	·	
STATE C	F WISCONSIN,	
	PLAINTIFF,	JURY TRIAL VOIR DIRE - DAY 2
vs.		Case No. 06 CF 88
BRENDAN	I R. DASSEY,	
	DEFENDANT.	
DATE:	APRIL 13, 2007	MANITOWOC COUNTY STATE OF WISCONSIN E I L E D
	HON. JEROME L. FOX	DEC 11 2007
	Circuit Court Judge	CLERK OF C'ROUIT COURT
APPEARA	NCES:	Chein of Chison coom
	KENNETH R. KRATZ Special Prosecutor On behalf of the State	of Wisconsin.
	THOMAS FALLON Special Prosecutor On behalf of the State	of Wisconsin.
	NORMAN A. GAHN	or wroomer
	Special Prosecutor On behalf of the State	of Wisconsin.
	MARK R. FREMGEN	
	Attorney at Law On behalf of the defend	lant.
	RAYMOND L. EDELSTEIN	
	Attorney at Law On behalf of the defend	lant.
	BRENDAN R. DASSEY Defendant	
	Appeared in person.	

* * * * * * *

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Reported by Jennifer K. Hau, RPR
Official Court Reporter

(Reconvened at 8:39 a.m.; Jurors present.)

THE COURT: Looks as though everyone's here. I'll call the, uh -- We'll go on the record. This is the matter of the State of Wisconsin vs. Brendan Dassey. It's a Manitowoc County case, 06 CF 88. Appearances.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Yes. Good morning,
Your Honor. The State appears by Assistant
Attorney General Tom Fallon, District Attorney
Ken Kratz, and Assistant District Attorney Norm
Gahn as special prosecutors for Manitowoc County.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Judge, Attorney Mark Fremgen appears in person with Attorney Ray Edelstein. Brendan Dassey appears, also, in person.

THE COURT: Thank you, gentlemen. Uh, members of the jury panel, yesterday I told you at the close of individual voir dire we would do something called, uh, general voir dire. Again, uh, the purpose of general voir dire is not to invade anyone's privacy, but, rather, to get sufficient information to assure everyone involved in this case that the final jury will be fair and impartial.

I'm going to ask a number of questions.

If your answer to any of these questions is

yes -- yes, I ask that you please raise your hand. I ask that those panel members who are not in the jury box listen to -- carefully to all the questions that I'm asking. If one or more of the jurors in the jury box are excused, one of you will be called from the panel to replace them. If that occurs, I will ask a few general questions covering all the previous questions and ask for your response.

Once I have completed my general voir dire, each side, beginning with the prosecution, will be permitted to ask questions. After they have completed their questions, each side will be permitted to strike a number of names from the panel until we have a final jury.

As I told you yesterday, the final panel will consist of 16 persons. So I'm going to start with the questions.

Is there anyone of you that is related by blood, marriage, or adoption, or acquainted with the defendant, Brendan Dassey, who is seated at the defense table?

Do any of you know any member of the defendant's family or relations?

Do any of you know the defendant's

attorneys, Mark Fremgen or Ray Edelstein, both of whom practice in Oshkosh?

I'm going to ask one of these attorneys -- We're going to have a number of witnesses during the course of this case. Uh, most of the witnesses have no connection with, uh, the Dane County area, but I'll ask one of the defense attorneys to identify any witness or witnesses that they may have who have connections with the Dane County area.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: There's a -- One witness will be Mike Riddle. Works at the, uh, Crime Lab here in Madison. I imagine also lives in Madison.

THE COURT: All right. Is anyone acquainted with Mike Riddle?

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: The other is a Dr. Robert Gordon. He's a forensic psychologist from Janesville.

THE COURT: Anyone acquainted with Dr. Robert Gordon? All right. Thank you.

Are any of you acquainted with the prosecutors; Attorney Ken Kratz, Tom Fallon, or Norm Gahn? Mr. Kratz is the district attorney of Calumet County, Mr. Fallon, to give this a little

context, is with the Department of Justice, and Mr. Gahn is an assistant district attorney in Milwaukee County. Anyone acquainted --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge --

THE COURT: -- with them? There may be a number of witnesses from the Dane County area that testify for the prosecution. I ask one of the prosecutors to identify those witnesses.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Thank you, Judge. Uh, morning. The first four names are, um, special agents for the Wisconsin Department of Justice.

They're not based in Madison, but they come to Madison frequently. They are Tom Fassbender, Kim Skorlinski, Tom Sturdivant, Ron Pevytoe.

Uh, other witnesses with Madison connections and -- are Sherry Culhane from the Wisconsin Crime Lab, a DNA analyst; Uh, Dr. Leslie Eisenberg, a forensic anthropologist, uh, who also works for our State Historical Society; uh, Dr. John Ertl from the Crime Lab; Bill Newhouse from the Crime Lab here; Kenneth Olson from the Crime Lab; Dr. Don Simley, a forensic dentist based here in Madison; Mr. Nick Stahlke, also of the Crime Lab; and I believe Counsel may have already mentioned, uh, Mike

1	Riddle, a fingerprint analyst from the Crime Lab.
2	THE COURT: Thank you. Are any of you
3	acquainted with any of these persons?
4	Have any of you any interest in this
5	case or its outcome?
6	Is there Are there any among you who
7	is a member of any police department, sheriff's
8	department, or other law enforcement agency?
9	Is there any member of your immediate
10	family or relation who's employed in a law
11	enforcement-related capacity?
12	All right. I'm going to start over
13	over here with Ms. Hayman Ware. If I recall
14	correctly, your husband is a police officer?
15	JUROR HAYMAN WARE: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Uh, and I think we touched upon
17	this in individual voir dire yesterday. Does
18	does that, in your own mind, mean that you would
19	favor the the side that, uh, reflected law
20	enforcement values?
21	JUROR HAYMAN WARE: No.
22	THE COURT: That you would be able to
23	to to hear the evidence and decide fairly and
24	impartially based on what you heard in court?

JUROR HAYMAN WARE: Yes.

1	THE COURT: There was another hand that
2	went up. Uh, you are Ms. Garske?
3	JUROR GARSKE: Correct.
4	THE COURT: And who is in law enforcement?
5	JUROR GARSKE: My brother.
6	THE COURT: Uh, is he a local law
7	enforcement agent?
8	JUROR GARSKE: No.
9	THE COURT: Where is he located?
10	JUROR GARSKE: Arkansas.
11	THE COURT: Does the fact that you have a
12	family member or a brother involved in law
13	enforcement affect the way you look at this case?
14	JUROR GARSKE: No.
15	THE COURT: Maybe You believe that you
16	can decide this case fairly and impartially based on
17	the evidence that is brought to court?
18	JUROR GARSKE: Yes.
19	THE COURT: All right. Was there Oop,
20	we have more hands up here. I'll I'll go and
21	Mr. Drewsen?
22	JUROR DREWSEN: Yeah. I have an uncle
23	who's a, uh, Chief of Police in Woodruff,
24	Wisconsin.
25	THE COURT: Your uncle is the Chief of

1	Police in of Woodruff; is that correct?
2	JUROR DREWSEN: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Does that fact affect the
4	way you look at the this case?
5	JUROR DREWSEN: No.
6	THE COURT: Uh, can you consider the
7	evidence and decide fairly and impartially based on
8	that evidence?
9	JUROR DREWSEN: Yes.
10	THE COURT: All right. I think there was
11	an additional hand? Uh, Ms. Foss?
12	JUROR FOSS: My cousin is a police
13	officer in Lake City, Minnesota.
14	THE COURT: The fact that you have a a
15	family member or relative involved in police work,
16	does that affect the way you look at a case like
17	this?
18	JUROR FOSS: No.
19	THE COURT: Can you consider Can you
20	base any decision you make on the evidence and only
21	on the evidence that you see in court?
22	JUROR FOSS: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Anyone else? Ah. Uh, Ms.
24	Blankenship?
25	JUROR BLANKENSHIP: My father was a

1	police officer.
2	THE COURT: And where was he a police
3	officer?
4	JUROR BLANKENSHIP: In Dane County.
5	THE COURT: Does that affect the way you
6	look at this case?
7	JUROR BLANKENSHIP: No.
8	THE COURT: Can you base any decision you
9	make on the evidence that is brought to court?
10	JUROR BLANKENSHIP: Yes.
11	THE COURT: And render a fair and impartial
12	judgment?
13	JUROR BLANKENSHIP: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Anyone else? I'm going to
15	address the court reporter. Are you hearing the
16	answers?
17	COURT REPORTER: Yeah.
18	THE COURT: Okay. There's a mike,
19	apparently, that can be used to be passed
20	COURT REPORTER: I've been able to so
21	far, so
22	THE COURT: I'm sorry?
23	COURT REPORTER: I can So far I've
24	been able to hear them okay.

THE COURT: Okay. There's a mike that can be used to be passed around to jury members, and if someone's having difficulty hearing --

ATTORNEY FALLON: Right. I was going to suggest maybe that should be made available, because I'm certainly going to invite the jurors to talk during the voir dire, and I'm pretty sure counsel is likewise, so if the jurors want to hear each other's responses, maybe it would be good to --

THE COURT: Okay. Who's in charge of that? While we're getting the mike, I'll ask the, uh -- I'll ask the next question.

Is there any among you who believes that a person is likely to be guilty simply because that person has been charged with a crime?

Under our laws, the State has the burden of proving guilt in a criminal proceeding. No defendant is required to prove his or her innocence. A defendant may testify in a criminal trial, but our al -- our laws also provide that a defendant need not testify. Is there anyone among you who cannot or will not accept these requirements of our legal system?

