall, Judge Grossi's juryroom.

If you would be good enough to go with the Officer, and the four Alternates, if you would be good enough to go with the Officer to the office where you have been retiring to.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.
(Jury leaving courtroom at 11:01

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Nr. Bovino, do you have any objection to your client addressing the Court at this time or do you wish to confer with him first?

MR. BOVINO: If he wishes to confer with me, Judge, I would be glad to speak to him. He hasn't indicated he wishes to speak to me at all.

THE COURT: Mr. Stone, would you like to speak to your attorney at this time?

THE DEPENDANT: I have nothing to say

to him. Nothing.

THE COURT: Do you wish to say something to the Court now?

THE DEPENDANT: Yes, sir. I would

2

11

12

13

15

16

17

19

21

22

23.

24

2

5

7

10

11

13

15

17

19

21

23

24

convenient right on this floor down at the end of the hall, Judge G.ossi's juryroom.

If you would be good enough to go with the Officer, and the four Alternates, if you would be good enough to go with the Officer to the office where you have been retiring to.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.
(Jury leaving courtroom at 11:01

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, do you have any objection to your client addressing the Court at this time or do you wish to confer with him first?

MR. BOVINO: If he wishes to confer with me, Judge, I would be glad to speak to him. He hasn't indicated he wishes to speak to me at all.

THE COURT: Mr. Stone, would you like to speak to your attorney at this time?

THE DEPENDANT: I have nothing to say to him. Nothing.

THE COURT: Do you wish to say something to the Court now?

THE DEPENDANT: Yes, sir. I would

like to know why is my people being barassed. They have no bearing with this case or nothing, but yet, you know, people just came and took them from the house and brought them over here from New York, as a matter of fact, if you want to know, and brought them over here and start barrassing them.

Why? So they can trick my people to get up there and testify on something they don't know? I would like to know why is they being harassed. Do I hear an answer? Do I hear an answer from you? Now about you?

THE COURT: Will you please be seated, sir? Anything, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVIMO: Judge, I'm ready to proceed. I don't believe Mrs. Stone or Joanne have been harassed. They appear voluntarily, and I am calling them as my witnesses.

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me. They are not here voluntarily. My mother and my sister will tell you that they care over here -- I mean, excuse me, that the people

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22 23.

25

like to know why is my people being harassed. They have no bearing with this case or nothing, but yet, you know, people just came and took them from the house and brought them over here from New York, as a matter of fact, if you want to know, and brought them over here and start harrassing them.

11

1

2

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

Why? So they can trick my people to get up there and testify on something they don't know? I would like to know why is they being harassed. Do I hear an answer? Do I hear an answer from you? Now about you?

THE COURT: Will you please be seated, sir? Anything, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I'm ready to proceed. I don't believe Mrs. Stone or Joanne have been harassed. They appear voluntarily, and I am calling them as my witnesses.

THE DEPENDANT: Excuse me. They are not here voluntarily. My mother and my sister will tell you that they care over here -- I mean, excuse me, that the people

went over to their house and brought them over here. My people live in New York. THE COURT: All right.

THE DEPENDANT: That's not voluntarily.

THE COURT: Sir, you have placed your position on the record. Mr. Bovino has indicated he's ready to proceed. Are you ready to proceed, Mr. DePasio?

THE COURT: Mr. Stone, there will be no further outbursts of that fashion when we proceed. We will proceed in an orderly fashion, and there will be no further

MR. DePASIO: Absolutely.

Do you understand what I am saying, sir?

THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do. THE COURT: May we have the Jury, please, Officers?

outbursts by you.

(Jury entering courtroom at 11:05 A.B.)

> (Defendant talking to his sister.) MR. DeFASIO: Judge ---THE COURT: No.

went over to their house and brought them 1 over here. My people live in New York. 2 THE COURT: All right. THE DEPENDANT: That's not 5 voluntarily. THE COURT: Sir, you have placed your 7 position on the record. Mr. Bovino has indicated he's ready to proceed. Are you ready to proceed, Mr. DePasio? 10 MR. DePASIO: Absolutely. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Stone, there will be 12 no further outbursts of that fashion when 13 we proceed. We will proceed in an orderly 14 fashion, and there will be no further 15 outbursts by you. 16 Do you understand what I am saying, 17 sir? 18 THE DEPENDANT: Yes, I do. 19 THE COURT: May we have the Jury, 20 please, Officers? 21 (Jury entering courtroom at 11:05 a.m.) 23 (Defendant talking to his sister.)

MR. DeFASIO: Judge ---

THE COURT: No.

24

25

12

MR. DeFASIO: Judge, sidebar.

THE COURT, Sidebar. All right. All right. Will the attorneys come to sidebar, please?

(The following occurred in the presence of, but out of the hearing of the Jury.)

TRE COURT: Let the record reflect that Mr. Defasio did wish to say something to the Court and, Mr. Bovino, you were conferring with Mr. Winograd, and I indicated that I would not hear any comment until such time that you were both available, and that's why I don't know what he wanted to say.

What is it, Mr. DePario?

MR. DeFAIIO: I think we have a very serious concern here about security.

THE COURT: Excuse me for interrupting you, Mr. DeFazio. That's why I called the Sergeant over before, that we have extra Officers in the courtroom.

MR. DefAZIO: I want somebody over there near me when I cross-examine him.
All right?

THE COURT: Sidebar. All right. All right. Will the attorneys come to sidebar, please?

(The following occurred is the presence of, but out of the hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Let the record reflect that Mr. Defazio did wish to say something to the Court and, Mr. Bovino, you were conferring with Mr. Minograd, and I indicated that I would not hear any comment until such time that you were both available, and that's why I don't know what he wanted to say.

What is it, Mr. DePazio?

MR. DefAIIO: I think we have a very serious concern here about security.

THE COURT: Excuse me for interrupting you, Mr. DeFazio. That's why I called the Sergeant over before, that we have extra Officers in the courtroom.

MR. DeFAIIO: I want somebody over there near me when I cross-examine him.
All right?

THE COURT: May I respectfully suggest that you stay back at the counsel table.

MR. DeFAIIO: Even so, even staying there, I want somebody over there on my side of the courtroom. Let me put it on the record. If this guy comes for me, I'm gonna whack him.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I don't think we have to engage in this type of dialogue. If the Prosecutor is afraid for his safety or if he is going to whack him, I would suggest he have somebody from the Prosecutor's Office sit right behind in the first row as an Investigator and be inconspicuous. I don't want anymore Court Officers in here than we have. If the security becomes a problem ---

MR. DeFAZIO: All right, Judge. Do whatever you want.

THE COURT: Excuse me. I think the record should reflect that we do have extra Officers in the courtroom. I am not going to give any instructions to them because 1

10

11

13

17

18

21

23

24

25

1

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

suggest that you stay back at the counsel table.

TRE COURT: May I respectfully

MR. DefASIO: Even so, even staying there, I want somebody over there on my side of the courtroom. Let me put it on the record. If this guy comes for me, I'm gonna whack him.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I don't think we have to engage in this type of dialogue. If the Prosecutor is afraid for his safety or if he is going to whack him, I would suggest he have somebody from the Prosecutor's Office sit right behind in the first row as an Investigator and be inconspicuous. I don't want anymore Court Officers in here than we have. If the security becomes a problem ---

MR. DefAZIO: All right, Judge. Do whatever you want.

THE COURT: Excuse me. I think the record should reflect that we do have extra-Officers in the courtroom. I am not going to give any instructions to them because !

know that the Officers will do whatever is secessary, particularly the Officer who is always assigned to this Court, who will -who always is conscientious and does whatever is necessary to protect the attorneys and everyone in the courtroom.

15

So, I think there will be a conscious effort because he was here when I requested the Sergeant to accommodate us with extra Officers.

We will proceed.

(The hearing resumed in the presence and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, before we proceed, I would like to ask the Court to take judicial notice of all the evidence that we presented in the first part of the case by the defense and move into evidence all the exhibits that were marked into evidence.

> THE COURT: Any objection? MR. DeFAZIO: No.

THE COURT: The Court and Jury wil. take judicial notice of all the evidence

3

4

5

7

.

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

20

22

23

25

know that the Officers will do whatever is mecessary, particularly the Officer who is always assigned to this Court, who will -- who always is conscientious and does whatever is necessary to protect the attorneys and everyone in the courtroom.

15

So, I think there will be a conscious effort because he was here when I requested the Sergeant to accommodate us with extra Officers.

We will proceed.

(The hearing resumed in the presence and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, before we proceed, I would like to ask the Court to take judicial notice of all the evidence that we presented in the first part of the case by the defense and move into evidence all the exhibits that were marked into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. DeFAZIO: No.

THE COURT: The Court and Jury wil. take judicial notice of all the evidence

that was presented on behalf of the defendant, and all of the exhibits that were offered and admitted into evidence by the Court in the first part of the case are admitted into evidence and made part of this proceeding also.

Mr. Bovino?

10

14

16

17

18

21

22

24

MR. BOVINO: Leonard Stone.

L E O N A R D S T O N E, 145 Warner Avenue, Jersey City, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

THE DEFENDANT: I was asked, you know, can I address the Court because, first of all, in the first part of the case and so forth, it wasn't a fair trial, okay? I'm telling you straight off the bat.

The Prosecutor said it, you know, that there was a lot, you know, that he wanted a fair, impartial trial. There was things that they spoke about, they told you about my arrest, they told you about public assistance, that, you know, more like to show you that I needed money, you know.

.

that was presented on behalf of the defendant, and all of the exhibits that were offered and admitted into evidence by the Court in the first part of the case are admitted into evidence and made part of this proceeding also.

Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: Leonard Stone.

L E O N A R D S T O N E, 145 Warner Avenue, Jersey City, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

THE DEFENDANT: I was asked, you know, can I address the Court because, first of all, in the first part of the case and so forth, it wasn't a fair trial, okay? I'm telling you straight off the bat.

The Prosecutor said it, you know, that there was a lot, you know, that he wanted a fair, impartial trial. There was things that they spoke about, they told you about my arrest, they told you about public assistance, that, you know, more like to show you that I needed money, you know.

They told you about I had two different names. My mother is right there. She'll tell you exactly the whole story about the names. Okay. The Social Security cards. I did have two numbers.

Stone -

The reason for that because like

Stone is on my birth certificate, okay?

And I use Joshus because George Joshus is
my father and I use -- he's the name that's
the name that I want, my father's name,
okay? You know, so, being that Stone was
on the birth certificate, there was no way
in the world that, you know, that they
would accept it. Okay?

You accept my identification as

Joshua, like when I came over to Jersey

City, people wouldn't accept it unless my,
you know, I had the birth certificate and
the birth certificate didn't say Joshua.

It said Stone.

You see, I'm just bringing this, you know, to your attention because there was a lot of things that they tried -- as a matter of fact, they tried, you know, they wanted -- they wanted to make you look like

,

They told you about I had two different names. My mother is right there. She'll tell you exactly the whole story about the names. Okay. The Social Security cards. I did have two numbers.

The reason for that because like

Stone is on my birth certificate, okay?

And I use Joshua because George Joshua is
my father and I use -- he's the name that's
the name that I want, my father's name,
okay? You know, so, being that Stone was
on the birth certificate, there was no way
in the world that, you know, that they
would accept it. Okay?

You accept my identification as

Joshua, like when I came over to Jersey

City, people wouldn't accept it unless my,
you know, I had the birth certificate and
the birth certificate didn't say Joshua.

It said Stone.

You see, I'm just bringing this, you know, to your attention because there was a lot of things that they tried -- as a matter of fact, they tried, you know, they wanted -- they wanted to make you look like

that -- that I'm in need of money. You know, that I needed the ax to kill Clarence McMillen.

Clarence was a very good friend of mines, okay? I'm going to tell you right off he was a very good friend of mine. He was the only white man that I respected, the only one, okay?

There was things that like -- things that the Prosecutor never said nothing about. He never told you that I was a carpenter. They never told you that, okay? They never said anything about any of my skills, okay?

That, first of all, that, you know, I deal with electricity, electricity and so forth. I deal with plumbing, okay? I deal with all kinds of stuff. I even deal auto mechanic work, okay? These are the types of things that I do, okay? They never said nothing about, you know, how good I am, okay? They just showed you certain things, you know, just to discredit me.

They never told you about the cars that I had. As a matter of fact, my lawer

11

12

13

15

17

20

1 2

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

that -- that I'm in need of money. You know, that I needed the ax to kill Clarence McMillen.

Clarence was a very good friend of mines, okay? I'm going to tell you right off he was a very good friend of mine. He was the only white man that I respected, the only one, okay?

There was things that like -- things that the Prosecutor never said nothing about. He never told you that I was a carpenter. They never told you that, okay? They never said anything about any of my skills, okay?

That, first of all, that, you know, I deal with electricity, electricity and so forth. I deal with plumbing, okay? I deal with all kinds of stuff. I even deal auto mechanic work, okay? These are the types of things that I do, okay? They never said nothing about, you know, how good I am, okay? They just showed you certain things, you know, just to discredit me.

They never told you about the cars that I had. As a matter of fact, my law; er Stone -

never told you about it, okay? Because he sold me out. That's why.

Excuse me. They spoke about my jewelry. Okay? They did. They asked me how many chains I had. I told you, I remember, the first trial, my jewelry, it was about ten pieces of necklace and a bracelet, okay?

My sister went to my house. None of my stuff was there. He never told you about the fur coats that I had or the \$6,700 that I had in my house. He never told you about the three piece tailor made suits that I wear. He never told you about that.

You know what I'm saying? They just want to discredit me and what, you know, they says that Sal Bovino is my Public Defender. That's supposed to protect me under the law. I'm just showing you it wasn't no fair trial, okay?

That's why the Prosecutor, the questions that he asked me? It's very limited, and he only dwelled on certain things, you know, as far as my arrest,

. 2

.

met .

never told you about it, okay? Because he sold me out. That's why.

jewelry. Okay? They did. They asked me how many chains I had. I told you, I remember, the first trial, my jewelry, it was about ten pieces of necklace and a bracelet, okay?

My mister went to my house. None of my stuff was there. He never told you about the fur coats that I had or the \$6,700 that I had in my house. He never told you about the three piece tailor made suits that I wear. He never told you about that.

You know what I'm saying? They just want to discredit me and what, you know, they says that Sal Bovino is my Public Defender. That's supposed to protect me under the law. I'm just showing you it wasn't no fair trial, okay?

That's why the Prosecutor, the questions that he asked me? It's very limited, and he only dwelled on certain things, you know, as far as my arrest.

Stone -

okay? As far as the two names, you know, say, oh, well, I might run down to, what you call it, down south and things, you know, using phony names and so forth. He just wanted to discredit me, and which I see he already succeeded, okay?

But nothing -- never said nothing about my -- about how good I am and the things that I had. You know, nothing was said. Nothing about it. You see that just shows you what type of lawyer that I have, okay? That I was sold out by Sal Bovino, okay? I'm making this on record. He never said nothing about them things, okay?

First of all, some of the evidence that they produced in this courtroom, the pictures? They was fixed, okay? I'm going to tell you just as it is. They was fixed, okay? They show you a picture of things all over my bed. I just got out the bed. okay? I just got out the bed. How in treworld could anything be on my bed when I just got out of it?

Only thing that was supposed to nave been on my bed was the credit cards and ...

. 2

--

okay? As far as the two names, you know, say, oh, well, I might run down to, what you call it, down south and things, you know, using phony names and so forth. He just wanted to discredit me, and which I see he already succeeded, okay?

But nothing -- never said nothing about my -- about how good I am and the things that I had. You know, nothing was said. Nothing about it. Tou see that just shows you what type of lawyer that I have, okay? That I was sold out by Sal Bovino, okay? I'm making this on record. He never said nothing about them things, okay?

Pirst of all, some of the evidence that they produced in this courtroom, the pictures? They was fixed, okay? I'm going to tell you just as it is. They was fixed, okay? They show you a picture of things all over my bed. I just got out the bec. okay? I just got out the bed. How in treworld could anything be on my bed when I just got out of it?

Only thing that was supposed to nave been on my bed was the credit cards and ...

part of the trial I found the credit cards on the steps downstairs when I took Mr.

McCarthy or whatever -- McCarthy downstairs, okay? To check the apartment, and I did put it on my bed, okay? In my apartment, okay? And that was for safekeeping, because, you know, you know, if I put it anywhere else in the house, okay? Other than my apartment, it's possible to be stolen or whatever, and which I thought that he just dropped it and so forth, rushing out to work, and I stated earlier in the, what you call it, trial.

The keys. When they produced this key ring, with the black key ring with the keys, okay? The black key ring is mines, okay? Black key ring -- well, they ain't got the graphic there, is where I told you all that I had a chest, a small chest, okay? A wooden chest in my room, okay? In my apartment. This black key ring was in there, okay?

The keys is the deceased, Clarence McMillen's. It was put on there, because

McCarthy or whatever -- McCarthy

covers, because I told you in the first

part of the trial I found the credit cards on the steps downstairs when I took Mr.

downstairs, okay? To check the apartment,

.

and I did put it on my bed, okay? In my apartment, okay? And that was for safekeeping, because, you know, you know, if I put it anywhere else in the house, okay? Other than my apartment, it's possible to be stolen or whatever, and which I thought that he just dropped it and so forth, rushing out to work, and I stated earlier in the, what you call it, trial.

The keys. When they produced this key ring, with the black key ring with the keys, okay? The black key ring is mines, okay? Black key ring -- well, they ain't got the graphic there, is where I told you all that I had a chest, a small chest, okay? A wooden chest in my room, okay? In my apartment. This black key ring was in there, okay?

The keys is the deceased, Clarence McMillen's. It was put on there, because

Stone -

there was no keys or nothing on the key -on that key ring. No key rings because I don't even use that key ring no more.

They talked about the ax. They said that I needed the ax to kill Clarence McMillen. I needed the ax. Remember, I'm gonna tell you something. I believe in pistols. I don't believe in all that stabbing stuff. They confiscated a twenty-two caliber pistol in my apartment. They sin't never said nothing about that.

They want you to believe that I needed that ax. Do you understand? And that's what they did. They wanted you to believe that, you see, but, no, I didn't need that ax. If I wanted to kill somebody, I would use the pistol, not an ax. I don't believe in all that messy stuff. That stuff scares me. I'm going to tell you straight up. It scares me.

Let me tell you about some of the witnesses. As a matter of fact, I'm start with any neighbors, okay? Do you know that the Prosecutor or the Investigator for the Public Defender scared my neighbors so bad

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

24

25

21

u

In

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

1 9 20

21

22

23

24

25

there was no keys or nothing on the key -on that key ring. No key rings because I don't even use that key ring no more.

They talked about the ax. They said that I needed the ax to kill Clarence McMillen. I needed the ax. Remember, I'm gonna tell you something. I believe in pistols. I don't believe in all that stabbing stuff. They confiscated a twenty-two caliber pistol in my apartment. They ain't never said nothing about that.

They want you to believe that I needed that ax. Do you understand? And that's what they did. They wanted you to believe that, you see, but, no, I didn't need that ax. If I wanted to kill somebody, I would use the pistol, not an ax. I don't believe in all that messy stuff. That stuff scares me. I'm going to tell you straight up. It scares me.

Let me tell you about some of the witnesses. As a matter of fact, I'm start with any neighbors, okay? Do you know that the Prosecutor or the Investigator for the Public Defender scared my neighbors so bad

they didn't really know me.

that they said that they want no part of the case? They'il come and they'll say

23

I spoke to them. I spoke to them on the phone recently, and they and that -the way they was talking was really ridiculous, you know. They said they don't even want to get involved in it.

They told you about Shearron Washington, one of the tenants that lived in the same house I did. You want to know something? Do you know somebody in the Prosecutor's Office told him to skip town? Do you want to know that? I'm going to tell you right now.

They told him to skip town because they showed you a thirteen page -- excuse me -- a thirteen page statement, but they failed -- but what they did, they failed to bring the tape, the original tape, because it was on tape, okay? His statement was on tape, but they transferred it, okay? Onto a paper, and which they put whatever they want in there, you see?

I'm gonna tell you what they did. I

2

11

16

19

20

21

23

that they said that they want no part of the case? They'il come and they'll say they didn't really know me.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I spoke to them. I spoke to them on the phone recently, and they so d that -the way they was talking was really ridiculous, you know. They said they don't even want to get involved in it.

They told you about Shearrom

Washington, one of the tenants that lived in the same house I did. You want to know something? Do you know somebody in the Prosecutor's Office told him to skip town? Do you want to know that? I'm going to tell you right now.

They told him to skip town because they showed you a thirteen page -- excuse me -- a thirteen page statement, but they failed -- but what they did, they failed to bring the tape, the original tape, because it was on tape, okay? His statement was on tape, but they transferred it, okay? Onto a paper, and which they put whatever they want in there, you see?

I'm gonna tell you what they did. I

mean, they said fair, impartial? No, it wasn't. It wasn't fair at all. I'm going to tell you straight off. It was not fair. And as far as where my Public Defender is, he sold me out.

Stone -

There was plenty of times and things that I told him certain things. It came right back to the Prosecutor because when we got in this court -- you see, you all wouldn't know about it because he shoved you all in the room, okay? So you all wouldn't know about it.

He brought up certain things. I

just -- that I would tell Bovino. He

brought up certain things, and it came

right out in this court, and I'm sitting

there, and I'm saying like wow, what

happened? What really happened? Sal

Bovino sold me out. I'm going to tell you

straight up off the bat. He sold me out.

okay?

All this, you know, sitting down, you know, being nice and being relaxed, no. : cannot. I cannot sit down there, you know, and just hold everything back, okay?

nean, they said fair, impartial? No, it
wasn't. It wasn't fair at all. I'm going
to tell you straight off. It was not fair.
And as far as where my Public Defender is,

he sold me out.

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

There was plenty of times and things that I told him certain things. It came right back to the Prosecutor because when we got in this court -- you see, you all wouldn't know about it because he shoved you all in the room, okay? So you all wouldn't know about it.

He brought up certain things. I

just -- that I would tell Bovino. He

brought up certain things, and it came

right out in this court, and I'm sitting

there, and I'm saying like wow, what

happened? What really happened? Sal

Bovino sold me out. I'm going to tell you

straight up off the bat. He sold me out,

okay?

All this, you know, sitting down, you know, being nice and being relaxed, no. : cannot. I cannot sit down there, you know, and just hold everything back, okay?

out. That's not me. I cannot do that.

1

2

11

15

16

17

18

20

21

There was something else that I wanted. I'm sure you all -- what's in your mind is why Sal Bovino sold me out. I don't know. To be honest with you, I don't know the reason, okay? But, I guess, there's some kind of little gang that they have going on through here. I don't know what it is.

I have lots of -- right in my folder
I have lots of things, clippings out the
paper, about certain type of racism and so
forth in these here courts. I got
clippings. I would be glad to show you if
you want to know.

There's -- as I said, there was
evidence and so forth, man, that as fac as
where my capability and so forth, you know,
it was never brought up. Never brought up.
Nothing about, you know, what type of
person I am. Okay? Nothing. Okay?

They didn't even tell you that I rave kids, okay? They asked -- and I was tell cross-examined -- they asked -- they sa that the reason I was going down south:

?

to

on

2

3

10

13

14

15

21

23

24

out. That's not me. I cannot do that. 1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There was something else that I wanted. I'm sure you all -- what's in your mind is why Sal Bovino sold me out. I don't know. To be honest with you, I don't know the reason, okay? But, I guess, there's some kind of little gang that they have going on through here. I don't know what it is.

I have lots of -- right in my folder I have lots of things, clippings out the paper, about certain type of racism and so forth in these here courts. I got clippings. I would be glad to show you if you want to know.

There's -- as I said, there was evidence and so forth, man, that as far as where my capability and so forth, you know, it was never brought up. Never brought up. Nothing about, you know, what type of person I am. Okay? Nothing. Okay?

They didn't even tell you that I rave kids, okay? They asked -- and I was being cross-examined -- they asked -- they sa that the reason I was going down south :

Stone -

people -- I don't know.

to work and go to school. That's true, but, see, it wasn't work as far as work for somebody else, okay? I was going down there to open up a workshop because, you see, I'm very -- as I say, I'm a carpenter. I deal with wood. I deal with wood. These

Oh, they never told you -- they never told you about the cameras. They just brought one camera in here, a Yashica. They never told you about my Minolta, okay? I'm a free lance photographer. I deal with this.

They have pictures. Within a year's time, you know, I have taken plenty of pictures. You heard Ms. James came in here yesterday. She spoke. She said that's all I been doing is taking pictures. I love pictures, you know, what I'm saying, because that's part of my work. You gotta have a special skill, you know, to take pictures, and that's another source of income that they don't want you all to see, okay?

As a matter of fact, being that I

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 2

25

Juc

1't

y

.

11

12

13 14

16

17

19 20

21

22

23

24

to work and go to school. That's true, but, see, it wasn't work as far as work for somebody else, okay? I was going down there to open up a workshop because, you see, I'm very -- as I say, I'm a carpenter. I deal with wood. I deal with wood. These people -- I don't know.

Oh, they never told you -- they never told you about the cameras. They just brought one camera in here, a Yashica. They never told you about my Minolta, okay? I'm a free lance photographer. I deal with this.

They have pictures. Within a year's time, you know, I have taken plenty of pictures. You heard Ms. James came in here yesterday. She spoke. She said that's all I been doing is taking pictures. I love pictures, you know, what I'm saying, because that's part of my work. You gotta have a special skill, you know, to take pictures, and that's another source of income that they don't want you all to see, okay?

As a matter of fact, being that I

Stone -

have four cars, I been doing a lot of

27

mechanic work, auto mechanic work, okay? In that box of evidence that they

> so-called have, it has where I had bought a starter for a van, okay? A man had paid me, you know, to do work on his van, okay? He paid me -- this is just to let you know, you know, I am getting money, because I do a lot of work, okay? Different types of work, and, you know, there's a receipt in there for a starter, a van starter, okay?

I had bought two days before I was 12 13 arrested. 14

They don't want to let you know that the day that I was arrested -- because I'm going to let you know right now, if I was on the street, okay? I would have fought my case.

