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                Colloquy
THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Have a seat. Thanks for coming. Happy Saint Patrick's Day. Have a seat.
I met you all yesterday. My name is Joseph Isabella, I'm a Judge of the Superior Court of the State of New Jersey. You've been brought here today so that we may select a jury for this case, which is entitled State of New Jersey versus Stephen Wright.
We are about to begin a process called the voir dire. The purpose of the voir dire is very simple. It is to obtain a jury which is able to hear this case without bias, prejudice or preconceived ideas. Our goal is to select a fair jury.
We are here to try the matter in dispute between the State of New Jersey and Stephen Wright. This is a criminal case and the charges are as follows. Aggravated sexual assault and burglary. Jury service may be new to some of you so a few preliminary remarks may prove to be helpful to you. The first step in a jury trial is the selection of a jury. This process is important because both the state and the defendant are entitled to jurors who are impartial and agree to keep their minds open until a verdict is reached.
Jurors must be as free as humanly possible
```

from bias, prejudice or preconceived ideas and sympathy and must not -- and must not be influenced by preconceived ideas.

Those of you selected as jurors on this case shall serve as judges of the facts. In other words, you will listen to testify of witnesses, examine any physical evidence produced, and thereafter you will determine what the facts are.

I am the Judge of the law. At the conclusion of this matter, after the evidence has been presented and counsel have made their closing arguments, I will tell you what the law is and you must apply that law to the facts as you find them to be in order to reach a fair and impartial verdict.

Although you may be qualified to serve as a juror in most cases, there may be something that could disqualify you in this case or make it embarrassing for you to serve. In order to learn this, I have to ask you questions. Please understand the questions I ask are for a legitimate purpose, and not simply to pry into your personal affairs.

Do not hesitate to speak your mind honestly and plainly. It's very important that you answer each question fully and truthfully. There are no right or wrong answers. Truthful and honest answers are
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necessary so that a fair and impartial jury can be selected.

As we mature, we all to some extent develop certain biases, prejudices, fixed opinions and views. We develop these from our families, those around us, the media, from our every day life experiences. You're entitled to be who you are and to feel and think about things as you do but it's important to recognize any bias, prejudice, fixed opinions or views you have and 10 to disclose them to me during the jury selection 11 process.

If, for any reason, my questions do not cover why you would not be able to listen with an open mind to the evidence in this case or be unable to reach a fair and impartial verdict, it is necessary that you volunteer this information to me when you're questioned.

If at any time during the jury selection process you wish to discuss anything with me concerning your ability to serve as a juror, raise your hand. I will speak with you outside of the presence of the other jurors but in the presence of the attorneys to my left here at sidebar.

After I've questioned each of you, you may be excused as a juror by me if in my opinion there's a
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valid reason why you should not serve.
Each attorney may also excuse a limited number of jurors without giving any reason for doing so. In the event you're excused, please do not consider this an insult or take it personally. It's merely part of the process employed by our court rules in selecting a jury.

All right, now this case as $I$ indicated to you the charge is aggravated sexual assault and burglary. The victim here is a woman by the name of Liliana Santos. It occurred on or about the 19th day of November in 2006 in the area of 235 Arlington Avenue, a basement apartment in Jersey City.

Our best estimate is this case will take at the worse, five days. Today is Wednesday, tomorrow is Thursday. The two days this week. Next week, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. You should get this done in five days. It could carry over to Eriday for deliberations only but the case should be in by Wednesday. So we think we have, we're concerned over that estimate.

We try to start at nine, we try to get you out of here by four. And this is a criminal case, so there are certain principles of law that must be accepted and followed by jurors.

Colloquy

I read to you charges from an indictment. An indictment is not evidence of defendant's guilt on the charges. It's simply a step in the procedure to bring the matter before the court and jury for the jury's ultimate determination as to whether defendant is guilty or not guilty of the charges stated in it.

The defendant has pled not guilty to the charges and is presumed to be innocent. Unless each and every essential element of the offense charged are proven beyond a reasonable doubt, the defendant must be found not guilty of that charge.

The burden of proving each element of the charges beyond a reasonable doubt rests upon the State. That burden never shifts to the defendant. It is not the obligation or the duty of a defendant in a criminal case to prove innocence or offer any proof relating to his innocence. The prosecution must prove its case by more than a mere preponderance of the evidence yet not necessarily to an absolute certainty.

The State has the burden of proving defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Some of you may have served as jurors in civil cases where you're told that it's necessary to prove only that the facts are more State's proof must be more powerful than that. It must
be beyond a reasonable doubt.
A reasonable doubt is an honest and reasonable uncertainty in your mind about guilt of the defendant after you've given full and impartial consideration to all the evidence.

A reasonable doubt may arise from the evidence itself or from a lack of evidence. It is a doubt that a reasonable person hearing the same evidence would have.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt. In this world we know very few things with absolute certainty. In criminal cases, the law does not require proof that overcomes every possible doubt.

If, based on your consideration of the evidence, you're firmly convinced defendant is guilty of the crime charged, you must find him guilty.

If, on the other hand, you are not firmly convinced of defendant's guilt, you must give defendant the benefit of the doubt and find him not guilty.

You have to apply the law as I give it to you regardless of your own personal feelings about it. This is a criminal case. Any verdict must be unanimous. That means all 12 deliberating jurors must agree upon the verdict.
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            At this time I will introduce you to the
    attorneys. The State of New Jersey will be represented
    throughout these proceedings by Mr. Matthew Troiano.
            Mr. Troiano, please.
            MR. TROIANO: Thank you, Judge. Good
morning, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Matthew
Troiano, I'm assistant Prosecutor here in Hudson
County. On behalf of the State, I thank you all for
being here this morning. Look forward to hearing a
little bit more about you as the case goes on.
    Thank you.
    THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Troiano.
    Okay, Mr. Wright, Stephen Wright is
    represented by Mr. Keith Hirschorn.
    Mr. Hirschorn, please.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, Your Honor.
    Morning, ladies and gentlemen, as the Judge
    said, my name is Keith Hirschorn. This is my client,
    Stephen Wright. I'm a local attorney here in Hudson
    County. I'll be representing Mr. Wright throughout
    these proceedings. I'd like to thank you for your
    willingness to serve and like Mr. Troiano said,I look
        forward to hearing more about each and every one of
        you.
            Thank you again.
```

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
Now, in order to be qualified under New
Jersey law to serve on a jury, a person must have certain qualifying characteristics. A juror must be 18 years old; a citizen of the United States; able to read and understand the English language; a resident of Hudson County.

A juror must not have been convicted of any indictable offense in any state or federal Court; must not have any physical or mental disability which would prevent that person from properly serving as a juror. But of course we will provide accommodations consistent with the American Disabilities Act if we need to. We're happy to do that.
okay. And I told you, the trial's going to be two days this week, three next week. That being said, you know what the trial's about, I told you the charges, okay, I told you how long it's going to be. I told you the qualifications you must possess in order to be a juror in this county.

Okay, that being said, now that you have all that information, who believes they have a reason, whether it be financial hardship, a planned vacation, a medical problem. Who believes they are not able to sit on this jury for those five days which I just mentioned

Okay, who believes they can, please stand up. Those that -- that's a very small number, that's very disappointing.

Okay, this is what we're going to do. Those who are standing, those who are, who can serve, we're going to hand you a questionnaire and we're going to ask you to take about a 45 minute break, step outside, enjoy the fresh air, and I'm going to listen to all these hardships and decide whether or not they're legitimate or not.

And the rest of you can read my questionnaire and go over the questions we're going to ask you, and come back in 45 minutes, okay. This is the quickest way to do this, believe me, and we do it quite often. Just as you're walking out the door, my sheriff's officer will hand you a questionnaire, those who believe they have a reason why they cannot serve remain and I'll listen to you.

Those people who believe you have a hardship, I want you to talk over here one at a time, and we'll start with those in the box.
(Jury selection not requested for transcription)
THE COURT: Okay, we have our jurors.
Everybody knows, we're here tomorrow, off Friday, off

Monday, and then Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. We're good to go?

Okay, for right now, this is what we're going
to do. I'm going to send you to lunch. It's a
beautiful day out, why don't you come back at 2:15.
Enjoy your lunch, come back at 2:15, I'll give you a
few more minutes of instructions, we'll have our
openings and we'll start the case.
Thank you very much; see you at 2:15.
(Jury leaves the courtroom)
(RECESS)
THE COURT: Okay, hope you enjoyed the weather. Sit down, please.

Okay, first thing we're going to do is we're going to swear you in. Stand up and raise your right hands, please.

Swear the jury in.
JURY PANEL SWORN
THE CLERK: Jury's sworn, Judge.
THE COUR'T: Thank you; have a seat.
Okay, ladies and gentlemen, you have been selected as the jury in this case, and as you know, this is a criminal case. And to assist you in better understanding your function and duties, I'm going to tell you how we're going to proceed right now.
You are the sole judges of the facts. 13
Your
determination of the facts. Your determination of the
facts will be based solely upon the evidence submitted
during the course of the trial.
When I use the term evidence, I mean the
testimony from witnesses who will testify from the
witness stand, and any exhibits which may be marked
into evidence and which will be taken into the jury
room for your review at the end of the case.
First order of business will be the
Prosecutor's opening statement. In the opening
statement, the Prosecutor will present the State's
contentions and will outline what he expects to prove.
Following that, defense counsel will make an
opening statement. What is said in an opening
statement is not evidence. The evidence will come from
the witnesses who will testify and from whatever
documents or tangible items are received in evidence.
During the trial, the attorneys may make
objections as evidence is offered by them, or they may
address Motions to me. They have a right, and indeed a
duty to make objections and Motions when it seems to
them to be proper to do so.
I have a duty to rule upon any objections and
objection is overruled, that means I'm ruling against the attorney making the objection.

If I say the objection is sustained, I'm ruling in favor of the attorney making the objection. Anything excluded by me is not evidence and must not be considered by you in your deliberations.

Sometimes these evidence questions or legal
questions will be heard in your presence in open court.
Other times at sidebar. Or you may be excused to go
into the jury room so we can discuss the issue in open Court.

I realize that being confined in the jury room for any length of time is not very pleasant, but I ask your indulgence and patience. I'm sure you realize that these legal arguments must be heard outside of your presence.

You should not conclude that because I rule one way or another that $I$ have any feelings about the outcome of the case; I do not. But even if I did, you would have to disregard them since you will be the sole judges of the facts.

During the trial from time to time there's going to be recesses. During any of these recesses you are not to discuss the case among yourselves, and when we recess overnight, you must not discuss the case or
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the testimony you heard with any members of your family or any other friends or people that you may know.

The reason of course is that you should not begin any deliberations until the entire case is concluded. That is until you've heard all the witnesses and final arguments of counsel, and my instructions as to the law.

It would be improper for any outside influence to intrude upon your thinking. If anyone should attempt to discuss the case with you, you should report the fact to me or my staff immediately.

If you have a cell phone, pager or other
communication device you must turn that device off while in the courtroom. And you also have to turn it off while you're in the jury deliberation room. If you need an emergency number to contact you, I'll give you a telephone number for my chambers.

Otherwise, you can only use your cell phones,

Please be mindful of these instructions at all times.

During jury selection you were asked to respond to a series of questions from the court and counsel. If, during the course of the trial, you
realize that you may have made a misstatement or an omission during your responses, do not discus the matter with your fellow jurors. Rather just let my officer know and he'll notify me immediately.

During the trial, you are not to speak to or associate with any of the attorneys, the witnesses or the defendant, Mr. Wright. Nor are they permitted to speak or associate with you. This separation should not be regarded as rudeness, but rather as a proper precaution to ensure fairness to both sides.

If anyone connected with this case or any other person approaches you or attempts to influence you in any way, do not discuss it with the other jurors. Simply tell a sheriff's officer and I will be notified immediately.

Your deliberations should be based on the testimony in the case without any outside influence or opinions of relatives and friends. Additionally, I must instruct you not to read any newspaper articles pertaining to this case. I do not know if there will be any newspaper or media coverage, I don't believe there will be. But if there is, you are instructed to completely avoid reading or listening to any newspaper or media accounts, or listening to anyone else discuss them.
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> re you can understand why this instruction is so important. Newspaper and media accounts are not evidence. They're often based upon second or third hand information, purely hearsay, not always accurate and not subject to examination by the attorneys.

I have no way to monitor you in this area, but must rely upon your good faith and the fact you've been sworn to comply with the instructions of the Court so that both sides may receive a fair trial.

Because this instruction is so important, it's my duty to remind you of it at the end of each day's proceedings.

Since you are the sole judges of the facts, you must pay close attention to the testimony. It's important you carry with you to the jury room, not only a clear recollection of what the testimony was, but also a recollection of the manner in which it was given. It will be your duty to pay careful attention to all the testimony. If you are unable to hear any witness, raise your hand and I'll instruct the witness to speak loudly and more clearly.

As jurors, you'll be required to pass upon all questions of fact, including the credibility or believability of the witnesses. You're not permitted
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to visit the scene of the alleged incident, do your own research or otherwise conduct your own investigation. Your verdict must be based solely on the evidence introduced in this courtroom.

You're not permitted to take notes. Our experience has shown that note-taking is distracting. It is better to rely upon the combined recollections of all the jurors than upon notes taken by one or more of them.

At the conclusion of the testimony, the attorneys will speak to you once again in their summation. At the time, they'll present to you their final arguments based upon their respective
recollection of the evidence. Again, this is not evidence but their recollection as to the evidence. It is your recollection as to the evidence presented that is controlling.

Following summations you'll receive your final instructions on the law from me. You'll then retire to consider your verdict. You're not to form or express an opinion on this case but are to keep an open mind until you've heard all the testimony, have heard summations, have had the benefit of my instructions as to the applicable law, and have been instructed to begin your deliberations.
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It is your duty to weigh the evidence calmly, and without bias, passion, prejudice or sympathy, and to decide the issues based upon the merits. You as jurors should find your facts from the evidence adduced during the trial.

Evidence may be either direct or circumstantial. Direct evidence means evidence that directly proves a fact, without an inference, and which in itself, if true, conclusively establishes that fact.

On the other hand, circumstantial evidence means evidence that proves a fact from which an inference of the existence of another fact may be drawn.

That's a very wordy definition. I'll give you an example to illustrate what that means.

An inference is a deduction of fact that may be logically and reasonably drawn from another fact or group of facts established by the evidence.

It's not necessary that facts be proved by direct evidence. It may be proved by circumstantial evidence, or a combination of direct and circumstantial evidence. Both direct and circumstantial evidence are acceptable as a means of proof.

In many cases, circumstantial evidence may be more certain, satisfying and persuasive than direct
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evidence. In any event, both circumstantial and direct evidence should be scrutinized and evaluated carefully. A conviction may be based on circumstantial evidence alone, or in combination with direct evidence, provided of course that it convinces you of defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

And conversely, if circumstantial evidence gives rise to a reasonable doubt in your minds as to the defendant's guilt, then the defendant must be found not guilty.

Let me give you an example.
The problem is to prove that it snowed during the night. An example of direct evidence would be testimony from the witness stand by the witness indicating she observed snow falling during the night. Direct evidence.

An example of circumstantial evidence, testimony indicating there was no snow on the ground before the witness went to sleep and that when the witness arose, woke up in the morning, it still wasn't snowing, but the ground was snow covered. The first example goes to prove, goes directly to prove the fact that snow fell, the witness saw it happen. While the latter establishes facts, snow on the ground, from which the inference that it snowed during the night can
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be drawn.
That's the difference.
As judges of the facts, you are to determine the credibility of the witnesses, and in determining whether a witness is worthy of belief and therefore credible, you may take the following into consideration.

The appearance and demeanor of the witness; the manner in which he or she may testify; the witness' interest in the outcome of the trial, if any; his or her means of obtaining knowledge of the facts; the witness' power of discernment, meaning their judgment and understanding; their ability to reason, observe, recollect and relate; the possible bias, if any, in favor of the side for whom the witness testifies; the extent to which, if at all, each witness is either corroborated or contradicted, supported or discredited by other evidence; whether the witness testified with an intent to deceive you; the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the testimony the witness has given; whether the witness has made any inconsistent or contradictory statements; and any and all other matters in evidence which serve to support or discredit his or her testimony to you.

During your deliberations you may ask what is
Colloquy
more reasonable, the more probable or the more logical
version. Inconsistencies or discrepancies in the
testimony of witnesses or between the testimony of
different witnesses may or may not cause you to
discredit such testimony. Two or more persons
witnessing an incident may see or hear it differently.
An innocent misrecollection like failure of
recollection is not an uncommon experience.
In weighing the effect of a discrepancy,
consider whether it pertains to a matter of importance,
or an unimportant detail. And whether the discrepancy
results from innocent error or willful falsehood.
indictment found by the Grand Jury charging him with
committing the crimes of aggravated sexual assault and
burglary.
The indictment is not evidence of the
defendant's guilt. It's simply a step in the procedure
to bring a matter before the Court and jury for the
jury's ultimate determination as to whether he is
guilty or not guilty on the charges stated in it.
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doubt, the defendant must be found not guilty of that charge.

The burden of proving each element of the charges beyond a reasonable doubt rests upon the state. That burden never shifts to the defendant. It's not the obligation or the duty of the defendant in a criminal case to prove his innocence or offer any proof whatsoever relative to his innocence.

The Prosecution must prove its case by more than a mere preponderance of the evidence. Yet not necessarily to an absolute certainty. The state has the burden of proving defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Some of you may have served as jurors in civil cases and there you were told that it is necessary to prove only that a fact is more likely true than not true.

Well, in criminal cases, the state's proof must be more powerful than that. It must be beyond a reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is an honest and reasonable uncertainty in your minds about the guilt of the defendant, after you've given full and impartial consideration to all the evidence.

A reasonable doubt may arise from the
evidence itself or from a lack of evidence. It's a
doubt that a reasonable person hearing the same evidence would have. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt.

In this world we know very few things with absolute certainty. In criminal cases, the law does not require proof that overcomes every possible doubt. If, based on your consideration of the evidence, you're firmly convinced that the defendant is guilty of the crime charged, you must find him guilty.

If, on the other hand, you're not firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt, you must give the defendant the benefit of the doubt and find him not guilty.

You'll note we have 14 people in the jury box. the conclusion of all the evidence and my final instruction, there will be a random selection where two of you will be chosen to act as alternates. The 12 remaining jurors will then deliberate and return a verdict.

And obviously at this point we don't know who the alternates will be, and whether or not their services will be utilized. Thus, I direct all jurors should pay equal attention to the evidence as it is
presented and to the Court's rulings which are applicable to the case.

That being said, we'll move right to openings. This is what we're going to do today, folks.

We're going to have openings by both attorneys, and then we're going to break for the day and we'll put our first witness on nine o'clock tomorrow morning, okay. That's the plan today. We'll be out early to enjoy the day.

Mr. Troiano.
OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. TROIANO:
MR. TROIANO: Judge, thank you. Mr. Hirschorn, ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon.

This morning went kind of quick actually in my experience as a Prosecutor picking juries, it sometimes takes a little bit longer, sometimes a little bit shorter. Today was fairly quick.

It has nothing to do with the significance of the case. This is a very, very important matter. You have a very important role in this case.

I would think that during the lunch hour you found yourself thinking what is this case all about, why are we here, what are we going to listen to, what 25 are we going to hear.
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You don't know anything about this. You've heard the charges from the indictment from the Judge, but other than that, you know nothing.

This case is about one very serious and simple act. An act by this man, Stephen Wright, of sexually assaulting Liliana Santos. So who is Liliana Santos? And you'll meet her, she is the victim in this case. She'll come and testify tomorrow morning. Liliana Santos I want to tell you about now but I also want to tell you about about three and a half years ago. I want to tell you about November of 2006. At the time Liliana Santos was 20 years old. She was living down in the Greenville section of Jersey City. She was living in a basement apartment at 235 Arlington Avenue.

This was her first apartment; she was 20 years old, all right. A basement apartment, not much in there. But it was hers. She had just moved there, she had been there for about three months or so. She'll come in and tell you that the basement apartment was somewhat small. It was in the shape of a capital $E$ if you could visualize that.

You would walk in and there would be a living room area, there's a hallway that ran on the left side, there was a bathroom, a kitchen and towards the rear of
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the apartment was a bedroom area.
Not many doors to open and close from room to room; it was a small place.

She had virtually no furniture in there, all right. She was living on an air mattress at the time. She had a TV, she had her personal belongings that were there, her clothes, things like that. And she had small little wine cooler that her mother had given her. But this was her apartment. This was hers. This was the first apartment that she had, and this was her home.

On November 19th, 2006, that home was broken into. On November 19th, 2006, Liliana Santos was raped. Now going back before November 19th, 2006, days before, Liliana Santos went out with a group of
16 friends. She went out to a baby shower in downtown 17 Jersey City. Spent the evening there, went from there 18 to a place called the Latin Lounge, hung out there for 19 a little while, then went with her friends to the area 20 of Communipaw and Halladay, an area down in Jersey 21 City.

At that point she hung out with her friends. Ultimately she met up with a person by the name of Anthony Waring. You'll meet Mr. Waring as well.

Mr. Waring was a little bit more than a
friend, a little bit less than a boyfriend to Liliana. But they were close and they decided that at the end of that night they were going to hang out.

So she went to meet Mr. Waring at a place called Marjay's (phonetic), it's a bar that Mr. Waring was at. She went to meet him, he picked her up, they drove up to her house. It wasn't the first time that Mr. Waring had been there, he had been there before. They drove up, parked in front of her place.

It's a three story brownstone. Pulled up in front, parked, walked inside. At the time that they walked inside, neither Mr. Waring nor Liliana Santos noticed anything suspicious about the house.
Everything was fine. They walked inside, the hung out for awhile, spent time together, they had sex, she wound up taking a shower, they hung out for a little while longer. At some point Mr. Waring decides to leave. This is probably about four or five o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Waring walks out the front door, gets into his car, drives home, all right. When Mr. Waring walks out, walks out of the house and to his car, he doesn't notice anything at all, all right. Nothing wrong with the house, nothing wrong with his car, nobody lurking in the area.
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He goes home, Liliana locks the door behind him, kind of walks around, straightens up her house a little bit, winds up smoking a cigarette in front of one of the front windows. After that, decides to go to bed. Goes to bed with the TV on, all right, much like we all do.

Was that the end of Liliana's night? No, unfortunately it wasn't, all right. About 6 a.m. or so, Liliana hears a noise, all right. Doesn't know what it is, but she is awakened. She's not awakened by an alarm clock, she's not awakened by a phone, she is awakened by someone in her house.

And let me set the scene for you, ladies and gentlemen, because it's important. She lives in a basement apartment. There are a few windows but the windows are basically on the ground level of the apartment, maybe two feet or so above from the ground level. It's six o'clock in the morning and it's dark outside.

Below in the basement apartment it is
virtually pitch black. Can't see anything. The TV
that she had on before has been shut off. So you cannot see anything.

So she hears this noise, doesn't know what it is.
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Eventually someone grabs at her neck. She
was laying in bed, ladies and gentlemen. She was
sleeping in her bed. She will testify that she was
wearing a white kind of spaghetti strap shirt, short
pajama shorts. She was sleeping.
Woken up by hands on her neck. And she has
no idea what's going on, okay. Can't see anything, is
confused, is certainly scared. Doesn't know what's
going on.
So she begins to fight back, all right. She's trying to push this person off her. He's grabbing at her. Back and forth, back and forth for a little while. At some point she is actually removed from the bed and kind of tossed along the floor.
And let me tell you about the bed. The bed is an air mattress, all right, just to show the lack of furniture in this place. The bed is an air mattress and it is on the floor. She is tossed from the bed. She kind of rolls over, she rolls over to the area of her TV that was not on and is not on anymore. A few feet away from her bed. And she decides let me try to hit the TV to get some light into the room.
She actually hits the TV, turns it on. Her attacker immediately shuts it off. Her attacker then picks her up and throws her back on the bed and she is
```
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on her stomach. Attacker comes behind her, grabs her hands, pulls down her pants, his own pants come down. She will tell you that she thinks she hears what may be a condom wrapper opening and then she's raped.

Now, during the course of this rape, while she is on her stomach, her attacker must get a phone call, ladies and gentlemen. A phone call. And he picks up the phone.

So as this assault is taking place, this person decides to pick up the phone, all right, which evidences to you what this attacker thought about this person in front of him that he was going to take a phone call during this.

Now I told you that the apartment is pitch black and Liliana has no idea who this is. Phone comes up to the ear and Liliana turns around. She would be with her back, turns around and the side of the 18 attacker's face is somewhat illuminated by the phone. 19 And she thinks to herself, I know this guy. I think I know this guy.

He finishes, he runs out the door. She kind of gets her bearings together, walks, runs to the front door actually, looks out the window, sees if she can find where this person's going. Can't see anything. Opens up the front door, comes up to the little patio
front area and sees a person running to the left down the street.

She goes back into her house, immediately calls 911 and says I've been raped. The 911 operator says to her, don't take a shower, okay. Liliana despite those instructions takes a shower. Reason why she takes a shower and she'll tell you is I felt disgusting, all right. I had just been violated. I took a shower.

She's in the shower maybe two or three minutes, hears knocking on the door, the EMT's arrive. Police arrive, Jersey City Police arrive and she tells them that I've just been raped, it was a black male.

At some point when she takes her clothes off and goes to take a shower she notes that the white shirt that she was wearing has some stains on it. Stains weren't from her. She thought that they were blood, she was not bleeding.

So the shirt stays to the side. When the police come, they recover the shirt. Liliana is taken to Christ Hospital, where she is evaluated for about an hour, all right. Immediately from her house, taken to Christ Hospital. After that hour, she is basically cleared, and then she has to be examined by a sexual assault nurse examiner.
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That examination takes about another hour. A rape kit is taken from her. At some point during that, after those two hours, a detective from the special Victims Unit of the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office comes and brings her down to take a formal statement under oath.

That statement lasts about two hours, all right. So just time-wise, ladies and gentlemen, this assault happened, she calls the police, she then has to go immediately through hospital, to examiner to two hour statement, all right.

She gets done somewhere about 11 o'clock in the morning. During the course of that statement, she tells Detective Shonda Rosario (phonetic) of the Special Victims Unit who will also testify, that her attacker's name she believes is S.DOT (phonetic). No first name. No last name. No address. No further identifying information besides S.DOT. She describes him as a guy she knows from the neighborhood, she's seen around. A guy that she had actually seen earlier on November 19th.

But nothing further.
So what happens from there? That's November 19th, 2006. Nothing. Nothing happens. The police have a name. On a few occasions, one specific
occasion, they go out and try to look for this person, S.DOT. Liliana calls up to Detective Rosario and says he's down here or he was down here, gives a description. Detectives go down, don't find anything.

And then at that point the case kind of stays dormant. For the better part of about a year or so. So move forward to November of 2007, about a year later. It's found out then that the blood on the shirt that I told you about which does come back to be blood is that of Stephen Wright.

Now, wouldn't you know, ladies and gentlemen, what do you think is the name that Stephen Wright goes by? S.DOT. Blood comes back to him. Mr. Wright is charged, all right. He's charged with two counts, aggravated sexual assault and burglary as the Judge read to you.

And I'll tell you briefly what they're about, but that is basically within the province of the Judge. That's the Judge's role.

Aggravated sexual assault means that he sexually penetrated her without consent during the course of a burglary.

With regard to that burglary, you probably are asking yourselves how did this person get into this house. Interesting. When the police show up that
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night, they see that the front window of Liliana's basement apartment is busted. Window is broken, shattered There's glass all over.

So this person didn't go through the front door, person wasn't let in. Through the window.

So Mr. Wright is also charged with burglary. And burglary is that you enter into somebody's premises, somebody's house, you don't have their consent to do it, and you do so with the intent to commit a crime while inside.

Now, a lot of you may think that you have to steal something. That's not the case, all right. That's a misconception about what burglary is. It's just that you enter into somebody's residence, in this case Liliana Santos, you don't have permission and you do so with the intent to commit a crime while you're inside. The crime here being that he was going to sexually assault her.

Now, you may ask yourself, did he steal anything? Yes, on the way out he stole some money, he stole some pictures, he just grabbed them on the way out.

So, those are the facts that the State intends to prove. That is the law that will be before you.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, are you allowed at this point right now to raise your hands and say guilty? You're not, all right. As the Judge said, Mr. Wright is presumed innocent. Our system presumes him to be innocent. It is my burden, my obligation as a representative of the state, to prove these charges beyond a reasonable doubt. That's not a little bit of proof, that's not some proof, it's a good amount of proof. Beyond a reasonable doubt is a high standard.

Ladies and gentlemen, I tell you now, with confidence, that $I$ accept that burden and $I$ fully intend to satisfy it.

When the 12 of you get this case at the end, you will become the judges of the facts. You're the judges of the facts now, and you will be the judges of the facts in the deliberation room. And when you are analyzing those facts, I'm going to leave something with you. It is not only what you hear but who you hear it from. It's not only who tells you things, but why they tell you things. It is not only who is a witness, but why they are a witness. And it is not only what they tell you, but when they tell you.

Four things, all right. When you go back into that deliberation room, remember those four things. And the State submits to you that using those
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four little sentences to analyze the facts in this case at the conclusion of this case, you will come back with the only true honest verdict, that Stephen Wright is guilty as charged.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
Counsel.
OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, Judge.
Mr. Troiano, Stephen, ladies and gentlemen.
Eirst of all, like Mr. Troiano, I want to thank you all. As Mr. Troiano said, when you go through these trials, jury selection to you all may have seemed like, you know, we were sitting there for all morning, took a little bit of time. I promise you, that was a very short jury selection. And we thank you all for your candor, your honesty and enabling us to move it relatively quickly. And obviously thanks to the Judge for the way that he does this. We're able to move it relatively quickly to get the 14 of you here, ready to listen to what we have to say and ready to move forward.

Mr. Troiano stood up here and he told you quite a poignant story. We all have mothers, sisters, daughters, friends who are female, whatever it may be.

If this is what happened, I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, not only is it awful, but my client should be found guilty by the 12 of you.

But this isn't what happened, ladies and gentlemen. The story that Mr. Troiano told you is the evidence that was presented to myself and Mr. Wright from day one of this case. The Judge indicated to you that we're here through what's called an indictment. Mr. Wright was indicted. Indictment is probably the most misunderstood word in our legal language.

The average citizen hears the word indictment, they think that that means that oh, someone must be guilty or they have to come to Court to plead guilty or whatever it may be.

As a matter of fact, ladies and gentlemen, an indictment is just the opposite. This today March 17th, 2010 is the first opportunity that my client and myself can question what Mr. Troiano just stated to you. The first opportunity that we have to question Miss Santos about what may or may not have occurred that night back in 2006. The first opportunity to question Mr. Waring as to what this relationship was, who he was, what his relationship was with Miss Santos. The first opportunity that we have, in essence, ladies and gentlemen, to defend Mr. Wright against these
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charges.
So as you 14 ladies and gentlemen sit here again, as Mr. Troiano said, even if you believe every single word that Mr. Troiano told you, and believe that there's no way that somebody could have fabricated this, exaggerated this, that this is exactly how it happened, even if you believe that, if the Judge were to give you the verdict sheet right now, and asked you to vote, each and every single one of you has to vote not guilty.

Because what Mr. Troiano told you is not evidence. What I'm telling you is not evidence. What's evidence in this case, ladies and gentlemen, comes from right here, and it starts tomorrow. I believe that it's going to start with Miss Santos.

As I said, it's the first opportunity that we get to examine her along with the 14 of you. So again, while this may sound like a horrific crime, I submit to you that there's a lot more to this than meets the eye.

From what we've received so far and what I believe is going to take place here, you're going to hear Miss Santos state as Mr. Troiano said, that she thought it might be S.DOT.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, you delve a
little bit deeper into that and when you listen to all the testimony, not only are you going to hear as Mr. Troiano said that $S$.DOT is known as stephen Wright, but you're going to hear that Anthony Waring knew that back in 2006. Did he go to the police and say S.DOT is Stephen Wright, he lives here, I'm friends with his brother. No. Never did that.

Did he tell his girlfriend, Liliana Santos, oh, if it's S.DOT, that's Stephen Wright, let's go tell the police. No. State of $S$.DOT, never happened.

Ladies and gentlemen, you're going to hear from other witnesses that were not mentioned by Mr. Troiano that are going to establish here that Liliana Santos and Stephen Wright knew each other. That Liliana Santos and Stephen Wright didn't just know each other but maintained a relationship to some degree. That's for you, ladies and gentlemen, to decide when you hear the testimony.

But I submit to you that as I said to begin this, the story is not as simple as it sounds.

So I just ask that as you've listened to myself, you've listened to Mr. Troiano, that you listen to each of the witnesses. You evaluate their credibility. You guys decide, are they telling the truth, are they fabricating something, are they being here and make something up, or is there a reason for them to come here and tell the truth?

I can't decide that. The Judge can't even decide that. You guys decide that. You're the judges of the facts. And as Mr. Troiano stated, I ask you too to take back those four infamous questions that Mr. Troiano mentioned because $I$ think they are very important in this case. And I think they are going to be very important when you evaluate as I think we would both agree the key witness here, the alleged victim, Miss Santos.

Evaluate her, evaluate her motivations, evaluate how she testifies, what she testifies to, her demeanor here on the stand. And I ask you to evaluate every witness that way, whether they be police officer, whether they be witness for the state or whether they be witness for the defense. They are all to be treated equally by you, to be looked at the same, to be decided upon the same way.

And I am certain that after you've listened to all of the evidence, you've heard the closing arguments of myself and Mr. Troiano, that not only will you not be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr.
25 Wright did anything or committed these two heinous
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    crimes, but you won't even need to get to that level,
    ladies and gentlemen. It will be plainly obvious to
    you that he's innocent. Not not guilty, innocent.
Thank you for your time.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hirschorn.
Okay, ladies and gentlemen, that will do it
for the day, okay. Thank you very much for sitting
through the jury selection process. It's sometimes
tedious, we appreciate your efforts there.
Thank you for listening to opening
statements. We're done for the day. You can go
home right now. But I got to tell you a couple of
things.

One, do not discuss the case at all amongst yourselves, with family or friends at home. Keep it to yourselves. Again, avoid any media. I don't think there is any but avoid that too.

Have a pleasant ride home. We'll start tomorrow at nine o'clock, once all 14 of you are here, we'll start. So please try to be here on time because if just one of you is late, we're all going to sit and wait.

Thank you very much. Come directly here, ninth floor, Judge Isabella, do not go to the fourth floor, okay. Thank you very much, have a pleasant trip
home.
Nine o'clock tomorrow. And again, we're not sitting Friday, we're not sitting Monday, okay. Thank you.
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THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

JURORS: Good morning.
MR. TROIANO: Judge, good morning, and this time the State will call Liliana Santos.
L I L I A N A S A N T O S, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
COURT OFFICER: State your full name for the record and speak loud?

THE WITNESS: Liliana Santos.
COURT OFFICER: Okay, be seated.
MR. TROIANO: Judge, thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
Q Good morning, Liliana.
A Good morning.
Q I would just like to ask you to speak up a little bit. These microphones here should be working. Good morning. Would you please state, again, for the ladies and gentlemen here what your name is?
A Liliana Santos.
Q Okay. And how old are you now?
A Twenty three.
Q And where do you live?
A Jersey City.
Q Okay. I would like -- strike that -- have you been a life long Jersey City resident?

A Yes.
Q I'd like to direct your attention to November of 2006, about three years ago or so. Do you remember that time?
A Yes.
Q Do you remember where you were living in
November of 2006?
A Yes.
Q And where was that?
A 235 Arlington.
Q Okay. And do you remember when it was that you moved in there, how long you had been living there? A I moved in September of '06. I was only living there for two months.

Q Okay. And if you would, please, describe to the ladies and gentlemen the layout of 235?
A When you walk in through the entrance it's the living room is the first room you walk into. Then if you keep walking it's like a little hallway with the bathroom is on the right side, keep walking, the kitchen is next on the right side, and you keep walking, there's like a little hallway with steps going up to the upstairs apartment. And if you keep walking it's the room, my bedroom was in the back room.

Q Okay. Was your bedroom separated by a door
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or was it all an open layout?
A It was separated by a door.
Q Okay. So if you were on Arlington Avenue and you were facing your apartment, what would the building look like? What did it look like, the building?
A It was a brownstone building.
Q Okay. And you were on the lowest level?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Any windows to your apartment?
A Yes.
Q All right.
A Two windows.
Q Okay. Where were they?
A In the front in the living room.
Q Okay. And, then, if you were looking and you see two windows how would you enter into the apartment building through a door, what was the main entrance?
A The main entrance was under the steps that lead to the upstairs apartment. You have to go under.

Q Okay. Underneath the steps and through your front door?
A Correct.
Q Okay. In November of 2006 would you tell the ladies and gentlemen here what type of furnishings you had in your apartment?

A I didn't have anything. I had just moved in.
Q Okay. And what were you sleeping on?
A I'm sorry.
Q That's all right. We'll go -- we'll go a step at a time. Do you want a cup of water?
A No thank you. I was sleeping on an air bed.
Q Okay. Like an air mattress?
A Um-hum.
Q And did you have any couches in the apartment?
A No.
Q Were your personal belongings there?
A Yeah.
Q But other than the air mattress not much?
A No.
Q Had you had any apartments before this?
A No, this was my first apartment.
Q And how old were you at the time that you had
been living there?
A I was 20 years old.
Q And when is your birth date?
A September 4th, 1986.
Q Okay. So in November of 2006 would it be fair to say that you had just turned 20?
A Correct.
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The -- I'd like to ask you, and first I'd like to show you what has been marked as S-1 for identification, do you recognize this picture? A Yes.

Q Okay. And what is this a picture of?
A The house.
Q Okay. 235?
A Correct.
Q All right. Is this an accurate picture?
A Yes.
Q All right. This is what 235 looks like?
A Yes.
Q All right. And $I$ would just like you to, with this marker, just circle those windows that you were referring to, you said there were how many?
A Two of them.
Q Okay. Do you recall these windows, what they looked like?
A Yes.
Q Do you recall -- can you explain to the ladies and gentlemen, how they were situated, how they were set up?
A Well, the window if you're looking -- if you're standing outside of the apartment the window on the right side was actually inside of a closet. It was

```
like some sliding doors. They were like covering some
```

water pipes and stuff. And, then, there was a window
there. And on the left side it was a window, which was
a window that was open. It was like a little ledge
that you sit on right next to the window.
Q And this ledge that you're referring to is it
inside or outside?
A Inside.
Q Okay. So there was -- was there a ledge in
front from the outside?
A No.
Q Okay. Do you recall if the windows were --
had screens?
A Yes.
Q Did you -- do you have a recollection as to
whether or not the windows would lock?
A They were locked.
Q Okay. And how do you know this?
A Because I locked them before I went to sleep.
Q And --
A Well, I locked the one that was open. The other
window that was in the closet was never opened. I
never opened it.
Q Okay. And why was that?
A Because it was inside a closet. I never needed to
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        open it.
            Q You indicated that the windows themselves
    were locked, is that correct?
    A Correct.
            Q Were there screens on the windows?
        A Yes.
        Q And if you know were those screens able to be
        locked?
        A No. They just come up.
            Q All right. With regard to the furnishings or
        the stuff that you had inside of your house was there a
        TV there?
        A Yes.
        Q And where was that located?
        A In my bedroom.
        Q Near your bed?
        A Yes, near the door. It was like as soon as you
        walk in it was like against the wall on top of a, like,
        a plastic bin where I put clothes in. It was on top of
        there like against the wall.
            Q Okay. And if you could estimate for the
        ladies and gentlemen here about how far away from your
        bed would the TV have been?
        A Maybe two feet, three feet, not far.
            Q Okay. All right. Liliana, I would like to
```

direct your attention to Saturday, November 18th, 2006.
Do you remember that day?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Specifically, the -- starting that
day. Do you remember what you did on that day?
A Everything is a little blurry, but I remember some
of what I did. I know I attended a baby shower that
night.
Q Okay. And do you know where the baby shower
10 was?
11 A Yes. It was on Erie Street.
12 Q Okay. And for the ladies and gentlemen here
13 where is Erie Street?
14 A In Jersey City.
15 Q Okay.
16 A Downtown Jersey City.
17 Q Okay. And do you recall whose baby shower it
18 was?
19 A It was my best friend's sister's baby shower.
20 Q And if you recall about what time did that
21 baby shower take place?
22 A It started like around eight.
23 Q Okay. In the evening, the night time?
24 A Um-hum.
25 Q Okay. And do you recall who you went there
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        with?
        A I don't remember.
            Q Do you recall if you drove there, took the
        bus there?
        A I took the bus there.
            Q And if you would just describe to the ladies
        and gentlemen to the best of your recollection when it
        was that you left there, where you may have gone after
        9 that?
    10 A I left like around the baby shower ended like
    11 12/12:30 around there. From there I went to the Latin
    12 Lounge for a little while. And, then, from there I
    13 left with some friends. We all met up on Pine Street.
    14 Q Okay. Let me stop you there. Where is the
    15 Latin Lounge?
    16 A I'm not sure. It's off of Mammoth.
    1 7 ~ Q ~ S t i l l ~ d o w n t o w n ? ?
    18 A Yes.
    19 Q And do you recall who it was that you were
    20 with there?
    21 A Yes.
    22 Q And who was that?
    2 3 ~ A ~ I ~ w a s ~ w i t h ~ a ~ c o u p l e ~ o f ~ f r i e n d s , ~ J a s m i n e , ~ J u n e , ~ h e r ~
    24 cousins P.J. and Macho. It was just us.
    25 Q Okay. And if you recall how long did you
```

1 stay at the Latin Lounge?
2 A Not long. I don't remember how long I stood
3 there, but $I$ don't think $I$ stood till closing.
4 Q And all the while do you recall how it was
5 you were getting to these places?
6 A After -- once I got to the baby shower June, which
7 is Jasmine's uncle, he -- he was -- we was riding with
8 him.
$9 \quad$ Q In his car?
10 A In his car.
11 Q And after you had left the Latin Lounge you
12 indicated that you went somewhere from there?
13 A Yes.
14 Q And where was that?
15 A Pine Street.
16 Q Okay. And for the ladies and gentlemen,
17 where is Pine Street?
18 A Pine Street is in downtown Jer -- well, not
19 downtown. It's in Jersey City around the Communipaw
20 area.
21 Q Okay. And are you familiar with that area?
22 A Yes.
23 Q Okay. And what was the purpose of going to
24 that area?
25 A There was a couple of people there that's usually
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        like we just go there and meet up. We was just hanging
        out for a little while before we went (indiscernible).
            Q What was that last part?
        A We was just talking, hanging out before I went
        home.
            Q Okay. And do you recall that evening what
        happened after you were at the this Pine Street
        location?
        A Excuse me?
            Q Where did you go after Pine Street?
    A After Pine Street everyone was leaving going home,
    so I asked June to take me home -- no, actually, I
    asked June to use his phone. I called Anthony from his
        phone and Anthony told me he was on Halladay Street and
        Communipaw at the Bar Marjae's (phonetic).
            Q Okay. Let me stop you. You indicated that
        you borrowed somebody's phone?
        A Correct.
            Q And who was that?
    A June, Jasmine's uncle.
            Q Did you have a phone at the time?
    A No.
            Q And where is -- you said Marjae's, is that
        correct?
    25 A Correct.
```

Q Where is Marjae's in relationship to Pine Street?
A It's one, two -- it's three blocks away.
Q Okay. Same neighborhood?
A Correct.
Q And you indicated that you spoke with
somebody on the phone, who was that?
A Anthony.
Q And for the ladies and gentlemen here who is
Anthony?
A Anthony was my boyfriend at the time.
Q And where was he?
A He was inside the bar on Halladay Street and
Communipaw, Marjae's.
Q What's the name of it?
A Marjae's?
Q Okay. Did you have occasion to meet up with Anthony?
A Yes.
Q All right. And did you at any point go into
Marjae's?
A No.
Q And so describe to the ladies and gentlemen
how it was that you met up with him, where it was?
25 A I pulled up like across the street, yeah, like
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    across the street from the bar, I pulled up there, I
    got out the car, Anthony was already standing outside
    the bar. He -- once he saw me he started walking to
    his car. I started walking to his car and we just got
    in the car and he took me home.
        Q Did you go home after that point?
        A Yes.
        Q And did Anthony drop you off or did he stay
        with you?
        A He came in with me.
            Okay. Was that the first time -- or strike
        that -- had Anthony ever been to your house before?
        A Yes.
            Q Now, in the few months that you had been
        living there had many people been inside your -- the
        new apartment that you had?
        A No, just family.
            Q Okay. And Anthony?
        A Yes.
        Q And do you recall what the reason was that
        family would have been over, that you would have had
        people over your house?
        A They wanted to come and see the apartment, or they
        would come visit me and make sure I'm okay. It was my
        25 first apartment. I was young. They were just checking
```

```
up on me.
            Q Okay. So you went back to your apartment
        after you met up with Anthony?
        A Yes.
            Q If you could approximate what time was that?
    A Like around 1:30/2:00 between there.
            Q Okay. And at the time you had indicated that
        Anthony was your boyfriend. That night how was your
        relationship, were you on good terms, were you on bad
        terms?
        A We were on good terms.
            Q When you arrived to your house did you drive
        in Anthony's car?
        A No.
            Q How did you get there?
    A He drove.
                            Okay. You drove with him?
    A Yes.
        Q And do you recall where it was that he
        parked?
        A I'm not absolutely positive. He didn't park too
        far from my house.
            Q Okay. And, then, what happened from there?
        A He came in, I got comfortable, I took my boots
        off, jumped in the shower. I think I smoked a
```
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        cigarette by the window. I went into the room, I laid
        down. We watched TV for a little while. And, then, we
        had sex.
            Q Okay. Let me stop you there. When you said
    that you and him first went into the apartment, where
    was it that you -- how did you enter into the
    apartment?
    A Through the front door.
        Q Okay. And that was the door that's
        underneath those steps?
        A Correct.
            Q Okay. And when you had walked -- first when
        you had gotten out of the car did you notice anything
        about the area, anything out of the ordinary?
        A No.
        Q Okay. When you had begun to enter into your
        apartment did you notice anything then?
        A No.
        Q You indicated that you and Anthony went
        inside, you hung around for a little while. At some
        point did Anthony stay over or did he leave?
        A He left at like around five o'clock in the
        morning, around there.
            Q Okay. And were you awake at that point?
    Describe to the ladies and gentlemen what happened?
    ```
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A I'm not -- I don't remember if I was awake or if
he woke me up and let me know that he was leaving. But
I know at that point I woke up and I locked the door
behind him. I sat down. I smoked another cigarette by
the window. I closed the window, I locked the window.
Then I went to sleep from what I remember.
Q Okay. When you say that you were -- you
smoked a cigarette both before and after he left, where
did this take place?
A By the window in the living room.
Q Okay. All right. And which window is that?
A The window with the little ledge that you sit on.
I'm going to show you what has been marked as
S-2 and S-4 for identification. First S-2, do you
recognize this picture?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And what is this?
A A picture of the front.
Okay. It would be fair to say that this is
basically a little closer of a view from the one I
showed you before, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And if you would just mark on here
where it was that you would smoke the cigarette or did
smoke the cigarette, I should say?
Santos - Direct
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A At this point.
Q Okay. And just put in there, let's put cig,
C-I-G, all right? And this picture here, which is S-4,
do you recognize this picture, although it's a little
dark?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And what is that?
A This is the picture of the window inside.
Q Okay. And when you say the window, which
window are you referring to?
A The window on the left.
Q Okay. Is that the window that you would
smoke near?
A Yes.
Q All right. I'd like you to circle that, put
the same thing. All right. Now, it's fair to say that
his picture, $S-4$, is a picture from inside your
apartment, would you agree with me?
A Yes.
Q All right. Is there another window in that
general area?
A Yes.
Q And where is that?
A To the left inside this closet right here.
Q Okay. And if you could, I know that it's not
the direction that it was at. And this is -- it's
showing like a little ledge there?
A Yes.
Q All right. So you have your cigarette, you
indicated that you locked the door, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q When Anthony left. When Anthony left was
there -- was there any issue between you and him?
A No.
Q Once you got back into the apartment and you
finished smoking your cigarette, what did you do from
there?
A In between me laying down and going to sleep
everything is like a blur. I don't really remember.
It was so long ago.
Q Okay. But at some point you went to sleep?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And where did you sleep?
A On the air mattress in my room.
Q And we talked about it a little bit before,
but this air mattress, could you describe to the ladies
and gentlemen, where it was in your apartment?
A It was on the floor to the right corner.
Q In the front or rear of the apartment?
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A In the rear of the apartment.
Q Okay. And you went to sleep, you recall at
the point that you went to sleep what the -- what the
conditions were in your apartment?
A What do you mean the conditions?
Q Was it dark, was it light? Were you able to
see?
A I think I left the bathroom door -- the bathroom
light on. Everything else was off. The TV was on.
And that was it.
Q Okay. Why do you -- why do you say now that
the TV was on? Is it normal for you to have the TV on?
A Yes, I can't sleep without the TV on.
Q So you fall asleep. Do you recall what it
was that you were wearing that night?
A I was wearing some light blue checker board
pajamas with a white cami shirt, spaghetti string shirt
to go to sleep.
Q Okay. Were the pants that you were wearing
were they long pants, short pants?
A They were long pants.
Q You fall asleep what happens next?
A I woke up and someone was choking me. And the TV
was off, everything was dark.
25 Q Did you shut the TV off at any point?

## A No. No.

Q And describe to the ladies and gentlemen, you say it was dark, were you able to -- were you able to see anything?
A I couldn't see anything.
Q All right. So I realize it's difficult, but describe what happened?
A He was choking me. I don't remember everything exactly what happened because I tried so hard to block everything out. It happened so long ago.

Q As best as you can.
A He was choking me. He was telling me to shut the F up. And I was fight -- I was trying to fight him back. At one point we rolled off the bed, off the air mattress. And I reached my arm up and I turned the TV on and he turned my face, he squished my face against the floor, and he turned the TV back off. Then he threw me on -- back onto the air mattress. And that's when he raped me. He pulled my pants down. He told me if $I$ keep moving he was going to kill me.

Q Okay. Were you able to see -- in the beginning from what you just described were you able to see who this person was?
A No.
Was there anything that was identifiable
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1 about the person?
2 A I was trying to feel his face. I was scratching 3 his face. I was trying to feel his hair. He had like 4 waves. I felt the waves in his hair. And he smelled

5
6
7 like alcohol. He smelled like he had been drinking a lot. All I smelled was the alcohol.

Q And when you say he, fair to say that it was a male?
A Correct.
Q When you say that you tried to fight back what were you trying to do to fight back?
A I was trying to push him off of me. I was kicking him, trying to kick him off of me. Like he was on top of me choking me and I was like -- I was trying to pick my legs up and kick him off of me. But he was too strong. He was too tall. He was like tall and strong. I couldn't fight him back.

Q And if you recall, Liliana, where on your body was he grabbing you or touching you? A He was grabbing -- he choked me first and, then, he just started trying to like pull all my clothes off. Q And by doing that he grabbed your shirt? A Correct.

Q Once -- you said that you got off the bed, you rolled off the bed and, then, you were put back on
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the bed, all right? In what -- how were you positioned on the bed, if you remember?
A He -- when he threw me on the bed he threw me on my stomach, so I was laying face down on the bed. And he was holding me down. I think he was on his knees. I don't know I couldn't look back. He was just holding me. I guess he had his hand or something on my back, and that was it.

Q Okay. And what happened from there?
A At one point I heard a condom wrapper unwrapping and he -- that's when he inserted his penis inside of me, he on top of me. And he got a phone call, he answered his phone. And when I looked back I saw his face.

Q Okay. You were on your stomach, I'll give you a second? A Correct.

Q And this person was behind you, is that correct? A Yes.

Q All right. How do you know that the person got a phone call? A I heard the phone ringing.

Q And what, if you call, happened once he got this phone call?
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 25A He answered the phone.
Q Okay. And just describe to the ladies and gentlemen what -- what you heard or what you saw from there?
A He just said hello. I don't remember exactly what the conversation was. But I remember he opened his phone and I was in front of him and when I looked back I saw his face, the light was shining on his face and I saw his face.

Q Okay. And when you saw this person's face, did you recognize him?
A Yes.
Q All right. And describe to the ladies and gentlemen who that person was?
A The defendant.
16 Q At the -- on the night that this happened, or
17
18 name?
19 A I just knew him by S.DOT (phonetic). That's what
20 I knew him by. I didn't know his real name.
21 Q And when the light from the phone, you know,
22 illuminated the side of his face was there any other
23 light in the apartment at all?
24 A No.
25
Once he got this phone call what happened

1 from there?
A I don't remember. I don't remember if he got the phone call before he raped me or after he raped me. But I know he got the phone call and after he got the phone call he got up and he left.

Q And if you recall what way did he leave?
A He left -- he left through the front door.
Q Which would be the door going out to
Arlington Avenue?
A Yes.
Q Liliana, I know that it's difficult. You indicated you used the word rape a couple of times. The person their penis went into your vagina, would that be fair to say?
A Yes.
Q All right. And you didn't give consent for this, is that fair to say?
A No.
Q Okay. When this person got up to leave what did you do from there?
21 A I got up -- once I heard the door close I got up,
22 I ran to the door, I opened the door -- no, actually, I
23 looked out the window first and I saw the gate was
24 open. I opened the door, I ran out, I looked to the
25 right, I looked to the left and I saw someone running
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            1 down the street. Someone was running. Then I ran back
            2 inside. I was just crying hysterical. I didn't know
            3 what to do. I was confused. I was looking for a
            4 phone, 'cause I didn't have no phone. I couldn't call
            5 911 or anything, but I knew I had a phone around that
            6 didn't work that wasn't connected, but I knew I could
            7 call 911 from it. So I searched for it. When I
            8 finally found it I called 911. They told me they would
            9 be there as soon as possible. I jumped -- I took a
            1 0 \text { shower and before I can even get out the shower they}
11 were already there.
12 Q And --
13 A The ambulance.
14 Q -- you say they were there, who was there?
15 A The ambulance was already there.
16 Q And how did you know that they had arrived?
17 A They rang the bell.
1 8 ~ Q ~ Y o u ~ i n d i c a t e d ~ t h a t ~ y o u ~ w e n t ~ t o ~ a ~ w i n d o w ~ t o
19 look out the window, is that correct?
20 A Um-hum.
2 1 ~ Q ~ A n d ~ w h i c h ~ w i n d o w ~ i s ~ t h a t ?
22 A The window on the right with the little ledge.
23 Q The same window you were smoking from?
24 A Yes.
25 Q Okay. And, then, you indicated that you went
```

outside and you saw somebody running away, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q All right. Is there -- can you describe the person at all, anything that he was wearing while inside the apartment?
A While inside the apartment? I know he had a leather jacket on.

