G046081

COURT OF APPEAL - STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOURTH APPELLAGE DISTRICT DIVISION III

THE PROPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. PHAINTIFF/RESPONDENT,

VS.

TIEN DUC NGUYEN.

DEFENDANT/APPELLANT.

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY HONORABLE DAPHNE SYKES SCOTT, JUDGE PRESIDING REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAU

> MARCH 30, 2011 APRIL 4 AND 5, 2011

APPEARANCES

FOR PLAINTIFF/RESPONDENT: FOR DEFENDANT/APPELLANT:

ATTORNEY GENERAL 110 WEST A ST., STE. 1100 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

JASON DAVIS 27281 DAS RAMBLAS, STD. 200 MISSION VIEWO, CA 92691

MARGARET M. CARABINE, CSR #4859 OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

VOLUME 1 OF 3 PAGES 1 TO 164, INCLUSIVE REPORTER PRO TEMPORE

LORI L. PARNESS, CSR #9117

1	THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALLFORNIA
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE, WESTMINSTER JUDICIAL DISTRICT
3	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAPENE SYKES SCOTT, JUDGE
4	DEPARTMENT W-2
5	
6	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
7	PLAINTIFF, CASE NO.
8	VS. 10WF0918
9	NGUYEN, TIEN DUC
10	DEFENDANT.
11	4×m————————————————————————————————————
12	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF COURT PROCEEDINGS
13	MARCH 30, 2011
14	
15	APPEARANCES:
16	FOR THE PROPER: RENEE JONES
17	DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
18	FOR THE DEFENDANT: CHRISTOPHER HENNES
19	ATTORNEY AT LAW
20	
21	
22	REPORTED BY: MARGARET M. CARABINE, CSR NO. 4959
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
24	
25	
26	

CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

WITNESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIREC <u>U</u>	RECROSS	VOIR DIRE	VOL
CHAPMAN, BRIAN (402 HEARING)	93	94				1
CHAPMAN, BRIAN	_C1	143	160			2
SCHUCH, GREGORY	167	224				3
PENHALL, MICHAEL	267	306	316	324		3

ALPHABETICAL INDEX

WITNESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS	VOTR DIRE	VOT.
CHAPMAN, BRIAN (402 HEARING)	93	94				1
CHAPMAN, BRIAN	101	143	160			2
PENEALL, MICHAEL	267	306	316	324		3
SCHUCH, GREGORY	167	224				3

EXHIBITS

PEOPLE'S EXHIBITS	FOR <u>IDENTIFIC</u> ATION.	IN EVIDENCE	VOL
150 CALIBER DTC RIFLE 2 - BOX OF 50 ROUNDS AMMO 2A - SINGLE ROUND AMMO 3 - BOX OF BEOWULF AMMUNITION 3A - SINGLE BEOWULF AMMUNITION 4 - LARGE BOX 5A-W - CONTENTS OF PEOPLE'S 4 6 - SALES RECEIPT 7 - BOX 8 - PACKING SHIP 9 - B.O.H.I.C.A. INSTRUCTIONS 10 - TRANSCRIPT 10A - TAPE 11 - PHOTOGRAPH 12 - PHOTO OF LOWER RECEIVER 13 LOWER RECEIVER COMPARISON 14 - COMPARISON PHOTO OF AMMO	104 115 117 117 117 120 121 125 127 127 128 132 133 140 142 142	2X2XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	1,2 1,2 1,2 1,2 1,2 1,2 1,2 1,2 1,2 1,2
DEFENSE EXHIBITS	FOR IDENTIFICATION	EVIDENCE	VOL
A - FLAT RECEIVER B - RIFLE C - PARTS KIT D - KYDEX WRAP	275 278 300 302		2 2 2 2

INDEX

PEOPLE'S	WLINESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS	VOIR DI <u>RE</u>
CHAPMAN, (402 HEAS		93	94			
CHAPMAN,	MALAN	201	143	160		

EXHIBITS

PEOPLE'S EXHIBITS	FOR <u>IDEN</u> TIFI <u>CATION</u>	IN EVIDENCE
150 CALIBER DTC RIFLE 2 - BOX OF 50 ROUNDS AMMO 2A - SINGLE ROUND AMMO 3 - BOX OF BEOWULF AMMUNITION	104 115 115 117	
3A - SINGLE BEOWULF AMMUNITION 4 - HARGE BOX 5A-W - CONTENTS OF PROPHE'S 4 6 - SALES RECEIPT	117 120 121 125	
7 - BOX 8 - PACKING SLIP 9 - B.O.H.I.C.A. INSTRUCTIONS 10 - TRANSCRIPT	127 127 128 132	
10A - TAPE 11 - PHOTOGRAPH 12 - PHOTO OF LOWER RECEIVER 13 - LOWER RECEIVER COMPARISON PHO	133 140 142 OTO 142	
14 - COMPARISON PHOTO OF AMMO	143	

WESTMINSTER, CALIFORNIA MARCH 30, 2011 1 2 3 AFTERNOON SESSION 4 5 (WHEREUPON THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD 6 IN OPEN COURT:) 7 THE COURT: CALLING THE MATTER OF THE PROPLE 8 VERSUS TIEN DOC NGUYEN, CASE NUMBER 10WE0918. THIS CASE 9 10 IS ON FOR JURY TRIAL TODAY. APPEARANCES, PLEASE. 11 12 MS. JONES: RENAE JONES FOR THE PEOPLE. 13 MR. HENNES: CHRIS HENNES FOR THE DEFENDANT WHO IS 14 PRESENT OUT OF CUSTODY. 15 THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. NGUYEN. 16 COUNSEL AND I HAVE BEEN IN CHAMBERS 17 DISCUSSING SOME OF THE MATTERS IN THIS CASE, AND THERE 18 ARE A COUPLE OF LEGAL ISSUES THAT THE COURT IS GOING TO RULE UPON BEFORE THE TRIAL GETS STARTED. THE COURT HAS 19 20 ALSO INVITED COUNSEL TO SUBMIT ANY AUTHORITY THAT THEY HAVE RELATIVE TO THE 402 ISSUES THAT WE DISCUSSED IN 21 22 CHAMBERS. TOMORROW IS A COURT HOLIDAY, FRIDAY THE COURT MEARS PUBLIC DEFENDER PRE TRIALS, SO THE JURY TRIAL WILL 23 24 BE TRAILED UNTIL MONDAY. AND ON MONDAY, THE COURT WILL 25 FIRST DECIDE THE 402 OR THE PRELIMINARY LEGAL ISSUES 26 BEFORE WE'RE GOING TO PICK A CURY, AND THEN WE EXPECT TO

```
1
    SELECT THE JORY ON MONDAY, AND HOPEFOLLY START WITH
    TESTIMONY, OPENING STATEMENTS, ON IUESDAY. THAT IS THE
 2
 3
    PLAN.
               IS THERE ANYTHING THAT COUNSEL WANTS TO PUT
 4
 5
    ON THE RECORD AT THIS TIME?
 6
         MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, I HAD A QUESTION
 7
    REGARDING THE POINTS AND AUTHORITIES THAT THE COURT HAS
    REQUESTED. IS IT POSSIBLE TO E-MAIL THEM ANY WHERE TO
 8
    THE COURT AND TO COUNSEL?
 9
10
          THE COURT: ABSOLUTELY.
         MR. HENNES: THAT MIGHT BE MORR--
11
         THE COURT: ABSOLUTELY, COUNSEL. LET'S SEE.
12
    BEFORE--
13
14
          MR. HENNES: IF CONVENIENT WITH THE COURT AND
15
   COUNSEL. I DON'T KNOW, JUST A SUGGESTION.
16
         THE COURT: PLEASE DO. BEFORE YOU LEAVE IF YOU
27
    COULD JUST GET THE CLERK'S E-MAIL ADDRESS YOU CAN E-MAIL
    IT TO HER, AND THEN OF COURSE COPY TO OPPOSING COUNSEL.
18
19
         MR. HENNES: RIGHT.
          THE COURT: COUNSEL, IF YOU COULD, BEFORE YOU
20
    LEAVE HERE TODAY, LEAVE YOUR E-MAIL AND YOUR CELIPHONE
21
22
    NUMBER FOR MY CLERK. THAT WOULD BE GREAT.
23
         MR. HENNES: ABSOLUTELY.
24
         THE COURT: DO COUNSEL WANT TO STIPULATE WHEN THE
25
   E-MATE IS RECEIVED BY MY CLERK II IS DEEMED FILED AND
26
    SHE CAN MAKE A COPY OF IT AND FILE STAMP IT?
```

MS. JONES: YES.

1.5

2-

2 MR. HENNES: SO STIPULATED.

3 THE COURT: OKAY.

LET ME JUST MAKE SURE I'M CLEAR WITH RESPECT TO THE PROPOSED 402 ISSUES. ONE OF THE ISSUES WAS IF MR. NGUYEN WERE TO PLEAD GUILITY TO COUNTS 3 AND 4, WHETHER EVIDENCE OF THOSE COUNTS CAN BE USED BY THE PEOPLE IF LT'S ATTEMPT IS TO PROVE THE COUNTS 1 AND 2. IS THAT CORRECT?

MR. HENNES: THAT STATES IT, (BELIEVE.

MS. JONES: WHETHER THEY COULD BE SEVERED AT THIS POINT.

THE COURT: WHETHER THEY CAN BE SEVERED AT THIS
POINT, AN ISSUE OF TUMELINESS. THAT IS ONE ISSUE. TWO
ISSUES. ONE REQUEST WAS THAT. ANOTHER REQUEST RATHER
WAS THAT THE COURT PRECLUDE THE OFFICER WITNESS, OR ANY
WITNESS RATHER, FROM OPINING WHETHER IT IS LEGAL TO
POSSESS ANY OF THESE GUNS AND OR AMMUNITION. SO THAT
WAS ANOTHER ISSUE. THAT IS NUMBER THREE.

MS. JONES: ACTUALLY, QUESTIONING TO THAT EFFECT OF THE WITNESSES.

THE COURT: WHETEER YOU CAN QUESTION THE WITNESS
TO MIJICIT FROM THE WITNESS WHETHER IT WAS LEGAL TO
POSSESS ANY OF THE GONS AND/OR AMMUNITION. WHETHER IT IS
PROPER FOR THE WITNESS TO GIVE AN OPINION IF RELATIVE TO

26 THE DEFENDANT'S INTENT.

```
THAT MOTION IS OF COURSE GRANTED. THAT WAS
 1
 2
    AN ISSUE THAT WAS BROUGHT UP IN CHAMBERS. THE DEFENSE
 3
    HAD A DOCUMENT WHICE APPEARED TO BE SOME SORT OF FLOAT
 4
    CHART. IT'S A SUMMARY OF ASSAULT WEAPONS LAW, PORPORTED
 5
    TO BE A SUMMARY OF ASSAULT WEAPONS LAW IN THE STATE OF
 6
    CALIFORNIA. AND THE COURT'S TENTATIVE IS TO PRECLODE
7
    IT'S ADMISSION. IF AT SOME POINT THE DEFENSE FRELS AS
8
    THOUGH IT SHOULD BE OR COULD BE ADMITTED, THE COURT
9
    WOULD REQUEST THAT OF COURSE THAT IT SHOULD BE MADE
10
    OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY BEFORE SHOWING THE
11
    DOCUMENT TO THE WITNESS.
12
         MR. HEXXES: YOUR HOXOR, MAY I INTERPOSE A
13
   OUESTION?
         THE COURT: YES.
14
         MR. HENNES: WOULD THE COORT LIKE A COPY OF THIS
15
   IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND WHAI WE'RE -- WHAI IT'S ALL
16
17
   ABOUT, RATHER THAN JUST PRECLUDING II WITHOUT LOOKING AT
:8
    IT? I'VE GIVEN IT TO COUNSEL. I'D BE GLAD TO PROVIDE
19
   THIS COPY FOR THE COURT.
2C
         THE COURT: I'LL TAKE A LOOK SINCE I HAVE NOT
   LOOKED AT IT. I HAVE NOT READ IT.
21
22
         MS. JONES: I DON'T HAVE A COPY. IF YOU HAVE AN
23
    EXTRA ONE. YOU GAVE II TO THE COURT AT THE PRELIMINARY.
24
    AOO DIDN, L --
25
         THE COURT: WE'LL MAKE A CORY. WE'LL MAKE TWO.
```

MR. HENNES: 1'LL JUST PRINT ANOTHER ONE. I DON'T

- 1 NEED ONE.
- MS. JONES: FOR THE RECORD, THE PEOPLE'S POSITION
- 3 IS THAT IT'S IRRELEVANCE AND WITHOUT FOUNDATION TO THESE
- 4 PROCEEDINGS. WE DON'T KNOW WHO CREATED IT OR THE
- 5 VALIDITY OF II.
- 6 THE COURT: THERE WAS A REQUEST ALSO THAT -- THE
- 7 DEFENSE MOST HAVE MADE THIS REQUEST -- THAT THE PEOPLE'S
- 8 EXPER" BE LIMITED TO THAT PERSON'S EXPERTISE.
- 9 MS. JONES: THAT WAS ACTUALLY MINE BECAUSE I DON'T
- 10 WANT THE DEFENSE TO BE INQUIRING AS TO HIS OPINION OF
- 11 WHAT THE LAW IS.
- 12 THE COURT: NO OPENIONS ABOUT LEGALITY. | DID
- 13 WRITE THAT RATHER.
- 14 SO THE WITNESS WILL NOT BE ASKED WHAT IS
- 15 DEGAL AND NOT RENDER ANY OPENION AS TO THE LEGALITY IN
- 16 THAT PARTICULAR AREA OF EXPERTISE. THAT WAS THE ISSUE.
- 17 | I WILL TAKE ANOTHER LOOK AT THAT.
- 18 MR. HENNES: FOR THE RECORD, I DON'T JOIN IN THAT
- 19 MOIION. " DON'T CARE IF SHE ASKS "HE WITNESS ABOUT
- 20 LEGALITIES.
- 21 THE COURT: SEEMS TO BE ALG I HAVE. IS THERE
- 22 ANYTHING ACCITIONAL?
- 23 MS. JONES: I THINK THAT IS LT.
- 24 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT WITH THAT, TODAY WAS THE
- 25 DAY ZERO OF TEN, WAS IT?
- 26 MR. HENNES: YES.

-	THE COURT: DAY FIVE ON MONDAY.
2	MR. NGUYEN, YOU ARE CREERED BACK HERE TO THIS
3	COURT ON MONDAY. IEAT WILL BE APRIL THE 4TH, AT 9:00
4	O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING. SEE EVERYBODY AT 9:00 O'CLOCK.
5	THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
6	LOOKS LIKE DAY FOUR OF THE BECAUSE TOMORROW
7	IS A HOLIDAY.
8	MR. HENNES: I DON'T THINK THEY COUNT HOLIDAYS ON
9	A TEN-DAY TRIAL.
10	MS. JONES: OR WEEKENDS.
11	MR. HENNES: STRATGAT CALENDAR DAYS.
12	MS. JONES: TWO OF TEN, RIGHT?
13	MR. HENNES: YFS. WE'LL GET STARTED. IT'S A MOOT
14	POINT.
15	THE COURT: I'LL KNOW BY THEN FOR SURE WHAT DAY IT
16	IS.
L7	(WHEREUPON THE PROCEEDINGS ENDED.)
18	
. 9	
20	
21	
2.2	
5.3	
24	
25	
26	

- 1	
1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE, WEST JUSTICE CENTER
3	DEPARTMENT W8
4	
5	THE REOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)
6	PTAINTIFF,
7	VS.) NO. 10WF0918
8	TIEN DUC NGUYEN,) G046081
9	DEFENDANT.
10)
11	
12	HONORABLE DAPHNE SYKES SCOTT, JUDGE PRESIDING
1.3	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
14	MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2011
1.5	
16	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
17	FOR THE PEOPLE:
18	TONY RACKAUCKAS, DISTRICT AUTORNEY
19	BY: RENEE JONES, DEPUTY DISTRICT ACCORNEY
20	FOR THE DEFENDANT:
21	BY: CHRISTOPHER J. HENNES, RETAINED ATTORNEY
22	LORU J. PARNESS, C.S.R. #9117,
23	PRO TEMPORE COURT REPORTER
24	
25	
2.6	
- 1	

1	WESTMINSTER, CALIFORNIA - MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2011
S	MORNING SESSION
3	(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT
4	OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)
5	THE COURT: CALLING THE CASE OF PEOPLE VERSUS
6	TIEN DUC NGUYEN, CASE NUMBER 10WF0918.
7	APPEARANCES, PLEASE.
8	MS. JONES: RENEE JONES FOR THE PEOPLE.
9	MR. HENNES: CHRISTOPHER HENNES FOR DEFENDANT,
10	WHO IS PRESENT OUT OF CUSTOUY.
11	THE COURT: CKAY. THIS IS THE TIME AND DAY FOR
12	THE JURY TRIAL IN THIS MATTER. HOWEVER, THE COURT HAS
13	RECEIVED A TAHL FORM. AND THE COURT UNDERSTANDS THAT
14	MR. NGUYEN WILL BE PLEADING CUILTY TO COUNTS 3 AND 4 OF
15	THE INFORMATION.
16	AND COUNTS 1 AND 2 ARE STILL ON FOR JURY TRIAL;
17	1S THAT CORRECT?
18	MR. HENNES: THAT IS CORRECT, YOUR HONOR.
1,9	THE COURT: OKAY. MR. NGUYEN, IS THAT YOUR
20	UNDERSTANDING? YOU'RE GOING TO BE PLEADING GUILTY TO
21	TWO COUNTS?
22	THE DEFENDANT: YES.
23	THE COURT: DO YOU SEE THIS FORM THAT I HAVE IN
2.4	WA HVND3
2.5	THE DEFENDANT: YES.
26	THE COURT: OKAY. THE COURT ALSO UNDERSTANDS

1 THAT YOU'RE GOING TO BE ADMITTING A PRIOR STRIKE 2 ALLEGATION; IS THAT TRUE? 3 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 4 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DID YOU DESCUSS YOUR 5 CHARGES AND YOUR CASE THOROUGHLY WITH YOUR ATTORNEY? 6 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 1 MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, MAY I INTERJECT? 8 THE COURT: YES. 9 MR. HENNES: WE ARE NOT NECESSARILY CONCEDING 10 THAT THE EVENT IS A STRIKE, BUT FOR PURPOSES OF THE PLEA 11 OF GUILTY, WE ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THERE WAS A CONVICTION 12 FOR TUAT OFFENSE. 13 AND I WOULD LIKE TO RESERVE ANY ARCUMENS THAT I 14 MAY OR MAY NOT MAKE CONCERNING I'TS QUALLTY AS A STRIKE. 1.5 IT APPEARS IT IS, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO --16 THE COURT: I SEE. YOU WILL BE ADMITTING A 17 PRIOR CONVICTION WITH A VIOLATION DATE OF AUGUST TITH, 18 1999 IN CASE NUMBER 99WF1808; IS THAT CORRECT? 19 MR. HENNES: THAT IS CORRECT, YOUR HONOR. 20 THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. 21 DID YOU READ ALL OF THE TERMS IN THIS DOCUMENT 22 CAREFULLY AND DISCUSS THEM WITH YOUR AUTORNEY, 23 MR. NCUYEN? 24 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 2.5 THE COURT: AFTER READING THE FORM, DID YOU 26 PLACE YOUR INTITIALS IN THE BOXES DOWN THE LEFT-HAND

1 SIDE? AND DID YOU SIGN THIS DOCUMENT? 2 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 3 THE COURT: OKAY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT WHEN 4 YOU PLEAD COLLEY YOU GIVE UP THE RIGHTS SET FORTH IN 5 THIS DOCUMENT? 6 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 1 THE COURT: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE MAXIMUM. PENALTY FOR THESE TWO CHARGES IS SEVEN YEARS AND FOUR 8 9 MONTHS IN STATE PRISON? DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 10 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 11 THE COURT: OKAY. AND IF YOU ARE ULTIMATELY --12 AND WE'RE NOT SENTENCING YOU TODAY, OBVIOUSLY: IS THAT 13 CORRECT? 14 MR. HENNES: THAT IS CORRECT. 15 THE COURT: ALG RICHE. WHEN YOU ARE SENTENCED, 16 THE YOU GO TO STATE PRISON, WHEN YOU ARE RELEASED, YOU 17 WILL BE PLACED ON PAROLE FOR THREE YEARS. IF YOU 18 VIOLATE THE TERMS OF PAROLE, YOU COULD BE SENTENCED TO 19 AN ADDITIONAL YEAR IN PRISON FOR EACH VIOLATION. 20 DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 21 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 22 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND 23 THAT -- AND I'M COING TO GO AHEAD AND GIVE YOU THIS 24 ADMONITION AS WELL: 25 DE YOU ARE GRANTED PROBATION, HOWEVER, AND TATER VIOLATE A TERM OF PROBATION, YOU COULD BE 26

SENTENCED TO THE MAXIMUM TIME IN PRISON.
DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?
THE DEFENDANT: YES.
THE COURT: OKAY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IF
YOU ARE NOT A CITTZEN, THIS FELONY CONVICTION COULD
RESULT IN YOUR DEPORTATION, DENIAL OF NATURALIZATION OR
CITIZENSHIP OR EXCLUSION FROM ADMISSION TO THE
UNITED STATES?
DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?
THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR.
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. OKAY. ON PAGE THREE,
LINE 21, THERE IS A STATEMENT OF THE FACTS OF THIS CASE.
IS THAT STATEMENT TRUE AND CORRECT?
THE DEFENDANT: YES, MA'AM.
THE COURT: OTHER THAN WHAT IS SET FORTH IN
THIS EXCUMENT, HAS ANYONE MADE ANY PROMISES TO YOU TO
CET YOU TO PLEAD GUILTY TODAY?
THE DEFENDANT: NO.
THE COURT: OKAY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND EVERYTHING
THAT IS GOING ON HERE TODAY?
THE DEFENDANT: YES, YES.
THE COURT: OKAY. ARE YOU PLEADING GUILTY
FREELY AND VOLUNTARTLY AND BECAUSE YOU ARE GUILLY?
THE DEFENDANT: YES.
THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT
ANYTHING THAT YOU WANT TO ASK YOUR ATTORNEY AT THIS

1 TIME? 2 THE DEFENDANT: NO, MA'AM. 3 THE COURT: OKAY. THE COURT FINDS A KNOWING, 4 VOLUMBARY AND INTELLIGENT WATVER OF YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL 5 RIGHTS. I FIND THAT YOU UNDERSTAND THE CONSEQUENCES OF YOUR GUILTY PLEA. AND I FIND THERE IS A FACTUAL BASIS 6 7 FOR THE GUILDRY PLEA. 8 AS TO COUNT 3 OF THE INFORMATION, FELONY 9 POSSESSION OF A FIREARM BY A FELON ON MARCH 1711, 2010, 10 HOW DO YOU PLEAD? 11 THE DEFENDANT: GUILTY. 12 MR. HENNES: COUNSEL JOINS. 13 THE COURT: THANK YOU. 14 AND DO YOU ADMIT THAT ON AUGUST 13TH, 1999 IN 15 CASE NUMBER 99WF1808 YOU SUPFERED A PREVIOUS CONVICTION? 16 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 17 "THE COURT: DO YOU ADMIT THAT? 18 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 19 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. HOW DO YOU PLEAD TO IN 20 COUNT 4, FELONY POSSESSION OF AMMUNITION BY A PROHIBITED 21 PERSON ON MARCH 17TH, 2010?

MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE THAT'S A WORBLER. AND WOULD THAT BE -- WE'RE NOT -- WE'RE JUST PLEADING TO THE CONVICTION. AND I THINK IT WOULD BE UP TO THE COURT WHETHER TO SENTENCE IT AS A FERONY OR A MISDEMEANOR.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: WELL, AT THIS TIME IF HE'S PLEADING 1 2 TO THE COUNT AS CHARGED, HE WOULD BE PLEADING TO IT AS A 3 FELONY. IF DEFENSE WISHES TO MAKE A 17(B) MOTION LATER 1 ON, YOU'RE FREE TO DO THAT. 5 MR. HENNES: OKAY. THE MATTER MAY BE UP FOR 6 SENTENCING. 1 THE COURT: YES, THAT WOULD BE. 8 MR. HENNES: TEANK YOU. 9 THE COURT: HOW DO YOU PLEAD, MR. NGUYEN, TO FELONY POSSESSION OF AMMUNITION BY A PROHIBITED PERSON 10 11 ON MARCH 17TH, 2010? 12 THE DEFENDANT: GUILTY. 13 THE COURT: OKAY, LET'S SEE HERE, OKAY, 14 COUNSEL JOIN IN THE PLEADING, WAIVERS AND 15 FACTUAL BASIS? 16 MR. HENNES: 1 IX), YOUR HONOR. 17 MS. JONES: YOUR HONOR, COULD THE COURT CLARIFY 18 WITH THE DEFENDANT THAT THE CRIME HE WAS CONVICTED OF IN 19 THE '99 CASE WAS 12025 (A) (1) (B) (3)? 20 THE COURT: ABSOLUTELY. ONE MOMENT. 21 AND THAT 12025 (A) (1) (B) (3) WAS APPARENTLY 22 CARRYING A CONCEATED WEAPON BY A PERSON WHO IS AN ACTIVE 23 PARTICIPANT IN A CRIMINAL STREET GANG; IS THAT CORRECT, 24 MS. JONES? 25 MS. JONES: CORRECT. 26 THE COURT: AND YOU'RE ADVISING TEAT WAS THE

1 VIOLATION. 2 AND DO YOU AGREE THAT THAT WAS THE SUBSTANCE OF 3 THE PRIOR CONVICTION? 4 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 6 MS. JONES: AND ALSO WE WOULD REQUEST THAT HE 7 UNDERSTAND EE'S WAIVING HIS RIGHT TO APPEAL AND HIS 8 EQUITH AMENDMENT RIGHTS DURING THE TIME HE'S ON 9 PROBATION OR PAROLE. 10 THE COURT: I'M SORRY? WHAT WAS THE LAST PART 11 OF THAT? "DURING "THE" 12 MS. JONES: DURING THE TERM OF PROBATION OR 13 PAROLE. 14 "THE COURT: OKAY, MR. NGUYEN, DO YOU UNDERSTAND YOU'RE ALSO WAIVING YOUR FOURTH AMENDMENT 15 16 RIGHTS, MEANING HE'LL BE SUBJECT TO SEARCH AND SETZURE 17 18 MS. JONES: RIGHT. 19 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 20 THE COURT: DURING THE THAT YOU ARE ON 21 PAROLE. AND THAT YOU ARE SUBJECT TO SEARCH AND SEIZURE 22 ANYTIME OF DAY OR NIGHT WITH OR WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE? 23 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 24 THE COURT: AND THAT YOUR HOUSE AND EFFECTS ARE 2.5 ALSO SUBJECT TO SEARCH AND SERVURE WITH OR WITHOUT A 26 WARRANT?

1	THE DEFENDANT: YES.
2	THE COURT: OKAY.
3	MS: JONES: HE'S FURTHER WAIVING HIS RIGHT TO
4	APPEAL?
5	THE COURT: YES. YOU ARE FURTHER WAIVING YOUR
6	APPEAU RICHTS. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?
7	THE DEFENDANCE YES.
8	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, COUNSEL.
9	MS. JONES: THANK YOU.
10	THE COURT: IS MR. NGUYEN ALSO WAIVING FORMAL
11	PROBATION REPORT OR NCT?
1.2.	MR. HENNES: NO.
13	THE COURT: OKAY. SO WETEL JUST SET HIS
14	SENTENCING DATE OUT AT THIS TIME.
15	DO WE NEED TO SET A SENTENCING DATE NOW? HE'S
16	ENTITLED TO BE SENTENCED WITHIN 20 DAYS OF TODAY'S DATE.
17	MR. HENNES: WE'LL WAIVE TIME FOR SENTENCING,
18	YOUR HONOR. I WOULD REQUEST THAT IF THERE IS ANY
19	SENTENCE ON THE CASE THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE OR THE
20	REMAINING COUNTS TWAT, I GUESS, WE COULD JUST SET A
21	SENTENCING DATE WITH ENOUGH TIME TO DO A PROBATION
22	REPORT.
2.3	THE COURT: YES. LET'S GO AHEAD AND SET IT.
24	AND THEN WE CAN CERTAINLY ADJUST IT DEPENDING UPON WHAT
25	HAPPENS IN THE TRIAL.
26	MR. HENNES: YES.

MS. JONES: I DON'T THINK IT WOULD CHANGE THE 1 2 SENTENCING DATE ANYWAY BECAUSE YOU JUST SET IT OUT EIGHT 3 WEEKS EITHER WAY. 4 THE COURT: YOU DO EIGHT WEEKS? OKAY. SO IF THAT'S BEYOND THE ZO DAYS, YOU WAIVE TIME 5 6 TO BE SENTENCED WITTEIN 20 DAYS? 7 MR. EENNES: YES, YOUR HONOR. 8 THE COURT: OKAY, LET'S GO AHEAD AND SET IT 9 OUT THEN ON MAY 31. JUNE 1ST? MAY 31? 10 MS. JONES: THAT'S FINE. 11 THE COURT: BET'S GO AMEAD AND SET IT FOR MAY BIST. I THINK THAT'S ALL FOR NOW. 12 13 ANYTHING ADDITIONAL THAT I HAVE MISSED, 14 COUNSEL2 15 MS. JONES: NO, YOUR HONOR. 16 THE COURT: OKAY. NOW, LET'S MOVE ON TO THE 17 TRIAL ISSUES. THERE WERE A FEW 402 ISSUES THAT WE 18 INITIALLY SPOKE ABOUT BACK ON MARCH THE BOTH. 19 AND STACE THEN THE COURT HAS RECEIVED BRIEFS. 20 FROM THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY FILED TODAY. ! HAVE RECEIVED 21 A TRIAL BRIEF. I HAVE READ AND CONSIDERED THAT. 22 I RECEIVED -- IN ADDITION TO DEFENDANT'S TRIAL 23 BRIEF FILED ON APRIL 1ST, I RECEIVED A SUPPLEMENTAL 2.4 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES. AND WELL CO 25 AHEAD. 26 IS COUNSEL READY TO MOVE FORWARD ON THE 402

1 ISSUES? 2 MR. HENNES: YES, YOUR HONOR. 3 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 4 MS. JONES: AND A POINT OF CLARIFICATION AS TO 5 THE ISSUES. 6 THE COURT: YES. 7 MS. JONES: THERE WAS AN ISSUE PROUGHT UP AS TO 8 THE PURPOSE OF THE OFFICERS IN SEARCHING THE DEFENDANT'S 9 SHOP THAT DATE. AND THE PARTIES HAVE DISCUSSED THAT 10 ISSUE AND AGREED THAT WE WILL STATE THAT THEY WERE THERE 11 FOR AN UNRELATED PURPOSE. 12 AND THEY'RE NOT TO SPECULATE AS TO THE PURPOSE 13 THAT THEY WERE THERE, WHETHER IT WAS WHATEVER KIND OF 14 INVESTIGATION, THEY WERE THERE. BOTH OF US HAVE AGREED 15 WE WILL NOT APPROACH THAT SUBJECT. 16 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO YOU CAN ADVISE YOUR 17 WITNESSES NOT TO EVEN INADVERTENTLY COME OUT WITH THAT 18 PARTICULAR INFORMATION. ALL RIGHT. I GUESS ONE USSUE IS WHETHER NOW THAT THE 19 20 PLEA HAS BEEN TAKEN " EVIDENCE OF THE EVIDENCE OF 21 THE COUNTS 3 AND 4 WILL BE ABLE TO BE USED IN THE 22 PROSECUTION'S CASE IN CHIEF. 23 IS THERE ANY ADDITIONAL ARGUMENT IN ADDITION TO 24 WHAT WAS SET FORTH IN THE BRIEFS, COUNSEL, THAT YOU WANT 25 TO SAY AT THIS TIME BEFORE I MAKE MY RULLING?

