going to happen with traffic and you're going to be 15 to 20 minutes late and then we don't start at 9. Okay? So everybody in here at 8:45 and you'll come in that back door. Thank you guys and be careful going home.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED)

(3-3-23) (JURY NOT PRESENT)

THE COURT: Anything, guys, before we bring the jury in?

MS. RICH: Yes, sir. We have a video of the Comfort Inn that the Defendant stipulated to yesterday. However, this additional video from the Comfort Inn that we did not know about and Detective McCullough had that we became aware of yesterday, so we're going to introduce it.

And we asked the Defendant if they wanted to introduce it and they said they might. So we provided them to the Defense when we first knew about them and we are now trying to -- we let the person who would authenticate the video go. So now we're trying to determine if those videos, if they stipulate to the authenticity of those additional Comfort Inn videos --

MR. JAFFE: May it please the Court? Judge, I think this is very important to us and to the Court, so I need to put it in some context. We did

get this yesterday. And while reviewing it, I wanted to know when the detective testifies had it because under a case I need to cite to you, it's a Seminole United States Supreme Court case and it's Kyles Versus Whitley and it was argued in 1994.

The opinion came out in 1995 and my reading and I think most courts, all courts reading of Kyles Versus Whitley says this that if the police have it, then it doesn't matter, that they failed to turn it over to the prosecutor. It's the same thing as the prosecutor having it, but I wanted to know more.

So I saw McCullough while we were arguing about getting it 10 hours or so ago of the contents and I saw him reading a report. And I said, can I have a copy of the report and see it and he said no.

THE COURT: A report?

MR. JAFFE: Yes, a report of the videos.

THE COURT: That he prepared?

MR. JAFFE: And he said it's work product. No, because I wanted to know when McCullough got it, Judge. Because under Kyles, U.S. Supreme Court case, if Detective McCullough had it, then the prosecutor, according to this case which I would

ask the Court to review again, he wouldn't tell us. 1 2 But we figured out from the tapes that we can't go through 10 hours that quickly but Stephen --3 4 THE COURT: How long is the additional tape? 5 MS. RICH: It's not long at all, and we can 6 show it to Your Honor. 7 Seven and-a-half hours. MR. KNIZLEY: THE COURT: Seven and-a-half hours? You're 8 9 talking about sometime before the accident and way 10 after the accident? 11 MR. JAFFE: No, sir, immediately before and 12 immediately after, that's correct, different camera 13 angles. Let me just get the crux of our argument, 14 seven and-a-half hours. But regardless of whether 15 the prosecution had them or not, two things to say 16 about that please, Judge. It's not imputed that 17 they have under Kyles V. Whitley --18 THE COURT: We will revisit that concept, but 19 get to the point. 20 MR. JAFFE: Whether they have the seven 21 and-a-half hours of video or not, they had the 22 There was a report that Detective 23 McCullough surely handed over, I guess I can assume. I think we need to examine him so 24

presumably the prosecution at least has the written

report of what was on them and the times. I haven't reviewed them, but Stephen has and Dennis has.

MR. KNIZLEY: To a limited degree.

MR. JAFFE: To a limited degree. What I said is it's extremely Brady material and Giglio material, it's exculpatory and impeachment material and that we cannot investigate now because we don't have the opportunity to and therefore, we wouldn't be able to adequately examine Mr. Davis which Dennis is going to do.

And if you'll allow Dennis to explain why it's exculpatory and why the investigation is essential to our effective rendering of the Sixth Amendment, Counsel, I would appreciate it.

THE COURT: Mr. Knizley.

MR. KNIZLEY: Your Honor, at about 6 p.m.

last night, we were wrapping up and as Mr. Jaffe said, they asked for the stipulation they're asking for this morning as to the three Comfort Inn videos. We're only aware of one, the one the Court has seen with the cars on the street. And not getting into all the conversations that took place there, I said, well, I want to see the other videos and some discussion and then eventually Detective

McCullough downloaded on a hard drive of Mr.

Yeager's that video and we left around 6:15 or so.

Mr. Yeager, who is the information technology assistant for us in this case, began to examine the video to determine there were three different camera angles. We had never seen it, not of what we have seen before. This is inside the hotel, in and out, inside the hotel, but that Your Honor has seen.

And he alerted me to the evening what he was discovering that he thought would be relative to the matter at that point, the whole hard drive to look at, and I'm relying on Stephen to do that.