The only one that was really doing an investigation, because -- that woman there, my mother, okay? She was the only one. Sal Bovino failed to do an investigation. The Public Defender's Department and the Prosecutor failed to do an investigation, okay? There was no investigation on this

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

23

have four cars, I been doing a lot of mechanic work, auto mechanic work, auto mechanic work, okay?

In that box of evidence that they so-called have, it has where I had bought a starter for a van, okay? A man had paid me, you know, to do work on his van, okay? He paid me -- this is just to let you know, you know, I am getting money, because I do a lot of work, okay? Different types of work, and, you know, there's a receipt in there for a starter, a van starter, okay? I had bought two days before I was arrested.

They don't want to let you know that the day that I was arrested -- because I'm going to let you know right now, if I was on the street, okay? I would have fought my case.

The only one that was really doing an investigation, because -- that woman there, my mother, okay? She was the only one.

Sal Bovino failed to do an investigation.

The Public Defender's Department and the Prosecutor failed to do an investigation, okay? There was no investigation on this

surder here at all. None. Okay? There was no investigation.

But as it was said, that they figured, well, you know, hey, since we got somebody, we got somebody to confiscate for the murder and which -- that's what they did, okay? They got me, and they railroaded me.

They made you all -- I'm not saying that it's your fault, okay? In your decision. What your decision was was straight up, okay? Because of what they presented to you and what they didn't present to you, okay?

As I said, there's lots of evidence in this whole thing that they don't even want you to know nothing about. You see, that's the part of this so-called legal system, you know. They don't want you to know nothing about it. Nothing about it.

They just want -- they just take him away. We got somebody to confiscate.

That's -- a conviction makes they record look good. That's right. Makes their record, if they want to run for politic,

r .

10

er

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

y ?

.

.

.

2

10

15

17

20

22

the murder and which -- that's what they did, okay? They got me, and they

railroaded me.

They made you all -- I'm not saying that it's your fault, okay? In your decision. What your decision was was straight up, okay? Because of what they presented to you and what they didn't present to you, okay?

As I said, there's lots of evidence in this whole thing that they don't even want you to know nothing about. You see, that's the part of this so-called legal system, you know. They don't want you to know nothing about it. Nothing about it.

They just want -- they just take him away. We got somebody to confiscate.

That's -- a conviction makes they record look good. That's right. Makes their record, if they want to run for politic.

Stone -

any kind of seat in the political field, they can do so because they record here.

We got the conviction. Oh, sure, why not?
They can do so, and they know this. The more conviction that they get, okay? Look good on their record. Ney, I got the votes. Of course they do. I got the money, take the taxpayers' money and so forth and use it just to play around with

You scums. That's what you are. You scums, and you know it.

I'm finished.

people lives.

MR. BOVINO: I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Anything, Mr. Defazio?

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. Defazio:

Q Mr. McMillen was the only white man you ever respected, you said?

19 A The only one because he was truthful.

Q How old are you? Twenty-five?

21 A I'm twenty-five years old.

Q You never respected any other white man except Mr. McMillen?

24 MR. BOVINO: Judge, I am going to

object. It goes beyond the scope of thir

27

?

io

t

e,

23

2 4

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

11

1

14 15

16 17

20 21

19

22

24 25

any kind of seat in the political field, they can do so because they record here. We got the conviction. Oh, sure, why not? They can do so, and they know this. The more conviction that they get, okay? Look good on their record. Hey, I got the votes. Of course they do. I got the money, take the taxpayers' money and so forth and use it just to play around with people lives. You scums. That's what you are. You scums, and you know it. I'm finished. MR. BOVINO: I have nothing further. THE COURT: Anything, Mr. DePazio?

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DeFAZIO:

Mr. McMillen was the only white man you ever respected, you said?

The only one because he was truthful.

How old are you? Twenty-five?

I'm twenty-five years old.

You never respected any other white man except Mr. McMillen?

> MR. BOVINO: Judge, I am going to object. It goes beyond the scope of this

hearing.

MR. DeFAZIO: No, it doesn't.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the

objection. The question has been asked and answered.

Stone - cross

30

You didn't get a fair trial, you say?

No, I didn't. Bow about the Jury? Did you get a

fair and impartial jury?

Oh, the Jury, yes.

The Jury is fine?

Of course. No problem, whether they black

or white. 13

14 The Jury is fine?

15

0 They made the right decision ---

17 Yes.

--- based on what they heard?

Yes, and based on what you gave them to go

20 by.

1

2

11

12

Well, you told your story to the 21

Jury, right? 22

23 Sure. Why not?

That story about stubbing your tar.

toe, right? You told them all that?

toe, right? You told them all that?

?

k

Stone - cross 31 Yes, I did. They heard your whole story? Sure. I hope. Right? They heard it, right? Sure they did. You were cross-examined by me? But you didn't cross-examine me about certain things. You only repeated the same thing that Sal Bovino repeated. 10 Well ---Wasn't that true? I wasn't complete enough in my cross-examination then; is that what you are saying? 15 Whatever you got on the table, bring it forth. 17 Well, you know ---Let's see what you got on the table. 19 You know everything that's in this file, Mr. Stone. Stone? Joshus. So, what? My baby brother 21 is right there. He use Joshua, too. 23 THE COURT: Just a minute, Mr. 24 Defazio. One at a time, please. You have seen everything that's in my

Stone - cross 31 Yes, I did. They heard your whole story? 2 Sure. I hope. Right? They heard it, right? Sure they did. You were cross-examined by me? But you didn't cross-examine me about certain things. You only repeated the same thing that Sal Bovino repeated. 10 Well ---11 Wasn't that true? I wasn't complete enough in my 12 cross-examination then; is that what you are 13 saying? 15 Whatever you got on the table, bring it forth. 16 17 Well, you know ---Let's see what you got on the table. 19 You know everything that's in this 20 file, Mr. Stone. Stone? Joshua. So, what? My baby brother 21 is right there. He use Joshua, too. 22 23 THE COURT: Just a minute, Mr. Defazio. One at a time, please. 25 You have seen everything that's in my

Stone - cross file? Not necessarily, no. I seen just about the things that's in Sal Bovino's file. Mr. Bovino in his file has absolutely everything that the State has in its file. I don't think so. I don't think so. MR. BOVINO: Judge, that may or may not be so, and I would object to this line of questioning as to what he has seen that's from the Prosecutor's file, whether what he has seen in my file is different. 12 THE COURT: I will allow the 13 question as it stands, but I don't know how 14 the witness may know everything that's in the Prosecutor's file is in the defendant's 15 file, but in any event, proceed, Mr. Defazio. You mentioned this twenty-two caliber pistol that was in your apartment ---Yes, I did. 21 --- under your mattress? 22 Yes. Now, you know, because you were here, 23 that the State tried to get that introduced into

evidence.

1 file?

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

A Not necessarily, no. I seen just about the things that's in Sel Bovino's file.

O Mr. Bovino in his file has absolutely everything that the State has in its file.

I don't think so. I don't think so.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, that may or may not be so, and I would object to this line of questioning as to what he has seen that's from the Prosecutor's file, whether what he has seen in my file is different.

THE COURT: I will allow the question as it stands, but I don't know how the witness may know everything that's in the Prosecutor's file is in the defendant's file, but in any event, proceed, Mr. Defazio.

Q You mentioned this twenty-two caliber pistel that was in your spartment ---

20 A Yes, I did.

Q --- under your mattress?

A Yes.

Q Now, you know, because you were here, that the State tried to get that introduced into evidence.

Stone - cross

33

1 MR. BOVINO: I am going to object to
2 what the State ---

THE COURT: Come to sideber, please.

A Lie.

3

.

11

13

15

16

20

21

23

Q I'm a liar?

A Tes, you are. That's why you had cut the picture in half. Now, produce that.

THE COURT: Excuse me, sir. There is no question before you.

(The following occurred in the presence of, but out of the hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: I'll hear you, Mr. Bovino.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I object to this
line of questioning. I know Mr. Stone has
given a broad, general statement in
narrative form without a direct, and I told
the Court that that was one of the reasons
why I advised him not to testify since I
didn't know what he was going to testify

While I would submit that the apparent contradiction that that gun was not brought into this case should be

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

5

-

.

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

MR. BOVINO: I am going to object to what the State ---

THE COURT: Come to sidebar, please.

0 I'm a liar?

Lie.

A Yes, you are. That's why you had cut the picture in half. Now, produce that.

THE COURT: Excuse me, sir. There is no question before you.

(The following occurred in the presence of, but out of the hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: I'll hear you, Mr. Bovino.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I object to this
line of questioning. I know Mr. Stone has
given a broad, general statement in
narrative form without a direct, and I told
the Court that that was one of the reasons
why I advised him not to testify since I
didn't know what he was going to testify
to.

While I would subsit that the apparent contradiction that that gun was not brought into this case should be

Stone - cross

cross-examined by the Prosecutor, I would stipulate that the Prosecutor attempted to offer that gun into evidence, and for legal reasons not connected with this trial, it was kept out.

Essentially, Judge, I am objecting to the line of cross-examination of the Prosecutor. This is not cross-examination to impeach his credibility. This is just an examination to show hostility, to have the defendant get baited by the Prosecutor, to prolong the examination and just to show the Jury that this guy deserves to die, but not for the aggravating factors that the State has attempted to establish.

I object to the line of cross-examination; more particularly, to this questioning of where the gun was found.

THE COURT: Mr. DePario?

MR. DePASIO: Well, do I assume now, from what Mr. Bovino said, that the Jury is going to be instructed that the State tried to introduce the gun?

THE COURT: As I understand it, you

cross-examined by the Prosecutor, I would stipulate that the Prosecutor attempted to offer that gun into evidence, and for legal reasons not connected with this trial, it

Essentially, Judge, I am objecting to the line of cross-examination of the Prosecutor. This is not cross-examination to impeach his credibility. This is just an examination to show hostility, to have

was kept out.

the defendant get baited by the Prosecutor, to prolong the examination and just to show

the Jury that this guy deserves to die, but

not for the aggravating factors that the

State has attempted to establish.

found.

I object to the line of cross-examination; more particularly, to this questioning of where the gun was

THE COURT: Mr. DePario?

MR. DePASIO: Well, do I assume now, from what Mr. Bovino said, that the Jury is going to be instructed that the State tried to introduce the gun?

THE COURT: As I understand it, yo.

Stone - cross

have indicated you will stipulate.

1

10

11

19

20

21

MR. BOVINO: I am objecting to it, Judge, being brought out in the examination. If your Honor disagrees with that, rather than go on through a prolonged hearing as to what the reasons were, I would stipulate that the State offered the gun. Because of legal reasons the Court agreed that the gun should not go in.

Whether he knows the right reasons or doesn't understand the right reasons, it's a legal reason why it shouldn't go in.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Would you agree to a stipulation? MR. DeFAZIO: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Then, I think, in the fashion it should be, it's stipulated by the attorneys that the gun in question was offered into evidence by tre State, and the Court did not admit the exhibit into evidence period.

MR. BOVINO: And was not part of the first case, and it's not part of the ceand case, and they should not speculate as any value that that gun has in either

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

24

25

have indicated you will stipulate.

1

10

11

12

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

MR. BOVINO: I am objecting to it,

Judge, being brought out in the
examination. If your Bonor disagrees with
that, rather than go on through a prolonged
hearing as to what the reasons were, I
would stipulate that the State offered the
gun. Because of legal reasons the Court
agreed that the gun should not go in.

Whether he knows the right reasons or doesn't understand the right reasons, it's a legal reason why it shouldn't go in.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this.
Would you agree to a stipulation?
MR. DeFAZIO: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Then, I
think, in the fashion it should be, it's
stipulated by the attorneys that the qun in
question was offered into evidence by tre
State, and the Court did not admit the
exhibit into evidence period.

MR. BOVINO: And was not part of the first case, and it's not part of the search case, and they should not speculate as any value that that gun has in either

Stone - cross

portion of the case.

1

2

9

10

11

12

16

17

21

MR. DeFASIO: Well, quite frankly, based on his statements that if he was going to kill somebody he'd use a pistol, I don't think that -- I don't think the Court should have -- any instructions at this point would serve any purpose.

36

THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio, wasn't that before the guilt phase, though?

MR. DeFAZIO: Judge, this is all going to credibility, please. If this man was on the stand during the trial in chief, and he had said things like he just said, there would be no doubt that I would have been allowed to cross-examine him on it.

There is no difference now that we are in this phase. It's the same rules concerning credibility, but, you know, I'm not going to belator this. I've had enough. All right?

THE COURT: All right. Do you want the stipulation?

MR. DeFAZIO: Oh, yeah.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I respectfully disagree with the Prosecutor. This is a

.

d

12

13

15

17

20

21

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ed

MR. DeFASIO: Well, quite frankly, based on his statements that if he was going to kill somebody he'd use a pistol, I don't think that -- I don't think the Court should have -- any instructions at this point would serve any purpose.

THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio, wasn't that before the guilt phase, though?

MR. DeFATIO: Judge, this is all going to credibility, please. If this man was on the stand during the trial in chief, and he had said things like he just said, there would be no doubt that I would have been allowed to cross-examine him on it.

There is no difference now that we are in this phase. It's the same rules concerning credibility, but, you know, I's not going to belabor this. I've had enough. All right?

THE COURT: All right. Do you want the stipulation?

MR. DeFAZIO: Oh, yeah.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I respectfully disagree with the Prosecutor. This is a

Stone - cross

*

separate hearing in itself, not a rebuttal of every single thing that would have been rebuttal if he testified this way at the trial.

It's a different proceeding. Be's exercising his right, I guess what they would call elocution in the ordinary sense, and the State would come back in, I don't believe, at this time to rebut every single item.

I am willing to enter into a stipulation that the gun was kept out for legal reasons and shouldn't be considered by this Jury.

I think the cross-examination alleging a credibility issue -- credibility has got nothing to do with this portion of the case. He is here to present and prove aggravating or mitigating factors.

The mitigating factors are age, no substantial record. We are bringing in guns which are not connected to the mitigating factors. We are bringing in guns, which are not connected to the aggravating factors.

10

11

15

19

24

38

separate hearing in itself, not a rebuttal of every single thing that would have been rebuttal if he testified this way at the trial.

It's a different proceeding. He's exercising his right, I guess what they would call elocution in the ordinary sense, and the State would come back in, I don't believe, at this time to rebut every single item.

I am willing to enter into a stipulation that the gun was kept out for legal reasons and shouldn't be considered by this Jury.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I think the cross-examination alleging a credibility issue -- credibility has got nothing to do with this portion of the case. He is here to present and prove aggravating or mitigating factors.

The mitigating factors are age, no substantial record. We are bringing in guns which are not connected to the mitigating factors. We are bringing in guns, which are not connected to the aggravating factors.

I think it goes beyond the scope of the hearing. I realize that it's partially caused by the defendant's testifying this way. That doesn't give the State the right to open the door and do anything they want.

THE COURT: Mr. DeFasio indicated he would not pursue the line of questioning.

MR. BOVINO: Additional lines of questioning that he may get into, I object to them too as not being relevant.

THE COURT: It's reserved unto you the right to object to any question that Mr. Defazio may ask.

Do you want me to indicate the stipulation with regard to the gun?

MR. DeFAZIO: I do.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I have no problem as long as the Jury is instructed that the gun was kept out for legal reasons and should not be dealt with them for any reason at all at this hearing.

THE COURT: At this part of the hearing.

MR. DeFAZIO: All right.

(The hearing resumed in the rpesence

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

10

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

I think it goes beyond the scope of the hearing. I realize that it's partially caused by the defendant's testifying this way. That doesn't give the State the right to open the door and do anything they want.

THE COURT: Mr. DeFasio indicated he would not pursue the line of questioning.

MR. BOVINO: Additional lines of questioning that he may get into, I object to them too as not being relevant.

THE COURT: It's reserved unto you the right to object to any question that Mr. DeFazio may ask.

Do you want me to indicate the stipulation with regard to the gun?

MR. DeFAZIO: I do.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I have no problem as long as the Jury is instructed that the gun was kept out for legal reasons and should not be dealt with them for any reason at all at this hearing.

THE COURT: At this part of the hearing.

MR. DeFAZIO: All right.
(The hearing resumed in the rpesence

Stone - cross

and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, the attorneys have stipulated that the gun that has been referred to by the witness during the course of his examination, his direct and cross-examination, that gun was offered by the State during the first part of the case, and the Court for legal reasons found that that gun would not be admitted during the course of that first part of the case.

Insofar as this part of the case is concerned, you are not to consider that insofar as making a determination insofar as penalty is concerned.

Mr. DeFazio?

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

23

Q You don't dispute, Mr. Stone, that you have this prior criminal conviction from the State of New York for possession of a dangerous weapon?

A Yes. I was arrested for it. I was arrested for possession of a pistol. I don't dispute it.

Q You don't dispute that you have ; conviction?

3.0

and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, the attorneys have stipulated that the gun that has been referred to by the witness during the course of his examination, his direct and cross-examination, that gun was offered by the State during the first part of the case, and the Court for legal reasons found that that gun would not be admitted during the course of that first part of the case.

Insofar as this part of the case is concerned, you are not to consider that insofar as making a determination insofar as penalty is concerned.

Mr. Defazio?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

Q You don't dispute, Mr. Stone, that you have this prior criminal conviction from the State of New York for possession of a dangerous weapon?

A Yes. I was arrested for it. I was arrested for possession of a pistol. I don't dispute it.

Q You don't dispute that you have a conviction?

Stone - cross I pleaded guilty to it because I did have 1 it. 3 A conviction ---Right. Please. A conviction in Brooklyn for possession of a dangerous weapon for which you were sentenced to a year. You don't dispute that? I don't dispute it, no. You don't dispute that you are twenty-five years of age? 11 That's right. What do that have to do with murder? 12 13 THE COURT: Next question, Mr. DePazio. MR. DeFAZIO: I don't have anymore questions, Judge. THE COURT: Anything further? 17 MR. BOVINO: No. THE COURT: You are excused. You may 20 step down. Watch your step. 21 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 22 (Witness excused.) 23 MR. BOVINO: Mrs. Stone, please? THE DEFENDANT: Now you're trying . > get my mother? That's how you are goir to

Stone - cross I pleaded guilty to it because I did have it. A conviction ---3 Right. Please. A conviction in Brooklyn for possession of a dangerous weapon for which you were sentenced to a year. You don't dispute that? I don't dispute it, no. You don't dispute that you are twenty-five years of age? That's right. What do that have to do with murder? 12 13 THE COURT: Next question, Mr. 14 DePazio. MR. DeFAZIO: I don't have anymore 15 16 questions, Judge. 17 THE COURT: Anything further? 18 MR. BOVINO: No. 19 THE COURT: You are excused. You may step down. Watch your step. 21 THE WITNESS: Thank you. (Witness excused.) 23 MR. BOVINO: Mrs. Stone, please? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Now you're trying .. get my mother? That's how you are goir to

L. Stone - direct 41 get me? My mother? 1 LORMA STONE, 145-4 Artin Terrace, Queens, New York, having been duly sworn, testified as DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BOVING: Mrs. Stone, are you the mother of Leonard Stone? 8 I am his mother. 10 How many children do you have? I had eleven kids, and I buried four. I 11 have seven alive. 12 13 Do any of them live at home with you now? 15 Come a little louder, please. I didn't hear you. 17 At what age did Mr. Stone, Leonard Stone's father, leave the house? Leonard was exactly two years old when his father left the house. He was in the hospital for 21 fluid on the lungs. 22 Do you understand that you are here today because this Jury has found Leonard guilty of murder?

A Yes, I understand that.

39

nd

y

.

	L. Stone - direct 41
1	get me? My mother?
2	
3	LORNA STONE, 145-4 Artin Terrace, Queens,
4	New York, having been duly sworn, testified as
5	follows:
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BOVING:
7	Q Mrs. Stone, are you the mother of
8	Leonard Stone?
9	A I am his mother.
10	O Sow many children do you have?
11	A I had eleven kids, and I buried four. I
12	have seven alive.
13	Q Do any of them live at home with you
14	now?
15	A Come a little louder, please. I didn't
16	hear you.
17	Q At what age did Mr. Stone, Leonard
18	Stone's father, leave the house?
19	A Leonard was exactly two years old when his
20	father left the house. He was in the hospital for
21	fluid on the lungs.
22	Q Do you understand that you are here
23	today because this Jury has found Leonard guilty
24	of murder?

Yes, I understand that.

	L. Stone - direct 42
1	Q You understand that this Jury will
2	decide whether or not your son should live or die?
3	A Yes, I understand.
4	Q Do you love your son?
5	A Yes, I love my son very much.
6	Q Would you ask this Jury to save your
7	son's life?
8	A Yes, I will ask them please not to kill my
9	child, because we all have problems, and I think
0	we cannot solve this problem by killing him.
11	MR. BOVINO: That's all I have.
12	THE COURT: Mr. DeFasio?
3	MR. DePASIO: Nothing.
4	THE COURT: You are excused. You may
5	step down. Watch your step, please.
6	(Witness excused.)
7	MR. BOVINO: Joanne Wilson.
8	
9	JOANNE IDA WILSON, 193-069 Ninth
0	Avenue, Bollis, Queens, New York, having been duly
1	sworn, testified as follows:
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BOVING:
3	Q How old are you?
4	A Twenty-seven years old.
5	Q How are you related to Leonard Stone?

10

t?

th

,

25 A

L. Stone - direct 42 You understand that this Jury will decide whether or not your son should live or die? Yes, I understand. Do you love your son? Yes, I love my son very much. Would you ask this Jury to save your 7 son's life? Yes, I will ask them please not to kill my child, because we all have problems, and I think we cannot solve this problem by killing him. 10 11 MR. BOVING: That's all I have. THE COURT: Mr. Defamio? 13 MR. DePASIO: Nothing. 14 THE COURT: You are excused. You may 15 step down. Watch your step, please. (Witness excused.) 17 MR. BOVINO: Joanne Wilson. 18 JOANNE IDA WILSON, 193-069 Ninth 20 Avenue, Hollis, Queens, New York, having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BOVING: 23 How old are you? Twenty-seven years old. 24

How are you related to Leonard Stone?

25

He's my brother. Did you grow up in the same house with Leonard? Yes, I did. What were your family conditions as you were growing up with Leonard? We lived in a broken home. We weren't rich, but we were healthy and, I quess, it was just comfortable. My mother kept us comfortable. 10 Since October 1, 1985, have you had occasion to visit with and speak to Leonard? 12 I visited him once. Two times I went to the jail they wouldn't let me in, but I was there. 13 I tried to be there for him. Por what reason? Because I love my brother, and I wanted to 17 be there for moral support to let him know that he 18 wasn't in this by himself, and we're there for 19 him. 20 Do you love your brother? Yes, I love my brother. 21 22 Do you want to see your brother die? No, I don't want to see my brother die. 23 24 Would you ask this Jury to have mercy

and sentence your brother to life imprisonment as

Wilson - direct

43

He's my brother. 1

> Did you grow up in the same house with Leonard?

Yes, I did.

10

11

12

14

15

21

22

What were your family conditions as you were growing up with Leonard?

We lived in a broken home. We weren't rich, but we were healthy and, I quess, it was just comfortable. My mother kept us comfortable.

Since October 1, 1985, have you had occasion to visit with and speak to Leonard? I visited him once. Two times I went to the jail they wouldn't let me in, but I was there. I tried to be there for him.

Por what reason?

16 Because I love my brother, and I wanted to 17 be there for moral support to let him know that he 18 wasn't in this by himself, and we're there for 19 him.

20 Do you love your brother?

Yes, I love my brother.

Do you want to see your brother die?

23 No, I don't want to see my brother die.

24 Would you ask this Jury to have mercy and sentence your brother to life imprisonment as

Please don't kill my brother.

opposed to death?

MR. BOVINO: That's all I have, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. DePazio?

MR. DePAZIO: Nothing.

THE COURT: You are excused. You may step down. Watch your step, please.

Wilson - direct

I don't even want to see him go to jail.

44

(Witness excused.)

MR. BOVING: Can we have a sidebar, 11

please?

THE COURT: Yes.

(The following occurred in the presence of, but out of the hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Bovino.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I am going to ask the Court to take judicial notice of 2C:49-1, which is the procedure for inflicting the death penalty, so that I could comment upon it in summation.

THE COURT: May I see the statute, please? 2C:49-1.

MR. BOVINO: And the following

9

10

12

15

16

18

19

20

21

42

opposed to death?

2

3

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

25

I don't even want to see him go to jail. Please don't kill my brother.

> MR. BOVINO: That's all I have, Judge.

> > THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio?

THE COURT: You are excused. You may

11

(The following occurred in the presence of, but out of the hearing of the

the Court to take judicial notice of 2C:49-1, which is the procedure for inflicting the death penalty, so that I could comment upon it in summation.

MR. BOVINO: And the following

sections.

10

11

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

24

THE COURT: Just one minute, please. (Pause) What is it -- the Court was aware generally of the contents, but for the record, I have read 2C:49-1, 2, 3 and 4. That's what you are referring to?

MR. BOVINO: There's more, Judge. THE COURT: There's more.

MR. BOVINO: I would ask for that whole part of the statute, I guess, up to 2C:49-10.

With that offer, Judge, I am going to rest.

Off the record. Mickey said that there was a case. I don't know. I think it's State_v_ Buller that might apply to the instruction concerning shall or may. So, I just want to get the citation on it. If he has it, I'll let you know, if I could have a couple of minutes.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect ! have read through 2C:49-1. What is it vou want to refer to? All of this?

MR. BOVINO: Well, any portions c: it that I may. I think there's some port: 's

MR. DeFAIIO: Nothing. step down. Watch your step, please. (Witness excused.) MR. BOVINO: Can we have a sidebar, please? THE COURT: Yes. Jury.) THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Bovino. MR. BOVINO: Judge, I am going to ask THE COURT: May I see the statute, please? 2C:49-1.

. .

. .

sections.

THE COURT: Just one minute, please.

(Pause) What is it -- the Court was aware generally of the contents, but for the record, I have read 2C:49-1, 2, 3 and 4.