MS. JONES: NOT AT THIS POINT, YOUR HONOR.

1 MR. HENNES: NO, YOUR HONOR. 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WHOSE MOTION WAS THAT? 3 MR. HENNES: DEFENSE MOTION. 4 THE COURT: THAT WAS THE DEFENSE MOTION TO 5 PRECIDIE. THAT MOTION IS DENIED. 6 L FIND THAT THE PROSECUTION'S ARGUMENT IS MORE 7 PERSUASIVE. AND THAT EVIDENCE OF THAT WOULD BE ELICITED 8 RELATIVE TO COUNTS 3 AND 4 WILL BE ALMITTED. 9 THE JURY WILL BE ASSE TO HEAR EVIDENCE THAT THE 10 DEFENDANT DID POSSESS THOSE OTHER ITEMS. IT DOES GO TO 11 KNOWLEDGE, DOMINION AND CONTROL POSSIBLY AS TO COUNTS 1 12 AND 2. 13 OF COURSE, THERE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO BE ANY 14 TESTIMONY ABOUT THE UNDERLYING OFFENSE FOR WELCH 15 DEFENDANT IS A FELON. HOWEVER, THE FACT THAT HE WAS A 161 FELON IN POSSESSION OF A PIREARM CAN BE ELECTED AND IS 17 RELEVANT. 1.8 COUNSEL, DID YOU HAVE A RESPONSE? 19 MR. HENNES: IS THE COURT RULING THAT THE JURY 20 MAY HEAR EVIDENCE THAT MY CLIENT IS A CONVICTED FELON? 21 THE COURT: WELL, YES. OTHERWISE, JUST LIKE 22 YOU POINT OUT ON YOUR PAPERS, IF THE AMMUNITION CAN BE 23 POSSESSED BY ANYONE AND IT'S LEGAL TO POSSESS THAT 24 AMMUNITION AS SET FORTH IN COUNT 4, THE JURY WOULD BE LEFT TO SPECULATE, "WELL, IT'S LECAL. WHY IS IT THEN 25 26 LEGAT:?"

MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, WHY IS THERE A
REFERENCE TO THE AMMUNITION OR THE OTHER RIFLE THAT IS
NOT AN ASSAULT WEAPON AT ALL? HOW ARE THOSE RELEVANT TO
THE ISSUES OF WHETHER MR. NOUYEN ATTEMPTED TO POSSESS AN
ASSAULT WEAPON, BECAUSE THE RIFLE, THE COMPLETED RIFLE
DIC IS NOT AN ASSAULT WEAPON.

ASSAULT WEAPONS. IT'S LEGAL AS A MATTER OF FACT, BUT IT IS NOT UNDER THE BY IT IS NOT A TYPE OF ASSAULT WEAPON. IT'S, YOU KNOW, IT'S SIMPLY AN ILLEGAL FEREARM.

AND I'M HAVING TROUBLE UNDERSTANDING WHY THE COURT WOULD ROLE THAT ANY OF THE AMMUNITION FOR THAT LEGAL RIFLE WOULD BE ADMITTED TO THE -- IN FRONT OF THE JURY BECAUSE IT'S NOT AN ISSUE BEFORE THEM. WHAT IS AN ISSUE IS THE ASSAULT WEAPON, WEIGH IS THE AK-47 PART KIT.

THE COURT: ONE OF THE COMPONENTS THAT THE
PEOPLE HAVE TO PROVE IS DEFENDANT'S KNOWLEDGE THAT HE
KNEW OR REASONABLY SHOULD HAVE KNOWN THAT IT HAD
CHARACTERISTICS OF AN ASSAULT WEAPON.

DE'S GOT TO KNOW THE NATURE OF WHAT HE'S

POSSESSING AND AS OPPOSED TO HAVING AN INNOCENT, SORT

OF -- HE'S GOT AN INNOCENT POSSESSION OF IT.

IN OTHER WORDS, "I DIDN'T REALLY KNOW THAT THIS
WAS SOMETHING THAT WAS ILLEGAL. THIS IS JUST A HOBBY OF
MINE. I'M JUST FIDDSING AROUND WITH THESE THINGS,"

1 VERSUS IF HE HAD ELEVATED KNOWLEDGE, IF YOU WILL, OR 2 SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THESE TYPES OF WEAPONS. 3 AND THE COURT FINDS THAT HIS HAVING ALREADY 4 ASSEMBLED ONE OF THESE VERY SIMILAR WEAPONS WOULD HAVE 5 SOME TENDENCY AND REASON TO SHOW THOSE PARTICULAR 6 ELEMENTS. SO THAT IS THE CONNECTION THAT THE COURT 7 MADE: 8 MR. HENNES: I WOULD JUST POINT OUT FOR THE 9 RECORD, YOUR HONOR, THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS ARRESTED FOR 10 HAVING .50 CALIBER BMG, WHICH WAS THE RIFLE IN QUESTION. 11 THAT IS NOT -- THE INFORMATION CHARGES 12 MR. NGUYEN WITH VIOLATING THE CODE BY POSSESSING A 13 WEATON THAT WAS IN VIOLATION OR THAT IS DESCRIBED BY 14 PENAL CODE 12276 AND 12276.1. 15 THOSE -- NEITHER OF THOSE SECTIONS HAS ANYTHING 16 TO DO WITH THE BMC/DIC WEAPON. I MEAN, THEY'RE NOT --17 TI'S JUST ANOTHER ILLEGAL WEAPON TO HAVE. AND THEY'RE 18 NOT EVEN --- THEY ARE NOT SIMILAR AT ALL. 19 AND MERELY BECAUSE HE WAS ABLE TO BUY THE 20 PARTS, YOU KNOW, TO MAKE A LEGAL DTC HAS NO BEARING ON 21 HIS KNOWLEDGE TO MAKE AN ASSAULT RIFLE AS DESCRIBED IN 22 12276 AND 12276.1. 23 I MEAN, TO THE UNINITIATED, I GUESS, FOR THE ---24 A BIG GUN IS A BIG GUN, OR IT'S IN THE SAME PORTION OF 25 THE PENAL CODE UNDER THE ASSAULT WEAPONS ACT, BUT IT IS

NOT BY DEFINITION AN "ASSAULT WEAPON." L'M TALKING

ABOUT THE DTC.

AND FURTHERMORE THAT, YOU KNOW, BECAUSE THAT DIC WAS OTHERWISE, IT WAS LEGAL TO OWN, WOULD HAVE NO TENDENCY AND LOGIC OR REASON TO PROVE THAT MR. NGUYEN INTENDED TO MAKE AN ILLEGAL WEAPON.

NOT BELLEVE THAT, YOU KNOW, THAT TYPE OF EVIDENCE WOULD PROVE THAT HE INTENDED TO MAKE AN ILLEGAL ONE.

AND FURTHERMORE, THESE WEAPONS CAN BE MADE
LEGALLY AND THEY ARE ALL THE TIME, WHICH I THINK IS
GOING TO BE MORE SO FOR THE PROSECUTION. BUT I ALSO, AS
I SAID IN MY PAPER, I JUST THINK IT'S PREJUDICIAL TO BE
WAYING THESE CUNS AROUND.

AND FURTHERMORE, THE AMMUNITION WOULD NOT SHOW ANY KNOWLEDGE WHATSOEVER OF HOW TO CONSTRUCT ANY KIND OF A WEAPON, SO I WOULD ASK THE COURT CERTAINLY TO EXCLUDE THAT. IT HAS NO BEARING ON ANY ISSUE OF THIS CASE THAT REMAINS.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE A RESPONSE, MADAM PROSECUTOR?

MS. JONES: YOUR HONOR, AS SET FORTH IN MY
MOTION, IT GOES TO THE DEFENDANT'S INTENT, HIS MOTIVE
AND HIS SPECIFIC ELEVATED AND EXTENSIVE KNOWLEDGE OF HOW
TO COMPLETE, MANUFACTURE AND COMPLETE FIREARMS AND THAT
HE'S ALREADY DONE SO AND DID SO IN SUBSTANTIALLY THE
SAME MANNER BY GATHERING TOGETHER THE LOWER AND ADDING

TO IT. AND HE HAS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED A RATHER
DETAILED PROCESS OF MANUFACTURING OF AN ASSAULT WEAPON
ONCE ALREADY.

THAT ARE CLEGAL.

AND HE'S DONE THAT BECAUSE HE SUCCESSFULLY
CONSTRUCTED ANOTHER VERY SIMILAR WEAPON. IT'S HIGHLY
PROBATIVE. AND THE AMMUNITION COES TO THE FACT THAT
HE'S IN THE BUSINESS OF CREATING WEAPONS, NOT TINKERING.

1 WOULD SUBMIT.

THE COURT: PINAL, COUNSEL?

MR. HENNES: YEAH. THE PACT THAT HE WAS ABLE, THAT HE BULLT ONE LEGAL WEAPON HAS NO BEARING OR IT IS OF NO VALUE TO PROVE THAT HE KNEW THAT HE WAS GOING TO BUILD AN ILLEGAL ONE.

THERE IS JUST SIMPLY NO LOGICAL CONNECTION

BETWEEN THE TWO. MERELY JUST BECAUSE HE KNEW THAT HE

COULD FOLLOW DIRECTIONS AND BUILD A WEAPON IN NO WAY

PROVES AN ILLEGAL INTENT. IN FACT, IT PROVES THE

OPPOSITE.

COUNSEL SALD PREVIOUSLY, HE WAS JUST SKIRTING THE DAW OR

1	HOWEVER SHE WANTS TO PUT IT, THE FACT THAT HE BUILT A
2.	LEGAL ONE MEANS THAT HE WAS COING TO BUILD A LEGAL AKA.
3	AND TO SHOW CRIMINAL INTENT IT HAS NO VALUE IN MY
4	OPINION, BUT
5	THE COURT: SUBMITTED?
6	MS. JONES: SUBMITTED.
7	THE COURT: OKAY. THAT MOTION IS DENIED.
8	THERE WAS ALSO ON MR. HENNES'S MEMORANDUM A
9	MOTION TO EXCLUDE ALL EVIDENCE AND TESTIMONY CONCERNING
10	THE ALLEGED INSURANCE FRAUD INVESTIGATION. THAT IS
1]	POINT NUMBER ONE ON HIS SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM. THAT
12	MOTION IS GRANTED.
1.3	POINT NUMBER TWO ON EIS SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM
14	IS MOVING THE COURT TO EXCLUDE THE DEFENDANT'S RECORDED
1.5	STATEMENTS THAT WERE NOT PROVIDED TO DEFENDANT'S
1.6	ATTORNEY BEFORE TRIAL.
17	I'M NOT AWARE OF WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT,
18	COUNSEL. PERHAPS YOU COULD EXPLAIN. OR PERHAPS
19	MADAM PROSECUTOR MIGHT KNOW AND MIGHT BE ABLE TO ADDRESS
20	In.
21	MS. JONES: THERE'S A TAPED RECORDING
22	REFERENCED IN THE POLICE REPORT. THE SUBSTANCE OF THE
23	TAPE-RECORDING IS WITHIN THE MARRATIVE OF THE POLICE
2.4	REPORE.
25	I BELIEVE I DID PROVIDE THE DISK. I DON'T HAVE
26	A RECEIPT FOR IT AT THIS POINT, BUT I GAVE IT TO DEFENSE

1	IN PRETRIALS. HOWEVER, I'VE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO TALK
2	ABOUT IT. HE'S AGREED THAT THE SUBSTANCE OF IT HAS BUEN
3	DISCOVERED.
4	I WILL COPY ANOTHER DISK OF THE ACTUAL TAPE.
5	AND WE ARE WORKING ON REDACTING THE PARTS THAT ARE
6	TRRELEVANT. AND I HAVE PROPOSED THE PLACE WHERE I WILL
7	STOP IN THE TAPE BASED ON THE COURT'S RULINGS.
8	AND I CUESS WE'LL NEED TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT
9	ON THAT OR IF THERE'S SOME PART IN OR IN ADDITION THE
10	DEFENSE COUNSEL WANTS REDACTED, THEN WE WOULD NEED TO
1.1	ADDRESS THAT WITH THE COURT, BUT I THINK WE ARE AT AN
12	AGREEMENT.
13	THE COURT: IS THAT TRUE, MR. HENNES?
1.4	MR. HENNES: YES. I CONCUR WITH THAT.
1.5	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THAT MOTION WILL BE
16	DENTED.
17	WITH RESPECT TO NUMBER THREE, THE COURT SHOULD
18	EXCLUDE ALL REFERENCES TO ALLEGED FIREARM AND FIREARM
19	PARTS IN DEFENDANT'S POSSESSION AS QUOTE, "ASSAULT
20	WEAPONS" OR "ASSAULT RIFLES."
21	MR. HENNES: THE BASIS IF 1 MAY, YOUR HONOR
22	THE COURT: YES, PLEASE.
23	MR. HENNES: I DIDN'T HAVE THAT MUCH TIME, SO)
24	JUST THREW THAT IN.
25	THE BASIS FOR MY MOTION IN THAT REGARD IS IN
26	THE INSTRUCTION DEFINING AN UNLAWFUL RIFLE THE

DTC SHOULD BE REFERRED TO AS JUST THAT. I'M NOT --

2.6

THE COURT: SO THE COURT WILL PRECLUDE THEN
REFERENCES TO THE FIREARM OR PARTS AS "ASSAULT WEAPONS"
OR "ASSAULT RIFLES." AND COUNSEL IS ADVISED TO -- OR
ORDERED, RATHER, TO ADVISE THE WITNESSES THAT THEY NEED
TO QUALIFY THEIR LANGUAGE OR TEMPER THEIR LANGUAGE
ACCORDINGLY. SO THAT MOTION IS GRANTED.

AND THE ISSUE RAISED IN DEFENDANT'S INITIAL TRIAL BRIEF, THE ONE ISSUE RAISED, WHICH IS WHETHER EVIDENCE UNDERLYING COUNT 3 AND 4 WHILL BE ABLE TO BE ELICITED IN THE PROSECUTION'S CASE.

THAT MOTION -- THE MOTION IS TO PRECLUDE. AND THE COURT IS DENYING THAT MOTION.

MR. BENNES: IS THAT WITHOUT PREJUDICE, YOUR HONOR? IF I FIND SOME OTHER AUTHORITY, WILL YOU REVISIT THAT RULING?

THE COURT: SURE. ABSOLUTELY.

MR. HENNES: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: THE ISSUES IN THE PROSECUTION'S TRIAL BRIEF -- THERE ARE TWO OF THEM. ONE OF THEM IS WHETHER DEFENDANT IS ENTITLED TO AN ADVISORY OPINION. THAT ISSUE IS MOOT.

AND THE SECOND ISSUE ASKS THAT TALKS ABOUT,

RATHER -- OH, THAT ISSUE IT'S NOT PHRASED IN TERMS OF

ISSUE, BUT IT IS GRANTED BECAUSE THE COURT ALREADY RULED

ON IT WHETHER IF DEFENDANT PLEADS TO COUNTS 3 AND 4 THAT

EVIDENCE CAN BE ADMITTED ON HIS INTENT AND KNOWSEDGE.

AND I ALREADY SAID THAT IT COULD.

1.0

1.3

OKAY. THE DEFENDANT ALSO PRESENTED TO THE COURT AND I ASKED TO SEE WHAT APPEARS TO BE A FLOW CHART. AND WITHOUT A FOUNDATION OR OTHER EVIDENCE SHOWING ITS RELEVANCE, THAT WILL BE NOT ADMITTED UNLESS SOMETHING FASE -- UNless defendant presented something ELSE. AND I'M RETURNING THESE TWO COPIES TO THE DEFENSE RIGHT NOW.

THERE WAS ALSO A COPY OF A LETTER TO THE -- OR FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL DATED MAY 1ST, 2003 THAT DEFENSE COUNSEL HAD REFERENCED. AND THE COURT IS NOT RELYING ON ANYTHING CONTAINED IN THIS LETTER, SO I WILL KEEP A COPY OF IT IN THE ELLE.

BUT IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE EFFORE WE GO THROUGH THE JURY INSTRUCTIONS?

MS. JONES: THERE IS, YOUR BONOR. A NEW ISSUE
CAME UP THIS MORNING. DEFENSE VERBALLY ADVISED ME THAT
THERE IS NOW A DEFENSE EXPERT BY THE NAME OF
MICHAEL PENHALL.

I AM REQUESTING COMPLIANCE WITH DISCOVERY AND THAT I RECEIVE A SUMMARY OF HIS OPINIONS, SPECIFICALLY WHAT HE IS BASING HIS OPINIONS ON AND AN OFFER OF PROOF AS TO THE RELEVANCE OF THIS PERSON'S TESTIMONY.

THE COURT: FIRST OFFER OF PROOF, COUNSEL?

MR. HENNES: WELL, THE OFFER OF PROOF IS THAT

HE'S EXPERIENCED IN THE PARTICULAR RIPLE, THE AK-47 AND

WILL, YOU KNOW, EXCEPT FOR MAYBE A FEW HOURS. I BELLEVE

1" WILL BE HIGHLY RELEVANT TESTIMONY. THE PROSECUTION

IS COING TO BE PRESENTING A WITNESS WHO IS COING TO BE

24

25

AN EXPERT.

1.3

2.3

I KNOW THAT I READ REPORTED APPELLATE CASES IN WHICH -- THEY CALL IT AN EFT. IT'S A PERSON WITH A FEDERAL FIREARM LICENSE TO DEAL WITH GUNS HAS TESTIFIED, ACTUALLY FOR THE PROSECUTION AS AN EXPERT WITNESS IN THE SAME AREA OF ASSAULT WEAPONS.

SO CERTAINLY COUNSEL SAYS HE WANTS TO ARRIVE AT THE TRUTH. I MEAN, THIS IS WHEN THIS IS CALL HE ALL, BUT, I MEAN, THERE'S NOT GOING TO BE ANY SURPRISES. AND I WILL TRY TO PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION I CAN BEFORE THE EXPERT WOULD TESTIFY, WHICH I DON'T THINK WOULD BE BEFORE WITNESS ANYWAY AT THIS RATE.

THE COURT: NOW THIS CASE HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR A WHILE. ARE YOU SAYING THAT YOU JUST GOT AUGLD OF AN EXPERT?

MR. HENNES: WEST, I DID HAVE ONE WHO HAD EXPRESSED WILLINGNESS TO TESTIFY AND THAT WAS SOME WEEKS AGO.

UNFORTUNATELY, FOR SOME REASON 1 THINK IT

WAS FAMILY OR PERSONAL REASONS HE OPTED OUT. HE

INFORMED ME -- THIS WAS ABOUT A WEEK AGO -- THAT HE

WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO ASSIST US IN THE CASE. SO I HAD TO

SCRAMBLE AND TRY TO FIND SOMEBODY ELSE, WHICH I DID.

MS. JONES: YOUR HONOR, WE MADE AN APPOINTMENT
AT THE DEFENSE REQUEST TO MAKE ALL OF THE EVIDENCE
AVAILABLE AT THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT SHOOTING RANCE AND

1	SUFFICIENCY OF EVIDENCE. YES.
2	225, CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, INTENT OR MENTAL
3	STATE. YES. 226, WITNESSES. YES.
4	250? 250? LET ME SEE THAT. AREN'T THESE BOTH
5	ATTEMPTS?
6	MS. JONES: CH, BECAUSE WE HAD COUNT 3 AND 4.
7	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO THAT IS WITHDRAWN.
8	MR. HENNES: STRIKE THEM.
9	THE COURT: 251, YES. UNION OF ACT,
10	SPECIFICALLY ACT OF INTENT, THAT WILL BE GIVEN.
11	1 THINK 252 WILL BE DO WE NEED 252?
12	MS. JONES: NO.
1.3	THE COURT: WITHDRAWN. THAT IS UNION OF ACT
14	AND INTENT, GENERAL AND SPECIFIC INTENT TOGETHER. WELL,
15	ACTUALLY, YES, LET ME REVISIT. I'M GOING TO PUT A
16	QUESTION MARK THERE.
L7	MS. JONES: OKAY.
18	THE COURT: COUNSEL HAVE ANY INPUT?
19	MR. HENNES: NO. I'M STILL READING IT.
SO	THE COURT: OH, OKAY. LET ME HOLD ON ONE
21	MOMENT. 252?
22	MR. HENNES: I WOULD SAY REVISTT IT. I DON'T
23	KNOW. IT MIGHT BE CUMU: ATTVE.
2.4	THE COURT: YEAH. I HAVE A QUESTION MARK
25	THERE. SO LETT'S MOVE ON TO 300, YES, ALL AVAILABLE
26	EVIDENCE

1	301, SINGLE WITNESS'S TESTIMONY. YES.	
2	302, EVALUATING CONFLICTING EVIDENCE. YES.	
3	POSSIBLY 306. 306 IS UNTIMELY DISCLOSURE OF	
1	EVIDENCE. I'M COING TO PUT IT IN THERE WITE A QUESTION	
5	MARK. I WILL RESERVE MY RULING ON TU.	
6	ON TO 332, EXPERT WITNESS TESTIMONY. YES.	
7	333, OPINION TESTIMONY OF LAY WITNESS. YES.	
8	355 AND 358. I'M COING 'NO PUT A QUESTION MARK	
9	NEXT TO BOTH DEPENDING ON THE STATE OF THE CASE, WHETHE	
LO	DEFENDANT TESTIFUES OR NOT. EVIDENCE OF THE	
11	MS. JONES: OH, WAIT A MINUTE. ON 358, I THINK	
12	THAT WOULD BE.	
3	THE COURT: ABSOLUTELY, 358 IS IN. AND 355	
4	HAS A QUESTION MARK DEPENDING UPON WHETHER MR. NGUYEN	
15	TESTIFIES OR NOT. 359, CORPUS DELECTI: I WILL GIVE	
16	THAT IN MR. NGUYEN TESTIFTES.	
17	MR. HENNES: DO YOU WANT 362, YOUR HONOR?	
18	THE COURT: I WAS ON 361, ACTUALLY, BUT I'M	
19	COING ON TO 362 NOW.	
20	MR. HENNES: I WOULD THINK THE COURT ON	
21	362 THE COURT WOULD HAVE TO RESERVE RULING ON THAT	
22	ONE.	
2.3	THE COURT: YES, 362 - 361 AND 362. 361, 1111	
2.4	REVISUTITAT BASED ON THE EVIDENCE OF MR. NGUYEN	
2.5	TESTIFIES, AS WELL AS 362, "CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT."	
26	WHAT'S YOUR RESPONSE MADAM PROSECTION?	

26

A CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT.

MR. HENNES: I AGREE. 1 2 THE COURT: SO I WOULD GO AUEAD AND GIVE THAT. 3 MR. HENNES: OKAY. THE COURT: AND THAT'S WHAT THE ARCUMENT IS. 4 5 OKAY. 370 IS MOTIVE: I WILL GIVE THAT. DOWN TO 460, 6 ATTEMPT: I WILL GIVE THAT. 7 AND THEN I THINK WE MOVE ON DOWN TO THE ACTUAL. 8 SUBSTANCE OF THE OFFENSE IN 2511. 9 MS. JONES: THAT'S AS TO COUNT 3, WHICH HAS 10 BEEN REMOVED. THE COURT: CKAY. TEAT WILL BE WITHDRAWN. 11 12 2560 WILL BE GIVEN. THAT IS THE ACTUAL CHARGE ITSELF IN 13 COUNT 1 AND --14 MR. HENNES: AND THE COURTS GOING TO NOT USE 15 THE ".50 CALIBER BMC RIFLE" PORTION OF THAT INSTRUCTION, 16 J. ASSUME? 17 THE COURT: ONE MOMENT, COUNSEL. HOLD THAT 18 THOUGHT. 19 MR. HENNES: OKAY. 20 MS. JONES: THE PROPER ARE PROCEEDING ON 21 12602.1, SO WE WOULD AGREE THAT THE LANGUAGE RECARDING 22 THE ".50 BMG RIFLE" WILL BE OMITTED. 23 THE COURT: YOU KNOW WHAT, MY QUESTION IS THIS: 24 CALCRIM 2560 ADDRESS COUNT 2, CORRECT? 25 MR. HENNES: COUNT 1 ALSO. MS. JONES: COUNT 1. 2.6

THE COURT: COUNTS 1 AND 2? 1 2 MS. JONES: YES. 3 THE COURT: OH, I SEE. THE TITLE JUST DOESN'T 4 MERELY CONFORM. 5 MS. JONES: YES. THE COURT: OKAY, SO THAT INSTRUCTION COVERS 6 7 BOTH COUNTS. 2592 IS WITHDRAWN, CORRECT? 8 MR. HENNES: CORRECT. 9 MS. JONES: YES. THE COURT: AND THEN WE'RE DOWN TO 3515. THAT 10 11 WILL BE GIVEN. AND THEN THE GENERAL PREDELIBERATION INSTRUCTIONS AND 3550 AND WHATEVER INSTRUCTIONS APPLY TO 12 1.3 THE ALTERNATE INSTRUCTIONS. OKAY. 1.4 NOW, WHAT I WANT TO DO NOW IS TURN TO THE 15 ACTUAL TEXT OF THE INSTRUCTION. I WANTED TO MAKE SURE I 16 HAVE THIS LANGUAGE EXACTLY CORRECT. SO, LET'S SEE, COUNSEL, TURN TO PAGE, CALCRIM 2560. CKAY. SO THAT 17 WILL READ, "THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED IN COUNTS 1 AND 2" 18 19 20 MS. JONES: WELL, WE NEED TWO SEPARATE 21 INSTRUCTIONS: ONE FOR COUNT 1. AND ONE --THE COURT: AND ONE FOR COUNT 2. SO WE NEED TO 22 23 COPY THIS. 24 MS. JONES: YEAH. 25 MR. HENNES: YEAH. 26 THE COURT: OKAY. AND YOUR TIEORY - WELL,

LET'S DO THIS:

1.3

"THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED IN COUNT I THEN WITH UNLAWFULLY ATTEMPTING TO" -- I CHESS I CAN READ ALL THE LANGUAGE. I GUESS I CAN TAILOR IT, RATHER, BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE AN OFFERING OR SALE OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT, SO I CAN REDACT ALL OF THAT.

MS. JONES: YES. I JUST REQUEST "UNLAWFULLY ATTEMPTING TO MANUFACTURE."

THE COURT: PERIOD. TIMY'S ALL?

MS. JONES: AND THEN "ASSAULT WEAPON." YES.

THE COURT: OKAY. AND "ASSAULT WEAPON."

MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T SEE WHERE THE

(B) SUBSECTION IS COVERED BY THIS ENSTRUCTION. I THINK

POSSESSION IS USED IN BOTH (A) AND (B) OF 12280, I

BELLIEVE, UNLESS TWO IS THE POSSESSION. I'M NOT SURE.

PERHAPS THAT'S WHAT IT IS.

MS. JONES: 12280(B) IS THE POSSESSION OF THE ASSAULT WEAPON.

THE COURT: I SEPARATED THAT OUT.

MR. HENNES: WELL, 1 UNDERSTAND, BUT I DON'T KNOW WHETHER -- IS IT THE SAME INSTRUCTION? I GUESS IT'S JUST ODD THAT THE INSTRUCTION TITLE WOULD BE 12280(A)(1) AND (A)(2).

THE COURT: INSTEAD OF (B), YEAH. THAT'S WHAT THREW ME OFF. THAT'S WHY I WAS LOOKING FOR ANOTHER INSTRUCTION.

1 MR. HENNES: WE'RE OF SIMILAR MIND THEN. 2 THE COURT: I'M LOOKING FOR I'L TO MATCH UP. 3 FOUND IT'. MR. HENNES: YEAH. 4 5 THE COURT: SO WHAT I'M COING TO DO IS, I'M 6 GOING TO HAVE TWO COPIES OF THE SAME INSTRUCTION, BUT 7 WE'LL REDACT IT DIFFERENCLY. 8 AS TO COUNT 1, THE ONE WE'RE LOOKING AT NOW, 9 "THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED IN COUNT 1 WITH UNLAWFULLY 10 ATTEMPTING TO MANUFACTURE AN ASSAULT WEAPON IN VIOLATION 11 OF 12280(A)." 12 "TO PROVE THE DEFENDANT GUILDY OF THIS CRIME 13 THE PEOPLE MUST PROVE THAT, NUMBER ONE, THE DEFENDANT 14 ATTEMPTED TO MANUFACTURE AN ASSAULT WEAPON." 15 DO COUNSEL AGREE WITH THAT? 16 MR. HENNES: I ACREE, YOUR HONOR. 17 THE COURT: IS THAT ALL RICHT? MS. JONES: OH, I'M SORRY. YES. 18 19 THE COURT: AND NUMBER 2, "THE DEFENDANT KNEW 20 THAT HE MANUFACTURED IT." 21 AND NUMBER 3, "THE DEFENDANT KNEW OR REASONABLY 22 SHOULD HAVE KNOWN THAT I'T HAD CHARACTERISTICS THAT MADE 23 I'I AN ASSAULT WEAPON." 24 MR. HENNES: IN --25 MS. JONES: AND THEN WE'RE COING TO HAVE TO 26 DEFINE AN "ASSAULT WEAPON" BECAUSE -- AND 1 THINK THAT'S

1 WHY THEY PUT IN THE PART ABOUT SPECIFICALLY "A." AND 2 THEN YOU GET RID OF THE ".50 BMG" BECAUSE THAT'S NOT A 3 TYPE OF ASSAULT WEAPON WE HAVE. 4 AND I LOOKED AT THIS INSTRUCTION AND BEFORE --5 DOWN BELOW IT COES ON TO DEFINE THE .50 BMG. AND I THINK THAT WE HAVE TO TAKE THAT OUT AND INSTEAD DEFINE 6 7 8 THE COURT: YES. MS. JONES: - THE ASSAULT WEARON PURSUANT TO 9 10 12276.1. THE COURT: WHICH IS -- WHAT IS THAT, AK-4/? 11 12 NO. 13 MS. JONES: WELL, THAT'S AN AK-47. ASSAULT 14 WEAPONS ARE DEFINED IN 12276. 15 THE COURT: YES. 16 MS. JONES: AND THEN IT'S A SUPPLEMENTAL 17 DEFINITION. AND THAT'S THE ONE WE'RE COING UNDER. 18 MR. HENNES: WELL, YOUR HONOR, IF T MAY, THE INSTRUCTIONS THAT I'M READING SAYS TRAT "IN THE CASE OF 19 20 AN ASSAULT WEAPON WHERE INDICATED IN THE INSTRUCTION THE 21 COURT MAY INSERT A WEAPON LISTED IN PENAL CODE SECTION 22 12276 OR A DESCRIPTION OF A WEAPON FROM SECTION 23 12276.1." 24 BECAUSE THIS IS -- WHAT DEFENDANT'S CHARGED 25 WITH IS NOT ANYTHING DESCRIBED IN 12276, SO I DON'T

THINK YOU CAN LEAVE THAT OUT.