But what he uncovered and I think Richard has mentioned it, of course the foundation of the Defense in this case is it was an intervening factor by another driver, an operator of a vehicle in a fashion that caused this wreck regardless of the speed for intoxication or at least impact speed and intoxication and the degree of recklessness that Dr. Nakhla, whatever, engaged if there was a mitigating factor. Of course Your Honor has seen the video and Your Honor can assess that.

But then this video which has Mr. Davis on it and his compadres on it -- and I say compadres, I

think that's what the video tells us --

THE COURT: Standing and walking around, or are you talking about in the car pulling in?

MR. KNIZLEY: Standing, walking around in and out of the hotel it appears.

THE COURT: After the incident?

MR. KNIZLEY: Immediately before and I think the time range of the videos from Stephen, I understand, is about 11 a.m. to 2 a.m. That's the time range of the video. 11:30, I think, whatever Detective McCullough felt appropriate to draw from the videos at the Comfort Inn that he felt was relevant to the issues which we now think they've become extremely relevant to the issues.

We already had before this, in discovery, some Facebook exchanges and what I said is Facebook Messenger, a group text of sorts or phone-type communication between Mr. Davis and Harry Matthews who was here yesterday who is going to be offered as a witness and Harry Matthews is in these videos as well.

But what happens and there is language in those Facebook videos where they talk about somebody's alcohol use and drug use. But that, in and of itself, may not have been enough to make a

reasonable circumstantial evidence -- to make a reasonable deduction that Mr. Davis may have been partaking in alcohol before or after this wreck.

But what we find in the videos is that Mr.

Davis is communicating with this group of people
that he socialized with throughout the course of
the evening which I think a reasonable subject on
the videos all going into the hotel rooms are right
by one another. That actually happens at 12:40,
okay.

About 11:30, there's a video, and of course Mr. Davis is in communication with these people. There is a video of -- I'm not sure Mr. Harry is in that, but the group of compadres or someone appears to be incapacitated, can't stand up, is being helped down the hall, is being sat down and is being taken into this hotel room where Mr. Davis soon comes into. And then we have a depiction of another individual at a later time coming down the hall that seemed to be very very unsteady on his feet.

THE COURT: Is that the driver Davis?

MR. KNIZLEY: It's not -- we don't know, but

I'll get to driver Davis in a moment. And then we have a bunch of comradery and Mr. Davis is in the

videos.

THE COURT: Now, these are surveillance vidoes from inside the hotel, like, in the lobby or hallway area?

MR. KNIZLEY: Yes, sir, two different hallway shots.

THE COURT: The additional video provided is not of the incident with Mr. Nakhla's car but really internal things happening inside the hotel, that's what you're talking about?

MR. KNIZLEY: Yes, sir, and we would like to play them and mark them as a Court's Exhibit to this hearing if necessary. The reason they're relevant and important to the Defense of the case is whether or not Mr. Davis operated a vehicle in such a fashion that a reasonable person, such as Dr. Nakhla, driving on the highways would have taken the actions no matter what the circumstances would have been or the culpability of recklessness that's alleged in this case. Also, in the e-mail -- excuse me, in the Facebook that we already had at about one hour after the wreck, there is a photograph, and I don't know if it was taken by Mr. Davis or not. Mr. Davis sees the photograph, he's in the loop of the social media

exchange where a person is in the bed, in a bed. 1 2 don't know what bed, okay, apparently unconscious or sleeping with regurgitation, vomit around that 3 4 person. THE COURT: Who is that? It's not the driver, 5 6 Davis? 7 MR. KNIZLEY: Perhaps it does appear to be him and another person in the loop saying that's to 8 9 the effect that's why I don't use alcohol, I smoke 10 weed or something. 11 THE COURT: Is Davis in the picture at that 12 point? 13 MR. KNIZLEY: He's not in that picture. He's 14 apparently in the conversation is all we can say. THE COURT: How do you know that? 15 MR. KNIZLEY: Because McCullough produced it 16 from Mr. Davis's Facebook account, and of course we 17 18 know Mr. Davis, in these videos we got last night, 19 we saw him with these people in and out these rooms 20 where this activity is going on. And then we know 21 Mr. Davis left the scene, we know Mr. Davis was 22 reluctant to talk to law enforcement. 23 Today we know that Mr. Davis had an uncle, a police officer that we think would have some 24

investigations and counseled him not to speak to

police which certainly gives rise to a reasonable concern that needs to be thoroughly investigated as to maybe the reason is because he was associated with these individuals we know for the first time ever seeing last night.