Q And what makes you say that?
A Because I felt it when he was on top of me and we
were wrestling I felt the leather jacket.
Q And I know you said it was dark, but do you know what color or could you --
A No.
Q -- tell what color it was?
A I couldn't even tell you what color it was.
Q Okay. And when you went outside and you saw this person running away which direction were they going?
A They was running to the left.
Q Okay.
A I know the jacket he had on was a dark jacket 'cause it looked almost black. When he was running down the street it looked like the person that was ruining was wearing black.
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Q When you went outside it was still dark out? A Yes.

Q When you called the police, how did you go about doing that? What number did you call?
A I called 911.
Q Okay. And what did you tell them when you
10 called 911?
11 A I told them someone broke into my house and raped
12 me.
ordinary about your apartment when you came back after
24 running outside?
25 A Yes.

```
    Q And what was that?
A The window was broken.
    Q All right. And which window are you
referring to?
A The window on the right side.
    Q I'm going to show you, again, the same
picture, S-2, you earlier circled this window where you
had smoked a cigarette, is that correct?
A Yes.
    Q All right. The window that was broken is
    that depicted in this picture? Is that shown in this
picture?
A No.
    Q All right.
    A This is the window that was broken.
    Q Okay. And I would like you to circle that
    and just put broken. Okay. And where did this -- what
    was behind this window?
    A Some sliding doors, like a little closet.
            Q Okay. Does this picture here accurately
        reflect what your apartment looked like on November
        19th -- strike that -- on November 18th, 2006?
        A Nope.
            Q Okay. Is there anything different about it?
        A Yes.
```

Okay. Is there anything different about it?

```
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```

M Q What is that?

```
M Q What is that?
    Q Okay. And where is the -- the ladies and
    gentlemen here haven't seen this picture. But describe
    what this picture shows here?
    A The picture shows the garbage can between the two
    windows. The garbage can was in front of the right
    hand window. It was directly in front of it.
    Q Okay. So you're saying that this picture
    shows that it's in the middle, is that correct?
    A Yes.
            Q But before this night it would be fair to say
        that it was right below the window that was broken, is
        that correct?
        A Yes.
            Q All right. I'd like you to just put a little
        circle where that garbage can usually was, and put on
        there garbage. Liliana, if you recall, were you given
        any instructions -- strike that -- you noticed that a
        window was broken. Did you break a window?
        A No.
            Q Earlier in the evening either hours before on
        the 19th or on the 18th, any time before that did you
        ever notice that that window was broken?
    A That window was not broken.
```
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1 Q Can you say that with certainty here?
A Yes.
Q When you spoke with the 911 operator, whoever it was that you spoke to, were you given any instructions on what you should or should not do?
A Yes.
Q And what was that?
A She, specifically told me not to take a shower.
She specifically told me not to take a shower.
Q And despite -- despite that what did you do?
A I took a shower.
Q Okay. And tell the ladies and gentlemen why it was that you did that?
A I wasn't thinking straight. I just was so nervous and so scared. I didn't know what to do. I felt so disgusting.

Q You took the shower and eventually somebody arrived, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q And do you recall who arrived first?
A The ambulance arrived first.
Q Okay.
A I think they arrived at the same time, the ambulance and the police officers.

Q Okay. Would that have been Jersey City

```
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    Police?
    A Yes.
        Q I would like to show you a couple of more
        pictures. All right. First, I'm going to show you
        what has been marked as S-7 for identification. What
        does that picture show?
        A This is the picture of the air mattress on the bed
        -- on the floor.
            Q Okay. And is this an accurate reflection of
        what your air mattress looked like that night?
        A Yes.
            Q Now, this wall that's behind where your
        pillows are in this picture, all right, what is behind
        that wall?
        A A backyard.
            Q Okay. I would, also, like to show you S -- I
        think it's S-19, all right. I'm going to show you this
        diagram, which has been marked as S-19. You've seen
        this picture before, is that correct?
        A Yes.
        Q Okay. You didn't draw this?
        A No.
        Q All right. What is -- what does this drawing
        show or this diagram show?
        25 A It's a diagram of the apartment.
```
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                    All right. So would it be fair if I just put
a line here that would have been your walk?
    A Yes.
            Q Okay. Now, where in this bedroom would your
    TV have been?
    A See this is too long, because the bed wasn't too
    far from the door. The bedroom was like about this
    short. The bed was right here.
            Q Okay.
    A There was a closet right here.
            Q Okay.
    A And the TV was like right here against the wall.
    But the entrance was like where the TV was at. The TV
    was like right in front of the doorway.
            Q Okay. Did you leave your door open or shut?
        A Open.
        Q Okay. So just mark here what that square is
    that you put. Okay. And mark here what this -- it's
    kind of a square, rectangle. All right. And you said
    that this is what? All right. So it would be fair to
    say that it's just condensed a little bit more?
        A Yes.
        Q Okay. And you indicated that you had been
        sleeping here on this bed, correct?
        A Yes.
```

Q All right. Now, did you sleep kind of which way was your body positioned?
A This way.
Q Okay. And that's how you were sleeping on the morning of the 19th? A Yes, on the left side.

Q Now, with regard to this area here they show, agree with me if you will, this is the living room, correct? And would it be fair to say that those are the two windows?
A Yes, but it's like a little closer.
Q Okay. Everything is more condensed?
A Yes.
Q Okay. But they are side by side, is that correct? A Yes.

Q All right. And you indicated before that one 18 of the windows was broken, correct?
19 A Yes.
20 Q Does this diagram accurately show which of
21 those two windows was broken?
22 A Yes.
23 Q Let me take this. Thank you. I'm sorry.
24 Liliana, if you remember, what happened with the
25 clothes that you were wearing when you were assaulted?
Santos - Direct
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Q I'm going to show you what has been marked, the outside bag is $\mathrm{S}-20$.

MR. TROIANO: I assume that we should mark the rest. There's a bag inside that we should have marked as $S-20 A$. And there's another bag. That would be $S-20 B$. A couple of minutes, Judge. I apologize.

THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q All right. Liliana, I'm going to show you what's been marked as $S-20 C$ for identification. Do you remember this, shirt?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Is this the shirt that you were wearing that night?
A Yes.
Q Okay. I'm going to put it right here. Now, there's a hole in this shirt, all right, did you put that hole there?
A No.
Q Okay. When you last saw this shirt was there a hole in the shirt?
A No.
Q Okay. What was in the area where the hole was?
A The blood.
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A No. They put me in the ambulance.
Q Did you tell either the police or the people in the ambulance the identity of the person who assaulted you?
A No.
Q Did you ever say S.DOT?
A No.
Q When you went in the ambulance where did you go from there?
A Christ --
Q Where did they take you to?
A -- Christ Hospital.
Q And if you know Christ Hospital is where?
A On Palisades Avenue in Jersey City.
Q And when you arrived at Christ Hospital
explain to the ladies and gentlemen what it was that you did when you were there?
A I was examined by a nurse. She did a rape kit. They gave me the morning after pill.

Q Did you meet with this nurse first, or did you meet with anybody else before that?
A I don't remember it was so long ago.
Q But you remember meeting with her?
A Yes.
Q And do you remember how long, could you guess
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1 about how long the examination took?
2 A I was there for a long time. I was there for like
3 two hours.
4 Q okay. And was it only the nurse, as you
5 said, or were there other -- were there other people
6 with you?
7 A After I spoke to the nurse I spoke to Shanda
8 Rosario. She came to Christ Hospital.
9 Q Okay. And Shanda Rosario, if you know, is a
10 detective or was a detective at the time --
11 A Yes.
12 Q -- correct? With the Prosecutor's Office?
13 A Yes.
14 Q The examination that was done by the nurse if
15
16 you could briefly describe to the ladies and gentlemen what that entailed?
17 A She -- she used swabs. They swabbed me down
18 there. She took -- she took swabs under my nails. I
19 think she took swabs of my mouth, because I told her
20 that he kissed me. That's all I remember.
21 Q Okay. Did you have occasion to tell the
22 nurse what had happened to you? Did you at any point
23 have to give her --
24 A I don't remember.
25 Q Okay. Had you ever met this nurse before?

```
A No.
    Q She wasn't your doctor?
    A No.
    Q Had you ever met Detective Rosario before?
    A No.
        Q Strangers?
        A Yes.
        Q You indicated that this examination took a
        couple of hours, is that correct?
        A Yes.
        Q Okay. And did you -- were you able to go home
        after that?
        A No.
            Q Okay. Where did you go from there?
        A I went on Duncan Avenue in Jersey City.
            Q So you went from your house on Arlington up
        to Palisades you said?
        A Yes.
            Q And, then, down to Duncan Avenue?
        A Yes.
        Q And what was the purpose of going to Duncan
        Avenue?
        A She wanted me to give a statement.
            Q And who is she?
        A Shanda Rosario.
```
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    Q You went there to give a statement?
        A Yes.
        Q Do you recall doing that?
        A Yes.
        Q And throughout the course of these events
        going to the hospital, going -- eventually going down
        to Duncan Avenue were you accompanied by anybody?
        A No.
            Q You were alone?
        A Yes.
        Q You went down to Duncan Avenue and explain to
        the ladies and gentlemen how it was that you went about
        giving this statement?
        A When we got there Anthony was there waiting. And
        we went upstairs. They made me sit in the waiting room
        with Anthony for, I think it was like, 20 minutes to 30
        minutes. And I was so scared I wasn't going to tell.
        who it was. But Anthony told me to tell her who it
        was. So I gave a statement. I told her who I knew him
        as. I only knew him by S.DOT. I didn't know his real
        name, and that was it.
            Q You said that Anthony met you down there. If
        you know how did he know to come down there?
        A I called him.
            Q And do you know where you called him from?
```

Q Okay. And do you recall what you told him? A Yes.

Q And what was that?
A I told him that someone broke into my house, and raped me, and that I knew who it was. And he asked me who it was, and I told him it was S.DOT.

Q Okay. So up until the point that you speak with Shanda and you give her this statement, Liliana, would it be fair to say that you never told anybody else in an authority position --
A No.
Q -- the identity of this person?
A No.
Okay. And the reason for that was?
A I was scared. I was confused. I didn't know what to do.

Q During -- do you remember giving a statement Shanda, Detective Rosario?
A I remember bits and pieces of it. I don't remember everything.

Q Okay. But you recall you gave the name --
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anything.
Q Okay. You said that night of the baby shower, was it before or after the baby shower? A Before the baby shower.

Q Okay. Before the baby shower you were where that this took place?
A On Communipaw Avenue.
Q Okay. And what was the reason, if you recall, that you were down on Communipaw Avenue? A I was just down on VanHorne Street and Bramhall Avenue, 'cause that's where my mom used to be at, my brothers, my friends, family. So I would go down there, see them and, then, I'll go home.

Q Okay. And on the day of the 18 th would that be fair to say, okay, you saw S.DOT in that area, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q But the extent of your conversation was nothing more than what's up?
A That was it.
Q Okay. Do you recall how you got home from Duncan Avenue?
A Anthony drove me.
Q And he drove his car down to pick you up?
A Yes.
47
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18 A How many times did I call her?
19 Q Yes. November of 2006. If you recall did you have contact with Detective Rosario after this incident took place? A Yes.

Q And under what circumstances were that? Could you describe it for the ladies and gentlemen? her where he was at, so she could try to get him. But he would always run, so they couldn't catch him. found or arrested, is that correct?
A No. you think it was that you had conversations with Detective Rosario after you gave a statement at Duncan Avenue?

A A lot. Like ten times. reason for you calling her? where he was at to see if they could try to get him. A
ght. Now, Liliana, this was in A Whenever I would see him I would call her and tell

Q And it was your understanding that when you had called them, that he was never caught, he was never

Q Okay. If you could guess how many times do

And what was the reason for -- what was the lot her know couple of times I call her just finding -- trying to
turned himself in --

Q Let me stop you there for a second. I'll go back and ask you again. It's your understanding that every time that Detective Rosario went out no arrest was made, is that correct?
A Correct.
Q Okay. In fact, would it be fair to say that a long period of time went by that you didn't hear from anybody with the Prosecutor's Office?
A Yes.
Q Do you recall about how long it was till you heard from the Prosecutor's Office again?
A A year later.
Q And if you recall, Liliana --
MR. TROIANO: Judge, one second please. BY MR. TROIANO:

Q -- if you recall when you spoke to them again you were asked if you wanted to continue to proceed with this case, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q And what was your answer to that?
A I said, yes.
Q And do you recall if you were asked to
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testify at the grand jury?
A Yes.
Q And did you do that?
A Yes.
Q And if you could approximate how many times do you think that you met with me?
A About four, five times.
Q And it would be fair to say that you've
indicated that you want to continue with this
throughout --
A Yes.
Q -- correct? After this happened in November of 2006 did you -- or strike that -- do you still live in 235 Arlington Avenue?
A No.
Q All right. Did you live there again?
A Never went back.
Q What happened to the rest of the stuff that was there?
A The owner of the house he told me he was going to pack everything up and put it in a different apartment for me, move me into a different apartment, but I never received the things. All the stuff stood there. I mean it wasn't much, but it was a couple of things that he stood with.
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with you on that night?
A No.
            MR. TROIANO: No further questions.
            THE COURT: You need a restroom break or
    anything?
            MR. HIRSCHORN: Yes.
            THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's take a
    couple of minutes. Knock on the door when you're ready
    about five, ten minutes. You can all go. Do not
    discuss the case whatsoever, okay? Thank you.
            (TAPE OFF - TAPE ON)
    CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
        Q Good morning, Ms. Santos.
    A Good morning
        Q I'm just going to ask you a couple of
        questions -- a few questions. Try to get to some of
        the issues that Mr. Troiano raised and maybe some other
        issues, okay? Ms. Santos you stated that on the night
        of November the 18th you went to a baby shower, that's
        correct?
        A Yes.
        Q Where was the baby shower?
    A On Erie Street in downtown Jersey City.
        Q In downtown Jersey City. And did you -- you
        said you didn't remember who you went there with,
```

```
correct?
```

A Yes.

Yes.
Q At the baby shower were there a lot of your
friends and family there?
A Yes. Well, not my family, friends.
Q Not family, but friends. Was the -- is the
baby shower -- it's like a party, right?
A Yes.
Q Was there alcohol at the party?
A Yes.
Q Were you drinking?
A I had a cup.
Q A cup of?
A Of I think it was that Mist, Arbor Mist.
Q Okay. Is that an alcoholic drink?
A Yes.
Q And you said that you stayed at the baby
shower for a couple of hours, correct?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And, then, you went to the Latin
Lounge?
A Correct.
Q That's a bar too?
A Yes.
25 Q Did you go there with friends?

```
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A Yes.
            Q Who did you go to the Latin Lounge with?
            I went with Jasmine, June, her cousin Macho and
        P.J.
            Q Okay. And you said you stayed there for, I
        guess, about an hour and a half, is that right, or
        less?
        A I'm not sure I don't remember.
            Q You're not sure. But you were there for some
        time?
        A Yes.
            Q Okay. Did you drink any alcohol while you
        were at the Latin Lounge?
        A No.
            Q Okay. And, then, eventually you left the
        Latin Lounge, correct?
        A Yes.
            Q And you said you went to hang out in a car by
        Pine Street?
        A No.
            Q No.
        A We were in the car, but we --
            Q Okay.
    A -- weren't hanging out in the car.
            Q Okay. But you eventually made your way to
```

```
Pine Street here in Jersey City, correct?
A Correct.
    Q And Pine Street where you went you were
    outside of one of your friend's houses, correct?
    A Correct.
            Q Now, Pine Street in Jersey City is only about
        two or three blocks away from Halladay and Communipaw,
        right, where the bar was where Anthony was located?
        A Yes.
            Q Okay. What did you do when you were at Pine
        Street?
        A I was sitting in the car with Jasmine, her cousin
        and her uncle. And there was some people outside of
        the car. Everybody was just talking.
            Q So it's normal, a commonplace on a Saturday
        night in that area to be hanging out outside?
        A Yes.
            Q Okay. So you want down there to speak with
        some friends or just hang out, whatever it may be?
        A Yes.
            Q Okay. Were you drinking any alcohol while
        you were at Pine Street?
        A No.
            Q Okay. After you were at Pine Street you said
        you went and you met up with Anthony?
```
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            Q How did you know where Anthony was?
    A I called him from June's phone, Jasmine's uncle.
    Q And when Mr. Troiano was asking you questions
    you said you recall speaking with, this is much later
    on you said you recall speaking with Detective Rosario
    from their office, correct?
    A From their office?
    Q The Prosecutor's Office, later, the next day
    you ended up speaking with Detective Rosario. You
    indicated you had spoken with her a number of times
    since --
    A Not in the Prosecutor's Office though.
        Q Detective Rosario?
    A It was on Duncan Avenue. She met me in Christ
    Hospital and from Christ Hospital I left with her to
    Duncan Avenue.
    Q I'm not asking you where you spoke with her.
    You know that she's a member of the Hudson county
    Prosecutor's Office?
    A Oh, I thought she was a Sheriff's Officer.
        Q Oh, okay. You didn't know, that's fair. But
        you spoke with her at some point later and you provided
        her a statement, correct?
    A Yes.
    1 Q Do you recall telling her that you had been in constant contact with Anthony all night?
A Yes, I remember telling her that.
Q Okay. Were you using your own phone to contact him?
A No.
Q What were you doing to contact him?
A I would ask Jasmine to use her phone. I'll borrow someone's phone.

Q So at no point in time around November 18th of 2006 did you have a working cell phone?
A Yeah, I had a working cell phone, but it didn't have minutes at the time.

Q Okay. So that night you did not have a working cell phone is what you're testifying to? A Yes.
17 Q Okay. When you met up with Anthony was he 18 still in the bar?
19 A No, he was waiting -- when I got there?
20 Q Yes.
21 A He was already outside the bar.
22 Q Okay. Was he out there with other people?
23 A Yes.
24 Q Were there a lot of people outside?
25 A Yes.


```
    Q -- it's a little bit away?
    Yeah.
    Q Okay. And he drove?
    A Yes.
    Q Had he been drinking that night?
    A I'm not sure, I didn't ask him.
    Q Okay. Did you smell alcohol on his breath?
    A No.
            Q Okay. About what time do you arrive at your
    apartment?
    A About 1:20 to 2:00 around there.
            Q 1:30/2:00? And, then, you gave some things
    that you did while Anthony was there, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q You said you smoked a cigarette, you took a
    shower and got out --
    A Yes.
    Q -- out of your boots. And, then, you said
    that you and Anthony had sex, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Approximately, if you recall, what time was
        that?
        A Don't remember.
            Q Did you have sex that night on one occasion,
        two occasions?
```

            Santos - Cross
            1 A Just with Anthony.
            2 MR. TROIANO: Objection, Judge. With
            3 regard --
        BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
            Q With Anthony? With Anthony, excuse me.
    A With Anthony?
            Q I'm talking about with Anthony?
    A With Anthony, just that one time that night.
            Q Okay.
            That was --
            Q Did Anthony use protection?
    A Yes, he did.
            Q Have you and Anthony engaged in sex previous
    to that?
    A Yes.
    Q Do you know what kind of protection he used?
    A Magnums.
        Q Okay.
    A Sometimes he used Magnum, sometimes he used, I
    really didn't pay attention to his condoms.
            Q Okay. Do you recall what he used that
        evening?
        A A Magnum.
        Q And, then, you said after that I believe you
        went and you took anther shower, correct?
    ```
A After, yeah.
    Q Okay. And at some point in time Anthony left
    that evening?
    A Yes.
        Q What time was that?
    A Like around five o'clock.
        Q And you indicated that when he left around
        five o'clock you did what?
        A I -- I think he woke me up. I'm not sure if I was
        up already or he woke me up. I walked him to the door.
        I locked -- I locked the door behind him. I sat down,
        I smoked another cigarette. After I finished I closed
        the window, I locked the window. And I'm not sure what
        I did after that, but I know not long after that I went
        to sleep.
            Q Okay. So you went to sleep you say somewhere
        between five and six o'clock in the morning?
        A Correct.
            Q Okay. Now, Mr. Troiano showed you what was
        marked S-2 and you testified that those were the two
        windows in the front of your apartment, correct?
        A Yes.
            Q Are there any other windows in your
        apartment?
        A Yes.
```
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24 A They were open.
```

1
25
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                                    6 1
                                    Q Okay. Where is that located?
        A There was one window in the back in my bedroom.
            Q Okay. And that led to where?
    A The backyard.
        Q Okay. Was that window locked as well?
        A Yes.
        Q Now, you indicated that the window that you
        smoked a cigarette in that's located in what you would
        call the living room?
        A Correct.
            Q And this window that you circled and wrote
        broken on that's located inside of a closet?
        A Yes.
            Q Do you recall before you went to bed if the
        closet doors were open or closed?
        A They were closed. I never open them.
        Q You never open them?
        A No.
        Q You never stored anything in that closet?
        A No.
        Q Okay. Do you recall that when the police
        arrived later on that morning were the closet doors
        open or closed?
        A They were open.
        Q They were open?
```
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## window?

A Yes.
Q A bigger shot of the window, correct?
A Yes.
Q Closer up?
A Yes.
Q And you can see that the window is broken, correct?
A It is.
Q Can you, also, see in that picture that the screen is closed?
A Um, no, I can't tell. It's kind of dark.
Q Okay. Now, you stated that Anthony left
14 about five o'clock in the morning, correct?
15 A Yes.
16 Q You fell asleep?
17 A Yes.
18 Q You were awoken by what?
19 A Someone choking me.
20 Q Was it light in your room?
21 A No.
22 Q Was it dark in your room?
23 A Yes.
24 Q The television was off?
25 A Yes.

```
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A He was telling me to shut the F up.
Q Okay. And he had his hands around your
throat?
A Correct.
Q Did it hurt?
A He was choking me.
Q Were his hands tight around your throat?
Yes.
Q Tight enough that from your experience it
would have caused a bruise?
MR. TROIANO: Objection, Judge.
A No.
THE COURT: Overruled.
BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q No?
A No.
Q Tight enough that what?
A I was fighting him back, so at one point he let me
go.
Q And you said that you scratched his face,
correct?
A Yes.
Q Did you, that you recall, draw blood?
A Excuse me?

```
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1
23 scratched the individual on the face _- them that you
24 A I don't - -
25 Q -- anyone the nurse, Shana Rosario?
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A -- I don't remember saying anything.
Q You don't remember? Do you -- so --
A All I remember was crying the whole time I was
there. That's all I remember.
Q Okay. Do you remember giving the statement
itself?
A It's kind of blurry, but, yeah.
Q Do you remember being placed under oath?
A Yes.
Q Do you remember her telling you that what you
said was going to be recorded?
A Yes.
Q And, then, you provided a statement as to the
incident --
A Yes.
Q -- that took place, correct?
A Yes.
Q When you told her that statement did you tell
the truth?
A Yes.
Q Did you tell her everything that you
remembered to the best of your recollection at that
time?
A Yes.
Q So if you didn't tell her that you scratched

```
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        the individual is that because you didn't remember it
        then, or because it didn't happen?
        A Um, I don't even remember if \(I\) told her that he
        scratched me. I don't -- I don't remember.
            Q Wait a minute, did he scratch you or did you
        scratch him?
        A I -- I was fighting him. I remember scratching
        him, kicking him, punching him. I remember fighting
        him back.
            Q Okay. And you said that when you were at the
        hospital you spoke with Ms. Rosario and you spoke with
        a nurse as well, correct?
        A Correct.
            Q And the nurse, you said, did a rape kit?
        A Yes.
            Q And did she ask you any questions about --
        A I don't remember.
            Q You don't remember? You don't remember
        speaking with the nurse?
        A I don't even remember what she looks like.
            Q Do you remember speaking with the nurse?
            A Yes, I remember speaking with a nurse.
            Q Now, how long -- you said you had lived in
            this apartment for approximately two months --
            25 A Yeah.

\section*{Santos - Cross 68}

Q -- correct? How far, and you can estimate by the courtroom, is it from where the front windows are to where you slept?
A From here to that door back there.
Q So about the length of the courtroom?
A Yes.
Q And you slept there, presumably, every night for the two months, correct?
A No, not every night.
Q All right. Well, you had slept there more than on one or two nights --
A Yes.
Q -- you slept there a decent amount of times?
A Yes.
Q Is Arlington Avenue a fairly busy street in Jersey City?
A I mean it seemed quiet to me. It seemed like a good neighborhood.

Q Do cars go back and forth on that street during the course of the night?
A I wouldn't -- I'm not up during the night so I wouldn't even be able to tell you that.

Q Let me just ask you, if \(I\) can, when you're in your bedroom --
A Yes.
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Q -- if people are talking out in front of your apartment, if cars are going by you can hear them, right?
A No.
Q You can't hear anything?
A Nope.
Q Okay.
A Not with my TV on, no.
Q What about if the TV's off?
A Yeah, if the TV's off I'll probably be able to hear something. But not in my sleep.
Q Now, obviously, as you've testified to this
you didn't hear the window break?
A No.
Q You didn't hear the closet doors open?
A Nope.
Q You didn't hear the television get shut off?
A No.
Q What happened to the bathroom light?
A I have no idea.
Q Well, you testified earlier that it was on?
A Yeah, I left it one when $I$ went to sleep. Q Okay.
A He must -- he must have turned it off. Q He must have turned it off?

```
```

A Yeah.
Q Where was the bathroom in relation to where
you were sleeping?
A The bathroom?
Q Um-hum.
A The bathroom was located right before the kitchen.
Q So it's a separate room from the bedroom?
A Yes.
Q So someone would have had to have walked in
there physically turned off that light --
A Yes.
Q -- and continued on?
A Yes.
Q Was there anything on the floor in that
apartment other than your mattress and your television?
A Not that I remember.
Q Now, when you were woken up do you recall
telling the investigators who you first thought this
was?
A Yes.
Q Who?
A Anthony.
Q Why did you tell the investigators that you
thought that this was Anthony?
A Because he told me he was Anthony.

```
```
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            Q Okay. Did you tell anybody that he told you
        that it was Anthony?
        A Yes.
            Q You did?
    A Yes.
        Q Who did you tell that to?
    A I told Shanda Rosario.
            MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, can I have Ms.
        Santos's statement marked as D-1 for identification?
        Thank you.
            THE CLERK: D-1 for identification.
        BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
            Q Ms. Santos, I'm going to show you what's been
        marked Defense Exhibit 1 for identification. Do you
        recognize that document?
        A Yes, I do.
        Q And what is it?
        A This is my statement.
        Q Okay. That's the statement we've been
        discussing here that you provided to Detective Rosario?
        A Correct.
            Q And have you had an opportunity to review
        that statement prior to coming to court today?
        A Yes, I have.
        Q Actually before we get to the question about
    ```
    the statement, how many times did you say you met with
Mr. Troiano?
A Like five times.
                Q Okay. And how many times did you meet with
other members of the Prosecutor's Office?
A I met with Ms. Maloney about two or three times.
            Q Okay. And you met with the detectives as
well, or just those two people?
A Yeah, I met with the detectives.
10 Q On separate occasions or the same seven times
11 that you went to the Prosecutor's?
12 A What you mean on separate occasions?
13 Q Did you meet with detectives on other times
14 -- did you go other times to just meet with detectives?
15 Or did you meet with the detectives on the same seven
16 times that you spoke with either Mr. Troiano or Ms.
17 Maloney?
18 A Yes. Just -- I met -- when I met -- when I went
19 to speak to him that's the only time I spoke to the
20 detectives.
            Q So on each of those occasions you had the
        opportunity with whether it would be Ms. Maloney, who
        is an Assistant Prosecutor as well, correct?
24 A Yes.
25
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testimony or what took place or discuss this case, correct?
A Yes.
Q I'm going to ask you to review that statement to yourself. And after you've had an opportunity to 6 review that \(I\) want you to answer for me if you told
7 Detective Rosario that you believed that your attacker 8 was Anthony because he told you his name was Anthony or
9 because he was your boyfriend?
10 A No.
11 Q You never told Detective Rosario that?
12 A No, I told her that I called him Anthony because I
13 thought it was Anthony.
14 Q So is that an accurate reflection of what
15 took place?
16 A Yes.
17 Q So he never, in fact, told you that he was
18 Anthony?
19 A After I called him Anthony, yeah, he said, yes.
20 Q He said, yes?
21 A Yeah, he said that he's Anthony.
22 Q Okay.
23 A I kept asking him who are you? Like everything
24 is --
25
Q Did you tell the Detectives that --
```

A -- a blur.
Q -- you kept asking him who he was?
A No, I didn't tell her that.
Q Now, obviously when you spoke with the
detectives they asked you if you can identify this
individual, correct?
A Yes.
Q Isn't it true that you indicated to them
about the phone call that you believed that you -- he
opened the phone and took a phone call, correct?
A Yes.
Q Isn't it true that you told the officers that
you got a glance but you didn't get a real good look?
A At first I was afraid to tell her who it was.
Q You were afraid to tell her who it was?
A Yes.
Q So as you sit here today you are sure that
the person was the person you referred to as S.DOT?
A I'm positive.
Q So you had seen S.DOT previously?
A Yes.
Q In the area?
A Yes.
Q Now, you said that after the incident took
place at some point you made your way to Christ

```
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    Hospital, correct?
    A The ambulance took me to Christ Hospital, yes,
        correct.
            Q And Anthony was presently at Christ Hospital
        or he comes later?
        A No, he came later.
            Q Okay. When you spoke with Anthony on the
        phone did you tell him that it was S.DOT?
        A Yes.
            Q Did Anthony -- but you say at that time you
        didn't know who \(S\). DOT was, you just knew the name
        S.DOT?
        A I mean \(I\) knew him by face. I knew him from being
        around the area. I knew his name was \(S\).DOT. I knew
        that's what they called him.
            Q Did you mention that name to Anthony, as I
        said?
        A Yes.
            Q Did Anthony tell you he knew who it was?
                        MR. TROIANO: Objection.
                        THE COURT: Sustained.
        BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
            Q On that day, night into day, so we're talking
        about November 18 th/November \(19 t h\), at some point in
        time did you come to know that \(S\). DOT was Steven Wright?
```

A Yes.
Q Did you tell the police?
A Yes.
Q You did?
A When I found out that it was S. -- that his name
was Steven?
Q Yes.
A The detective told me his name was Steven --
Steven Wright.
Q Which detective?
A Shanda, Shanda Rosario.
Q So on November 19th, 2006 Shanda Rosario told
you that S.DOT was Steven Wright?
A She said that she made a phone call and that they
-- that the police -- someone knows -- the only person
that they know by the name of S.DOT is someone that
goes by his real name is Steven Wri -- Steven Wright,
whatever his name is.
Q Okay. And you're sure that you were told
that by Detective Rosario that day?
A Yes.
Q Did there -- there came a time that you saw
this individual after November 19th, correct?
A Correct.
Q And you said you contacted the Prosecutor's

```
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        Office to tell them that he was in the area?
        A Um-hum.
        Q Who did you contact?
    A Shanda Rosario.
        Q And you said you did that on at least ten
        occasions?
    A Like four or five occasions.
        Q Four or five occasions?
    A Yeah. I called her like ten times all together.
        Q Okay. But four or five times you spoke with
    Detective Rosario and said Steven Wright is in this
    area or \(S . D O T\) is in this area, or the person who
    attacked me in this -- was in this area, what did you
        say?
        A I told her -- I told her that \(S\). DOT was on the
        corner of Communipaw and VanHorne Street.
            Q Okay. When was the last time that you saw
        him, if you recall, on the corner of Communipaw and
        VanHorne?
        A I don't remember.
            Q Was it --
        A After this happened he was out there every night.
            Q Okay. Did you speak with him?
        A No.
            Q Did you ever contact the Jersey City Police
or just Ms. Rosario?
A No, just Ms. Rosario.
    Q Now, back in 2006 was your family still
residing in Jersey City?
A Yes.
    Q Was your mother residing in Jersey City?
    A Yes.
        Q Did your mother reside on Seidler Avenue?
    A Correct.
        Q Where on Seidler Avenue was her home located?
    A What do you mean the address?
        Q No. Just give me cross streets?
    A Between Bramhall Avenue and between, I'm not sure,
    I think that's Clerk -- Clerk (sic) Street.
        Q Clinton Street?
    A Clinton Street.
        Q Isn't it true, Ms. Santos that prior to this
        incident you and Mr. Wright were at your mother's home
        on Seidler Avenue?
        A No, that's not true.
        Q Isn't it true that prior to this incident you
        and Mr. Wright had hung out on numerous occasions on
        the corner of Communipaw and VanHorne Street?
        A Nope, that's not true.
        Q Isn't it true, Ms. Santos, that prior to this
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        incident you and Mr. Wright used to pal around the
        2 neighborhood?
        3 A Not true.
        \(4 \quad Q \quad\) Do you know an individual by the name if Mia
    5 Jones?
    6 A Mia? No.
    7 Q Do you know an individual by the name of
    8 Lamia (phonetic) Jones?
    9 A No.
10 Q Do you know an individual by the name of
11 Davone Parsons (phonetic)?
12 A Yes, I've seen -- yeah.
13 Q You do?
14 A Yes.
15 Q Where do you know Mr. Parsons from?
16 A I see him around all the time.
17 Q Where do you see Mr. -- around all the time,
18 give me an area?
19 A Around Jersey City.
20 Q Does he hang out in a specific area?
21 A Not that I know of.
22 Q Are you friendly with Mr. Parsons?
23 A No.
24 Q But you know him?
25 A I've seen him around.
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Q After the incident took place what was the first thing that you did, if you recall?
A After I heard the door close I ran to the window, looked out the window. I saw that the gate was open. I didn't see anybody in the gate. I ran out the door. I looked to the right, I looked to the left. I saw someone running down the street. Then I went back inside. I remember just walking back and forth confused not knowing what to do.

Q So after this took place the first thing that you did, by your testimony, was you went after your attacker?
A No, I wanted to see which way he was going.
Q And you recall telling the police at that time that you couldn't identify the individual, correct?
```

A Yes -- no, I didn't speak to no police officer.
Q To Ms. Rosario, I apologize. She is a police
officer. She just works for the Prosecutor's Office.
A Okay.
Q To Ms. Rosario, Detective Rosario, do you
remember telling her that you couldn't identify
anybody, correct?
A Yes, I remember saying that.
Q And you remember telling her that the only

```
thing that you could identify is you thought that your attacker was a black male because you felt his hair, correct?
A No, I don't remember saying that.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, can I show the witness D-1?

THE COURT: Yes.
BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q If you could review your statement one more time, Ms. Santos, and when you're done let me know, and I'll ask you a question again.
A I can't even find it.
Q Maybe I can point you in the right direction, if you can just hand that back to me. Thanks. If you can read Page 12 about midway down to yourself please. A Excuse me, but this doesn't say anything about a black male.

Q Okay. So you never told the police that you recognized the individual by the texture of their hair? A What I said was that I called him Anthony. I thought it was Anthony because I was feeling his hair and Anthony had waves like that.

Q Okay. Is Anthony a black male?
A Yes. That didn't come up though, but okay.
Q Now, when you were speaking to Mr. Troiano
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about the incident itself you indicated that your attacker pulled off your pants, correct?
A Yes.
Q Did you show the police the pajama pants?
Were they pants or shorts, by the way?
A They were pants.
Q Did you show the police those pants?
A I don't remember showing them. I just remember
them as soon as they came in they put me in the ambulance and I went straight to the --
11
A I'm not sure.
Q Did you look at the pants after the incident?
A. No.

Q Did you notice if there was blood on the
pants?
A I didn't look. I thought they took them. They had the shirt. I thought they took the pants.

Q Okay. So it was your understanding that the police took everything that they thought might be relevant to this case?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Now, your shirt that Mr. Troiano showed you there's -- there's a couple of specs of blood on that shirt, correct?
A.R.T. AGENCY, INC.

A Yes.
Q And you indicated that you were not bleeding, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q Now, your belief is that the individual that entered your apartment entered through that window, correct?
A Yes.
Q Did you see the individual bleeding from anywhere?
A No.
Q Did you have blood on any other part of your
body that you recall?
A No.
Q Now, as you stated that you were being held down on the bed, correct?
A Yes.
Q How were you being held down?
A I think he had his hand on my back of something.
Q Okay. And, then, I believe you said that you
were tussling, correct?
A Yes.
Q So you were fighting back?
A Yes.
Q You were punching?
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A Yes. You were kicking?

```
    A Yes.
    Q Was he doing the same to you?
    A He was choking me, he was pulling my hair.
    Q At some point in time you indicated that you
heard a condom wrapper, correct?
A Yes.
    Q Is he still choking you, holding you?
    A No, at this point he has me on the bed and that
    was after he told me not to move or he will kill me.
            Q Okay. Did he show you a knife?
    A No.
            Q Did you feel a gun?
    A No.
            Q Okay. So it was the threat that kept you
        there?
    18 A Yes. The threat and the fact that he was choking
19 me and about to rape me, yeah.
20 Q Okay. So he was being pretty violent with
21 you, correct?
22 A Yes.
23 Q Okay. Now, you stated that after -- by the
24 way about what time was this, if you recall?
25 A This had to happen like around six o'clock.

Q In the morning?
A Five something -- between five and six.
Q Okay. Do you recall what time you called the police?
A No.
Q You had testified earlier that the police arrived pretty quickly after you called them, correct? A Yes.

Q So if they arrived -- if I told you they arrived at your house shortly before 6:30 what time would you tell me that you made the call?
A Like around 6:20. Between 6:20, around there.
Q Okay. At any point in time through the course of this attack did you take anything from your attacker?
A No.
Q Did you ever hold his cell phone?
A No.
Q Did you ever take off his jacket?
A No.
Q Did you ever speak to him?
A At -- I called him Anthony and he said what?
Q Okay. After this took place you spoke with the various individual you spoke with on November the 19th, when was the next time you spoke with somebody
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from the Prosecutor's Office, Ms. Rosario, I guess?
A When I called her and let her know where he was
at.
Q Okay.
A That was -- that's the only time I remember calling her.

Q Okay. And, again, as we've established earlier, you told Detective Rosario that S.DOT was Steven Wright?
A No.
Q That's what you testified to earlier. I asked you --
A You asked me and I told you that she told me that his name was Steven --

Q I apologize.
A Okay.
Q But that was on November the 19th or shortly, thereafter?
A Excuse me?
Q You found out from Detective Rosario either on the 19th or a couple of days or a week or two weeks later, but around November 19th, 2006 that S.DOT, the person that you said attacked you, was Steven Wright? A Yes.

Q And you saw him in that area everyday?
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questions. Thank you.
THE COURT: Redirect?
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
Q Liliana, you -- would it be fair to say that you put trust in the Detective Rosario --
A Of course.
Q -.. with regard to this case?
A Yes.
Q And would it be fair to say that it would be difficult for you to go to the area of Communipaw and Halladay and make an arrest?

MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection.
A For me to do it?
THE COURT: Sustained. Don't answer the
question. Next question?
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q You said that you saw S.DOT outside, where did you mean by that, outside?
A On the corner.
Q Which corner?
A Of Communipaw and VanHorne Street.
Q. Okay. Different section from where you live on Arlington or where you live, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q Okay. The night that this happened how long
```
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    after S.DOT left your house did you call the police?
    A Immediately after. I came in -- when I looked
outside then I saw him running down, I went inside my
apartment and I started searching for a phone.
Q Okay. And he was running down to the left,
that's correct, right?
A Yes.
Q Mr. Hirschorn asked you if -- strike that --
when this attack was taking place did you feel
threatened?
A Of course.
Q And why was it that you felt threatened?
A He -- there was nothing I can do. As much as I
tried fighting -- fighting him back he was just too
strong. There was nothing I could do. I had no choice
but to just lay there and let him rape me.
Q And you went over that statement that's in
front of you, right, Liliana?
A Yes.
Q All right. In fact, you and I went over that
before, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q And it would be fair to say that the first
time you actually saw that statement was probably with
me?

```
```
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        A Correct. Would you agree that that statement is 22
        pages?
        A Yes.
            Q And that was a question and answer of you and
        Detective Rosario?
        A Yes.
            Q And would it be fair to say that you gave the
        name S.DOT throughout the course of that statement?
        A Yes.
            Q How you thought you knew him, what
        neighborhood and when you saw him, correct?
        A Yes.
            Q Now, with regard to your apartment, and we
        went through it on that diagram, if you were to -- and
        you know this apartment, you know the layout, is that
        correct?
        A Yes.
            Q Okay. Let's say that the light in the
        bathroom is on, light from the TV is on that night,
        correct, no other light?
        A No.
            Q Okay. If you were to come from the front of
        the apartment, let's say by the area of the closet, and
        you were to have to get to your bedroom would it be
    ```
from that closet? Let me see. Let me -- let me
explain better. You would agree that the closet is
here, correct?
A Yes.
    Q All right. And where is your bed?
    A All the way on the other side.
    Q Okay. Would it be fair to say that if you
    were to start here the furthest point away is your bed?
    A Correct.
    Q Okay. And you, also, indicated that there is
    some sort of door here, is that correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Okay. And you didn't hear anything that
        night, correct?
        A No.
            Q Now, if you were to start at the closet, walk
        towards your bedroom, you would pass by, first, the
        bathroom, is that correct?
        A Coming from the front door?
            Q Yes.
        A Yes.
            Q Okay. And, then, you would pass by your TV,
        correct?
        A The kitchen.
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            Q Okay. Kitchen?
        A Yeah.
            Q Okay. And, then, you would keep on walking,
        ultimately, you would enter into your bedroom and you
        would pass by the TV, is that correct?
        A TV, yeah, the TV was right there.
            Q So starting from the closet or from the front
        of the apartment the -- your bed is the actual last
            9 thing that you would get to?
10 A Yes.
11 Q All right. You'd pass the bathroom, pass the
12 TV , is that correct?
13 A Yes.
14 Q And you indicated that when you fell asleep
15
16 correct?
17 A Correct.
18
19
20
21
22
23
25 A No, never.

Q And why didn't you?
A Because when I went to inspect the apartment, when I went to look at it before I rented it out I looked in there one time, I saw that there was nothing in there, but like water pipes and stuff and, then, after that when I moved in I just felt there was no need for me to look in that closet. I already knew what was in there.

Q Okay. So you didn't -- you didn't store anything there?
A No.
Q You didn't hang anything there?
A No.
Q You didn't go over there to smoke cigarettes?
A No.
Q All right. You didn't open those windows, shut those windows?
A No.
Q They stayed in the same position down?
A Yes.
Q Screen down on the outside, glass down on the inside, is that correct?
A Correct.
Q Mr. Hirschorn asked you and I'm going to ask you again did you and Anthony ever get into any physical altercation --
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A Never.
Q -- fight?
A Never.
Q What was the reason, tell the ladies and gentlemen here, that at the point that you began to get attacked you thought the name Anthony?
A His hair. Him and Anthony had the same hair.
Q And you couldn't see anything?
A I couldn't see anything.
Q You grabbed up?
A I was grabbing his face. I was trying to feel and see if I knew who it was or something. When I said Anth -- when I said -- I didn't even call him Anthony. I called him Scoop. When I said Scoop, he said what? But after -- after -- even when he said what, like he was disguising his voice. He was like whispering, I knew it wasn't him.