1 MS. JONES: RIGHT. 2 MR. HENNES: BECAUSE THERE'S ABOUT FIVE 3 CHARACTERISTICS IN 12276.1 THAT I BELLEVE PROBABLY NEED 1 TO BE FILLED IN IN THE INSTRUCTION. 5 MS. JONES: AND THAT DOES LAY THAT OUT. 11 LAYS OUT THE DEFINITION TEAT WE'RE PROCEEDING UNDER. 6 7 MR. HENNES: YOU DIDN'T SAY ANYTHING ABOUT AN 8 AK-47. I MEAN, THERE ARE ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS THAT 9 ARE GOING TO HAVE TO BE NECESSARY, LIKE THE CENTERPIRE 10 RIFLE. AND I DON'T KNOW THAT -- I DON'T KNOW THAT ALL 11 THE INSTRUCTIONS ARE 12 THE COURT: COVER ALL OF THOSE DEFINITIONS. 13 MR. HENNES: I THINK WE MAY HAVE TO --14 THE COURT: WHICH IS WHY WE'RE STARTING NOW. 15 MS. JONES: YEARL THE COURT: ALL RICHT. SO, LETT'S SWE. 16 NUMBER 3 OF SAYS, THE DEFENDANT KNEW OR REASONABLY 17 18 SHOULD HAVE KNOWN IT HAD CHARACTERISTICS IS MADE AN 19 ASSAULT" -- WHAT? "WEAPON"? 20 MS. JONES: YES. 21 MR. HENNES: YES. 22 THE COURT: OKAY. 23 MS. JONES: AND I WOULD PROPOSE THAT IT THEN 24 STATES. "SPECIFICALLY A SEMIAUTOMATIC CENTERFURE RIFLE 25 THAT HAS THE CAPACITY TO ACCEPT DETACHABLE MAGAZINE AND

ANY OF THE FOLLOWING," AND THEN LISTS A TUROUGH F. THE

1 DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS OF AN ASSAULT WHAPON 2 UNDER THAT DEFINITION. 3 MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, IF ! MAY? 4 THE COURT: ABSOLUTELY. 5 MR. HENNES: IT'S TELENK THAT WE'RE COING TO HAVE TO DEFINE ALL OF THESE TERMS IN THE INSTRUCTIONS, 6 7 "SEMIAUTOMATIC CENTERFIRE RIFLE, DETACHABLE MAGAZINE." 8 AND THERE ARE REGULATIONS THAT COVER A LOT OF IT. BUT THEY'RE NOT IN THE STATUTE ITSELF. I THINK THOSE WILL 9 10 HAVE TO BE PROBABLY INCLUDED. 11 MS. JONES: I THINK AN EXPERT CAN TESTIFY AS TO 12 WHAT THOSE ARE. 13 THE COURT: THEY CERTAINLY WILL BE TESTIFYING 11 WITH RESPECT TO WHAT THEY ARE, BUT THE QUESTION IS TE 15 THERE ARE TWO EXPERTS WHOSE DEFINITIONS DIFFER, THEN WE 16 HAVE A PROBLEM. 17 MR. HENNES: I THINK IF THERE ARE THE STATUTORY 18 OR REGULATORY DEFINITIONS, I WOULD THINK THAT THOSE 19 WOULD BE INCLUDED, YOU KNOW, IN THE INSTRUCTION. I 20 DON'T KNOW THAT IT'S, YOU KNOW, A TREMENDOUS ISSUE, BUT 21 22 MS. JONES: YEAH. I DON'T THINK THAT THAT'S 23 GOING TO BE CONTESTED. 24 THE COURT: OKAY, WHY DON'T I DO THIS THEN: 25 COUNSEL, IF YOU ALL COULD -- ONE OR BOTH OF 26 YOU -- PROPOSE, PUT THAT VERBLAGE IN THERE, IF YOU

1	WOULD, MADAM PROSECUTOR, AND SUBMIT TO THE COURT YOUR
2	PROPOSED INSTRUCTION REDACTED AND CLEANED UP
3	MS. JONES: OKAY.
4	THE COURT: THAT WOULD BE BELPFUL WITH
5	RESPECT TO 2560.
6	MR. HENNES: ONE OTHER THING, YOUR HONOR, WAS
7	
8	THE COURT: YES.
9	MR. HENNES: SUBSECTION 11 THERE, SECOND
10	PARAGRAPH, SAYS, "THE DEFENDANT" I THINK IT NEEDS TO
11	SAY THAT HE KNEW THAT HE ATTEMPTED TO MANUFACTURE IT,
12	RIGHT
13	MS. JONES: RIGHT.
14	MR. HENNES: INSTEAD OF "MANUFACTURED IT."
1.5	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YES. WE'LL ADD THAT
16	LANGUAGE IN PARACRAPH NUMBER TWO ON CALCRIM 2560,
17	"ATTEMPTED TO MANUFACTURE."
18	MS. JONES: AND AS TO ELEMENT ONE, TOO, AS
19	WELL, "THE DEFENDANT."
20	THE COURT: OH, 1 D(1) "ATTEMPT TO MANUFACTURE"
21	IN PARAGRAPH ONE.
22	AND THE PARAGRAPH STARTING WITH "A BMG RIFLE,"
23	THAT WILL BE REDACTED. AS A MATTER OF FACT, ALL THE WAY
24	DOWN TO NUMBER THREE BECAUSE THAT DEPINITION HAS
2.5	THREE PARTS THAT WILL BE REDACTED.
26	T WILL REDACT ALSO "TWO OR THREE PROPER MAY

ı	POSSESS SOMETHING AT THE SAME TIME" ON THE UNDERSTANDING
2.	THERE FOESN'T SEEM TO BE ANY FACTS TO SUPPORT THAT OR NO
3	THEORY TO SUPPORT THAT.
4	I WILL LEAVE IN THE LANGUAGE "A PERSON DOES NOT
5	HAVE TO ACTUALLY OWN THEIR TRUST COMPANY TO POSSESS ET.
6	IT'S ENOUGH IF HE HAS THE CONTROL OVER IT OR A RIGHT TO
7	CONTROL IT."
8	I DON'T THINK THE LANGUAGE RELATIVE TO THE NEXT
9	PARAGRAPH IS NECESSARY. I THINK THIS SEE.
10	MS. JONES: I WOULD AGREE.
11	THE COURT: YOU SEE THAT, COUNSEL?
12	MR. HENNES: YES, I DO -
13	THE COURT: I'M COING TO DETETE THAT.
14	MS. JONES: AND YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE
15	PARAGRAPH RIGHT UNDER THE "CONSTRUCTIVE POSSESSIONS"
16	PARAGRAPH; IS THAT RIGHT?
17	THE COURT: CORRECT.
18	MS. JONES: OKAY. AND THEN THE ONE BELOW THAT,
19	I DON'T THINK THAT IS PERTINENT.
20	THE COURT: NO, BECAUSE IT TALKS ABOUT HAVING A
21	REGISTERED WEAPON OR A VALID PERMIT.
22	MS. JONES: AND THAT WOULD BE A DEFENSE.
23	THE COURT: THAT'S A DESENSE, YEAH.
24	IT DOESN'T SOUND LIKE THAT'S YOUR DEFENSE; IS
25	THAT CORRECT, COUNSEL?
26	MR. HENNES: IT SEEMS TO ME I READ A CASE THAT

1 INDICATED THAT THE BURDEN IS ON THE PEOPLE TO PROVE THAT 2 IT WAS NOT REGISTERED. 3 BECAUSE OF THEIR THEORY IS THAT THE WEAPON WAS 4 AN ASSAULT WEAPON, I THINK THEY HAVE TO PROVE THAT IT 5 WASN'T REGISTERED, I BELLEVEL BUT, I MEAN, I'LL PROVIDE 6 THE COURT WITH AN AUTHORITY ON THAT, BUT I WOULD REQUEST 7 THAT THAT OURSTION BE --8

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

26

THE COURT: I'LL PUT A QUESTION MARK NEXT TO IT. IT DOESN'T APPEAR TO BE ONE OF THE ELEMENTS.

IT WOULD BE AN ELEMENT, WOULDN'T IT?

MS. JONES: THERE'S A DEFENSE. AND ONE OF THE DEFENSES IS WHETHER IT'S A REGISTERED -- IT'S LEGALLY RECISTERED. THESE ITEMS DON'T EVEN HAVE MANUFACTURER MARKINGS OR NUMBERS, SO THERE'S NO WAY IT COULD BE REGISTERED. AND I DON'T THINK THAT'S THE DEFENSE.

MR. HENNES: I DON'T KNOW THAT YOU NECESSARTLY HAVE TO HAVE ANY MARKINGS ON IT TO REGISTER TY. IT CAN GO BY THE PERSON'S NAME THAT HE HAS A CERTAIN WEAPON, BUT PROBABLY NEEDS TO BE EXPLORED.

THE COURT: I'LL PUT A QUESTION MARK THERE FOR NOW. OKAY. LET'S GO BACK THROUGH 2506 RELATIVE TO COUNT 2. "THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED IN COUNT 2 WITH UNLAWFULLY ATTEMPTING TO POSSESS" --

MS. JONES: I WOULD SUCCEST THAT ANYWHERE WE PUT "ATTEMPTED TO MANUFACTURE," WE JUST CHANGE IT TO "POSSESS."

1 THE COURT: AND THAT'S --2 MS. JONES: YEAR. AND THEN WHEN I WAS THINKING 3 ABOUT POSSESSION, MAYBE WE DO NEED -- I'M NOT SURE IF 4 YOU NEED THE DEFINITION OF "POSSESSION," BUT I THINK 5 WE'VE GOT THE STORY ABOUT -- ! THINK WE NEED A DEFINITION OF" POSSESSION." 6 1 THE COURT: 17 WON'T HURT. 8 MS. JONES: IF WE CAN JUST PULL THOSE FROM THE 9 2511. 10 THE COURT: THERE SHOULD BE A GENERAL ONE IN 11 THE CODE. LET'S SEE. "POSSESSION." 12 MS. JONES: OKAY. 13 THE COURT: WELL, I THUNK ISN'T THAT COVERED 14 UNDER "CONSTRUCTIVE"? 1.5 MS. JONES: YEAH. THE COURT: WHAT FISE WOULD CONSTRUCTIVE 1.6 17 POSSESSION ADD? THERE IS A CONTROL SUBSTANCE 18 INSTRUCTIONS, BUT I THINK THAT THE ONE WE HAVE MIGHT 19 SUFFICE. LET'S SEE. 20 MS. JONES: YEAH. 19 HAS THE SAME LANGUAGE 21 UNDER 12021 (A) (1). 22 THE COURT: OKAY. YES. I'M LOOKING UNDER 23 "SIMPLE POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE," AND IT 24 DOES HAVE THE SAME LANGUAGE AS WELL. 25 MS. JONES: FOR SOME REASON 1 TROUGHT THERE WAS 26 SOME KIND OF "DOMENTON AND CONTROL" LANGUAGE.

1 THE COURT: I THINK THEY MAY HAVE SIMPLIFIED 2 THE LANGUAGE IN THE CALCRIM. 3 MS. JONES: YES. 1 THE COURT: THAT'S PROBABLY CALUIC. OKAY. SO 5 I'LL ABOUT A HEAD AN THEN MOD FIGHT 2560 TO COME PORT 6 WITH COUNT 26789 IT SEEMS LIKE IT'S THE SAME IN ALL THE 7 OTHER RESPECTS. WHERE IT SAYS A BLANK IS AN ASSAULT 8 WEAPON, WILL THAT HAVE A SAME HAPPENING WELL. 9 MR. HENNES: 1 THINK YOU HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE 10 DEFINITION WITH ALL THE MIMMENTS, BECAUSE IT'S NOT A 11 BRAND, YOU KNOW. IT'S USED LOOSELY AS AN AK, BUT THAT'S 12 NOT THE DESCRIPTION WELL IN THE STATUTE. 13 IT'S WHAT IT IS. IT'S KNOW WHAT THE DEFINITION 14 SAYS IT IS. LT'S CENTERFIRE SEMINIFICMATIC AND ALL OF 15 THAT'. 16 MS. JONES: I THINK YOU HAVE TO CHANGE IT TO 17 "AN ASSAULT WEAPON IS DEFINED AS" --18 MR. HENNES: THAT WOULD BE FINE WITH ME. 19 THE COURT: OKAY, COUNSEL LEFT IT TO YOU TO 20 GET VERB A COUPLED LIKE COLLOQUIAGLY, BUT IT'S A 21 TECHNICAL THING HERE. MR. HENNES: YES. 22 23 THE COURT'S SO WE HAVE TO MAKE SURE THAT WE 24 HAVE PRESCRIBED IT CORRECTLY AND DON'T LABEL IT. 25 MR. HENNES: YEAH. OKAY. 26

THE COURT: OKAY. SO IN WRAPPING UP, WHAT'S

1 OUTSTANDING IS I WOULD LIKE FOR THESE INSTRUCTIONS IN 2 2560 FOR COUNT 1 AND COUNT 2 IF YOU COULD SEND ME A 3 CLEAN COPY OF THAT PAYING CLOSE ATTENTION TO THAT 4 DEFINITION OF ASSAULT WEAPON. 5 IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THAT COUNSEL IS GOING TO 6 GIVE MES 7 MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, I WAS GOING TO LOOK TO 8 SEE WHETHER THERE WAS OTHER DEFINITIONS OF THE VARIOUS, 9 I GUESS, CRITERIA IN THE .1, YOU KNOW, DESCRIBING RIFLE, 10 CENTERETRE, AND WHETHER THAT'S APPROPRIATE FOR THE JURY 11 INSTRUCTION. 12 THE COURT: WELL, THERE ARE SOME DEFINITIONS 1.3 THAT ARE IN THE PENAL CODE PISELF, SO WE SHOULD PROBABLY 14 LOOK FIRST TO THE PENAL CODE. 15 AND LE THERE ARE TERMS THAT COME OUT DURING 16 TESTIMONY, I WOULD ANTICIPATE THE EXPERT CAN ANSWER 17 THOSE QUESTIONS, LIKE, WHAT IS A RIFLE? YOU KNOW, WHAT 18 IS A RECEIVER? THAT SORT OF THING. 19 WELL, THERE IS ONE ADDITION THAT I THINK NEEDS 20 TO BE IN THE INSTRUCTION IN THE DESCRIPTION OF AN 2.1 ASSAULT RIFLE BECAUSE THERE IS A REGULATION THAT SPEAKS 22 TO THE MAGAZINE AND AS TO WHETHER IT'S DETACHABLE OR 23 NOT. 24 AND ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS IS THAT IT --25 DETACHABLE MEANS THAT IT CAN'T BE REMOVED WITHOUT THE

USE OF A TOOL AND THAT A BULLET IS A TOOL FOR PURPOSES

1 OF DESCRIPTION OF WHETHER OR NOT THERE IS A DETACHABLE 2 MAGAZINE. 3 IN OTHER WORDS, IF YOU USE A BULLET AND YOU PUSH A BUTTON AND THAT RELEASES THE MAGAZINE, THAT MAKES 4 5 IT NONDETACHABLE FOR PURPOSES OF THE ASSAULT WEAPON TO 6 CO OFF. 7 MS. JONES: WELL, I DON'T KNOW. I MISSED --8 THE COURT: A BUILDED AS A TOOL. 9 MR. HENNES: YES. IT'S CONSTDERED -- WELL, THE 10 IT'S A TOOL BECAUSE A TOOL A DEFINITION OF A 11 NONDETACHABLE MAGAZINE IS "ONE THAT REQUIRES A TOOL TO 12 BE USED TO DETACH THE MAGAZINE FROM THE RECEIVER." 13 AND IT'S SPECIFIC REGULATION, 1 THINK, IN 14 RESPONSE TO, YOU KNOW, QUESTIONS PROBABLY CO TO THE GUN 15 COMMUNITY, SPECIFICALLY STATES THAT A SULLET IS A TOOL. 16 AND THAT'S WITH RESERVICE TO WHAT'S CALLED A 17 BULLET BUTTON ONTO THE WEAPON THAT MAKES IT LEGAL AND 18 NOT AN ASSAULT RIFLE, SO -- AND THE REGULATION HAVE THE 19 EFFECT FOR THE LAW, OF COURSE, SO I THINK IT HAS TO BE 20 VERY CLEAR. THE COURT: A REGULATION AS A FORCE OF LAW? 21 22 MR. HENNES: REGULATION. 23 THE COURT: SO - I'M SORRY, COUNSEL. SO WHAT 24 IS YOUR POINT RELATIVE TO THAT? 25 MR. HENNES: MY POINT IS THAT THERE'S AT LAST

ONE OTHER DEFINITION THAT I BELLEVE SHOULD BE IN THE

2.6

INSTRUCTION. AND THAT'S REPORTING THE ISSUES OF WHAT CONSTITUTES AN ASSAULT RIFLE.

AND GOING TO 176.1 OR 176.2, WHERE IT SAYS, "AN ASSAULT WEAPON SHALL BE SEMIAUTOMATIC CENTERFIRE RIFLE THAT HAS THE CAPACITY TO ACCEPT A DETACHABLE MAGAZINE."

AND THEN "DETACHABLE" IS SOMEWHERE DEFINED, BUT
I MEAN, THE JURY NEEDS TO NOW WHAT IS A DETACHABLE
MAGAZINE. AND THERE ARE SPECIFIC DESCRIPTIONS OF WHAT
MAKES A MAGAZINE DETACHABLE OR NOT DETACHABLE.

THE COURT: AND WHERE ARE THOSE DESCRIPTIONS?

MR. HENNES: IN THE CODE OF REGULATIONS, IN THE REGULATIONS THAT ARE

THE COURT: SO IF YOU HAVE SOMETHING SPECIFIC THAT YOU WANT ME TO INSTRUCT THE JURY, LE YOU CAN DRAFT THAT AND GIVE ME THE AUTHORITY FOR THAT, I'M TAKE A LOOK AT THAT.

MR. HENNES: | W!I.L.

THE COURT: ANYTHING ADDITIONAL?

MS. JONES: JUST AS TO THE TRANSCRIPTS, I'VE OFFERED A PLACE WHERE I THINK IT NEEDS TO STOP WITHOUT INAUMISSIBLE EVIDENCE TO THE COURT AT PAGE SEVEN ABOUT HALFWAY DOWN.

AND I'VE INDICATED TO DEFENSE WHERE I INTEND TO STOP WITH THE RECORDING AND WITH THE TRANSCRIPT. AND I'D ASK IF THAT'S -- IF HE HAS NO OBJECTIONS TO ANYTHING PRIOR TO THAT?

MR. HENNES: I REALLY HAVEN'T HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO GO OVER THE REST OF IT. THE COURT: OKAY, WELL, TAKE YOUR TIME, AND WE CAN TALK ABOUT THAT WHEN WE COME BACK. MAYBE WE'LL HAVE THE JURY COME BACK AT 2:00. CAN WE DO THAT? ALL RIGHT. COUNSEL, IT IS THE NOON HOUR. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WANT TO RECORD? OTHERWISE, WE WILL COME BACK AT 1:30. MR. HENNES: VERY GOOD, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: OKAY, 1:30, MR. NGUYEN. (LUNCH RECESS) * * * * *

1	WESTMINSTER, CALIFORNIA - APRIL 4, 2011	
2	(AFTERNOON SESSION)	
3	(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT	
4	OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)	
5	THE COURT: WE ARE ON THE RECORD IN THE TRIAL	
6	MATTER OF PROPER VS. TIEN DUC NGUYEN, JOWED918. BOTH	
7	COUNSEL AND MR. NGUYEN ARE PRESENT.	
8	I MAVE IN MY HAND WHAT APPEARS TO BE A COPY OF	
9	THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, UNDER SECTION	
10	11:5469, "DEFINITIONS," THERE ARE FIVE DEFINITIONS HERE	
11	AND I TAKE IT, MR. HENNES, THAT YOU'RE GOING TO	
12	PROPOSE THAT THIS BE FORMATTED INTO A JURY INSTRUCTION	
13	THAT THE JURORS THAT I READ THIS TO THE JURORS?	
14	MR. HENNES: YES, YES. I	
15	THE COURT: ALL FIVE DEFINITIONS?	
16	MR. HENNES: YES, PARTICULARLY THE DETACHABLE	
17	MAGAZINE ONE. I DIEN'T REALLY REVIEW CLOSELY THE OTHER	
18	SECTION, BUT THAT'S KIND OF THE KEY ISSUE.	
19	THE COURT: OKAY. WELL, WE CAN TAKE A LOOK AT	
20	THIS WHEN MADAM PROSECUTOR GETS A CHANCE TO LAOK AT TT	
21	AS WELL.	
22	I DID WANT TO PUT ONE CASE ON THE RECORD WITH	
2.3	RESPECT TO MY RULING TO ALLOW THE JURY TO HEAR	
24	MR. NCUYEN'S FELON STATUS AS A PART OF HIS - IF THAT	
25	EVIDENCE IS USED BY THE PROSECUTION IN COUNT 1.	
26	AND I WILL CITE TO THE CASE OF PROPER VS.	

1	VALENTINE (1986), 42 CAL.3D 170 AT PAGE 184.
2	IN ADDITION, WITH RESPECT TO THE DISCOVERY
3	ISSUE MR. HENNES, DID YOU GET ANY DOCUMENTS OR
4	INFORMATION FOR THE PROSECUTION?
5	MR. HENNES: I DEDN'T HAVE TIME OVER THE LUNCH
6	HOUR. I WAS BUSY RUNNING THIS OTHER STUFF.
7	THE COURT: SO YOU TITINK YOU MIGHT HAVE THEM BY
8	TOMORROW MORNING?
9	MR. HENNES: FOR SURE WILL.
10	THE COURT: OKAY.
11	MR. HENNES: AND I WILL E-MAJI, THEM TO COUNSEL
12	AS SOON AS I GET THEM AFTER COURT TODAY. I'M ASSUMING
1.3	I'M GOING TO CHI SOMETHING FROM THEM. I WILL GET
1.4	SOMETHING.
15	THE COURT: SO YOU'RE DEFINITELY GOING TO CALL
16	THIS PERSON?
17	MR. HENNES: YES.
18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THERE'S A QUESTION
19	RELATIVE TO CALCRIM NUMBER 306, WHETHER THE COURT WOULD
20	GIVE AN ADMONITION TO THE JURY BASED ON NONCOMPLIANCE
21	WITH PENAL CODE SECTION 1054.3.
22	THE COURT DECLINES TO GIVE CASCRIM NUMBER 306.
2.3	THE COURT IS FINDING GOOD CAUSE UNDER PENAL CODE 1054.7
24	FOR THE DEFENDANT'S LATE DISCOVERY OF ITS CUN EXPERT TO
25	THE PEOPLE.

AND YOU CAN CORRECT ME: IF I'M WRONG, EITHER

1 PARTY, BUT DEFENSE COUNSEL MAD REPRESENTED TO THE COURT THAT HE HAD, IN FACT, PROCURED AN EXPERT THAT HAD 2 3 REVIEWED THIS CASE, OR AT LEAST CONE OVER SOME OF THIS CASE, IN THE PRESENCE OF THE PROPER; IS THAT CORRECT? 4 5 MR. HENNES: NO. NO. THE EXPERT THAT I HAD THOUGHT I HAD RETAINED JUST HAD DISCUSSIONS WITH ME. 6 7 THE COURT: OKAY, ALL RIGHT, BUT BE'S ETTHER WITHDRAWN OR HE'S NO LONGER ON THE CASE? 8 9 MR. HENNES: THAT IS CORRECT. IO THE COURT: OKAY. DURING OUR PRETRIAL CONFERENCE IN CHAMBERS LAST WEEK ON MARCH 30TH DEFENSE 11 12 COUNSEL INDICATED THAT HE MIGHT BE CALLING AN EXPERT. 13 AT THAT TIME THE PEOPLE REGISTERED AN OBJECTION AS 14 VIOLATIVE OF THE DISCOVERY RULES OF SECTION 1054.3. DEFENSE COUNSEL ADVISED THE COURT THAT YOU HAD 15 16 MET WITH AND SPOKE TO YOUR CURRENT PROPOSED EXPERT 17 YESTERDAY; IS "THAT CORRECT"? OR YOU JUST SPOKE WITH HIM 18 OVER THE PHONE? 19 MR. HENNES: OVER THE PHONE AND E-MAIL. 20 THE COURT: OKAY, AND THAT PERSON IS A 21 DIFFERENT ONE FROM THE ONE THAT YOU HAD --22 MR. HENNES: "HAT IS -- YES. 23 THE COURT: ... IN THE PAST? 24 MR. HENNES: CORRECT. THE COURT: YOU HAVE CONFIRMED THAT EXPERT'S 25

AGREEMENT TO APPEAR AS A WITNESS IN THIS TRIAL; IS THAT

CORRECT?

1.3

1.8

MR. HENNES: THAT IS CORRECT, YES.

THE COURT: OKAY. AS OF THIS MORNING YOU MADE
AN OFFER TO THE COURT RELATIVE TO THE ANTICIPATED EXPERT
TESTIMONY.

YOU AT THAT TIME ALSO INFORMED THE COURT THAT
AS SOON AS YOU YOURSELF RECEIVED THE DOCUMENTS FROM THE
EXPERT, THAT YOU WOULD DISCOVER THAT INFORMATION TO THE
PROPLE; IS THAT CORRECT?

MR. HENNES: THAT IS CORRECT.

THE COURT: OKAY. SO I FIND THAT THE PROPER TESTIMONY IS NOT ONLY RELEVANT, BUT OVER THE PEOPLE'S OBJECTION, I'M GOING TO ALLOW THE DEFENSE TO CALL THE EXPERT IN ITS CASE AND DECLINE TO GIVE AN ADMONISHMENT AND INSTRUCTION BECAUSE I FIND GOOD CAUSE.

MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, I MAY ADD ONE MORE OTHER THAT THE EXPERT MAY TESTIFY ON IN LIGHT OF THE COURT'S RULING THAT EVIDENCE OF THE OTHER FIREARM IS GOING TO BE ADMITTED AS EVIDENCE.

I MAY HAVE THE EXPERT COVER THAT TOPIC TOO

BECAUSE I BELIEVE HE WILL BE COMPETENT TO COVER THE

.50 CALIBER RIFLES FOR WHATEVER RELEVANCE THAT MAY HAVE.

THE COURT: OKAY. WELL, YOU WILL BE CALLING
THE EXPERT IN YOUR CASE IN CHIEF. AND SO WE'LL SEE AT
THAT TIME, ASSUMING THE FOUNDATION IS LAID, THEN SOUNDS
LIKE IT MAY BE RELEVANT.

ACTUAL AK-47 HERE, I THINK, BY THIS EXPERT. AND I DON'T

KNOW WHAT HE'S COING TO DISASSEMBLE OR SOMETHING WITH

25

IT.

AND SO I THINK I SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO -- THE DEFENSE SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO HAVE SIMILAR EVIDENCE WHAT CONSTITUTES THE RIFLE. AND I'M NOT SAYING THAT I'M GOING TO NECESSARILY AGREE WITH THAT OR NOT OBJECT TO THE DEMONSTRATION THAT I BELIEVE WILL BE OFFERED BY THE PEOPLE REGARDING TRIS AK-47 THAT IS SUPPOSEDLY INTACT, BUT IN ANY EVENT, THAT'S SORT OF THE CORE OF THE CASE, I THINK.

THE COURT: WHAT I WANT TO ASK THE PROPLE,
EVEN -- WE WILL CERTAINLY REVISIT THE ISSUE ONCE WE GET
THE DETAILS, SO I GUESS IT'S A LITTLE BIT PREMATURE NOW,
BUT I GUESS I'M WONDERING HOW I'T COULD NOT BE RELEVANT
IF HE'S COVERING THE SAME TOPICS.

IT SOUNDS LIKE IT'S ON POINT WHETHER DISACREES,
I ASSUME HE WILL DISACREE, BUT WHAT WILL BE YOUR
HESTTATION?

MS. JONES: WELL, HE'S SAID SEVERAL DIFFERENT THINGS IN THAT STATEMENT. HE SAID THAT HE WAS GOING TO PROFFER THE OPINION THAT THE COLLECTION OF UNASSEMBLED PARTS IS NOT OFFENSE, AND HE CAN'T TESTIFY TO THAT.

THE COURT: THAT'S TRUE.

MS. JONES: THEN IT'S NOT NEARLY COMPLETED,

SURE HE CAN TESTIFY TO THE STATUS OF TI. HE CAN TESTIFY

TO WHAT'S THERE AND WHAT'S NOT. HE CAN LOOK AT IT

AND -- AND THE PEOPLE DO INTEND TO BRING IN A COMPLETED

1 AK-47 THAT'S OPERABLE AND SHOW THE JURY WHAT IT LOOKS 2 LIKE COMPLETED.

2.6

AND THEN THE EXPERT WILL GO THROUGH EACH OF THE PLECES THAT IS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THAT GUN AND SHOW WHAT THE DEFENDANT HAD CORRESPONDING TO THAT GUN. SO, OBVIOUSLY, HE CAN CROSS-EXAMINE AND BRING IN HIS OWN EXPERT TO SAY NO PLECES ARE MISSING.

THE COURT: YES.

MS. JONES: SO I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT.

THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. WELL, THAT WILLS
BE MY RULING TENTATIVELY.

J.S THERE ANYTHING ADDITIONAL WE NEED TO COVER BEFORE WE BRING THE JURORS UP?

MS. JONES: NO.

MR. HENNES: YOUR BONOR, I WAS STILL CONCERNED ABOUT THE COURT'S INDICATION THAT THEY'RE GOING TO ALLOW EVIDENCE OF A PRIOR CONVICTION IN AS FAR AS THEIR CASE IN CHIEF AND NOT MERELY TO IMPEACH MY CLIENT IF HE SHOULD DECIDE TO TESTIFY.

AND I BELIEVE THERE'S SOME CASE LAW ON THAT. 1
WOULD CITE THE COURT TO PEOPLE V. KRONEMEER,

K-R-O-N-E-M-Y-E-R. IT'S AN OLDER CASE, BUT IT'S STILL

PRECEDENT OF 189 CALLAPPIND STATE DISCUSSES THE ISSUE
OF A SIMILAR INTENT OR SOME OTHER SIMILARITY BETWEEN THE

PRIOR -- WELL, THE PRIOR ACT AND THE CURRENT CHARGE.

