and you're free to go until in the morning at ninethirty.

## (ADJOURNMENT.)

## CORNING, ARKANSAS, FEBRUARY 4, 1994, AT 9:30 A. M.

(JURY ENTERING JURY ROOM AT 9:30 A.M.)

(JURY ENTERING COURTROOM AT 12:00 P. M.)

THE COURT: Alright, ladies and gentlemen, have you arrived at a verdict?

FOREPERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: If you would hand it to the bailiff, please, or the Sheriff, please.

FOREPERSON: (COMPLYING.)

THE COURT: (EXAMINING.) Alright, ladies and gentlemen, your verdicts are in good form and will be accepted by the Court and I'll announce your verdict in just a second.

Alright, ladies and gentlemen, I -- in the audience -- I am acutely aware that your feelings are on edge, that there is a great deal of emotion involved, and I certainly can understand that, and everyone that participates here can. But the Court cannot tolerate and will not tolerate any verbal outburst, any display of emotion whatsoever. So you're cautioned and warned as I read the verdicts that you are not to show any outburst, any emotion, or any display, and I recognize that that's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

difficult, and that's why I'm warning you in advance.

The verdicts read as follows:

"We, the jury find Jessie Lloyd Misskelley, Junior guilty of first degree murder in the death of Michael Moore." Signed by T. J. Williams, foreman.

Is that your unanimous verdict, ladies and gentlemen? All twelve of your agree?

JURORS: Yes.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, do you want the jury to be polled on that verdict?

MR. STIDHAM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Alright, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to go through a procedure called polling the jury which simply means that when your name is called, if this is your verdict answer "yes."

While the Clerk's getting the jury list, I'm going to read your other verdicts.

"We, the jury find Jessie Lloyd Misskelley, Junior guilty of second degree murder in the death of Stevie Branch."

"We, the jury find Jessie Lloyd Misskelley, Junior guilty of second degree murder in the death of Chris Byers."

Again, signed by T. J. Williams, foreman.

Are those verdicts your unanimous verdict? That is,

all twelve of you agree upon each finding?

JURORS: Yes.

THE COURT: Alright, and in just a moment when the Clerk returns with the jury list I'll ask her to call your name and if these verdicts -- all three of them reflect your individual findings -- then you should answer "yes" as your name is called.

And while the Clerk is bringing the jury list I might explain to you that your findings which the Court has accepted will require you to return to the jury room and consider the punishment. Before we do that, food has been ordered and it should be here for you and I'm going to ask that you take a break for lunch, take whatever time you need to rest and enjoy the food that's being provided. It won't be much. And after that then we'll reconvene and I'll give you further instructions and possibly if the lawyers care to there may be brief arguments or brief presentation of additional facts. That may not be necessary. It depends upon my discussion with the lawyers.

I'm going to let the Clerk poll the jury at this time. So if these represent your individual verdicts, please answer yes as your name is called.

THE CLERK: Carla Price.

MS. PRICE: Yes.

1	THE CLERK: Steven Green.
2	MR. GREEN: Yes.
3	THE CLERK: James Rainwater.
4	MR. RAINWATER: Yes.
5	THE CLERK: Teresa Burgess.
6	MS. BURGESS: Yes.
7	THE CLERK: Ronnie Smith.
8	MR. SMITH Yes.
9	THE CLERK: Lloyd Champion.
10	MR. CHAMPION: Yes.
11	THE CLERK: Margie Woods.
12	MS. WOODS: Yes.
13	THE CLERK: Donna Ludena Moore.
14	MS. MOORE: Yes.
15	THE CLERK: Janet Luter.
16	MS. LUTER: Yes.
17	THE CLERK: April Lunsford.
18	MS. LUNSFORD: Yes.
19	THE CLERK: Aubrey Dicus.
20	MR. DICUS: Yes.
21	THE CLERK: T. J. Williams.
22	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Alright, ladies and gentlemen, your
24	verdicts will be accepted by the Court as the verdicts in
25	this case and at this time you'll be allowed to recess

and I'm going to keep this area back here. You have coffee, cold drinks, and food coming. If you want to go outside in the back to smoke I'm going to provide deputies out in that area. That will be fine.

