

ADNAN SYED

Petitioner

V.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Respondent

IN THE

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

BALTIMORE CITY,

STATE OF MARYLAND

199103042-046 and

Post-Conviction No. 10432

TRANSCRIPT OF OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS

(Post-Conviction)

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE MARTIN P. WELCH, Judge

HEARING DATE:

October 25, 2012

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner: Justin Brown, Esquire

For the Respondent: Kathleen Murphy, Esquire

Transcriptionist: Erika B. Newton

Transcription Service: ACCUSCRIBES TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE

1301 York Road, Suite 601

Lutherville, Maryland 21093

Proceedings recorded by digital media with video, transcript produced by transcription service.

, [	TABLE OF CONTENT	rs				
1   2	WITNESSES:	D	С	RD	RC	
3	Petitioner:					
4	Adnan Syed	6	56	60		
5	Margaret Meade	63	97	100		
6	Margaret Medde					
7	Respondent:					
8	None offered.					
9	None official					
10	EXHIBITS: MARK		ID		RECD	
11	Petitioner:					
12	5- Handwritten notes from jail vis	it			6	
13	6- Second letter to Defendant from	Ms.	McCla	ane	25	
14	7- First letter to Defendant from	Ms.	McCla:	ne	26	
15	8- Correspondence to Ms. Gutierrez	z fro	m Def	endant	45	
16	9A-L- Certificates for Petitioner			•	53	
17	10- Excerpt of trial transcript for	com 2	/25/0	0	63	
18						
19	Respondent: "					
20	1- Correspondence from Ms. Gutier:	rez t	o Sta	te	102	
21						
22	CLOSING ARGUMENTS					
23	by MR. BROWN				102,	129
24	by MS. MURPHY				114	
25						
						0.0

#### PROCEEDINGS

(On the record - 11:30:20 a.m.)

2.3

State.

THE COURT: Would you call the matter, please?

MS. MURPHY: Thank you, Your Honor. Good

morning. Calling State -- or I'm sorry, calling Adnan

Syed vs. State of Maryland, Case No. 199103042 through

046, Post-Conviction No. 10432. Kathleen Murphy for the

THE COURT: And Mr. Brown?

MR. BROWN: Good morning, Your Honor. Justin Brown, on behalf of Adnan Syed, who is seated to my right.

THE COURT: And Counsel, again, I want to thank you for cooperation. I think we were last here on the October 11th, in accommodating the Court's schedule. And we did, that day, we did complete, at least two witnesses, I believe. Is that correct?

MR. BROWN: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And we really have the balance of the day. So, we can figure out when we would like to take a break for lunch but I was hoping we could get a little bit done before then and so I'm as flexible as you all need the Court to be.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, my intention is to call Mr. Syed first. And then the second witness would be Margaret Meade as our expert witness. And I tentatively

told her to be here around 2:00, but certainly I can shoot 1 her a text message or something to change that. 2 THE COURT: And any other witnesses after? 3 No, Your Honor. MR. BROWN: 4 THE COURT: Okay. Any, Ms. Murphy? 5 MS. MURPHY: At this point, the State is not 6 intending to call any witnesses, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Any idea -- well, and Mr. 8 Syed is probably your longest witness, I assume. 9 I would imagine. MR. BROWN: 10 Okay. Well let's sort of see where 11 THE COURT: we are and then we can always adjust. So, is the 12 Petitioner prepared to call its next witness then, Mr. 13 Brown? 14 MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. I would like to 15 before I call Mr. Syed, I just want to address one issue 16 that came up at the last hearing. We -- I discussed, that 17 it was my understanding there was a stipulation regarding 18 a note that was found in Ms. Gutierrez's file. And Ms. 19 Murphy initially objected, that she didn't recall there 20 being a stipulation. But we have had the opportunity to 21 discuss it. And, in fact, there was an agreement that an 22 affidavit, she would not object to its admission into 23 evidence. 2.4

25

So, I would like to introduce it into evidence

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

at that time and briefly explain to Your Honor what it is. THE COURT: All right. And I missed the first thing you said as to what it was. So maybe you'll --MR. BROWN: Your Honor, there was a note found in Ms. Gutierrez's file related to the alibi witness, Asia McClane. And, essentially what the note said was, "Asia McClane saw him in the library at 3:00. Asia, boyfriend saw him too." That's a handwritten note. And I was able to determine that that note was written by a law clerk to Ms. Gutierrez named, Ali Cornedor (phonetic), who's now an attorney in Washington D.C. So I sent that note, along with some requests for a jail visit to Mr. Cornedor, so that he could authenticate them. And say that, indeed, that was his handwriting. That by the best of his recollection, he visited Syed, obtained that information, and that in the normal course of being a law clerk, he would have relayed that information to Ms. Gutierrez. So, I believe we're on Defendant's Exhibit No. 5. And I would move that into evidence at this time, Your Honor. THE COURT: And, Ms. Murphy? MS. MURPHY: No objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: So admitted then as Defendant's Exhibit No. 5.

(Whereupon, Defense's 1 Exhibit No. 5 was admitted 2 into evidence.) 3 4 (Pause.) 5 THE COURT: And if I didn't say it then, this would be admitted then as Defendant's -- or Petitioner's 6 7 Exhibit No. 5, I'm sorry. MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor. And with 8 that taken care of, I would call Adnan Syed. 9 THE COURT: If you'll take the witness stand, 10 11 please. ADNAN SYED 12 (A witness produced on call by the Petitioner, first 13 having been duly sworn according to law, testifies as 14 15 follows:) I ask that you speak directly into the CLERK: 16 mic. State your name for the record. 17 THE WITNESS: My name is Adnan Syed. 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. BROWN: 2.0 21 Good morning, Mr. Syed. 0 22 Good morning. Α And, again, please make sure -- if I may 23 0 pull that even closer to him. Well, I guess that's as 24 good as it gets. Mr. Syed, where are you currently 25

-		
1	incarcerated?	
		Branch Correctional Institution.
2		
3	_	w long have you been there?
4		imately four years.
5	Q How lo	ong have you been incarcerated total,
6	for the case that we're here for today?	
7	A Almost	14 years.
8	Q And wh	aat is the sentence that you're
9	currently serving?	
10	A Life y	olus thirty.
11	Q I'd l:	ke to take you back to the winter of
12	1999, prior to your a	arrest, and how old were you then?
13	A Seven	ceen.
14	Q Who d	id you live with?
15	A My mo	ther and father.
16	Q And w	nat are their names?
17	A My mo	ther's name is Shamim Rahman and my
18	father's name is Mas	ud Rahman.
19	Q Were	you in school at the time?
20	A Yes.	
21	Q Where	did you go to school?
22	A Woodl	awn High School.
23	Q And i	s it true that you were in the Honors
24	Program there?	
25	A Yes.	

150		
1	Q	At that time, did you have any criminal
2	record?	
3	А	No.
4	Q	Ever been arrested, any juvenile offenses,
5	anything?	×
6	А	No.
7	Q	Do you recall that you were arrested on
8	February 28, 19	999?
9	А	Yes.
10	Q	And do you remember where you were detained
11	initially?	
12	A	At the Baltimore City Detention Center.
13	Q	Were you able to get released on bail?
14	A	No.
15	Q	Were you represented by an attorney at your
16	bail hearing?	,
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	Do you recall the name of that attorney?
19	- A	I believe it was Professor Douglas Colbert.
20	Q	Okay. And did there eventually come a time
21	when you obtai	ned a lawyer other than Professor Colbert to
22	represent you?	
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And who was that other lawyer?
25	A	Ms. Cristina Gutierrez.

```
To the best of your recollection, how did
 1
     Cristina Gutierrez come to represent you?
 2
                    Well, when I was arrested, the community
 3
     that I was a part of _ they raised money to hire an
 4
     attorney. So, that's how she was hired. The members of
 5
 6
     the community, they hired her.
                    Okay. Were you personally involved in the
 7
     selection process?
 8
 9
               Α
                    No.
                    Had you met with Ms. Gutierrez prior to the
10
               0
     time when she was of ficially retained?
11
12
               Ά
                    No.
                    Do you recall when you first met Ms.
13
14
     Gutierrez?
15
                    Yes.
                    And I assume that was prior to the trial;
16
17
     is that correct?
18
                    Yes.
                    Do you remember where that meeting took
19
               0
    place?
20
                    In the city jail visiting room.
21
               Α
                    Okay. What was she like at that meeting?
22
               Q
                    Well, I would characterize my interactions
23
    with Ms. Gutierrez in the same manner that I would
24
    interact with, I guess, my teachers, or my coaches, or
25
```

even my doctor. In the sense that, they were very much, 1 you know, the adult. And they were in charge. And 2 whatever they said, that's what it was. You know, I 3 depended on them. I trusted on them. So, I guess, that 4 would be the best way to describe my interactions with Ms. 5 Gutierrez. 6 Is it fair to say that Ms. Gutierrez was 7 assertive? 8 9 Yes. Did you feel at all intimidated by her? 0 10 To an extent. I guess, the best way to 11 A describe it was like the relationships I just described, 12 that whatever she said, that's what it was. 13 Okay. And you testified before, that you -14 - this was the first time you'd ever been arrested, right? 15 Yes. 16 How much did you know about the whole 17 process of being charged with a crime? 18 Other than what I had seen on T.V. or read 19 in the books, I didn't have any experience with it. 20 What, if anything, did you know about the 21 discovery process? 22 I didn't know much of anything about it. 23 What, if anything, did you know about the 24 plea bargaining process? 25

I didn't -- until the initial hearings 1 began and through conversations with other inmates over at 2 the city jail, I didn't know anything about the plea 3 bargaining process. 4 Did you understand suppression issues and 5 other evidentiary issues? 6 7 Α No. Did you understand anything about jury 0 8 selection? 9 Not in detail. Α 10 Did you know all the components of a jury 11 Q trial? 12 Α No. 13 And did Ms. Gutierrez explain all of these 14 things to you? 15 Not in any detail. A 16 Now, I want to ask you a few questions 17 about the discovery in this case. Do you now know what I 18 mean when I use the word discovery? 19 Α Yes. 20 Did Ms. Gutierrez explain to you the 2.1 State's evidence piece by piece, or at least what she 2.2 understood to be the State's evidence? 23 Not in any detail. Α 2.4 Did she explain to you --25 0

MS. MURPHY: Your Honor, I'm going to object to 1 the leading nature of these questions. 2 Sustained. THE COURT: 3 BY MR. BROWN: 4 What, if anything, did Ms. Gutierrez 0 5 explain to you about cellular telephone evidence? 6 She didn't really go into detail about any 7 aspects of cellular. Just, she did mention that -- when 8 she would describe the case to me, when I would ask her, 9 she would give me bits and pieces in a sense. And she 10 would tell me that, for example, they're trying to use 11 your cell phone to pinpoint where you were during the day. 12 So that was the gist of her explanations to me. They were 13 not in any great detail. 14 Did she attempt to explain to you what 1.5 other witnesses would testify to? 16 MS. MURPHY: Objection as to the leading nature 17 of the question. 18 THE COURT: Sustained. 19 BY MR. BROWN: 20 What, if anything, did Ms. Gutierrez tell 21 you about other witnesses and how they might testify 22 against you? 23 She didn't go into great detail with me 24 about the total extent, I guess, of what she knew about 25

the prosecutor's case. 1 MS. MURPHY: Objection, Your Honor. As to what 2 she knew. 3 THE COURT: Sustained as to what she knew. 4 BY MR. BROWN: 5 Let me ask you this, did you feel like you 6 had a good grasp of the evidence against you? 7 Not to a great extent. 8 Now, you mentioned that there was at least 9 one meeting with Ms. Gutierrez. Did there ever come a 10 time when other people from her office would visit you? 11 Yes. Α 12 And I'm going to read you a couple of names 13 and I want to ask you if you recall those people and 14 whether they visited you at all. Do you recall someone 15 named Michael Lewis? 16 Α Yes. 17 Who is Michael Lewis? 18 He was one of, I guess, a paralegal or a Α 19 law clerk or. I guess he was a lawyer who worked 2.0 underneath of -- I'm not even sure what the term is for 2.1 that. 22 What about Caleoby (phonetic) Farmamous 0 23 (phonetic)? 24 She was in the same capacity. Α 25

1	Q What about Rita Pazmiacous (phonetic)?
2	A She was an attorney who worked with her or.
3	Q Did you recall someone named Ali Cornedor?
4	A Yes.
5	Q And did any of these people ever visit you
6	prior to your trial?
7	A Yes.
8	Q Was there one in particular, or was it the
9	sum of them, or was it all of them? What do you recall?
10	A They would come at different intervals.
11	So, they would come individually, at different times.
12	Q And what, if anything, was your
13	understanding as to whether those people would relay
14	information to Ms. Gutierrez?
15	A I was under the impression that whatever I
16	told them, they would pass it along to her.
17	Q Okay. Now, prior, there were numerous I
18	want to ask you a few questions about your court
19	proceedings but not your trial, but prior to the trial.
20	Do you recall any of those proceedings?
21	A Yes.
22	Q And do you recall who represented you at
23	those proceedings?
24	A Yes.
25	Q Who was that?
	â.

A Ms. Gutierrez.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. Can you describe to the Court what those proceedings were like?

Well, it was always very crowded. courtroom was always full of people. And it was really like emotionally charged atmosphere. And through the first initial hearings, I was just really trying to pay attention to what was going on. And whenever I would get back to the jail, I would see on the news, news stories of it, or someone would show me a paper -- excuse me, stories from the newspaper. And, I guess, the sense that I got was that, initially and throughout the entire proceeding was that, this wasn't really -- this was really a situation where I would have to prove that I didn't commit This wasn't a situation where I could just this crime. lay back and see, well they have to prove that I did it. And, I guess, that understanding comes from, you know, when you watch T.V. or you watch the legal shows. It's the sense of innocent until proven guilty. But my impression from going to court and seeing all the media coverage and in the newspaper or on T.V., that that was just the impression that stuck with me. That, I was going to have prove that I didn't commit this crime. That in a sense, I was already -- it felt like I was just presumed quilty by everyone.

Q Did you ever have the opportunity to speak with your lawyer about how strong the case against you was?

A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1.9

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Q And what, if anything, do you recall her saying?

Well, I asked her and I asked some of her Α legal people that work with her when they would come to visit me. I would ask them, you know, what are the elements of the State's case? You know, do you guys know what they're going to present against me? Essentially, what is it that I'm facing? And, they never really went into great detail about it. They would just kind of ask me the questions and then that was it. And to the extent that I explained earlier, that that was my relationship with them. I mean, specifically with Ms. Gutierrez that, I trusted her. And I took it to be that, well, she understood what was important, she would come and ask me what it was. And I may ask her a question or not, but whatever her response was, that's what it is. I mean, the best way I can explain it is, is to be 17-year-old and go visit your doctor. And your doctor asks you questions and he tells you something, you listen to what they say. You know, whatever they say, that's what it is.

Q But, did you feel like you understood how

strong the case was against you or wasn't against you? 1 I definitely did not have confidence that, 2 unless I was able to prove I didn't commit this crime, 3 because it seemed as if from what the State was saying at 4 these different hearings, that they were pinpointing, 5 like, an exact time and an exact place where this murder 6 7 took place. Did there come a time when Ms. Gutierrez 8 sat down with you and explained your options with regards 9 to pleading guilty or going to trial? 10 No. Α 11 Did you ever raise this issue with Ms. 12 Gutierrez? 13 I did. 14 THE COURT: You said you didn't? 15 THE WITNESS: Oh, no, I'm sorry, Your Honor. 16 said, I did. Yes sir, I did. 17 THE COURT: You did. 18 THE WITNESS: Yes sir, I did. 19 BY MR. BROWN: 20 And how did you -- you mentioned before 21 that you'd never been arrested for a crime. How did you 22 come to ask her about this issue, this issue about 2.3 pleading guilty or proceeding to trial? How did you come 24 to ask her about it? 25

Well, when I was housed in the city jail, a 1 lot of times, you know, other inmates and myself we would 2 talk about our cases. And my conversation with some older 3 guys, I would explain that, I really didn't have 4 confidence in my case. Because, I felt that, the time 5 that they said -- or excuse me, the time that it seems the 6 State's theory was that this murder took place or the time 7 that they were alleging in the bits and pieces of 8 information that Ms. Gutierrez was giving me, it seemed 9 that I couldn't prove I was somewhere else or with someone 10 else at that time. So, I felt that I was expressing I 11 didn't really have confidence in my case. And it was 12 suggested to me that, well, you should ask your attorney, 13 did the State offer a plea deal or, you know, what is the 14 possibility of that. And it was explained to me that 15 that's pretty much common practice. That in most cases, 16 the State will -- you know, a person will be offered a 17 plea deal. So that's how the conversation came up about 18 the plea deal and the idea came to me. 19 Okay. Do you know approximately when this 20 conversation took place? 2.1 It was prior to the first trial. Α 2.2 And what exactly did you ask Ms. Gutierrez 0 23 to do? 2.4 Well, I asked Ms. Gutierrez if the State Α 25

2.0

offered a plea deal. She said no. My next question to was to her, could she speak to the State's Attorney or request some type of a plea. And I explained to her that I didn't really have confidence that I'd be able to prove I was somewhere else when the murder take place and when the State's theory that the murder took place, from the information that we were getting. So that's what I asked her.

O And how did she respond to your request?

A She responded in the affirmative. And I took it to mean that, okay, she was going to ask her.

Q And did she ever follow-up on this?

A Well, my next time that I saw her, I asked her, what was the end result? Did she get a chance to speak to the State's Attorney? And her response was, "They're not offering you a plea deal." So, when she said that, that's what it was. There was nothing else for me to ask her after that, because I believed that she went and spoke to the State's Attorney, the State's Attorney said no, and that's what it was. Whatever she said, I mean, that's what it was. I didn't feel the need to question her about it. I took her for her word.

Q Okay. And do you recall, do you recall how your first trial ended?

A It ended in a mistrial.

And do you recall why it ended in a 1 0 2 mistrial? Yes. 3 Why was that? 0 4 Well, Judge Quarles had called Ms. Α 5 Gutierrez a liar during an exchange and Christopher Flohr 6 was sitting behind us. He made reference to Ms. Gutierrez 7 about it and Judge Quarles also stated that he received 8 the letter from the juror saying that they heard him call 9 her a liar in court. 10 Were you able to hear him call her a liar? 11 I was able to hear it, yes. 12 What was that like to hear the judge call 13 your client -- your attorney a liar? 14 I mean, it was -- I didn't really have a --15 I don't even know what to say. I mean, I didn't -- it was 16 just kind of shocking to hear that. 17 Do you recall whether the mistrial occurred 18 0 before or after Jay Wilds (phonetic) testified? 19 THE COURT: I'm sorry, after who testified? 20 MR. BROWN: I said, does he recall whether the 21 mistrial occurred before or after Jay Wilds testified --22 THE COURT: Jay Wilds. 23 MR. BROWN: -- testified in your trial, in that 24 first trial? 25

THE WITNESS: I know that he had testified 1 extensively. I don't know if his testimony -- I can't 2 remember -- I don't recall if his testimony was complete 3 at this time. 4 BY MR. BROWN: 5 And is it fair to say that Jay Wilds was 6 0 7 the State's primary witness against you? I believe now that I'm able to say that the 8 answer is yes. And I was able to hear the State's entire 9 opening arguments. And specifically, at that time when 10 they pinpointed that at 2:36 p.m., I made a phone call to 11 Jav Wilds to come pick me up in the Best Buy parking lot, 12 and I showed him the body of Hae Lee in the trunk of the 13 14 car. Now, after that mistrial, do you recall how 15 long it was until your second trial started? 16 I believe it was several weeks. It wasn't 17 long at all. 18 And during that interim, did you have an 19 0 opportunity to speak to Ms. Gutierrez? 20 Yes. 2.1 Α And did you, at any time, raise the issue 22 0 23 of a plea? Yes. 24 Α Can you describe to the Court what 25 0

happened?

A Well, at this point, my fear was even greater. And it was confirmed because, once again, back to the original point, I felt that I needed to prove that I didn't commit this crime. And I felt the best opportunity to do that was to be able to prove at the time they said the murder was committed, I was somewhere else or with someone else. And absent of that, I didn't believe that I would prevail at trial. And I had a pretty good opportunity of seeing all of the State's case, so my fears were confirmed earlier. And my request to her was, I guess, based on an even greater fear that I wouldn't be able to prevail at trial.

Q Can you tell me though, what did you tell her with -- or what, if anything, did you tell her about the pleas?

that, I really didn't have confidence in the case because now, my fears are confirmed that, that's essentially to me what it came down to. The perception in my mind was, this is what this case comes down to. Where was I at this time. So, I asked Ms. Gutierrez once again, do you think the State will offer a deal? Could you talk to them again?

Q And, did she respond?

Ī		
1	A She responded that, they're not offering	
2	you a deal.	
3	Q I'm going to turn your attention to	
4	somebody named, Asia McClane. Do you know Asia McClane?	
5	A I went to school with her.	
6	Q And how long did you know her at school?	
7	A She was the girlfriend of a friend of mine,	
8	who I had went to school with since middle school.	
9	Q And what's that person's name?	
10	A His name is Justin Adger (phonetic).	
11	Q Justin Adger?	
12	A Yes, sir.	
13	Q Okay. Did you did you know her well?	
14	A I only knew her through him. We had a few	
15	classes together. But other than that, I only knew her	
16	through him.	
17	Q Were you aware of whether she had a	
18	boyfriend?	
19	A Well, when I knew her, she was his	
20	boyfriend. I knew they had broken up. So, I did not know	
21	at the time whether she had a boyfriend or not.	
22	Q Okay. Were you aware of whether she was a	
23	good student or not?	
24	A We were in a lot some of the same	
25	classes together. So, I believe, that she was a pretty	

good student. 1 And I believe you mentioned before that you 2 were in some type of Honors Program at the school; is that 3 4 correct? Yeah. It was a magnet program. 5 Were you aware of whether she was also in 0 6 that program? 7 She was in some of the classes. So, I Α 8 believe she may or may not have been. But, I know we were 9 in a lot -- but we were in a few of the same classes 10 together. 11 And, did there come a time when she 12 contacted you following your arrest? 13 Yes. Ά 14 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, may I approach the 15 16 witness? THE COURT: You may. 17 (Whereupon, Counsel approached the witness stand 18 and the following ensued:) 19 BY MR. BROWN: 20 I'm going to show you what's been marked as 2.1 Defendant's Exhibit 6. Do you recognize that document? 22 Yes. A 23 Can you describe for the Court what this 0 24 25 is?

It's the letter I received from Asia 1 Ά McClane, probably within a few days after I was arrested. 2 And do you, do you need a chance to review 3 that letter or do you recall? 4 I recall it. 5 Α MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I'd offer into evidence 6 7 Defendant's Exhibit No. 6. THE COURT: Any objection, Ms. Murphy? 8 MS. MURPHY: No, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: So admitted then as Defendant's 10 Exhibit No. 6. 11 (Whereupon, Defense's 12 Exhibit No. 6 was admitted 13 into evidence.) 14 BY MR. BROWN: 15 Can you explain to the Court what 16 impression this letter had upon you? 17 I think that's the second letter. 18 Okay. Let me -- let's do this. Do you 19 recall that there was -- do you recall how many letters 20 you received from Asia McClane? 21 I received two letters from her back to Α 2.2 back. 23 I want to show you what's been marked as 24 Defendant's Exhibit No. 7. Do you recognize Defendant's 25

```
Exhibit No. 7?
1
2
                    Yes.
                    What's Defendant's Exhibit No. 7?
3
                    It's the first letter that she wrote me.
4
    It's dated March 1, 1999 and I was arrested the day
5
    before, February 28, 1999. So, I probably received it
6
    maybe two or three days after I was arrested.
7
               MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I would like to move
 8
     Defendant's Exhibit No. 7 into evidence.
 9
               THE COURT: And again, any objection, Ms.
10
     Murphy?
11
               MS. MURPHY: No, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: So admitted then, as Defense Exhibit
1.3
     No. 7.
14
                                     (Whereupon, Defense's
15
                                    Exhibit No. 7 was admitted
16
                                    into evidence.)
17
     BY MR. BROWN:
18
                    So, do you recall chronologically which
19
     letter you received first?
20
                     I received Exhibit No. 7 first. It's
21
     dated, March 1, 1999.
22
                     And do you recall what impression these
                Q
23
      letters had on you?
24
                     Well, once I was arrested, I realized that
 25
```

what happened that day. And, when I received these letters, it kind of fortified the memory that I had of after school that day. School ended at 2:15, that after school that day, I went to the public library. And I stayed there between approximately 2:40 to 3:00, and then I went to track practice. So, these letters essentially, they verify in my mind what my memory was of that day.

Q Were you surprised to receive these letters?

2.1

2.2

A I was surprised to received these letters. And in them, she stressed several things to me. She stressed number one, that she was very clear and concise about remembering that day. And she was very emphatic about being able to help me out. She was emphatic about, she provided me with her phone number, her, I believe, her mother or her grandmother's phone number. She requested me to ask my attorney to contact her, so that she could come forward with this information. And, I mean, she — and, I guess, what surprised me in a sense was that, she wrote me back to back. And she told me that she also took it upon herself to visit my family and she spoke to my mother. And, you know, she expressed these things to my mother. So, yeah.

Q And all that's in those letters?

- 1			
1	A All of this contained in these letters.		
2	Q If I could turn your attention to Exhibit		
3	No. 6, is there a mention of someone named, Justin Adger?		
4	A Oh, yes, sir. There is.		
5	Q Is that the same Justin Adger who you		
6	mentioned before in your testimony?		
7	A Yes.		
8	Q And, again, who is Justin Adger?		
9	A He was a friend of mine, that I had known		
10	since middle school.		
11	Q And just to be absolutely clear, did those		
12	letters come to you before the trial or after the trial?		
13	A I received these letters within the first		
14	week of being arrested. So that was way prior before the		
15	trial.		
16	Q And did you solicit these letters in any		
17	way?		
18	A Not at all.		
19	Q Is what she said, in these letters about		
20	January 13th true?		
21	A I it's absolutely true. She one of		
22	the things that really stuck out in my mind, was that she		
23	stated that she spoke to the librarian who stated that		
24	they had security cameras. And one of the things that she		
25	mentioned was that, that's something that we should look		

at, trying to secure those or retrieve the security camera

Q Tell me, and not what these letters say, but tell me what your own recollection is from that date of January 13th, with regard to Asia McClane?

A I would say my -- well, my recollection is

THE COURT: And, I'm sorry, January 13th is the date of the letter or?

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, that's the date when Ms. McClane ran into Mr. Syed at the library. It's the date when the murder took place.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.0

McClane, she came over and there were two other guys with her. And she introduced them as her boyfriend and her boyfriend's best friend. So, we sat, and we talked for a little while about different things, like, college and what's going on in high school. You know, things like that. And, I would say the two things particularly that really stuck out in my mind, and she did mention them — excuse me, she did mention them — excuse me. The one thing that stuck out in mind was the fact that, there were two snow days immediately after this day. And she mentioned that in the letter. And, so, that would be January 14th and 15th. We didn't have school those two

2.0

days. And that stuck out in my mind was because, when I met her boyfriend, I had put in my head that, well, when I see Justin tomorrow in school, you know, I'm just going to let him know, you know, I met Asia's boyfriend. He seemed like a pretty nice guy. 'Cause I just felt like that was something, you know, he -- you know, he may want to know. But I didn't have a chance to tell him this until the following Monday because we had two snow days.

Q Do you recall what you were doing at the library at that time?

A I'm fairly certain that I was accessing my e-mail from the library.

Q Okay. And why, why had you not told anyone this before about the library?

absolutely no idea that I would need to -- have to recount every single aspect of my day that day. I didn't know that I was going to be charged with her murder. I had absolutely nothing to do with her murder. So, up until the day I was arrested, in my conversations with the detectives or with anyone for that matter, I never went into great extent or felt the need to, because I didn't believe I needed to provide an alibi. I didn't know that I was going to be charged with her murder.

Q And is it correct that, to the best of your

recollection, the victim's body was not found until nearly 1 a month later, after this date, this January 13th date? 2 I believe it was February 9th, 1999. 3 And is it correct that you were arrested on 4 February 28th, 1999? 5 Α Yes. 6 And after receiving the letters from Ms. 7 McClane, did you notify Cristina Gutierrez? 8 I immediately notified her. Α 9 0 How did you notify her? 10 Well, it would have been, the next time 11 Α that I saw her on a visit, I showed her the two letters 12 and she read them. And I asked her, could she please do 13 two things, contact Asia McClane, and try to go to the 14 library to retrieve whatever security footage was there. 1.5 And do you recall whether this conversation 16 with Ms. Gutierrez took place prior to the start of the 17 18 trial? It took place very much prior to the start 19 of the first trial. 20 Do you -- we mentioned this name before. 2.1 I'm gong to run it by you again, Ali Cornedor. Do you 2.2 recall who he was? 23 Yes. He was one of Ms. Gutierrez's law --24 I don't know. He was a lawyer, I think. So, I don't know 25

1	if that's called a law clerk. But he worked for her and
2	he would come talk to me about the case.
3	Q And do you recall meeting with him?
4	A Yes.
5	Q And did there come a time when you told him
6	about Asia McClane?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And, just very briefly, because we've been
9	over it. But what did you tell him about Asia McClane?
LO	A Well, I told him that I remembered being in
L1	the public library with her that day from right after
L2	school, which is about 2:15 to around 2:40, 2:45'ish,
13	close to three.
14	Q And, again, when you spoke to him, was it
15	your understanding that that information would eventually
16	be conveyed to Ms. Gutierrez?
17	A True. And I specifically pointed out the
18	two things about this, the surveillance cameras. And I
19	also asked him if he could please, well, pass along that,
20	about the e-mail access. And I gave him my e-mail address
21	and the password.
22	Q Okay. And did Ms. Gutierrez, or anybody
23	working for her, working under her, ever get back to you
24	about Asia McClane?
25	A Subsequent to the time when I mentioned

this to Ms. Gutierrez, the next visit, I immediately asked her, what -- did you speak to Asia McClane? What did she have to say? Were you able to secure the surveillance cameras?