AND I BELIEVE ALSO UNDER 11 -- EVIDENCE CODE

1101, I DON'T BELIEVE A FELONY CONVICTION WOULD BE
PROPERLY ADMITTED UNLESS DEFENDANT TESTLETES.

THERE IS SOME CITER ADMISSIBLE REASON FOR THE PRIOR ACT FOR THE PRIOR CONVICTION TO BE ADMITTED AND TEAT COVER BOTH — APPARENTLY, BOTH THE POSSESSION OF THE HANDGUN IN THE CAR, THE 1999 CONVICTION, OR ELGHT CONVICTION, WHATEVER IT WAS, AND ALSO THE COURT'S INTENTION TO PERMIT THE EVIDENCE OF THE .50 CALIBER WEAPON AND THE AMMUNITION TO PROVE INTENT, APPARENTLY TO PROVE INTENT OR KNOWLEDGE ON THE PART OF MY CLIENT. I DON'T THINK THAT'S A NEXUS. I BELLEVE THAT KRONEMYER DISCUSSES THAT ISSUE.

THE COURT: OKAY. MY RULING REMAINS THAT THE EVIDENCE IS RELEVANT TO INTENT AS WELL AS OTHER ISSUES.

AND SO, THEREFORE, THE EVIDENCE UNDERLYING COUNTS 3 AND 4 CAN BE USED BY THE PEOPLE.

I'LL TAKE -- ALSO AT ONE OF THE BREAKS I'LL
TAKE A LOOK AT THE KRONEMYER CASE.

MR. HENNES: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: ALSO WITH RESPECT TO VOIR DIRE, PLEASE, COUNSEL, DO NOT PRESTRY THE CASE, YOU KNOW, USING, SORT OF, THE HYPOTHETICAL FACTS OF THIS CASE TO GET A FEEL FOR THE JURORS.

PLEASE TO NOT ASK THEM TO EXPLAIN OR DEFINE ANY

LEGAL DOCTRINES. WHAT DOES THE PRESUMPTION MEAN TO THEM? PLEASE STICK TO THOSE QUESTIONS. IT WILL ASSIST IN A STRICTLY-FOR-CAUSE DETERMINATION.

THE COURT HAS ASKED UNLESS YOU NEED TO FOLLOW UP OR USE YOUR TIME, I GUESS, HOWEVER YOU WOULD LIKE OTHERWISE. I THINK THAT WOULD BE IT FOR NOW.

MR. HENNES: OKAY.

(RECESS)

THE COURT: WE'RE BACK THE RECORD.

COUNSEL, I'M GOING TO AMEND ONE OF MY RULINGS.

AND THAT IS THE DEFENDANT'S FELONY STATUS DOES NOT COME

TO IN THE PEOPLE'S CASE IN CHIEF. THAT PART IT IS NOT RELEVANT, BUT CERTAINLY THE UNDERLYING CONDUCT I FIND IS RELEVANT, THE POSSESSION OF THIS OTHER SIMILAR FIREARM AS WELL AS AMMUNETION.

THE D.A. TO ADMONISH THE WITNESS NOT TO -- AND YOU PROBABLY WOULD HAVE NO REASON TO DO THIS -- BUT NOT TO TALK ABOUT THE DEFENDANT'S FELONY STATUS. AS A MATTER OF FACT, YOU CAN EVEN LEAD THE WITNESS A LITTLE BIT AROUND THAT AREA TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT DOES NOT COME OUT. AND, YEAH, SO --

MS. JONKS: OKAY.

MR. HENNES: SO THE "UNDERLYING CONDUCT" BEING THE .50 CALIBER?

1	THE COURT: .50 CALIBER.	
2	MR. HENNES: AND WHAT ABOUT THE AMMUNITION? IS	
3	THAT THAT STAYS?	
4	THE COURT: YES.	
5	MR. HENNES: OKAY. BUT HIS PRIOR FELONY IN THE	
6	90S IS NOT COMING IN AND	
7	THE COURT: CORRECT, THE FACT OF THE	
8	CONVICTION I THINK HE WAS CONVICTED FOR FELONY	
9	POSSESSION DOES NOT COME IN, OF COURSE.	
10	IF AND WHEN THE DEFENDANT SHOULD TAKE THE	
11	STAND, THAT CAN PROBABLY BE REVISITED, BUT AT THIS	
12	JUNCTURE THAT WILL BE MY NEW AND IMPROVED RULING,	
13	HOPEFULLY.	
14	BECAUSE THE CASE OF PEOPLE VS. VALENTINE WAS A	
15	CASE THAT WAS TALKING ABOUT WHEN THE STATUS OF THE	
16	DEFENDANT IS AN ELEMENT THAT THE PROPER HAVE TO PROVE,	
17	OF COURSE, THEN IT'S RELEVANT TO COME IN, ALTHOUGH IT	
18	MIGHT BE SANITIZED, BUT IT'S RECEVANT TO COME IN, SO	
19	THAT CASE IS INADEQUATE REALLY.	
20	OKAY. IS THERE ANYTHING ADDITIONAL BEFORE WE	
21	CALL IN THE JURY?	
22	MS. JONES: NO.	
2.3	MR. HENNES: NO.	
24	THE COURT: OKAY. LET'S CO AHEAD AND GET THEM	
25	IN HERE.	
26	CHIRY VOIR DIRE PROTECTINGS REPORTED AND NOT	

1 TRANSCRIBED) 2 (RECESS) 3 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE TER 4 PRESENCE OF THE JURY: } 5 THE COURT: OKAY, WE ARE OUTSTDE OF THE 6 PRESENCE OF THE JURY. 7 WE WILL RESUME TOMORROW WITH --8 MS. JONES: CHALLENGING FOR CAUSE? 9 THE COURT: - YEAH, CHALLENGING FOR CAUSE. 10 AND THEN WE'LL BEGIN THE SELECTION PROCESS, CONTINUE THE 11 SELECTION PROCESS. 12 IS THERE ANYTHING THAT NEEDS TO BE DISCUSSED 13 BEFORE WE BREAK? 14 MR. HENNES: I DON'T THINK SO. 15 THE COURT: THE PROSECUTOR, MS. JONES. 16 SUBMITTED TO ME THIS -- DID YOU SHOW THAT TO DEFENSE 77 COUNSEL? 18 MS. JONES: YES. 19 THE COURT: OKAY. 20 MR. HENNES: WHAT IS THIS? IS THAT THE 21 ADDENDUM OR THE --MS. JONES: IT'S THE ONE I TYPED UP. 22 23 MR. HENNES: THE MODIFIED INSTRUCTION. 24 THE COURT: ON THE CHARGE, CORRECT. AND IT 25 ADDS THE DEFINITION "ASSAULT WEAPON." 26 MR. HENNES: RICHT, WELL, THERE WAS THE

ADDITION THAT I WAS ASKING FROM THE REGULATION.

THE COURT: YES. AND YOU KNOW WHAT, I'M
INCLINED TO GIVE THAT, BECAUSE IN THE PENAL CODE IT
REFERENCES THE FACT THAT THE ATTORNEY CENERAL, I THINK
IT WAS, HAS BEEN CHARGED WITH DRAFTING VERBIAGE FOR THE
CODE OF REGULATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE DEFINITIONS, IF
I READ THAT CORRECTLY.

ONE MOMENT.

22.

MR. HENNES: I THINK THAT'S ACCURATE WITH RESPECT TO THE 12276.1, IN PARTICULAR.

THE COURT: I THINK YOU'RE RIGHT, COUNSEL.

YES. 12276.5, ACTUALLY, OF THE PENAL CODE SAYS THAT

"PREPARATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF DESCRIPTION OF ASSAULT
WEAPONS, LIST OF FIREARMS DESIGNATED AS ASSAULT
WEAPONS."

TARRED WITH PREPARING A DESCRIPTION AND A LIST FOR DISTRIBUTION OF ASSAULT WEAPONS AND THE DEFUNITION, ACTUALLY, OF TERMS AND THAT THAT THAT SHALL BE FILED WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR A PUBLICATION IN THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS.

AND I THINK WEAT COUNSEL COPIED WAS AT LEAST ONE SET OF DEFINITIONS THAT IS IN THE CODE OF REGULATIONS PURSUANT TO THAT SUBJECT, IF I'M READING THAT CORRECTLY?

MR. HENNES: MY UNDERSTANDING, YES, OF THE

1 SO CALLED "CATEGORY III ASSAULT WEAPONS." AND BECAUSE 2 IT'S NOT LISTED IN 12276, THAT'S THE GENERIC DESCRIPTION 3 OF AN ASSAULT WEAPON. YOUR HONOR, IT'S ALSO MY UNDERSTANDING THAT 4 5 A.G. WAS SUPPOSED TO COORDINATE WITH VARIOUS DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OF THE STATE TOO --6 7 MS. JONES: ALL OF THEM. 8 MR. HENNES: -- TO GET AT SOME UNIFORMITY 9 ANYWAY: HENCE, THAT THAT'S WHY I THINK THAT LETTER MIGHT 10 BE. 11 THE COURT: NOT OKAY. OKAY. SO WHAT I WILL IX) 12 IS I WILL ANTICIPATE GIVING THOSE FIVE DEFINITIONS. I'M 13 INCLINED TO GIVE A DEFINITION FROM THE CALIFORNIA CODE 14 OF RECULATIONS BECAUSE I THINK IT'S JUSTIFIED FROM THE 1.5 CODE. 16 I THINK THERE'S SOME DEPINITIONS THAT ARE NOT 17 IN THE CODE THAT WOULD ASSIST THE JURY AND -- BUT I'LL 18 MAKE THE FINAL DECISION AFTER WE HEAR THE TESTIMONY, 19 BECAUSE PERHAPS ALL OF THOSE DEFINITIONS WILL NOT BE 20 NECESSARY. I (XON'T KNOW. THE DETACHABLE MAGAZINE 21 SOUNDS LIKE IT WILL BE, BUT I DON'T KNOW ABOUT THE REST 22 OF THEM. 23 SO THAT'S MY TENTATIVE. 24 MR. HENNES: THANK YOU. 25 MS. JONES: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: "OMORROW 9:00 O'CLOCK. GET HERE A

		6.3
1	FEW MINUTES EARLY SO WE CAN GET COING.	
2	MS. JONES: WE CAN DO IT OFF THE RECORD.	
3	(EAD OF PROCEEDINGS)	
4		
5	A & F F	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
20 21 22		
22		
23		
23 24 25		
25		
26		

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE, WEST JUSTICE CENTER	
3	OEPARTMENT W8	
4		
5	THE PROPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)	
6	PLAINTIFF,	
7	VS. NO. 10WF0918	
8	TIEN DUC NGUYEN,	
9	DEFENDANT.	
10		
11		
12	HONORABLE DAPINE SYKES SCOTT, JUDGE PRESIDING	
13	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT	
14	TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 2011	
15		
16	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:	
1.7	FOR THE PEOPLE:	
18	TONY RACKAUCKAS, DISTRICT ATTORNEY	
19	BY: RENEE CONES, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY	
20	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	
21	BY: CHRISTOPHER J. HENNES, RETAINED ATTORNEY	
22	LORI 1. PARNESS, C.S.R. #9117,	
23	PRO TEMPORE COURT REPORTER	
24		
25		
26		

AND I HAVE INSTRUCTED COUNSES, MR. HENNES, THAT

1	IF NEED BE, YOU CAN WALK HIM THROUGH OR ASK TIGHTEN
2	UP AND ASK CLOSE-KNIT QUESTIONS IN ORDER THAT HE NOT
3	INADVERTENTLY TALK ABOUT WHETHER A PARTICULAR CUN IS
4	LIFGAL.
5	AND THAT I WOULD IMAGINE WOULD BE JUST A SMALL
6	PART OF THE A FEW QUESTIONS IN HIS TESTIMONY, SO I
7	DON'T WANT HIM TO BLURT OUT THAT TYPE OF THING. AND I
8	DON'T WANT COUNSEL TO ELICIT A QUESTION WHICH WOULD
9	REASONABLY TEND TO ELICIT THAT SORT OF TESTIMONY FROM
10	THE EXPERT, SO PLEASE ADVISE YOUR EXPERT TO NOT IX THAT.
11	MR. HENNES: WILL DO, YOUR HONOR.
1.2	THE COURT: THANK YOU. I THINK THAT'S ALL FOR
13	NOW.
14	WE'RE GOING TO CALL IN THE JURY. AND THEN WE
15	WILL, AFTER THE JURY IS SELECTED, TAKE A WHEN THE
16	AUTERNATES AND THE JURY HAVE BEEN SWORN TAKE A
17	10-MINUTE BREAK IN ORDER FOR THE PROSECUTION TO SET UP
18	WHATEVER THEY NEED TO SET UP WHATEVER IT IS THEY NEED
19	FOR THE TRIAL.
20	IS THAT ALL?
21	MR. HENNES: THAT IS ALL.
2.2.	THE COURT: OKNY.
23	(RECESS)
24	(JURY VOIR DIRE REPORTED AND NOT TRANSCRIBED)
25	(JURY SWORN)
26	(ALTERNATES SWORN)

1.3

DESCRIBE FOR YOU HOW THE TRIAL WILL BE CONDUCTED. AND EXPLAIN WHAT YOU AND THE LAWYERS AND I WILL BE DOING.

AND MAY THE RECORD REFLECT THAT BOTH COUNSEL AND MR. NGUYEN ARE PRESENT, AS WELL AS ALL JURORS AND THE ALTERNATES.

WHEN I REFER TO "THE PEOPLE," I MEAN THE ATTORNEY FROM THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE WHO IS TRYING THIS CASE ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. WHEN I REFER TO "DEFENSE COUNSEL," I MEAN THE ATTORNEY WHO IS REPRESENTING THE DEFENDANT TIEN DUC NGUYEN.

THE TRIAL WILL PROCEED AS POLLOWS: THE PEOPLE MAY PRESENT AN OPENING STATEMENT. THE DEFENSE IS NOT REQUIRED TO PRESENT AN OPENING STATEMENT, BUT IF UT CHOOSES TO DO SO, IT MAY GIVE IT EITHER AFTER THE PEOPLE'S OPENING STATEMENT OR AT THE BEGINNING OF THE DEFENSE CASE.

THE PURPOSE OF AN OPENING STATEMENT IS TO GIVE YOU AN OVERVIEW OF WHAT THE ATTORNEYS EXPECT THE EVIDENCE WILL SHOW.

NEXT THE PEOPLE WILL OFFER THEIR EVIDENCE.

EVIDENCE USUALLY INCLUDES WITNESS TESTIMONY AND

EXRIBITS. AFTER THE PROPLE PRESENT THEIR EVIDENCE, THE

DEFENSE MAY ALSO PRESENT EVIDENCE, BUT IS NOT REQUIRED

TO DO SO.

BECAUSE HE IS PRESUMED INNOCENCY, THE DEFENDANT

7 8

1.2

2.4

DOES NOT HAVE TO PROVE HE IS NOT CUILTY. AFTER YOU HAVE HEARD ALL THE EVADENCE AND BEFORE THE JURY IS GIVEN THETR FINAL ARGUMENTS, I WILL INSTRUCT ON THE LAW THAT APPLIES TO THE CASE. AFTER YOU HAVE HEARD THE ARGUMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS YOU WILL GO TO THE JURY ROOM TO DEGLIBERATE.

PROCEDURE. THESE RULES ENSURE THAT BOTH SIDES RECEIVE A FAIR TRIAL:

DURING THE TRIAL DO NOT TALK ABOUT THE CASE OR ABOUT ANY OF THE PROPER OR ANY SUBJECT INVOLVED IN THIS WITH ANYONE, NOT EVEN YOUR FAMILY, FRIENDS, SPERITUAL ADVISORS OR THERAPISTS. DO NOT SHARE INFORMATION ABOUT THE CASE IN WRITING, BY E-MAIL, BY TELEPHONE, ON THE INTERNET, OR BY ANY OTHER MEANS OF COMMUNICATION.

YOU MUST NOT TALK ABOUT THESE THINGS WITH THE OTHER JURORS EITHER UNTIL THE TIME COMES FOR YOU TO BEGIN YOUR DELIBERATIONS. AS JURORS YOU MAY DISCUSS THE CASE TOGETHER ONLY AFTER ALL OF THE EVIDENCE HAS BEEN PRESENTED, THE ATTORNEYS HAVE COMPLETED THEIR ARGUMENTS AND I HAVE INSTRUCTED ON THE LAW.

AFTER I TELL YOU TO BEGIN YOUR DELIBERATIONS
YOU MAY DISCUSS THE CASE ONLY IN THE JURY ROOM AND ONLY
WHEN ALL JURORS ARE PRESENT. YOU MUST NOT ALLOW
ANYTHING THAT HAPPENS OUTSIDE OF THE COURTROOM TO AFFECT
YOUR DECISION UNLESS I TELL YOU OTHERWISE.

1.2.

1.4

DURING THE TRIAL DO NOT READ, LISTEN TO OR
WATCH ANY NEWS REPORT OR COMMENTARY ABOUT THE CASE FROM
ANY SOURCE. DO NOT DO ANY RESEARCH ON YOUR OWN OR AS A
GROUP REGARDING THIS CASE. DO NOT USE A DICTIONARY OR
THE INTERNET OR CELL PHONE OR ANY OTHER ELECTRONIC
DEVICE. DO NOT INVESTIGATE THE FACTS OR LAW. DO NOT
CONDUCT ANY TESTS OR EXPERIMENTS OR VISIT THE SCENE OF
ANY EVENT INVOLVED IN THIS CASE.

IF YOU HAPPEN TO PASS BY THE SCENE, DO NOT STOP
TO INVESTIGATE. IF YOU HAVE A CELL PHONE OR OTHER
ELECTRONIC DEVICE, KEEP IT TURNED OFF WHILE YOU'RE IN
THE COURTROOM AND DURING JURY DELIBERATIONS INCLUDING
ANY STORAGE DATA DEVICE. IF ANYONE NEEDS TO CONTACT YOU
IN AN EMERGENCY THE COURT CAN GIVE MESSAGES, CAN RECEIVE
MESSAGES THAT IT WILL DELIVER TO YOU WITHOUT DELAY.

DORING THE TRIAL DO NO SPEAK TO ANY PARTY,
WITNESS OR LAWYER INVOLVED IN THE TRIAL. DO NOT LISTEN
TO ANYONE WHO TRIES TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT THE CASE OR
ABOUT ANY OF THE PEOPLE OR SUBJECTS INVOLVED IN IT.

IF SOMEONE ASKS ABOUT THE CASE, TELL HIM OR HER
YOU CANNOT DISCUSS IT. IF THAT PERSON KEEPS TALKING TO
YOU ABOUT THE CASE, YOU MUST END THE CONVERSATION. WHEN
THE TRAIL HAS ENDED AND YOU HAVE BEEN RELEASED AS A
JUROR YOU MAY DISCUSS THE CASE WITH ANYONE, BUT UNDER
CALLEDONIA LAW MUST WAIT AT LEAST 90 DAYS BEFORE
NEGOTIATING OR ACREEING TO ACCEPT ANY PAYMENT FOR

INFORMATION ABOUT THE CASE.

IF YOU RECEIVE ANY INFORMATION ABOUT THIS CASE FROM ANY SOURCE OUTSIDE OF THE TRIAL, EVEN UNINTENTIONALLY, DO NOT SHARE THAT INFORMATION WITH ANY OTHER JUROR. IF YOU DO RECEIVE SUCH INFORMATION OR IF ANYONE TRIES TO INFLUENCE YOU OR ANY JUROR, YOU MUST IMMEDIATELY TELL THE BALLIFF.

SOME WORDS OR PHRASES THAT MAY BE USED DURING TRIAL HAVE LEGAL MEANINGS THAT ARE DIFFERENT FROM THEIR MEANINGS IN EVERYDAY USE. THESE WORDS AND PHRASES WILL BE SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED IN THE INSTRUCTIONS.

PLEASE BE SURE TO LISTEN CAREFULLY AND FOLLOW
THE DEFINITIONS THAT I GIVE YOU. WORDS AND PHRASES NOT
SPECIFICALLY DEFINED IN THE INSTRUCTIONS ARE TO BE
APPLIED USING THEIR ORDINARY AND EVERYDAY MEANING.

MAKE UP YOUR MIND ABOUT THE INDIVIDUAL OR ANY ISSUE
UNTIL AFTER YOU HAVE DISCUSSED THE CASE WITH THE OTHER
JURORS AFTER DELIBERATION. DO NOT TAKE ANYTHING I SAY
AS AN INDICATION OF WHAT I THINK ABOUT THE FACTS, THE
WITNESSES, OR WHAT YOUR VERDICT SHOULD BE. DO NOT LET
BIAS, SYMPATHY, PREJUDICE OR PUBLIC OPINION INFLUENCE
YOUR DECISION.

YOU MUST REACH YOUR VERDICT WITHOUT ANY
CONSIDERATION OF PUNISHMENT. YOU HAVE BEEN GIVEN
NOTEBOOKS AND MAY TAKE NOTES DURING THE TRIAL. DO NOT

1)

REMOVE THEM FROM THE COURTROOM. YOU MAY TAKE NOTES INTO THE JURY ROOM DURING DELIBERATION.

J. DO NOT MEAN TO DISCOURAGE YOU FROM TAKING NOTES, BUT HERE IS SOME INFORMATION TO CONSIDER IF YOU DO TAKE NOTES:

NUMBER ONE: NOTE-TAKING MAY TEND TO DISTRACT
YOU. IT MAY AFFECT YOUR ABILITY TO LISTEN CAREFULLY TO
ALL THE TESTIMONY AND TO WATCH THE WITNESS AS THEY
TESTIFY.

AND, NUMBER TWO, THE NOTES ARE FOR YOUR OWN
INDIVIDUAL USE TO HELP YOU REMEMBER WHAT HAPPENED DURING
THE TRYAL. PLEASE KEEP IN MIND THAT YOUR NOTES MAY BE
TNACCURATE OR INCOMPLETE. AT THE END OF TRIAL YOUR
NOTES WILL BE COLLECTED AND DESTROYED.

AND THE PEOPLE'S BURDEN OF PROOF: THE DEFENDANT HAS PLEADED NOT GUILTY TO THE CHARGES. THE FACT THAT A CRIMINAL CHARGE HAS BEEN FILED AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IS NOT EVIDENCE THAT THE CHARGE IS TRUE.

YOU MUST NOT BE BIASED AGAINST THE DEFENDANT
JUST BECAUSE HE HAS BEEN ARRESTED, CHARGED WITH A CRIME
OR BROUGHT TO TRIAL. A DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL CASE IS
PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT. THIS PRESUMPTION REQUIRES THAT
THE PROPIE PROVE A DEFENDANT GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE
DOUBT.

WHEN I TELL THE PEOPLE MUST PROVE SOMETHING, I

1 <u>|</u>

1.3

2.3

2.4

MEAN, THEY MUST PROVE IT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT,
UNLESS I SPECIFICALLY TELL YOU, OTHERWISE, PROOF BEYOND
A REASONABLE DOUBT IS PROOF THAT LEAVES YOU WITH AN
ABIDING CONVICTION THAT THE CHARGE IS TRUE.

THE EVIDENCE NEEDED TO FILMINATE ALL POSSIBLE DOUBT, BECAUSE EVERYTHING IN LIFE IS OPEN TO SOME POSSIBLE OR IMAGINARY EXUBT. AND IN DECIDING WHETHER THE PEOPLE HAVE PROVED THEIR CASE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT YOU MUST IMPARTIALLY COMPARE AND CONSIDER ALL THE EVIDENCE THAT WAS RECEIVED THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE TRIAL. UNLESS THE EVIDENCE PROVES THE DEFENDANT GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT HE IS ENTITLED TO AN ACQUITTAL, AND YOU MUST FIND HIM NOT GUILTY.

YOU MUST DECIDE WHAT THE FACTS ARE IN THIS
CASE. YOU MUST USE ONLY THE EVIDENCE THAT IS PRESENTED
IN THE COURTROOM OR DURING A JURY VIEW. EVIDENCE IS THE
SWORN TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES, THE EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO
EVIDENCE, AND ANYTHING ELSE I TELL YOU TO CONSIDER AS
EVIDENCE.

THE FACT THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS ARRESTED AND CHARGED WITH THE CRIME OR BROUGHT TO TRIAL IS NOT EVIDENCE OF GUILT.

NOTHING THAT THE ATTORNEYS SAY IS EVIDENCE. IN THEIR OPENING STATEMENTS AND CLOSING ARGUMENTS THE ATTORNEYS WILL DISCUSS THE CASE, BUT THEIR REMARKS ARE NOT EVIDENCE. THEIR QUESTIONS ARE NOT EVIDENCE. ONLY

THE WITNESSES' ANSWERS ARE EVIDENCE. THE ATTORNEYS'
QUESTIONS ARE SIGNIFICANT ONLY IF THEY HELP YOU
UNDERSTAND THE WITNESSES' ANSWERS. DO NOT ASSUME THAT
SOMETHING IS TRUE JUST BECAUSE ONE OF THE ATTORNEYS ASKS
A QUESTION THAT SUGGESTS IT IS TRUE.

DURING THE TRIAL THE ATTORNEYS MAY OBJECT TO
QUESTIONS ASKED OF A WITNESS. I WILL RULE ON THE
OBJECTIONS ACCORDING TO THE LAW. IF I SUSTAIN AN
OBJECTION, THE WITNESS WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO ANSWER.
YOU MUST IGNORE THE QUESTION. IF THE WITNESS DOES NOT
ANSWER, DO NOT GUESS WHAT THE ANSWER MIGHT HAVE BEEN OR
WHY I RULED AS I DID.

THE TORDER TESTIMONY STRICKEN FROM THE RECORD,
YOU MUST DISREGARD IT AND NOT CONSIDER THAT TESTIMONY
FOR ANY PURPOSE. YOU MUST DISREGARD ANYTHING YOU SEE OR
HEAR WHEN THE COURT IS NOT IN SESSION, EVEN IF IT IS
DONE OR SAID BY ONE OF THE PARTIES OR WITNESSES.

THE COURT REPORTER IS MAKING A RECORD OF

EVERYTHING THAT IS SAID BEING SAID DURING THE TRIAL.

IF YOU DECIDE THAT IT IS NECESSARY, YOU MAY ASK THAT THE

COURT REPORTER'S RECORD BE READ TO YOU. YOU MUST ACCEPT

THE COURT REPORTER'S RECORD AS ACCURATE.

YOU ALONE MUST JUDGE THE CREDIBILITY OR

BELLEVABILITY OF THE WITNESSES. IN DETERMINING WHETHER

TESTIMONY IS TRUE AND ACCURATE USE YOUR COMMON SENSE AND

EXPERIENCE. YOU MOST JUDGE THE TESTIMONY OF EACH

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

WITHESS BY THE SAME STANDARDS, SETTING ASIDE ANY BLAS OR PREJUDICE YOU MAY HAVE.

YOU MAY BELLEVE ALL, PART OR NONE OF ANY WITTHESS'S TESTIMONY. CONSIDER THE TESTIMONY OF EACH WITNESS AND DECIDE HOW MUCH OF IT YOU BELIEVE. IN EVALUATING A WITNESS'S TESTIMONY YOU MAY CONSIDER ANYTHING THAT REASONABLY TENDS TO PROVE OR DISPROVE THE TRUTH OR ACCURACY OF THAT TESTIMONY.

AMONG THE FACTORS THAT YOU MAY CONSIDER ARE HOW WELL COULD THE WITNESS SEE, HEAR OR OTHERWISE PERCEIVE THE THINGS ABOUT WHICH THE WITNESS TESTIFIED, HOW WELL WAS THE WITNESS ABLE TO REMEMBER AND DESCRIBE WHAT HAPPENED, WHAT WAS THE WITNESS'S BEHAVIOR WHILE TESTIFYING? DID THE WITNESS UNDERSTAND THE OUESTIONS AND ANSWER THEM DIRECTLY? WAS THE WITNESS'S TESTIMONY INFIDENCED BY A FACTOR SUCH AS A BLAS OR PREJUDICE, A PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH SOMEONE INVOLVED IN THE CASE, OR A PERSONAL INTEREST IN HOW THE CASE IS DECIDED?

WHAT WAS THE WITNESS'S ATTITUDE ABOUT THE CASE OR ABOUT TESTIFYING? DID THE WITNESS MAKE A STATEMENT IN THE PAST THAT IS CONSISTENT OR INCONSISTENT WITH HIS OR HER TESTIMONY? HOW REASONABLE IS THE TESTIMONY WHEN YOU CONSIDER ALL OF THE OTHER EVIDENCE IN THE CASE? DID OTHER EVIDENCE PROVE OR DISPROVE ANY FACT ABOUT WHICH THE WITNESS TESTIFIED? DID THE WITNESS ADMIT TO BEING UNTRUTHFUL?

4 5

2.3

DO NOT AUTOMATICALLY REJECT TESTIMONY JUST BECAUSE OF INCONSISTENCIES OR CONFLICTS. CONSIDER WHETHER THE DIFFERENCES ARE IMPORTANT OR NOT. PEOPLE SOMETIMES HONESTLY FORGET THINGS OR MAKE MISTAKES ABOUT WHAT THEY REMEMBER. ALSO, TWO PEOPLE MAY WITNESS THE SAME EVENT, YET SEE IT OR HEAR IT DIFFERENTLY.

I WITHDRAW THAT. LE YOU DO NOT BELIEVE A WITNESS'S
TESTIMONY THAT HE OR SHE NO LONGER REMEMBERS SOMETHING,
THAT TESTIMONY IS INCONSISTENT WITNESS'S EARLIER
STATEMENT ON THAT SUBJECT.

ABOUT SOMETHING SIGNIFICANT IN THIS CASE, YOU SHOULD CONSIDER NOT BELLEVING ANYTHING THAT WITNESS SAID. OR IF YOU THINK THE WITNESS LIED ABOUT SOME THINGS BUT TOLD THE TRUTH ABOUT OTHERS, YOU MAY SIMPLY ACCEPT THE PART YOU THINK IS TRUE AND IGNORE THE REST.

IF DURING THE TRIAL YOU HAVE A QUESTION THAT
YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE ASKED OF A WITNESS, YOU MAY WRITE
OUT THE QUESTION AND SEND IT TO ME THROUGH THE BAYLLIFF.
I WILL DISCUSS THE QUESTION WITH THE ATTORNEYS AND
DECIDE WHETHER IT MAY BE ASKED.

DO NOT FEEL SELIGHTED OR DISAPPOINTMENT TO YOUR QUESTION IS NOT ASKED. YOUR QUESTION MAY NOT BE ASKED FOR A VARIETY OF REASONS INCLUDING THE REASON THAT THE QUESTION MAY CALL FOR AN ANSWER TEAT INAUMISSIBLE FOR

LEGAL RELATION.

ALSO, DO NOT GUESS THE REASON YOUR QUESTION WAS NOT ASKED OR SPECULATE ABOUT WHAT THE ANSWER MIGHT HAVE BEEN. ALWAYS REMEMBER THAT YOU ARE NOT ADVOCATES FOR ONE SIDE OR THE OTHER IN THIS CASE. YOU ARE IMPARTIAL JUDGES OF THE FACTS.