Is there anyone among you who would

impute guilt to this defendant simply because he did not take the witness stand and testify?

Would the types of crimes in these charges prevent any of you from serving on this jury fairly and impartially?

Is there any among you who cannot or will not try this case fairly and impartially on the evidence that is given here in court, and under the instructions of the Court, and render a just and true verdict?

Is there anyone among you who, for any reason that I have not yet touched on, cannot serve on this jury?

All right. Mr. Fallon? Oh, one moment here. Uh, Ms. Shea?

JUROR SHEA: Yes. Can I just say for being on the jury, I just want to reiterate that I'm a student, and I'm kind of getting really nervous about having to take, like, five exams when I come back and missing my finals. I know it's not a legal system but it's --

THE COURT: You're a full-time student at the University?

JUROR SHEA: Yeah. I just feel like maybe my concentration won't be all there because

1	I'll be thinking about everything.
2	THE COURT: I Have you made arrangements
3	with your
4	JUROR SHEA: Yeah
5	THE COURT: teachers?
6	JUROR SHEA: Yeah. I talked to all my
7	professors.
8	THE COURT: Counsel?
9	ATTORNEY FALLON: I All I can say is
10	we'll definitely keep that in consideration.
11	THE COURT: All right.
12	JUROR SHEA: Okay. Thank you.
13	ATTORNEY FALLON: On behalf of the
14	prosecution team, welcome. Um, I know that, uh,
15	I'll be asking some general questions here, and
16	my, uh, colleague, um, from Oshkosh, uh,
17	Mr. Fremgen, will also be asking some questions,
18	and we did want to make one point with you as we
19	begin, and that's simply this:
20	There are two points in the trial in
21	which you, as jurors, if you're selected as
22	jurors, have a chance to talk with each other and
23	interface, and, obviously, one is deliberations,
24	but the other one is right now. And the only

other time, in fact, the only time, you actually

get to engage in a dialogue with the attorneys, is now. And so this is your opportunity, and we invite you to participate in the discussion here to help us in -- in selecting 16 of you, and, ultimately, 12, to be the jurors in this case.

So we -- we do appreciate your, uh, willingness to be here and we do appreciate any participation in -- in this regard.

Um, in terms of, uh, how we're going to begin, there's about just four or five topic areas that I want to, uh, discuss with you, and, hopefully, elicit some comments from you. Um, there'll be more discussion, I think, as we get into the issues, and I have some preliminary questions that I'm going to begin with, uh, and that's how I'd like to start.

Um, so the first kind of general area are some safety issue discussions, and my first question of anyone on the panel:

Has anyone ever been in charge of writing any kind of safety guidelines or enforcing any safety standards in any employment situation that you may have or any others?

Okay. Great. Um, let's do this: We'll start, and we'll go back. Uh, none in the first

row. And in the second row, we'll start with the 1 2 hands in the second row. Oh, are -- Okay. Ms. Hayman Ware? 3 JUROR HAYMAN WARE: Yes. Um, I work for Child Welfare, so I often have to come up with 5 safety plans for the children I'm working with 6 and put those in place. 7 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. And, um, have you been called upon to actually enforce any 9 10 safety standards in some regards? JUROR HAYMAN WARE: Yes. 11 12 ATTORNEY FALLON: Uh, tell us about 13 that. 14 If the safety plans JUROR HAYMAN WARE: 15 aren't followed by the family, there are times when I've had to remove children from their 16 17 parents' homes because, um, a safety plan wasn't 18 being followed or children weren't safe even with 19 the safety plan in place. 20 ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. So, in 21 other words, if the plans aren't followed, then 22 there are consequences for not following those 23 plans? 24 JUROR HAYMAN WARE: Yes.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Um, I think

there was -- Right here? That would be, um --1 JUROR ANDERSON: Anderson, Heidi. 2 ATTORNEY FALLON: -- Ms. Anderson? JUROR ANDERSON: Um, I work for a day I watch 12 four- and five-year-olds, and 5 I'm responsible for their safety, and if I feel 6 that the parents or a teacher is negligent, I then have to go through the measures to make sure that the child will stay safe. 9 10 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. And what kind 11 of measures, um --12 JUROR ANDERSON: Um, a lot of times it's 13 talking with the parents. Sometimes we have to 14 call authorities, you know, whether it's social 15 workers or the police, to make sure that the child's safety is seen to. A lot of times it's 16 17 smaller things like making sure the child, 18 itself, doesn't hurt themselves. 19 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. So in terms of 20 your specific role, do you actually en -- enforce 21 any consequences, or do you call upon others to 22 en -- enforce consequences for not following 23 these safety behaviors?

24

25

allowed to enforce. I have to go through either

JUROR ANDERSON: Legally, I'm not

1	my director or call an outside individual.
2	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Great. Um,
3	anyone else in row two? All right. Let's jump
4	to row three. Um, yes, sir. Mr. Williams?
5	JUROR HEINZEL: Heinzel.
6	ATTORNEY FALLON: Oh, Heinzel. Excuse
7	me.
8	JUROR HEINZEL: Yes. I worked in, uh,
9	plant operations for about 18 years. Not the
10	past two years, but prior to that 18 years in
11	plant operations in a plant. We had to enforce
12	safety, uh, rules for the plant. If an employee
13	violated a lock-out, tag-out, or wasn't following
14	the plant rules, I had to enforce that.
15	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. And, uh,
16	occasionally what were some of the consequences?
17	JUROR HEINZEL: Um, we would have a
18	discipline program, and maybe a written writeup,
19	a verbal warning, could lead to suspension, those
20	types of things.
21	ATTORNEY FALLON: Very good. Um, anyone
22	else in row three? All right. How about the
23	back row? Um, on the far end there?
24	Mr. Johnson?

JUROR JOHNSON: Yep. Um, the -- the

2.0

2.5

company that I work for, we're in a warehouse setting, and I'm a manager there, and we have a strict set of guidelines as far as our safety policies and procedures, and, uh, if a associate fails to follow those, um, it's gone anywhere from a written warning to termination.

ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. And, um, are you one who writes the guidelines, or do you enforce, them or both?

JUROR JOHNSON: Enforce them.

ATTORNEY FALLON: You do. All right.

JUROR JOHNSON: Yeah. We -- we have to do a followup and write kind of new guidelines for our store if an accident does happen.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Have you been called upon to enforce those regularly, or is it just something that's an occasional issue?

JUROR JOHNSON: Um, it -- it's pretty occasional. I guess I -- I would say we have really good associates.

ATTORNEY JOHNSON: Anyone else in the back row? Yes. On the far end? Ms. McDonald?

JUROR McDONALD: Um, I run a volunteer bird vending, uh, station up at the University of

Wisconsin campus natural areas, and I am required

1	by the animal welfare, uh, folks on campus to
2	abide by the certain safety guideline.
3	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. And, um,
4	do you write the guideline, or do you enforce, or
5	little of both?
6	JUROR McDONALD: Uh, I am supposed to
7	make sure that the volunteers follow, uh, animal,
8	uh, handling practices, and also safety
9	practices, and we do have certain, uh, rules for
10	health safety reasons.
11	ATTORNEY FALLON: Are there, uh,
12	consequences? Uh, what kind of What are the
13	range of consequences if some of the folks don't
14	follow the rules or the guidelines that are set
15	forth?
16	JUROR McDONALD: Uh, they can make me
17	angry. Uh, I can ask them to not volunteer with
18	our projects.
19	ATTORNEY FALLON: That's a polite way of
20	showing them the door?
21	JUROR McDONALD: Yes. Outside, yes.
22	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Anyone
23	else in the back row? Uh, yes, sir.
24	JUROR: Um, I'm not sure if this is in

the same guideline, but I literally do show --

1	I I literally do show people I work at a
2	bar, um, as a doorman
3	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right.
4	JUROR: is one of my jobs
5	ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure.
6	JUROR: and so I do you know,
7	literally do show people the door occasionally.
8	I don't write there's no hard, fast
9	guidelines, but it's just, you know I
10	there's no, like, set guidelines for it, but
11	occasionally I do have to evict people from the
12	tavern where I work.
13	ATTORNEY FALLON: But there is a a
14	code of appropriate conduct for a tavern?
15	JUROR: There's an unwritten code.
16	ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. Right.
17	JUROR: So Yeah.
18	ATTORNEY FALLON: I'm just curious,
19	what what what tavern do you work? I want
20	to make sure where I go.
21	JUROR: Yeah. The Crystal Corner Bar
22	here in Madison.
23	ATTORNEY FALLON: Crystal Corner Bar.
24	Okay. Very good. Um, anyone else? Okay.
25	Great. Um, next question:

1	How many on the panel, um, own a firearm
2	of some sort? Whether it's a a hunting rifle,
3	or a a handgun, or anything like that? Uh,
4	Mr. Johnson.
5	JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.
6	ATTORNEY FALLON: Uh, what what do
7	you own?
8	JUROR JOHNSON: Uh, I own two 12 gauge
9	shotguns, and then a 12 gauge deer hunting rifle.
10	ATTORNEY FALLON: Are are those all
11	for hunting purposes?
12	JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.
13	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Um, yes, sir?
14	JUROR: I also own, um, two shotguns and
15	a 30.06 rifle. All
16	ATTORNEY FALLON: That's Mr
17	JUROR: for hunting.
18	ATTORNEY FALLON: That's Mr. Drewsen.
19	Okay. Uh, were were you able to hear that
20	answer, Mr. Covington?
21	JUROR COVINGTON: No, I didn't.
22	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Um
23	JUROR DREWSEN: Sure. Uh, I own two
24	shotguns and a 30.06, all for hunting purposes.
25	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Um, anyone

Anyone else own any firearms of any kind? else? 1 Great. 2 Okay. Um, the next is, uh, let's deal with a 3 little bit about, uh, science and fiction. 4 5 don't quite go together the way you might 6 imagine. Um, how many watch television shows like, um, Bones, CSI: Las Vegas, CSI: New York, 8 CSI: Miami? It's going to be CSI: Madison 9 10 pretty soon. I'm not sure. Um, how many watch 11 shows like that? 12 Okay. Very good. We've got lots of 13 hands. All right. 14 Um, how many would say, in your opinion, 15 based on your general knowledge, and the world, 16 and your own life experiences, that those shows 17 have realistic portrayals of what the science of 18 forensic law enforcement can do? How many say they're very realistic? You don't believe in 19 20 flashbacks? Solving crimes? 21 All right. How about, um, somewhat 22 realistic? We got one hand in the back, two, 23 couple? 24 How many think not realistic at all?

