

## DigitalCommons@NYLS

**Appendix** 

Carter v Rafferty 631 F Supp 533

10-25-1976

Appendix: Stenographic Transcript of Voir Dire Proceedings, Volume 3A

Lewis M. Steel '63

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/appendix

# UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS for the THIRD CIRCUIT

Docket No. 85-5735			
RUBIN CARTER,			
	Petitioner-Appellee,		
vs.			
JOHN J. RAFFERTY, Superintendent, Rahway Prison, and IRWIN I. KIMMELMAN, The Attorney General of the State of New Jersey,			
	Respondents-Appellants.		
JOHN ARTIS,			
	Petitioner-Appellee,		
vs.			
CHRISTOPHER DIETZ, Chairman, Parole Board of the State of New Jersey and IRWIN I. KIMMELMAN, The Attorney General of the State of New Jersey,			
	Respondents-Appellants.		
APPENDIX			
VOLUME 3 A			

PERSON CO., BAYORME, M.J. 07602 - FORM 2046

## INDEX PROSPECTIVE JURORS: VOIR DIRE PHILIP J. ZYLKA: By the Court DONALD W. WETZEL: By the Court JOHN N. CARROTTA: By the Court DOMINICK R. DE ANGELO: By the Court BETTY H. KOHLEMAN: By the Court MORNING SESSION: AFTERNOON SESSION: Prospective juror, Dominick R. DeAngelo, accepted

## 

## 

#### 

## 

#### 

#### 

## 

## 

# 

#### .

## 

## 

## 

## 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

## 

## MORNING SESSION

(Following occurs in Court's chambers: (Further jury excuses heard)

THE COURT: All right. With reference to DeSimone, he can sit down during voir dire.

On Saturday I'll hear further argument as to his being precluded from being in the courtroom during the trial and I'll rule on that aspect of it.

But, at this point I'm ruling, after having heard counsel last week, that he could sit during the trial during the selection of the jury even, because no testimony is being selected, being heard at this time.

MR. STEEL: Your Honor, before you go further.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. STEEL: I know you heard argument.

I would just like to state contemporaneously with your rulings, our strong objection to that.

And I would like the record to note the objection is being made on Constitutional grounds, that the defense believes that DeSimone is a key prosecution witness.

THE COURT: You said this before.

MR. STEEL: Right.

1	
_	
2.	
_	I
3	
4	$\ $
_	
5	
6	
U	$\ $
7	
•	
8	
	1
9	
LO	
11	
12	
13	
4	$\ $
	I
15	
16	
16	
17	
- •	
18	
19	
20	
21	
L	
• •	

24

25

	THE	COURT:	Okay.	You're protected.
	MR.	STEEL:	Okay.	I just wanted to make sure
I was p	prote	ected.		•
	THE	COURT:	I just	ruled DeSimone can sit in
during	the	jury se	lection	process.

About the participation at the trial, during the trial, I will reserve on that until Saturday until both counsel have had an opportunity to explore it.

MR. STEEL: Judge, we also want your Honor to know, and I think you do, that unless either defendant otherwise specifies the objection of one stands for both.

THE COURT: I'll proceed on that theory.

I assume one adopts the argument with reference to their client.

Now, with reference to the voir dire of the juror, I'll ponder it over a little further.

I'm not going to get into law any further.

I'm not going to question on reasonable doubt or anything.

When I question the jurors individually, I'm still going to conduct the same address to the jury as I did to the other panel when I addressed them,

all collectively, but individually, I'm not going to ask them any law except for the fact that I will impress upon them that it is their obligation to return a verdict in accordance with the law as I give it to them and as I explain it and in accordance with the law which will be presented at the trial.

MR. STEEL: Your Honor, on that point we would at least ask that your Honor as a minimum say to the jurces, say, remind them that you gave them an opening address with regard to burden of proof, reasonable doubt, et cetera, et cetera, in which you laid out what those factors were and you want to find out now if they have any problem, trouble with any of them.

THE COURT: I'm not going to particularize any of that charge.

I'm going to ask them generally if they will accept the law as I give it to them? Will they apply it as to the facts in the case and return a verdict in accordance with the law and the facts? And your exception is noted. Your application is noted on behalf of both defendants, and your application, you've made your position clear.

All right.

Let us bring in the juror.

MR. HUMPHREYS: Your Honor, may I inquire as to your order? Is your Honor not going into any question about alcoholism?

THE COURT: Alcoholism, yes. That one I'm going to ask them, do you have any feeling about alcoholics? Do you have any such feelings about alcoholics that you would be unable to consider testimony by an alcoholic? I'm going to ask them that period. I'm not going to get into any other area.

MR. STEEL: Excuse me. Can we do this in the courtroom?

THE COURT: No. This one juror was started here. I feel he feels more at home here.

MR. STEEL: Let me get my papers.

THE COURT: What was the juror's number?

THE COURT CLERK: Number 425, Philip J. Zylka

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HUMPHREYS: Your Honor, may I also inquire, if your Honor has definitely made up your mind on the question of when peremptory challenges have to be exercised?

THE COURT: They will be exercised after the juror passes the cause challenge.

MR. HUMPHREYS: My objection to that is noted.

THE COURT: Your objection to that is noted.

(Prospective juror enters room)

PHILIP J. ZYLKA, called as a prospective juror, having been previously sworn, testifies further as follows:

#### BY THE COURT:

Q Okay. Good morning. I'm sorry to keep you waiting.

A Good morning, your Honor.

Q You are not going to wait too much longer.

All right. I think we went into this area,
I think we went into this question 106, 107. We are going
to be very brief with you, Mr. Zylka, so we appreciate your
patience, okay?

Did I ask this juror about Bob Dylan or Dylan?

MR. HUMPHREYS: You did not, your Honor.

Q I did not. Okay. I think that's where I had left off. Okay.

Are you familiar with a person named Bob Dylan, D-Y-L-A-N?

A I've seen his name in the paper, but I don't know

ع ددد

7

1

Zylka - voir dire

1	Zylka	- voir dire	8
2	a head	dache, and I had to go back and call my medica	ation,
3	which	I have a nervous stomach, and I also have cap	sules
4	for m	ny nerves. I had to go back on them again. An	nd your
5	Honor	please, I would like to be dismissed.	
6		Q Have you been to a doctor?	<del>.</del>
7	A	Not over the weekend, no.	
8		Q Well, are you under the care of a doc	tor?
9	A	I was, yes.	
10		Q Until when?	
11	A	Until May.	
12		Q Last May?	
13	A	That's right.	
14		Q I see. But you haven't been there s	ince then
15	A	No, I haven't.	
16		Q Do you feel that on Friday may have a	iggra-
17	vated	your condition a little bit?	
18	A	I believe so, your Honor.	
19		Q Well, you are not going and it is und	lerstand-
20	able	that you would be a little upset, after all you	ou are
21	not u	used to being questioned like you were, and al	though I
22	tried	to do it as courteously as possible, I could	appreci-
23	ate w	where it might upset you. But procedurally, de	epending
24	on wh	nat happens, if you are not accepted, of course	e, you go
25	home	If you are not excused and if you are excuse	n d

Zylka - voir dire

you'll go home too. If you are accepted as a juror, you will go home today. And if you are not accepted, you will go home. The only thing is, if you are accepted, except that you have to come back for the trial. But what I'm trying to say is, the difficult part is over for you, you are not going to be subjected to any questioning like that, we try and tone it down as much as we can for the other jurors as well. It is an ordeal to a lay person like yourself, but you shouldn't let it really affect you. And if you are accepted as a juror, you are not going to have that type of situation anymore. Nobody will question you at all. So you don't have to be concerned.

Now, I can appreciate where you would have some reaction, but let us play that by ear. Let me finish my questioning, and I'll cover that again and let you talk to me about it.

So, in other words, other than that medical reason you've given, you have no other reason why you shouldn't serve on this jury? You don't have any feelings about the case that would prevent you from being fair to both sides in this case? Is that so? I can assume that?

A Probably, yes.

Q And---

MR. BELDOCK: I didn't hear that answer.

Zylka - voir dire

words, you would base your verdict on two things, basically the evidence and the law; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q Not on what you might have read about it, right? Not on what you might have discussed about it; is that correct?

In other words, anything you read about this case, anything you discussed about it before you came here wouldn't be a basis for your verdict, would it?

A I don't think so.

Q Well, I would tell you. What if I told you that you are not to consider anything you read, you are not to consider anything you discussed as a basis for your verdict, would you listen to me and follow the law as I give it to you, because that is the law?

A I think I would.

Now, with reference to, you mentioned the other day that you did have some discussions about this case and you mentioned the other day that you did read about the case.

Now, I did ask you, and I'm not going to be too long, believe me, and I'm not trying to make you nervous, and I'm not trying to embarrass you. I'm just trying to elicit information so that I, as the judge hearing it

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α

and these gentlemen as the attorneys, could evaluate in deciding the selection of a juror.

So, first of all, I'd like for you to try to relax and I would like for you not to feel embarrassed in any way. It is a procedure which perhaps I'm not too happy about it asking you these questions, but I have to. And by the same token, I have to do it in such a way that the information is conveyed to the lawyers and to the Court for the purpose of evaluating a juror for selection but yet we don't want to put a juror in the position by saying what are you doing this to me for, after all I'm a juror. You know, I don't want to put you in that position. I don't want to put you in a position where you might react against any defendant, because this is my doing. You can't. don't want you to react against the State's position because of this.

In other words, I would, we would be defeating our whole purpose here if you went home and you were angry at someone in this room today or any litigant that's in this case because of my questioning. Do you understand that?

Yes, your Honor.

All right. So I am hoping that that isn't the situation.

Now, one or two other questions and then I'll be finished.

Do you have any personal feelings about alcoholics, persons who may be alcoholics or who drink a lot?

A Well, I personally think they're weak people.

Q Okay. Now, assuming that these people, an alcoholic or alcoholics were to testify in this case, do you have such feelings about these people who are alcoholics that you would be unable to consider their testimony just because they are alcoholics?

A Well, it would depend upon the circumstances of whatever they were talking about.

Q And you would weigh it?

A Yes.

Q And then you would make a decision?

A Yes.

Q But you are not prejudiced to the extent where you would say to yourself that you don't believe him period?

A No.

Now, have you held any salaried or appointed governmental job at any time or job with a governmental. facility of any sort, such as a prison, a hospital, or things of that nature?

A No, your Honor.

Q Are there any members in your immediate family that are so associated?

A No, your Honor.

Q I'm going to ask you one, two, at the most questions. Then I'm going to be finished.

Can you tell me as best you remember now, I'm going to qualify the question for this reason. I don't ex-

pect you to remember exactly. Give me the benefit of what comes to your mind with reference to this question. What

do you know about this case that you haven't told me? Or

have you told me everything you know about it?

A All I know that the two defendants are accused of killing, as you told me the other day three people.

Q All right.

A At the time we were talking about I didn't know whether they were white or black people.

Q All right. Now, do you know anything else about the details?

A No, I don't, your Honor.

Q All right. Now, is that information which you have just given me, is that the result of your having read about the case?

That's about as far as I read it. Yes. Actually

<b>.</b>	Zylka	- Voir dire	15
2	the ca	se never interested me.	
3		Q Okay. Now, with reference to your d	iscus-
4	sions,	do you remember specifically what you have	discussed
5	about	this case?	
6	A	Well, my wife asked me questions, what was	it all
7	about.		
8		Q What did you say to her?	
9	A	Because she herself hadn't known.	•
10		Q Is this after you were selected as a	juror.
11	you mea		
12	A	No. This was before.	·
13		Q Okay. And what did you say to her?	
14	A	I told her that it was two black people tha	t were
15	accused	d of having killed three other people.	
16		Q And you didn't know whether the othe	r three
17	people	were black or white at the time?	
18	A	Yes, your Honor.	
19		Q When did you find that out for the f	irst time
20	A	When you told me here Friday.	
21		Q On Friday. Before that you didn't k	now that?
22	A	No, I didn't.	
23		Q What about your thinking on the case	? Would
24	that ma	ake a difference to you whether the victims	
25		ck, if you were chosen as a juror?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	11	<b>₹</b>	



25

1

Zylka - voir dire

16

A Like I said Friday, I have no prejudice against anyone.

Q Okay. So you still would be able to hear this case and weigh the facts before you make up your mind and listen to what the facts are and what the law is and then apply the facts, the law to the facts; is that correct A I believe so.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask the State to exercise its peremptory challenge.

MR. MARMO: Can we just be heard, Judge?

THE COURT: All right. I'll ask Mr. Zylka to just step out for a few seconds.

(Prospective juror leaves room)

MR. MARMO: We would like to have a few minutes at the finish of your questioning of the juror.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MARMO: I would like to, if I can impose on you for two and a half minutes, and you can stop me then, Judge, just to make some statement of the problems that we're facing with this.

THE COURT: I'm not going to stop you at all.

MR. MARMO: I appreciate that. Because I know you've ruled and we've been thinking about this because we haven't had any thoughts about it before

you adopted this system this morning, and we have a lot of problems with it, because; and I think it's equally bad for both sides, because we have situations where we're exercising a challenge in a vacuum, not knowing the composition of a juror. We have that kind of problem, which we spoke about this morning. We also have the problem of not knowing the relationship of future jurors to the juror that we're presently making a judgment upon.

We may have situations where we have a juror, we have no problem with. We suddenly get another juror, another person on the panel who perhaps works with him or comes from his neighborhood. We think there may be some problem. We can't go back to the juror we already adopted, and we have a problem with that.

We also have a very serious problem with regard to what's going to happen as we get along the line, since we don't have the total composition of the jury we may move along and exhaust our challenges by the time we are at number ten or twelve, then there is absolutely no way to use peremptory challenges with regard to four or six, or eight more jurors. And we think this is contrary to the scheme

of peremptory challenges.

THE COURT: I don't quite understand what you're saying. If you put ten or twelve, you're not entitled to four or six more.

MR. MARMO: By that I meant when we are at juror ten or juror number twelve, if we exhausted our challenges, at that point we've done it without knowing what six jurors are going to be who will survive your questioning and your challenge for cause, and it puts us in a very, very difficult position, one which we think is contrary to the whole scheme of peremptory challenges and jury selections.

We consulted with the appellate people and the Prosecutor himself in Hudson County, and he tells us that even in capital cases this is unheard of.

They never had this kind of situation.

In fact, they suggest that we do not permit the precedent and that we should take an appeal.

But, of course, this is something that we have to think about. We haven't made any kind of decision on it.

THE COURT: You have any law on it as to this?

MR. MARMO: Well, we were just faced with

this this morning for the first time. Judge, frankly, they tell us that even in capital cases what they would do before this new system was, that the jury would be questioned. They are put in the box and then when there are sixteen people there, and you had a view of the entire composition of the jury panel, you could exercise your challenges.

It seems to me that the more we think about this and discuss it, the more problems, very serious problems we find that are inherent in this system that we're now going to be forced to follow.

THE COURT: But I told you, you give me the capital case, where we interrogate the juror.

MR. MARMO: I understand that.

THE COURT: Of course we interrogate them.

They are sworn right there and then.

MR. MARMO: Yes, but you have had the opportunity of having questioned them.

THE COURT: I know. But the Court has passed upon that. The Court has a duty to question.

MR. MARMO: I understand that. But now we are in a situation where we don't get a chance to speak to the juror where we have to exercise our challenge, we don't know when we say this juror is

satisfactory and along comes juror number nine, which causes a problem for us with this juror and the relationship between them.

THE COURT: Why type of problems?

MR. MARMO: We want number nine, but we don't know number nine, if this juror is going to be on the panel too, because they work in the same place, but one fellow is in a higher position than the other fellow, we like number nine, we think he will be a fair juror, we don't want to waste a peremptory challenge on him, but on the same---

THE COURT: Tell me to excuse him and maybe
I won't have you waste a peremptory challenge.

MR. MARMO: Judge, we don't think it is fair to us to embark on this type of thing on the expectation of maybe that kind of situation materializing. And there are other situations along the same lines that maybe you will agree with us that the man should be excused for cause. Probably it's not a basis for an excuse for cause. It sounds like, I would think that in all probability in that type of situation, it's a peremptory kind of situation.

THE COURT: I heard your argument. I think you made it rather clear.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gentlemen, what is your feeling on this?

MR. BELDOCK: Your Honor, I'll let Mr. Steel argue it perhaps at length, if he needs to.

THE COURT: Are you opposed to it?

MR. BELDOCK: No. My position is pursuant to your discussion off-the-record this morning, I was willing to accept your suggestion of our exercising the challenges after each individual juror.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BELDOCK: Provided that is a final exercise of challenges.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BELDOCK: In the alternative, I still believe that the fairest most expeditious, and most sensible system would be the full struck jury system where if I have one juror, as we discussed before, and exercise our challenges in alternate manners so we then end up with 16 jurors.

The system that seems less likely to be expeditious and fair is the one proposed by Mr. Marmo. In my opinion that's all I have to say to your Honor on this subject.

I do want to ask to put some things before your Honor concerning the questioning of this juror,

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which I will do after Mr. Steel addresses you.

THE COURT: Let us hold off.

All I want to know, is do you oppose this system or not? If you do, give me your reasons so you'll be protected on the record.

Let us not repeat the same things.

If we keep repeating things that were said before, we are never going to pick a juror here.

MR. STEEL: I did not oppose the system that you suggested.

THE COURT: You don't prefer -- you don't oppose it?

MR. STEEL: I don't oppose it. The only thing that I do oppose is any system which allows the consent of passing.

THE COURT: We discussed this. I'm not going to permit you to discuss it again.

> MR. STEEL: Okay.

I already made that clear. THE COURT: is not going to be any passes.

> MR. STEEL: Okay.

THE COURT: The juror, once he survives a challenge, a challenge for cause stage, then the lawyers will exercise their challenges.

MR. STEEL: Okay.

THE COURT: Or they'll accept the juror.

MR. STEEL: No opposition to that.

THE COURT: Now, with reference to the question of the juror, I'm going to give you a couple of minutes to do that. I don't intend to spend a half hour allowing you to tell me how I should question the juror. We've gone through that.

Now, go ahead.

MR. BELDOCK: Well, ---

THE COURT: What area?

MR. BELDOCK: Your Honor, there were a number of responses that this juror would give, which had you been sitting in my seat and had the ability to look at objectively, you would have seen it, that he was trying to consider saying the things he was about to say, other things, that would have been pertinent to us, and they all related to very sensitive responses to very sensitive questions. And I ask your Honor once again, and I'll give you the questions and answers, and I have in my notes once again to please permit the juror to expose himself to disclose what is on his mind rather than you saying to the juror, if I instruct you such and such a way,

24

25

you will follow it, because you'll see, I think as I review these few questions and answers, that we should have gotten the man's responses in detail.

THE COURT: Well, I think I permitted him to answer.

MR. BELDOCK: Judge, he said as to the question you were asking him, whether he would be biased or prejudiced against either side, and he said: "Probably not."

Probably not, now you asked him whether he would be affected by what he read or discussed. said: "He didn't think so."

THE COURT: But he said, I would do the same thing as I did in the other trial. That's what he said. And then he explained what he did in the other trial.

MR. BELDOCK: That doesn't answer our problem here.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BELDOCK: You asked him as to whether it would make a difference to him that the victims were white or black.

Now, Judge, he hesitated a number of seconds, was about to say something, his face obviously showed

that he was trying to come out with an answer.

THE COURT: And he did.

MR. BELDOCK: No. Judge, he said his answer was as I said the other day, I have no prejudices and that is not the kind of answer that we should get in fairness, because that's a stock answer and the man is trying sincerely to give us a response, Judge. And you said something to him as he was hesitating, you went on.

THE COURT: But I did not suggest the answer.

MR. BELDOCK: No. But, Judge---

THE COURT: It was his response.

MR. BELDOCK: But by going on, you didn't, you just missed that opportunity for us to get a response from him, what he had on his mind, Judge, and that's what we are here for.

