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

25

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.