That's what you are referring to?

MR. BOVINO: There's more, Judge.
THE COURT: There's more.

MR. BOVINO: I would ask for that whole part of the statute, I quess, up to 20:49-10.

With that offer, Judge, I am going to rest.

Off the record. Mickey said that
there was a case. I don't know. I think
it's State_v__Muller that might apply to
the instruction concerning shall or may.
So, I just want to get the citation on it.
If he has it, I'll let you know, if I could
have a couple of minutes.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect I have read through 2C:49-1. What is it you want to refer to? All of this?

MR. BOVINO: Well, any portions c: it that I may. I think there's some port: 's

of it I can refer to, in general, about capital punishment and how it's executed by needle and which, I think, would be allowable as fair inference based upon common knowledge.

There may be some things in there which may be more than common knowledge. I would like the opportunity to at least comment upon it, if I choose to comment upon it. I think the only way I can comment upon it, more intimate parts of the statute, would be if I introduced it into evidence.

THE COURT: Mr. DePario?

MR. DePAIIO: I don't think that is relevant to the Jury's function at this point. They are to determine whether specific aggravating and mitigating factors exist and to weigh them accordingly.

This would only serve to confuse the Jury. It's unduly prejudicial to the State, and I think it should be kept out pursuant to some sort of R. 4 rationale.

THE COURT: All right. I think it's best that I -- this particular section,

5

۰

8

9

11

--

13

15

16

17

19

20

22

24

of it I can refer to, in general, about capital punishment and how it's executed by needle and which, I think, would be allowable as fair inference based upon common knowledge.

46

There may be some things in there which may be more than common knowledge. I would like the opportunity to at least comment upon it, if I choose to comment upon it. I think the only way I can comment upon it, more intimate parts of the statute, would be if I introduced it into evidence.

THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio?

MR. DePAZIO: I don't think that is relevant to the Jury's function at this point. They are to determine whether specific aggravating and mitigating factors exist and to weigh them accordingly.

This would only serve to confuse the Jury. It's unduly prejudicial to the State, and I think it should be kept out pursuant to some sort of R. 4 rationale.

THE COURT: All right. I think it's best that I -- this particular section,

Chapter 49, is entitled, "Procedure for Imposing Capital Punishment." Each subtitle deals with some specific area, and I won't read the entire statute, but I will read each heading.

2C:49-1 is entitled "Definition."

Two is entitled "Intravenous

Injection."

Three is entitled "Imposition by Commissioner."

Four is entitled "Pacility."

Pive is "Judge's Duties."

10

11

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Six is entitled "Confinement and Isolation of Prisoner."

Seven is entitled "Persons Who May Be Present."

Eight is entitled "Examination of Dead Body."

Nine is "Disposition of Body."

Ten is "Suspension of Sentence of Pregnant Female."

I will allow Mr. Bovino to comment upon the fact -- the manner in which, in the event the death penalty is voted by the Jury -- the manner it will be executed --

Chapter 49, is entitled, "Procedure for Imposing Capital Punishment. * Each subtitle deals with some specific area, and I won't read the entire statute, but I will read each heading. 2C:49-1 is entitled "Definition." Two is entitled "Intravenous Injection. * Three is entitled "Imposition by Commissioner." Four is entitled "Pacility." Pive is "Judge's Duties." Six is entitled "Confinement and Isolation of Prisoner." Seven is entitled "Persons Who May Be Present. "

Dead Body. "

Pregnant Female.*

Eight is entitled "Examination of

Ten is "Suspension of Sentence of

I will allow Mr. Bovino to comment

Nine is "Disposition of Body."

upon the fact -- the manner in which, in

the event the death penalty is voted by the

Jury -- the manner it will be executed --

2

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

the manner in which the defendant will be executed with an intravenous injection.

However, insofar as -- I think I will take each section at a time. The definitions, I don't see what that has to do with this part of the case.

I will allow you to comment upon the intravenous injection. A lethal dose of whatever it may be, but not to go into, as in subparagraph two -- as to specifically the procedure designated.

Insofar as imposition by Commissioner given the authority, I will not allow you to go into. Of course, you can comment it will be done by the State of New Jersey, the Department of Corrections.

As to the facility, I will not allow you to go into.

To the Judge's duties, certainly you can go into the fact that you make the decision, but the Judge ultimately imposes the sentence because we have already told them about that.

Subsection 6, confinement, isolation of prisoner, I would not allow you to go

the manner in which the defendant will be executed with an intravenous injection.

However, insofer as -- I think I will take each section at a time. The definitions, I don't see what that has to do with this part of the case.

I will allow you to comment upon the intravenous injection. A lethal dose of whatever it may be, but not to go into, as in subparagraph two -- as to specifically the procedure designated.

Insofar as imposition by Commissioner given the authority, I will not allow you to go into. Of course, you can comment it will be done by the State of New Jersey, the Department of Corrections.

As to the facility, I will not allow you to go into.

To the Judge's duties, certainly you can go into the fact that you make the decision, but the Judge ultimately imposes the sentence because we have already told them about that.

Subsection 6, confinement, isolation of prisoner, I would not allow you to go

into that area because that's a matter of security and not a matter of this phase of the case.

In the other procedures with regard to persons who may be present and examination of the body and disposition of body, that's procedural matters directed to primarily the Commissioner and state officials, not insofar as this part of the case either, and, therefore, I will not allow you to go into that.

Of course, paragraph ten won't apply at all. It only applies to a female.

MR. BOVINO: You're saying paragraph one, 2C:49-1 ---

THE COURT: Two -- excuse me. I'm sorry.

MR. BOVINO: My offer of proof,
Judge, would be that the immediate
transportation down the death row, keeping
him in isolation, the anonymous nature of
the actual executioner, the execution being
held in a nonpublic place, attended by
certain witnesses who are anonymous, that's
my offer of proof.

into that area because that's a matter of security and not a matter of this phase of the case.

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

23

24

In the other procedures with regard to persons who may be present and examination of the body and disposition of body, that's procedural matters directed to primarily the Commissioner and state officials, not insofar as this part of the case either, and, therefore, I will not allow you to go into that.

Of course, paragraph ten won't apply at all. It only applies to a female.

MR. BOVINO: You're saying paragraph one, 2C:49-1 ---

THE COURT: Two -- excuse me. I'm sorry.

MR. BOVINO: My offer of proof,
Judge, would be that the immediate
transportation down the death row, keeping
him in isolation, the anonymous nature of
the actual executioner, the execution being
held in a nonpublic place, attended by
certain witnesses who are anonymous, that's
my offer of proof.

I think the Jury should know that just as the Judge in the normal case, when he sentences a person to prison, he has a knowledge as to what the prison facilities are like, what's available in prison facilities, whether it be, say, maximum security or minimum security, the programs that are available, and he takes all those factors into consideration in incorporating the sentence.

THE COURT: That's your proffer.

12

13

14

MR. BOVINO: I think that catch-all phrase any other reason would allow the Jury to be aware of the fact as to how and all the circumstances concerning -- surrounding the death penalty.

THE COURT: Any objection to that proffer?

MR. DeFAIIO: I object to everything, Judge. My objection on the record stands. In fact, I am going to need time on this because I want to see what authority there is to allow all this.

THE COURT: What we will do is rather than go any further, if you wish an

I think the Jury should know that
just as the Judge in the mormal case, when
he sentences a person to prison, he has a
knowledge as to what the prison facilities
are like, what's available in prison
facilities, whether it be, say, maximum
security or minimum security, the programs
that are available, and he takes all those
factors into consideration in incorporating
the sentence.

THE COURT: That's your proffer.

MR. BOVINO: I think that catch-all phrase any other reason would allow the Jury to be aware of the fact as to how and all the circumstances concerning -- surrounding the death penalty.

THE COURT: Any objection to that proffer?

MR. DeFAIIO: I object to everything, Judge. My objection on the record stands. In fact, I am going to need time on this because I want to see what authority there is to allow all this.

THE COURT: What we will do is rather than go any further, if you wish an

opportunity to see if you have any authority ---

MR. DeFAZIO: I sould like to know if Mr. Bovino has any authority that allows this to come in.

MR. BOVINO: The only authority I have, Judge -- I seem to recall a case where there was a person who testified he was on death row and was a witness to an execution. He was allowed to testify as to how the execution takes place and ---

THE COURT: A New Jersey case?

MR. BOVINO: I'm not sure if it's a

Jersey case. I think it's a Supreme Court

case.

THE COURT: We will take a recess, and we'll let the Jury retire to the juryroom.

MR. BOVINO: It can't be a New Jersey case. There's no New Jersey executions.

So, it would have to be Supreme Court.

THE COURT: Unless it was prior to.

(The hearing resumed in the presence and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen c:

21

10

11

14

17

18

19

22

2

25

21

22

23

24

25

opportunity to see if you have any authority ---

MR. DeFAZIO: I would like to know if Mr. Bovino has any authority that allows this to come in.

MR. BOVINO: The only authority I have, Judge -- I seem to recall a case where there was a person who testified he was on death row and was a witness to an execution. He was allowed to testify as to how the execution takes place and ---

THE COURT: A New Jersey case?

MR. BOVINO: I'm not sure if it's a

Jersey case. I think it's a Supreme Court

case.

THE COURT: We will take a recess, and we'll let the Jury retire to the juryroom.

MR. BOVINO: It can't be a New Jersey case. There's no New Jersey executions.

So, it would have to be Supreme Court.

THE COURT: Unless it was prior to.

(The hearing resumed in the presence and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen c:

the Jury, we'll take a recess at this time.

I'd ask the four Alternates to retire

1

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to the room where you have been retiring to, and the twelve other Jurors please go with the Officers to the juryroom right down the hall, just at the end of this hall.

(Jury leaving courtroom at 11:50

(The hearing recessed for lunch and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

With the consent of Counsel, we broke for lunch from twelve noon to 1 p.m., and ordered lunch for the Jurors. Unfortunately, the Jurors only received their lunch about twenty minutes ago.

So, therefore, we'll proceed now with any legal arguments, and then very shortly we'll have the Jurors come back into the courtroom to receive the summations.

Insofar as the question that is before the Court at sidebar by Mr. Bovino, that he wished to refer to the provisions 2 3 4

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

24

the Jury, we'll take a recess at this time.

I'd ask the four Alternates to retire to the room where you have been retiring to, and the twelve other Jurors please go with the Officers to the juryroom right down the hall, just at the end of this hall.

(Jury leaving courtroom at 11:50

(The hearing recessed for lunch and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

With the consent of Counsel, we broke for lunch from twelve noon to 1 p.m., and ordered lunch for the Jurors. Unfortunately, the Jurors only received their lunch about twenty minutes ago.

So, therefore, we'll proceed now with any legal arguments, and then very shortly we'll have the Jurors come back into the courtroom to receive the summations.

Insofar as the question that is before the Court at sidebar by Mr. Bovino, that he wished to refer to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 2C:49-1 through 10, first, I have before me now my statute book, and I think some of the titles are a little bit different than might have been shown on the copy that Mr. Bovino showed us.

I don't have it before me now, but I think that -- such as, I believe, the Subdivision 5. I think on mine it says "Judge's Duties." The statute I am referring to is "Warrant of Execution Date" and 2C:49-10 indicates for a female, and the title is a little bit different.

"Pregnant Person, Inquisition, Suspension of Execution or Warrant."

In any event, insofar as that statute is concerned, I want to make it clear my ruling was that the attorney for the defendant could comment in summation as to the means with which the death penalty would be carried out by the proper authorities, meaning the use of an intravenous administration of a legal quantity of whatever is prescribed by law, and the fact that the Jury would decide whether the death penalty would or would

24

21

22

1

11

12

15

16

17

12

13

14

17

18

23

1

re

.

th

of N.J.S.A. 2C:49-1 through 10, first, I have before me now my statute book, and I think some of the titles are a little bit different than might have been shown on the copy that Mr. Bovino showed us.

I don't have it before me now, but I think that -- such as, I believe, the Subdivision 5. I think on mine it says "Judge's Duties." The statute I am referring to is "Warrant of Execution Date" and 2C:49-10 indicates for a female, and the title is a little bit different.
"Pregnant Person, Inquisition, Suspension of Execution or Warrant."

In any event, insofar as that statute is concerned, I want to make it clear my ruling was that the attorney for the defendant could comment in summation as to the means with which the death penalty would be carried out by the proper authorities, meaning the use of an intravenous administration of a legal quantity of whatever is prescribed by law, and the fact that the Jury would decide whether the death penalty would or would

not be imposed, but the Court would, in fact, be issuing the warrant.

1 .

2

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Other than that, I want to make it clear my ruling is that Mr. Bowino cannot comment upon the provisions of the statute to which Mr. Bowino referred and I referred, regardless of the proffer that Mr. Bowino gave after I made my ruling.

Is there anything further? MR. BOVINO: No. Judge.

MR. DeFASIO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. I think we should give the Jurors just a few more minutes to finish their lunch.

I'd ask you if you would be good enough to remain in the immediate vicinity of the courtroom so we can proceed promptly, and then we'll proceed with the summations.

(The hearing recessed briefly and then resumed.)

(Jury entering courtroom at 1:37 p.m.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladier and gentlemen. Poll the Jury, please.

not be imposed, but the Court would, in fact, be issuing the warrant.

Other than that, I want to make it clear my ruling is that Mr. Bovino cannot comment upon the provisions of the statute to which Mr. Bovino referred and I referred, regardless of the proffer that Mr. Bovino gave after I made my ruling.

Is there anything further? MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

MR. DeFASIO: No, your Monor.

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. I think we should give the Jurors just a few more minutes to finish their lunch.

I'd ask you if you would be good enough to remain in the immediate vicinity of the courtroom so we can proceed promptly, and then we'll proceed with the summations.

(The hearing recessed briefly and then resumed.)

(Jury entering courtroom at 1:37 p.m.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladier and gentlemen. Poll the Jury, please.

(Jury polled; all are present.)

MR. BOVINO: The defense rests,

Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino?

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

MR. BOVINO: May it please the Court, Mr. Prosecutor, Madam Forelady, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We're at the end of the road here, so to speak. Twelve Jurors will now deliberate and decide the life and death of Leonard Stone. As I said yesterday and as the Prosecutor said yesterday, we both fear the result. I perhaps more than the State because Leonard Stone's life is in my hands.

I stand between him and the executioner. I stand between him and life imprisonment with not one chance of parole until he serves thirty years.

2016, 2016 would be the first time he would be considered for parole, and the parole board can say no, you will stay in prison. He is twenty-five years old.

Thirty years from now he is fifty five.

Some of you have seen that. Some of you

(Jury polled; all are present.)

MR. BOVINO: The defense rests,
Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Bowine?

MR. BOVINO: May it please the Court, Mr. Prosecutor, Madam Forelady, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We're at the end of the road here, so to speak. Twelve Jurors will now deliberate and decide the life and death of Leonard Stone. As I said yesterday and as the Prosecutor said yesterday, we both fear the result. I perhaps more than the State because Leonard Stone's life is in my hands.

I stand between him and the executioner. I stand between him and life imprisonment with not one chance of parole until he serves thirty years.

2016, 2016 would be the first time he would be considered for parole, and the parole board can say no, you will stay in prison. He is twenty-five years old.

Thirty years from now he is fifty five.

Some of you have seen that. Some of you

will see that. You know what those twenty-five or thirty years from twenty-five to fifty five means. It is, in fact, your life.

1

11

12

13

16

17

21

22

So, we now know that Leonard Stone probably will die in jail, whether it be through the act of God, the unknown day, the unknown time when God will say, Leonard Stone, you are coming home to pay for your sin, to pay for the crime that the jury said you committed or some day earlier. If you Jurors say earlier, he will pay for the murder sooner, and he will be wheeled into a room and needles will be placed in his arm to be put to death, and I ask you this is enough death.

I regret -- I'm sorry that Mr.
McMillen died, and I equally regret Leonard
Stone facing the death penalty. I regret
having to ask you to save his life.

I treasure life. I think we all co. We all want the good things in life. We all want something finer in life.

When you decide this case now, this part of the case, you as judges have the

will see that. You know what those twenty-five or thirty years from twenty-five to fifty five means. It is, in fact, your life.

probably will die in jail, whether it be through the act of God, the unknown day, the unknown time when God will say, Leonard Stone, you are coming home to pay for your sin, to pay for the crime that the jury said you committed or some day earlier. If you Jurors say earlier, he will pay for the murder sooner, and he will be wheeled into a room and needles will be placed in his arm to be put to death, and I ask you this is enough death.

I regret -- I'm sorry that Mr.
McMillen died, and I equally regret Leonard
Stone facing the death penalty. I regret
having to ask you to save his life.

I treasure life. I think we all co. We all want the good things in life. We all want something finer in life.

When you decide this case now, this part of the case, you as judges have tre

right to consider compassion, mercy, sympathy, justice, fairness, and you must decide not the fact that Mr. McMillen died. That is beyond our decision at this point. You must decide whether or not the State has proved aggravating factors as to Mr. Stone.

The State's thesis in the beginning was this was a robbery and a murder committed during that robbery, and you Jurors have rendered a verdict of not guilty on that theory. You rejected that theory, but you found Mr. Stone guilty of murder and robbery, and the State now says that he committed this murder to avoid detection on the robbery. You will decide that.

Is that so? Do you believe? Are you satisfied? Do you know what happened in that room? You said a murder took place in that room, but do you know the circumstances? Are you sure? Are you convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the only reason for this murder was the robbery, then the attempt to escape or

1 right to consider compassion, mercy, sympathy, justice, fairness, and you must 2 decide not the fact that Mr. McMillen died. That is beyond our decision at this point. You must decide whether or not the State has proved aggravating factors as to Mr. Stone.

> The State's thesis in the beginning was this was a robbery and a murder committed during that robbery, and you Jurors have rendered a verdict of not guilty on that theory. You rejected that theory, but you found Mr. Stone guilty of murder and robbery, and the State now says that he committed this murder to avoid detection on the robbery. You will decide that.

Is that so? Do you believe? Are you satisfied? Do you know what happened in that room? You said a murder took place in that room, but do you know the circumstances? Are you sure? Are you convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the only reason for this murder was the robbery, then the attempt to escape or

avoid detection?

Judge Harrington will tell you -- or the other thesis submitted to you on Monday was that you knew something more about this case. There was more to this case and relationships change, and that you had to read between lines, and there was an attack or a fury, a rage, whatever it was that the Prosecutor said, words to that effect.

If that's what you found yesterday in your verdict, then I submit to you that the aggravating factor that the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, before you even consider -- before you even consider whether he should live or die, if you find or if you found that this death was caused by a fury or rage, and I submit to you that your verdict really is one where the person did not have time to deliberate and he was blinded, he was in such a rage where it happened and it happens simultaneously, two, three or four, five, six blows in a matter of seconds, the State says that tris is a wantonly vile torture.

Any evidence of what torture is? 1

1 .

11 12

13

16 17

18

20 21

22 23

24

3

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

avoid detection?

Judge Harrington will tell you -- or the other thesis submitted to you on Monday was that you knew something more about this case. There was more to this case and relationships change, and that you had to read between lines, and there was an attack or a fury, a rage, whatever it was that the Prosecutor said, words to that effect.

If that's what you found yesterday in your verdict, then I submit to you that the aggravating factor that the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, before you even consider — before you even consider whether he should live or die, if you find or if you found that this death was caused by a fury or rage, and I submit to you that your verdict really is one where the person did not have time to deliberate and he was blinded, he was in such a rage where it happened and it happens simultaneously, two, three or four, five, six blows in a matter of seconds, the State says that this is a wantonly vile torture.

Any evidence of what torture is? 1

don't know what torture is. You have to decide as judges. There may be twelve definitions of torture. Maybe Judge Barrington will tell you what torture is. I don't know.

I submit to you, as Dr. Natarajan said, there were five wounds, undisputed, six wounds, counting the one to the neck, but any one of those five wounds could have rendered Nr. McMillen unconscious.

Torture. He would have aspirated in time, over a -- whatever period of time that might be.

You can't accept -- I say to you that you can't accept that this was an act of torture where Mr. Stone hit Mr. McMillen, tortured him by hitting him again a second time after some prolonged period of time.

I would say it -- submit to you rest
the rage that the Prosecutor spoke about
yesterday, if that's what you found, would
mean that the blows were administrated
quickly and death over a period of time,
short period of time, whatever period of
time Dr. Natarajan said it would be,

1

11

12

15

16

17

18

20

don't know what torture is. You have to decide as judges. There may be twelve definitions of torture. Maybe Judge Harrington will tell you what torture is. I don't know.

I submit to you, as Dr. Natarajan said, there were five wounds, undisputed, six wounds, counting the one to the neck, but any one of those five wounds could have rendered Mr. McMillen unconscious.

Torture. He would have aspirated in time, over a -- whatever period of time that might be.

You can't accept -- I say to you that you can't accept that this was an act of torture where Mr. Stone hit Mr. McMillen, tortured him by hitting him again a second time after some prolonged period of time.

I would say it -- submit to you that the rage that the Prosecutor spoke about yesterday, if that's what you found, would mean that the blows were administrated quickly and death over a period of time, short period of time, whatever period of time Dr. Natarajan said it would be,

swift, unconscious, was swift and immediate.

After you determine -- if you determine that those aggravating factors exist, Judge Harrington will tell you that you must then balance -- somehow you must balance, how you weigh, what you weigh, what value you give to them.

Are they pounds or ounces or points or whatever. I don't know how you are going to do that, but you must weigh each aggravating factor against the mitigating factors.

10

12

13

14

15

17

24

25

Mitigating factor being Mr. Stone's young age, twenty-five years of age, with no prior substantial criminal record.

We've heard about it ad nauseam, that he was convicted of a gun in 1982, and he pleaded guilty because he was guilty, and that doesn't mean that he deserves death now because he was in possession of a gun in 1982.

You can consider anything else that you feel is important to go to his background or his character or any reason

inne

4

7

9

10

12

14

15

16

18

19

21

23

swift, unconscious, was swift and insediate.

After you determine -- if you determine that those aggravating factors exist, Judge Harrington will tell you that you must then balance -- somehow you must balance, how you weigh, what you weigh, what value you give to them.

Are they pounds or ounces or points or whatever. I don't know how you are going to do that, but you must weigh each aggravating factor against the mitigating factors.

Mitigating factor being Mr. Stone's young age, twenty-five years of age, with no prior substantial criminal record.

We've heard about it ad nauseam, that he was convicted of a gun in 1982, and he pleaded guilty because he was guilty, and that doesn't mean that he deserves death now because he was in possession of a gun in 1982.

You can consider anything else that you feel is important to go to his background or his character or any reason

why he should live, any reason.

1

2

13

You may consider the testimony of Georgia James. Georgia James is a friend that Mr. Stone has developed over the past year or so, two years, and I wish I could bring in a priest to ask for mercy, a schoolteacher to ask for mercy, but we don't live in that type of world. We bring in the person who knows him and has some understanding of him.

She says he is a good person. He's not a bad person. He may have problems which may be addressed. We don't know what those problems are, but she was satisfied that when Leonard Stone introduced himself to her children down at the school yard lifting weights, whatever it was, he was a good person.

What happened? I don't know. I's not here to attack what happened. I am only here to ask you for his life, and Mrs. James was satisfied that he was a good influence on her children, on her middle son who was fourteen years of age, and would talk to him, take him out bowling,

why he should live, any reason.

You may consider the testimony of Georgia James. Georgia James is a friend that Mr. Stone has developed over the past year or so, two years, and I wish I could bring in a priest to ask for mercy, a schoolteacher to ask for mercy, but we don't live in that type of world. Me bring in the person who knows him and has some understanding of him.

She says he is a good person. He's not a bad person. He may have problems which may be addressed. We don't know what those problems are, but she was satisfied that when Leonard Stone introduced himself to her children down at the school yard lifting weights, whatever it was, he was a good person.

What happened? I don't know. I'm
not here to attack what happened. I am
only here to ask you for him life, and #rs.
James was satisfied that he was a good
influence on her children, on her middle
son who was fourteen years of age, and
would talk to him, take him out bowling,

don't get involved in drugs or whatever, and she adopted him into her family.

Leonard Stone. Mr. Stone has told us something about himself. You could accept it or reject it. We don't know everything about his background in this short period of time that you can decide he's a good or bad person, he deserves to die because he's a bad person, because of something that may have happened in his life. We know he is a person.

We have his mother who comes into court. One of the saddest facts of life is to bury a child, to see your son at any age, your daughter at any age, to be buried by a parent. It's one of the worst feelings in the world. Mrs. Stone says she has lost four children, and she now may have to plan to bury a fifth.

She doesn't want her son to die. She loves her son. She will support her son for whatever period of time you extend his life by, whether it be thirty years, and if she lives thirty years, she will support

don't get involved in drugs or whatever,

and she adopted him into her family.

Ne don't know everything about
Leonard Stone. Mr. Stone has told us
something about himself. You could accept
it or reject it. We don't know everything
about his background in this short period
of time that you can decide he's a good or
bad person, he deserves to die because he's
a bad person, because of something that may
have happened in his life. We know he is a
person.

We have his mother who comes into court. One of the saddest facts of life is to bury a child, to see your son at any age, your daughter at any age, to be buried by a parent. It's one of the worst feelings in the world. Mrs. Stone says she has lost four children, and she now may have to plan to bury a fifth.

She doesn't want her son to die. She loves her son. She will support her son for whatever period of time you extend his life by, whether it be thirty years, and if she lives thirty years, she will support

him for thirty years, but she asks you to not let her bury that child. Don't let her make plans for the death of this child.

There is no question she loves him. She wants you to save his life. She doesn't want you to kill him. I don't think she is sitting up on that chair crying because she wants to put you on or go over on you. She's there on that chair because she loves him. Whatever he is, whatever he did, she loves him, and she asks you to not surrender that mercy, that compassion, that sympathy, that any person who comes before this bench, before that Judge, or you judges, would want to show.

We don't want revenge. We don't want vengeance. We want -- I want your mercy.