THE COURT: But counsel have to appreciate, that prejudice, racial prejudices we went into at length on Friday.

MR. BELDOCK: But he is showing by his responses today that he has something else he wants to tell us about what he read or what he thinks about this matter.

THE COURT: That's your feeling. I don't

quite agree. I think he was very objective, very responsive to the questions. And for you to evaluate it as to what I feel, what weight to give to his responses, not to interpret them.

MR. BELDOCK: Let me put it this way.

Are you prejudiced? He will say, no. If you are going to ask the man do you have, is there anything you want to tell us about your attitudes as to whether the defendants, the victims were white or black, or about what you read that you think that we might want to evaluate, we might get a response.

THE COURT: Okay. You're speaking for both.

MR. STEEL: Well, I just want to say---

THE COURT: Now, gentlemen. I'm not going to waste time now. We just made it crystal-clear that one attorney is the spokesman for both.

MR. STEEL: No, no, no, no, Judge.

THE COURT: We already discussed this juror's responses on Friday at length. And I don't intend to spend an hour discussing the juror's responses.

Now, you have your objection. Your objection is that you feel that I should either probe more or that I should excuse for cause, although you didn't articulate it in that fashion, but I will interpret

it for you, I should excuse for cause because of the manner in which he responded?

MR. BELDOCK: No, Judge. Not me.

MR. STEEL: Let me just add, I won't take more than a minute of your time.

THE COURT: I will give you time, but I don't want repetitive argument.

MR. STEEL: Will you wait until I'm repetitious?

THE COURT: I will wait. Go ahead.

MR. STEEL: I think even on the question of his medical problem, I think your Honor should say, well, do you think that there is anything about your medical condition, your stomach condition, which in any way could interfere with your ability to sit and listen to this case?

I think you owe it to that man as a prospective juror. I think you owe it to the defendants, and I think frankly with regard to that, you owe it to the State.

Now, I think you also have to ask him again especially in light of the medical thing.

THE COURT: I'm not concerned about the medical. He hasn't had any treatment since May and

22

23

24

25

he's acknowledged the fact that he was nervous when he left here on Friday, which was understandable, after being questioned for at least a half hour.

> MR. STEEL: Okay. I would also---

THE COURT: And I'm sure also that he's given the information of being sequestered, he doesn't I'm not going to excuse a juror because he doesn't want to be sequestered. That's a real problem.

I think sequestration in a way MR. STEEL: could prejudice him.

> THE COURT: I'm not going to ask him any more I've already explored these areas.

Your exceptions are noted.

Do you have any exceptions, Mr. Marmo?

MR. HUMPHREYS: No, your Honor.

MR. MARMO: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. STEEL: Will you ask him a few more questions?

I'm not going to ask any more THE COURT: questions.

We are at a point now where I have passed this juror insofar as any challenge for cause is concerned.

20

21

22

23

24

25

You will exercise your perempt challenge. Your objection is noted.

MR. STEEL: Your Honor, I challenge this man for cause and I will tell you exactly why.

THE COURT: You already told me. And I denied your request.

MR. STEEL: I haven't told you at all.

I think any person who can only say that he would probably be fair and any person who can only say that he doesn't think he would be influenced by what he's read, and can't say any more than that, in light of a voir dire, which does not ask him to be specific about what he means, by what he means, by probably and why, the best he can only say, he only thinks that he can put aside prejudicial pre-trial publicity, is not somebody who can be passed for cause.

THE COURT: All right.

Your application is denied.

Anything further on the record, gentlemen? All right. Bring in the juror.

MR. MARMO: Judge, I wonder, does the jurgr have to be here when we use our challenges?

> THE COURT: I don't think so. Not at all.

Leave him out there.

You want to think about it? You may think about it. Take a few moments. I'll give you to quarter of. You have five minutes to get in the huddle.

Let the record indicate that it is twenty
minutes of. I'm going to give both sides five
minutes to confer before they exercise their perempt
challenges on this juror.

But no further argument.

MR. HUMPHREYS: We go first this time?

THE COURT: Yes, you do. Next time they go first.

MR. STEEL: There is no law that says a defendant goes first. On exercising, we keep rotating.

THE COURT: That's the way we do it.

MR. STEEL: Excuse me. You rotate? I don't understand that.

THE COURT: They go first. Who has defendant one, Mr. Beldock?

MR. BELDOCK: Yes.

THE COURT: And then you. Then you finish.

You keep going around. The next time you still go.

Maybe we haven't gotten to defendant number two, so you go the next time.

MR. STEEL: Excuse me.

Well, you wouldn't exercise two challenges. What they're saying, if I were to exercise a challenge for this juror, then the next turn is Mr. Beldock; is that what you're saying?

MR. MARMO: That's the way it would be done if we were outside.

MR. STEEL: Well, I would object to ever being put in a position where I have to exercise any kind of challenge.

THE COURT: We'll talk about that later. Let us take first things first.

I'm going to give you five minutes.

(Recess taken at 12:40 P.M.)

(Court reconvened at 12:45 P.M.)

THE COURT: I want everybody here at one time I don't want lawyers here alone. I'm not inferring anything, Mr. Humphreys, believe me.

MR. HUMPHREYS: I know.

THE COURT: As you were going out Mr. Steel came back in. And I want to be sure that there are no inferences of any byplay in between.

All right. Let us go. State first.

MR. MARMO: The juror is satisfactory.

MR. HUMPHREYS: Without prejudice to our position, your Honor, that we should not have to exercise our peremptory challenge at this time.

THE COURT: Your application is on the record

I've ruled on it. You've indicated you might take

an appeal. If you can, you go right ahead. But

that's my ruling.

All right. You don't have to reiterate it.

MR. STEEL: Well, your Honor, I must say that the defense still does not understand the mechanics of what we're doing now.

THE COURT: You're selecting a jury.

MR. STEEL: No, no. I understand that much, your Honor.

MR. MARMO: I would object to getting into arguments on any other points until after the challenges are used, because Mr. Steel doesn't want to exercise a challenge without understanding the mechanics. I certainly don't want him to do that. Let me tell you my problem.

THE COURT: Let him say what he wants.

MR. STEEL: Okay. As of now, there are

twenty-two defense challenges, which as I understand 2 each defendant has eleven. 3 4 It's about time you knew that. THE COURT: 5 Go ahead. MR. STEEL: Well, your Honor please, ---6 7 THE COURT: Didn't we rule on this before? 8 Didn't you make an application? MR. STEEL: Please don't express irritation 9 10 at me. THE COURT: I'm not irritated. I gave you 11 an extra challenge, and you still have twenty-two 12 13 challenges. 14 Go ahead. MR. STEEL: Okay. I merely want to know, 15 your Honor, the mechanics now of how we challenge. 16 17 For example if---18 THE COURT: Defendant number one is after 19 the State. 20 MR. STEEL: Right. THE COURT: Defendant number two after 21 defendant number one. 22 23 MR. STEEL: Okay. THE COURT: Now, if the State has accepted 24 25 the juror and Mr. Beldock should excuse him, then

1 2 the next time around you're number one, then the 3 State, and then Mr. Beldock. That's the way we do 4 it in Jersey. 5 MR. BELDOCK: And if I do excuse, if you 6 accept the juror, and Mr. Steel accepts him, then 7 the State is first, and if Mr. Steel should excuse 8 him---

> THE COURT: Yes. Then Mr. Marmo is first. Then we go one-two-three.

In other words, if Mr. Marmo should accept a juror and you excuse him, we don't go back to Marmo first. Then we go to Mr. Steel because he hasn't had his turn.

All right. Now, that's the way we do it.

Now, do you understand it now? How about you, Mr. Steel, the mechanics, that's what you wanted to know?

MR. STEEL: I think if Mr. Beldock for example doesn't exercise a challenge, he still has his eleven?

THE COURT: What de you mean if he doesn't exercise?

MR. STEEL: I don't lose a challenge if I don't exercise it.

THE COURT: If you say acceptable, you still

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

have eleven.

MR. B

MR. BELDOCK: I move a challenge for this juror.

THE COURT: Now, do we have that clear, gentlemen, so there is no misunderstanding.

All right, Mr. Beldock.

MR. BELDOCK: The juror is acceptable.

MR. STEEL: I challenge.

THE COURT: All right. He's excused by defendant number two.

Okay. The juror is excused.

(Prospective juror enters room)

THE COURT: Have a seat, Mr. Zylka.

All right, Mr. Zylka. You have been excused and you may return to your profession or occupation.

MR. ZYLKA: Yes.

THE COURT: And we want to thank you for your time.

MR. ZYLKA: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have been very fair by being here and we thank you for permitting us to impose on you.

MR. ZYLKA: All right. Thank you, your Honor THE COURT: All right. Just go out that door.

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

23

24

25

(Prospective	juror	leaves	room)

(Prospective juror enters room)

DONALD W. WETZEL, called as a prospective juror, having been first duly sworn, testifies as follows:

THE COURT: Have a seat here, please.

Gentlemen, I just want to make sure about one thing. I'm quite sure. I just want to be positive. When the panel was in court on Friday and I introduced the attorneys and the litigants, did I refer to Mr. Fogel as being associated in this case?

MR. STEEL: We both mentioned their names.

THE COURT: In other words, the juror has heard their names?

I think Mr. Goceljak, who was not, I did mention him too.

MR. HUMPHREYS: I think you missed him.

THE COURT: All right. His name is John Goceljak.

All right. Is Mr. John Goceljak here right now?

MR. MARMO: He is in Hudson County.

THE COURT: Where does he live? Do you know?

MR. MARMO: West Milford, sir.

BY THE COURT:

Your name is Mr. Wetzel?

A Yes. Right.

Q All right. Mr. Wetzel, the other day various persons were introduced to the panel. By various persons, I mean the attorneys and the defendants, and associates of the attorneys. And then we read a list of witnesses. And among those names, I did not read the name of Mr. John Goceljak, whose name is spelled G-O-C-E-L-J-A-K, he lives in West Milford. He's an Assistant Prosecutor with the Passaic County Prosecutor's office. Do you know him, have you ever heard of him?

A No.

Q Where do you live, Mr. Wetzel?

A Jersey City.

Q And what is your profession or occupation?

A I'm a supervisor in a bolt and nut company.

Q All right. Now, with reference to education, what type, have you had any formal education?

A No. I went two years of high school.

I see. And how long have you been associated with the firm that you are with now?

A Seventeen years.

1

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Q I see. What does your family consist of?

A Wife and three children.

Q And could you just give us the ages of your children and what their status is?

A Daughter, twenty-two, married, nurse, lives in Connecticut. Son works in the post office, twenty-one. Another son goes to Jersey City State College.

Q I see. And what is your religious affiliation?

A Catholic.

Q Do you belong to any social, professional associations, or clubs of any kind?

A No.

 $\mathbb{Q}$  And I may assume that there is a Mrs. Wetzel?

A Yes.

Q And what does she do?

A She's a security guard in school.

Q Would the fact that she's a security guard, which has some image of law enforcement to the extent of she takes care of traffic I suppose on the corner?

A No. She works in the school.

Q Oh. In the school. In other words, her duties are what specifically? Do you know?

A Keep out unauthorized people and find out who comes

into the school and who goes out of it as far as visitors, not the pupils.

Q Okay. With reference to those duties, assuming that she had to eject or have to investigate somebody who wasn't authorized, and in so doing she might have to call on the police to help her, would that put you in a position where you might favor the State in this particular case, if you were chosen as a juror?

A I don't think so.

In other words, could you ignore your wife's position as a security guard if you were chosen as a juror in this case, and decide this case strictly on the facts and on the law?

A Yeah. I could.

In other words, could you appreciate that the fact that she is a security guard would have no bearing on this case and it shouldn't influence your thinking at all?

A No, it doesn't.

Q And it doesn't. It would not?

A (Prospective juror shaking head)

Q All right. You know the nature of the charges in this case, do you not? You were told?

A Vaguely, yes.

.

Q All right. The defendants are charged with homicide in the indictment.

A Right.

Q As I told you right from the outset, the fact that they are charged, is no evidence of their guilt, but they are charged with the charge of homicide, and it relates to three charges of homicide in the indictment.

Were you aware of that?

A Yes.

Q Now, does the nature of the charge disturb you in any way?

A The charge, no.

Q Is there something that does disturb you?

A Yeah, being locked up and being put away from my family.

Q Okay. Other than that, do you have anything that disturbs you, that is understandable, we do not take it lightly, because I'm going to go over it, I'll get back to it, but I will listen to you on that, but other than that, do you have any prejudices at this point that would affect your thinking in this case?

A I'm starting to become slightly prejudiced.

Q Why do you say that?

A Well, with what goes on, there are certain blocks

like in Jersey City I can't walk down with my wife. And it goes against my grain a little bit.

Q And that would cause you to react to these defendants to some extent?

A That I don't know. In fact, I have never seen these guys before. I don't know them. I guess it shouldn't.

Q It shouldn't. But if it does in any way I want to know about it. I can appreciate what you just expressed as perhaps being a fact. I don't know. I don't live here. But is it going to affect your thinking in this case? Are those feelings that you have developed because of what happened in your town going to affect your feelings?

A It's not only my town, it's a lot of towns. There is a big piece going on in the News right now about the old people up in the Bronx.

Q What does that got to do with this case?

A You asked me about prejudice.

Q Right.

A I said I am becoming slightly prejudiced. Like I say, I don't know these guys. I never seen them before. It shouldn't, but how do you answer that until you know it's all over and you've become, well, here you say, yes

or no at the end. I don't know if I can answer that question right now, like I say, it shouldn't affect me.

Q Well, let me put it this way. You don't know whether it would affect you at this point, but you think it might?

A Like I say, I don't know. It's according to what I hear, you know, you know what goes too.

Q When is the last time you read about the situation in the Bronx?

A This morning. And then there was one Saturday too in the paper. It is a series that just started. It cries out headlines.

Q And it upsets you?

A Sure it does.

Q And you feel if you are chosen---

A I've considered moving out of Jersey City.

Q Let me ask you this. I might as well ask you right now. Were you aware in this particular case that the victims are white?

A Yeah.

Q You're aware of that?

A Yes.

Q Would the fact that the defendants are black and the victims was white, put you in a position where your

· 

judgment would either be affected in any way or do you think it might be affected in any way?

A That reason? Like I say, it shouldn't affect me, because these guys I never seen before and they've done nothing to me or they've done nothing as far as I know.

But according to, you know, during the trial, I don't know whether it would or not. Like I say, it shouldn't.

Would you be able to hear this case and put aside any feelings you may have developed because of what happened in your community and what has happened in other communities, and decide this case solely on the evidence and solely on the law? Would you be able to do that, if you were chosen as a juror, or do you feel that your feelings as to what's going on, as you put it, are so strong that you would find it difficult, you would find it difficult to not permit these feelings to affect your thinking? Did I make myself clear?

A Yeah, you did.

Q All right.

A It's a lot easier to answer that. It could be difficult, yes.

All right. I observed you in your answers very frankly and I think you're being very candid with me.

I don't think you're using this as an excuse to be excused

1

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

from this service.

I try not to . I try to be honest with myself too. Α

You feel that these feelings could cause you to react against these defendants during the trial? Like I say, it's a tough question to answer right A It might depend upon what I hear in here.

What you are going to hear has nothing to do with Jersey City or the Bronx. It has to do with a specific situation where certain facts will be presented. And from these facts you are going to have to sift the truth and you're going to have to decide on the innocence or guilt, starting on the premise as I said before, as far as I'm concerned, that they're not guilty at this point. The State is going to prove, if it can, its position. And the burden as I told you Friday is always on the State. It never shifts to the defendants. They don't have to prove their innocence. The State has to prove their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, if after you've heard the facts and you've heard the applicable law as I explain it to you, you're not convinced of their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, would you acquit them laying aside all prejudices that you may have developed because of collateral matters not related to this matter? Could you acquit them?

A Worded like that, yes, yeah, I could.

Q But you do have a serious reservation that your feelings as to what happens elsewhere might affect your thinking here?

A There is a reservation, yes.

Q There is; and you feel it's strong enough to affect your thinking?

A I honestly don't know if it's strong enough to or not.

Q But you have given a lot of thought to the situation in the Bronx?

A Yeah. I've had butterflies since we talked Friday here. Like I say, I don't know whether I can give without some reservation.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to excuse you. I think you've been candid and didn't use it as an excuse not to serve. I don't have to get to the next area about the sequestration.

All right. I'm going to excuse you for cause.

Is there any objection, gentlemen, at this point?

MR. STEEL: No objection.

THE COURT: The State?

MR. HUMPHREYS: No objection.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wetzel, you are excused.

I'm going to ask you to do a couple of things. We've asked you to do enough I suppose by having you here waiting around, which we know isn't pleasant. Don't discuss the fact that you have been excused and the reasons why you've been excused with anyone.

MR. WETZEL: Fair enough.

THE COURT: You're free to go back to your employment.

As far as your service is concerned, you're completely finished. Okay.

MR. WETZEL: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Go out that way, please. That left door.

(Prospective juror leaves room)

THE COURT: Just wait one second.

All right. Okay.

MR. LIPTAK: Bring the next one in, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Prospective juror enters room)

JOHN N. CARROTTA, called as a prospective juror, having been first duly sworn, testifies

as follows:

3

BY THE COURT:

4

Q What is your name?

5

A John N. Carrotta.

6

7

Q Have a seat. Good morning, Mr. Carrotta.

Just about good afternoon.

8

Where do you live? Just tell me your town.

9

You don't have to give me your address.

10

A Jersey City.

11

Q Jersey City. And for how long have you lived in Jersey City?

12

13

A All of my life.

14

Q Okay. Now, I don't know if this is going to

15

help you, but I'm going to ask you to try and relax, be-

16

cause I'm not going to ask you anything that is going to

17

embarrass you. The sole purpose of this questioning is to

18

ascertain whether or not you'd be able to serve on this

.19

case and return a verdict in accordance with the evidence

20

as well as the law.

21

22

23

24

27

25

So, if I could help you by telling you to relax, I would appreciate that you would relax. You'll be guided accordingly. I can see that you are a little tense, which is understandable, but you are here with twelve people, and they're just as human as you are. If I prick

1

.3

4

6

7

9

10

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

23

25

my finger with a pin, I'll bleed just like you. Don't let the title or anything like that bother you.

Okay. Let us talk about the case now.

What is your profession or occupation?

A I'm, I work for the Postal Service.

Q And how long have you been with the Postal Service?

A Since August of '74.

Q And what did you do before that?

A I was in the Army for two years and I had just gotten out of high school.

Q I see. Where did you go in the Army? Did you go out of the country?

A No.

Q What division were you in?

A Third Infantry.

Q Have anything to do with military police?

A No.

Q Did you have any difficulty in the Army?

I'm not going to ask you embarrassing questions, but I

want to make sure that you didn't develop any feelings

about authority. You have any difficulty in the Army?

A No. No problems.

Q When did you get out, a year and a half ago,

## 3/9 a A

I see. Where?

Jersey City State.

Q

24

25

Α

Q What if you get into this case, what's going to happen?

A Well, I would do whatever assignments I would be assigned.

Q Would it create a real hardship for you?

A No, not really.

Q You're all right?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Because, you know, I would consider that in evaluating you as a juror. If you had a hardship, if we get a man in here who has a hardship, or a student who has a hardship, who's trying to go to school at night, and things of that nature, we consider that.

Now, if you told me you paid for your tuition; and I'm not giving you an out now, I'm not trying to get you off by any means, but what I'm saying to you, you are going to school, you lose tuition, lose a semester, I am not going to let you lose your tuition or a semester. I'm sure these lawyers would not want to do that either. How do you feel about that?

A Well, if it came to that, I wouldn't want that to happen.

Q But that won't happen as far as you're concerned?

Not particularly, no.

and

Q You could hear this type of case, in other words, and decide it fairly and squarely on the merits,

right?

