25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any complaint or criticism that you want to tell me now about their services, their advice or their treatment of you in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Are you completely satisfied?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Have they discussed with you your right to testify?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Have they discussed with you all the facts and circumstances of the case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Have you been truthful with them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Is it your desire not to testify?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. STIDHAM: Would you like us to make our motion for a directed verdict back here or in open court or---

THE COURT: Do you have anything to add to your original motion for a directed verdict at this point?

MR. STIDHAM: Not really, your Honor. I just want to be real careful---

MR. CROW: -- There was a case recently where a guy

said, "I renew my motions," and the Court said that wasn't enough, and that scared us to death.

THE COURT: I'm familiar with that case and that's what I'm getting ready to say. Do you have any new matter that you want to add to your original motion for a directed verdict?

MR. STIDHAM: Just the same arguments that we made previously.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect that defense counsel has reannunciated and reaffirmed all of their motions, all of their reasons and justifications for a directed verdict, and the Court has considered those motions again at the close of the defendant's case and the motion is denied.

MR. STIDHAM: I hope that's sufficient, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't know why it wouldn't be. There isn't any point in your rehashing them. What I've done is give you an opportunity to state any matter---

MR. STIDHAM: --We would like to very briefly say that we don't feel the State has met its burden of proof on capital murder because of the intent required of Mr. Misskelley. We don't think that has been established.

We would also state that we don't feel the State has met its burden with regard to accomplice liability.

We'd also submit the State hasn't met its burden

with regard to first degree murder.

And again, we'd like you to consider all those arguments that we made at the close of the State's case---

THE COURT: --I think you made those at the close of the State's case as well. I will reconsider them now, and it will be the Court's finding that the State has made a prima facie case as to Jessie Misskelley, Junior's liability as an accomplice clearly.

There is testimony in the record from Mr. Misskelley to the officers that he knew what they were going to do, that they had talked about beating some boys up before they ever went out there the day before. He went out there and met with them, if his story is to be believed, nd during the course of the attack on the first two boys, one of them -- Moore, I believe -- ran. He ran him down, retrieved him and brought him back and that to me is more than enough conduct to implicate him in both capital murder, first degree murder or any lesser degree in that there is a transferred intent that he knew at the time he retrieved the one boy that the other two were being beaten; and that he aided and agreed to aid and assist in that criminal enterprise that turned out to result in the death of the three youngsters. And I think a jury could easily conclude from that that he was guilty of capital,

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

first degree, second degree. I don't know about manslaughter. I hadn't thought about that yet, but we will talk about that later.

MR. DAVIS: Do you anticipate if we get through with our rebuttal evidence by around noon or so that we will go ahead and instruct, argue and do everything this afternoon?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STIDHAM: Your Honor, are you satisfied with -
I don't want to waive any motion for a directed verdict.

If the Court feels I need to go out and---

THE COURT: No. I think you've made your motion, and I also would point out you made a long offer of proof yesterday with regard to Doctor Ofshe, and I had made a ruling that basically limited and restricted his testimony to some degree and as it ended up he was able to voice and view and articulate all of his opinions and beliefs that I had originally instructed him not to, not as a result of anything you did but it turned out that way, so the record should reflect that those opinions were given to the jury.

MR. STIDHAM: Not all of his opinions.

THE COURT: All except the business about cult activity, and you didn't attempt to ask him that. I think I made a statement that some of the cult stuff was

probably admissible.

MR. STIDHAM: Doctor Ofshe was never allowed to tell the jury of his opinion in regard to the involuntary nature of the statement.

THE COURT: The main reason for that is he indicated to the Court he had taken a seventy-five page statement from Jessie Misskelley and that he was basing a great deal of his opinion on that statement.

And the Court felt to allow him to do that would be having him testify for Mr. Misskelley and that while he can rely upon hearsay data and information, it is not normally reliable. It does have to be evidence that is adduced during the trial.

It might have been a different ruling had Misskelley elected to testify and testified to the effect that -"The officers tricked me. They did this, they did that"
-- and then Ofshe testified, it might have been a totally different picture.

But to do what you wanted to do was going to allow an expert to testify for the defendant, and I didn't think that was appropriate.

I think in a narrow case where the real issue is the truthfulness of a confession, that to allow experts to go in and give their opinion that, "I don't believe it is true," invades the province of the jury.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I respectfully disagree, your Honor. MR. STIDHAM: 1 I understand your ruling. Thank you. 2 3 (RETURN TO OPEN COURT.) MR. STIDHAM: Your Honor, may I approach the bench? THE COURT: 5 Yes. (THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION WAS HELD AT THE BENCH OUT 6 OF THE HEARING OF THE JURY.) 7 MR. STIDHAM: Your Honor, I think it kind of confuses the jury when we rested back there and they 9 don't know what happened. 10 11 THE COURT: I'll tell them. 12 MR. STIDHAM: Okay. (RETURN TO OPEN COURT.) 13 THE COURT: 14 Are we ready? 15 Alright, ladies and gentlemen, good morning, and 16

Alright, ladies and gentlemen, good morning, and Court will be in session and for your information and everyone else's information the defense has rested their case. The Court's heard a motion and we're now ready to proceed with rebuttal.

MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, the State would call Gary Gitchell.

MR. STIDHAM: Your Honor, may counsel approach the bench again?

THE COURT: Yes.

(THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION WAS HELD AT THE BENCH OUT

2141