THE COURT: Is Davis here?

MS. RICH: Yes, sir, he's going to be a State's witness, so is Harry Matthews that had the party and rented the room, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Knizley. I'm about to tell you where we're headed but go ahead.

MR. KNIZLEY: Yes, sir. Your Honor, what a portion of seven and-a-half hours was and when we say seven and-a-half hours and Stephen Yeager, such as in doing that, you don't look at something like this once and he really has every frame of seven and-a-half hours. You don't look at it twice. You look at it three or four times in order to determine what was going on with the critical person that is a part of this case, Mr. Davis. And we have to send investigators out to talk and understand this is three and-a-half years, after two and-a-half years after this happened.

The State has had this two and-a-half years.

If we had had it two and-a-half years ago, we would

be doing that investigation and further developing the cross-examination, an investigation that is relevant to this.

But it's blatantly unfair for us to be given, at 6 o'clock in the evening, seven and-a-half hours of stuff that's pertinent and relevant to the core of the Defense's case and then expect to go forward with the rest of the case without going back and finding out, well, what is this all about.

And it is, you know, exculpatory. It's impeachment material. It's Giglio and impeachment material. It's Brady material, and there is so much investigation that needs to be done and we would have done it.

The Defendant has invested so much time and resources in investigations and lawyers and everything else that if it had have been Davis's investigation and had we had this or weeks of investigation, we would have to finally say how do you -- where, what did you do, was the detective there before when he -- or did he just go out and come in, was he intoxicated or straight, what were you people doing there.

And the last thing I will say is I have a generation of disconnect with what young people may

do on Friday night that all live in a town -- that live in one town and go rent a hotel room for recreational purposes, I suppose. I don't know. It may be some other person, I don't know, in an area which I suggest is going to be demonstrated as a drug area, a prostitution area and high crime area. I don't know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think the evidence is going to show that because of the generational disconnect or maybe cultural, I don't know. But I'm inquiring of people that age and I think in what people do most, I think there is a reasonable assumption and conclusion that if young people go congregate by renting a hotel room in a town that they live in and late night hours and compare that with the videotape footage, that it's going to be a reasonable conclusion with their investigation that there may have been some consumption of the people in that room, including Mr. Davis, a consumption of either alcohol, drugs or something that would have impaired their ability to operate a motor vehicle and that is the crux of this case. We can't go forward with any parts of the case without investigating this. And for instance, we might be able to determine why he fled the scene and why he

was reluctant to talk to the police when we can't go forward with a 6 p.m., seven and-a-half hour video that we really -- and Judge, Mr. Jaffe and I, it's not something that we took lightly that we have all been -- I have been in this situation with Your Honor before. And I've been in this situation in many many other cases and Mr. Jaffe has too and it's very important and the Court has invested time. Everybody has invested time in this case.

We feel our certain positions -- how the case may come out, but we have to stop at this point and say the remedy, it's very very unfortunate in this case is a mistrial, and we're going to move for a mistrial on the foundation of the cases that Mr.

Jaffe is appointed in, Judge. And that's the best I could do factually from 6 p.m. last night to basically 9 o'clock this morning.

THE COURT: I've got a plan for us there, and I want to get to it because I want to get the jury and get this plan under way. Go ahead, Mr. Jaffe.

MR. JAFFE: This case I was involved in personally, Your Honor, it's State of Alabama

Versus Drinkard and I don't recall if it's Padgett
--

THE COURT: State Versus Padgett.

MR. JAFFE: In that case, Judge, the prosecution had a type of blood sample, it's not a DNA but a type of blood typing. And they waited until a week into the trial and they disclosed it then to the Defense and the Alabama Court reversed that case for a new trial. I handled the trial because of the late disclosure. I would like to also cite the --

THE COURT: What is the cite on Padgett? I want to go ahead to the plan that I've got. Go ahead.

MR. JAFFE: State Versus Ellis, 165 So. 3d. 576, Alabama 2014. And please let us quote this, and I'm not sure where it comes from. The Brady Rule encompasses evidence known only to the police and not to the prosecution and that's Kyles Versus Whitley. Let me give you a good cite on that, 514 U.S. 419 (1995). So we don't have a choice, but I agree with Mr. Knizley.