A Yes.

Do you know anything about this case at this point except for what they told you in court from other sources, like newspapers, television, magazines, other people?

A Well, yes. What I've read in the papers in the past, you know.

Q Okay. Tell me how long ago did you start reading about it?

A Probably about a year ago or so.

Q All right. Do you remember what you read about the case when you first read about it?

A That Mr. Carter was asking for a re-trial. And that at that time it was up to the Governor. And he had brought his petitions to the Governor. And it was then turned over back to Passaic County. And they felt that it wasn't to meet their approval, they felt that it should not have been granted, and then it went to the Supreme Court and it was granted.

Q All right. That's what you read as far as

you are concerned?

A Yes, as far as I remember.

Q How about that? Did you ever hear about this case before a year ago?

A No.

Q You read about it in 1966 or after that except for a year ago?

A I'm twenty-three years old, so I don't recall that at that time.

Q So the first contact as you remember as you sit there now, would be your reading about it about a year or so ago?

A Yes.

Q Okay. As a result of what you read at that time; incidentally, was that the only source that you've had? Have you had any exposure to television about this case at any time?

A Well, what I had mentioned, would include television if it was on it.

Q Did you ever discuss it with anybody?

A No.

Q Have you formulated any opinions as to innocence or guilt at this point?

A No.

Carrotta - voir dire

Q Do you have an open mind about the innocence or guilt of these defendants at this point?

A Yes.

Q In other words, you don't have an opinion about innocence or guilt, or do you?

A No. No, I do not.

Q Do you know any of the participants in this trial? By participants, I mean the lawyers for the State, for the defendants, the associates with them, the defendants themselves, or witnesses, whose names I've read the names of persons that I read who might be mentioned in the trial. Do you know any of these people?

A No, I don't.

Q Have you ever been associated with law enforcement yourself? By law enforcement, I mean local police, like I said, the other day, on the city level, municipal police, city police, township police?

A You mean do I know?

Q No, have you yourself ever been associated with any law enforcement agency as I defined it?

A No.

Q Are you, any members -- I'll take it one at a time now. Nine. I want to know how close, are there any relatives in your immediate family associated with law

Α

enforcement on either side, yourself or your wife?

A No.

Q Okay. Do you have any close friends that are associated with law enforcement?

A No, I do not.

Q All right. Have you or any member of your immediate family ever been the victim of a crime?

A No.

Q Have you ever been a participant in a criminal proceeding such as a witness, a defendant, or a complainant?

A No. No, I haven't.

Q Has any member of your family ever been a victim of a crime that you know of?

A No.

Q All right. This is your first time that you've been called as a juror?

A Yes, it is.

Q You've never been on jury duty before?

Never before.

Q Okay. If you are chosen as a juror in this case, would you have any difficulty in listening to the testimony during the course of the trial, listening to the law as I explain it to you, and returning a verdict in

accordance with the evidence as well as the law?

A No, I don't think I would have any problem.

Now, there is going to be sequestration in this case, which means that procedurally we are going to spend some time selecting a jury. And we don't know how long that's going to take. But after you're through here today, if you're excused, that means you're not going to be a juror in this case. You go home and go to work, and do whatever you have to do.

If you are accepted, you still will probably be able to go home at this point until we have selected the rest of the jury. And then once we select the jury, we are going to ask you to come back. And then the trial will start.

Procedurally, now once the trial starts, we are going to sequester the jury. You know what sequestration is?

A Yes, I do.

Q It means that you'll be housed in a hotel with your fellow jurors and you'll be under the supervision of the Passaic County Sheriff's office. I suppose Passaic County. At any rate, there will always be someone in attendance and you'll be transported from there to the courthouse and back in the evening. And you'll have to stay

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

sequestered for the period of the trial, whatever it could be. Five weeks. It could be six. It could be less. It could be more. I don't know.

Now, how do you react to that? I know you don't like it. Nobody would like it. But would you have any real hardship except the inconvenience, the fact that you wouldn't be with your family?

A Not particularly, but as long as I could make some arrangements with my school that I could get assignments brought over or something like that.

Q No problem with that. You'd be able to do that?

A Yes.

Q All right. Let us get into some specific areas.

Now, let me see. You told us that you don't know any of the participants. That's correct; isn't it?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Are you familiar with the City of Paterson at all?

A East Paterson, a little bit.

Q Do you ever recall socializing in Paterson?

A No.

Q Did you ever hear of a James Oliver?

327 a A

232425

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And a Fred Nauyaks?

I think you mentioned those names before.

Right. I just want to be sure. And then there is one more person, a Hazel Tanis?

Okay. Did I ask you if you belonged to any associations, professional, social, or otherwise?

A No, you didn't ask that. But, I don't.

Okay. How about in school? You have any fraternities you belong to?

A No.

Okay. Generally, what newspapers or magazines, or periodicals do you read?

The Times and local papers, the Jersey City Journal Star Ledger, one of those.

All right. Now, from what you -- maybe I will get to that later.

Let me ask you about, did you ever hear the name Rubin Hurricane Carter before?

Not before the, like I said, the incidents, the retrial had come about.

Before that you had never heard of him as a Q boxer?

309aA

A

24

25

I don't know what you mean quite by that question.

Well, let us assume you're a student and

you're a postman, right? And let us assume I have a bartender maybe, would our lifestyles might be different in a bar most of the time or things of that nature, would you have any opinions about that?

A No.

Q What if I was on trial and I was a bartender, would that put you in a position because my lifestyle is different from yours, you might be prejudiced against me?

A No. What you decide to do with your life is your own business.

defendants lifestyles might be different from yours in some way, shape, or form, I don't know that it would, but assuming that it were different from yours, would that affect your thinking in any way just by reason of the fact that they don't do the things you do and you don't do the things they do?

A No.

Q Now, you have told us quite specifically what you remember reading about the case originally when it was up for the re-trial; is that it?

A Yes.

Q Have you read anything about the case since that time or heard anything about it?

A Not what was previously before. I was called for that.

Q When you were called for this, did you read about it again?

A Yes. I recall seeing that it was moved from this Passaic County to Hudson County.

Q Okay. And what else do you remember reading about this case other than what you told us so far?

A That's about it.

Q Have you formulated any opinion as to innocence or guilt in this case?

A No.

Q Have you discussed the case with anyone, your wife, or any employee, co-employee, or friend, or anybody?

A No. no.

Well, did you discuss it? The next question would be, that's why it's very important that you try to search your mind. And I appreciate that you don't remember the answers readily to some questions. But, the next question would be, did they discuss it with you? And did they formulate an opinion or did they express an opinion about this case? You see, you just have stated you have not formulated an opinion; is that correct?

1

5

7

6

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, as far as actually discussing any opinion on A it, I did not. But I spoke to my wife. Naturally she wanted to know where I was going, and what I was doing.

> Q Right.

You know. So I had informed her that this was the A case that I was a possible juror.

You identified the case for her? Q You said about these two fellows from Paterson and things of that nature?

Yes.

Now, did she express an opinion about their innocence or guilt at that time?

A No.

Did you express an opinion about their innocence or guilt?

Α No, I didn't.

Do you have an opinion today about their Q. innocence or guilt at this point?

Α No.

You feel if you were chosen as a juror, and I asked you to keep an open mind as to innocence or guilt, I would ask you to listen to all the facts in the case before you make up your mind. And I would tell you to withhold judgment even at that point, that you would have to

13

14

16

15

18

17

20

19

22

21

23

24

25

withhold judgment until, not only the evidence has been presented. I would tell you to withhold judgment until I have explained the applicable law to you. And then I would tell you again, you still have to withhold judgment. You can't decide this case even once the facts have been developed and the law has been given, you have to wait until the case has been given to you for decision by the Court so that you can discuss it with your fellow jurors.

So, actually I'm making it brief and a little less complicated, but you have three stages.

Number one, you must listen to all of the evidence.

Number two, you must listen to the law.

Number three, you must have an opportunity to discuss the case with your fellow jurors when it's given to you for deliberation, and not before, of course.

And now, would you be able to do that, wait until you make up your mind until all these things are done? You mean until everything is entirely---A

In other words, you can't say, for example Q the State goes first, okay. After they finish, oh, oh, I know where I'm going on this case. You can't do that. Would you be able to withhold judgment on the defendants' innocence or guilt at that point?

A Yes.

Q Then I would say to you then, if the defense decides to go ahead with the defense, you must still keep an open mind. You can't decide innocence or guilt yet. Would you be able to do that?

A Yes.

Q Then I would say to you that even though you have heard the State's case and even though you have heard the defense, you still can't make up your mind. You have to wait until I give you the law. Would you be able to do that?

A Yes.

And then I would say to you, even after I have given you the law, you can't make up your mind until you've had an opportunity to discuss the pros and cons with your fellow jurors. That is what we call deliberations. Would you be able to do that?

A Yes.

Q So, in other words, may the lawyers and may I assume at this point you don't have an opinion as to innocence or guilt?

A Correct.

May we assume then that you would be willing to keep an open mind until the case is actually given to

T

\_\_

you for decision?

A Yes.

All right. Now, let me just give you as a sideline, you understand if a juror should make up their mind before, let us assume that you are a litigant in a civil case, all right, and you had a jury, right, and the jurors are going to hear your case so you're interested in the outcome, right.

Now, if one of the jurors during the course of that trial before the case is tried and before it's given to them they are charged on the law, and before it's given to them for decision, deliberations, and decision, one of the jurors says about your case, you know, I know where I'm going on this case, if he did, let us assume after you presented your facts or before you had an opportunity to present your facts, there wouldn't be any reason to go ahead with the trial, would there?

A No.

Q So you realize how important it is that a juror keeps their mind open?

A Yes.

Q Okay. You're willing to do that in this case, aren't you?

A Yes, I am.

4

5

6

7

. 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q All right.

Now, you indicated you discussed it with your wife. Did you discuss it with other persons too? Well, my employer to explain to him that again, the Α same circumstances, where I had been.

I mean, other than that. I mean did you ever discuss it with him before that?

A No.

At this time you discussed it solely for the Q purpose of advising him why you wouldn't be at your place of employment?

A. Yes.

Q And what did you tell him specifically? I just showed him my summons and I told him that I A explained the case that I was selected for.

All right. Did he express any opinion about Q the case?

Α No.

Did he express any knowledge which he con-Q veyed to you about the case?

Α No.

Did you express any opinion to him about the Q case?

No, I didn't. A

24

25

1

3

4 5

Α

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Now, are there any other persons that you may have discussed it with either before you were summoned as a juror or since that time? No.

> Okay. Q

May we assume then that as a result of what you may have read in the newspaper; as a result of what you may have heard on television; as a result of what discussions you may have had about this case, may we assume that you do not have any opinion about the innocence or guilt of these defendants?

Yes.

May I ask you this? To your recollection, and I want you to think about this now. Have you ever at anytime expressed an opinion about this case one way or another?

No.

Now, I'm going to get into an area and I  $\,$ want your candid answers about this like I want throughout all my questioning. I don't want to pick one area out. I'm going to ask you this. The reason I'm qualifying it, I'll make it clear. I told the jurors, I think I told you! we're not here to embarrass anybody and we're not to pry into your personal affairs. But we have a duty and

obligation to make inquiry which we think are necessary for the purpose of evaluating a juror's service in this case.

Now, do you have any black friends?

A Yes.

Q Do you work with any black persons?

A Yes. That's the friend I was referring to.

Q And aside from being co-employees, do you extend your relationship any further? Do you socialize in any way like bowl with them or go out drinking with them from time to time, or socialize in any way?

A No.

Q Is there any reason why you don't do it?

A No, not particularly. Some of them live in New

York. Maybe that would be the reason there.

Q All right. Are you prejudiced against them in any way?

A No.

Q Do your children have any black friends in the school? Your child is only three years old?

A Yes.

Q So we're not going to get into that. All-right. Have you had any disputes with black people?

A No.

Q Has race ever been part of an argument with any black person?

A No, no.

Q You tell me you live in Jersey City?

A Yes, I do.

Q In Jersey City. How long have you lived in Jersey City?

A All of my life.

Q All your life. Have there been any racial disturbances in Jersey City?

A Yes, there have been.

Q And do you recall how old you were and when that happened?

A When I was going to high school there were problems like that, but there were that type of problems just about in any major city.

Q All right. And as a result of those problems did you formulate any opinions about black people that you might think affect your opinion in this particular case in any way?

A No.

Q Do you have any particular opinions or prejudices or biases against black people generally which might affect your thinking in this particular case?

No.

2

A

4

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, you were in high school. You make note of the fact that there were racial disputes in many major cities, I think that is the way you put it, most major cities you had these racial problems, right?

A Yes.

Do you have any opinions about these disputes at this point that you think might affect your thinking in this particular case?

A From what had occurred at that time?

Q Right.

A No.

Q Were you ever personally involved in any of these disputes?

A No.

Q What was the extent of your knowledge? In other words, may I assume that you never participated in these disputes?

A Yes.

Q All right. What was the extent of your know-ledge of these disputes? Was it by observations in the news media or was it by personal contact?

A Well---

Q Or both?

Α Both, yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. Now, can you tell us to what extent you were personally involved? I'm using the word "involved" advisedly. You might say you were involved, but to what extent did you have contacts with these disputes that you described?

Well, there were problems within the school itself, you know.

What were the problems?

A Well, minor disputes within locker rooms and that type of thing.

Did they have racial overtones to them? In other words, would it be a black boy picking on a white boy, things of that nature or vice-versa?

In some cases it was both. Even Spanish or, you Α know, even Italian, you know.

Did you personally ever become involved in an altercation of any kind with a black boy?

A No.

> Or a Spanish boy? Q

Α No.

Did you have any altercations yourself while Q you were in high school, actual fight?

I've had fights, but none were with a black person. Α

Q

A No.

Q Now, considering that there might have been

Was it because of any racial problems?

Now, considering that there might have been racial disputes in and about your town or adjacent to your town, or around the nation for that matter, as you put it, most urban areas, and considering that you may have been actively engaged in some of these areas, whether it be a school or otherwise, to the extent that you described, which apparently is minimal by the way; is that it?

A Yes.

Q Your actual participation, your personal participation, but considering that and considering the fact that you've read about it elsewhere, and you've heard about it, and you've watched T.V. concerning racial disputes, have you formulated any opinion about blacks or against blacks as a result of these things?

A No.

Q May we assume that you don't have any opinion about blacks specifically which could prejudice you in this case?

A No.

Q Are you aware of the race of the persons who were allegedly victims of the homicides?

A Yes.

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

18

20

2122

23

24

25

Q And what is that knowledge that you have?

A Excuse me?

Q What do you know that the victims were?

A Three white people.

All right. Does that disturb you at all?

A No.

Q Would the fact that the two defendants are black, the three victims are white, would that put you in a position where if you were chosen as a juror, you might feel that you should react because white people were killed by two blacks?

A No.

Q Would you still be fair to both sides, the State and the defendants?

A Yes.

Q And you would follow the law as I give it to you?

A Until I considered it was completely, I heard both sides, and deliberations had been complete, and the law was applied.

And right up until that point you would at that point then you would predicate your verdict on the evidence and on the law?

A Yes.

Q And your verdict would not be affected by any prejudices of any kind?

A No.

And affected by any opinions about this case of any kind, although you stated that you don't have any; is that correct?

A I don't have any.

Q You don't have any opinion?

A No.

Q At this point?

A No.

Q How old did you say you are, Mr. Carrotta?

A Twenty-three.

Q Twenty-three. In 1966 you were thirteen years old?

A Yes.

And at that time were you aware of any disputes outside of Jersey City? Do you recall any disputes in any other towns that you're aware of?

A No, not at that time.

Let me ask you this. Have you yourself personally or any member of your family ever been inconvenienced or injured, or suffered any problem as a result of these racial disputes which we have been discussing?

No.

2 | A

Q Do you think that blacks are more likely to commit crimes than any other ethnic group or more than whites generally?

A No.

Q Do you think that non-white people are more prone to crime of violence than white people?

A No.

Q Would you be biased against a person because he's either black or non-white?

A No.

Q Are you prejudiced against a person who isn't white or he's a non-white?

A No.

Q Have you yourself suffered any incident or had any incidents which would, which might interfere with your judgment in this case?

A No.

Q And if you did have any incident, would you be able to discard it from your thinking completely and decide this issue fairly and squarely on the merits?

A Yes.

Q Did you ever hear of a fellow by the name of Bob Dylan or is it Bobby Dylan? Bobby or Bob Dylan?

A I think he's a singer.

3

Q Yeah, I think he's a rock singer or what.

4

How would you describe him. He's a singer. Did you ever hear him?

5

6

A I've heard of him.

7

Q You have any of his albums?

8

A No.

9

Q When is the last time you heard of him?

10

Just heard of his name.

11

Q I see. You remember any songs that he may

12

have sang or arranged, if I asked you?

13

A No.

14

Q I'm going to be through in a minute. Let me

15

ask you this. Do you have any strong feelings about

16

17

A No.

alcoholics?

18

Q Do you have such feelings about alcoholics that you would be unable to consider testimony by an

20

19

alcoholic?

21

A No.

22

Now, you already told us that you're employed by the government, the United States Post Office; is that

2324

right?

Α

25

Yes.

1

4

5

7

8

10

11

13

14

16

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q And have you had, held, and you've been in the service, so we're not concerned with those two areas.

have you held any other salaried or governmental position or job?

A No.

Q And are there any members in your immediate family with any governmental facilities like a prison or a hospital?

A I have a brother-in-law in the Air Force.

Q All right. Okay. Let me just review very briefly one or two questions. Then I won't impose on you anymore. And I appreciate your patience with me.

May the lawyers and I assume at this point you know of no reason why you should not serve on this case? At this time do you know of any reason why you shouldn't serve on this case?

A No.

Q May we assume that you have an open mind about this case?

A Yes.

Q May we assume that if you're chosen as a juror, you'll listen to the testimony, the charge of the Court, and ultimately base your verdict on the evidence and on the law?

A Yes.

And may we assume that you'll keep an open mind until this case is given to you for decision, given to you and your fellow jurors who will hear the case with you?

A Yes.

Q You have any physical disability like hearing or sight, or anything of that nature that might impair you?

A You mean me personally?

Q Yes.

A No.

Q Did you want to say something else? Why did you ask me personally?

A I didn't hear you.

Q In other words, you can hear well and you don't have any physical impairment?

A Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What I'm going to do, I'm through with my questioning. I'm going to have to ask you to go to lunch and come back at, well, let us make it twenty minutes to two, and then you'll just sit in the courtroom outside. Somebody will be there. And we'll finish up at that time.

I'm through with my questioning.

Thank you very much.

MR. CARROTTA: Thank you.

THE COURT: Have a good lunch.

(Prospective juror leaves room)

THE COURT: All right. Are there any general areas that I haven't covered.

I'll start off with the State at this time and I'll alternate. This way I don't have any hard feelings, then I'm not giving preference to one side over the other.

Now, do you have any, first of all, try to answer my question. Then I'll take it from there, because I don't want to get too involved.

You have any general areas that I may have missed? By that, I mean background, prejudice, employment?

MR. MARMO: No. I have some specifics.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. I will get to that.

We have any general areas?

MR. STEEL: No.

THE COURT: Okay. What are your specific areas, Mr. Marmo?

13 14 15

17 18

16

19

21

20

22

2324

25

MR. MARMO: I would like to know his address in Jersey City if he still lives on Bleecker Street (sic), which is indicated on the list. I would like to know the address of all the prospective jurors, frankly.

THE COURT: Okay. Except as a rule, what I try to do is not make it a public record so it doesn't appear in the newspapers where they live. That's the only reason I don't ask for a street address. It's on the list.

Who is privy to that list. I will impound that list. It's privy.

MR. MARMO: Nobody, I don't think anybody is going to give out the list.

THE COURT: Okay. If that's the case, I don't want these jurors' addresses being published.