25

Okay. Let's -- let's start there in the

1	first row. Uh, Ms. Austin, you'd say not
2	realistic at all. So you're a doubter?
3	JUROR AUSTIN: It just seems like I'm
4	sorry. Um, I just don't think they're realistic
5	in how, um I mean, by chance they come across
6	evidence, or by chance they come across, you
7	know, something that it just is so far out there.
8	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay.
9	JUROR AUSTIN: Just doesn't seem real.
10	ATTORNEY FALLON: Any particular example
11	jump in your head at all?
12	JUROR AUSTIN: Well, I think one thing
13	that kind of comes to my mind is, um, about I
14	don't know how many years ago when ER first came
15	out, my sister is a nurse, and one of her first
16	comments was, you know, shows like that are so
17	unrealistic. So that always sticks in my head
18	when I see these types of TV shows.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Um, anyone else in the
20	first row think that they're
21	JUROR: Do you mean unrealistic if you
22	don't watch them or unrealistic if you do watch
23	it?
24	ATTORNEY FALLON: No. I mean, if you

watch them --

1	JUROR: I don't watch them.
2	ATTORNEY FALLON: do you believe
3	what if you what you see is a realistic
4	portrayal of how crime is solved?
5	JUROR: Okay.
6	ATTORNEY FALLON: That
7	JUROR: I don't watch it.
8	ATTORNEY FALLON: That's the point.
9	Okay. You don't watch them. Um All right.
10	How about in the second row? How many think it's
11	just not very realistic at all? Uh, we'll start
12	at the end. Go ahead, Ms. Hayman Ware.
13	JUROR HAYMAN WARE: It doesn't seem like
14	a crime can be solved in that short amount of
15	time, and then they always find someone to
16	confess, and, um, their DNA evidence comes back
17	really quickly. And, um, back to my husband,
18	who's a cop, he sits there and tells me every
19	part of it is unrealistic so
20	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Well, so
21	you get first-hand coaching. Um, and, uh, Ms.
22	Edge?
23	JUROR EDGE: Yeah. First of all, it's a
24	TV show, so I have to assume that it's

entertainment. Second of all, I have nothing to

1	base it on, so I have no reason to believe any of
2	it is accurate, and it just seems in some cases
3	to be very far-fetched.
4	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. If you
5	have no basis to, uh to to believe it,
6	are are you one who's, um, maybe from Missouri
7	and you want to be shown some something first
8	or
9	JUROR EDGE: Excuse me.
10	ATTORNEY FALLON: Well, you're a
11	you're a doubter?
12	JUROR EDGE: That was almost offensive.
13	ATTORNEY FALLON: Oh
14	JUROR EDGE: No, I'm not from Missouri,
15	and, uh, it's entertainment. I
16	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay.
17	JUROR EDGE: just don't put more
18	any more thought to it other than what it is.
19	ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. Um, any
20	anyone else in the second row? Mr. Drewsen?
21	Yeah. I think I take it for entertainment value
22	too. I think you see a lot of situations where
23	they're the ones doing it first with their guns
24	drawn. It doesn't really seem realistic.

COURT REPORTER: Maybe slow it down a

1	little. I'm I'm not understanding
2	JUROR DREWSEN: Okay.
3	COURT REPORTER: what you're saying.
4	JUROR DREWSEN: Um, I kind of mumble.
5	Um, I said I take it for entertainment value. I
6	think a lot of times you see situations in these
7	TV shows that you can say that wouldn't happen in
8	real life.
9	For example, when the CSI are the first
10	on the scene with their guns drawn, to me that
11	doesn't seem realistic.
12	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Um, row
13	three? Yes. Um, Ms. Garske?
14	JUROR GARSKE: Yes.
15	ATTORNEY FALLON: Um, not ver not
16	very realistic? Why?
17	JUROR GARSKE: I just don't see it being
18	solved that quickly.
19	ATTORNEY FALLON: So time is clearly
20	a an issue?
21	JUROR GARSKE: Yes.
22	ATTORNEY FALLON: What about the manner,
23	uh what about the science? Uh, do you think
24	the science is actually capable of doing some of
25	the things that are depicted in the show?

1	JUROR GARSKE: I really I don't study
2	science so I don't
3	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay.
4	JUROR GARSKE: pay attention to that
5	part of it.
6	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Um, anyone
7	else in row three, uh, have a perspective? Yes,
8	sir. Mr. Williams?
9	JUROR WILLIAMS: I think it's just the
10	speed of how they solve the crime. That's
11	clearly unrealistic. Um, the best Miami has a
12	lot of murders every year. Apparently, this one
13	CSI group can solve them all with in 35
14	minutes.
15	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Um, how about,
16	uh, in the, uh the last row? Anyone have a
17	any particular reason why it's not very
18	realistic?
19	All right. Having heard that, we did
20	have some that thought it was somewhat realistic.
21	So for those who did who did think it was
22	somewhat realistic, how about a reason why?
23	Who How many thinks it might be somewhat
24	realistic? In the back. Sure. Ms. McDonald?

JUROR McDONALD: I have a little

1	experience in genetics and, uh, other than
2	finding it unrealistic that they have all the
3	state of the art equipment, uh, for doing the
4	forensics, it seems that some of the techniques
5	that they're using are real.
6	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Fair
7	enough. Um, did I see someone shaking their head
8	there? Mr
9	JUROR HUGHES: I agree with that.
10	ATTORNEY FALLON: Mr. Hughes?
11	JUROR HUGHES: Yeah.
12	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Anyone
13	else have a comment? Right here in, uh, row
14	Ms. McGuire.
15	JUROR McGUIRE: I'm a nurse by
16	background so the science makes sense to me.
17	ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure.
18	COURT REPORTER: Mr. Fallon, could you
19	identify her again, please?
20	ATTORNEY FALLON: Yeah, that's, uh, Ms.
21	McGuire.
22	JUROR McGUIRE: I'm a nurse by
23	background so I agree that the the science
24	makes sense. The the ability to have all the
2 1	makes sellec. The the astricy to have all the

high state-of-the-art equipment is not as

reasonable, but some of the science is actually 1 2 there, present to the --ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. Uh, and that leads me to my next question. Um, in -- in your background, um, with science, have you had some 5 experience, for instance, with DNA technology? 6 JUROR McGUIRE: Not personally, no, 7 but --8 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. 9 JUROR McGUIRE: -- you know, obviously 10 you get science and DNA background in your 11 12 schooling. 13 ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. Um, and -- and 14 so you -- you studied a little bit of it when you 15 were in -- getting your nursing degree? JUROR McGUIRE: Yeah. Back 20 years ago 16 DNA isn't what it is now, but what it was. 17 18 ATTORNEY FALLON: You don't have to say 19 20 years ago. Um, I'm going to jump right up to 20 Ms. McDonald again. Uh, you said you had some 21 experience in genetics? Could you tell me a 22 little bit about that? 23 JUROR McDONALD: Uh, I -- I've studied, 2.4 uh, evolutionary systematics in which we used,

25

uh, some DNA technology to look at relationships

on species, and I work in the genetics 1 2 department, so I, um, as a -- administrator, but I interact with some (inaudible). COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. You interact with --5 ATTORNEY FALLON: Some geneticists 6 there. Um, the genetics that you work with, is 7 it all in the animal kingdom, or do you work with 8 9 human genetics as well? JUROR McDONALD: Only in the sense that, 10 11 uh -- Well, I've never worked with human 12 genetics. 13 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. JUROR McDONALD: We are interested in 14 1.5 how organisms are related to humans, and so there -- there is information out there that 16 17 we've used but... 1.8 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Very good. 19 Anyone else have any particular experience in, 20 um, uh, either DNA technology or anything a --21 along those lines? Genetics? Um, Ms., uh Shea? 22 Pass that down to her. 23 JUROR SHEA: I've had several classes 24 that involve DNA, and DNA sequencing, and things

25

like that.