Q And how did she respond?

- A Her response was, I looked into it and nothing came of it.
  - Q Did you press her on this?
- A When I asked her, and her response was that, I asked her again, well, Ms. Gutierrez, did you go speak to her? You know, did they say that -- I just began in my mind to try to understand what she meant, but she moved onto another subject. And I understand now, it looks one way, but to be a 17-year-old kid in this type of situation, whatever your lawyer tells you, that's what it is.
- Q And after you were told by Ms. Gutierrez that nothing came of it, which is what you just testified to. Did this -- what, if any, affect did this have about how you felt about the strength of the case?
- A Well, as I explained before about the plea deal, this was what precipitated my fear, that I wouldn't be able to prove where I was at this time. I didn't know the exact timing at the time, but I would find out at the first trial. But from the pieces and tidbits of

2.3

information that was gleamed from the hearings that we had and some of the things, Ms. Gutierrez, I understood that. That was the most crucial time during the day, right after school. People had seen me in school. People had seen Hae Lee in school afterwards. People testified that they saw her leaving by herself. People testified that they saw me after school by myself. That this timing was the most crucial time between 2:15 and come to find out later 2:36 p.m. It's the window of 21 minutes, that was the most crucial time. If I was going to prove I didn't commit this crime, that was where it was. My case lived and died in those 21 minutes, that's it. There was nothing else to -- you know, that's what it was.

So, when Ms. Gutierrez told me that I looked into it and nothing came of it, I took that into mean that, now I have no way to prove I was somewhere else at this time. So that precipitated my fear and the conversations about -- I didn't have confidence in my case at all then, because that's where the case lived and died at. At that time, right then and there.

Q Okay. And what, if any, affect did this have on your willingness to take a plea?

A Well, at that time, particularly after the first trial when I heard the -- for the most part, the State's entire theory. The State's entire case was that,

if I couldn't prove right then and there, or at that particular time I was some place else, other than what the State's theory was placing me, then I wasn't going to prevail at trial. And I had come to learn that with a first-degree murder conviction comes a life sentence. in my mind it was, take a life sentence or take something else. It would be no difference if, like, a doctor said if you have an infection in your leg, I would cut your leg off of you're going to die. It was never in mind that take a plea deal or go home. No, it was take a plea deal and go to prison for X amount of years or don't take a plea deal, and lose at trial, and spend the rest of my life in prison. I had absolutely no confidence that I would prevail once Ms. Gutierrez indicated to me that the alibi that I provided to her, it didn't pan out. So there was nothing else to do. Okay. And you mentioned a specific time and that time is 2:36.

A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q And that's on January 13, 1999?
- A Yes.
- Q How did you learn that that was the time when the murder supposedly took place?
- A Well, specifically in opening statements, the prosecution -- that was their theory. That at 2:36

p.m., I was in a Best Buy parking lot, on the phone, calling Jay Wilds. Telling him, come pick me up. You know, I, I, I, killed Hae Lee. And so that was -- it was the exact same time. And, I guess, the -- well, during trial, they had a board with the cell phone records on it and they indicated 2:36 p.m. That was when a call was made. So that's how I knew that was the exact time.

Q And was there any witness testimony supporting this?

A As far as the (inaudible), no one places me with -- Jay Wilds' word is the only thing that places me, at this Best Buy parking lot, at 2:36 p.m. No surveillance footage showed me at 2:36 p.m. in the Best Buy parking lot. There's no phone record of me making a call to the cell phone from the Best Buy parking lot. It's in the middle of the holiday season, 2:36 p.m., broad daylight, somehow I'm able to kill Hae Lee in the car, get her body to the trunk of a car, in broad daylight, in the middle of the parking lot. So, as far as this information right here, I think it's crucial, because that makes our case right there.

Q And I just want to be absolutely clear, I asked you was, there any testimony about this time 2:36. Did Jay Wilds testify consistent with this?

A Oh, yes, sir.

Okay. And once this became apparent to 1 you, did you have any further conversations with Ms. 2 Gutierrez about it? 3 After the first trial, I specifically asked 4 her about the plea deal situation. And -- well, as I 5 stated earlier, I asked her once again about the plea deal 6 situation and her response was, "They're not offering you 7 a deal." 8 9 Okay. 0 THE COURT: I'm sorry. And the response was? 10 THE WITNESS: Her response was, "They're not 11 offering you a deal." 12 13 BY MR. BROWN: And for the sake of clarity, was this a 14 conversation that took place between the mistrial and the 15 second trial? 16 Yes, sir. Α 17 And based on your being present at the 18 second trial, was the time 2:36 consistent in the second 19 trial with what it was in the first trial? 20 I mean, it was absolute. The cell phone 21 Α records were presented like an exact science. As if to 22 say, Jay Wilds said the murder was committed at this time. 23 The cell phone records prove it. So I knew that that was 24 the exact time. If I couldn't prove it at that time -- no 25

one puts me with Jay Wilds anywhere near 2:36 p.m. No one puts me anywhere near Hae Lee at 2:36 p.m. It's just his word versus nothing. And that's why I felt it was so crucial about her contacting Asia McClane. So when she contacted -- so when she impressed upon me that she spoke to her and nothing came of it, that's what led to me, just completely having lack of faith in my defense. Because I realized that nothing -- it didn't matter if someone came to court and said, I was a good son or I went to the mosque, or I was a good student, or a good athlete. None of this stuff mattered.

Because no one came to court, not one single person, you can look at the transcript, and said they witnessed me threatening Hae Lee, they witnessed me physically abusing her, emotionally abusing her. Hae Lee — no one testified that Hae Lee expressed to them that she was afraid of me. Except for Jay Wilds, no one said anything about us being anything but friends. So, none of that other stuff mattered about, if I was a good son. This whole case was built — could I prove that I was somewhere else when Jay Wilds said I was here. And if I couldn't do that, I had no confidence in the case whatsoever.

Q Okay. How was your relationship with Ms. Gutierrez throughout the second trial?

2.0

2.4

1 I mean, I trusted her as I did in the first 2 I trusted her word completely. I didn't have any 3 reason to doubt up to that point. Did she tell you what her strategy was in 4 5 the second trial? 6 Α Absolutely not. 7 Did you keep her on -- and, in fact, you Q 8 were convicted, correct? 9 Α Correct. 10 Q Did you keep her on for your sentencing? 11 Α No. 12 0 Why not? 13 Α Well, after I was convicted, I had made 14 mention to Rabia Chaudry about Asia McClane. And I had 15 made mention to her that, you know, I wish there was some 16 way that I could of proved that I was somewhere else at 17 this time. And I told her that, well, Ms. Gutierrez 18 checked into it and obviously it didn't pan out. So, 19 Rabia requested that I send her the information. She was 2.0 a law student at the time. 21 So, I sent her the information. These two --22 these letters -- well, copies of these letters, or these 23 letters. And she, in turn, contacted Asia McClane. And 24 Asia McClane informed her that she was never contacted. 2.5 No one ever reached out to her. No one ever talked to

her. No one ever called her. Nothing.

2.2

Q Were you surprised to hear this?

A I was completely surprised. I was shocked. And I, in turn, Rabia Chaudry, she -- well, Asia McClane met Rabia Chaudry and she signed an affidavit. So, Rabia Chaudry sent me a copy of it. So, this is -- I found all of this information out at once. And I immediately called Ms. Gutierrez from the city jail phone. And it was a short conversation, because the jail phones, they only last for like five or ten minutes.

And the first thing that I asked her was, Ms.

Gutierrez -- and I read through the affidavit and I

reminded her about the letters. And I said, Ms.

Gutierrez, did you speak to her? Did you talk to her?

Did you contact her? And she said, no. And I was very

upset at that point. Because I said, Ms. Gutierrez, it's

the exact same time. And I asked her, did she ever try to

go to the library to secure the video footage? And she

said, no. So, I became very upset with her. And I asked

her, was there anything we can do at this point? And she

said, no. We need to focus on the appeal.

Q Okay. I'm going to take you through this step-by-step. But, did there come a time when you terminated Ms. Gutierrez's representation?

A Well, I did -- after that conversation, I

realized that I didn't trust Ms. Gutierrez. I didn't believe she had my best interests at heart. And, at the end of the conversation, when she was mentioning about the appeal, she said that, she would need an extra, I think it was forty or fifty-thousand dollars for the appeal.

Now, at that point, I had come to realize that, between the community and my family, they had gave her almost 100 -- or about \$100,000. So, in that short brief conversation that we had, towards the end, I said, Ms. Gutierrez, what did you do with the \$100,000? There was no forensic experts. There was no psychology experts. I just asked her, what did you do with the \$100,000 that you need \$50,000, and the only person I asked you to contact was Asia McClane? There was no, the only physical evidence found on this case on Hae Lee's body was two hair samples that the State's expert said didn't match me. So there was no need for a forensic expert or none of that other stuff. What in the world did she do with \$100,000 that she needed another \$50,000?

But, to make a long story short, I decided to discharge her for two particular reasons. Number one, I felt she was dishonest with me about the whole Asia McClane situation. I felt that she lied to me. And then I felt that she was just being dishonest about the money.

Q Okay. And were you successful in obtaining

```
a new lawyer for sentencing?
1
                    Yes. I was appointed a Ms. Charles Dorsey
2
3
    -- Mr. Charles Dorsey.
                    And you mentioned the name of Rabia
               0
4
5
    Chaudry.
                    Yes.
               Α
6
                    Correct. And she testified earlier in this
7
    post-conviction, correct?
8
               Α
                    Yes.
9
                    And you know that she's an attorney now?
10
                    Right.
               Α
11
                    At that time, what was your relationship
               0
12
     like with Ms. Chaudry?
13
                    I was close friends with her brother, Saad
14
     (phonetic). I didn't really -- I only knew her as his
15
16
     sister.
                     Okay.
17
               0
                     As his older sister.
18
                     And can you just provide a description of
19
               0
     how, how you came to speak to Ms. Chaudry about the topic
20
     of Asia McClane?
21
                     Well, subsequent to the conviction, I had
                A
22
     called Saad's mother, and I guess she was there. And so
23
     we were talking about the case. And that's when I
24
     broached the subject of Asia McClane. And when I
25
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

expressed to her that Ms. Gutierrez intimated to me that, you know, it didn't pan out. And she said, well, let me check into it. So I sent her the information. And she, in turn, reached out to Asia McClane and Asia McClane informed her that no one had ever contacted her. And then she agreed to -- she met with Rabia to get it notarized, to get the affidavit notarized. And then she sent the -and then Rabia Chaudry sent the information to me. And I, in turn, forwarded it to Ms. Gutierrez. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, could I retrieve Petitioner's Exhibit No. 2? THE COURT: Certainly. MR. BROWN: Is the affidavit. I'll show you what's already been introduced into evidence as, it says Defendant's Exhibit No. 2 on that. What is that? THE WITNESS: That's the affidavit that Asia McClane met with Rabia and they went and signed. And then Rabia Chaudry sent it to me. MR. BROWN: Thank you. BY MR. BROWN: Mr. Syed, do you know what a motion for a new trial is? I know now. I didn't know back then. A Are -- let me -- I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 8, Petitioner's Exhibit 8.

[	
1	Do you recognize this exhibit?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Would you like to take a minute to review
4	it or can you describe what it is to the court?
5	A I would like to read it to myself please.
6	(Pause.)
7	BY MR. BROWN:
8	Q Okay. And is there a date on that letter?
9	A Yes, sir. March well, 3/30/2000.
10	Q And can you put that into perspective. How
11	long is that after your sentencing?
12	A Well, I was convicted in February of 2000.
13	And so this was, in-between my conviction date and my
14	first sentencing date.
15	Q And what is it?
16	A It's a letter that I sent to Ms. Gutierrez,
17	asking her about, could she please file something about
18	this to the court and try to mention something about Asia
19	McClane to the court before I get sentenced.
20	Q And is there a stamp on that letter?
21	A Yes.
22	Q What does the stamp say?
23	A It says, "Received, April 1, 2000."
24	Q And is that your handwriting on the letter?
25	A Yes, sir.

```
Is that your signature?
              Q
1
              Α
                    Yes.
2
              MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I would move
3
    Petitioner's Exhibit No. 8 into evidence.
4
               THE COURT: Any objection to its introduction,
5
6
    Ms. Murphy?
               MS. MURPHY: No, Your Honor.
7
               THE COURT: So admitted then as Petitioner's
8
     Exhibit No. 8.
9
                                    (Whereupon, Petitioner's
10
                                    Exhibit No. 8 was admitted
11
                                    into evidence.)
12
               MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.
13
     BY MR. BROWN:
14
                     So, can you explain in your own words
15
     exactly what you were asking Ms. Gutierrez to do, by way
16
     of this letter.
17
                     Well, I was asking her to make it apparent
                Α
18
     to the court that, Asia McClane existed and that she had
19
     - that she could provide an alibi for me, along with two
20
     other people, her boyfriend and her boyfriend's friend,
21
     for the exact time that the State alleged or Jay Wilds
22
     testified that I committed this murder.
23
                     Okay. And do you recall how specifically
                Q.
2.4
      you asked Ms. Gutierrez to raise this issue?
 25
```

New Trial. I mean, I didn't know the in's and out's of it or I didn't know the technical aspects of it. But I just came to understand that through talking to other inmates in the city jail, that's really the only thing you can do after you've been convicted, until you get to your appeal.

Q And do you recall whether Ms. Gutierrez raised that issue in a motion for a new trial?

A From what I can recall, she didn't. And she refused to do it. She emphasized that that's something we can -- that can only be raised on appeal. That is nothing that we can use right now. So, I -- I mean, what can I do but just take what she said as true.

Q I'm going to -- I want to turn your attention back to the issue of plea bargaining. Did there come a time when Ms. Gutierrez explained to you what an Alfred plea is?

A No. But I did learn about Alfred plea when I wrote to the city jail library. You can (inaudible) because I was a juvenile at the time, so I was housed on the juvenile (inaudible). We didn't get a chance to go to the library. So, I wrote to the city jail library and asked them about Alfred plea because it was recommended to me by another inmate. And I received the information from the librarian that, essentially, the Alfred plea was a

plea that you take when you acknowledge that you can't -- a person is afraid to win a trial -- excuse me, a person is afraid they're not going to win a trial. So, they would plead guilty to the charge in exchange for a lesser sentence than would be imposed if a person went to trial. That was my understanding of it.

Q Okay. And if you had been offered a reasonable plea, would you have accepted it?

realized that there was no way I could prove that I was somewhere else, when the State's theory placed me -- or excuse me, the State argued that I was committing this murder and Jay Wilds testified to that. So, in my mind, it wasn't a choice of taking a plea deal or going home. It was a choice of taking a plea deal for X amount of years or going to prison for the rest of my life.

Q And I just use the word reasonable to describe a plea deal. What does that mean to you?

A I mean, well, it was explained to me, as I said, you know, when you're a young guy coming through the jail, a lot of older guys would tend to try to educate you to things and share advice about different things. And from what I gathered, it would be something like 20 or 30 years and I would do half the time. And -- once again, this is what the impression was in my mind, at what was

2.1

2.1

being told to me by other guys in the jail. And I was 17 at the time. So that would play a strong factor, because I was young. I didn't have a criminal record. So, I mean, I did have some understanding of it. And essentially, that's what led me to -- I mean, I could say the chronology of the events was, get little bits and pieces of it, of what the State's theory was. After I received the letter from Asia McClane, gave the letter to Ms. Gutierrez. Ms. Gutierrez told me, she looked into it, nothing came of it. And then afterwards, I felt that there was no chance for me to prevail at trial. Because at the end of the day that's -- in my mind, that's what was the most important part. What happened between 2:15 and 2:36 p.m.? If I couldn't prove that, nothing else mattered.

Q Okay. Would you -- you mentioned a plea of, I think you said, 20 to 25 years.

A I mean, I was understanding that something like 20 or 30 years.

Q Would you have accepted a longer plea?

A As I stated before that to me, it wasn't a case of me taking a plea deal or beating it at trial, or going home. It was a case of me going to prison for X amount of years versus me going to prison for the rest of my life.

1 Mr. Syed, are you aware of whether there 2 was a Motion for a Modification of Sentence filed in your 3 case? 4 At the time I was not. Well, once I 5 discharged Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Dorsey was appointed to me. 6 And I did broach the subject of, you know, this Asia 7 McClane situation. And he, in turn, also said, well, we 8 just got to focus on the sentencing. So, I said okay. And I didn't know at the time that -- well, I didn't 9 understand that the whole concept of filing a motion for 10 11 reconsideration of sentence and I didn't find out until 12 actually probably 2006 that it was filed and denied. I 13 think, within like 30 days. So, I believe, that Judge 14 Heard, on the docket entries, it says, "Read, considered, 15 and denied." Within, like, a few weeks of my sentencing. 16 And, I'm sorry, who was the judge that --Q 17 Α Judge Wanda Heard. 18 Q And was Judge Heard also your trial judge? 19 A Yes, sir. 20 So, are you aware of whether Mr. Dorsey 21 asked Judge Heard to hold that motion for modification sub 22 curia? 23 At the time, I had no knowledge of it. But Α 24 now, I do have an understanding that he did not ask for it 25 to be held in advance or sub curia. And, probably in 2000

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-- a couple of years ago when I found out about this, I couldn't figure out how someone could be sentenced to life in prison, and if you file for a modification request, you don't ask for it to be held. Because the modification is intended to demonstrate to the sentencing court, that the defendant has changed or that he's earned an opportunity to get a lesser sentence. And it just didn't make sense that if I just received a life sentence plus 30 years, what could I possibly show the judge within the 30 or 60 day time limit that I deserved a sentence reduction. didn't make any sense to me. Had I known at the time, I absolutely would have asked him to -- for it to be held sub curia or in advance. Because realistically, what could I do in 30 to 60 days to demonstrate to the sentencing judge that I deserve a sentencing cut. And, again, your motion for modification sentence was denied in approximately what year? Α I mean, it was denied -- I believe 30 days after my sentence. So that would have been the year 2000? 0 The year 2000. Yes, sir. Α Okay. Since that time, since the year of 0 2000, have you gotten into any trouble while you've been locked up? No, sir. I've maintained a very clean

adjustment record. And I participated in all the programs 1 that are offered. I have certificates which you got right 2 there. I have recommendations. Throughout my 3 incarceration, I worked in the Chaplain's Office. 4 participated in a lot of programs and a lot of fundraising 5 programs, and a lot of (inaudible) programs. I mean, I 6 have certificates for them. I just always try to -- yeah. 7 MR. BROWN: I'm going to -- Your Honor, I'm 8 going to show the Defendant or the Petitioner what's been 9 marked as -- it's actually a series of exhibits --10 They're all of the same nature? THE COURT: 11 MR. BROWN: Correct. There are numbered 9A --12 THE COURT: That's fine. I was going to suggest 13 that. 14 MR. BROWN: -- through 9L, as in Larry. 15 BY MR. BROWN: 16 Mr. Syed, could you take a look at these 17 exhibits and very briefly just go through them and very 18 briefly explain to the court what they are. In fact, I'll 19 put the page -- starting with Exhibit 9A. 20 Well, it's -- it -- I guess all of them are 21 specifically, they are certificates awarded to me by the 22 voluntary activities coordinator, Sgt. Lynn. Then there 23 was a Sgt. Porte (phonetic). There's the Warden's Office. 24 The Warden himself, I mean, they're basically certificates 25

that people achieve when they stay three years infraction free, four years, five years, six years, seven years, when you participate in different programs. Essentially, I mean, I did all this and tried to stay positive because I believe one day I'd be able to go back to court and demonstrate that -- I'd either earned opportunity to get a sentence cut or to get paroled or whatever. Or if I would get a chance like today, to plead my innocence to the court.

Q So, I just -- I'm flipping through these here. I'm on 9I, 9J, 9K. Have you had a chance to -- and I'm sorry, and 9L. Have you had a chance to see all of these exhibits, 9A through 9L?

A Yes, sir.

2.0

2.3

Q And do you recognize them to be authenticate, copies of actual certificates you received?

A I mean, absolutely. A person -- you could contact the case manager at the prison. That's who I got these from. They're in my base file. So he's the one who gave me the copies of them.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I move for the introduction into evidence of Defendant -- or Petitioner's Exhibits 9A through 9L.

THE COURT: Any objection, Ms. Murphy?

MS. MURPHY: No, Your Honor.

```
THE COURT: The Court will admit into evidence
1
    then Petitioner's Exhibits 9A through L.
2
              MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.
3
                                   (Whereupon, Petitioner's
4
                                   Exhibit Nos. 9A-L was
5
                                   admitted into evidence.)
6
     BY MR. BROWN:
7
                    If this Court were to modify your sentence
8
    and even if it were a minimal modification. For example,
9
     if your sentence had been reduced from life, plus 30, down
10
     to life. What affect would that have --
11
               MS. MURPHY: Objection as to relevance, Your
12
13
     Honor.
               MR. BROWN: Well, Your Honor, we have raised an
14
     issue based on the Motion for Modification of Sentence and
15
16
               THE COURT: Well, I guess the question is, would
17
     I -- even if the Court --
18
               MR. BROWN: I'm sorry, I guess --
19
               THE COURT: -- even if the Court granted that
20
     relief, I would not be the judge to -- would consider the
21
     motion, correct?
22
                MR. BROWN: I'm sorry, Your Honor?
23
                THE COURT: Even if, or if, were the Court to
24
     grant the relief requesting a form of, I guess, a revised
25
```

Motion for Modification of Sentence, I wouldn't be the 1 2 judge. I guess what I should have asked, 3 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, if you can give me a chance again. 4 BY MR. BROWN: 5 If the initial judge who denied your motion 6 7 for modification, if she had even reduced your sentence 8 from life plus thirty, down to life, would that have had 9 an impact on your incarceration? 10 MS. MURPHY: Objection as to relevance, Your 11 Honor. 12 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, it goes directly to 13 prejudice. 14 THE COURT: I'll overrule the objection. 15 THE WITNESS: Well, it would have a tremendous 16 Because as it stands right now, I'm housed in a 17 maximum security prison and I've completed all of the 18 programs that are available. And I'm ineligible to go to 19 medium, not because of my record, but because of my 20 sentence. So if it was to be a situation, and it does 21 happen a lot, where sentencing judges will look at the 22 person's record and say, well, I'll take away the plus, 23 but I'll leave you with the life. And that makes you 24 eligible to transfer to medium where you'll be afforded 25 the opportunity to participate in more programs and things

```
of that nature. So, it would further the programs that I
1
     could participate and the opportunities that I would have
2
     while I'm incarcerated. So, it would have a tremendous
3
     affect. And it wouldn't even have to be such a drastic
4
5
     reduction either.
               MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I have no further
 6
7
     questions at this time.
               THE COURT: And, Ms. Murphy, it's about 12:30
8
 9
          Do you want to keep going or?
     now.
10
               MS. MURPHY: Um --
               THE COURT: Because I'm almost inclined to --
11
               MS. MURPHY: Are you inclined to take a break
12
13
     now?
               THE COURT: No, I'm thinking.
14
15
               MS. MURPHY: That's fine, Your Honor. I don't
     expect to be lengthy but I can certainly do it after the
16
1.7
     break.
1.8
               THE COURT: Okay. Let me just check. Sheriff
     and Madam Clerk, are you two okay?
19
20
               CLERK: How long is she thinking?
               THE COURT:
                           Hmm?
21
22
               CLERK: How long is she thinking?
               THE COURT: (Inaudible.)
23
24
               (Open court:)
25
               THE COURT: Ms. Murphy, why don't we go ahead
```

- [	
1	and try and let's sort of see where we are.
2	MS. MURPHY: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: And, as much time as you need. But
4	let's it's productive time.
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	BY MS. MURPHY:
7	Q . Mr. Syed, you've always maintained your
8	innocence, correct?
9	A Yes, ma'am.
10	Q And that's what you conveyed to Ms.
11	Gutierrez, that you were innocent?
12	A I conveyed to Ms. Gutierrez that I was
13	innocent, but I did not have confidence in prevailing at
14	trial.
15	Q I'm just asking you, that's what you
16	conveyed to Ms. Gutierrez, that you were innocent,
17	correct?
18	A Yes, ma'am. Along with the fact that I
19	didn't have confidence
20	Q I'm just asking that one question. Thank
2	
2	night of January 13th, correct?
2	A I believe it was Officer Agcot (phonetic),
2	4 who called my cell phone and he testified that we had
2	about a three, four minute conversation.

1	Q Right. So you knew, you were one of the
2	first to know essentially that, Hae Min Lee was missing,
3	correct?
4	A Yes, ma'am.
5	Q So that day would be significant to you,
6	correct?
7	A Well, as far as I didn't know that she
8	was missing. The only thing that he mentioned to me was
9	that, her family was she didn't I believe, she
10	didn't go pick up her cousin from school. So, as far as
11	saying that I knew that she was missing, I didn't know
12	that she was missing.
13	Q Okay. You and Hae Min Lee had been very
14	close that year, correct?
15	A We had been close for the four years that
16	we knew each other.
17	Q And that year in particular, you had been
18	very close, correct?
19	A We had dated for about six months.
20	Q And that included a sexual relationship,
21	correct?
22	A Yes, ma'am.
23	Q You spoke on the phone often, correct?
24	A Yes, ma'am.
25	Q You didn't call Hae Min Lee on the 13th,

did you? 1 Well, I would have seen her in school that Α 2 day. So, if we were both in school, I wouldn't have 3 called her. 4 You didn't call her after Officer Agcot 5 called you, did you? 6 Did I call her? 7 Yes. 0 8 Did I call her house? She didn't have a Α 9 phone or anything? 10 Did you call her house after Officer Agcot 11 called you? 12 I did speak to several of her friends. 13 From what I understood from the conversation, he was at 14 her house saying that, asking me, had I seen her that day 15 16 I'm just asking you, did you call her 0 17 house? 18 He called me from her house. Α 19 Did you call Hae Min Lee's house after you Q 2.0 spoke to Officer Agcot? 21 When he called me from her house. I don't 22 understand, why would I call her house back if he's at her 23 house calling me, asking, you know, did I see her that day 24 or anything like that. 25

1	Q So, I take it from your answer, that you
2	did not call Hae Min Lee's house after Officer Agcot spoke
3	to you on January 13th, correct?
4	A He called me from Hae Min Lee's house.
5	Q All right. So you spoke to Officer Agcot
6	on the 13th?
7	A Yes, ma'am.
8	Q You also were interviewed by detectives in
9	the days and weeks following, correct?
10	A I believe it was a Det. O'Shea, on the
11	25th.
12	Q From Baltimore County, right?
13	A Yes, ma'am.
14	Q Less than a week later?
15	A It was on the yes, ma'am.
16	Q And Det. O'Shea asked you where you were on
17	the 13th, right?
18	A I believe that he asked me if I had seen
19	Hae Lee that day.
20	Q You told Det. O'Shea you had been at school
21	that day and had gone to track practice, correct?
22	A Yes, ma'am.
23	Q And that was in response to his questions,
24	I presume, correct?
25	A Yes, ma'am.