Q Okay. And as you sit here today you could say to these ladies and gentlemen that it was not Anthony or Scoop that was attacking you?
A No.
Q You have never thought that -- you have never thought that?
A No.
MR. TROIANO: Nothing further, Judge.
```
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THE COURT: Recross?
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, yes. Judge, if
you can just give me one minute please?
THE COURT: Sure.
(TAPE OFF - TAPE ON)
RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q Ms. Santos, Mr. Troiano asked you about the 22 page statement you gave to the Prosecutor's Office, right?
A Yes.
Q And it was a question and answer, right? The Detective asked you questions and you provided answers?
A Yes.
Q You had spoken to her or someone else before that to provide them with your story so they would be able to ask you the right questions, correct?
A Excuse me?
Q Before you provided the statement that you had an opportunity to review today and you had an opportunity to review with Mr. Troiano, you explained what happened that night to someone, whether it be Detective Rosario, the nurse, both, the police, right? A I think I -- I think I told the nurse what happened.

Q Okay. And Detective Rosario was there as
```

                Santos - Recross
                    9 7
        well?
        A I'm not -- I don't remember.
            Q Okay.
    A I think she got there after I got examined.
                            The lawsuit. Basically, what I'm asking you
    is you had an opportunity -- or Detective Rosario had
    an opportunity to hear what had happened to you, so she
    would know how to ask you the questions so you could
    answer, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Okay. So the statement that you provided
    wasn't the first time that you had talked about what
    took place a couple of hours earlier?
    A No, it wasn't.
    Q Okay. Do you remember how many times you had
        spoken about it before you provided the statement?
        A I think I just spoke to the nurse about it and,
        then, that was it.
            Q Okay. Did -- had Mr. Wright ever been over
        to your apartment before?
        A Never.
            Q Okay. Now, you said that the person that
        attacked you was disguising their voice, correct?
        A Yes.
            Q Do you recall telling the police originally
    ```
that you recognized the person to be \(S\). DOT because of
his voice?
A I don't remember saying that.
    Q You don't remember saying that. Okay. Now,
you testified on redirect here that you never went in
that closet, correct?
A No, not while I was living there.
    Q Not while you were living there. You only
went in the one time when you were buying the apartment
or renting the apartment, excuse me, to see what was
back there?
A Yeah.
    Q And you realize that you weren't going to be
able to use it?
A Yeah.
            Q Okay. So it's fair to say you never opened
that window?
A Yeah, I never opened that window.
19 Q It's fair to say you never opened that
20 screen?
21 A Never opened the screen.
22 Q Then can you explain to me how the window was
23 broken --
24 MR. TROIANO: Objection.
25 Q -- but the screen was down?
```
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                                    THE COURT: Overruled.
    A He must have put it down.
Q Did you hear it get put down?
A Excuse me?
Q Did you hear the screen go down?
A No.
Q Did you hear the closet doors open?
A I didn't hear anything.
Q You didn't hear anything.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Nothing further, Judge, thank
you. Thank you, Ms. Santos.
THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
MR. TROIANO: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Okay. You're excused, Ms.
Santos. Thank you very much.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. TROIANO: Sidebar, Judge?
THE COURT: Sure.
(On the record discussion at sidebar)
MR. TROIANO: Take lunch?
MR. HIRSCHORN: That's fine.
THE COURT: All right. I'll make it 1:15.
(Sidebar discussion ended)
THE COURT: All right, folks, we're going to
take lunch now rather than put a witness on and break

```
the witness up. We'll take lunch now, okay. It's
12:10. I'll tell you what, why don't you come back,
it's nice out, come back about 1:15, all right. Do not
discuss the case among yourselves, enjoy your lunch.
Once you roll back we will resume, about 1:15, 1:20,
okay.

Thank you very much.

\section*{(RECESS)}

THE COURT: Okay, folks, sorry for the delay. Notice all the equipment's gone that was here before. The trial that started last week just finished. We do two things at once sometimes, okay, so now we're going to solely focus on your trial and we're ready to continue.

Mr. Troiano.
MR. TROIANO: Judge, thank you. At this time the State will call Anthony Waring.
A N T H O N Y WAR I N G, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN COURT OFFICER: State your full name for the
record.
THE WITNESS: Anthony Waring.
COURT OFFICER: Have a seat.
MR. TROIANO: Thank you, Judge.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Mr. Waring, Anthony, I'd just ask you to
```
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    speak into that microphone so the ladies and gentlemen
here could what you're saying, all right?
A. All right.
Q. Your name again for the record?
A. Anthony Waring.
Q. Okay. And Anthony, I have asked you to come
here as a witness for the State, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you and I have met on a couple of
different occasions, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And would it be fair to say that you were
brought here because a couple of years ago you were in
some sort of a relationship with Liliana Santos, is
that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Before I get to that, you yourself,
Anthony, have been in some trouble in the past, is that
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And in fact, you've been to court,
you've been convicted, you've even gone down to State
Prison, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you about those

```
briefly and I'm going to start with 2001. In 2001 specifically September 21st, 2001, you were convicted of possession of a controlled dangerous substance as well as possession of a con -- of a -- excuse me, controlled dangerous substance with intent to distribute within 1000 feet of school property, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And if your recollection serves you, you received a sentence of probation for five years, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Moving on a couple, a couple of years later. You were actually, it was -- this one predates. On January 21st, 2003 you were convicted of possession of a controlled dangerous substance within 1000 feet of school property, two counts of that in which you were sentenced to three years in New Jersey State Prison with nine months of parole ineligibility, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Also in 2003 specifically May 1st, 2003, you were convicted of possession of a controlled dangerous substance with intent to distribute within 1000 feet of school property and you
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were sentenced to three years in New Jersey state Prison with 18 months of parole ineligibility, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And finally, Anthony, on May 22nd, 2008, you were convicted of possession of a controlled dangerous substance in which you received probation for a period of three years. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, you are still on probation, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You doing good?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Now, despite that, I'm going to ask you some questions, all right. And I'm going to take you back to 2006, the fall, November time, 2006. Do you recall that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And it's fair to say you and I have talked about this, you know what I'm referring to, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And at that time you were in a relationship again with Liliana Santos, is that correct?
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay. With Liliana?
A. Yes.
Q. Had you been there more than once?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I want to direct your attention to Saturday night, November 18th, 2006, or let me do it this way. Next day, November 19th, 2006, you got a call from Liliana in the morning, is that correct? A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And do you recall where she was calling from?
A. She was at the detective's office.
Q. And do you recall how she was acting on the phone?
A. She was upset I would say, slightly nervous. Q. And what do you mean by that? And if you could just speak up a little bit. A. Upset, crying, you know, saying something happened to her.
Q. Okay. And do you recall what she said happened to her?
A. She said she had got raped.
Q. Okay. Did she identify somebody as the person that had raped her?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And who was that?
A. She just said S.DOT.
Q. Okay. And I'll go into it a little bit more but at the point that she says S.DOT, do you have an idea of who that person may be?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. All right, now I want to go back the night before this happened. Did you at any point meet up with Liliana?
A. Yes, after the bar we met up and left and went to her house.
Q. Okay. And what -- what bar was that?
A. Marjay's (phonetic) on Communipaw.
Q. All right, down on Communipaw?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You were at that bar?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay, were you with Liliana while you were at that bar?
A. No.
Q. And how was it if you recall that you two met up?
A. Well there was a lot of people outside, she was in the neighborhood, I was in the neighborhood at the bar,
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and from there we met up after that, after the bar.
Q. And if you recall, where'd you go from there?
A. We went to her house.
Q. Her house?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's the basement apartment, 235?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And do you recall how it was that you got there?
A. I drove.
Q. And what kind of car were you driving at the time?
A. A gold Acura.
Q. Okay. Had you been to this bar, Marjay's, earlier in the evening?
A. I got there kind of late, it was like before it closed. I got there like, probably like two, three hours before it closed.
Q. Okay. And you -- you were there for a little while?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have a recollection as to whether or not S.DOT, the person you know as S.DOT, was either at Marjay's or in that area that evening? A. He wasn't in the bar. I seen him in the
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neighborhood though. Everybody was outside so he was
in the neighborhood.
Q. Okay, so your recollection is that he was not in the bar, Marjay's, where you were, but that he was in the neighborhood hanging out that night? A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you see in Court here today the individual you know as S.DOT?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And could you please identify him for
us?
A. Right there.
Q. And you're pointing at the gentleman with the white shirt on?
A. Yes.

MR. TROIANO: Judge.
THE COURT: Defendant for the record.
MR. TROIANO: Okay. BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. How do you know this gentleman?
A. From the same neighborhood. I don't know too -like I told you, being that \(I\) just came home from state Prison, like \(I\) know of him from the same neighborhood. Q. Okay. How old are you?
A. I'm 28.
```
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Q. Okay. Do you know him to be younger or older
than you?
A. Younger.
Q. If you know?
A. Younger.
Q. Okay. You indicated that you know him by the name S.DOT. Do you know what his real name is?
A. No. Now I do.
Q. Okay. Let me ask, back in 2006 did you know
what his real name was?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Eirst name or last name?
A. No.
Q. Okay. But it would be fair to say that you
know him by sight?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Did you know any of his family members?
A. Only his brother.
Q. And for the record, what's his brother's
name?
A. Ant.
Q. You call him Ant?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Do you know if his brother is younger
or older than you?
A. Younger.
    Q. Okay. And how do you know his brother?
    A. From the neighborhood.
    Q. Okay. Had you guys hung out, spent time
together?
A. They cool, play the game.
Q. And what does that mean?
A. Like playing Play Station game.
    Q. Okay. But you knew him, the brother?
A. Yes.
Q. Didn't know S.DOT.
A. Yes.
Q. All right, going back to that night, you
leave Marjay's, you pick up Liliana, you go back to her
house. Could you describe if you recall what happened
when you got there?
A. We went in, went in the house, kicked it, did what
we did, and I left.
            Q. Okay. Just so the ladies and gentlemen here
understand what you mean you guys by kicked it you mean
you hung out?
A. Yeah, we hung out.
Q. Okay. You did what you did, probably meaning
that you had sex?
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay. We're all adults, we can say it. When you arrived at Liliana's house, do you
recall where it was that you parked?
A. In front, in front of her house.
Q. Okay. Right side, left side do you remember?
A. Right side.
Q. Okay. So if you were parked then your
driver's side would have been in the street side?
A. Yeah, driver's side.
Q. And upon walking to her apartment, did you notice anything out of the ordinary?
A. No.
Q. It would be fair to say that at this point now, three years later, you know that a window was broken at that apartment, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. If you recall, when you walked into the apartment, did you see a broken window?
A. No.
Q. All right. Do you believe that you would have seen it if it had been broken?
A. Yes.
Q. And why do you say that?
A. There's only two windows and it's a basement
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apartment. There's two windows right here in the front, so it's real noticeable.
Q. And is the area where you walk in, the outside area where you walk in in front of the windows, is that a big area?
A. It's kind of small, kind of like a -- like a driveway.
Q. Okay. So you go in, you guys hang out, did you spend the night?
A. No.
Q. Okay. At some point you left?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you approximate what time that would have happened?
A. Probably like around -- probably like around like six in the morning.
Q. Okay. And did you leave for any specific reason?
A. No, I just went home.
Q. And what'd you do when you got home?
A. Shower and went to sleep.
Q. You had been out the entire night beforehand, is that correct?
A. Yes, I was out all day.
Q. Okay. When you left Liliana's apartment, was
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there a problem between the two of you?
A. No.
Q. Was there an issue as to whether or not you should leave or not?
A. No.
Q. Did she get mad at you that you left?
A. No.
Q. In your prior relationship with Liliana, did you guys ever get into a physical fight or anything like that?
A. No.
Q. You had a good relationship?
A. Yes.
Q. When you left the apartment, do you recall what she was doing at the point that you left?
A. She took a shower, I waited for her to take a shower, and when she got out the shower, she walked me to the door and then I left.
Q. And upon leaving, walking to your car which was out front, did you notice anything suspicious?
A. No.
Q. Do you think that you would have noticed anything suspicious?
A. Yes.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection, Judge.
A. No.
Q. Did you look around?
A. Yes.
Q. Why'd you do that?
A. It's not my neighborhood, it was kind of dark, so walking to my car \(I\) looked both ways before \(I\) get in my car.
Q. Okay. Didn't notice anything?
A. No.
Q. And at the point that you walked out, did you notice whether or not a window was broken?
A. No, no window wasn't broken.
Q. Okay. You drive home, down to Woodward?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You said you take a shower, you go to sleep. Did you hear from Liliana again later that day?
A. In the morning like around like seven, eight o'clock when I got all the phone calls.
Q. Okay. And -- and explain to the ladies and gentlemen what -- what happened with these phone calls? A. She called me from the detective's office and said
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that --

```

MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection.
THE COURT: Sustained.
THE WITNESS: She called me and said that had got --

MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection.
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Okay, just -- I'll rephrase.

Did you get a phone call from her?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you recall how many phone calls you got from her?
A. A whole lot.
Q. Okay. And if you could estimate what a whole lot means, what do you mean by that?
A. Ten, 20.
Q. And what was your reaction before speaking with Liliana when you were getting these phone calls? A. Actually I didn't answer my phone, I was in my bed sleeping. I didn't think nobody was, I didn't know who would be calling me this time in the morning. Then when I did answer, when \(I\) did call the number back that's when I spoke to her.
Q. Okay. And your recollection is that she was where at the time that you spoke to her?
A. Excuse me?
Q. Your recollection now is that she was where when you spoke to her?
A. At the detective's office.
Q. Okay. And do you know where that is?
A. Duncan Avenue.
Q. We already talked about it, she indicated to you that she had been raped, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Where'd you go from there?
A. Before I went there?
Q. Yeah, okay.
A. Well I -- well after, when she told me everything,

I rode past to see if she was serious. I thought she was kind of playing at first until \(I\) seen all the cops and stuff around like her apartment and everything.
Then \(I\) went down to the detective's office.
Q. Okay. So from Woodward you drove past

Arlington first?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what was in that area?
A. Yellow tape, lot of cops.
Q. And at that point you said?
A. Serious.
Q. Okay. You went where after that?
```
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    A. To the detective's office.
Q. And when you arrived and -- strike that.
Did you see Liliana when you arrived?
A. Yes.
Q. And could you describe for the ladies and
gentlemen what she looked like, how she was acting?
A. She was scared, crying, she had like a few
bruises.
Q. And when you mean bruises, what do you mean
by that?
A. Like scratches, real red.
Q. You say that she was crying. Did you see her
crying?
A. Yes.
Q. And this condition that she was in, was she
in that condition when you left her a few hours prior?
A. No.
Q. You had -- you were under the belief, correct
me if I'm wrong, or you had the name of S.DOT at that
point, is that correct?
A. That's what she said.
Q. Okay. Do you know of any, or did you ever
see any relationship or Liliana speaking with S.DOT
ever in the past?
A. I don't know if they ever spoke, I don't know

```
```

about no relationship.

```
Q. You never saw anything with your own eyes?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Did you speak with the detectives when you went down to Duncan Avenue?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did they ask you to do anything?
A. Cotton swab.
Q. Okay. And then ultimately how was it that
you left there? Did you leave alone?
A. No, I took Liliana home.
Q. Okay. You brought her back to her house?
A. Yes.

MR. TROIANO: One second, Judge.
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. After you had gotten home and in the days thereafter, did you see, did you personally see \(S\). DOT again?
A. In the neighborhood.
Q. Did you your self ever have a confrontation
with S.DOT about this incident?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And if you would, tell the ladies and gentlemen why that was?
A. Why I didn't have a confrontation with him?
```
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    Q. Yes.
A. It's not my place.
Q. And what do you mean by that?
A. It's not my job, that's the police job.
Q. Okay. And was it your understanding that the
police were involved in this?
A. Yes.
MR. TROIANO: Nothing further.
CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Waring.
When did you come home from doing that three
with an 18 in 2003?
A. October 29th, 2004.
Q. Okay. When did you meet Liliana?
A. I'd say probably summer `05, close towards the winter, fall of `05.
Q. Of `05?
A. Yes.
Q. So you knew her for a little bit of time
prior to November 2006?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. On the night of November 18th, you
stated that you were hanging out at, was it Marjay's?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Were you in there by yourself?

```
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A. Everybody from the neighborhood was in there. Q. Okay. So everybody from the neighborhood hangs out in there?
A. Yes.
Q. You said you know my client's brother?
A. Yes.
Q. Was he in there?
A. No.
Q. No. You just know him from other days or
from --
A. From the neighborhood.
Q. And you play video games with him?
A. Yeah.
Q. And you said you knew -- do you know his real
name?
A. No.
Q. You just know him as Ant?
A. Yeah, just street name.
Q. Okay. Now when you were at Marjay's, were you drinking?
A. No.
Q. You weren't drinking at all? You don't
drink?
A. I drink.
Q. But you weren't that night?
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A. I didn't drink.
Q. Okay. Now how did you know that Liliana was coming back there?
A. Coming back where?
Q. To Marjay's?
A. She didn't come to Marjay's.
Q. Oh, she came outside of Marjay's, right?
A. Yeah, she was outside when I met up with her.
Q. Oh, she was hanging out outside?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Had you spoken to her earlier that
day?
A. Probably like a text or two.
Q. Text or two? Did she call you?
A. Yeah, I spoke to her, you could say that.
Q. She spoke to you? So she would call you from
her phone, right? Yeah? And you would know that it
was her phone because you recognized the phone number,
right? That's how you knew it was her?
A. It wasn't -- it wasn't her phone she called me from.
Q. Oh, she called you from somebody else's
phone? Okay. How did you know it was her?
A. I know her voice.
Q. You know her voice? But so you didn't
```
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recognize the number, you just picked up? Okay. THE COURT: You have to speak, say yes. You shook your head yes right?
BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. Now, have -- you said you've talked to Mr.

Troiano a couple of times about this case, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you talked to Liliana about the case?
A. Yes, I spoke to her.
Q. You've spoken to her since November about
what took place?
A. Yes.
Q. What you took, what each of you talked to the police about, things like that?
A. No, I never said what \(I\) said to him.
Q. Did she ever tell you?
A. No, I just know what was going -- she was telling me about the court date, soon as she go to Court.
Q. Okay. But she never talked after that day back in November of 2006, she never, you and her never talked about what took place?
A. Only Court dates. No, we never talked about what took place.
Q. Okay. Now back in November, you were
involved in some type of relationship with Liliana,
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correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So you hung out with her after that day I assume, right, after November 19th?
A. Yes.
Q. Did she ever tell you that she found out that S.DOT's name was Stephen Wright?
A. No.
Q. She never told you that?
A. No, she never mentioned his name.
Q. She never told you that the detective in the Prosecutor's office told her that \(S\). DOT was stephen Wright?
A. Well she probably found out his name, but she never mentioned his name.
Q. She never mentioned it to you?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Now do you remember about a little
over, I guess a little over a year ago now, you went into the Prosecutor's office and you spoke with one of their detectives? Detective Racquel (phonetic) Kraus, do you remember talking to her?
A. I spoke to her before.
Q. You spoke to her before. Do you remember talking to her about what happened back in 2006?
A. They questioned me, yes.
Q. They questioned you?
A. Yeah, asked me questions.
Q. Okay. And you said as you said here today
that early in the morning after you went home, your phone started to vibrate, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it started to vibrate a lot?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were asleep, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Eventually you woke up because the phone wouldn't stop vibrating I assume, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you remember telling them that you picked up because you knew it was Liliana?
A. No, I didn't know the number at first, but then I called the number back.
Q. Okay. So you never told the detectives that you saw that it was Liliana so you picked up the phone? A. No, I said it was -- the last call I had on my phone was her number, then it was her number and a whole bunch of other numbers. But the other numbers I didn't know, that turned out to be the detective's number.
```

                                    Waring - Cross
                                    125
                Q. Okay. But one of them was her number, right?
    A. Yes.
Q. So you recognized that. Okay.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I have no further
questions, thank you very much.
MR. TROIANO: Nothing, Judge.
THE COURT: All right, you're excused, sir.
Thank you very much for coming.
Okay, folks, we're going to take a short
break, waiting for the next witness to show up. Do not
discuss the case at all. Just step in the jury room.
As soon as the witness comes --
(Off the record/on the record)
MR. TROIANO: Judge, at this time the State
will call Sergeant Shonda Rosario.
SHON D A R O S A R I O, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
COURT OFFICER: For the record, state your
name.
THE WITNESS: Shonda Rosario.
MR. TROIANO: Thank you, Judge.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. You are a sergeant with the Hudson County
Prosecutor's Office, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can I call you Sergeant Rosario?

```
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\hline \multirow[b]{26}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
A. You may. \\
Q. All right. Just speak into the microphone so the ladies and gentlemen here could, can hear what you're saying. \\
How long have you been employed by the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office? \\
A. I've been employed since June of 1992. \\
Q. Okay. And you are now of the designation of sergeant, correct? \\
A. Correct. \\
Q. How long has that been? \\
A. Since December of 2006. \\
Q. Okay. And before that? \\
A. I was promoted to detective in January of 1995. \\
Q. Okay, so detective from '95 up until the \\
point that you became sergeant, is that correct? \\
A. That's correct. \\
Q. Okay. And you are currently with the Special Victims Unit, is that correct? \\
A. Correct, I've been with the Special Victims since May of 1998. \\
Q. Okay. And just so the ladies and gentlemen here know, the Special Victims Unit handles generally what type of crimes, allegations? \\
A. We handle all sexual assault cases involving
\end{tabular}} \\
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\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline
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penetration of both adults and children. And then we handle contact cases of children 12 and under. And then we handle physical abuse major physical abuse cases of children.
Q. Okay. Now, just so the -- the ladies and gentlemen here understand, if there is an allegation generally of one of these crimes, why would it be that the municipality, for instance Jersey City, does not, is not the primary investigator?
A. That was a decision made before my time.
Q. Okay. But -- but--
A. In cooperation --
Q. -- at this point now, if there are those allegations made, the investigation will be done by the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. I'd like to direct your attention to November, specifically November 19th, 2006. Do you recall that date?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And at that time, were you working with the Special Victims Unit?
A. Correct.

24 Q. And you were a detective at that point?
25
That's correct.
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Q. Okay. Do you recall receiving a call with regard to an alleged sexual assault down at 235 Arlington Avenue?
A. That is correct. I was the on-call detective for that day.
Q. Okay. And what does that mean so the ladies and gentlemen understand?
A. We -- we run shifts, we work, we have staff Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to midnight. We have two shifts, 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. and then 4 p.m. to midnight. From midnight to 8 a.m. Monday through Friday, there's a detective that goes on call. And if something happens then they are, at that time we were, we had pagers and they would beep us and then we would respond in the middle of the night if need be.

And then we also were on call for either Saturday and Sunday also.
Q. Okay. With regard to this case, do you recall how it was that you became involved?
A. I was the on-call detective for that day.
Q. Okay and do you recall whether or not it was a weekday or weekend?
A. It was a weekend.
Q. So as the on-call detective at that point, what if anything did you do?
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A. I received the page from the sheriff's office, and -- to contact Jersey City, which I did. I contacted a police officer from Jersey City and he advised me of allegations. And at that point \(I\) got ready and responded to Christ Hospital.
Q. Okay. And is there a reason why you responded to Christ Hospital?
A. If there's a -- an alleged victim of sexual assault, and it occurred within the last five days, then any, at that time whoever is the victim and it happened within the last five days is taken to Christ Hospital for a sexual assault examination, evidence collection kit is basically done.
Q. Okay. So with regard to this case on the 19th of November, you responded directly to Christ Hospital?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And upon arriving there, what if anything do you recall happening? Who'd you meet with? A. Well at that point \(I\) met with the nurse that was on call. That was Nurse Richardson. She had -- she had already been at the hospital. She was just getting off so, and to the best of my recollection the victim was extremely upset, so it was decided that they would go ahead and do -- and I'm just going to call it the
```

rape kit.
Q. Okay, that's fine.

```
A. It's actually the sexual assault evidence
collection kit, but I'll call it rape kit for short.
That we would just do the rape kit first and then when
I got there which is about, I would say maybe 45
minutes later, maybe an hour, then we conducted a joint
interview with the victim.
            Q. Okay. So upon arriving at Christ Hospital,
    an examination, a physical examination of this victim
    had begun, is that correct?
    A. That's correct.
    Q. Okay. And the victim, Liliana Santos, you
    recall meeting her?
    A. Yes.
            Q. Okay. Did you meet her during the course if
    you recall of the examination or once it was completed?
    A. It was -- it would have been when she, it was
    completed. I -- I'll be honest with you, I don't
    recall, but \(I\) don't -- we don't normally practice going
    into the examination room once it starts.
            Q. Okay. And the examination room is just the
        nurse and the alleged victim, correct?
        A. Correct, and it's an advocate if the victim
    chooses to have the advocate in there.
                                    Rosario - Direct 131
            Q. Okay. Once the physical examination was over
        with and you had occasion to meet with Liliana, did you
        speak with her?
    A. Yes.
            Q. Okay. And do you recall where that took
        place?
    A. The initial -- when we spoke with the nurse --
    after her examination, the nurse and I did speak with
    her and it was at Christ Hospital.
            Q. Okay. And is there a reason for both you and
        the nurse to speak with her there? Is that documented
        anywhere or recorded anywhere?
        A. No, it's not a formal interview, it's just a -- a
        -- usually -- the purpose for it is that we usually
        talk to them and get a sense of what happened, and
        that --
            MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection, Judge.
            THE COURT: No, that's overruled. It's her
        procedure, that's all.
            THE WITNESS: So the purpose of that
        interview is an informal interview, and it's to kind of
        get an idea of what happened. And that gives the nurse
        an idea of what she needs to do as far as the evidence
        collection kit goes. And then it might also help the
        detective know, maybe there's some things that that
person can do while the exam is going on.
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Okay. Upon meeting Miss Santos, could you describe for the ladies and gentlemen how she presented to you?
A. She appeared visibly upset, shaken, you know. She had, you know, it looked like she may have been crying. She appeared visibly upset.
Q. And at the conclusion of the physical
examination and then your speaking with her, what if anything happened from there?
A. Then \(I\) transported her down to our office and conducted a formal interview of Liliana.
Q. Sergeant Rosario, at the time of the hospital
first, do you know or can you tell the jury what the allegations were at that point?
A. Do you want the scenario or just stick with the allegations?
Q. No, just generally.
A. Was that she had been sexually assaulted.
Q. And at the hospital specifically, was a name of an alleged, her alleged attacker given to you?
A. Not, no. No, not at that time.
Q. Okay. So you leave there, you go down and -and where is it that you go after that?
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A. We went to our office which is located at 555 Duncan Avenue in Jersey City. Q. And what's at that address?
A. It's -- it's offices of the Prosecutor's Office, the Special Victims Unit. At that time we were called S.A.V.A. -- Sexual Assault Victims Assistance. We changed the name since then. But it was a S.A.V.A. unit and we were on the second floor of that, we have the whole second floor of that.
Q. Okay. And if you recall, who went with you from Christ Hospital to Duncan? Was it just Liliana or were other people with you?
A. I -- it was just Liliana, or it was definitely Liliana. I -- I know that she had a friend at the hospital, because that's one of the reasons why she didn't want an advocate. But \(I\) don't know if the friend came with us down to S.A.V.A. Q. Okay. So you arrived down to the base as you call it and what takes place from that point?
A. At that point \(I\) conduct a formal interview of

21 Liliana and at that point \(I\) place her under oath,
22 swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing
23
24 recorded. At that time \(I\) believe we were doing audio
25 recordings so it was on an audio tape recording, that
interview.
Q. And did she in fact speak with you?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. During the course of this statement, if you recall, how was Liliana's demeanor, how was she acting?
A. Well she -- I -- I be -- she was still visibly upset.
Q. Okay. And during the course of this
interview, did she at any time give you a name of a potential suspect?
A. She -- she said to me that it looked like a guy
she knew from the neighborhood by the name of S.DOT.
Q. And at this point she -- did she give you any additional information with regard to his name, address, anything like that?
A. No, no, she didn't have a name other than the nickname S.DOT and she had no address. I believe she did give a physical description.
Q. And upon -- strike that.

If you recall, how long was Liliana down at the base for?
A. I don't recall exactly but probably for maybe a couple hours, an hour or, you know, between an hour and two hours.
Q. Okay. And during the time that she was
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there, during the course of those couple of hours, did anybody come down to see her?
A. I -- I don't know.
Q. After -- after Liliana left, what if anything did you do with regard to this investigation?
A. Well I had the name S.DOT which was a nickname, so

I contacted Jersey City P.D. and asked them to check their nickname I guess data base or talk to some people that are familiar with people in the area with
10 nicknames. And, you know, they weren't familiar with
11 that one. And then I also contacted some of our people
12 from Hudson County Prosecutor's Office and ran that
13 nickname by them also. And they were unfamiliar with
14 it.
Q. Okay. So upon following that lead with regard to the name it'd be fair to say that you -- you had no name. You never discovered the name, is that correct?
A. Never discovered or not at that point?
Q. Not immediate, yes.
A. Not at that immediate time did I discover a name, no.
Q. Okay. After November 19th, 2006, did you have any subsequent conversations with Miss Santos? A. Yes.
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Q. Okay. To your knowledge, were there any other investigative leads with regard to this case? A. Other than the -- the results from the rape kit, or would you consider a that --
Q. And to your knowledge, was -- was there evidence recovered from the scene of 235 Arlington Avenue?
A. I don't know about the scene. I believe the evidence we did recover was on the shirt she had been wearing which we recovered at the hospital.
Q. Okay. And this shirt that had been retrieved, what was the significance of that, if any? A. The shirt had blood on it, and Liliana was adamant that it wasn't her blood. And from checking her at the hospital, she didn't appear to be bleeding from anywhere.
Q. And it's -- it would be fair to say that about a year later or so, towards the end of 2007, you had received information at the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office that the blood found on that shirt was that of Stephen Wright, is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. Upon receiving that information -strike that.

Before receiving that information, about a
```
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    year later, within that year timeframe, did you ever
    have the name Stephen Wright?
    A. No, no, I did not.
    Q. It'd be fair to say that the only name you
    had was S.DOT?
    A. That is correct.
    Q. And upon receiving the information with
    regard to the blood, was Liliana notified?
    A. Yes, she was.
    Q. Okay. And before that, had you ever notified
    her that, of a name, a specific name for this person?
    A. No, because prior to that, I didn't have the name.
    Q. Okay. After receiving this information with
    regard to the blood, is it your recollection that --
    that Mr. Wright was charged with various offenses from
    that night?
    A. Yes, that is correct.
        Q. And be fair to say that that was over a year
        after the incident, correct?
    A. That is correct.
                MR. TROIANO: Nothing further.
                THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen,
    the parties stipulate to the following. On or about
November 19, 2006, various items were recovered. Two of
said items were subsequently sent to the New Jersey

```
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State Police Lab for analysis and testing. The parties stipulate to the following results. The shirt of Liliana Santos, the parties hereby stipulate that the blood found on Liliana Santos's shirt was that of Stephen Wright.

Now, he parties have agreed to certain facts. The jury should treat these facts as undisputed. That means the parties agree that the facts are true. But as with all evidence, undisputed facts can be accepted or rejected by the jury in reaching a verdict.
okay, thank you.
Cross examination, please.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, judge. CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. Good afternoon, Sergeant Rosario. A. Good afternoon.
Q. Sergeant Rosario, I believe you testified on direct, the first time that you learned that \(S\). DOT which was the name, the only name that you had back in November of 2006 , correct?
A. Correct.
Q. The first time that you learned that S.DOT was also known as Stephen Wright, or Stephen Wright was 24 also known as S.DOT, was approximately a year later in 25
A. That is correct.
Q. So there was never an occasion back in

November 2006, specifically on the \(19 t h\), the \(20 t h\) or shortly thereafter that up contacted Liliana Santos and
told her that S.DOT was Stephen Wright?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Because you didn't know?
A. No, I didn't know.
Q. Okay. And that's because you checked as you said earlier, all of your sources and your sources at that time didn't have any link to that nickname?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. So it would be fair to say that if Liliana knew that name, it came from a source other than you or your office?

MR. TROIANO: Objection, Judge. Speculative. THE COURT: What's the question again?
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I'm asking her if Liliana knew the name, it came from someone other than her or someone in her office.

MR. TROIANO: Objection.
THE COURT: That's sustained.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Sustained? Okay.
BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. Were you -- on November the 19 th, you said
\[
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you arrived at Christ Hospital about seven o'clock in the morning?
A. No, I think I was called about seven o'clock in the morning, and I arrived probably around 8:30-ish.
Q. Okay, but still shortly after the incident allegedly took place, correct?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Were you able to -- I think you testified, and correct me if I'm wrong, that you did not go in during the physical examination of Liliana, is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. But shortly after that physical examination, she was -- she came with you over to Duncan Avenue and you talked, you -- you and the nurse talked to her together, correct?
A. No, not at Duncan Avenue.
Q. At the hospital?
A. At the hospital and the nurse --
Q. I put it out of sequence, I apologize.
A. Okay.
Q. You and the nurse talked with her at the hospital, then you took her to Duncan Avenue and I believe you said you spent an hour, maybe two hours at Duncan Avenue.

So I guess my question is you spent some length of time with Liliana that morning, correct? A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you would agree with me that you didn't notice any physical injury to Liliana, correct?
A. No.
Q. No?
A. No.
Q. Okay. You said she was visibly upset?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. Did -- when you conducted the interview with the nurse, did you conduct the interview, or the nurse, or was it kind of a joint thing?
A. It's a joint.
Q. So you've worked with Nurse -- I believe in this case it's Richardson. You've worked with her previously?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Would you consider her to be pretty thorough in her ways of doing things?
A. Yes, I would.
Q. Okay. Now, when you -- when she -- strike
that.
When Liliana called you as you testified

Rosario - Cross 143 earlier, you said she called a couple of times, do you recall how many times you actually spoke with her? Was it just the one occasion that you referenced on direct? A. No, I probably spoke with her, I know it was more than once. It was definitely that one occasion and I be -- I believe I probably talked to her at least maybe I'll say two, three, four times after that.
Q. Okay. Was -- were those conversations all surrounding her seeing this person, S.DOT on the street, or just that one particular conversation? A. No, just that one particular conversation was her seeing him.
Q. And upon that you said you followed up and were unable to locate anybody matching the description, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you -- you proceeded down to the scene with the intention of if you saw that individual, you were going to at least bring them in for some questioning, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And what was the area that you said you went to to look for the individual?
A. I believe it was Communipaw and VanHorn and Halladay.

\section*{Q. In that general area?}
A. In that general area.
Q. But on Communipaw Avenue?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I believe you testified on direct that when you arrived at Christ Hospital, that Miss Santos had a friend there with her?
A. The -- according -- when I reviewed the -- the nurse's I don't know what you call it, the nurse filled out this 15 page form and one of the questions is who was with the victim. And there was the name of the friend. Again, I don't, I don't remember that specifically --
Q. But you remember that there was a friend there?
A. Yeah, that at least on, it was documented that there was a friend there.
Q. Now you also testified earlier and then the stipulation was read into evidence about a shirt?
A. Correct.
Q. You stated that you recovered that shirt at the hospital?
A. Again, that's what I -- I -- I stated.
Q. Is that your recollection?
A. That's, I know there's a shirt and I know, I
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believe it's like a -- a camisole type shirt maybe with thin spaghetti straps.
Q. Sorry to interrupt you, Sergeant, but my question is more about not what the shirt was, more about where you got the shirt?
A. I'm sorry, well that's why I -- I was thinking she had it on but I -- I -- I thought that it was on her.
Q. So your recollection is that the shirt was on her at the hospital and you recovered it there?
A. Correct.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I have no further
questions. Thank you.
Thank you, Sergeant.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Sergeant, the other conversations that you had with Miss Santos, you indicated that the one was with regard to S.DOT being by Communipaw and VanHorn. The other ones if you recall, what were they about? A. Just the status on the investigation, you know, what was going on with it. You know, I would let her know that everything went down to the lab, you know, told her that it would take awhile for the lab results to come back. Things of that nature.
Q. Okay. So would it be or you tell me, were you calling her to give her an update or was she
calling you to get an update?
A. She was calling me.
Q. Okay. And she would call you and you would provide her with that information, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, you indicated and I'm going to
have this marked for identification.
THE CLERK: S-21 for identification.
THE COURT: Twenty-one?
MR. TROIANO: Twenty-one, Judge.
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. I'm showing you what's been marked as S-21 for identification. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. It'd be fair to say it's the 15 page document you were looking at before, talking about before?
A. Correct.
Q. What -- what's contained within that -- that stack of papers?
A. It has all the patient information, name, address, telephone number, other contact information. And the examination information. It goes -- it gives a brief history and that would be the interview that we did together. And then it asks specific questions about,
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you know, was there contact made between the suspect
penis and the victim's genitals and --
Q. A whole report that's done?
A. A whole report, yeah.
Q. On -- on cross examination you were asked by Mr. Hirschorn about this friend, okay. And you indicated that from reading the document there, you believe that there was a friend there, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. I'll direct you to page one
there, is that what you were referring to?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And what does that say?
A. It says other contact information.
Q. When you were there on the 19th of November, do you specifically recall meeting this other contact person?
A. No, I don't.
Q. So when you say that there was somebody else there, it only came from this?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And correct me if I'm wrong, Sergeant, but this does not indicate whether or not this person's 24 there or not?
25 A. That's correct, it doesn't indicate that.
```
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                            Q. Okay. Sergeant, generally speaking, how
    many cases do you investigate a year? Or strike that.
As a detective, how many cases did you on
average investigate a ear?
A. I was running about, in the last, from 2006 I'd
say between 2004 and 2006, 2005, I was running about 75
cases a year.
Q. Okay. And you indicated that at some point
you were elevated to the rank of sergeant, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. At that point are, is your primary function
one of investigations or in a supervisory role?
A. I'm in a supervisory role. I have 20 detect--
excuse me, I wish I had 20 detectives under me. I
have five detectives under me and I monitor and --
their investigations now.
Q. Okay, and when was it again that you were
elevated to the rank of Sergeant?
A. In December of 2006 and sworn in in January 3rd of
2007.
Q. A month to two months after this?
A. Correct.
MR. TROIANO: No further questions.
RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. Sergeant, you're familiar with S-21 as Mr.

```
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Troiano pointed out to you?
A. Yes.
            Q. Now contained within \(S-21\) is the statement as
you referenced that was provided to you and Nurse
Richardson?
A. Yes.
    Q. Also contained with in there is the
    reference, I'm speaking to the physical examination and
    collection of specimens, and then the skin surface
    assessment basically pages eight and nine. Are you
    familiar with those pages of the report?
    A. Yes.
    Q. My question is had Miss Santos told you that
    she believed that she scratched her assailant on --
                    MR. TROIANO: Objection, Judge. I believe
that the testimony before was that she was not present
during the physical examination.
                    MR. HIRSCHORN: She said she reviewed the
document.
            THE COURT: She can answer whether the
    document reflects that.
    BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
    Q. Does the document reflect anywhere that --
    let me take a step back.
    If a -- an alleged victim of a crime
indicates that they may have scratched an assailant --
                        MR. TROIANO: Objection, Judge.
                        THE COURT: Go ahead.
BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
    Q. Would it be referenced in that report?
A. On these specific pages? You mean if she --
    Q. Or in the report itself, if she claimed that
she had scratched her assailant --
A. She scratched him.
    Q. Scratched him. Would it be referenced in
that report?
A. If the nurse asked her I guess because there is
fingernail swabs.
Q. Okay. So then I guess my question is from
your experience if someone does a fingernail swab,
that's to check to see if there's the skin of the
possible assailant there for DNA matching, correct?
A. Correct.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I have no further
    questions. Thank you.
    THE COURT: Any redirect?
    REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
    Q. Sergeant, your recollection is that there
    were no fingernail samplings with regard to this case?
    Nothing tested, nothing that you're aware of?
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A. Nothing that I'm aware of. No.
            Q. The only thing that you are aware of was the
testing done on the shirt, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
    Q. And your recollection is that that came back
as Stephen Wright's blood, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
                    MR. TROIANO: No further questions.
                            MR. HIRSCHORN: Nothing, Judge.
                            THE COURT: You're excused, thank you very
much.
            THE WITNESS: Thank you.
            THE COURT: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, we
are done for the day. We ran out of witnesses, okay.
So you are excused until Tuesday morning at nine
o'clock.
            You do not have to go to the fourth floor,
you can come directly here, ninth floor, Judge
Isabella's courtroom, ninth floor, Tuesday morning,
nine o'clock.
                    Do not discuss the case amongst yourselves or
with any of your friends at home at all. I don't
believe there's any media coverage. If there was, you
have to disregard that yourself or anyone else
discussing it. And I trust you'll do that.

Thank you very much, we'll see you Tuesday morning, nine o'clock. Once you're all here, we'll start.
Thank you very much. And you'll be our sole focus until the trial's over so we shouldn't have any delays, okay. Thank you.
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Colloquy
THE COURT: Okay, good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

JURORS: Good morning.
THE COURT: I apologize for the delay. I had to run downstairs to take care of something for another judge who was out today. I took care of that. That's why we're late today. So I apologize to you. We're ready to begin.

Mr. Troiano please?
MR. TROIANO: Judge, thank you, good morning. At this time the State would call Detective Matthew Stambuli.
MATTHEW S T A M B U L I, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN
COURT OFFICER: State your full name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Detective Matthew Stambuli.
COURT OFEICER: Okay, you can have a seat.
MR. TROIANO: Thank you, Judge.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
Q Good morning, Detective.
A Good morning.
Q I want to just ask you to speak into the microphone please. Would you please tell the ladies 24 and gentlemen of the jury with whom are you employed? 25 A I'm a Detective with the Hudson County

Prosecutor's Office.
Q And how long have you been employed with the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office?
A Five years.
Q And before -- in what capacity do you work currently with the Prosecutor's Office?
A I'm currently a detective in the Prosecutor's Office assigned to the Homicide -- Homicide Unit as a crime scene investigator as well as the In Court Unit as a general detective.

Q Okay. And before your time at the

14 A I was a police officer in the Township of West 15 Caldwell for five years.
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A Okay. Crime Scene Investigation includes, basically, photographing the scene, collecting evidence, processing evidence for fingerprints, for trace evidence. Basically, anything where you can take evidence and have it analyzed for additional tests. I was trained by the New Jersey State Police Crime Scene Investigation School for six weeks. And I attended that school as well as many other supplemental programs which were one of the programs.

Q Okay. And when you refer to something like trace evidence, what do you mean by that? A Trace evidence could be blood, hairs, small -smaller items of evidence, thus, the name trace.

Q And now, Detective, are you yourself responsible for the analysis of this evidence or just the retrieval of it?
A We're not trained as laboratory chemists.
Laboratory chemists are the ones that conduct the analysis such as DNA, blood typing, whatever else needs to be done. We just basically do the technical aspect 21 of it, the collection aspect of it.

Q Okay. I would like to draw your attention to November 19th, 2006. First on that day were you
24 working with the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office?
25 A Yes, I was.

Stambuli - Direct 6
Q And at the time were you working as a Crime Scene investigator?
A Yes, I was.
Q Specifically, do you recall being called to
the address of 235 Arlington Avenue in Jersey City?
A Yes, I do.
Q And what was your understanding as to why you
were being called there?
A I was called to assist another detective,
10 Detective Andrew Winter, with processing the crime
11 scene of a sexual assault.
12 Q Do you recall, Detective -- strike that --
13 with regard to Detective Winter, is it your
14 understanding or where is your understanding that he 15 works currently?
16 A Currently he's employed by the Middlesex County
17 Prosecutor's Office as a Crime Scene Investigator.
Q Okay. But on that day, November 19th, 2006, 18 you were working with him in tandem, is that correct? 20 A That's correct, yes.
21 Q Do you recall your specific role in that
22 investigation?
23 A Yes, to assist Detective Winter in processing the
24 crime scene. My primary duty that day was to
25 photograph the scene and, again, assist him with

```
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    anything else that needed to be done.
            Q Okay. Upon arriving to that location could
        you describe to the ladies and gentlemen, what it is
        that you saw? Who was there, the type of scene that it
        was?
        A Okay. Upon arrival at the scene I met with
        Detective Winter and two uniform Jersey City Police
        officers, a Sergeant and a Patrolman. We got to the
        residence. It was a three story brownstone on
        Arlington Avenue. And the victim's apartment was
        located on the ground floor of the building.
            Q Okay. And you indicated that there were two
        Jersey City Police Officers there, is that correct?
        A That's correct.
            Q At the time, if you recall, was the alleged
        victim still present at the scene?
        A No. The victim had been transported to the
        hospital for basically examination by a nurse that's
        certified in sexual assaults.
            Q At the time that you arrived to the scene
        what, if anything, took place specifically with regard
        to your investigation?
        A Okay.
        Q When we arrived at the scene we met with the
        uniform Jersey City Police officers. The uniform
```

```
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    evidence and secure it in evidence bags.
            Then when that's finished we, then, draw a sketch
        of the apartment, basically, to memorialize the layout
        of the apartment. The pictures give you one
        prospective. But a sketch gives you another
        prospective. It gives you, basically, a flat
        prospective of how each room is related to the other
        rooms in the layout of the house.
            Q Okay. You started by saying that there were
        photographs taken, did you take photographs or did
        11 Detective Winter take photographs?
        12 A I did.
        13 Q Do you recall doing that in this case?
        14 A Yes, I do.
        1 5
17 A Okay. So when we take photographs of a scene, we
1 8 \text { take overall photographs, which is photographs of every}
1 9 \text { room and, then, we'll take medium range photographs of}
20 specific items, any items of evidence that we, again,
2 1 \text { we spot during our walk-through. We'll take}
2 2 \text { photographs of them from like a medium range, which is}
2 3 \text { a distance of, you know, say five feet or so. And,}
24 then, after that we'll take closeup photographs of
25 those items of evidence.
```
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doors. And it's, again, looking at the prospective from inside the apartment to the window which was broken.

Q Okay. Pictures were taken of that broken
window?
A Yes.
Q And the -- this picture that I'm referring to S-25 is that a picture from the inside or the outside?
9 A That's a picture, again, from the inside looking 10 outside through the window.

11
12
13
14 A Okay. If you're standing in front of the house
15 it's on the ground floor and it's a window on the right
16
17
18
19
side of the first floor, the ground floor.
Q And do you recall, Detective, how many
windows there were on that ground floor?
A There were two.
Q I'm going to show you what has been marked as
S-2 for identification, do you recognize this picture?
A Yes, I do.
Okay. And what does that depict?
A This depicts the ground floor of the three story brownstone. And these two windows are accessible to
the victim's apartment.
Q Okay. The picture $S-2$ the windows that are captured there are one of the broken windows from S-25 captured in that picture?
A Yes.
Q And which one is that?
A It would be the window on the right side.
Q Okay. Do you recall seeing that -- that
window in person there that day?
A Yes.
Q Would you describe to the ladies and
gentlemen how it was that that window was set up?
A Okay. It's a double hung window, meaning that -that there's, basically, two windows on a track. Okay? The top windows stay stationary and you can lift up the bottom window vertically. The window is locked by thumb locks, which are on the upper part of the -upper window, which secure the bottom window from going up and down.

Q Okay. Is there a screen? Is it just glass? A Yeah. On this particular window there was a screen on the outside of the window. However, there was no lock on this screen. It could move freely up and down.

Q And upon arriving to the scene do you recall

```
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    the condition or the position, rather, of that screen?
    A Yes. Upon arrival the screen was down.
    Q Okay. I'm going to show you what's been
    marked as S-3 for identification. Do you recognize
    this picture?
    A Yes, I do.
        Q Okay. And which win -- or what does that
    show first?
    A That's a closer photograph of the window that was
    broken.
    Q Okay. If you would just write on there
    broken window and of the two windows was it on the
    right or the left, again?
    A Again, it's on the right.
    Q All right. And if you would put that. Now,
    Detective, I've asked you about a few of these pictures
    already. These are pictures that you took, is that
    correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q All right. And for the pictures so far they
    accurately depict what was there on that day, is that
    correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q All right. I'm going to show you what has
    been marked as S-11 for identification, do you
```

```
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recognize this picture? Let me take these out of the way.
A Yes. This is a view of that same window from the outside, depicting broken glass on the exterior sill of the window. And, also, depicting broken glass still in tact on the window.

Q Upon your arrival, Detective, would it be fair to say that there was glass outside of the window? A Yes, that's correct.

Q Okay. And this picture depicts that, is that correct?
A Yes, it does.
Q If you would please circle those pieces of glass? And I'm going to show you what's been marked as S-10, again, if you would describe for the ladies and gentlemen what is depicted in that picture?
A Okay. This is a photograph taken from the outside on a paver patio, front patio beneath those double hung windows depicting broken glass on the -- on the surface of the paver patio.