1	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. And, um, is
2	there a particular field that you're studying at
3	school right now? I mean, are you in science per
4	se or
5	JUROR SHEA: I'm going into nursing.
6	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Uh, how many
7	courses in, um, the DNA technology
8	JUROR SHEA: Well, it's not totally in
9	DNA, but within classes like zoology, which is
10	animal bacteria, or animal biology and
11	bacteriology. We've had units all about just
12	just DNA.
13	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Um, well, how
14	many courses have you had in which there's been a
15	fair amount of discussion, uh, training on DNA
16	issues?
17	JUROR SHEA: At least two or three.
18	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Fair enough.
19	Are you junior? Senior?
20	JUROR SHEA: I'm a sophomore.
21	ATTORNEY FALLON: Sophomore. All right.
22	Um, anyone else with any particular training in
23	science? We have here in the front row could
24	you pass the mike? Oh, wait, we got one in the

back row, so might as well start up there. Uh,

1	Mr. Oakes?
2	JUROR OAKES: Um, well, my undergraduate
3	degree is in molecular biology from the UW here.
4	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right.
5	JUROR OAKES: So
6	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right.
7	JUROR OAKES: That was also, like, 20
8	years ago.
9	ATTORNEY FALLON: Um, did you, um,
10	practice in the field at all
11	JUROR OAKES: Um
12	ATTORNEY FALLON: were you
13	employed
14	JUROR OAKES: bre
15	ATTORNEY FALLON: in that area?
16	JUROR OAKES: briefly. I worked for
17	Becton Dickinson Microbiology Systems here town.
18	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. What what
19	kind of work I'm not familiar with that
20	outfit?
21	JUROR OAKES: They they make auger
22	for plating out bacteria and other, um um,
23	stuff for testing for like, uh, venereal
24	diseases, um, infections, that sort of stuff.
25	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay.

1	JUROR OAKES: Um, so that was about all
2	I know also.
3	ATTORNEY FALLON: Very good. Um, I
4	think we had, Ms. um, Lowery here in the front
5	row. We'll get you a mike.
6	JUROR LOWERY: I have very minimal
7	experience, um, in school, and I worked for
8	Becton Dickinson for, like, a week maybe.
9	ATTORNEY FALLON: So
10	JUROR LOWERY: So very minimal, but a
11	little bit.
12	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. So you
13	just had a a smattering of it?
14	JUROR LOWERY: Um-hmm.
15	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Very good. Uh,
16	and in row three? Uh, is that Ms. Harris?
17	JUROR HARRIS: I'm also a nurse, so
18	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay.
19	JUROR HARRIS: I've had limited
20	experience
21	ATTORNEY FALLON: So you
22	JUROR HARRIS: yeah. Yeah. And now
23	I work for well, with children with, um,
24	profound (inaudible).
25	ATTORNEY FALLON: Ah.

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I didn't 1 2 understand. 3 ATTORNEY FALLON: You'll have to repeat. She couldn't hear your last response. 4 JUROR HARRIS: I am -- I now work with 5 6 children that are profoundly retarded. That's in 7 the Wisconsin Center. ATTORNEY FALLON: Um, so your 8 9 familiarity with DNA comes more from your formal 10 training as opposed to on-the-job stuff you're doing now? 11 12 JUROR HARRIS: Correct. 13 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Great. Okay. 14 Did we get everyone there? All right. I'm going 15 to change gears. And -- and one question here we 16 have, um, in anyone's work, whether it's, um, 17 nursing, or what have you, do you have occasion to use industrial solvents or cleaning product --1.8 19 um, products, such as paint thinner or bleach, on 20 a regular basis to clean things? Does anyone 21 have a fair amount of experience in that? Yes, 22 sir. Um, we'll start in the back row.

Mr. Hughes?

23

24

25

JUROR HUGHES: I'm a mechanic at the post office. We have to clean up, uh, equipment

before we relubricate it, so we're always using 1 2 solvents and --ATTORNEY FALLON: And do you -- Um, what are some of the solvents that you use? 4 JUROR HUGHES: Mostly it's a 5 degreaser-type of thing, and then we take off 6 7 the -- the grease from the machinery and that 8 type of thing. 9 ATTORNEY FALLON: These degreasers, do they -- they don't -- do they include bleach and 10 11 paint thinner, or they use a particular -- some 12 other type of product to degrease or pick up that, uh --13 14 JUROR HUGHES: We -- we do use bleach at 15 times, uh, for spills and things, and we're on 16 the spill team as well, and so to clean up blood and -- and that type of thing, you have to use a 17 18 ten percent bleach product, and, um, we don't use 19 too much on the machinery, no, uh --20 ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. 21 JUROR HUGHES: -- the bleach, but... 22 ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Great. 23 Um, let's start and come -- come back this way. 24 Row three. Yes, sir? Mr. Williams? Or, uh,

excuse me, Mr. Heinzel?

1	JUROR HEINZEL: Right. Um, I worked in
2	a number of food plants, and for food safety we
3	would use sanitizers. Um, we also have
4	blood-borne pathogen training, so if somebody was
5	cut or hurt, we'd have to use bleach to to
6	clean up that area as well.
7	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Um, yes?
8	Uh, Ms. Harris?
9	JUROR HARRIS: We use, uh it's Quan
10	(phonetic). You know. I don't know. It's a
11	combination of bleach with for all the
12	bacteria purposes, so but I'm not sure what it
13	consists of. You know, it's all set up for us
14	because of the problems with germs.
15	ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. Sure. Um
16	All right. Row two? Yes. Ms. Anderson.
17	JUROR ANDERSON: As I said, I work in a
18	day care, and one of the safe ways to clean
19	everything is bleach water, so with every room
20	has it locked up in a case, and that's what we
21	use at the end of the days to clean everything,
22	to sanitize
23	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay.
24	JUROR ANDERSON: before the next day.
25	ATTORNEY FALLON: Very good. And, uh,

1	right on the end? Mr. Covington?
2	JUROR COVINGTON: I work at, uh, Oscar
3	Mayer's Food Corporation and Kraft, and we use
4	a a lots of type of bleach. One of them, we
5	use, uh, B-K. It's a bleach, but it's stronger
6	than bleach (unintelligible). And it involves,
7	uh, cleaning of steel. We use, uh, AC 300
8	(unintelligible). And it's very strong
9	COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, AC
10	JUROR COVINGTON: And then we use a
11	sanitizer
12	COURT REPORTER: Wait. Sir? Sir?
13	ATTORNEY FALLON: Oop, oop, oop. She's
14	having a little hard time. Now, just slow down
15	for her. She's can't keep up with you.
16	COURT REPORTER: I just don't
17	understand. I don't understand what he's saying.
18	JUROR COVINGTON: When we sanitizing
19	something, we use, uh, Swisher (phonetic), and we
20	just spray it on there and that kill all the
21	bacteria.
22	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Okay.
23	JUROR COVINGTON: And we use Enforce.
24	We can't mix B-K
25	COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry

1	JUROR COVINGTON: with Enforce
2	COURT REPORTER: I don't
3	JUROR COVINGTON: that's for sure.
4	THE COURT: We're we're not we're not
5	hearing it here. Just a moment, please. Uh, he had
6	said AC 300 at one point and that was one of the
7	things I think you missed, but the the last thing
8	you didn't hear.
9	COURT REPORTER: No.
10	THE COURT: So could we go over that,
11	please, so we can get a record?
12	JUROR COVINGTON: Uh, sure. We use AC
13	300. That's a acid. And it cleans steel.
14	ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure.
15	JUROR COVINGTON: You want to clean some
16	steel from corrosive. If something was on it,
17	just cut it out.
18	ATTORNEY FALLON: Right.
19	JUROR COVINGTON: And
20	ATTORNEY FALLON: What was the other
21	product you used?
22	JUROR COVINGTON: We use, uh, Swisher to
23	sanitize and kill all the bacteria.
24	COURT REPORTER: What was
25	ATTORNEY FALLON: And that product was?

JUROR COVINGTON: Uh, it's Swisher. Uh, it kills the bacteria.

ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Right here. Okay. Ms. McGuire.

JUROR McGUIRE: When I was doing hands-on nursing, uh, again, for blood spills and blood-borne pathogens, we used a bleach solution that usually includes some other solvent, fifteen, twenty years ago, that now is most of the time, but mainly bleach.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Yes, ma'am?

JUROR: Same thing as Ms. McGuire for,

um, blood spills for patients, or any type of

thing that we think we might need bleach for -
for a patient, but they kind of are moving away

to other things like Hepacide-Quat and things

like that right now.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. That was Ms.

Lowery. Very good. Let -- There's just two,

uh -- couple of areas left that I wanted to talk

about, and, um, I'm going to begin with this, uh,

general statement, which I'm sure that almost

everyone here has heard at one point in their

life, and probably many times, and let me ask it

this way:

Generally speaking, is there anyone who
disagrees with this statement, "where there is
smoke, there is fire"? How many have actually
heard that phrase? How many have used that
phrase? Okay.

Um, as a general rule, how many think

Um, as a general rule, how many think that's true? That where there's smoke, there's probably a fire? And we've used it metaphorically, but how many would agree with that?

Um, let's do that in reverse then. How many don't think it's a truism? All right.

Good. Let's -- let's -- let's start with the naysayers. Uh, we'll, uh, begin with

Mr. Williams.

JUROR WILLIAMS: It's a cliché, and I -- most clichés, life is more complicated than that. There aren't absolutes so...

ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay.