What else?

MR. MARMO: I'd like you to ask him what type of work he does at the postal service. He's listed as a mechanic. He looks like he has a little grease under his nails now.

And let us see, his school, I think.

THE COURT: High school?

MR. MARMO: No, no. The college where he's

going to now. I'd like to know what he's majoring in. And I don't frankly understand how he's going to attend his classes for what his situation is going to be. I think before we pass on him, we ought to at least have that firmed up, so after he's picked, if he is picked, a week or two from then, there won't be any problem then that will cause us a problem then.

THE COURT: I'll explore that area so that there is no problem.

MR. MARMO: No. I don't think you followed that up, frankly.

THE COURT: I thought I did explore it. I did ask him what the situation was. He said, as long as I can have my assignments where I'm sequestered, I'll be satisfied.

MR. MARMO: I understand he said that. I just want to know whether he attends classes or this is something that he just sends in.

THE COURT: In other words, could be cut classes or what?

MR. MARMO: Whatever his schedule. And also, you asked him what magazines and newspapers he read. And he answered you, and gave you the newspapers.

24

25

And I don't know if that means he doesn't subscribe to any magazines.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll explore that.

Anything further?

MR. MARMO: No.

THE COURT: How about the defense, the defendant number one?

MR. STEEL: Mr. Marmo raised the material that I was interested in.

THE COURT: All right. Is that it?

MR. BELDOCK: Just what did he do in the Army?

THE COURT: You want it explored?

MR. BELDOCK: Just very briefly, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Army. I'll add that to the list by the State.

MR. BELDOCK: That's it, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. We will do that at quarter of two.

MR. STEEL: I wanted to know, I really forgot on the last juror, because I don't want to forget on this juror.

I remember at one point, we were talking about the State's knowledge, that you would ask

them after each prospective juror was brought in, whether the State has any particularized knowledge as to the individual juror. And I just wonder whether that could be asked.

THE COURT: Of course, I ruled on that. And if they have any knowledge, they are to give it to you. If they don't have it, they can't give you what they have if they're not privy to the information that I directed them to give to you, then they don't have to. All I need is their representation that they don't have it.

You have any knowledge about this juror?

MR. HUMPHREYS: We spoke to Prosecutor

O'Halloran earlier this morning. And he's checking
them out and he hasn't gotten back to us.

THE COURT: Right now they don't have any knowledge of this juror.

MR. STEEL: I take it the ruling is, if you do get it---

THE COURT: If they get it during lunchtime they will give it to you before they come back.

(Further jury excuses heard)

THE COURT: All right.

Gentlemen, I'll see you at that time, quarter

5

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of two.

At that time I'll ask the juror the areas that have been asked of me.

Thank you.

(Recess taken at 12:45 P.M.)

## AFTERNOON SESSION

(Following occurs in Court's chambers:

(Court reconvened at 1:50 P.M.)

(Prospective juror, Mr. Carrotta, reenters

room)

JOHN N. CARROTTA, called as a prospective juror, having been previously sworn, testifies further as follows:

## BY THE COURT:

All right. Mr. Carrotta, I just have a few more questions I'm going to ask you. And let me see. is your address in Jersey City? This will be kept confidential.

120 Booraem Avenue. Α

And how long have you lived there at that address?

Three years December.

What type of work do you specifically Q Okay. do for the post office?

A Maintenance mechanic.

Q Okay. In other words, you don't handle mail or anything?

A No. I work on machinery, conveyor systems, and that type of thing.

Q Okay. And in college, what are you majoring in, what field?

A Geoscience.

Q What does that incorporate?

A Geology, oceanography.

Q And with reference, you did tell us that you read certain newspapers. Do you subscribe to any periodicals or magazines of any kind?

A The New Yorker.

Q Newsweek or anything like that?

A New Yorker.

Q All right. And in the Army, I know you told us you were with the infantry?

A Yes.

Q Can you give us a little bit more, you were in the Army, the time you were there?

A I was stationed out of Washington, D.C. in Fort Myers, Virginia, and it was a unit assigned to take care of the Arlington National Cemetery, Tomb of the Unknown

Soldiers, parades, and things like that.

THE COURT: I have another here. I don't know what that means, the last area somebody mentioned. No, I guess that's about it.

Okay. All right.

All right. Let us see. I'm going to give the lawyers about until two o'clock. That will be five or six minutes. Then I'll call you back them. All right. You're through with my questions though Okay. I'll be right with you.

(Prospective juror leaves room)

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. You want to take a few minutes to confer unless you're ready:

MR. STEEL: We would like a few minutes.

THE COURT: You want a few minutes?

MR. STEEL: Yes.

THE COURT: No more than five.

MR. STEEL: No. We'll be back in court in five minutes.

THE COURT: Don't let me call you in all the time.

(Brief recess)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Marmo, Mr. Humphreys?

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

MR. HUMPHREYS: Pardon?

MR. MARMO: Yes. We'll excuse Mr. Carrotta.

THE COURT: Excused by the State.

Okay. You want to let the juror come in?

(Prospective juror enters room)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Carrotta, you have been excused, which means that your services will no longer be required.

But we want to thank you for your patience, the time you have given us, and we would urge you very strongly not to discuss what was discussed in here with anybody. All right.

Thank you. Good luck in your studies.

MR. CARROTTA: Thank you.

(Prospective juror leaves room)

(Prospective juror enters room)

DOMINICK R. DE ANGELO, ca as a prospective juror, having been first duly sworn, testifies as follows:

BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. DeAngelo, how are you, sir?

A Fine, your Honor.

Q First of all, thank you for your patience so far, but unfortunately, we don't have much of a choice but

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

24

25

to do it this way. It is a little time-consuming and we recognize that we are imposing on you people. But we ask you to bear with us, and of course, by all means, don't ever, if you are disturbed in any way, don't react against any of the participants in the trial, whether it be the defendants or the State.

Now, I'm quite sure you are familiar with the nature of the charges. In other words, you know what these defendants are charged with?

A Yes.

Q They are charged with three counts of homicide.

Now, like I told you before, the fact that they are charged is no evidence of guilt.

Does the charge in itself, the charges in and of themselves, put you in any position where you are prejudiced against any of these defendants?

A Prejudiced, you say, your Honor?

Q Yes.

A No, I'm not prejudiced.

Q Okay. Does the nature---

Yes, Sylvia?

MRS. SCHWARTZ: (Judge's secretary) Ray.

THE COURT: You want to take it? All right.

Go ahead.

(Slight pause while Court Reporter answers telephone call).

MR. ABT: Thank you, Judge.

Q All right. Do you know of any reason at this point before I even question you about anything; and let me, before I even ask you the question, I want you to understand that we are not here to embarrass you or pry into your affairs by our questioning. Okay. We are going to ask you some questions which have a bearing on this matter. But we want to make it crystal-clear that it is not to embarrass you, to pry into your personal affairs. It is just for the purpose of ascertaining whether you have any prejudices or any opinions, or any feelings about different subject matters that may affect your thinking. Do you understand that?

A Yes, I do, your Honor.

Q All right. Now, do you have any knowledge about this case at all. At this point, do you know anything except what we have told you?

A No, just what I've been reading, your Honor.

Q All right. You have been reading about it?

A Yes.

Q And you read newspapers?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A Yes.

And you've read, have you read any magazines about it?

A Not magazines, sir.

How about television media?

Yes. I have seen T.V. A

Okay. All right. Now, will the nature of Q the charge prevent you from returning a fair verdict, the nature of the charge being a homicide?

Well, I really couldn't answer that, your Honor, because I haven't drawn my own opinion.

I understand that. But that's not the question I'm asking you.

In other words, does the nature, the word "homicide" affect you in any way? Does it disturb you? A Well, homicide does upset me a little, yes.

Does it upset you to the extent where you couldn't render a fair and proper verdict in this case in accordance with the evidence and the law?

I guess I could keep an open mind on it.

All right. Now, do you know any of the par-Q ticipants in this trial? Remember I defined the word participant?

Yes.

1

A Right.

3

Q And, therefore, you would not consider it?

4

A I don't think so, your Honor.

5

Q All right. I have to be a little more specific. When you say, I don't think so, you leave it open

7

6

as if you might. You have to start out on the premise

8

thinking along these lines, the fact that you have a

9

brother-in-law who was in law enforcement, really has

10

nothing to do with this case; that's what I am trying to

11

12

A Right.

find out.

13

Q Would you permit it to enter into your

14

A No, I won't.

thinking at all?

15 16

Q Have you ever been a victim of a crime, you yourself? You ever had a car stolen, ever been assaulted?

17

A I got burglarized twice.

18 19

Q Your home?

20

My home and my car, yes.

21

Q How long ago was that?

22

A That was the end of August of this year down in Miami, Florida.

23

Q I see.

24

25

And approximately five years ago at the home,

DeAngelo - voir dire burglarized.

Q In other words, as a result of these experiences, do you feel that this being a criminal case, you might be prejudiced against the defendants?

A No, not against the defendant himself.

Q All right. Would you be prejudiced against the State, against the prosecution?

A No, I don't think so.

Q In other words, would you be able to say to yourself, well, although I had two instances where my home, my car was burglarized, it has nothing to do with this case and therefore, it shouldn't affect my thinking? Would you be able to say that?

A I don't think I would associate the two of them together.

Q All right. Fine. Okay. Now, are there any members of your immediate family who have suffered any, have been the victim of a crime?

A We are a large family, your Honor. I'm trying to think a minute.

Q Immediate family, I'm not talking about long-distance cousins or one of those things. I'm talking about immediate family?

A No. I would say no.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Have you or any member of your immediate

family ever been a participant in a criminal proceeding,

such as a witness or a complainant?

A No.

Q Or a defendant for that matter?

A No.

Q Have you ever served on a -- as a juror before?

A No.

Q This is your first experience as a juror?

A Yes.

Q Is there any reason why you could not apply the laws to the facts, the law as I give it to you to the facts in this case? Any reason why you couldn't do that?

A No, I don't think so, your Honor.

Q Do you have any prejudice against the defendant just because he's charged with a crime?

A Well, I'm not prejudiced against the defendant himself, but I don't believe in violence or crime. This I don't believe in.

Q Well, the fact that you don't, in other words, you don't approve of it?

A Right.

Q Okay. Would the fact that these defendants

are charged with the, if I told you that the fact that they are charged with a crime is no evidence of guilt, would you still hold it against them because they are charged with a crime because you have feelings against crime, or would you consider them innocent until and if proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

A Well, you couldn't. You would have to hear the case in order to.

Q In other words, let us start off. Let me try to explain it this way. You are sitting there, Mr. DeAngelo, and you say to yourself, I don't approve of violence, I don't like people stealing, I don't like people hurting other persons or committing murder, right. But if I'm chosen as a juror, the fact that I have those feelings, I'm still going to hear this case and decide it on the merits; is that what you are telling me?

A Yes, sir.

Q So the fact that you have these feelings, does that make you prejudiced against the defendants in this case?

A No. I'm not prejudiced, your Honor, no.

Would you be able to keep your feelings separate and apart from your thinking in deciding this case?

Well, I couldn't answer that until I heard the whole

case, your Honor.

\_\_\_

Q No. I'm talking about your personal feelings about crime generally. Would you be able to keep
those personal feelings away from this case so they

A I imagine so, your Honor.

wouldn't affect your judgment in this case?

Q But are your feelings against crime so strong that they would affect your judgment?

A Like I said before, I am definitely against crime.

There is no two ways about it.

Q Would that affect your judgment in this case your feelings, are they that strong?

A It is hard for me to answer, your Honor.

Well, let us assume you read in the papers that there had been a homicide in New York and one in Pennsylvania, and you don't approve of it. Now, you are a juror on this case. Would the fact that you don't approve of it, would that put you in a position where you start out on the premise these guys must be guilty, these defendants must be guilty until they're proven innocent? Would that change your thinking that way?

A No.

You would follow the law that they are innocent until proven, and if proven guilty beyond a reasonable

doubt; is that correct?

11.

A Well, they would have to, yes, your Honor.

Q The State would have to prove their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A Yes.

Q And you understand that I am going to tell you, like I told you on Friday, a defendant doesn't have to prove his innocence. You understand that, don't you?

A Yes, your Honor.

Q Will you accept the law as I give it to you?

A I would have to accept the law, yes.

Q Now, if you are chosen as a juror, I want to advise you in all fairness to you that this case may take several weeks to try. By several, I don't know. Five, six, seven, I don't know.

Now, procedurally, if you should be accepted as a juror today, you would probably, the way I have it planned right now, that the juror will go home and I'll ask you not to discuss the case. I'll ask you not to read about it, not to watch T.V. I'll ask you not to formulate any opinions about this case. I'll ask you not to prejudge it. Then I will call you back when we are ready for the trial. That means after we've selected a jury, we will call you back.

A

Now, once you are called back and the case starts, the actual trial starts, you are going to be sequestered with your fellow jurors. You know what sequestration is?

A Yes, sir, your Honor.

And that means that you will be housed in a hotel, a local hotel, and instead of going home after court each day, you will be going back to the hotel. Does that present any special problem? I know it is an inconvenience, I know.

A Well, I wouldn't particularly care for it, your Honor. I have a boy down in college in Florida, which will be flying home for the holidays, and all. If he does fly home, and I'm held up, it would present a little problem.

Q And if, I don't know that the case will go beyond the holidays. If it did, I would probably make some arrangements for the jurors to see their families. I wouldn't before the holidays. And I would try to do everything within my power to make it as comfortable as I could for the jurors than not, you know, minimize the hardship as much as I can.

All right.

Now, where do you live, Mr. DeAngelo?

149 West 30th Street, Bayonne.

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

anywhere from kindergarten to the fourth.

And has she been teaching for a long time? A Twenty-one years.

Do you know what type of children she teaches? Is it mixed group or is it just white, black, Spanish?

Ninety percent black, and the rest is white and Spanish.

As a result of her teaching experiences, have you developed any opinions for or against black people?

Would you explain that to me, your Honor?

In other words, your wife teaches 90 percent did you say, black children?

Yes. Yes, 90 percent.

I am sure she comes home at the end of the day, either they are black children or white children or mixed, I am sure she has problems with the children. I don't mind telling you I've got a daughter who teaches grammar school and a daughter-in-law for that matter, they complain about the children. But aside from that, general complaints about trying to handle children in a minimal low grade like kindergarten or first or second and third grades, does she complain about them because of their race anytime?

Catholic, your Honor.

you want.

Α

23

24

25

What is your religious affiliation?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

These two gentlemen that just walked in are day, and Mr. Artis.

Do you know who wrote it?

No, I don't. I believe it was Hurricane.

All right. But you never read the book?

Do you know, do you remember reading the review about it anyplace, any specifics about the book?

I might of, but I don't recall.

What if I asked you to give me an idea about what the book is about except that sixteenth round intimates a fight, I suppose. But other than that, do you know anything else about the book?

No. I couldn't tell you.

(At this point, the defendants Rubin Carter and John Artis entered the Court's chambers.)

THE COURT: Let us see. There are a couple of chairs there. One there, and I think, oh, there they are.

Mr. Carter. They were introduced to you the other

Q Okay. Have you ever been on the Grand Jury before?

A No. I never been on any jury, your Honor.

Q Okay. Let me see now.

You are, I'm sure, you have your own lifestyle about things. You have your own daily routine, your
social activities, your professional activities in connection with your work, et cetera. If other persons' lifestyles differ from yours, would you have any prejudice
against that person for that reason alone?

A No. I believe everyone should lead their own life, your Honor.

Q Now, you told me that you did discuss this case, or you did read about it?

A Yes. I did read about it.

Q And your source of information was the newspapers and the radio, and the T.V. Should I include radio, too?

A Well, you might of, yes.

Q All right. How about magazines, you remember reading anything in any specific magazines?

A No. Only newspapers and television.

I know some of those questions you are going to say to yourself, well, he asked how do I remember, well,

23

Α

Α

I read where there was an incident in Newark.

24

Where? What? Q

25

In Newark, New Jersey, involving these two

3

**4** 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

gentlemen. And that's about it.

Q All right. Actually, I am going to try to refresh your recollection. I'm not trying to educate you as to any facts of this case, but it was in Paterson, the allegation is.

A Paterson.

Q Okay. Now, do you remember specifically what the charges were at that time?

A I believe it was murder, your Honor.

Q All right. And did you know at that time the race or color of the persons who were charged with it?

A Well, yes. Like I say, I knew Hurricane Carter from

the fighting game. That's how I knew.

Q You knew his race, you knew he was what?

A Yes. I knew he was black. Yes, sir.

Q And the other defendant, Mr. Artis, did you know anything about him?

A No. I wasn't too familiar with Mr. Artis.

Q Did you know whether he was black or white?

A No, I didn't.

Q Did you know the color of the victims at that time?

A No, I didn't.

Q Do you know what they are now, you know the

Q Now, you understand, I told you before that they don't have to prove their innocence. The State has to prove their guilt. You understand that?

A Yes.

Q The defendant doesn't have to do anything, because the law is, he is presumed innocent until and if proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt; and, therefore, a lot of laymen like yourselves may think that a trial is where a defendant proves he's innocent. Well, that's a misconception of the law. The law is, he stands innocent until and if proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Would you accept that the State has the burden to do that and that the defendant doesn't have to prove his innocence?

A Yes.

Now, let us assume, like you told us, that you read about the case and you heard something on the news media about the case, and you have some knowledge. Do you think I'm giving you a chance to tell me everything you know about this case or is there more you know about it that I haven't asked you?

A No. There isn't in particular.

Q Now, when you read about it, did you have occasion to discuss it with anybody, whether it be with your wife, your boy who is in college now or your fellow

employees, or your friends? Did you discuss it with anyone?

A No.

Q Did you ever discuss it with your wife?

A No. We don't discuss these things.

Q In other words, may we assume here that you did not discuss the case with anyone?

A No, we didn't, no.

Q Or as a result of your exposure to the case, whether it be through the news media, papers, television, or whatever you might have read here or there, did you make an opinion, did you formulate an opinion in your mind and say, oh, these guys must be guilty or these guys must be innocent? You make any opinions about innocence or guilt?

A No, your Honor.

Q As you sit there today and as you reflect, do you have an opinion about the innocence or guilt of these defendants?

A No.

Q And except for what you've told us so far, you know nothing about this case?

A Nothing, your Honor.

Now, you worked in the same place for twentyone years?

7	
4	

A Yes, sir.

3

Q And you lived in the same neighborhood for how many years?

5

4

A Going on fourteen years now.

6

Q Are there any black people in your neighborhood?

7

A None in our neighborhood, but in the city, yes.

9

Q Are there any black people where you work?

10

Α

Α

Oh, yes, many.

11

Q About how many people work in your place?

12

Two hundred, your Honor.

13

Two hundred?

14

A Yes.

Q

15

Q And would you have any idea how many are blacks and how many are white, just roughly? In other words, would you have fifty, sixty black people or Spanish?

17

18

16

A Well, we have, I'd say, approximately forty-five

19

blacks in the place.

20

Q Are you in any supervisory capacity at your work?

21

22

A No, I'm not.

23

24

Q Are you ever in a position where you have any black people supervise your work or you supervise their work?

25

A No.

Q With reference to your work, have you had any disputes with any black persons which could cause you to be prejudiced against a black man?

A No.

Q Do you, as you sit there now, do you have any prejudice against a black man?

A (Prospective juror shaking head.)

Q Would the fact that these two defendants are black, would that prejudice you against them?

A No, your Honor.

Q Would the fact that the two black men are charged with a crime of homicide and that the victims are white, would that prejudice you against these defendants?

A No.

Q You have any feelings as a result of that?

When I say these two defendants are black, they are charged with the homicide of three white people, does that cause you to react so that your judgment may be affected?

A No, your Honor.

Q Could you still be fair to the State and to the defendants in spite of the facts as they are?

A I would have to be, yes.