```
Thank you. There also came a time that
1
    police did a search warrant at your house, right?
2
                    I know that from trial.
3
              MS. MURPHY: Court's indulgence one moment,
4
    please.
5
               (Pause.)
6
              MS. MURPHY: No further questions, Your Honor.
7
               THE COURT: Any redirect, Mr. Brown?
8
               MR. BROWN: I just have a very brief question.
9
               REDIRECT EXAMINATION
10
                    BY MR. BROWN:
11
                    Ms. Murphy asked whether you called Hae
12
     Lee's house on the 13th. Were you dating her at that
13
     time?
14
                    No, sir.
               Α
15
                    Were you aware of whether she had another
16
     boyfriend at that time?
17
                     Well, yes, sir.
18
                MR. BROWN: No further questions.
19
                THE COURT: I'm sorry. The answer was, yes sir?
20
                THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. That I was aware that
 21
      she had another boyfriend at the time.
 22
                MR. BROWN: No further questions, Your Honor.
 23
                THE COURT: Any limited recross, Ms. Murphy?
 24
                MS. MURPHY: No, Your Honor.
 25
```

```
1
               THE COURT: All right. You may step down then,
 2
     Mr. Syed.
 3
               (Witness was excused.)
 4
               THE COURT: And, your next witness then?
 5
               MR. BROWN: It would be Ms. Meade. And if --
     Your Honor, if you could advise me as to what time I
 6
 7
     should tell her to be here.
 8
               THE COURT: And this will be your last witness?
 9
               MR. BROWN: Correct.
10
               THE COURT: You want to err on the side of
11
     caution and maybe say 2:30?
12
               MR. BROWN: 2:30, okay.
13
               THE COURT: So, the Court will take its luncheon
14
             We'll reconvene at 2:30.
15
               (Whereupon, a luncheon recess was taken at
16
     12:43:42 p.m., and the proceeding resumed at 2:44:55 p.m.,
17
     as follows:)
18
                    AFTERNOON SESSION
19
               THE COURT: And, Ms. Murphy, would you be so
20
     kind to recall the matter then, please.
21
               MS. MURPHY: Thank you, Your Honor. Recalling
22
    Adnan Syed vs. State of Maryland, Case No. 199103042
23
    through 046, Post-Conviction Petition No. 10432. Kathleen
24
    Murphy for the State.
25
               THE COURT: And, Mr. Brown?
```

```
MR. BROWN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
1
    Brown on behalf of Adnan Syed, who's seated to my right.
2
              THE COURT: And I believe when we broke, we were
3
    continuing with the Petitioner's case. And is the
4
    Petitioner prepared to call its next witness, Mr. Brown?
5
                           Yes, Your Honor. Very briefly, I'd
              MR. BROWN:
6
    like to introduce another exhibit, which I believe is
7
    self-authenticating. It's a court --
8
               THE COURT: Is it 10? Would be 10?
9
               MR. BROWN: Number 10. It's a portion of the
10
     transcript. And, specifically, it's the portion in which
11
     the State, in closing arguments, specifies the time range
12
     when the murder took place. So, I would offer Defendants
13
     Exhibit No. 10 into evidence.
14
               THE COURT: And so, it's trial transcript pages,
15
     page numbers?
16
               MR. BROWN: The date is February 25, 2000, pages
17
     65 and 66.
18
               THE COURT: And any objection, Ms. Murphy?
19
               MS. MURPHY: No, Your Honor.
20
                            So admitted then as Petitioner's
               THE COURT:
21
     Exhibit No. 10.
22
                            May I approach?
               MR. BROWN:
23
                            You may.
                THE COURT:
2.4
                                     (Whereupon, Petitioner's
25
```

- 2	
1	Exhibit No. 10 was admitted
	into evidence.)
2	
3	MR. BROWN: And, Your Honor, at this time, the
4	Petitioner calls Margaret Meade.
5	THE COURT: Ms. Meade.
6	MARGARET MEADE
7	(A witness produced on call by the Petitioner, first
8	having been duly sworn according to law, testifies as
9	follows:)
10	CLERK: Please state your name and address for
11	the record.
12	THE WITNESS: Margaret A. Meade, 1 North Charles
13	Suite 2470, Baltimore, Maryland, 21202.
14	THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Meade. And, Mr.
15	Brown.
16	MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. BROWN:
19	Q Good afternoon, Ms. Meade.
20	A Good afternoon.
21	Q Where did you go to law school?
22	A University of Baltimore.
23	
24	school?
25	A I worked as a law clerk during law school

1 for the Honorable Judge John N. Prevas, worked in the 2 Attorney General's Office. And then when I -- and worked 3 at two small criminal defense firms, Walker -- excuse me, Crew, Curlin (phonetic), Rosenburg (phonetic) during and 4 Dominic Donnelly (phonetic) during law school. And then I 5 6 went to, upon graduation, I clerked on the Court of Special Appeals for Judge Wenner. Excuse me, prior to 7 8 that, I went back to clerk with Judge John Prevas. And 9 then I went to clerk on the Court of Special Appeals for a 10 year, for Judge Wenner and Frederick. And then I went to 11 work at the law firm, at that time the name was Walker and 12 Van Bavel. 13 0 And what year were you admitted to the 14 Maryland Bar? 15 I was sworn in in June of 1990. A 16 Are you admitted into any other Bar's? 17 Yes. The United States District Court, the Fourth Circuit, and the United States Supreme Court. 18 19 Okay. And since you were admitted into the 20 Maryland Bar, have you been practicing law ever since? 21 Α Yes. 22 0 And how much of that, approximately, what 23 percentage has been criminal law, criminal defense? 24 Eighty-five percent, 90 percent. Α 25 And, again, could you -- could you tell me Q

the name again of the firm, where you first started your--1 As an associate, I first went to work for 2 Walker and Van Bavel. And that was in July of 1991. 3 then it became Walker, Van Bavel, Amaral and Meade. 4 then after eight years there, I left and formed a 5 partnership with Catherine Flynn. We had done a complex 6 death penalty case. Well, it was three death penalty 7 cases, three separate incidences -- excuse me. Correct 8 that. It was two death penalty and a regular trial of 9 assault and false imprisonment, same client. And we got 10 along well, had similar values. And so we formed a 11 partnership in June of 1999. 12 Okay. And, do you still have a firm today? 13 Yes. Α 14 What's that firm called? 15 It's now Meade, Flynn and Gray. Α 16 And in your career as a defense attorney, 17 have you ever represented a defendant charged with murder? 18 Yes. Α 19 Have you ever represented a defendant 0 2.0 charged with attempted murder? 2.1 Yes. Α 22 Approximately how many times have you 23 represented someone charged with murder? 24 I probably have, probably 10, 12 murders a 25

year, attempt murder. Some years it can be as much as 20. 1 But, it's -- I would say alot of what I do in our office 2 are either the sex offenses or attempted murders, murders. 3 I seem to have a lot of those. 4 And are you able to tell what percentage of 5 those have been in Baltimore City? 6 The vast majority, intentionally, the vast 7 majority of my 22 years has been either in Baltimore City 8 or Baltimore County. Because I think it's important to, sort of, know the system. It's a better way of 10 representing an individual. So, best guess, 75 -- 65, 75 11 percent of homicide cases have been in Baltimore City. 12 Do you hold any leadership positions in the 13 Baltimore legal community? 14 I'm the co-chair of the Criminal Law 15 Committee for the Bar Association for three years. I'm 16 the Attorney Grievance Commission Peer Review. On the 17 character committee, the Maryland Bar Law Examiner's 18 Character Committee. And I've been doing that now for six 19 years, maybe seven years. 20 Do you have any experience teaching, either 21 young attorneys or in law school? 22 Well, I've been involved in the mentor Α 23 program and the law (inaudible) program, but I've also

done three -- two primary teaching courses, Fourth

24

25

1 Amendment type courses with Judge Gordy and then with 2 Judge Kathleen Cox to judicial institute. And, so, in 3 that capacity. And I volunteer at the University of 4 Baltimore for the moot court competitions, that sort of 5 thing. 6 0 Okay. 7 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I'm not sure if the 8 State wishes to voir dire --9 THE COURT: Well, why don't you make your motion 10 first. 11 MR. BROWN: Okay. Your Honor, I would move to have Ms. Meade admitted as a criminal -- as an expert in 12 the practice of criminal defense in Baltimore City murder 13 14 cases. 15 THE COURT: An expert in the field of -- in the 16 practice of criminal defense in Baltimore City? 17 MR. BROWN: Of murder cases in Baltimore City. 18 Yes, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Any voir dire, Ms. Murphy? 2.0 MS. MURPHY: No, Your Honor. I'll --21 THE COURT: Any objection? 22 MS. MURPHY: I won't object to Ms. Meade's 23 expertise in that area. I'll just note my continued 24 objection to the relevance of her testimony. 25 THE COURT: Your objection is duly noted.

1 MS. MURPHY: Thank you, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: But the Court finds that Ms. Meade 3 is, in fact, an expert in the practice of criminal defense of murder cases, in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. 4 5 BY MR. BROWN: 6 Ms. Meade, I'd like to go through some of 7 the materials that you've reviewed for this case. just name the document, you tell me if you've reviewed it? 8 9 Have you read the post-conviction petition? 10 Α Yes. 11 Have you read the supplement to the post-12 conviction petition? 13 Α Yes. 14 Have you reviewed the exhibits that are 15 associated with the petition and the supplement? 16 Well, the exhibits that were provided to 17 me, yes. 18 Are you familiar with the judges who have been involved in this case? That being Judge Heard and 19 20 Judge Quarles? 21 Α Yes. Very familiar. 22 Are you familiar with the prosecutors who 23 have been involved in this case, that being, Kevin Urick 24 and Kathleen Murphy? 25 Α Yes.

Q And are you familiar with Cristina Gutierrez?

A Yes.

Q Now, the way that you practice law and the way that you defend murder cases, is that in conformity, to the best of your knowledge, of the prevailing norms of practice?

A What I do? Yes. I think it is. I mean, I have a good reputation about it. But, yes, I think it's the norm.

Q Okay. I'd like to turn your attention to general case preparation, how you approach a case. And, in particular, a murder case. And what, if any, significance do you attach to having a young client who's charged with such a serious offense, such as, a 17-year-old?

A The issue with a juvenile or somebody young or inexperienced in the criminal justice system is that you do have to spend a significant amount of time explaining the process. And, I do it to everybody but it's -- you know, people don't understand the process of preliminary hearing versus an indictment. And, for example, I describe it as, it's two different ways to drive to your house. The State can do this or the State can do that. And lots of times people are, well, why

1.7

2.0

2.1

2.5

can't I have a preliminary hearing? Well, the State's the driver. So, I think particularly with young individuals and they have minimal or no experience in the criminal justice system, they need a lot of hand-holding. And sometimes I find that the family may need it more. But, it is extremely important, in any kind of case, but particularly murders and attempted murders because the consequences are so high. That your client, one's client, my client, has a deep understanding of the judicial process.

Q Okay. And what, how much, if at all, would you be concerned with the culture in which your client was raised? Is that a factor in how you would approach the case?

A Well, I have a very, 10-page form that I fill out. Everything from the names of your parents, your children, do you have church, background, how far you got in school. It's important in any case to really have an understanding about your client's educational background, cultural background. Because the way they do things, for example, I'm representing somebody who's Korean. So, explaining things and making sure that they understand, not only the process, but the culture that someone grows up in, does have an impact on how you defend them, what mitigating factors can come up. So it is — the totality

of the person is important.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Q Okay. And before you testified about the importance of educating your client on various issues, without going into a whole lot of detail. What basically do you tell them about a jury trial and their right to have a jury trial?

Well, I always with my clients start with Α the preliminary hearing. And this is a conversation that I have repeatedly. And I often make my clients repeat it back to me. So I know that when we show up at 11:00, in Part 45, and no court's available, they understand that it's not me holding it up, or the judge, or the prosecutor has some hidden agenda to drag out their case. That they understand how the court system as a whole works. always start out with preliminary hearing or the indictment. And a lot of times people think the indictment means, they've basically been found guilty. Well, it's not. You know, I use the example, you can get a ham sandwich indicted for murder. And so, explaining the arraignment and what you have to do at the arraignment. And why, for example, I just explained this the other day. Why, at the arraignment, the indictment is read out, in Baltimore City. It's not done in other jurisdictions, is read completely, and so.

Q And specifically, again, for someone

charged with murder, what would you tell them about the prospect of a jury trial, in general?

A Well, a jury's a gamble. You know, and with all due respect to this Court. You know, when I'm explaining, you can have a court trial -- there are three things, four things that can happen that I explain.

First, the State could dismiss the case. Second, you could enter into a plea. Third, you can have a court trial. Fourth, you can have a jury trial. And when I go through that process, you know, I'll have clients say, well, tell them I'll take a stet. Well, that is not an option here. So, when we get past the part that the State is going to dismiss the case or that circumstance, then it becomes a discussion on plea negotiations as well as jury trial and court trial.

And I'll say, sometimes a court trial is a long guilty plea. So, you have to have legal issues or there's certain rare circumstances that you do a court trial. And like I did one a couple of months ago in front of Judge Williams, because it was clear that there was some very clear -- I didn't mean to say clear twice. But it's -- there were legal issues that it was inappropriate to try the case in front of a jury. So, in explaining the guilty plea process, the court trial process, and the jury trial process, I often say, you never know what a jury is going

to do. And if you want justice, go to church. If you want to roll the dice, 'cause we don't know with 12 people.

1.8

Q Can you tell the court a little bit about the discovery process? In a murder case, how do you as the attorney, obtain discovery related to the case?

A Well, you file motions. And the State is obligated to produce certain evidence, mitigating Brady material under 4-263, the Rule 4-263. And then once you get the discovery and you start evaluating it, it's an ongoing process. Are their loopholes? Like, I'm involved in a case where there was some text messages. So, it's going back and some are missing. And so you have to have an open communication with the prosecutor to make sure you're getting all of the discovery.

Q And do you share that discovery with your client?

- A Absolutely.
- Q How do you do that?

A There was a time that people would just

Xerox it and mail it to the jail. And not that I don't

want my client to have the discovery but I don't want

anybody else to have the discovery. 'Cause I do -- early

in my career, somebody else, and it was in Baltimore

County, got the discovery from my client. And then was

able to fashion some level of cooperation with the State. Ultimately, that was discovered. So, I have found particularly in Baltimore City, they move inmates between the JI building, or Central Booking, or the city jail, and it's hard for them to have this legal packet following So, I take -- I go and see them. As I'm getting discovery, I review it with them. I usually do a summary that I give to them. And then there are certain statements or certain things, I will give them a copy of. Again, depending on, if there's been any kind of agreement with the State not to disclose certain information. it -- I mean, it's my client's case. This is not about me, "it's about my client. I work for my client. So, they need to know what's going on. The good, the bad, and the ugly.

And is this a discretionary thing on your part or is it something that you believe, or that in your opinion, a defense attorney has a duty to?

The defense attorney has to do -- I mean, it's a must. How can you ever think to defend somebody if they don't know what the information is against them. I mean, they may be able to explain something or provide you with information about somebody's statement or a circumstance that you don't know. I mean, you don't get everything about a case necessarily in discovery.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

are two sides.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q Okay. I'd like to ask you some questions about plea bargaining. Why in a criminal case, and in particular in a murder case, why is plea bargaining important?

Plea bargaining or plea negotiations are Α crucial in any case. Again, because going in front of 12 people that you don't know. You don't know who they're going to be. I mean, that jury panel can come in and you are fine with almost everybody in it. That jury panel can come in and you're thinking, did all these people just get brought in from Carroll County. No disrespect to Carroll County, but, you know, there's geographical differences. So, you don't know what 12 people you're going to get. And the consequence can be so devastating. You know, if you don't have a discussion about resolving a case, you not only put your client at very, serious high risk or very lengthy, or harsh punishment. But it's not good for the system. It's not good for witnesses. You know, a plea is -- although some people don't like pleas, but a plea is one of the best ways to resolve a case, in reality.

Q In your opinion, what, if any, duty does the defense have, defense attorney have with respect to plea negotiations?

A I believe that an attorney, a defense attorney, has an affirmative duty to engage or at least speak about plea negotiations.

Q Okay. And looking at that from the flipside, what, if any, duty is there for the attorney to keep their client in the loop about any such discussions?

A I'm a firm -- I work for my client. I work for that person. So, as an employee of that person, I have a duty to keep them informed and give them all of their options. I mean, this is their case. They are the ones that are going to go to prison or not go to prison. They need to be involved in the decision making.

Q What other kind of scenario in which your client insists on his innocence, what, if any, affect does that have on whether you will engage in plea negotiations?

A Well, as I tell all my clients, there are innocent people sitting in jail. So, you have to evaluate with your client, so that there is an understanding, that what the evidence is against them. And that there's always the option of an Alfred plea, North Carolina vs. Alfred or Alfred vs. North Carolina, where you can say, the State has all this evidence against me. I'm not guilty, but I want to take the benefit of a bargain.

'Cause, again, it's a gamble. And so, it is important to have those discussions with your client.

1 0 And just so I'm clear, even if the client is maintaining his innocence? 2 3 It depends on what the evidence is. I just had this discussion with a client the other day. That, 4 5 you know, I think we're going to win at trial but the State has made a reasonable offer. And he has a couple of 6 7 days to think about it. And, you can maintain your 8 innocence, but you could do a long time in jail. So, I characterize it as a damage control. You know, what is 9 the best of way handling something when you're faced with 10 11 these kinds of charges. 12 And before you mentioned an Alfred plea, from your experience, is it difficult to convince a court 13 14 to accept an Alfred plea in Baltimore City? 15 I've never had a problem with it. I've never had -- I can't recall, could it have happened? 16 17 I can't recall any incidents where judges said, 18 I'm not taking an Alfred plea. 19 Now, when you are -- once you have engaged 20 in plea negotiations or when you're considering engaging 21 in them, what are the factors that weigh most heavily in a 22 plea bargaining decision? 2.3 Well, first, what does my client want to 24 do. And second, it's what are the consequences?

the worst case scenario and what's the best case scenario?

That's how I describe it to my client. Worst case 1 scenario, first-degree murder, life plus 50,000 years, you 2 know. Best case scenario, not guilty. What is in there, 3 what's in there between? And, again, you have to -- every 4 single case is different. You have to look at, what is 5 the evidence against this particular person, and 6 evaluating plea negotiations. What are you strengths and 7 weaknesses. You know, if the State has a dead-up strong 8 case, then your plea position, your negotiating position 9 is a little weaker. If they've got five witnesses and 10 only two are showing up to court all the time. They can't 11 find the other -- when there are some weaknesses on the 12 part of the State's case, then that makes plea 13 negotiations a little different. But you've got to know 14 your case. 15 Is it fair to say that if the State's case 16 is stronger, that would push you further in the direction 17 of a plea agreement? 18 I'm not sure I understand the question. Ιf Α 19 the State has a lot of evidence against my client. 20 Yes. 0 21 Would I push? Yes. Α 22 And what, if any --23 0 But it's not -- let me strike that. Α 24 not a push. It's not like I'm forcing, because I 25

ultimately always say to my client, this is your choice, your option. But they need to know what all their choices are. They need to know what their options are and what the consequences are for each of those choices. So, you know, I would pursue it. Particularly, if somebody was facing first-degree murder and life, a potential life sentence.

Q And what -- what affect, if any, might the presiding judge have over this process?

A A tremendous, tremendous impact on plea negotiations.

Q How?

A Well, it's ultimately, the judge, is the neutral detached magistry. And I would be willing to say, 90 percent or more of the judges on the Baltimore City Circuit Court are very good about doing a King Solomon and, you know, split the baby so to speak. It's -- you know, the State has one position, the Defense has one position. And it's important to have the judge be involved in that. I mean, the State always comes to me with, oh, I want 20 years, for example, and something. I'm like, let's see what judge we have. We'll approach the bench and discuss it and see what the judge says.

Q And is that the typical genesis of a plea deal in this courthouse, that initially the State brings

it to you or can it be the other way around?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

It happens in all ways. Again, depending on the case, but usually I'll bring a -- I'll say to the State, what are you offering? Now it's much easier now than it was back in 1999 or 2000. Now, we have, what I call, the cheat sheets, and they go to Reception Court. The State's Attorney fills out the cheat sheet, is again as I've nicknamed it. And there's always a column for State's offer. And so it's much more well documented as well as better communicated, as far as what the offers are. And that way when the State's Attorney changes, 'cause they might move around the office, there's some document and some consistency from one State's Attorney to the other. So, now it's easier, you just take the cheat sheet, approach the bench, and engage in whatever discussion. But back in 1999, 2000, it was a little more -- usually before going to court, there would be discussions, or at the court, there would be some discussions. What are you offering? I can't think of a case I've ever not asked the State, what's your offer. Okay. And just one more question about the

Q Okay. And just one more question about the process. Do you ever involve your client's family in the plea bargaining process?

A I do. Because, I find that if -- for a couple of reasons and I've learned this the hard way. Is

that if I am communicating with the family, then my client's not talking to them on jail calls. Jail calls have been a problem. A benefit to the State and a detriment to the defense. So, it's important that the family's on board. And, particularly, in cases, a serious nature of attempted murder or murder, that the family -if my client is maintaining that I'm innocent, I didn't do The family wants to believe that. Whether they do this. or not is case-by-case, but wants to believe that. So, it's important to explain to a family why now your son or daughter is going to enter a plea. But I thought he was innocent. Well, there are innocent people in jail, going to trials, a gamble. So, this is why we're engaging in a So, it's very important that the client knows that the family will keep writing letters when he goes to prison. And, you know, that everybody is on board. Everybody has the information. Okay. And you briefly mentioned what it

Q Okay. And you briefly mentioned what it was like back around 1999 to 2000, in that time period. Were you defending murders back then?

A Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Q And were there a lot of murders in Baltimore City around then?

A Well, yes. I mean, unfortunately, there are a lot of murders in Baltimore City. But, yes. I know

that the murder rate's gone down a little. Although, this 1 year it's suppose to be up from last year. But, yes. 2 And what -- can you describe what 3 experiences you have plea bargaining in murder cases with 4 the Baltimore City's State's Attorney's Office around that 5 time? 6 Positive. You know, I never had a 7 Α situation where I had a State's Attorney ignore me about 8 plea negotiations. Then, it was more what judge you were 9 going to be in front of. And I think a lot more of plea 10 negotiations, during that time occurred more in the 11 courtroom, approaching the bench, engaging the judge more. 12 Okay. We'll get to that. But, I mean, you 13 said that you were never ignored, but were you ever told 14 by a State's Attorney that, no, we will not offer your 15 16 client --Never. Never. I never had that. Α 17 Um --18 Q I mean, I can't even imagine -- I can't Α 19 even imagine a State's Attorney saying, we're not offering 2.0 anything. 21 Did there ever come a time when the best 0 22 offer that you got was a life sentence? 23 I don't recall ever being -- I had one 2.4 where there were two people killed and the offer was, 25

like, life, suspend all but 60. And sometimes if you get an offer like, life, suspend all but 60 -- I think it's important to look at what count they're calling to.

Because if you -- if they're insisting on calling, for example, first-degree murder. Then I've got to look at, my client's going to have letters versus numbers. And what is his or her life going to be in the DOC. So that's a consideration. But in that case with the two, the double homicide, it was life, suspend all but 60.

And then you always could go to the judge. I mean, it is certainly common that a judge can, people call it undercut the State. But, it's the judge looking — doing what a judge is suppose to do. When the judge shouldn't take just what the State says. The judge should look at both sides and make what is a fair and appropriate proposal, or say what he or she would do in a particular circumstance.

Q So is it fair to say that if you weren't satisfied with the State's offer, you'd take it to the judge?

A Right. I mean, I can't think of a case that there wasn't an opportunity to discuss -- every judge's first question, have you guys discussed a plea? Have you guys discussed resolving this and not have a jury trial? I can't -- I can't think of an experience where a

2.3

judge would say that. 1 Okay. I'd like to turn your attention now 2 to Mr. Syed's case. And based on what you know about this 3 case, in your opinion, is this a case in which the defense 4 attorney should have, at least, obtained a plea offer for 5 Mr. Syed? 6 Yes. Absolutely. 7 Why is that? 0 8 Well, he was 17, potentially facing a life 9 It was a emotional kind of homicide. And it --10 the consequences were very steep, (inaudible) life 11 sentence. So, plea negotiation should have been done. 12 would have done a plea negotiation. Even if -- even if my 13 client was saying I'm innocent. I would say, we need to 14 look and see what are your options. That way you're 15 making an educated choice. 16 And are you aware that a -- there was a co-17 conspirator, who testified against Mr. Syed? 18 Who supposedly helped him bury? 19 What, if any, significance would 0 Yeah. 20 that have in your calculation, in terms of seeking a plea? 21 It would have a significant -- I mean, when Α 22 you look at a murder case, I do witness chart, crime scene 23

charts, and then a summary. That's what I do always.

And, you look at the witnesses. All right. You have a

24

co-conspirator, what are the options of discrediting this 1 individual by, in that this individual is providing hands-2 on information, eye-witness kind of information, a jury is 3 going to give that some weight. So that would be 4 something that would be very important in balancing 5 whether or not to go to trial versus plea negotiations. 6 And it's not -- and I want to make the record 7 It's not that you only do a plea, only go to clear. 8 trial. You prepare for trial. When you start getting 9 mounting evidence against your client, you look at what 10 all the options are, short of trial. 11 You mentioned before that you are familiar, 12 of course, with Judge Wanda Heard, correct? 13 Very familiar. 14 And do you have experience plea bargaining 0 15 with her? 16 Yes. Α 17 And are you aware that she's the judge that Q 18 presided over Mr. Syed's second trial? 19 Yes. Α 20 What experience do you have plea bargaining 21 with Judge Heard? 22 Judge Heard, I've had trials with her. 23 I've had pleas with her. And she always asks about a

I mean -- and, in fact, Your Honor, I said to Mr.

24

Brown, go check the record. I can't imagine there were 1 not some kind of discussions, on the record, or indication 2 that there were discussions on the record, about plea 3 resolution. The only way that Judge Heard would have not 4 gone into that, is if somebody said, no plea negotiations. 5 I'm not doing that. Going to trial. Unless that was, the 6 line was drawn in the sand, so to speak. But Judge Heard 7 always -- and she's very good to work pleas out with. 8 She's very fair. She's very reasonable. She will listen 9 to both sides. I mean, I love taking a case in front of 10 Judge Heard, both for trial as well as, I want to work it 11 out. Oh, great, I've got Judge Heard. 12 You just mentioned before, someone drawing 13 a line in the sand. Who was in the position to draw such 14 15 a line? The defense attorney would be the only one 16 in the position of that. 17 Are you aware that Mr. Syed's -- well, of 18 course you are, because we discussed it. His first trial 19 ended in a mistrial. 2.0 Right. Because Judge Quarles had found 21 Α that something with Cristina Gutierrez didn't tell the 22 truth about something. 2.3 Correct. 2.4 0 There was a rather a blow-out. In fact, I 25

1 remember hearing about it at that time. 2 Did you have any experience with Judge 3 Ouarles? 4 Α Yes. 5 Q And what --6 I did a family law case in front of Judge Quarles and I did some criminal matters in front of Judge 7 8 Quarles. 9 Was Judge Quarles receptive to plea 10 bargaining? 11 Yes. And Judge Quarles -- again, different judges. Judge Quarles is extremely intelligent. He was 12 very formal. He had a -- I think he has a very nice, dry-13 whit sense of humor. But, in the courtroom, it was no 14 nonsense. He was -- he expected everybody to be prepared 15 and come in and -- I wrote my one and only check for 16 17 contempt, because I was two minutes late in his courtroom. He had a little thing about it. But, he was -- and that 18 19 is an example. He was very precise and he was an 2.0 excellent judge. He is an excellent judge. 21 If you -- and I imagine over the years you've had numerous cases that end in mistrials. 22 2.3 I actually haven't had numerous. I've had a couple, but it's not been -- it's not very often, 24 there's a mistrial. It's usually something pretty 25

startling to generate a mistrial.

Q Okay. Well, from what experience you have had, after a mistrial and prior to a new trial, if indeed the State seeks a new trial, is that another opportunity to plea bargain?

A Absolutely. And, in fact, that's often and again, not having a lot of them. But it's often a good chance to say, now you know what a jury is, now you see what that experience is. Because no matter how much you describe a jury, and the panel, and the selection process to a client, I've had them say when the panel was coming in, what are all these people doing here? Well, there's the 12 people we're going to be picking. So that is an excellent opportunity to work out a resolution, short of going through another trial. I mean, trials are very stressful and very difficult for everybody. You know, the attorneys but more important, the client. And if that can be avoided and it's in his or her best interest, then that's what should happen.

- Q Do you have experience with clients, your clients, asking you about a plea deal?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Asking you what's my offer?
  - A Yes.
  - Q And --

A Well, they phrase it, what does the State want? Well, I don't know what the State wants. Let's find out or, you know, the State's wanting 25 years but we're going to go in front of the judge and see what it is. It's always a discussion.

2.4

Q And based on what you know about this case, would you expect that someone in Mr. Syed's shoes would make that inquiry to their lawyer?

A Yes. And this is why, he was in jail. There are jailhouse lawyers. And those jailhouse lawyers will say, well, what's the State want? What do you -- what are they offering? That is -- I've had people that are inexperienced with the system and they always ask that. I mean, that's standard.

Q Based again on what you know about Mr. Syed's case, if you had been his lawyer and if you were seeking a plea deal for him, in your opinion, what kind of deal would you be looking for?

A I'd try to push the State for a second-degree. And maybe they would do it and maybe they wouldn't. But, you know, it -- I would want to try to push for a second-degree, try to demonstrate mitigating or unique circumstances. And again, you know, I did not have the benefit of having, outside of the -- reviewing the transcript, sort of, the flavor of all of the State's

1.7

evidence. But, the State's case, even though there was certainly this alibi issue but the State's case was pretty strong. And there was -- would be a lot of emotions with this because where somebody might rob somebody and don't know them. Most murders or attempted murders, are somebody you know -- they're over an issue. They're some sort of relationship between the parties. And so, in that, Mr. Syed had a relationship with the decedent in this case, the victim in this case, that would be something that could possibly generate a deprayed heart, sort of, argument for second-degree.

And his being 17, and no experience, no prior criminal record, you know, I would try to push for a 25 or 30 year sentence. You know, I don't think that the sentence, as tragic as it is for the victim and the family, you know, to put somebody away at 17 for life over this type of circumstance and all, I don't think would have been fair, or just, or what society should do.

Q And what would you have done if you had received an offer from the State that you didn't like, that you didn't think was fair under the circumstances?

A Approach the judge. I mean, I -- occasionally in District Court, they won't let you approach the bench. But, I've never had a judge, that I say, judge, I want to discuss a potential plea offer.

I've never had a judge say, no. No plea negotiations. No plea discussions. Going to trial. I've never had that. I mean, the judge may agree with the State and sort of leaves me in that same box. But you don't know until you try. Especially with Judge Heard. I mean, she just -- she's fair and she's reasonable.

1.6

Q Okay. If I can turn your attention to the other issue we're pursuing; the alibi witness. Could you very briefly explain the significance of an alibi witness in a murder case?

the example of the young man who was supposedly committed a robbery in just recently, in Federal Hill. And it turns out the guy's on a video at a pizza place, at the same time that he's been I.D.'d as having committed this robbery. An alibi is important to pursue. And you have to look at, who is providing the alibi, how they know what they know, and the circumstances regarding it. But you have to investigate it. It's an affirmative defense. I mean, it's -- I am looking at all these documents in this case, looking at all of the circumstances, the fact that this fellow student wasn't interviewed. And I don't mean to get ahead of you, Mr. Brown. I just -- it's incogitable. I can't -- maybe if I interview them, or I usually would send somebody else to interview them. I