Q Okay. So the glass depicted there is outside, is that correct? A That's correct.
24 Q And, again, Detective, if you would if you
25 would circle the pieces of glass that are shown on that
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15
picture? Detective, you had begun to speak about the locking mechanism on the window. If you would describe to the ladies and gentlemen what your recollection is with regard to that locking mechanism?
A Yes. They are thumb activated or finger activated locks that sit on top of the -- the double hung window, the bottom portion of it. And to lock or unlock the window you slide with your fingers, actually, more conveniently with your thumbs, the locks that prevent
10 the window from going up and down. And there are two
11 locks on the bottom portion of the window.
12 Q Okay. And now this is with regard to the
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 glass window, is that correct?
A That's correct, yes.
Q You had indicated that there's no locking mechanism on the screen, correct?
A That's correct, yes.
Q Now, this picture, what has been marked as S-15, albeit, a little blurry shows the locking mechanism, is that correct?
A That's correct, yes.
Q Did you take this picture?
A Yes, I did.
Q All right. And does this picture accurately reflect what that locking mechanism looked like on that

```
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day?
A Yes, it does.
    Q Detective, you indicated that there was glass
    on the outside of the building on the patio, I believe,
    as you said, do you recall if there was glass
    elsewhere?
    A Yes. There was, also, glass inside.
            Q And where do you recall was that located?
    A It was adjacent to the window.
            Q I'm going to show you a closeup or a closer
        picture of what you looked at before, this is S-14, do
        you recognize this picture?
        A Yes, I do.
            Q Okay. And could you describe for the ladies
        and gentlemen what that is?
        A Yes. That's a closer picture of looking in --
        from her -- looking from the apartment to the outside
        to the window that's broken, okay, basically through
        the window. And it's depicting the broken glass that's
        still in tact in the lower window portion of the double
        hung window. And, also, some broken glass on the sill,
        interior sill of the window.
            Q Detective, to your knowledge were any of the
        other windows at that location, 235 Arlington Avenue,
        broken?
```
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        A No, they were nt.
            Q Besides the window was there anything else of
        evidential value that was either recovered,
        photographed?
        A Yes.
            Q And what was that?
        A During the walk-through of the scene we located an
        apparent used condom on the sidewalk, basically, next
        to the property of 235 Arlington Avenue. And, again,
        we recovered that shirt with apparent blood stains on
        it.
            Q Okay. Let me start with the shirt. If you
        recall, Detective, where was that shirt recovered by
        either you or Detective Winter?
        A The shirt was recovered in a plastic grocery bag
        on a cooler, like a wine cooler in the kitchen of the
        residence.
            Q Okay. And what was the purpose of retrieving
        that shirt from your prospective?
        A Okay. Prior to arriving on the scene we were told
        that the victim placed a shirt that had apparent blood
        on it in a plastic bag and left it on the cooler, and
        it was believed to be the actor's blood. So upon
        arriving on the scene we located that bag still on top
        of the cooler in the grocery bag. Opened up the
    grocery bag, examined the shirt, and looked at the
white shirt, and there was apparent blood on the shirt.
Q Did you have occasion to take pictures of
that shirt?
A Yes, I did.
Q I'm going to show you, Detective, what's been
marked as AS-8 and S-9 for identification, do you
recognize these pictures?
A Yes, I do.
Q And what do they show?
A They depict the -- that white shirt taken from the
bag, laid out on top of the grocery bag and, again,
there's a closeup photo of the shirt with the apparent
blood stain on it.
Q Okay. And, again, Detective, you took these
two pictures?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Was the -- what happened to the shirt,
if you know?
A The shirt was submitted to the New Jersey State
Police Forensic Laboratory for analysis. And, again,
we don't do any of the laboratory analysis of items.
Therefore, the State Police is in charge of examining
the shirt for trace evidence, also, they can determine
whether, in fact, that is blood or not blood on the
Stambuli - Direct
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shirt. I don't know until we submit it to the lab
whether it's blood or not but, again, from seeing
hundreds of crime scenes I know what blood looks like.
So, again, we submitted that --
MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection, Judge.
THE COURT: Overruled.
A (Continued) -- again, we submit that to the
laboratory for them to tell -- confirm that it's blood
or not. And to, also, conduct DNA analysis on it.
10 BY MR. TROIANO:
11 Q Now, Detective, with respect, specifically,
12 to this case do you recall who would have retrieved
13 this shirt from the crime scene?
14 A Yes. That would be both myself and Detective
15 Winter.
16 Q
17 A No.
18 Q Okay. And if you recall where did it go
19 after leaving 235 Arlington Avenue?
20 A It gets taken down to the Hudson County
21 Prosecutor's Office, Special Victims Unit, Evidence
22 Vault. It's secured there until it's submitted to the
23 laboratory.
$24 \quad Q \quad$ Okay. And that's what happened in this case?
25 A Yes, it is.

$$
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$$ found outside of 235 Arlington Avenue, is that correct? A That's correct, yes.

Q And if you would, please, tell the ladies and gentlemen where that was found with relation to 235?
A Yes. If you're standing in the street on
Arlington Avenue looking at 235 Arlington Avenue, which is, again, the residence, it was on the sidewalk to the right of the residence. So, basically, about a hundred feet away from the residence.
$Q$ Okay. Now, just so we're clear if you were -- if you were looking at the residence from the street, it would have been on your right hand side? A That's correct.

Q Okay. So if you were walking out, just turn that around, if you were walking out of the residence it would have been on your left hand side?
A That's correct, yes.
Q And what, if anything, happened with regard to this condom?
A The condom was collected -- photographed, collected, and, then, sent to the New Jersey State Police Forensic Laboratory for analysis. And the results came back, basically, inconclusive. They could not -- they did not have a strong enough sample to

```
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analyze it for DNA.
    Q Okay. And, Detective, what was the reason
    for you, specifically, to retrieve this piece of
potential evidence?
A The condom appeared that it was recently placed on
the ground or thrown on the ground and -- because it
was November 19th. It was a little chilly that day
that there was still a little -- a moist liquid
substance in that condom. So we thought best to
collect it, send it to the laboratory to see if they
can detect anything in there.
    Q Okay. But it would be fair to say that
    nobody pointed you in that direction. It was just done
    as part of the general investigation, correct?
A Correct.
    Q Okay. And, Detective, was a picture of that
    condom taken?
A Yes.
    Q And that was by you?
    A Yes.
    Q Okay. I'm going to show you what has been
    marked as S-18 for identification, do you recognize it?
    A Yes, I do.
    Q Okay. And what does that picture show?
    A That depicts the condom laying on the sidewalk
```

with a ruler next to it.
Q Okay. You took this picture?
A Yes.
Q Detective, you spoke about the condom, you spoke about the shirt and the glass window, was there anything else of evidential value, either recovered or found at the scene?
A Yes. We -- typically, again, for a crime scene we dust for fingerprints if we don't know who the actor is. If the actor isn't in custody we dust for fingerprints to see if we could find any fingerprints that either don't belong in the house, meaning that 13 it's not the victim's fingerprints. And, then, we lift 14 those fingerprints and send them for additional
readable fingerprints.
Q Okay. Was that done in this case?
A The fingerprints were -- initially the latent
prints were initially not sent out because they didn't
have enough detail. I'm, also, trained in latent
fingerprint identification. And upon lifting the
prints we noticed that there wasn't sufficient detail
in the finger - in the actual latent print. you need
-- if you look at your fingers you have what are called
ridges on them, friction ridges. And that's what
Stambuli - Direct
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leaves the -- your fingerprint on a surface. And once fingerprint dust is applied to that surface it brings those ridge details out. And in this case there wasn't sufficient ridge detail to compare for fingerprints.

Q You had mentioned, Detective, the word lifting fingerprints. Would you describe for the ladies and gentlemen, how that was done in this case? A Okay. Essentially what we do is we apply a contrasting fingerprint powder. Basically, it's fingerprint dust. We apply it to a surface, and we attempt to develop a fingerprint on that surface. We, then, take a transparent adhesive, it's a tape essentially, and we apply it over the surface over the print and attempt to lift the print off the surface and apply it to a contrasting background, so the print can be compared to either a fingerprint database or another set of latent prints. And in this case every time we touch a surface we may leave basically a readable fingerprint or a non readable fingerprint. And in this case we lifted non readable fingerprints. And that is just, again, the contact to the surface, 'cause contacting a surface is not always regular. It's not always perfect, you know, it might be too hard, too soft, so that's the variation.
Q If you recall, Detective, where were the

```
fingerprints located or lifted from?
A They were lifted from -- they were lifted from the
top of the wine cooler, 'cause we received information
from one of the detectives that was with the victim
during the time that the actor may have touched the
cooler in the kitchen.
    Q Okay. And, Detective, did you have occasion
to take pictures of those dusted prints?
A Yes, I did.
1 0 ~ Q ~ I ' m ~ g o i n g ~ t o ~ s h o w ~ y o u ~ w h a t ~ h a s ~ b e e n ~ m a r k e d ~ a s
11 S-23, S-24, and S-22, do you recognize these three
12 pictures?
13 A Yes, I do.
14 Q Okay. You took these pictures?
15 A Yes, I did.
1 8 \text { the -- that were developed on the cooler, again, which}
19 weren't suitable for comparison.
23 A They can the more
24 fingerprints the better. But general -- I knew when I
25 -- when I saw them I knew they were unsuitable for
```

16
17

```
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comparison. That's -- they were just, again, not
enough friction ridge detail to compare. But, again,
to send them to another agency, specifically, a state
Police, you know, is not uncommon just to have them
take a look at them as well.
    Q Detective, to your knowledge was there
anything else of evidential value taken from or
recovered from the scene?
A We recovered sheets from the victim's bed. That's
basically what I recall now.
    Q Okay. Is there anything that would refresh
your recollection?
A Yeah, if I can take a look at my report.
                                    MR. TROIANO: If I can have this marked,
Judge?
Matt?
            MR. TROIANO: 26.
            MR. HIRSCHORN: 26?
            THE CLERK: S-26 for identification.
            MR. TROIANO: Thank you.
                THE CLERK: You're welcome.
BY MR. TROIANO:
    Q Detective, I'm showing you a three page
document, which has been marked as S-26 for
```
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identification, do you recognize this document?
A Yes, I do.
            Q And what is this?
A This is a Crime Scene Investigation report. It
was, again, completed after processing the crime scene.
            Q And who was it that completed this report?
        A Detective Andrew Winter completed the report and I
        read it after he completed it.
            Q Okay. Is there a list of items found or
recovered from the crime scene?
A Yes, it -- yes, there is.
            Q I had asked you if there was anything in
        addition recovered from the crime scene -- crime scene,
        excuse me, after reading that, does that refresh your
        recollection?
        A Yes, it does.
            Q And what was, if anything else, what was
        recovered?
        A There was a condom wrapper located in the victim's
        bedroom that was recovered. There was, also, a bath
        towel located in the victim's bedroom.
        Q With regard to the condom wrapper, would
        pictures of that been taken?
        A Yes.
            Q Okay. I'm going to show you what's been
```
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        marked as \(S-17\) for identification. Do you recognize
        this picture?
        A Yes, I do.
        Q Okay. And what does that picture show?
    A That's a picture of a gold colored condom wrapper
        that was apparently torn open.
        Q Okay. After taking this picture would that
    condom wrapper had been taken?
    A Yes.
            Q And all of these items were, would it be fair
    to say, placed into evidence?
    A Yes, it was. Yes, they were.
                MR. TROIANO: Nothing further, Judge.
                        MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, sidebar?
            (THE FOLLOWING TAKES PLACE AT SIDEBAR)
                MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, just that's my witness
        that just walked in. So \(I\) don't know if you want him
        sitting in here while the testimony is --
            THE COURT: -- right?
            MR. HIRSCHORN: Yes. And, also, about the
        stipulation, do you want it during him?
            THE COURT: Yes, what do you want to do about
        the stipulation? Because --
            MR. HIRSCHORN: About all the other stuff
        that --
                Stambuli - Cross
            THE COURT: -- recovered and --
            MR. HIRSCHORN: -- no DNA.
            THE COURT: I'll read it now.
            MR. HIRSCHORN: Yes, that's fine.
            (THE EOLLOWING TAKES PLACE IN OPEN COURT)
            THE COURT: Okay, ladies and gentlemen,
    another stipulation by the parties.
On or about November 19the, 2006 various
items were recovered in relative to this matter. Two
items were sent to the State Police Lab for analysis
and testing. One was the shirt, we told you about that
already. The other thing was the condom. And the
parties, hereby, stipulate that the condom was examined
and was determined to be unsuitable for further
testing. Okay? Thank you.
Cross please?
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, did you want to take a
moment, or if you would like me to begin now?
THE COURT: You can begin now. There is an
order of sequestration though. So any parties who are
witnesses in this trial have to leave the room now
please. Thank you.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, Judge.
CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q Good morning, Detective Stambuli.

```
A Good morning.
            Q You were involved in this crime scene
    investigation with Detective Winter from the very
    beginning, correct?
    A That's correct, yes.
        Q And the two of you arrived at approximately
        the same time?
        A That's correct.
        Q Okay. And you conducted the investigation
        together?
    A That's correct, yes.
        Q Did you compile the report or did Detective
        Winter?
        A Detective Winter did.
        Q Okay. Did you have an opportunity to review
        that report before it was submitted?
        A Yes, I did.
        Q Do you would agree with everything that's
        written in that report, that was both of your findings
        at the location, correct?
        A Yes, that's correct.
        Q Okay. Now, Mr. Troiano was discussing with
        you about these windows, and I'm going to show you
        what's been marked, I think that's S-25 for
        25 identification. That's a picture of the broken window,

\section*{correct?}
```

A That's correct.
Q And we've already established that the screen
-- the window was broken, correct?
A That's correct.
Q You found glass on the inside as well as on
the outside, correct?
A That's correct.
Q You found the screen to be in the down
position?
A That's correct.
Q But as you indicated earlier there's no lock
on that screen, correct?
A That's correct.
Q You, also, found that the window was located
in a storage closet?
A That's correct.
Q Were those doors open or closed when you
arrived?
A They were found as is. As is in the picture, they
were open.
Q So those doors were open in the picture. You
didn't move anything around in the crime scene, or if
you had you would have taken a picture of it in its
original state and, then, if you had to open that to

```
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        take a picture of the window you would have noted that
        somewhere in your report, correct?
        A Correct.
            Q Okay. You, also, indicated that the window
        was locked on your arrival, correct?
        A Can \(I\) refresh my recall --
        Q Sure.
    A -- recollection with the report?
        Q Is there something that would refresh your
        recollection?
        A Yeah, the report.
        \(Q \quad\) Your report?
        A Yeah.
        \(Q \quad\) I'm going to show you what's been marked
        S-26, you've already had a chance to look at it once.
        If you could review it to yourself and let me know if
        it is refreshes your recollection as to those windows,
        or that particular window. If I may, just for the
        purposes of time I believe it's on the top of the
        second page?
        A Yes, yes. The --
        Q It indicates in your report, correct, as to
        the status of that window?
        A Yes.
            Q And what was it?

Q Okay. And, also, if \(I\) show you \(S-14\) that would be memorialized a little bit better in that picture 'cause it's closer up. Because we all know in common knowledge of window mechanisms like that if they were open or unlocked the latch would be facing out in that picture, rather than flat with the window. That's in the locked position, correct?
A That's correct, yes.
Q Okay. So, then, you would agree with me that that was -- strike that -- we'll get to that. When you arrived were there any other windows that you looked at in that apartment?
A Yes.
Q Okay. There was a third window, correct?
A That's correct.
Q And that was located in the bedroom?
A That's correct.
Q And you found that window to be in the
unlocked position, correct?
A That's correct, yes.
Q Was that window a similar window to those two, if you recall?
A Yes, it was a double hung. I don't recall similar in size, I don't recall. But I believe it was similar
```

        in the mechanism
        Q Okay. And I believe -- I believe you
        examined the front door as well, correct?
        A That's correct, yes.
        Q And that door didn't look like that had been
        disturbed in any way, correct?
        A Correct.
        Q It had a dead bolt as well as a regular lock?
        A That's correct, yes.
        Q And they were still in tact?
    A Correct.
        Q So from your experience as an investigator
        you wouldn't consider that front door point of entry
        into that apartment, correct?
        A Correct.
        Q As a matter of fact what you considered to
        be, based upon your investigation the only possible
        point of entry is that window?
        A That's correct.
            Q Correct?
    A Yes.
        Q Now, you would agree with me, then, that for
        an individual to have entered that window it would have
        had to have happened one of two ways, they would have
        either have lifted up that screen, broken the window,
    ```

\section*{The State of NJ v. Wright}
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A The screen would have just fell down by itself.
Q Okay. What about the window?
A The window itself, yes, you would have to re-lock
it.
Q So that person would have had to take the affirmative action of pushing that mechanism closed on both sides? There's two of them, correct?
A Correct.
Q And they would have had to taken that affirmative step, right to lock them?
A Correct. Q Now, presumably someone entering the apartment would have done that with their hand, correct?
A Correct.
MR. TROIANO: Objection, Judge.
THE COURT: Overruled.
BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q Did you dust that for prints?
A Yes.
Q And nothing came up?
A Nothing.
Q Did you dust the screen for prints?
A The sides of the screen, yes, not the actual -not the screen.

1
2 screen -
A Yes.
Q -- I apologize. You dusted that for prints as well?
A Yes.
Q And nothing came up on that?
A Nothing.
Q Okay. Now, Mr. Troiano discussed with you a condom that was found outside that apartment, correct? A Correct.

Q And you, also, found a wrapper inside the apartment, correct?
A Correct.
Q Do you recall the brand of the wrapper inside the apartment?
A Yes. I believe Trojan Magnum.
Q Okay. Were you able to determine what the brand was of the condom on the outside of that apartment?
A No.
Q There's no way to determine that, correct? A Not to my knowledge, no.

Q But you sent both of those items for the lab to be tested, correct?
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A The condom was sent, yes.
Q The condom was sent, was the wrapper sent as well?
A The wrapper was printed by us.
Q Was printed. Were any prints on that wrapper?
A No.
Q Okay. The condom was sent to the lab, correct?
A Correct.
Q And the reason you sent it to the lab is, as you indicated earlier, that there was a substance that you believe could have contained DNA, is that correct, contained within the condom?
A Correct.
Q For lack of more graphic terms. It was sent to the lab, right?
A Correct.
Q And nothing came back, it was untestable?
A Correct.
Q So you're not even sure, it would be fair to say, whether that condom had anything to do with this crime?
A Correct.
Q Okay.
It was just something that you found

\section*{The State of NJ v. Wright}
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upon your walk-through or -- of the outside of the apartment as you indicated earlier, that you found and you thought might be --
A Correct.
Q -- doing police work, but it turned out to be nothing?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Now, the blood stained shirt that you found, that was sent to the lab for evaluation as well, correct?
A Correct.
Q And that did come back?
A Yes.
Q Correct? And that came back to a specific individual, correct?
A That's correct, yes.
Q Okay. That is to your knowledge the only item of all of these items that we discussed that was sent out for prints, for possible DNA, for any other type of forensic evidence that came back as a match to any one individual?
A Correct.
Q Okay. Now, you indicated that that shirt was found on a wine cooler or chiller, is that what you said?
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A Yes.
Q And you indicated that that shirt was placed
in a plastic bag, is that accurate?
A That's correct, yes.
Q Did you take the plastic bag into evidence by
any chance?
A No, we did not.
Q You did not. But it's your understanding
from speaking with the Jersey City detectives that that
shirt was placed there by the victim?
A I -- I was told by Detective Rosario, who was with
the victim at the time. Okay? She was -- as the
victim was being examined by the sexual assault nurse
examiner Detective Rosario was finding out information
and relaying it to us. And that was told to us by
Detective Rosario.
Q Okay. But you're certain that shirt was
found in a plastic bag on the wine chiller?
A Yes.
Q It wasn't found in the bathroom floor?
A No.
Q Okay. Was -- I believe Mr. Troiano asked you
about the bed sheets and a towel, those two things
were, also, taken into evidence, correct?
25 A That's correct.

```

Q And presumably they were sent out for evaluation as well for examination or look for DNA, possible DNA evidence, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q And those sheets were on the bed, correct?
A Correct.
Q Okay. Are you familiar with the facts of this case at all, or are you just familiar with your part of the investigation?
A No, just with my part of the investigation.
Q Okay. But those sheets were sent out for forensic examination, correct? A To my -- I would have to see the lab submission report just to confirm that.

Q Sure. I think it's noted in your report. Do you have your report? If you could review that and see -- you took that into evidence, correct?
A It -- yes, I did, but it would actually be in the State Police Laboratory Submission report.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, if I could just have one minute.

THE COURT: Sure. BY MR. HIRSCHORN:

Q So if it's not contained within the laboratory report that means it was taken into evidence
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and never sent to the lab, correct?
A Yes, it was -- it was not sent because we had that other item of evidence with the apparent blood on it.

Q Okay. But you would agree with me that it could be important considering that this was an alleged sexual assault that took place on those sheets that there could have been, whether it be blood or semen or some other type of DNA evidence that could have been pulled from those sheets, correct?
A The State Police cannot examine every single item that's submitted.
Q Why not?

A Because they would just be overwhelmed. So, again, we're confident that it was blood located on
that shirt, so we submitted that shirt for analysis and it came back to the defendant.

Q Okay. Detective, but you would agree with me that it would be pretty important if you sent those sheets to be examined, and those sheets came back as positive for DNA and it was somebody else's DNA that would be important, wouldn't it?
A But, again, we have an actor identified by the white shirt with the apparent blood on it. So it potentially could be, but, again, we had that one item which was positive for the blood on it.
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answer my question. You would agree with me that if
there was DNA in that crime scene, in evidence that you
took doing your job and it was sent to the lab and it
came back as another individual that would be important
to this case, wouldn't you agree with that?
A It could be, yes.
            Q Could be?
    A Could be.
            Q It could have shown another actor, correct?
A Possibly.
            Q It could have shown a different way that this
    situation took please, correct?
    A We -- possibly but, again, we had this information
    with the actor, then we had this item with the apparent
    blood on it.
            Q Okay.
A So there was no need to send these sheets out.
            Q All right. Well, then, let me ask you this,
        you in your opinion thought it was more important to
        send out a used condom a hundred feet away on the road,
        then the sheets where the alleged incident took place?
        A Yes. We -- well, we had information that the
        actor had fled in that direction.
            Q Okay.
```
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    A Therefore, the condom was there and it was pretty
        close to the house, so we could associate that condom
        with the incident that took place.
            Q Are you familiar with that area of Jersey
        City?
    A Yes.
        Q Do you think that the actor --
        MR. TROIANO: Objection, Judge, him thinking.
        THE COURT: I need a question.
        MR. HIRSCHORN: Excuse me, Judge.
        THE COURT: I need a question first.
        BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
            Q Do you believe that that condom could have
        come from anywhere in that area, correct?
        MR. TROIANO: Objection, Judge.
                THE COURT: Overruled.
    A Potentially, yes.
    BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
    Q So, basically, at some point in time, whether
    yourself or someone else in the Prosecutor's Office,
    made the decision that it was not important, or not
    relevant to send those sheets, for examination?
    A Correct, somebody made that decision, yes.
            Q Did you?
        A No.
            Q Along with everything else?
    A Correct.
            Q And aside from the State Police's time
    problems, in your opinion those sheets could be
    important?
    A Correct.
                        MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I have no further
        questions. Thank you very much.
            THE COURT: Redirect?
    REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
            Q Detective, were there any apparent stains on
        the sheets that were recovered?
        A Nothing that we -- nothing that we noticed and,
        again, nothing that was -- that appeared to be apparent
        biological stain
            Q And with regard to the -- I believe you said
        it was a towel?
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        A Correct.
            Q No stains with regard to the towel?
    A Nothing that appeared to be biological stain. You
    can see biological stains for the most part with a
    naked eye. Again, not to get too graphic, but, you
    know, from your personal experiences you know what a
    biological stain looks like on fabric.
            Q Okay. On the other hand with regard to the
    shirt?
    A With the shirt, again, based on my experience and
    Detective Winter's experience we were pretty convinced
    that it was blood on there.
            Q I'm going to show you, again, what's been
    marked as S-2 for identification, you've already
    identified this. Two windows here, is that correct?
    A That's correct, yes.
    Q Okay. Is it the window on the right or the
    left that had the -- that was broken?
    A On the right.
    Q Okay. This picture when it was taken, is the
    screen up or down at this point?
    A It's down.
        Q And from your vantage point when you look at
    this or when you looked at it that day with the screen
    being down, are you able to notice right then and there
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that the window is broken?
A Yes, from -- from a distance not as much. When you get a little closer you have to actually be looking for it, but you could see the window is broken.

Q Okay. But from a distance with the screen down you can't see that it's broken, is that correct? A That's correct.

MR. TROIANO: No further questions.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Just briefly.
RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q You just testified on redirect about your examination of the sheets. Did you see any blood on the sheets?
A No.
Q Did you see any blood on the wall in that room, in the bedroom?
A No.
Q Any blood on the floor?
A No.
Q Any blood anywhere else in that apartment?
A No.
Q Any blood on the window?
A No.
Q The screen?
A No.
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MR. HIRSCHORN: No further questions, Judge.
thank you.
MR. TROIANO: Nothing, Judge. Thank you.
THE COURT: You're excused, sir, thank you
very much.
THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, just take two minutes in the jury room.
(Off the record/on the record)
THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Troiano.
MR. TROIANO: Judge, thank you. At this time
the State calls Linda Richardson.
L I N D A R I C H A R D S O N, STATE'S WITNESS, SWORN

COURT OFFICER: State your full name for the
record.
THE WITNESS: Linda Richardson.
COURT OFFICER: Thank you; you may be seated.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. TROIANO: Thank you, Judge.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. Miss Richardson, would you mind if I called you Nurse Richardson?
A. Not at all.
Q. But here in Jersey City for the past six
Q.
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years or so?
```

A. Yes.
Q. You also have occasion to work somewhat with the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office, is that correct? A. I do. I have a part time job, a per diem job with the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office as a sexual assault nurse examiner.
Q. Okay. And if you would describe to the ladies and gentlemen here what exactly that is?
10 A. I am on a call basis, I take call every weekend,
11 and if any patients come into Christ Hospital or any
12 hospital in Jersey City, I'm responsible to do the
13 report and examination that is required by the
14 Prosecutor's Office.
Q. Now, if you would, describe to the ladies and
Q. And Nurse Richardson, what would be the primary role or function for you as a sexual assault
nurse examiner?
A. I meet the patient in the emergency room. They go
to the emergency room. They are medically cleared by
the doctors and nurses in the E.R. When that's
finished, I meet them as the SAY (phonetic) nurse. I
take a report from them, a written report and we do a
physical examination and $I$ make $a$ written and $a$
physical report of the occurrence.
Q. Okay. And what is the reason for making the
10 report and doing the examination?
11 A. That is box that we prepare to be turned over to
12 the detective who is also there at the time who takes
13 that for use in any future --
Q. You indicated that you would meet with an
alleged victim or patient, however you refer to them
after they are seen by other doctors, is that correct?
A. Eirst the patient is medically cleared by the
emergency room doctor. That is to make sure she
doesn't have any acute physical injuries, any bleeding
or fractures, any -- any medical problem that prevents
her to go on further with another exam. First they
deal with the emergent problems. If there are none,
she's cleared and she can come to me.
Q. Okay. And now you -- you've used the pronoun
she. I think it's a pronoun. It could be a male as
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well?
A. It could be a male, yes. We have males.
Q. Now does somebody have to complain of a certain type of incident, certain type of injury to be seen by a sexual assault nurse examiner?
A. Well, she makes a claim of a sexual assault.

That's when we are called in when she claims sexual assault.
Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention

10 to November 19th, 2006. Do you recall that morning
11 specifically?
12 A. I didn't recall it but after I read the notes I
13 recall it. Yes, I do.
14 Q. Okay. And the notes that you're referring to
15 is a report that you generated, is that correct?
16 A. The report that I make, yes.
17 Q. Okay. Have you -- let me ask this. Have you
18 been a SA nurse since that time, November 19th, 2006?
19 A. Oh, yes, I've been --
20 Q. You're presently one now?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. Okay. But I contacted you and let you know
23 about this trial, correct?
24 A. Yes.
25
Q. Now I want to draw your attention to that
day. You met with a young woman by the name of Liliana Santos, is that correct?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. And could you describe for the ladies and gentlemen how it was that she or you met with her? A. I was already working in the emergency room because I work $7 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. to $7: 30 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. and when she arrived I was there already. So I went in, introduced myself, and I took over the sexual assault part of it when I
10 left my shift from the emergency room.
So I -- we have a special area that we keep these patients so they have the privacy and, you know, not a lot of people walking in and out. So we stayed there until she was medically cleared, and then $I$, we have a separate room in Christ Hospital which is on a whole separate floor, different area that we go to to start the actual report and -- and what I have to do as a SA nurse. And that starts in a different area from the E.R.
Q. Do you recall meeting with Miss Santos?
A. Yes.
Q. And at the time that you met with her, and began this examination, was there anyone else present? A. There was no one else present, no.
Q. Okay. Nobody with her?
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A. Nobody was with her.
Q. Throughout the course of the examination, did anybody else arrive?
A. I believe the detective did arrive after I started my written report.
Q. And by detective, a detective with the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, would it be fair to say that you are working in conjunction with the Hudson County
Prosecutor's Office?
A. Oh, yes, absolutely.
Q. Would you describe to the ladies and
gentlemen how it was that Miss Santos presented to you?
A. She came by ambulance to our emergency room from her apartment and she was very, still very upset, even when I met her, which was probably an hour after she arrived.
Q. Okay, and when you say upset, what do you mean by that?
A. She was -- she was scared, because --

MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: She was very nervous and scared because she felt that he may return. She said that --
Q. Go ahead.
A. She was -- she was really scared. She didn't know
how someone had entered her apartment at that time. She
didn't have, you know, she just knew somebody was there
and she was very upset, very emotional, and nervous.
Q. Okay. Despite that emotion and nervousness,
were you able to complete an examination?
A. Yes, sometimes it takes us a long time to get
through because the patient is very emotional. But
it's my job to take as long as I have to to complete the entire report.
Q. Okay. You indicated that your, this
examination is somewhat in two parts, physical and then
you speak with them, is that correct?
A. We speak with them first and then we do the --
Q. You speak with them first.
A. Yeah.
Q. And what is the reason for speaking to them first?
A. Primarily because we want to get the information
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from them as quickly and immediately so they can remember as much as they can, give us whatever facts and whatever they remember quickly. So we can write it down and have it, you know, right there. We -- we try to take the written part quickly and accurately so the facts are right there in their mind.
Q. Okay. Is the written portion of this memorialized? Is it taken down anywhere?
A. It's taken exactly as they say it on my report. I have a report that I write, it's word for word as the patient says it, and it's as much and as many things as she can remember about what happened.
Q. Okay. Was that done in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. And in this case specifically, Miss Santos was first, and correct me if I'm wrong, she was first seen by $a$, the emergency room physicians and nurses, correct?
A. Yes, she was.
Q. And then immediately brought over to you? A. Yes, but the emergency room does not go through the entire story. They only accept the report that she was sexually assaulted. They don't make her repeat or go through the story. They don't get any of those facts. The first one that hears it is the detective
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BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what is this document?
A. This is the written report that $I$ make with every case that I do.
Q. Okay. Specifically with regard to this case,
what information is contained in this report? Whose information $I$ should say?
A. This is Lillian Santos, this is her personal information like $I$ said. The first page tells her address, phone number, the date where we did the case, the name of the detective and we assign every case a number.
Q. Okay. I'm going to direct your attention to page three. Do you recognize what page three is? A. Uh-huh, this is the --
Q. Okay, go ahead.
A. -- the history.
Q. Okay. And describe to the ladies and gentlemen what -- what is taken down in this portion of the report.
A. Okay, we start with the date and if they can give us an exact time where it took place. This says the patient's bedroom in her basement apartment. And if
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there's any, you know, sometimes it's the second floor
or the back of the building, wherever the exact
location is and then the exact description of the
event.
Q. Okay. And that's contained, the exact
description as you say in the patient's description of
the incident, is that correct?
A. This is the patient's words.
Q. Okay. Now you wrote that down, is that
correct?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And it was written down from what she told
you exactly, is that correct?
A. Exactly.
Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you to read that
portion to the ladies and gentlemen.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection.
THE COURT: Let's go to sidebar.
(On the record discussion at sidebar)
THE COURT: All right, where is this going?
MR. TROIANO: Prior consistent statement.
She's been subject to cross examination and there's
been an allegation that she's fabricated this.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Not at this point. I mean
that's an allegation in every trial is that she
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fabricated it. It's -- she can come back and testify
to what she told the nurse but the nurse can't read
what she told her.
MR. TROIANO: It's a --
THE COURT: She can't repeat the description
to the nurse, no.
MR. TROIANO: It's -- it's in the rule.
THE COURT: I don't have the rule here.
Prior consistent statement to --
MR. HIRSCHORN: But what has been raised at
this point --
(Off the record/on the record)
MR. TROIANO: I think it's 803C.
THE COURT: I think that's it, a prior
consistent -- okay but -- but -- that's not, you know,
you're offering to rebut on the prior charge of
fabrication. But there's been no allegation of
fabrication.
MR. TROIANO: The whole defense is predicated
on --
THE COURT: But we don't know that yet
though.
MR. TROIANO: That was what happened during
her cross examination. His opening and cross
examination. And he's already crossed her.

```
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    Can we put the jury in the box --
    THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I need two
minutes --
            (Off the record/on the record)
            (Sidebar discussion ended)
    THE COURT: Now just for the record --
    MR. TROIANO: Judge, should we have the
witness step out?
    THE COURT: Yeah, she can step out. Yeah.
Yeah, she can step out. We'll need about two minutes,
okay?
    THE WITNESS: Okay.
    THE COURT: Now, Mr. Troiano wants the nurse,
Nurse Richardson to testify as to exactly what the
victim told her. She's trained to take down exactly
what she says including a description of what happened,
okay. And he -- he's -- he's proffering it, and his
proffer is 803A2. It's consistent with a witness'
testimony and it's also to rebut an express and implied
charge against a witness of recent fabrication or
improper influence of motive.
            Now, so what he has to show is he has to
rebut an express or implied charge of recent
fabrication. And I'm going through my notes of the
cross examination. Most of it went to identification.
```
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None of it -- I don't think he ever touched upon -- he never touched upon the topic of consent at all.

MR. TROIANO: With all due respect, Judge, it's my recollection that Mr. -- we marked this for identification, Mr. Hirschorn confronted her with this on various portions of what her statement was. And forgive me for not remembering specifically, but what his description was, what she may or may not have told, whether or not it was the boyfriends's stuff, whether or not she said it was the boyfriend, was it Anthony, was it, did he say I'm Anthony. And he confronted her. She looked at this. She also looked at -- at her statement but she was confronted with this. That was the reason that we marked it.

There would have been, up until this point there would have been no other reason why this document was marked into evidence because there'd be no witness to -- to offer it.

MR. HIRSCHORN: But it's marked as $\mathrm{S}-21$,
right?
THE COURT: But $I$ think the -- the thrust of the cross examination was why she didn't tell them the name of her assailant if she knew it.

Now, is that in and of itself an attempt to
rebut --

MR. TROIANO: An implied charge. THE COURT: -- an implied charge of fabrication.

MR. TROIANO: The fabrication here being that this was not consensual, which is, you know, with all due respect, defense's whole theory. That this was in fact consensual.

THE COURT: Mr. Hirschorn.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, my recollection of why
it was marked had to do with whether or not she told
the nurse that my client was either known as S.DOT or Stephen Wright.

MR. TROIANO: No, she never mentions, she never mentions the name in here.

MR. HIRSCHORN: That's my point. Right,
that's the point. So if anything, and I would also, I don't know that this is necessarily a prior consistent statement. There are certain, I mean if you want to try to get it in under another -- there's certainly inconsistencies throughout here with what she's testified to, with what other things that have been marked for identification.

THE COURT: You can't get it in for that
reason.
MR. TROIANO: I can't get it in, I realize
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that I cannot, I wouldn't proffer that it is an inconsistent statement and $I$ wouldn't proffer that it's -- that it's -- that it's under a medical exception. But I would say that this squarely fits under here. The whole, defense's whole theory is that this is a consensual relationship. She gives a consistent statement with what her testimony is now that happened an hour after this incident and that should come in.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, if Your Honor is me, with the testimony she gave here in Court.

MR. TROIANO: I would submit that there's, besides maybe little small details, there is not one inconsistency. It is the exact story that she has said from day one.

THE COURT: Well let me ask you this. Before I rule, is the issue really moot because when you cross examine her, you're going to cross examine extensively about that document and its lack of the name S.DOT? That's pretty -- that's coming down the road, isn't it?

MR. HIRSCHORN: Yes, Judge.
THE COURT: During this examination, not on
your case, during the State portion of the case.
MR. HIRSCHORN: If you allow this in, Judge, I'm going to cross examine her not only extensively on the $S$.DOT but on the various other things in that report.

THE COURT: Well, well in light of the fact, I mean $I$ think it's a very close call, but we can make an argument that there's an implied charge of
9 fabrication. And I'm on the fence now, but in light of
10 the fact, I believe you're going to cross examine 11 extensively in any event about the lack of the name 12 S.DOT in the report, it would seem logical to let her 13 testify to it now.

MR. HIRSCHORN: As I said, Judge, if you allow the report in, I'm not only going to -- I'm not going to stop at that, I'm going to cross examine her --

THE COURT: We could do it this way. You know what, $I$ could sustain the objection, okay, and then on cross he's going to go over the report ad nauseam and then that in fact it would be admissible pursuant to 803A2.

So in other words, if I don't let you do it now, I can let you do it after his assuming he does what $I$ think he's going to do on cross, it will clearly
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be allowed then, done then. Do you understand what I'm saying?

MR. HIRSCHORN: I completely understand.
THE COURT: Understand?
MR. TROIANO: I mean I understand what you're saying with all due respect I disagree. But, you know, if we're getting to that point, ultimately we're just going to keep this witness here a whole lot longer.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, at this point I will withdraw my objection, allow him to get it in now and we'll just do it that way. It's going to come out anyway, so -..

THE COURT: I agree. Okay, bring the jury in please and ask the witness to come back in.

Thank you, gentlemen.
MR. TROIANO: Thank you.
(Jury enters the courtroom)
THE COURT: Okay, folks, ready to begin again. Mr. Hirschorn withdrew his objection and we're going to continue.

Go ahead, Mr. Troiano.
MR. TROIANO: Thank you, Judge.
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Nurse Richardson, as we were about to begin,

I --
THE COURT: I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I missed
one.
MR. TROIANO: Oh, I apologize.
JUROR: I was in the men's room.
THE COURT: That's perfectly okay, sir, my
fault. I indicated that the objection was withdrawn and we're continuing. Have a seat, sir.

Thank you, and forgive me for not noticing
you not coming out.
Let's continue.
MR. TROIANO: Thanks, Judge.
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Nurse Richardson, S-21 again, you began by or you were about to begin reading the patient's description of the incident. And I would ask you to read that to the ladies and gentlemen if you now wouldn't mind.
A. This is a little broken up because I try to write it exactly as she says it. We went to Latin Lounge with friends around 12:30 a.m., had one drink. Called my boyfriend to pick me up. June, P.J. and me went with boyfriend to Pine Street to hang out. Then we went with Marjay's and met with boyfriend again. We went to my apartment about $1: 30 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. We hung out. We
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did have consensual sex in my apartment. We did use a condom. He left at 3:30 a.m. I took a shower and went to sleep. I woke up about 6 a.m. Lights and TV were off. A black man was on top of me. I felt like I knew him and he knew me. He said he was my boyfriend but he was not. I heard him say my name. I looked up. He grabbed my neck with one hand. He was choking me. He told me to shut up. He took off my PJ pants, he kissed my neck, left side, and my mouth. Then he started playing with his thing. He got on top of me. I heard
11 a condom wrapper, I think he put a condom on. He put
12 his thing, his penis, into my vagina and he raped me.
13 I don't know if he ejaculated.
14 Q. And that continues on another page, is that
15 correct?
16 A. Yes. This is continuation.
Q. Okay.

17
18
19
20
21 looked out. I ran to the door, looked out to the left
looked out. I ran to the door, looked out to the left
22 and I saw someone running. His back was toward me.
23 Went back into the apartment and called 911. I took a
24 shower. Ambulance came, I came to the hospital.
25
Q. And that's the conclusion of that?

```
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A. Yes.
    Q. Okay. Thank you. Now that's -- that's
basically a narrative that she gives you, is that
correct?
A. Yes.
    Q. Now, Miss Santos also allowed you to conduct
a physical examination, is that correct?
A. Yes.
    Q. And I'm going to ask you some questions about
that. First of all, is the, is Miss Santos asked
whether or not she will agree to have an examination?
A. Yes, there's a consent form, maybe the second
page, that she has to sign which gives us the
permission to make a report, conduct a physical exam
and maybe take photos. We usually take their panties
and maybe other clothing or personal items. And she
signs and initials the consent.
    Q. Okay. And where -- strike that.
    On page four, there is a question or I guess
    a sub-heading that is entitled Description of
    Offenders, is that correct?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Okay. Would you read what that shows? Or
    what's written there?
    A. Number of offenders, one, male, black, over six
```

    Richardson - Direct 69
    feet tall, skinny, dark colored jacket. That's what
        she remembered.
            Q. Okay. And to your knowledge, do you recall
        if Liliana ever gave you a specific name while she was
        being examined or while you were talking to her?
        A. No, if she gave me a specific name, it would be in
        my report.
            Q. Just for -- to make this easier, I'm going to
        ask you to keep that. I'm going to look at a copy that
        I have. She's asked if there's any physical contact
        between the offender and the patient, is that correct?
        A. Yes.
            Q. And do you recall her answer to that?
        A. It says was, was she physically restrained in any
        way and she said yes, he held my hands with his hand.
            Q. Okay. On the next page, on page five, you
        asked her if there was any contact between the genitals
        of the two people, is that correct?
        A. Yes.
            Q. Okay. And are there -- did she answer yes to
        any of these questions?
        A. Yes, we have to ask every single question, make
        sure they understand the question. She answered yes to
        did the offender's penis contact patient's genitals?
        25 Yes. Did offender's penis enter patient's vagina?
    Yes.
Q. And at the bottom of that page, she is asked if the offender ejaculated and do you recall her answer to that?
A. Unsure.
Q. Unsure. On the next page, page six, you asked about the patient's activities since the incident. What is the reason for asking these questions?
A. Well we ask the patient did they shower, did they change their clothes, did they urinate. All of this affects the evidence that we're able to collect.
Q. How so?
A. For instance if the patient urinates and wipes herself, she can wipe evidence away. If she showers she pretty much wipes everything away. And in this case she did shower, so --
Q. Okay and the significance of that again would be what?
A. Well for instance he kissed her on the neck. In a, in any other case $I$ would take $a$ swab and a smear of that area trying to collect his DNA from her missing her on the neck. But she showered so that was not even a possibility.
25 Q. One second.
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1 $\quad$| On page eight, if you would go to page eight, |
| :--- |
| 2 | at the top of that page it's entitled physical

describe the general appearance and demeanor of the patient. If you would, would you describe how she was from your recollection?

MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection, Judged, asked and
answered.
THE COURT: Overruled.
Go ahead, answer.
THE WITNESS: She was -- she was very
emotional. She was very nervous and $I$ just keep saying scared because she really was afraid of what had just happened and if it could possibly happen again. BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Now, going down further, I would like to direct your attention to page nine, and I'd like to ask you about some of the, some of the physical examination that was done. It's entitled dried secretions. Could you describe to the ladies and gentlemen what takes place with regard to finding any dried secretions?
A. Well dried secretions --

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, could I be heard?
THE COURT: Yes.
(On the record discussion at sidebar)
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, why not just submit the document into evidence? I mean he's reading line by line of the paper.

Richardson - Direct
THE COURT: You're going a little overboard on reading the document. You are. You ask her why she does things and why -- why she does certain -- that's not so bad because it's why do you do it.

MR. TROIANO: You want to admit this whole document?

MR. HIRSCHORN: No.
THE COURT: No, we can't do that.
MR. HIRSCHORN: But that's basically what you're doing by reading it.

MR. TROIANO: This is exactly what she went through, every step of the way.

MR. HIRSCHORN: You can ask her what she did, not how it's read on the document and what she checked.

MR. TROIANO: Okay, so I'll rephrase but I'm still going through it.

THE COURT: All right.
(Sidebar discussion ended)
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Nurse Richardson if you would, what type of examinations did you do with regard to Liliana Santos?
A. Well Liliana, I was limited because she took a shower. And she said that he used a condom, so there was, you know, some limitations that I had. But I 25 still tried to, you know, investigate every possible
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source.
I didn't take dried secretions because she took a shower, they would be gone. But then we take -- so this first page I didn't really find necessary because there wouldn't be -- I still did head, hair combing, because if she didn't wash her hair there still could possibly be something from his head to her head. So I do -- I did that.
Q. Go on to anything else.
A. The next -- the next part is page 13. So the first thing we do is external genital specimen where we --

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, could we testify instead of read the report please?

THE COURT: Yes. Nurse Richardson, just tell
us, don't tell us what the form says, tell us what you did.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: Don't tell us what the form says, tell us what you did.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
The next thing I did is --
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Tell us what an external genital specimen is?
A. -- examine the external genitalia. That is look
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for any marks, any bruising, any evidence, any body fluid. We do swabbing of the entire external area?
Q. Of her vaginal region?
A. Of the vaginal area.
Q. Any other tests done, specifically on Liliana?
A. After the external area, then we use a vaginal speculum and a colposcope which is a special light that we use to see properly into the -- once the speculum is inserted, and we swab the vaginal walls and the cervical area and around the cervical area for any body fluid.
Q. Okay. And this was done with regard to Miss Santos?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay, so at first the speculum is used and then a colposcope is for what?
A. It's a light source that we use in conjunction with the speculum to show any injury, fluid, anything inside the vagina.
Q. And were these tests permitted by Liliana? A. Yes.
Q. Did -- if you recall, did Miss Santos, Liliana, complain of any pain, injuries, anything of the sort?

```
                    Richardson - Direct
A. I don't recall her complaining of any pain.
    Q. At the -- you indicated early, early on on
the direct examination that at some point a detective
arrived, is that correct?
A. Right.
```

    Q. Okay. And do you recall with regard to this
    case at what point that was?
A. I believe it was during the exam, so then she
would wait outside of the examination room and then we
would join her when we're finished.
Q. Okay. And at the conclusion of this
examination, what would have happened with regard to
Miss Santos, to your knowledge?
A. At the conclusion of the examination, I-- Miss
Santos would go with the detective and I prepare a box
which contains all the evidence, anything else, if we
have clothing or whatever. Whatever is appropriate. I
prepare it, label, sign it and we call it the chain of
custody. I turn it including the written report and
the physical report, $I$ turn it over to the detective.
And usually the patient and the evidence and the
detective leave together.
Q. Okay and then that box that you refer to in
laymen's terms, do you know what that's referred to as?
A. We call it the evidence box.

Richardson - Direct
Q. Okay. I'll leave it there.
A. I don't know.
Q. How long did this examination take?
A. I think this took about an hour. It usually takes about an hour, hour and a half.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much, Nurse Richardson, no further questions.