Q All right.

Newark, Paterson, Jersey City. I don't know about Bayonne, where you live in Bayonne?

A Bayonne.

Q Have you had any problems like that in Bayonne?

A No. We're in a pretty good town. People seem to get along pretty well.

Q You read about the racial disturbances in other towns?

A Yes, I have.

Q As a result of that, have you formulated any opinion against black people as a result?

A Not against black people, but as a whole, I think it is a crime what's going on, that it shouldn't have been.

Q You think there shouldn't have been racial disturbances?

A No, I don't think so.

Q Okay. Now, if you were chosen as a juror, are your feelings so strong that you would react against these two defendants because of racial disturbances involving black people? You have two defendants who are black. Would it cause you to react against them?

A No. It wouldn't, your Honor.

Q Would you and could you be fair to these two

Yes.

2

3

4

Α

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

defendants considering the fact that you do have feelings about racial disturbances in the cities?

You could. You wouldn't permit that to cause you to react against the defendants?

Α No.

Do you have, Mr. DeAngelo, any opinions about Q governmental programs which have been designed for the purposes of racial integration?

In what field? Would you say, your Honor? Α

Well, let us talk about busing for example. Q Do you have any feelings about that program which are strong enough to affect your judgment or thinking in this case?

Well, I never really thought about it, your Honor. Α

> You haven't thought about it? Q

I read about it, but I feel more or less what-Α No. ever the government wants to do, it is up to them.

Q Do you have any strong feelings about these governmental programs concerning racial integration?

Well, it is according on what subject, your Honor? A

Q Well, what you mean by that? I would like you to elaborate what you mean by what subjects?

I believe like on this school busing, if a child

18

20

19

21 22

23

24

25

DeAngelo - voir dire

116

wants to go to another school, he should be allowed to go to the other school.

All right. As a result of any program that has to do with racial integration, do you have any strong feelings that might affect your judgment here?

Α No.

Q Have you ever been the victim of any racial disputes?

No, I haven't, your Honor. A

> Have you ever had a fight with a black man? Q

I can't say I did. Α

Have your children ever been the victims of disputes with black children?

Α No.

Q Has your wife, as a school teacher, ever been assaulted by any black students?

Α No.

Do you think that black people are more likely to commit crimes than any other ethnic group or more than whites, generally?

Α Well, I would say it is up to the individual themselves, your Honor.

But do you have a feeling inside of you that black people are more inclined to commit crimes of violence

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Would that fact alone prevent you from being fair to both the State and the defendants?

Α No.

0 Now. Listen to this question, Mr. DeAngelo. Is there any incident in your background or in your past that you would have reason to believe might interfere with your judgment in this case or prevent you from being fair to both sides?

No, your Honor.

Have you had any experience that stands out in your mind which puts you in a position where you know now as you sit there, and by this time, you know exactly what I'm attempting to do. I'm attempting to find out your philosophies. I'm trying to find out if you have any opinions. I want to find out if you have expressed any opinions, I want to find out what your feelings are about this case. and I want to know now if you've had any experience in your past which would interfere from your rendering a fair and impartial jury verdict in this case?

No. Α

> Q Did you ever hear the name of Bob Dylan?

Α No, I haven't, your Honor.

Q If I told you he's a singer, would that ring a bell?

1

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23

24

25

No. it wouldn't.

You don't. You are in the age group that doesn't hear about Bob Dylan?

I only know Perry Como, Bing Crosby.

Q Okay.

Now, do you have any feelings about alcoholics, generally? Have you ever thought about it? Well, I don't approve of alcoholics, your Honor. Α

Well, let us assume; in other words, you have Q the feelings that you don't approve of them, right? A Right.

All right. Are your feelings about alcoholics such that you would be unable to consider the testimony of a person, if it were shown that he was an alcoholic, would you still be able to consider it, or would you not be able to consider it just because he's an alcoholic?

Well, I guess that would depend on the nature of the A crime, if it was done under the influence of alcohol.

I'm talking about witness now.

Let us assume a witness were called by any side, and that witness is, was shown that that particular witness was an alcoholic, are your feelings so strong against alcoholism that you wouldn't be able to consider his testimony at all, or would you be willing to listen to

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what that person says, and then give it whatever weight you think is necessary?

A I would be willing to listen.

Q Have you ever held any salaried position in the government?

A No, I haven't.

Q Or anybody in your family associated with the government in any way, work for a hospital, the government, or prison, or things of that nature?

A Well, I don't know if it would be associated with the government. I have two uncles with the weights and measures.

Q On a local level, or the city level?

A Yes, city level, and the board of health.

Q I see. What are they, inspectors?

A Yes. Inspectors.

Q That wouldn't -- would that affect your thinking in this case in any way?

A No, it wouldn't.

Q Were you in service?

A Yes, I was.

Q What branch?

A U.S. Army.

Q Were you ever with the M.P.'s?

1

A No.

3

Q Or things of that nature?

4

Α

Α

Α

No. I was with the 14th A.C. Armored Cavalry.

5

Q Cavalry. What years was that?

6

'Fifty-seven to 'fifty-nine.

7

Q And were you in this country or overseas?

8

A I was overseas in Germany.

9

Q Germany?

10

Yes, sir.

11

12

Q You ever have any trouble with black soldiers while you were there? I'm sure you had black soldiers in your outfit.

13

A Many.

15

14

Q You get along with them all right?

16

A Very well.

17

Q Now, as you sit there now, like I said before,

18

do you know why we are questioning you. We want to make

19

sure that we have a fair and impartial juror. As you sit

20

there right now, do you know of any reason why you couldn't

21

serve in this case, except for the personal hardships of

22

A No, I have no personal hardships, your Honor.

being a juror and being sequestered?

2324

Q All right. Would you, if you were chosen as

25

a juror, listen to the testimony in this case, once the

1 123 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. 3 Mr. DeAngelo, I'm going to ask you to step out for a couple of more minutes. I don't have any 4 5 more questions. If there is, it is only one or two. 6 and I appreciate your patience. 7 MR. DE ANGELO: Thank you. 8 (Prospective juror leaves room) 9 THE COURT: Well, you can be on the record. 10 That juror took how long, gentlemen? I would say it took at least forty minutes approximately. 11 12 MR. MARMO: About forty minutes. 13 THE COURT: Forty minutes. 14 All right, I'll take the defense first. 15 MR. STEEL: I just have a few questions. 16 Could I know whether he has any friends who 17 are in law enforcement. You asked him family. 18 THE COURT: Okay. I thought I did. Okay. 19 I'll re-read it. 20 MR. STEEL: I would also like to know if he 21 has any union affiliation, I would like to know. 22 THE COURT: Why do you want to know his union 23 affiliation? 24 MR. STEEL: I think as a background fact. 25 THE COURT: Okay.

20

22

23

24 25

MR. STEEL: I would like to know other than high school, whether he has ever taken any kind of courses.

THE COURT: Well, I was going to do that, Mr. Steel in all fairness, but, you know, it's a little embarrassing when you ask a man what is your educational background, he said, third year of high, which I would assume he hasn't got anything further. I would be embarrassed to pry further, unless you insist.

MR. STEEL: Well, I would like to know. might have taken night courses or something. would also like to know if he has any outside interest.

Like what? I asked what he does THE COURT: and I thought ---

The only reason I say that, he MR. STEEL: indicated that he didn't do the bowling because he was very busy.

THE COURT: Didn't have time.

MR. STEEL: Doesn't have time. And it just struck me that might be---

I will ask him what his hobbies THE COURT: are.

. 15

cause him to be prejudiced in this case because the defendants are black, considering he doesn't like to see racial disturbances. I think I explored it.

I'm not going to reopen that.

Anything else?

MR. BELDOCK: The other area is that he made it very clear that he's opposed to crime, which we all share. That he has particular feelings about any criminality.

Then when you questioned him about if he would follow the extent of the charge about reasonable doubt, his initial response was somewhat ambiguous to the effect that he would have to see what the facts are, rather than give a direct response to your question.

And I would like to ask, because of those responses, I would like to ask him whether he has any opinion to the effect that the courts have been liberal in regard to criminal charges, or something to that effect, which would give us a little more information in that regard.

THE COURT: All right. You have anything?

MR. STEEL: I just have one more going over my notes.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. Off-the-record. (Off-the-record discussion had)

MR. STEEL: Okay. I have almost as a direct quote, as I'm going over my notes, the question where you asked him when he got into his problems with violence, whether he could deal with that.

THE COURT: He hasn't had any problems involving violence.

MR. STEEL: Not approving of violence.

THE COURT: Oh.

MR. STEEL: And I have, I think it's almost a quote, it's hard for me to answer whether my feelings are so strong that I could put them aside.

THE COURT: I don't recall him saying that. But I do recall exploring the area rather thoroughly and I thought he handled them very well.

MR. BELDOCK: He said, I imagine so, if I remember correctly. And he said that several times, or words to that effect. I see, I have notes to the same effect.

MR. STEEL: As a final question, I would like your Honor to go back to that and see if he's really totally satisfied with himself that those feelings wouldn't cause him any difficulty.

THE COURT: All right.

Anything further, gentlemen?

MR. MARMO: No. I think that last area was covered, and I think the juror gave satisfactory responses.

THE COURT: I think all the areas have been covered.

I will ask him if he has any friends in law enforcement. I will ask if he has any union affiliations. I will ask him about any hobbies. I will ask him about any further education. I'm not going to make any inquiry as to his daughter in the eighth grade. I don't think it is imperative that we go that far.

And with reference to feelings against crime, opinions as to crime and not approving of violence, I think I've explored it sufficiently, but your application is noted.

You want to bring him in, please?

(Prospective juror, Mr. DeAngelo, enters room)

DOMINICK R. DE ANGELO,

called as a prospective juror, having been previously sworn, testifies further as follows:

BY THE COURT:

Q All right. Mr. DeAngelo, just three or four questions, and they'll be very brief. I asked you if you yourself had been ever associated with law enforcement. I asked if your family, if there was any member of your family; and you responded.

Now, do you have any close friends that are associated with law enforcement?

A Yes, many friends.

Q Many friends that you socialize with? In other words, that you go out with, they visit you, they visit your home?

A We get together at parties normally.

Q Okay. And are you associated -- first of all do you ever discuss their work with them?

A No. I can't say we do, your Honor.

All right. Would the fact that you have friends that are associated with law enforcement, would that put you in a position, where, if you were a juror in this case, you are going to be in favor of the State because your friends are associated with law enforcement, the State represents law enforcement?

A No.

Q Would it put you in a position where you

would be prejudiced against the defendants because you have friends that are associated with law enforcement?

A No.

Q Would it put you in a position where you would be prejudiced against the State because you have friends in law enforcement?

A I'm not prejudiced, your Honor.

Q Would that color your thinking at all because you have these friends?

A No. I wouldn't say that.

Q Let me ask you. You went through high school, third year, you mentioned. Have you taken courses, any other evening courses, or any after that, pursuits of any kind?

A No, I haven't.

Q You have any hobbies? You say you don't bowl because you don't have time. You have any other hobbies?

A Well, I like to fool around with my cars and house.

Things like that. More or less family.

THE COURT: I see.

Okay. That's sufficient. All right. I'm going to ask you to step out one more time.

MR. DE ANGELO: Okay.

THE COURT: And then I'll be calling you

4 5

•

back in.

All right. No more questions.

(Prospective juror leaves room)

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen.

MR. STEEL: Judge, I just have seriously one follow-up, which is, if he has some friends in law enforcement, I would like to know whether if he voted for an acquittal in this case, whether he would have any feeling that that could in any way embarrass him.

THE COURT: He said it wouldn't affect his judgment. I don't think I have to go much further than that. I'm not going to go much further than that.

Okay.

You have got five minutes, gentlemen.

(Brief recess)

THE COURT: I want the record to indicate while waiting for counsel for the defendants and the defendants, and their associates to come in here, the door was opened and that there was no discussions with the Prosecutor's office on this case at all.

All right. Now I want to further indicate --

_	132
2	all right. Never mind. I'll withdraw that.
3	The challenge at this time is defendant
4	number one.
. 5	MR. BELDOCK: No.
6	THE COURT: I think it's now, no, Mr.
7	Carrotta was excused by the State.
8	MR. MARMO: That's correct.
9	THE COURT: Therefore it's defendant number
10	one is the first one.
11	MR. BELDOCK: The juror is acceptable to
12	defendant number one.
13	MR. STEEL: Acceptable to defendant number
14	two, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Number one. Number one, did you
16	say the same?
17	MR. STEEL: We both said the same. The State
18	goes next according to you.
19	THE COURT: All right. The State
20	MR. STEEL: Can I just ask one question?
21	Judge, if this juror is accepted, does he
22	become juror number four in the box?
23	THE COURT: No, number one.
24	MR. STEEL: In other words, he becomes juror
25	number one?

5

THE COURT: Yes. He's the first one selected, sure.

MR. MARMO: He's acceptable to the State.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, I'm going to call the juror inside and I'm going to give him instructions.

I want the record to indicate before I do
that that this juror's questioning commenced at
two-oh-one, I checked my court clerk who swore him
at two-oh-one, and that it is now three-oh-five,
that forty-five minutes were devoted to questioning
of the juror.

I gave counsel at least ten minutes to confer before they exercised their challenges. And it is now three-oh-five, at which time I will call the juror in to make inquiry, to give him specific instructions.

Yes, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. HUMPHREYS: I was going to say, I assume that your Honor is going to instruct him with respect to not reading anything.

THE COURT: Oh, yes.

MR. HUMPHREYS: Or discussing it with anybody

THE COURT: I'm going to do that now.

Communicate it to you, anyone tries to contact him, let me know immediately.

In fact, if you don't have any objection,
I'm going to ask both of you gentlemen, the three
of you, I would give the juror my private telephone
number.

MR. HUMPHREYS: No objection.

MR. STEEL: Your Honor, I just, I assumed that it goes for every single prospective juror, I assume, if there is any information known by the Prosecutor, they would have put that on the record.

THE COURT: That's a standard.

MR. HUMPHREYS: The Hudson County Prosecutor's office advised us this morning, the 16 people originally put in the box, that none of them have criminal records or arrest records. That there possibly might be some DP hanging around some municipal court that they don't know about it, and they don't have any expression by a juror of a philosophy, whatever that order said.

THE COURT: All right.

Bring in the juror.

(Prospective juror enters room)

(Prospective juror duly sworn)

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. DeAngelo, you have been selected as juror number one in this case.

At this time I'm going to excuse you until further notice, which means that you should go back to work, if you care to, because I can't tell you now when I'm going to call you again. Whether it's a week from now or ten days, or fifteen days, or twenty days. I don't know.

I'm going to ask you at this time to give me your word that you are not going to read about this case in the meantime. That you are not going to discuss it. That you are not going to expose yourself to any news media, whether it be T.V., radio, or newspapers.

I'm also going to ask you to keep an open mind, not to think about the case or prejudge it in any way. Don't let anybody discuss it with you at work or anyplace else.

Now, I'm sure it's going to be in the papers that Mr. DeAngelo has been selected as a juror.

And I'm sure that your wife and your children perhaps, and your co-workers, and your friends are going to be asking you about it.

Now, it would be really a burden on jurors to start sequestering them from the minute they're selected; but when these people make any inquiry of you, you are to be very firm and blunt about it.

You are to tell them, I'm not to discuss it period.

And that's it. Don't discuss it. Don't let them discuss it with you.

I'm going to give you my private telephone number here and home. And if anybody, and I'm not suggesting this for one moment that anybody would, but if anybody should, sometimes these things happen from perhaps outside the courthouse, outside this case, you never know, should ever call you and contact you about this case in any way, you immediately call me and I'll take whatever steps are necessary.

Like I said, I'm not suggesting that anybody would. I'm going to give you both my phone numbers before you leave.

I don't think there is anything else that I have to tell you at this point, is there, gentlemen?

Do you have any other suggestion, Mr. Humphreys?

MR. HUMPHREYS: No. Except, your Honor, said about it appearing in the newspaper. I don't

3

5

4

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

think it has to, perhaps your Honor might want to advise Mr. DeAngelo, if a newspaper man asks him, say "No comment"; don't talk to him at all.

THE COURT: I would be very happy to give the names of the jurors thus far selected. They're hounding me for it.

MR. HUMPHREYS: I think you should not.

THE COURT: I can tell them that we have one juror. Should I tell them a machinist or whatever occupation?

MR. MARMO: Why should you tell him anything?

MR. STEEL: I think for the prospective juror it is better that they know nothing about him and let him live his normal life. And when he is sequestered, the press will ask their names, it won't bother him then.

THE COURT: Suppose we do that. Let us now formulate a directive here agreeable by all parties, that the jurors' names, addresses, or occupations, will not be divulged to the press until the jury has been totally completed, the selection has been completed. And this way we'll just tell the press perhaps that we have one juror, two this afternoon.

All right, Mr. DeAngelo.

You have to understand our problem, too, that we don't have any short cuts unfortunately and we can only do the best we can. We are not unmindful of your feelings and of the jurors' problems. We are concerned about it and we try to be as considerate as we can. Let me ask you right off where do you live? What's your address?

A 111 Hancock Avenue, Jersey City.

Q This is kept confidential. It will not be in the newspaper, so you don't have to be concerned. Okay.

You know what type of a case this is at this point?

A I believe it is a second trial or something of something that happened ten years ago or something like that, but it was supposed to be a murder trial, I believe.

Q Right. Two defendants, Mr. Rubin, who is here now, Rubin Carter and Mr. Artis, they are charged with three homicides in the indictment. And you know, I told you right from the outset, the fact that these defendants are charged in a criminal case is no evidence of guilt. You can't say to yourself, well, where there is smoke there is fire, they wouldn't be charged, if they weren't guilty. If you said that, we would be starting off on the wrong foot. You have to presume the defendants innocent until they have been proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. But I'll go into the law a little more further in the

1

5

7 8

9

10

12

13

.14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

trial, not now. At any rate, you start out on the premise at this time that they're innocent until and if proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you have problem with that?

A No.

Q Does the charge itself depress you or upset you in any way, as to preclude you from sitting as a juror?

A I don't know enough about it.

Q In other words, if this were another criminal case, the charge in and of itself doesn't disturb you, does it? You could hear this type of case.

A Oh, yes. I mean, would I be upset with it?

Q Yes.

A No.

Q All right. Now, do you know any reason at this point why you couldn't sit on this jury before I ask you any questions?

A Well, I don't know, unless, I believe in capital punishment.

Q Well, there isn't any capital punishment in this State.

A I know we don't have, but that's why I said what I do believe in.

Q We really don't want your opinion about it.

But the fact is that you stated that you do. You don't have to concern yourself with it here; and you shouldn't concern yourself with any punishment in this particular case.

A I don't know anything about it.

Q Well, it is not the jurors' function. The jury does not decide the punishment. The court does. You understand that, don't you?

A Yes.

Q So whatever your feelings about punishment are, you shouldn't concern yourself.

A I just thought if that meant anything.

Now, I'm going to ask you some questions, and there are a few questions, but they are not designed to embarrass you and they are not designed to pry into your personal affairs. I'll give you a general statement as to what the purpose of my questioning is. The purpose is first of all, we start out on the premise that we want a fair and impartial jury. And by fair and impartial jury, we mean fair and impartial to the State and to the defendants, both sides. Could you do that in this case? Could you be fair to both sides?

A I believe so. I mean you have to go by evidence, right?

Q Right. And the evidence and the law. Would you be able to do that?

A Evidence and what?

Q And the law as I explain it to you.

A Oh, the law.

Q You see, procedurally---

A Subject to the law.

Q Right. In other words, at the end of the case, after both sides have rested, I will explain the law to you and then the case will be given to you to discuss with your fellow jurors. And based on the evidence that you receive in the courtroom, based on the law as I explain it to you, you will return a verdict. Could you do that?

A In other words, I don't prejudge until I hear what's there?