MR. KNIZLEY: Judge, I know you're in a hurry

THE COURT: I'm not in a hurry. I just have a plan to address that, and I want to get underway before we use up a clock this morning.

MR. JAFFE: At the very least, we believe Mr.

Yeager told us the State mentioned Mr. McCullough had this in September and August of 2020 and his worksheet that he would not give and we're not faulting him for that. We think the Court should look and make it a Court's Exhibit and it will show how long the State has had this information.

MS. RICH: What we're talking about is video and what we intend to introduce today is Channels 8 and 20. We do not intend to produce -- introduce the other three videos, and we do have those videos and they were not produced to the Defense until this week.

THE COURT: Did the police have it though?

MS. RICH: Yes, sir, the police did have it,
absolutely, and the police provided it to Ms.

Wright way back when. And I'll make this a Court's
Exhibit, Your Honor, as his work product and the
other three channels, 6, 7 and 19 and what they
depicted. Okay. Channel 8 -- it's very
important to understand what is going on here, Your
Honor. Channel 8 depicts a vehicle that's
traveling, I submit, in front of Christopher Davis
going down the roadway.

And then you see Chris Davis enter the screen. This is the front of the Comfort Inn, and

then you will see Chris Davis pull into the Comfort
Inn and drive through the front entrance. Then you
see Chris Davis run along the fence line to the
crash because we submit today that you'll hear
evidence that he doesn't go to the hotel room at
all. He goes out to his car.

The four individuals that were in the hotel room come running down and meet him and they all run to the front of the Comfort Inn because they've heard a loud bang and they think it's a crash, and they run out to the car. They see the crash.

There's all kinds of people there, so they don't call 911 and they come back into the hotel.

15 minutes into the video you see the three friends who are with Chris Davis -- I'm sorry, 21 minutes you see all four of the males walking back from the front where the crash occurred to the rear of the hotel from the crash scene. Okay.

And then on the second view that we provided to the Defense, you see a vehicle pass and the second vehicle is Chris Davis. You see the Defendant's vehicle come into view and you see Chris Davis enter the parking lot and he stops a vehicle for driving to the rear parking lot, those have already been seen in the Daubert hearing as

well.

The other three videos show the same four people, the same four males, that's important, okay, the same four males. And all they see is the three males leaving the hotel room and running to the stairwell. Okay. And then you see the four males walking back, three males exit the room, come out, meet Chris Davis in Channel 20 which they have and then see those four males walking back to the hotel room, Chris Davis and the same three males.

Okay. Channel 7 which we did not produce is -- frankly, I didn't know about this until it was shown to me yesterday.

THE COURT: Is this the one they're talking about?

MS. RICH: Yes, sir. The officer had it, that's the same three males running down the hall to the stairwell.

THE COURT: The three males to include driver Davis?

MS. RICH: No, that's the three males from the apartment complex. The video they have shows them leaving the complex.

THE COURT: Same unidentified three people?

MS. RICH: Yes, and the video they don't have

shows them running down the hall. And then the video they don't have shows them running to the stairwell, and then the video they do have shows them at the stairwell meeting Chris Davis and then the four of them running. So the only thing they were missing, Your Honor, is the view of them running after they came out of the hotel door, running down the hall and running through the stairwell, okay, and then exiting the stairwell and then walking down the hallway going back to the hotel room.

We have them walking back to the hotel room in the video that was produced to them, the same males -- and this is important, Judge. That's why I need to put it on the record. Then the last view that was not produced to them, you see the same three males running down the stairs. We have them coming out of the room, that was introduced to them.

The only thing, they see them running down the hall, running down the stairs coming out of the stairwell. Okay. That's it, Your Honor. And they've had all these Facebook records, the throw-up and all that which the State concludes that is not even relevant because Chris Davis is in

none of those photographs, and that's what it's all about.

THE COURT: In terms of alleged new facts, actually, there aren't any. They are not present just because they have other views, essentially the same conduct you say?

MS. RICH: That is exactly right, Your Honor.

And Your Honor, I think what's important is we were not planning to introduce these all out of an abundance of caution. We gave them to the Defense last night, and that's where this issue came up, and that is exactly what is identified in these videos.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. RICH: Also, Your Honor, in regards to him leaving the hotel that Mr. Knizley is saying this has some bearing on, there's another video that obviously Mr. Knizley and them haven't discovered that shows Officer Estes at the scene that actually shows Chris Davis leaving the hotel in his car at 1:20 a.m., and it has already been introduced in evidence.