But you may stand in recess for let's say thirty minutes. Will that be sufficient time? Alright, you may stand in recess for thirty minutes.

Gentlemen, I need to see the lawyers. Gentlemen, could I see the lawyers at the bench?

(RECESS.)

(THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION WAS HAD AT THE BENCH OUT OF THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: What I need to know from you all -first of all I don't---

MR. STIDHAM: You're over the P. A., your Honor, if you don't want to be. I don't know if you want to be or not.

THE COURT: No, I don't really.

I guess under our new law you all are entitled to put on aggravation or mitigation. I don't know whether it's really necessary with these findings, but I think that if you want to you're permitted to do so. I'm not sure of the effective date of the new bifurcation---

MR. CROW: I though it was effective for crimes that occurred after---

THE COURT: After the -- that's what I thought, too, but now -- so I'm not sure that it's even appropriate or applicable.

MR. DAVIS: What they're telling us out of the Prosecutor's Coordinator's office is that it's applicable to crimes that are tried after January first of this year.

THE COURT: Which means you could do aggravation or mitigation.

MR. DAVIS: Right. The biggest thing that -- you know, there is an instruction that they've prepared that instructs the jury on parole eligibility and that sort of thing. I hadn't even given that any thought.

THE COURT: Well, that's why -- that's why I took
the recess because I haven't either and I haven't even
read that material, and I'm sure most of you all haven't.
I was on the -- the---

MR. STIDHAM: I discussed this matter with several attorneys and it was my understanding that we had the option of opting in or opting out.

THE COURT: That's kind of what I thought, too, but I don't know.

MR. STIDHAM: And Mr. Crow and I don't feel any need to go into mitigating---

MR. CROW: We want to opt out---

MR. STIDHAM: ---or aggravating matters since the crimes were committed in May of ninety-three.

THE COURT: Do you all want to do a little research on it and call and find out what you want to do and just let me know. Whatever one of you wants to do---

By the way, do you all have any verdict forms that fit this situation because I'm not sure you gave me any.

MR. CROW: I don't think those can get entered today, your Honor. Quite frankly, I don't think we have one.

MR. STIDHAM: Is there a book here? We can get started on it.

THE COURT: Well, I need verdict forms, too---

MR. CROW: Okay.

THE COURT: --- that provide for---

MR. CROW: I don't have them prepared.

MR. STIDHAM: Let's find a typist and get them done.

THE COURT: Just let me instruct that the range of punishment on first degree murder is ten to forty years or life.

MR. DAVIS: I want to put on some argument real brief.

MR. STIDHAM: I don't want to.

MR. CROW: We would object, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, that's why I want you all to find

out. I---

MR. FOGLEMAN: Well, even if you did -- even if that doesn't apply, you've always got the right to argue punishment.

MR. DAVIS: Yeah, and we didn't have the right to until---

MR. STIDHAM: Your Honor, we would submit that under the existing law at the time these acts occurred---

THE COURT: Well, but I think since it was bifurcated I think you're both entitled to a five or ten minute argument as to what the appropriate punishment is.

MR. STIDHAM: But they didn't come back with a verdict of capital murder.

THE COURT: I know, but you neither -- neither of you have really argued the law as to punishment in any of these things.

MR. CROW: We'll look at the law, your Honor. (RECESS.)

THE COURT: Alright, Court will be in session and, ladies and gentlemen, again, I seem to have to be thanking you for your patience. That thirty minutes I indicated to you turned out to be a little better than an hour -- more than that -- and I do appreciate your indulgence on our delays.

I might explain to you that the delay was absolutely

necessary in order to allow the attorneys an opportunity to discuss whether or not they needed to produce additional testimony or evidence which they would have been entitled to. However, I'm informed -- am I correct, gentlemen -- that each of you just chose to do a brief additional argument and proceed. Is that correct?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, your Honor.