```
interview them and no, they're lying. They're on the
1
    wrong day. Then I've done what I'm supposed to do. But,
2
    not to interview an alibi witness is just -- not to
3
    interview any witness is just wrong, not right.
4
                    Okay. And you mentioned that you had
5
               0
    reviewed some of the documents. I just want to run
6
    through a couple of them and make sure that you have seen
7
    them. Did you review Asia McClane's affidavit?
8
               Α
                    Yes.
9
                    Did you review the letters that Asia
10
    McClane wrote to Syed?
11
12
               Α
                    Yes.
                    Did you review the handwritten notes of Ali
13
     Cornedor who was a law clerk?
14
                    The law clerk for --
               A
15
                    For Cristina Gutierrez.
               0
16
                    Yes, I did.
               Α
1.7
                    And did you review the relevant parts of
18
     the State's closing argument, in which, they discuss the
19
     time when the murder occurred?
2.0
                     Right. The time, I think they put the
21
     time, basically, I'm summarizing, 2:20 to 2:40 in that,
22
     2:36 p.m. I think the decedent was seen leaving the
2.3
     school, getting a snack at 2:20, getting in her car, and
24
     then not being seen again.
2.5
```

Q Now, if you were to take my word that the defense, Mr. Syed, was primarily a reasonable doubt defense. In general, would an alibi witness be consistent with a defense like that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

An alibi would be crucial to a defense like that. Reasonable -- and every case is reasonable doubt. That's a standard, the State did -- the State did not prove this case beyond a reasonable doubt. Yes, they had A, B, and C, but that could also be interpreted as D, E, and F. The old saying is, is your cup half empty? your cup half full? Same thing, but it sounds different. It creates a different mental image. So, when the argument is, the State hasn't proven its case, an alibi, just like self-defense, is an affirmative defense that bolsters the issue of the State didn't prove its case. mean, I just -- maybe the alibi witness is wrong, maybe the person that's the co-defendant is lying, but that is up for a jury to decide. And I was particularly disturbed that the alibi witness was not even interviewed. I find that very surprising.

Q Now, obviously, you've never met the alibi witness. But based on what you know about the alibi witness from these documents you've reviewed, do you think that that would initially be a credible witness?

A Yes. I mean, this is not a girlfriend,

baby's, you know, mother or something like that, or grandmom. Everybody always wants to discredit that. But this is a fellow student who knows this individual, knows the parties, has no hidden agenda. I mean, she doesn't have any reason to lie. And when she brought herself forward, it wasn't like, oh, a friend of a friend, gets somebody to say a lie. I mean, she volunteered. Wait a minute, I saw you at that time. And I think she did it relatively shortly after his arrest. So, it's not like it's a year later that she's miraculously appearing. But it's pretty soon that she would be able to put together and verify certain information. So, not only should she have been interviewed, but certainly -- if she sounds -if she's as good as what her document sound, the way she clearly can describe certain events, surrounding having seen Mr. Syed at the library. Then I would predict that she would probably be very credible in front of a jury.

Q And can you think of any strategic reason why a criminal defense attorney would not even bother to interview or investigate an alibi witness, such as, Asia McClane?

A There would be no reason. There would be no reason not to find out and send an investigator to talk to this person. Give the information -- now, we have to get the information -- well, actually back then you had to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

give the information to the State. But there was no follow-up on that, to allow the detective to investigate. And when somebody's in jail, I mean, they're -- they can only call collect. Their link to the outside world and their case, the defense of their case, is their lawyer and their family. And most importantly, as far as the defense of the case is concerned, witnesses or information, their connection to that is their attorney. And the attorney's obligation, affirmative obligation, is to investigate any defenses. And an alibi witness being one of the best, this kind of alibi witness. There are some alibi witnesses you don't want.

Q Just a few more questions. I'm going to ask you about motions for modification of sentence. In a case like this, in which a defendant receives a very long sentence. What is your policy about whether you file a motion for modification of sentence, and how do you file that?

A You automatically file a motion for modification. Why wouldn't you? I mean, there's nothing to be hurt by doing it. So, it should be automatic.

Q And what, if any --

A You have a pretty long time to do it, 90 days. I have missed on one or two occasions that 90 day, but -- for bad filing over the years, but.

Q In the case of a very long sentence, is it possible to have that motion held sub curia?

remember when it changed. It use to be that the judge could hold, to have that motion to modify indefinitely. Could hold it sub curia indefinitely. Now, the rule changed and you have to have it within five years, a hearing on it within five years. But, there's nothing — there's no harm. There's harm to do, for example, a three-judge panel review if you have 20 years and you could get life. There's a harm in going to a three-judge panel, potential harm. So, there may be a reason not to do that. But, there's no reason not to file a motion to modify.

Q And what is the advantage of having it held sub curia? Whether you can do that for five years or longer?

A Well, the advantage to asking the judge to hold it sub curia is to, maybe a couple -- first of all, calm things down. Put some distance between event. And also to show if your client has been infraction free while incarcerated, has gone to school, has made some steps of rehabilitation, that that can serve as a basis for a judge to consider modifying his sentence.

Q And from your experience, do judges

generally grant that motion or that request to hold the 1 motion sub curia? 2 Most do. Every once in a while, if a judge 3 Α is very strong about a circumstance, a particular case, 4 they might not. But most of them hold it sub curia if you 5 ask. 6 And regardless of the judge's reputation, 7 would you ask anyway? 8 Absolutely. Why wouldn't you ask? I mean, 9 what's the worst thing that could happen? The answer is 10 no. You know, it is -- might as well. 11 MR. BROWN: I've got no further questions for 12 this witness. 13 THE COURT: Any cross examination, Ms. Murphy? 14 MS. MURPHY: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 CROSS-EXAMINATION 16 BY MS. MURPHY: 17 Hello, Ms. Meade. 0 18 Hello, Ms. Murphy. Α 19 So you were not involved with this case in 0 20 '99 and 2000? 21 Α No. 22 You didn't have any extensive discussions 23 with the counsel involved at the time? 2.4 No. I was well acquainted with Cristina 25

Gutierrez. Because, when I first saw her, when I was 1 clerking for Judge Prevas, and she was the only woman out 2 there, doing criminal defense. So, she was sort of a 3 semi-mentor, semi-idol, for a while. So, I was --4 But you didn't have any extensive 5 discussions with her about this case? 6 No, no. Α 7 I assume you didn't have any discussions 8 with Judge Quarles or Judge Heard about the case? 9 No. Α 10 Did Mr. Brown provide you with just the 11 transcript of the closing argument and no other 12 transcripts? 13 I looked at some other transcripts but it 14 was mainly going through, he explained the circumstances 15 and the evidence, and going through the petition and his 16 supplemental petition. 17 But you didn't get all 35 volumes? 18 Oh, no. 19 A You would remember that, right? 0 20 I would remember that. There was one other 21 It was sections of it that I reviewed. 22 part. So, basically the only knowledge you have 0 23 of this case is what the Defendant has provided you? 24 Right. A 25

Q Now, we talked a little bit about Alfred pleas. We talked about various offers that clients have received over the years. And you mentioned that, you know, you could always go to the judge. In any of those scenarios, it's correct, is it not, that the judge has to accept the plea?

1.4

A Yes. I mean, a judge can say, I'm not going to accept -- that's why I'm saying, the judge gets involved in it, because a judge is going to say -- let's say if the State wanted 25 years and I want 10. The judge might say 20. You know, the judge may say, I think 25 is fair.

Q Right. But, ultimately, the judge gets the final word?

A Yes. Well, ultimately, actually the defendant gets the final word because whether or not to accept the plea. But they have to have the information to be able to know what their choices are and whether or not, how they should proceed with their respective case. And you know, quite frankly, the judge could say 25 and the State come back the next trial date and say, okay, I'll do 20. I mean, it's a fluid -- and case-by-case circumstance.

 $\,$  Q  $\,$  I understand. What I'm driving at is, regardless of what is proposed by the State or the

```
Defendant, the judge must be in agreement?
1
                   Yes.
2
              MS. MURPHY: I have no other questions, Your
3
    Honor.
4
              THE COURT: Any redirect?
5
              MR. BROWN: Just a follow-up.
6
               REDIRECT EXAMINATION
7
                    BY MR. BROWN:
8
                    Ms. Murphy asked you about whether you had
9
     any discussions with Ms. Gutierrez about this case. And
10
     you said you did not, correct?
11
                    About this specific case, no.
               Α
12
                    Did you discuss other legal matters with
13
     Ms. Gutierrez?
14
                    When I --
15
               MS. MURPHY: Objection. Objection.
16
               THE COURT: Sustained.
17
               MR. BROWN: Okay. No further questions.
18
               THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Meade.
19
                THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
20
                THE COURT: Nice seeing you. You are excused.
21
                (Witness was excused.)
 2.2
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Brown?
 23
                MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the -- that would be our
 24
      final witness. The one, I guess, motion I would like to
 25
```

```
make would be that the trial transcript be incorporated
1
    into this proceeding. Just to put that on the record for
2
    future references to the transcript.
3
               THE COURT: All right. And I assume, Ms.
4
    Murphy, there's no objection?
5
               MS. MURPHY: None, Your Honor.
6
               THE COURT: All right. So noted.
               MR. BROWN: And with that, if I could have the
8
    Court's indulgence for just one moment to check with my
 9
     client.
10
               THE COURT:
                           Sure.
11
               (Pause.)
12
                           And, Your Honor, with that, we close
               MR. BROWN:
13
     the Petitioner's case.
14
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And, Ms.
15
16
     Murphy?
               MS. MURPHY: Your Honor, I would ask the Court
17
     to incorporate by reference, a letter that was filed with
18
     Cristina Gutierrez, on October 5, 1999, with the Court.
19
     It should be in the court file. I have a copy here, just
2.0
     for easy reference for the court. But I ask you to
21
     incorporate that document by reference --
2.2
                THE COURT: Into the court file. Would it be
23
     easier just for, I think, for the purposes of review, that
24
     -- and if there's no objection, maybe just introducing it
25
```

```
as an exhibit --
1
              MS. MURPHY: Certainly, Your Honor.
2.
              THE COURT: -- even though there may be some
3
    duplication. That way we're not searching through the
4
     record and it could be marked as such.
5
               MS. MURPHY: I can do that.
6
              MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I have no objection.
7
               THE COURT: All right. And I assume, Ms.
8
    Murphy, this would be State's 1, correct?
 9
               MS. MURPHY: Yes, Your Honor. This is State's
10
     1. And as I stated, Your Honor --
11
               THE COURT: And just one second. So that's a
12
     letter to the court from Ms. Gutierrez?
13
               MS. MURPHY: I believe it's a letter to the
14
     State from Ms. Gutierrez, making the State aware of a very
15
     large number of potential alibi witnesses in this case.
16
               THE COURT: And the date of that letter, Ms.
17
     Sullivan is?
18
               CLERK: October 4th.
19
               THE COURT: 2000?
2.0
               CLERK: '99.
21
               THE COURT: '99. So the Court will admit that
22
     into evidence.
23
                                    (Whereupon, State's
24
                                    Exhibit No. 1 was admitted
25
```

into evidence.)

MS. MURPHY: Thank you, Your Honor. The State has no witnesses at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. Argument?

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I'd like to go through the (inaudible) -- first of all, we have covered three issues in the course of today's hearing and the hearing two weeks ago. For all other issues that are raised both in the original post-conviction petition, as well as, the supplement, we submit on the record and we don't wish to waive any of those issues, by virtue of not having discussed them with the witnesses presented today.

on that is that there is a duty to investigate. There's a duty for a defense attorney to investigate their client's case. And, in addition, if the attorney does not fulfill that duty, that would satisfy the first deficiency prong of Strickland vs. Washington. As the Court is well aware, there is also a prejudice prong from Strickland vs. Washington.

The question though is not whether the error would have changed the course of the trial but it's whether the error undermines our confidence in the jury's verdict. And all of this is in our papers, for more citations to that effect.

2.0

So what did we prove with regard to the alibi witness? Well, first, after Syed was arrested, he received two letters from Asia McClane. He did not solicit these letters. These letters came to him right out of the blue. In those letters, which are in evidence, this alibi witness reminds Syed that she recalls being with him on the day of the murder, at approximately the time of the murder.

We can prove that Syed communicated the fact of this alibi witness to Gutierrez. And the way that we prove that is through the affidavit of Ali Cornedor, which is also introduced into evidence. Mr. Cornedor has verified the note, that was found in Gutierrez's file. He's confirmed that it was his handwriting. He's confirmed that he visited Syed and those are his notes from Syed. And he's also stated in that affidavit, that it wouldn't have been the normal course of his employment, working for Ms. Gutierrez, that those notes would have been turned over to her. That essentially, he was an extension of her when he visited Mr. Syed.

So, we also know that at trial, Asia McClane was never called as a witness. The State has just introduced some evidence. That's a list of potential alibi witnesses. I would also note that Asia McClane's name does not appear on that list. There's a huge number of

2.0

2.3

people that appear on that list. You will not find Asia McClane on that list.

So what happened? Syed gets convicted. And afterwards, he discusses what happened. He discusses Asia McClane with Rabia Chaudry, who you heard testify two weeks ago. I would submit to the Court that Ms. Chaudry was an exceptionally reliable and competent witness. She's an attorney. She's a member of, I believe, it's the Virginia Bar. She's worked for Homeland Security, other law enforcement agencies. She testified about exactly how she learned about Asia McClane and about exactly how she obtained that affidavit from Asia McClane.

Significantly, that affidavit puts Syed in the library, speaking to Asia McClane, and her boyfriend, and her boyfriend's friend at precisely 2:36 or at least during a span that covers that time. So, it is a complete alibi to this murder case. We also know that she was never contacted by the Defense from that affidavit.

Syed made every effort he possibly could to get Gutierrez's attention with regard to this. He wrote her a letter. There were correspondence from the family, which Ms. Chaudry helped them draft, because they were unable to draft it themselves. Essentially, begging her to raise the Asia McClane issue. For whatever reason, she did not do it.

2.0

2.1

2.4

Now, there was a hearsay objection to that affidavit coming in. And one of the arguments that I would like the Court to consider is because this issue is framed as a failure to investigate, that affidavit should also come in, because it's not hearsay. It's not offered to necessarily prove what is written in the affidavit. Rather, the fact is, that that affidavit was out there and those statements were out there. And, therefore, the attorney had the duty to at least investigate it. Not necessarily, it's not necessarily provable in the sense that things would have turned out that way. But at the very least, Cristina Gutierrez had to investigate such an alibi witness.

We heard from Kevin Urick about the same alibi witness. Kevin Urick spoke to her on the phone. We heard from him that she lives in Oregon now. Your Honor, we tried -- and I submit, as an officer of the court, Your Honor, has granted a certification in which we attempted to get her here. For whatever reason, she evaded service in Oregon. We could not produce her. But we know from Kevin Urick that she's real. That she exists. That she called him up. Sure, she said that she felt coerced or pressured into signing that affidavit. But, by saying that, she's acknowledging that she did, in fact, sign that affidavit.

And I would submit to the Court that the overwhelming evidence is that, she was not coerced. She's the one who wrote two letters, that came out of the blue, and that Mr. Syed received while in the Baltimore City Detention Center.

You heard from Ms. Meade that this alibi witness would have dovetailed perfectly with the defense, with the insufficiency of the evidence defense, or I'm sorry, excuse me. With a reasonable doubt defense, which is what Gutierrez employed at the trial. You know, it's hard to fathom why any defense attorney would not, at the very least, followed up with this witness. At the very least, send an investigator out to talk to her. Don't just dismiss it out of hand, because this could have been the best thing they had going in that defense case.

The plea issue. That's the second major issue we've raised. The law is that, a defense attorney must be constitutionally effective in the plea bargaining process. There's a couple supreme court cases that came out recently, Lafler and Frye, which although they don't touch on this specific issue, they do underscore the importance of defense counsel in the plea bargaining process.

And another thing that those cases say, those cases note that something like 95 percent of all cases end up in a plea bargain. So that in many respects, the plea

2.1

bargaining phase is arguably more important than the actual trial phase itself. Because, such a high percentage of cases are resolved that way.

In terms of the prejudice prong with respect to

-

1.0

1.8

2.0

THE COURT: I have to ask, though, unless I'm missing something, Mr. Brown. What evidence is there at all in this case, that there were any plea negotiations? That one was offered either by the State, sought by the Defense, or that the judge became involved?

MR. BROWN: There is none, Your Honor. And that's the problem. The problem is, you know, number one, is you heard Ms. Meade say, the defense attorney has a duty to at least find out what the plea offer is. Mr. Syed was 17-years-old at the time. He could not make an intelligent choice. The most difficult choice in the whole process of a criminal trial, do you plead guilty or do you go to trial? How can you possibly make an intelligent choice with that if you don't even know what the plea offer is. What's more, Mr. Syed has testified and credibly, and it's entirely believable, that he did ask her. He said, find out what my plea is. He did it before trial and he did it after the mistrial. What client doesn't say that?

Again, you heard from Ms. Meade, that's entirely

typical. You're waiting around in the Baltimore City lock-up and everyone is talking about him, what's your offer? What's your offer? What does the State want from you? So, the fact that Mr. Syed would convey that to him. Here he is, the only one in there who hasn't heard what his plea offer is. So, not only does she not follow his instructions, she does not go to the State and talk about it. And, again, you heard testimony from Mr. Urick, they were never approached by Gutierrez about it. But what's more, is she reports back to Syed that there is no plea offer.

Merzbacher case, which I believe just went up to the 4th Circuit. There was an article in the paper yesterday about it. In the Merzbacher case, at least she -- at least Ms. Gutierrez pursued a plea offer. She took that first step and where she failed was not taking the second step and conveying the offer back to her client. Well, here, she was even more ineffective, because she didn't even take that first step. Her client asked her to get his plea offer and she disregards that request and comes back and lies to him.

So, hopefully that answers your question. But, you're absolutely correct. Nothing from the State about it. They've been straightforward about it. No transcript

about it. No judge talking about it. Completely absent from this case. And you're talking about a 17-year-old who's facing a life sentence \_-

THE COURT: Wouldn't that be on the record -- wouldn't that be on the record somewhere?

MR. BROWN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: I mean, I know --

MR. BROWN: I have scoured the record. This is actually, this document I have, it's a summary. Just a summary of the transcript, it's 75 pages long. You know, I -- when Ms. Meade was consulted, that's what she said. She said, go back and look again at the record. And there is nothing on the record. I asked Mr. Urick, or Ms. Murphy asked Mr. Urick, were there any discussions with any judge about this at any time. He said, no. And I propose to you -- and Your Honor knows this --

THE COURT: So what we have then, I assume, is the allegation, or the testimony of your client, that he asked Ms. Gutierrez?

MR. BROWN: That's correct.

THE COURT: And that's all there is, correct?

MR. BROWN: Well, you know, we filed a supplement. We tried to introduce other evidence, a lie detector test, to this effect, and the Court found that was inadmissible. But I propose that his, not only was he

1.2

1.8

2.0

2.3

a credible witness but his statement about this is entirely believable. And Ms. Meade confirmed that. Ms. Meade, she talked about, you know, the guys sitting around at lock-up and that's what they talk about. And she's use to it all the time. They come out, hey, what's my offer? What does the State want from me? She said, that's how they ask it.

So that, for him to ask that was entirely consistent. Moreover, we're talking about a case in which there was a mistrial, where he had the opportunity to see what the trial looked like. And he had the opportunity to hear the main witness against him, Jay Wilds, on the witness stand, the co-conspirator, basically standing up there, incriminating him.

So, Your Honor, I propose that it is entirely credible testimony by Mr. Syed. But, based on what Ms. Meade said, even if he didn't ask that, she would have --Gutierrez would have had an affirmative duty to go find out, at least, lay the options on the table for your client, here at this most critical juncture of a criminal case.

Finally, Your Honor, the motion for modification issue. You know, Ms. Meade testified and obviously Your Honor is very experienced in that. But it is and should be standard practice that when a defendant receives a very

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

long sentence, at least, the defense attorney, file a motion for modification, had it held sub curia. Allow the defendant some time, number one, for things to cool off. And, number two, to show that he can rehabilitate himself, that he can follow the rules. That he can do what they ask of him in the DOC. He can come back. Ms. Meade is correct, now, I believe -- I'm not sure whether it's five years or ten years that they have to do that, to activate the motion. However, it is sufficient time for them to come back with some certificates, with some letters. perhaps get that sentence reduced a little bit. Mr. Syed testified that even if his sentence came down from life, plus 30, down to life, while that would not necessarily mean he'd get out earlier. It would mean that he could go to a lower level of security and he could, at least, go to school. He'd perhaps have access to more books, something like that, while he spends the rest of his life in prison. So that's that issue. A pretty simple issue.

We've also raised the issue of cumulative ineffective assistance of counsel. You know, these two issues that we raise, in a lot of ways they go hand-in-hand. And, Mr. Syed, did an excellent job of articulating that when he was on the witness stand.

It was apparent to Mr. Syed that his chance of prevailing at his trial relied on having an alibi. There

was evidence against him. And, he had to be able to show where he was when this murder took place. There was an alibi witness. There was an alibi witness who was willing to talk. But his defense attorney completely blew that off. As his hopes were dwindling, mentally, he turned more toward the plea deal. Yet, she failed him again. Because she never followed up on that plea deal. So the two additives that he had for resolving this case, trial and guilty plea, they were both ruined by his lawyer. His lawyer, who has been disbarred. Who, this Court is well aware of, there were scores of clients whom she cheated out of their money.

THE COURT: Well, I, I -- the Court is unaware

THE COURT: Well, I, I -- the Court is unaware of that. And --

MR. BROWN: Okay. Well, you heard testimony from Mr. Syed's mother about those interactions.

THE COURT: Yeah. But I, in all fairness, Mr. Brown, to the late Ms. Gutierrez.

MR. BROWN: I understand your point, Your Honor, without you saying it. She certainly had some great moments as a defense attorney. But, I think the record, that we have established is that, she also had some not so great moments. And, this was one of them. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I didn't mean to cut you off.

MR. BROWN: Well, no, I mean, that's --1 I -- I --THE COURT: 2 MR. BROWN: That's the gist of --3 THE COURT: I'm unaware -- I'm unaware, the 4 Court has some knowledge of Ms. Gutierrez may have been 5 disbarred, but the Court is unaware specifically as to 6 what may have brought about that disbarment. 7 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, in our petition, that's 8 discussed. And there are some footnotes and some 9 citations provided, should the Court care to delve more 10 into that. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Brown. 12 MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Murphy? 14 MS. MURPHY: Thank you, Your Honor. I have 15 filed with the court and provided Mr. Brown a copy of a 16 written response. But, I do feel that it is important to 17 spend just a moment talking about the facts of the case, 18 Your Honor. Simply because the Defendant took the stand 19 today and claimed that this case lived and died in a 21 20 minute time frame. And this case was so much more than 21

This was one of the earliest cases, I believe, to incorporate the use of a cell phone and cell tower records. And this case truly demonstrated the power of

22

23

24

25

that.

those records. Essentially, those records, not only did
the cell phone records identify many vital witnesses in
this case but they corroborated everything that was said.
What the witnesses said matched the records and what the
records said matched the witnesses. And it all fit into
place, and Jay Wilds was central to all of this. And you
can't emphasize strongly enough, that there's no way that
Jay Wilds could concoct a story like this and know to put
himself in specific places at specific times, because some
cell tower, somewhere, was going to record that he was on
the phone with somebody. It's just simply not fathomable.
In fact, Jay Wilds was cross-examined for five days by Ms.
Gutierrez in this trial. And, clearly, based on the
verdict, the jury still found him credible in spite of
that.

Yes, the call at 2:36 was a significant call, but there were many others. Even if the Defendant had managed to account for some alibi at that particular point in time, there's been no showings to what affect that would have in light of the other evidence. It wouldn't explain why he's in Leakin Park with Jay Wilds at 7:00 on the night that Hae Min Lee is murdered. That is the strength of the State's evidence in this case.

I think if this Court could decide his post-conviction entirely on the prejudice prong alone, I will

address each argument individually. But, I think there's simply no showing that the outcome of the case would have been any different.

1.1

2.2

There's a suggestion there's simply no physical evidence in this case. That's not true. The autopsy report revealed that Hae Min Lee had been brutally strangled. She had bruising to the back of her head, which entirely corroborates Jay Wilds' statements that the Defendant told him that this occurred in her car. The back of her head would have been pressed against the window. Jay Wilds also testified that this Defendant told him that as she struggled, she broke the signal switch on the steering column. And yes, in fact, the signal switch in Hae Min Lee's car was dangling from the steering column.

There was a map book found in the back seat of
Hae Min Lee's car, an ABC map book. It was, as I said, in
the back seat. And from that book was ripped the page
bearing the map of Leakin Park, the particular section
where the victim was buried. On the back cover of the map
book, Your Honor, was the Defendant's left palm print.

The evidence in this case speaks volumes. This was a strangulation that resulted in a disappearance of a beautiful young woman. It's an unusual set of facts, Your Honor, even from Baltimore City. And I think Mr. Urick

1.4

did a good job of conveying that. This is not a case we see every day. And for that reason, Ms. Meade's testimony is utterly unhelpful. You had an entire cross-section of people, students from Woodlawn High School. For the most part, there's no evidence that any of these kids were anything but good kids. Honor students, athletes, all involved as witnesses, and as our Defendant. These are young, college-bound kids from good homes. It's simply just not your typical case. And what Ms. Meade does or does not do in her cases on a day-to-day basis in Baltimore City, gives this Court no guidance on what may have happened in this case.

With respect to the alibi witness, the

Strickland case discusses the duty to investigate and does
state, "That strategic choices are virtually
unchallengeable. Even without an investigation, choices
are reasonable to the extent the professional judgment
supports the communication. Counsel has a duty to make a
reasonable decision that makes a particular investigation
unnecessary. Counsel must assess in all the circumstances
and the Court must apply a heavy measure of deference to
Counsel's judgments."

Your Honor, we can look at what the records shows, what Cristina Gutierrez did do, was prepare an alibi defense as suggested. She would only do so based on

information provided by her client, provided by other sources, other fact gathering that she'd done. And what that information suggests, and if Your Honor looks closely at the letter that was filed, that I've admitted as State's Exhibit 1. She identified more than 80 potential alibi witnesses in that letter. And she states, "That on January 13, 1999, Adnan Masud Syed, attended Woodlawn High School for the duration of the school day. At the duration of the school day, the Defendant remained at the high school until the beginning of his track practice." That was also consistent with what the Defendant told to the Baltimore County detective, as he conceded here in his testimony today. He said nothing about attending a library, going to the library after school.

And these detectives, as was brought out in testimony today. He was called by a police officer, January 13th, the night Hae Min Lee disappeared, he received a phone call. Then again, in the days and weeks to follow, he was interviewed and that's when he said he attended track practice today. So for him to stand before this Court and say that it had not been apparent to him that he needed to account specifically for his whereabouts is simply disingenuous. I find that not to be credible at all.

And the actions that Ms. Gutierrez took are

2.

2.4

entirely consistent with that. She tried to fashion an alibi defense out of the information she had. Information that was consistent with other evidence that was provided. And the fact that Asia McClane contradicts the stated alibi of her own client, would be the basis for a reasonable judgment by Gutierrez to not further investigate.

Now, assuming that her refusal to investigate that witness. I'm not conceding that's deficient. But if we assume for the sake of argument that that's the case, we must consider Veeney (phonetic) vs. Warden (phonetic). Because in this case, the Defendant has failed to produce this witness at this post-conviction hearing. And in Veeney, "A proffer is simply not persuasive than the plain's testimony would have affected the outcome in this case."

Her affidavit is not effective in this regard. In fact, this is clearly a witness that the State would have spent some time cross-examining with respect to bias, memory, motive, credibility. And I'll point out a few things in these letters, Your Honor, that the Defense provided both in their petition and as exhibits during the course of this hearing.

At the completion of the handwritten letter, dated March 1, 1999, Ms. McClane actually writes, "If you

Were in the library for a while, tell the police."

Certainly this witness needs to be cross-examined about whether she's even certain, because that doesn't convey any certainty at all. She's asking him, if you were in the library. That letter also conveys a very clear bias. She says, you know, "If so, I will try my best to help you account for some of your unwitnessed, unaccountable, lost time from 2:15 to 8:00 p.m., January 13th." Which is also interesting because the Defendant testified, you know, he really didn't think he had to account for his time in that time frame. This letter is mailed to him, he says right after he's arrested, I believe, yes. And someone who really isn't even involved in the case, someone who never came forward as a witness, is aware of the time that he needs to account for.

I think that -- it brings to light how sensational this case was among the students at Woodlawn. It was constantly discussed. It was what everyone was talking about, students and teachers alike. And I think the record is replete with examples to support that along with Ms. McClane's letters. And Ms. McClane seems to be eager to interject herself into this case. In the typed-written letter, dated March 2nd, I believe, she asks a lot of very pointed questions of the Defendant. She wants to know specifically where he was that day. What he told the

1.7

2.5

police. And then she explains, "You see, I have an analytical mind. I want to be a criminal psychologist for the FBI one day." And she goes on to ask some unusual questions. In particular, "Why doesn't he have any markings on his body from Hae's struggle?" This witness is seemingly interjecting herself well into the facts of the investigation that, by all-counts, she's not involved with.

So, as I was saying, Your Honor, if somehow this Court finds that Ms. Gutierrez was deficient. And, again, the State does not concede that. There's no way that Petitioner can satisfy the second prong of Strickland which is prejudice. There's absolutely no showing, because he has not produced Asia McClane, that Asia McClane's availability at trial would have in any way affected the outcome of the case.

Addressing the motion for modification, Your Honor. First I'll begin by stating, there simply is no precedent to indicate that a failure to ask to have a motion for modification held sub curia is ineffective assistance of counsel. The original motion was filed in a timely matter and was denied. So this is clearly not a (inaudible) situation where the court did not have an opportunity to consider it. In this situation, the Petitioner simply cannot remotely show prejudice. He has

not called Judge Heard to testify. To ask Judge Heard, if she would have held the motion sub curia. And to establish what, if any, relief she might have granted. So, the only evidence we have is in the record. And that indicates quite to the contrary.

We can look to the record of sentencing in this case, Your Honor. And what happened at sentencing was that, Mr. Dorsey had asked the Court to consider this case, almost as a second-degree case. He said, consider it as a crime of passion, Your Honor, in light of the Defendant's age and his emotional state. And the Court stated, "I disagree with you, Counsel. This wasn't a crime of passion. The evidence meant premeditated with malice and forethought, as we say in the law. That means you thought about it. The evidence was, there was a plan and you used that intellect. You used that physical strength. You used that charismatic ability of your's that made you the president of the -- what was the king or the prince of your prom? You used that to manipulate people. And even today, I think you continue to manipulate, even those that love you, as you did to the victim. You manipulated her to go with you to her death."

So, even on the date of sentencing, Judge Heard had ample evidence of the very things that most defendants would bring to light at a motion for modification and she

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

did consider these. Stating, "Both you and the person whose life you choose to end, unlike so many others, had the world in front of you. Not only did you have support of family, but you had the intelligence, the intellect, the physical strength and the ability, to do anything you wanted."

2.4

And I find it interesting today, Your Honor, that even in his testimony, Defendant concedes, had he known that his sentence wouldn't be reviewed, he wouldn't have gone through all of these programs. That was why he was doing it. Again, it's the same manipulation.

MR. BROWN: Objection, Your Honor. He never said that.

THE COURT: It's argument.

MS. MURPHY: And now at this point, Your Honor, I'll address the failure to seek a plea agreement. I think on this argument we have to address the Defendant's credibility. I've touched on it, but I believe what you heard from the Defendant here today is not credible. Keeping in mind, that he's no longer cloaked in innocence, as he is at trial. He stands before us convicted of first-degree murder, in a particularly heinous case. The acts involved are replete with deceit, lying, strangled a woman to death and buried her body so that her family might not ever know what became of her.

2.2

The records are clear, he drove her car around with her body stuffed in the trunk, while he and Jay Wilds looked for marijuana and sought to get high. And as he was getting high, he bragged to Jay Wilds, "I killed somebody with my bare hands."

Even before that, the record exemplifies the deceit that he employed with his only family in trying to maintain his relationship with the victim in this case. He utilized people from his mosque and other friends to hide his activities. One of the very reasons that this relationship was so complicated and problematic for both the Defendant and the victim. As Judge Heard said, manipulative, from start to finish. His testimony here today was not credible.

Particularly when -- Your Honor, has a clear idea that this case garnered a lot of attention. There was lots of speculation and some media coverage at the time. But -- well, I'm not going to repeat myself. But for him to acknowledge that he was called by the police, on the very dates she disappeared. And then again interviewed by the police, as to his whereabouts on that date, to say that he wasn't aware he had to account for those whereabouts, is just entirely disingenuous. And the Court had the opportunity to observe how evasive he was as the State asked him questions. He simply refused to

answer the State's question at one point.

The Defense is relying heavily, and has since the beginning of this petition, on Merzbacher. It's not coincidental that this petition comes on the heels of that case. Although that case is still yet to be resolved. And, although Counsel has produced no concrete evidence of when Ms. Gutierrez was disbarred, as the Court has pointed out, or any circumstances around that. What's clear is that there has simply been no evidence shown that her disbarment had anything to do with this case. That it occurred — that even if anything that was going on at the time of this case, led to her disbarment. There simply is no factual record of that.

And the parallels between Merzbacher and this case are pretty slim. About the only thing that they had in common was that they were high profile cases and that Ms. Gutierrez represented the Defendants. Merzbacher was a case with multiple victims. Victims who didn't come forward for years, and years, and years, after they were sexually assaulted by a teacher.

THE COURT: And just if I could, though, and you can chime in for a second if you need to, Mr. Brown.

Although I was on the bench at the time, Merzbacher, there was some evidence that there was an offer, correct?

MS. MURPHY: Interesting that the Court says

that. There was evidence that an offer was discussed in an in-chambers meeting between counsel. Whether it was a firmly conveyed offer or whether it was simply brought up.

THE COURT: But there was some scent.

MS. MURPHY: Right. It was brought up and discussed. And that truly distinguishes Merzbacher from this case. Because in this case, there's simply no evidence of any offer whatsoever and that's undisputed.

THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Brown, if you want to interject now, you can, or you can save it for your rebuttal, if you wish.

MR. BROWN: I'll save it.

2.5

THE COURT: Just don't forget. I'm sorry, Ms. Murphy.

MS. MURPHY: Oh, that's all right, Your Honor. But, Merzbacher was the kind of case where it's foreseeable that the State might entertain plea negotiations, because of the nature of the case, the multiple victims, and the length of time that had transpired from when the crimes occurred.

There is no constitutional right to a plea offer, Your Honor. And I think Counsel has raised two recent Supreme Court opinions, both Lafler v. Cooper and Missouri v. Frye. Both which deal with the responsibilities of counsel in a plea negotiation case.

Both cases must be distinguished from where we are today. Because, in each of those cases, plea offers had been extended. In one case, Lafler, the defendant rejected an offer that was extended, based on bad advice. And in the other case, the defense counsel failed to convey an offer before it lapsed.

So, again, we're in an entirely different situation. But the court in Lafler points out, and I believe this is very important. The Court states, "It is of course true, the Defendants have no right to be offered a plea, nor a federal right that the judge accept it. If no plea offer is made, or a plea deal is accepted by a defendant, but rejected by the judge, the issue raised here simply does not arise."

Not only has Petitioner not established that there's a deficiency in that regard, Your Honor. But there's absolutely no showing of prejudice. To attempt to show prejudice, Petitioner would have to show that the State would have conveyed an offer, what it might have conveyed, what it would have conveyed, and that's bearing in mind the high-profile nature of this case. The nature of the facts. It's particularly a compelling and heinous crime. The premeditation involved. I mean, Mr. Urick so accurately stated, this was not a run of the mill, first-degree homicide, if there is such a thing. This was

simply not it.

Furthermore, Petitioner has not shown that the Defendant would have accepted such an offer or if any court would have accepted it. Judge Quarles and Judge Heard have not been asked, what, if any, offer would you have given in this case? What, if any, offer would you have accepted in this case? Everything that has been presented, even this testimony of Ms. Meade, which is why the State noted its continuing objection. It's just speculation.

I think what is clear, is that throughout this case, Your Honor, the Defendant maintained his own innocence. I do think it's worth pointing out, after the first trial, after both Ms. Gutierrez and the Defendant have an opportunity to see almost the entirety of the State's case. The case ended in a mistrial. And there was a bail hearing right after that mistrial. Petitioner was present and Ms. Gutierrez stated, "We felt confident about the first trial. All the post-trial interviews with the jury has certainly supported the confidence in that. There is no reason to be afraid of a second trial from Mr. Syed's part."

I think that speaks volumes about the tenure of what was going between attorney and client, the decision moving forward, and the fact that this Defendant was

1.8

maintaining his innocence. His own statements at his sentencing speak, and support the notion, that he wished to assert his right to a trial. He stated, "Since the beginning, I have maintained my innocence. And I don't know why people have said the things that they have said that I have done, or that they have done. I have maintained my innocence from the beginning. And to my family and to those who have believed in me since the beginning, I would just like them to know that it is for a reason."

He also stated his intention to pursue an appeal and his desire for yet another chance in court. He's now attempting to assert, 10 years after the sentencing, that sentencing, that what he really wanted back in 2000, was an opportunity to plead guilty. And that contention is simply not credible, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Murphy. And any rebuttal, Mr. Brown?

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Judge. A few points. The State is apparently raising the argument that it was strategic, strategic work by Cristina Gutierrez, not to investigate an alibi witness. Because somehow that alibi witness would have conflicted with the 80 other alibi witnesses that were listed in the letter to the State.

First of all, the letter sent to the State which

would have been an alibi -- notice of alibi witnesses, is not evidence in the case. So, therefore, there would be no reason why a defense counsel would be afraid that by interviewing another alibi witness, they might produce some kind of evidence that contradicts the evidence of those 80 other people. With all due respect to Ms.

Murphy, to say there was a strategic decision made not to investigate an alibi witness is -- I find that hard to fathom.

Second, talking about the case Veeney that Ms. Murphy cited and other cases about this, where there's a failure to produce an alibi witness. The difference between those cases and this case, is in this case, we have a contemporaneous statement by the alibi witness. She was saying things at the time when the trial would have happened. So we do have a good idea of what she would have said, had she gone to trial. If we -- let's say we did succeed and we got her in here today, 10 years later, what she might say now, 10 years later, is afar less value than what she would have said 10 years ago. And I would even submit to the court, that the only thing really matters is what she would have said then. doesn't matter what Asia McClane might say or not say right now. So, I think that's a little misleading. And I think those cases that she's referring to, talk about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

witnesses who are called to provide a after-the-fact statement as to what they would testify about. And attempt to do so through proffer, through affidavit, rather than through live testimony at a post-conviction hearing.

Second of all, moving on to the plea issue. Merzbacher and Syed do have something in common. And what they have in common is that they're both a case in which the attorney, Cristina Gutierrez, was determined to take a high-profile case to trial. In Merzbacher, as I said before, she at least did take that first step and got a plea offer, but after that first step is where she failed. Because she didn't convey the plea offer to her client. Again, here, we have a client who requests a plea offer yet her error was in not even taking that first step in that process.

THE COURT: But you --

MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And again, I guess the question is, the only evidence of that, is the testimony of the Petitioner as to that request.

MR. BROWN: Well, that and the corroboration by our expert witness, Ms. Meade. Who said that that's entirely consistent with her experience. That when defendants are sitting around in the lock-up, that's a

common thing that they talk about. And that it is reasonable to expect that a client would make such a request.

But, you're correct. There's no, you know, addon witness who heard him say that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I wanted to make sure I wasn't --

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is correct. And apparently, and I'm not sure if this is the State's argument or not. But, if they are saying that the State would not offer a plea in this case, I think, Ms. Meade's testimony pretty clearly, demonstrated that that might not necessarily be the case. And certainly, Your Honor, can draw from your experience on the bench as to whether something like that would happen with a 17-year-old kid, with no criminal history whatsoever.

But, Ms. Meade's experience is that she has never had a case in which she could not get a plea. And if someone like Ms. Gutierrez wanted a plea, certainly, I think she could have gotten one.

In terms of the law, you know, again I want to read some quotes from our supplement as to this issue of the plea. Cases have found an attorney's failure to, quote, "Explore possible plea negotiations and deals on the Defendant's behalf, may fail the first prong of

Strickland when particular circumstances of the case and prevailing practice standards, show that a reasonably competent attorney would have done so." That's page 8 of the supplement, cited in Newman vs. Vasbinder, which is a 6th Circuit Case.

Also cited there is Freund vs. Butterworth, "Exploring possible plea negotiations is an important part of providing adequate representation of a criminal client." Mason — and I'm sorry, that's at an 11th Circuit case. And then there's a 5th Circuit Case, Mason vs. Valcom (phonetic), "Ineffective assistance in part due to counsel's failure to plea bargain when his client may have benefitted from plea bargaining."

And then there's a quote also from a book about the professional responsibility as a criminal lawyer, "If the nature of the case warrants it, defense counsel should explore plea discussions with the prosecutor." So, I think those cases do go right to the legal issue of whether the first prong of Strickland is satisfied by this issue.

And in the test for the prejudice is articulated in a Maryland case called Williams vs. State, 326 Md. 367, at 379. It says, "A defendant need not establish that he definitely would have accepted a plea offer. All that is required, is that the totality of the evidence supports an

inference that the outcome may well have been different, had he been fully and accurately informed."

And that's the problem we have here is, again, you've got a 17-year-old kid with absolutely no experience in the criminal justice system, being forced to make the biggest decision of his life. And that's where Lafler and Frye are important, that they highlight, this is the, arguably be, I think they referred to it as the most critical phase of a prosecution. The decision whether to plead guilty or to go to trial.

And what is suppose to happen, as Ms. Meade articulated, there's suppose to be some options for him to choose. And his lawyer is suppose to educate him on each option, the pluses and minuses, and help him make that decision.

What happened here, the option, the option -the primary option that resolves 95 percent of all cases,
nationally, was not provided to him. He didn't really
have an option in this case. And that's where the problem
lies. Again, it's a 17-year-old who has no experience in
the --

THE COURT: I mean, isn't this the class or type of cases though, I agree, at one far end of the spectrum of the typical, what your expert says, is the type of cases tried in Baltimore City, this is somewhat a-typical.

MR. BROWN: A-typical?

THE COURT: Of the run of the mill murder case, and I hate characterizing that way. That there wouldn't be any plea negotiations. A 17-year-old without any prior, without any prior record, not drug related, not gang related. But a case like this, you know, the case would be tried strictly on the defendant maintaining his innocence and that's the run of the case.

MR. BROWN: But what Ms. Meade has testified to and, you know, she has been admitted as an expert in criminal defense in Baltimore City, is that there is a duty to go out and find out what that offer is. And, in particular, after there had been a mistrial. Ms. Murphy read the quote from the bond hearing after the first mistrial. Those were the words of Ms. Gutierrez. Those aren't the words of Mr. Syed.

So, we think these cases establish that duty and this is, this is a cognizable issue on post-conviction.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The Court is going to hold its ruling sub curia and issue a written opinion. Thank you. And, Counsel, I do thank you for your schedule being -- I'm surprise we were able to get it done in the two days that we had. So, thank you.