Q Fine. And at this point you haven't prejudged this case, could we assume that?

A You could assume it, because I don't know anything about it.

Q Now, let me ask you this. You just said you don't know anything about this case?

A All I know that there was supposed to be three people that were killed. And what the circumstances were why there is another trial, why anything else, I don't know, because-

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

Α

Α

21

22

23 24

25

All right. The less you know---

I didn't even know about the original. I didn't even know that such as that happened.

I'm going to ask you two questions along those lines. Just relax. When did you find out anything about this case for the first time?

A · When they called me.

You didn't know about it before that?

No. I'm not interested in those cases. I mean, I Α don't. The news is very bad today. Whatever you see on the news is nothing good. I never see anything good in the news. It is always someone dying. Somebody getting killed or something else. So I don't bother with the news and I don't read up on all this stuff.

So you don't have any knowledge about this case?

Only those first few circumstantial things. Α

Q Now, when did you find out those things?

That was only recently.

How long ago? Q

Maybe last week.

And what did you find out?

Well, they said there was going to be a re-trial or Α something on the Rubin Carter case.

Q And what did you find out that last week?

A Well, just the case, that they were going to be retried. That they wanted another trial. Why I don't know.

I mean, they don't have every detail in an article. Being

called, me on this jury, this is why I looked at that stuff, because---

Q Now, ---

A They don't give you enough information on any case.

Q All right. Where did you get your information?

A Jersey Journal.

Q All right. And after you got your information, did you discuss it with anybody?

A My daughter.

Q How old is your daughter?

A Forty-two.

Q And you have a Mr. Kohleman?

A No. He's in a mental hospital.

Q All right. And you discussed it with your daughter. As a result of what you discussed with your daughter, did she give you any additional information that you didn't have? Was she aware of this case?

A She's the same as I am. We don't delve into those things.

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

12

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24

25

And as a result of what you read about it, Q did you formulate an opinion about the case? You have? Α I couldn't.

All right. Did you, in addition to reading 0 about it, did you see any television programs, which made any reference to it?

There might have been on that side something about A it, something about the jury was called off until another week or something. That's it. It was very short.

All right. Did you read anything on it in any other newspaper besides the Jersey Journal?

I very seldom even read the Jersey Journal. I just happen to get it on Saturday. That's all. I don't have time for reading those things.

Did you read any magazine articles about it? Α I don't read magazines.

> Q Okay.

Α I read the Bible.

All right. And incidentally, what is your Q religion by the way?

I'm a Born Again Christian.

Do you know anybody in this case? I talked Q about participants. You know any of them?

Nobody. The only time I had anything to do with a

court was five years ago. I was on the Grand Jury.

Now, remember I defined law enforcement for you the other day. I said, law enforcement is people associated with a local police department, state police, the county police, the Prosecutor's office, the federal police, that would be the F.B.I., remember that? Have you ever been associated with law enforcement?

A (Shaking head).

Q Are there any members of your immediate family associated with law enforcement?

A (Shaking head).

Q Do you have any real good friends that are associated with law enforcement?

A (Shaking head).

MR. ABT: You are going to have to say yes or no, ma'am.

THE COURT: Please say yes or no, Mrs. Kohleman. He has to write it down.

A He has to hear it.

Q What is that?

A He has to hear it.

Q Right. He has to hear it. That's right. What about that?

Α

Yes.

Q

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

As opposed to that of a grand juror is decidedly different. Α Right.

But I'm sure you are pretty familiar, but I am going to go over it for the record. As a grand juror, you just decide whether a charge should be preferred against a defendant, but you don't hear the entire case. Are you aware of that?

No. Only the Prosecutor's side.

A one-sided proceeding?

Α That's right.

And the defendant invariably doesn't have any lawyer there present. It is the Prosecutor who presents certain facts?

That's right.

And even the Prosecutor doesn't present the entire case?

Just the one side. Yes, that's right.

And the purpose of a Grand Jury function or 0 the purpose of a hearing is to decide whether a defendant should be charged, period, nothing else, right?

A Right.

> Q Now, as a petit juror---

> > MR. LIPTAK: This is for you, Judge.

(Cup of coffee handed to the Court)

THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to drink it.

It wouldn't be fair to the other people here. But I appreciate it.

MRS. KOHLEMAN: You're excused.

THE COURT: What's that?

MRS. KOHLEMAN: I'll excuse you.

Q No. We are not interested. As a petit juror you are going to decide the issue of innocence or guilt, which is not considered by a Grand Jury.

A Which I don't think I would like very much.

Q I'm sure if I asked every juror who would come into this courthouse, they would say, if I didn't have to have the responsibility, I would rather not have it.

And I can appreciate that. I'm sure these lawyers appreciate it. But, at any rate, we have to take on responsibilities that we are not too fond of. But the point is, you understand your function as a petit juror as opposed to a grand juror?

A Right.

Q So, if you are chosen as a juror in this case, you have to decide the issue of innocent or guilty, which you didn't do as a grand juror.

A Right.

experience as a grand juror, which you think might affect your judgment in this case? In other words, did you formulate any opinions in your mind about criminal cases generally, which would affect your thinking in this case?

A No I didn't.

Did anything occur during the course of your

Q If you were chosen as a petit juror in this case, you could be fair to both sides in spite of your experience as a grand juror? May I assume that?

A Yes.

Q All right. So the fact that you have served as a grand juror will not affect your ability as a petit juror in any way?

A I wouldn't see how it could.

All right. Now, I think you indicated before that if you were chosen as a juror, you would want to hear the facts in this case. You would also want to hear the law, wouldn't you, that's applicable, so you could apply the law to the facts before you make a decision?

A Right.

Q Now, a defendant in a criminal case by way of the indictment is charged with a crime.

A That's right.

Q That in itself is no evidence of guilt.

I have a daughter, a son-in-law, and three

25

Α

Kohleman - <u>voir dire</u> grandchildren.

Q And does your daughter live with you or is she apart from you?

A No, she has her own place.

Q And who lives in your household with the exception of your husband?

A Just myself.

Q What would be the situation if you were chosen as a juror in this case and the jury would have to be sequestered?

Now, before you answer that, let me explain it to you. Right now we are going through what we call the jury selection process. And that may take a week, two weeks. It all depends. It is a slow process unfortunately, but it will take one to two weeks hopefully.

What happens is, if we select a juror now, he or she is excused and you go home, you go back to your employment or whatever your duties are, your personal activities.

A I'm retired.

Q What's that?

A I'm retired.

Q You are retired. Now, after we pick our jury, then we call back our jury that's been picked.

Now, if you were picked for today, you were one of the first ones questioned, you might not be called for two weeks. Then we would call you back and the trial would start. Once the trial starts, we are going to sequester the jury. And there is a reason for it. We don't want the jury to be exposed to publicity. We want the jury isolated for those reasons. We want a fair verdict here. And we don't want it predicated upon what some newspaper might decide to write about this case. So, we found through experience the best way to do it is to segregate a jury, sequester a jury, that's what it is called. You'll be comfortable. You will be in a hotel with your fellow jurors and you will be very comfortable. As far as that is concerned, would that create any real problem?

A That wouldn't be comfortable.

Q It wouldn't?

A Who wants to be isolated?

No. When we say isolated, ---

A I like to walk.

Q Let me give you the routine. You would come to court all day and at night you probably would have dinner somewheres. They probably have different places for the jury. We would permit that. You would probably have some form of entertainment, which would have to be arranged,

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25

whether it be a theatre or a trip somewhere. I mean, you are not going to be isolated from the public. You will be able to read newspapers and watch television. The only thing is, we are going to supervise it. We are going to make sure you don't see a program that has to do with this case. There might not be, maybe they won't care by then. I don't know.

- Α A free prisoner.
  - Q What's that?
- Α Be a free prisoner.
  - No, you wouldn't be a prisoner at all. Q
- A I like to walk. I wouldn't be.
- You will get a chance to walk. You will get a chance to walk.

All right. Now, let us get down to some other questions. You are not going to have any difficulty with being a juror.

I hope so. Α

You told us your occupation is that of retired lady. What did you do before you retired?

I was a comptometer operator for S. Cole and Company Α

MR. BELDOCK: What kind of operator?

MR. ABT: Comptometer.

Adding machine, multiplies and divides. A

me.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Would that make any difference to you what his profession or occupation was?

A No. To each his own.

Q So the fact that it might develop during the course of the trial that Mr. Carter was in the boxing profession, would that affect your judgment either for or against him?

A No. I've watched boxing. I've watched Ali or whatever his name is.

Q Muhammad Ali?

A Yes.

Q Did you ever see Mr. Carter box?

A No. I didn't even know he does it.

Q All right. Did you ever hear of the book---

A He don't look that big.

Q All right. Did you ever read the book or hear of the book entitled "The Sixteenth Round"?

A Book, Sixteenth Round?

Q The name of it is "The Sixteenth Round".

A I don't read books. The Bible is the only book I read.

Q Okay.

A Ask me something on that. Maybe I can give you an answer. That's why I couldn't swear. James 5:12,

Q Do you watch the news at night on T.V. or in the morning, early in the morning?

A A little bit once in a while. I might hear it on WMCA, I put on that five minutes news, listen to Bob Grant.

Q I think I did ask you if you belonged to any organizations. All right. You know we all have our own different lifestyles. You appreciate that?

A I certainly do.

Q Do you have any opinions about people whose lifestyle may differ from yours?

A Well, today life is very different from what I've known of it.

Q Well, do you have adverse opinions for or against?

A When it comes to morals, sure.

Q To morals?

A To morals, yes.

Q I see. Would you be prejudiced against people whose morals are different from yours?

A If they were degrading, yes.

Q You are giving me some answers that are making me think a little bit, Mrs. Kohleman. All right. Let us try to pursue that. The issue in this case is for you to

Α

determine, if you're chosen as a juror, to start off with, after you have heard all the evidence and have heard the charge of the Court and have been given the opportunity to discuss the case with your fellow jurors, when it is given to you to determine, the issue of innocence or guilt in this case.

Now, let us assume that you have certain feelings about lifestyles and it developed during the course of the trial that a witness or witnesses or persons who might testify had different lifestyles than yours -- let us assume somebody got up there and for argument's sake; and admitted he's an alcoholic for example, would that prejudice -- I'm sure you probably have feelings against people who drink or people who have different morals than yours; is that right?

- Well, I don't drink.
  - Q All right.
- A But each one lives his life as he sees fit.
  - Q Now, ---
- A It is wrong in my eyes, but if that's what he wants to do, that's his life.
  - Q That's what I am trying to find out.
- A That's his life.
  - Q Would people who may have a different moral

Ŭ

standard than you have, would you still feel that it is their life?

A It is not for me to judge actually.

All right. Now, you do have feelings about it though?

A Yes.

Are they strong enough to be prejudiced against those people? In other words, would you still be fair to those persons regardless of their lifestyle?

A Well, I guess I would be. Well, take a man, if he is depriving his family of food or something because of that drink, then I would be very much prejudiced against him.

Q Would you just find him guilty because of that, if you were otherwise convinced that he wasn't guilty beyond a reasonable doubt? If I didn't make myself clear, I will rephrase that.

A No.

In other words, let us assume you hear the case, okay, it has nothing to do with this case, but you hear a case, and if it was brought out that the defendant in the case was a drunkard, but it had nothing to do with whether he committed a robbery or not, would you hold that against him?

2 A No. You couldn't hold it against him.

Q Okay. So then you would decide the case on the merits of that particular case?

A Yes. Absolutely.

Q Then may I assume that you are prejudiced against those people so as to have your judgment affected?

A No. You take things as you see them.

Q Now, you already told us that there is very little you know about this case at this point; isn't there?

A I told you what I know about it.

Q Okay. Is there---

A Unless you tell me more about it.

Q No, no. If you're chosen as a juror, you will listen to the testimony. All right. You have told us all you know about it?

A As far as I know, I mean---

Q Now, let me ask you this. From what you know which you indicated is minimal---

A There were three people who were supposed to have died; am I right?

Q Right.

A Who they are, what they are, what they were, or anything else, I know nothing about it.

Q Okay. Have you developed or formulated any

2 opinion about this case from what you know?

A One opinion I can give you.

Q What's that?

A If a man was convicted originally, why is he going to get another trial?

Q Well, let us assume that he went through the judicial process and for some reason the court decided that he is entitled to it?

A You mean, there is new evidence or something?

Q He may be entitled to it for many reasons, but they have decided. And if a court decides a defendant is entitled to a new trial, then he is entitled to a new trial, and is entitled to a fair trial as though he was never tried before. Would you be able to do that?

A I can't see it.

Q You can't? In other words, if I told you now, all right, you know, Mrs. Kohleman, that these defendants have been tried before, but they have been granted a new trial by another court now, can you hear this case and decide it fairly and squarely on what you hear ignoring the fact that they were tried before? Could you do that?

A No, because if the circumstances and the evidence and everything came out in the first trial and the people said that they were guilty, why do they need another trial?

2 | I can't see it.

Q Well, what if there was something done at the first trial, which for example wasn't in accordance with the law, for example, and the court now feels that they should be granted a new trial; and what if I told you that you're not to concern yourself with that, and that it is your obligation, if you're chosen as a juror, that you must give them a fair and new trial? What would you say about that? Would you still feel---

A In other words, there was -- were circumstances that came up that said---

Q Warranted a new trial.

A Well then, yes.

Q Okay.

A Then you would have to listen.

Q In this particular case there were circumstances where a new trial was granted. And if you're chosen as a juror, I am going to have to instruct you and your fellow jurors that you are to completely disregard the fact that they were convicted at a prior trial, because that is why they are getting a new trial. And it has to be exactly that, a fair trial. What about that? Would you accept that and would you say to me, I can forget the fact that they had another trial, because now that they have

MR. STEEL: I think it dissipates.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, the

24

25

1

procedure has been established.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. STEEL: I object, your Honor.

Q At this point then, considering what you and I have discussed thus far, do you have any opinion about this case?

What opinion could I have?

In other words, I assume you do not from that statement?

A The only opinion like I say is that I felt that if they had a trial, why should they have another one.

But, if I instructed you that you must dis-Q. regard the fact that they had another trial, that you're not to concern yourself with the prior trial, and that if you're chosen as a juror, it will be incumbent upon you to judge this case on the facts which you will hear in this case only, and the fact that there was another trial should not affect your thinking, can you do it? Will you be able to do it, or is your feeling about the prior trial so strong, that you can't be fair in a subsequent trial? want to know that. In other words, would that put you in a position where your judgment would be affected, you keep saying to yourself, well, they had a new trial, I don't see why it was given, I don't care what the judge said; would it put you in that position, or would you say to yourself

the judge---

A Actually I told you before, I don't like to judge anybody.

Q I know that, but neither does anyone else, perhaps.

(Judge answered telephone call, and left chambers for approximately five minutes).

Q Let the record indicate that I took about five minutes for a phone call; and at that point we were discussing this juror's opinions about the case in view of a re-trial being ordered.

Now, I want to make myself clear, Mrs.

Kohleman about this, in this area, it is very important to me. It is very important to the attorneys. You came in here today and you didn't know too much about this case, and you correct me if I am wrong, as I try to recapitulate your thinking. And then you said to me, well, I don't know too much about this case, but I do know that they were tried before?

A Right.

Q And my feeling is, why should they be tried again, another jury heard it?

A Right.

Q They disposed of the matter, why should they

2 have a new trial?

1

3

4

5

6

7.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A Right.

Q Okay. You have a right to that opinion?

A Right.

Now, I am asking you this. If I told you Q that as a citizen, if you thought that way, and if you think that way as a citizen, fine. As a juror, I am going to say to you, I will instruct you as to the law in this case; and among the things that I will tell you is, now, Mrs. Kohleman, the fact that these men have been re-tried should be of no concern insofar as not Mrs. Kohleman the citizen is concerned, as Mrs. Kohleman the juror is concerned. Now, can you take a position, if I asked you to -of saying to yourself although they have been re-tried, I am not going to consider that in this case, I am going to hear this case new, de novo from the beginning, and what happened in the other trial and why it happened, the judge told me not to concern myself with. Can you do that? Α Yes.

Q So, if you're chosen as a juror, then you are going to predicate your verdict on what you hear in this trial and you are going to forget that there was even a trial before; is that possible? Can you do that?

A Right.

14.

Q Now, other than what you told me about this case, you don't know anything else about it?

A No.

Q Okay. Relax. I am not going to be too long.

Just a few more questions. Like I say, I have asked you

most of the questions. There are a couple of things. I

am going to get into a different area.

Now, the two defendants in this case are black. You know that. You saw them. Do you know the race of the alleged victims in this case?

A No.

Q If I told you that it will develop during the course of the trial that the victims are white, would that shock you?

A No. I don't know who they are.

Q What if they were? If that's all you knew at this point, you knew that the defendants were black and the victims were white, would that put you in a position where you will say to yourself---

A I don't know the circumstances of why it happened.

Q All right. In other words, at this point you're in a position where the fact that the defendants are black and the victims are white, that has nothing to do with innocence or guilt as far as you're concerned, unless

this boy came along. I'm walking along minding my own

business.

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

· · · 9

11

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

\_\_

25

Q All right.

A And I had a bundle in my arm and a pocketbook. He come along and he swung in front of me and I felt a prick in my finger, like a knife or something dug it, and I let go of the bag because it stung, you know.

Q Would you hold that against these men?

A No. Why should I hold it against them? They had nothing to do with it. I say, if something happens to you personally, you can want to do things at that moment.

Q I understand that. The point I am -- oh, I understand what you're saying.

A I'm looking at things, if somebody does something to you, you could for that moment want to do something back to them.

Q Want to react?

A You can't help it.

Q The fact that your purse was taken, would that put you in a position that you would be prejudiced against the defendant?

A That has nothing to do with them. That's entirely different. But you wanted to know what it was about.

Q Okay. Let us get back to the situation of two black people charged with killing three white people.

commit crime than white people?

25

7.

A I don't know. I really don't know because like I say, this was a white boy that did it to me. I don't care who the kids are. I've been walking down the block here to come here from the Heights. I see windows broken and they must have been done by white kids, because that neighborhood has white kids in it.

Q Let me ask you---

A So, I don't care who you are.

Q Do you have any feeling about black people that might prejudice you in this case?

A It is like I said originally, if people are decent morally, individually, they could be white or black or anything else, no matter what color they are, if they are decent people. But if they are not decent people, then, yes, I'm prejudiced against them. We have a society that needs a little more correction.

Q Let me ask you about that. Why do you feel that way?

A Why? Because I think the children today get away with murder.

Q The who?

A Children, the young people.

Q Do you feel that if these defendants were tried and you were not convinced of their guilt beyond a

22

Α

Α

Yes.

Q

23

24

25

you may have heard that may have had racial problems?

Specifically? Well, New York.

And do you recall specifically any towns that

Α No, because I believe the colored people are the

24

25

same way. They feel the same way. They don't want their children bused a mile away.

- Q So the fact that you have some feelings about busing wouldn't put you in a position where you would react against these two defendants? Would it?
- A Absolutely not. They have nothing to do with it.
- Q Let me ask you some other questions about black people.

Do you think black people are more likely to commit crime than any other people?

- A I couldn't say.
  - Q Well, do you have any opinions?
- A I have no statistics.
- Q I mean, do you have any feelings, your own feelings about that? Do you feel black people more than white people are more inclined to commit crime?

A Well, I think young people, if they were working, they wouldn't get into the troubles that they are getting into. It is a lack of work that does it. I worked when I was fourteen.

- Q All right. Do you feel---
- A I had money in my pockets to buy the things that I wanted. The kids today are left on the streets. The mothers are working; and the kids are left on the streets.

And I don't think it should be that way. The mothers should be home.

Q All right. Do you feel that black people are inclined to be prone to crimes of violence more than white people or vice-versa?

A They maybe because of the dope that's going around.

And they pick on these people for those reasons.