JUROR WILLIAMS: I mean, it's obviously -- We've all used "where there's smoke there's fire" but, I mean, has that determined, you know, to look at something differently because of the cliché? I mean, I just think life is more complicated than, "where there's smoke,

1	there's fire." I've used it, obviously, but
2	ATTORNEY FALLON: Do you think there's
3	some truth in a phrase or is it
4	JUROR WILLIAMS: Well, like all clichés,
5	there's some truth. There wouldn't be clichés if
6	they weren't somewhat truthful.
7	ATTORNEY FALLON: Right. All right.
8	Um, right here. Um, Ms. um, Anderson?
9	JUROR ANDERSON: Um, I don't believe it
10	because there's too many variables in this day
11	and age. I mean, yes, when there's a fire,
12	there's smoke, but there's so many other things
13	that could cause you to believe there's a fire,
14	and then you get there and there isn't one.
15	ATTORNEY FALLON: Right.
16	JUROR ANDERSON: So I'm just have a
17	feeling that you need more than one thing to
18	point you to say that, oh, yeah, there's a fire.
19	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. So that
20	you think the cliché has, um, spent its time?
21	JUROR ANDERSON: I agree that when you
22	see smoke, there's a fire, because a fire causes
23	smoke, but I'm not going to say every time I see
24	smoke, I'm going to yell, fire, fire.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Fair enough. Um, yes.

Back row, Ms. Miletic?

JUROR MILETIC: I would treat it as a hypothesis. So, basically, it's a hypothesis. There is a -- there is a smoke, there must be a fire, so now you have to go prove and (unintelligible).

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, could you repeat that last part?

JUROR MILETIC: I said I would treat it as a hypothesis, so, then, um, let's go and prove or disprove it.

ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Um, at the end? Mr., uh, Johnson?

JUROR JOHNSON: Um, as -- as part of the management team for my company, uh, we get a lot of he said-she saids, uh, from employees that may have a gripe against each other, and I'm -- I'm one of the people that has to go kind of investigate that to see what the truth is, and I would say 99 percent of the time, 95 percent of the time, it's just trying to get somebody else in trouble in the -- in the job. You know.

ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. So for you -- your experience, it's an overused cliché?

JUROR JOHNSON: Absolutely.

1	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Fair
2	enough. Uh, yes?
3	JUROR: I'm going to come at this from a
4	more literal standpoint. As a Boy Scout, tried
5	to light a lot of fires. On more than one
6	occasion there was smoke and no fire.
7	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. I use that
8	as introduction to this to this concept,
9	because this, as you may have, um, surmised, is
10	likely to be somewhat of an issue in the case, so
11	let's talk a little bit about this. I'm sure
12	Counsel will agree.
13	Um, has anyone read, seen or heard
14	anything in the media about people who claim they
15	falsely confessed to a crime? How many have
16	heard something or about that? Very good.
17	Hands up. All right. Um, let's see. Let's
18	start We'll go in the back row and we'll work
19	our way forward again. Uh, let's start with Ms.
20	McDonald. I believe she had her hand up first.
21	JUROR McDONALD: What do you want me to
22	say? I mean
23	ATTORNEY FALLON: What
24	JUROR McDONALD: do you

ATTORNEY FALLON: What --

1	JUROR McDONALD: want me to respond
2	to?
3	ATTORNEY FALLON: What have you read,
4	seen or heard about that?
5	JUROR McDONALD: I've been reading
6	stories about, uh, torture, uh, in which, uh,
7	people are, uh the only way they can get away
8	from torture is just to confess, and then when
9	they're released, they, um they tell their
10	true story.
11	ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. Um, have you
12	heard about it in any other context other than in
13	a a torture scenario?
14	JUROR McDONALD: Um, in some I think
15	in in in a couple of cases where there were
16	long-term police questioning of particular
17	suspects, they just gave up. The suspect gave up
18	and and said what the police wanted them to
19	say.
20	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Um, very
21	good. Uh, someone else in the back row? Yes,
22	sir. Mr., uh, Oakes?
23	JUROR OAKES: Nothing very specific but,
24	I mean, through the years you hear about, um, you

know, convicts have been in jail for 20 years and

1	then recant you know, what they take back
2	what they said 20 years earlier, or, you know, if
3	there's a famous case, uh, you hear about people
4	writing letters to the police and confessing
5	when, obviously, they're, you know they
6	couldn't have done it. So just, in general,
7	there are people who say they've done one thing
8	and it turns out not to be true for one reason or
9	another.
10	ATTORNEY FALLON: Like the JonBenet
11	Ramsey case for one?
12	JUROR OAKES: Sure. Exactly.
13	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Yes, sir?
14	JUROR: Yes, I agree with what he just
15	said.
16	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. That would be
17	Mr., uh, Hughes? All right. Um, yes, Ms. Shea?
18	JUROR SHEA: Well, I agreed with him
19	also, that you hear about it in the media and
20	people take back their stories.
21	ATTORNEY FALLON: Um, how about, uh, uh,
22	Ms., uh Durst?
23	JUROR DURST: I would agree with what
24	previous jurors have said.
	1

ATTORNEY FALLON: But you've heard some

1	things about it?
2	JUROR DURST: I don't have anything
3	specific.
4	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Um, anyone
5	have a specific recollection or circumstance of
6	a of a of a case of interest to them?
7	Let's go this end here with, uh, Ms.
8	Blankenship?
9	JUROR BLANKENSHIP: I just was briefly
10	listening to the radio and they kept referencing
11	those three lacrosse players from the
12	university
13	ATTORNEY FALLON: Right.
14	JUROR BLANKENSHIP: And that story
15	apparently fell through and they've all been
16	acquitted now.
17	ATTORNEY FALLON: Right. Um, but there
18	wasn't a attribution to them that they
19	actually admitted any involvement in the offense,
20	was there?
21	JUROR BLANKENSHIP: I didn't follow it
22	that closely. It just seemed like that is
23	sensitized to that.
24	ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. Um, yes, right
25	here. Uh, Ms. McGuire?

1	JUROR McGUIRE: In addition to some of
2	the cases brought forward, one of the ones
3	recently here would have been more of somebody
4	accusing of a crime that didn't occur, and she
5	confessed that it was fake. The Audrey Sealer
6	case.
7	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Audrey
8	Sealer. Sure. All right. All right. Right
9	next door here, to, uh, Ms. Lowery?
10	JUROR LOWERY: Um, the one that I
11	remember, um and I'm not really even sure of
12	all the details was all of those people in
13	Illinois they were letting go, a couple years ago
14	even maybe. I don't know even how long ago.
15	They were letting go because they said they were
16	having false confessions, and now they're doing
17	something down there to, I guess, maybe taping or
18	videotaping confessions now.
19	ATTORNEY FALLON: Um-hmm.
20	JUROR LOWERY: But I'm not even sure
21	what
22	ATTORNEY FALLON: The circumstances?
23	JUROR LOWERY: Yeah.
24	ATTORNEY FALLON: Right.

JUROR LOWERY: I just kind of heard

1 about it.

2.0

ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. Okay. Well, let's, um -- let's go to the next question that that would logically bring, and that is, um -- Well, how likely is it -- Let's use that as a phrase. How likely is it that a person would claim they had an active role in the commission of a crime and later claimed they did not? I mean, is that, in your experience, a common occurrence or an uncommon occurrence?

Let's -- How many think that would be a -- a common occurrence? Anybody?

How about uncommon? Okay. Fair enough. What would some of the reasons be in your mind for someone to at first claim involvement in the commission of a serious crime and then later say, no, no, that wasn't right, I -- I didn't mean to say that?

What would -- What are some of the reasons you think that would motivate somebody to do that? Let's start with Mr., um, uh, Hughes in the back there?

JUROR HUGHES: I think attention.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Wait for your microphone there.

1	JUROR HUGHES: They want some attention
2	or some public some attention.
3	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. All right. Ms.
4	Miletic?
5	JUROR MILETIC: Fear.
6	ATTORNEY FALLON: Fear? Let's talk a
7	little bit about that. Why?
8	JUROR MILETIC: Because of fear,
9	consequences. If you, uh, don't see something,
10	you might get in trouble, so you say it, and at
11	that moment it probably maybe it's, uh you
12	think it's better for you to confess than than
13	not to confess, or to tell the truth. I don't
14	know.
15	ATTORNEY FALLON: Well, what would be a
16	greater fear in your thinking, then, in the
17	hypothesis you've given me
18	JUROR MILETIC: Um-hmm.
19	ATTORNEY FALLON: what would be the
20	greater fear, uh, of not confessing to a very
21	serious crime? What would be worse than
22	confessing to a very serious crime, and being
23	subject to prosecution and ridicule, and What
24	would be worse? What would be a greater fear?

JUROR MILETIC: It depends. I mean, we

have all heard of, um, women that have been 1 abused by their husband and husbands don't end up 2 in jail and the women end up with husbands at 3 home. Or in this particular situation -- I 5 don't know if I can specifically talk about this 6 7 case, I can see how fear would motivate a person to confess. 8 9 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. JUROR MILETIC: Like, for example, the 10 uncle did -- was re -- re -- released once from 11 12 jail, so the question could be, well, if he get away with this crime, if I, um, cause, anyhow, 13 14 fear. 15 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. JUROR MILETIC: Yeah. 16 17 ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Um, anyone 18 else have an explanation of why someone might do 19 that? Yes. Ms. Harris? 20 JUROR HARRIS: I think sometimes people 21 get so anxious when they're in a certain setting 22 that they'll say things that, um -- just to try 23 to get out of the situation.

2.4

25

JUROR HARRIS: So lot of it's anxiety?

ATTORNEY FALLON: Um-hmm.

1 ATTORNEY FALLON: What would be some of the manifestations of anxiety do you think?

JUROR HARRIS: I think having people around that are, um, you know, asking you a lot of questions, and feeling that they're a lot more powerful than you are --

ATTORNEY FALLON: Um-hmm.

JUROR HARRIS: -- so you become anxious.

manifestations do you think the person would have under those circumstances if they were going to confess to committing a serious matter or offense when -- when they really didn't? If they were -- If -- You're saying that they're being questioned and asked a lot of questions by authority figures or power figures, would -- would we see some manifestations of this anxiety on the person do you think?