THE COURT: All right, go ahead.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, Judge.
CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. Good morning.
A. Hi.
Q. Nurse, just to take you back to that day back in November of 2006, you said that up until reviewing this report, both on your own and with Mr. Troiano, you don't have any independent recollection of Miss Santos or that day?
A. I really didn't remember that case, no.
Q. That's fine. Now you had indicated that when in these particular cases, when an individual comes in complaining of an alleged sexual assault they're first looked at by the E.R. doctor?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you present for that?
A. Not usually. If I'm working in the E.R. at the
time I could be present as an emergency room nurse. Q. Do you recall that day if you were present for the exam in the E.R.?
A. I don't really recall but $I$ don't think $I$ was present.
Q. Okay. Are you provided with when the individual comes to you for your report and everything else, are you provided with the report of the emergency room physician?
A. Only that she's medically cleared and ready to go on with an examination by the sexual assault nurse.
Q. Okay. So if there was, if she had sustained
some type of injury that they deemed needed medical
treatment, she would have been kept in the emergency
room
and treated prior to going to you?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. Do you recall in this case and I think you may have answered this, but do you recall in this case if you did review the release note from the emergency room physician?
A. I don't recall reviewing the release note.
Q. Do you recall as you sit here today that

Liliana had no bruises at that time?
A. That's correct.
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A. Uh-huh.
Q. Okay. Now the information that's provided to you on that report that you referenced, you know, over and over again on direct examination, that's provided to you completely by Miss Santos, correct?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. If you could, could you look at the first page of that report.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Now that provides her biographical
information, correct?
A. That's right.
Q. And it provided you with her name, her address, rate, date of birth, social security number, things like that, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Also on there there's a space that asks you

```
for a phone number, isn't that accurate?
A. Yes.
    Q. And she provided you with a telephone number,
correct?
A. Yes.
    Q. And you listed that under home phone number,
right?
A. Uh-huh.
    Q. And then you asked her if she had a cell
phone, isn't that correct?
A. Uh-huh.
    Q. What did she indicate to you as far as the
cellular telephone?
A. Same.
    Q. So that meant to you that the number that she
provided to you as the home number was a cell phone,
correct?
A. I don't know if that's correct. Some time people
say their cell is their home and their home is their
cell. Sometimes people just have one cell phone and
they --
    Q. Well certainly she provided you with that
telephone number.
A. She gave me this information.
    Q. And that's the only telephone number that she
```
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    provided you with, is that correct?
A. That's right.
Q. She also provided you with a, an individual
that she considered her to be her contact information,
correct?
A. Right.
Q. And a second phone number for that person?
A. Right.
Q. And that number is different, right?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. Now, when Miss Santos came in, Mr.
Troiano asked you, at no point in time during your
entire conversation with you did she provide you the
name of her attacker?
A. No.
Q. Did she provide you the nickname of an
attacker?
A. Not me.
Q. At no time and you conducted --
A. If she did say a name $I$ would write it in my
report.
Q. And we reviewed that extensively and you
didn't, correct?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. So it's safe to say from the way that
you prepared these and your thoroughness that that was
never provided to you?
A. Not to me, no.
Q. Okay. Now, you indicated about the problems
if someone, the questions about did you urinate, did
you shower, and you -- you said that if someone
showers, that creates a problem, correct?
A. Well it --
Q. For specimen collection.
A. That's right, it destroys the evidence.
Q. And you also indicated that if someone uses a
condom, that could limit the amount of evidence,
correct.
A Absolutely.
Q. Okay. Do you recall what Miss Santos told you as far as whether or not she thought someone used a condom?
A. I think she said she thought she heard a condom wrapper opening.
Q. And is it, would it refresh your recollection if I told you that she said she thought a condom was used?
A. That's right, I wrote unsure.
Q. But she was unsure. Unsure. So wouldn't it be safe then, Nurse, at that time to do that part of
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the examination just to make sure in case a condom wasn't used?
A. And I did that part.
Q. I didn't say you didn't do anything, I'm just asking a question.
A. Okay, right. That's the swabbing.
Q. So you did do that exam anyway just in case?
A. Oh, yeah.
Q. And again, that came up as no physical injury based upon your examination?
A. That's right.
Q. Now, after that evidence that you discussed and you said it's labeled evidence and sent to the Prosecutor's Office, do you ever have any dealings with the results of those tests?
A. No.
Q. So you would have no knowledge as to whether or not any DNA was found based upon what you had done, right?
A. No, usually $I$ don't hear of it again.
Q. Okay. You're -- basically you end at the exam?
A. This is actually the first time that I'm coming back for any case that I've done.
Q. And you're doing very well, so hang in there.
I'm almost done, I promise.
Based upon your narrative that you took from
Liliana, I don't know if you recall reading it. If you
need to refresh your recollection just let me know.
But did she ever indicate to you that she scratched her
attacker?
A. No. If she did I --
Q. That would have been important, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Because despite the shower and other factors
that may have happened, you would have gotten a little
bit further with the fingernail samples to make sure?
A. If she said that, I still would do fingernail
samples, but when a patient showers especially if they
wash their hair, the fingernails are cleaned.
Q. Okay. But you don't recall and as we read
earlier, she never told you that, or you would have
again --
A. That she scratched --
Q. That she scratched the attacker?
A. No.
Q. Because that would have been an important
piece of information.
A. It would have been in my report.
Q. Now when you take this narrative, do you just
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allow the individual to speak or do you stop them and
ask them questions or how does that take place?
A. I usually allow them to speak if it's following
the right, you know, chain of events and she's giving
me the information I need. If they're really going
off, you know, crying and why, you know, then I stop my
writing and let them vent and cry and once they're
collected, I'll continue.
And if -- if you look at the writing, in this case
she says he put his thing, I have to stop her and say,
you have to give me the exact word for what you mean by
that.
Q. Right, so this is -- I'm sorry. Things like
where you, where it says consensual sex, you probably
asked her was it consensual or not. That's basically
what I'm getting at.
17 A. Well in another area we ask them have you had
18 consensual sex in the past five days with anyone.

24 A. When she did say she had consensual sex with her boyfriend.
Q. So that may have been contained within a narrative. Now Mr. Troiano asked you a couple of times about any type of description that was contained throughout your taking of this statement from her. And basically the description that she provided to you was black, over six feet tall, skinny, dark colored jacket, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. That was as extensive as she got with the description?
A. Yeah, she said she didn't really see the man, only a flash from his cell phone.
Q. Right, she said that she -- she -- she heard, she saw a flash of his face through the light of the cell phone, correct?
A. Cell phone.
Q. And that was all that she provided to you as
far as a description?
A. Right, and his voice.
Q. And his voice. And what exactly did she -she said she may have recognized his voice?
A. She said she felt like she knew him and he knew her name, but she didn't give me a name.
Q. Did she ever indicate to you that she thought
it might have been her boyfriend Anthony? Did that
Richardson - Cross
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name ever come up?
A. No. And she - no, she did not indicate and she would have said if it was her boyfriend.
Q. No, I'm not asking if you said that the -that she thought it might have been her boyfriend was the question. She never mentioned that to you, correct? A. No.
Q. Okay.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I have no further
questions. Thank you.
MR. TROIANO: Just a couple, Judge.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Nurse Richardson, you -- when you checked or examined Liliana's genital area, you concluded that there were no injuries?
A. Right.
Q. Is that fair to say?
A. That's right.
Q. She also told you that she had consensual sex earlier in the evening with her boyfriend, is that correct?
A. That's right.
Q. Did she ask you if -- did you ask her, excuse me, if she had consensual sex at any other time predating that?
A. Yes, the question is have you had consensual sex in the last five days.
Q. Okay.
A. No, the question is have you had any sex with anyone in the last five days.
Q. Okay. And with regard to, specifically with
regard to injuries, what would be the significance of asking that question?
A. For me to ask her does she have any injuries?
Q. What would be the reason for you asking about
the consensual sex prior?
A. Well, because if a person is sexually active, they
don't always have injuries from sex. I mean usually they do not have injuries from sex.
Q. And in this case, Liliana indicated that she was --
A. She was sexually active.
Q. -- sexually active.

MR. TROIANO: No further questions.
RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. Nurse, if someone comes in complaining of being sexually assaulted, you examine them for an injury, correct?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And despite the fact that they're sexually
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active, if that sex caused injury, you would see it, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In your exam?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And about how many of these exams have
you conducted?
A. About 100.
Q. And you're pretty certain that had there been
injury in this case you would have seen it and you
would have noted it?
A. Yes, if there was bruising or bleeding or anything
that I can see, I absolutely would note it.
Q. Thank you very much.

MR. TROIANO: One more, Judge.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Is someone having sex, intercourse, would
that automatically be indicative of injuries?
A. Not at all.

MR. TROIANO: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Okay. You're excused, thank you
very much.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Mr. Troiano.
MR. TROIANO: Judge, at this time

```
notwithstanding moving evidence in and anything
possibly on rebuttal, State rests.
                    THE COURT: Okay. That's a good time to go
to lunch then. It's 12:15, I would like the jury to
come back at 1:25. I'll give you an hour and ten
minutes. The elevators aren't working. All right? So
1:25, do not discuss the case among yourselves, enjoy
your lunch, see you at 1:25. We're right on course
with my schedule.
                    (Jury leaves the courtroom)
                    (Off the record/on the record)
                            THE COURT: Mr. Wright. The State's rested,
and now is the time when the defense can choose to
present a case if they want to. They're not required
to.
Who's that person? She's not a juror is she?
COURT OEFICER: No, no.
THE COURT: Oh, okay.
In the -- it's your absolute right to
testify if you want to, and that's a decision you and your attorney will have to make after --
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I think we can discuss that now. Just before he makes his decision which, Judge, to be candid with the Court and I've already informed Mr. Troiano what the decision is, and
```
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I will voir dire Mr. Wright to this effect, that he does plan on testifying here. The defense does plan on calling the two other witnesses that were listed on the witness list after Mr. Wright.

The question $I$ guess at this point so he is aware before he takes the stand is as far as his prior convictions. He does have two, Judge. One is a third degree aggravated assault --

MR. TROIANO: No, I believe it's --
MR. HIRSCHORN: It's probation, had to be -MR. TROIANO: I believe it's a possession of a weapon.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Possession of a weapon, I'm sorry. You're right, third degree possession of a weapon, unlawful possession of a weapon and the other sentence, Judge, is the one he is presently serving which is an armed robbery, first degree.

THE COURT: Okay. A couple things and then let's talk about that. I think I'm supposed to give him this instruction. If you choose not to be a witness, I can read the following to the jury. The defendant in this case chose not to be a witness. It is the constitutional right of a defendant to remain silent. I charge you that you are not to consider for any purpose in any manner in arriving at your verdict the fact that the defendant did not testify nor should
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that fact enter into your deliberations in any manner at any time. The defendant is entitled to have a jury consider all the evidence and he is entitled to the presumption of innocence even if he does not testify as a witness.

If you don't testify, I can read that if you wanted me to. I'm just letting you know. I'm not telling you what to do, I'll letting you know.

Your -- but even knowing that instruction is available, you plan on testifying. How do you plan on sanitizing these?

MR. TROIANO: I don't. If these were with regard to prior domestic cases, sex cases, I would acknowledge that I would have to. But I don't --'I don't see that I have to under SANS BRUNSON.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I -- I -- I would tend to disagree. I think that armed robbery at the very least is a crime of --

THE COURT: The weapon itself would not be --
MR. HIRSCHORN: Not the weapon, no, clearly.
THE COURT: It -- well it's either all or
none.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Right, I understand that, Judge, but I would make the argument as to sanitizing them as to the armed robbery case, Judge. That this is
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alleged to have been a violent act. That's alleged to have been a violent act.

THE COURT: Armed robbery is a violent act,
that will be sanitized. I mean but obviously you can go through the sentence, the degree --

MR. TROIANO: That's the other issue I have, just it's probably your issue but I'll bring it up. He was sentenced a year ago, 13 months ago, to a ten with 85. There's the obvious implication that he's serving that sentence right now. Yet, it's whether or not we take out when he was convicted, we need to address that.

THE COURT: When was he convicted?
MR. TROIANO: When?
MR. HIRSCHORN: A year ago.
MR. TROIANO: He was --
MR. HIRSCHORN: A year ago -- or 13 months --
or he pled guilty --
MR. TROIANO: -- sentenced on January 9th,
2009.

MR. HIRSCHORN: So 13 months ago.
THE COURT: But this occurred in 2006,
correct? Am I right?
MR. TROIANO: This incident, yeah. The --
the armed robbery which he's serving the time for
occurred after this incident.
MR. HIRSCHORN: So that wouldn't --
THE COURT: So why -- why address the issue then of the - the date?

MR. TROIANO: Because they're going to know he's in State Prison. Well, all right.

MR. HIRSCHORN: No, I don't think there's any way to get around that.

THE COURT: To avoid that. No way to avoid that $I$ don't believe.

MR. HIRSCHORN: I don't think there's any way to avoid that. And I mean $I$ don't actually have much of a problem with that coming out. I mean I think it's going to be pretty obvious. He's a young guy, he's got ten with 85, I don't think it really matters what the conviction is.

MR. TROIANO: NO, I'm just saying, I'm trying
to make a record.
MR. HIRSCHORN: No, I understand what you're
saying.
MR. TROIANO: So then the, and I assume
you'll do this on direct, first degree conviction, serving ten with 85?

MR. HIRSCHORN: Sentenced on such and such. MR. TROIANO: Probably better off having you
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say armed robbery.
MR. HIRSCHORN: That may be, which I may
decide. I may be -- I think it has to be sanitized at our option but I'm not certain --

THE COURT: Absolutely certain.
MR. HIRSCHORN: -- whether or not -- if I
bring it out, obviously that opens the door. I will make that decision when --

THE COURT: That's a strategic decision you have to make because the jury --

MR. HIRSCHORN: Without a doubt. I mean the law tells us we have to sanitize. The other thing, Judge, if you want me, so we can get right to it when we get back, Mr. Wright, you and I've discussed your right to testify here, correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
MR. HIRSCHORN: And as a matter of fact,
we've gone over at length what you would testify to, isn't that correct?

THE DEEENDANT: Yes.
MR. HIRSCHORN: And I discussed with you that although in my opinion based upon the defense that you have brought to me and I have raised here in court that you would have a very difficult time having the jury acquit you without testimony, that ultimately it

```
was your decision, isn't that correct?
            THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
                            MR. HIRSCHORN: And after I told you that you
had the right to testify or not to testify, nobody
could force you. And then you heard what the Judge
read, he could read that to the jury if you chose not
to testify.
    THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Basically what you've
indicated to me is that this was a consensual act,
correct?
    THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it was.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: And I told you that legally
the only way we're going to be able to raise that based
upon something called the Rape Shield and other law
considerations is if you were to get up there and tell
your side of the story.
    THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Are you under the influence
of any drugs, alcohol or medication today?
    THE DEFENDANT: No.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Do you want to testify or not
testify?
    THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Am I forcing you or is
```

```
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anybody else forcing you to take that stand and
testify?
            THE DEEENDANT: NO.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: You want to do it?
    THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: And you understand you have
the absolute right not to testify?
    THE DEEENDANT: Yes.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: And you're ready to testify
here this afternoon?
    THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: And you understand that what
was just stated is that your two past criminal
convictions are going to come out in one way, shape or
form. They're either going to come out what's called
sanitized, meaning just the date you were convicted,
the length of the sentence and so, and what you're
serving, do you understand that?
    THE DEEENDANT: Yes, I do.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Or if we make the strategic
    decision, we may raise what you're sentenced for,
because we don't want the jury to think that it's
another sex offense.
    THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: And you understand that, you
```

```
understand that comes out?
```

    THE DEFENDANT: I understand that.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: And we've discussed that I'm
    probably going to even bring that out on direct exam.
THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
MR. HIRSCHORN: And you still wish to
testify?
THE DEEENDANT: Yes.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Again, is anybody forcing you
or threatening you to do that?
THE DEFENDANT: No.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: You're all set then?
MR. TROIANO: Ready to go.
THE COURT: And again, sanitize at your
discretion. Okay? See everybody in about an hour and
five minutes.
Thanks.
MR. TROIANO: Got it.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thanks, Judge.
(RECESS)
THE COURT: Are you ready to go?
MR. TROIANO: Yes, Judge.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Bring the jury out, please.
S. Wright - Direct
(Jury enters the courtroom)
THE COURT: Okay, good afternoon, everyone.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, Judge. The
defense calls Stephen Wright.
S T E V E N W R I G H T, DEFENDANT, SWORN
COURT OFFICER: For the record state your
name?
THE WITNESS: Steven Wright.
COURT OFFICER: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q Steven, just like everybody else I'm going to
ask you to keep your voice up just like all the other
witnesses did. This microphone $I$ think is on, but it
doesn't really -- yeah, you're good. Just keep your
voice up so everybody can hear the answers to my
questions, okay?
A Okay.
Q Let's start with first thing's first. You've
been convicted of a couple of crimes, correct?
A Yes.
Q Back in June 19th of 2005 you were convicted
of unlawful possession of a weapon, correct?
A Yes.
Q And you received probation for that?
A Yes, I did.
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A Antoine Wright.
Q And you said he was in the same grade as
Lillian San -- Liliana Santos?
A Yes, he was. Yes, he was.
Q Keep your voice up, Steven, okay?
A All right.
Q Now, so you knew her back then when you guys
were kids?
A Yes.
Q And you knew who she was?
A Yes, I did.
Q Do you know where she lived at that time when
you were kids?
A VanHorne and Bramhall.
Q VanHorne and Bramhall, where is that?
A Yes, that's -- that's downtown in Jersey City.
Q Okay. And where did you live at that time?
A At that time $I$ was living on wilkinson. That's on
the hill in Jersey City. Wilkinson and Ocean.
Q Okay. Are those -- about how far apart are
those two locations?
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A I'd say about 50 to a hundred blocks.
Q Okay. So they were pretty far apart?
A Yes.
Q Okay. At some point in time later in your
life did you begin to see or meet with Liliana again?
A Yes.
Q When was that?
A I think '05 like -- '06.
Q 2006?
A Yes.
Q And how did you come to get back in contact
with Ms. Santos?
A She be down the block from where $I$ be at.
Q What does that mean --
A I be on Communipaw and VanHorne, she be down the
block on VanHorne and Bramhall. So I would see her
walk to the store.
Q Okay.
A And I would talk --
Q Would you talk to her?
A -- to her. Yes. Yes, I would.
Q Would she talk to you?
A Yes, she would.
Q At some point in time did you have any other
kind of communication with her other than words? Did
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1 you become closer?
```

A A couple of times we would chill together. Well,

```
hang out together in the neighborhood.
            Q Okay. Let's stop there. So you said late
-- or in 2006 you began to see Liliana hang out in the
area again?
A Yes, I did.
            Q What happened next between you and Liliana
Santos?
A Well, we would just basically talk.
            Q Keep your voice up?
A We would -- we would talk.
            Q Okay.
A Hang out together.
            Q okay. When you say hang out together do you
        mean on the block, do you mean you went places
        together?
        A On the block. No, we never -- we never went
        anywhere together.
            Q Okay. So you would hang out on the block.
        Were there other people out there at that time?
        A Yes, there was.
        Q Were members of her family out there?
        A Yes.
            Q Who do you know that's a member of her
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family?
A I know Macho, I know Marsalino (phonetic).
    Q And who are they to her?
    A Those is her brothers.
            Q Her brothers?
    A Yes, they are.
        Q You know both of them?
    A Both of them.
        Q Okay. And you said that she knows your
    brother?
    A Yes, she do.
        Q Okay. And you all hung out in the same area?
        A In the same area.
        Q At some point in time did you and Liliana's
        relationship go beyond just hanging out on the block?
        A Yes, it did.
        Q When was that?
        A I would say before the summertime.
        Q Before - -
        A Of 06 .
        Q Before the summertime of '06?
        A Yes.
        Q And what happened at that time?
        A Well, I would call her some times and we would
        hook up to go chill with each other or hang out.
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A On Bramhall.
Q Was it a house an apartment?
A An apartment building. Between Clerk and
Arlington.
Q On Bramhall between Clerk and Arlington?
A Yes.
Q You said it was a house or an apartment?
A An apartment building.
Q How many rooms?
A Two.
Q Two bedrooms?
A Yeah.
Q Who lived there?
A My mother and my brother lived there.
Q Your brother, what's his name?
A Antoine Wright.
Q Okay. When you brought Liliana to your
mother's house was anybody home?
A Yes, my brother was home.
Q Was your mother home?
A No, she wasn't home.
Q But your brother Antoine was home?
A Yes, he was.
Q And what happened then?
A We went to my mother house. We was in the living

```
    room watching a little \(T V\), and we removed ourselves to
    my mother room, had sex, she woke up in the morning.
    Later told me she was going to her mother house. She'd
    see me later.
            Q Okay. You and her were intimate that night,
you had sex?
A Yes, she was.
    Q And when was that again?
A That was in the summertime of ' 06 at my mother
house.
            Q And that was the first time that you and
Liliana had had sex?
A Yes, it was.
\(Q\) And you said that your brother Antoine was
nome?
A Yes, he was.
    Q Did you and Liliana see each other after that
day, again, summer of '06?
A Yes, we definitely did.
    Q Okay. Did you and her become intimate again?
A Yes, at her house.
            Q When was that?
A This is, I would say, probably a couple of month
after that.
    Q Before or after November - the date that's
                    S. Wright - Direct
    been discussed here as you've heard?
    A That was a couple of days before this date.
        Q A couple of days?
    A A couple of days before the date that the alleged
    thing happened.
        Q Okay. And you said you went to Liliana's
        apartment?
        A Yes, I did.
        Q Okay. How did you end up going over there?
        A I called the phone, her cell phone.
            Q And what happened?
    A Went over there to go hang out with her. We was
    in the living room, smoked a couple of cigarettes, went
    in her room, had sex, \(I\) left, she stayed there, and
    that was it.
        Q And that was in November?
        A Yes, it was.
        Q A couple of days you said before --
    A A couple of days before this alleged event.
        Q Okay. Had you in between that time at your
        mom's house that you told the ladies and gentlemen
        about, and that time a couple of days before this
        alleged event had you and Liliana been intimate at any
        24 other times?
    25 A Can you say that again?

1 Q Yeah. You told us that the first time that
        mother house.
            Q Okay. Approximately how many times had you
        gone to your mother's house?
        A We went there like three times.
            Q Three times?
        A Yes.
            Q On those three occasions -- excuse me --
        strike that -- on all three occasions was it the same
        set of facts, or what happened each time?
        we'd both go our ways.
            Q Okay. Did you have a girlfriend at this
        time?
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Q Did Liliana -- what was her name?
A Mia.
Q Okay. Did Liliana know that you had a
girlfriend?
A Yes, she did.
Q Did she -- was she happy with the fact that
you had a girlfriend?
A At first she was acting like she was happy with
it. Like it was okay. But feelings get involved later
on down the road, so she wasn't liking it.
Q Okay. So approximately, Steven, before the
night of this allegation how many times would you
estimate that you and Liliana have had sex?
A Say about five times.
Q Eive times. And three of those you said was
at your mother's house?
A Yes.
Q We know one was in her apartment?
A And one was downtown at my friend house.
Q And one was at -- what's his name or her
name?
A His name is Buddha.
Q Okay. Now, directing your attention to the
night that we've all been talking about, where were you
-- let's start earlier that night, where were you?

```

1 A Well, that night --
2 Q Say midnight where were you?
3 A Midnight \(I\) was downtown on Communipaw and
4 VanHorne.
5 Q Okay. What were you doing there?
6 A Hanging out with my friends.
7 Q At some point in time did you come to be
8 together with Liliana?
9 A I seen her.
10 Q Where did you see her?
11 A She was by the bar on Halladay.
12 Q What bar?
13 A Marjae's (phonetic).
14 Q So the bar that she said she went to meet Mr.
15 Weiring (phonetic)?
16 A Yes.
17 Q Okay. You saw her there?
18 A I seen her there that night.
19 Q Did you speak with her?
20 A No.
21 Q At some point in time did you speak with her
22 later that night?
23 A Yes, I did.
24 Q How did you speak with her?
25 A I called her cell phone.
```
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            1 Q Did she answer?
        A Yes, she did.
            Q And what happened next?
    A I asked her what was -- what was she doing? She
said in the house chilling, laying down.
Q Okay. Do you recall approximately what time
that was?
A No, I don't -- not really.
Q Was it around the midnight that we discussed
before, or was it a couple of hours later?
A It was hours later.
Q Okay. So you -- you called Liliana?
A Yes.
Q And she answered her phone?
A Yes, she did.
Q And what did she say to you?
A She said that she was in the house relaxing,
laying in her bed.
Q Did she invite you over?
A I said, can I come over? She said, sure.
Q Okay. Did you ultimately go to 235 Arlington
Avenue?
A Went from where I was at straight there?
Q Did you do something in between?
No. I went straight there.

``` SHEET 58
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A Yes, she did.
\(Q\) And you went in the apartment?
A Yes, I did.
Q And this is 235 Arlington Avenue?
A Yes, it is.
Q Did you notice that the windows were broken when you went in?
A No, I wasn't paying attention to it.
Q And you had said before you had been to that apartment before?
A Yes, I did.
Q Do you remember how many times you had been there before?
A Twice.
Q This was the third time, or this was the second time?
A This was the second time.
Q Okay. So the one time you had discussed
before where you were chilling on the porch and, then,
this time?
A Yes.
Q Or chilling on the window side?
A Chilling on the inside, on the window sill.
Q So ultimately you go inside?
25 A Yes.
```

Q Do you recall what you were wearing that
night?
A I had a green hoody on, blue jeans, black Gotech
boots, a black fitted green T-shirt, that's it.
Q What's a green hoody, is that a sweatshirt?
A Like -- like a sweatshirt with the -- with the
hoody on it.
Q Were you wearing a black leather jacket?
A No, I wasn't.
Q So you go in the apartment, what happens
next?
A Go in there, get comfortable, take my shoes off,
my shirt, my hoody, my hat, sit it down on the floor.
Started talking for a minute. Then we had sex. After
we had sex since --
Q Let me stop you there. We'll get to that
next. So you had sex that night?
A Yes.
Q So you had -- did -- did you believe it was
consensual sex?
A Yes, it was.
Q You had sex with her where in her apartment?
A In her bedroom.
Q On the floor or on the bed?
A On the bed.

```
```
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                            Q Okay. You had sex with her and, then, what
    were you going to say, what happened next?
A After we had sex we sitting on the bed talking for
a minute. It wasn't even that long. I'd say about
five minutes, my phone started ringing. That's when
Mia called me.
Q And Mia was?
A My girlfriend.
Q Okay. So your girlfriend called you while
you were with Liliana?
A Yes, she did.
Q Okay. Do you recall approximately what time
that was?
A It probably was the morning time 'cause she was
yelling at me, angry about not being home yet.
Q Okay. So what do you do next?
A I tell Liliana that I got to go. I guess she
assumed that -- I never told her I was going to call --
MR. TROIANO: Objection.
A -- my girlfriend.
THE COURT: Sustained. Don't say anything.
Next question?
BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q So don't say what Lilian -- what you assume
Liliana thought. You can't testify to that, okay?

```

A All right.
Q Just testify to what you did or what you know, all right? A Well, I told --

Q So what happened, after you had sex the phone rings, it's your girlfriend?
A Yes.
Q What do you say to Liliana?
A I told her that I have to go.
Q Okay. What happens next?
A She didn't like it that \(I\) was leaving. So she started a little argument, you're not leaving the house. You're staying here tonight. So she grabbed my hoody, my phone and my hat, like you're not going no where without this.

Q Okay. So are you still in the bedroom at this time?
A Yes, we are.
Q So she grabs some of your clothes and your shoes from you?
A Yes -- no, not my shoes.
Q Not your shoes?
A No.
Q She grabbed some of your clothes from you?
A She got my hoody, my hat and my cell phone.

1
2
```
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And what does she do with those clothes?
A She holding them hostage. She don't want to give
them back to me.
Q Okay.
A So what I did was I put my boots on like I got to
leave. I'm not staying here. I will leave without
that. She like no, you won't. Now, she's trying to
start a little argument, but I told her that I have to
go no matter what she do. I'm leaving.
Q Okay. Did she ultimately do anything with
your clothes?
A Well, she stormed out the bedroom started walking
towards the living room. And she threw my stuff inside
the closet.
Q Now, when you say the closet are you talking
about -- what closet are you talking about?
A The closet by the window with the boiler room.
Q Okay. So the close that's been discussed
here in the front of the apartment?
A Yes.
Q At that time is the window broken?
A No.
Q Do you go into the closet?
A Did I go in the closet?
Q Did you go in the closet?

```
```

    A No, 'cause I'm standing like where did you put my
    ```
    stuff at? So I see the closet door open. I'm like you
    put my stuff in there? She like, yeah, you're not
    going no where. She grabs it, I goes over there. I'm
    like why -- why is you doing this? So she's making me
    frustrated and angry. I punched the glass window.
            Q Okay. So let me stop you there. So you're
        still inside this apartment, correct?
        A Yes.
            Q You punched that window?
        A Yes, I did.
            Q Did it break?
        A Yes, it broke.
            Q And the glass -- did the glass shatter?
        A Yes, the glass shattered.
            Q Did you have any cuts on you?
        A I had a cut on my hand.
            Q Was it your right or your left hand?
        A Right hand.
        Q Is that the hand you punched the window with?
        A Yes, it was.
            Q After you punched the window where was your
        stuff now, Liliana had it?
        A She had my stuff --
            What did you -- what did you do next?
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        A I'm like Liliana, I have to go now. I hear the
        horn blowing outside. So --
            Q When you say you hear the horn blowing
        outside, what is that to you?
        A That's my -- I told my friend Steve I'm not going
        to be here long, come back in a half an hour, 45
        minutes.
            Q So you hear the horn, what happens next?
        A I'm telling her that's my ride. It's time for me
        to go.
            Q Okay.
        A She didn't want me to go. So what I did was I
        grabbed my hoody out of her hands.
            Q How was she holding your stuff, if you
        remember?
        A She's holding it like this.
            Q Okay. And what did you do, show it to the
        ladies and gentlemen again?
        A I grabbed it like this and I yanked it.
                    THE COURT: For the record he said her hands
        were next to her body. He extended his hands forward
        and yanked. Okay.
        BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
            Q Did you make contact with her, did your hands
        touch her shirt?
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A Yes, it is.
Q It's your testimony here that you were allowed to enter 235 Arlington through the front door? A Yes.

Q You didn't break the window and climb in that way?
A No.
Q After this incident, after November 19th, did you see Liliana again?
A After that? Yes, I did see her again.
Q When was that?
A Downtown on Communipaw and VanHorne.
Q Did she speak to you?
A She said hi, that's it, and just kept walking.
Q If you remember about how long after this incident was that?
A After the house \(I\) would say a couple of days, a week.
Q Do you go by the name S.DOT?
A Yes.
Q Did Liliana ever call you Steven?
A No.
Q What would she call you?

24
25
A S.DOT.
Q Did the people -- strike that -- was it

2006 did you have sex with Liliana Santos?
A Yes, I did.
    Q Did Liliana Santos at any point in time
during the course of that night tell you to stop?
A No.
            Q Did Liliana Santos during the course of that
night ever say you're raping me?
A No.
            Q Did Liliana Santos ever tell you get out of
    her apartment?
    A No.
            Q Did you break that window from the inside or
        the outside?
        A Inside.
                            MR. HIRSCHORN: I have no further questions,
        Judge.
                    THE COURT: Cross?
        CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
            Q Mr. Wright, as you probably know by now my
        name is Matthew Troiano. I'm an Assistant Prosecutor
        here. You admit that on the night of November 19th,
        2006 you were at Liliana's basement apartment, is that
        correct?
        A Yes.
            So that issue is off the table, correct?
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A Yes. You were there. And you had admitted first
questions, that you are currently serving a sentence of
10 years with 85 percent New Jersey State Prison, is
that correct?
A Yes, I am.
    Q And you realize that if you were found guilty
    of these charges that you could serve an additional
    period in State Prison, is that correct?
    A Yes.
        Q Separate and apart from the ten years?
        A Yes.
            Q And you don't want that to happen?
        A No.
            Q Now, you have -- you've told this jury here
        that you are quite the lady's man with regard to
        Liliana --
            MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection.
            Q -- is that correct?
            THE COURT: Overruled.
        BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
            Q You can answer.
        A Say that again?
            Q You are quite the lady's man, especially with
        regard to Liliana?
```
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    A No, I wouldn't say that.
Q You had a girlfriend, correct?
A Yeah.
Q She, apparently, had a boyfriend, Mr.
Weiring, is that correct?
A Yes.
Q All right. But you guys still had sex?
A Yes.
Q In fact, you said that you remember three and
a half years ago that you had sex with her five times,
correct?
A Yes.
Q You remember where you were, correct?
A Yes.
Q You remember that you were at your mom's
house, your brother was there, is that correct?
A Yes, it was.
Q Okay. And the three times that you had sex
at your mom's house everything happened about the same,
is that correct?
A Yes.
Q Nothing different. You would call her up,
correct?
A Yes, I would.
Q All right. You know her cell phone?

```
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        A Do I know her cell phone?
        Q Yeah.
        A No.
        Q You don't know her cell phone number?
        Do I knew it, no, it was in my cell phone.
        Q Okay. You indicated that her brother, what's
        her brother's name?
        A Marsolino.
        Q Marsolino you said that you didn't know his
        cell phone, so you couldn't call him, is that correct?
        A No.
        Q But Liliana's cell phone you have, correct?
        A I had.
        Q And you admit that you were close to her
        you've known her for a long time, is that correct?
        A Yes, I do.
        Q All right. But you don't know her cell phone
        number here today?
        A No.
        Q Okay. Did you ever know her cell phone
        number?
        A I had it inside my phone.
        Q And you indicated that you knew Liliana from
        24 down on the block, is that correct?
25 A Yes.
```
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                            Q All right. You guys went to school together?
    A Yes, we did.
Q Okay. And that's when you were up on
Wilkinson and Ocean and she was down on Bramhall, you
still went to school together --
A Bramhall --
Q -- correct?
A Yes.
Q When you were younger?
A Yes.
Q You mentioned that on the night of this
incident when you were at Liliana's house that you were
wearing a green hoody, correct?
A Yes.
Q Blue jeans, correct?
A Yes.
Q Green T-shirt?
A Yes.
Q Boots?
A Yes.
Q Do you remember what you were wearing on
November 17th, 2006?
A November 17th? I wear -- I wear blue everyday,
but, I don't remember the exact colors though.
Q Okay. What about November 20th, 2006, do you

```


```
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        assume you were aware that she was with Anthony
        Weiring?
        A I -- I wouldn't say with, 'cause he --
        Q Physically with.
        A -- you was --
        Q Physically with her that night?
        A Yes.
        Q Okay. He was spending time with her that
        night before, and did you know that?
        A Did I know he was there that night?
        Q Yes.
        A Before I got there? No.
        Q She didn't say that?
        A No.
        Q Okay.
        A She did not.
        Q So it's your testimony today that she called
        you up, after she was done with Anthony, calls you up,
        told you to come over --
        A No, I called --
        Q -- that's your testimony here?
        A -- her.
        Q It's your testimony that you called her after
        Anthony left --
        MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection.
    ```

Q -- and she invited you over?
MR. HIRSCHORN: He said he didn't know
whether Anthony was there or not.
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q You called her up, she invited you over?
A Yes.
Q And you guys had sex?
A Yes.
Q And this was the fifth time that you had sex, is that correct?
A I don't remember.
Q Well, it was your testimony on direct that you had sex five times?
A Five times, but I don't know whether that was the fifth time.
```

                                    Oh, you had sex after that?
    A Did we have sex after that?
Q You had sex after November 19th, 2006?
A No.
Q Okay. So it would be fair to say that that
was the last time you had sex?
A Yes.
Q When you had arrived to Liliana's that night
was her TV on?

```
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A Was her TV on? Yes, her TV was on.
    Q The TV was on?
    A Yes, it was.
    Q Was her bathroom light on?
    A Yes, it was.
    Q Was her living room light on?
    A No.
    Q Just the bathroom and the TV, is that --
    A And TV --
        Q -- correct?
    A Yes.
        Q And you had sex that night with the lights
    on, is that correct?
    A Yes, we did, TV on.
    Q TV on, you don't know about the bathroom
    light?
    A No, the bathroom light was on.
        Q Okay. So TV light, bathroom light. And the
    previous times that you had sex with her, once at the
    friend's, three times at the -- at your mother's house,
    were those with the lights on?
    A Yes.
        Q I assume it would be an easy question for you
    here with your level of the relationship with her to
    tell us all what color her hair is?
```
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A Who?
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A Who?
Q Liliana?
Q Liliana?
A Liliana be -- sometimes it be black. One time she
had it like a brunette, like burgundy looking color.
Q Okay. And it would be an easy question for
me to ask you what color her eyes were?
A No, because I don't be looking at her face like
that.
A NO.
Q Okay. And it would be safe for me to assume,
correct me if I'm wrong, that during the course of you
having sex with her that she was naked at some point?
A When?
Q Any one of those five, you pick?
A Yes.
Q Okay. She was naked?
A Yes, like bottom off.
Q And with her bottom off all five times. She
was never naked any of the other times. She just had
her bottom off, all five times?
A Like she wouldn't take like -- I would just pull
her shirt -- her breasts out of her shirt like, that's
it, like. I'm not getting -- that's not my girlfriend.
Okay. I'll leave that one alone. I assume

```
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        that you could tell the ladies and gentlemen of this
        jury that if, in fact, Liliana were to have some sort
        of distinguishing mark on her legs, back, you could
        tell them where it is?
        A No, I really don't pay attention like that to her
        body.
            Q Just having sex?
        A Just having sex.
            Q All right.
        A That's it.
        Q But it was light on and she was naked,
        correct?
        A Naked? No, she wasn't never --
            Q It was light on and she had her pants off, is
        that correct?
        A That's it.
        Q But it's your testimony here that you don't
        know if she had any marks on her body, nothing?
        A No.
        Q Okay. How many times you been to that
        apartment, 235 Arlington Avenue?
        A Twice.
            Just twice?
        A That's it.
            Q Never there after?
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relationship of boyfriend and girlfriend.

```
    Q Just have sex and that's it?
A We would just be as cool, that's it.
    Q Okay. No strings attached?
    A No.
        Q Okay. But on that night she got in an
    argument with you because you wanted to leave to go to
    your girlfriends?
    A I mean feelings get involved later on down the
    10 road once you're having sex with somebody. You're
11 talking to them like there's going to be feelings.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 A Yes.
22 Q She wanted to spend more time with you?
23 A Yes.
24 Q Okay. And she takes her clothes -- your
25
```
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    walks them around to the other side of the apartment
    and puts them in a closet, correct?
    A I guess she was trying to hide them from me.
    Q Okay. She was trying to hide them. Was the
    closet locked?
    A It was open.
        Q And, so, by doing that she was going to keep
        you there, that's your testimony?
    A I guess that's what she thought. But I -- I would
        have left it anyway.
            Q You were going to leave -- you were going to
        up and leave with no clothes on?
        A If that would have kept going on like that, I
        would have left it there.
        Q Okay. Yet your testimony is that you picked
        up the clothes, she grabbed them back and, then, you
        punched the window?
        A I never said I picked the clothes up.
        Q Okay.
        A I said she picked the clothes up.
        Q She picked the clothes up, you got mad at her
        and you punched the window?
        A Yes.
        24 Q All right. And how did you punch the window?
    25 A I punched it like that with my hand.
    ```

1
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1 0 \text { going to go into the closet and punch the window?}
1 1 ~ A ~ I ~ w a s ~ s t a n d i n g ~ r i g h t ~ b y ~ t h e ~ c l o s e t .
1 2 ~ Q ~ O k a y . ~ Y o u ~ w e r e ~ l o o k i n g ~ i n t o ~ t h e ~ c l o s e t ?
15 closet. I'm like why we got to go through this?
Q All right. So you gave her the clothes
first?
A Gave her the clothes?
    Q She picked up the clothes?
A Yes.
    Q Okay. She goes into the closet, picks up the
clothes?
A Like the closet is right here. I was, like,
            Q So you decided to punch the window?
A Yes.
            Q Again? When you decided to punch the window
        where was Liliana? Say I'm you and I'm punching
        windows, I'm standing right here, I'm punching with my
        A Like standing behind like over there.
            Q Okay. She's standing behind you?
        A Yes.
            Q All right. But you decide to punch the
```
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    window anyway?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Did you happen to see $S-28$ any of this
stuff in here, hot water heater, pipes, anything --
A That's what I was talking about the boiler room.
Q You remember that?
A Yes.
Q All right. But you were able to -- you were
able to extend your arm far enough inside the closet to
break that window?
A I was standing like inside the closet and I had a
long reach.
Q Okay. You were standing inside the closet?
A Like in front of it.
Q Okay. But you never picked up the clothes?
A No.
Q Liliana picked up the clothes?
A Yes, she did.
Q But you were standing inside the closet and,
then, you punched?
A Yes.
Q All right. I got you. You got blood on your
hand?
A Yes.
Q Right hand?
A Grabbed what shirt?
Q -- grabbed her shirt and that's how the blood
got on there?
A I never grabbed her shirt. I said I grabbed my
hoody and stuff out of her hands, and yanked like this.
I guess that's how the blood got on her shirt.
Q You guess that's how the blood got on the
shirt, okay. You grabbed like this and, I guess, the
blood was on your knuckle, would that be fair to say?
A Yes.
Q All right. Blood on your knuckle and you
grabbed and it touched her shirt?
A Yes.
Q That's how it got on there?
A Yes.
Q And, then, you left?
A Yes.
Q And, then, it's your testimony that your
S. Wright - Cross
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friend --
A Steve.
Q -- Steve just happened to be there ready for
you to leave?
A He know -- he knew what time it was.
Q What time was it?
A I'm staying there for like a half an hour, forty
five minutes, he's going to come back and pick me up.
Q Okay. What time did -- what time did Steve
drop you off?
A I don't remember the time.
Q But you remember now that Steve was waiting a
half an hour, 45 minutes and, then, he was going to
come swing around pick you up?
A Yes.
Q Okay. So Steve was -- Steve was your guy.
He was like your -- your car service, for lack of a
18 better phrase?
19 A No, I wouldn't call it that. That's just my
20 friend.
21 Q He was going to drop you off, leave you
22 there, come pick you up?
23 A Yes.
24 Q How far is it from Communipaw up to
25 Arlington?
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pocketed that Magnum?
A Huh?
Q It's your testimony that you pocketed that, you kept that with you?
A No, I threw it in the garbage.
Q What garbage?
A There was a garbage in the kitchen. When you're walking down the hallway there was a garbage right there on the side counters.

Q In Liliana's house?
A Yes.
Q You left a condom in her house?
A In the garbage.
Q In the garbage. And forgive me for asking, but did you ejaculate that night?
A Yes, I did.
Q Okay. So you left a used condom in her wastebasket?
A Yes.
Q Okay. So the condom at 249 Arlington Avenue, not yours?
A 249, no.
Okay. You've heard testimony that if you were, and correct me if, you know, I'm wrong at any point here, if you were looking at the street from 235
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A Yes.
Q Okay. And your mother was where?
A She wasn't home.
Q Where? No, no, no, where does she live?
A Bramhall.
Q Bramhall. All right. Correct me if I'm wrong, that if you were to look outside of 235
Arlington Avenue to that street Arlington Avenue there,
and you were to make a left and go down to the next
10 cross street, that would be Bramhall?
11 A No, it wouldn't. That would be Union, then
12 Bramhall.
13 Q Okay. Bramhall is maybe a block that way.
14 A And you can't see it anyway because it go in a
15 circle like this. It turns.
16 Q The Light Rail Station is over there. Okay.
17 A The Light Rail Station on --
18 Q But down that street maybe --
19 A -- Randolph.
20 Q -- maybe a half of mile, maybe less than that
21 is Bramhall?
22 A Yeah.
23 Q And, in fact, your mother lives right at that 24 corner, is that correct?
25 A No, she live up the block.

```
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                    Q A couple of houses.
A Four buildings.
    Q Okay. Four buildings up the block, okay.
    Your testimony that you weren't staying there that
    night, you weren't staying there before that, none of
    that?
        A No.
            Q Okay. You just went there to have sex?
            Yes.
            Q Okay.
                    MR. TROIANO: One second, Judge.
BY MR. TROIANO:
            Q When you punched that window do you remember
        your hand going all the way through it?
        A No.
            Q Did it stop from something?
    A It snapped it back.
            Q Snapped it back. It didn't hit anything on
        the other end?
        A No.
            Q No screen?
        A No.
            Q Nothing?
        A Nothing.
        Q Okay. All right. And it's your testimony
```

                S. Wright - Cross/Redirect
                                    151
        here today that you spoke with Liliana afterwards and
        she said, hi to you?
        A Yes.
        Q And that you never had marks on your face?
        A Never.
        Q And there were never any allegations in the
        neighborhood about what you did to her?
        A No.
        Q And the first time you knew about this was a
        year later?
        A Yes, it was.
        Q That's your testimony here today?
        A Yes, it is.
            MR. TROIANO: Judge, I have nothing further.
            MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, briefly.
        REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
            Q I'm going to show you what's been marked
        \(S-14\), do you recognize that?
        A Yes. Yes.
        Q What is it?
        A It's a window, broken window.
        Q Okay. You can see the closet doors there,
        right?
        A Yes.
        Q How deep is that closet? How many feet is it
    ```
from those closet doors to that window?
A It's not deep at all.
    Q So you could be standing by those doors and
reach the window?
A Yes, I could.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Nothing further, Judge.
    Thank you.
                            MR. TROIANO: Nothing, Judge.
                            THE COURT: You're excused. You may step
    down.
    (On the record discussion at sidebar)
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, can you give me five
minutes in the back, I've just got to see if his
brother's here. The other kid is supposed to be here
at 3:30.
    THE COURT: Someone at 3:30?
    MR. HIRSCHORN: The third kid. I don't know
how long he'll take.
            MR. TROIANO: Who, the brother?
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Yeah, if you could give me
five minutes, Judge.
    THE COURT: Sure.
        (Sidebar discussion ended)
    THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen,
just take a couple of minutes in the jury room. We're
```

A. Wright - Direct

153
waiting for the next witness to arrive. He's due any
moment. Do not discuss the case at all amongst
yourselves. Just step inside, thank you. (Jury leaves the courtroom)
THE COURT: All right, let me know when you're ready.
(Off the record/on the record)
THE COURT: Okay, we're ready to go? Next
witness, please.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, Judge. The
defense calls Antwan Wright please.
A N T W A N W R I G H T, DEFENSE WITNESS, SWORN
COURT OFFICER: State your full name for the
record, sir.
THE WITNESS: Antwan Wright.
COURT OEFICER: You can have a seat.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. How you doing, Antwan?
A. Hey.
Q. Just do me a favor, just keep your voice up
as much as you can. Everybody has to be able to hear you.
A. All right, sure, no problem.
Q. Antwan, this is your brother sitting over
here, right?
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A. In the area where we grew up at, where we chilled out $I$ guess you could say. Q. Okay. Where is that?
A. Downtown area, Communipaw, VanHorn, you know. Q. Okay. And you lived in that area, right?
A. Yeah, we lived on Bramhall but we went down that way like, didn't like the other area too much.
Q. Now, back in November of 2006, did you live
on Bramhall?
A. Yes.
Q. Who did you live with?
A. My mother.
Q. And that was your mother's apartment?
A. Yes.
Q. How big was the apartment?
A. Two bedroom.
Q. Okay. And it was just you and her living
there?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Would Stephen stay there on occasion?
A. On occasion, once in awhile.
Q. Did he have another home or another place that he lived?
A. He pretty much stayed with his girl most of the time, Mia.
Q. Who was his girlfriend?
A. Mia, Mia Jones.
Q. Mia Jones?
A. Yes.
Q. So that was his girlfriend at that time?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Did they have any children together?
A. No.
Q. Now, at some point, let's take you a couple of months back. Were you still living on Bramhall back
in the summer of 2006?
A. Yes.
Q. At some point in time, did you see your
brother begin to hang out with Liliana Santos?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. You got to speak.
A. Yes, yes, I did.
Q. We can all see you nodding your head. When was that if you recall?
A. I'm not too good with times like but I'd say about -- I'm not too good with times.
Q. Okay, was it spring, summer, early fall?
A. I would say maybe spring, summer, something like
that.
Q. Okay. At some point in time did you have
A. Wright - Direct
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occasion to see Liliana and Stephen together somewhere other than the block?
A. The house.
Q. Whose house was that?
A. Mine.
Q. Your house?
A. Yeah.
Q. If you can, describe to me the first such
time that this happened?
A. It was late $I$ mean like four, five o'clock in the morning like he came in and she --
Q. Who came in?
A. My brother, Stephen Wright came in and Liliana was with him.
Q. Okay. And they came in to you and your mother's house?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you see them together?
A. Yes.
Q. You were awake?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you asleep and woke up or were you awake sitting up --
A. No, $I$ was in the living room playing a game.
Q. Playing a video game?

```
A. Yeah.
```