I want your compassion. I went you to save his life. Being in prison for life without eligibility for thirty years is a long.

long time.

Prison is not a piece of cake. It's no bed of roses. Perhaps death is merciful. Perhaps I could say that I know

4

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

24

There is no question she loves him. She wants you to save his life. She doesn't want you to kill him. I don't think she is

him for thirty years, but she asks you to

make plans for the death of this child.

not let her bury that child. Don't let her

sitting up on that chair crying because she wants to put you on or go over on you.

She's there on that chair because she loves

him. Whatever he is, whatever he did, she loves him, and she asks you to not

surrender that mercy, that compassion, that

sympathy, that any person who comes before this bench, before that Judge, or you

judges, would want to show.

We don't want revenge. We don't want vengeance. We want -- I want your mercy. I want your compassion. I want you to save his life. Being in prison for life without eligibility for thirty years is a long, long time.

Prison is not a piece of cake. It's no bed of roses. Perhaps death is merciful. Perhaps I could say that I know I'm going to die, I don't have to live behind these walls of concrete and bars, but life at any cost is better than no life at all. I'd rather face life knowing I am getting up tomorrow morning or hoping I am getting up tomorrow morning than I am going to sleep tonight and never get up. I don't know what waits for me when I don't get up.

We will prolong life at any cost. We prolong Leonard Store's life even if you were to decide the death penalty. You will prolong his life. The State will prolong his life so they can take their judgment. They will not let Mr. Stone die prior to the day that is fixed by the judgment, if your judgment is death.

11

12

17

21

22

If he decides to go on a hunger strike, if he decides to hang up and exictly suicide, they will stop him so that recan die when they say, when the State says you will die, Leonard Stone. You will not die a day before you are planned to cie. You will wait for death.

It's not a pleasant task, I thire, that you are going to have to face, ar:

__

--

I'm going to die, I don't have to live behind these walls of concrete and bars, but life at any cost is better than no life at all. I'd rather face life knowing I am getting up tomorrow morning or hoping I am getting up tomorrow morning than I am going to sleep tonight and never get up. I don't know what waits for me when I don't get up.

We will prolong life at any cost. We prolong Leonard Stone's life even if you were to decide the death penalty. Tou will prolong his life. The State will prolong his life so they can take their judgment. They will not let Mr. Stone die prior to the day that is fixed by the judgment, if your judgment is death.

If he decides to go on a hunger strike, if he decides to hang up and exit by suicide, they will stop him so that recan die when they say, when the State says you will die, Leonard Stone. You will not die a day before you are planned to cie. You will wait for death.

It's not a pleasant task, I thire, that you are going to have to face, ar:

think you Jurors realized when you went into vote the first day on Monday that it doesn't come easy. Perhaps you were split as to your decision initially. Perhaps one or two of you changed your mind, and that's because Judge Harrington told you that you must as Jurors deliberate, and reconcile to render a verdict, a unanimous verdict, but now that's different.

One of you, just one of you, one of you has a voice to not go along with the eleven, to not say death. Any one of you who has the conscious conviction to stick to your position and say I am not satisfied that the State should take this person's life will halt the process.

That is your verdict. If your verdict is eleven to one or eleven and three-quarters to a quarter or eleven and nine-tenths to one-tenth, that one-tenth of your conscious, that one-tenth of your heart that says I want to give Leonard Stone, Mrs. Stone, something to live for, I am not satisfied, I am not confident, perhaps there is a mistake, if there is a

nq

p.

We

doesn't come easy. Perhaps you were split
as to your decision initially. Perhaps one
or two of you changed your mind, and that's
because Judge Harrington told you that you
must as Jurors deliberate, and reconcile to
render a verdict, a unanimous verdict, but
now that's different.

One of you, just one of you, one of

think you Jurors realized when you went

into vote the first day on Monday that it

One of you, just one of you, one of you has a voice to not go along with the eleven, to not say death. Any one of you who has the conscious conviction to stick to your position and say I am not satisfied that the State should take this person's life will halt the process.

That is your verdict. If your verdict is eleven to one or eleven and three-quarters to a quarter or eleven and nine-tenths to one-tenth, that one-tenth of your conscious, that one-tenth of your heart that says I want to give Leonard Stone, Mrs. Stone, something to live for, I am not satisfied, I am not confident, perhaps there is a mistake, if there is a

mistake we can fix the verdict, if there was a mistake, but once the mistake is carried through and death is the final act, there is no reclamation, there is no rehabilitation of the death.

So, any one of you, any single one of you twelve that deliberate, you merely have to say I am not satisfied, Mr. State. I will not sentence this man to death. I will not deliver him to the executioner to be put to sleep and then the needles to be injected and killed. One of you can just stand back, stand up for your opinion, and your verdict is less than unanimous, and Leonard Stone lives to serve a prison sentence of life.

During this case this morning, you heard Mr. Stone -- Mr. Stone gets on the stand, and he makes accusations. He's an angry person. As I said to you yesterday, it's difficult to come back, and I have been defeated. I have been. I have lost to the State, and that is a loss, but I, as an advocate, I as an adversary, am not personally involved in it, but Mr. Stores.

,

mistake we can fix the verdict, if there
was a mistake, but once the mistake is
carried through and death is the final act,
there is no reclamation, there is no
rehabilitation of the death.

So, any one of you, any single one of you twelve that deliberate, you merely have to say I am not satisfied, Mr. State. I will not sentence this man to death. I will not deliver him to the executioner to be put to sleep and then the needles to be injected and killed. One of you can just stand back, stand up for your opinion, and your verdict is less than unanimous, and Leonard Stone lives to serve a prison sentence of life.

During this case this morning, you heard Mr. Stone -- Mr. Stone gets on the stand, and he makes accusations. He's an angry person. As I said to you yesterday, it's difficult to come back, and I have been defeated. I have been. I have lost to the State, and that is a loss, but I, as an advocate, I as an adversary, am not personally involved in it, but Mr. Stores.

a party. He is a loser. There is a winner, and there is a loser.

He has lost, and he is not happy, because he says in his heart -- he knows he is innocent, and he's saying if I was in a better position, I could have had a different laywer, and he may be right. I may not be the best lawyer. I may not have done what he said I should have done, but I am not on trial. Mr. Stone is on trial.

He gets on that stand and perhaps he's angry, perhaps you may interpret his position to be not sympathetic or whatever. You expected him to react differently. He should react differently.

How would you react? How do you react when you are rightfully wronged? If you feel you are innocent, if you feel somebody has wrongfully accused you and you are being condemned for that, how do you react? Do you sit back and take it? Do you say, fine, I'll just go along or do you come back and say you are making a mistake?

I will accept your verdict. You people did what you had to do on the

2 3

8

10 11

12

13

15

16

17

18

21 22

23

24

a party. He is a loser. There is a winner, and there is a loser.

He has lost, and he is not happy, because he says in his heart -- he knows he is innocent, and he's saying if I was in a better position, I could have had a different laywer, and he may be right. I may not be the best lawyer. I may not have done what he said I should have done, but I am not on trial. Mr. Stone is on trial.

He gets on that stand and perhaps he's angry, perhaps you may interpret his position to be not sympathetic or whatever. You expected him to react differently. He should react differently.

How would you react? How do you react when you are rightfully wronged? If you feel you are innocent, if you feel somebody has wrongfully accused you and you are being condemned for that, how do you react? Do you sit back and take it? Do you say, fine, I'll just go along or do you come back and say you are making a mistake?

I will accept your verdict. You people did what you had to do on the

verdict, but he says I was not given a fair trial. He may be right. He may say in his mind, and he may feel in his heart, I have been wronged because of the State, because of my lawyer, because of my lawyer-investigator, whatever it is.

I'm not going to be here to -- I'm not here to seek your comfort or solace. I am here to represent him as best I can. I hope I did what was right for him. If I didn't, it will be reviewed by somebody else, not by me.

I forgive him. He's desperate. He's depressed. He lashes out at me. I'll take it. I'll take his blame. I'll take his heat. I forgive him. I'm not mad at him. I will go on tomorrow. I will go home. If the good Lord provides, I will see my family, but Mr. Stone will never be put in a position to get out of prison at least for thirty years and perhaps longer. So, he can't react the way you want him to react.

How would you react? You can't tell how you would react because you have never

24 25

23

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

verdict, but he says I was not given a fair trial. He may be right. He may say in his mind, and he may feel in his heart, I have been wronged because of the State, because of my lawyer, because of my lawyer-investigator, whatever it is.

I'm not going to be here to -- I'm not here to seek your comfort or solace. I am here to represent him as best I can. I hope I did what was right for him. If I didn't, it will be reviewed by somebody else, not by me.

I forgive him. He's desperate. He's depressed. He lashes out at me. I'll take it. I'll take his blame. I'll take his heat. I forgive him. I'm not mad at him. I will go on tomorrow. I will go home. If the good Lord provides, I will see my family, but Mr. Stone will never be put in a position to get out of prison at least for thirty years and perhaps longer. So, he can't react the way you want him to react.

How would you react? You can't tell how you would react because you have never

there. If you haven't walked in the person's shoes, don't say how you would react. It's difficult.

I ask you that the mitigating factors are such here that there is something good in Leonard Stone. He's not an evil person. He's not a bad person. He doesn't deserve to die.

Is death the only alternative? Life imprisonment is an alternative, and I think that's a reasonable alternative, and I ask you to spare his life regardless of how you feel about him.

As judges, you have the discretion, you have the right to say whatever you wish to say. Stand up for that right and enforce that right. Save Leonard Stone. Save him for our sake, for the sake of society. Don't condemn him. Don't put him to death. Save him so that Mrs. Stone and to death. Save him so that Mrs. Stone and the balance of their lives well have a son and a brother to talk to, retain his life because there's something good perhaps that can be saved and should the saved and saved and

12

17

21

22

23

2

3

5

7

9

10

12

13

15

17

18

19

21

23

24

person's shoes, don't say how you would react. It's difficult.

I ask you that the mitigating factors

been in his shoes. You haven't walked

I ask you that the mitigating factors are such here that there is something good in Leonard Stone. He's not an evil person. He's not a bad person. He doesn't deserve to die.

Is death the only alternative? Life imprisonment is an alternative, and I think that's a reasonable alternative, and I ask you to spare his life regardless of how you feel about him.

As judges, you have the discretion, you have the right to say whatever you wish to say. Stand up for that right and enforce that right. Save Leonard Stone. Save him for our sake, for the sake of society. Don't condemn him. Don't put nim to death. Save him so that Mrs. Stone and to death. Save him so that Mrs. Stone and Joanne for the balance of their lives with have a son and a brother to talk to, find his life because there's something good.

saved.

I would ask you to find that the mitigating factors exist, and Leonard Stone should not be put to death.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Defazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: Your Honor, Judge Harrington, Mr. Bovino, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury:

We reach this stage in this

proceeding not due to anything that the

State has done, but due to what the

defendant in this case did on October 1,

1985, and we're at this stage because he

was convicted by you of murder, purposeful
and knowing murder by his own hand, by his

own conduct, convicted of robbery by you,
and he's convicted of the weapons'

offenses. That's what brings us here now.

I have been an Assistant Prosecutor for seven years, and I'm a lucky man, because I love my job. Sometimes it's difficult to avoid letting personalities become involved in what you have to do.

Yesterday an attorney asked me -- he

I would ask you to find that the mitigating factors exist, and Leonard Stone should not be put to death.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Defazio? MR. DefAZIO: Your Honor, Judge Harrington, Mr. Bovino, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury:

We reach this stage in this proceeding not due to anything that the State has done, but due to what the defendant in this case did on October 1, 1985, and we're at this stage because he was convicted by you of murder, purposeful and knowing nurder by his own hand, by his own conduct, convicted of robbery by you, and he's convicted of the weapons' offenses. That's what brings us here now.

I have been an Assistant Prosecutor for seven years, and I'm a lucky man, because I love my job. Sometimes it's difficult to avoid letting personalities become involved in what you have to do.

Yesterday an attorney asked me -- he

said what do you think? What do you think? What's the Jury gonna do? I said I don't know personally. Personally, I don't know. Legally, I said, I know what they have to do, because, you see, ladies and gentlemen, what we are talking about here is this.

The Legislature in this State, the law in this State, is that if you are convicted of surder under certain circumstances, there are two choices -life with thirty years without parole and death. Those are the choices.

Your decision is not is thirty years in jail enough. That's not your decision, because it's easy to say. It's easy for anybody to think, including the State, when you hear that thirty years, that that's enough.

You see, what you have to do now is follow the law, and the law says that you have to determine whether there are aggravating factors, and if you determine that these aggravating factors exist, you have to weigh them against the mitigatir: factors. That's the law.

1

10

11

12

13

15

16

19

20

21

23

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

said what do you think? What do you think? What's the Jury gonna do? I said I don't know personally. Personally, I don't know. Legally, I said, I know what they have to do, because, you see, ladies and gentlemen, what we are talking about here is this.

The Legislature in this State, the law in this State, is that if you are convicted of murder under certain circumstances, there are two choices -- life with thirty years without parole and death. Those are the choices.

Your decision is not is thirty years in jail enough. That's not your decision, because it's easy to say. It's easy for anybody to think, including the State, when you hear that thirty years, that that's enough.

You see, what you have to do now is follow the law, and the law says that you have to determine whether there are aggravating factors, and if you determine that these aggravating factors exist, you have to weigh them against the mitigation; factors. That's the law.

That's your task, and it's not easy, and it doesn't involve, and it shouldn't involve, and it's going to be so difficult to prevent personal feelings from getting involved. Very difficult. Very difficult.

I thought about what I was going to say to you yesterday, and I've changed my mind. I was going to read from the autopsy report of Dr. Natarajan. I'm not going to do it. You heard what she had to say. You heard what happened to Mr. McMillen on October 1, 1985, and it was savage, and it was brutal, and it's not pretty, and it's not neat.

You think, ladies and gentlemen, just think, take your time when the time comes -- you think about somebody taking that ax and actually thrusting it into somebody's face, not once, not twice, five times, face, skull being crushed by that hatchet.

You determine whether that evidence is some sort of depravity of mind. You have to decide that. You will see the pictures. You heard the testimony, and you

k?

11

12

13

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

25

23 24

That's your task, and it's not easy, and it doesn't involve, and it shouldn't involve, and it's going to be so difficult to prevent personal feelings from getting involved. Very difficult. Very difficult.

I thought about what I was going to say to you yesterday, and I've changed my mind. I was going to read from the autopsy report of Dr. Natarajan. I'm not going to do it. You heard what she had to say. You heard what happened to Mr. McMillen on October 1, 1985, and it was savage, and it was brutal, and it's not pretty, and it's not neat.

You think, ladies and gentlemen, just think, take your time when the time comes -- you think about somebody taking that ax and actually thrusting it into somebody's face, not once, not twice, five times, face, skull being crushed by that hatchet.

You determine whether that evidence is some sort of depravity of mind. You have to decide that. You will see the pictures. You heard the testimony, and you

decide whether that is an aggravated battery or an aggravated assault upon the person of Mr. McMillen as he lay in his bed.

1

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

No defensive wounds. You determine the nature of that attack, the ferocity of that attack with the choke mark on the neck, the handle holding him down.

I don't know whether that happened first or last or whenever, but whenever it happened, it exhibits that the man who did this is capable of extraordinary savagery and brutality, and it evidences a depraved mind.

The State, most respectfully submits, that you must find that that aggravating factor should be in existence based on the evidence, based on what you heard and the objects you are going to view. I am not going to wave the ax around. You've seen it. That's enough said about that.

The second aggravating factor alleged is that the murder was committed to avoid detection or apprehension on another offense.

decide whether that is an aggravated battery or an aggravated assault upon the person of Mr. McMillen as he lay in his bed.

No defensive wounds. You determine the nature of that attack, the ferocity of that attack with the choke mark on the neck, the handle holding him down.

I don't know whether that happened first or last or whenever, but whenever it happened, it exhibits that the man who did this is capable of extraordinary savagery and brutality, and it evidences a deprayed mind.

The State, most respectfully submits, that you must find that that aggravating factor should be in existence based on the evidence, based on what you heard and the objects you are going to view. I am not going to wave the ax around. You've seen it. That's enough said about that.

The second aggravating factor alleged is that the murder was committed to avoid detection or apprehension on another offense.

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not presume, the State does not presume, to know and could never know what you people thought when you deliberated. We don't know. Mr. Bovino doesn't know. I do know this. You found Mr. Stone guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of robbery, and that robbery occurred on October 1, 1985.

If you commit an offense like that upon somebody you know and the relationship between these men is undisputed, it follows that one of the reasons why you would have to kill him would be to cover it up.

All you have to do, ladies and gentlemen, is find that one of the reasons for this was to avoid detection. It doesn't have to be the only reason. That is not the law. Mr. Bovino misspoke when he said that.

what I misspoke about the law. The Court will give the law, not me and not the Prosecutor.

THE COURT: Come to sidebar.

MR. DeFAZIO: Judge ---

9

11

13

16

15

19

21 22 23

24

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not presume, the State does not presume, to know and could never know what you people thought when you deliberated. We don't know. Mr. Bovino doesn't know. I do know this. You found Mr. Stone guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of robbery, and that robbery occurred on October 1, 1985.

74

2

11

12

13

17

18

21

22

23

If you commit an offense like that upon somebody you know and the relationship between these men is undisputed, it follows that one of the reasons why you would have to kill him would be to cover it up.

All you have to do, ladies and gentlemen, is find that one of the reasons for this was to avoid detection. It doesn't have to be the only reason. That is not the law. Mr. Bovino misspoke when he said that.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, objection as to what I misspoke about the law. The Court will give the law, not me and not the Prosecutor.

THE COURT: Come to sidebar.

MR. DefAZIO: Judge ---

THE COURT: Do you wish to continue?

MR. DeFASIO: I'll continue.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, can we have a

sidebar?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(The following occurred in the presence of, but out of the hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, if I misspoke about the law, I don't want the Prosecutor to give his version of the law. I assume the same charge -- summation I gave the other day, I said I don't give the law. The Court gives the law. I don't want the Prosecutor to correct me as to what the law is. I object that I misspoke the law.

MR. DeFAIIO: I don't know why we had to come over to sidebar for that, Judge. I was prepared to continue.

MR. BOVINO: I didn't know what you were going to say.

MR. DefAZIO: Mr. Bovino opened it. He was the one who started giving them the law.

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you wish to continue? MR. DefATIO: I'll continue. MR. BOVINO: Judge, can we have a sidebar? THE COURT: Yes, you may. (The following occurred in the presence of, but out of the hearing of the Jury.) THE COURT: Mr. Bovino?

1

2

10

11

12

15

16

17

20

21

22

24

MR. BOVINO: Judge, if I misspoke about the law, I don't want the Prosecutor to give his version of the law. I assume the same charge -- summation I gave the other day, I said I don't give the law. The Court gives the law. I don't want the Prosecutor to correct me as to what the law is. I object that I misspoke the law.

MR. DefAZIO: I don't know why we had to come over to sidebar for that, Judge. I was prepared to continue.

MR. BOVINO: I didn't know what you were going to say.

MR. DefAZIO: Mr. Bovino opened it. He was the one who started giving them the

THE COURT: All right. Just a minute. What is it, Mr. Bovino? MR. BOVINO: If I opened up something, that doesn't mean that you retaliate by doing something which is equally wrong as what you allege I did. If I did open it up, and I don't say I opened up anything, the Court will give the law.

That was my objection. I didn't know what the Prosecutor was going to say, and I can't rely on him saying anything else, that he was going to go on now. Maybe he was going to give a curative instruction at that point as to something else I did wrong. I wanted to be heard at sidebar.

THE COURT: Mr. Defazio, you may proceed, please.

(The hearing resumed in the presence and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Proceed, Mr. DePazio.

MP. DeFAZIO: The State submits that the aggravating factors alleged in this case, unfortunately for the defendant, ro exist.

The mitigating factors? Do you

2

10

11

15

16

17

19

20

21

25

20 21 22

19

23 24 25

THE COURT: All right. Just a minute. What is it, Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: If I opened up something, that doesn't mean that you retaliate by doing something which is equally wrong as what you allege I did. If I did open it up, and I don't say I opened up anything, the Court will give the law.

That was my objection. I didn't know what the Prosecutor was going to say, and I can't rely on him saying anything else, that he was going to go on now. Maybe he was going to give a curative instruction at that point as to something else I did wrong. I wanted to be heard at sidebar.

THE COURT: Mr. Defazio, you may proceed, please.

(The hearing resumed in the presence and hearing of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Proceed, Mr. DePazio.

MP. DeFAZIO: The State submits that the aggravating factors alleged in this case, unfortunately for the defendant, co exist.

The mitigating factors? Do you

ladies and gentlemen believe that the fact that this defendant is twenty-five years old is a mitigating factor? This is no kid we are dealing with here. This is a man. This is a man who knows what's going on. This is a man who knows about life. This is no child.

Can any of you truly say the fact that he is twenty-five years old is a mitigating factor? By twenty-five years old, don't we know better? Basn't the time come that you accept responsibility for your actions? The State submits that that is not a mitigating factor in this case.

It also turns out the defendant does have a criminal conviction from the State of New York for a felony for which he was sentenced to jail. He's been through the system. He's not a first offender. He knows what it's all about. He knows.

what can I say about his family? I can't say anything. They love him, like a mother will always love her son no matter what he does. His sister, she loves him, too. I believe that they were sincere and

ladies and gentlemen believe that the fact that this defendant is twenty-five years old is a mitigating factor? This is no kid we are dealing with here. This is a man. This is a man who knows what's going on. This is a man who knows about life. This is no child.

Can any of you truly say the fact that he is twenty-five years old is a mitigating factor? By twenty-five years old, don't we know better? Masn't the time come that you accept responsibility for your actions? The State submits that that is not a mitigating factor in this case.

It also turns out the defendant does have a criminal conviction from the State of New York for a felony for which he was sentenced to jail. He's been through the system. He's not a first offender. He knows what it's all about. He knows.

What can I say about his family? I can't say anything. They love him, like a mother will always love her son no matter what he does. His sister, she loves him, too. I believe that they were sincere and

honest people.

That's what I mean by personalities.

What can we logically expect from his
family? Of course they don't want to see
him die. Of course not, but we have to
supersede that. We have to come over that.

We have to follow the law and try to remain
fair and impartial.

We heard from Mr. Stone again. You saw him. The State submits that this was not the first time that he was angry. He's been angry before. It wasn't only to do with this conviction that was properly and justly brought by each of you. There's a lot more to the anger in that man.

I'm no doctor. I'm no psychologist.

I don't think any of you are either, but
there was a lot more to that than being
depressed about his conviction for murder.

The same as all of you cannot let
personalities, not let your personal
feelings interfere, neither can I despite
things that were said.

You people will have to make the decision, and it is, and will be, the most

2

11

12

13

14

16

17

20

21

22

honest people.

That's what I mean by personalities.

What can we logically expect from his
family? Of course they don't want to see
him die. Of course not, but we have to
supersede that. We have to come over that.

We have to follow the law and try to remain
fair and impartial.

78

1

2

10

12

13

17

19

22

We heard from Mr. Stone again. You saw him. The State submits that this was not the first time that he was angry. He's been angry before. It wasn't only to do with this conviction that was properly and justly brought by each of you. There's a lot more to the anger in that man.

I'm no doctor. I'm no psychologist.

I don't think any of you are either, but
there was a lot more to that than being
depressed about his conviction for murder.

The same as all of you cannot let
personalities, not let your personal
feelings interfere, neither can I despite
things that were said.

You people will have to make the decision, and it is, and will be, the most

difficult decision you will have to make because the State has proved that aggravat ag factors exist, and there really aren't -- really there are not any of the mit gating factors.

If you follow the law, there is no choice. You will be doing what is required, what is just and what is right for the State and for the victim, a 61-year-old victim who suffered.

If you do that and you follow the law, there will be no other decision than Mr. Stone having to be executed according to law by the State of New Jersey.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, you must now decide what penalty is to be imposed on the defendant Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard, to: his conviction of murder.

As I have explained to you earlier, you must decide whether the defendant is to be sentenced to death or sentenced by the color a term of years between thirty years at iffe imprisonment of which thirty year

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

20

21

22

difficult decision you will have to make because the State has proved that aggravating factors exist, and there really aren't -- really there are not any of the mitigating factors.

If you follow the law, there is no choice. You will be doing what is required, what is just and what is right for the State and for the victim, a 61-year-old victim who suffered.

If you do that and you follow the law, there will be no other decision than Mr. Stone having to be executed according to law by the State of New Jersey.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, you must now decide what penalty is to be imposed on the defendant Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard, to: his conviction of murder.

As I have explained to you earlier.

you must decide whether the defendant into be sentenced to death or sentenced by the coaterm of years between thirty years at life imprisonment of which thirty year.

must be served before the defendant is eligible for parole.

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Your decision is based upon your consideration of what are called aggravating and mitigating factors.

As a general proposition, aggravating factors are those which would tend toward imposing the death penalty, and mitigating factors are those which would tend towards the sentence of between thirty years and life of which thirty years must be served before the defendant is eligible for parole.

The factors have to be both with the circumstances of the crime and the personal traits, qualities and background of the defendant. The ultimate burden rests upon the State to convince you that the death penalty is fitting and appropriate punishment in this case.

The State alleges the following aggravating factors as enumerated by the Legislature exist in this case:

Firstly, that the murder was outrageously or wantonly vile, horrible or

10

11

15

16

17

20

21

24

must be served before the defendant is 1 eligible for parole.

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your decision is based upon your consideration of what are called aggravating and mitigating factors.

As a general proposition, aggravating factors are those which would tend toward imposing the death penalty, and mitigating factors are those which would tend towards the sentence of between thirty years and life of which thirty years must be served before the defendant is eligible for parole.

The factors have to be both with the circumstances of the crime and the personal traits, qualities and background of the defendant. The ultimate burden rests upon the State to convince you that the death penalty is fitting and appropriate punishment in this case.