YOU MAY BE PERMITTED TO SEPARATE DURING RECESSES AND AT THE END OF THE DAY. I WILL TELL YOU WHEN TO RETURN. PLEASE REMEMBER WE CANNOT BEGIN THE TRIAL UNTIL ALL OF YOU ARE IN PLACE, SO IT IS IMPORTANT TO BE ON TIME.

REMEMBER DO NOT TALK ABOUT THE CASE OR ABOUT
ANY OF THE PEOPLE OR ANY SUBJECT INVOLVED IN IT WITH
ANYONE INCLUDING THE OTHER JURORS. DO NOT MAKE UP YOUR
MIND AT ALL ABOUT THE VERDICT OR ANY ISSUE UNTIL AFTER
YOU HAVE DISCUSSED THE CASE WITH THE OTHER JURORS DURING
DELIBERATIONS.

COUNSEL MAY BE STIPULATING THAT THE JURORS MAY
BE DEEMED TO HAVE BEEN SO ADMONISHED AT EACH ADJOURNMENT
WHETHER OR NOT THE ADMONITION IS REPEATED IN FULL; AND
THAT THE DEFENDANT WILL BE DEEMED TO BE PRESENT WITH
COUNSEL; AND EACH OF THE JURORS WILL BE DEEMED IN THE
BOX AT THE BEGINNING AND END OF EACH SESSION UNLESS THE
CONTRARY IS SHOWN ON THE RECORD.

DO YOU STIPULATE?

MS. JONES: STIPULATE.

MR. HENNES: STIPULATE.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. OKAY. COUNSEL, WOULD
YOU APPROACH BRIEFLY, ADMINISTRATIVE SIDEBAR?
(SIDEBAR PROCEEDINGS WITHOUT THE REPORTER)
(PROCEEDINGS IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. A COUPLE OF THINGS:
FIRST OF ALL, FROM THIS POINT FORWARD WHEN

COUNSEL AND I BEAVE THE COURTROOM TO HAVE A STDEBAR, YOU ALL FEEL FREE TO STAND UP AND STRETCH AND TURN AROUND TO DO A JUMPING JACK, WHATEVER YOU NEED TO DO TO STAY AWAKE.

NUMBER TWO: THE SCHEDULE WILL BE THAT WE WILL HAVE USUALLY A MORNING BREAK AROUND 10:00, 10:15 OR SO. WE'LL HAVE AN AFTERNOON BREAK AROUND 3:15 OR SO. WE'LL BREAK FOR LUNCH FROM NOON TO 1:30, BECAUSE THE COURTS ARE DARK DURING THAT PERIOD OF TIME, AND IT HELPS US DEAL WITH RELEVANT ISSUES DURING THAT PERIOD OF TIME AS WELL.

BUT TODAY, BECAUSE OF LOGISTICS, WE'RE GOING TO
LET YOU OUT A FEW MINUTES EARLY. AND I NORMALLY LIKE TO
TAKE UP AS MUCH COURT TIME AS POSSIBLE SO AS NOT TO
WASTE YOUR TIME AND TO MAKE THE BEST USE OF YOUR TIME.

BUT WE'RE GOING TO NEED TO BREAK FOR 10 MINUTES
BECAUSE WHILE YOU ARE BREAKING, WE'RE DISCUSSING ANOTHER
LEGAL ISSUE THAT HAS COME UP. SO WE'RE NOT JUST LYING
BY THE POOL. I WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW THAT.

. . .

SO YOU'RE ORDERED TO COME BACK AT 1:30. PLEASE CONCREGATE RIGHT OUTSIDE THOSE DOORS THERE. AND ENJOY YOUR LUNCH.

(PROCEEDINGS OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)

THE COURT: WE'RE OUTSIDE OF THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. AND OFF THE RECORD FOR A MOMENT.

(DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD)

THE COURT: THERE IS AN ISSUE THAT HAS COME UP.

AND I DO WANT TO HEAR THAT NOW BEFORE THE LUNCH HOUR.

COUNSEL, GO AMEAD AND EXPLAIN ON THE RECORD

WHAT THAT IS.

MR. HENNES: YES, YOUR HONOR. I AM

ANTICIPATING WHAT TESTIMONY MAY BE FORTHCOMING FROM

DETECTIVE CHAPMAN HERE. I'M READING FROM THE POLICE

REPORT. AND IN LIGHT OF THE COURT'S EARLIER RULINGS,

I'LL JUST READ ONE SENTENCE FROM IT. AND THIS IS WHAT

I'M CONCERNED ABOUT:

IN THE REPORT DETECTIVE CHAPMAN STATES IN THE INITIAL INTERVIEW ON THE DAY BEFORE THE ARREST, ACTUALLY, YOU KNOW, AT THE BUSINESS, AT MR. NGUYEN'S BUSINESS, WHERE THEY HAD ALREADY FOUND THE FIREARMS IN THE BOX, DETECTIVE CHAPMAN WRITES, "WHEN ASKED ABOUT THE LEGALITIES OF THEN NGUYEN MAKING AND HAVING HIS OWN ASSAULT WEAPONS WITHOUT REGISTERING THEM, THEN IMPLIED HE KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING WAS WRONG AND LATER ADMITTED THAT HE HAD A FELONY, PREVIOUS FELONY CONVICTION, FOR

POSSESSING A FIREARM AND GANG MEMBER AND, AGAIN, WAS NOT SUPPOSED TO HAVE ANY FIREARMS WHATSOEVER."

THINK THE COURT HAS RULED, NUMBER ONE, THAT, YOU KNOW, LEGALITIES IS NOT SOMETHING THAT ANY WITNESS CAN DISCUSS. "ASSAULT WEAPONS," I THINK THE COURT HAS RULED THAT WE'RE NOT GOING TO USE THAT TERM.

AND FURTHERMORE, "TIEN IMPLIED" IS SIMPLY
SPECULATION. HE DOESN'T SAY - YOU KNOW, I DON'T KNOW
WHAT THE YOU KNOW, WHAT THE OFFICER IS BASING THAT
IMPRESSION ON THAT TIEN IMPLIED HE KNEW WHAT HE WAS
DOING WAS WRONG. THAT COULD MEAN ANYTHING. AND I WOULD
OBJECT TO ANY KIND OF TESTIMONY OF ALL OF THAT STUFF.

THE COURT: MADAM PROSECUTOR?

MS. JONES: THANK YOU. I THINK THAT THAT'S AN AREA WHERE THE DEFENSE CAN CROSS-EXAMINE HIM AS TO WHAT HE MEANT WHEN HE WROTE THE WORD "IMPLIED."

THE PROFFERED EVIDENCE IS THAT

DETECTIVE CHAPMAN ASKED HIM ABOUT THE ILLEGALITY. IN

OTHER WORDS, "DO YOU KNOW THAT IT'S ILLEGAL FOR YOU TO

HAVE AND MAKE YOUR OWN" -- AND HE DOESN'T REMEMBER

WHETHER HE SAID "AK-47" OR "ASSAULT WEAPON" BECAUSE HE

USES THOSE TERMS INTERCHANGEABLY -- "ASSAULT WEAPONS

WITHOUT RECISTERING THEM?"

AND HE ADMITTED HE KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING WAS WRONG. LATER HE ADMITTED HE'S NOT SUPPOSED TO HAVE ANY WEAPONS BECAUSE HE'S A FELON, SO THAT CONVERSATION THAT

HE HAD RIGHT THERE IS AN ADMISSION. AND I THINK THAT WE CAN FIX IT BY JUST REFERRING TO IT DE KNOWS HE USED EITHER AN "AK-47" OR AN "ASSAULT WEAPON."

AND SETTHE PREJUDICE THAT THE DEFENSE IS CONCERNED ABOUT IS REFERRING TO LT AS AN "ASSAULT WEAPON," I'M FINE WITH HAVING HIM REFER TO LT IN THE OUESTIONS AS AN "AK-47."

THE COURT: A COUPLE OF THINGS: NOT SO MUCH THAT ISSUE ABOUT THE TERMINOLOGY, BUT HOW IS IT RELEVANT THAT YOU'RE ELICITING FROM YOUR WITNESS THE DEFENDANT'S KNOWLEDGE OF WHETHER THE CUN WAS LEGAL OR NOT LEGAL?

HOW IS THAT RELEVANT?

MS. JONES: BECAUSE IT'S -- THE WHOLE THEORY OF THE CASE IS THAT THE WAY HE'S -- DE'S TRYING TO POSSESS TILLEGAL WEAPONS. THAT'S IN THE BROAD SCHEME OF THINGS, THAT'S WHAT HE'S DOING. AND HE'S DOING UT BY MAKING HIS OWN.

THAT'S AN ADMISSION THAT HE KNOWS HE'S NOT SUPPOSED TO MAKE THEM, BECAUSE HE SAYS, "I'M NOT SUPPOSED TO BE MAKING THESE." HE KNOWS THEY'RE HILEGAL.

THE COURT: IS THAT, THOUGH, IS HIS KNOWLEDGE OF WHETHER IT'S LEGAL OR NOT RELEVANT?

MS. JONES: LT'S CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT. IT'S CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT THAT HE KNOWS THAT THESE HAVE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN ASSAULT WEAPON. AND HE KNOWS HE'S MAKING IT. I MEAN, THAT'S --

1	THE COURT: WELL, THAT'S TRUE. I MEAN, THAT
2	CAN BE ELICITED. HE KNOWS THEY HAVE BECAUSE THAT'S
3	ONE OF THE ELEMENTS. HE'S GOT TO KNOW THAT HE'S PUTTING
4	TOGETHER THIS THING THAT HAS THE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN
5	ASSAULT RIFLE. PERIOD.
6	MS. JONES: RICHT. WELL,
7	THE COURT: DOES IT MATTER IF HE KNOWS IF IT'S
8	LEGAL OR NOT LEGAL?
9	MS. JONES: WELL, HE KNOWS HE'S NOT SUPPOSED TO
10	BE MAKING - I MEAN, I DON'T MIND YOU SANITIZING IT TO
1]	GET AWAY FROM THE IN PLAIN LANGUAGE, YEAR, IT IS. HE
12	KNOWS HE'S BREAKING THE LAW.
13	THE COURT: BUT IS THAT RELEVANT TO ANYTHING?
14	MS. JONES: IT'S RELEVANT TO HTS KNOWLEDGE THAT
15	HE'S MANUFACTURING SOMETHING THAT HAS THE
16	CHARACTERISTICS OF AN ASSAULT WEAPON. THE REASON IT'S
17	ACAINST THE LAW IS BECAUSE HE'S MAKING SOMETHING THAT
18	HAS THE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN ASSAULT WEAPON.
19	THE COURT: DOES HE HAVE TO KNOW IT'S AGAINST
20	THE LAW?
21	MS. JONES: HE HAS TO KNOW WHAT HE'S DOING IS
22	WRONG.
23	MR. HENNES: NO.
24	THE COURT: DOES HE?
25	MS. JONES: YEAH. HE NEEDS TO KNOW HE NEEDS
26	TO KNOW THAT WELL, I'M SORRY. HE DOESN'T NEED TO

1 WESTMINSTER, CALIFORNIA - APRIL 5, 2011 2 AFTERNOON SESSION 3 THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) 4 5 THE COURT: WE'RE ON THE RECORD ON THE TRIAL. ALL COUNSEL AND MR. NOUYEN ARE PRESENT. AND I BELLEVE 6 7 THERE WAS JUST COING TO BE A WRAP-UP OF AN ADDITIONAL 8 402 ISSUE. 9 MR. HENNES? MR. HENNES: YES. REGARDING THE STATEMENT THAT 10 11 I READ FROM THE POLICE REPORT, DETECTIVE CHAPMAN'S 12 REPORT, I THINK THAT THERE ARE SEVERAL REASONS WHY THAT 13 SHOULD NOT BE ADMITTED: FIRST REASON IS BECAUSE THE COURT'S PREVIOUS 14 15 RULING ABOUT WITNESSES GIVING OPINIONS AS TO WHETHER 16 SOMETHING IS LEGAL OR NOT AND REFERENCE TO "ASSAULT 17 WEAPONS." 18 SECONDLY, THIS IS NOT AN ADMISSION BECAUSE 19 THERE IS NO ACTUAL STATEMENT BY THE DEFENDANT THAT'S 20 DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT. 21 OTHER OUESTION IS WHEN, APPARENTLY, 22 DETECTIVE CHAPMAN ASKED MY CLIENT ABOUT THE, QUOTE, 23 "LEGALITIES" OF MAKING AND HAVING JUS OWN ASSAULT 24 WEAPONS WITHOUT RECISTERING THEM, THE REPORT SAYS THAT 25 "TIEN IMPLIED HE KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING WAS WRONG."

I MEAN, THAT'S COMPLETE SPECULATION. I MEAN,

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

THERE'S NO BASIS, AT LEAST IN THE REPORT, FOR THINKING. FOR ASSUMING THAT THAT WAS ANY KIND OF ADMISSIBLE STATEMENT.

I MEAN, I CON'T KNOW WHAT THE IMPLICATION IS. 1 DON'T THINK THAT WOULD BE PROPER TESTIMONY. CERTAINLY, HE COULDN'T GET UP ON THE STAND AND SAY THAT THE DEFENDANT LMPLIED THAT WHAT HE WAS DOING IS WRONG.

SECONDLY, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF REASONS WIY, EVEN ASSUMING THAT MR. NGUYEN DID STATE THAT HE KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING IS WRONG. AND THE MOST OBVIOUS REASON COMES TO MIND IS THAT HE WAS A FELON IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM.

SO LET'S SAY THAT THE OFFICER CETS UP AND SAYS HE SAID HE KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING WAS WRONG BECAUSE HE WAS BUTTIDING AN INTEGAL WEAPON. AND THEN, OF COURSE, WE'RE NOT COING TO BE ABLE TO REBUT THAT WITH TEST IMONY FROM MR. NGUYEN. I MEAN, WHICH IS ALL FAIR GAME.

I MEAN, IF HE GETS UP HERE, HE'S GOING TO HAVE TO ADMIT, NUMBER ONE, THAT "I WAS - ! SAID I WAS WRONG FOR DOING THIS BECAUSE I'M A FELON, AND I CAN'T HAVE ANY WEAPONS." OR HE GETS UP AND HE GETS TO IMPEACH HIS FELONY CONVICTION. AND FINALLY - AND I THINK THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON -- IS BECAUSE IT'S IRRELEVANT.

AS THE COURT INDICATED BEFORE THE BREAK. THERE'S NO REQUIRE -- THEY DON'T -- THE PROSECUTION DOES NOT HAVE TO PROVE THAT MR. NOUYEN KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING

1.3

WAS WRONG. WHATEVER THAT MEANS. THAT WOULD MEAN MORALLY WRONG, LEGALLY WRONG, JUST ANY DIFFERENT WAY.

TT COULD BE NOT A COOD THING TO DO. IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE AGAINST THE ASSAULT WEAPON BAN LAWS. AND IT'S ERRELEVANT AS TO HIS KNOWLEDGE OF WHETHER A PARTICULAR ACT IS HILEGAL OR NOT IS IRRELEVANT BECAUSE HE DOESN'T SAY, YOU KNOW, "I KNEW I WAS WRONG BECAUSE I WAS MAKING A CENTER-FIRE SEMIAUTOMATIC RIFLE TO FIX OR WITH A DETACHABLE MAGAZINE."

I MEAN, THAT'S WHAT THEY HAVE TO PROVE IS THE ELEMENTS, JUST HIS KNOWLEDGE OF WHETEHER WHAT HE WAS DOING IS WRONG OR RIGHT.

THE COURTS ORAY, AND YOUR OPINION,
MADAM PROSECUTOR?

MS. JONES: THANK YOU. THE PROPER STATEMENT IS
THAT INVESTIGATOR CHAPMAN ASKED IF HE KNEW THAT MAKING
AND HAVING AN UNREGISTERED AK-47 WAS ILLEGAL. BE
ADMITTED HE KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING WAS WRONG.

THIS COMES IN UNDER SEVERAL THEORTES: FIRST OF ALL, IT'S NOT OFFERED FOR THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER AS TO WHETHER REGISTERING IT OR NOT REGISTERING IT IS ILLEGAL. IT GOES TO HIS STATE OF MIND. IT GOES TO HIS CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILD. IT GOES TO HIS MOTIVE FOR MANUFACTURING IT.

SPECIFICALLY, HE KNOWS THAT HE'S MANUFACTURING SOMETHING THAT HAS BAD CHARACTERISTICS, IF YOU WILL.

AND IT'S SOME EVIDENCE OF WHY HE'S CREATING IT. AND 2 HE'S ADMITTING, IN FACT, THAT HE IS CREATING IT IN HIS RESPONSE. HE SAYS, "I KNOW IT'S WRONG." HE DOESN'T 4 SAY, "I'M NOT MAKING IT." HE SAYS, "I KNOW TT'S WRONG." SO IT'S HUGELY PROBATIVE TO THE SLEMENTS THAT I HAVE TO 6 PROVIN-

1

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

21

25

26

! RAVE TO PROVE THAT HE INTENDS TO MAKE IT. HE SAYS HE'S MAKING IT. HE SAYS HE'S POSSESSING IT. HE SAYS, "I KNOW IT'S WRONG." THAT'S WHY HE'S POSSESSING IT, SO IT COMES IN UNDER SEVERAL -- FOR SEVERAL PURPOSES.

MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, IF I MAY RESPOND. IF THEY DO BRING THIS, OR TH THE COURT DOES ALLOW SUCH EVIDENCE ABOUT THE LEGALITIES AND WHITTER SOMERODY IS RIGHT OR WRONG, THEN I THINK THAT OPENS UP

THE DOOR FOR MY EXPERTS TO TESTIFY AS TO WHETHER THAT COLLECTION OF PARTS IS LEGAL OR NOT.

THE COURT: OKAY. STOP RIGHT HERE.

LET'S TAKE, MADAM PROSECUTOR, YOUR RATIONALES ONE AT A TIME, BECAUSE YOU NAMED ABOUT FOUR THEORIES UPON WHICH YOU WERE BASING YOUR -- FIVE THEORIES, I THINK -- UPON WHICH YOU WERE BASING YOUR ARGUMENT.

FIRST OF ALL, LET ME GET CLEAR WHAT THE STATEMENT IS. THE STATEMENT SAYS SEVERAL THINGS IN IT. YOUR STATEMENT SAYS -- I''S MULTI -- IT'S MULTI -- IT'S SEVERAL SENIENCES, ISN'E IT?

MR. HENNES: NO. IT'S THE OFFICER'S SUMMARY OF 1 2 WHAT HE WAS ASKING TIEN NGUYEN IS THE OFFICER WHO 3 APPARENTLY, FROM READING THE REPORT, USED THE TERMS 1 "ASSAULT WEAPONS" AND LECALLTY MAKING. AND [-- I'LL READ IT EXACTLY WHAT I HAVE IN THE POLICE REPORT. 5 6 MS. JONES: WHAT THE PROFFERED EVIDENCE IS, 7 THOUGH. 8 THE COURT: WHAT IS THE PROFFERED EVIDENCE? 9 MS. JONES: THE PROFFERED EVIDENCE IS THAT HE 10 ASKED HIM IF HE KNEW WHAT HE WAS MAKING AND WHAT HE 11 HAD -- I'M SORRY -- IF HE KNEW THAT MAKING AND HAVING 12 UNREGISTERED -- AND HE'S NOT SURE WHETHER HE SAID 13 "ASSAULT WEAPONS" OR "AK-47'S," BECAUSE THEY'RE 14 INTERCHANGEABLE IN THE OFFICER'S MIND -- WAS ILLEGAL. 15 THE COURT: HOLD ON. STOP RIGHT THERE. THE 16 OFFICER ASKED IF MR. NGUYEN, WHO KNEW THAT WHAT HE WAS 17 MAKING, MEANING THE UNREGISTERED 18 MS. JONES: MAKING. 19 THE COURT: CON WAS HILEGAL; IS THAT WHAT 20 YOU JUST SAID? 21 MS. JONES: NO. 22 THE COURT: OH ---23 MS. JONES: THAT IF HE KNEW THAT MAKING AND 24 HAVING I'I' WAS ILLEGAL. 25 MR. HENNES: HAVING WHAT, YOUR HONOR? 26 MS. JONES: HAVING THE UNREGISTERED AK-47 OR

1	ASSAULT WEMPON. HE DOESN'T REMEMBER WILLCH ONES HE USED.
2	THE COURT: OKAY.
3	MS. JONES: HE SAYS, "HEY, DO YOU KNOW THAT
4	IT'S LECAL FOR YOU TO MAKE AND HAVE THIS?"
5	THUS COURT: YES.
6	MS. JONES: THAT'S WHAT HE ASKED HIM.
7	THE COURT: ONE MOMENT.
8	MR. HENNES: ALL RIGHT.
9	THE COURT: IS THAT CORRECT, COUNSEL, THAT ONE
10	STATEMENT?
11	MR. HENNES: WELL, I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S WHAT
12	HE'S SAYING, BUT IF HE IS, THEN HE'S STATING HIS
13	OPINTONS OF THE LAW. AND HE'S INCORRECT.
14	THE COURT: HOLD ON. HOLD ON. AND,
15	MADAM PROSECUTOR, YOU'RE SAYING THAT I'T'S NOT OFFERED
16	FOR THE TRUTH OF THE DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE AS TO WHETHER
17	IT'S ILLEGAL, CORRECT?
18	I'M SORRY. LET ME ASK YOU THIS THEN: WHAT WAS
19	THE DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE AGAIN, BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT'S
20	GOING TO BE ELICITED?
21	MS. JONES: HE SAID HE KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING
22	WAS WRONG.
3.3	MR. HENNES: IS THAT THE PROFFERED EVIDENCE,
24	BECAUSE IT'S NOT IN THE POLICE REPORT IT SAYS "HE
2.5	IMPLIED HE KNEW WHAT HE" WE CAN 402 THE OFFICER.
26	WHAT HE SAID WAS HE KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING WAS WRONG.

1,1300

THE COURT: OKAY. AND YOU SAID, FIRST OF ALL,
MADAM PROSECUTOR, THAT'S IT'S NOT OFFERED FOR ITS TRUTH
THAT THE DEFENDANT KNEW?

MS. JONES: NO, NOT THAT IT WAS, QUOTE,
"TLLEGAL." WHAT IT'S OFFERED FOR IS THAT HE KNOWS IT
WAS WRONG TO HAVE IT. HE ADMITTED THAT HE KNEW IT WAS
WRONG.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND HOW IS IT RELEVANT
THAT WHETHER HE KNOWS IT'S WRONG OR NOT?

MS. JONES: BECAUSE IT GOES TO THE REASON WHY
HE'S MANUFACTURING THE GUN. HE KNOWS THAT IT'S WRONG
FOR HIM TO HAVE THE GUN. IT ALSO GOES TO THE FACT THAT
HE IS MANUFACTURING THE GUN BECAUSE IT'S AN ADMISSION
THAT HE'S MANUFACTURING THE CUN. IT GOES TO HIS
CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILD. AND IT GOES TO HIS STATE OF
MIND. "YEAH, I KNOW THAT I'M NOT SUPPOSED TO BE DOING
THIS."

THE COURT: SEE, THE PROBLEM I HAVE IS IT IS IN A SENSE OVERLAPPING WITH WHAT I'VE BEEN PRECLUDING THE PARTIES FROM ELICITING FROM A WITHESS. I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT DOESN'T OPEN THE DOOR TO DIFFERENT PROPLE OPINING WHETHER UT'S WRONG OR NOT TO CARRY A PARTICULAR TYPE OF CUN. THAT'S MY PROBLEM.

WELL, IT'S HIGHLY PROBATIVE OF THE FACT THAT HE IS MANUFACTURING THAT GUN AND THAT HE IS ATTEMPTING TO POSSESS THAT GUN.

SUBMITTED? OR DO YOU HAVE ANOTHER ARCUMENT?

MR. DENNES: I DON'T KNOW. I GUESS I'M JOST

REPEATING MYSELF, BUT, I MEAN, ADMITTING THAT HE'S

MANUFACTURING A WEAPON IS NOT IN AND OF ITSELF EVIDENCE

OF ANYTHING BECAUSE IT HAS TO BE -- IT HAS TO FIT THE

DEFINITION OF AN ASSAULT RIFLE. AND HE WASN'T ASKED

THAT.

I THINK THE OFFICER, LIKE PROBABLY EVERYBODY AND MANY OFFICERS AND PROBABLY EVERYONE IN THE PUBLIC, JUST ASSUMES THAT IF YOU SEE ONE OF THESE GUNS, AND AUTOMATICALLY IT'S ILLEGAL TO HAVE, WHEN IN FACT JUISN'T.

SO IF THE OFFICER IS ALLOWED TO TESTITY THAT HE ASKED MY CLIENT, YOU KNOW, IF HE KNEW THAT THIS WAS WRONG, AND MY CLIENT SAYS, YEAH, FOR WHATEVER REASON, OBVIOUSLY, WE CAN'T PUT HIM ON THE STAND BECAUSE HE'S COINC TO BE IMPEACHED. BUT I SHOULD BE ABLE TO ALLOW MY EXPERT TO SAY THAT THE OFFICER —

THE COURT: WHETHER THAT'S LEGAL? OR WHETHER THAT'S ILLEGAL?

MR. HENNES: YES, IT WAS LEGAL. AND SO
THEY'RE - BOTH THE DEFENDANT AND THE OFFICER WERE WRONG
JF THAT THEY DID THINK THAT IT WAS ILLEGAL BECAUSE THEY
WEREN'T.

THE COURT: YOU DON'T THINK THAT IF THE OFFICER
WERE TO TESTIFY TO DEFENDANT'S STATEMENT, "YEAH, I KNEW

1 IT WAS WRONG," THAT THE EXPERT THEN BY THE DEFENSE 2 SHOULDN'T BE ABLE TO OPINE WITH RESPECT TO WHETHER IT'S 3 WRONG OR NOT TO POSSESS THAT WEAPON? 4 MS. JONES: NO. I DON'T THINK THAT HE CETS TO 5 GO INTO THE LEGALITIES OF - WHAT'S ILLEGAL IS TO 6 MANUFACTURE THAT WEAPON. AND THAT'S THE ULTIMATE 1 OUESTION FOR THE JURY. BUT THERE'S CONSCIOUSNESS OF 8 GUILT BY THE DEFENDANT THAT WHAT HE IS DOING IS WRONG. 9 I STILL THINK THAT COMES IN. THE COURT: AND YOU THINK THAT DOES NOT OPEN 10 11 THE DOOR? 12 MS. JONES: NO. 13 MR. HENNES: WELL, YOUR HONOR, AND FURTHERMORE, 14 THERE ARE TWO WEAPONS WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. WELL, I 15 MEAN, ONE WEAPON PARTS. AND SECONDLY, A WEAPON. 16 WE CAN 402 THE OFFICER, BUT I THINK IT'S PRETTY 17 CLEAR THAT HE BELLEVED THAT THAT BIG ONE THERE WAS ILLECAL TO HAVE BY ANYBODY. AND THEREFORE --18 19 THE COURT: YOU MEAN THE ONE THAT WAS THE 20 SUBJECT TO COUNT 3, SPECIFIC TO COUNT 3? MR. HENNES: NO, NO. IT WAS JUST -- NO. THE 21 22 DTC RIFLE, THAT GUN RIGHT THERE, WHICH IS CALIFORNIA 23 LEGAL. 24 MS. JONES: THREE. 25 MR. HENNES: OH, THEY'RE COUNT 3? WELL --26 THIN COURT: I DON'T KNOW WHAT AT THIS POINT --

1 MR. HENNES: WELL, YEAH. OKAY, YES. I'M 2 SORRY. YES, IT WAS COUNT 3. 3 THE COURT: WE HAVE TO STOP TALKING OVER KACH 4 OTHER. 5 MR. HENNES: L'M SORRY. 6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 1 MR. HENNES: SO I THINK THERE WAS A 8 MISINTERPRETATION OF THE LAW BY THE OFFICERS. AND 9 THAT'S FINE. I MEAN, IT'S EASY TO DO. BUT IF WE'RE 10 GOING TO GET INTO TECHNICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LEGAL AN 11 ILLEGAL RIFLES, I THINK IT'S NOT -- YOU KNOW, IT'S NOT 12 PROVIDING JUSTICE FOR DEFENDANT TO BE HANDCUFFED IN THE 13 OFFERING OF EXPERT TEST MONY. 14 THE COURT: LET ME STOP YOU THERE. WE NEED TO 15 402 THIS ISSUE. I NEED TO KNOW EXACTLY WEAT THE OFFICER. 16 IS COING TO TESTILY TO BECAUSE I'M NOT EXACTLY SURE 17 RELATIVE TO THE DEFENDANT'S STATEMENT. 18 THE CLERK: DO YOU SOLEMNLY STATE THAT THE 19 EVIDENCE YOU ARE ABOUT TO GIVE IN THE CAUSE NOW PENDING 20 BEFORE THIS COURT SHALL BE THE TRUTH, THE WHOLE TRUTH, 21 AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH, SO HELP YOU GOD? 22 THE WITNESS: T DO. 23 THE CLERK: WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR FULL 24 NAME FOR THE RECORD AND SPELL YOUR LAST AND INCLUDE YOUR 25 TITIE, IF ANY?

THE WITNESS: BRIAN LEE CHAPMAN, C-H-A-P-M-A-N.