And it shows Chris Davis leaving the hotel at 1:20 a.m. He's not at the party, the room, none of those things, and he is going to be here to

testify. So Harry Matthews is the person that rented the room, spent the night in the room, knows about the drunk guys, and I submit it's irrelevant about the drunk guys.

But if the Defense wants to ask them about the drunk guys, he certainly can and one of them lying in the throw-up, if he wants to ask him that, of those individuals or whatever they want to make it out to be, it has anything to do with Chris Davis because he leaves at 1:20.

MR. KNIZLEY: Your Honor commented that she's suggesting we had this video or from a different angle that is 100 percent. I'm not saying that that's true. I'm saying that is what she's arguing. I'm trying to summarize her argument.

MS. RICH: I will say that that argument is blatantly incorrect.

THE COURT: Look, verbally, both sides are verbally arguing, guys, what's in the videos there. I've got to look at the videos. We're spinning the clock right now. And so what we've got to do -- look, just hold it. I'm not going to have a jury sit in here for hours while we do this.

MS. RICH: I submit to Your Honor it wouldn't take longer than 30 minutes.

THE COURT: Is it seven and-a-half hours of new video?

MR. KNIZLEY: We got it at 6 o'clock last night, six hours, seven and-a-half.

THE COURT: Judge Brooks is going to watch all six hours of it today in open court, that's what we're about to do. I'm going to place this jury in recess and they're not going to come back until Monday or Tuesday, that's what I'm about to do.

I'm not going to have either side -- I'm not going to make any comments. The mission of this case, the journey of this Court is to get at the truth in the manner that the law requires us to pursue the case. I am aware of Brady and Giglio.

There's nobody that respects the constitution anymore than I do. I respect it as much as anybody. I'm going to make sure the constitution and the law are followed. I'm very familiar with Brady and Giglio. I've got to look at the video and I've got to look at it and the witnesses are here right now.

So I'm going to give the Defense this option, it's totally your option. You can bring all three of these folks in, Davis, his father and his uncle and Harry Matthews. You can bring them in this

morning before we play the video and it's totally in your control. And then I'll watch the video and then you can call them again and ask them more questions this afternoon or Monday. I'm going to allow you to call Detective McCullough this morning or afternoon or both before and after we watch the videos. I will recess the jury by Tuesday if necessary. I'm not going to have a jury sit here for eight hours -- it's wasting everybody's time.

We've got to look at the videos to make a decision. You're both arguing -- I don't know what is in them until I look. And both of you are good advocates, I will say this about the State and the Defense. I've known Mr. Knizley for over 30 years, almost 40 years, Ms. Rich, I've known for probably 25 years. I know both sides to be people of integrity.

And there's no question in my mind as we enter this process as we're doing the thing the constitution requires us to do, and there's no question in my mind about the integrity of either side.

I don't think anything unethical probably was done, but there may be evidence to the contrary,

we'll see, but I'll travel on the assumption there was an inadvertent failure to disclose even if it's inadvertent or Brady or Giglio.

There is still an issue that I've got to figure out, I've got to work through and I'm going to work through it and take those -- like, I'm not going to try to get it fast, I'm going to try to get it right. I will give you time to talk privately if you would like.

And Counsel, just think about what you want to do, do you want to look at the videos with Judge Brooks and everybody else in open court and then take depositions of the three people together that are here now and I'll put them on hold? And Detective McCullough, would you like to do all of them, look now at the videos? I'll give you that option. I do think I'll tell the jurors to come back at 1 o'clock Monday if we do some things today and then I'll determine, well, whatever is remaining to be done by the Defense to avoid prejudice could be done over the weekend.

I'm not saying I will determine that. I don't know I'll determine it, it takes months of work. And then we've got a situation we've got to deal with listening to what the witnesses say, his

tone, what Detective McCullough says. Whatever the Defense needs to do to rearrange their argument, their examinations would be done over the weekend.

Then, you know, we could have the jury come in Monday afternoon at 1 o'clock, resume the trial at that point or if you think might need the holiday Monday, we can start the trial back on Tuesday. That's what we'll do. So I would ask the Defense counsel privately what would you defer to do. Do you want to look at the video now or exam?