MR. STIDHAM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you've consulted with the family members, with your clients, and with anybody that might be appropriate at this time. Have each of you done that?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, your Honor.

MR. STIDHAM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you're satisfied that arguments are all that's necessary?

MR. STIDHAM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Alright, ladies and gentlemen, you have found Jessie Lloyd Misskelley, Junior guilty of first degree murder in the death of Michael Moore and found him guilty in the -- of second degree murder in the deaths of Stevie Branch and Chris Byers.

It's now necessary that you listen to additional arguments of the attorneys, which I hope are confined to about fifteen minutes a side, and then again retire and fix and impose -- fix the sentences for each of these

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

offenses.

And you are instructed that the range of punishment for first degree murder is a term of not less than ten years nor more than forty years or life in the Arkansas Department of Correction. You are further instructed that the range of punishment for second degree murder is a term of not less than five years nor more than twenty years in the Arkansas Department of Correction, or a fine not exceeding Fifteen Thousand Dollars, or both a term of not less than five nor more than twenty years in the Arkansas Department of Correction and a fine not exceeding Fifteen Thousand Dollars.

After the lawyers do their additional arguments, then I will read the verdict forms that you'll be asked to consider and complete.

Alright, gentlemen, you may -- how much time do you all want -- is fifteen minutes cutting you too close?

MR. DAVIS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you want to split -- are you going to split your arguments?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DAVIS: Ladies and gentlemen, and I'm saying this with all sincerity, I know what a difficult decision you all had to make. This case is very emotionally

draining for anybody who is a party to it. Whether it's the victims' family, whether it's a juror, whether it's the Court Reporter -- anybody who has to view the photographs, who has to listen to this testimony, it is a gut wrenching experience. And you all the time hear people criticize the job that jurors do, but I want to tell you that we thank you for being willing and able to go through this process and to do your civic duty and serving on a jury, listening to the evidence, and rendering a decision as the law requires.

Now, you have to determine what is the appropriate punishment within the range allowed by the law that fits the crime that you found that this defendant committed. In the first count you will have the option in first degree murder for the death of Michael Moore — the ranges — you'll will be given a verdict form that shows ten to forty years or life. And you can fill that form in with anything from ten to forty years or you can put life in prison as the appropriate punishment for what this defendant did.

when you make that determination and you determine what is appropriate for the crime he's committed, I'll just ask that you think back again and I know it's hard, but again, fitting the punishment to the crime. You have found that he purposely took the life -- he was an

That -- and remember the evidence was that the beatings had already started. Damien had already started to hit the one boy when Michael Moore took off. And but for the action of that defendant who sits right there, Michael Moore would be alive today. And he brought him back to his ultimate death. The death of an eight-year-old boy.

And I put to you that appropriate punishment for someone who does that -- to take the life of an innocent eight-year-old -- under the circumstances that we know by the physical evidence what happened to him -- that that rates a life sentence. I can't think of a case that could be more appropriate to get the maximum sentence in the circumstances surrounding this.

The other two charges which are Class B felonies that you found the defendant guilty of second degree murder carried five to twenty year sentences. Anywhere within that range — and there's also an option of a fine. Frankly, in this case with the taking of two lives I don't think a fine is even an appropriate consideration but that's up to you.

In regard to those two boys just remember in finding this defendant guilty you had to determine that he went out there with the intent to inflict serious physical injury on those two boys. That he acted -- he or an

accomplice acted and think back as to what injuries those individuals suffered. And I know it's something that as soon as you leave this courtroom you'll want to cut out of your memory as much as possible for the rest of your life, and I do, too. But when determining what is appropriate punishment within that range of five to twenty years, think for a little bit about the agony and the torture that those boys went through that afternoon, and that man right there, ladies and gentlemen, he's a man. He's eighteen years old. You found that he did it and somebody that put those three little boys through what he was involved in, twenty years is something that is clearly appropriate.