1 I'M A DETECTIVE WITH THE ORANGE COUNTY AUTO THEFT TASK 2 FORCE. 3 THE CLERK: AND IS THAT BRIAN, B-R-1-A-N? 4 THE WITNESS: H-R-I, YES. 5 THE CLERK: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. PLEASE BE 6 SEATED. 7 THE COURT: WHEN YOU ARE READY, COUNSEL. 8 MS. JONES: THANK YOU. 9 BRIAN CHAPMAN, 10 CALLED AS A WITNESS REGARDING 402 ISSUES, HAVING BEEN FIRST 11 DULY SWORN, WAS EXAMINED AND TESTLELED AS FOLLOWS: 12 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MS. JONES: Q. OFFICER CHAPMAN, IN YOUR CONTACT 15 WITH THE DEFENDANT ON MARCH 17TH, 2010, THERE'S -- IN 16 THE REPORT THAT YOU PROVIDED RECARDING THAT CONTACT YOU STATED THAT WHEN ASKED ABOUT THE LEGALITIES OF 17 18 TIEN NGUYEN MAKING AND HAVING HIS OWN ASSAULT WEAPONS 19 WITHOUT REGISTERING THEM, "TIEN IMPLIED HE KNEW WHAT HE 20 WAS DOING WAS WRONG." 21 CAN YOU EXPLAIN TO THE COURT SPECIFICALLY WHAT 2.2. YOU ASKED HIM ABOUT THE WEAPONS, HOW YOU PHRASED IT AND 23 WHAT HIS RESPONSE WAS? 24 WELL, AS YOU CAN SEE IN MY REPORT, I DIDN'T 25 PUT ANYTHING IN OUCTES. AND I DON'T REMEMBER THE EXACT SPECIFIC WORD-FOR-WORD PURASE THAT WE USED AS FAR AS 26

"THE COURT: YOU CAN ASK A OUESTTON AND PHRASE

IT IN ONE QUESTION, COUNSEL. I KNOW YOU'RE KIND OF

25

1 THINKING OUT LOUD, BUT --2 MR. HENNES: YES, YOUR HONOR. I IXN'T HAVE ANY 3 FURTHER QUESTIONS. 4 THE COURT: ANYTHING FURTHER? 5 MS. JONES: NOTHING FURTHER. 6 THE COURT: YOU'RE EXCUSED, THANK YOU. 7 COUNSEL, DO I KNOW ANY MORE THAN BEFORE THE 8 OFFICER TOOK THE STAND? PERHAPS, YOU KNOW, IS THERE ANY 9 DIFFERENT ARGUMENT ON THIS POINT? 10 MR. HENNES: THE OFFICER CAN'T EVEN REMEMBER 11 WHAT WAS SAID. ALL HE HAS IS HIS CENERAL, VAGUE. 12 RECOLLECTION THAT MR. NGUYEN SEEMED TO BELLEVE THAT WHAT 13 HE WAS DOING WAS WRONG AND FOR REASONS NOBODY KNOWS, BUT 14 WE KNOW VERY WELL THAT HE WAS A FELON IN POSSESSION. 15 "I'HE COUR'I": OKAY. 16 MR. HENNES: AND IF THE PROSECUTION INTENDS TO 17 USE THAT TEST IMONY TO SHOW KNOWLEDGE OF VIOLATING THE 18 ASSAULT WEAPON LAW, THEN I THINK THAT THE DEFENSE OUGHT 19 TO BE ABLE TO REBUT THAT. 20 THE COURT: FINAL WORD, MS. PROSECUTOR? 21. MS. JONES: YOUR HONOR, I LXXX'T THINK IT'S THAT HE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT WAS SAID. I THINK IT'S HE DOESN'T 22 23 REMEMBER THE SPECIFIC LANGUAGE WHAT WAS SAID. BUT WHAT 24 WAS CONVEYED OVER AND OVER IS THAT THE DEFENDANT 25 ADMITTED HE WAS MAKING THE WEAPON, WHICH I THINK IS

ADMISSIBLE. AND HE ADMITTED THAT HE KNEW IT WAS WRONG.

g

1.1

MR. HENNES: YOU CAN YOU KNOW

MS. JONES: AND THE DEFENSE IS THE ONE WHO
DOESN'T WANT TO BRING UP THE FELONY BUSINESS. HE WANTS
TO HAVE HIS CAKE AND EAT IT TOO.

HE WANTS TO BAR US FROM A LCGICAL AND RATIONAL INTERPRETATION OF THAT IF HE'S KNOWS HE'S NOT SUPPOSED TO MAKE ASSAULT WEAPONS AND SAY, WELL, IT COULD HAVE BEEN THAT HE DIDN'T THINK HE THOUGHT IT WAS WRONG BECAUSE MAKING THESE THINGS, HE SHOULDN'T MAKE ANY GUNS BECAUSE HE'S A FELON.

WELL, YOU KNOW, I THINK THAT'S KIND OF UNREASONABLE TO SAY, WELL, WE DON'T WANT THEM TO KNOW ABOUT THIS, BUT WE ONLY WANT THE INTERPRETATION THAT THE PROSECUTION WANTS IN, SO, I MEAN, YOU CAN GO EITHER WAY ON IT, BUT IT SHOULDN'T PREVENT THE JURY FROM HEARING THE TRUTH ABOUT THE ADMISSION BECAUSE HE MADE AN ADMISSION.

MR. HENNES: ADMISSION OF WHAT, THOUGH? WE ALL KNOW THAT THAT DTC RIFLE THERE IS LEGAL TO HAVE. AND SO IF THE OFFICER WAS TALKING ABOUT THAT ONE AS WELL AS A COLLECTION OF PARTS, MORE THAN LIKELY, YOU KNOW, HE WAS LOOKING AT THAT ONE.

THE COURT: OKAY. I NEED TO STEP AWAY FROM THIS FOR JUST A FEW MINUTES. WE'RE COING TO BE IN A BRIEF RECESS, MAYBE ABOUT FIVE MINUTES.

MR. HENNES: ALL RIGHT.

22.

MS. JONES: YOUR HONOR, I HATE TO BOG DOWN THE COURT, BUT PRIOR TO THE DEFENSE OPENING, I'D REQUEST THAT HE BE BARRED FROM MENTIONING THIS BUSINESS ABOUT THE BUTTON MECHANISM THAT HE'S BEEN TALKING ABOUT IN 402'S BECAUSE THERE IS NO EVIDENCE PROFFERED OF ANY TWIENT TO PURCHASE SUCH A MECHANISM.

AND I THINK THAT UNLESS THE DEFENDANT AT SOME POINT TESTIFIES, THERE'S NOT GOING TO BE, BECAUSE BE'S TALKING ABOUT A FUTURE INTENT THAT WAS NEVER ACTED UPON. AND HE'S INVITING THE JURY TO SPECULATE. AND THEN HE'S GOING TO ASK HIS EXPERT TO RENDER AN OPINION BASED ON AN IRRELEVANT AND IMPROPER HYPOTHETICAL.

THE COURT: OKAY. THAT MAY BE TRUE. I'M NOT COING TO BAR HIM AT THIS TIME BECAUSE THE JURY WILL BE INSTRUCTED THAT COUNSEL'S ARGUMENTS AND COMMENTS ARE NOT EVIDENCE.

NOT COME TO FRUITION OR DOES NOT COME OUT FROM THE WITNESS STAND, THEN THAT WILL BE ABLE TO BE ARGUED.

MR. HENNES: OKAY.

MS. JONES: OKAY.

(RECESS)

(PROCEEDINGS OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)

THE COURT: HACK ON THE RECORD. ALL COUNSEL

AND THE DEFENDANT ARE PRESENT.

MY RULING IS THIS: I'M GOING TO ALLOW THE

1	STATEMENT TO COME IN. HOWEVER, I FIND THAT IT IS
2	DOES NOT OPEN THE DOOR TO CHANGE MY MARLIER RULING
3	RELATIVE TO WHETHER THE EXPERTS CAN OPINE AS TO THE
1	LEGAL NATURE OF THESE WEAPONS.
5	THE DEFENDANT'S STATEMENT I FIND IS WHETHER THE
6	DEFENDANT USED THE WORD OR NOT "LEGAL" OR "NOT LEGAL" IN
7	THIS STATEMENT. THAT IS NOT DISPOSITIVE OF THE ISSUE.
8	THAT IS REALLY NOT THE ISSUES.
9	THE ISSUE IS THAT THE STATEMENT IS MADE. IT IS
10	AN ADMISSION. IT GOES TO HIS CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT AND
11	MOTIVE OR OTHER THINGS.
12	AND I FIND THAT THAT STATEMENT ALONE CAN BE
13	CROSS-EXAMINED AT LENGTH, BUT IT DOES NOT OPEN THE DOOR
14	TO THE EXPERTS OPINING ON THE ULTIMATE ISSUE FOR THE
15	JURY TO DECIDE. THAT'S TWO DIFFERENT THINGS. AND SO,
16	THAT'S WHAT MY RULING IS.
17	ALL RIGHT. AT THIS TIME WE CAN BRING THE JURY
1.8	IN.
19	(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN THE PRESENCE OF
20	THE JURY:)
21	THE COURT: WE'RE BACK BEFORE THE JURY.
22	LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, DURING THE
23	COURT OF THE TRIAL IT MAY BE NECESSARY FOR THE COURT AND
24	COUNSEL TO MEET OUTSIDE OF THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY, AS

YOU HAVE SEEN, ETTHER IN CHAMBERS, AT SIDE BENCH, OR BY

ASKING YOU TO LEAVE THE COURTROOM.

25

DO NOT SPECULATE ON THESE PROCEEDINGS BECAUSE
THEY CONCERN LEGAL ISSUES UPON WHICH THE COURT MUST RULE
BEFORE THE TRIAL MAY PROCEED.

OPENING STATEMENT. AT THIS TIME THEY MAY OUTLINE WHAT THEY INTEND TO PROVE IN TRIAL. PLEASE REMEMBER THAT WHAT THE ATTORNEYS SAY IS NOT EVIDENCE.

MADAM PROSECUTOR.

MS. JONES: THANK YOU.

(OPENING STATEMENT REPORTED AND NOT TRANSCRIBED)

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO MAKE AN OPENING STATEMENT NOW? OR WILL YOU RESERVE?

MR. HENNES: I WILL RESERVE. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: PROPER CALL YOUR FIRST WITNESS.

MS. JONES: PEOPLE CALL BRIAN CHAPMAN.

THE CLERK: DO YOU SOLEMNLY STATE THAT THE EVIDENCE YOU ARE ABOUT TO GIVE IN THE CAUSE NOW PENDING BEFORE THIS COURT SHALL BE THE TRUTH, THE WHOLE TRUTH, AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH, SO HELP YOU GOD?

THE WITNESS: I DO.

THE CLERK: COULD I HAVE YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD, SPELL YOUR LAST AND INCLUDE YOUR TELLE, IF ANY.

THE WITNESS: BRIAN LEE CHAPMAN. LAST NAME IS SPELLED C-H-A-P-M-A-N. AND I'M A POLICE OFFICER WITH THE CITY OF BUENA PARK CURRENTLY ASSIGNED TO THE

1	ORANGE COUNTY AUTO THEFT TASK FORCE AS A DETECTIVE.
2	THE CLERK: THANK YOU. PLEASE BE SEATED IN THE
3	WITNESS BOX.
4	BRIAN CHAPMAN,
5	CALLED AS A WITNESS BY AND ON BEHALF OF THE PROPLE,
6	HAVING BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN, WAS EXAMINED AND TESTIFTED
7	AS FOLLOWS:
8	
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION
10	BY MS. JONES: Q. GOOD AFTERNOON, SIR.
11	A. GOOD AFTERNOON.
12	Q. I KNOW THIS IS REPETITIVE, BUT I'VE GOT TO GET
1.3	IT ON THE RECORD. HOW ARE YOU EMPLOYED?
14	A. I'M A POLICE OFFICER WITH THE CITY OF
15	BUENA PARK. AND I'M ON LOAN TO THE ORANGE COUNTY AUTO
16	THEFT TASK FORCE AS A DETECTIVE.
1.7	Q. AND HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN A SWORN PEACE
18	OFFICER?
19	A. FOR APPROXIMATELY 16 YEARS.
20	Q. AND HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN WITH THE AUTO THEFT
21	TASK FORCE IN PARTICULAR?
22	A. IT WAS A YEAR AGO IN JANUARY.
23	Q. WERE YOU ON DUTY ON MARCH 17TH OF 2010?
24	A. YES.
2.5	Q. OKAY. AND ON THAT DATE DID YOU RESPOND TO
26	13040 HOOVER STREET, IN WESTMINSTER IN THE COUNTY OF

1	ORANGE?
2.	A. YES.
3	Q. AND DID YOU GO TO THAT LOCATION AS PART OF AN
4	ONCOING INVESTIGATION?
5	A. YES.
6	Q. WHAT TYPE OF BUSINESS IS THAT?
7	A. IT'S AN AUTO SHOP, AUTO REPAIR, I GUESS, FOR
8	LACK OF A BETTER TERM.
9	Q. AND WHEN YOU ARRIVED AT THAT LOCATION, DID YOU
10	SEE SOMEONE THAT YOU SEE IN THE COURTROOM HERE TODAY?
11	A. YES.
12	Q. AND CAN YOU POINT TO THAT PERSON AND TELL THE
13	COURT WHAT HE'S WEARING?
14	A. THAT WOULD BE TITN NGUYEN, WEARING A CRAY
15	JACKET, LOOKS LIKE A I GUESS, A GRAY SHIRT AND LOOKS
16	LIKE GRAY PANTS AND BLACK SHOES.
17	MS. JONES: MAY THE RECORD REFLECT THAT THE
18	WITNESS HAS IDENTIFIED THE DEFENDANT?
19	THE COURT: YES.
20	BY MS. JONES: Q. DID MR. NGUYEN CONFIRM THAT HE
21	WAS THE OWNER OF THAT SHOP?
22	A. YES.
23	Q. AND DED YOU ADVISE HIM THAT YOU AND OTHER
24	DETECTIVES PRESENT INTENDED TO SEARCH THE PREMISES?
25	A. YES.
26	Q. IN CONNECTION WITH THAT, DID YOU ASK HIM IF

- 1	
1	THERE WERE ANY WEAPONS OR ILLEGAL ITEMS ON THE PREMISES?
2	A. YES, I DID.
3	Q. AND IS THAT A STANDARD QUESTION THAT YOU ASK
4	WHEN YOU ARE ABOUT TO SEARCH A PREMISES?
5	A. YES.
6	Q. WHAT WAS HIS RESPONSE?
7	A. HE TOTAL ME THAT HE HAD A RIFLE FOR HUNTING.
8	O. AND WHEN HE TOLD YOU HE HAD A RIFLE FOR
9	HUNTING, DID HE DO ANYTHING AT THAT TIME?
10	A. HE BEGAN TO SHOW DETECTIVE WOOD AND I PICTURES
17	FROM HIS CELL PHONE FROM A PIG HUNTING TRIP AND SAID
12	THAT HE HAD GONE PIG HUNTING AND THAT HE, AGAIN, USES
1.3	HIS RIFLE FOR HUNDING.
14	Q. AND WHAT WAS THE CONDITION OF THE PIGS HE
15	SHOWED YOU ON HIS CELL PHONE?
16	A. THEY HAD BEEN SHOT AND KILLED.
17	Q. DID YOU ASK HIM WHERE HE KEPT HTS HUNTING
18	RIFLE?
19	A. YES, I DID.
20	Q. AND WHAT DID HE DO AT THAT POINT?
21.	A. HE LED US TO A STORAGE AREA WHICH WAS ABOVE
22	HIS OFFICE.
23	Q. AND DID HE LEAD YOU TO A PARTICULAR AREA
24	THERE? OR DID YOU NOTICE ANYTHING WHEN YOU GOT THERE?
25	A. HE LED US TO THE .50 CALLBER DIC RIFLE, WHICH
26	IS THE LARGE ONE ASSEMBLED BEHIND ME.

KNOW ABOUT WHAT KIND OF WEAPON THAT IS.

1	A. I FORGOT TO MENTION THAT I WAS
2	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.
3	NONRESPONSIVE.
4	THE COURT: SUSTATNED.
5	BY MS. JONES: Q. WAS THERE ADDITIONAL TRAINING
6	AND EXPERIENCE THAT YOU WANTED TO MENTION?
7	A. YES.
8	Q. WHAT WAS THAT?
9	A. I WAS A MEMBER OF OUR S.W.A.T. TEAM FOR MORE
10	THAN 10 YEARS.
11	Q. ANYTHING ELSE?
12	A. NO.
13	Q. AND IF YOU COULD JUST DESCRIBE WHAT TYPE OF
14	WEAPON THAT IS FOR THE GURY ON EXHIBIT 1.
15	A. WELL, IT'S A VERY LARGE, LARGE-CALIBER
16	BOLT-ACTION-TYPE RIFIE:
17	Q. AND IS IT FULLY ASSEMBLED THERE?
18	A. YES.
19	Q. IT WAS FULLY ASSEMBLED AT THE TIME YOU SAW IT?
20	A. YES.
2.3.	Q. SO IT'S IN THE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME SHAPE IT
22	WAS THE FURST TIME YOU SAW IT?
2.3	A. YES.
24	Q. TELL ME ABOUT THE UPPER PORTION OF THE RIFLE.
2.5	A. WELL, THE UPPER PORTION IS THE PORTION WHERE
26	THE BOLT IS AND THE BARRET.

THE WITNESS: OKAY. FOR THIS TYPE OF RIFTLE

25

26

RESTATE THAT.

1	THERE'S TWO MAJOR COMPONENT OR COMPONENT GROUPS: YOU
2	HAVE THE UPPER ASSEMBLY, WHICH WOULD BE THE BARREL
3	COMPENSATOR OR MUZZIE BRAKE.
4	THE COURT: YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE CYLINDER
5	THAT'S ON THE TOP OF THE WEAPON?
6	THE WUTNESS: YES.
7	THE COURT: OKAY. GO AHEAD.
8	THE WITNESS: THIS PART OF THE STOCK, THE
9	FORWARD GRIP HERE
10	THE COURT: AND YOU'RE JUST POINTING TO THAT
1.1	PLASTIC PORTION THAT IS RIGHT BELOW THAT CYLINDER THAT
12	WAS ON THE TOP? IT'S APPROXIMATELY IN THE MIDDLE OF THE
13	RIFLE; IS THAT CORRECT?
14	THE WITNESS: YES.
15	THE COURT: OKAY.
16	THE WITNESS: A BIPOD USED FOR STABILIZING THE
17	GUN.
18	THE COURT: AND IT APPEARS TO BE TWO FEET THAT
19	ARE JETTING OUT FROM THAT PLASTIC PLECE THAT'S IN THE
20	MIDDLE OF THAT; IS THAT CORRECT?
21	THE WITNESS: YES.
22	THE COURT: OKAY.
23	THE WITNESS: AGAIN, THE BOLT THAT'S USED TO
2.4	CHAMBER THE AMMONITION.
25	THE COURT: THAT APPEARS TO BE A HANDLE, SORT
26	OF A TUBULAR HANDLE, THAT'S COMING OUT PERPENDICULAR

1	FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE RIFLE. AND YOU CAN HELP TO
2.	EXPLAIN THAT IF I'M NOT QUITE BECAUSE THE RECORD
3	NEEDS TO BE CLEAR.
4	OKAY. CARRY ON, DETECTIVE.
5	THE WITNESS: AND THE LOWER ASSEMBLY WOULD BE
6	THE PISTOL CRIP, THIS PORTION HERE, WHICH IS BASICALLY
7	KIND OF LIKE A FRAME, THE TRICCER ASSEMBLY AND THE
8	STOCK.
9	THE COURT: OKAY. SORRY. SO THE PISTOL GRIP
10	IS COMING OUT FROM THE TRIGGER AREA; IS THAT CORRECT?
11	THE WITNESS: YES.
12	THE COURT: THE TRIGGER AREA IS JUST A LITTLE
1.3	TOOP WHERE YOU WOULD PUT YOUR FINGER ON THE TRIGGER,
14	RIGHT?
15	THE WITNESS: RIGHT.
16	THE COURT: YOU ALSO POINTED TO SOME SORT OF
1.7	PLASTIC THING THAT'S ABOVE THAT TRIGGER AREA. YOU CALL
18	THAT THE - THAT WHAT DID YOU CALL THAT?
19	THE WITNESS: THIS IS THE, AGAIN, THE LOWER
20	ASSEMBLY. THIS WOULD BE, YOU KNOW, I GUESS A BLOCK FOR
21	LACK OF A BETTER TERM WHERE THE TRIGGER ASSEMBLY IS
2.2.	MOUNTED INSIDE.
23	THE COURT: OKAY.
24	THE WITNESS: THIS PORTION IS TYPICALLY
25	CONTROLLED. THIS IS THE CONTROLLED PART OF THE RIFLE.
26	WHEN YOU REGISTER A GUN OR WHEN YOU PURCHASE A GUN

2.3

PURCHASE A FIREARM, YOU PURCHASE A PARTICULAR FIREARM
WITH A SERIAL NUMBER ON IT AND "THE MANUFACTURER'S NAME.

THIS PORTION OF THE GUN WOULD TYPICALLY HAVE
THAT ON IT. SO IF I WERE TO GO DOWN TO A CUN STORE AND
PURCHASE A FIREARM, WHEN THEY CO TO REGISTER IT AND THEY
DO A BACKGROUND CHECK ON ME --

MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION TO THIS KIND OF TESTIMONY. HE'S TESTIFYING AS AN EXPERT. THERE'S NO FOUNDATION.

THE COURT: COUNSEL, APPROACH.

(PROCEEDINGS OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)

JURY. WAS THAT OBJECTION FOUNDATION?

MR. HENNES: YES. AND RELEVANCE ALSO. AND FOUNDATION IS WHAT EXPERITSE DOES HE HAVE IN THE WATVERS GOING DOWN AND BUYING A WEAPON AT A SPORTING GOODS STORE AND WHAT RELEVANCE DOES THAT HAVE?

T MEAN, I BELIEVE THAT IN LIGHT OF THE COURT'S RULING HE CAN TESTIFY THERE WERE NO NUMBERS ON IT, PERIOD, NOT WHAT YOU USUALLY DO, BECAUSE IF HE GETS INTO THAT, HE'S IMPLYING THAT THAT IS ILLEGAL TO HAVE A WEAPON LIKE THAT WITHOUT NUMBERS ON IT.

AND I'VE GOT TO BE ABLE TO COUNTER THAT WITH TESTIMONY THAT ONE DOES NOT NEED TO RECESTER AND DOESN'T HAVE TO HAVE A SERIAL NUMBER AND ALL OF THAT BUSINESS.

MS. JONES: THE COURT RULED ON THIS YESTERDAY

AND THAT WE COULD GET INTO THE FACT THAT IT DOESN'T HAVE SERIAL NUMBERS ON IT. THAT'S UNUSUAL. AND WHY IT'S UNUSUAL AND THE BASIS FOR THE COMMENTS ON WHY IT'S UNUSUAL.

AND I THINK THAT WE CAN DELVE INTO THE
FOUNDATION THAT HE KNOWS THAT. I MEAN, YOU WOULD
TYPICALLY EIND A MANUFACTURER'S STAMP ON A WEAPON THAT
YOU WOULD BUY IS PROBABLY COMMON KNOWLEDGE ANYWAY, BUT I
CAN LAY THAT FOUNDATION.

BUT IF THERE'S NOTHING, I'M NOT GETTING INTO
THE LEGALITY OF OR THEEGALITY OF IT. IT'S WHAT IS USUAL
OR UNUSUAL. AND IT DREW THAT OFFICER'S ATTENTION TO
THAT WEADON. AND HE PROCEEDED TO ASK HIM QUESTIONS
ABOUT IT AND FOUND OUT THAT HE MADE IT.

THE COURT: FINAL WORD.

MR. HENNES: WELL, THEN IF THEY'RE COING TO BRING THAT KIND OF EVIDENCE IN, THEN I SHOULD BE ABLE TO PRESENT EVIDENCE THAT MANY SALES ARE DONE INTERSTATE LEGALLY WITHOUT ANY KIND OF NUMBERS, SERIAL NUMBERS, WHATEVER ON IT.

HE'S MAKING IT SOUND LIKE IT'S SOMETHING THAT'S NEFARIOUS AND ILLEGAL. AND HE'S WRONG.

THE COURT: HE JUST MADE THE STATEMENT. T DON'T KNOW. PERHAPS I DIDN'T --

MR. HENNES: I'T WAS HIS -- HIS MERE SUSPICION
THAT SOMETHING WAS WRONG, WHICH HE IS NOT AN EXPERT ON

1.2

1.3

1.7

2.2

THE LAW, OBVIOUSLY, AND -- BUT THAT'S THE WHOLE REASON FOR HIS SUSPICION IS THAT THERE WERE NO NUMBERS ON IT BECAUSE HE DOES NOT KNOW THE LAW.

AND MY -- IT CAN BE A SOURCE OF INQUIRY AT THE SCENE, BUT TO PUT ON AS EVIDENCE THAT WHY DO HIS QUESTIONS NEED EXPLANATION? HE ASKED HIM WHY THERE WERE NO NUMBERS ON IT, PERIOD. AND THEN --

THE COURT: OKAY. LET ME GO AHEAD AND RULE.

FIRST OF ALL, I FIND THAT -- FIRST OF ALL, THE COURT

DOES HAVE WIDE LATTTOOK IN DETERMINING WHETHER THE

FOUNDATION HAS BEEN SET AT QUESTIONED FOR THIS WITNESS,

OR OF ANY EXPERTS FOR THAT REASON, TO TESTIFY.

T FIND THAT THERE IS ADEQUATE FOUNDATION FOR THIS PERSON TO TESTIFY AS AN EXPERT. I ALSO FIND TRAT I WILL ALLOW THE OFFICER TO SAY WHY HE HAPPENED TO LOOK AT THE CUN, WHAT WAS UNUSUAL TO HIM ABOUT THE CUN. AND THAT'S AN APPROPRIATE PLACE, COUNSEL, FOR YOU TO CROSS-EXAMINE HIM.

I FIND THAT THAT, HOWEVER, DOES NOT OPEN THE DOOR TO THIS OFFICER'S OPINING ON WHETHER IT'S LEGAL OR ILLEGAL. AND THAT TESTIMONY HAS NOT BEEN ELICITED. AND I ADVISE BOTH COUNSEL NOT TO ELICIT IT.

T HAVEN'T BEARD THAT TESTIMONY YET, SO T BELLEVE AT THIS POINT THERE HAS BEEN NO VIOLATION OF THAT ORDER.

MR. HENNES: ALL RICHT.

1 THE COURT: OKAY. 2 (PROCEEDINGS IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) 3 "THE COURT: OKAY. COUNSEL, YOU MAY PROCEED. 1 BY MS. JONES: Q. WE LEFT OFF WITH YOU, OFFICER, 5 THAT WHAT SEEMED UNUSUAL TO YOU WAS THAT YOU WOULD SEEM 6 EXPERT TO SEE A SERIAL OR MANUFACTURER NAME ON THE GUN, 7 CORRECT? 8 A. THAT'S CORRECT. Q. AND YOU HAVING NOT SEEN THAT, WHAT DID YOU DO? 9 10 A. T ASKED HIM, NGUYEN, ABOUT IT. Q. AND WHAT DID HE TELL YOU? 11 12 Λ. HE TOLD ME THAT HE HAD PURCHASED THE LOWER 13 PORTION OF THE RIFLE THAT WOULD TYPICALLY HAVE THE 34 SERTAL NUMBERS AND MANUFACTURING NAME OFF THE INTERNET. 15 AND HE DESCRIBED AS AN 80 PERCENT LOWER. HE EXPLAINED TO ME THAT WHAT HE PURCEASED THAT OFF THE 16 17 INTERNET WAS NOT COMPLETED. 18 O. WHAT WAS NOT COMPLETED, THE LOWER? A. THE LOWER PORTION WAS NOT COMPLETED. HE 19 20 DESCRIBED TRAT HE HAD -- HE HAD TO HONE OUT THE TRIGGER 21 WELD OR THE AREA IN THE BOTTOM WHERE HE WOULD PUT THE 22 TRICCER. 23 SO IN OTHER WORDS, HE HAD TO MILL IT OR DRILL

SO IN OTHER WORDS, HE HAD TO MILL IT OR DRILL

TH OR FINISH THE PRODUCT HIMSELF THAT IT WASN'T

COMPLETED WHEN HE PURCHASED IT, AND THEREFORE IT WAS NOT CONSIDERED A COMPLETED RECEIVER WHEN HE BOUGHT IT AT THE

24

25

	_
	114
1	TIME.
2	Q. OKAY. LET ME STOP YOU THERE. AND SO, HE
3	INDICATED THAT HE HAD TO MACHINE IT OR DRILL HOLES IN IT
4	TO FINISH IT; IS THAT CORRECT?
5	A. YES.
6	Q. AND THAT WAS ITS EXPLANATION FOR NO
T	IDENTIFICATION OR MANUFACTURER MARKS ON TTO
8	A. YES.
9	Q. WHAT DID HE SAY HE DID AFTER HE RECEIVED THE
LO	LOWER PORTION OF THE RIFLE?
11	A. AGAIN, HE SAID HE COMPLETED IT HIMSELF AND
12	THAT HE HAD PUT IT TYPE THE COMPLETED THE DETLING

- D AFTER HE RECEIVED THE
- APLETED IT HIMSELF AND THAT HE HAD PUT IT TOXESHER, COMPLETED THE DRILLING PROCESS, PUT IT TOGETHER; THAT IT WAS -- SHOULD BE READY TO FIRE.
- O. AND DID HE ACTUALLY TELL YOU THAT HE HIMSELF PURCHASED THE UPPER PART OF THE GUN AS WELLS
 - YES, HE DID. A.
 - AND HE ATTACHED THE PLECES TOGETHER? 0.
 - A. YES.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. AND HE AFFIRMED THAT IT WAS NOW COMPLETE?
- Δ. YES.
- DID YOU LATER TEST THAT RIFLE? Q.
- Λ. I DRY-FIRED IT.
 - O. WHAT DOES THAT MEAN?
- 2.5 A. THAT MEANS YOU COCK IT AND SEE IF THE FIRING 26 PIN HITS. IT IS NOT PUTTING A ROUND IN THE CHAMBER AND

1	FIRING THE WEAPON.
2	TYPICALLY, IF YOU COCK THE GUN AND PULL THE
3	TRICCER AND YOU HEAR IT, HEAR THE FIRING PIN RELEASE,
1	THEN IT SHOULD BE IN GOOD WORKING ORDER.
5	Q. AND WAS IT?
6	A. YES. IT IS MY OPINION THAT IT WAS IN GOOD
7	WORKING ORDER.
8	Q. DID YOU ASK HIM ABOUT THE AMMUNITION FOR THAT
9	GUN?
0	A. YES.
1.1	Q. AND DIRECTING YOUR ATTENTION TO PEOPLE'S 2,
.2	WHICH IS A BOX WITH, I BELIEVE, 50 ROUNDS?
13	A. YES.
1.4	MS. JONES: AND I'M GOING TO 50 ROUNDS OF
5	AMMUNITION. AND I'M GOING TO HOLD UP ONE OF THOSE
16	ROUNDS AS PROPIETS 2A.
.7	THE COURT: THAT WILL BE PEOPLE'S 2A FOR
18	IDENTIFICATION.
.9	(EXHIBIT 2A MARKED)
20	BY MS. JONES: Q. WHEN YOU ASKED HIM ABOUT THE
21	AMMUNITION, IS THIS WHAT HE DIRECTED YOU TO?
22	A. YES.
23	Q. TILLS ACTUAL BOX?
4	A. YES.
25	Q. AND YOU TOOK A LOOK AT THAT AMMUNITION?
26	A. YES, UDID.