JUROR HARRIS: Yeah. I -- I think, you know, you'd have your head down and, um, you wouldn't want to elaborate on a lot of things, but when someone's asking you questions, you go ahead and you try to answer the questions what I think what they would want to hear.

ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Um, anyone

1	else? Um, we'll go back to the back row. Ms.
2	McDonald?
3	JUROR McDONALD: This this has to do
4	with the psychology experiment that was done
5	decads ago, uh, in terms of social pressures to,
6	uh, respond to a situation, uh, the length of
7	a a stick, and most people succumb to the
8	social pressure of, uh, calling the stick longer
9	or shorter than it actually was, and they
10	actually reviewed it or viewed it as themself
11	from their own perspectives.
12	ATTORNEY FALLON: Now, was that study
13	not going in group dynamics as opposed to an
L 4	individual, one-on-one; if I'm correct?
15	JUROR McDONALD: Uh, it it was in a
16	group, yes.
17	ATTORNEY FALLON: Right.
18	JUROR McDONALD: Um, and one person
19	was
20	ATTORNEY FALLON: And eight people say
21	this is, uh
22	JUROR McDONALD: Hmm.
23	ATTORNEY FALLON: really green and
24	the oth and
25	JUROR McDONALD: Yes.

1	ATTORNEY FALLON: and and the one
2	person thinks it's blue?
3	JUROR McDONALD: Um-hmm.
4	ATTORNEY FALLON: But
5	JUROR McDONALD: And and most of the
6	people responded that it was green, even though
7	they thought it was blue.
8	ATTORNEY FALLON: It was blue.
9	JUROR McDONALD: Um-hmm.
10	ATTORNEY FALLON: Right. But that
11	also but that was a group dynamic. Uh
12	JUROR McDONALD: Um-hmm.
13	ATTORNEY FALLON: that's several
14	people involved as
15	JUROR McDONALD: Um-hmm.
16	ATTORNEY FALLON: opposed to a
17	one-on-one or two-on-one
18	JUROR McDONALD: Um-hmm.
19	ATTORNEY FALLON: discussion
20	JUROR McDONALD: Um-hmm.
21	ATTORNEY FALLON: right?
22	JUROR McDONALD: Um-hmm.
23	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Let's see. We
24	did have some hands Yes, sir. In the front
25	row. Mr. Nehrbass?

JUROR NEHRBASS: If you're, like, trying 1 to protect somebody. Like, you could admit 2 3 something if you're trying to protect somebody, like, your kid or something, like, say their 5 parent. ATTORNEY FALLON: So if you're trying 6 7 to -- Yeah. If you're trying to protect someone else, you might say you did something. In other 8 9 words, take the rap for --10 JUROR NEHRBASS: Right. ATTORNEY FALLON: -- somebody else --11 12 JUROR NEHRBASS: Right. ATTORNEY FALLON: -- or, perhaps, 13 14 dissuade, um, somebody from looking -- or 15 accusing a loved one of something? 16 JUROR NEHRBASS: Right. 17 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Good. 18 anyone else have a reason why someone might do 19 that? Yes. Uh, ma'am -- Ms., uh, Schmitt? 20 JUROR SCHMITT: Yes. Okay. Um, the 21 only other thing, like, in general, that I could 22 think of is if someone was coercing you to give a 2.3 confession. 24 ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. And what would

be some of the indicators in your mind of -- of a

1	coercing to getting a confession?
2	JUROR SCHMITT: Um, indicators as far
3	as, like, how you would be able to tell if that
4	person was being coerced?
5	ATTORNEY FALLON: Yes.
6	JUROR SCHMITT: Gosh, I don't know. I
7	was just thinking in general terms, but
8	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay.
9	JUROR SCHMITT: That's all I can come up
10	with.
11	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Um, anyone
12	else? Yes. Um, Ms., uh, Anderson?
13	JUROR ANDERSON: I go back to the
14	almighty buck. A lot of people do things they
15	normally wouldn't do for money.
16	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Does anyone
17	think the age of a person might be a factor?
18	Yes? No? Sure.
19	Anyone think that age would not be a
20	factor?
21	How about intelligence? Yes? That's
22	a a factor? Sure.
23	Does anyone believe that simply age or
24	intelligence alone is certainly reason enough for
25	someone to say they did something when, in fact,

1	they didn't? All right. No thoughts on that.
2	Very good.
3	All right. I'm going to go into one
4	more area, and then I'm going to pass the
5	questioning to my colleague.
6	Um, a little discussion on distinction
7	between guilt and punishment. That's the
8	context. All right? So let's begin with a
9	couple of easier questions.
10	How many of you have been or are parents
11	of teenagers who were of below average, uh,
12	intelligence or gifts? We got, uh, two?
13	Um, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Hughes. Very
14	good.
15	Let's let's start with you two guys.
16	Let's start with Mr. Hughes first. When
17	when Was it a son or a daughter?
18	JUROR HUGHES: Son.
19	ATTORNEY FALLON: Son? All right. When
20	your son misbehaved, did you hold him responsible
21	for his behavior?
22	JUROR HUGHES: Up to a point.
23	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Let's talk
24	about that. How how did you manage the

challenge?

by a neuropsychologist and, uh, he was found to
have Central Integrative Disorder, and, uh, it's
something in his neurological makeup that, um, he
really wasn't aware of what he was doing. He was
kind of in his own world and, um, they cautioned
us to over-discipline him.

ATTORNEY FALLON: To not over-discipline?

JUROR HUGHES: Not to over-discipline.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure.

JUROR HUGHES: That, uh, he wasn't really aware of some of the things he was doing, so...

attorney fallon: All right. So how -in -- in -- in walking that line, how were you
able to determine or, um, to discipline when he
needed to be disciplined?

JUROR HUGHES: Really, I didn't know if I'd made a mistake sometimes, and, um, it was hard. You know, it was hard to determine that with him. If -- if I had known that -- if he was laughing about it, and he was, uh, kind of making fun of the situation, then I would, uh, tend to discipline. If, uh, he showed no signs of humor

whatsoever, and, uh, if he was doing something inappropriate, then I would have had to sit him down and really talk to him.

ATTORNEY FALLON: So if it looked like to you he really didn't appreciate at all the significance of the behavior he was engaged in, you'd go light on him and just kind of sit him down and --

JUROR HUGHES: Yes. I'd, uh, try to talk with him, reason with him, and, uh, that was his problem. He -- he -- he had some reasoning -- he doesn't have the deductive reasoning where he can put his ducks in a row and make sense out of things.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. Did he know right from wrong?

JUROR HUGHES: Somewhat. You know, he didn't know that he was in -- inappropriate at times.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure. Fair enough.
Mr. Johnson?

ATTORNEY JOHNSON: I have a 15-year-old son with kind of a more advanced case of ADHD, uh, than you typically see, um, which leaves -- leaves him susceptible to just kind of do things

1	on a whim because he thinks they're fun, or it
2	could be fun, without thinking consequences
3	through the end. Um, we do hold him accountable
4	for all those.
5	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay.
6	JUROR JOHNSON: Unfortunately, he thinks
7	of the consequences after he's already done
8	whatever he does, so
9	ATTORNEY FALLON: Little impulse issues?
10	JUROR JOHNSON: Absolutely.
11	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Um, but you do
12	hold him accountable for his behavior?
13	JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.
14	ATTORNEY FALLON: He he knows right
15	from wrong?
16	JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.
17	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. He just
18	sometimes forgets to think about that?
19	JUROR JOHNSON: Right. He forgets to
20	think about this could be wrong and before he
21	does it.
22	ATTORNEY FALLON: Okay. Anyone else?
23	All right. Um, how many would agree with this
24	statement; that, um, 16-year-olds are not or

should not be held as responsible for their

behaviors as 18-, 19-, or 20-year-olds as a
general rule? Does anyone adhere to that?
All right. Let's start in the back row
with Ms. Miletic.
JUROR MILETIC: Um, I think, um,
mentally, um, we don't develop at age 16.
Physically, our bodies are more developed than
our, um, mental abilities, and, especially,
thinking does not develop fully at age 16.
ATTORNEY FALLON: Um, by age 16, would
you agree with the proposition that a 16-year-old
knows right from wrong?
JUROR MILETIC: Yes, but that doesn't
mean that a person cannot do wrong.
ATTORNEY FALLON: Cannot what?
JUROR MILETIC: I think person knows
right from wrong, but a a person can still do
wrong.
ATTORNEY FALLON: Sure.
JUROR MILETIC: Uh-hmm.
ATTORNEY FALLON: But should they be
held accountable for that? Should there be
consequences for doing wrong?
JUROR MILETIC: I think it's all
situational. It depends on the situation. I

definitely think to a certain degree they have 1 to, but, um, it all depend -- depends on the 2 3 circumstances. ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Anyone else have a comment on that? Anyone else thinks 16-year-olds should 6 be not -- held not as accountable? Yes, sir. 7 8 Mr., um, Williams? JUROR WILLIAMS: When you say "not as 9 10 accountable" are you saying not as accountable as 11 an adult as someone --12 ATTORNEY FALLON: Right. JUROR WILLIAMS: -- that's of 18 or 13 older? 14 15 ATTORNEY FALLON: Right. JUROR WILLIAMS: Well, I would agree 16 17 that the -- the psychological makeup of a 16-year-old -- and as a history teacher and 18 19 working with teenage boys and girls -- to -- to 20 hold them to the same standards as you or I $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ I 21 mean, I just -- I totally -- I think we all go 22 through our lives and think to ourselves that we 23 did things when we were 16 we wouldn't do when we

That said, should there be consequences

were 24 and 25.