```
. 1
                    MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.
    2
                    MS. MURPHY: Thank you, Your Honor.
    3
                    (Off the record -- 4:37:34 p.m.)
    4
    5
    6
    7
   8
   9
  10
  11
  12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

#### TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the proceedings in the matter of Adnan Syed versus State of Maryland, Case Number 199103042-046, and Post-Conviction No. 10432, heard in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City on October 25, 2012, was recorded on digital media with video.

I hereby certify that the proceedings, herein contained were transcribed by me or under my direction. That said transcript is a true and accurate record to the best of my ability and constitutes the official transcript thereof.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name on this 8th day of March, 2013.

Shiry a Miller Miller

Sherry R. Miller, President

\$100,000 H
\$100,000 41:8,10,1 41:18
<b>\$50,000</b> 41:13,19
a-typical 134:25
135:1
a.m 3:2
<b>ABC</b> 116:17
ability 122:17 123:5
137:11
able 5:9 8:13 17:3
19:4 20:11,12 21:8
21:9 22:6,13 27:1
27:15 33:3,23 36:1
52:5 66:5 74:1,22
94:11 99:18 113:1
135:24
absent 22:8 110:1
absolute 37:21
absolutely 28:11,21
30:16,19 35:13
36:22 39:6 47.9
50:12 52:17 73:18
84:7 88:6 97:9
109:24 121:13
127:17 134:4
abusing 38:15,15
accept 77:14 99:6.8
99:17 127:11
accepted 47:8 48:20
127:12 128:3,4,7
133:24
access 32:20 112:16
accessing 30:11
accommodating 3:14
account 115:18
118:22 120:7,10,15
124:22
accurate 137:10
accurately 127:24
134:2
ACCUSCRIBES
1:21
achieve 52:1

acknowledge 47:1 124:19 acknowledging 106:24 acquainted 97:25 actions 118:25 activate 112:8 activities 51:23 124:10 acts 123:23 actual 52:16 108:2 add 132:4 addition 103:16 additives 113:8 address 4:16 32:20 63:10 116:1 123:16 123:17 Addressing 121:17 adequate 133:8 Adger 23:10,11 28:3 28:5,8 adjust 4:12 adjustment 51:1 admission 4:23 admit 53:1 102:22 admitted 5:24 6:2,6 25:10,13 26:13,16 45:8,11 53:6 62:21 63:1 64:13,16,19 67:12 102:25 118:4 135:10 Adnan 1:1 2:4 3:5,11 6:9,12,18 61:22 62:2 118:7 137:4 adult 10:2 advance 49:25 50:13 advantage 96:15,18 advice 47:22 127:4 advise 61:6 afar 130:19 affect 33:19 34:21 53:11 54:16 55:4 76:14 79:8 115:19 affidavit 4:23 40:5,12

43:7,13,16 92:8 104:11,16 105:12 105:13,18 106:2,4,6 106:7,23,25 119:17 131:3 affirmative 19:10 76:2 91:19 93:14 95:9 111:18 afforded 54:24 afraid 38:17 47:2,3 128:21 130:3 after-the-fact 131:1 afternoon 62:1 63:19 63:20 Agcot 56:23 58:5,11 58:21 59:2,5 age 122:11 agencies 105:10 agenda 71:13 94:4 ago 50:1 72:19 103:8 105:6 130:20 agree 91:3 134:23 agreed 43:6 agreement 4:22 74:10 78:18 100:1 123:16 ahead 55:25 91:23 Alfred 46:17,18,23 46:25 76:20,21,21 77:12,14,18 99:1 Ali 5:10 14:3 31:22 92:13 104:11 alibi 5:5 30:23 35:15 45:20 90:2 91:8,9 91:11,16,17 92:3 93:3,5,13,16,19,21 93:22 94:20 95:10 95:11,11 102:16 103:13 104:1,6,10 104:23 105:17 106:13,14 107:6 112:25 113:3,3 115:18 117:13,25 118:6 119:2,5

129:22,22,23 130:1 130:1,4,8,12,14 alike 120:19 allegation 110:18 alleged 45:22 alleging 18:8 allow 95:2 112:2 alot 66:2 Amaral 65:4 Amendment 67:1 amount 35:11 47:15 48:24 69:19 ample 122:24 analytical 121:2 answer 21:9 59:1 60:20 97:10 125:1 answers 109:23 anybody 32:22 73:23 anyway 97:8 apparent 37:1 45:18 112:24 118:21 apparently 129:20 132:9 appeal 40:21 41:4,5 46:6,11 129:11 Appeals 64:7,9 appear 104:25 105:1 APPEARANCES 1:16 appearing 94:10 apply 117:21 appointed 42:2 49:5 approach 24:15 62:23 69:12 70:13 79:22 80:15 90:22 90:24 approached 24:18 109:9 approaching 82:12 appropriate 83:15 approximately 7:4 18:20 27:6 50:17 64:22 65:23 104:7 April 44:23

60:12 80:20 100:9 109:20 110:13,14 Page 139

area 67:23	
aren't 135:16	
arguably 108:1 13	1.0
argued 47:12	4:8
argument 90:11	
92:19 93:13 98:13	2
103:4 116:1 119:	ر 10
123:14,17 129:20	10
132:10	
arguments 2:22	
21:10 62:12 106:2	
arraignment 71:20	
71:21,22	
arrest 7:12 24:13	
94:9	
arrested 8:4,7 9:3	
10:15 17:22 25:2	- 1
26:5,7,25 28:14	
30:15,20 31:4 104:	2
120:12	٠   ه
article 109:14	
articulated 133:21	
134:12	a
articulating 112:22	1.
Asia 5:5,6,7 23:4,4	1
25:1,21 29:4,13	a
31:14 32:6,9,24	a
33:2 38:4 39:14.23	la
39:24 40:4 41:14,22	a
42:21,25 43:4,4,16	a
44:18 45:19 48:8	at
49:6 92:8,10 94:20	1
104:3,21,24 105:1.4	at
105:11,12,14,24	
119:4 121:14,14	
130:23	at
Asia's 30:4	at
isked 16:7,7 18:25	ati
19:7,13 22:22 31:13	att
32:19 33:1,9,10	2
36:23 37:4,6 40:11	8
40:17,19 41:12,13	1
45:25 46:23 49:21	att
50:12 54:3 59:16,18	9
, ,	

4:8	110:19 122:8
	124:25 128:5
	asking 44:17 45:16
2	45:18 56:15,20
0	58:15,17,24 88:21
	88:23 96:18 120:4
	asks 16:22 85:24
	120:23
	aspect 30:17
	aspects 12:8 46:3
	assault 65:10
	assaulted 125:20
	assert 129:3,13
	assertive 10:8
- 1	assess 117:20
-	assistance 112:20
2	121:21 133:11
-	associate 65:2
1	associated 68:15
1	Association 66:16
1	assume 4:9 9:16 98:8
1	101:4 102:8 110:17
T	119:10
1	assuming 119:8
	athlete 38:10
	thletes 117:6
a	itmosphere 15:6
	ttach 69:14
a	ttempt 12:15 66:1
	127:17 131:3
a	ttempted 65:21 66:3
	70:7 81:6 90:5
	106:18
a	ttempting 129:13
a	tended 118:7,20
ai	tending 118:13
at	tention 15:8 23:3
	28:2 46:15 69:11
	84:2 91:7 105:20 124:16
	100
at (	torney 5:11 8:15,18
5	9:5 14:2 18:13 19:2
S	CRIBES TRANGO

19:15,19,19 20:14 27:18 42:10 64:2 65:17 66:17 73:6 74:18,19 75:24 76: 76:2,5 80:7,11,13 82:8,15,20 84:5 86:16 94:19 95:8 103:15,16 105:8 106:9 107:11,17 108:13 112:1 113:4 113:21 128:24 131:9 133:3 attorney's 82:5 95:8 132:23 attorneys 66:22 88:17 authenticate 5:13 52:16 automatic 95:21 automatically 95:19 autopsy 116:5 availability 121:15 available 54:18 71:11 avoided 88:18 awarded 51:22 aware 23:17,22 24:6 49:1,20 60:16,21 84:17 85:18 86:18 102:15 103:18 113:11 120:14 124:22
В
D 1 00 00

1

110:12 112:6,10 116:7,10,16,18,20 129:14 background 70:17,19 :1 70:20 bad 74:14 95:25 127:4 bail 8:13,16 128:17 balance 3:18 balancing 85:5 Baltimore 1:4 8:12 59:12 63:13,22 66:6 66:8,9,12,14 67:4 67:13,16,17 68:4 71:23 73:24 74:3 77:14 79:15 81:23 81:25 82:5 107:4 109:1 116:25 117:11 118:12 134:25 135:11 137:6 Bar 64:14,20 66:16 66:18 105:9 Bar's 64:16 bare 124:5 bargain 76:23 88:5 107:25 133:12 bargaining 10:25 11:4 46:15 75:3,4,6 77:22 80:23 82:4 85:15,21 87:10 107:18,22 108:1 133:13 base 52:19 based 22:12 37:18 53:15 84:3 89:6,15 93:22 111:16 115:13 117:25 127:4 basically 51:25 71:4 71:17 92:22 98:23 111:13 basis 96:23 117:10

119:5

			Page 140	į
Bavel 64:12 65:3,4	112:11	4:10,14,15 5:4 6:8	50.00.50.0.50	_
bearing 116:19	bits 12:10 18:8 48:6	6:20 12:4,20 13:5	58:23 59:2 62:5	
127:20	blew 113:4	17:20 20:21,24 21:5	63:7 80:6 83:11	
beating 48:22	blow-out 86:25	24:15,20 25:6,15		
beautiful 116:24	<b>blue</b> 104:5 107:3	26:8,18 29:9 37:13	118:18	
began 11:2 33:11	board 36:5 81:5,16	43:10,13,19,20 44:7	called 20:5 32:1 40:1	
begging 105:23	body 21:13 31:1	45:3,13,14 51:8,12	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
beginning 118:10	36:18 41:15 121:5	51:15,16 52:21 53:3	58:4,6,12,19,22	
125:3 129:4,7,9	123:24 124:2	53:7,14,19,23 54:3	1 33.13	
behalf 3:11 62:2	bolsters 93:15	54:5,12 55:6 60:8,9	104:22 106:22	
132:25	bond 135:14	60:11,19,23 61:5,9	118:16 122:1	I
believable 108:21	book 116:16,17,18,21	61:12,25 62:1,2,5,6	124:19 131:1	I
111:2	133:14	, 1,2,5,0	133:22	I
<b>believe</b> 3:16 5:19	Booking 74:4	62:10,17,23 63:3,15	calling 3:5,5 36:2	ı
8:19 21:8,17 22:9	books 10:20 112:16	63:16,18 67:7,11,17 68:5 86:1 91:23	58:24 83:3,4	l
23:25 24:2,9 27:16	bother 94:19		calls 63:4 81:2,2	l
30:23 31:3 41:2	box 91:4	97:12 98:11 100:6,8	calm 96:20	
49:13 50:18 52:5	boyfriend 5:7 23:18	100:18,23,24 101:8 101:13 102:7 103:5	camera 29:1	
56:23 57:9 59:10,18	23:20,21 29:15 30:2	108:7,11 110:6,8,20	cameras 28:24 32:18	
62:3,7 74:17 76:1	30:4 45:21 60:17 22	110:22 113:15,18	33:4	
81:8,9 102:14 105:8	105:14	113:19 114:1,3,8,12	can't 21:2 47:1 70:1	
109:13 112:7	boyfriend's 29:16	114:13,16 123:12	77:16,17 78:11	
114:23 120:12,23	45:21 105:15	125:22 126:9,12	80:19 82:19,19	
123:18 127:9	Brady 73:8	129:18,19 131:18	83:21,25,25 86:1	
believed 19:18 129:8	bragged 124:4	131:22 132:8 135:1	91:24 115:7	
bench 79:23 80:15	Branch 7:2	135:9,19,20 136:1	capacity 13:25 67:3	
82:12 90:24 125:23	break 3:20 55:12,17	bruising 116:7	car 21:14 36:17,18	
132:14	brief 41:8 60:9	brutally 116:6	92:24 116:9,14,17 124:1	
benefit 76:23 81:3	<b>briefly</b> 5:1 32:8 51:18	building 74:4	care 6:9 114:10	
89:24	51:19 62:6 81:18	built 38:20	career 65:17 73:24	
benefitted 133:13	91:9	buried 116:20 123:24	Carolina 76:20,21	
best 5:15 9:1 10:5,11	bring 80:3 122:25	bury 84:19	Carroll 75:12,12	
16:21 21:12 22:5	brings 79:25 120:16	Butterworth 133:6	case 3:6 7:6 11:18	
29:16 30:25 36:1,12	broach 49:6	Buy 21:12 36:1,12,14	12:9 13:1 16:2,10	
36:13,15 41:2 66:11	broached 42:25	36:15	17:1 18:5,12 22:10	
69:6 75:21 77:10,25	<b>broad</b> 36:16,18		22:18,21 32:2 33:20	
78:3 82:22 88:18	broke 62:3 116:12	C	34:11,18,19,25	
95:10 107:15 120:6	broken 23:20	C 2:2 3:1 93:9	36:21 38:20,22	
137:11	brother 42:14	calculation 84:21	41:15 42:24 48:22	
better 66:10 80:10	brought 75:12 94:5	Caleoby 13:23	48:23 49:3 52:18	
beyond 93:8	114:7 118:15 126:3	call 3:3,23 4:7,13,16	61:22 62:4 65:7	
bias 119:19 120:5	126:5	6:9,13 20:9,11,13	68:7,19,23 69:12,12	
<b>biggest</b> 134:6 <b>bit</b> 3:21 73:4 99:1	Brown 1:17 2:23 3:9	21:11 36:6,15 57:25	69:13 70:6,14,18	
011 3.21 /3:4 99:1	3:10,11,17,23 4:4	58:5,7,9,11,17,20	71:13 72:7,13,23	
	1	1.	- 12.7,13,23	

73:5,6,12 74:12,2 75:3,4,7,16,21 76:10 77:25,25 78 78:3,5,9,13,15,16 80:3,20 83:8,21 84:3,4,4,23 86:10 87:6 89:6,16 90:1, 90:9,9 91:10,11,21 93:6,8,13,15 95:5, 95:7,15 96:1 97:4 97:20 98:6,9,24 99:19 100:10,12 101:14 102:16 103:16 105:17 107:15 108:8 109:13,15 110:2 111:9,21 113:8 114:18,20,21,25 115:3,23 116:2,5,22 117:1,9,12,14 119:10,12,16 120:13,17,22 121:16 122:7,9,9 123:22 124:8,16 125:5,5,10,12,15,18 126:7,7,16,18,25 127:3,5,21 128:6,7 128:12,16,16 130:2 130:10,13,13 131:8 131:10 132:11,13 132:18 133:1,5,10 133:10,16,22 134:19 135:2,6,6,8 137:4  **Case-by-case 81:9 99:22 **Cases 18:3,16 65:8 66:12 67:14,17 68:4 69:5 81:5 82:4	2 1 5 5 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C
69:5 81:5 82:4	
	cl
87:22 107:19,23,24	cl
107:24 108:3	
114:23 117:10	A.R.
	cŀ
125:16 127:1,2	cł
130:11,13,25	ch
, , <b></b>	CI