I normally don't get up here and say, "If the range

I normally don't get up here and say, "If the range is this, I think you should do that." Use your discretion, but in this case I sincerely believe that what happened to those three little boys merits the maximum punishment you can give out on all three offenses. And I ask you, please, to look back over that evidence, think hard, think long, and do what's right and give a punishment that fits this crime — and fits the three crimes, and give this defendant the maximum sentences on all three counts.

In asking that, I do that because of not only what happened to the children, but what happened to their

23

24

25

1

And they've been here and you've had a chance families. to look at that and I don't think it's inappropriate to say when you determine punishment, think about what the effect has been, not only in the taking those three lives, but what impact it's had on the mothers, the fathers, and the other family members of those three When you think about those things and you look at the evidence, I think it will be a clear and easy decision that the maximum punishment -- although it's something that's a heavy responsibility to deal out particularly to somebody who's eighteen years old -- I think it's clearly appropriate and it's something that you can feel that you've done something right in regard to having the courage to give out that type of punishment for this type of crime, but if people can see what the punishment is in this case and say that that fits what this defendant did. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Are you all going to split or are you going to do it all?

MR. CROW: Do it all, your Honor.

THE COURT: Alright.

MR. CROW: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, your Honor, Mr. Fogleman, Mr. Davis. I want to thank you all, too, for your patience, and your willingness to serve on the jury. It's been a hard three weeks for all

of us. I thank you all very much for your willingness to serve, to pay attention, and to be here without y'all, this trial would not have been possible. Obviously from your findings you have found that Jessie was at the scene.

When you go back to that jury room I'll ask you to consider a few things. First, please consider what Jessie said in his statement. Please consider what he said he did and what he said he didn't do. Please consider all of the circumstances.

I'll also ask you to consider the age of Jessie. The prosecutor talks about him being eighteen. He's eighteen. He was seventeen when the crimes were committed and now he's eighteen. I'll also ask you to consider not only his physical age, but his mental ability. You've heard testimony that Jessie reasons on the level of a six to eight year old. He certainly can function in society to some extent but he does have certainly some type of mental deficiency. Now, his chronological age doesn't always tell the whole story. I think each of you know that.

I'll also ask you to consider his family background.

He had mental problems -- you've heard bits and pieces of his background. You heard some testimony about his mother and father. He was raised by his father and

stepmother and the other family history. I ask you to please consider those things.

Most importantly though, ladies and gentlemen, I want you to consider what Little Jessie said. I take it you believe his statement. I would ask you to (INAUDIBLE) consider what he himself contends. That he himself contends (INAUDIBLE).

As Mr. Davis pointed out, there is a range of punishment. The State of Arkansas has decided that when a person has committed the crime that you have found that Jessie committed he must be punished for murder in the first degree — the range of punishment is ten to forty or life. I'll please ask you to consider all of them.

I'm not going to stand here and say it should be one or it should be another. I would ask you to please consider all of them.

Murder in the second degree, ladies and gentlemen, the range of punishment is five to twenty. I would ask you to consider the full range of punishment. When you are considering those things again, think back to the statement. Think about what Jessie did and what he didn't do. To go in and not pay attention to those details, (INAUDIBLE). It's a difficult situation for us all and a hard duty. Please review the tape and consider what did and didn't happen. Consider what Jessie did and

2

MR. FOGLEMAN: Was there a circumstantial evidence 3 instruction? 4 THE COURT: There should have been but I don't No. 5 remember giving it. 6 MR. FOGLEMAN: Ladies and gentlemen---7 THE COURT: Approach the bench. 8 (THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION WAS HELD AT THE BENCH OUT 9 OF THE HEARING OF THE JURY.) 10 THE COURT: I didn't give it, but I don't know 11 whether it would be inappropriate at this time. 12 circumstantial evidence? I probably should have given 13 it but nobody requested it. 14 MR. DAVIS: We would request it if it was not given. 15 Did I give it? Do you remember? THE COURT: 16 MR. DAVIS: No, you did not, your Honor. I know. 17 Well, in this case it sure should have THE COURT: 18 been given. 19 MR. DAVIS: We had it prepared. 20 MR. CROW: They didn't offer it. 21 THE COURT: I didn't read it. Alright, I think it's 22 probably appropriate at this time for me to read it. 23 I would object since it wasn't in the MR. CROW: 24 original, your Honor---25

what he didn't do. I will trust you to come back with

the proper verdict. Thank you.