MR. KNIZLEY: Again, we would like to have five minutes on one other matter, on the Facebook disclosure, the video link, the videos that are taking -- this is from Mr. Davis's Facebook. There are video links that says Chris Davis plays video and they're not active on our end. They may not have been active when Detective McCullough got them. I don't know, but Detective McCullough is shaking his head negatively. So I'm assuming that he could not activate the videos.

THE COURT: Look, I'm going to have to look at all that you're arguing. What's in it, I don't know. We're doing the same thing again. I understand you're doing your jobs. But there's several layers here, is it Brady or Giglio material

and if so, has prejudice just occurred. If so, that's the remedy, you know, so I've got to go through this analysis.

And the first step for me is to understand what has happened. I've got argument as to what has happened, but that's argument. That's not the evidence, that's the lawyers' argument. I've got to look at it and hear what Detective McCullough says, what the witnesses say.

My thoughts are that's the best process. I will just tell you let's look at the videos, first to examine the videos. We're waisting the morning. We're not making time. I would rather get on to the videos, look at it and put this jury in recess. What I would say is plan on 1 o'clock Monday. I'm going to ask every one of them to call my office Monday morning at 10 to make sure we're still on for 1.

I'm going to tell them it might be 1 o'clock
Tuesday and explain this to them. I'm not going to
say anything substantially about what happened
except I've got to take care of some matters that
have arisen during the course of the trial and it
can't be done for them waiting for hours and that's
all I'm going to say to them.

1 MR. KNIZLEY: Can we proceed with the videos 2 first? MS. RICH: Your Honor, can we have them come 3 4 back at 9 on Monday? THE COURT: Well, the problem is I don't know 5 6 what the future holds. I'm trying to build myself 7 some options depending on where this takes us. MS. RICH: Could we have them call in Sunday 8 9 night? 10 THE COURT: How do I have them call me at my 11 house? I really don't think -- that would be 12 improper because I don't want to become a witness 13 of some sort as to people calling me at my house as 14 I have to work Sunday. 15 MS. RICH: Could they call Monday morning? 16 THE COURT: 9 or 10 o'clock, it's possible of getting everybody here to start, like, the 17 18 situation did not arise because of the Defendant's 19 conduct. I'm trying to respond to a variable which 20 has been thrown into the middle of the trial 21 without the Court being able to prepare for it. 22 I've got to have some applicability to where 23 if the Defense hears -- I'm going to -- so we spend 24 six hours today looking at video, two hours in

testimony with Detective McCullough and the three

witnesses, so then I've got to make some decisions.

The Defense goes out and does this this weekend, they're going to come back Monday morning. No matter what I or you say, they're going to come back Monday morning, we need to do more stuff, and we're going to have argument Monday morning. It's going to happen. We all are big boys. It's going to happen.

I don't want the jury sitting back there for three hours the way it's going right now -- I'm not angry at anybody. There's no point in whining.

I'm going to have the jury down here at 9 on Monday morning. They will come down and we'll argue about it -- I know that's coming. I've been around here too long.

So I'm going to put people in recess until 1 o'clock Monday. I'm going to ask them to call into the office. Darlene will be in my office from 9 until 11 Monday. I'm going to tell them and I will follow up, but I'm going to tell them to check in about whether they know for sure they need to come in Monday or Tuesday afternoon.

It may be that the Defense says, well, Judge, we've done everything else outside in candor to the Court, now we still want to talk to the witnesses

again, we want to take McCullough again and the witnesses Davis and the other guy again based on what we have done that weekend. I'm going to give you that chance. Look, I have to abide by the law.

I have to make sure there's not a Brady issue or Giglio issue and if there is, has the Defense been prejudiced. I have to make sure that did not happen. It's not taking sides one way or the other, so it's the solution I have. So let's do this.

(JURY PRESENT)

THE COURT: Come on in, everybody. Please be seated, everybody. I hope everybody had a good break overnight. I apologize for the delay.

I will tell you that, you know, whether it's our justice system or simply human relations, in the world of human affairs things are often fluid and unpredictable. And so some things -- in that context, I tell you that some things have been brought to my attention which I've got to deal with related to this case.

I'm not going to discuss with you what those are. Nobody on either side has done anything wrong, it's not for you to interpret that one way or another. These things happen in trials.