5	132:23 133:18	
	134:17,23,25	
3:	1   135:17	
	Catherine 65:6	
	cause 30:5 73:2,23	
	76:24 80:12	
2	caution 61:11	
5	cell 12:12 36:5,15	
5	37:21,24 56:24	
	114:24,24 115:2,10	
	cellular 12:6,8	
	Center 8:12 107:5	
	central 74:4 115:6	
	certain 30:11 72:18	
	73:8 74:8,9,11	
	94:12,15 120:3	
	certainly 4:1 43:12	
	55:16 83:11 90:2	
2	94:13 102:2 113:20	
	120:2 128:20	
	132:13,19	
h	certainty 120:4	
	CERTIFICATE	
	137:1	
	certificates 2:16 51:2	
1	51:7,22,25 52:16	
1	112:10	
1	certification 106:18	
1	certify 137:3,8	
1	chance 19:14 25:3	
1	30:7 46:21 48:11	
1	52:8,11,12 54:4	
I	88:8 112:24 129:12	
	change 4:2	
l	<b>changed</b> 50:6 96:4,7	
l	103:22	
	changes 80:11	
ľ	Chaplain's 51:4	
ľ	character 66:18,19	
ľ	characterize 9:23	
•	characterizing 135:3	
C	charge 10:2 47:4	
charged 10:18 15:6		
3 13.0		

30:18,24 65:18,21 65:24 69:15 72:1 charges 77:11 charismatic 122:17 Charles 42:2,3 63:1 chart 84:23 charts 84:24 Chaudry 39:14 40:4 40:5,6 42:5,13,20 43:8,18 105:5,6,22 cheat 80:6,7,14 cheated 113:11 check 43:3 55:18 86:1 87:16 101:9 checked 39:18 children 70:17	2
chime 125:22	
<b>choice</b> 47:14,15 79:1 84:16 108:16,16,19	
choices 79:2,4 99:18	
117:15,16	
choose 123:2 134:13	
Christopher 20:6	1
chronologically 26:19	1
chronology 48:6	1
church 70:17 73:1	1
Circuit 1:2 64:18	ı
68:4 79:16 109:14	ı
133:5,10,10 137:6	l
circumstance 72:13 74:24 83:17 90:17	
97:4 99:23	
circumstances 72:18	
89:23 90:21 91:18	
91:21 98:15 117:20	
125:8 133:1	
citations 103:25 114:10	
eited 130:11 133:4,6	
ity 1:4 8:12 9:21	
11:3 18:1 40:8 46:5	c
46:19,22 66:6,8,12	
67:13,16,17 68:4	

	71:23 74:3,4 77:14
	79:15 81:23.25
	107:4 109:1 116:25
	117:11 134:25
2	135:11 137:6
	City's 82:5
	claimed 114:20
	clarity 37:14
	class 134:22
	classes 23:15,25 24:8
	24:10
	clean 50:25
- 1	clear 27:13 28:11
- 1	36:22 72:20,21,21
- 1	77:1 85:8 120:5
-	124:1,15 125:8
	128:11
-	clearly 94:15 115:13
	119:18 121:22
	132:12
	clerk 5:10,17 6:16
1	13:20 32:1 55:19,20
1	55:22 63:10,23,25
I	64:8,9 92:14,15
1	102:19,21
1	clerked 64:6
1	clerking 98:2
1	client 20:14 65:10
	69:14 70:8,8,9,12
	71:3 73:17,22,25
	74:13,13 75:17 76:6
1	76:7,14,18,25 77:1
l	77:4,23 78:1,20
	79:1 81:7,14 82:16
	84:14 85:10 88:11
	88:17 96:21 101:10
	108:24 109:18,20
	110:18 111:20
	118:1 119:5 128:24
	131:13,14 132:2
	133:9,12
cl	ient's 70:19 74:12
	80:22 81:2 83:6
	103:15
_	

clients 71:7,9 72:	10
76:16 88:20,21	99.2
113:11	11.4
cloaked 123:20	
close 32:13 42:14	
57:14,15,18 101	:13
closely 118:3	1
closer 6:24	- 1
closing 2:22 62:12	
92:19 98:12	
co-chair 66:15	- 1
co-conspirator 85:	1
111:13	. 1
co-defendant 93:17 coaches 9:25	'
coerced 106:22 107	
cognizable 135:18	:2
coincidental 125:4	
Colbert 8:19,21	C
collect 95:4	C
college 29:17	c
college-bound 117:8	c
column 80:8 116:13	
116:15	
come 8:20 9:2 13:10	co
14:10,11 16:8,18	co
17:8,23,24 21:12	co
24:12 27:19 28:12	co
32:2,5 34:8 35:4	co
36:2 40:23 41:6	co
46:16 70:25 75:9,11	co
82:22 87:16 99:21	co
106:5 111:5 112:6	co
112:10 125:18 comes 15:17 22:21	COI
35:5 79:20 109:21	COI
125:4	cor
coming 47:20 88:12	cor
106:2	con
Commission 66:17	1 2
commit 15:14,23	34 56
17:3 22:5 34:11	12
committed 22:7	con
37:23 45:23 91:12	con
	COII)

10 99:		8	104:14,15 1 conflicted 12:
	66:19 <b>committing</b> 47:12		conformity 6
13	common 18:16 83: 125:16 131:7,8	11	consequences consequences
	132:1 communicated 80:	10	77:24 79:4 8 consider 53:2
	104:9 communicating 81	:1	106:3 119:11 121:24 122:8
1	communication 73:14 117:18		123:1 consideration
,	community 9:3,6 41:7 66:14		considered 49: considering 77
:2	compelling 127:22 competent 105:7 133:3		consistency 80: consistent 36:2
	competitions 67:4 complete 3:15 21:3		37:19 93:3 11 118:11 119:1,
	105:16 <b>completed</b> 54:17	1	131:24 conspirator 84:
	completely 38:7 39:2 40:3 71:24 110:1		constantly 120: constitutes 137:
	113:4 <b>completion</b> 119:24		constitutional 1 constitutionally 107:18
	complex 65:6 complicated 124:11		consulted 110:1: contact 27:18 31
	components 11:11 concede 121:11		40:15 41:13 52 ontacted 24:13
1	conceded 118:12 concedes 123:8		39:23,24 43:5 105:18
C	conceding 119:9 concept 49:10	C	ontacting 38:4 ontained 28:1 1:
c	oncerned 70:12 95:7 oncise 27:13		ontemporaneou 130:14
C	oncoct 115:8 oncrete 125:6	co	ontempt 87:17 ontention 129:15
1	onfidence 17:2 18:5 18:12 19:4 22:18	Co	ONTENTS 2:1 ontinue 122:20
	34:18 35:13 38:22 56:13,19 103:23 128:20	co	ntinued 67:23 ntinuing 62:4
co	onfident 128:18	co	128:9 ntradicts 119:4
-0	nfirmed 22:3,11,19	1	30:5

104:14,15 111:2
conflicted 129:23
conformity 69:5
connection 95:8
Lagrandarine 12:12
consequences 70:8
77:24 79:4 84:11
1 consider 33:21 96:24
106:3 119:11
121:24 122:8,9
123:1
consideration 83:8
considered 49:14
considering 77:20
consistency 80:13
consistent 36:24
37:19 93:3 111:9
118:11 119:1,3
131:24
conspirator 84:18
constantly 120:18
constitutes 137:11
constitutional 126:21
constitutionally
107:18
consulted 110:11
contact 27:18 31:14
40:15 41:13 52:18
contacted 24:13 38:5
39:23,24 43:5
105:18
contacting 38:4
contained 28:1 137:9
Contemposes
130:14 c
contempt 87:17
contention 129:15
CONTENTS 2:1
continue 122:20
continued 67:23
continuing 62:4
128:9

contrary 122:5 control 77:9 conversation 18:3,18 18:21 31:16 37:15 40:9,25 41:3,9 56:25 58:14 71:8 conversations 11:2 30:20 34:18 37:2 convey 109:4 120:3 127:6 131:13 conveyed 32:16 56:10,12,16 126:3 127:19,20,20 conveying 109:18 117:1 conveys 120:5 **convicted** 39:8,13 44:12 46:6 105:3 123:21 **conviction** 35:5 42:22 44:13 68:12 115:25 convince 77:13 cool 112:3 Cooper 126:23 cooperation 3:13 74:1 coordinator 51:23 copies 39:22 52:16,20 **copy** 40:6 74:9 101:20 114:16 **Cornedor** 5:11,13 14:3 31:22 92:14 104:11,12 correct 3:16,17 9:17 24:4 30:25 31:4 39:8,9 42:7,8 51:12 53:22 56:8,17,22 57:3,6,14,18,21,23 59:3,9,21,24 61:9 65:8 85:13 86:24 99:5 100:11 102:9 109:24 110:20,21 112:7 125:24 132:4 132:8

93:5

Correction	nal 7·2	1
correspond	dence 2:15	1
2:20 105:	21	ı
corroborat		
corroborat		
corroborat	ion	
131:22		
couldn't 18	:10 35:1	
37:25 38:2	22 48:14	
50:2	1	
counsel 3:12	2 24:18	
97:24 107:	:22	
112:20 113	7:18,20	
121:21 122	2:12	,
125:6 126:	2,22,25	,
127:5 130:	3 133:16	9
135:23	1	1
counsel's 11'	7:22	1
133:12	1	1
<b>count</b> 83:3		1
<b>counts</b> 121:7	-	1
County 59:12	2 66:9	1
73:25 75:12	,13	1
118:12	1	1
couple 13:13	50:1	1
72:19 77:6 8	30:25	1
87:24 92:7 9	06:19	11
107:19		11
course 5:16 85		12
86:19 103:7,	22	12
104:17 119:2	23	12
127:10		12
courses 66:25	67:1	12
court 1:2 3:3,9	,12,18	13
3:22 4:3,5,8,		13
5:22,24 6:5,1	4 4 6	13.
12:19 13:4 14		
15:2,20 17:15	11.06	71:
20:10,20,23 2		
24:17,24 25:8 26:10,13 29:7		
37.10 38.0 10	,12   8	2:
37:10 38:9,12 44:4,18,19 45	7 O I	
45:19 50:5 51	11 10	
50.5 51	:11,13   cov	er
	.000	

51:19 52:5,9,24 53:1,1,8,17,18,20 53:20,24,24 54:14 55:8,11,14,18,21,	4
55:24,25 56:3 60: 60:20,24 61:1,4,8 61:10,13,13,19,25 62:3,8,9,15,19,21 62:24 63:5,14 64:	8
64:9,17,18 67:4,9 67:15,19,21,25 68 68:2,4 71:14 72:4, 72:8,15,16,18,24 73:4 77:13 78:11	:2
79:16 80:6,17,18 90:23 97:14 100:5 100:17,19,21,23 101:4,7,11,15,17,19 101:20,21,23,23	9
102:3,8,12,13,17,20 102:22,22 103:4,18 105:6 106:3,17 107:1,19 108:6 110:4,7,17,21,24	)
113:10,13,13,17,25 114:2,4,5,6,10,12 114:14,16 115:24 117:11,21 118:21	
121:10,23 122:8,11 123:14 124:24 125:7,21,25 126:4,9 126:13,23 127:8,9 128:4 129:12,17	c
130:21 131:17,19 132:6 134:22 135:2 135:19,21,21 137:6 court's 3:14 60:4 71:11 101:9	c; C
courthouse 79:25 courtroom 15:5	cr
82:12 87:14,17 cousin 57:10	cr
cover 116:20	cr cr
coverage 15:21	3

	124:17	
	covered 103:6	
1	covers 105:16	
23	Cox 67:2	
8	creates 93:12	
	credibility 119:20	
	123:18	
	credible 93:24 94:1	7
5	111:1,16 115:14	′
	118:23 123:19	
2	124:14 129:16	
5	credibly 108:21	
- 1	Crew 64:4	
- 1	crime 10:18 15:15,2	2
- 1	17:3,22 22:5 34:11	J
	84:23 122:10,13	
- 1	127:23	
	crimes 126:20	
-1	criminal 8:1 48:3	
	64:3,23,23 66:15	
1	67:12,13,16 68:3	
1	69:18 70:3 75:3	
	87:7 90:13 94:19	
1	98:3 108:17 111:20	
1	121:2 132:16 133:8	1
	133:15 134:5	1
1	135:11	1
10	Cristina 8:25 9:2	
	31:8 69:1 86:22	
	92:16 97:25 101:19	1
1	106:12 117:24	1
1	129:21 131:9	1
CI	ritical 111:20 134:9	1
cı	coss 97:14	1
	ROSS-EXAMIN	
	56:5 97:16	
	oss-examined	l
	115:12 120:2	
	oss-examining	d
	119:19	d
	oss-section 117:3	d
	owded 15:4	u
	ucial 34:3,8,10	
3	6:20 38:4 75:7	
	JUIT 1J./	

cultural 70:20 culture 70:12,23 cumulative 112:19 cup 93:10,11 curia 49:22,25 50:13 96:2,6,16,19 97:2,5 112:2 121:20 122:2 135:22 Curlin 64:4 **currently** 6:25 7:9 cut 35:8 50:15 52:7 113:25 D d 2:2 3:1 91:15 93:9 **D.C** 5:12 damage 77:9 dangling 116:14 date 1:14 29:3,8,9,10 31:2,2 44:8,13,14 62:17 99:21 102:17 122:23 124:22 dated 26:5,22 57:19 119:25 120:23 dates 124:20 **dating** 60:13 daughter 81:11 day 3:15,19 12:12 26:5 27:2,4,5,8,14 29:23 30:17,17,20 32:11 34:3 48:12 50:10 52:5 57:5 58:3,15,24 59:19,21 71:22 77:4 92:2 95:24 104:7 117:2 118:8,9 120:25 121:3 137:14 day-to-day 117:10 daylight 36:17,18 days 25:2 26:7 29:23

30:1,8 49:13 50:14

50:18 59:9 77:7

95:24 115:12

			Page 14
118:18 135:24	defending 81:20	described 10:12	130:12
dead-up 78:8	defense 26:13 38:7	description 42:19	differences 75:13
deal 18:14,18,19 19:1	64:3,23 65:17 67:13	deserve 50:15	different 14:10,11
19:16 22:23 23:2	67:16 68:3 74:18,19	deserved 50:10	17:5 29:17 47:22
33:22 35:10,10,12	75:24,24 76:1 79:18	desire 129:12	
37:5,6,8,12 47:14	81:4 84:4 86:16	Det 59:10,16,20	52:3 69:23 78:5,14
47:15,18 48:22	91:19 93:2,3,4,5,14	detached 79:14	87:11 93:11,12
79:25 88:21 89:17	94:19 95:5,6 98:3	detail 11:10,16,24	116:3 127:7 134:1
89:18 113:6,7	103:15 105:18	12:7,14,24 16:13	difficult 77:13 88:16
126:24 127:12	107:7,8,9,11,15,17	71:4	108:16
deals 132:24	107:22 108:10,13	detained 8:10	digital 1:24 137:7
death 65:7,7,9 122:22	112:1 113:4,21	detective 95:2 118:12	dire 67:8,19
123:24	117:25 119:2,21	detectives 30:21 59:8	<b>DIRECT</b> 6:19 63:17
decedent 90:8 92:23	125:2 127:5 130:3	118:15	direction 78:17 137:9
deceit 123:23 124:7	133:16 135:11	detector 110:24	directly 6:16 54:12
decide 93:18 115:24	Defense's 6:1 25:12	<b>Detention</b> 8:12 107:5	disagree 122:12
decided 41:20	26:15		disappearance
decision 76:12 77:22	defenses 95:10	determine 5:9	116:23
117:19 128:24	deference 117:21	determined 131:9 detriment 81:4	disappeared 118:17
130:7 134:6,9,15	deficiency 103:17		124:20
deep 70:9	127:16	devastating 75:15 dice 73:2	disbarment 114:7
defend 69:5 70:24	deficient 119:9		125:10,12
74:20	121:10	didn't 4:20 6:5 10:20	disbarred 113:10
defendant 2:13,14,15	definitely 17:2	10:23 11:1,3 12:7	114:6 125:7
50:6 51:9 52:22	133:24	12:24 15:14,23 17:3	discharge 41:21
65:18,20 95:15	degree 89:20 127:25	17:15 18:4,12 19:4	discharged 49:5
98:24 99:16 100:1	delve 114:10	19:21 20:15,16 22:5	disclose 74:11
111:25 112:3	demonstrate 50:5,14	22:8,18 29:25 30:7	discovered 74:2
114:19 115:17	52:6 89:22	30:17,22,23 33:23	discovery 10:22
116:9,11 117:7		34:10,18 35:15 38:8	11:18,19 73:5,6,10
118:9,11 119:12	demonstrated 114:25	39:2,18 41:1,1,16	73:15,16,22,23,25
120:9,24 123:8,19	132:12	42:15 43:2,23 46:2	74:7,25
120.9,24 123.8,19	denied 49:12,15	46:3,9,21 48:3 49:9	discredit 94:2
124.12 127.3,13	50:17,18 54:6	49:9,11 50:7,11	discrediting 85:1
133:23 135:7	121:22	56:19 57:7,9,10,11	discretionary 74:16
	depended 10:4	57:25 58:5,9 72:21	discuss 4:22 79:23
Defendant's 5:19,24	depending 74:10	81:7 86:22 90:20,21	83:22 90:25 92:19
6:6 24:22 25:7,10	80:2	93:15 97:23 98:5,8	100:13
25:25,25 26:3,9	depends 77:3	98:18 109:19	discussed 4:17 83:23
43:15 116:21	depraved 90:10	111:17 113:25	83:24 86:19 103:12
122:11 123:17	describe 10:5,12 12:9	120:10 125:18	114:9 120:18 126:1
132:25	15:2 21:25 24:24	131:13 134:18	126:6
lefendants 62:13	44:4 47:18 69:23	die 35:9	discusses 105:4,4
122:24 125:17	78:1 82:3 88:10	died 34:12,19 114:20	117:14
127:10 131:25	94:15	difference 35:7	discussion 72:14

75:16 77:4 80:1 89:5 <b>discussions</b> 76:6,2 80:18,19 86:2,3	103:10 107:1 108:19 126:1
91:2 97:23 98:6, 100:10 110:14 133:17	Dorsey 42:2,3 4
dishonest 41:22,24 disingenuous 118: 124:23 dismiss 72:7,13	double 82.0
disregards 109:21 disrespect 75:12 distance 96:20	dovetailed 107:7 draft 105:22,23 drag 71:13
distinguished 127:1 distinguishes 126:6 District 64:17 90:23 disturbed 93:18	draw 86:14 132:
DOC 83:7 112:6 docket 49:14 doctor 10:1 16:22,22 35:7	driver 70:2
document 24:22 68:8 80:13 94:14 101:22 110:9 documented 80:9	due 72:4 130:6 133:11
documents 91:20 92:6 93:23 doesn't 94:4 108:24	duly 6:14 63:8 67: duplication 102:4 duration 118:8,9 duty 74:18 75:23
120:3 121:4 130:23 <b>doing</b> 30:9 66:19 79:16 83:13 86:6 88:12 95:21 98:3 123:11	76:2,5,9 103:14,1 103:17 106:9 108:14 111:18 117:14,18 135:12 135:17
dollars 41:5 Dominic 64:5 don't 20:16 21:2,3	dwindling 113:5
31:25,25 35:11 50:4 55:15,25 58:22 67:9 69:21 73:2,21,22 74:21,24,24 75:8,8 75:14,16,20 82:24	E 3:1,1 61:18,18 93 e-mail 30:12 32:20,2 eager 120:22 earlier 16:15 22:11 37:6 42:7 112:14
89:2 90:4,14,17	earliest 114:23

91:4,22 95:12 103:10 107:13,20 108:19 126:13 129:4
Donnelly 64:5 Dorsey 42:2,3 49:5 49:20 122:8 double 83:9 doubt 39:3 93:2,6,8 107:9 Douglas 8:19
dovetailed 107:7 draft 105:22,23 drag 71:13 drastic 55:4 draw 86:14 132:14 drawing 86:13
drawn 86:7 drive 69:24 driver 70:2 driving 99:24 drove 124:1
drug 135:5 dry 87:13 due 72:4 130:6 133:11 duly 6:14 63:8 67:25
duplication 102:4 duration 118:8,9 duty 74:18 75:23 76:2,5,9 103:14,15 103:17 106:9 108:14 111:18
117:14,18 135:12 135:17 dwindling 113:5
E 3:1,1 61:18,18 93:9

	1	
5	91:4,22 95:12	early 73:23
£ .	103:10 107:13,2	earned 50:6 52:6
5	108:19 126:13	easier 80:4,14 101:2
3	129:4	easy 101:21
8	Donnelly 64:5	educate 47.01 104 4
- 1	Dorsey 42:2,3 49:5	educated 84:16
	49:20 122:8	educating 71:3
,,	double 83:9	educational 70 10
23	doubt 39:3 93:2,6,8	8 effect 103:25 110:24
- 1.	107:9	effective 107:18
-	Douglas 8:19	119:17
- 1	dovetailed 107:7	effort 105:19
10	draft 105:22,23	eight 65:5
10	drag 71:13	Eighty-five 64:24
	lrastic 55:4	either 52:6 55:5 66:3
C	Iraw 86:14 132:14	66:8,21 108:9
d	lrawing 86:13	elements 16:10
	rawn 86:7	eligible 54:24
	rive 69:24	emotional 84:10
	river 70:2	122:11
d	riving 99:24	emotionally 15:6
	rove 124:1	38:15
di	rug 135:5	emotions 90:3
	ry 87:13	emphasize 115:7
dı	ie 72:4 130:6	emphasized 46:10
	133:11	emphatic 27:14,15
du	lly 6:14 63:8 67:25	employed 107:10
du	plication 102:4	124:7
du	ration 118:8,9	employee 76:8
du	ty 74:18 75:23	employment 104:17
7	6:2,5,9 103:14,15	empty 93:10
1	03:17 106:9	ended 19:24,25 20:1
1	08:14 111:18	27:4 86:20 128:16
1	17:14,18 135:12	enforcement 105:10
	35:17	engage 76:2,15 80:15
dwindling 113:5		engaged 77:19
-		engaging 77:20 81:13
E		82:12
E 3:1,1 61:18,18 93:9		ensued 24:19
e-mail 30:12 32:20,20		enter 72:8 81:11
eager 120:22		entertain 126:17
earlier 16:15 22:11		entire 15:12 21:9
37	:6 42:7 112:14	34:25,25 117:3
earl	iest 114:23	entirely 108:21,25
		Vay 100.21,23

	111.2 8 15 115 05
5	111:2,8,15 115:25 116:8 119:1 124:23
1:24	4   127:7 131:24
	entirety 128:15
4:13	entries 49:14
	Erika 1:20
	err 61:10
9	
24	error 103:21,23 131:15
	Especially 91:5
	Esquire 1:17,18
	essentially 5.6.16.14
	essentially 5:6 16:11 22:19 27:7 46:25
	48:5 52:3 57:2
5:3	104:10 105 22
	104:19 105:23 115:1
	establish 122:3 133:23 135:17
	established 113:22 127:15
	evaded 106:19
	evaluate 76:17
	evaluating 73:10 78:7
- 1	evasive 124:24
	event 96:20
	events 48:6 94:15
- 1	eventually 8:20 32:15
	everybody 69:20
	75:10 81:16,17
	87:15 88:16 94:2
1.	evidence 4:24,25 5:20
	6:3 11:22,23 12:6
	13:7 25:6,14 26:9
;	26:17 41:15 43:14
	45:4,12 52:22 53:1
3	53:6 62:14 63:2
	73:8 76:19,22 77:3
	78:6,20 85:10 90:1
1	98:16 102:23 103:1
	104:5,12,23 107:2,8
	108:7 110:23 113:1
	115:20,23 116:5,22
1	117:5 119:3 122:4

122:13,15,24 125	5:6   122.2
125:9,24 126:1,8	1
130:2,5,5 131:20	F-55564 07.15
133:25	experience 10:20
evidentiary 11:6	66:21 70:3 77:13
exact 17:6,6 33:24	83:25 85:15,21 8
36:4,7 37:22,25	88:2,9,20 90:12
40:17 45:22	96:25 131:24
exactly 18:23 27:1	132:14,17 134:4,2
45:16 105:10,11	experienced 111:24
examination 6:19	experiences 82:4
60:10.62:17.07.1	expert 3:25 41:16,1
60:10 63:17 97:14 100:7	12,15 00.5
	131:23 134:24
Examiner's 66:18	135:10
example 12:11 53:9	expertise 67:23
69:23 70:21 71:18	experts 41:11,11
71:21 79:21 83:5	explain 5:1 11:14,21
87:19 91:12 96:9	11:25 12:6,15 16:2
examples 120:20	18:4 25:16 45:15
excellent 87:20,20	51:19 72:6 74:22
88:14 112:22	81:10 91:9 115:21
exceptionally 105:7	explained 16:15 17:9
Excerpt 2:17	18:15 19:3 33:21
exchange 20:6 47:4	46:16 47:19 71:21
excuse 15:10 18:6	98:15
29:21,21 47:2,12	explaining 69:20
64:3,7 65:8 107:9	70:22 71:19 72:5,23
excused 61:3 100:21	explains 121:1
100:22	explanations 12:13
exemplifies 124:6	explore 132:24
exhibit 5:19,25 6:2,7	133:17
24:22 25:7,11,13,25	Exploring 133:7
26:1,3,9,13,16,21	expressed 22:17
28:2 43:11,15,25,25	27:23 38:16 43:1
44:1 45:4,9,11	expressing 18:11
51:20 53:5 62:7,14	extended 127:3,4
62:22 63:1 102:1,25	extension 104:20
118:5	<b>extensive</b> 97:23 98:5
exhibits 2:10 51:10	extensively 21:2
51:18 52:13,23 53:2	extent 10:11 12:25
68:14,16 119:22	13:8 16:14 30:22
existed 45:19	117:17
exists 106:21	extra 41:4
expect 55:16 89:7	extremely 70:6 87:12
	, , v.o o / .12

:6   132:2	
expected 87:15	
experience 10:20	
66:21 70:3 77:13	
83:25 85:15,21 87	. 🤈
88:2,9,20 90:12	٠.
96:25 131:24	
132:14,17 134:4,20	n
experienced 111:24	,
experiences 82:4	
expert 3:25 41:16,17	
67:12,15 68:3	
131:23 134:24	
135:10	- 1
expertise 67:23	- 1
experts 41:11,11	-
explain 5:1 11:14,21	-
11:25 12:6,15 16:21	- 1
18:4 25:16 45:15	
51:19 72:6 74:22	1
81:10 91:9 115:21	1
<b>explained</b> 16:15 17:9	
18:15 19:3 33:21	1
46:16 47:19 71:21	
98:15	1
explaining 69:20	
70:22 71:19 72:5.23	1
explains 121:1	f
explanations 12:13	1
explore 132:24	1
133:17	f
Exploring 133:7	f
expressed 22:17	f
27:23 38:16 43:1	f
expressing 18:11	fa
extended 127:3,4	
extension 104:20	
<b>extensive</b> 97:23 98:5	fa
extensively 21:2	
extent 10:11 12:25	
13:8 16:14 30:22	
117:17	
extra 41:4	
	47

		eye-witness 85:3
		F
3		F 61:18 93:10
7:	2	faced 77:10
	- [	facing 16:12 79:6
	-	84:9 110:3
20	1	fact 4:22 29:22 39:7
4		51:19 56:18 68:3
		85:25 86:25 88:6
7	1	91:21 104:9 106:7
		106:24 109:4
		115:12 116:13
		118:2 119:4,18
	1	128:25
		actor 48:2 70:13
1	Į į	actors 70:25 77:21
21	I	acts 114:18 116:24
	١.	121:6 127:22
	I	actual 125:13
_		ail 132:25
9	1	ailed 109:17 113:6
	l	119:12 127:5
		131:12
W	12	ilure 106:4 121:19
		123:16 130:12
3	£.	132:23 133:12
	12	ir 10:7 21:6 78:16
		83:15,18 86:9 90:18
- 1		90:21 91:6 99:12
- 1		irly 30:11
		irness 113:17
		ith 38:7 lse 65:10
	141 6	miliar 68:18,21,22
	1	59:1 85:12,14 09:12
1		nily 27:22 41:7
		7:9 70:5 80:22
		1:1,6,8,10,15 87:6
	9	0:16 95:6 105:21
1		23:4,24 124:7
1		29:8
f		nily's 81:5
1^		JAAJ SUL.J