1	Q. AND CAN YOU DESCRIBE WHAT TYPE OF AMMUNITION
2	THAT IS FOR THE JURY?
3	A. WELL, HE DESCRIBED IT AS AMMUNITION THAT GOES
4	TO HIS RIFLE. AND IT HAS A .50 DTC.
5	Q. AND WHAT IS A _50 DTC?
6	A. IT'S A CALIBER OF AMMUNITION. IT'S SIMILAR TO
7	THE .50 BMC.
8	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. THAT'S
9	VAGUE OR NONRESPONSIVE.
10	THE COURT: SUSTAINED ON NONRESPONSIVE. THE
11	ANSWER, "IT COES TO HIS .50 DTC RIFLE" WILL REMAIN. TU-
12	REST WILL BE STRICKEN.
13	BY MS. JONES: Q. AND WHERE DID HE SAY THAT HE COT
14	THAT AMMUNITION?
15	A. HE SAID HE GOT IT FROM A RELOADER THROUGH THE
16	INTERNET OR I'M SORRY FROM THE MAIL. HE RECEIVED
17	IT FROM THE MAIL.
18	Q. DID HE INDICATE TO YOU THAT THAT AMMUNITION
19	FIT THE .50 CALIBER WEAPON?
20	A. YES.
21	Q. DID HE DID YOU LOCATE ADDITIONAL
22	AMMUNITION?
23	A. YES. (ASKED HIM IF HE HAD ANY OTHER
24	AMMUNITION. AND HE PRODUCED THE .50 BEOWILE CALIBER
25	AMMUNITION.
26	Q. AND DIRECTING YOUR ATTENTION TO A BOX OF 120

1	ROUNDS OF BEOWULF AMMUNITION AND ASK THAT THAT BE MARKED
2	AS PEOPLE'S 2. AND T'LL TAKE ONE OF THOSE OUT.
3	THE COURT: WOULD THAT BE PROPLE'S 2?
4	MS. JONES: I'M SORRY. PT'S PROPER'S 3.
5	THE COURT: PEOPLE'S 3 FOR IDENTIFICATION.
6	(EXHIBIT 3 MARKED)
7	MS. JONES: AND I'LL TAKE ONE OF THEM AS
8	PEOPLE'S 3A.
9	THE COURT: OKAY. THE ONE UNIT WILL BE
10	PEOPLE'S 3A FOR IDENTIFICATION.
11	(EXHIBIT 3A MARKED)
12	BY MS. JONES: Q. WHAT DID HE TELL YOU ABOUT THAT
13	VWWONITION:
14	A. THE TOLD ME THAT THAT WAS AMMONITION THAT IN
15	HAD PURCHASED FOR HIS PIG HUNTS. AND IT WAS LEFT OVER
16	FROM THE PIG HUNT.
17	Q. AND THAT AMMUNITION DOES GO TO EITHER THE .50
18	CALIBER OR THE AR 47?
19	Λ. NO.
20	Q. WHAT DOES IT GO TO? OR DID HE SAY?
21	A. DIFFERENT TYPE OF RIFLE. HE SAID THAT HE HAD
22	RENTED A RIFLE WHEN HE WENT PIG HUNTING.
2.3	Q. RENTED FROM A STORE? RENTED FROM A DEALER?
24	DID HE SAY?
25	A. I DON'T THINK HE WAS THAT SPECIFIC.
26	Q. HE JUST SAID SOMFBODY RENTED HIM A RIFLE.

1	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. MISSTATES
2	TRE EVIDENCE.
3	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
4	BY MS. JONES: Q. WHAT DID HE SAY?
5	A. HE SAID THAT IT WENT TO
6	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION. ASKED AND ANSWERED,
7	YOUR HONOR.
8	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
9	THE WITNESS: HE SAID IT WENT TO A RIFLE THAT
10	HE RENTED WHEN HE WENT PIG BUNTING.
11	BY MS. JONES: Q. NOW, DID YOU ASK HIM IF HE HAD
12	ANY OTHER WEAPONS IN HIS POSSESSION?
13	A. YES.
14	Q. AND WHAT SPECIFICATORY DID HE TELL YOU?
1.5	A. HE LED ME TO A DIFFERENT PART OF THE SHOP.
16	Q. WELL, BEFORE HE LED YOU THERE, WHAT DID HE
17	TEXA, YOU?
18	A. HE SALD THAT HE WAS MAKING AN AK 47.
19	Q. AND WHEN HE - AFTER HE TOLD YOU HE WAS MAKING
20	AN AK-47, DID YOU ASK HIM TO SHOW YOU UT? OR DID HE
21	DIRECT YOU TO IT?
22	A. YES. HE DIRECTED ME TO IT.
2.3	Q. AND WHERE WAS FT?
24	A. AT THE OTHER END OF THE SHOP.
25	Q. STILL UPSTALRS?
26	A NO IVAMINETATES

1	Q. AND CAN YOU DESCRIBE THE SHOP FOR US AND TELL
2	US A LITTLE BIT ABOUT IT?
3	A. WHEN YOU FIRST ENTER YOU WALK INTO THE OFFICE,
4	WELL, THE FRONT COUNTER AREA. ABOVE THAT WOULD BE A
5	STORAGE LOFT. AND THEN YOU HAVE BASICALLY AN OPEN SHOP
6	WHERE THEY DO THEIR AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR.
7	Q. AND IS THE LOFT WHERE YOU WHERE HE SHOWED
8	YOU THE .50 CALIBER AND THE AMMUNITION?
9	A. YES.
10	Q. AND SO WHEN YOU ASKED HIM IF THERE WAS ANOTHER
11	WEAPON WERE YOU STILL UP IN THE LOFT?
12	A. NO.
13	Q- WHERE WERE YOU?
14	A. AT THE OTHER END OF THE SHOP AT THE BACK
15	TOWARDS THE ALLEY. I GUESS THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN THE
16	NORTHWEST CORNER, L'M GUESSING.
17	Q. AND WHAT'S LOCATED IN THAT AREA SHOP? IS IT
18	LIKE A REPAIR SHOP? OR WHAT IS IT?
19	A. REPAIR TOOLS AND THINGS THAT YOU FIND IN AN
20	AUTO SHOP.
21	Q. AND AT THE BACK OF THE SHOP HE LED YOU TO
22.	ANOTHER AREA THERE?
23	A. YES.
24	Q. AND WHAT SPECIFICALLY DID RE LEAD YOU TO?
2.5	A. A BOX OF PARTS FOR THE AK-47.
26	Q. AND WHEN YOU FIRST SAW THE PARTS, WERE THEY IN

1	THIS BOX THAT I WOOLD ASK TO BE MARKED AS PEOPLE'S 4.
2	THE COURT: SO MARKED AS PROPIE'S 4 FOR
3	IDENTIFICATION. IT'S A LARGE BOX.
4	THE WITNESS: YES.
5	(EXHIBIT 4 MARKED)
6	BY MS. JONES: Q. AND WERE THEY CONTAINED LOOSELY,
7	ALL OF THE PARTS WITHIN THAT BOX?
8	Λ. YES.
9	Q. DID YOU LATER LABEL AND PACKAGE EACH
10	INDIVIDUAL ITEM THAT WAS IN THAT BOX?
11	A. YES. MYSELF AND OUR SECRETARY DID.
12	Q. AND SO, THE BAGS THAT ARE OUT ON THE TABLE
13	THAT ARE LABELED AND LETTERED, ARE THOSE WHAT YOU AND
14	THE SECRETARY DID TOGETHER WITH RESPECT TO THE PARTS
1.5	THAT WERE IN THIS BOX?
16	A. YES.
17	Q. SO CLEARLY WHEN YOU FOUND THEM IN THE BOX THEY
18	DIDN'T HAVE ANY PLASTIC AROUND THEM? THEY WERE IN THERE
19	LOSE?
20	A. NO.
21	Q. AND YOU'VE HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK AT ALL OF
22	THOSE ITEMS ON THE TABLE, CORRECT?
23	A. YES.
24	Q. AND THEY'RE MARKED PEOPLE'S A THROUGH W AT
25	THIS POINT WITH NO NUMBER. ! GUESS I'D ASK THAT THAT BE
26	MARKED. THEY'LL BE 5, THEN SORRY. PEOPLE'S 5. ALL

1	RIGHT.
2	SO PEOPLE'S 5A THROUGH W ARE THE ITEMS THAT
3	WERE CONTAINED IN PEOPLE'S 4, CORRECT?
4	A. YES. ALL THE PARTS HERE ON THE TABLE.
5	Q. OKAY. DID HE TALK ABOUT THE RECEIVER PORTION
6	OF THE AK-47?
7	A. YES.
8	Q. AND IF YOU COULD PLEASE HOLD THAT PORTION UP
9	FOR THE JURY AND TELL US WHAT LETTER THAT IS AND WHAT
10	I'M'S CALLED?
11	A. IT'S MARKED W, AS IN "WHISKEY." AND IT'S THE
12	LOWER RECEIVER.
13	Q. AND A'T THIS POINT HE HAD TOLD YOU THAT HE MADE
14	THE WELL, STRIKE THAT THAT HE WAS MAKENG THE GUN
15	HIMSELF, CORRECT?
36	A. YES.
17	Q. AND WHEN YOU TOOK A LOOK AT THAT RECEIVER,
18	WERE THERE ANY MANUFACTURER NAME OR SERUAL NUMBER
19	AFFIXED TO IT?
20	A. NO.
21	Q. WHAT DID HE TELL YOU ABOUT THAT RECEIVER?
22	A. I ASKED HTM HOW HE DID IT. AND HE EXPLAINED
23	US TO AND ALSO WENT ON HIS COMPOTER AND WENT ON THE
21	WEBSITE AK-BUILDER.COM.
25	HE EXPLAINED THAT HE PURCHASED THE LOWER

RECEIVER, WHICH IS THE METAL -- WELL, THE TIN, METAL

2.6

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

PORTION OF THIS RECEIVER, THE OUTSIDE, AS AN AK 47 RECEIVER FLAT.

AND ON THE WEBSTITE IT SHOWS THAT YOU CAN PURCHASE THOSE. BASICALLY WHAT IT IS IS A FLAT PIECE OF METAL AT THAT TIME WITH HOLES DRILLED IN IT WHICH HAS TO BE MOLDED OR BENT INTO THE CORRECT POSITION IN ORDER TO HOLD THE INTERNAL PARTS FOR THE AK-47.

SO AGAIN, HE SAID THAT HE PURCHASED AN AK-47 FLAT AND THAT HE HAD BENT IT INTO SHAPE AND HAD BEGAN THE PROCESS OF ASSEMBLING IT.

- DID HE TELL YOU THAT BY DOING IT THAT WAY HE 0. COULD AVOID REGISTRATION?
- 1 ASKED HIM ABOUT THAT. AND IE SAID THAT BECAUSE, AGAIN, WHEN HE BOUGHT IT AS A FLAT PLECE OF METAL, AND IT WASN'T BENT INTO THE PROPER SHAPE AND IT WAS NOT A COMPLETED RECEIVER, THAT HE DIDN'T HAVE TO REGISTER THE GUN OR REGISTER THAT PORTION OF THE RIFLE, WHICH IS THE CONTROL PORTION.
- AND HE TOLD YOU THAT HE PERSONALLY ALTERED THE RECEIVER AND BENT IT INTO THE PROPER SHAPE TO ASSEMBLE HIS AK 47?
 - A. YES.
 - WHAT DID HE TELL YOU WAS LEFT OF THE GUN? 0.
- A. I DON'T RECALL HIM BEING SPECIFIC AS TO WHAT HE HAD LEFT TO DO.
 - Q. DID HE DESCRIBE THAT HE HAD LEFT TO ASSEMBLE

1	IT OR HE HAD NOT YET ASSEMBLED 197?
2	A. HE TOLD ME THAT HE HAD NOT YET ASSEMBLED IT.
3	Q. DID YOU ASK HIM IF HE KNEW IT WAS WRONG FOR
4	HIM TO HAVE AND MAKE HIS OWN AK-47 WEAPON?
5	A. YES.
6	Q. AND DID HE ADMIT THAT HE KNEW IT WAS WRONG?
7	A. YES.
8	Q. HOW LONG DID THE SEARCH OF DEFENDANT'S
9	BUSINESS TAKE APPROXIMATELY?
10	A. APPROXIMATELY TWO HOURS.
11	Q. AND AT SOME POINT DID YOU OBSERVE HIM TO BE IN
12	THE BACK ALLEY?
1.3	A. YES.
14	Q. DID YOU OBSERVE RIM TALKING ON A PHONE?
15	A. YES.
16	Q. AND THIS WAS DURING THE TWO BOURS THAT THE
17	SHOP WAS BEING SHARCHED?
18	A. YES.
19	Q. DID YOU ASK HIM IF HE HAD ANY MORE WEAPONS?
20	A. YES.
21	Q. WHAT DID HE TELL YOU?
22	A. HE TOLD ME THAT HE HAD HEARD THAT HIS WIFE HAD
23	A SHOT GUN REGISTERED TO HER, BUT THAT HE HAD LENT IT
24	OUT. AND HE CLAMPED THAT HE DIDN'T HAVE ANY MORE
25	WEAPONS AT THE SHOP OR AT HIS HOME.
26	Q. DID YOU ASK HIM IF YOU COULD SEARCH HIS HOME?

1	A. YES.
2	Q. AND DID YOU AND OTHER OFFICERS DID HE AGREE
3	TO LET YOU DO THAT?
4	A. YES.
5	Q. AND DID YOU AND OTHER OFFICERS RESPOND TO HIS
6	HOME THAT SAME AFTERNOON?
7	A. YES.
8	Q. WHAT, IF ANYTHING, DID YOU FIND INSIDE THE
9	HOME OF SIGNIFICANCE?
10	A. WE DID NOT FIND ANY MORE WEAPONS. I FOUND THE
11	BOX THAT THE UPPER RECEIVER FOR THE .50 DTC WAS IN THE
12	HOUSE AND ALSO A RECEIPT THAT HE HAD PURCHASED THAT
13	PORTION OF THE .50 CALIBER RIFLE.
14	AND WE ALSO SAW THAT THERE WAS A GUN SAFE IN
15	THE HALL CLOSET AND THE DOOR WAS WIDE OPEN AND THERE WAS
16	NOTHING INSTITE.
17	Q. DID YOU ASK HIM WHY THE DOOR WAS AJAR?
18	A. YES.
19	Q. AND WHAT DID HE TELL YOU?
20	A. I DON'T REMEMBER THE SPECIFIC QUOTE, BUT HE
21	SAID THAT HE HAD LEFT IT OPEN BASICALLY BECAUSE HE
22	DIDN'T HAVE ANY GUNS IN IT OR DIDN'T HAVE ANYTHING IN
2.3	JT-
24	Q. SO LIKE A COAT CLOSHIP?
2.5	A. YES.
26	Q. AND HOW BIG WAS THE GUN SAFE?

1	A. 1. WOULD CALL A MODERATE SIZE CON SAFE. I
2	DON'T KNOW. I'M JUST GREETING
3	Q. WELL, I DON'T WANT YOU TO CUESS. CAN YOU
4	ESTIMATE THE APPROXIMATE HEIGHT, WIDTE?
5	A. I WOULD GUESS IT'S ABOUT FOOR FEET TALL AND
6	PROBABLY TWO FEET WIDE, MAYBE TWO AND A HALF FEET WIDE,
7	SOMETHING LIKE THAT AND PROBABLY 18 INCHES DEEP, MAYBE
8	TWO FEET DEEP, APPROXIMATELY.
9	Q. THANK YOU. SHOW YOU A COUPLE OF MORE
10	EXHIBITS. SHOWING YOU WHAT I WOULD ASK TO BE MARKED AS
11	PEOPLE'S 6, 1 BELIEVE
12	THE COURT: IT WILL BE SO MARKED AS PEOPLE'S 6
13	FOR IDENTIFICATION.
14	(EXHIBIT 6 MARKED)
15	BY MS. JONES: Q WHICH APPEARS TO BE A SALES
16	RECEIPT FROM B.O.H.I.C.A. ARMS CORPORATION.
17	DO YOU RECOGNIZE THAT PIEM?
18	A. YES.
19	Q. WHAT IS IT?
20	A. IT LOOKS LIKE A RECEIPT TO MR. NGUYEN
21	REGARDING THE .50 DTC PURCHASE FOR \$1585.
22	Q. AND WHAT SPECIFICALLY ARE THE LITEMS THAT WERE
2.3	PURCHASED ACCORDING TO THAT SALES RECEIPT?
24	A. WELL, I'T SAYS "30-INCH BARREL."
25	Q. AND DOES PEOPLE'S 1 HAVE A 30-INCH HARREL?
26	A. I DIDN'T MEASURE IT, BUT IT LOOKS PRETTY

1 CLOSE. 2 O. DOES THAT APPEAR TO BE THE INVOICE THAT WOULD 3 MATCH THAT GUN? 4 YES. A. 5 O. OKAY, A WHAT IS THE SECOND LITEM? 6 TT SAYS ".510 DTC CHAMBER" OR ".510 DTC 7 CHAMBERING." THAT WOULD DESCRIBE THE CALIBER OF 8 AMMUNITION THAT IT USES. 9 Q. SO WHAT IS THAT THEM THAT WAS \$50? 10 IT APPEARS THAT THEY CHARGED \$50 EXTRA FOR Λ. 11 THAT CALIBER OF AMMUNITION. 12 AND THE NEXT ITEM THAT HE PURCHASED? Q. 13 IT SAYS "FLUTED BARREL." A_ 14 WHAT IS THAT? AND YOU CAN USE THE PROPLE'S 1. 0. UT APPEARS TRAT THEY CHARGED HIM A JUNDRED 15 A. 16 DOLLARS EXTRA FOR A PLUTED BARREL. 17 O. WHAT'S A FIJUED BARREL? 18 Λ. THE FLUTED BARRET IS BASICALLY THIS MILLING ON THE BARREL TYSELF. YOU CAN SEE WHERE THERE'S INSTEAD OF 19 20 HAVING A SOLID ROUND BARREL. FLUTED MEANS THAT THEY 21 REMOVE MATERIAL, WHICH I'VE BEEN TOLD STRENGTHENS THE

THE COURT: MAY THE RECORD REFLECT THAT THE OFFICER WAS RUNNING HIS FINCERS UP AND DOWN THE CYLINDRICAL BARREL WHICH -- TOWARD THE TOP OF THE WEAPON.

BARRET, AND ALSO MAKES IT LIGHTER AT THE SAME TIME.

22

23

24

25

1	BY MS. JONES: Q. AND I'M NOT SURE WHAT THAT : AST
2	ITEM IS. DO YOU KNOW? SHIPPING?
3	A. SAYS "S&H." I THINK THAT'S SHIPPING AND
4	HANDLING. IT SAYS "SHIPPING, C-O-N-U-S," SAYS "\$40."
5	Q. WHERE DID YOU FIND THIS SALES RECEIPT?
6	A. THIS RECEIPT WAS IN THIS BOX RIGHT HERE, WHICH
7	WAS AT MR. NGUYEN'S HOUSE.
8	MS. JONES: AND I'LL ASK THAT THE BOX THAT HE'S
9	REFERRED TO BE MARKED AS PEOPLE'S 7.
LD	THE COURT: IT WILL BE SO MARKED AS PEOPLE'S 7
11	FOR IDENTIFICATION.
12	(EXHIBIT / MARKED)
13	THE WITNESS: IF YOU LOOK INSIDE THE BOX, IT
14	LOOKS LIKE IT'S BEEN CUT OUT FOR THAT HARRED FOR THE
1.5	UPPER THIS WOULD BE THE BARRELL THIS WOULD BE THE
16	BOLV.
17	THE COURT: AND WHAT'S HE POINTING TO I'M
18	SORRY. HE'S HOLUTNG THE BOX UP. AND YOU'RE POINTING TO
19	THE LEFT SIDE OF THE INDENTATION OF THE BOX.
20	MS. JONES: AND AS TO THE BARREL AT THE
21	POINTING TO THE CENTER OF THE INDENTATION.
22	THE WITNESS: THAT'S WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE.
23	THE COURT: AND THE RECORD WILL SO REFLECT.
21	BY MS. JONES: Q. AND I THINK WE'RE UP TO
25	PROPLE'S 8, IS A PACKAGING SLIP IN THE NAME OF THE
26	DEFENDANT.

1	DO YOU RECOGNIZE THIS ITEM?
2	A. YES, I DO.
3	Q. WHAT IS IT?
4	A. IT LOOKS LIKE A PACKAGING SLIP TO TIEN NGUYEN.
5	Q. AND WHERE DID YOU FIND THAT?
6	A. I FOUND THAT IN THE BOX OF AK-47 PARTS.
7	Q. OKAY. AND FINALLY PROPUE'S 9, WHICH IS A
8	HALF-SLIP OF PAPER THAT SAYS "B.O.H.I.C.A. ARMS IMPROVED
9	BOLT HANDLE INSTALLATION INSTRUCTIONS."
10	DO YOU RECOGNIZE THAT ITEM?
11	A. YES.
12	Q. AND WHERE DID YOU FIND THAT?
13	A. I FOUND THAT IN THIS BOX ALSO.
14	Q. AND THE BOX YOU'RE REFERRING TO PROPER'S 7, 1
15	HELLEVE?
16	THE COURT: SO PEOPLE'S 9 FOR IDENTIFICATION
1.7	WAS FOUND - EXCUSE ME - IN THE BOX THAT'S BEEN MARKED
18	AS PEOPLE'S 7 FOR IDENTIFICATION?
19	I'M SURRY. WHAT WAS PROPLE'S 9?
20	MS. JONES: IT WAS THE B.O.H.I.C.A.
21	INSTRUCTIONS, INSTALLATION INSTRUCTIONS.
22	(EXHIBIT 9 MARKED)
23	BY MS. JONES: Q. NOW, ON THAT FIRST DATE THAT YOU
2.4	HAD CONTACT MARCH 17TH, 2010, SO DID YOU CONFISCATE THE
2.5	WEAPONS THAT YOU DISCOVERED FROM THE DEFENDANT?
26	A. YES.

1	Q. AND DID YOU MEET WITH HIM AGAIN ON MARCH 18TH,
2	THE VERY NEXT DAY?
3	A. YES.
4	Q. AND YOU MET WITH HIM AGAIN WELL, LET ME ASK
5	YOU THIS: WAS HE FAIRLY FORTHCOMING WITH YOU THE FIRST
6	DATE THAT YOU SPOKE WITH HIM?
7	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. CALLS FOR
8	SPECULATION.
9	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
10	BY MS. JONES: Q. DID HE ANSWER YOUR QUESTIONS
1.1.	DIRECTLY THE FIRST DATE THAT YOU CONTACTED HIM?
12	A. YES.
13	Q. AND THE SECOND DATE THAT YOU CONTACTED HIM DID
14	HIS DEMENDOR CHANGE IN ANY MANNER?
1.5	A. YES.
16	Q. HOW SO?
17	A. WELL, WHEN I ASKED HIM DIRECT QUESTIONS, HE
18	TYPICALLY TALKED IN CIRCLES AND -
19	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR.
20	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
21	BY MS. JONES: Q. DID HE GIVE YOU DIRECT ANSWERS
22	TO DIRECT QUESTIONS THE SECOND DAY?
23	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. CALLS FOR
24	SPECULATION.
25	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
26	THE WITNESS: I'M SORRY. ASK THE OURSTION

BY MS. JONES: Q. DID HE SEEM TO ANSWER -- DID HE
GIVE YOU DIRECT ANSWERS TO DIRECT QUESTIONS WHEN YOU
ASKED HIM REGARDING WEAPONS THE SECOND DAY?

- A. TYPICALLY, NO.
- Q. DID HE THE FIRST DAY WHEN HE TOLD YOU ABOUT HOW HE MADE THE RECEIVER FOR THE AK-47, DID HE DESCRIBE THE INSTRUMENT THAT HE USED TO DO THAT?
 - A. THE FIRST DAY?
 - Q. YEAH, ON THE 17TH.
- A. ON THE 17TH HE TOLD ME THAT HE HAD BENT IT IN A VISE.
 - Q. AND DID HIS STORY CHANCE THE SECOND DAY?
 - A. YEAH, SOMEWHAT.
- Q. AND DID YOU QUESTION HIM OR CONFRONT HIM WITH
 THE INFORMATION THAT YOU HAD THE SECOND DAY THAT YOU
 DIDN'T HAVE THE FIRST DAY?
 - A. YES.
 - Q. WHAT WAS THAT?
- A. BETWEEN THE 17TH AND THE 18TH I HAD -- WELL,
 BETWEEN THE TWO DAYS I HAD SPOKE WITH HIM. I WENT ON
 THE A-K -- I'M SORRY -- AK-BUILDER.COM WEBSITE. AND I
 SAW THAT THEY SOLD AN AK-47 FLAT RECEIVER DYE SET, WHICH
 IS A TOOL USED TO MOLD THE FLAT RECEIVER INTO THE PROPER
 SHAPE TO ASSEMBLE AN AK-47.
 - Q. AND SO, WHAT DID YOU ASK ITIM WHEN YOU TALKED

1	TO HIM THE SECOND DAY?
2	A. I ASKED HIM IF HE HAD USED THIS FLAT BENDING
3	DYE SET TO MOLD THE RECEIVER.
4	Q. AND WHAT DID HE TELL YOU ABOUT IT? WHAT DID
5	HE SAY?
6	A. WELL, I COULD READ THE DIALOGUE IF THAT WOULD
7	HELP. IN A ROUNDABOUT WAY, HE SAID, YES, HE USED IT AND
8	THAT HE HAD IT AND THAT HE WOULD GIVE 15 US TO.
9	Q. DID HE EVER GIVE IT TO YOU?
10	A. NO.
11	Q. DID HE TELL YOU - DID YOU ASK HIM WHERE IT
12	WAS?
13	A. YES.
14	Q. DID HE TELL YOU HE WASN'T SURE WHERE IT WAS?
15	A. YES. HE TOLD US THAT HE IMPLIED IT WAS
16	MITHER AT THE SHOP OR AT HIS HOUSE, OR HE THOUGHT IT WAS
17	AT THE SHOP OR AT HIS HOUSE.
18	THE COURT: THIS IS PROBABLY A GOOD TIME TO
19	BREAK FOR ABOUT, OH, FIVE MINUTES OR SO JUST TO KIND OF
20	GET UP, MAYBE GET A QUICK BATHROOM BREAK.
21	YOU ARE ORDERED NOT TO DISCUSS THE CASE WITH
2.2.	EACH OTHER OR ANYONE ELSE.
23	(RECESS)
24	(PROCEEDINGS IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY)
2.5	THE COURT: OKAY. DETECTIVE CHALMAN, DEPUTY
26	CHAPMAN, YOU'RE REMINDED THAT YOU'RE STILL UNDER OATH.

1	AND BACK ON THE RECORD WITH ALL JURORS, ALTERNATES AND
2	PARTIES AND DEFENDANT PRESENT.
3	YOU MAY RESUME, MADAM PROSECUTOR.
4	MS. JONES: THANK YOU.
5	BY MS. JONES: Ω . OFFICER DETECTIVE, WE WERE
6	TALKING ABOUT THE 18TH WHEN YOU WENT BACK AND TALKED TO
7	MR. NCUYEN ACAIN.
8	WAS THAT CONVERSATION RECORDED?
.9	Λ. YES.
10	Q. AND I'M GOING TO PLAY A PORTION OF THAT
11	CONVERSATION THAT WAS RECORDED RIGHT NOW.
12	AND YOU'VE HAD A CHANCE TO REVIEW THE
13	TRANSCRIPT ON THAT, HAVE YOU NOT?
1.4	A. YES.
15	Q. AND TO THE BEST YOUR KNOWLEDGE, IS THAT AN
1.6	ACCURATE REFLECTION OF WHAT WAS ON THE TARE?
17	A. YES.
18	Q. AND IT'S NOT THE COMPLETE CONVERSATION WITH
19	MR. NGUYEN IS 1'f?
20	A. NO, IT'S NOT.
21	THE COURT: GET A COPY OF THE TRANSCRIPT,
22	COUNSEL? TXX YOU HAVE AN EXTRA COPY? DID YOU MARK THE
23	TRANSCRIPT ALREADY?
2.4	MS. JONES: I'D ASK THAT IT BE MARKED 10. AND
25	J GUESS THE TAPE CAN BE 10-A.
26	THE COURT: OKAY, OF WILL BE 10 FOR

1	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LEADING.
2	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
3	BY MS. JONES: Q. ABOUT HOW MUCH MORES?
4	A. IF I WERE TO GUESS
5	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. CALLS FOR
6	SPECULATION.
7	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
8	BY MS. JONES: Q. IF YOU WERE TO ESTIMATE.
9	A. IF I WERE TO ESTIMATE, PROBABLY TWO
10	MILLIMETERS.
11	THE COURT: HOLD ONE MOMENT, PLEASE.
12	COUNSEL, WHAT WAS YOUR QUESTION RELATIVE TO THE
13	BMG AND THE DTC? WHAT WAS YOUR QUESTION TO THE
1.4	DETECTIVE?
1.5	MS. JONES: WHAT THEY WERE I ASKED FOR
1.6	CLARIFICATION OF WHAT WAS ON THE TAPE AS TO WHAT THEY
17	MEANT BY THE BMG AND DIC, I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE EXACT
18	QUESTION WAS.
19	THE COURT: WOULD YOU READ THE LAST QUESTION,
20	PLEASE?
21	(RECORD READ)
22	THE COURT: I'M GOING TO STRIKE THAT ANSWER AND
23	THAT WILL BE STRICKEN FROM THE RECORD. AND YOU MAY
2.4	REPHRASE THE QUESTION, IF THAT
25	MS. JONES: ACTUALLY, THAT PART OF IT, THE REST
26	OF THAT IN IS TIME.

EXPERTS TO REVIEW THE EVIDENCE THAT YOU OFFICIALNED FROM

1	MR. NGUYEN?
2	A. YES.
3	Q. AND FIRST DID YOU SPEAK TO DAVID THAGUE?
4	A. YES, I DID.
5	Q. WHO IS HE?
6	A. HE'S A RANGEMASTER WITH THE ORANGE COUNTY
7	SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT.
8	Q. AND NOW DID YOU COME TO CONTACT IMM?
9	A. A COWORKER RECOMMENDED - I WAS SEEKING HE
10	HEARD THAT I WAS SEEKING AN EXPERT TO EXAMINE THE AK-47
11	AND RECOMMENDED THAT I GO SPEAK TO HIM.
12	Q. AND DID HE DO A THOROUGH EXAMINATION OF THE
13	AK-47 PARTS?
1,4	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. THEY
15	MS. JONES: I'LL REPHRASE.
16	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
17	BY MS. JONES: Q. DID YOU DESCRIBE HOW THAT
18	WELL, DID 100 SUBSEQUENTLY TAKE A LOOK AT THE AK-47
19	PARTS?
20	A. YES.
2.1	Q. HOW DID THAT OCCUR?
2.2	A. HE STARTED OUT BY TELLING ME THAT ALL OF HIS
23	CERTIFICATES HAD EXPIRED AND IMPLIED THAT HE WASN'T
2.4	COINC TO BE A GOOD WITNESS. HE BRIEFLY LOOKED AT THE
25	BOX OF PARTS ON THE TAILGATE OF HIS TRUCK. AND AFTER A
26	QUICK LOOK AT THE PARTS, HE WAS OF THE OPINION THAT IT

1	WAS MISSING SEVERAL PARTS.
2	Q. AND SPECIFICALLY WHAT PARTS DID HE SAY WERE
3	MJSSING?
4	A. THE HAMMER AND THE SEAR.
5	Q. SO TWO PARTS, CORRECT?
6	A. YES.
7	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS
8	TRRELEVANT.
9	THE COURT: COUNSEL, APPROACH.
10	(PROCEEDINGS OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)
11	THE COURT: WE'RE OUTSIDE OF THE PRESENCE OF
12.	THE JURY. AND THE ANSWER THAT WAS JUST ELICITED WAS
13	THAT THE SEAR AND HAMMER WERE MISSING. COUNSEL HAS AN
14	OBJECTION OF RELEVANCE.
15	WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE, MADAM PROSECUTOR?
16	MS. JONES: WELL, THESE ARE IS THAT WELL,
17	FIRST OF ALL, I THINK THE OBJECTION IS UNTIMELY AS TO
18	THAT PERSON VIEWING THE EVIDENCE.
19	HOWEVER, WE ANTICIPATED IT WAS GOING TO COME UP
20	THAT ONE EXPERT SAID THAT THERE WERE PARTS MISSING. AND
21	THOSE TWO PARTS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED.
2.2	AND I WAS COING TO GO AHEAD AND ASK THE OFFICER
23	OF THOSE PARTS, IN FACT, ARE INCLUDED IN THE KIT, IN THE
24	BOX OF PARTS AND HAVE HIM JUENTIFY THOSE PARTS TO SHOW
25	THAT THEY'RE THERE.
26	MR. HENNES: I'M NOT COING TO SAY THAT THEY

WHICH IS IN HERE.