24

1	for actions that one take that person knows
2	that they're doing right or wrong? Absolutely.
3	But you're asking me, shouldn't be held to the
4	same standard as me? I mean, I would find that
5	to be somewhat foolish.
6	I have more life experience, as you have
7	more life experience as I do. It should be held
8	to at least some mitigating circumstances from
9	our own experiences.
10	ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. Anyone
11	disagree with that?
12	How many Would everyone agree with
13	that? Yes? No? Okay. Very good.
14	Do you see a distinction between holding
15	someone accountable for their behavior and then
16	determining a punishment for that behavior? Is
17	there a distinction?
18	How many think there's a distinction
19	there between, say, a a finding of guilt, for
20	instance, and a
21	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Judge, could we have
22	a sidebar on that question, please?
23	THE COURT: Yes.
24	(Discussion off the record.)

ATTORNEY FALLON: All right. I have

just one -- one other circumstance that I wanted
to talk with you about.

Before I do, could we have a -- a -- Let's have a little discussion. I want to talk with Counsel about something first.

(Discussion off the record.)

ATTORNEY FALLON: Well, after a discussion with Court and Counsel, I'm going to stop here. My colleague, uh, Mr. Fremgen, is going to pick up and cover some of the things that I was going to cover in any event. So I'm going to pass the, uh, questioning to, uh -- to Mr. Fremgen, and -- and thank you very much for your time.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Thank you. Good morning again. What's, uh, nice about going second, despite the introduction, I don't have to ask a lot of questions. Mr. Fallon kind of covers most of it.

I've been through the jury process before as well. We -- Not as long as you folks. Four hours seemed to be a lot to me, so I'm going to try to keep it as -- as simple and as short as possible.

The, uh, jury process, and this process

of selecting a jury, yesterday, I believe the Judge explained to you that we're trying to pick a fair and impartial juror, and a lot of the questions that we asked you, and the reason why you're here, is because you answered questions that indicated that you can set aside opinions, you can listen to the evidence, and you can follow the instructions.

But I -- In regards to jury selection, I think it's just as important for you 30 individuals to make a decision within yourself to decide if you're a good juror. Do you think that you can actually be a juror in this case more so than, maybe, whether Mr. Fallon and I believe that? Besides, part of the process and part of why Mr. Fallon asked you to raise your hands and interact and -- and talk, uh, because that's the process for you as well, to be able to say, can I be a fair and impartial juror? So please feel free to interrupt me. Raise your hands.

You, uh -- Fortunately, the jury selection process is somewhat shorter than normal because you were, uh, kind enough to fill out 65-question questionnaire, and, uh, it -- it allows us to eliminate a lot of the questions

that we would normally ask in this process, or,

as of yesterday, the individual voir dire.

I -- I think it's only fair that -- that we have to proc -- do the process somewhat as well. I mean, you are -- we are -- been introduced to you, and I want to introduce myself to you as well in this process, and as the Judge pointed out, I'm an attorney in Oshkosh. I don't think any of you know me. I've only been to Madison once for court, so I never been in this -- this building more than the last two days.

And, uh, I also have children as well, and my hobbies are similar to a lot of your hobbies. I like to golf and be involved in youth hockey, um, and I like to watch CSI as well. So you're no different than the rest of us.

One of the questions that, again, you all answered appropriately yesterday, was you could set aside any opinions and you can presume Mr. Dassey innocent.

What I want to ask you in that regard is, what if Mr. Dassey chose not to testify?
Would that affect your opinion of his innocence right now?

Would anyone feel differently about him being presumed innocent if he decided I'm not going to talk to you folks when it comes time for the jury? For the trial?

Would it change your opinions?

Does anyone here feel that you want to hear from both sides at any trial? You think it's important to hear from both sides? You agree with that? Just about everyone? Okay.

Now, if Mr. Dassey were to testify, would you agree that he, along -- as well as all other witnesses, that you will consider all the testimony the same way?

Now, let me ask -- preface it this way:
You decide who you want to believe, and you
decide what weight you want to give any witness.
That's entirely up to you. But as you sit there
listening to it, you would listen to him no
different than, let's say, a police officer.

Ms. Ware, would that be okay? You would be willing to listen to Mr. Dassey and give him the same consideration as if a police officer testified?

JUROR HAYMAN WARE: Yes.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: The reason I asked

1	you, is you have a police officer for a husband,
2	and I thought that would made a nice segue.
3	Does that Your relationship, uh, with your
4	husband Let me ask you a couple questions
5	about that. Do you feel that police officers,
6	themselves, are more truthful than other
7	witnesses?
8	JUROR HAYMAN WARE: Not necessarily. I
9	think there's all kinds of police officers just
10	like there's all kinds of lawyers or all kinds of
11	social workers.
12	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Touché. So if I can
13	just follow up a little bit, so you would agree
14	that that there are times that witnesses
15	Well, let let's not say witnesses. There are
16	times people lie; correct?
17	JUROR HAYMAN WARE: Yes.
18	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: And that would be no
19	different than a police officer?
20	JUROR HAYMAN WARE: Correct.
21	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Or a lawyer?
22	JUROR HAYMAN WARE: Correct.
23	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Not today though.
24	Now, there In that regard In regards to

sometimes people lie, would it also be correct --

would anyone -- I guess would you agree that 1 2 there are times when people just are mistaken? 3 Anyone agree with that? Let me ask, uh, someone who hasn't had their hand up, much. Um, Ms. Rasmussen, you 5 raised your hand? 7 JUROR RASMUSSEN: Well, it's fairly common if you have 12 people seeing something, 8 you're going to get 12 different stories, because 9 10 no one can see the same thing the same way. all have different experiences, different filters 11 12 to how we experience everything by what we've 13 seen in our past. 14 ATTORNEY FREMGEN: So if you saw 15 something one way, and another person saw it a 16 different way, you're not necessarily lying? 17 JUROR RASMUSSEN: Right. 18 ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Neither is the other 19 person? 20 JUROR RASMUSSEN: Right. It just means 21 then that we were focusing on different things 22 and maybe didn't remember the part that the other 23 person was talking about. 24 ATTORNEY FREMGEN: I saw a couple other

25

hands. Right next to Ms., uh, Tedder?

1	JUROR: I think sometimes people just
2	maybe mis misspeak and just made an error, but
3	not necessarily mean to lie, but
4	JUROR FREMGEN: Besides not different
5	perceptions as Ms. Rasmussen pointed out,
6	sometimes you just misspeak?
7	JUROR: Correct.
8	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: And that's would
9	you say that's common?
10	JUROR: Um, maybe for some people.
11	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Okay. When you hear
12	about When you watch TV A lot of you
13	yesterday would answer the questions that you
14	you watch TV or listen to the radio. Uh, when
15	you hear, for instance, on TV, uh, a news report
16	that somebody was arrested for a crime, those
17	reports happen rather routinely in the news, do
18	you think it's a common reaction or do you have
19	this reaction that, well, you must have done it?
20	Is that a knee-jerk reaction? A normal
21	knee-jerk reaction? Does anyone agree that that
22	can be a knee-jerk reaction at times?
23	Mr. Hughes, you had your hand up?
24	JUROR HUGHES: I think it can. I I

believe it can be.

1	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Okay. And let me ask
2	you this, and picking on you, Mr. Hughes, just
3	now because you raised your hand. Sorry.
4	JUROR HUGHES: Yes.
5	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Uh, and all you've
6	heard is the two-minute, maybe 30-second news
7	bit?
8	JUROR HUGHES: Yes.
9	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Did you have nothing
10	else to go on as to far as far as whether
11	the person may or may not have done it; correct?
12	JUROR HUGHES: No.
13	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: So it you might be
14	wrong; correct?
15	JUROR HUGHES: Yes.
16	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: But it's just common
17	nat it's human nature; right?
18	JUROR HUGHES: Yeah.
19	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Ms., uh, Miletic?
20	Miletic?
21	JUROR MILETIC: I didn't raise my hand.
22	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: You were you were
23	shaking your head. I saw you shaking your head.
24	Sorry.

JUROR MILETIC: Well, it's true. I

mean, I live in this society where people are not 1 I have never witnessed anyone being 2 arrested. arrested. So if my neighbor's arrested, I would 3 think like, my gosh, what happened? I wouldn't necessarily think he's guilty, but I would say 5 like, wow, what did he do? I would, um, still 6 wait to see the verdict, but it would be a surprise to me.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: So you would -- the better process would be, let's see what the actual --

JUROR MILETIC: Oh, definitely, but I would definitely, like, peek through the window and see what's going on and -- because that doesn't happen. Not in my life.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Okay. There was another hand. Uh, Ms. McDonald. Same answers though?

JUROR McDONALD: I think sometimes a knee-jerk reaction is to think, well, this person may be quilty for this reason, uh, but I think that subsequent information may change one's mind.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: So if you receive more information --

1	JUROR McDONALD: Um-hmm.
2	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: But in the newscasts,
3	you don't usually get the one and never
4	JUROR McDONALD: No
5	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: see it again?
6	JUROR McDONALD: and it's usually on
7	petty crimes that, uh, sort of go by the wayside.
8	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Okay. Oh, I'm sorry.
9	No. 7? Ms. Shea. You had your hand up, too.
10	I'm sorry.
11	JUROR SHEA: I guess when I see it on
12	TV, I kind of assume that police had some reason
13	for arresting that person, that they must be
14	and don't mean, I guess, that I just assume
15	guilt, but they must have had a reason for it, so
16	I'm trusting that that's why they arrested them.
17	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Okay. Would you
18	agree, though, there are times when people are
19	arrested and
20	JUROR SHEA: Yeah, and it was
21	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: was wrong?
22	JUROR SHEA: Yes.
23	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Okay. One of the
24	instructions the Judge will give you eventually
25	within this trial, is that at the end when it's

your time to get together and decide guilt or innocence, that you have to do it -- it's called beyond a reasonable doubt, and that burden is actually on the prosecutor only. That's where yesterday we talked a lot about presumption of innocence. Do you need us to prove something to you? Well, it's the prosecutor that actually has to prove each and every element of the offense.