Q Would that enter into your consideration these feelings that you might have, in this case when you decide the issues in this case?

A I don't see any connection.

Q As you sit there now, Mrs. Kohleman, would you be biased against a person just because he's black?

A No.

Q Or because he's not white?

A No. I was sitting outside with colored people; and they are very nice.

Q And may the lawyers and may the Court assume that you're not prejudiced against a person just because he isn't white?

A No. His color means nothing.

Q Have you had an incident in your personal life; and I'm not trying to get personal, when you hear the question, you know it isn't. It is a general question.

5

7.

Is there any incident in your past which would put you in a position or which would put you in a position where you have reason to think that it might interfere with your judgment in this case and prevent you from giving the defendants and the State a fair trial? Have you had any incident?

A I don't know what you mean incident.

Q Well, you had the incident about somebody stealing your purse?

A Yes. That's the only thing.

Q You said that would not affect your thinking here in this case?

A No.

Q Have you had any other incident in your life which would put you in a position where your judgment would be affected here?

A Not that I know of. no.

Q And if you did, would you be able to chase it out of your mind and say it has nothing to do with these defendants, I'm going to decide this case on the merits?

You would be able to do that?

A That's the only thing. You have to listen to what's going on.

Q Did you ever hear the name of Bob Dylan?

1

A No.

3 4 Q If I told you he is a singer, would that mean anything to you?

5

A No.

6

Q Never heard of him?

7

A I don't listen to those singers.

8

Q All right. Only a couple of more questions.

9

Now, I am going to ask you about alcoholics.

10

Do you have any feelings generally about alcoholics? I

11

think you indicated that you don't approve of people who

12

drink?

Q

13

A Yes. I don't drink. Like I say each man has his own life, but as long as he's not harming somebody with it.

14 15

All right. Do you have such feelings about

16

alcoholics that you would be unable to consider their tes-

\_\_\_

timony? In other words, just because a person drank and

17 18

you say, well, he's a drunk, I don't want any part of him

19

or---

A If it is connected with what's happening, then na-

21

20

turally you would. But, if it has no connection with

that happened just because he takes a drink.

22

what's happening, you can't condemn somebody for something

23

Q All right. Would you be willing to listen to

25

24

a person who is an alcoholic and say, well, I'm going to

listen to him and I'm going to evaluate what they say, and give them whatever credence I think---

A You mean an alcoholic like somebody that drinks all the time?

Let us assume he drinks all the time or he testifies or she testifies in this case for one side or the other, would you still be willing to say, well, I want to hear what they have to say and then decide how much to believe or not to believe? Would you be able to do that?

Or would you say to yourself, oh, oh, he's an alcoholic,

I'm not going to believe anything?

A Well, I couldn't believe he would know what went on, if he was an alcoholic, because if he was under the influence of liquor, I believe it would affect his mind.

Q All right. Do you believe that people who drink have lucid moments wherein they could testify as to events? Would you be able to judge for yourself whether that was the case or not?

A Well, not drinking myself, I don't know anything to judge anything like that. I don't know if they have sane moments or what they have.

Q Well, in other words,---

A If a person drinks, is he drunk? I don't know.

Does he ever have a moment when he knows what he's doing?

7.

I don't know. I think they are very senseless. I heard that a person who's drunk, if they fall down, they don't feel nothing. So?

Q If a person were testifying that he fell and he was trying to tell you what he felt as a result of falling while in a drunken stupor, you might come to that conclusion.

Well, let us assume that people testify or a person might testify, it was just brought out that he's an alcoholic, but when he testifies he's sober and he's testifying as to an experience perhaps that you would have to decide whether he really knew what he was talking about or not. Would you be able to listen to him and make that judgment?

A Well, it would be difficult.

Q Would you be prejudiced against him just because he was an alcoholic?

A No. A person could be an alcoholic, right? He could be drinking this one day, but if something happened and he wasn't drunk that time, then all right, I would believe him.

Q Well, would you be willing to at least listen to him?

A Oh, yes. If he wasn't drunk when something happened

2

3

4

5

6

7.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I could believe him. But who knows?

Q In other words, would you be able to keep an open mind and listen to him first and then make a decision?

A Yes.

Q Are there any people in your immediate family or have you ever been employed by the government or been appointed to a government job?

A (Shaking head).

Q Or has any member of your family ever been so employed?

A No.

Q Have you ever been in the service, by the way?

A Me? No.

Q Yourself?

A No. Too young.

Q What's that?

A Too young.

Q All right.

A They didn't take women when I was young.

Q All right. Let me ask you this. Mrs.

Kohleman, assuming that you were chosen as a juror in this case, and I said to you, Mrs. Kohleman, you and your fellow jurors, I want you to keep an open mind in this trial from the day this trial starts, if you were accepted now, right

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

until the time it ends, I'm going to ask you to keep an open mind during that period and I am going to ask you to keep an open mind when I give you the applicable law, and I am going to ask you to keep an open mind until the case is given to you for decision, but even then you have to 6 withhold judgment until you have had an opportunity, when 7. 8 I give it to you for decision, to discuss it with your 9 fellow jurors. Would you be willing to do that?

You mean after you hear a case? Α

> In other words, I would---Q

Α Hear all sides of the case?

Yes. Hear both sides. Then I will give you the applicable law; then the case is given to you for decision, you discuss it with your fellow jurors and then decide it. Could you keep an open mind right up until that point?

I believe I could, yes.

Now, what if I asked you then, if you're chosen as a juror, would you and could you return a verdict in accordance with the evidence and in accordance with the law as I give it to you? Would you be able to do that?

Give a what? Α

> In other words, your verdict. Q

Α Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Q Which would have to be predicated and would have to be based on the law and on the facts, the facts which---

A Would the law be in accordance with the facts?

Q You would have to apply it to the facts.

A Oh.

Q You would have to apply the law to the facts as I give it to you. At the end of the case I charge the jury on the law; and I say under the laws of this case.

A You say the law says so-and-so?

Q Right. Now, I want you to apply the law of this case to the facts. Would you be able to do that?

A Yes.

Q Then your verdict would be based on the law and the facts; is that understandable?

A Right.

Marmo.

THE COURT: All right. You know what I am going to do. I am going to ask you to just step out for a few moments. I want to confer with counsel.

And bear with us just a little longer.

MRS. KOHLEMAN: All right.

(Prospective juror leaves room)

THE COURT: All right. I'll hear you, Mr.

25

22

23

24

7.

MR. MARMO: Judge, the only thing, the only point that concerns me about this woman is, I know we have gone through this and re-argued and re-argued it and that is, the business about a witness who's given prior statements under oath, which are inconsistent.

Now, in light of her religious beliefs and so forth, I am interested to know what her feelings are in that kind of setting. Would you say because a person has given a different or varying statements under oath, different than what he's testifying to today, that that means I can't believe what he's telling me now.

THE COURT: How about you, Mr. Humphreys?

MR. HUMPHREYS: I have nothing, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Beldock.

MR. BELDOCK: I don't know what she does do with her time.

THE COURT: What's that?

MR. BELDOCK: What does she do with her time now that she's retired? She's been retired for seven years, and she says she doesn't have time to read the newspapers. I think I might want to find out what she does in her daily life. She might be

a housewife so to speak, or she might proliferize her religion on a daily basis.

THE COURT: I'll ask her. I'll ask her. Anything else?

MR. BELDOCK: Well, your Honor, I think if
I may say so, you did not properly handle the problem raised by this potential juror's comments about
prior convictions.

She was candid when she presented a very serious problem. And she said on a number of occasions words to the effect, she can't see why they should get a new trial and raised a question about newly-discovered evidence, then she might be able to understand. She wasn't given a direct answer and she was given, I understand why you might not choose to give a direct answer, she was given a general answer, well, as a result of the law they got a new trial. Put that aside and she went back to it and gave her opinion, if they had a trial already, why should they have another.

And then your Honor in a number of leading questions went over and over again the proposition that if you charged her in such and such a way would her opinion be so strong, then put in would your

judgment be affected. And her response then was that she doesn't like to judge anyone.

THE COURT: She what?

MR. BELDOCK: That she didn't like to judge anyone.

Then your Honor went on with leading questions and in effect, and finally she had to say yes.

Therefore, we are left with a neutralization and serious problem and that may have been a basis for challenge for cause.

On the face of it, it certainly seemed to me, I think what your Honor should have done is to have drawn the potential juror out some more and some words she started to speak, in her words, we should find out if it might affect her judgment considering the evidence. She didn't know why a new trial was granted. I mean it's not possible for us to put before her why a new trial was granted in new detail I would have no objection.

But I'm sure the other side would, and I think led to the question whether she would require the defendant to put on some evidence, put on some evidence, or to offset here her attitude.

THE COURT: What's your suggestion?

MR. BELDOCK: Left where we're at, I have to challenge her for cause. And I'm suggesting to your Honor that I might not have done that had the questioning gone differently.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BELDOCK: She is a candid witness, candid potential juror apparently, but yet we got stymied at the circumstances at the point where we should have gone further.

THE COURT: Well, don't you agree, Mr.

Beldock, if a juror as a lay person comes in here
and is under a misapprehension as to her thinking
as a citizen as opposed to her obligations as a
juror, that I have a right to explain it to her.

And after I have explained it to her, I have a right
to ask the juror if she would accept my explanation
and be guided accordingly.

In this situation don't you think I explored sufficiently the fact that she is not to concern herself with the prior trial? And ultimately didn't I establish through her whether or not in fact she could place herself in a position where she would not be affected by the fact that there was a prior trial.

3

4

5

6

7.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BELDOCK: But you placed her in the position where she practically could say nothing else but yes, your Honor.

And I'm trying to pose the dilemma. I'm not saying that I'm inclined to challenge this juror in general, and I might not have challenged her for cause, you know, a candid statement from this woman, we have a lot of information about her now.

THE COURT: You sure do.

MR. BELDOCK: I certainly consider what I would do on this one issue.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BELDOCK: I feel if your Honor had explored further, we would have been in a better position to know whether or not her opinion might affect her judgment and whether or not she would require some explanations in the course of this trial to offset her opinion about what happened in the prior trial. And there is no way to do that by leading questions.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Beldock. Steel.

MR. STEEL: Well, we would like to just add a word to what Mr. Beldock said.

THE COURT: You can have two words.

MR. STEEL: Okay.

First of all, your Honor, I must say with all respect that I felt that you used your authority as a judge to get the answers you wanted to get from this witness, this prospective juror, rather than let her talk. And by doing so you destroy the concept of the voir dire. You used judicial authority to save a witness from telling the truth. And your Honor---

THE COURT: That statement sounds very academic. For myself, I don't think from a practical standpoint that really happened. If you just place that on the record as a characterization, you may do so.

MR. STEEL: In this particular case I do wish to do that.

THE COURT: All right. Is that your opinion?

MR. STEEL: In this particular case that's exactly what I think you did.

THE COURT: You have that. What else?

MR. STEEL: Having done that, your Honor---

THE COURT: Okay. We're not conceding. That may be your opinion.

MR. STEEL: I can't have an opinion for your 2 Honor? 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 5 MR. STEEL: I assume you want---6 THE COURT: What's your application, Mr. 7 Steel? 8 MR. STEEL: I assume you want to hear my opinion, otherwise you wouldn't ask me to talk. 9 10 THE COURT: I want your application. MR. STEEL: My application is that when you 11 call her back, that you ask her in very, in very 12 unleading terms a question to the effect, now that 13 we've had this discussion with you, do you feel that 14 the fact that you know that these defendants are 15 having a re-trial and were convicted, and were con-16 victed once before, do you feel that may have any 17 effect on you whatsoever if you became a prospective 18 juror? And, if so, what effect would it have? 19 THE COURT: Now, wait a moment. They were 20 convicted once before. Would that have any effect? 21 What was the second question? 22 MR. STEEL: And, if so, what effect would it 23 have? 24 THE COURT:

All right.

7.

There is only one problem as I see it with that. You see, she was under the impression before when she first started, that once they've been convicted, there is no reason for a new trial.

When I told her that she would not be permitted, if chosen as a juror, to consider that fact because they have been granted a new trial and, therefore, she has to start from scratch, as it were, and must evaluate the case as she hears it here, she said she could accept that and do that.

Now, I can't just out of context say, well, you know, they were convicted before, would have any effect on you? It would destroy everything that she said before because it's being taken out of context and I don't think that would be fair. It would be wasting time.

MR. STEEL: Let me, my problem, Judge--THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. STEEL: It's always a problem that I feel when a judge conducts a <u>voir dire</u> as opposed to me.

I know that is the law.

THE COURT: I told you my feeling. I don't see, I don't agree with the law. I'd rather have the lawyers do it.

23

24

25

MR. STEEL: I think what happens that a person in trying to please the majesty of the court. who is the judge, listens carefully to what the judge is saying on these matters and tries to do the right thing by agreeing with the judge, which leaves us in the dilemma frankly as to whether or not we're going to get a prospective juror who may have said the right thing to the judge, but doesn't believe it in her heart. And I don't know if that's the case in this situation. And that's why I objected so strongly to what your Honor did. And I understand your Honor has a hard job. I think we all do. THE COURT: Don't worry about it. That's my job. MR. STEEL: I think we all have hard jobs. THE COURT: I know.

MR. STEEL: But I'm desperately trying to find out what people believe, not what people think what you think they should believe.

THE COURT: All right.

Anything further, gentlemen?

MR. MARMO: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Bring in the juror.

(Prospective juror enters room)

THE COURT: Mrs. Kohleman, have a seat.

BETTY H. KOHLEMAN, called as a prospective juror, having been previously sworn, testifies further as follows:

## BY THE COURT:

Q How are you doing? You're ready to go? You'll be going very shortly.

Mrs. Kohleman, just one area and it's for me.

I want to clear myself, clear my mind as to this.

You started out by saying that I don't know too much about this case. Like I said before, I think I covered it, but I just want to be sure. I don't know too much about this case, but I do know they had a trial before. You remember you told me that?

## A A re-trial.

And, well, if you're chosen as a juror, you have to disregard that fact. I asked you once and I'm going to ask you once more, at the risk of being repetitious, could you disregard a new trial if I asked you to do that?

A Yes.

Q And would you be able to judge this case on what you hear in this courtroom and forget the fact that they had another trial, which has nothing to do with you? Would you do that? Would you be able to hear this case

I'm going to proceed.

24

25

Let us see if there was anything I did want

1	196
2	to ask her that was brought out.
3	MR. MARMO: Her time element.
4	THE COURT: Okay. That's too bad. I let he
5	step out.
6	All right. Let us bring her in.
7	(Prospective juror enters room)
8	BETTY H. KOHLEMAN, called as a
9	prospective juror, having been previously sworn, testifies
10	further as follows:
11	BY THE COURT:
12	Q Okay. Mrs. Kohleman, I'm sorry, I meant to
13	ask you. You can stand where you are. What do you do with
14	your time during the day? Are you engaged in any activi-
15	ties at all?
16	A I go shopping. I do a lot of walking.
17	Q You do? Do you belong to any social
18	organization?
19	A I help my daughter with her work. I used to belong
20	to a couple of Senior Citizen clubs, but I gave them up.
21	Q That's the extent of your activities during
22	the day?
23	A Yes.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you again. Have

another seat.

9

10

11.

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

MRS. KOHLEMAN: I have to wait yet?

THE COURT: Just a few minutes, not even five or six minutes.

(Prospective juror leaves room)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, I'm going to give you five minutes. It's now four-fifteen, since we started with this juror, and I want to give counsel five minutes to consult among each other, their respective sides, as to challenges.

MR. BELDOCK: Your Honor, I find five minutes inadequate. I would ask your Honor to give us ten minutes and we come back sooner in many instances.

THE COURT: Ten minutes?

MR. BELDOCK: But five minutes, it is a pressure, it's only four minutes.

THE COURT: Mr. Beldock, you have ten minutes.

MR. BELDOCK: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: And if you need more, you ask for it, you'll have it.

(Brief recess)

THE COURT: All right. Before the juror comes in, it seems to me, Mr. Beldock went first last time.

MR. BELDOCK: Yes, sir. You're talking about exercising challenges, and we want to make an

23

24

25

application first.

THE COURT: All right. Wait until the State gets here.

MR. BELDOCK: You're talking about exercising a challenge.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Steel would go first.

Then the State, and then you, then next time the

State goes first.

MR. STEEL: That's right.

THE COURT: They went first last time.

MR. STEEL: No, Mr. Beldock went first.

THE COURT: Oh, that's right. Then it's you.

MR. STEEL: I go first this time?

THE COURT: You keep alternating.

MR. BELDOCK: Who goes first next?

THE COURT: Right now I have Mr. Steel would go first, because you went first last time. After this one, Mr. Humphreys will go first.

MR. STEEL: Goes and then Mr. Marmo?

THE COURT: And then you.

Let the record indicate that it's now four twenty-five. Counsel have returned to chambers after having been given an opportunity to confer with their associates on the challenge.

All right. Before we proceed with the challenge, I think Mr. Beldock has indicated he has an application.

MR. BELDOCK: Well, yes.

Your Honor, I would like to argue a challenge for cause of this potential juror on a combination of factors.

THE COURT: Is it anything in addition other than what you told us?

MR. BELDOCK: It's a combination of what I've told you plus other factors that I see as being significant.

She said in answer to several questions the following, blacks might be more inclined to violent crimes. Because of that she indicates a cultural prejudice that's going to be difficult to eradicate in that she doesn't know whether blacks are more inclined to commit crimes.

She said at one point, then we have her particular experience with crimes. She said that she was mugged and it involved a pocketbook snatch and she was, of course, very angered by that. She says there are good and bad in all kinds and obviously quite correct she thinks that's an example of bad

action.

Your Honor may not know it, but if you follow the ruling that Judge Marchese previously followed, there was no change. And if Mr. Carter takes the stand, the record to be elicited will involve exactly that type of crime. In fact, 1959, I think it was as long ago as it was nonetheless.

MR. CARTER: 'Fifty-six.

MR. BELDOCK: 'Fifty-six. I'm corrected.

There were three charges. I think all on the same day or about the same time all involving that type of crime, one of which involved a woman and a pocketbook.

Now, obviously if this case were one involving that type of charge, I would say automatically that her response would be a basis for challenge for cause---

THE COURT: Except, ---

MR. BELDOCK: ---I think and one that should be granted.

It would be very, very questionable whether anyone with such a strong feeling about that kind of crime could eliminate from her feelings, attitudes, opinions, and ultimate determinations, that part of

her personality and being, as you see a moralistic, a very strong-minded person, and I think that the fact that we do not have that kind of crime here, but we also have charges of crimes of violence, and we will have elicited, if Mr. Carter takes the stand, exactly the type of crime that she was involved in, is in itself a good basis to grant a challenge for cause and I combine that with a few

Now, the fact that she volunteered at the beginning that she believes in capital punishment, now the fact that this doesn't involve capital punishment, does not mean that volunteered information should be disregarded. It indicates a cultural attitude which goes along with the other matters I am bringing to your attention.

matters that I just brought to your attention.

And it is perfectly clear to me and to the Court, and experienced members of the bar and bench, that we are dealing with a person that has definitive strong attitudes and they are attitudes I think that would affect her judgment as a juror no matter how many times she says well, I can be fair-minded.

Those attitudes exist and persist. They're reflected by her, the fact that she doesn't read the newspapers

very much, because the news is very bad today and people are being killed, dying, that's all she reads about. More of the same, your Honor. It reflects a sort of cultural attitude that is prejudiced.

Now, she says she's only prejudiced against individuals. And that's a fair statement for her to make, but her words and her expressions are enough to indicate what most of us would consider to be a prejudice of a strong nature and one that should not be involved with a juror in this case in view of the kind of evidence that is going to come before the jury.

Now, we go back to what I raised before, her opinion, if a man is convicted originally, why a new trial? She can't see it. She said she can't see that they should get---

THE COURT: I explored that. I considered it.