The State alleges the following aggravating factors as enumerated by the Legislature exist in this case:

Firstly, that the murder was outrageously or wantonly vile, horrible or

inhuman in that it involved torture, depravity of mind or an aggravated battery to the victim, and, secondly, that the murder was committed for the purpose of escaping detection, apprehension, trial, punishment, or confinement for another offense committed by the defendant or another.

After listening to and then considering the proofs concerning these aggravating factors, you may not find that either exists unless you are satisfied that it does beyond a reasonable doubt.

Insofar as the first aggravating factor which I have just mentioned, although murder may be viewed as vile, horrible or inhuman, this does not mean that there is an automatic aggravating factor in the case of murder.

What is necessary is that the State prove that the attack by the defendant, Leonard Stone, on the victim Clarence McMillen, involved either torture or conducting -- strike that -- or conduct indicating a depraved mind or that the

1

2

10

11

12

13

16

17

20

22

to the victim, and, secondly, that the

After listening to and then

11

12 13

1

2

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

inhuman in that it involved torture, depravity of mind or am aggravated battery murder was committed for the purpose of escaping detection, apprehension, trial, punishment, or confinement for another offense committed by the defendant or another.

considering the proofs concerning these aggravating factors, you may not find that either exists unless you are satisfied that it does beyond a reasonable doubt.

Insofar as the first aggravating factor which I have just mentioned, although murder may be viewed as vile, horrible or inhuman, this does not mean that there is an automatic aggravating factor in the case of murder.

What is necessary is that the State prove that the attack by the defendant, Leonard Stone, on the victim Clarence McMillen, involved either torture or conducting -- strike that -- or conduct indicating a depraved mind or that the

attack was so savagely brutal or outrageously cruel and violent that the adjectives wantonly vile or horrible or inhuman are justified. You must be satisfied that such conduct was present beyond a reasonable doubt.

As I explained to you in the prior phase of the case, a reasonable doubt is a doubt based on reason. It is not a doubt based on guesswork or speculation. It is not a possible or imaginary doubt. Everything relating to human affairs is open to some possible or imaginary doubt.

Insofar as proof in a criminal case is concerned, the law does not require absolute certainty. It does require proof beyond a reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is an honest and reasonable uncertainty as to the existence of an aggravating factor which you have after you have given full and impartial consideration to all the evidence bearing on that factor.

A reasonable doubt may arise from something contained in the evidence or it may arise from a lack of evidence. It is a

attack was so savagely brutal or outrageously cruel and violent that the adjectives wantonly vile or horrible or inhuman are justified. You must be satisfied that such conduct was present beyond a reasonable doubt.

1 .

As I explained to you in the prior phase of the case, a reasonable doubt is a doubt based on reason. It is not a doubt based on quesswork or speculation. It is not a possible or imaginary doubt.

Everything relating to human affairs is open to some possible or imaginary doubt.

Insofar as proof in a criminal case is concerned, the law does not require absolute certainty. It does require proof beyond a reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is an honest and reasonable uncertainty as to the existence of an aggravating factor which you have after you have given full and impartial consideration to all the evidence bearing on that factor.

A reasonable doubt may arise from something contained in the evidence or it may arise from a lack of evidence. It is a

doubt which a reasonable, thinking person has after a careful weighing of all of the evidence.

Therefore, if, after giving full and impartial consideration to all the evidence bearing on a particular aggravating factor, you have a reasonable doubt as to its existence, you should check no on the verdict form provided by the Court. If you are satisfied that such aggravating factor exists and are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt, you may check yes in the appropriate box or line.

The defense has advanced the following mitigating factors in accordance with the listing of them in the criminal code:

Firstly, at the time of the incident the defendant was twenty-five years of age; secondly, the defendant has no significant history of prior criminal activity; thirdly, any other factor which may be relevant to the defendant's character or record or to the circumstances of the offense.

.

doubt which a reasonable, thinking person has after a careful weighing of all of the evidence.

Therefore, if, after giving full and impartial consideration to all the evidence bearing on a particular aggravating factor, you have a reasonable doubt as to its existence, you should check no on the verdict form provided by the Court. If you are satisfied that such aggravating factor exists and are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt, you may check yes in the appropriate box or line.

The defense has advanced the following mitigating factors in accordance with the listing of them in the criminal code:

Firstly, at the time of the incident the defendant was twenty-five years of age; secondly, the defendant has no significant history of prior criminal activity; thirdly, any other factor which may be relevant to the defendant's character or record or to the circumstances of the offense.

As to mitigating factors, as distinguished from aggravating factors, they do not have to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. So long as you are satisfied from all of the believable and acceptable evidence that a mitigating factor exists, you should check yes alongside it on the verdict sheet. If you are not satisfied that it does exist, check no.

If you find that the State has not proved either aggravating factor beyond a reasonable doubt, check the verdict sheet accordingly, knock on the courtroom door and through your Foreperson announce trose facts as your verdict in open court. In that event, the sentence will be a term of years between thirty years and life imprisonment of which thirty years must be served before the defendant is eligible for parole.

If you find that the State has croud at least one aggravating factor beyond treasonable doubt, but are not satisfied to the existence of any mitigating factor.

11

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

10 11

12

13

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

As to mitigating factors, as distinguished from aggravating factors, they do not have to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. So long as you are satisfied from all of the believable and acceptable evidence that a mitigating factor exists, you should check yes alongside it on the verdict sheet. If you are not satisfied that it does exist, check no.

If you find that the State has not proved either aggravating factor beyond a reasonable doubt, check the verdict sheet accordingly, knock on the courtroom door and through your Foreperson announce those facts as your verdict in open court. In that event, the sentence will be a term of years between thirty years and life imprisonment of which thirty years must te served before the defendant is eligible tor parole.

If you find that the State has creed at least one aggravating factor beyond . reasonable doubt, but are not satisf: + to the existence of any mitigating factor. check the verdict sheet accordingly and through your Poreperson announce those facts as your verdict. In that event, the sentence will be death.

If you find that at least one aggravating factor has been proved and at least one mitigating factor exists, then you must weigh the value represented by the mitigating factor or factors against the value represented by each aggravating factor proved and check on the verdict sheet where, in your judgment, each aggravating factor is or is not outweighed by the mitigating factor or factors found to exist.

If you find the aggravating factors outweigh beyond a reasonable doubt all the mitigating factors, the sentence will be death. If the mitigating factors are not weighed -- strike that -- if the mitigating factors are not outweighed beyond a reasonable doubt or you cannot reach a unanimous verdict, the sentence will be a term of years between thirty years and life imprisonment of which thirty years must be

.

check the verdict sheet accordingly and through your Poreperson announce those facts as your verdict. In that event, the sentence will be death.

If you find that at least one aggravating factor has been proved and at least one mitigating factor exists, then you must weigh the value represented by the mitigating factor or factors against the value represented by each aggravating factor proved and check on the verdict sheet where, in your judgment, each aggravating factor is or is not outweighed by the mitigating factor or factors found to exist.

If you find the aggravating factors outweigh beyond a reasonable doubt all the mitigating factors, the sentence will be death. If the mitigating factors are not weighed -- strike that -- if the mitigating factors are not outweighed beyond a reasonable doubt or you cannot reach a unanimous verdict, the sentence will be a term of years between thirty years and life imprisonment of which thirty years must te

served before the defendant is eligible for parole.

This weighing process is not mechanical or numerical. If, for example, you find one aggravating factor and three mitigating factors, that does not justify an automatic answer to the weighing process required. The answer does depend on your careful and considered judgment as to whether the mitigating factor or factors as you evaluate them favor the defendant to the extent that they outweigh the gravity of the aggravating factor or factors.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have prepared a verdict sheet, and I'd like to go over it with you now, and I would ask the Officer if you would be good enough to give each Juror -- each of the sixteen Jurors a copy and give this original to the Madam Forelady and a copy to each of the Jurors, please.

Ladies and gentlemen, if I may, : would like to read down the verdict sheet with you.

First entitled "Aggravating Facto: . "

..

served before the defendant is eligible for parole.

This weighing process is not mechanical or numerical. If, for example, you find one aggravating factor and three mitigating factors, that does not justify an automatic answer to the weighing process required. The answer does depend on your careful and considered judgment as to whether the mitigating factor or factors as you evaluate them favor the defendant to the extent that they outweigh the gravity of the aggravating factor or factors.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have prepared a verdict sheet, and I'd like to go over it with you now, and I would ask the Officer if you would be good enough to give each Juror -- each of the sixteen Jurors a copy and give this original to the Madam Forelady and a copy to each of the Jurors, please.

Ladies and gentlemen, if I may, : would like to read down the verdict sheet with you.

First entitled "Aggravating Factu: ,"

page 1.

Do you unanimously find beyond a reasonable doubt that any of the following aggravating factors exist? Check the appropriate answer.

1. The murder was outrageously or wantonly vile, horrible or inhuman in that it involved torture, depravity of mind or an aggravated battery to the victim.

Yes or no.

2. The murder was committed for the purpose of escaping detection, apprehension, trial, punishment or confinement for another offense committed by the defendent or another.

Yes or no.

If all of the above are checked no, proceed no further, but return this veroict sheet to the Court as your verdict in the case, signed by your Foreperson. The penalty imposed by the Court will be life imprisonment with no parole eligibility for thirty years.

If any of the above answers or eltner of the above answers are yes, then answer

2 3 4

7

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

20

10

55

8 8

page 1.

Do you unanimously find beyond a reasonable doubt that any of the following aggravating factors exist? Check the appropriate answer.

 The murder was outrageously or wantonly vile, horrible or inhuman in that it involved torture, depravity of mind or an aggravated battery to the victim.

Yes or no.

2. The murder was committed for the purpose of escaping detection, apprehension, trial, punishment or confinement for another offense committed by the defendent or another.

Yes or no.

If all of the above are checked no, proceed no further, but return this verdict sheet to the Court as your verdict in the case, signed by your foreperson. The penalty imposed by the Court will be life imprisonment with no parole eligibility for thirty years.

If any of the above answers or either of the above answers are yes, then answer

the following.

1

2

11

12

16

17

18

21

22

Please go to page 2 entitled, "Mitigating Factors."

Do you find that any of the following exists as mitigating factors? Check the appropriate answer.

 At the time of the incident the defendant was twenty-five years of age.

Yes or no.

 The defendant has no significant history of prior criminal activity.

Yes or no.

 Any other factor which may be relevant to the defendant's character or record or to the circumstances of the offense.

Yes or no.

If you have checked at least one aggravating factor yes and have checked all the above mitigating factors no, proceed no further, but return this verdict sheet to the Court as your verdict in this case, signed by the Foreperson. The penalty imposed by the Court will then be death.

Now go to page 3, please.

4

6

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

18

19

21

23

24

Do you find that any of the following

the following.

exists as mitigating factors? Check the appropriate answer.

Please go to page 2 entitled,

 At the time of the incident the defendant was twenty-five years of age.

Yes or no.

"Mitigating Factors."

 The defendant has no significant history of prior criminal activity.
 Yes or no.

 Any other factor which may be relevant to the defendant's character or record or to the circumstances of the offense.

Yes or no.

If you have checked at least one aggravating factor yes and have checked all the above mitigating factors no, proceed no further, but return this verdict sheet to the Court as your verdict in this case, signed by the Foreperson. The penalty imposed by the Court will then be death.

Now go to page 3, please.

If you have checked one or more aggravating factors yes and one or more mitigating factors yes, then state as to each aggravating factor checked yes whether it outweighs any one or more mitigating factors checked yes beyond a reasonable doubt. This decision must also be unanimous. If no aggravating factors outweigh beyond a reasonable doubt any one or more of the mitigating factors, the penalty imposed by the Court will be life imprisonment with no parole eligibility for thirty years.

1. Does aggravating Factor No. -and if you do find an aggravating factor to
be proved beyond a reasonable doubt then
insert, if you would, the appropriate
number -- outweigh any one or more of the
mitigating factors?

Yes or no.

1 .

2

3

11

12

15

17

19

20

21

22

25

Number two reads in the same manner, depending upon what your finding may te :s to aggravating factors.

Additionally, if you have check. . . . or more aggravating factors yes and cor .

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

21

23

6

9

10

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

If you have checked one or more aggravating factors yes, then state as to each aggravating factor checked yes whether it outweighs any one or more mitigating factors checked yes beyond a reasonable doubt. This decision must also be unanimous. If no aggravating factors outweigh beyond a reasonable doubt any one or more of the mitigating factors, the penalty imposed by the Court will be life imprisonment with no parole eligibility for thirty years.

and if you do find an aggravating factor to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt then insert, if you would, the appropriate number -- outweigh any one or more of the mitigating factors?

Yes or no.

Number two reads in the same manner, depending upon what your finding may te :s to aggravating factors.

more mitigating factors yes, then also complete the following:

Yes or no.

Do you unanimously find beyond a reasonable doubt that all the aggravating factors outweigh all the mitigating factors? Check the appropriate answer.

If you have checked yes, the penalty imposed by the Court will be death. If you have checked no, the penalty imposed by the Court will be life imprisonment with no parole eligibility for thirty years.

Ladies and gentlemen, your verdict must be unanimous; that is, all twelve Jurors deliberating must agree to each answer checked in the verdict sheet.

I would ask now if the Officer would be good enough to collect all of the verdict sheets except for the Madam Forelady who has the original.

Do the attorneys wish to be heard at sidebar?

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

MR. DeFAZIO: No.

THE COURT: Will you sweet the

3

5

.

8

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

more mitigating factors yes, then also complete the following:

Do you unanimously find beyond a reasonable doubt that all the aggravating factors outweigh all the mitigating factors? Check the appropriate answer.

Yes or no.

If you have checked yes, the penalty imposed by the Court will be death. If you have checked no, the penalty imposed by the Court will be life imprisonment with ne parole eligibility for thirty years.

Ladies and gentlemen, your verdict must be unanimous; that is, all twelve Jurors deliberating must agree to each answer checked in the verdict sheet.

I would ask now if the Officer would be good enough to collect all of the verdict sheets except for the Madam Forelady who has the original.

Do the attorneys wish to be heard at sidebar?

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

MR. DeFAZIO: No.

THE COURT: Will you swear the

Officers, please?

(Officers sworn.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, you will have with you the verdict sheet and also all the evidence that has been admitted as part of this case that was previously admitted during the first part of the case, both admitted on behalf of the State and the defendant, and they will be available as previously, a pad and pencil if you need it during the course of your deliberations.

I'd ask that the four Alternate
Jurors retire to the room with the Officer
where you have been for the past day or so,
and the remaining twelve Jurors who
deliberated on the first part of the case
retire to the juryroom, Judge Grossi's
juryroom, right down the hall, and to
commence your deliberations as to the
penalty aspect of this case.

Please retire to the juryroom.

(Jury leaving courtroom at 2:30 p.r.)

(The hearing recessed and then resumed out of the presence of the Jury.

24

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

23

Officers, please?

(Officers sworn.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, you will have with you the verdict sheet and also all the evidence that has been admitted as part of this case that was previously admitted during the first part of the case, both admitted on behalf of the State and the defendant, and they will be available as previously, a pad and pencil if you need it during the course of your deliberations.

I'd ask that the four Alternate
Jurors retire to the room with the Officer
where you have been for the past day or so,
and the remaining twelve Jurors who
deliberated on the first part of the case
retire to the juryroom, Judge Grossi's
juryroom, right down the hall, and to
commence your deliberations as to the
penalty aspect of this case.

Please retire to the juryroom.

(Jury leaving courtroom at 2:30 p.r.)

(The hearing recessed and then resumed out of the presence of the Jury.

THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio and Mr. Bovino, please be seated.

I originally asked you to appear here now to swear in additional Officers who will be available for the Juross.

However, in the meantime, one of the Officers who was sworn presented to me a note from the Jury. I normally advise Counsel informally in chambers before, but I think it's appropriate -- I will read it now, and if you wish time to respond to the question, I'll give you an opportunity to do so.

The note reads as follows: Cannot arrive at a unanimous decision. What do you advise?

Mark that C-8.

(Note marked C-8 in evidence.)
THE COURT: Anything from either

attorney?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I would accept that as the verdict.

THE COURT: Mr. Defazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: I don't know by that question whether we can simply accept that

2

5

10

11

12

15

16

17

21

24

25

..

6

3

4

9

11 12 13

14

16

17

18

20

22

23

25

THE COURT: Mr. DeFazio and Mr. Bovino, please be seated.

I originally asked you to appear here now to swear in additional Officers who will be available for the Jurors.

However, in the meantime, one of the Officers who was sworn presented to me a note from the Jury. I normally advise Counsel informally in chambers before, but I think it's appropriate -- I will read it now, and if you wish time to respond to the question, I'll give you an opportunity to do so.

The note reads as follows: Cannot arrive at a unanimous decision. What do you advise?

Mark that C-8.

(Note marked C-8 in evidence.)

THE COURT: Anything from either attorney?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I would accept that as the verdict.

THE COURT: Mr. Defazio?

MR. DeFAZIO: I don't know by that question whether we can simply accept that

they would be unable to reach a verdict with further deliberations.

Honestly, I don't know what, if any, decided law there is in this State concerning whether your discretion to recharge has in any way been circumscribed in this phase. I know of no case that says that that's been decided.

So, that would mean following through under normal circumstances, since they've only been out an hour and a half, that your Bonor would in some way ask them to continue their deliberations.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, the charge was that if it was not unanimous, it would mean life, and that's what that means to me.

They can't agree. They are not unanimous.

It's in accordance with your instructions, and it's in accordance with what the statute says.

That is a verdict. Eleven to one, whatever it maybe. It's not unanimous, it can't be death. Anything else would be worse to keep them in the juryroom to deliberate, and I would ask your Honor to

they would be unable to reach a verdict with further deliberations.

Honestly, I don't know what, if any, decided law there is in this State concerning whether your discretion to recharge has in any way been circumscribed in this phase. I know of no case that says that that's been decided.

So, that would mean following through under normal circumstances, since they've only been out an hour and a half, that your Bonor would in some way ask them to continue their deliberations.

MR. BOVINO: Judge, the charge was that if it was not unanimous, it would mean life, and that's what that means to me. They can't agree. They are not unanimous. It's in accordance with your instructions, and it's in accordance with what the statute says.

That is a verdict. Eleven to one, whatever it maybe. It's not unanimous, it can't be death. Anything else would be worse to keep them in the juryroom to deliberate, and I would ask your Boror to

accept that verdict.

1

2

10

11

12

15

16

20

21

22

25

a

THE COURT: All right. What I will do, I will take a recess to consider the application by the State to reinstruct the Jury.

However, since we are here, perhaps we should at this time -- the Officers who will be in place instead of the Officer originally sworn, I think they should be sworn at this time on the record, please.

(Officers sworn.)

THE COURT: Five officers have been sworn.

(The hearing recessed briefly and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, we have another note from the Jurors which react as follows: Your Honor, we're mentally exhausted, and we'd like permission to leave. Please advise.

We'll mark that C-9, please, ir evidence.

(Note marked C-9 in evidence.)
THE COURT: Anything further fr

ere

he

ut

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

he

accept that verdict.

sworn.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right, What I will do, I will take a recess to consider the application by the State to reinstruct the Jury.

However, since we are here, perhaps we should at this time -- the Officers who will be in place instead of the Officer originally sworn, I think they should be sworn at this time on the record, please.

THE COURT: Five officers have been

(The hearing recessed briefly and then resumed, out of the presence of the Jury.)

(Officers sworn.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, we have another note from the Jurors which react as follows: Your Honor, we're mentally exhausted, and we'd like permission to leave. Please advise.

We'll mark that C-9, please, in evidence.

(Note marked C-9 in evidence.)
THE COURT: Anything further f:

MR. DePAZIO: No.

either attorney?

11

12

13

16

17

1.8

19

21

22

23

24

MR. BOVINO: I renew my application, your Bonor, to accept the verdict as previously indicated in the first note that they can't be unanimous.

MR. DeFAZIO: Just for the record,
Judge, I oppose this, especially in light
of the second note.

THE COURT: All right. I have read into the record what has been marked in evidence C-8 and C-9, the notes that we received from the Jurors indicating they cannot arrive at a unanimous decision.

The Court did instruct the Jurors if the mitigating factors are not outweighed beyond a reasonable doubt or you cannot reach a unanimous verdict, the sentence will be a term of years between thirty years and life imprisonment, of which thirty years must be served before the defendant is eligible for parole.

N.J.S.A. 2C:11-3(c)(3)(c) provides if the Jury is unable to reach a unanimous verdict, the Court shall sentence the

12

13

14

17

18

19

24

25

11

12

15

17

18

21

22

either attorney?

MR. DeFAZIO: No.

MR. BOVINO: I renew my application, your Bonor, to accept the verdict as previously indicated in the first note that they can't be unanimous.

MR. DeFAZIO: Just for the record. Judge, I oppose this, especially in light of the second note.

THE COURT: All right. I have read into the record what has been marked in evidence C-8 and C-9, the notes that we received from the Jurors indicating they cannot arrive at a unanimous decision.

The Court did instruct the Jurors if the mitigating factors are not outweighed beyond a reasonable doubt or you cannot reach a unanimous verdict, the sentence will be a term of years between thirty years and life imprisonment, of which thirty years must be served before the defendant is eligible for parole.

N.J.S.A. 20:11-3(c)(3)(c) provides if the Jury is unable to reach a unanimous verdict, the Court shall sentence the

defendant pursuant to Subsection B.

The Assistant Prosecutor argues the time in which the Jury has been deliberating.

The Court is mindful of the fact that these are the same twelve Jurors who deliberated and decided the guilt phase of the case. I am also aware of the fact that these same twelve Jurors deliberated on Monday, considering substantially most of the facts that have been presented before them on the penalty phase of the case.

from the instruction given by the Court and the provision in the statute that I just read, it appears clear to this Court, and I find, that the Court has no alternative but to accept the note C-8 as, in effect, the verdict rendered by the Jury, and, therefore, the application by the State is denied, and the Court will rot reinstruct the Jury to continue deliberations.

Is there anything further, gentleren, before I have the Jury returned to the courtroom?

defendant pursuant to Subsection B.

The Assistant Prosecutor argues the time in which the Jury has been deliberating.

The Court is mindful of the fact that these are the same twelve Jurors who deliberated and decided the guilt phase of the case. I am also aware of the fact that these same twelve Jurors deliberated on Monday, considering substantially most of the facts that have been presented before them on the penalty phase of the case.

From the instruction given by the Court and the provision in the statute that I just read, it appears clear to this Court, and I find, that the Court has no alternative but to accept the note C-8 as, in effect, the verdict rendered by the Jury, and, therefore, the application by the State is denied, and the Court will not reinstruct the Jury to continue deliberations.

Is there anything further, gentleren, before I have the Jury returned to the courtroom?

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.
MR. DeFAZIO: No.

THE COURT: All right. Officer, may we have the Jury, please, the twelve Jurors and the Alternates?

(Jury entering courtroom at 4:40 p.m.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, I have your notes, the first note which reads as follows: Cannot arrive at a unanimous decision. What do you advise? I have your second note: Your Honor, we're mentally exhausted, and we'd like permission to leave. Please advise.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, since you have indicated to the Court that you cannot arrive at a unanimous decision as to the verdict sheet presented to you, and since you have so indicated to me you cannot reach a unanimous verdict, the sentence will be a term of years between thirty years and life imprisonment of which thirty years must be served before the defendant is eligible for parole.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury,

hat

of

hat

at

MR. BOVINO: No, Judge. MR. DeFAZIO: Jo.

THE COURT: All right. Officer, may we have the Jury, please, the twelve Jurors and the Alternates?

(Jury entering courtroom at 4:40 p.m.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, I have your notes, the first note which reads as follows: Cannot arrive at a unanimous decision. What do you advise? I have your second note: Your Bonor, we're mentally exhausted, and we'd like permission to leave. Please advise.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, since you have indicated to the Court that you cannot arrive at a unanimous decision as to the verdict sheet presented to you, and since you have so indicated to me you cannot reach a unanimous verdict, the sentence will be a term of years between thirty years and life imprisonment of vaich thirty years must be served before the defendant is eligible for parole.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury,

with the return of your verdicts, in the guilt phase and in the penalty phase, you may have performed one of the most important tasks which you will be called upon to fulfill as a citizen, and with the return of your verdicts, your service in this case is now concluded.

The key to your function has been the free and open discussion among yourselves during your deliberations. It is essential to the continuation of the fair administration of justice that those discussions remain solely within your minds.

Upon your discharge as a Juror, you are not required, except upon order of this Court, to discuss with anyone your part in those deliberations or the part of your fellow Jurors in arriving at the verdict returned in this matter.

In addition, no one connected with this trial is permitted under the rules of court to engage you in conversation about this matter or your role or your fellow Jurors' role in its outcome. All Jurors

with the return of your verdicts, in the guilt phase and in the penalty phase, you may have performed one of the most important tasks which you will be called upon to fulfill as a citizen, and with the return of your verdicts, your service in this case is now concluded.

The key to your function has been the free and open discussion among yourselves during your deliberations. It is essential to the continuation of the fair administration of justice that those discussions remain solely within your minds.

Upon your discharge as a Juror, you are not required, except upon order of this Court, to discuss with anyone your part in those deliberations or the part of your fellow Jurors in arriving at the verdict returned in this matter.

In addition, no one connected with this trial is permitted under the rules of court to engage you in conversation about this matter or your role or your fellow Jurors' role in its outcome. All Jurors

have a right to expect that their discussions during deliberations will remain confidential.

It is in the public interest that there be the utmost freedom of discussion in the juryroom, and that each Juror be permitted to express his or her views without fear of incurring public scorn or the anger of any litigant.

Therefore, under no circumstances should you make any comments or statements concerning the deliberations in this matter which you would not be willing to repeat under oath in open court in the presence of your fellow Jurors.

One of the reasons for this cautionary instruction is that if the discussions of Jurors during deliberations were to be made public, future Jurors might then feel that they cannot freely and honestly discuss their views and opiniors in the juryroom out of the fear that trose views and opinions would be publicly criticized.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Court

have a right to expect that their discussions during deliberations will remain confidential.