Now, if, for instance, the State were able to convince you, two out of three of the elements absolutely perfect, evidence clearly establishes that, but doesn't establish the third, under that instruction you'd have to say, not guilty. Does anyone feel that's just unfair that if the State's able to truly convince you with -- on two elements, but not on the third, that, well, close enough. Do you think that that's just not -- Ms. Rasmussen?

JUROR RASMUSSEN: Uh, if by elements are you speaking two or three charges or two or three elements of a specific charge?

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Good question. As a lawyer, we -- we tend to think everyone understands what we're talking about. Each charge -- The Judge will instruct you each charge

has separate elements to the charge. Um, and an element just simply means it's something that the State would have to prove.

And my question is, essentially, if the State convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt to all but one element, are you willing to find the defendant not guilty because the instruction is you must find him guilty on all the elements beyond a reasonable doubt? Is that a fair burden on the State? Even though they came pretty darn close, you think that's pretty fair?

JUROR RASMUSSEN: I think that's fair.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Okay. Any -- anyone else -- anyone think it's not fair? It's just not a fair burden on the prosecutor to come so close, but not to be able to prove it in my hypothetical? Not fair?

Okay. Mr. Fallon stole my thunder with the JonBenet Ramsey case. That was a great example. But let me ask you about -- follow up on Mr. Fallon's questions about false confessions.

He asked you about certain factors, whether or not you thought that would play a part in whether a person's, uh, confession was true or

1 false.

Let me ask you, does anyone feel that a maturity level of a person is a factor that you should consider in that same question? That same set of questions Mr. Fallon asked? Mr., uh, Johnson, you're rais -- you're shaking your -- I'm sorry. Mr. Williams. Sorry. You're shaking your head?

JUROR WILLIAMS: Obviously, maturity has something to do with it. I mean, I had a six-year-old, and, you know, did you hit your brother? You're going to get a different answer if I asked her if she was 15 so...

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Not necessarily.

Because I know.

JUROR WILLIAMS: Hopefully.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Okay. All right.

Anyone else, uh, agree? Ms., uh --

JUROR LOWERY: Lowery.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: -- Lowery.

JUROR LOWERY: Um, I kind of agree with him, because my two-year-old, if you asked her who did it, she always says, Jenaya, Jenaya, Jenaya. And Jenaya is gone for eight hours out of the day. And she's usually the only one at

1	home, so she's the only one, that you know,
2	that could possibly do it. So, I mean, a
3	two-year-old versus, you know
4	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Sure.
5	JUROR LOWERY: another age where you
6	can probably understand a little better and get a
7	correct answer.
8	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Jenaya is not that
9	naughty of a girl?
10	JUROR LOWERY: Oh, yeah. Jenaya is the
11	naughtiest.
12	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: She's a good fall
13	guy, huh?
	TUDOD TOURDY W. I
14	JUROR LOWERY: Yeah.
14 15	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Anyone else agree
15	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Anyone else agree
15 16	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Anyone else agree that that's Just generally agree?
15 16 17	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Anyone else agree that that's Just generally agree? JUROR: Sure.
15 16 17 18	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Anyone else agree that that's Just generally agree? JUROR: Sure. ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Another factor I
15 16 17 18 19	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Anyone else agree that that's Just generally agree? JUROR: Sure. ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Another factor I wanted to ask you if you agree might have an
15 16 17 18 19 20	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Anyone else agree that that's Just generally agree? JUROR: Sure. ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Another factor I wanted to ask you if you agree might have an impact on this topic of false confessions, and
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Anyone else agree that that's Just generally agree? JUROR: Sure. ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Another factor I wanted to ask you if you agree might have an impact on this topic of false confessions, and that is, whether it's coming from authority.

All right. Ms. -- Ms. Tedder? Is that -- You

were shaking your head yes? 1 JUROR TEDDER: Yes. 2 3 ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Do you agree that that's -- that can also be a factor? JUROR TEDDER: Yes. I think it can be 5 intimidating, so, yes. 6 7 ATTORNEY FREMGEN: So intimidation can sometimes be a factor in that? 8 9 JUROR TEDDER: Yes. ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Is that fairly 10 agreeable by the group? Everyone's shake -- I'm 11 not going to call on all of you, we'll be here 12 13 all day. But that that's a common theme among --14 Okay. 15 I just have one last question, and it's a question I've asked just about every time since 16 17 a case I had seven years ago. I won't go into that case. Does anyone here have any strong 18 19 dislike for attorneys that you just simply cannot 20 sit on a jury? It came up, and I just want to 21 make sure that -- Okay. Well, I appreciate your 22 answers. Thank you, very much. 23 THE COURT: All right. That -- that 24 concludes the individual voir dire -- or, excuse me,

the general voir dire done by the prosecutor and the

defense. We now are going to have what are called 1 peremptory challenges. That is the, uh -- the 2 3 lawyers are --ATTORNEY FALLON: I -- I was just -- I would like to take about a five-minute break. 5 THE COURT: All right. Okay. We'll 6 have the -- Well, let's do this, um -- It's 7 10:05. Uh, 10:15? 8 ATTORNEY FALLON: That would be great. THE COURT: All right. 10 11 (Recess had at 10:05 a.m.) 12 (Reconvened at 10:25 a.m.) 13 THE COURT: Back on the record. Ladies and 14 gentlemen, you're discovering how ten minutes of court time rapidly turns into fifteen to twenty 15 16 minutes real time, but we're back, and we're going 17 to do the peremptory challenges at this point. Uh, 18 preemptory challenges are an opportunity for each 19 side to strike a certain number of jurors so that we 2.0 finally reach the final panel -- panel number, 21 which, in this case, is 16. So let's -- let us 22 begin. 23 (Peremptory Challenges.) 24 THE COURT: I'll ask the clerk to read the

names of those who have been selected for the final

jury. If your name is called, please stand.

THE CLERK: Thomas Oakes, Timothy Hughes,
Heather Rasmussen, Rachel Tedder, Leah Shea, Kristen
Durst, Thomas Heinzel, Becky Foss, Robert Covington,
Cynthia Edge, Renee Schmitt, Janeen Running, Judy
Orth, Jane McGuire, Tamara Lowery, and Ashley
Shippy.

THE COURT: All right. Would the persons whose names weren't called rise, please, and -- and we'll do the -- clear the courtroom.

(Wherein jurors not selected are escorted out of the courtroom.)

I'm going to ask, uh, the jury clerk to -- to seat the people so we can get a seating chart. She's going to seat you in a -- in a manner so we have a chart for Monday.

I'm just going to talk to you very, very briefly. You're going to get some additional instructions at the back of the room. You've been selected this, a sequestered jury. You won't officially become sequestered until Monday morning when you're sworn in in the -- in the Manitowoc County Courthouse, but I want to reiterate to you that it is absolutely essential that you not read, listen to, or watch any news

1	accounts of this case, whether on radio,
2	television, newspapers or the internet, and that
3	you do not discuss this with anyone, any matter
4	involving this case or your involvement in it.
5	That is, uh that is, actually, a court order.
6	I ask that you be diligent in following it.
7	Now, I'm going to ask that you exit the
8	jury box. Go to the back. One second.
9	THE CLERK: Would you wait one second? I
10	just want to make sure I have
11	ATTORNEY FALLON: Judge, before you
12	excuse them, could, uh, counsel and I, uh
13	THE COURT: Sure.
14	ATTORNEY FALLON: remind you about a
15	previous discussion we had?
16	THE COURT: Oh.
17	(Discussion off the record.)
18	THE COURT: One more thing. Counsel have
19	suggested that I remind you that there may be
20	matters on television that your family sees and they
21	may want to talk to you about it. Uh, don't
22	don't engage in any of that discussion. Don't watch
23	it. Don't talk to them. You might advise family
24	members if if there are matters that they run

25

into either on the internet or television that, uh,

1	it it's out of bounds for you and you can't talk
2	about it. Does everybody understand that
3	instruction? Thank you. All right. Uh, have you
4	got the the list?
5	THE CLERK: Yeah, that's fine.
6	THE COURT: All right.
7	THE CLERK: Thank you.
8	THE COURT: We'll see you Monday.
9	(Court stands adjourned at 10:50 a.m.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF WISCONSIN))SS.
2	COUNTY OF MANITOWOC)
3	
4	I, Jennifer K. Hau, Official Court
5	Reporter for Circuit Court Branch 3 and the State
6	of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that I reported
7	the foregoing matter and that the foregoing
8	transcript has been carefully prepared by me with
9	my computerized stenographic notes as taken by me
10	in machine shorthand, and by computer-assisted
11	transcription thereafter transcribed, and that it
12	is a true and correct transcript of the
13	proceedings had in said matter to the best of my
14	knowledge and ability.
15	Dated this it day of December, 2007.
16	
17	
18	Association and established
19	Jennifer K. Hau, RPR Official Court Reporter
20	Official Court Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	