MR. BELDOCK: I think you should combine all those arguments that I now make with the factors that I presented before and one off-the-record matter that occurred when your Honor stepped out to make the phone call. I don't know whether the reporter did pick it up, he was closer to her. I don't know whether he was then making a record, but

she did turn and smile and say something to the effect about our being mad at her. It was a very pleasant exchange, but it indicates more of the sort of an involvement beyond her beliefs.

THE COURT: Was that the extent of the colloquy between the jurors and counsel?

MR. BELDOCK: It was her statement. We made no statements. The words as I can remember, you're not mad at me or are you mad at me? Or something like that. I heard the "mad at me" referring to her. They heard it over there. I don't know what it was over there.

THE COURT: Can you help?

MR. MARMO: I think her comment was to Mr. Steel. And as Mr. Beldock said, she said it in a very light manner. I think it was, "Did I make you mad at me?" But it was said with smiles, in a jovial manner.

MR. STEEL: I said absolutely nothing to her, your Honor. I was sitting here.

THE COURT: I didn't say you did.

MR. STEEL: Your Honor walked out of the room, and she said, "Are you mad at me?" I think it was addressed to me.

MR. BELDOCK: That is also a factor, smiles and lightness, it's a comment that goes deep into her psychic and I think she is sort of saying to us that she knows that her attitudes somehow is reflecting something she thinks we would not like. That's what she's saying. She says that her comments reflect something that she thinks we would not like. She doesn't know that. She may be completely wrong.

The fact is, she has that attitude.

THE COURT: I think when Mr. Steel, while I was still in the room attempted to state an objection on the record before that, didn't that happen before that?

MR. STEEL: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I think that's what precipitated saying that. She thought she was attempting to tell me something which would reflect on his feelings towards her. And I think she attempted to make that inquiry when she said that. I'm not going to give it any significance to the extent that I would have to excuse her for cause because of it.

That's why I would hope that counsel would abide by my directive. And like I said before, I

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

25

think I've given counsel the opportunity by excusing the juror to give you an opportunity to state on the record areas that you wanted covered. doesn't have to be done while the juror is in the room. And I wish we wouldn't.

All right. Is that your application to excuse this juror for cause for the reasons given; is that correct?

> MR. BELDOCK: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. STEEL: I join in. I just wanted to add one thing.

> THE COURT: Go ahead.

That she said over and over again MR. STEEL: that she had prejudices.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STEEL: And then she said, when she explained her prejudices, your Honor kept asking her, well did she have prejudices against blacks? And you kept trying to explore that. Her answer was, well, I got prejudices against a lot of people, against whites as well. And the "as well", your Honor, I must say can only be interpreted one way, indicating a general prejudice against blacks in

which you can also throw in some whites.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. STEEL: Your Honor did not choose to explore that either.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. STEEL: To follow-up what she meant by that type of statement.

But it seems to me that if we are going to have a fair voir dire, if the purpose of the voir dire is to see whether or not a juror can sit fairly rather than to see whether they can answer questions by route then, I guess those things should be taken into account.

MR. BELDOCK: May I say one other thing before you rule?

Judge, I find it very unsatisfactory in the area particularly of possible challenges for cause that you should be the sole person questioning a juror. That when you come to sensitive responses that you should be the person reconstructing the jury and that you should be the person ruling.

Now, at least in that area, why I would say that, our being deprived of the ability to personally conduct a voir dire on a challenge for cause is

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

improper, an improper excess of discretion and Constitutional deprivation of the right to counsel.

THE COURT: Anything further, gentlemen?

All right. The application to excuse the juror for cause is denied.

The application to voir dire the juror by counsel is denied.

You may bring her in.

Let the record indicate, it's now four thirty-four.

MR. MARMO: You want us to exercise the challenge before she is brought in? That's the practice we have been following.

THE COURT: Oh, yes. I'm sorry.

Okay. Let us proceed, Mr. Beldock.

MR. BELDOCK: Mr. Steel is first.

MR. MARMO: No, it's Mr. Beldock's turn, I think.

THE COURT: Mr. Beldock was first last time.

MR. MARMO: That's true. And he said satisfactory and Mr. Steel said satisfactory, and I said satisfactory. And consequently it's now Mr. Beldock's turn again.

·

THE COURT: Why wouldn't you go to Mr. Steel?

-12

MR. MARMO: The last time we challenged, Mr. Beldock went first. He said satisfactory. Then Mr. Steel went and said satisfactory or acceptable, and then I indicated that the juror was satisfactory.

THE COURT: That's the status quo.

MR. MARMO: That's it. Mr. Beldock's turn. He follows me.

MR. STEEL: I thought the system was that it rotated each time.

THE COURT: Why don't we rotate? Don't we start off with Mr. Steel at this time being that Mr. Beldock went first and then you?

MR. MARMO: No.

THE COURT: Then Mr. Beldock, then the next time it would be Mr. Beldock and Mr. Steel?

MR. MARMO: No.

Now, if we were out in the jury room, Judge-THE COURT: Right.

MR. MARMO: ---exercising challenges and the last round of challenges went this way, that it was Mr. Beldock's turn first and he stood up and said satisfactory; and then Mr. Steel stood up and said satisfactory, and then I stood up and said satisfactory, and now a new juror were placed in the box

and we started again, it would be Mr. Beldock's turn.

THE COURT: I agree. That's the way it works.

If we were out in the courtroom, that's the way it

would work. But once you have excused, then it

moves on to the next man; is that so?

Once you exercise. Then it moves on to the next person.

MR. BELDOCK: Well now -- really, what's the order at this point?

THE COURT: Right now you would go first. If you should excuse the juror then Mr. Steel would go first next time. You see, because you haven't really gone first.

All right. Wait a moment. The last time the three of you accepted the juror, right?

MR. BELDOCK: Yes.

THE COURT: Had you excused the juror, then the move would be after, next to you would be Mr. Steel would go first.

MR. BELDOCK: You're saying it's my turn to exercise a challenge or not exercise a challenge.

I open my mouth and close it, who goes next on this round?

THE COURT: Mr. Steel and then Mr. Marmo,

Mr. Humphreys.

MR. BELDOCK: That's reversing the order.

THE COURT: No it isn't. That's the way, that's the order.

I didn't say anything.

MR. STEEL: First of all, my understanding was that the State always exercised its peremptory challenge first; so that I don't even understand how we're getting ourselves in a position.

THE COURT: No, no. We rotate. The State doesn't always go first. So, let us assume the State said excuse the juror. The State wouldn't go first again. Then it would be next, the first defendant to go first.

MR. STEEL: Well.

THE COURT: Let me show you, Mr. Steel. With Mr. Carrotta, the State went first. They excused him. Okay. You didn't have to exercise any challenge, did you, because they excused him, they were the first one and they excused him. You recall that?

MR. STEEL: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Then Mr. Beldock and Mr. Steel didn't have to say anything, because he was excused. They exercised their challenge.

Now, when Mr. DeAngelo came up, Mr. Beldock went first because the State just before him excused the juror. They had exercised a challenge. Then it was, then you, and then the State. But at that point with DeAngelo the three, whole three of you said okay. So everybody excused a juror. So nobody excused a juror.

So, we start again with Mr. Beldock.

MR. STEEL: The logic escapes me.

THE COURT: The last challenge that was used was by the State. The last one that was used by Mr. Marmo when he excused Mr. Carrotta. There haven't been any excuses since then.

In other words, the man who goes first is the man who follows the last excuse.

MR. STEEL: Well, that, it seems to me to be terribly unfair because that means that any time, any time Mr. Marmo exercises a challenge, it goes back to Mr. Beldock and skips me.

THE COURT: No, it doesn't skip you. If Mr. Beldock should exercise a challenge for example at this point---

MR. STEEL: Right.

THE COURT: With this juror, then you would

1	213
2	MR. STEEL: Absolutely not.
3	MR. BELDOCK: The rotation is in a circle.
4	They're not alternating rotation.
5	MR. STEEL: But every time the State exer-
6	cises, you got two defendants and one Prosecutor.
7	MR. CARTER: Yes on them.
8	THE COURT: Twice as many challenges.
9	MR. STEEL: Every time Mr. Marmo exercises or
10	Mr. Humphreys exercises a challenge, no matter what
11	the order, you're saying it comes back to Mr.
12	Beldock.
13	THE COURT: Because he's defendant number one
14	MR. STEEL: But then it's not going in a
15	circle, it's very clear.
16	THE COURT: Can I explain? I don't see any
17	question.
18	MR. MARMO: I thought I explained it as best
19	as I could.
20	MR. STEEL: There is no question it is not
21	going in a circle.
22	MR. MARMO: Apparently they do it different
23	in New York.
24	MR. STEEL: It's not a question of doing it
25	in New York. If we are doing it in a circle; we are

not doing it in a circle.

THE COURT: How should you say it should be done?

MR. STEEL: I think we should keep going around. One time Mr. Beldock goes first. The next time I go. The next time Mr. Marmo first. The next time Mr. Beldock. I think it should either be that way or the State should go first all the time. But the New York practice, but you say you don't follow that practice, but I object in the absence of that, at least it should be going around in a circle. Mr. Beldock went first last time. That means I should go first this time. That means Mr. Marmo should go first next. That means Mr. Beldock should go after that.

THE COURT: You see any objection to that?

MR. MARMO: Yes.

THE COURT: Why?

MR. MARMO: Why should we follow special procedures in this case?

THE COURT: I don't think it's a special procedure.

MR. MARMO: I think you do know, Judge, that it's a special procedure. You are certainly aware

PENGAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. 67602 . FORM 204

of the procedures that are uniformly followed in trying cases in New Jersey. Why should we depart from that now. If we follow their procedures, then there will be rounds when one party or another might not go.

THE COURT: You object to the way we're doing it? You say we shouldn't do it this way?

MR. STEEL: I say we should go around in a circle, which I understood you said we should do.

THE COURT: Yes, but from the time you exercise a challenge; in other words, you follow the attorney following the person who exercises the last challenge goes first. That's the way we do it in New Jersey.

MR. STEEL: Well, that really is, does not seem to me to be proper.

THE COURT: All right. That's the way we're going to do it.

Now, you have your objection noted.

Now, in this case we start off with Mr. Beldock.

MR. BELDOCK: This juror is excused.

THE COURT: Now, the next juror that comes in, Mr. Steel will be first.

1	216
2	Okay. You want to bring in the juror?
3	(Prospective juror enters room)
4	THE COURT: All right. Mrs. Kohleman, you
5	have been excused from this case.
6	MRS. KOHLEMAN: Oh, thank you.
7	THE COURT: We did impose on you until, to
8	wait almost until quarter of five. It is now five
9	forty-two.
10	At any rate you don't have to come back.
11	But, I'm going to ask you not to discuss what
12	we discussed in here with anybody.
13	MRS. KOHLEMAN: Okay.
14	THE COURT: That's why we do it in chambers,
15	all right?
16	MRS. KOHLEMAN: Thank you.
17	THE COURT: And I want to thank you for your
18	time and your patience.
19	MRS. KOHLEMAN: All right. Thank you very
20	much.
21	(Prospective juror leaves room)
22	MR. STEEL: Your Honor, I would like to make
23	an application, if I could.
24	THE COURT: All right.
25	MR. STEEL: Your Honor, I say this with all

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

respect.

Your Honor promised us a fair voir dire, which your Honor promised would root out people that were prejudiced. And I have sat and listened to your Honor's voir dire for two days. And I must say that I feel frankly that your Honor is resorting to the old device of moving in very quickly to save virtually every prosecution witness, every prospective juror. I'm sorry. When they show the least sign of exposing their prejudice, I must say that I feel like I'm sitting with my hands tied behind my back. When it happens, it's very frustrating. seems to me, your Honor, that in this case where people obviously do know quite a bit about the case and more than they tell you about the case, and this last witness was the classic example, she came in and told you she knew about the case, but she knew more than nothing. She knew that there had been a conviction and God knows what else she knew.

THE COURT: You're inferring I don't know from what, but for you to make these statements on the record, I want the record to be crystal-clear that this is your statement. I'm not agreeing with the fact that this witness knows, that a juror knew

anything about this case any more than what she testified to. I don't know where you get that information from.

I have to assume that a juror who's under oath is at least attempting to be candid with me.

I'm not going to come out and say she's an unmitigated liar.

Let us proceed.

MR. STEEL: Judge, I'm saying, that I really think that in a case that has had this much publicity, it's actually been moved to another jurisdiction because of publicity, and that has been around for as long as this case has been around, so the jurors have had much opportunity to have some feelings for the case.

THE COURT: You're asking me to disbelieve a juror when she tells me her knowledge of the case is limited.

MR. STEEL: No, no.

THE COURT: Because of the tremendous publicity. I'm not going to do that.

MR. STEEL: What I'm asking your Honor to do is rather than stepping right in on the juror who indicates some problem with sitting as a fair juror

and saying, well, if I told you the law was so and so, ta-ta-ta-ta, could you follow that, which is what your Honor has been doing in virtually in every single case rather than doing that, it seems to me that your Honor is obligated to ask some open-ended question to probe the question of that prejudice rather than doing what I consider is showing judicial disapproval of that attitude and in effect---

THE COURT: I don't know what you mean by that. I wish you would clarify that. I don't know what you mean by judicial disapproval.

MR. BELDOCK: By telling the juror wouldn't you follow this rubric that I give you? The juror is standing, sitting there in front of the judge and the judge says, wouldn't you do it? And the juror automatically says, yes, I will. And the juror knows that if he says, no, I won't, or indicates hesitation that will involve disapproval because a citizen recognizes that sitting here. And as soon as you close that door, you close the juror's mind and you close our source of information. I think you did. And you know we're here. There is no one else around except all the persons participating in this.

We feel very strongly that we had to exercise two challenges today rather blindly because your Honor did not sufficiently inquire in the areas that would have given us that information.

THE COURT: All right. I've heard you on that. I think you're well-protected on the record, gentlemen.

MR. BELDOCK: It's not the record I'm concerned about, Judge.

I'm concerned about the rest of the voir dire

I'm concerned about what happened today. But I'm

concerned about the rest of the voir dire. And I

find that your Honor's tendency, if I may put it

that way to say the standard things, certainly with

no improper intent, has a very poor result to us

when the jurors are indicating by their hesitation,

by the words they're trying to formulate, that they

have more that is significant to tell us.

THE COURT: Well, I'll tell you what I'm going to do.

Gentlemen, I'm going to ask my reporter to type up the voir dire of these witnesses, the jurors And I'm going to go over it. I think that I have explored areas more so than I would ordinarily, that

I would explore them in this particular instance.

And I'm going to go over it and as soon as I can
get it; let me ask him. What's the situation on
that. Actually you only have two hours of work.

You can take a day off tomorrow and you do it for me, and send someone else here and I want it as soon as possible.

I'm going to want my voir dire typed. And I'm going to go over it myself first and I'm going to let counsel go over the questions and you will see that I have explored the areas a lot more than you mentioned for the record. I notice, I have noticed that I have opened areas, and when I did, I went into them very thoroughly.

But I'm going to do this. I'm going to have my reporter type Zylka, Carrotta, and DeAngelo, and Kohleman, if possible by tomorrow. I will have it sometime tomorrow or the next day. In the meantime I'm going to proceed as I am. And if I'm going to reserve on the motions, I'll reserve on the motion.

MR. HUMPHREYS: What motion is this?

THE COURT: He just made a motion now that I should explore further certain areas and I should change my method of voir diring the jurors and that

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

I should review this motion that this juror be excused for cause, apparently, and I'm going to reserve on it for the purpose of being able to examine the transcripts of the voir dire. I feel that I have explored the areas, but I don't want to preclude counsel from having that opportunity of my reviewing what we've done so far.

MR. STEEL: Thank you, your Honor. appreciate that.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. STEEL: Do we have a question about, you have a pending motion, your Honor, as to whether or not you're going to hold an evidentiary hearing.

THE COURT: I'll decide that during the week, if we do have it.

MR. STEEL: That's the only thing. a scheduling problem.

THE COURT: Okay. I will tell you why I won't decide it at this moment, but I'll decide it tomorrow morning before we start.

I want to couch it in my own language and I want to make my decision clear so that there is no misunderstanding.

And the motion will be, if I grant it, it will

15 16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

1	223
2	be, the hearing will be held on a Saturday.
3	We will save a lot of things for Saturday.
4	Is there anything else before we recess?
5	MR. STEEL: Yes, your Honor. I think your
6	Honor asked that by tomorrow that we have prepared
7	a pre-trial list.
8	THE COURT: Open question of things that have
9	to be resolved.
10	MR. STEEL: I just wonder if we could have
11	another day.
12	THE COURT: You want until Friday?
13	MR. STEEL: Well, not necessarily.
14	THE COURT: Thursday?
15	MR. STEEL: Hopefully we'll be through by
16	Thursday.
17	THE COURT: Is that all right with you, Mr.
18	Humphreys?
19	MR. HUMPHREYS: Yes, your Honor.
20	MR. BELDOCK: If you rule on the other matter
21	tomorrow, I think we can put it over for at least
22	one day, your Honor, because we want to keep moving
23	with the jurors. We want to keep moving with jurors
24	And the other matter would take, I suspect a few
25	hours' time and that would be bad procedure for the

moment.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Could we recess until tomorrow morning?

MR. BELDOCK: May I ask your Honor's permission on one matter?

Whether the defendants at their option with counsel's consent may be absent from time to time during the voir dire of the jurors.

THE COURT: If they, if they choose to be and they waive their right to be here, I'm not going to insist that they're here.

MR. BELDOCK: I just want to have that option on the record, if I might.

THE COURT: Do you have any objection?

MR. HUMPHREYS: No, your Honor. I think the record should indicate that the defendants were absent during a part of the day.

THE COURT: And that was by choice?

MR. BELDOCK: In other words, Mr. Carter apparently didn't have a ride, Mr. Artis had to go get him.

THE COURT: But you have no objection, gentlemen?

I'll ask you individually, the fact that we

went ahead without you, you have no objection to that, Mr. Carter?

MR. CARTER: No, sir. I certainly don't have any objection.

THE COURT: How about you, Mr. Artis?

MR. ARTIS: None whatsoever.

THE COURT: Now, if you want to be excused when we are selecting the jury, you have my permission. And that is by your request; is that by Mr. Carter?

MR. CARTER: Yeah, that's correct. As I was going to say as a follow-up to what you were saying, without trying to be facetious to the Court at all, as long as my attorneys are here while things are going on, I'm perfectly satisfied.

THE COURT: You understand you have a perfect right to be here. If you're not here, you're absent by your own choice, not because anyone is precluding you from being here.

MR. CARTER: Absolutely by my own choice and by circumstances which I can't help.

THE COURT: How about you, Mr. Artis?

MR. ARTIS: All right. The same thing.

THE COURT: You are absent because it is of

your own choice and not because you're being. precluded?

MR. ARTIS: Absolutely.

THE COURT: If we do proceed with your counsel in the event that you choose to be absent during the voir dire?

MR. ARTIS: Definitely, with my counsel.

THE COURT: No objection. No problem.

All right. Gentlemen, tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon Court adjourned at 4:55 P.M.)

496 a A

1	227
3	SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION-CRIMINAL INDICTMENT NO. 167-66
4	THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY, :
5	v.
6	RUBIN CARTER and : REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
7	JOHN ARTIS, :
8	Defendants. :
9	·
10	
11	I, RAYMOND E. ABT, C.S.R., R.P.R., and Official
12	Court Reporter of the State of New Jersey, do hereby
13	certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate
14	transcript of the testimony and proceedings had in the
15	above-entitled matter, as reported by me, stenographically,
16	on the date and at the place hereinbefore set forth.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	0000
22	Kaymon 6. Clot
23	Raymond E. Abt, C.S.R., R.P.R. Official Court Reporter
24	DATED 11/2/27
25	