FORM ON-328 REPORTED TO THE WIND OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER

MR. STIDHAM: We're talking about punishment.

MR. FOGLEMAN: Your Honor, part of their argument is what he did or didn't do. They're now arguing what he did or didn't do.

MR. STIDHAM: We've maintained throughout the course of the trial that he didn't do anything. Now we're in the punishment phase---

THE COURT: Well, they've heard the facts already and now -- but they're going to have to consider the facts again. This should have been read initially. I didn't realize I hadn't done it.

If you're objecting to it though, I won't give it.
MR. STIDHAM: Well, we object, your Honor.

THE COURT: Alright.

## (RETURN TO OPEN COURT.)

MR. DAVIS: It's almost over for you all and in about a month it'll be over for me. The Moores, and the Branches, and the Byers, it's not ever going to be over. What this is talking about is responsibility. You heard the defendant's own expert say, Warren Holmes, that it is common, it's usual for a person who confesses to a crime to lessen their involvement. You are not restricted to what this defendant says that he did. You're entitled to look at the evidence -- all of the evidence -- the number of weapons, all of the circumstances, the type of knots,

and decide that he was more involved than what he said he was.

If we did not have -- if we didn't have a confession, let's say, we didn't have a confession, instead all you had -- all you had was a fingerprint of this defendant on Michael Moore's arm. Would you say, "Well, oh my gosh, we don't know exactly what he did."?

No. I would submit to you that you would be entitled from all of the evidence in the case, every bit of the evidence, to look at the evidence and draw your -- a reasonable conclusion from that evidence as to what this defendant did.

Now, we know -- we know from this defendant's own mouth in the interview before he admitted being there that he had a phone call the day before from Jason Baldwin saying that they were going -- their intention was to go and beat up some boys. He went there knowing that was the intention. They went there and they did it.

He's not retarded. He is not retarded. You've got the picture of the real defendant. That's not something that we're showing in trying to make you made at him or angry at him or prejudice you against him. It's to show you that what you see is not necessarily what you get when you look at this defendant. It's not necessarily what

you get. What you see is not -- you can't always take everything at face value and the expert testified that this defendant -- how did he function? Not as for as book learning, but how did he function? Do you remember the testimony? He says that he functions on an average level -- his performance I. Q. -- how he functions.

Apart from verbal things and book learning things, he functions on an average level.

When you go back there and you consider the punishment, there are a number of things to consider. The punishment that was served to deter this defendant from doing something like this again. And even more importantly, what effect will your verdict have on other people who might engage in similar type behavior? Is it going to be a message that "Well, it's a bad thing, but it's not so bad?" I don't believe you all could find that way.

In this case Michael Moore, he won't ever go to Scouts again. Stevie Branch and Chris Byers and Michael, they won't play ball. They won't play basketball. They won't play baseball. They won't grow up. Their lives are gone. But your verdict — it can't — it can't bring them back. Nothing you do can bring them back and really, honestly, when you look at it, nothing you do is going to make the families feel all that much better. It

might make them feel good for a minute if you gave him the maximum, but it's not to -- in the long time, it's not going to make that much difference. But what can your verdict do? It can stop this kind of junk. It can stop these kids doing these stupid, crazy things and it can put an end to it. And that's what we're asking you to do.

THE COURT: Alright, ladies and gentlemen, you may now retire to the jury room to consider your verdicts with regard to punishment and I'll read those verdict forms for you. The first reads:

"We, the jury having found Jessie Lloyd Misskelley, Junior guilty of first degree murder in the death of Michael Moore fix his sentence at a term of" -- with a blank that you would complete -- "not less than ten nor more than forty years or life in the Arkansas Department of Correction" with a signature space for the foreman.