A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And what did Stephen and Liliana do
Q. Okay. And what did Stephen and Liliana do
when they entered the apartment?
when they entered the apartment?
A. Went straight into my mother's room.
A. Went straight into my mother's room.
Q. Was your mother home?
Q. Was your mother home?
A. NO.
A. NO.
Q. Did they close the door?
Q. Did they close the door?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. And did you stay awake?
Q. And did you stay awake?
A. Yeah, pretty much.
A. Yeah, pretty much.
Q. Did you see them do anything?
Q. Did you see them do anything?
A. No, I didn't see anything. The door was closed.
A. No, I didn't see anything. The door was closed.
Q. Did you hear anything?
Q. Did you hear anything?
A. I heard some things, I mean --
A. I heard some things, I mean --
Q. What did you hear?
Q. What did you hear?
A. Should I be vague? I mean --
A. Should I be vague? I mean --
Q. Just tell us what you heard.
Q. Just tell us what you heard.
A. Sex.
A. Sex.
Q. You heard noises that resembled sex?
Q. You heard noises that resembled sex?
A. Yeah, bed rocking like.
A. Yeah, bed rocking like.
Q. Okay. Were they the only two people in the
Q. Okay. Were they the only two people in the
room?
room?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you certain that this was Liliana Santos?
Q. Are you certain that this was Liliana Santos?
A. Guaranteed.
A. Guaranteed.
A. Wright - Direct
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    that Steven came to you and your mother's house with
Liliana Santos?
A. I can remember definitely one more time, maybe two
more times, but definitely one more time after that.
Q. On that other time that you definitely
remember did you see or -- did you see anything go on?
A. I mean no, the door was still closed, but --
Q. Did they go into your mother's room that
time?
A. Same scenario.
Q. Did you hear anything?
A. Same thing, sex, bed rocking (laughing).
Q. On either of those two occasions did you see
Liliana leave?
A. Leave as in after they was done?
Q. As in leaving the apartment, yes?
A. No, I took it down before they left. Before she
left I usually went to bed.
Q. Okay. Now, would Stephen and Liliana in
times that you were in their presence would you see
them together on the block as well?
A. Yeah, I seen them outside a couple of times.
Q. Okay. What were they doing when you would
see them outside?

```
A. Like they was just chilling like --
Q. When you say chilling, give us --
A. Like maybe, I don't know, just hanging out, smoking maybe. That's about it.
Q. Okay. Now, at some point in time after November of 2006, your brother went to jail, correct? After your brother went to jail, did you start to hear anything about what may have happened in November?
A. Yeah, I remember being in the house and someone
called my mother and let her know they showing mug
shots of Stephen and they told her they were showing mug shots because he was supposed to have raped Liliana.
Q. Okay. Now is it your recollection that when this started to take place, Stephen was already in jail?
A. I believe so. I believe so.
Q. You believe so but you're not 100 percent
sure?
A. I'm not guaranteed sure but I believe so.
Q. Okay. Do you know any of Liliana's brothers?
A. Yeah.
Q. Who are they?
A. Goon, Macho.
Q. Okay. Do you know their real names?
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A. We all grew up together, we all went to 22, all of us.
Q. After November -- you may not remember this, but if you do, after November 19th, 2006, were you and your brother still hanging out in that same area?
A. Yeah.
Q. Would you see Liliana's brothers?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Would --
A. I still shake their hand to this day like.
Q. Okay. At any point in time did -- that you
were out there, did Liliana's brothers or Liliana
herself approach Stephen and accuse him of anything?
A. I don't think so, not that \(I\) know of.
Q. That you know of. That's all you can testify
to.
A. Yeah, not that \(I\) know of.
Q. You never witnessed anything like that? Did
you and/or Stephen, especially Stephen, start to hang
out somewhere else?
A. No.
Q. So he never left hanging out on that same
block?
A. Hanging out in the same area every day.
Q. Okay. Do you still hang out there?
A. Yeah, unfortunately.
Q. That's okay. Now at some point in time, let's direct your attention forward now. A couple of months ago, did you have a conversation with Liliana Santos?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ask to speak with her or did she ask to speak with you?
A. I asked to speak with her.
Q. And what exactly did you want to speak with
her about?
A. I basically just wanted to know what was going on.

It was like I seen you come in my house so it was like Liliana, like what are you doing like.
Q. Okay.
A. And then I'm hearing everything that they was
saying she was saying and it was like you're saying you
don't know him, really, like --
Q. At some point in time during that
conversation did she say to you that she believed that Stephen raped her?
A. Yeah, she said that.
Q. She did. Did she admit to you that you had obviously seen her before that?

MR. TROIANO: Objection.
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            Q. So as far as you're concerned as you sit here
today, you and Liliana have no problem?
A. I thought we was cool (laughing).
                    MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I have no further
questions. Thank you.
CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
    Q. Mr. Wright, my name is Matthew Troiano, I'm
the Assistant Prosecutor on this case. Thanks for
coming in.
A. How you doing? No problem.
    Q. You just said, this last part that you just
said you said that I was shocked, something to the
effect of I was shocked that Liliana was saying that I
was threatening her. How did you find out about that?
A. How'd I find out about --
    Q. How did you find out that Liliana was saying
that you threatened her?
A. I mean being like we in the streets, people talk
and it get back to you like. That's just how it go.
            Q. Okay. So if I were to tell you that Liliana
never accused you of that, would you say that that's a
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lie?
A. Well couldn't say nothing like it just be like oh,
okay.
Q. Okay, and you weren't told about these threats or anything by Mr. Hirschorn, were you? A. No.
Q. No.
A. It's the first time I ever met him.
Q. First time you ever met him in person?
A. In person.
Q. You spoke to him on the phone a few times though.
A. Yeah, but it was basically Mr. Wright, are you coming to Court? Yeah, okay, sure. So I just got the date, time, all right.
Q. Okay. But you knew what you were coming to Court for, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. In fact, you spoke to an investigator a couple of months ago, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Wright is your big brother, correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. And a couple years older than you?
A. Yes.
Q. And it would be fair to say and \(I\) think everybody here could understand that you don't want to see him get in trouble, is that correct?
A. Of course not.
Q. Okay. And you don't want to see him, you know, potentially go to prison, nothing like that, correct?
A. Nothing, no.
Q. He's your -- he's your older brother and
you're going to do what it takes to help him out?
MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection, Judge.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Everyone, I mean there's
limits. So no. There's limits.
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. All right, but -- but he's your brother.

Now, let me ask you a question, when did you first find out about these allegations that Liliana was making against your brother?
A. Like he said, `06 sometime in --
Q. You knew about it in `06, is that correct?

And you knew in `06 that this is crazy, my -- my brother's having a relationship with her, right? You knew about that. But you also knew that Liliana was
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making these accusations saying that he raped her, you know, he strangled her, whatever the case may be, correct? You knew about that back in `06, correct?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. You never told anybody that they had a relationship, did you?
A. Of course I told people.
Q. You never went to the police, did you?
A. I mean I didn't, I was going wait for everything to pan out, see how it go.
Q. Your brother has been accused of this crime for three and a half years, yet you knew maybe a month later that they had a relationship. You never went to the police, yes or no?
A. Never went to the police.
Q. You never came up to the Hudson county Prosecutor's Office to say my brother had a
18 relationship with this girl, he's innocent. You never
19 did that?
20 A. I go off -- basically if my mother and my father 21 would have came to me and told me that they felt it was 22 necessary for me to do that, then I'd a did that. Q. Okay.
A. But being that my mother and my father never came 25 to me and said that, there's no reason to do that.
```
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                            Q. Fair enough. Simple answer is no, you never
    did anything.
A. No, I never did anything.
Q. Okay. You're friends with Anthony Waring, is
that correct?
A. Yeah (laughing).
Q. You guys hang out sometimes, play video
games sometimes, is that correct?
A. Yeah, Scoop's my mans.
Q. He's what?
A. He's my mans.
Q. You guys, you guys are friends, right?
A. Yeah (laughing).
Q. And you knew bout this again back in 2006 and
you, you know, the relationship never wavered, did it,
with Anthony?
A. Not never.
Q. Okay. And you said that you knew Liliana
from -- from way back when, is that correct?
A. (indiscernible).
Q. Say again?
A. Toddlers, we were toddlers.
THE COURT: Toddlers.
BY MR. TROIANO:
Q. Oh, since you were -- since you were young,

```
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        since you were kids. Do you recall speaking with a
        member of Mr. Hirschorn's staff with regard to this?
        A. The investigator.
            Q. I P.O. Rosetta, is that correct? That was in
        probably some time in January of this year, correct? I
        think you spoke to him twice?
    A. Probably, yes.
    Q. Okay. So you'd admit that that was the first
    time that you had ever spoken to somebody related to a
    lawyer about this case?
    A. Anybody.
    Q. Okay. And do you recall -- what's Liliana's
    name?
    A. Liliana.
    Q. Do you know her last name?
    A. Santos.
        Q. Okay. Do you remember in the report speaking
        with the investigator, Officer Rosetta and saying that
        her name was Liliana Garcia?
        A. Maybe I did say that?
        Q. Okay.
        A. I don't remember. You know the last, when I was
        in her class? Like, maybe I did say that.
            Q. Okay. Do you know today what her name is?
    A. Santos, Garcia, one of them.
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Q. Either one, okay.
A. I don't know.
Q. But your testimony today is that you knew her since you were toddlers, you hung out, she had been to your house, but you don't know her last name, is that correct?
A. Do you know when second, third grade was? I'm 23 like.
Q. You said that she's come to your house to have sex with your brother while you're there?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay, so you've seen her, you would admit to me that you've seen her in between that second and third grade, is that correct?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. At the time that Stephen brought Liliana over and they were in the bed, you know, that whole thing, you were staying at Bramhall, 470 Bramhall Avenue, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Two bedroom apartment mom was there?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You never had a problem with your brother having sex on your mom's bed?
A. I've had sex on my mom's bed so how could I get
A. Wright - Cross
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mad at him?
Q. Okay. And the -- all right. And at the time that this happened, Mr. Wright was not staying there, is that correct?
A. I mean he passed through but he wasn't living --
Q. All right, but he wasn't living there? A. No, he wasn't living there.
Q. Okay. So if I were to tell you that in this investigation report it says at the time speaking about this relationship at the time he and his brother were staying at their mother's apartment, you would say that this investigation report is incorrect?
A. I wouldn't say totally incorrect. I might have said that but when I meant staying, I didn't mean living, like I mean he should a emphasized, you know, living, staying, like should have said living.
Q. Okay. So if somebody were to say to you, if
Q. Okay. Your testimony is despite the fact that it says here that at times he and his brother were staying at their mother's apartment, that he was not in fact staying there. That's your testimony?
```
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A. No, he was not living there. My brother wasn't living there.
Q. All right. And that was 470--
A. He couldn't be on the lease, he's, he got charges so he can't even be on the lease. Can't even put his name on the lease. He wasn't technically even allowed in the house but that's her son, so it ain't like she going kick him out.
Q. Okay. But he wasn't staying there. Okay. And it's your testimony that you had a conversation with Liliana Garcia Santos, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Somewhat recently, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, wouldn't it be accurate that you had a conversation with her back in 2006 about this case? A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you asked her what, you know, what was going on, what were these charges about, yes?
A. Yes, uh-huh, yes.
Q. Okay. And most recently about a month ago give or take --
A. A month?
Q. Longer?
A. Yeah.
A. Wright - Cross
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A. No, why would I ever say that (laughing).
                                MR. TROIANO: One second, Judge.
                        Nothing further.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
    Q. Antwan, are you sure that the individual that
we've been talking about today is the girl that's the
alleged victim of this case?
A. Liliana?
    Q. Liliana?
A. Yeah, I'm sure.
    Q. Whether her name is Garcia or Santos, are you
sure it's that girl?
A. Absolutely positive.
    Q. A hundred percent?
A. Couldn't be more positive.
    Q. Are you sure this is the same girl you went
to grade school with?
A. Absolutely positive.
            Q. Are you sure this is the same girl that you
saw come into the apartment with your brother on at
least two, maybe three occasions and have sex?
A. Absolutely positive.
                    MR. HIRSCHORN: Nothing further, Judge, thank
you.
RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
```
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Q. Are you as sure about that as you are about her last name?
A. No, because last name is all up in the air.
Q. Last name, you've known her for a long time but you don't know that?
A. It was second, third grade man.
Q. No further questions.
A. I ain't keeping up with nobody.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. You hang out with a lot of people on the street, right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. You know all their last names?
A. Phew.
Q. How do you know a lot of people? What do you
call them?
A. Nicknames, first names.
Q. Nicknames, first names?
A. Whatever we call them on the street.
Q. Still friends with those people?
A. I just found out Scoop name was Waring (laughing).
Q. If I brought him in court, would you be able
to say who he was though?
A. Scoop?
Q. Yeah.
A. Yeah.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Nothing further, Judge,
thanks.
THE COURT: You're excused, sir, thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: No problem.
(On the record discussion at sidebar)
MR. HIRSCHORN: I just need a couple of
minutes to check with this other kid, see if he's -- he should be here shortly.

You want to send them downstairs for a drink or something?

THE COURT: Is anything open?
MR. HIRSCHORN: Isn't the cafeteria open?
THE COURT: No, they close at three o'clock.
MR. TROIANO: Two o'clock, three o'clock.
THE COURT: All right, I --
MR. HIRSCHORN: Just give me five minutes to make sure the kid's coming. If not, I'll have him here first thing tomorrow morning. I can do it that way.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HIRSCHORN: All right?
(Sidebar discussion ended)
THE COURT: Take about a five minute break, folks. Do not discuss the case at all. Please step
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in the jury room, okay. Thanks. We'll bring you out as soon as we're ready to go.
(Off the record/on the record)
THE COUR': We're going to adjourn for the evening, okay. Please do not discuss the case amongst yourselves, family or friends. Media as usual, I give you the same instructions. Don't do that. We're going to start tomorrow at 9:30 though, a few minutes later. 9:30. I told you last week we're Tuesday and Wednesday 10 last week and Tuesday, Wednesday of this week. We're 11 right on schedule, everything is going according to you're here we'll start promptly, okay.

Thank you very much for your attention today. (Off the record/on the record)
THE COURT: Tomorrow goes, make sure he's here, all right?

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, he's under subpoena. If it comes to it, I'm going to have to do what I got to do as far as through you. But he was served with a subpoena to be here and hasn't come yet.

THE COURT: Does he have any open warrant or anything like that? No reason for him not to come is
my question.
MR. HIRSCHORN: No, he was just C.O. at
Delaney Hall. Today he got stuck working a double shift.

THE COURT: Oh, he works in Delaney Hall?
MR. HIRSCHORN: Yeah.
THE COURT: Oh, he'll be here then. All right.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Yeah, so hopefully when he gets off today I'll be able to -- my client's probably going to be able to get ahold of him and --

THE COURT: Okay, make sure we have him here by 9:15 tomorrow, okay.

All right, good, then thank you everybody,
see you tomorrow.
MR. TROIANO: Good night, Judge.
1 shift. THE COURT: Oh, he'li of our knowledge and ability.


Date:
We, Dorothy A. Miragliotta and Donna Weber, the assigned transcribers, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings in the Hudson County Superior Court on March 23, 2010, Tape No. 106-10, Index No. 0001 to 3180-7332, Tape No. 107-10, Index No. 0001 to 6427, is prepared in full compliance with the current Transcript Format for Judicial Proceedings and is a true and accurate compressed

## sytat

1


VS.

STEPHEN WRIGH'T,
TRIAL

## Defendant.

 595 Newark Avenue:

Date: March 24, 2010
B E $F$ ORE:

HON. JOSEPH V. ISABELLA, J.S.C. and a Jury

TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:

HELEN C. GODBY, ESQ.
(Office of the Public Defender)
A P P EARANCES:

MATTHEW J. TROIANO, ESQ.
(Assistant Prosecutor for the county ofreme Attorney for the state. APFELLATE DIVSIOM
KEITH HIRSCHORN, ESQ.
(Keith Hirschorn)
Attorney for the Defendant.
MAY 102011


Transcribers Donna Weber
Dorothy A. Miragliotta
A.R.T. Agency, Inc.

4 Orchard Drive
Towaco, New Jersey 07082

Recording Operator, $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ Compressed Transcript
A.R.T. AGENCY, INC.

## The State of NJ v. Wright

SHEET 2



## Colloquy

3

1

24 talking to somebody in the back of the room, okay?
25 A. Okay, no problem.
here?
A. Yes.
Q. What's his name?
A. Stephen Wright.
Q. How long have you known Stephen?
A. Since grammar school.
Q. And what, about how old would you say?
A. Maybe about ten.
Q. Okay. Are you the same age as Stephen, are
you older, younger?
A. Yes. The same age. He's older than me by maybe
about two months I think I believe, yes.
Q. So were you guys in the same grade growing
up?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know somebody by the name of Liliana
Santos?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you know her?
A. She chills -- excuse me, she hangs out in the same
area where I hang out at.
Q. Okay. Did you know her before hanging out?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. When did you know her from?
Parsons - Direct
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A. We grew up together.
Q. Okay. Is she the same age as you? Is she
older, younger?
A. No, she's younger than us.
Q. She's younger?
A. Yes.
Q. Did she go to the same school?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know any other members of her family?
Yes.
Q. Who do you know?
A. I know her two brothers.
Q. What are their names?
A. Marceleno (phonetic) and Macho.
Q. And how do you know those guys?
A. We went to school together too.
Q. Did they hang out on the block?
A. Yes.
Q. Did Liliana hang out on the block?
A. Yes.
Q. What is your -- we're calling it the block
like everybody knows what we're talking about. Where
did you all hang out?
A. Communipaw and VanHorn Avenue.
Q. Is that the area you grew up in?
A. Yes.
Q. And you used to hang out there about how frequently?
A. Well, every day.
Q. Every day?
A. Yes.
Q. Did Stephen used to hang out there a lot?
A. Yes.
Q. Did -- do you know his brother, Antwan?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he hang out there as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know somebody by the name of Anthony

Waring or Scoop or Swoop?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he hang out there as well?
A. Yes.
Q. He grew up in the neighborhood as well,
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. At some point in time you started to
say later in life Liliana hung out in that area?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew her?
A. Yes.
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19 A. Yes.
20 Q. What was that?

1
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A. Yes.
Q. Do you know where Stephen was when that started to circulate the block?
A. No.
Q. Was he still hanging out on the block?
A. Yes, he still was out there.
Q. Okay. Did anybody ever approach you and ask
you about this situation back in 2006?
A. Yes.

MR. TROIANO: Objection, Judge.
THE COURT: What he asked was okay. BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. They did?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was it -- strike that.

THE COURT: Next question I'll sustain.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Yeah, that's why I stopped,
Judge. Strike that.
BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. At some point it time did it come to your knowledge that Stephen got arrested?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was in jail, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And he's been in jail ever since?
A. Yes.
Q. And did it -- at that point in time did you find out any details about what the accusation was?
A. No, just word of mouth like.
Q. Okay. It was word of mouth that there was an accusation?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was circulating around the block?
A. Yes.
Q. And where was Stephen at this time?
A. He was arrested then. He was in jail.
Q. He was in jail. So at that time he was no
longer hanging out on the block?
A. No.
Q. Are you presently employed?
A. Yes.
Q. Where do you work?

MR. TROIANO: Objection, Judge.
THE COURT: He can answer the question.
BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q. Where do you work?
A. Delaney Hall.
Q. And what do you do over there?
A. I'm a operations counselor.
Q. And Delaney Hall is over by the Hudson County
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Jail?
A. Essex County Jail.
Q. Essex County Jail, excuse me. I'm thinking of Talbot (phonetic) Hall, I apologize.

Are -- as you sit here today, have you had any conversations with Liliana Santos subsequent to November of 2006?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Have you spoken with her brother, Marceleno,

10 or Macho?
11 A. Brief, hi, bye, what's up, what's going on. But
12 not about this situation, no.
Q. That was my next question. At no point in
time did one of her two brothers ask you about this situation?
A. No.
Q. At no point in time did they bring up this accusation to you?
A. No.
Q. As you sit here today, are you certain that Liliana Santos knew Stephen Wright back in 2006?
A. Yes, I'm positive.
Q. Are you certain that you saw them hugging?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you certain that you saw them flirting?

```
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A. Yes.
                MR. HIRSCHORN: No further questions, Judge.
                Thank you.
CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
            Q. Mr. Parsons, my name is Matt Troiano, I'm an
assistant Prosecutor here.
A. Okay.
            Q. You realize and you know today that Mr.
    Wright has been charged with the sexual assault of
    Liliana Santos, is that correct?
    A. Yes, I understand.
            Q. And -- and obviously you were not there that
night, you would admit that?
A. Yes.
    Q. So you don't know if he did or did not
    sexually assault her?
    A. No, I don't.
            Q. It'd be fair to say that the purpose of your
        testimony here today is to -- to talk about this
        relationship between them, is that correct?
        A. Yes.
            Q. Okay. How long have you known Mr. Wright?
    A. Like I said, about grammar school, ten years old.
            Q. And how old are you now?
    A. Twenty-five.
```
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            Q. Okay. So awhile you've known him?
    A. Yes.
            Q. Would you consider him a good friend?
    A. Yes.
        Q. You obviously realize that these are serious
    charges?
    A. Yes, I understand.
            Q. And if he were to be found guilty, he could
    go to prison for a long time?
    A. Yes, I know.
            Q. And it'd be fair to say that you don't want
    to see that happen to your friend, correct?
    A. No.
            Q. I have a report here from a Mr. or Mrs.,
    excuse me, Rosetta from December 15th, 2009. Do you
    remember speaking with somebody by the name of that,
    Rosetta?
    A. Rosetta? Not that I recall, no.
        Q. Somebody with Mr. Hirschorn's office?
    A. Rosetta? An investigator? I'm not --
        Q. An investigator.
    A. Yes.
        Q. Okay. With regard to this case?
    A. Yes.
        Q. All right. And -- and correct me if I'm
    wrong, but this was December 2009, three or four months
ago?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. It's your testimony, it was your
testimony on direct examination that shortly after this
incident happened, word started to circulate around
the, around the block of these allegations, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. That Liliana was accusing Mr. Wright
of sexually assaulting her?
A. Yes.
Q. And you knew then, it's your testimony that
you knew then that they were having this relationship,
that they knew each other, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And you would agree with me that
you never went about telling an investigator or police
officer or Prosecutor, nobody?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Mr. Hirschorn asked you when it was
that -- he tried to, tried to get a little timeframe
out of you, when it was that Mr. Wright was in jail.
Do you know when he was in jail?
24 A. Yes.
25
Q. When was that? When did he go into jail?
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A. If I'm not mistaken, well I know, early 2007 if
I'm not mistaken.
Q. January?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Okay. And if you know, this event, sexual
assault, happened in November of 2006.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Would you agree with me?
A. If it happened, yes.
Q. Okay. Just the date, November 2006?
A. Yes.
Q. It's your testimony that nothing happened, no
word of mouth, nothing on the street for those two
months between November and January?
A. Yes.
Q. You never heard anything?
A. Nothing.
Q. Okay. It wasn't until after he was arrested,
in jail, that people started talking about it?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you, it would be fair to say that
you did not call this investigator Rosetta, they called
you, correct?
A. Yes. Yes.
MR. TROIANO: Nothing further, Judge.

```
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                        MR. HIRSCHORN: No questions, Judge.
                        THE COURT: You're excused, sir, thanks very
much.
    THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, at this point after
the testimony of our witnesses, the defense rests.
    THE COURT: Okay. You have something?
    MR. TROIANO: Yes.
    THE COURT: Let's go.
    MR. TROIANO: Judge, at this time the State
would re-call Detective Matthew Stambuli.
        THE COURT: Detective, you were previously
sworn, correct?
        THE WITNESS: That's correct.
        THE COURT: Okay. Please.
MA T T H E W S T A M B U L I, STATE'S WITNESS,
PREVIOUSLY SWORN
        MR. TROIANO: Thank you, Judge.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
            Q Detective, please be seated. Again, I'll
remind you to keep your voice up. And, again, you've
been previously sworn.
A Yes.
    Q Detective, just a couple of questions. When
you had arrived, and I'll get to the point, when you
```
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had arrived to this crime scene on November $19 \mathrm{th}, 2006$
at 235 Arlington Avenue, did you have occasion to find
a garbage pail or a garbage basket inside Liliana
Santos's house?
A No. When we conducted our systematic check of the
residence we did not find any identifiable garbage can,
garbage pail inside the residence.
Q If you recall was there anything in the
residence that, you know, your recollection, that
garbage would have been put into?
A There may have been a bag or something to that
extent, but it was checked and there was nothing found
that appeared to have been related to this incident
whatsoever.
Q Okay. And during the course of your
investigation you canvassed the entire apartment,
correct?
A That's correct, yes.
Q Did you at ever time -- at any time, excuse
me, discover a used condom inside 235 Arlington Avenue?
A No. And if we would have it would have been
collected, photographed and everything else.
MR. TROIANO: No further questions.
CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q Good morning, Detective.

```
Stambuli - Cross
```

A Good morning.
before you arrived, correct?
A Again, before I arrived?
Q Before you arrived.
A I wouldn't have any --
Q Exactly.
A -- knowledge of that.

```
            Q Detective, you don't know what or if Liliana
        Santos did with any garbage can in that apartment
        Q So you would have no idea whether or not she
        disposed of a garbage can or of garbage or whatever it
        may be before your arrival and your photographing of
        the scene?
        A That's correct. But I did check. There is a
        garbage on the exterior of the residence that's in the
        photos. We did check that as well, and there was
        nothing like a discarded garbage pail or garbage can
        within that exterior garbage pail.
            Q The one right outside the apartment?
    A That's correct.
            Q But it's fair to say you didn't canvass the
    area to look for a disposed garbage can because there
    was no information as to that?
    A Correct.
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Nothing further, Judge, thank
                Stambuli - Cross
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    you.
            MR. TROIANO: Nothing, Judge.
            THE COURT: You're excused, sir, thank you
    very much.
            MR. TROIANO: Sidebar please, Judge.
            (THE FOLLOWING TAKES PLACE AT SIDEBAR)
                            MR. TROIANO: I think she's here. I just got
to go down to get her. Can we have five minutes.
            THE COURT: All right. And, then, after her
        we'll take five minutes than summations, right?
            MR. TROIANO: That's fine.
            THE COURT: This is your last witness?
            MR. HIRSCHORN: How long is she going to be?
            THE COURT: For me maybe ten minutes.
            (CANNOT HEAR ALL OF SIDEBAR)
            THE COURT: Then I'll tell them what's going
    on.
            MR. TROIANO: Yes.
            MR. HIRSCHORN: Okay.
        (THE FOLLOWING TAKES PLACE IN OPEN COURT)
            THE COURT: Okay, folks, this is the plan,
        okay, the State has one more witness, okay, who will be
        here in two minutes. Okay? Right after that witness
        I'm going to give both lawyers about five minutes or
        ten minutes to collect their thoughts and, then, we're
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going to have two summations. All right? After the summations I'm going to give you some time for lunch. Once you come back for lunch I'll give you my instructions and, then, you deliberate. So you should get the case some time this afternoon. But that's our plan for the rest of the day, okay? Right now while the Prosecutor goes downstairs and gets the witness who is being kept on the fourth floor -- third floor -they're going to bring her up. Once we get her here, bring right out, we're going to listen to her, five minute break. They'll prepare their notes. They'll do their summations then you go to lunch. Okay? Just step in the jury room for a couple of minutes right now, we'll bring you right back out in a couple of minutes.
(TAPE OFF - TAPE ON)
MR. TROIANO: Judge, thank you. At this time the State recalls Liliana Santos.

THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Santos, you previously have been sworn, okay?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.
THE COURT: Have a seat.
THE WITNESS: Okay. L I L I A N A S A N T O S, STATE'S WITNESS, PREVIOUSLY SWORN
```
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    DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TROIANO:
Q Good morning.
A Good morning.
Q Again, just speak up into the microphone so
everybody can hear you. And as the Judge said you've
previously been sworn, okay?
A Okay.
Q A few questions for you, Liliana. S. Dot's
-- or rather do you know an individual by the name of
Ant or Antoine Wright?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And how do you know him?
A He came up to me a couple of months ago.
Q Well, before we get there did you ever see
him before?
A Yeah, he's from that area.
Q Okay. You see him often, you recognize him?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Do you know his name?
A I know him by Ant. They call him Ant.
Q But you know him to be S. Dot's brother,
would that be fair to say?
A Yes.
Q Now, you indicated that he came up to you and
explain what happened there?

```

A He came up to me and he told me -MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection. MR. TROIANO: Judge, this will all come out. THE COURT: It's -- no, it's overruled. Go ahead. BY MR. TROIANO:

Q And just speak up.
A (Continued) He came -- he came up to me, he told me that he apologized for what his brother did. That he know that it was real fuck -- messed up. That he's embarrassed that that's his brother. That -- but at the end of the day that's his brother and if there's anything \(I\) can do to stop, I guess no show up in court or whatever, that I will own him. That if I need him for anything all \(I\) would have to do is call him. He says that he feels responsible for me because what his brother did was messed up. And -- but at the end of the day his mother is -- she's really stressed out about the situation and that if there's anything I can do. Basically not show up in court or whatever I can do.

Q Okay. And do you recall how this conversation -- how you got to the point that you spoke with him?
A Well, he had told Anthony to tell me that he
\[
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wanted to speak to me. So I saw him one time and he pulled me to the side, and he didn't -- he didn't come up to me cursing at me or screaming or anything. He came up to me apologizing for what his brother did.

Q Okay. So you weren't threatened in any way?
A No.
Q Okay. And had you ever had any issues with Ant or Antoine in the past?
A No, he came up to me like a month later after this happened, and he -- he approached me and he asked me if it was true what everybody was saying? And I told him, yes, it was true. And he told me that he apologizes for what his brother did. The same thing.

Q And when you say a month after, it was a month after this happened back in 2006 ? A Correct.

Q Liliana, the last time that you were here I had asked you as to whether or not you knew or had any knowledge as to whether or not these accusations got out on the street, whether or not it was talked about in the neighborhood?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And what's the answer to that question?
A Yes, it was talked about.
    \(Q\) And could you provide a time frame as to how
long it took for people to start talking about it?
A A week later I came outside and everyone was
coming up to me asking -- telling me --
                            MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection, Judge.
    A (Continued) -- asking me if I was okay --
                                    MR. TROIANO: Not for the truth, Judge.
                            THE COURT: All right. Overruled. Continue.
A (Continued) -- everyone was asking me if I was
10 okay? If they wanted me to do anything to him. And
11 stuff like that.
12 BY MR. TROIANO:
13
16 Q -- in November 2006?
17 A Yes.
18 Q We went over the layout of your apartment a
19 lot. I'd like to ask you about in November -- November
20 19th, 2006 how it was that you threw away garbage in
21 your apartment?
22 A I had a little pail. But when I would take the
23 pail outside I would have a little plastic bag hanging,
24 like on the doorknob or something.
25 Q Okay.
```
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        A And, then, I would just take it out.
            Q So you had one pail?
        A Yes.
            Q Okay. And I'd like to show you what has been
    marked as --
            MR. TROIANO: Pardon me, Judge.
            MR. HIRSCHORN: What number?
            MR. TROIANO: S-2 for identification.
    BY MR. TROIANO:
            Q Do you remember looking at this picture?
    A Yes.
            Q Okay. And all these circles and writings are
    yours, is that correct?
    A Yes.
            Q All right. There's a garbage pail there, is
    that correct?
A Yes.
Q Is this the pail that you're referring to?
A Yes.
Q Okay. At some point was this inside of your
house?
A Yes.
Q But how did it get out there?
A I put it out there.
Q Okay. And when -- when did you do that?

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & A I'm not exactly sure when, but it couldn't have \\
\hline 2 & been took long after. I think the day before this \\
\hline 3 & happened I must have took it outside. \\
\hline 4 & Q Okay. After you were assaulted that night \\
\hline 5 & did you go about taking this pail outside and placing \\
\hline 6 & it on the curb -- \\
\hline 7 & A No. \\
\hline 8 & Q -- or patio, whatever you call that? \\
\hline 9 & A No. \\
\hline 10 & Q Okay. So no pail inside besides that? \\
\hline 11 & A No. \\
\hline 12 & Q And you would use garbage bags to throw away \\
\hline 13 & your garbage? \\
\hline 14 & A Yes. \\
\hline 15 & Q To your knowledge on the morning of November \\
\hline 16 & 19 th, 2006 was there a used condom in one of those \\
\hline 17 & garbage bags? \\
\hline 18 & A No. \\
\hline 19 & Q Did you yourself ever find a used condom? \\
\hline 20 & A No. A ( \({ }^{\text {a }}\) \\
\hline 21 & Q Did you ever throw away a used condom? \\
\hline 22 & A No. \\
\hline 23 & Q Okay. Did you ever flush one down the \\
\hline 24 & toilet? \\
\hline 25 & A No. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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1 Q Had you ever been to \(S\). Dot -- \(S\). Dot's
2 mother's house at 470 Bramhall Avenue?
3 A No.
Q Never once?
A Never.
Q Do you know where he lives?
A Now, I do.
Q In November of 2006 did you know where he
lived?
10 A No.
11 Q Were you having a relationship with him on
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Q If somebody were to come in here and say that
A No.
Q Did you sleep with him five times?
A No.
Q Did you guys ever have sex?
A No.
Q Did you guys ever kiss, hug, make out, anything like that --
A Nothing --
Q -- on the street?
A \(\quad-\quad\) no, no. you did have a relationship with him would that be accurate?

\section*{Santos - Direct/Cross}
```

A No.
MR. TROIANO: No further questions.
CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q You told me the last time you were here you
know Davon Parsons, right?
A I know --
Q Davon Parsons, excuse me?
A I know his name now after Matt told me his name.
But before I only knew him by face.
Q Okay. You would agree with me that he hung
out in the same area as you?
A Correct.
Q So if he came in here and said that you were
on the street and he saw you hugging Steven Wright
before November he's lying?
A Correct.
Q Okay. And Antoine Wright or Ant came in
here, despite coming in -- coming to you and saying
drop the charges, this, that and the other, if he came
in here and said you had a relationship with his
brother, he'd be lying?
A He would be lying.
Q If he said you went to 470 Bramhall and had
sex in Steven Wright's mother's bed he would be lying?
A Yes, he would be lying.

```
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        Q If he came in here and said he knows you from
        P.S. 22 he'd be lying about that too?
        A No, I don't think he would be lying about that. I
        went to P.S. 22 School.
            Q And you're the same age as him, right,
        Antoine Wright or Ant?
        A I'm not sure we're the same age.
            Q Okay. What are your brothers' names?
        A My brother?
            Q Your brother?
            A My brother's name is Marsolino Ramos and Eddie
            Berdal (phonetic) Ramos.
            Q Okay. Does one of them go by Macho?
            A Correct.
            Q Okay. Do you know that your brother knows
        both Steven Wright and Antoine Wright?
        A He prob --
        Q Brothers.
    A -- he probably does.
        Q Do you know when you talked about that after
        Antoine approached you back in November of 2006 did you
        tell your brothers about this?
        A No, I didn't.
        Q Never told your brothers?
```
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A He's -- he does drugs. He be out on the street.
```

I don't even speak to him.
Q He's your brother though, right?
A Yeah, he's my brother.
Q And you would agree that your brother if you
told him or somebody else told him --
A I never told --
Q -- you were raped --
A -- him anything.
Q I didn't say you did. I said you would agree
with me that if you did tell him or if someone else
told him that $S$. Dot, a guy he knows on the block,
raped you, he'd be upset about that, right?
A I don't know what he would be because he's

```
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        bipolar. So I don't know what he would be feeling.
            Q So you don't think that your brother would be
        mad?
        A Of course.
            Q Okay. Do you think that he would do
        something about it?
        A I don't know.
            Q Okay. That's fair. Now, this pail that
        we're talking about, did you ever search that pail on
        November 19th?
        A Did I search it?
            Q Yeah, did you look through it?
    A No.
            Q Did you empty it?
    A No.
            Q I'll show you what's been marked S-2 for
        identification -- sorry about that -- is that the pail
        you're referring to, the one to the right as you're
        looking at the picture?
        A Yes.
            Q Does it look like there's things in that
        garbage pail?
        A Yes.
            Q It doesn't look like it was emptied by
    anybody, correct?
1 A No. And that's the pail that was at some point
2 inside your apartment?
Santos - Cross 33
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2 him?
3 A Not that I know of.
4 Q Did anybody ever do anything to help you out
5 in November of 2006?
6 A I told them it was being taken care of by the 7 police.
8 Q But now you understand it wasn't really taken
9 care of by the police, right, back in November of 2006 ?
10 A Well, the -- Shanda Rosario told me that she was 11 going to take care of it and they were going to find 12 him.
13 Q And Shanda Rosario, again, told you that S.
14 Dot was Steven Wright, right?
15 A Correct.
16 Q Back in November of 2006?
17 A Yes.
\(18 \quad 2\) And she knew his name?
19 A Yes.
\(\begin{array}{lll}20 & \text { Q } \\ 21 & \text { No. }\end{array}\)
22 MR. TROIANO: Judge, we are completely
23 outside of the scope of the --
24
25

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, that's fine.
THE COURT: Overruled.
```

BY MR. HIRSCHORN:
Q Did she tell you where he lived?
A No.
Q But she knew his name and she told you?
A Yes.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Nothing further, Judge.
Thank you very much.
MR. TROIANO: Thank you.
THE COURT: You're excused. Thank you very
much for coming.
THE COURT: All right, folks, this is what
we're going to do. I'm going to give the lawyers a few
minutes to review their notes, then you're going to
have two summations. Then lunch, okay. So just step
in the jury room for a couple minutes, we'll bring you
right back out. Thank you. Do not discuss the case at
all.
(Off the record/on the record)
MR. TROIANO: Judge, how would you like to
address evidence?
THE COURT: We didn't do that yet?
MR. TROIANO: No.
THE COURT: All right, what are you going to
move into evidence?
MR. TROIANO: S-1 through four; S-7 through

```
```
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    15. THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. HIRSCHORN: To the photos, Judge? I
believe those are all photos, correct?
MR. TROIANO: Correct.
MR. HIRSCHORN: No, no objection, Judge.
THE COURT: One through four, seven through
15?
MR. TROIANO: Correct. Then S-17 and 18 are
also photos.
MR. HIRSCHORN: No objection to those, Judge.
MR. TROIANO: S-19 is the blow-up. S-20A, B
and C are the shirt and the packaging. S-22 is a
photo, S-22, S-23, S-24 are photos of the fingerprints.
S-25 is an additional photo. That's it.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, no objection to any of
the photos. Judge, I believe the shirt was S-20,
correct?
MR. TROIANO: Yes.
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. HIRSCHORN: And the other A, B, and C are
just the packaging?
THE COURT: Correct.
MR. TROIANO: Correct.
```


Summations came in as I listened and took notes.

Certainly you guys, the 14 of you, men and women, are the judges of the facts here. The Judge will instruct you on the law, it's your recollection of the facts that rules.

If you think that I say something that's not accurate, go with your recollection. If you think that there's something that I say that is accurate or is important, stick with that recollection.

But certainly it's up to you 14 ladies and
gentlemen to go by what you remember took place here.
Now, before I go into the actual testimony,
there's one other thing I wanted to hit on. Eirst of
all, what I'm about to say to you, ladies and

Summations
gentlemen, isn't evidence. What Mr. Troiano will say to you is not evidence either.

The evidence in this case is over. What's for your consideration what will be given to you in the jury room, I know some of you were interested in actually seeing these photos. I'm going to show them to you now, some of them, and they're all going to go in with you. That's what we just did, we marked those into evidence.

But our closing arguments, just like I said to you during our openings, those aren't evidence. These are just what we believe is important. I'm going to tell you what I believe is important and Mr. Troiano gets his opportunity to do the same.

The reason that I get to go first, ladies and gentlemen, as you all remember, I went second the last time, is because the burden in this case is on the State. Beyond a reasonable doubt. It's a serious burden. I'm sure Mr. Troiano from listening to many of these closing arguments from the State is going to tell you how he stands by that burden, he knows it's a hard burden and he believes he can meet it. He's going to go through the elements of the crimes and tell you how he satisfies each of those elements.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's Mr. Troiano's
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burden. He has to prove to you each and every element of each and ever crime to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt.

In this case, there's two crimes. Aggravated sexual assault and burglary. You'll hear when the Judge instructs you on the law that there's what's called lesser included offenses that comprise different facts. And those are for your consideration as well.

But certainly you will hear that later and that's when you listen to it, you listen to what the Judge tells you when he instructs you on the law. And the Judge will tell you exactly what the law is to each of these crimes and their lesser included offenses.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the first thing I want to hit on as far as the testimony is you ladies and gentlemen heard that the parties entered into what's called stipulation. You'll also have this. It's been marked Court's exhibit one and the reason it's marked Court's exhibit is because it's an agreement between myself and Mr. Troiano that certain facts are true.

The fact that we agreed upon is true is that the blood on Liliana Santos' white camisole belonged to Stephen Wright.

> I'll get to the reason later, ladies and
    gentlemen, why we didn't make the State bring in their
    experts to testify to how DNA is done and how blood is
    collected. Because as you heard Mr. Wright say, he
    admitted the blood on her shirt was his. There's a
    reason it was on her shirt, and he gave you that
    explanation. But we'll get to that later.
        The second part of the stipulation is also
    very important. And it discusses the condom that
    Detective Stambuli decided to pick up off the road from
10 about 100 yards away or 100 feet away. And that was
11 tested and it came back untestable (phonetic).
    So ladies and gentlemen, basically what that tested and it came back untestable (phonetic).

So ladies and gentlemen, basically what that means is that the State doesn't know whose it was, whose DNA was in there. They couldn't test it, they couldn't figure it out.

Now the first witness that you all heard from was Liliana Santos. Liliana Santos got on the stand and told you a story. She told you what she believed happened back in November of 2006 with many tears, with some emotion. And if it happened that way, ladies and gentlemen, I submit to you that you should have been emotional as well. If it happened that way, if that happened, then this is a sad situation and you should find Mr. Wright guilty.

But ladies and gentlemen, it didn't happen
Summations
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2 like Liliana Santos said. Liliana Santos got on the
3 stand and testified about that night, about before that

Let's get to the pictures that you guys were so interested in. I saw you looking along. S-14, picture of the window. You'll get it inside if you can't see it clearly. It's a little small and hazy. Detective Stambuli and Liliana Santos agreed the only way that someone could have entered through that window is to break that window.

First of all, take out the screen, break that window. Couldn't climb through, shards of glass, too small. Stephen Wright's not a small guy. Couldn't climb through. So the individual if they entered through that window lifted the screen, broke the window from the outside, lifted the window, climbed through the window, took the time in the pitch black of a closet to turn around, close the window, lock the window, and then go in to rape somebody.

Ladies and gentlemen, in our law, rape is about as serious a crime as you can be charged with. I'd submit to you that murder is about the only thing worse, if worse. If worse.

This individual took the time to lock a window. Detective Stambuli searched that window, he told you about how he fingerprints and all the things he does. No prints on the lock, no prints on this window that was lifted up. No prints that are
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discernible anywhere.
The only thing we have is Liliana Santos telling the police she believed that somebody touched the wine chiller. Police, Detective Stambuli and his partner at the time, pulled those prints. No match.

Ladies and gentlemen, we all watch shows on
TV like C.S.I., Law and Order. They talked about DNA evidence. That's what C.S.I.'s all about. They think that you can pull prints from anything. You can't. 10 But you certainly can pull a print if he, stephen 11 Wright touched those. No doubt about that. That's a
12 flat surface that somebody, I submit to you when I
13 close my eyes can go like this or go like this.
14 There'd be fingerprints on that.
He looked. There were none.
Now Liliana Santos, again, gave a whole story about how this took place, how the individual came into her room, put his hands around her neck and told her to shut the fuck up. That's what she said.

She goes to the hospital. No injury. No contusions to the neck. No contusions to the arm where she's allegedly being held down. No injury to her private area where they do the rape kit.

No injury, no DNA. She says she thinks that this individual used a condom. They check as Nurse

Richardson said when she got up here, extensively during the rape kit, just in case that wasn't the -wasn't the situation. They don't find anything.

Now ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to take a step back here for one second, and this goes along with my argument about the window. Someone broke into a house, put their arms around somebody and choked them. And while they're doing this, to rape them, decided to open and put on a condom? Seems a little strange to me, ladies and gentlemen. Doesn't make sense.

And that's what you see throughout Liliana's testimony. Did she go to the -- to the hospital? She certainly did. Did she tell the nurse her story? She certainly did. Did she continue at the Prosecutor's Office after that? At that time she did. Do I know why she came in here and made up this story? I have absolutely no idea.

Was she disturbed that Mr. Wright didn't want to be with her or that he no longer wished to have any kind of a relationship with her other than of a sexual nature? I don't know.

As a matter of fact, I would submit that none of us know. But that's not really for our consideration here. Liliana Santos got up on this stand and pinned herself in to the story of she didn't
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know S.DOT or Stephen Wright before that day, never spoke to him other than to say what's up.

So, this isn't a situation where you, ladies and gentlemen, should go back there and consider did she let Stephen Wright in and then say no at some point or did he continue after she said no. This isn't that situation. Liliana Santos didn't say that. She said Stephen Wright broke into her apartment and raped her. But she couldn't identify him.

And ladies and gentlemen, this kind of goes to this whole thing about who told her what his real name was. She knew him and she tells Detective Rosario as S.DOT. Liliana Santos testified not once, but twice, that in November of 2006, either the day of or the day after, that Detective, now Sergeant, Shonda Rosario told her that \(S\).DOT was Stephen Wright.

Nobody arrested him. Nobody went to the block that he told you he hung out on before and after. Never left that area until he was arrested on the other charge that we've already discussed. The reason he's in jail today. He pled guilty to another offense, he was in jail, he admitted his quilt, he was in jail.

At that point in time, a year and a month later, the State decides to charge Mr. Wright with this crime. Now ladies and gentlemen, either the State

Something's not right here, ladies and gentlemen. Something isn't right that this took a year for the State to finally be convinced that Stephen Wright should be charged with this crime.

Now, a couple of things also about Liliana Santos' testimony. Liliana Santos testified before you, ladies and gentlemen, that she left the white shirt on the bathroom floor because she took a shower after this incident took place because she felt dirty. That was her testimony.

Detective Stambuli got in and told you that he found the white shirt in this plastic bag. Meaning that Liliana Santos took the affirmative step after she had suffered this traumatic event to pick up this white tee shirt off the bathroom floor, throw it in a plastic bag and put it on top of the wine chiller so the police could come and collect it.

That doesn't add up again with the state of
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mind that you heard she was in throughout this. You heard Nurse Richardson say two hours, three hours later she was visibly upset and shaking. But she took the time to collect evidence? Doesn't add up. Now, ladies and gentlemen you heard some testimony about a garbage can. Those are the two garbage cans. The small one is the one that Liliana stated was in her kitchen, that she removed and put outside some days earlier. In that garbage can is
10 trash. Did Detective Stambuli search through that? I
11 don't know. I don't remember if you ladies and
12 gentlemen know either.
Stephen Wright testified before you, ladies

He told you he put the condom in the wastebasket and he left.

He told you the truth, even though he sat here for a week and listened to all the testimony about how there was nothing found related to him other than the blood. And this and that and the other, and there was no condom found in the apartment, only a wrapper of the condom.

Yet, he still told you the truth and told you he put the condom in the garbage pail and left.

Ladies and gentlemen, he gave you an explanation for this window. He told you, Liliana Santos was reluctant to let him leave. He told you he got angry. He told you that he wanted his things back and he wanted to go. He was having problems with his girlfriend. He told you he punched that window from the inside. He told you he cut his hand. He told you he took the clothes from Liliana and believes his hand brushed up against her shirt. He told you he pulled back after he punched the window and he was bleeding.

All consistent with the blood on her shirt.
Detective Stambuli told you there was no blood anywhere else in the apartment. Wasn't bleeding profusely, blood didn't drip in the closet, blood didn't drip in the hallway. No blood in the bedroom.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Summations \\
\hline 1 & No DNA. Speaking of Detective stambuli, I \\
\hline 2 & was a little bit outraged, ladies and gentlemen, and I \\
\hline 3 & hope you are as well, that we live here in a time that \\
\hline 4 & a detective from the Prosecutor's Office is going to \\
\hline 5 & tell you that he collected a piece of evidence where \\
\hline 6 & an alleged rape took place on a bed, he collected the \\
\hline 7 & sheets because he thought it was important, and the \\
\hline 8 & State Police are too busy to test it? \\
\hline 9 & It would be one thing, good for the state if \\
\hline 10 & evidence came back and pointed to Stephen Wright. But \\
\hline 11 & what if evidence came back and pointed to a third \\
\hline 12 & person, not Anthony Waring, not Stephen Wright, \\
\hline 13 & somebody else? Wouldn't that have been important here? \\
\hline 14 & I think so. And Detective Stambuli obviously thought \\
\hline 15 & so or else he would have left it there. But he didn't \\
\hline 16 & do that. State Police was too busy to look into this. \\
\hline 17 & It's a little outrageous, ladies and \\
\hline 18 & gentlemen. Now, ladies and gentlemen, as I started and \\
\hline 19 & I'll finish. I don't know why Liliana Santos lied to \\
\hline 20 & you. I don't know why Liliana Santos wouldn't come in \\
\hline 21 & here and admit that she went to grammar school with \\
\hline 22 & Antwan Wright, that she knew Davon Parsons and Antwan \\
\hline 23 & Wright, that they all hung out on the street, that she \\
\hline 24 & knew them by face. She wouldn't even admit that. She \\
\hline 25 & wouldn't admit that she knew Stephen Wright. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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Antwan Wright came in here, because I asked him to. He came in here to testify for his brother. No way around that. This is his brother. Does he have motivation to testify and help his brother? Of course he does, it's his brother. Does he want to see his brother get in any more trouble? Of course not. It's his brother.

But Mr. Troiano asked him if he'd do anything for his brother and I think he was quite candid with you when he said there's limits. Why would he come in here and say I heard him have sex on two or three occasions in my mother's house, in my mother's bed? Tell you ladies and gentlemen that. He could have come in here and said I saw them hang out on the block, I know they touched once or twice on the block. I know they kissed. He didn't say that. He said he heard them have sex, saw them walk in, heard them have sex in the mother's bed.

Why? Why go that far? Why make that up? All in my opinion the defense needed to show you, ladies and gentlemen, that Liliana Santos was lying is that these two people knew each other. We could go a step further than that. We could bring in Antwan Wright, and prove to you, ladies and gentlemen, that they not only knew each other, but they had a
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relationship. And a sexual relationship at that.
Had Davon Parsons come in here, took his time off from work. Again, why didn't he tell anybody back then? I guess the same reason Liliana Santos told nobody. I don't know. The streets talk, they hear things, did they go to police as Mr. Troiano asked? No. Doesn't work like that I submit, ladies and gentlemen, here in Jersey City. You don't just go to the police. You wait to be contacted by somebody.

I reached out to Davon Parsons because I knew he had information that would help you ladies and gentlemen in your determination. So I brought him here. I made him take a day off work, made him come here. He came in, he testified. Ask yourselves, what motivation does he have?

It's his friend, who he hasn't seen in a long time. They've been friends a long time. Ask yourselves, are you going to come in here, risk your job, lie on the stand, just to help out a friend? Make something up completely? Why would he make it up? He didn't tell you ladies and gentlemen he saw them have sex or heard them have sex. He gave you the other side. Yes, she was on the block all the time. I know her brothers. We all hung out together. I know Anthony Waring. We all hung out together.