- 1	far 36:10,19 57:7,10
_	70:17 80:10 95:6
-1	134:23
- 1	Farmamous 13:23
	fashion 74:1 119:1
	father 7:15
	father's 7:18
- 1	<b>fathom</b> 107:11 130:9
	fathomable 115:11
	FBI 121:3
1	ear 22:2,12 33:22
1	34:17
I	ears 22:11,19
1	February 8:8 26:6
E	31:3,5 44:12 62:17
f.	ederal 91:13 127:11
1	eel 10:10 13:6 16:25 19:21 114:17
fe	ellow 91:22 94:3
fe	elt 15:24 18:5,11
^`	22:4,5 30:5,22
	33:20 38:3 41:22,23
	41:24 48:10 106:22
	128:18
	eld 67:15
	ty-thousand 41:5
fig	ure 3:19 50:2
fil	e 4:19 5:5 44:17
	50:3 52:19 73:7
9	95:16,17,19 96:13
1	01:20,23 104:13
	12:1
file	ed 49:2,12 101:18
I	10:22 114:16
	18:4 121:21
IIII) æn	ng 49:10 95:25
	70:16
	880:7
caars Rin	al 99:14,16 100:25 ally 111:22
ind	133:24 34:8 49:11
70	0:5 78:12 80:24
89	9:3 93:19 94:23
	5:1 108:14,22
- 0	-12 100,17,22

# AL AN SYED VS. STATE OF M. YLAND October 25, 2012 BEFORE JUDGE MARTIN P. WELCH

		11111	WELCH
			Page 147
111:18 118:23	100:6	1	Page 147
123:7 130:8 13	5.12 Cu. 340	friends 38:18 42:	14   90.7:21 12:7.24 16.21
Tinds 68:2 121:10	113:7	58:13 124:9	21:14:22:10:21
fine 51:13 55:15	1 -10.7	from 4.70 10 00	31:14 33:10 35:10
75:10	following 24:13,1	9 82:10 86:10 87:	_   1 10.10 40:21
finish 124:13	30:8 59:9 74:5		
firm 64:11 65:1,13	follows 6:15 61:1	Frye 107:20 126:2	1 22 27 10 63 71
76:7		1 124.7	12.7 /3.1 /4.0 1
firmly 126:3	footage 31:15 36:	13   <b>fulfill</b> 103:16	76:11,11 80:6 83:10
firms 64:3	40:18	full 15:5 93:11	85:6,8 86:1 89:4
first 2:14 3:24 5:2	footnotes 114:9	fully 134:2	99:4 103:5 108:18
6:13 9:13 10:15	forced 134:5	fundraising 51:5	109:7 110:12
15:7 18:22 19:24	forcing 78:25	further 37:2 55:1,6	111:18 112:14,15
20:25 26:4,20,21			112:21 122:22
28:13 31:20 33:25	foreseeable 126:17	1 11/.10 100	1 134.10
34:24 37:4,20 39:	forethought 122-12	Furthermore 128:2	-55.12
40:11 44:14 57:2	1   Torget 126:13	future 101:3	0 0 0 0 1.12 01.13
63:7 65:1,2 67:10	form 53:25 70:15	101.5	121:3
72:7 77:23 83:23	1	G	going 12:1 13:13 15:8
86:19 96:19 98:1	formed 65:5,11	G 3:1	15:20,22 16:11
103:6,13,17 104:2	fortified 27:3	gamble 72:3 76:24	17:10 19:11 23:3
109:17,20 121:18		81:13	24:21 29:18 30:3 18
127:24 128:14,19	forward 27:19 94:6	gang 135:6	30:24 34:10 35-3 9
129:25 131:11,12	120:14 125:19	garnered 124:16	40:22 43:24 46:14
131:15 132:25	128:25	gathered 47:23	47:3,14,16 48:23 23
133:19 135:14	forwarded 43:9	gathering 118:2	48:24 51:8.9.13
first-degree 35:5	found 4:19 5:4 31:1	general 69:12 72:2	55:9 71:4 72:13 25
78:2 79:6 83:5	40:6 41:15 50:1	93:3	73:13 74:14 75:7.9
123:22	71:17 74:2 86:21	General's 64:2	/3:14 76:11 77:5
fit 115:5	104:13 110:24	generally 97:1	80:17 81:11.12
five 40:10 52:2 78:10	115:14 116:16	generate 88:1 90:10	82:10 83:6.7 85.4
96:7,8,16 112:7	132:23	genesis 79:24	86:6 88:13,15 89:4
115:12	four 7:4 52:2 56:25	geographical 75:13	91:2 95:13 96:11
flavor 89:25	57:15 72:6	getting 19:7 73:15	98:15,16 99:8,9
flexible 3:21	Fourth 64:18 66:25	74:6 85:9 92:24,24	107:15 115:10
flip 76:4	72:9	124:4	118:14 124:18
flipping 52:10	frame 114:21 120:11	girlfriend 23:7 93:25	125:11 128:24
Flohr 20:6	framed 106:4	gist 12:13 114:3	135:21
fluid 99:22	frankly 99:20	give 12:10 54:4 74:8	gong 31:22
Flynn 65:6,16	Frederick 64:10	74:9 76:9 85:4	good 3:4,10 6:21,22
focus 40:21 49:8	free 52:2 96:21	94:24 95:1	6:25 13:7 22:10
I follow 100 care	Freund 133:6	given 128:6	23:23 24:1 38:9.10
118:19	friend 23:7 28:9	gives 117:11	38:10,19 62:1 63:19
follow-up 19:12 95:2	29:16 45:21 94:6,6	giving 18:9	63:20 69:9 74:14
mp 19.12 95:2	105:15	gleamed 34:1	75:18,19 79:16 86:8
			88:8 94:14 117:1,6
_			

ACCUSCRIBES TRANSCRIPTION SERVICES

	117.9 120.16	
	117:8 130:16 Gordy 67:1	
	gotten 50:23 132:20	
	graduation 64:6	,
	grandmom 94:2	
	grandmother's 27:1	7
	grant 53:25 97:1	. /
	granted 53:20 106:1	0
	122:3	0
	grasp 13:7	
	Gray 65:16	
	great 12:14,24 13:8	
	16:13 30:22 86:12	
	113:20,23	
	greater 22:3,12	
	Grievance 66:17	À
	grows 70:23	
	guess 6:24 9:25 10:4	- 1
	10:11 12:25 13:19	
	13:20 15:11,17	- 1
	22:12 27:20 36:4	
I	42:23 51:21 53:17	
ı	53:19,25 54:3 66:11	
l	100:25 131:19	
ı	guidance 117:11	-
l	guilty 15:19,25 17:10	
	17:24 47:4 71:17	1
	72:17,23 76:23 78:3	1
	108:17 113:9	
	129:15 134:10	1
	Gutierrez 2:15,20	
	5:10,18 8:25 9:2,10	
	9:14,24 10:6,7	
	11:14,21 12:5,21	1
	13:10 14:14 15:1	1
	16:16 17:8,13 18:9	1
	18:23,25 20:6,7	1
	21:20 22:17,22 31:8	ŀ
	31:17 32:16,22 33:1	ŀ
	33:10,17 34:2,14	l l
	35:14 37:3 38:25	h
	39:17 40:8,12,14,16	
	41:1,10 43:1,9	h
	44:16 45:16,25 46:7	
		1

46:16 48:9,9 49:5 56:11,12,16 69:2 86:22 92:16 98:1 100:10,14 101:19 102:13,15 104:10 104:18 106:12 107:10 109:9,16 110:19 111:18 113:18 114:5 115:13 117:24 118:25 119:6 121:10 125:7,17 128:14,18 129:21 131:9 132:19 135:15  Gutierrez's 4:19 5:5
31:24 40:24 104:13
105:20
guy 30:5 47:20
guy's 91:14
guys 16:10 18:4
29:14 47:21 48:1
83:23,24 111:3

#### H Hae 21:13 34:5 36:3 36:17 38:2,14,15,16 41:15 57:2,13,25 58:20 59:2,4,19 60:12 115:22 116:6 116:14,17 118:17 Hae's 121:5 hair 41:15 half 47:24 93:10,11 ham 71:19 hand 107:14 112:22 hand-holding 70:4 hand-in 112:21 handling 77:10 hands 85:2 124:5 handwriting 5:14 44:24 104:14 handwritten 2:12 5:8 92:13 119:24

honnon 54 01 55	
happen 54:21 72:6	
88:19 97:10 132:1	5
134:11	
happened 22:1 27:2	
48:13 77:16 105:3	,4
117:12 122:7	
130:16 134:16	
happens 80:2	
hard 74:5 80:25	
107:10 130:8	
harm 96:9,9,11,12	
harsh 75:18	
hasn't 93:13 109:5	
hate 135:3	
haven't 87:23	- 1
he'd 112:14,16	1
he's 50:6 52:19 58:23	
91:15 104:14,14,16	- 1
115:21 120:12	-
123:20 129:12	-
head 30:2 116:7,10	1
hear 20:11,12,13,17	
21:9 40:2 111:12	I
heard 20:9 34:24	1
49:14,17,18,21	1
68:19 85:13,22,23	1
86:4,7,11,12 91:5	
98:9 105:5 106:14	1
106:15 107:6	P
	1
108:13,25 109:5,8	١.
113:15 122:1,1,23	1
123:19 124:12	
128:5 132:5 137:5	ŀ
hearing 1:14 4:17	
8:16 69:22 70:1	H
71:8,15 87:1 96:8	ŀ
103:7,7 119:13,23	h
128:17 131:5	
135:14	F
hearings 11:1 15:7	
17:5 34:1	
hearsay 106:1,5	
heart 41:2 90:10	
han-il 77 01 10 5 6	

heavy 117:21			
heels 125:4			
heinous 123:22			
127:22			
held 49:25 50:4,12			
96:2,15 112:2			
121:20 122:2			
Hello 97:18,19			
help 27:15 120:6			
134:14			
helped 84:19 105:22			
hereunto 137:13			
hey 111:5			
hidden 71:13 94:4			
hide 124:10			
high 7:22 29:18 70:8			
75:17 108:2 117:4			
118:7,10 124:3,4			
125:16			
high-profile 127:21			
131:10			
highlight 134:7 Hill 91:13			
hire 9:4			
hired 9:5,6			
history 132:16			
Hmm 55:21			
hold 49:21 66:13			
96:5,6,19 97:1,5			
135:21			
holding 71:12			
holiday 36:16			
home 35:10 47:14			
48:23	ı		
Homeland 105:9			
homes 117:8			
homicide 66:12 83:9			
84:10 127:25	I		
Honor 3:4,10,17,23			
4:4,7,15 5:1,4,21,23	1		
6:8 12:1 13:2 17:16			
24:15 25:6,9 26:8			
26:12 29:9 43:10			
45:3,7,13 51:8			

heavily 77:21 125:2

October 25, 2012 BEFORE JUDGE MARTIN P. WELCH				
52:21,25 53:3,13,14 53:23 54:4,11,12 55:6,15 56:2 60:7 60:23,25 61:6,21 62:1,6,20 63:3,16 67:7,11,18,20 68:1 85:25 97:15 100:4 100:20,24 101:6,13 101:17 102:2,7,10 102:11 103:2,5 106:16,18 108:11 109:12 110:6,16 111:15,22,24 113:19,24 114:8,13 114:15,19 116:21 116:25 117:6,23 118:3 119:21 121:9 121:18 122:7,10 123:7,12,15 124:15 126:15,22 127:16 128:12 129:16 131:18 132:5,13 135:20 136:1,2 Honorable 1:12 64:1 Honors 7:23 24:3 hopefully 109:23 hopes 113:5 hoping 3:20 house 58:9,11,15,18 58:19,20,22,23,24 59:2,4 60:2,13 69:24	54:22,23 67:20,23 68:7 72:10,11,16 80:3,3 99:21 119:20 121:18 123:16 126:12 I'm 3:5,21 6:7 12:1 13:13,21 16:12 17:16 20:20 21:8 23:3 24:21 29:7 30:3,11 31:22 36:17 37:10 40:22 43:24 46:14 49:16 51:8,8 52:10,11,12 53:19 53:23 54:16,18 55:3 55:11,14 56:15,20 58:17 60:20 66:15 66:16 67:7 70:21 72:4 73:11 74:6 76:7,22 77:1,18 78:19,25 79:22 81:7 84:14 86:6 92:2,22 95:13 96:3 99:7,8 99:24 107:8 108:6 109:12 112:7 114:4 114:4 119:9 124:18 126:13 132:9 133:9 135:24 I've 50:25 54:17 66:19,23,24 77:15 77:15 80:8,20,25 83:5 85:23,24 86:12	immediately 29:23 31:9 33:1 40:7 impact 54:9 70:24 79:10 importance 71:3 107:21 important 16:18 27:1 48:13 66:9 70:6,18 71:1 75:5 76:24	indicate 121:19 indicated 35:14 36:6 indicates 122:5 indication 86:2 indicted 71:19 indictment 69:22 71:16.17.22	
housed 18:1 46:20 54:16 huge 104:25 humor 87:14 hurt 95:21	87:23 88:11 89:12 90:24 91:1,2 92:2 97:12 118:4 123:18 ID 2:10 idea 4:8 18:19 30:16 124:16 130:16 identified 118:5	incarceration 51:4 54:9 incidences 65:8 incidents 77:17 inclined 55:11,12 included 57:20 incogitable 91:24	informed 39:24 43:5 76:9 134:2 infraction 52:1 96:21 initial 11:1 15:7 54:6 initially 4:20 8:11 15:12 79:25 93:24 inmate 46:24 inmates 11:2 18:2	
<b>I'd</b> 7:11 19:4 25:6 52:5,6 62:6 68:6 69:11 75:2 84:2 89:19 103:5	identify 115:2 ignore 82:8 ignored 82:14 image 93:12 imagine 4:10 82:19	incorporate 101:18 101:22 114:24 incorporated 101:1 incriminating 111:14 indefinitely 96:5,6	46:4 74:3 innocence 52:8 56:8 76:14 77:2,8 123:20 128:13 129:1,4,7 135:8	

Page	150
------	-----

immoon.415.10.55.44
innocent 15:19 56:11
56:13,16 76:17 81:7
81:12,12 84:14
inquiry 89:8
insisting 83:4
insists 76:14
institute 67:2
Institution 7:2
instructions 109:7
insufficiency 107:8
intellect 122:16 123:4
intelligence 123:4
intelligent 87:12
108:16,19
intended 50:5
intending 4:7
intention 3:23 129:11
intentionally 66:7
interact 9:25
interactions 9:23
10:5 113:16
interest 88:19
interesting 120:9
123:7 125:25
interests 41:2
interim 21:19
interject 120:22
126:10
interjecting 121:6
interpreted 93:9
intervals 14:10
interview 91:24,25
92:1,3,4 94:20
interviewed 59:8
91:22 93:19 94:13
118:19 124:21
interviewing 130:4
interviews 128:19
intimated 43:1
intimidated 10:10
introduce 4:25 62:7
110:23
ntroduced 29:15
43:14 104:12,22

introducing 101:25 :7 introduction 45:5 52:22 investigate 91:19 94:20 95:2,9 103:14 103:15 106:4,9,12 117:14 119:7,8 129:22 130:8 investigation 117:16 117:19 121:7 investigator 94:23 107:13 **involve** 80:22 involved 9:7 66:23 68:19,23 73:11 76:12 79:20 97:20 97:24 99:9 108:10 117:7 120:13 121:7 123:23 127:23 isn't 120:13 134:22 issue 4:16 17:12,23 17:23 21:22 45:25 46:8,15 53:15 69:17 90:2,6 91:8 93:15 105:24 106:3 107:16,16,21 111:23 112:18,18 112:19 127:13 131:6 132:22 133:18,20 135:18 135:22 issues 11:5,6 71:3 72:17,22 103:7,8,11 112:21 it's 15:18 25:1 26:4,5 26:21 28:21 29:10 34:9 36:16,20 38:2 40:16 44:16 51:10 51:21-55:8 56:4 62:8,10,11,15 65:16 66:2,9,10 69:9,21 69:23 70:18 71:12 71:18,23 72:21 73:10,12 74:5,12,13

74:20 75:18,19 76:24 77:24 78:24 78:24,25 79:13,17 79:19 80:4,9,14 81:4,10,14 82:2 83:2,12 85:7,8 87:24,24,25 88:7,18 89:5 91:19,20,23 94:9,10,11 99:5,22 102:14 103:22 105:8 106:5,5,10 107:10 108:21 110:9,10 112:7 115:11 116:24 117:8 123:11,14 125:3 126:16 127:22 128:9,13 134:20

J jail 2:12 5:13 9:21 11:3 15:9 18:1 40:8 40:9 46:5,19,22 47:21 48:1 73:21 74:4 76:17 77:8 81:2,2,12 89:9 95:3 jailhouse 89:10,10 January 28:20 29:4,7 29:25 31:2 35:20 56:22 59:3 118:7,17 120:8 **Jay** 20:19,22,23 21:6 21:12 36:2,11,24 37:23 38:1,17,21 45:22 47:13 111:12 115:6,8,12,21 116:8 116:11 124:2,4 **JI** 74:4 job 112:22 117:1 John 64:1,8 judge 1:12 20:5,8,13 49:13,16,17,18,18 49:21 50:9,15 53:21 54:2,6 64:1,7,8,10

67:1,2 68:19,20 71:12 72:19 79:9,13 79:19,22,23 82:9,12 83:10,11,12,13,13 83:14,20 84:1 85:13 85:18,22,23 86:4,7 86:11,12,21 87:2,6 87:7,9,11,12,20,20 89:4 90:22,24,25 91:1,3,5 96:4,18,23 97:3 98:2,9,9 99:4,5 99:7,8,9,10,11,13 99:20 100:1 108:10 110:1,15 122:1,1,23 124:12 127:11.13 128:4,4 129:19 judge's 83:23 97:7 judges 54:21 68:18 77:17 79:15 87:12 96:25 judgment 117:17 119:6 judgments 117:22 judicial 67:2 70:9 July 65:3 juncture 111:20 June 64:15 65:12 jurisdictions 71:24 juror 20:9 jury 11:8,11 71:5,6 72:2,9,14,23,24,25 75:9,10 83:24 85:3 88:8,10 93:18 94:17 115:14 128:20 jury's 72:3 103:23 justice 69:18 70:4 73:1 134:5 **Justin** 1:17 3:10 23:10,11 28:3,5,8 30:3 62:1 juvenile 8:4 46:20,21 69:17 K

Vadble 140 c
Kathleen 1:18 3:7
61:23 67:2 68:24
keep 39:7,10 55:9
76:5,9 81:15
Keeping 123:20
Kevin 68:23 106:14
106:15,21
kid 33:14 132:15
134:4
kids 117:5,6,8
kill 36:17
killed 36:3 82:25
124:4
kind 16:13 20:17
27:3 61:20 70:6
74:10 76:13 84:10
85:3 86:2 89:17
95:11 126:16 130:5
kinds 77:11
king 79:16 122:18
knew 12:25 13:3,4
23:14,15,19,20 36:7
37:24 42:15 57:1,11
57:16
know 10:2,3,17,21,23
10:24 11:3,11,18
15:17 16:9,10,10,24
18:2,14,17,20 20:16
21:1,2 23:4,6,13.20
24:9 27:23 29:18
30:3,4,4,6,6,6,17,23
31:25,25 33:11,23
34:13 36:3 39:15
42:10 43:2,21,23,23
46:2,3 47:20 49:6,9
57:2,7,11 58:24
60:3 66:10 69:21
71:10,18 72:3,4,10
72:25 73:2 74:14,21
74:24 75:8,8,13,14
75:15,19 77:5,9
78:3 8 14 70:2 2 6
78:3,8,14 79:2,3,5
79:17,18 81:16,25
82:7 84:3 88:8,17

89:2,3,6,15,21,23 90:5,6,13,14,16 91:4,17,18 93:22 94:1 97:11 99:4,11 99:18,20 104:21 105:17 106:20 107:10 108:12,19 110:7,10,22 111:3 111:23 112:20 115:8 120:6,9,25 123:25 129:5,9 132:4,21 135:6,10 knowledge 49:23 69:6 98:23 114:5 known 28:9 50:11 123:9 knows 81:14 94:3,3 110:16 Korean 70:21

L L 53:2 lack 38:7 Lafler 107:20 126:23 127:3,8 134:6 lapsed 127:6 large 102:16 Larry 51:15 late 87:17 113:18 law 5:10,17 6:14 13:20 31:24 32:1 39:20 63:8,21,23,23 63:25,25 64:5,11,20 64:23 66:15,18,22 66:24 69:4 87:6 92:14,15 103:13,13 105:10 107:17 122:14 132:21 lawyer 8:21,24 13:20 16:2 31:25 33:15 42:1 89:8,16 95:5 113:9,10 133:15 134:13 lawyers 89:10,10

lay 15:16 111:19 leadership 66:13 **leading** 12:2,17 Leakin 115:21 116:19 learn 35:4,22 46:18 learned 80:25 105:11 leave 54:23 leaves 91:4 leaving 34:6 92:23 led 38:6 48:5 125:12 Lee 21:13 34:5 36:3 36:17 38:2,14,15,16 57:2,13,25 59:19 115:22 116:6 118:17 Lee's 41:15 58:20 59:2,4 60:13 116:14 116:17 left 65:5 116:21 leg 35:8,8 legal 15:18 16:8 66:14 72:17,22 74:5 100:13 133:18 length 126:19 **lengthy** 55:16 75:18 lesser 47:4 50:7 let's 4:11 25:19 56:1 56:4 79:22 89:2 99:9 130:17 letter 2:13,14 20:9 25:1,4,17,18 26:4 26:20 29:8,24 44:8 44:16,20,24 45:17 46:1 48:8,8 101:18 102:13,14,17 105:21 118:4,6 119:24 120:5,11,23 129:24,25 letters 25:20,22 26:24 27:3,7,10,11,25 28:1,12,13,16,19 29:2 31:7,12 39:22 39:22,23 40:13

81:15 83:6 92:10 104:3,4,4,5 107:3 112:10 119:21 120:21 level 74:1 112:15 Lewis 13:16,18 liar 20:6,10,11,14 librarian 28:23 46:25 library 5:7 27:5 29:10,13 30:10,12 30:14 31:15 32:11 40:18 46:19,22,22 94:16 105:14 118:14,14 120:1,5 lie 94:5,7 110:23 lied 41:23 lies 109:22 134:20 **life** 7:10 35:5,6,13 47:16 48:25 50:2,8 53:10,11 54:8,8,23 78:2 79:6,6 82:23 83:1,2,7,9 84:9,11 90:16 96:11 110:3 112:12,13,17 123:2 134:6 light 115:20 120:16 122:10,25 limit 50:10 **limited** 60:24 line 86:7,14,15 link 95:4 list 104:23,25 105:1,2 listed 129:24 listen 16:23 86:9 little 3:20 29:17 48:6 73:4 78:10,14 80:16 82:1 87:18 99:1 112:11 130:24 live 7:14 131:4 lived 34:11,19 114:20 lives 106:16 lock-up 109:2 111:4 131:25 locked 50:24

long 7.2 5 21 1 5 1		312	Page 152
long 7:3,5 21:16,13	1 3- 1 0 2 1 1 3 2	,15 <b>Masud</b> 7:18 118:7	20.1.45.5
23:6 41:20 44:11	59:22,25	match 41:16	39:1 46:2,13 47:9
55:20,22 72:16 7	00.17	matched 115:4,5	47:18,19 48:4,5,18
95:15,23 96:1	magistry 79:14	material 73:9	50:18 51:6,25 52:4
110:10 112:1	magnot 24.5	materials 68:7	52:17 69:8 72:21
longer 48:20 96:17	mail 73:21	matter 3:3 30:21 38	74:12,19,22,24 75:9
123:20	mailed 120:11	61:20 88:0 121 22	1 1110 17120 01.24
longest 4:9	main 111:12	61:20 88:9 121:22 130:23 137:4	02,12,17,03,11,21
look 28:25 38:13	maintain 77:7 124:	8 mettored 20 11 10	84:22 85:25 86:10
51:17 54:21 78:5	maintained 50.05	8 <b>mattered</b> 38:11,19 48:15	88:15 89:14 90:22
83:3,5,15 84:15,23	3   56.7 128.12 120.4		91:3,5,20,22 93:16
84:25 85:10 91:17	maintaining 77:2	7,7 matters 87:7 100:13	93:25 94:4,7 95:3
110:12 117:23	81:7 129:1 135:7	_	95:20 97:9 99:7,22
122:6	major 107:16	maximum 54:17	110:7 112:14,14
looked 33:6 34:14	majority 66:7,8	McClane 2:13,14 5:6	113:25 114:1
48:9 98:14 111:11	making 36:14 70:22	5:7 23:4,4 25:2,21	127:23 134:22
124:3	76:12 84:16 102:15	1 1,32 U31 T J 1,0,14	means 71:17 122:14
looking 76:4 83:12	malice 122:14	1 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	meant 33:12 122:13
89:18 91:20,21	man 91:12	39:14,23,24 40:4	measure 117:21
looks 33:14 118:3	managed 115:18	41:14,23 42:21,25	media 1:24 15:20
loop 76:6	manager 52:18	43:4,4,17 44:19	124:17 137:7
loopholes 73:11	manipulate 122:19	45:19 48:8 49:7	medium 54:19,24
lose 35:12	122:21	92:11 94:21 104:3	meeting 9:19,22
lost 120:7	manipulated 122:22	104:21 105:2,5,11	13:10 32:3 126:2
lot 18:2 21:12 23:24	manipulation 122.11	105:12,14,24 119:4 119:25 120:21	member 105:8
24:10 36:1,12,14,15	manipulative 124:13	121:14 130:23	members 9:5
36:19 47:21 51:5,5	manner 9:24	McClane's 92:8	memory 27:3,8
51:6 54:21 66:4	map 116:16,17,19,20	104:24 120:21	119:20
70:4 71:4,16 78:20	March 26.5 22 44.0	121:15	mental 93:12
81:22,25 82:10 88:7	119:25 120:23	Md 133:22	mentally 113:5
90:3 112:21 120:23	137:14	Meade 2:5 3:25 61:5	mention 12:8 28:3
124:16	Margaret 2:5 3:25	63:4,5,6,12,14,19	29:20,21 39:14,15
lots 69:25 124:17	63:4,6,12	65:4,16 67:12 68:2	44:18
love 86:10 122:21	marijuana 124:3	68:6 97:18 100:19	mentioned 13:9
lower 112:15 lunch 3:20	MARK 2:10	107:6 108:13,25	17:21 24:2 28:6,25
	marked 24:21 25:24	110:11 111:2,3,17	29:24 31:21 32:25
luncheon 61:13,15	43:25 51:10 102:5	111:23 112:6 117:9	35:17 42:4 48:16
Lutherville 1:23	markings 121:5	128:8 131:23	57:8 77:12 81:18
lying 92:1 93:17 123:23	MARTIN 1:12	134:11 135:9	85:12 86:13 92:5
Lynn 51:23	<b>Maryland</b> 1:4,5,23	Meade's 67:22 117:2	99:3
LJ III 31.43	3:6 61:22 63:13	120.11 1m	mentioning 41:3
M	64:14,20 66:18		mentor 66:23
ma'am 56:9,18 57:4	133:22 137:4	19:11,21 20:15,16	Merzbacher 109:13
50.7,10 37.4	Mason 133:9,10	27:19 34:15 37:21	109:15 125:3,14,17
		0 5 57.21	125:23 126:6,16

131:7,10	
message 4:2	
messages 73:12	
met 9:10,13 30:2,4	
40:5 43:6,17 93:2	1
mic 6:17	I
Michael 13:16,18	
middle 23:8 28:10	
36:16,19	
mill 127:24 135:2	
Miller 137:20	
	_
Min 57:2,13,25 58:2	0
59:2,4 115:22 116:	6
116:14,17 118:17 mind 22:20 27:8	
28:22 20:20 22 22	_
28:22 29:20,22 30:	1
33:12 35:6,9 47:13	
47:25 48:12 121:2	
123:20 127:21	78
mine 23:7 28:9	1
minimal 53:9 70:3	-
minuses 134:14	1
minute 44:3 56:25	1
94:8 114:21	1
minutes 34:9,12 40:10 87:17	1
	1
miraculously 94:10	1
misleading 130:24	ı
missed 5:2 95:24	l
missing 57:2,8,11,12 73:13 108:7	1
	1
Missouri 126:24	1
mistrial 19:25 20:2	
20:18,22 21:15	
37:15 86:20 87:25	1
88:1,3 108:23	r
111:10 128:16,17	n
135:13,15	
mistrials 87:22	ŋ
mitigating 70:25 73:8	
89:22	
modification 49:2,21	
50:3,4,16 53:9,15	
54:1,7 95:14,17,20	

_		
	111:22 112:2 121:17,20 122:25	69:5,13 71:19 7 73:5 75:4 78:2
	modify 53:8 96:5,1	4 81:6,6 82:1,4 83
_	modifying 96:24	84.23 01.10 02.
1	moment 60:4 101:9	104:7,8 105:17
	114:18	113:2 123:22 13
	moments 113:21,23	murdered 115:22
	Monday 30:8	murders 65:25 66
	money 9:4 41:24	70:7,7 81:20,22,
	113:12	90:5,5
	month 31:2	Murnby 1.19 2.24
0	months 57:19 72:19	3:4,7 4:5,6,20 5:2
6	moot 67:4	5:23 12:1 17 12:0
	morning 3:5,10 6:21	25:8,9 26:11,12
- 1	6:22	45:6,7 52:24,25
1	mosque 38:10 124:9	53:12 54:10 55:8
-	mother 7:15 27:17,2	3 55:12,15,25 56:2,
	27:24 42:23 94:1	60:4,7,12,24,25
1	113:16	61:19,21,24 62:19
	mother's 7:17	62:20 67:19,20,22
1	motion 43:21 46:1,8	68:1,24 97:14,15,
	49:2,10,21 50:16	97:19 100:3,9,16
ı	53:15,22 54:1,6	101:5,6,16,17 102
	67:9 95:17,19 96:2	102:6,9,10,14 103
	96:5,13 97:1,2	110:14 114:14,15
1	100:25 111:22	123:15 125:25
	112:2,9 121:17,20	126:5,14,15 129:1
1	121:21 122:2,25	130:7,11 135:13
ľ	notions 73:7 95:14	136:2
	notive 119:20	100.2
n	nounting 85:10	N
n	nove 5:20 26:8 45:3	N 3:1 61:18,18,18
	52:21 67:11 74:3	64:1
	80:12	name 6:17,18 7:17,18
moved 33:13		8:18 23:9,10 31:21
moving 128:25 131:6		42:4 63:10 64:11
m	ultiple 125:18	65:1 68:8 104:24
	126:19	137:14
murder 17:6 18:7		named 5:10 13:16
,	19:5,6 22:7 29:11	14:3 23:4 28:3
30:18,19,24 35:5,23		names 7:16 13:13
37:23 45:23 47:13		70:16
-	52:13 65:18,21,24	nationally 134:18
(	66:1 67:13,17 68:4	nature 12:2,17 51:11
	1	