You must unanimously agree upon the punishment that you complete in the blank. And whatever your unanimous finding is should be reflected in the blank provided and then the foreman would sign. The next verdict form reads as follows:

"We, the jury having found Jessie Lloyd Misskelley, Junior guilty of second degree murder in the death of Steven Branch fix his sentence at" -- you have three

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

alternatives, A, B, and C -- "A, a term of" -- a blank -"not less than five nor more than twenty years in the
Arkansas Department of Correction" or "B, a fine of" -with an appropriate blank -- "not exceeding Fifteen
Thousand Dollars" or "C, both a term of not less than
five nor more than twenty years in the Arkansas
Department of Correction and a fine not exceeding Fifteen
Thousand Dollars" -- again, with the appropriate blank.

In order to fix any punishment your finding must be unanimous and you would fill in the appropriate blanks that represent your finding and the foreman would sign. The third verdict form reads identically to the last with the exception that this is for Count Three in the death of Christopher Byers on the second degree murder charge.

So you may now retire and consider your verdicts with respect to punishment.

Alright, Court will be in temporary recess.

(JURY EXITING COURTROOM AT 2:00 P. M.)

(JURY ENTERING COURTROOM AT 2:30 P. M. )

THE COURT: Alright, ladies and gentlemen, have you arrived at a verdict or verdicts, Mr. Foreman?

FOREMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Alright, if you would hand it to the Sheriff, please -- or hand them to the Sheriff.

FOREMAN: (COMPLIES.)

THE COURT: (EXAMINING.) Alright, your verdicts are in good form and read as follows:

"We, the jury having found Jessie Lloyd Misskelley, Junior guilty of first degree murder in the death of Michael Moore fix his sentence at a term of life in the Arkansas Department of Correction." Signed by T. J. Williams, foreman.

Is this your unanimous verdict, ladies and gentlemen?

JURY: Yes.

THE COURT: Count Two. "We, the jury having found Jessie Lloyd Misskelley guilty of second degree murder in the death of Steven Branch fix his sentence at a term of twenty years in the Arkansas Department of Correction."

Again, signed by the foreman, T. J. Williams.

Is that your unanimous verdict, ladies and gentlemen?

JURY: Yes.

THE COURT: Alright, verdict form three. "We, the jury having found Jessie Lloyd Misskelley, Junior guilty of second degree murder in the death of Christopher Byers fix his sentence at a term of twenty years in the Arkansas Department of Correction." Signed by T. J. Williams, foreman.

Is that your unanimous verdict, ladies and

## gentlemen? 1 JURY: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Questions, gentlemen? 3 MR. DAVIS: Mo, sir. 4 MR. STIDUAM: No, sir. 5 T'IE COURT: Do you want the jury polled? 6 MR. STIDHAM: Yes, your Honor. 7 Alright, again, ladies and gentlemen, if THE COURT: 8 9 these are your verdicts as your name is called, please 10. answer yes. THE CLERK: Carla Price. 11 12 MS. PRICE: Yes. 13 THE CLERK: Steven Green. 14 MR. GREEN: Yes. 15 THE CLERK: James Rainwater. 16 MR. RAINWATER: Yes. 17 THE CLERK: Teresa Burgess. 18 MS. BURGESS: Yes. 19 THE CLERK: Ronnie Smith. 20 MR. SMITH: Yes. 21 THE CLERK: Lleyd Champion. 22 MR. CHAMPION: Yes. 23 THE CLERK: Margie Woods. 24 MS. WOODS: Yes.

THE CLERK: Donna Ludena Moore.