It is in the public interest that there be the utmost freedom of discussion in the juryroom, and that each Juror be permitted to express his or her views without fear of incurring public scorn or the anger of any litigant.

he

al

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

23

24

25

Therefore, under no circumstances should you make any comments or statements concerning the deliberations in this matter which you would not be willing to repeat under oath in open court in the presence of your fellow Jurors.

One of the reasons for this
cautionary instruction is that if the
discussions of Jurors during deliberations
were to be made public, future Jurors might
then feel that they cannot freely and
honestly discuss their views and opinions
in the juryroom out of the fear that trose
views and opinions would be publicly
criticized.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Court

thanks you for your service, in accepting
your duty and responsibility of spending
'time beyond the normal time for jury
service. I thank you for that.

I indicated originally that if you wish and you need an additional letter from me to your employer with regard to the term of service over and above whatever the Jury service may give you, my secretary is here, and you just go around to my outer chambers, and she has a letter and will address it to your employer if you wish a letter.

10

14

15

16

19

You are excused now from further service in this matter with the thanks of the Court.

(Jury leaving courtroom at 4:45 p.m.)

THE COURT: All the Jurors gone? We have the verdict sheet, original verdict sheet, from the Forelady. We'll mark that C-10.

(Verdict sheet marked C-10 in evidence.)

THE COURT: I will set a sentence date at this time.

.

thanks you for your service, in accepting your duty and responsibility of spending . time beyond the normal time for jury service. I thank you for that.

I indicated originally that if you wish and you need an additional letter from me to your employer with regard to the term of service over and above whatever the Jury service may give you, my secretary is here, and you just go around to my outer chambers, and she has a letter and will address it to your employer if you wish a letter.

You are excused now from further service in this matter with the thanks of the Court.

(Jury leaving courtroom at 4:45 p.m.)

THE COURT: All the Jurors gone? We have the verdict sheet, original verdict sheet, from the Forelady. We'll mark that C-10.

(Verdict sheet marked C-10 in evidence.)

THE COURT: I will set a sentence date at this time.

Sentencing date will be on June 20 at same before this Court.

Anything else in this matter at this time, gentlemen?

MR. DeFASIO: I'd like to see the verdict sheet for one thing.

THE COURT: You certainly may.

Anything further at this time,
gentlemen?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, may I see you in chambers, please, about something else; other than this?

THE COURT: Anything on this matter at this time?

MR. DeFAIIO: No, your Bonor.

THE COURT: All right. The defendant is remanded to the Hudson County Jail.

Sentencing date will be on June 20 at 9 a.m. before this Court Anything else in this matter at this time, gentlemen? MR. DePASIO: I'd like to see the verdict sheet for one thing. THE COURT: You certainly may. 8 Anything further at this time, 9 gentlemen? 10 MR. BOVINO: Judge, may I see you in 11 chambers, please, about something else 12 other than this? 13 THE COURT: Anything on this matter 14 at this time? 15 MR. DePASIO: No, your Bonor. 16 THE COURT: All right. The defendant 17 is remanded to the Budson County Jail. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

CERTIFICATE 11 matter.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the above-entitled

CERTIFICATE NO. X100421

17

19

20

21

22

4

6

7

.

10

11

13

14

16

17

19

21

22

24

25

CERTIPICATE

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter.

Winifel O. Mc del MINIFRED A. BANDEL, C.S.R. CERTIFICATE NO. X100421

DATED: 8/18/86

A 1973-8974

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION (CRIMINAL) HUDSON COUNTY INDICTMENT NO. 1369-85

TRANS FILED

A-5529-85 T4 STENOGRAPHIC

Complainant,

LEONARD STONE,

TRANSCRIPT OF

Œ,

PROCEEDINGS: REC'D

Defendant.

PENCE APPELLATE DIVISION

75.3- W. K

Wednesday, June 25, 1986 Jersey City, New Jersey

BEFORE:

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE HONORABLE CHARLES J. HARRINGTON, JR., J.S.C.

APPELLATE DIVISION

APPEARANCES:

OEC 8 1986 3-

EDWARD J. DE FAZIO, ESQ. Assistant County Prosecutor Charles W. County

SALVATORE BOVINO, ESQ. Assistant Deputy Public Defender For the Defendant



Reported by: Kathi L. Trindade, C.S.R. Official Court Reporter Hudson County Court House Jersey City, New Jersey License No. XI 00689

THE COURT: State of New Jersey versus Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard, under Indictment 1369 of the '85 term. May we have your appearances, please?

MR. DE FAZIO: Edward J. De Fazio, Hudson County Prosecutor's Office, for the State.

MR. BOVINO: Salvatore Bovino, on behalf of Leonard Stone.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect the Defendant's present here in court.

MR. DE FAZIO: Your Honor, the State would move for imposition of sentence on Indictment No. 1369-12 of the '85 term.

THE COURT: Leonard Stone, also known as

Joshua Leonard, on April 21, 1986, represented
by Counsel, you appeared before this Court for
scheduled trial of Indictment 1369 of the 1985

term. That Indictment charged you under the
First Count with murder, under the Second Count,
felony murder, under the Third Count, armed
robbery, the Fourth Count, possession of a weapon
for an unlawful purpose, and in the Fifth Count,
unlawful possession of a weapon, and the Jury
was impaneled and the trial commenced until May 19th,
1986, at which time the Jury returned the following

10

15 16 17

19

22 23

21

THE COURT: State of New Jersey versus
Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard,
under Indictment 1369 of the '85 term. May we
have your appearances, please?

MR. DE FAZIO: Edward J. De Fazio, Hudson County Prosecutor's Office, for the State.

MR. BOVINO: Salvatore Bovino, on behalf of Leonard Stone.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect the Defendant's present here in court.

MR. DE FAZIO: Your Honor, the State would move for imposition of sentence on Indictment No. 1369-12 of the '85 term.

THE COURT: Leonard Stone, also known as
Joshua Leonard, on April 21, 1986, represented
by Counsel, you appeared before this Court for
scheduled trial of Indictment 1369 of the 1985
term. That Indictment charged you under the
First Count with murder, under the Second Count,
felony murder, under the Third Count, armed
robbery, the Fourth Count, possession of a weapon
for an unlawful purpose, and in the Fifth Count,
unlawful possession of a weapon, and the Jury
was impaneled and the trial commenced until May 19th,
1986, at which time the Jury returned the following

verdict: Guilty as to the First Count, charging murder, guilty as to the Third Count, robbery, a second-degree offense, guilty as to the Fourth Count, charging possession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose, guilty as to the Fifth Count, charging unlawful possession of a weapon, and a verdict of not guilty as to the Second Count, charging felony murder, and that same Jury thereafter, on May 21st, 1986, advised the Court by written note, which is part of the record, of its inability to unanimously return a special verdict determining the sentence to be imposed on the First Count.

Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard, do you have anything to say on your own behalf, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, it really wouldn't make no difference, so, you know, everything is going through, so...

THE COURT: I just want to advise you. You understand this is the time in the proceedings if you wish to say something to the Court, you may do so at this time. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEPENDANT: I've been saying things
to the Court ever since I was arrested, so it really
wouldn't make no difference if I say anything right now.

.

11

12

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

17 18

10

11

12

13

15

20

22

11

2

verdict: Guilty as to the First Count, charging murder, guilty as to the Third Count, robbery, a second-degree offense, guilty as to the Fourth Count, charging possession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose, guilty as to the Pifth Count, charging unlawful possession of a weapon, and a verdict of not guilty as to the Second Count, charging felony murder, and that same Jury thereafter, on May 21st, 1986, advised the Court by written note, which is part of the record, of its inability to unanimously return a special verdict determining the sentence to be imposed on the First Count.

Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard, do you have anything to say on your own behalf,

THE DEPENDANT: Well, it really wouldn't make no difference, so, you know, everything is going through, so ...

THE COURT: I just want to advise you. You understand this is the time in the proceedings if you wish to say something to the Court, you may do so at this time. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I've been saying things to the Court ever since I was arrested, so it really wouldn't make no difference if I say anything right now.

THE COURT: Do you understand you may say something if you wish?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand that. THE COURT: Do you wish to say anything? THE DEFENDANT: I don't want to say nothing. THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, do you wish to say anything on behalf of the Defendant?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, before you proceed any further, Mr. Stone has been given a copy of the Presentence Report. He's indicated to me that there are errors in that report, or corrections. He hasn't told me what they are. I don't know what he's referring to. He told me that he would straighten this out with the Court when he came into court.

10

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

25

I just ask your Honor to ask him if there's anything that he wishes to bring to the Court's attention that's inaccurate in the report, in addition to what you've already asked about what he would want to say to the Court.

THE COURT: Well, sir, do you have -you've heard Mr. Bovino. Do you have other -insofar as you're concerned, are there mistakes in the Presentence Report? Yes, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. There's a lot of

int,

da

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you understand you may say something if you wish?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand that.

THE COURT: Do you wish to say anything?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't want to say nothing.

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, do you wish to

say anything on behalf of the Defendant?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, before you proceed
any further, Mr. Stone has been given a copy of
the Presentence Report. He's indicated to me
that there are errors in that report, or corrections.
He hasn't told me what they are. I don't know
what he's referring to. He told me that he
would straighten this out with the Court when
he came into court.

I just ask your Bonor to ask him if there's anything that he wishes to bring to the Court's attention that's inaccurate in the report, in addition to what you've already asked about what he would want to say to the Court.

THE COURT: Well, sir, do you have -you've heard Mr. Bovino. Do you have other -insofar as you're concerned, are there mistakes
in the Presentence Report? Yes, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. There's a lot of

mistakes in there, yeah, but as I said, I don't want to say anything on it, because it really wouldn't do no difference.

THE COURT: Well, what I'd like to know, if I may, I'd like to know if -- if there are any mistakes, and if there are, I'd appreciate it if you'd bring it to my attention if there are any mistakes.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, ever since I
was arrested -- okay? -- I've been -- I've
been calling about, you know, my -- about my lawyer.
Okay? That was a big mistake, you know, as
far as where -- you know, representing -- you know,
having Sal Bovino representing me. Nobody did
nothing, so a little report like this, for me -for me to say anything against it and so forth,
or -- you know -- or say, "Well, I would like this
changed," or whatever, it really would make no
difference.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, sir:

Have you had -- have you had a chance, an opportunity,

to read the Presentence Report?

THE COURT: Okay. Well -- just a minute.

please.

mistakes in there, yeah, but as I said, I don't want to say anything on it, because it really wouldn't do no difference.

THE COURT: Well, what I'd like to know, if I may, I'd like to know if -- if there are any mistakes, and if there are, I'd appreciate it if you'd bring it to my attention if there are any mistakes.

THE DEPENDANT: Your Honor, ever since I
was arrested -- okay? -- I've been -- I've
been calling about, you know, my -- about my lawyer.
Okay? That was a big mistake, you know, as
far as where -- you know, representing -- you know,
having Sal Bovino representing me. Nobody did
nothing, so a little report like this, for me -for me to say anything against it and so forth,
or -- you know -- or say, "Well, I would like this
changed," or whatever, it really would make no
difference.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, sir:

Have you had -- have you had a chance, an opportunity,
to read the Presentence Report?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I've read it.

THE COURT: Okay. Well -- just a minute.

please.

Well, at this time of the proceeding, if there are mistakes in there, in that report, I'd like to know about it, for -- for the record, so that you could tell me if there's mistakes in there, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I have no comment. Okay? I have no comment.

THE COURT: If there are mistakes, you don't want to tell me about them?

THE DEFENDANT: It's no use. I see
that there's no purpose in saying anything, because
nothing is going to be done.

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, to your knowledge, are there any errors or omissions or deletions in the report, sir?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I -- I don't have any information to correct any of the information that's contained in this report. I mean, the background history as to employment is rather minimal. I know Mr. Stone has told me that he has worked in the past as a mechanic and a carpenter and electrician, miscellaneous handyman-type things -- amateur -- perhaps even professional -- photographer. That information is not here, but unless he cooperates with the Probation Department

s

cy.

Well, at this time of the proceeding, if there are mistakes in there, in that report, I'd like to know about it, for -- for the record, so that you could tell me if there's mistakes in there, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I have no comment. Okay? I have no comment.

THE COURT: If there are mistakes, you don't want to tell me about them?

THE DEFENDANT: It's no use. I see
that there's no purpose in saying anything, because
nothing is going to be done.

THE COURT: Mr. Bovino, to your knowledge, are there any errors or omissions or deletions in the report, sir?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I -- I don't have any information to correct any of the information that's contained in this report. I mean, the background history as to employment is rather minimal. I know Mr. Stone has told me that he has worked in the past as a mechanic and a carpenter and electrician, miscellaneous handymantype things -- amateur -- perhaps even professional -- photographer. That information is not here, but unless he cooperates with the Probation Department

and is willing to bring that to the Court's attention as to dates and places, I can't assist the Court in completing the Presentence Report.

Family history, I know he has brothers and sisters. His mother's been in court. His mother has spoken to me. I spoke to his brother and sister. The exact number of the brothers and sisters that he has, again, I don't have information for the Court to complete the Presentence Report in that respect, but that is information that either the Defendant will have to generate through the Probation Department, or the Probation Department would have to generate independently of the Defendant, through his family, through their investigation, so I don't know exactly what he's talking about.

For the purposes of the record, I will acknowledge that the Presentence Report consists of a cover sheet, one page, two page, three, four, five pages of background information, including the prior record, then it has sixteen pages of police reports, incident reports, arrest reports, continuation pages, death certificate, one-page laboratory report, six-page autopsy report and a copy of the two-page Indictment. All this --

Family history, I know he has brothers and sisters. His mother's been in court. His mother has spoken to me. I spoke to his brother and sister. The exact number of the brothers and sisters that he has, again, I don't have information for the Court to complete the Presentence Report in that respect, but that is information that either the Defendant will have to generate through the Probation Department, or the Probation Department would have to generate independently of the Defendant, through his family, through their investigation, so I don't know exactly what he's talking about.

For the purposes of the record, I will acknowledge that the Presentence Report consists of a cover sheet, one page, two page, three, four, five pages of background information. including the prior record, then it has sixteen pages of police reports, incident reports, arrest reports, continuation pages, death certificate, one-page laboratory report, six-page autopsy report and a copy of the two-page Indictment. All this --

everything that's in this report has been made available to Mr. Stone, either prior to trial, during trial and, certainly, the report itself has been made available to him today. I have no corrections or applications based upon what's in this report, and I think your Honor would have certain notes concerning his family background from his mother's testimony, from his own testimony, so I have no additions or corrections to make to the report.

THE COURT: Mr. De Fazio, to your knowledge, are there any errors, omissions or deletions as to the Presentence Report, sir?

MR. DE FAZIO: No, your Honor.

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Now, if -- I note that the Jury found the Defendant guilty of the Fourth Count, charging posession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose, and also the Fifth Count, charging unlawful possession of a weapon. It would appear to the Court that perhaps those two Counts merge, for the purpose of sentencing. Do you have any thought on that, Mr. De Fazio?

MR. DE FAZIO: I think the possession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose probably would merge with the murder offense, since the unlawful

17

20

21 22

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

22 23 24 everything that's in this report has been made available to Mr. Stone, either prior to trial, during trial and, certainly, the report itself has been made available to him today. I have no corrections or applications based upon what's in this report, and I think your Honor would have certain notes concerning his family background from his mother's testimony, from his own testimony, so I have no additions or corrections to make to the report.

THE COURT: Mr. De Fazio, to your knowledge, are there any errors, omissions or deletions as to the Presentence Report, sir?

MR. DE FAZIO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, if -- I note that the Jury found the Defendant guilty of the Fourth Count, charging posession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose, and also the Fifth Count, charging unlawful possession of a weapon. It would appear to the Court that perhaps those two Counts merge, for the purpose of sentencing. Do you have any thought on that, Mr. De Fazio?

MR. DE PAZIO: I think the possession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose probably would merge with the murder offense, since the unlawful purpose was, in fact, the murder of Clarence MacMillan. I think we can clearly infer that from the verdict.

The unlawful possession of a weapon charge I don't think -- I don't think merges, under the case law. That's my thought about it, Judge.

THE COURT: Anything Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I would say that both
the Fourth and Fifth Counts should merge into
the First Count. Mr. De Fazio says the Fourth
Count merges into the First, because it is -I assume by the Jury's verdict that it was, in
fact, the murder weapon. There's nothing to
indicate that Mr. Stone possessed the weapon
at any time prior to the murder, and I think
it would be the same set of facts and circumstances
that give rise to the conviction in the Fourth
Count and the Fifth Count, so I think both those
Counts should merge into the First Count.

15

16

19

20

21

22

25

Whether or not there's a question as to the Third Count merging, in my own mind, I don't understand the Jury's verdict. I -- I would say that the incidents were so intertwined and related in point of time that they really should merge as a single transaction. Unfortunately,

5 6 7

10

16

19 20 21

18

22 23 24 purpose was, in fact, the murder of Clarence MacMillan. I think we can clearly infer that from the verdict.

The unlawful possession of a weapon charge I don't think -- I don't think merges, under the case law. That's my thought about it, Judge.

THE COURT: Anything Mr. Bovino?

MR. BOVINO: Judge, I would say that both
the Fourth and Fifth Counts should merge into
the First Count. Mr. De Fazio says the Fourth
Count merges into the First, because it is -I assume by the Jury's verdict that it was, in
fact, the murder weapon. There's nothing to
indicate that Mr. Stone possessed the weapon
at any time prior to the murder, and I think
it would be the same set of facts and circumstances
that give rise to the conviction in the Fourth
Count and the Fifth Count, so I think both those
Counts should merge into the First Count.

Whether or not there's a question as to the Third Count merging, in my own mind, I don't understand the Jury's verdict. I -- I would say that the incidents were so intertwined and related in point of time that they really should merge as a single transaction. Unfortunately,

the Jury's verdict was not guilty of the felony murder, so that sort of defeats my argument, but I think, as a practical matter, it should merge into Count 1, also.

I'm not as clear on the law as -- I think the law is against me on that issue, but I think, practically, it should merge.

THE COURT: Insofar as which?

10

11

12

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BOVINO: Count 2, 4 and 5 I have no problem. I'm sure they should merge.

MR. DE FAZIO: Well, I can say this,

Judge: The robbery doesn't merge, as a matter
of law, with the murder. The purposeful murder
is one offense, and the finding of guilty on the
robbery is a separate and distinct offense,
and there's no merger. State v. Stanson would be
right on point. I know the case, because
I was the trial attorney on that.

THE COURT: Well, what about with regard to the Fourth and Fifth merging with the First?

MR. DE FAZIO: Well, Judge, my memory is that the unlawful possession of a weapon doesn't necessarily merge. I think it's <u>State version</u>.

Ortiz is the case where it was a rebbery case.

I believe that the law is that the unlawful pur se

12

14 15 16

17

20 21

22 23

25

murder, so that sort of defeats my argument, but I think, as a practical matter, it should merge into Count 1, also. I'm not as clear on the law as -- I think the law is against me on that issue, but I think,

the Jury's verdict was not guilty of the felony

THE COURT: Insofar as which?

practically, it should merge.

MR. BOVINO: Count 2, 4 and 5 I have no problem. I'm sure they should merge.

MR. DE FAZIO: Well, I can say this, Judge: The robbery doesn't merge, as a matter of law, with the murder. The purposeful murder is one offense, and the finding of guilty on the robbery is a separate and distinct offense, and there's no merger. State v. Stenson would be right on point. I know the case, because I was the trial attorney on that.

THE COURT: Well, what about with regard to the Fourth and Fifth merging with the First?

MR. DE FAZIO: Well, Judge, my memory is that the unlawful possession of a weapon doesn't necessarily merge. I think it's State v. Ortiz is the case where it was a robbery case. I believe that the law is that the unlawful pur se weapons charge merges. My position would be that the Fifth Count, the unlawful possession of a weapon, doesn't merge, as a matter of

THE COURT: All right. We'll just take a short recess until I make a determination on the question of merger. I'd ask everyone to remain right in the courtroom, please.

> (Whereupon there is a brief recess.) (Following recess.)

THE COURT: Under the rationals and the reasoning of our Supreme Court in the case of State v. Best, 70 N.J. 56 (1976), I find that the Third Count, wherein the Jury rendered a verdict of guilty to robbery, a second-degree offense, does not merge with the First Count. However, the Fifth -- strike that -- the Fourth and Fifth Counts merge with the First Count, for the purpose of sentencing.

Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard, on the Jury's finding of guilty of the First Count and Third Count of Indictment 1369 of the '85 term, it is the sentence of this Court as follows: On the Jury's finding of guilty as to the First Count of Indictment 1369 of the

15

16 17

12

13

Theat

18 19

22

21

20

14 15 16

> 17 19

20 21 22

23 25

weapons charge merges. My position would be that the Fifth Count, the unlawful possession of a weapon, doesn't merge, as a matter of law.

THE COURT: All right. We'll just take a short recess until I make a determination on the question of merger. I'd ask everyone to remain right in the courtroom, please.

> (Whereupon there is a brief recess.) (Following recess.)

THE COURT: Under the rationale and the reasoning of our Supreme Court in the case of State v. Best, 70 N.J. 56 (1976), I find that the Third Count, wherein the Jury rendered a verdict of guilty to robbery, a second-degree offense, does not merge with the First Count. However, the Fifth -- strike that -- the Fourth and Fifth Counts merge with the First Count, for the purpose of sentencing.

Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard, on the Jury's finding of guilty of the First Count and Third Count of Indictment 1369 of the '85 term, it is the sentence of this Court as follows: On the Jury's finding of guilty as to the First Count of Indictment 1369 of the

'85 term, charging murder, it is the sentence of this Court, pursuant to W.J.S.A. 2C:11-3(c), that the Defendant be delivered to the custody of the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections for the remainder of his life, with the direction that he be required to serve the first thirty years of that term without any eligibility for parole. This sentence shall run concurrent with the sentence which the Court will impose on the Third Count.

And, Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua Leonard, on the Jury's finding of guilty of robbery under the Third Count of Indictment 1369 of the '85 term, it is the sentence of this Court that you be delivered to the custody of the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections for a term of seven years. This sentence will run concurrent with the sentence which the Court just imposed under the First Count of the subject Indictment.

Also, you're assessed a penalty of twenty-five dollars on each Count, a total of fifty dollars, payable to the Violent Crimes Compensation Board under N.J.S.2C:43-3.1, to be collected by the appropriate agency. Credit is to be given for time

15

12

20

21 22

23

24

'85 term, charging murder, it is the sentence of this Court, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2C:11-3(c), that the Defendant be delivered to the custody of the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections for the remainder of his life, with the direction that he be required to serve the first thirty years of that term without any eligibility for parole. This sentence shall run concurrent with the sentence which the Court will impose on the Third Count.

And, Leonard Stone, also known as Joshua
Leonard, on the Jury's finding of guilty of
robbery under the Third Count of Indictment 1369
of the '85 term, it is the sentence of this
Court that you be delivered to the custody of
the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections
for a term of seven years. This sentence will run
concurrent with the sentence which the Court
just imposed under the First Count of the subject
Indictment.

Also, you're assessed a penalty of twenty-five dollars on each Count, a total of fifty dollars, payable to the Violent Crimes Compensation Board under N.J.S.2C:43-3.1, to be collected by the appropriate agency. Credit is to be given for time

spent in custody, if any, while awaiting disposition of this charge. There will be no costs allowed.

The reasons for the sentence imposed by this Court being, firstly, the serious and violent nature of this offense, causing and resulting in the death of Clarence MacMillan; secondly, the Defendant's prior record; thirdly, that this sentence will be a deterrent to this Defendant and others in the future; fourthly, the risk that this Defendant will commit another offense; and, lastly, the Court is mindful of the provisions of N.J.S.A. 2C:11-3(c).

Sir, you are advised you have the right to appeal this sentence, and if you cannot afford an attorney, one will be provided for you by the State at no expense to you.

> Anything further in this matter? MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. The Defendant is remanded to the Hudson County Jail for delivery to the custody of the Commissioner

MR. DE FAZIO: No.

of the Department of Corrections.

17

19 20

21

22

24

spent in custody, if any, while awaiting disposition of this charge. There will be no costs allowed.

The reasons for the sentence imposed by this Court being, firstly, the serious and violent nature of this offense, causing and resulting in the death of Clarence MacMillan; secondly, the Defendant's prior record; thirdly, that this sentence will be a deterrent to this Defendant and others in the future; fourthly, the risk that this Defendant will commit another offense; and, lastly, the Court is mindful of the provisions of N.J.S.A. 2C:11-3(c).

Sir, you are advised you have the right to appeal this sentence, and if you cannot afford an attorney, one will be provided for you by the State at no expanse to you.

> Anything further in this matter? MR. BOVINO: No, Judge.

MR. DE FAZIO: No.

THE COURT: All right. The Defendant is remanded to the Budson County Jail for delivery to the custody of the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections.

CERTIFICATE

I, KATHI L. TRINDADE, C.S.R. XI 00689, and an Official Court Reporter of the State of New Jersey, do hereby state that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes of the within proceeding.

· Halle & Thereadel & &

Dated: acres 1, 180

22 23 24

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

20

21

CERTIFICATE

I, KATHI L. TRINDADE, C.S.R. XI 00689, and an Official Court Reporter of the State of New Jersey, do hereby state that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes of the within proceeding.