O. AND WHAT LETTER IS THAT?

25

1	A. THAT IS "T," TANGO.
2	MS. JONES: THAT WOULD BE 5-T.
3	THE COURT: THE RECORD WILL SO REFLECT.
4	MS. JONES: THANK YOU.
5	BY MS. JONES: Q. OKAY. DLD YOU ALSO MEET WITH
6	ROCKY EDWARDS, A FIRE EXAMINER FROM THE
7	FORENSICS SERVICES DEPARTMENT OF THE SANTA AND POLICE
8	DEPARTMENT?
9	A. YES, I DID.
10	Q. AND WITH HIM DID YOU GO THROUGH ALL OF THE
11	COMPONENTS OF THE AK 47 THAT WERE IN THE BOX?
12	A. YES.
13	Q. DID YOU USE A DIAGRAM THAT GISTED ALL OF THE
14	WORKING PARTS OF THE AK-47 AND CHECK THEM OFF AND MAKE
15	SURE ALL WERE PRESENT?
16	A. YES. THE DIAGRAM WAS THERE WAS MANY SLIGHT
17	VARIATION OF THE AK-47. AND THE DIAGRAM WAS SLIGHTLY
18	DIFFERENT.
19	FOR INSTANCE, IT DIDN'T HAVE A FOLDING STOCK.
20	IT HAD A FIXED STOCK. DIDN'T HAVE THE FORWARD PISTOL
21	GRIP, BUT AGAIN, THE WORKING PARTS OF THE AK-47 IT
22	SHOWS.
23	Q. THANK YOU. AND FINALLY, DID YOU MEET WITH
2.4	SERCEANT GREG SCHUCH, SERGEANT WITH THE ORANGE COUNTY
25	SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT?
26	A. YES.

AGAIN, I'''S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE'S MANY

1	DIFFERENT COUNTRIES, MANY DIFFERENT MINOR VARIATIONS OF
2	AK 47-TYPE RIFLE.
3	BY MS. JONES: Q. AND, IN FACT, THE PARTS OF THESE
4	TWO RIFLES APPEAR TO COME FROM DIFFERENT COUNTRIES,
5	CORRECT?
6	A. YES.
7	Q. AND I'M JUST COING TO ASK YOU IDENTIFY A
8	COUPLE OF MORE PHOTOGRAPHS. SHOWING YOU ONE I'D ASK TO
9	BE MARKED AS PEOPLE'S 12, IF YOU CAN TELL THE JURY WHAT
10	THEY'RE LOOKING AT THERE.
11	A. IT'S A PHOTOGRAPH OF THE LOWER RECEIVER WHICH
12	MR. NGUYEN HAD MADE.
13	THE COURT: ALL RICHT. AND IT WILL BE MARKED
1.4	AS PEOPLE'S 12 FOR IDENTIFICATION.
15	(EXHIBIT 12 MARKED)
16	BY MS. JONES: Q. AND THAT'S THE ONE THE FIRST DAY
1,7	THAT HE REFERRED TO AS MAKING BY A VISE. THE SECOND DAY
18	HE SALD HE PURCHASED A DYE TO MAKE IT?
19	A. YES.
20	Q. AND PEOPLE'S 13, IF YOU COULD IDENTIFY WHAT
21	THAT IS?
22	THE COURT: IT WILL BE SO MARKED AS PEOPLE'S
23	13.
24	(EXHIBIT 13 MARKED)
25	THE WITNESS: IT'S A COMPARISON OF THE LOWER
2.6	RECEIVER, WHICH IS THIS SHINY ONE BELOW, THAT MR. NOUYEN

1	TILAT TRUE?
2	A. APPROXIMATELY.
3	Q. OKAY. NOW, WHAT DAY OF THE WEEK WAS 112
4	A. I DON'T REMEMBER.
5	Q. WAS IT A DORING THE WEEK? WAS IT ON THE
6	WEEKEND?
7	A. I DON'T REMEMBER.
8	Q. WAS THE BUSINESS OPEN?
9	A. YES. IT APPEARED TO BE OPEN FOR BUSINESS.
10	Q. AND DID YOU ACTUALLY HEAR WHAT MR. NGUYEN WAS
11	SAYING WHEN YOU SAID HE WAS ON HIS TELEPHONE IN THE
12.	ALLEY BEHIND THE SHOP?
13	A. NO.
14	Q. OR YOU DON'T REALLY KNOW WHAT HE WAS TALKING
15	ABOUT ON THE TELEPHONE, RIGHT?
16	A. NO, I DON'T'.
17	Q. AND RECARDING THAT DIC, COULD YOU TELL WHETHER
18	THAT WEAPON HAD EVER BEEN FIRED BEFORE?
19	MS. JONES: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE.
20	THE COURT: OVERRULED. EXCUSE ME. SUSTAINED.
21	BY MR. HENNES: Q. YOU SAID THAT YOU HAD FIRED THE
22	WEAPON. DID YOU USE A ROUND?
23	MS. JONES: OBJECTION. MISSTATES THE EVIDENCE.
24	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
25	THE WITNESS: I SAID THAT I DRY-FIRED THE
26	WEAPON.

1	BY MR. HENNES: Q. RIGHT. WHICH MEANS YOU DIDN'T
2	PUT ANY AMMINITION INTO AND FIRE IT, RIGHT?
3	A. "HAT!"S CORRECT.
4	Q. AND WHY NOT?
55	MS. JONES: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE.
6	THE COURT: COUNSEL APPROACH.
7	(PROCEEDINGS OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)
8	THE COURT: WE'RE OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE
9	JURY. WHAT'S THE RELEVANCE?
10	MR. HENNES: WELL, MY CLIENT SUPPOSED TO BE
11	SUCH A HOTSHOT MANUFACTURER OF WHAPONS, I THINK THE
12	REASON HE DIDN'T FIRE THAT WEAPON WAS BECAUSE HE DIDN'T
1.3	WANT TO BECAUSE HE KNOWS IT WASN'T PROFESSIONALLY MADE.
14	AND JUST AS MY CLIENT TOLD HIM, HE WOULD NEVER
15	FIRE THAT CUN. SO I THINK IT'S RELEVANT. AND ALSO TO
16	DETERMINE WIFTHER IT'S A WORKING FIREARM YOU GOT TO FIRE
17	IT, YOU KNOW.
1.8	IT'S NOT A DEPINITION, A FIREARM IS A, YOU
19	KNOW, A DEVICE THAT PROPELS A PROJECTILE OUT OF A BARREL
20	AND WITHOUT, YOU KNOW, FIRING YOU CAN'T TELL, YOU COULD
21	NOT SAY THAT THIS IS A WORKING RIFLE.
22	THE COURT: NEED IT BE WORKING?
23	MR. HENNES: NO, NOT THAT IS NOT RELEVANT TO
24	THE ISSUES OF THIS CASE, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT ENTIRE
25	RIFLE IS RELEVANT TO THE ISSUES OF THIS CASE. HOWEVER,

SINCE THE PROPER HAVE BROUGHT IT INTO EVIDENCE --

1 THE COURT: YES. 2 MR. HENNES: - I THINK I HAVE A RIGHT TO 3 EXPLORE WHETHER MY CLIENT IS AN ARMS PURCHASER SUCH THAT 4 HE COULD MAKE A WORKING RIFLE. 5 THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW. THAT'S NOT AN 6 FLEMENT WHETHER IT'S A WORKING RIFLE. ISN'T THAT JUST 7 IRRELEVANT? 8 MR. HENNES: WELL, IT'S RELEVANT BECAUSE IT'S 9 BEEN BROUGHT INTO EVIDENCE. I BELIEVE IT IS RELEVANT 10 BECAUSE THEY'RE TRYING TO USE ASSEMBLY OF THAT .50 11 CALIBER TO SHOW THAT HE HAD THE ABILITY TO MAKE A 12 FUNCTIONING AK-47. 13 I MEAN, I THINK IT'S A STREACH, BUT THAT'S THETR THEORY. AND IN THAT RIFLE IS NOT CAPABLE, YOU'RE 14 15 TESTLEYING THAT IT'S FUNCTIONAL. 16 THE COURT: YES. 1.7 MR. HENNES: YOU CAN'T TELL THAT IT'S FUNCTIONAL UNLESS YOU'VE ACTUALLY FIRED A ROUND. 18 19 THE COURT: WELL, ACTUALLY, THE WITNESS DID 20 TESTIFY THAT HE THOUGHT IT WAS IN WORKING ORDER. AND SO 21 I GUESS FROM THAT STANDPOINT I GUESS COUNSEL CAN, NOW 22 THAT I THINK OF IT, INQUIRE RELATIVE TO, YOU KNOW, I GUESS IF IT WAS REALLY IN WORKING ORDER SINCE IT'S BEEN 23 24 TESTIFIED TO. I GUESS I'DE ALLOW IT. OVERRULED. 25 (PROCEEDINGS IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)

THE COURT: THAT OBJECTION IS OVERRULED. YOU

2.6

26

RTGHT?

1	A. YES.
2	Q. AND IS THAT SIMILAR TO A . IT WORKS LIKE A
3	VISE?
4	A. I WOULD CALL IT MORE LIKE A PRESS WHERE IT
5	PRESSES THE METAL INTO SHAPE.
6	Q. TO BEND METAL; IS THAT RIGHT?
7	A. YES.
8	Q. I MEAN, IF YOU WERE STRONG ENOUGH YOU COULD
9	PUT IT IN A VISE AND BEND IT YOURSELF; IS THAT FAIR TO
10	SAY?
11	A. I SUPPOSE THAT'S POSSIBLE.
12	Q. SO IT WORKS ON THE SAME PRINCIPLE. IT'S
13	BENDING METAL, SAME PRINCIPLE AS A VISE, IN A SENSE.
14	IT'S OSED TO BEND SOME METAL?
15	A. YOU CAN BEND METAL IN A VISE.
16	Q. NOW, YOU TESTIFIED THAT YOU CONTACTED
17	ROCKY EDWARDS OF THE SANTA ANA POLICE DEPARTMENT AND
18	THAT MR. EDWARDS AND YOU EXAMINED THE BOX OF PARTS
19	THAT'S BEEN IDENTIFIED HERE I DON'T RECALL THE EXACT
20	EXHIBIT, BUT THE AKA PARTS; IS THAT CORRECT?
21	A. YES. WE EXAMINED THE PARTS.
22	Q. AND YOU ASKED MR. EDWARDS HE'S A FIRFARMS
23	EXAMINER; IS THAT CORRECT?
24	A. I THINK THAT'S HIS TITLE.
25	Q. WHAT DOES THAT MEAN?
26	A. I GUESS THAT MEANS HE EXAMINES FIREARMS.

1	Q. DO YOU KNOW IF DE'S EVER BUILT AN AK TYPE OF
2	WEAPON FROM A KIT OR OTHERWISE?
3	A. I IXXXI'I' KNOW.
1	Q. HAVE YOU EVER
5	A. HE, KIND OF LIKE SERGEANT SCHUCH, TOOK A WHAT
6	APPEARED TO BE A WORKING AK-47 AND TOOK IT APART. AND
7	WE LOOKED AT THAT AND COMPARED THE PARTS, AND WE WENT
8	THROUGH THE LIST AS WELL.
9	Q. WELL, HAVE YOU EVER YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER
10	HE'S EVER DONE ALL OF THE MACHINE WORK OR WHATEVER IT
11	TAKES TO ACTUALLY MAKE AN AK 17 FROM A KIT SIMILAR TO
1.2	THIS?
13	A. I IXON'T KNOW IF HE'S EVER DONE THAT.
1.4	Q. HAVE YOU EVER DONE TH?
15	A. NO.
16	Q. HAVE YOU EVER MADE ANY KIND OF A FIREARM IN
17	WHICH YOU HAD THE MACHINE PARTS AND WELL, PARTS TO
18	MAKE A FUNCTIONAL FIREARM? HAVE YOU EVER DONE THAT
19	YOURSELF?
20	MS. JONES: OBJECTION. REJEVANCE.
21	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
22	BY MR. HENNES: Q. HAVE YOU?
23	A. HAVE I WELDED AN
24	Q. NO. GO AHMAD.
25	A. I'M SORRY. CAN YOU ASK THE QUESTION AGAIN?
26	Q. YEAH. HAVE YOU EVER ASSEMBLED A WORKING

1	FIREARM FROM A COLLECTION OF UNFINISHED PARTS SUCH AS
2.	THE ONE THAT YOU'VE TESTIFIED ABOUT THAT ARE IN THAT BOX
3	OR WERE IN THAT BOX?
4	A. L'VE TAKEN YOU KNOW, I TESTIFIED THAT I'VE
5	BEEN TO ARMOR SCHOOL. AND WE TOOK APART AND PUT
6	TOCHTHER THOSE TYPE OF ASSAULT WEAPONS NUMEROUS TIMES.
7	Q. AND WHAT DID YOU DO "O TAKE IT APART? WHAT
8	DID YOU BREAK DOWN IN THE AR-15?
9	A. WELL, I'T STARTS OUT WHEN YOU BEGIN THE CLASS.
10	IT'S A 24 HOUR TRAINING COURSE. AND THEY BASICALLY HAND
11	YOU A WORKING RIFLE. AND WE END UP TAKING THE PARTS
12	APART ON THE RIPLE.
13	THE SCHOOL IS DESIGNED TO NOT ONLY TEACH YOU TO
14	ASSEMBLE AND DISASSEMBLE A WORKING RIFTE, BUT ALSO TO
15	TROUBLESHOOT POSSTBLE PROBLEMS AND THINGS OF THAT NATURE
16	SO YOU CAN REPAIR OR TROUBLESHOOT PROBLEMS THAT A RIPLE
17	MAY HAVE.
18	Q. AND DO YOU THINK YOU CAN PUT TOCETHER AN AK-47
19	FROM THAT OR AN AK RIFLE, A FUNCTIONING FTREARM FROM
20	THAT BOX OF PARTS YOURSELF?
21	MS. JONES: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE.
22	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
23	THE WITNESS: I BELIEVE
24	THE COURT: 1'M GOING TO I'M SORRY. COUNSEL
25	APPROACH.
26	(PROCEEDINGS OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)

MR. HENNES: OKAY.

A. ON THE SIDE OF THE RECEIVER HERE IT SHOWS

1	SEVERAL MARKINGS IT LOOKED LIKE.
2	MR. HENNES: YOUR HONOR, COULD WE REMOVE IT
3	FROM THE BAG?
4	THE COURT: IS THERE A PROBLEM WITH THAT?
5	OKAY. YES. HE CAN REMOVE I'V FROM THE BAG.
6	THE WITNESS: IN THE PICTURE WHEN I COMPARED IT
7	TO THE OTHER WORKING AK-47 RECEIVER, WHAT YOU COULD SEE
8	WERE THE PINS OR THE RIVETS THAT HAVE BEEN PUT IN TO
9	HOLD THE INTERNAL PARTS.
10	BY MR. HENNES: Q. NOW WHAT ARE YOU HOLDING UP?
11	ARE YOU HOLDING UP THE ONE THAT YOU RECOVERED FROM
12	MR. NGUYEN?
13	A. YES.
14	Q. OKAY.
15	A. YOU CAN SEE HERE THAT SOME RIVETS FOR PINS
16	WILL BE INSTALLED.
37	Q. HOW ARE THEY INSTALLED?
18	A. LOOKS LIKE THEY ARE HAMMERED IN OR PRESSED IN.
19	Q. WITH A MACHINE; IS THAT RIGHT?
20	A. NOT NECESSARILY.
21	Q. BUT DO YOU KNOW HOW MR. NGUYEN PUT WHATEVER HE
22	PUT IN THERE?
2.3	A. HE DUN'T TELL ME.
24	THE COURT: LOOKS LIKE WHEN THE WITNESS IS
25	REFERRING TO "PINS," ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT SOME METAL,
26	LOOKS LIKE A FLAT PART OF THE NATIOTAT'S BEEN PUSHED

i	
1	INTO THE METAL, THE ROUND THINGS; IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE
2	TALKING ABOUT?
3	THE WITTHESS: YES. YOU HAVE SOME THAT HAVE
4	BEEN FLATTENED OVER HERE. AND OTHERS TRAT APPEAR THAT
5	THEY HAVE NOT YET BEEN FLATTENED OR COT OFF AND
6	FUATTENED.
7	THE COURT: ALL RICHT. THANK YOU.
8	THE WITNESS: AND WHAT ! WAS SHOWING THE JUDGE
9	IS BASICALLY THESE PINS OR RIBBONS APPEARED TO HAVE BEEN
10	SAWED HERE, THIS PIECE.
11	THE COURT: "THIS PLECE," MEANING THE FLAT
12	EXCUSE ME THE PLASTIC, BLACK PIECE THAT'S PROTRUDING
13	FROM THE METAL ON ONE END OF THE ITEM; IS THAT CORRECT?
14	THE WITNESS: IT'S ALL METAL.
15	THE COURT: OKAY. J CAN'T SEE FROM HERE, THE
16	DARKER METAL THAT'S PROTRUDING?
17	THE WITNESS: YES.
18	THE COURT: OKAY.
19	THE WITNESS: THESE PINS APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN
20	INSTALLED TO HOLD THIS PIECE HERE. THESE PINS OR RIVETS
21	LOOK LIKE THEY HAVE BEEN INSTALLED, BUT YET HAVE NOT YET
22.	BEEN CUT OFF AND SMASHED SO THAT THEY CANNOT FALL OUT.
23	THE COURT: THEY APPEAR MORE CYLINDRICAL IN
24	SHAPE; IS THAT CORRECT?
25	THE WITNESS: I THINK THAT'S FAIR TO SAY.
26	THE COURT: OKAY, AND THEY'RE ON THE OPPOSITE

1	SIDE OF THE DARKER METAL THAT'S PROTRUDING ON THE OTHER
2	SIDE?
3	THE WITNESS: YES.
4	THE COURT: OKAY.
5	THE WITNESS: HERE IS THE SPOT RICHT HERE WHERE
6	BY LOOKS LIKE A PIDOT HOLE HAS BEEN MADE. AND WHEN WE
7	COMPARED THE TWO RECEIVERS, IT LOOKED LIKE THERE WAS
8	ANOTHER PIN THERE.
9	THAT HOLE IS NOT LARGE ENOUGH YET, AT LEAST TO
10	HOLD THIS SIZE PIN. AND IT APPEARS THAT HE WOULD HAVE
1.1	TO DRILL ANOTHER HOLE THERE TO POLD THE PIN.
12	BY MR. HENNES: Q. DID YOU AND ROCKY HOWARDS
13	DISCUSS THAT ISSUE ABOUT DRILLING HOLES IN THE RECEIVER?
14	A. YES.
15	Q. AND DID NOT EDWARDS SAY THAT SEVERAL MORE
16	HOLES NEEDED TO BE DRILLED ONTO THAT RECEIVER?
17	MS. JONES: OBJECT AS HEARSAY AT THIS POINT.
18	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
19	THE WITNESS: I DON'T REMEMBER 11 HE SAID
20	SEVERAL OR ONE. WHEN I JOOK AT THE BACK, IT LOOKS LIKE
21	THERE'S A COUPLE MORE.
22	BY MR. HENNES: Q. EXCUSE ME, DETECTIVE, WOULD
23	LOOKING AT YOUR REPORT REFRESE YOUR RECOLLECTION AS TO
21	WHETEIER EDWARDS SAID ONE OR SEVERAL?
25	A. PROBABLY.
26	O. WOULD YOU LIKE TO

1	MR. HENNES: MAY I, YOUR HONOR?
2	THE COURT: YES. AND YOU MAY REFRESH YOUR
3	RECOLLECTION. LET US KNOW WHEN IT HAS BEEN REPRESHED.
4	BY MR. HENNES: Q. DETECTIVE CHAPMAN, IS YOUR
5	RECOLLECTION REFRESHED AS TO HOW MANY HOLES NEEDED TO BE
6	DRILLED INTO THE AK-47 OF ROCKY EDWARDS?
7	A. YES, SIR.
8	Q. HOW MANY APPROXIMATELY? WAS IT SEVERAL?
9	A. SEVERAL.
10	Q. AND DID EDWARDS ALSO STATE THAT THERE WAS
11	NEEDED A DIFFERENT MODIFICATION TO THE COLLECTION OF
12	PARTS IN ORDER TO MAKE A FUNCTIONING FIREARM?
13	A. HE SAID THAT'S POSSIBLE.
14	Q. OKAY. DO YOU KNOW IF YOU HAD DISCUSSED WITH
15	WHAT MODIFICATIONS NEEDED TO BE MADE?
16	A. WELL, HE INDICATED THAT NOT ALL THE PARTS HAD
17	BEEN INSTALLED INTO THE RECEIVER, YET & BELLEVE IT WAS
18	THE RAILS SPECIFICALLY, BUT THERE'S OTHER PARTS AS WELL,
19	LIKE THE TRIGGER MECHANISM.
20	Q. WHAT PART IS THE RAIL? DO YOU HAVE THAT
21	BEUIND YOU THAT YOU COULD SHOW THE JURY?
22	A. YES. WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO TAKE IT OUT?
23	Q. YES, PLEASE.
24	A. THESE ARE THE BOLT CARRIER RATES WHICH SIT
2.5	INSIDE THE RECEIVER, WELCH THE BOLT RIDES ON WHEN IT
26	MOVES BACK AND FORTH.

7	O. THOSE NEED TO BE WELDED INTO; IS THAT CORRECT?
2	A. I DON'T BELIEVE THEY HAVE TO BE WELDED IN.
3	Q. IT WAS YOUR TESTIMONY THAT THEY DO OR DO NOT
4	NEED TO BE WELDED ONTO THE RECEIVER?
5	A. I DON'T THINK SO.
6	Q. HOW ARE THEY AFFIXED?
7	A. WELL, I'M CERTAINLY MORE FAMILIAR WITH THE
8	AR-15S, BUT I BELIEVE I GOESS I DON'T KNOW.
9	THE COURT: I'M SORRY, DID THAT THEM COME OUT
10	OF 5-B, AS IN BOY?
1.1	THE WITNESS: YES.
12	BY MR. HENNES: Q. IS 17 YOUR OPINION THAT THE
13	AR-15 LOWER RECEIVER IS DIFFERENT FROM AN AK-STYLE
14	RECEIVER?
15	A. THEY'RE SIMILAR, BUT, YES, THEY'RE NOT THE
16	SAME.
17	Q. IS IT FAIR TO SAY THAT YOU WERE FAR MORE
18	FAMILIAR WITH THE AR-15 RECEIVER THAN THE AK TYPE
19	RECEIVER?
20	A. YES.
21	Q. NOW IN YOUR INTERVIEW ON THE 18TH WITH
22	MR. NGUYEN YOU ASKED HIM WHETHER HE HAD ALL OF THE
23	PARTS. AND I DON'T WANT TO MISQUOTE IT, SO ALL THE
24	PARTS TO THE TO MAKE THE AK. AND L'IL SEE IF I CAN
25	FIND IT FXACT ON PAGE.
26	DO YOU HAVE A "TRANSCRIPT"?

1	A. YES, J DO.
2	Q. ON PAGE TWO, ABOUT TWO THIRDS OF THE WAY DOWN
3	YOU ASKED MR. NGUYEN, "DO YOU HAVE ARE ALL OF THE
4	PARTS THERE TO PUT THE AK TOXISTHER?"
5	AND MR. NGUYEN SAYS, "NO. THAT'S WIY IT'S NOT
6	TOGETHER. I DON'T KNOW. I NEVER GOT AROUND TO IT."
7	IS THAT WHAT IF SAID?
8	A. I ASKED HIM SEVERAL TIMES IF ALL THE PARTS
9	WERE THERE. AND THAT'S WING HE SAID ON THAT PARTICULAR
10	MOMPAT.
11	Q. DOES IT APPEAR IN THE TRANSCRIPTS ANYWHERE
12.	ELSE WHERE YOU ASKED HIM WHETHER ALL THE PARTS ARE
13	THERE?
14	A. YES.
15	Q. OR WAS THERE ANOTHER INTERVIEW THAT WE DON'T
16	HAVI-:?
17	A. WELL, THERE WAS AN INTERVIEW ON THE 17TH,
1.8	WHITCH WAS THE DAY BEFORE. AND I ASKED HIM AGAIN ON THE
19	18TH AS WELL.
20	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION. NONRESPONSIVE.
21	THE COURT: MAKE SURE YOU FINISH ANSWERING THE
22	QUESTIONS SO THE COURT REPORTER IS GETTING THEM BOTH
23	DOWN.
24	COUNSEL, YOUR OBJECTION IS SUSTAINED.
25	MS. JONES: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T BELIEVE HE
26	ALLOWED THE WITNESS TO ANSWER THE LAST QUESTION AS TO

WHETHER HE HAD ALL THE PARTS? AND YOU CAN GO AHEAD AND

1	READ IT IF IT
2	A. ABOUT A THIRD OF THE WAY DOWN ON PAGE THREE
.3	IT'S THE SAME CONVERSATION.
4	AND I ASKED. "OKAY. IF I UNDERSTAND
5	CORRECTLY, THE YOU SHOULD HAVE ALL THE PARTS THAT YOU
6	BOUGHT IN THAT KIT MINUS THE RECEIVER THAT YOU BOUGHT?"
7	AND HE RESPONDS BY SAYING, "YEAH. YEAH.
8	EVERYTHING IS IN THAT."
9	Q. THANK YOU. NOW WITH REGARD TO ROCKY EDWARDS'
10	STATEMENTS, DID HE GIVE YOU AN OPINION THAT THE
11	NECESSARY PARTS WERE THERE TO CREATE A WORKING RIFLE?
12	A. YES.
13	Q. AND WHEN HE SAID "POSSIBLY WITH SOME
14	MODIFICATION, " HE WAS REFERRING TO THE RAILS AND THE
15	TRIGGER MECHANISM, CORRECT?
16	MR. HENNES: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. MISSIATES
17	THE EVIDENCE.
18	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
19	BY MS. JONES: Q. IS THAT WHAT YOU TESTIFIED TO ON
20	CROSS?
21	A. THOSE WERE SOME OF THE THINGS THAT HE
2.2	MENTIONED.
23	Q. OKAY. AND THE RAILS AND THE TRIGGER
24	MECHANISMS WERE PRESENT, CORRECT? YOU JUST SHOWED THEM
2.5	TO THE JURY.
2.6	A. YES.

1	Q. AND DID HE FORTHER EXAMINE THE AKC RECEIVER
2	AND POINT OUT THAT IT HAD BEEN BENT INTO A SHAPE FOR
3	ASSEMBLY?
4	A. YOU MEAN AK-47 RECELVER?
5	Q. YES.
6	A. YES.
7	Q. AND HOLES HAD BEEN DRILLED ACCORDING TO HIM?
8	A. I'M NOT SURE NOW TO ANSWER THAT BECAUSE WE
9	DON'T KNOW IF THOSE HOLES WERE DRILLED BEFORE OR AFTER
LO	IT WAS BENT INTO POSITION.
11	Q. OKAY. LET ME REPHRASE THAT.
12	DID HE COMMENT TO YOU THAT THE RECEIVER HAD
1.3	HOLES DRILLED INTO IT, BUT IT NEEDED SEVERAL MORE?
14	A. YES.
15	Q. DID HE ALSO INDICATE TO YOU THAT A LOT OF THE
16	WORK THAT WAS REQUIRED HAD ALREADY BEEN COMPLETED ON 177?
17	Λ. YES.
18	Q. AND DID HE EVER INDICATE TO YOU THAT THERE WAS
19	ANYTHING NOT CONTAINED IN THAT BOX OF PARTS THAT WOULD
20	BE NEEDED TO FINISH THAT AK-17?
2.1	Λ . NO.
22	MS. JONES: NOTHING FURTHER.
2.3	THE COURT: OKAY. ANY ADDITIONAL BY
24	MR. HENNES?
25	MR. HENNES: NO, YOUR HONOR.
26	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MAY THIS WITNESS BE

Ob3

MS. JONES: SUBJECT TO RECALL.

THE COURT: OKAY. YOU'RE EXCUSED SUBJECT TO RECALL, DETECTIVE CHAPMAN.

THE WITNESS: WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO PACKAGE IT

THE COURT: THIS IS A COOD TIME TO BREAK. WE WILL SUBSEQUENTLY BREAK SOMETIME BETWEEN 4:30 AND 5:00 O'CLOCK OR WHERE THERE IS A NATURAL BREAK.

PLEASE REMEMBER THE ADMONISHMENT. DO NOT TALK
ABOUT THE CASE OR ABOUT ANY OF THE PEOPLE OR SUBJECTS
INVOLVED IN IT WITH ANYONE INCLUDING OTHER JURORS. DO
NOT MAKE UP YOUR MIND ABOUT THE VERDICT OR ANY ISSUE
UNTIL AFTER YOU HAVE DISCUSSED THE CASE WITH THE OTHER
JURORS DURING DELIBERATION.

THANK YOU. HAVE A COOD EVENING.

(PROCEEDINGS OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)

THE COURT: WE ARE OUTSIDE OF THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. IS THERE ANYTHING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO BRING UP BEFORE WE BREAK?

MR. HENNES: NOT FROM THE DEFENSE, JUST TO INFORM THE COURT THAT I BELIEVE THAT THEIR EXPERT IS GOING TO BE ON IN THE MORNING. AND I'LL HAVE MY EXPERT READY AT 10:00 A.M. TOMORROW. MAYBE THAT'S WISHFULL THINKING.

THE COURT: HIGH HOPES.

MS. JONES: I THINK THAT'S FAIR. THE COURT: LET'S HAVE BOTH EXPERTS HERE. THAT'S A COOD TIME PERSOD TO TRY TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE'S NO GAPS. ADDITIONALLY, I WOULD LIKE COUNSEL HERE IF YOU CAN BY 8:45, JUST TO KIND OF GET IN HERE, GET SETTLED, SET UP SO WE CAN HOPEFULLY HAVE THAT JURY COME IN. MR. NGUYEN, YOU ARE ORDERED BACK TOMORROW FOR 8:45. MR. HENNES: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: YOU'RE WELCOME. (END OF PROCKEDINGS) * * * * *