THE CLERK: April Lunsford. 4 MS. LUNSFORD: Yes. 5 THE CLERK: Aubrey Dicus. 6 7 MR. DICUS: Yes. 8 THE CLERK: T. J. Williams. MR. WILLIAMS: 9 Yes. 10 THE COURT: Any other questions, gentlemen? MR. DAVIS: 11 No, your Honor. 12 MR. STIDHAM: No, your Honor. 13 Alright, ladies and gentlemen, with the thanks of the Court for your consideration of this case 14 15 you will be excused from further attendance and need not 16 report back in the morning at nine-thirty, and for that 17 matter, for the next two years. You'll be exempt from 18 jury duty. 19 I thank you very much for your consideration of a 20 difficult case and one that obviously had ramifications 21 that are not normally found in criminal cases. 22 attention, the pressure I know you went through, and I 23 certainly appreciate your hard work and dedication. 24 thank you very much.

I have been asked to inquire of you by the media

MS. MOORE:

THE CLERK:

MS. LUTER:

1

2

3

25

Yes.

Yes.

Janet Luter.

whether or not you want one of your member to be a spokesman, whether or not you choose not to make any statement whatsoever, and I want to point out to you you're not obligated to say anything to anyone about your deliberations. If you all would like to have a minute or two to discuss that before you depart.

JUROR: We have discussed it.

THE COURT: You have discussed it? Alright, then what is your pleasure in that matter.

JUROR: No comment.

THE COURT: Alright, then I'll certainly honor that and I would expect everyone else to. And you're not obligated to make any statement to anyone.

So with the thanks of the Court, you're free to go and I really appreciate your consideration. If you would like, I can have officers escort you to your cars and you're free to go. I want everybody to remain in the courtroom while the jury departs. Everyone please rise while the jury leaves.

(JURY EXITING COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: Alright, you may be seated.

Alright, Mr. Misskelley, did you hear the jury's finding in the reading of the verdict in your case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any legal reason or cause to

tell the Court why sentence should not be imposed at this time?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: You're going to have to -- I heard you, but you need to answer out a little bit louder.

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Alright. It's my responsibility and duty to tell you that you have a right to appeal your convictions in these cases. You must give notice within the statutory period of time. You have Court appointed counsel that can consult with you and your family in that regard, but you're notified that you do have a right to appeal and you're entitled to a bond on these charges.

Do you gentlemen want an appeal bond fixed at this time or do you -- 'cause it starts your time running -- or do you want to discuss that with Mr. Misskelley and his family?

MR. STIDHAM: We would like to discuss that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Alright. Is there anything you want to say before sentence is imposed? You have a right to make any statement you care to at this time.

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: You also have a right to have your attorneys make any comment in your behalf that you want

them to. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

MR. STIDHAM: Your Honor, the one comment that we would like to make is we respectfully request the Court to run this concurrently as opposed to consecutively.

THE COURT: Alright, well, I understand your statement in that regard and of course, that's a matter that addresses itself to the discretion of the Court and I'll consider that.

Now, is there anything else you want to say to the Court, or do you have any questions you want to ask the Court at this time?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with the service and advice of your attorneys through this trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Alright. Alright, based upon the jury's verdict finding your guilty of first degree murder in the death of Michael Moore, you'll be adjudicated guilty and you'll be sentenced to the Arkansas Department of Corrections for a term of life.

In the count involving the death of Steven Branch, the jury having found you guilty of second degree murder, you'll be adjudicated guilty and be sentenced to an additional term of twenty years in the Arkansas

1 Depar-

Department of Correction.

Then in regard to the death of Christopher Byers the jury having found you guilty of second degree murder, you'll be adjudicated guilty of second degree murder and be sentenced to an additional term of twenty years in the Arkansas Department of Corrections.

It'll be the finding of the Court that all of those sentences will run consecutively. That is you will receive a life sentence plus forty years, and that will be the judgment of the Court.

You'll be remanded to the custody of the Sheriff for immediate transportation to the Department of Corrections.

Mr. Sheriff, you'll be directed to forthwith take him to the Arkansas Department of Corrections and delivered to the proper custodian.

And that will be the judgment of the Court and this Court will be in recess until February the twenty-second.

(ADJOURNMENT.)