These people were chilling, were flirting, were hugging. That's what he came in here and told you. Again, Liliana Santos got on the stand and claimed to you ladies and gentlemen that she didn't know Stephen Wright. She knew him as S. DOT. That goes back again to how she found out his real name. Because we know that Sergeant Rosario didn't tell her. But yet she knew that day. Somehow, some way, she knew that day. She told you that.

Now ladies and gentlemen, you all have a difficult situation and decision to make here, because you've got to decide did Liliana Santos come in here and tell you the truth, the complete truth, or did Liliana Santos come in here and not tell you the complete truth. You've been presented with witnesses and evidence that shows that she didn't. If you lie about one thing, and you're caught in a lie about one thing, that's for your determination as to whether or not you're lying about other things.

But again, I don't know why she's doing what she's doing. I don't. I know that this man had sex with her that night. I know that this man was let in that apartment. I know that this man left that apartment after punching that window.

And by the way, what happened to dusting the
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doorknobs for fingerprints? He left through the door, had to grab the doorknob. Didn't find anything there either.

So ladies and gentlemen, Stephen Wright told you the truth. That truth was corroborated by his friend and his brother. He told you what happened that night. He can't provide you with an explanation for what Liliana Santos did. And like I said before, folks, either can I.

All he can do is tell you the truth.

And I submit to you that's what he did.
So I'd just ask when you ladies and gentlemen go back to that jury room and start your deliberations, that you consider everything that I've said. That you consider everything Mr. Troiano says as well, the Judge's law, but don't leave one thing out here. Because there's one thing that each of the 14 of you have in common. And that's common sense. We all come here with common sense; we all leave with common sense. And ask yourselves if common sense tells you that this happened the way Liliana Santos said.

And I submit to you that after you do that, and after you've considered all the evidence, the arguments of counsel, and the law of the Judge, that you'll return a verdict of not guilty to all counts.

Thank you again.
THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
SUMMATION BY MR. TROIANO:
MR. TROIANO: Judge, Mr. Hirschorn, ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon.

Let me first thank you again as Mr. Hirschorn
did. You've been here about a week. You've sat in these, in this box, you've sat in those chairs, you've heard serious, serious allegations. It has been emotional at times. We've seen it in your face.

You are going to be asked in hopefully for your sake maybe about 15 minutes or so to first listen to some jury, to some jury instructions and then to go and deliberate, render a verdict, all right.

And when \(I\) began my opening a week ago, I said to you that there were certain things that you needed to remember. Ways in which that \(I\) suggested to you that you should approach this case. Kind of like the who, what, when, where and why that you learned when you were little kids, all right.

Who tells you things, why do they tell you things, when did they tell you things, how did they tell you things. I asked you when you listen to each and every one of the witnesses to think about those things. And I ask you again, that when you go back
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into that jury room use that who, what, when, where, why, how, when you deliberate. When you think about this case.

I have every confidence, ladies and gentlemen, that you are going to return a verdict of guilty. I don't waver when \(I\) say that, I don't hesitate. I listened to the same arguments, I listened to the same testimony, I have no doubt.

I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that on November 19th, 2006, Liliana Santos' home was broken into. All right. You'll see pictures of that. You'll remember her testimony, you'll remember the testimony of others. Permission was not given, ladies and gentlemen. She didn't allow anybody into her house. She didn't allow anybody through her window into the closet. Her house was broken into, okay. That's burglary.

Broken into with intent to commit a crime when you're inside. That's burglary. He's also been charged with aggravated sexual assault, and \(I\) would submit to you that he is guilty of that. I would submit to you that on November 19th, 2006, S.DOT Stephen Wright broke into that house, sexually assaulted, raped, Liliana Santos.

I would submit to you that we know that
through the testimony. We know that Liliana was living there November 19th, 2006. We know that she was living there for a short period of time. She testified that not many people had been over there. She testified that on the 19th, she went, or rather on the 18 th first, she went to a baby shower. She was downtown Jersey City. She eventually met up with Anthony Waring. Earlier in the day she saw S.DOT. She meets up with Anthony Waring. S.DOT's still in that same area, right.

This nonsense about her not knowing him is an argument that's being made by counsel, but she admits to you I mean she knows who the guy is. She's seen him on the street. She doesn't know his first name, she doesn't know his last name, she doesn't know where he lived, but she knows who he is. Much the same with Ant or Mr. Parsons. They know each other. They know who they are, all right. They don't know anything about their family life, they don't know where they live, but they know who they are.

So she's out that night, S.DOT's out that night, she goes home with Mr. Waring. You heard her, they had sex. At some point he decides to leave, she hangs out for a little while, no broken window at this point. Mr. Waring leaves, everything's fine, she
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smokes a cigarette, she hangs by the window, eventually she goes to bed and leaves the TV on.

And she told you what happened from there.
And she told you how somebody entered her apartment, grabbed her neck, ultimately bent her over, pulled down her pants and raped her.

Now, it would be safe to say that at this point the stories that you've heard have gone in two separate directions. I'll admit that. I would submit to you though, ladies and gentlemen, I would submit to you, that at some point in that night, while Mr. Wright, S.DOT, was down at Communipaw and Halladay, Marjay's, wherever he was, he saw Liliana and probably got it in his mind to do something with her, all right. Not the way he says, but to go to that house.

I submit to you that he was living at that time on Bramhall Avenue which is probably about a half a mile away, right down the street. I submit to you that later on in the night he made his way over to 235 Arlington Avenue.

I submit to you that he probably knew that she lived there, all right, because it's basically the same neighborhood. I submit to you that he probably knew that she lived by herself. I submit to you that he arrived, he got there, maybe he saw Anthony Waring
leave, maybe he saw her smoking a cigarette, but I submit to you that towards the later portions of that night, S.DOT went to that window, all right.

And I'll submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that it's fair for you to infer that he probably started at the other window. Probably looked through there first. Probably realized that there was light from the TV, light possibly from the bathroom, said this is probably not a good idea, okay.

And let me just say this right now. I cannot
speak to what somebody like this or why someone like this would do this.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Objection, Judge.
THE COURT: Overruled. Continue.
MR. TROIANO: I can't speak to that, all right. I can't give you motivation. I can't do it, all right. This is the type of crime that has no motivation that \(I\) could speak to.

But I would submit he's probably looking in that window and he's probably seeing the lights on, all right, and he probably waits there for a little while and at some point realizes that there's no movement anymore.

So, he doesn't think that this is a good window, because it obviously leads right into the
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59 living room. So he moves over to the right. And he probably looks in and he sees immediately that this is some sort of closet area. It's dark in there, right? So if he were to break in and get inside the apartment, he's not going to be seen, he's in the closet. All right, there's water heaters, there's pipes.

Pushes up the screen. Screen has no locking mechanism. And busts the window. Whether or not he busts it with his hand, with his elbow, I have no idea. He testified on -- on cross examination that he had a scar on his hand. I don't know if you believe him or not. Okay.

But the window's broken. I would submit that he reaches in, thumbs the locking mechanism, raises the window, climbs in, probably moves that pail because 16 it's in the way, all right. Climbs in, shuts it.
17 Reason why he locks it? No idea. But the window's 18 locked. the screen is because if you were looking at the house from the street without the screen, you would just see broken glass, all right, and that would probably tip some people that something's going on here, all right.

So he shuts the screen, kind of blocks it. I would submit to you ladies and gentlemen, that he walks
into that house, opens up those closet doors, and there's some light. And I would submit to you that he strategically walks through and shuts the lights off. Shuts the light off in the bathroom or the kitchen, whatever was on. Ultimately gets to the end of the apartment, hits the light for the TV.

I would submit to you at this point he goes up to Liliana, grabs here by the neck, struggle ensues, she's thrown off the bed, she's thrown back on the bed, she's thrown on her stomach, her pants are removed, his pants are moved, and he rapes her.

Okay? Why he took a condom out and put it on, I have no idea, all right. I don't know if rape is practice safe sex or not. No idea. But he did, all right.

Or she said I think he was wearing a condom. Condom wrapper is left there, Magnum condom wrapper left on the floor. Condom outside, all right. And the significance of the condom outside is this, ladies and gentlemen. He tells you that his mother lives down the street to the left on Bramhall Avenue. He denied that he was living there. We know from his brother that he was. And I'll get to that.

But he ran down the street, Liliana saw him running down the street and \(I\) would submit to you
ladies and gentlemen, that he chucks a condom, all
1
2 right. He doesn't flush it there, he doesn't leave it
\[
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subjects herself to a speculum and a colposcope, words I don't even understand without asking, all right. She subjects herself to some serious stuff over the course of an hour. Gives a statement.

She's then taken directly to the Hudson County Prosecutor's Office, and gives a consistent statement. Immediately. She has come to Grand Jury and testified, she said she came to meet with me five times, she sat up there through direct examination and told you all this story. She sat through cross examination and was questioned about whether or not this happened.

Now, our system allows for that and we have a wonderful system. But it'd be fair to say that she was victimized twice, all right. Because not only was she victimized in her bedroom that night, but she had to come up here and be questioned about whether or not this actually happened, all right.

And despite the minor inconsistencies that Mr. Hirschorn has done a good job of bringing out, she has said to you throughout I never had sex with this guy before, I never had a relationship, he raped me. The reason that it took 14 months to arrest him is because that is when the DNA came back saying it was him. Simple as that, all right. No conspiracies,
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nothing like that. From the moment, and Shonda Rosario testified to this, from the moment that she got the results from the State lab, she contacted Liliana and Mr. Wright was arrested.

So that's what happened. Okay. And it paints this kind of picture, all right. You're left with this picture of what happened. And lawyers sometimes use this analogy of a puzzle, all right, that you need to put the pieces of the puzzle together to get the picture. I would submit to you that I've just given you the picture. All right. And the testimony and the evidence and the exhibits were all those pieces that went together to form this picture.

I would submit to you that once you have that picture, the defense is left with a situation where they need to change those pieces, all right. They need to come up with their own pieces that fit together to get the end result, all right. The end result being here a bloody shirt, the end result being a broken window, the end result being a sexual assault, all right.

But first, think about Liliana's testimony, all right. Was it consistent, all right. Besides those small inconsistencies who called who Anthony first, where did the -- Mr. Hirschorn actually wanted
to, he wants you to find Mr. Wright not guilty because she couldn't be sure if she put the bloody shirt on the floor or she couldn't be sure if she put the bloody shirt on the, in the bag on the wine cooler. She couldn't be sure. This is a girl that ten minutes prior had been raped, but now we're asking her to remember with specificity what she did with that shirt. And if she can't remember, then this didn't happen.

Okay? Is she consistent. Has she said the same story throughout. I would submit to you that she did. Is she believable? I would submit to you that she is. Would she make this up? And that is the most important thing, or one of the most important. Because I think there's other things that are more important. Would she make this up? Is she going to make up a rape allegation, an aggravated sexual assault allegation, within a couple minutes, have a story nailed down about how this happened, just because this guy left the house? All right?

She was so pissed that he left the house after half an hour spending time together that she is going to call the cops, accuse him of rape and for three and a half years pursue that rape charge. Just because he left.

Crazy. It's crazy. It doesn't make any
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sense. Is she believable? I would submit that she is.
Think about this. What did Liliana Santos do right after this incident happened? All right, remember this. She testified that she never went back to that apartment. All right, she testified that she went in there, I think Anthony brought her back, cleared out her stuff and didn't go back. She did not go back to that apartment. And I'm sure some of you have moved before, all right. I'm sure you all
understand the inconvenience of moving, all right. You don't just pack up your stuff and up and leave the apartment just because you got in a fight with your boyfriend, or a guy you're having sex with. You don't do it, all right.

Why do you leave an apartment, on the fly, never go back? Because somebody broke into the window of your basement apartment and you're scared that he's going to come back. So you leave and you don't come back.

This is irrefutable, all right. She said this. Now, are we to think that Liliana Santos is that much of a conspirer that she knows that, you know, just to kind of support this story that I've made up, I better leave my apartment and not go back? Does that 25 make any sense? I would submit to you that it makes no
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sense. And her actions afterward show that this in fact happened.

Now, her reliance on the criminal justice system and the Prosecutor's Office, ultimately you heard from detectives from my office, all right. And right here and right now I'm the representative from the office. Liliana Santos relied on the cops for this, okay. She didn't rely on anybody else, all right. She wasn't asking for vigilante justice, she wasn't, all right. She relied on the cops.

That is what we are trained to do. If somebody victimizes us, we call the cops. We don't call the biggest guy in the neighborhood to go beat somebody up. We just don't do that, all right.

She relied on the police. She tried to help the police. She called Shonda and she said I think he's over there, go get him. She called and asked for updates, periodically throughout. She relied on us to help her.

And I would submit to you that we did exactly that. Once we got the results from the lab that that blood on that shirt was that man's, he was charged.

I would submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the reason that she didn't go after him was because she was probably scared. She said she was
}

\section*{Summations}

67
scared. Nurse Richardson said she was scared. I would submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, as much as Anthony Waring probably didn't want to admit it, he was probably scared too. He probably didn't want to go and mess around with this, okay. He had been in trouble before, he didn't want to get in trouble again.

But ultimately it comes down to what's the motivation. What's her motivation to lie? What's her motivation to come in here, subject herself to
10 questioning by everybody, reveal specific details about
11 her life, intimate details, private details that
12 otherwise she didn't have to tell any of you, any of
13 us, nobody. But she did it, all right. She did it.
14 She did it because what she said is true and she stands
15 by it.
So, we saw obviously that the defense has put
        okay. You're left with a picture of -- of a bloody
        shirts, broken glass, sexual assault allegations, and
        you need to put together new puzzle pieces to fit
        together. And that's what he did.

And I would submit to you, ladies and
Summations
    gentlemen, that he knew what that puzzle looked like.
    He knew what that picture looked like. So he had to
    step back, all right. He had to start from there and
    reverse his way back. There had to be an explanation
    for each one of those things, all right.
            And I would submit to you that you heard from
    witnesses. Now if you think about it, you heard the
bare minimum.
                            THE COURT: Come to sidebar a minute counsel,
please.
            (On the record discussion at sidebar)
            THE COURT: You can't do that.
            MR. TROIANO: Sure I can. They put it out
there.
            THE COURT: You can't say that (inaudible)
            MR. TROIANO: (inaudible)
            THE COURT: Be careful please.
                (Sidebar discussion ended)
            THE COURT: I'm sorry, continue.
            MR. TROIANO: And I would submit to you,
ladies and gentlemen, that you heard the bare minimum.
All right. There weren't details provided to you.
When asked for specifics, they were non-existent, all
right.
    These witnesses were subjected to cross
        examination. Same as my witnesses, all right. They
        should be held to that same standard, credibility,
        common sense determinations, and if they didn't answer
        those obvious questions, you have to say to yourself,
        what's going on here, all right.
            And there's a few things that \(I\) think that
        are important, all right. First of all what the Judge
        will tell you about Mr. Wright's convictions. They
        could be used all right, in a sense that he has
        disobeyed society's laws in the past, he may be less
        inclined to take that oath seriously. And the Judge
        will explain that a little bit further, okay.
            He talked to you about everybody knowing
        names, all right. Everybody said we all know each
        other, we've known each other our whole lives,
        everybody knows everybody down there. Nobody knows
        anybody's last name, first name, but everybody knows
        everybody. If Liliana Santos wanted to make up these
        allegations, finger Mr. Wright for this crime, and she
        had been to his mother's house, then why didn't she
        take Shonda Rosario to his mother's house? Why didn't
        she take him down to the block and say his name is
        Stephen Wright, he lives on Bramhall Avenue, I've known
        his brother, Ant, since we were in grade school at
        25 PS22, all right. I know he hangs out with Davon
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Parsons (phonetic). & Summations \\
She didn't do that because she didn't know
\end{tabular} where he lived, she had never been to that house. So everybody knowing his name, maybe everybody does know his name, all right. But she didn't. She did not. He said that he had sex with her five times, all right. He said that at some points they were naked. I asked him what her eye color was, ladies and gentlemen. I don't know, I don't look at her eyes. All right. I asked when she was naked and, you know, and you guys were having sex, did you recognize anything about her? Any moles, anything that could say, you know, she's got a mole that looks like the State of New Jersey on her, on her hip. No, he didn't say nothing. He didn't say anything.

All right, now \(I\) don't want to delve into your sex lives or anything like that, but, you know, you start to have intimate relations with somebody, multiple times, five times, you start to know something about that person. Nothing. I know her hair is dark, sometimes it's burgundy. He could figure that out from seeing her on the street.

Had his testimony been true that he had sex with her, he could have provided you with additional information. And he didn't.
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        very nice, but he said what he said, all right, about
        his brother's culpability, responsibility and about
        what he would do for her if she didn't show up.
            Now, on the other hand, had Antwan Wright
        known about these allegations, what would he do? He
        would come in, because the Jersey City Police
        Department, Hudson County Prosecutor's Office, into
        this Court and say hold up, she's saying that she
        doesn't know him, they've known each other for 15
        years.
            Ladies and gentlemen, it's not my job to
        convict people, all right. It's not. It's not my job
        to convict people. It's my job to do justice, all
        right. If a law has been violated, it's my job to
        prosecute the violation of that law. I don't just try
        to convict people.
            THE COURT: Overruled. Continue.
            MR. TROIANO: Nothing. All right. Three and
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a half years, this has been on the street. Two and a half years he's been accused of this. Nothing. Same goes for Davon Parsons but \(I\) think Mr. Wright, Antwan Wright, a little bit more forceful of an argument.

I would submit to you that him saying the first time \(I\) found out about these charges was in November of 2007 is absolute nonsense. All right. And why do I say that? Because Liliana said that this came out right away on the street, all right. Antwan Wright said this came out right away on the street. Davon Parsons a day later said no, this didn't come out until after he was in jail, all right. It's pretty evident what was going on there, all right.

Antwan Wright said to you immediately everybody knew what was going on here. Stephen Wright says no, it wasn't until November of the next year. Not true.

The Bramhall address. He says I never lived in the Bramhall address. This is the bedroom where he's having sex, his mother's bed, all right? I never lived there.

The investigation report submitted by Mr. Hirschorn from Antwan Wright say she and his brother were staying there at that time. Now he tried to give you this line about staying at a hotel which made no
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there at the time. And why does he want all 14 of you to not think he was living there? Because it's a block, two blocks away from where this incident
happened. And he wants you to think he's living on the other end of town, all right.

It's in the exact same direction where
Liliana says this guy ran away. It's in the exact same direction that that condom was found. But he says no, I wasn't living there. I wasn't living there.

Not believable, ladies and gentlemen. The condom. Mr. Wright got caught up in his own story, all right. He didn't tell you about the condom because it was truth, all right. He told you about the condom because he got caught up in his own story. He wanted to support his own story so he just said oh, I threw it out in the garbage. There was no garbage. There was no garbage. There was no garbage according to Liliana. There was no garbage according to Detective stambuli. There was no garbage in the house. Mr. Wright says I dropped it in the garbage pail in the house.

Believable? Believable? No.
Liliana testified that she didn't have a working cell phone. She had to call 911 on one of the cell phones, but she had no minutes. Mr. Wright says
on the night that this happened I called her on the phone, all right. Think about that, ladies and gentlemen, and think about how that would have had to take place. Anthony Waring's at the house till four, five o'clock in the morning, he leaves, Liliana says I'm up for maybe ten, 15 minutes and then \(I\) go to bed.

Presumably Mr. Wright would have had to call
her within that ten to 15 minute timeframe at five o'clock in the morning after never speaking to her before in the night. He said he only called once and he just happened to get through to her, just happened to get through to her, she didn't call him, happened to get through to her, and she says to him, yes, just finished having sex with Anthony Waring, why don't you come over.

Does it make sense? It does not make sense.
But the best, the broken window, all right. Got to figure out how that window got broken. All right. They get in a fight back in the, back in the apartment, Liliana takes his clothes and he remembers, ladies, let's talk about that, he remembered everything he was wearing from November 19th -- November 17th, November 18th, November 19th, 20t, 21st, 22nd. I remember exactly what \(I\) was wearing three and a half years ago. To the point I was wearing color tee
shirts, hats, boots, different colors, different days. What were you guys wearing last Monday? No idea. No idea. But he remembers, all right. Doesn't make sense.

But let's talk about the glass. Liliana takes his clothes, she goes all the way on the other side of the apartment to the close that she says I never even go into. I went in there once when I was looking at this place. But she decides to hide his clothes in the closet, all right. These aren't five year olds, ladies and gentlemen, all right. These people are 20 to 25 years old, they're hiding each other's clothes, all right.

So he runs over there, they get into a fight, she picks up the clothes, and this is important, all right. She picks up the clothes, she goes, according to Mr. Wright, to the back of the room. He's standing by the doorway to the closet. They are arguing with one another, all right. Glass behind him mind you. They are arguing with one another. He gets so mad he wants to punch something. Does he punch the wall next to him? No. Does he punch the wall that's on the side of her head because he's so pissed off at her? No.

What he does, according to him, is he turns around and punches through a closet, past a water
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                    heater, all these pipes, all this other stuff that
    you're going to see, he punches through the closet into
    the window. Does that make any sense, ladies and
    gentlemen? Does that make any sense? No.
            But the window is broken, all right.
        Interesting thing about that window, okay. And this is
        it. This is why you know he's not telling the truth,
        all right. Screen is always down, that's the
        testimony, okay. Screen's always down. Screen never
        put up, screen doesn't have a locking mechanism, screen
        is always down. Liliana says \(I\) never even go in there.
        Screen's always down, all right. Where is this
        picture. Pardon me.
            Okay, screen's always down. Mr. Wright says
        on cross examination \(I\) punched the window and I pulled
        back so quick that I didn't hit a screen. Do you
        remember that? I asked him specifically and I asked
        him specifically for a reason, all right. Because if
        you punch through a window and there is nothing on the
        other side, for instance a screen, where is the broken
        glass going to go? On the other side. But in this
        case, there's a screen, all right. So he would have
        had to hit the screen with his hand. If he didn't,
        that's fine.
            Yet, ladies and gentlemen, next day glass
                    Summations
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        found outside. Screen down whole time, glass found
        outside. No rips in the screen, no tears in the
        screen, nothing like that. How did that glass get
        outside? Ask yourselves that question. It is
        physically impossible. If you were to believe what
        he's telling you, physically impossible for the glass
        to miraculously, magic glass, get past the screen onto
        the ground.
        Doesn't make sense.
        And then of course we get the story on the
        blood, all right. Obviously whacks it when he turns
        around to punch the glass and then he does one of these
        to get his clothes back and he just -- he doesn't know
        he gets blood on her but he, you know, whatever. We,
        he finds out a year and a half later, okay. He's got a
        scar to prove it, you know, all that.
            The Judge will tell you about this concept
        that we have, false in one, false in all, okay. Which
        basically means that if you lie about one thing, and
        you all recognize that he lies about one thing, then
        you can say that he lies about everything. And I've
        just given you, ladies and gentlemen, ten lies. Things
        that just don't make sense, all right. Things that
        sound good, all right. Make for some good argument.
        But if you think about them, you analyze them they
don't make sense.
But the pieces don't fit.
Ladies and gentlemen, I asked you in the beginning use that who, what, when, where, why, how. Go back there, make a decision about this case, all right. Put the two stories next to each other and see what makes sense, all right. See what lines up. See what doesn't make sense. See what's impossible, impossible to happen.

Ask yourselves, who's been saying the same story exactly for three and a half years. Ask yourself who's come in here after telling somebody about it a month ago. Ask yourself who's got more to lose here. Ask yourself who went to the police, who went to the nurses, who went to the Prosecutors, who went to the Grand Jury, who subjected themselves to questioning. All right?

Ask yourselves, who has motivation to lie? Ask yourselves if Liliana was going to make this up, ladies and gentlemen, why didn't she just give up a 21 long time ago? Why didn't she just give up a long time 22 ago. If this was as crazy a story as the defense wants 23 to put out that she was just mad because this guy was 24 leaving her that night after half an hour together, 25 then why didn't she just give up? Why has she been so
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consistent, so adamant for three and a half years that on that date at that time she was raped by that guy?

All right, you can't get around that.
Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Hirschorn said on his opening, said on his closing, if the facts as the State says you believe to be true, then he's guilty of a horrible crime. And I agree with him. The facts that I stated when I opened, the facts that I stated when I closed, the facts that you heard from this witness stand through my witnesses, told you the truth

I submit to you that Mr. Wright was guilty then, I submit to you that he is guilty now.

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you very much.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Troiano.
Okay, folks, this is the plan. I'm going to send you to lunch for one hour. You're to come back in one hour. Do not discuss the case at all amongst yourselves. Just enjoy your lunch. I want you to come back in an hour. I'll give you my instructions, it should take about 45 minutes.

With regard to timing for the day, normally I get you out of here by 4:30, okay. But if you want to stay past 4:30, I'll let you send me a note between four and 4:30 as to what you're going to do.

\section*{The State of NJ v. Wright}

But think about that. And the reason I tell you that now is because in the event you want to call family or friends or if you have obligations, you may want to put them on notice about that in terms of what you can do or can't do and in terms of your schedules this afternoon, okay.

So I thank you very much, thanks for your attention, see you in one hour. Don't discuss the case amongst yourselves.
(Off the record/on the record)
THE COURT: First degree aggravated assault, we'll give in addition to burglary. Second aggravated assault, physical force, coercion without physical injury, contact during the course of a burglary and contact, simple contact. That's four, those four, burglary, second and third.

MR. TROIANO: Yeah, we -- we -- none of us really like that wording of the verdict sheet.

THE COURT: Tell me what you want to change on it.

MR. TROIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: As far as the lesser included, I mean both parties are admitting penetration, but according to case law, I have to give lesser included. I'm going to do it. Statement of defendant, prior

    that this man should have known something that none of
    us know, because nothing was ever elicited as to that.
        So now I've got a jury who is going to go
        back there and believe or could potentially believe I
        should say, that he could be guilty because he didn't
        see as Mr. 'Troiano said, the State of New Jersey on her
        hip. That's problem, Judge. That's a problem. That
        wasn't part of the testimony in any way, shape or form.
        It was one question that was asked and he said he
        didn't know.
            That's my application, Judge. Thanks.
            THE COURT: Okay.
            Mr. Troiano, anything?
            MR. TROIANO: No, Judge. It came out in
    cross examination, I asked some multiple questions
    about any markings, his level of knowledge about her.
    I mean the -- the specific reference to New Jersey was
    kind of tongue in cheek.
            THE COURT: Yeah, I mean I don't think the
        jury's going to -- I disagree with you about the fact
        whether or not the jury's going to infer she had
        markings. I think the jury is going to ask why didn't
        Mr. Troiano ask her on rebuttal if she had any
        markings. You didn't ask. So I don't believe it
        assumes she had -- had them, because she came back.
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So I'm not going to assume they think she didn't have them. Erankly, I mean the purpose during, if you're talking about trial strategy, and Mr. Troiano was under the impression that Mr. Wright was not telling the truth, perhaps under the impression that she -- she couldn't come back, and he perhaps was fishing for him to make something up, at which time he'd bring her back on rebuttal and she'd be able to say, he could ask her, do you have such a marking, and 10 she could say no.

So, I don't think the jury's going to jump to
you there.
    All right, we'll see you at -- in an hour.
    MR. TROIANO: Thanks, Judge.
    THE COURT: And folks in the --
        (Off the record/on the record)
                                    (RECESS)
    THE COURT: -- ladies and gentlemen, the
    evidence in the case has been presented, the attorneys
    have completed their summations, we now arrive at that
    time when you as jurors are to perform your final
    function in this case.
            At the outset, let me express my thanks and
        appreciation to you for your attention to this case. I
would like to commend counsel for the professional manner in which they have presented their respective cases and for their courtesy to the Court and jury during the course of this trial.

Before you retire to deliberate and reach your verdict, it is my obligation to instruct you as to the principles of law applicable to this case. You shall consider my instructions in their entirety and not pick out any particular instruction and over-emphasize it.

You must accept and apply this law for this case as I give it to you in this instruction. Any ideas that you have of what the law is or what the law should be or any statements by the attorneys as to what the law may be, must be disregarded by you if they are in conflict with my instructions.

During the course of the trial, I was required to make certain rulings on the admissibility of the evidence either in or outside of your presence. These rulings involved questions of law. The comments of the attorneys on these matters was not evidence. In ruling, I have decided questions of law and whatever the ruling may have been in any particular case, you should understand that it was not an expression or opinion by me on the merits of the case.
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Neither should my other rulings on any other aspect of the trial be taken by you as favoring one side or the other. Each matter was decided on its own merits.

When I use the term evidence, I mean the testimony you have heard and seen from this witness box and the exhibits that have been admitted into evidence.

Any testimony that I may have had occasion to strike is not evidence and shall not enter into your final deliberations. It must be disregarded by you.

This means that even though you may remember the testimony, you are not to use it in your discussions or deliberations.

Further, if I gave a limiting instruction as to how to use certain evidence, that evidence must be considered by you for that purpose only. You cannot use it for any other purpose.

As jurors, it is your duty to weigh the evidence calmly and without passion, prejudice, or sympathy. Any influence caused by these emotions has the potential to deprive both the State and the defendant of what you promised them, a fair and impartial trial by fair and impartial jurors.

Also, speculation, conjecture and other forms of guessing play no role in the performance of your

\section*{duty.}

The defendant stands before you on an indictment returned by the Grand Jury charging him with aggravated sexual assault and burglary.

The indictment is not evidence of the defendant's guilt on the charges. It's simply a step in the procedure to bring the matter before the Court and jury for the jury's ultimate determination as to whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty on the charges stated in it.

The defendant has pled not guilty to the charges and he is presumed to be innocent unless each and every essential element of the offense charged is proved beyond a reasonable doubt, the defendant must be found not guilty of the charge.

The burden of proving each element of a charge beyond a reasonable doubt rests upon the State and that burden never shifts to the defendant. The defendant in a criminal case has no obligation or duty to prove his innocence or offer any proof relating to his innocence. The prosecution must prove its case by more than a mere preponderance of the evidence, yet not necessarily to an absolute certainty.

The State has the burden of proving the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Some of
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you may have served as jurors in civil cases where you were told that it is necessary to prove only that a fact is more likely true than not true. In criminal cases, the State's proof must be more powerful than that, it must be beyond a reasonable doubt.

A reasonable doubt is an honest and reasonable uncertainty in your minds about the guilt of the defendant after you have given full and impartial consideration to all of the evidence.

A reasonable doubt may arise from the evidence itself, or from a lack of evidence. It is a doubt that a reasonable person hearing the same evidence would have.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt. In this world, we know very few things with absolute certainty. In criminal cases, the law does not require proof that overcomes every possible doubt.

If, based on your consideration of the evidence, you are firmly convinced that the defendant is guilty of the crime charged, you must find him guilty.

If, on the other hand, you are not firmly convinced of defendant's guilt, you must give defendant the benefit of the doubt and find him not guilty.

In my preliminary instruction when we started the case \(I\) explained to you that you are the judges of the facts, and as judges of the facts, you to determine the credibility of the various witnesses as well as the weight to be attached to their testimony.

You and you alone are the sole and exclusive judges of the evidence, of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight to be attached to the testimony of each witness.

Regardless of what counsel said, or I may have said recalling the evidence in this case, it is your recollection of the evidence that should guide you as judges of the facts. Arguments, statements, remarks, openings and summation of counsel are not evidence and must not be treated as evidence.

Although the attorneys may point out what they think is important in this case, you must rely solely upon your understanding and recollection of the evidence that was admitted during the course of \(t\) he trial.

Whether or not the defendant has been proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt is for you to determine based on all the evidence presented during the trial.

Any comments made by the attorneys are not
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controlling. It is your sworn duty to arrive at a just conclusion after considering all the evidence which was presented during the course of the trial.

The function of the Court is separate and distinct from the function of the jury. It is my responsibility to determine all questions of law arising during the trial and to instruct the jury as to the law which applies in this case. You must accept the law as given to you by me and apply it to the facts as you find them to be.

I have sustained objections to some questions asked by counsel which may have contained statements of certain facts. The mere fact that an attorney asks a question and inserts facts or comments or opinions in that question in no way proves the existence of those facts.

You will only consider such facts which in your judgment have been proven by the testimony of the witness or from exhibits admitted into evidence by the Court.

As you know, evidence may be either direct or circumstantial. Direct evidence means evidence that directly proves a fact without an inference and which 24 in itself, if true, conclusively establishes that fact.
25 On the other hand, circumstantial evidence means

And the example of that was the snow falling. It's the best way to distinguish the two.

An inference is a deduction of fact that may logically and reasonably be drawn from another fact or group of facts established by the evidence. Whether or not inferences should be drawn is for you to decide using your own common sense, knowledge and every day life experience. Ask yourselves, is it probable, logical and reasonable.

It is not necessary that all the facts be proven by direct evidence. They may be proven by direct evidence, circumstantial evidence or by a combination of direct and circumstantial evidence. All are acceptable as a means of proof.

In many cases, circumstantial evidence may be more certain, satisfying and persuasive than direct evidence. However, direct and circumstantial evidence should be scrutinized and evaluated carefully. A verdict of guilty may be based on direct evidence alone, circumstantial evidence alone or a combination provided of course that it convinces you of the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

The reverse is also true. A defendant may be

\section*{found not guilty by reason of direct evidence,} circumstantial evidence, a combination of the two or a lack of evidence if it raises in your mind a reasonable doubt as to the defendant's guilt.

As the judges of the facts, you are to determine the credibility of the witnesses, and in determining whether a witness is worthy of belief and therefore credible, you may take into consideration. The appearance and demeanor of the witness; the manner
25 or her testimony.
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Through this analysis, as the judges of the facts, you weigh the testimony of the witness and then determine the weight to give it. Through that process, you may accept all of it, a portion of it or none of it.

If you believe any witness or party willfully or knowingly testified falsely to any material facts in the case, with an intent to deceive you, you may give such weight to his or her testimony as you deem it is entitled. You may believe some of it, or you may in your discretion disregard all of it.

Now there are two offenses charged in the indictment. They are separate offenses by separate counts of the indictment. In your determination of whether the defendant, I'm sorry, whether the State has proven the defendant guilty of the crimes charged in the indictment beyond a reasonable doubt, the defendant is entitled to have each count considered separately by the evidence which is relevant and material to that particular charge based on the law as I will give it to you.

Now, evidence including a witness' statement or testimony prior to trial showing that at a prior time a witness has said something which is inconsistent with the witness' testimony at trial, may be considered
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by you for the purpose of judging the witness' credibility.

It may be also considered by you as substantive evidence, that is as proof of the truth of what is stated in the prior contradictory statement.

Evidence has been presented showing that at a prior time the witness has said something or failed to say something which is inconsistent with his testimony at the trial. This evidence may be considered by you 10 as substantive evidence or proof of the truth of the

However, before deciding whether the prior inconsistent or omitted statement reflects the truth, in all fairness you will want to consider all the circumstances under which the statement or failure to disclose occurred.

You may consider the extent of the
inconsistency or omission and the importance or lack of importance of the inconsistency or omission on the overall testimony of the witness as bearing on his or her credibility.

You may consider such factors as where and when the prior statement or omission occurred and the reasons if any therefore.

The extent to which such inconsistencies or
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requiring truthfulness on the witness stand than a person who has never been convicted of a crime.

You may consider in determining this issue the nature and degree of the prior conviction and when they occurred.

You are not, however, obligated to change your opinion as to the credibility of these witnesses simply because of a prior conviction. You may consider such evidence along with all facts as we previously discussed in determining credibility of a witness.

You also heard evidence that Stephen Wright has previously been convicted of the crimes of possession of a weapon and armed robbery. This evidence may only be used in determining the credibility or believability of the defendant's testimony. You may not conclude that defendant committed the crime charged in this case or is more likely to have committed the crime simply charged, because he committed a crime on a prior occasion.

All right. A jury has a right to consider whether a person who has previously failed to comply with society's rules as demonstrated through a criminal conviction will be more likely to ignore the oath requiring truthfulness on the witness stand, than a person who has never been convicted of any crime.

You may consider in determining this issue the nature and degree of the prior convictions and when they occurred.

Our law permits a conviction to be received in evidence only for the purpose of affecting the credibility of the defendant and for no other purpose. You are not, however, obligated to change your opinion as to the credibility of the defendant simply because of a prior conviction. You may consider such evidence along with all other factors as we previously discussed in determining the credibility of this defendant.

All right. There is for your consideration in this case, a statement allegedly made by the defendant. And by statement I mean Liliana Santos testified that the person who assaulted her spoke some words.

I'll leave it to your recollection as to what those words were.

It is your function to determine whether or not the statement was actually made by the defendant and if made, whether the statement or any portion of it is credible.

In considering whether or not an oral
statement was actually made by the defendant and, if made, whether it is credible, you should receive, weigh
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and consider this evidence with caution based on the generally recognized risk of misunderstanding by the hearer, or the ability of the hearer to recall accurately the words used by the defendant.

The specific words used and the ability to remember them are important to the correct understanding of any oral communication because the presence or absence or change of a single word may substantially change the true meaning of even the shortest sentence.

You should, therefore, receive, weigh and consider such evidence with caution.

And I'm not going to repeat what he said, I'll leave that to your recollection.

If, after consideration of all these factors, you determine that the statement was not actually made, or that the statement is not credible, then you must disregard the statement completely.

If you find that the statement was made and that part or all of the statement is credible, you may give what weight you think appropriate to the portion of the statement you find to be truthful and credible.

Defendant as part of his general denial of guilt contends the State has not presented sufficient reliable evidence to establish beyond a reasonable
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The burden of proving the identity of the person who committed the crime is upon the State. For you to find the defendant guilty, the state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that this defendant is the person who committed the crime.

The defendant has neither the burden nor the duty to show that the crime if committed was committed by someone else, or to prove the identity of that other person.

You must determine, therefore, not only whether the state has proven each and every element of the offenses charged beyond a reasonable doubt, but also whether the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that this person, this defendant, is the person who committed it.

The state has presented the testimony of Liliana Santos. You may recall that this witness identified the defendant in Court as the person who committed the crimes of burglary and aggravated sexual assault.

The State also presented testimony that on a prior occasion before the trial, the witness identified the defendant as the person who committed these
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According to the witness, her identification of the defendant was based upon the observations, perceptions she made of the perpetrator at the time the offense was being committed.

It is your -- it is your function to determine whether a witness' identification of defendant is reliable and believable or whether it was based on a mistake, or for any reason not worthy of belief.

You must decide whether it is sufficiently reliable upon which to conclude that this defendant is the person charged who committed the offense -- that this defendant is the person who committed the offense charged.

You consider -- you should consider the observations and perceptions on which the identification was based, and the circumstances under which the identification was made.

Although nothing may appear more convincing than a witness' categorical identification of a
perpetrator, you must critically analyze such
testimony. Such identifications, even if made in good
faith, may be mistaken.
Therefore, when analyzing the testimony be
\(\qquad\)
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considering credibility that I've already explained to you.

In addition, you may consider the following factors. The witness' opportunity to view the person who committed the offense at the time of the offense; the witness' degree of attention to the perpetrator at the time of the offense; the accuracy of any description the witness gave prior to identifying the perpetrator; the degree of certainty expressed by the 10 witness in making any identification; the length of 11 time between the witness' observation of the offense 12 and the first identification; discrepancies or
13 inconsistencies between identifications, if any; the
14 circumstances under which any out-of-Court ID was made;
procedure including done or said -- including
everything done or said by the law enforcement to the
witness before, during or after the identification
process.

And any and all of the factors based upon the evidence or lack of evidence in the case which you consider relevant to your determination whether the identifications were reliable.

The fact that an identifying witness is not of the same race as the perpetrator and/or defendant,
```

and whether that fact might have an impact on the
accuracy of the witness' original perception, and on
accuracy of the subsequent identification, you should
consider that ordinary -- ordinary human experience
people have greater difficulty identifying members of a
different race.
Unless the -- unless the in-Court,
out-of-Court identification result from the witness'
observations or perceptions of the perpetrator during
the commission of the offense, rather than being the
product of an impression gained at the in-Court and/or
out-of--Court identification procedure, it should be
afforded no weight.
The ultimate issue of the trustworthiness of
the identification is for you to decide. If, after
consideration of all the evidence you determine the
State has not proven beyond a reasonable doubt the
defendant was the person who committed these offenses,
then you must find him not guilty.
If, on the other hand, after consideration of
all the evidence, you are convinced beyond a
reasonable doubt that defendant was correctly
identified, you will then consider whether the State
has proven each and every essential element of the
charges, beyond a reasonable doubt.

```
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Now I'm going to charge you the exact
    offenses in the indictment. I'm going to give you the
    definitions of aggravated sexual assault and the
    definition of burglary.
            All right, count one of the indictment
    charges the defendant with aggravated sexual assault.
    Our laws provide in pertinent part as follows. An
    actor is guilty of aggravated sexual assault if he
    commits an act of sexual penetration with another
    person during the commission of a burglary.
            In order to convict defendant of this charge,
    the State must prove the following elements beyond a
    reasonable doubt.
            Number one, that the defendant committed an
        act of sexual penetration with another person.
            Two, that defendant acted knowingly.
            Three, that the penetration occurred during
        the commission of a burglary.
            The first element the state must prove beyond
        a reasonable doubt is that the defendant committed an
        act of sexual penetration with Liliana Santos.
        According to the law, vaginal intercourse by the
        defendant constitutes sexual penetration.
            Any amount of insertion, however slight,
        constitutes penetration. That is the depth of the
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{24}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
insertion is not relevant. \\
The definition of vaginal intercourse is the penetration of the vagina. \\
Second element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that defendant acted knowingly. And knowingly is in a lot of definitions so please pay attention. I may not repeat it. \\
A person acts knowingly with respect to the nature of his conduct or the -- or the attendant circumstances if he is aware that the conduct is of that nature or that such circumstances exist or the person is aware of a high probability of their existence. \\
A person acts knowingly with respect to a result of the conduct if he is aware that it is practically certain that the conduct will cause such a result. \\
Knowing, with knowledge are equivalent terms and have the same meaning. \\
Knowledge is a condition of the mind, it cannot be seen. It can only be determined by inferences from defendant's conduct, words or acts. A state of mind is rarely susceptible of direct proof but must ordinarily be inferred from the facts. \\
Therefore, it is not necessary that the State
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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produce a witness to testify that an accused said he had a certain state of mind when he did a particular thing. It is within your power to find that such proof has been furnished beyond a reasonable doubt by inferences which may arise from the nature of his acts and conduct or from all he said and did at the particular time and place, and from all the surrounding circumstances established by the evidence.

Three, the third element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is the penetration occurred during the commission of a burglary. And I'm going to instruct you on burglary next.

If you find the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt each of these three elements then you must find the defendant guilty of the crime of aggravated sexual assault.

On the other hand, if you find the State has failed to prove any of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant not guilty of aggravated sexual assault.

Now, the law requires the Court to instruct
the jury with respect to possible lesser included offenses even if they are not contained in the indictment.

Just because the Court is instructing you
Jury Charge
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concerning these offenses does not mean the court has an opinion one way or another about whether the defendant committed these or any other offenses. You should consider these offenses along with those for which the defendant is indicted.

However, you are not to render a verdict on these offenses or answer the questions on the verdict sheet unless you find the state has failed to meet its burden with regard to the offenses in the indictment.

Now, on aggravated sexual assault, there are three lesser included offenses. I'm going to give you each one right now.

Okay, the first lesser included offense. Our statute provides in pertinent part as follows. An actor is guilty of sexual assault, this is different. The -- my first definition was aggravated sexual assault, now I'm defining sexual assault.

A person is guilty of sexual assault if he commits an act of sexual penetration with another person and the actor uses physical force or coercion but the victim does not sustain severe personal injury.

In order to convict defendant on these charges, the State must prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

One, defendant committed an act of sexual
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penetration with another person.
Two, defendant acted knowingly -- there's that word knowingly again.

Three, defendant used physical force or coercion.

Eour, the victim did not sustain severe personal injury.

The first element the State must prove beyond a doubt is the defendant committed an act of sexual penetration with Liliana Santos. And again, according to the law, vaginal intercourse by defendant constitutes sexual penetration. Any amount of insertion, however slight, constitutes penetration. Depth of insertion is not relevant. And vaginal intercourse is the penetration of the vagina.

The second element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that defendant acted knowingly. I just defined it so I'm not going to repeat knowingly for you, okay.

Third element the state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that defendant used physical force or coercion.

Physical force is defined as the commission of the act of sexual penetration without the victim's freely and affirmatively given permission to the

\section*{specific act of penetration alleged to have occurred.}

You must decide whether defendant's alleged act of penetration was undertaken in circumstances that led the defendant reasonably to believe that the victim had freely given affirmative permission to the specific act of sexual penetration.

Simply put, affirmatively given permission means the victim did or said something which would lead a reasonable person to believe he was -- she was agreeing to engage in the act of sexual penetration. And freely given permission means the victim agreed of her own free will to engage in the act of sexual penetration.

Freely and affirmatively given penetr -permission rather can be indicated through words or through actions that when viewed in light of all the surrounding circumstances would demonstrate to a reasonable person that affirmative and freely given permission for the specific act of sexual penetration had been given.

Persons need not of course expressly announce their consent to engage in an act of sexual intercourse for there to be affirmative permission. Permission to engage in an act of sexual penetration can be and indeed often is indicated through physical actions
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rather than words. Permission is demonstrated when the evidence in whatever form is sufficient to demonstrate that a reasonable person would have believed that the alleged victim had affirmatively and freely given authorization to the act.

Proof that the act of sexual penetration occurred without the victim's permission can be based on evidence of conduct or words in light of the surrounding circumstances and must demonstrate beyond a
10 reasonable doubt that a reasonable person would not
11 have believed that there was affirmative and freely
12
If there is evidence to suggest that
defendant reasonably believed that such permission had been given, the state must demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant did not actually believe that the permission had been freely given or that such belief was unreasonable under the circumstances.

In determining the reasonableness of defendant's belief that victim had freely given affirmative permission, you must keep in mind that the law places no burden on the alleged victim to have expressed non-consent or to have denied permission.

You should not speculate as to what the alleged victim thought or desired or why she did not
Jury Charge 110 resist or protest. The State is not required to prove the victim resisted.

To find defendant used coercion, you must find defendant, with the purpose to unlawfully restrict Liliana Santos freedom of action to engage in or refrain from engaging in the act of sexual penetration threatened to inflict bodily injury.

To find defendant used coercion, you must find that defendant's purpose was to compel Liliana Santos to engage in an act of sexual penetration by threatening her.

A person acts purposely and that's another very important word, purposely. A person acts purposely with respect to the nature of his conduct or the result of that conduct if it is his conscious object to engage in conduct of that nature and to cause such a result.

A person acts purposely with respect to attendant circumstances if the person is aware of the existence of such circumstances or believes or hopes that they exist.

With purpose, design, with design are equivalent terms and have the same meaning.

Knowledge and purpose are conditions of the mind that cannot be seen. They can only be determined
Jury Charge
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by inference from defendant's conduct, words or act. A state of mind is rarely susceptible of direct proof but must ordinarily be inferred from the facts.

Therefore, it is not necessary that the State produce witnesses to testify that an accused said he had a certain state of mind when he did a particular thing.

It is within your power to find that such proof has been furnished beyond a reasonable doubt by inference which may arise from the nature of his act and conduct and from all he said and did at the particular time and place, and from all the surrounding circumstances established by the evidence.

The fourth element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the victim did not sustain severe physical injury. And severe -- severe -- I'm sorry, severe physical injury, yes. Severe personal injury means severe bodily injury, 19 disfigurement, disease, incapacitating mental anguish 20 or chronic pain.

If you find the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt each of these four elements, then you must find defendant guilty of sexual assault.

On the other hand, if you find the State has failed to prove any of these elements beyond a
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Jury Charge 112 \\
\hline 1 & reasonable doubt, then you must find defendant not \\
\hline 2 & guilty of sexual assault. \\
\hline 3 & Okay. The next lesser included offense, the \\
\hline 4 & first one was aggravated sexual assault, next I defined \\
\hline 5 & sexual assault. Number three is aggravated criminal \\
\hline 6 & sexual contact. Okay? During the course of a felony. \\
\hline 7 & Okay, our law provides as follows. A person \\
\hline 8 & is guilty of aggravated criminal sexual contact if he \\
\hline 9 & commits an act of sexual contact, not penetration, \\
\hline 10 & contact, on another person during the commission of a \\
\hline 11 & burglary. \\
\hline 12 & In order to convict defendant of the charge, \\
\hline 13 & State must prove the following elements beyond a \\
\hline 14 & reasonable doubt. \\
\hline 15 & Number one, the defendant purposely, there's \\
\hline 16 & the word purposely again, committed an act of sexual \\
\hline 17 & contact with another person. \\
\hline 18 & And two, the act of the sexual contact was \\
\hline 19 & committed during the commission of a burglary. \\
\hline 20 & First element the State must prove beyond a \\
\hline 21 & reasonable doubt is that defendant committed an act of \\
\hline 22 & sexual contact upon Liliana Santos. Sexual contact \\
\hline 23 & means an intentional touching by the defendant, either \\
\hline 24 & directly or through clothing of Liliana Santos' \\
\hline 25 & intimate parts for the purpose of degrading or \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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humiliating Liliana Santos or sexually arousing and gratifying defendant.