· Year & Trunadel & &

Dated: acres , mi

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT COMPLETION AND DELIVERY State of New Jersey Supervisor of Court Reporters or Agency Representative complete and forward: 1) Original to the Clerk (Appelate Division or Supreme Court) with all transcript copies pertaining to this case 2) Dee (1) copy to Chief, Court Reporting Services 3) Requesting Party: FROM J. 90.715, 690. CASE INFORMATION AC DODNET NUMBER CREE NAME A-1973-89-14 STRTE OF NEW JERSEY VIL STONE, LEONING REC'D LOWER COURT DOCKET NUMBER 1369-12-65 MYTELLASE DINCH COUNTY LONER COURT Criminal HUDSON TRANSCRIPT INFORMATION DATES OF TYPE OF PROCEED INGS PROCEEDING REPORTER/TRANSCRIBER 05/25/89 HERRING CIMELLI (OFFICIAL) 20 04/20/90 FILED Assistant
IN ACCORDANCE WITH INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE COURT REPORTERS

1) Ori 2) One	of Court Reporters or Agency Res	vision or Supreme Court) a ting Services	eith all transcript copies pertain	ning to this co	
CASE NAME			AC DOOKET MAMBER 0-1973-69-14		
STATE O	F NEW JERSEY VI., STONE, LEONARD		LONER COURT DOCKET NUMBER 1369-12-85	RE	
COUNTY			LOWER COURT Criminal	APR 1	25 1999
	1940	TRENSCRIPT INFORM	ITION J	CO	1
DATES OF PROCEEDINGS	TYPE OF PROCEEDING		COURT REPORTER/TRANSCRIBER	NUMBER OF PROES	TANKSHITTRE SATE
05/25/89	HEARING	CIRELLI (OFF	(CIAL)	20	04/20/90
				FILI	ED
				APR 28	900
			A	Dur	6
				-	2
					200
				1000	4
	14. 81 ACC. 14.	Luc 70		1 4000	

REPORTERS / TRANSCRIBERS TRANSCRIPT TRANSMITTAL

INSTRUCTIONS: Forward original to the requesting party with completed original transcript.

Send copies to:

1. Supervisor of Court Reporters with copy of transcript.

2). Administrative Office of the Courts, After Chief, Reporting Svs., CN-986, Trenton, NJ 08625

3). Attorneys and/or Pro Se of known)

4) Other ____



10. Frank Soltis, Dep. PD 20 Evergreen Pl, East Darnge, NJ 07018

CASE INFORMATION				
State ofg New Jersey	V . Leonard S	(Defendants)) Long	XE≸ Appeni ☐ Non-Appeni	
TOWER COURT DOCKET TIPE XIII Indictment Accusulon Complaint	1369-12-8		TRANSCRIPT RECORST DATE 4/14/90	
оскет момен А - 1973-89Т4	RUDSON	EUPERIOR	HEGINST HEGINT SATE #4/15/90	

TRANSCRIPTS FILED HEREWITH					
	DATES	OF (OPE)	TOTAL PGS. PER TRANSCRIPT	PROCEEDING FORE	
1.	May 25, 1989	1	20	Motion	
2					
3.					
4					
5.					
6.					

REPORTER / TRANSCRIBER NAME (Print/Type) (Name of Agency, if applicable TRANSMITTAL DATE/20/90 FROM: (Check one) Lorraine Cirelli,m C.S.R. XX Reporter EPOBLER / TRANSCRIBER (Signature) ☐ Transcriber

Appellant is responsible for filing additional copies pursuant to Court Rule 2:6-12(a)(d)

White REQUESTING PARTY Blue CHIEF, REPORTING SERVICES Green: SUPERVISOR Canary: OTHER

Pink: MAINTAIN FOR SELF Gold: ATTORNEYS and/or PRO SE

REPORTERS / TRANSCRIBERS TRANSCRIPT TRANSMITTAL

INSTRUCTIONS. Forward original to the requesting party with completed original transcript.

Send copies to

1) Supervisor of Court Reportors with copy of transcript.

Administrative Office of the Courts, Attn. Chief, Reporting Svs., CN-988, Trenton, NJ. 08625

3) Attorneys and/or Pro Se (if known)

4) Other ___





			CASE	INFORMATION		
A JE NAME (Planettics)			٧ .			
	State ofg New 3	Tersey		Leonard Stone Lowescourscours 1369-12-85		
OWIER	COURT DOORS T TYPE					
100	ndictment [] Accusation []	Conspiant	13			
A - 1973-89T4			SGDEO	N .	SUPERIOR	#60/857 #60/857 #60/857 0478 #4/15/96
-			TRANSCRIP	TS FILED HEREWITH		
T	DATES	OF COPY(5	TOTAL PGS PER TRANSCRIPT	PROCEEDING TYPE		
1.	May 25, 1989	1	20	Motion		
2.						
T						
3.			+			
4						
5.						
6.						
	*Check, if applicable Appellant is responsible	c for filing addit	lional copies pursuant	to Court Rule 2:6-12(a)	(d) S Yos []	No
	(Check one) REPORTER / TRANSCRIBER NAME (PinNT)po) (Name of Agency, # applicable) XX Records: XX Records: C.S.R.					TRANSMITTAL DAYE/20/9

White REQUESTING PARTY Blue CHIEF, REPORTING SERVICES Green: SUPERVISOR Canary OTHER PINK: MAINTAIN FOR SELF Gold: ATTORNEYS and/or PRO SE

A-1973-8974 NOBY

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - HUDSON COUNTY INDICTMENT NO. 1369-12-85 APPELLATE NO. A-1973-89T4

THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY, Complainant

LEONARD STONE,

Defendant.

May 25, 1989

Hudson County Courthoung? Jersey City, N.J. 07306

BEFORES

HONORABLE CHARLES J. HARRINGTON, JR., 3

ORDERED BY:

FRANK J. SOLTIS, ESQ. ASSISTANT DEPUTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

REC'D .

TRANSCRIPT ALE DIVISION

APPEARANCE S:

GAETANO GREGORY, ESQ. Assistant Prosecutor for the Sta

> LEONARD CARAFA, ESQ. Attorney for the Defendant

LORRAINE M. CIRELLI, C.S.R., C.M. OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER LICENSE NO. X100977 HUDSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY 07306

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - HUDSON COUNTY INDICTMENT NO. 1369-12-85 APPELLATE NO. A-1973-89T4

THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY, Complainant

REC'D . TRANSCRIPT ALL DIVISION

LEONARD STONE, Defendant.

May 25, 1989

Hudson County Courthous Jersey City, N.J. 07306

BEFORE:

HONORABLE CHARLES J. HARRINGTON, JR., 3

ORDERED BY:

FRANK J. SOLTIS, ESQ. ASSISTANT DEPUTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

APPEARANCE S:

GAETANO GREGORY, ESG. Assistant Prosecutor for the Std

> LEONARD CARAFA, ESG. Attorney for the Defendant

LORRAINE M. CIRELLI, C.S.R., C.M. OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER LICENSE NO. XIDD977 HUDSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE

JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY 07306

MR. GREGORY: Gaetano Gregory on Indictment 1369-12-85, State of New Jersey vs. Leonard Stone. It's a return date for several motions pending a post conviction relief application.

MR. CARAFA: Leonard J. Carafa, 29 Park Avenue, Rutherford, assigned Counsel for Mr. Leonard Stone, your

THE COURT: Let the record reflect that the Defendant is present here in court.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20 21

22

23

24

25

it.

I think the record should also reflect that -- I don't remember the exact date and probably the attorneys can assist the Court. Pursuant to the request of the Defendant, the attorney for the Defendent made to the Court and to the State - arrangements were made and requests were made that the Defendant's attorney could review all the evidence that was admitted before the Court and Jury in the trial of this particular case.

> MR. CARAFA: If I may just add to that ---THE COURT: Can I have the date? I don't recall

MR. GREGORY: I believe it was May fourth, your Honor, but I may be wrong.

MR. CARAFA: The date -- well, if I may your Honor, what happened was we had a date set originally for Mr. Stone to be brought up on April 14th.

MR. GREGORY: Gaetano Gregory on Indictment

1369-12-85, State of New Jersey vs. Leonard Stone. It's a
return date for several motions pending a post conviction
relief application.

MR. CARAFA: Leonard J. Carafa, 29 Park Avenue, Rutherford, assigned Counsel for Mr. Leonard Stone, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect that the Defendant is present here in court.

I think the record should also reflect that -- 1 don't remember the exact date and probably the attorneys can assist the Court. Pursuant to the request of the Defendant.

"Maye attorney for the Defendant made to the Court and to the State -- arrangements were made and requests were made that the Defendant's attorney could review all the evidence that was admitted before the Court and Jury in the trial of this particular case.

MR. CARAPA: If I may just edd to that -THE COURT: Can I have the date? I don't receil

 $\label{eq:heat_model} \mbox{MR. GREGORY: I believe it was May fourth, your $$ \mbox{Honor, but I may be wrong.}$

MR. CARAFA: The date -- well, if I may your Honor, what happened was we had a date set originally for Mr. Stone to be brought up on April 14th.

Your Honor, at that time, on April 11th, the Defendant contacted me for the first time in months by collect telephone call. That was on a religious holiday for him, it was a Friday, and that he will not be appearing on that date

I immediately contacted the Court and the Prosecutor and a new date was set for April 20th, your Honor.

At that time. I came to court on April 20th and the Defendant was not produced because the State prison system indicated they had not received a formal piece of paper requesting them to bring him up, a writ, even though this Court did contact them by phone to advise them that we would have his brought up the next week, which would be April 20th.

Then, after that, your Monor sent a writ to have him produced on May 4th and that's when he was brought up here, on May 4th,

THE COURT: Okay.

Now, this Court was actively engaged in another trial and is still actively engaged in that same trial and you tell me if I'm wrong, but I believe I was advised informally by -- I don't recall who it was, but the evidence was available for the Defendant and you, sir, to review, but it was not reviewed for some reason.

Your Honor, at that time, on April 11th, the Defendant contacted me for the first time in months by collect telephone call. That was on a religious holiday for him, it was a friday, and that he will not be appearing on that date.

I immediately contacted the Court and the Prosecutor and a new date was set for April 20th, your

At that time, I came to court on April 20th and the Defendant was not produced because the State prison system indicated they had not received a formal piece of paper requesting them to bring him up, a writ, even though this Court did contact them by phone to advise them that we would have him brought up the next week, which would be April 20th.

Then, after that, your Honor sent a writ to have him produced on May 4th and that's when he was brought up here, on May 4th.

THE COURT: Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

21

22

23

24

25

Now, this Court was actively engaged in another trial and is atill actively engaged in that same trial and you tell me if I'm wrong, but I believe I was advised informally by -- I don't recall who it was, but the evidence was available for the Defendant and you, sir, to review, but it was not reviewed for some reason.

Is that correct?

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CARAFA: That's correct, your Monor. I have chere an original and a copy and, if the Court wishes, if you'd like to mark it. In regards to Mr. Stone being present on May 4th of 1989 on the ninth floor, in the Judge's Lounge. The Investigator for the Prosecutor's Office was present. Mr. Steven Moran was present.

At that time, I gave -- I hand-delivered a copy of the Jury selection transcript for Monday, April 21, 1986 of 134 pages which Mr. Stone acknowledged receipt of by his signature.

Then, at that time, with the Prosecutor's Investigator there and all the evidence from the evidence locker and the entire Prosecutor's file, we were to review —— my client myself —— and I and my client were going to review this discovery.

Mr. Stone, the Defendant, petitioner, refused to go through and review it and maked that he have copies of everything given to him.

At that point in time, he was very hostile and abusive to me and if at all he spoke to me, it was in an uncooperative manner. He just asked to be brought back down to Trenton State Prison.

The next I heard was that Mr. Stone had filed a pro se motion for discovery. I never got a copy of it, but

In that correct?

MR. CARAFA: That's correct, your Honor. I have here an original and a copy and, if the Court wishes, if you'd like to mark it. In regards to Mr. Stone being present on May 4th of 1989 on the ninth floor, in the Judge's Lounge. The Investigator for the Prosecutor's Office was present. Mr. Steven Moran was present.

At that time, I gave -- I hand-delivered a copy of the jury selection transcript for Monday, April 21, 1986 of 134 pages which Mr. Stone acknowledged receipt of by his signature.

Then, at that time, with the Prosecutor's

Investigator there and all the evidence from the evidence
locker and the entire Prosecutor's file, we were to
review -- my client myself -- and I and my client were going
to review this discovery.

Mr. Stone, the Defendant, petitioner, refused to go through and review it and asked that he have copies of everything given to him.

At that point in time, he was very hostile and abusive to me and if at all he spoke to me, it was in an uncooperative manner. He just asked to be brought back down to Trenton State Prison.

The next I heard was that Mr. Stone had filed a pro se motion for discovery. I never got a copy of it, but

I did review it briefly as to what was submitted to the Court, and in effect, he was asking for grand Jury transcripts and all other discovery that was made available to his at that date on May 4th.

I don't know if your Honor wishes to go into the problems with the Grand Jury transcript. If you want to put that on the record at this point in time, I will.

THE COURT: Well, you're anticipating my question.

I know that for a period of months, we have been waiting for
the transcripts of the Jury selection process.

Have you received all of that yet, sir?

MR. CARAFA: No, your Honor, and at this point in time. I have received personally up to April 22nd from Miss Kathy Trinidad, May lat. 5th and the 6th was received quite some time ago. I forwarded those over to Mr. Stone. That was taken by a different court reporter, however. Her name was Wini Handel. She forwarded that to the Public Defender's Office and had copies made for the Prosecutor, copies for my client, and he received that.

Miss Trindad has not yet completed her transcribing of the jury selection. I was told on Tuesday from the Public Defender's Office that the April 23rd transcripts had arrived and they were in the process of coping them and that I would get my copy, if I would pick it up today after this hearing, or they would mail it to me in

I don't know if your Honor wishes to go into the problems with the Grand Jury transcript. If you want to put that on the record at this point in time, I will.

THE COURT: Well, you're anticipating by question.

I know that for a period of months, we have been waiting for the transcripts of the Jury selection process.

Have you received all of that yet, sir?

11

12

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

MR. CARAFA: No, your Honor, and at this point in time, I have received personally up to April 22nd from Miss Kathy Trinidad, May 1st, 5th and the 6th was received quite some time ago. I forwarded those over to Mr. Stone. That was taken by a different court reporter, however. Her name was Wini Handel. She forwarded that to the Public Defender's Office and had copies made for the Prosecutor, copies for my client, and he received that.

miss Trinded has not yet completed her transcribing of the jury selection. I was told on Tuesday from the Public Defender's Office that the April 23rd transcripts had arrived and they were in the process of coping them and that I would get my copy, if I would pick it up today after this hearing, or they would mail it to me in

the mail. Mr. Stone would get his copy sent directly from the Public Defender's Office, due to the situation as we stand here and my motion pending.

I have spoken with Miss Trindad as to the belance of the grand jury selection transcripts. Miss Trindad has told me, as I reflected in my letter to this Court, that the 28th of April transcript is missing at this point in time. She can't locate it. She is continuing to try and locate it. However, at this point in time, she has not.

The balance of the Jury selection transcript of the 29th and 30th of April of 1986, I am told by her that they should be completed by June 12th. I guess that would be the Monday following June 10th, the Saturday.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

These transcripts were or ordered by me, originally, way back when Mr. Stone had initially told me that he had requested me to do some research as to possible issues during the jury selection.

I believe, your Honor, that was in June. If you will bear with me, your Honor, June of 1988, by letter of June 25, 1988.

I immediately contacted the Appellate Section of the Public Defender's Office to try to secure the Jury selection transcripts.

After speaking with Mr. Frank Soliis, who's the Assistant Deputy in charge, he researched the files at the

25

the mail. Mr. Stone would get his copy sent directly from the Public Defender's Office, due to the situation as we stand here and my motion pending.

I have spoken with Miss Trinded as to the balance of the grand jury selection transcripts. Miss Trinded has told me, as I reflected in my letter to this Court, that the 28th of April transcript is missing at this point in time. She can't locate it. She is continuing to try and locate it. However, at this point in time, she has not.

The balance of the jury selection transcript of the 29th and 30th of April of 1986, I am told by her that they should be completed by June 12th. I guess that would be the Monday following June 10th, the Saturday.

These transcripts were or ordered by me, originally, way back when Mr. Stone had initially told me that he had requested me to do some research as to possible issues during the jury selection.

I believe, your Honor, that was in June. If you will bear with me, your Honor, June of 1988, by letter of June 25, 1988.

I immediately contacted the Appellate Section of the Public Defender's Office to try to secure the Jury selection transcripts.

After speaking with Mr. Frank Soltis, who's the Assistant Deputy in charge, he researched the files at the

Appellate Section and went through and came up with the transcripts of the trial.

However, although initially there was what they call a blue sheet requesting a transcript of the jury selection to be ordered, that request was then pulled and there was no actual request for a jury selection transcript for the appeal from Mr. Stone.

Therefore, although we originally thought -- or I originally thought that the Appellate Section would have those transcripts, they, in fact, were never ordered.

At that point in time, I immediately contacted the Public Defender's Office in Hudson County and requested that they order the transcripts.

Transcripts were eventually requested. However, Miss Trinded never received something in writing and not until September was something sent in writing requesting transcripts, in September of 1988 from the Public Defender, Miss Koplitz, to Miss Trindad to comply and produce those transcripts.

In the interum, we were told by Miss Trinded on a variety of occasions that she was in the process of a homicide case and she was very busy, et cetera. Each time I requested another adjournment, I explained by letter to my client, a letter to the Cour with a C.C. to the Prosecutor as to the problems we were having getting the transcripts.

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

22

Appellate Section and went through and came up with the transcripts of the trial.

1.7

However, although initially there was what they call a blue sheet requesting a transcript of the jury selection to be ordered, that request was then pulled and there was no actual request for a jury selection transcript for the appeal from Mr. Stone.

Therefore, although we originally thought -- or I originally thought that the Appellate Section would have those transcripts, they, in fact, were never ordered.

At that point in time, I immediately contacted the Fublic Defender's Office in Hudson County and requested that they order the transcripts.

Transcripts were eventually requested. However, Miss Trindad never received something in writing and not until September was something sent in writing requesting transcripts, in September of 1988 from the Public Defender, Miss Koblitz, to Miss Trindad to comply and produce those transcripts.

In the interum, we were told by Miss Trinded on a variety of occasions that she was in the process of a homicide case and she was very busy, et cetera. Each time I requested another adjournment, I explained by letter to my client, a letter to the Cour ...th a C.C. to the Prosecutor as to the problems we were having getting the transcripts.

Finally, your Honor, as I have stated about three minutes ago, we are now getting them on a piece-meal basis. This was based on my constant contacting of the Public Defender's Office, Miss Kobiitz, the Court Reporters Office, the Court Reporter's Supervisor's office to get something moving on this because it's been such a lengthy delay from the time that we originally requested these transcripts from the Court Reporter, after we learned that the Appellate Section had not, in faut, ever ordered them for use on the appeal.

I have tried to comply with my olient's requests in regard to getting all the discovery. The Prosecutor's made his file evailable to me and I have copies of what he has given to me.

However, since I received a letter dated February 5th from Mr. Stone, indicating that he was thinking of taking action against me, that he was having problems with some type of a conspiracy, intimating and suggesting that I may be part of this with the Prosecutor, I thought it best that we bring Mr. Stone up, personally, and that's why we sought to bring him up here. So he could review the file, himself, with me present and go over it with him and compare it with the trial file that I received from the Public Defender's Office.

Once again, your Honor, Mr. Stone at that time

finally, your Honor, as I have stated about three minutes ago, we are now getting them on a piece-meal basis. This was based on my constant contacting of the Public Defender's Office, Miss Koblitz, the Court Reporters Office, the Court Reporter's Supervisor's office to get something moving on this because it's been such a lengthy delay from the time that we originally requested these transcripts from the Court Reporter, after we learned that the Appellate Section had not, in fact, ever ordered them for use on the appeal.

I have tried to comply with my client's requests in regard to getting all the discovery. The Prosecutor's made his file available to me and I have copies of what he has given to me.

However, since I received a letter dated February 5th from Mr. Stone, indicating that he was thinking of taking action against me, that he was having problems with some type of a conspiracy, intimating and suggesting that I may be part of this with the Prosecutor, I thought it best that we bring Mr. Stone up, personally, and that's why we sought to bring him up here. So he could review the file, himself, with me present and go over it with him and compare it with the trial file that I received from the Public Defender's Office.

Once again, your Honor, Mr. Stone at that time

refused to cooperate with me and asked to be brought back.

I think that besically covers where we're at right now, your Monor. If the Court has any other questions, I'll enswer them as best I can.

THE COURT: Would you like to say anything, Mr. Stone.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, Judge, a small thing here, you know.

You see, it's obvious what Mr. Carafa has said, most of it is true. When I requested it, you know, for my discovery. I requested it for him to file a motion. 1 didn't request to come to view the evidence or jury discovery, whatever the hell it is. But anyway, right, that stuff -- you're standing too close to me here and I forget what I was about to say.

Anyway, you know, his motion -- you know, I'm down for his motion as far as getting him off my case and all.

THE COURT: You don't want him?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't want him on my omme.

THE COURT: You don't want him to represent you anymore?

21 22 23

25

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

17

THE DEFENDANT: No, because he lied to me. He said -- he told me he reviewed -- he had the transcripts, the jury selection, and he reviewed them and found no issue. That's in his December 7th letter.

3

10

11

1.2 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

25

refused to cooperate with me and asked to be brought back. I think that basically covers where we're at right now, your Monor. If the Court has any other questions, 1'11 answer them as best I can. THE COURT: Would you like to say anything, Mr. Stone. THE DEFENDANT: Well, Judge, a smell thing here, you know. You see, it's obvious what Mr. Carafa has said, 10 most of it is true. When I requested it, you know, for my discovery, I requested it for him to file a motion. I 11 didn't request to come to view the evidence or jury 12 discovery, whatever the hell it is. But anyway, right, that 13 stuff -- you're standing too close to me here and I forget 14 15 what I was about to say. Anyway, you know, his motion -- you know, I'm down 16 for his motion as far as getting him off my case and all. 17 THE COURT: You don't want him? THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't went him on my case. 19 THE COURT: You don't want him to represent you 21 anymore? 22 THE DEFENDANT: No, because he lied to me. He said -- he told me he reviewed -- he had the transcripts. 23 the jury selection, and he reviewed them and found no issue. That's in his December 7th letter.

When I wrote him a letter, I told him send it to
me. He writes me, well, he assumed or I assumed that he
wrote you because he sent me a copy of a letter stating that
certain stenographers or whatever are supposed to be
transcribing it for the transcripts, but I still never
received nothing. And that right there is, as I said, I'm
hoping you grant his motion, really. I don't want him on
the case.
THE COURT: Well, you have
MR. CARAFA: If I may respond, your Honor, that I
sent Mr. Stone a letter.
THE COURT: Do you have an application before the
Court?
MR. CARAFA: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, he do, your Honor.
MR. CARAFA: If I may briefly respond to what Mr.
Stone has said?
THE COURT: May I ask this; do you wish to be
relieved, sir?
MR. CARAFA: Yes, your Honor, I do.
THE COURT: And you're a pool attorney, aren't
you.
MR. CARAFA: That's correct, sir.
THE COURT: Does the Public Defender's Office know

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

about that?

Whe	n I wrote him a letter, I told him send it to
me. He write	s me, well, he assumed or I assumed that he
wrote you bec	ause he sent me a copy of a letter stating that
certain steno	prephers or whatever are supposed to be
transcribing	it for the transcripts, but I still never
received noth	ing. And that right there is, as I said. I'm
hoping you gr	ant his motion, really. I don't want him on
the case.	
THE	COURT: Well, you have
MR.	CARAFA: If I may respond, your Honor, that I
sent Mr. Ston	e s letter.
THE	COURT: Do you have an application before the
Court?	
MR.	CARAFA: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE	DEFENDANT: Yes, he do, your Honor.
MR.	CARAFA: If I may briefly respond to what Mr.
Stone has sai	d7
THE	COURT: May I mak this; do you wish to be
relieved, sir	7
MR.	CARAFA: Yes, your Honor, I do.
THE	COURT: And you're a pool attorney, aren't
you.	
MR.	CARAFA: That's correct, sir.
THE	COURT: Does the Public Defender's Office know

17

18

20

22

23 24

about that?

MR. CARAFA: I have tried to contact the Public Defender's Office and I just most recently again tried to the reasons I stated in my affidavit to this Court.

Wini Hendel.

10

11

12

1.5

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

reach Miss Koblitz. She was not in this morning. THE COURT: The reason I say that, sir, is it's my understanding that the Public Defender's Office did does not silow individuals to select and choose who will represent them. They indicate who that person may be. MR. CARAFA: Well, I understand that, your Honor, I understand that, but this is not the case. My client has not sought for me to be relieved. I am seeking to be relieved. It's the Public Defender that is going to have to say, we don't allow you to pick and choose, Mr. Stone. Your Honor, it's my motion as assigned Counsel for

Just briefly to respond to what Mr. Stone said, in regards to sending him a letter, on December 7th, I indicated that I reviewed the Grand Jury transcript and that I find no legal issues that are meritorious. What I did not put in the letter, your Honor, was I received partial transcripts or I should have said the transcript of Miss

Clearly, Mr. Stone and I realized that there were many more transcripts that had not been received. However --

THE COURT: Just a minute, sir.

MR. CARAFA: I have tried to contact the Public Defender's Office and I just most recently again tried to reach Miss Koblitz. She was not in this morning.

THE COURT: The reason I say that, air, is it's my understanding that the Public Defender's Office did does not ellow individuals to select and choose who will represent them. They indicate who that person may be.

MR. CARAFA: Well, I understand that, your Monor. I understand that, but this is not the case. My client has not sought for me to be relieved. I am seeking to be relieved. It's the Public Defender that is going to have to say, we don't allow you to pick and choose, Mr. Stone.

Your Honor, it's my motion as assigned Counsel for the reasons I stated in my affidevit to this Court.

Just briefly to respond to what Mr. Stone said, in regards to sending him a letter, on December 7th, I indicated that I reviewed the Grand Jury transcript and that I find no legal issues that are meritorious. What I did not put in the letter, your Monor, was I received partial transcripts or I should have said the transcript of Miss Wini Handel.

Clearly, Mr. Stone and I realized that there were many more transcripts that had not been received.

THE COURT: Just a minute, air.

MR. CARAFA: However, I then sent him a letter in response to what he had written to me insimumating I had not read the transcript, that I didn't know there were other transcripts outstanding, when clearly we had ordered these way in advance from the two separate Court Reporters.

I've had stated earlier, Miss Wini Handel's transcript came in earlier than Miss Trindad's. Those are the ones that I referred to in my letter of December 7th.