After all this is over, I'll explain the whole process to you, but I'm bound as the neutral during the course of the trial. As I told you, I have to be able to protect your state of mind as it was at the beginning the case, you can render a decision based only on what's presented in the courtroom. So I don't want to talk to you about extraneous things that are of no concern to you.

But some things have come up that I think are going to take some time for me to deal with today. And again, nobody has done anything wrong on either side, and so I don't want you to leave with that perception at all. That's not the case. It's on me, this is my responsibility. Whatever is going on now is my responsibility to make sure that things are done according to the law.

And so rather than have you guys sit back
there for some hours, I just need to deal with
this. It is Friday, and you guys have worked
really hard. I want to really thank you, all of
you. You know, I'm approaching 150 jury trials
right now, 148 or something like that, 147 at this
point as a Judge.
You've been as attentive
and hard-working and patient and cooperative as any
jury that I've had. So I thank you for that, and

I'm very sincere in saying that. You've paid attention throughout and you followed every instruction. You've been here on time every day. I really appreciate it. But I'm not going to keep you here while I have to take up some matters that may take a good part of the day today. I'd just rather you go on and be about your business, take care of your personal affairs.

So what my plan is is I'm anticipating that there may even still be some things for me to deal with Monday morning. Again, I can't get into what it is because I want you to base your decision based solely on what's presented in this courtroom from the witness stand and what's in the exhibits.

Okay? Bear with me. I've seen a lot of things, so I'm trying to protect your status as it is now.

So what I'm going to do is place the trial in recess until 1 o'clock Monday, okay, 1 o'clock Monday. I'm going to ask you to call in to my office Monday morning at about 10 o'clock. Okay. My JA is going to get you a little piece of paper with our phone number on it.

I'm going to get you just to wait in the jury room here in a minute. She's going to give you our office phone number and I'm going to get you to

call in Monday morning and confirm are we still on for 1 o'clock. Because, frankly, I'm not even going to have you come down Monday if it looks like these things I've got to deal with may take beyond 1 o'clock. Once we get going again, I want to move and move efficiently. I'm not going to apologize to you.

You know, in the justice system, as I told you, our mission is to do it right, it's not to do it fast and that's what this is about. Okay. I want to make sure things are done right, and so we're going to take our time and we're going to get it right.

So you'll call in about 10 o'clock Monday.

And if I believe by then that it looks like we're not going to really start up with the testimony promptly at 1 o'clock Monday, I'm just going to have you come in Tuesday at 9 and just go on that way.

I told you at the start of the case that this was going to be a two to three-week trial, and that's going to be the case. I didn't mince any words about it. It is what it is. It's an important case to both sides, and I appreciate your patience.

So if you would, I will give you one instruction as you leave. This case is receiving intense media coverage, it is. And as I told you, I sat right here where the lady is sitting right here in the blue jacket. I told you in the same exact chair in this very courtroom 25 years ago as

Amazingly, now, I'm the judge in the same courtroom and that case received intense publicity. I told you what I had to do. I did not watch the evening news, the morning news. You can't do it. I'm telling you. There's going to be a story on these TV stations every morning, at the noon news and the evening. You can't watch it. I'm instructing you to not watch the news. You're going to have to do it. You can do it.

a juror in a capital murder case. I was the juror.

Stay off of social media. Stay off the social media. You will see something about this case on it. People are going to ask you about it. You cannot talk about it. Please help me protect this process and let's keep your status just as it is now. You've been religious about it for me, you've done a great job. Let's keep it going. Let's be strong, okay.

So I'm going to get you guys to wait in the

jury room, and then I'm going to give you a little printed up piece of paper with my office phone number and then you guys will call in at 10 o'clock Monday.

Remember all the rules that I told you when you were first seated that apply to your status as jurors continue to apply to you. Don't talk about this case with anybody. All right. Don't look up anything about the case in any form or don't go to the scene where these things allegedly happened.

Protect your state of mind the way it is now. And I really appreciate your patience, okay. All right, guys. I say guys, men and women.

(JURY EXITS THE COURTROOM)

MS. RICH: Your Honor, we're ready for the video. And for the times that there's nothing showing on the video, will we be allowed to fast forward?

THE COURT: Say what?

MS. RICH: For the times where there's -this is hallway footage, Your Honor, and stairwell
footage, so there's a lot of time where there is
nothing happening, no humans whatsoever. Are we
allowed to fast forward --

THE COURT: I assumed that.