Intimate parts means sexual organs, genital area, anal area, inner thigh, buttock or breast of a person.

To find defendant committed an act of criminal sexual contact you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the touching was both intentional and that it was done with the purpose of degrading or 10 humiliating Liliana Santos or sexually arousing or

Intentional means purposeful, it means on purpose. A person acts purposely with respect to the nature of his conduct or a result thereof if it is his conscious object to engage in conduct of that nature or to cause such a result.

A person acts purposely with respect to the attendant circumstances if he is aware of the existence of such circumstances or believes or hopes that they exist.

Second element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the act of sexual contact was committed during the commission of a burglary. And again I have to define burglary for you. I'll do that in a minute.
```
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    If you find the State has proven each of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant guilty.
If you find that the State has failed to prove any of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find defendant not guilty.
Okay, so that was aggravated sexual assault, number one. Sexual assault was number two. Three was aggravated criminal sexual contact during the course of a burglary.
The last lesser included is just criminal sexual contact. An actor is guilty of sexual contact if he commits an act of sexual contact with the victim and the actor uses physical force or coercion but the victim does not sustain severe personal injury.
In order to convict defendant of this charge, the State must prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt.
Number one, defendant purposely committed an act of sexual contact with another person.
Two, the defendant used physical force or coercion but the victim did not sustain severe personal injury.
First element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that defendant committed an act of

```
```
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    sexual contact with Liliana Santos. And I already
explained what that was. The intentional touching by
defendant either directly or indirectly through the
clothing of Liliana Santos for the purpose of degrading
or humiliating her or sexually arousing or gratifying
defendant.
And I already explained what intimate parts are and I won't do that again.
To find defendant committed an act of criminal sexual contact, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that both, that, that the touching was intentional and it was done with purpose of degrading or humiliating Liliana Santos or sexually arousing or gratifying the defendant.
I already defined purpose for you, I'm not going to repeat purpose.
Second element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that defendant used physical force or coercion but the victim did not sustain severe personal injury.
Physical force is defined as the commission of the act of sexual contact without the victim's freely and affirmatively given permission to the specific act of contact alleged to have occurred.
You must decide whether defendant's alleged

```
act of conduct was undertaken in circumstances that led
the defendant reasonably to believe the victim had
freely given affirmative permission to the specific act
of sexual contact.
    Simply put, affirmatively given permission
    means the victim did or said something which would lead
    a reasonable person to believe she was agreeing to
    engage in the act of sexual contact. And freely given
    permission means the victim agreed of her own free will
    to engage in the act of sexual contact.
    Freely and affirmatively given permission can
    be indicated either through words or through actions
    when viewed in light of all the surrounding
    circumstances would demonstrate to a reasonable person
    that affirmative and freely given permission for the
    specific act of sexual contact had been given.
    Persons need not of course expressly announce
    their consent to engage in an act of sexual intercourse
    for there to be affirmative permission. Permission to
    engage in the act of sexual contact can be and indeed
    often is indicated by physical actions rather than
    words.
```

    Permission is demonstrated when the evidence
    in whatever form is sufficient to demonstrate that a
    reasonable person would have believed that the alleged
    
## Jury Charge

117
victim had affirmatively and freely given authorization to the act.

Proof that the act of sexual contact occurred without the victim's permission can be based on the evidence of conduct or words in light of surrounding circumstances and must demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that a reasonable person would not have believed that there was affirmative and freely given permission.

If there is evidence to suggest that
defendant reasonably believed that such permission had been given, the State must demonstrate either that defendant didn't actually believe that such permission had really been given or that such a belief was unreasonable under all of the surrounding circumstances.

In determining the reasonableness of the defendant's belief that the victim had freely given affirmative permission you must keep in mind the law places no burden on the alleged victim to have expressed non-consent or have denied permission. You should not speculate as to what the alleged victim thought or desired or why she did not resist or protest. The state is not required to prove that the 24 victim resisted or resisted to the utmost of un -- or
25 resisted to the utmost or reasonably resisted the

|  |  | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 14 16 17 18 19 20 21 | sexual contact. <br> To find the defendant used coercion you must find defendant with purpose, that is a conscious object to unlawfully restrict Liliana San -- San -- Liliana Santos' freedom of action to engage in or refrain from engaging in the act of sexual contact, threaten to inflict bodily injury. <br> In other words, to find the defendant used coercion, you must find that defendant's purpose, that is his conscious object, was to compel Liliana Santos to engage in an act of sexual contact by threatening her. <br> Severe personal injury means bodily injury, disfigurement, disease, incapacitating mental anguish or chronic pain. <br> If you find the State has proven each of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find defendant guilty of the crime of sexual contact. <br> If you find the State has failed to prove any of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find defendant not guilty of criminal sexual contact, okay. <br> And what I'm going to do is I'm going to give you a verdict sheet, and the verdict sheet's going to have count one, aggravated sexual contact -- I'm sorry, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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aggravated sexual assault; two, sexual assault; three, aggravated sexual contact; and lastly sexual contact. You'll have all four to consider. And it's self-explanatory.

All right, the last charge in the indictment is burglary. The pertinent part of our statute on which the indictment is based reads as follows. A person is guilty of burglary in the third degree if with the purpose to commit an offense therein, the person enters a structure knowing that he is not licensed or privileged to do so, with the intent to commit a crime once he's inside.

A person is guilty of burglary in the second degree if in the course of committing the offense I just described to you, that person purposely or knowingly inflicts or threatens to inflict bodily injury on anyone.

In order for you to find the defendant guilty of the crime of burglary, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the following elements.

Number one, defendant entered the structure known as 235 Arlington Avenue in Jersey City without permission.

Two, defendant did so with the purpose to commit a crime once he was inside.

Structure means any building or room. Purpose to commit an offense inside means the defendant intended to commit an unlawful act once he went inside.

The unlawful act alleged here is what's set forth in count one, the aggravated sexual assault.

A person acts purposely with respect 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.

Purpose, with purpose, and similar words have the same meaning.

In other words, in order for you to find defendant -- in order for you to find defendant acted purposely, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that it was defendant's conscious object at the time he unlawfully entered the premises to commit an unlawful act once he went inside.

A person purpose is a state of mind and -- a --a condition of the mind which cannot be seen. It can only be determined by inferences from conduct, words of acts. A state of mind is rarely susceptible to direct proof but must be ordinarily inferred from the facts. Therefore, it is not necessary members of the jury that witnesses be produced to testify that an accused said he had a certain state of mind when he
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engaged in a particular act. His state of mind may be gathered from his acts and his conduct, from all he said and did at the particular time and place and from all the surrounding circumstances.

If you find the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt the elements of the crime of burglary, then you must determine whether the State the following additional elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

I have already informed you that a section of the statute provides that burglary becomes a crime of the second degree if the burglar purposely or knowingly inflicts or threatens to inflict bodily injury during the course of the burglary.

In this case, the State has alleged that defendant purposely inflicted or threatened to inflict bodily injury upon Liliana Santos. I've already defined purpose for you, I'm not going to repeat that.

In this case, the State has also alleged that defendant knowingly inflicted bodily injury upon Liliana Santos. I already did knowingly for you, I'm not going to repeat that.

The phrase bodily injury means of course physical pain, illness or impairment of physical condition.

If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that
defendant committed the crime of burglary, and in the
course of committing that offense he purposely or
knowingly inflicted or threatened to inflict bodily
injury upon Liliana Santos, then you must find the
defendant guilty of the crime of burglary in the second
degree.

If you find the State did prove beyond a reasonable doubt all the elements of the crime of burglary, but the State has not proven beyond a reasonable doubt the additional elements of the crime of burglary in the second degree as I defined those to you, then you must find the defendant not guilty of burglary in the second degree, but guilty of burglary in the third degree.

And lastly, if you find the -- if you find the State has not proven beyond a reasonable doubt each element of the crime of burglary as I defined that crime to you, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

That concludes my instructions as to the principles of law regarding the offense charged in the indictment. There is nothing different in the way a jury is to consider the proof in a criminal case from that in which all reasonable persons treat any questions depending upon evidence presented to them.
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You are expected to use your own good common sense, consider the evidence for only those purposes for which it has been admitted, and give it a reasonable and fair construction in light of your knowledge of how people behave. It is the quality of the evidence, not simply the number of witnesses that control.

Anything that has not been marked into evidence cannot be given to you in the jury room even though it may have been marked for identification. We marked several things that were shown to witnesses that were not admitted into evidence. You can't have those. Only those items marked in evidence can be given to you.

Very shortly you will go into the jury room to start your deliberations. I remind you that during deliberations and in fact at any time in the jury deliberation room you got to keep your cell phone off, your pager off, your Blackberry off, whatever electronic device you have, you got to keep it off, okay.

You are to apply the law as I've instructed you to the facts as you find them to be for the purpose of arriving at a fair and correct verdict. The verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror
and must be unanimous as to each charge.
This means all of you must agree if the defendant is guilty or not guilty on each charge.

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

You may return on each crime charged a verdict of either not guilty or guilty. Your verdict whatever it may be as to the crime charged must be unanimous. That means all 12 of you who are deliberating must agree as to the verdict.

Now, to assist you in reporting a verdict, I have prepared for you what's called a verdict sheet. And I'll give you a copy of this. This verdict form is

```
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not any form of evidence.
    Do you have a copy of the verdict sheet?
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, can we go to sidebar?
    (On the record discussion at sidebar)
    MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, can I just make a
    record. As I read it, I was reading the law again, it
    seems like the Appellate Division has said that the
    commission of the burglary is enough of -- the
    commission of a predicate offense which burglary
    obviously is one of the ones listed, is enough to
    establish lack of consent. And there's another case
    that's referenced in there, STATE VERSUS CUNI
    (phonetic) that seems to indicate that the charge to
        the jurors should include some mention of consent.
            I know the model charge doesn't. Clearly the
        facts in this case, that's the defense. So I don't
        know if the case that they're referencing is the
        Appellate Division case, it's not given a case name
        that's the controlling case or if this CUNI case that
        went up to the Supreme Court should -- the Appellate
        Division said if you're committing the crime (inaudible
        - much background noise)
            But this other case seems to indicate that
        you could --
            THE COURT: I'll say it.
```

MR. TROIANO: With regard to the aggravated sexual assault, are you going to specify that you only need the third degree even though we know that it does make a difference? It just says in there burglary, it doesn't say second degree burglary.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HIRSCHORN: I have no problem with that. Thanks, Judge.
(Sidebar discussion ended)
THE COURT: All right, now the verdict sheet
has count one, sexual assault -- sexual assault in the commission of a burglary. And lesser included, lesser included, then lesser included. Once you find, if you find him guilty if at all, you don't proceed lower, okay.

And then count two is burglary. Again, second degree and third degree.

Two things I need to point out to you. With respect to the first charge on sexual assault during the commission of a burglary, of course it has to be a sexual penetration without consent of the victim. If I didn't say that specifically, of course that's the law, and clearly that's an element the State has to prove.

Additionally, with respect to assault during the commission of a burglary, it doesn't matter whether

$$
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it's second or third degree burglary. But you must
find a burglary occurred for commission -- for the aggravated sexual -- aggravated sexual -- aggravated sexual assault to have occurred during the course of a burglary.

Understand what I'm saying? I'll repeat it again.

Two things. The first count, aggravated sexual assault during the commission of a burglary has
second or third degree burglary occurred.

Okay? If, during your deliberations, you have a question or feel you need further assistance or instructions from me, write it down on a piece of paper and give it to the sheriff's officer who will be standing at the jury room door who in turn will give it to me. I will then go over the question with the lawyers and I will try to answer it as quickly as possible.

But please be patient. If you need, if you do -- if you do send out a question, do not disclose to me where you stand on your deliberations. In other
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the verdict is, once the verdict has been reached. When you come out with your verdict, you'll stand and everyone will resume the same seats they have now. We'll the make sure every one is here and ask the foreperson to rise and give his verdict. After we read -- after you read the verdict, I'll ask -- I'll ask each juror whether they agree with that verdict.

Okay, as soon as the officers are sworn, you will proceed into the jury room. But do not begin deliberations until your jury, until the jury verdict form has been given to you and the exhibits have been given to you as well.

Additionally, send me a note some time after four o'clock how late you want to stay. If $I$ don't hear from you, I'm going to assume you want to go home at $4: 30$ and I'll send you home at 4:30. But if you want to stay later, just let me know some time between four and 4:30, okay.

Additionally, in the event you are back tomorrow, we may have to stay late tomorrow, because we won't be sitting Eriday.

So again, let your family, friends and anyone else who's important in your lives know if you have to be somewhere, you may be staying late tomorrow night, if necessary at all. I'm just giving you a heads up

```
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about what may happen in the future.
    All right, counsel, please review all the
evidence, verdict sheet, make sure they're in order.
If so, state on the record, and let's swear the
sheriff's officers in please.
SHERIFE'S OFFICERS SWORN
    THE CLERK: Officers sworn.
    THE COURT: Okay, 12 of you can proceed into
the jury room. Two of you stay right there.
                    (Off the record/on the record)
    THE COURT: We have to keep you in a separate
location in case it becomes necessary for you to
actively participate as a juror. Therefore, you should
not discuss the case at all with anyone else for that
matter. If it becomes necessary to bring you back in,
we'll give you further instruction. If they have a
question or a verdict, we'll bring you in for that as
well, okay?
Thank you very much. All right. Officer, let the jury know I'll trust that they're going to
follow my instructions and we'll not confiscate their
cell phones. But if I find out there's been cell phone
use, I will confiscate them.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, are we still on the
record?
```
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THE CLERK: Yes, we are.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Okay. Judge, on behalf of Mr.
Wright, I did review with Mr. Troiano, obviously he can
speak for himself, but I did review the evidence as
well as the verdict sheet and it does appear that
everything is in order.
THE COURT: Any objections to the charge
other than what we talked about?
MR. HIRSCHORN: Other than what I placed on
the record, Judge, that you corrected, no, no objection.

MR. TROIANO: No objection.
(Off the record/on the record)
THE COURT: Okay, the jury sent me a note. It says we need more time, we would like to return
tomorrow. So that's what we'll do. It came out at four o'clock. Make it $\mathrm{C}-1$ or $\mathrm{C}-2$. The stipulation is c-1. 3:24:10. Okay, bring the jury out please.

MR. HIRSCHORN: What time tomorrow, Judge?
THE COURT: Nine.
(Jury enters the courtroom)
THE COURT: We're waiting for the alternates.
All right. Okay, folks, I got your note, I marked it $\mathrm{C}-2$. We need more time, we'd like to return tomorrow. Perfectly okay. You are to cease
deliberations as of right now, don't talk about it with anyone else, amongst yourselves at all or with family and friends. And of course avoid the media coverage at all.

Have a pleasant evening, come back tomorrow morning nine o'clock sharp. Once all 12 of you are there, you can begin deliberations once we give you everything, okay. We have other things going on tomorrow. I'm completing I'm waiting for this case, so when you're here, please go right into the jury room and we'll have you begin, okay. But -- but we need 12 of you to start so if one person is late, 11 people are going to be sitting. So please try to be here on time, nine o'clock tomorrow.

Thank you. proceedings as recorded, to the best of our knowledge and ability.
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DECISION 14

## Colloquy

THE CLERK: Indictment 10736 of the 08 term. Your appearances, please for the record.

MR. TROIANO: Matthew Troiano for the State.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Good morning, Judge, Keith Hirschorn on behalf of Stephen Wright.

THE COURT: Okay. Any additions, corrections, deletions from the PSI other than the change in the sentence date listed from 6-17 to 9-10, and accordingly he'll get that much more time in gap time credit, and I'll calculate that.

MR. HIRSCHORN: That's correct, Judge.
Judge, the other change is my recollection of the verdict in this particular case and I believe it's referenced in Mr. Troiano's brief is that the final charge is to reflect count two, burglary, was a third degree offense.

THE COURT: That's correct, yeah.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Not a second degree.
THE COURT: Yeah, that's correct.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, other than that $I$ did have an opportunity to review the report with my client and it does appear to be accurate at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. And not to get ahead of ourselves, anyone disagree with the fact that count two shouldn't merge with count one?
A.R.T. AGENCY, INC.
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    MR. HIRSCHORN: No.
MR. TROIANO: No.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'll hear you, Mr. Hirschorn.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, would you like me to address the extended term Motion first or --
THE COURT: Yeah, whatever you need to.
Sure, go ahead, do that first.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, Judge.
Judge, Mr. Troiano did file originally with my self and Mr. Wright a notice --
MR. TROIANO: Judge, just for the purposes of the record, I think that $I$ should go first with regard to the Motion. It's the State's Motion.
THE COURT: Extended term? Okay.
MR. TROIANO: Yes. Judge, I believe that one of my colleagues filed the initial paperwork with Your Honor, Mr. Hirschorn as well as Mr. Wright with regard to the extended term.
I have since supplemented that with a brief. It's the State's position that Mr. Wright is extended term eligible as a persistent offender. Statute reads he was 21 years of age or over at the time of the offense. He had two priors.
With regard to the timing of the prior

```
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convictions with regard to this offense, it's basically irrelevant. There's case law on point to that. I have the case cited if Your Honor needs it but it's clear that the sequence of the convictions does not play a part.

With regard -- and that's what makes him eligible as a persistent offender.

With regard to the aggravating and mitigating
factors, as \(I\) cited in the brief, the state would ask
10 for the imposition of aggravating factors one, two, 11 three, six and nine. One and two being the factors
that would be of most point of contention.

But Judge, with regard to the facts of this case and you're fully aware of them, you sat through the trial, the allegations which were borne out at trial was that Mr. Wright broke into this house, ultimately raped Miss Santos.

The facts that were testified to went above and beyond simply a burglary and an aggravated sexual assault. There was physical injury to her, she was choked, she was thrown around the room, she was threatened at the end. There was a heinous nature to the, to the crime. There was lasting implications for Miss Santos, but that she testified to and that she's suffering now, but I'll rely on what she testified to.

The emotional strain that she was going through and the lasting harm that was done to her.

I would ask for thee, six and nine on the basis of his prior record. Both his convictions and with respect to his contacts with the system. He's not that old and basically every year he has had contacts with the system elevating in their level of severity. A lot of them having to do with weapons offenses. Now, Judge, I would not argue that that factor applies for his prior, his prior record which would be aggravating factor six but just the need to deter this defendant. He has obviously not gotten the point that he needs to stop this behavior.

The crimes that he has committed have been very, very, very serious, both namely both this and the prior robbery. And -- and the State thinks that those aggravating factors clearly outweigh the mitigating factors.

The number that was cited, this is a first degree aggravated sexual assault, the extended term range is 20 to life. The number that was cited by the State in its brief is 35 years. Obviously that's within your discretion, Judge.

But the State asks for that number and asks for the imposition of the 85 percent in accordance with
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N.E.R.A. and ask that that be consecutive to the ten with 85 that he is serving now. These are clearly separate and distinct crimes.

And -- and basically I'd like to speak as to, as to some of the things that were contained in the report, but I think it's fair to let Mr. Hirschorn respond to the extended term Motion.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, as far as the extended term Motion, Judge, I would ask that Your Honor not
10 impose the extended term. It is obviously
11 discretionary. Mr. Troiano does correctly state that

However, Judge, this is one of those cases that is somewhat unique as far as the convictions go because the date of this offense was prior to one of the two convictions that he's had as an adult. The original conviction, Judge, back in 2005 he received three years probation which he successfully completed.

So basically, Judge, what we're discussing here is a second conviction that took place after the date of this offense. Now Judge, while I understand and it is clear after reading through the statute as well as the commentary, there's case law on point that Your Honor can consider that second case which would be
\[
\text { Colloquy } 8
\]
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the factor that would make my client extended term.
    However, Judge, there has been much
    disagreement and if you read throughout the comments
    there is considerable discussion as to whether or not
    it is appropriate for a Court to consider an offense
    that took place prior to a conviction.
    Judge, it seems to me that this is the type
    of case that the discussion is about. It doesn't make
    sense to extend an individual, to me, Judge, and I
    would submit to the Court, it doesn't make sense to
    extend Mr. Wright in this particular case based upon a
    conviction that took place after the incident.
    Now, Judge, in this case if we were just
    dealing with a sequential time period here, we would be
        standing before Your Honor with Mr. Wright convicted of
        a first degree offense. His prior record at that time
        that this offense took place was a third degree offense
        to which he received and successfully completed
        probation.
            He has had other contacts, Judge, those
        resulted in either acquittals or dismissals. So Judge,
        the only convictions that he has are a prior
        probationary conviction and a subsequent first -- first
        degree robbery conviction.
            Judge, based upon those factors, I would ask

\section*{Colloquy}
that Your Honor consider not imposing the extended term here.

Additionally, Judge, we would while three, six and nine certainly are applicable here, and we would not dispute what the State has presented as far as those three factors based upon the usage of them in the Courts here in Hudson County, we do dispute, Judge, finding the additional aggravating factors one and two.

Judge, it would appear to me that those two factors while in their language may be applicable, Judge, what makes, what Mr. Troiano has argued is the circumstances that convicted my client of these crimes. I would submit to the Court that nothing above and beyond -- in its nature, Judge, aggravated sexual assault is going to be a heinous crime. That's the nature of the crime. When someone's convicted of that
        then find additional factors that make those one and
        two as aggravating factors, Judge, I don't think are
        applicable here.
            I would submit to the Court that even
        should Your Honor believe the testimony as the jury did
        of Miss Santos as well as the other witnesses, that
        this case is an aggravated sexual assault that should
        be sentenced accordingly. And I would submit that the
only aggravating factors that apply here, Judge, are three, six and nine.

But Judge, just in summation, based upon the prior argument as far as the sequential nature of these charges, based upon the fact that this isn't someone who would have otherwise been extended term eligible, or who has an extensive prior record that was on the cusp of -- of an extended term and that the sole factor pushing him to an extended term is a subsequent
10 conviction, I would ask that Your Honor not impose the
MR. TROIANO: Judge, just for the purposes of the record what was cited with regard to the chronology was STATE VERSUS COOK, 330 N.J. Super 395 at 421. This section permits a sentencing Judge to consider multiple convictions irrespective of chronology as long as the other criteria of the sub-section are satisfied.

And -- and just for the record, I would note, Judge, that this, the date of this crime was somewhere in the middle of November. The date of the armed robbery was within the first week of the following January which was about a month and a half difference. Both crimes extremely severe.

So while I note and Mr. Hirschorn's correct with the chronology, I would note the closeness in time
```
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    between these two criminal acts.
THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Wright, I'm sorry, did
you want to say something?
THE DEFENDANT: I just basically want to say
that I'm still innocent, Your Honor. I'm going to
remain innocent. I feel as though I did not have a
fair trial. That's basically all that I have to say.
THE COURT: What wasn't fair about it?
THE DEFENDANT: I feel that the facts of the
trial did not convict me guilty. When the jury first
heard the situation, they already convicted me guilty
by hearing it. They never gave me a fair chance.
THE COURT: Anything else, sir?
THE DEFENDANT: That's it.
THE COURT: All right. We, following a one
week trial which I presided over, a jury found Mr.
Stephen Wright --
MR. TROIANO: Judge, would you like to hear
arguments with regard to, additional arguments with
regard to sentencing?
THE COURT: Oh, you didn't speak about that
yet?
MR. HIRSCHORN: No, Judge, I thought you were
going to rule on the extended term prior to --
THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead. I

```
didn't mean to cut you off.
MR. HIRSCHORN: That's okay, Judge.
THE COURT: As to sentencing generally? I'm sorry, go ahead.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I would ask as far as sentencing goes should Your Honor decide to not impose the extended term, first of all with Mr. Troiano's statement as to consecutive terms, Judge, we have no argument that this should run concurrent to the sentence that -- that he's presently serving. Obviously they're separate dates. That's part of my argument as to the extended term Motion.

Judge, should Your Honor be inclined not to impose the extended term, I would agree with what the Court stated earlier that count two does merge into count one. Count one being an aggravated sexual assault which is a crime in the first degree. I would ask that Your Honor consider imposing a period of
19 incarceration for ten years New Jersey State Prison. 20 Obviously the 85 percent law does apply, that's part of 21 the statute as well, to run consecutive to the sentence

Should Your Honor be inclined to impose the extended term, the statement by Mr. Troiano as well was correct that it runs between 20 years and life.
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I would ask that Your Honor again consider imposing the minimum sentence at that point of 20 years New Jersey State Prison with 85 percent before parole.

Judge, as far as if Your Honor decides to impose the extended term, certainly he's receiving double the penalty that he could have received already. To then go above and beyond that, and sentence him to a period of incarceration longer than that, I don't think is appropriate in this particular matter. Certainly I
10 don't think sentencing him to 35 years in prison on top
11
or if that's just -- I don't know what it is. Really,

I don't know what it is.
What I do know about Mr. Wright and I've dealt with him now for four years is that Mr. Wright is a very, very dangerous person. He has been convicted or raping somebody, he has been convicted of shooting a 16 year old girl with a shotgun. He has been convicted of another weapons offense. Luckily for him he's cleared two weapons trials. But he is clearly a danger to society and he himself needs to be deterred.

I would ask that you honor what the State is requesting with regard to the extended term, sentence Mr. Wright accordingly.

THE COURT: All right, following approximately a week or more trial before me, Mr. Wright was convicted of first degree aggravated sexual assault and third degree burglary.

I'm obviously very familiar with the matter, I presided over the trial. And what -- and what leaps out of me in reading the presentence report as wall as listening to Mr. Wright today in Court is complete lack of remorsefulness, and indignation that he didn't do anything wrong.

Obviously the jury disagreed. I didn't play any function in the decision of the jury other than reading instructions. I'm not a Judge to get involved

\section*{Decision}
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the lawyers do what they have to do. But listening to that victim, there was no doubt in my mind she was the victim of a very terrible rape. And that was not consent. Clearly not. Here home was -- she was a young girl coming out into the world, finally was able to afford her own place, a little independence. And in the middle of the night, someone broke into her home and violated her and raped her. It's a horrible, horrible thing.

And there's no doubt in my mind that's what happened. And the fact that \(I\) believe that had nothing to do with any ruling \(I\) made in the case. Again, I had the lawyers try the case. I let the jury make the decision. But sitting back and listening to that young lady testify, I had an idea where the jury might go with this case because she was genuinely assaulted as was evidenced by her testimony.

Mr. Wright was born July -- I'm sorry, February 14th, 1984 in Jersey City. He's 26 years old, he's single, has one child himself, a daughter. And I'm sure I know what he'd be thinking if something like this happened to his own daughter.

Only made it to the lith grade in Snyder High School, last lived with his grandmother. He's in State
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Prison now on another charge. Last worked in January
of 07 for a moving company.

There was an Avenel report done and it was found that he did not fall within the purview of the sex offender statute for sentencing purposes.

One arrest as a juvenile, seven arrests as an adult, third indictable conviction. Aggravating factors -- I don't think aggravating factor one does apply because I think the act itself was heinous, cruel and depraved. So I think that would be double counting.

However, I believe aggravating factor two does apply because certain victims are affected a different way and I think there was a great deal of psychological serious harm done to the victim. She left her apartment shortly thereafter and can't go back there and can't live by herself. So I think it's a severe harmful impact on her life.

And aggravating factors three, six and nine of course also apply.

And I can't find any mitigating factors whatsoever. None whatsoever.

I am -- there are no mitigating factors and I'm absolutely convinced that the aggravating factors substantially predominate here.

\section*{Decision}

In terms of the discretionary extended term pursuant to 2C:44-3A, Mr. Wright is certainly eligible. He's over 21, has two previous convictions and the aggravating factors speak for themselves as well as the serious impact on this young lady's life.

So I find that the statute does apply.
And I am sentencing him accordingly pursuant
to 2C:44-3A.
Therefore, you're sentenced as follows. On count one, first degree aggravated sexual assault, you are committed to the custody of the Department of Corrections for a term of 25 years. You must serve 85 percent of said 25 years pursuant to the No Early Release Act. And I reached the number 25 above the number 20 pursuant to 2C:44-3A the extended term statute.

There'll be a five year period of supervision, parole supervision upon release, pursuant to the No Early Release Act.

This sentence shall run consecutive to the indictment he's now serving, 076924 which was the armed robbery.

There'll be parole supervision for life, and Megan's Law will apply as well once released. There's a state-wide sexual assault nurse examiner penalty --

MR. TROIANO: 800, yes.
THE COURT: \(\$ 800\). And the sex crime penalty will be \(\$ 1,000\). V.C.C.B. is \(50--\) I'm sorry, 100 , it's a first degree offense, the Safe Neighborhoods assessment of \(\$ 75\), Law Enforcement Training Fund Assessment is \(\$ 30\).

Count three -- I'm sorry, count two, third degree burglary, will merge into count one and be dismissed as the elements are the same.

The reason for the consecutive sentences it was a separate and different offense. And in fact, pursuant to plea negotiations I'll note for the record the State offered him a concurrent term which he rejected.

Mr. Wright, you have 45 days from today to appeal your conviction and your sentence. If you can't afford a lawyer, we will give you an opportunity to have a public defender.

\section*{Thank you.}

MR. TROIANO: Thank you, Judge.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Thank you, Judge.
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 \\ \section*{Colloquy \\ \section*{Colloquy \\ \\ 3 \\ \\ 3 \\ \\ THE COURT: Back to State versus Stephen} \\ \\ THE COURT: Back to State versus Stephen} Wright. We've got two notes. Eirst one, C-3, question, define aggravated sexual assault and sexual assault. That's at 10:20 a.m. And then five minutes later they asked for the definition of coercion which is contained in the other definition so I'll just do that.

Then the real life matters they want coffee. Can we have a coffee break. But didn't they have a coffee break at line ten o'clock? They didn't go for coffee? All right.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, the only thing I'd ask is what we discussed at the end of the charge if you could put that into the aggravated sexual assault charge as you read it about without consent. Because I think that is part of the definition.

THE COURT: I agree with you. I'm thinking about how to do it. I don't disagree with you in principle, but I'm thinking the proper way to do it.

MR. TROIANO: Judge, do you have a copy of the verdict sheet?

THE COURT: The verdict sheet? Yeah. Well I think the best way to do it is I'll read both model charges, and when I'm done with both model charges I'll indicate during the definition of sexual assault I
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indicated to you you have to make a determination as to whether the victim freely and affirmatively consented, okay. That same consent applies to the first count as well.

MR. HIRSCHORN: I would have no objection to that, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. TROIANO: I mean you would agree, Judge, that they're basically asking why the words physical force or coercion are left out of count one.

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Seems to be.
MR. TROIANO: And Judge, for the record, the only issue I have with it is that it's just not contained in the jury charge.

THE COURT: I agree, exactly.
MR. TROIANO: And -- and I understand what Mr. Hirschorn's saying about it but it's not that, and we're reading something into a charge that is --

THE COURT: Yeah, but, you know, it's not there, but \(I\) mean literally reading that charge, if the defendant hypothetically broke into someone's home, okay, with the intent to commit a crime, and then had consensual sex, it's -- it's a --

MR. TROIANO: I agree with you, but we can't
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explain that to them in those terms.
THE COURT: So -- so what I intend to do is I think in the case of both charges, that the same words -- you have a note? Okay. Words to the effect that -MR. TROIANO: What I'm saying, Judge, is even if you put in these words without consent, you know, it still is different from what's in count two.

THE COURT: Absolutely.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Yeah, I agree with you.
THE COURT: Different than the burglary. And they want a coffee break.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Do you want to give them that first, Judge, and then the charge, or --

THE COURT: I'll bring them out and ask them. MR. TROIANO: Could -- could you say to them basically or are you going to say to them basically that they are the same exact thing, it only becomes aggravated sexual assault if you find that there was a burglary.

THE COURT: That's probably better. That's probably -- that's probably much better.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I would just ask for that along with the additional language that you stated just so that element is clear that that's part of both charges.
A.R.T. AGENCY, INC.
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MR. TROIANO: No, I think how you should say this, maybe just read the sexual assault charge, and say that's sex assault. If you find that there was a burglary on top of that sex assault, it makes it an aggravated sexual assault.

THE COURT: I can't do that. I'll read both and when I'm done I'm saying and the bottom line, ladies and gentlemen, the only difference between sexual assault and aggravated sexual assault is the aggravated sexual assault has a component of burglary.

MR. TROIANO: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay? That's probably a better way to do it.

Let's bring them out. You know -- you know what I'll do, I'll read sexual assault first. Makes sense.

MR. TROIANO: It does.
MR. HIRSCHORN: It makes sense to read them all out of order when you, like you said yesterday. They're more confusing than they help, the jury charges.
(Jury enters the courtroom)
COURT OFFICER: Stay right here folks. Do you want coffee first or the charge first?

JURORS: Charge first.

\section*{Colloquy}
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THE COURT: Okay. Folks I got your three notes. First one, define aggravated sexual assault and sexual assault.

MR. TROIANO: Judge, I think there's someone in the rest room. Oh, she came out.

THE COURT: I'm good. I'll good, thanks.
MR. TROIANO: Sorry.
THE COURT: That's okay.
Your second note was definition of coercion.
Third note, coffee break.
So what I'll do is I'll give you the
definitions, you can go for coffee and you can come back and resume deliberations, okay?

This is what I'm going to do on this one. I'm going to -- you asked for aggravated sexual assault and sexual assault. I'm going to read sexual assault first, okay.

An actor is guilty of sexual assault if he commits an act of sexual penetration with another person, and the actor uses physical force or coercion, but the victim does not sustain severe personal injury.

In order to convict defendant of the charges, the State must prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

Number one, the defendant committed an act of
sexual penetration with another person.
Two, defendant acted knowingly.
Three, the defendant used physical force or
coercion.
And four, the victim did not sustain severe personal injury.l

The first element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant committed an act of sexual penetration with Liliana Santos.

According to the law, vaginal intercourse by the defendant constitutes sexual penetration. Any amount of insertion however slight, constitutes penetration. That is depth of insertion is not relevant.

The definition of vaginal intercourse is the penetration of the vagina.

The second element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is defendant acted knowingly. A person acts knowingly with respect to the nature of his conduct or the attendant circumstances if he is aware that the conduct is of that nature or that such circumstances exist or the person is aware of a high probability of their existence.

A person acts knowingly with respect to a result of the conduct of he is aware that it is

\section*{Colloquy}

\section*{9}
practically certain that the conduct will cause a result.

Knowing, with knowledge or equivalent terms have the same meaning. Knowledge is a condition of the mind and it cannot be seen. It can only be determined by inferences from defendant's conduct, words or acts.

A state of mind is rarely susceptible of direct proof but must ordinarily be inferred from the facts.

Therefore, it is not necessary that the State Produce witnesses to testify that an accused said that he had a certain state of mind when he did a particular thing.

It is within your power to find that such proof has been furnished beyond a reasonable doubt by inferences, which may arise from the nature of his acts and conduct from all he said and did at the particular time and place and from all the surrounding circumstances established by the evidence.

Third element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is the defendant used physical force or coercion. Physical force is defined as the commission of the act of sexual penetration without the victim's freely and affirmatively given permission to the specific act of penetration alleged to have

\section*{occurred.}

You must decide whether the defendant's alleged act of penetration was undertaken in circumstances that led the defendant reasonably to believe that the victim had freely given affirmative permission to the specific act of sexual penetration.

Simply put, affirmatively given permission means the victim did or said something which would lead a reasonable person to believe she was agreeing to engage in the act of sexual penetration. And freely given permission means the victim agreed of her own free will to engage in the act of sexual penetration. Freely and affirmatively given permission can be indicated either through words or through actions that when viewed in light of all the surrounding circumstances, would demonstrate to a reasonable person that affirmative and freely given permission for the specific act of sexual penetration had been given.

Persons need not of course expressly announce their consent to engage in an act of sexual intercourse for there to be affirmative permission. Permission to engage in an act of sexual penetration can be and indeed often is indicated through physical actions rather than words.

Permission is demonstrated when the evidence
```
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    in whatever form is sufficient to demonstrate that a
    reasonable person would have believed that the alleged
    victim had affirmatively and freely given authorization
        to the act.
                            Proof that the act of sexual penetration
        occurred without the victim's permission can be based
        on evidence of conduct or words in light of the
        surrounding circumstances and must demonstrate beyond a
        reasonable doubt that a reasonable person would not
        have believed that there was an affirmative and freely
        given permission.
            If there is evidence to suggest that
        defendant reasonably believed that such permission had
        been given, the state must demonstrate beyond a
        reasonable doubt that either defendant did not actually
        believe that such permission had been given, or that
        such a belief was unreasonable under all the
        circumstances.
            In determining the reasonableness of
        defendant's belief that the victim had freely given
        affirmative permission, you must keep in mind that the
        22 law places no burden on the alleged victim to have
        23 expressed non consent or to have denied permission.
        24 You should not speculate as to what the alleged victim
    25
        thought or desired or why she did not resist or
    ```
protest.
The State is not required to prove that the victim resisted.

To find the defendant used coercion you must find that defendant, with a purpose to unlawfully restrict Liliana Santos' freedom of action to engage or refrain from engaging in the act of sexual penetration, threatened to inflict bodily injury.

To find defendant used coercion, you must find that defendant's purpose was to compel Liliana Santos to engage in an act of sexual penetration by threatening her.

A person acts purposely with respect to the nature of his conduct or a result of that conduct if it is his conscious object to engage in conduct of that nature or to cause such a result.

A person acts purposely with respect to attendant circumstances if the person is aware of the existence of such circumstances or believes or hopes that they exist.

With purpose, design, with design are equivalent terms and have the same meaning.

Knowledge and purpose are conditions of the mind. They cannot be seen. They can only be determined by inference from defendant's conduct, words or acts.

\section*{Colloquy}
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A state of mind is rarely susceptible of direct proof but must ordinarily be inferred from the facts. Therefore, it is not necessary the State produce witnesses to testify that an accused said he had a certain state of mind when he did a particular thing. It is within your power to find that such proof has been furnished beyond a reasonable doubt by inference which may arise from the nature of his acts and conduct and from all he said and did at the particular time and place, and from all the surrounding circumstances established by the evidence.

Fourth element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the victim did not sustain severe person -- severe physical injury and severe personal injury means severe bodily injury, disfigurement, disease, incapacitating mental anguish or chronic pain.

If you find the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt each of these four elements, then you must find defendant guilty of sexual assault. If, on the other hand, you find the State has failed to prove any of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt then you must find him not guilty of sexual assault.

And I'll repeat the four elements.
One, defendant committed an act of sexual
penetration on another person.
Two, defendant acted knowingly.
Three, defendant used physical force or
coercion.
Eour, the victim did not sustain severe
personal injury.
Those are the four elements.
Now, I'm going to give you the definition of aggravated sexual assault. And basically the only
difference between these two definitions is with
aggravated sexual assault the sexual penetration as referred to in sexual assault occurred during the course of a burglary, okay. That's the only difference between the two. This has a burglary component, this does not.

But I'll repeat it.
Count one of the indictment charged the defendant with aggravated sexual assault. Our statute provides in pertinent part as follows. An actor is guilty of aggravated sexual assault if he commits an act of sexual penetration with another person during the commission of a burglary.

In order to convict defendant of this charge, the State must prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt.
```
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    One, that defendant committed an act of sexual penetration with another person.
And two, defendant acted knowingly. There's that word knowingly again.
And three, the penetration occurred during the commission of a burglary.
The first element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is the defendant committed an act of sexual penetration with Liliana Santos. And I've already defined that vaginal intercourse by defendant constitutes sexual penetration. Any amount of insertion however slight constitutes penetration. Depth is not relevant and vaginal intercourse is penetration of the vagina.
Second element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that defendant acted knowingly. And I've already defined that, I won't repeat that for you.
Third element the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the penetration occurred during the commission of a burglary, all right.
If you find the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt each of these three elements, then you must find defendant guilty of the crime of aggravated sexual assault.

```
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\section*{failed to prove any of these elements beyond a} reasonable doubt, then you must find defendant not guilty of aggravated sexual assault.

So again, three elements for that one. One, defendant committed an act of sexual penetration with another person.

Two, did so knowingly.
Three, the penetration occurred during the commission of a burglary.

So, between the two charges, the only difference is aggravated sexual assault has a burglary component. Without the burglary, if all other elements are met, then it's sexual assault. Okay? Understand?

All right, thank you very much. Sidebar one minute.

Okay, all right, that's your definition. Take, go grab a cup of coffee and come back. Don't do any discussion while you're having your coffee, okay? Think bout what \(I\) just said. Once you're all back in the room you can resume your deliberations, okay? Any other questions just let me know.

Thank you.
(RECESS)
THE COURT: Have a seat behind the first
```
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    seat.
            Okay. You're not feeling well, miss?
            JUROR: Headache, stomach and I feel my body
    hot.
            THE COURT: Hot? Okay, and you feel you're
    too ill to continue?
JUROR: Yeah, but I'll try. I got a headache
but --
THE COURT: You want to try to continue? Are
you sure? If you're too ill to continue, I'll excuse
you. But if you're telling me you're strong enough to
continue, you can continue. It's totally up to you.
JUROR: No, I'll try, I'll try. I'm going be
fine.
THE COURT: Okay then, thank you very much.
Step back inside. If there's a problem, let me know.
(RECESS)
THE COURT: Okay, back on State versus
Wright. We dealt with the sick juror, C-7. C-6 is as
follows. On the count two burglary, does mental
anguish qualify as quote, bodily injury, unquote, yes
or no.
I could just --
MR. HIRSCHORN: The answer's no. In my
opinion, Judge, I would submit to the court the

```
answer's no. I know Mr. Troiano has an argument he'd like to make. They asked a yes or no question, Judge, I think that the answer is no and that's all that needs to be said, despite what their confusion --

THE COURT: Well no, by saying yes or no I'm giving them, I'm giving them a factual answer.

MR. TROIANO: Yes, exactly.
THE COURT: Because here's, the phrase -- I
want to read the model charge. The phrase bodily
injury means physical pain, illness or impairment of physical condition. Now, whether impairment of physical condition is mental anguish that's a fact for them to find.

MR. HIRSCHORN: Then I would submit, Judge, that all that should be read is that one definition of bodily injury.

MR. TROIANO: The definition of bodily
injury.
MR. HIRSCHORN: That's fine.
THE COURT: That's what I was going to do.
MR. TROIANO: Judge, I think that there is definitely a more important point here, something I raised yesterday. I raised at sidebar before.

The -- the issue as to bodily injury has to do with the second degree burglary, all right. And the
```

                    Colloquy
                    1 9
    issue that I raised from the beginning is that they
    need to be specifically instructed that the burglary
    for aggravated sexual assault is only third degree
    burglary.
            I -- I'm forcing an issue here where they are
    saying we need to have third degree -- second degree
    burglary, excuse me, in order to get the aggravated
    sexual assault. I didn't think that it was clear
    yesterday, I didn't think that it was clear today, I've
    10 raised the issue and it's -- it definitely has become
    1 1 ~ a n ~ i s s u e .
    1 2
    1 3
    14
    1 5
    1 6
    1 7
    18
    1 9
    20
    2 1
    22
    23
    In the, in the verdict sheet itself it doesn't specify that you need only third degree burglary and I think that that they should be informed about this in light of the questions that have been presented so far. And in light of the objections or the issues that I've raised.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I would object to them being told anything in addition to what answers their question. Whether they're confused or not, they can ask another question if that's their issue.
THE COURT: Yeah, and the other thing they brought up the word mental anguish. You know why they brought that up, because the definition of severe bodily injury is incapacity mental anguish.

```
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But gentlemen, I can't give them information they didn't ask for.

MR. TROIANO: I -- I can't say that I disagree with what Mr. Hirschorn's response is. It's frustrating because \(I\) said this from the beginning that I thought that they should have been instructed specifically on this.

THE COURT: And they were. I told them either burglary, third or second degree burglary is the predicate act for the --

MR. TROIANO: But today when they had the question about the definition of aggravated sexual assault I specifically asked that the burglary that was sufficient -- in essence, Judge, today when they were read they were left out an element of aggravated sexual assault. That wasn't read to them, and that's why I made the objection before.

One of the elements of aggravated sexual assault is burglary, and when you instructed them again you didn't instruct them on what burglary is.

THE COURT: Oh, I didn't do it before when I should have done it you're saying.

MR. TROIANO: Yes.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I don't -- I would -I don't think that that was actually necessary. It
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wasn't as if the next question that came out is can you please reinstruct us on burglary. I don't think we're nece -- that the issue goes to whether -- I don't think that that question necessarily says that the issue goes to which degree of burglary do we need for aggravated sexual assault.

MR. TROIANO: Of course, I mean --
MR. HIRSCHORN: They could just be considering the difference between the two burglaries or some other issue.

MR. TROIANO: No, I mean I understand what -what Keith's saying with all due respect, and he may be right. But when they ask for a definition, you're supposed to give them, they are supposed to get rather, the definition of all the elements, and I -- I think you would admit, Judge, that you didn't define for them today what burglary --

THE COURT: I did not do it before. All right, I see your point.

MR. TROIANO: And if they're hung up on bodily injury, or mental anguish, then there's an issue with that burglary count.

THE COURT: All right, so you want me to correct the previous -- in other words, I can say this. Before when I gave you the definition of aggravated

\section*{The State of NJ v. Wright}
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sexual assault and \(I\) told you the only difference between that and sexual assault was the burglary component, let me repeat the elements for you.

An actor is guilty of aggravated sexual assault if he commits sexual penetration with another person in the commission of a burglary.

It doesn't make a difference if it's a third
degree burglary or a second degree burglary with respect to that count.

As to your question as to bodily injury, I'll repeat the definition. Bodily injury means physical pain, illness or impairment of physical condition.

And leave it at that.
MR. HIRSCHORN: Judge, I would object and just if \(I\) can make my position clear for the record. Judge, I would object to you going back and saying anything about the first count.

THE COURT: Well --
MR. HIRSCHORN: You did instruct them that it could be second or third degree at some point. It's not as if the question came out after you re-read the definitions that were asked before. Point one, it's not that it came back out could this be second or third degree burglary. That wasn't asked. It's not as if there was a question asked specifically as to burglary.
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And certainly it's not as if we limit their questions. So if that leads to another question, so be it. Then we answer it then. But --

THE COURT: But -- I -- I would agree but for the fact I omitted to do it when I should have did (sic) it, that -- that's the point.

If he -- if they're -- if -- if I didn't omit
it before, I would agree with you. But if I omitted to
do it before, then it makes it clearer.
So I'll -- based upon that I'll do it.
Bring the jury out please.
(Jury enters the courtroom)
(Off the record/on the record)
THE COURT: -- on count two burglary, does mental anguish qualify as bodily injury.

Couple things. Before I gave you the
definitions of aggravated sexual assault and sexual assault, and \(I\) told you the only difference was the burglary component in the aggravated, okay.

What I neglected or forgot to tell you was is
that it doesn't matter what level the burglary for aggravated sexual assault, it's any burglary for the aggravated sexual assault. Number one.

Number two, as to answer your question, I'm
going to redefine bodily injury for you. The phrase
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\begin{tabular}{|r} 
SHEET 13 \\
1 \\
1 \\
2 \\
3 \\
4 \\
5 \\
6 \\
7 \\
8 \\
9 \\
10 \\
11 \\
12 \\
13 \\
14 \\
15 \\
16 \\
17 \\
18 \\
19 \\
20 \\
21 \\
22 \\
23 \\
24 \\
25
\end{tabular}

> Colloquy
bodily injury means physical pain, illness or impairment of physical condition. That's what bodily injury means, okay?

Thank you very much; you can resume deliberations.
(Off the record/on the record)
THE COURT: Okay, would the Foreperson remain
standing please. In the matter of State versus Stephen
Wright, indictment number 1073-62008, has the jury
reached a verdict?
FOREPERSON: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Is it unanimous? EOREPERSON: Yes.
THE COURT: As to count one, sexual assault
during the commission of a burglary, how do you find,
not guilty or guilty?
EOREPERSON: Guilty.
THE COURT: As to count two, burglary, how do
you find, guilty or not guilty? FOREPERSON: For the first part, Judge?
THE COURT: Eirst part, yes. FOREPERSON: Not guilty.
THE COURT: Not guilty. Okay. As to burglary in the third degree, how do you find? FOREPERSON: Guilty.
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THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to call your
number. If you agree with the verdict, say yes.
Obviously if you don't agree, say no. (JURY WAS POLLED; VERDICT AS READ)
THE COURT: Okay, thank you very much.
Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, thank you
very much for your service. You gave us five days that
you dedicated to the assistance of New Jersey. We
thank you very much. Our system of justice cannot
10 function without you. I thank you, have a pleasant
11 trip home.

Thank you.
Unless you need something from the fourth floor, leave the badges on the seats, we'll take care of them for you. You can go right to your cars.

Give the verdict sheet, please, to the
officer.
(Jury leaves the courtroom)
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.
All right, Mr. Wright has been found guilty
of counts one and count two. We will sentence him -
THE CLERK: Thursday May 6th, Judge.
THE COURT: Well, it's an Avenel, so it will
probably be late June.
THE CLERK: Thursday, June --
THE COURT: Any time after June 14th. THE CLERK: June 17th, Judge. THE COURT: June 17th it is.
Thank you, counsel.
MR. TROIANO: Thank you, Judge.
MR. TROIANO: Thank you, Judge.
```
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