Now, in my letter on February 10th to Mr. Stone, I indicated to him. Just as he said in his letter to me, about the Jury selection transcripts. They were not the completed. The Jury selection transcript was partial and the bulk of the transcripts had still not been transcribed by Misa Trindad.

1.6

THE COURT: For the record, you filed your motion on May 19th. However, this Court did not receive your motion papers with the paperwork in the Clerk's office until, I believe, yesterday, just for the record. That's why I asked you whether you had an application. It's with the file, but the Court was busy in another trial, yesterday. Therefore, I did not have an opportunity to review your affidavit, but I have reviewed it at this time.

MR. GREGORY: I have no real position, your Monor,

Mr. Gregory?

for

NR. CARAFA: However, I then sent him a letter in response to what he had written to me insinuating I had not read the transcript, that I didn't know there were other transcripts outstanding, when clearly we had ordered these way in advance from the two separate Court Reporters.

I've had stated earlier, Miss Wini Handel's transcript came in earlier than Miss Trindad's. Those are the ones that I referred to in my letter of December 7th.

Now, in my letter on February 10th to Mr. Stone, I indicated to him, Just as he said in his letter to me, about the Jury selection transcripts. They were not the completed. The Jury selection transcript was partial and the bulk of the transcripts had still not been transcribed by Miss Trindad.

THE COURT: For the record, you filed your motion on May 19th. However, this Court did not receive your motion papers with the paperwork in the Clerk's office until, I believe, yesterday, just for the record. That's why I asked you whether you had an application. It's with the file, but the Court was busy in another trial, yesterday. Therefore, I did not have an opportunity to review your affidavit, but I have reviewed it at this time.

Mr. Gregory?

MR. GREGORY: I have no real position, your Honor, vis a vis Counsel and whether or not be should be excused or

relieved at this time.

1.0

My problem here is discovery. I don't know what the State is supposed to do in this instance, your Honor. I have allowed Mr. Carefa the opportunity to review my file. He went through the box and he told me what he wanted me to oppy for him. It was capied for him. It took me several weeks to do it, but it was done.

I don't have any intention of providing the same opportunity to the Defendant nor do I have any intention now, after having had the file copied once for trial and once for the PCR, to copy it a third time. What I have, they have. That's all I can assume.

As to the issue of viewing of the evidence, this is not pretrial. This is not governed by Rule Rule 3:15-3. The evidence that was produced on May 4th was the evidence that was produced at trial. It was everything that was moved into evidence by both sides at trial. That evidence resides in the custody of my office, but it's really technically the Court's.

I am not in a position to copy clothing. I'm not in a position to copy keys or credit cards. I'm certainly not in a position to reproduce photographs. I don't believe that a photocopy of a photograph would serve anybody's purposes at this point.

That was why my suggestion to Mr. Carafa was, if

relieved at this time.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

23

22

23

24

25

My problem here is discovery. I don't know what the State is supposed to do in this instance, your Monor. I have allowed Mr. Carafa the opportunity to review my file. He went through the box and he told me what he wanted me to copy for him. It was copied for him. It took me several weeks to do it, but it was done.

13

I don't have any intention of providing the same opportunity to the Defendant nor do I have any intention now, after having had the file copied once for trial and once for the PCR, to copy it a third time. What I have, they have. That's all I can assume.

As to the issue of viewing of the evidence, this is not pretrial. This is not governed by Rule Rule 3:13-3. The evidence that was produced on May 4th was the evidence that was produced at trial. It was everything that was moved into evidence by both sides at trial. That evidence resides in the custody of my office, but it's really technically the Court's.

I am not in a position to copy clothing. I'm not in a position to copy keys or credit cards. I'm certainly not in a position to reproduce photographs. I don't believe that a photocopy of a photograph would serve anybody's purposes at this point.

That was why my suggestion to Mr. Carafa was, if

he wanted to physically give the file to Mr. Stone, that I would suree that the evidence be produced before the Court so that Mr. Stone could review the evidence, but that it would never leave anybody's custody because it is in the Court's custody.

I don't know how I can satisfy Mr. Stone's demands unless the Court tells me. I don't think that I should have to. If he wants to see it, we'll produce it. If he doesn't want to see it, then we won't produce it. But I'm not about to start playing games, at this point.

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me, Judge. On what the Prosecutor said?

> THE COURT: You'd like to say something? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I would.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Stone.

×

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

THE DEFENDANT: Just as to what he just said now. right? He said that he had produced a copy of the discovery and gave it to Mr. Carafa. Well, I requested, back in I believe it was March, the earliest, for the discovery package, okay?

Now, this shows that Mr. Carafa really doesn't have my -- what you call it best interest, so I'm hoping that you will grant his motion as far as getting him off my case, in effect, your Honor.

MR. GREGORY: For the record, your Honor, Mr.

he wanted to physically give the file to Mr. Stone, that I would earee that the evidence be produced before the Court so that Mr. Stone could review the evidence, but that it would never leave anybody's custody because it is in the Court's custody.

I don't know how I can satisfy Nr. Stone's demands unless the Court tells me. I don't think that I should have to. If he wants to see it, we'll produce it. If he doesn't want to see it, then we won't produce it. But I'm not about to start playing games, at this point.

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me, Judge. On what the Prosecutor seid?

THE COURT: You'd like to say something?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I would.

THE COURT: Go shead, Mr. Stone.

THE DEPENDANT: Just as to what he just seid now, right? He said that he had produced a copy of the discovery and gave it to Mr. Carafa. Well, I requested, back in I believe it was March, the earliest, for the discovery package, okay?

Now, this shows that Mr. Carafa really doesn't have my -- what you call it best interest, so I'm hoping that you will grant his motion as far as getting his off my case, in effect, your Honor.

MR. GREGORY: For the record, your Honor, Mr.

Carafa contacted me either February or March for the copying. I mareed to do it. Mr. Carafa said that, however, he wanted to look at my file. He came one Thursday and spent several hours in my office, in a cubical, going through the file.

when he selected the parts of the file that
weren't work product and that were relevant to the case,
itself, he then gave them to me and I was to have them
copied. Part of it was copied on one day. There were other
things that were extraneous to the file, wrap sheets and
miscellaneous papers, which were not copied at my direction.
I then had them copied and they were done.

When we reached April, we decided on that April 20th date to hand over the discovery and to do the viewing all one one day. Mr. Carafa expressed to me his desire not to mail the discovery.

MR. CARAFA: That's correct, your Honor. That's absolutely correct, because I wanted to hand deliver it to my client so there was no question of problems, especially based upon the February 5th letter that Mr. Stone sent to me, your Honor. That's why we had him brought up here.

Now, Mr. Stone can have a copy of everything that we made. He's entitled to that, as far as I's concerned. I have it. When I say, I have it, unfortunately today when I got up, I had a flat tire on my car. It's in my other car

6

8

10

15

16

18 19 20

22 23

25

21

and I had to take my wife's car to work. But he will have it tomorrow, Judge, because I have it.

I told him I had it when I came up May 4th, I said, you can have it. I'll take it. I'll have you sign for it and I'll mail it.

Judge, it's been my experience in twelve years or thirteen years as a criminal defense attorney, that things tend to get loat. They tend to get looked at, perused by other people who shouldn't have had it. I can have them personally hand-deliver, at this time, to Mr. Stone. They were available and he can have them, Judge.

However, as far as what Mr. Greuory says, the only thing he has not provided me with, which I had requested, which is why we had Mr. Stone brought up on May 4th, was that evidence that was in the evidence vault. That was the evidence that Mr. Gregory says that he should not have to copy and that's what he's alluding to.

THE COURT: Well, that was available on that particular date, correct?

MR. CARAFA: Yes, it was available, your Monor.
That's why we had him brought up, Judge, because I had
requested everything. Albeit not by a formal motion, but
there was no need for it because the Prosecutor was
cooperating with me.

It's a voluminous file, around 700 pages, Judge,

THE COURT: All right.

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First, with regard to the motion to be relieved, there is merit in the application.

However, I'm not going to relieve you, sir, from representing this Defendant until we have another attorney who can take over and represent him.

I'm not going to have any interruption in this hearing and I want this matter heard as soon as possible on the merits of the applications for post conviction relief.

How much time do you think it would were take for the Public Defender to assign another attorney?

MR. CARAFA: I would have to speak with Miss Koblitz, your Honor. I tried to speak to her yesterday and again, today, and I have not been able to reach her.

THE COURT: Well, you won't -- I'm sorry for interrupting you. Won't have the transcript until June 12th, you stated?

MR. CARAFA: That's right, your Honor. June 12th.
I'm told by Miss Trinded.

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me, Judge Harrington, they have been ordered.

THE COURT: Excuse me. I know exactly what's

THE COURT: Excuse me. I know exactly what's

have been ordered.

24

25

17

1	nappening, sar. sout a manager
2	THE DEFENDANT: Well, it seems like you are
3	following his lie.
4	THE COURT: You just keep quiet, sir. Do you hear
5	867
6	THE DEFENDANT: Look, your Monor, they be here
7	and
8	THE COURT: Did you hear me?
9	THE DEFENDANT: since 1986, your Honor. They
10	be here.
11	THE COURT: I'm talking. It's my turn.
12	THE DEFENDANT: It's in the Appellate Division
13	since 1986.
14	THE COURT: Do you understand?
15	THE DEFENDANT: What he's telling you is a lie.
16	Whether you accept it or not, the whole thing is just, you
17	know, getting him off the boat. It min't going to work.
18	THE COURT: I'm going to set this matter down for
19	June 22nd. That will give you sufficient time to speak to
20	Miss Koblitz, the head of Public Defender's Office, and then

I want you to convey the message that it appears to this Court there is merit to this application, but I will not relieve you as Counsel until there is another attorney to represent Mr. Stone, so there's no interruption, at all.

you should have the transcript by them, also.

21

22

23

24

1	happening, sir. Just a minute.
2	THE DEFENDANT: Well, it seems like you are
3	following his lie.
4	THE COURT: You just keep quiet, sir. Do you hear
5	ne?
6	THE DEFENDANT: Look, your Honor, they be here
7	end
8	THE COURT: Did you hear me?
9	THE DEFENDANT: since 1986, your Honor. They
0	be here.
1	THE COURT: I'm talking. It's my turn.
2	THE DEFENDANT: It's in the Appellate Division
3	since 1986.
4	THE COURT: Do you understand?
5	THE DEFENDANT: What he's telling you is a lie.
6	Whether you accept it or not, the whole thing is fust, you
7	know, getting him off the boat. It ain't going to work.
8	THE COURT: I'm going to set this matter down for
9	June 22nd. That will give you sufficient time to speak to
0	Miss Koblitz, the head of Public Defender's Office, and the
1	you should have the transcript by them, also.
2	I want you to convey the message that it appears
3	to this Court there is merit to this application, but I wil
4	not relieve you as Counsel until there is another attorney

to represent Mr. Stone, so there's no interruption, at all,

	Insofer as the evidence is concerned, the new
-	
3	attorney can make arrangements to see the physical evidence
4	with Mr. Stone, but we're not going to play games.
5	Insofar as copies are concerned, Mr. Carafa, you
6	indicated that you'll make copies and get them to your
7	client by when?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, tomorrow, I can have
9	them brought over to the Public Defender's Office. At the
10	latest, tomorrow, and then they will either hand-deliver
11	them or send them certified seil, directly to him. That's
12	the way I like to do it.
13	THE COURT: Within a week. Whatever comes to your
1.4	office, you make copies and they'll be sent by a week from
15	tomorrow. That would be the
16	THE DEFENDANT: Was there a motion made for the
17	discovery? I like to ask him that.
18	MR. CARAFA: No, I never made a motion.
19	THE COURT: Mr. Carafa
20	THE DEFENDANT: Therefore, it's not completed. 1
21	guarantee it's not completed.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Stone, I made my ruling.
23	THE DEFENDANT: The discovery is not completed.
24	That is exactly what Mr. Bovino did when he represented me

at trial. Same thing. They took certain documents out of

with regard to this proceeding.

11

12

1.3

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

Insofar as the evidence is concerned, the new attorney can make arrangements to see the physical evidence with Mr. Stone, but we're not going to play games.

Insofar as copies are concerned, Mr. Carefa, you indicated that you'll make copies and get them to your client by when?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Monor, tomorrow, I can have them brought over to the Public Defender's Office. At the latest, tomorrow, and then they will either hand-deliver them or send them certified mail, directly to him. That's the way I like to do it.

THE COURT: Within a week. Whatever comes to your office, you make copies and they'll be sent by a week from tomorrow. That would be the --

THE DEFENDANT: Was there a motion made for the discovery? I like to mak him that.

MR. CARAFA: No, I never made a motion.

THE COURT: Mr. Carafa --

THE DEFENDANT: Therefore, it's not completed. I guarantee it's not completed.

THE COURT: Mr. Stone, I made my ruling.

That is exactly what Mr. Bovino did when he represented me at trial. Same thing. They took certain documents out of

the discovery.

10

11

1.2

THE COURT: Mr. Stone, I'm going to have you remanded back to the custody of the Officers --

THE DEFENDANT: Hell, it's the Prosecutor who runs the court in here and the Officers. Look at what we have -I have already -- the State knows what's happening. Man, there is really no motion or authority to that.

THE COURT: I made my ruling, Mr. Stone. Show the Defendant all the copies of --

THE DEFENDANT: As a matter of fact, you can send -- the State can send unatever you want because I'm not -- the Defendant going to sign for it.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter.

ORRAINE M. CIRELLI, C.S.R./ C.M.
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
LICENSE NO XIGO977
HUDSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE

JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY 07306

Dated: April 16, 1990

20

the discovery.

10

11

12

THE COURT: Mr. Stone, I'm going to have you remanded back to the custody of the Officers --

THE DEFENDANT: Hell, it's the Prosecutor who runs the court in here and the Officers. Look at what we have --I have already -- the State knows what's happening. Man, there is really no motion or authority to that.

THE COURT: I made my ruling, Mr. Stone. Show the Defendant all the copies of --

THE DEPENDANT: As a matter of fact, you can send -- the State can send whatever you want because I'm not -- the Defendant going to sign for it.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter.

> ORRAINE M. CIRELLI, C.S.R./ OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER LICENSE NO XIDO977 HUDSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY 07306

> > Dated: April 16, 1990

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSET LAW DIVISION - HUDSON COUNTY (CRIMINAL) INDICTMENT NO. 1369-12-85

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, :

POST-CONVICTION RELIEF HEARING

LEONARD STONE,

Defendant.

Thursday, November 9, 1989

Audson County Courthouse Jersey City, New Jersey

REC'D

THE HONORABLE CHARLES J. HARRINGTON, JR., J.S.C.

SUSAN B. GYSS, ESQ., Assistant Prosecutor For the State.

STEVEN MENAKER, ESQ.

Attorney for the Defendant

SCILON CONTENT

DOLORES M. GENNARO, C.S.R. OFFICIAL COURT REPORTS HUDSON COUNTY COU JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY 07306

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - HUDSON COUNTY (CRIMINAL) INDICTMENT NO. 1369-12-85

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,

-VS-

POSY-CONVICTION RELIEF HEARING

LEONARD STONE,

Defendant.

Thursday, November 9, 1989

Rudson County Courthouse Jersey City, New Jersey

BEFORE

THE HONORABLE CHARLES J. HARRINGTON, JR., J.S.C.

SUSAN B. GYSS, ESQ., Assistant Prosecutor For the State.

STEVEN MENAKER, ESQ.

SOLION CONTENT

REC'D

DOLORES M. GENNARD, C.S.R. OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

THE COURT: Let the record reflect the defendant is here in court.

Mr. Menaker.

MR. MENAKER: We're before the Court this morning on Mr. Stone's pro se petition for Post-Conviction Relief.

He cites in his application two bases for this Court to set aside his trial conviction and to grant a new trial.

The first basis recited in his brief is prosecutorial misconduct predicated upon prejudicial remarks recited by the Assistant Prosecutor in his summation to the jury. He sets forth what those remarks are.

I think the law is clear. In my opinion, it's a factual finding that's required by this Court as to whether those remarks constitute prosecutorial misconduct.

The second basis for relief is the ineffective assistance of trial counsel, and that's predicated upon his trial counsel's failure to effectively deal with the issue of discovery being supplied to him during the course of the trial. I've submitted a brief on that point. And because of that, I'd like to amplify upon it just briefly.

The issue presented by that question is whether his trial attorney should have effectively done anything in response to the receipt after the selection of the jury, after the openings by counsel, and after the presentation of

21

22

23

11

13

15

16

17

19

22

Mr. Menaker.

MR. MENAKER: We're before the Court this morning on Mr. Stone's pro se petition for Post-Conviction Relief.

He cites in his application two bases for this Court to set aside his trial conviction and to grant a new trial.

The first basis recited in his brief is presecutorial misconduct predicated upon prejudicial remarks recited by the Assistant Prosecutor in his summation to the jury. He sets forth what those remarks are.

I think the law is clear. In my opinion, it's a factual finding that's required by this Court as to whether those remarks constitute prosecutorial misconduct.

The second basis for relief is the ineffective assistance of trial counsel, and that's predicated upon his trial counsel's failure to effectively deal with the issue of discovery being supplied to him during the course of the trial. I've submitted a brief on that point. And because of that, I'd like to amplify upon it just briefly.

The issue presented by that question is whether his trial attorney should have effectively done anything in response to the receipt after the selection of the jury, after the openings by counsel, and after the presentation of testimony commenced with a fiber analysis -THE COURT: Just a minute.

I'm sorry.

MR. MENAKER: The question is whether his trial counsel should have done something to deal with the receipt during the course of the trial of a fiber analysis report which ultimately was used in rebuttal. The record revealed that his trial counsel objected initially to the receipt of that report and its use for any purpose but made no application for a mistrial, no application for a continuance, no application to bar or suppress the receipt of that information, and then later when that information was presented as rebuttal evidence, again failed to move for a mistrial, failed to move to preclude or bar its presentation.

And the significant prejudice that the receipt of discovery during the course of a trial has, and particularly in a capital case is that -- I'm sure the Court could well appreciate it -- a case like that is not one in which there should be any surprises. It's a case in which both sides have the right to demand early receipt of discovery and demand a full measure of time to prepare and analyze the facts and present their theories both as to prosecution and as to defense. And in this case that was obviously done by trial counsel in reliance upon certain evidence not being in existence. It was that that he predicated his spening on.

PENGRO CO. BATOMAE W.J.

23 24 25

21

22

12

13

THE COURT: Just a minute.

I'm sorry.

MR. MENAKER: The question is whether his trial counsel should have done something to deal with the receipt during the course of the trial of a fiber analysis report which ultimately was used in rebuttal. The record revealed that his trial counsel objected initially to the receipt of that report and its use for any purpose but made no application for a mistrial, no application for a continuance, no application to bar or suppress the receipt of that information, and then later when that information was presented as rebuttal evidence, again failed to move for a mistrial, failed to move to preclude or bar its presentation.

And the significant prejudice that the receipt of discovery during the course of a trial has, and particularly in a capital case is that -- I'm sure the Court could wall appreciate it -- a case like that is not one in which there should be any surprises. It's a case in which both sides have the right to demand early receipt of discovery and demand a full measure of time to prepare and analyze the facts and present their theories both as to presecution and as to defense. And in this case that was obviously done by trial counsel in reliance upon certain evidence not being in existence. It was that that he predicated his opening on.

it was that that he predicated his entire theory of defense on, and that rug was pulled out from underneath his struptly during the course of the trial. And that should have prompted some more measured reaction than simply protesting its late receipt.

He could have asked for a continuance to give him the opportunity to engage an expert witness to rebut the analysis. He could have asked for a mistrial based upon this discovery violation. He could send should have done something other than to simply accept it into evidence, albeit for the limited purpose on rebuttel. And it's that basis that I believe constitutes as presented the ineffective assistance of counsel in this case, and it's that basis that this Court is asked to reverse the conviction upon.

I've concluded. And I would simply ask the Court's permission, if Mr. Stone wishes to, to address the Court to amplify upon any of the reasons recited in his moving papers or in my presentation.

THE COURT: Mr. Stone, is there anything further you would like to add in addition to what Mr. Menaker has already said to the Court, Sir?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't.

22

23

THE COURT: Ms. Prosecutor, do you wish to address the Court?

MS. CYSS: Judge, there's a response brief filed

11

13 14 15

17 18 19

23

his

of

He could have asked for a continuance to give him the opportunity to engage an expert witness to rebut the analysis. He could have asked for a mistrial based upon this discovery violation. He could and should have done something other than to simply accept it into evidence, albeit for the limited purpose on rebuttal. And it's that basis that I believe constitutes as presented the ineffective assistance of counsel in this case, and it's that basis that this Court is asked to reverse the conviction upon.

I've concluded. And I would simply ask the Court's permission, if Mr. Stone wishes to, to address the Court to amplify upon any of the reasons recited in his moving papers or in my presentation.

THE COURT: Mr. Stone, is there anything further you would like to add in addition to what Mr. Memaker has already said to the Court, Sir?

THE DEFENDANT: No. I don't.

THE COURT: Ms. Prosecutor, do you wish to address the Court?

MS. GYSS: Judge, there's a response brief filed

with the Court and I'm not going to belabor any of the law that's set out in the brief.

My response to Mr. Menaker's eloquent argument is that the one point that I don't think the defense makes out at all is how the defendant was so prejudiced that a different result might have occurred.

The Lab Report was not used in the State's direct case. It was not used by the State until it was used to crossexamine the defendant and then was moved in on rebuttal.

The entire State's case went in without the use of this Lab Report. And I think that that should weigh heavily in your Honor's determination as to whether a different result would have resulted if the Lab Report had been produced slightly earlier than it was.

The burden of proof is on the defendant to establish by a preponderance of credible evidence his right to Post-Conviction Relief. And I think the Court is well aware that this is only done in extraordinary or exceptional circumstances.

15

17

20

21

22

23

Trials are never perfect. We seek to give the defendant the best opportunity to defend against the charges against him, but a trial will contain things that perhaps if we sat and looked at it in retrospect might have been done differently. These do not always rise to the level of reversible error, and the standard before the Court is even higher than that. You need extraordinary circumstances

My response to Mr. Menaker's eloquent argument is that the one point that I don't think the defense makes out at all is how the defendant was so prejudiced that a different result might have occurred.

The Lab Report was not used in the State's direct case. It was not used by the State until it was used to cross-examine the defendant and then was moved in on rebuttal.

The entire State's case went in without the use of this Lab Report. And I think that that should weigh heavily in your Honor's determination as to whether a different result would have resulted if the Lab Report had been produced slightly earlier than it was.

The burden of proof is on the defendant to establish
by a preponderance of credible evidence his right to PostConviction Relief. And I think the Court is well aware that
this is only done in extraordinary or exceptional circumstances.

Trials are never perfect. We seek to give the defendant the best opportunity to defend against the charges against him, but a trial will contain things that perhaps if we sat and looked at it in retrospect might have been done differently. These do not always rise to the level of reversible error. And the standard before the Court is even higher than that. You need extraordinary circumstances

here to grant the remedy the defendant is seeking.

I ask the Court to deny the petition.

THE COURT: This is a motion by the defendant to set aside the conviction as indicated by the defendant on two grounds, first on the ground of prosecutorial misconduct, and ineffective assistance of counsel.

On the first ground argued by the defendant, I find that there was no prosecutorial misconduct by the Prosecutor at the trial.

Further, on the second ground, ineffective assistance of counsel, the Court must note that the attorney representing him, the defendant, Mr. Bovino at that time, was a most experienced trial attorney who was trying cases for the Public Defender's Office in Rudson County for over ten years. He was an excellent, astute trial attorney. And I find that there was no ineffective assistance of counsel during the course of this trial.

But, in any event, it should be noted this Court presided over that trial. And there has been no showing on this motion of prejudice against this defendant.

It's also noted that the evidence presented before the jury was overwhelming in this case.

And for all the foregoing reasons, the motion is hereby denied.

The defendant is remanded to the State facility in

22

23

TT'S'B

here to grant the remedy the defendant is seeking.

erent

ct

cross

of

ily

result

blish

tad

I ask the Court to deny the petition.

THE COURT: This is a motion by the defendant to set aside the conviction as indicated by the defendant on two grounds, first on the ground of prosecutorial misconduct, and ineffective assistance of counsel.

On the first ground argued by the defendant, I find that there was no prosecutorial misconduct by the Prosecutor at the trial.

11

12

15

17

20

21

22

23

Further, on the second ground, ineffective assistance of counsel, the Court must note that the attorney representing him, the defendant, Mr. Bovino at that time, was a most experienced trial attorney who was trying cases for the Public Defender's Office in Hudson County for over ten years. He was an excellent, astute trial attorney. And I find that there was no ineffective assistance of counsel during the course of this trial.

But, in any event, it should be noted this court presided over that trial. And there has been no showing on this motion of prejudice against this defendant.

It's also noted that the evidence presented before the jury was overwhelming in this case.

And for all the foregoing reasons, the motion is hereby denied.

The defendant is remanded to the State facility in

the custody of the two Officers present in court.

Anything else at this time?

MR. MENAKER: No, your Honor.

MS. GYSS: The State will submit an order, Judge.

THE COURT: Please.

(Hearing concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

I DO HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter.

the custody of the two Officers present in court.

Anything else at this time?

MR. MENAKER: No, your Honor.

MS. GYSS: The State will submit an order, Judge.

THE COURT: Please.

(Hearing concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

I DO HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the above-entitled

DOLORES M. GENNARO, C.S.M. LICENSE NO. XIOOSO2



State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
DIVISION OF
ARCHIVES AND RECORDS MANAGEMENT

TITLE TARGET

TITLE OF RECORDS: Docket	Brief Transcripts
FIRST RECORD: A-2127-84 (LAST RECORD: A-1973-89	Continued from Real # 58 8707
FILMED FOR (use name of agency):	Judicialy Appellate Div.
TYPE CAMERA: Minolta	CAMERA NUMBER: 60
BATCH # JOB#BOX #	OP THEE EF
IMAGES	ROLL #

SR 8708