69:5,13 71:19 72 73:5 75:4 78:2 79 81:6,6 82:1,4 83:	9:6	
84:23 91:10 92:2	0	
104:7,8 105:17	۱ ۱	
113:2 123:22 135	:2	
murdered 115:22	- 1	
murders 65:25 66:3	3,3	
70:7,7 81:20,22,2	5	
90:5,5 Mumber 1 10 2 2 4		
Murphy 1:18 2:24		
3:4,7 4:5,6,20 5:22 5:23 12:1,17 13:2	4	
25:8,9 26:11,12		
45:6,7 52:24,25	-P	
53:12 54:10 55:8 1	۸ .	
55:12,15,25 56:2,6	0 1	
60:4,7,12,24,25		
61:19,21,24 62:19	1.	
62:20 67:19,20,22	n	
68:1,24 97:14,15.13	7	
97:19 100:3,9,16		
101:5,6,16,17 102:2	2	
102:6,9,10,14 103:2	2	
110:14 114:14,15		
123:15 125:25	n	
126:5,14,15 129:17	ne	
130:7,11 135:13 136:2		
130.2		
N		
N 3:1 61:18,18,18		
64:1	l i	
name 6:17,18 7:17,18	Ιí	
8:18 23:9,10 31:21	ne	
42:4 63:10 64:11	4	
65:1 68:8 104:24		
13/:14		
named 5:10 13:16 14:3 23:4 28:3		
names 7.16 12.12		
70.16 n		

	Page 1	53	
:1	55 1 01 1		
9:6	55:1 81:6 126:18	3	
	127:21,21 133:1	6	
5 0	near 38:1,2		
U	nearly 31:1		
	necessarily 74:25		
:2	106:6,10,10 112:	13	
, , ]	132:13		
3,3	need 3:22 19:21 25	:3	
5	30:16,22 40:21 41	1:4	
	41:13,17 56:3 70:	4	
	70:5 74:14 76:12		
2	79:2,3 84:14 125::	22	
	133:23		
-1	needed 22:4 30:23		
	41:19 118:22		
0   1	needs 120:2,15		
- 1	negotiating 78:9	- 1	
1	negotiation 84:12,13	3	
- 1	126:25		
r	negotiations 72:14	- 1	
7	75:6,25 76:3,15	- 1	
	77:20 78:7,14 79:1	1	
2	82:9,11 85:6 86:5	- 1	
?	91:1 108:8 126:18	- 1	
	132:24 133:7 135:4		
	eutral 79:14		
n	ever 16:12 17:22	1	
	30:21 35:9 39:24		
	72:25 77:15,16 82:7	/	
1	82:14,17,17,17	1	
	90:24 91:1,2 93:21	1	
	104:22 105:18	1	
1	109:9 113:7 120:13	1	
	123:12 132:18	1	
ne	ew 42:1 43:22 46:2	1	
4	46:8 88:3,4	1	
Ne	ewman 133:4	1	
ne	ws 15:9,9	1	
	wspaper 15:11,21	1	
Newton 1:20			
nice 30:5 87:13			
100:21			
nicknamed 80:8			
night 56:22 115:22			

	118:17				
	nonsense 87:15				
	norm 69:10				
	normal 5:16 104:17				
	norms 69:6				
	North 7:2 63:12				
	76:20,21				
	Nos 53:5				
	notarized 43:6,7				
	note 4:19 5:4,6,8,9,12				
	67:23 104:13,24				
	107:24				
	noted 67:25 101:7				
	128:9				
	notes 2:12 92:13				
	104:15,18				
Ì	notice 130:1				
I	notified 31:9				
I	notify 31:8,10				
I	notion 129:2				
l	number 27:13,16,17				
	41:21 62:10 102:16				
	104:25 108:12				
112:3,4 137:4					
numbered 51:12					
	numbers 62:16 83:6				
	numerous 14:17				
87:22,23					
-					

O 3:1 61:18,18,18 O'Shea 59:10,16,20 object 4:23 12:1 67:22 objected 4:20 objection 5:23 12:17 13:2 25:8 26:10 45:5 52:24 53:12 54:10,14 62:19 67:21,24,25 100:16 100:16 101:5,25 102:7 106:1 123:12 128:9 obligated 73:8

obligation 95:9,9 observe 124:24 obtain 73:6 obtained 5:16 8:21 84:5 105:12 obtaining 41:25 obviously 39:18 93:21 111:23 occasionally 90:23 occasions 95:24 occurred 20:18,22 82:11 92:20 116:9 125:11 126:20 October 1:14 3:14 101:19 102:19 137:6 offense 69:15 offenses 8:4 66:3 offer 18:14 22:23 25:6 62:13 77:6 80:9,20 82:15,23,25 83:2,19 84:5 88:23 90:20,25 108:14,20 109:3,3,6,11,16,18 109:21 111:5 125:24 126:1,3,8,22 127:4,6,12,19 128:3 128:5,6 131:12,13 131:14 132:11 133:24 135:12 offered 2:8 18:17 19:1 47:7 51:2 106:5 108:9 127:10 offering 19:16 23:1 37:7,12 80:4,19 82:20 89:12 offers 80:10 99:2 127:2 office 13:11 51:4,24 64:2 66:2 80:12 82:5 officer 56:23 58:5,11 58:21 59:2,5 106:17

official 1:9 137:11 officially 9:11 oh 17:16 28:4 36:25 79:21 86:12 94:6 98:19 126:15 okay 4:5,8,11 8:20 9:7,22 10:14 14:17 15:2 18:20 19:11,23 23:13,22 25:19 29:12 30:13 32:22 34:21 35:17 37:1,9 38:24 40:22 41:25 42:17 44:8 45:24 47:7 48:16 49:8 50:22 55:18,19 56:2 57:13 61:12 64:19 65:13 67:6,11 69:11 70:11 71:2 75:2 76:4 80:21 81:18 82:13 84:2 88:2 91:7 92:5 99:21 100:18 103:4 113:15 114:12 126:9 132:6 old 7:12 69:16 93:10 older 18:3 42:18 47:21 once 22:3,22 26:25 35:14 37:1,6 40:7 47:9,24 49:4 73:9 77:19 97:3 one's 70:8 ones 76:11 ongoing 73:11 open 55:24 73:14 opening 21:10 35:24 opinion 74:18 75:23 84:4 89:17 135:22 opinions 126:23 opportunities 55:2 opportunity 4:21 16:1 21:20 22:6,10 50:6 52:6 54:25 83:22 88:4,14

111:10,11 121:24 124:24 128:15 129:15 option 72:12 76:20 79:2 134:14,16,16 134:17,19 options 17:9 76:10 79:3 84:15 85:1,11 111:19 134:12 **Oregon** 106:16,20 original 22:4 103:9 121:21 out's 46:2 outcome 116:2 119:15 121:16 134:1 outside 89:24 95:4 overrule 54:14 overwhelming 107:2 P

### P 1:12 3:1 p.m 21:11 34:9 36:1,6 36:12,13,16 38:1,2 48:14 61:16,16 92:23 120:8 136:3 packet 74:5 page 51:20 62:16 116:18 133:3 pages 62:15,17 110:10 palm 116:21 pan 35:15 39:18 43:2 panel 75:9,10 88:10 88:11 96:10,12 paper 15:10 109:14 papers 103:24 paralegal 13:19 parallels 125:14 parents 70:16 Park 115:21 116:19 parking 21:12 36:1 36:12,14,15,19 paroled 52:7

118:16

part 9:4 34:24 48:1	3   66.5 100 2
71:11 72:12 74:1	_   00.5 100.5
78:13 98:22 117:	F ochelon 22
128:22 133:7,11	Portockly 107
participate 52:3	period 81:19
54:25 55:2	person 18:17
participated 51:1,5	41:13 47:2,2
particular 14:8 35:2	/
41:21 57:17 69:13	1
75:4 78:6 83:16	
97:4 115:18 116:1	person's 23:9
117:19 121:4 133:	1 J./
135:13	I T I OVI C 1-1
particularly 29:19	persuasive 119
34:23 70:2,7 74:3	petition 61:23
79:5 81:5 93:18	68:12,15 98:1
123:22 124:15	103:9 114:8 1
127:22	125:3,4
parties 90:7 94:4	Petitioner 1:2,1
partnership 65:6,12	2:11,16 4:13 (
parts 92:18	51:9 62:5 63:4
pass 14:16 32:19	121:12,25 127
passion 122:10,13	127:18 128:2, 131:21
password 32:21	_
Pause 6:4 44:6 60:6	Petitioner's 6:6
101:12	43:25 45:4,8,1
pay 15:7	52:22 53:2,4 6
Pazmiacous 14:1	62:21,25 101:3
Peer 66:17	phase 108:1,2 1:
penalty 65:7,7,9	phone 12:12 21:
people 13:11,14 14:5	27:16,17 36:1,
14:13 15:5 16:8	36:15 37:21,24 56:24 57:23 58
34:4,4,5,6 45:21	106:15 114:24
52:1 69:21,25 71:16	
73:3,20 75:8,11,14	115:2,11 118:1 phones 40:9
75:20 76:17 81:12	
82:25 83:11 88:12	phonetic 5:11 13 13:24 14:1 20:1
88:13 89:12 105:1	23:10 42:15 51
117:4 122:20 124:9	56:23 64:4,4,5
129:5 130:6	
percent 64:24,24	119:11,11 133: phrase 89:1
66:12 79:15 107:24	physical 41:14 11
134:17	122:16 123:5
percentage 64:23	physically 38:15
5	Emigreany 29:12

66:5 108:3	
perception 22:20	
perfectly 107:7	
period 81:19	
person 18:17 38:13	
41:13 47:2,2,5	
52:17 71:1 76:8,8	
78:6 93:17 94:24	
123:1	
person's 23:9 54:22	
personally 9:7	
perspective 44:10	
persuasive 119:14	
petition 61:23 68:9	
68:12,15 98:16,17	
103:9 114:8 119:22	
125:3,4	
Petitioner 1:2,17 2:3	
2:11,16 4:13 6:13	
51:9 62:5 63:4,7	
121:12,25 127:15	
127:18 128:2,17	
131:21	
Petitioner's 6:6 43:11	1
43:25 45:4,8,10	
52:22 53:2,4 62:4	
62:21,25 101:14	I
<b>phase</b> 108:1,2 134:9 <b>phone</b> 12:12 21:11	I
27:16,17 36:1,5,14	ı
36:15 37:21,24 40:8	l
56:24 57:23 58:10	l
106:15 114:24	
115:2,11 118:18	
phones 40:9	
phonetic 5:11 13:23	
13:24 14:1 20:19	
23:10 42:15 51:24	
56:23 64:4,4,5	
119:11,11 133:11	
phrase 89:1	
physical 41:14 116:4	
122:16 123:5	

87:9 88:5,21 89:17 90:25 91:1,2 99:6 99:17 107:16,18,22 107:25,25 108:8,14 108:20,22 109:6,10 109:16,21 113:6,7,9	I
	1.

:1	0	127:12 131:6,12,13
		131:14 132:11,18
		132:10 22 24 122 7
		132:19,23,24 133:7
		133:12,13,17,24
		135:4
		plead 47:4 52:8
		108:17 129:15
		134:10
	-	<b>pleading</b> 17:10,24
	1	pleas 22:16 75:20
	1	85:24 86:8 99:2
:2		please 3:3 6:11,23
	1	31:13 32:19 44:5,17
	1	60:5 61:20 63:10
	1	plus 7:10 50:8 53:10
9	1	54.9 22 79.2 112 12
	ı	54:8,22 78:2 112:13
		pluses 134:14
	ŀ	point 4:6 22:2,4 39:3
	l	40:16,20 41:6
4		113:19 115:18
4		119:20 123:15
		125:1
	ı	pointed 32:17 120:24
ı		125:7
	ľ	ointing 128:13
	ŗ	oints 127:8 129:19
-	p	olice 56:21 60:2
1		118:16 120:1 121:1
1		124:19,21
1	p	olicy 95:16
1		orte 51:24
1		ortion 62:10,11
		osition 78:9,9 79:18
1	•	79:19 86:14,17
1	p	ositions 66:13
		ositive 52:4 82:7
		ossibility 18:15
		ossible 96:2 132:24
ľ		133:7
١,		ossibly 50:9 90:10
		105:19 108:18
		st 68:11 115:24
Į Į	<b>J</b> O	st-conviction 1:7
		1:10 3:7 42:8 61:23

60.0.100.0	
68:9 103:9 119:13	3
131:4 135:18 137	:5
post-trial 128:19	
potential 79:6 90:25	5
96:12 102:16	
104:23 118:5	
potentially 84:9	
power 114:25	
practice 18:16 27:7	
59:21 67:13,16 68:	2
69:4,7 111:25	)
118:10,20 133:2	
Practicing 64.20	
practicing 64:20	
precedent 121:19	
precipitated 33:22	
34:17	- 0
precise 87:19	- 1
precisely 105:15	- 1
predict 94:16	
prejudice 54:13	-
103:19 108:4	1
115:25 121:13,25	1
127:17,18 133:21	-
preliminary 69:22	1
70:1 71:8,15	J
premeditated 122:13	
premeditation	
127:23	1
preparation 69:12	1
prepare 85:9 117:24	
prepared 4:13 62:5	1.
87:15	[]
present 16:11 37:18	1
128:18	1
presented 37:22	ŀ
	I
103:12 128:8	l
presided 85:19	
president 122:18	p
137:20	
presiding 79:9	
press 33:8	
pressed 116:10	
pressured 106:23	
presume 59:24	

_	presumed 15:24	
5	pretty 18:16 22:9	
	23:25 30:5 87:25	
	90:2 94:11 95:23	
	112:18 125:15	
	132:12	
	prevail 22:9,13 35:4	
	35:14 48:11	
	<b>prevailing</b> 56:13 69:	6
3	112:25 133:2	•
	Prevas 64:1,8 98:2	
	primarily 93:2	
	primary 21:7 66:25	
	134:17	
	prince 122:19	
	print 116:21	
1	prior 7:12 9:10,16	
1	14:6,17,19 18:22	
	28:14 30:15 31:17	
1	31:19 64:7 88:3	
1	90:12 135:5,5	1
ı	prison 35:11,13	1
I	47:16 48:23,24 50:3	1
ı	52:18 54:17 76:11	
l	76:11 81:16 112:17	1
l	probably 4:9 25:2	1
l	26:6 49:12,25 65:25	1
l	65:25 94:17	
	problem 77:15 81:3	
ľ	108:12,12 134:3,19	
١,	problematic 124:11	
	proceed 99:19	1
	proceeding 15:12	
•	17:24 61:16 101:2	]
r	proceedings 1:9,24	ı
•	14:19,20,23 15:3	
	137:3,8	
II)	process 9:8 10:18,22	
•	10:25 11:4 69:20,21	
	70:10,23 72:10,24	
	72:24,25 73:5,11	p
	79:9 80:22,23 88:11	p
	107:18,22 108:17	p
	131:16	

produce 73:8 106:2	20
119:12 130:4,12	
produced 1:25 6:13	3
63:7 121:14 125:6	5
productive 56:4	,
professional 117:17	7
133:15	
Professor 8:19,21	
proffer 119:14 131:	3
profile 125:16	
program 7:24 24:3,5	5
24:7 66:24,24	
programs 51:1,5,6,6	
52:3 54:18,25 55:1	
123:10	
prom 122:19	
<b>prong</b> 103:17,19	
108:4 115:25	
121:12 132:25	
133:19	
proposal 83:16	- [
propose 110:16,25	-
111:15	-
proposed 99:25	1
prosecution 35:25	1
134:9	1
prosecutor 71:12	1
73:14 133:17	
prosecutor's 13:1	1
prosecutors 68:22	1
prospect 72:2	1
provable 106:10	
prove 15:14,16,23	
17:3 18:10 19:4	1
22:4,6 33:23 34:10	1
34:16 35:1 37:24,25	1
38:20 47:10 48:14	l
93:8,15 104:1,9,11	l
106:6	
proved 39:16	
proven 15:19 93:13	q
provide 30:23 42:19	g
45:20 74:22 98:11	1
131:1	q

provided 27:16 35:15 68:16 98:24 114:10 114:16 118:1,1 119:3,22 134:18 providing 85:2 91:17 133:8 psychologist 121:2 psychology 41:11 public 27:5 32:11 pull 6:24 punishment 75:18 purposes 101:24 pursue 79:5 91:16 129:11 **pursued** 109:16 pursuing 91:8 push 78:17,22,25 89:19,22 90:13 put 30:2 44:10 51:20 75:17 90:16 92:21 94:11 96:20 101:2 115:8 puts 38:1,2 105:13

#### Q

Quarles 20:5,8 68:20 86:21 87:3,7,8,9,11 87:12 98:9 128:4 question 12:18 16:19 19:1,22 53:17 56:20 60:9 78:19 80:21 83:23 103:21 109:23 125:1 131:19 questions 11:17 12:2 14:18 16:14,22 55:7 59:23 60:7,19,23 75:2 95:13 97:12 100:3,18 120:24 121:4 124:25 quite 99:20 122:5 quote 132:24 133:14 135:14 quotes 132:22

				-11/1/1/	P. WELCI	H
R						
R 3-1 61-10	reasonable	47.8 17	, 1		Pag	e 157
R 3:1 61:18 1	137:20 77:6 86:9	91.6.02	1 - Colu 3.2 h	:17 8.2		
Rabia 39:14,	19 40:4 93:6,6,8 1	07.0 93	~ 1 30.14 48.3	51.1	relationships	10:12
1 40.3.3 42.4	12.60	110	54:19,22 63	3.11 00 0	relatively 94.	9 [
1 43:17.18.10	5.5	119:6	86:1,2,3 90	10	relay 14:13	
Kanman 7-17	10		101:2 102:5	4 1	relayed 5.17	
Talse 17:12-21	.22	133:2	110:45 9 10	103:10	released 8:13	- 1
45:25 105:23	1	1 80:25	110:4,5,8,12	2,13	relevance 53:1	~ I
1 112:21	124:10		1 113.41 115.	10	54:10 67:24	2
raised 9:4 46:8	rebuttal 126:	11	120:20 122:4	1,6	elevant 92:18	
53:14 70:13 1			124:6 125:13	135:5	eliable 107	
107:17 110		7 1 2	1 130:3 137.10	13.7%	eliable 105:7	1
107:17 112:19	9:13 13:14 1	5 14.2	recorded 1.24	107 -	elied 112:25	1
126:22 127:13	14:9,20,22 1	6.5	1 ccords 36.5 37	7.22	lief 53:21,25 1	22:3
raising 129:20	19:23,23 20:	1.10.5	1 37:24 114.25	115.1	ying 125.2	_,,
ran 29:10	21:3,15 25:4,	1,18,21	115:1,2,4,5 11	re re	mained 118.0	- 1
range 62:12	25:20 26:10	5,20	124:1	re	member 8-10 c	2.10
rare 72:18	25:20 26:19,2	23 30:9	recount 27:1 30:	.   2	1:3 87:1 96:4	7.19
rate's 82:1	31:16,23 32:3	45:24	recross 60:24	1 9	8:20.21	1
RC 2:2	1 70.7.961.207	77:16	redirect 60:8,10	ren	nembered 32:1	
RD 2:2	D //:1/ 82:24		100:5,7	ren	nembering 27:	0
reached 39:25 43	Recalling 61:21	1	roduce Los	ren	uinded 40:13	14
read 10:19 13:13	4   recalls 104.6	- 1	reduced 53:10 54	:7 rem	inds 104:6	- 1
31:13 40:12 44:5	RECD 2:10		112:11	rem	otal- 121	
49:14 69 0 44:5	receive 27.0	1	reduction 50:10 5	5:5   rone	otely 121:25	- 1
49:14 68:9,11 71	:23   received 20.8 25	1 21 1	elerence 20.7		at 71:9 124:18	
71:24 132:22	25:22 26:6,20,2	1,21	101:18.21.22	1 repe	atedly 71.0	- 1
135:14	27:2,11 28:13 4	10.7	elerences 101.2	reple	ete 120:20	
real 106:21	46:24 48:8 50:8	1.23	eterred 134.0	123	3:23	
realistically 50:13	52:16 90:20 99:	r	eterring 130.25	repor	t 116:6	1
reality 75-22	104.3 107 4 10	16	usal 119.2	repor	ts 109-10	
realize 41.6	104:3 107:4 118	:18   re	fused 46:10 124:2	repre	sent 8.22 0.2	1
realized 26:25 38.0	receives 95:15 111	:25   re	gard 29:4 104:1	repre	sentation 10.2	4 l
1 41:1 47:10	receiving 31:7		105:20 119:17	133:	8	+
really 3:18 12.7 15.5	Reception 80:6		27:16	repres	ented 8:15	
15:7,13,13 16:12	receptive 87:9	rec	rardin - 1 to	14:23	2 65:18,20,24	1
18:4,12 19:4 20:15	recess 61:14,15	rea	garding 4:18 91:1	8 125:1	7	
22:18 28:22 29:20	recognize 24:22	reg	ardless 97:7 99:2			1
42:15 46:5 70:18	25:25 44:1 52:15	reg	arus 17:9	70:21	enting 66:11	1
120:10 12 120	recollection 5.15 o.	reg	ular 65:9			I
120:10,13 129:14	1 49:3,5 31:1	7.7.7.4	abilitate 112:4	reputat	ion 69:9 97:7	1.
130:22 134:18	recommendations	1 CII;	IDILItation 06.22	forest	19:3,9 22:11	
reason 39:3 94:5,18	51:3	Licie	cted 127.4 12	30:39	/:1 109-21	
94:22,23 96:12 12	recommended 46:23	reia	red 5:5 73.6	131:21	132.3	ľ.
103:24 106:10	reconsideration	13:	5:5.6	requeste	d 27:17	
117:2 128:21	49:11	relat	ionship 16:15	39:19		
129:10 130:3		38:	24 42:12 57:20	requestin	1g 53·25	
S 7/18/	reconvene 61:14	90.	7,8 124:8,11	requests	5.12 121.14	
		1	,0 124:8,11	required	133.25	
10-16C ACCU	JSCRIBES TRANS			_	-55.25	
	ニートエエリじょう コロコカカティ					

ACCUSCRIBES TRANSCRIPTION SERVICES

resolution 86:4 88:14	
resolve 75:21	•
resolved 108:3 125:5	
resolves 134:17	
resolving 75:16 83:24	
113:8	
respect 72:4 75:24	
108:4 117:13	
119:19 130:6	
respective 99:19	
respects 107:25	
respond 19:9 22:25	I
33:5	
responded 19:10	
23:1	
Respondent 1:5,18	I
2:7,19	I
response 16:20 19:15	ı
33:6,9 37:7,10,11 59:23 114:17	ı
responsibilities	l
126:25	
responsibility 133:15	
rest 35:12 47:16	
48:24 112:17	l
result 19:14	
resulted 116:23	
resumed 61:16	
retained 9:11	
retrieve 29:1 31:15	
43:10	
revealed 116:6	
review 25:3 44:3	
66:17 74:7 92:8,10	
92:13,18 96:10 101:24	1
reviewed 68:7,8,14	-
92:6 93:23 98:22	•
123:9	9
reviewing 89:24	2
revised 53:25	9
right 3:11 5:2 10:15	
	S
36:20,21 42:11	

46:12 51:2 54:16 57:1 59:5,12,17 60:2 61:1 62:2 71:5 83:21 84:25 86:21 92:4,21 98:20,25 99:13 101:4,7,15 102:8 104:4 120:11 126:5,15,21 127:10 127:11 128:17 129:3 130:24
133:18
ripped 116:18
risk 75:17
Rita 14:1
Road 1:22
rob 90:4
robbery 91:13,16
roll 73:2
room 9:21
Rosenburg 64:4
ruined 113:9
rule 73:9 96:6
rules 112:5
ruling 135:22
run 31:22 92:6
127:24 135:2,8
S
S 3:1 61:18,18,18

0 3.1 01.10,10,10
Saad 42:14
Saad's 42:23
sake 37:14 119:10
samples 41:16
sand 86:7,14
sandwich 71:19
sat 17:9 29:16
satisfied 83:19
133:19
satisfy 103:17 121:12
save 126:10,12
saw 5:7,8 19:13 31:12
34:6,7 94:8 98:1
saying 16:6 17:4 20:9
57:11 58:15 82:20

84.14.02.10.00.0
84:14 93:10 99:8
106:23 113:20
121:9 130:15
132:10
says 43:14 44:23 46:1
49:14 79:23 83:14
120:6,11 125:25
133:23 134:24
scenario 76:13 77:25
77:25 78:2,3
scenarios 99:5
scene 84:23
scent 126:4
schedule 3:14 135:23
school 7:19,21,22
23:5,6,8,8 24:3 27:4
27:4,5 28:10 29:18
29:25 30:3 32:12
34:4,4,5,7 57:10
58:2,3 59:20 63:21
63:24,25 64:5 66:22
70:18 92:24 96:22
112:16 117:4 118:8
118:8,9,10,14
science 37:22
scores 113:11
scoured 110:8
search 60:2
searching 102:4
season 36:16
seat 116:16,18
seated 3:11 62:2
second 2:13 3:24
21:16 25:18 37:16
37:19,19 38:25 39:5
72:7 77:24 85:19
89:19 102:12
107:16 109:17
121:12 125:22
128:21 130:10
131:6
econd-degree 89:22
00.11 100.0

sections 98:22 secure 29:1 33:3 40:18 security 28:24 29:1 31:15 54:17 105:9 112:15 see 4:11 15:9,16 30:3 52:12 56:1 58:24 74:6 79:22,23 84:15 88:9 89:4 111:10 117:2 121:1 128:15 seeing 15:20 22:10 100:21 seek 123:16 seeking 84:21 89:17 seeks 88:4 seemingly 121:6 seen 10:19 34:4,4 58:2,15 59:18 92:7 92:23,25 94:16 **selection** 9:8 11:9 88:10 self-authenticating 62:8 self-defense 93:14 semi-idol 98:4 semi-mentor 98:4 send 39:19 91:25 94:23 107:13 sensational 120:17 sense 10:1 12:10 15:11,19,24 27:20 50:7,11 87:14 106:10 sent 5:12 39:21 40:6 43:3,7,8,18 44:16 129:25 sentence 7:8 35:5,6 47:5 49:2,11 50:7,8 50:10,17,19 52:7 53:8,10,15 54:1,7 54:20 79:7 82:23 84:10,12 90:14,15 95:14,16,17 96:1,24

90:11 122:9

section 116:19

### ADN... SYED VS. STATE OF MA. LAND October 25, 2012 BEFORE JUDGE MARTIN P. WELCH

				Page 159
	110:3 112:1,11,12	show 15:10 24:21	gituation 15.14.15	10704445
	123:9	25:24 43:13,24 50:9	situation 15:14,15	107:21 115:9,9
	sentenced 44:19 50:2	51:9 71:10 96:21	33:15 37:5,7 41:23	specifically 16:16
	sentencing 39:10	112:4 113:1 121:25	49:7 54:20 82:8	21:10 32:17 35:24
	42:1 44:11,14 49:8	127:18,18 133:2	121:23,24 127:8	37:4 45:24 51:22
	49:15 50:5,15,15	showed 21:13 31:12	six 52:2 57:19 66:19	62:11 71:25 114:6
	54:21 122:6,7,23	36:13	slim 125:15	118:22 120:25
	129:2,13,14		small 64:3	specifies 62:12
ł	separate 65:8	showing 78:11 116:2 121:13 127:17	snack 92:24	spectrum 134:23
	series 51:10		snow 29:23 30:8	speculation 124:17
	serious 69:15 75:17	showings 115:19	society 90:18	128:10
	81:5	shown 125:9 128:2	solicit 28:16 104:4	spend 35:12 69:19
	serve 96:23	shows 15:18 117:24	Solomon 79:16	114:18
	service 1:21,21,25	side 61:10 76:5	somebody 23:4 69:17	spends 112:17
	106:19	sides 75:1 83:15	70:21 73:24 74:20	spent 119:19
	•	86:10	79:5 86:5 90:4,4,6	spite 115:14
1	serving 7:9 set 116:24	sign 106:24	90:16 91:25 94:7	split 79:17
1		signal 116:12,13	115:11 124:5	spoke 19:19 27:22
	seven 52:2 66:20	signature 45:1	somebody's 74:23	28:23 32:14 38:5
	Seventeen 7:13	signed 40:5 43:17	95:3	57:23 58:21 59:2,5
1	sex 66:3	significance 69:14	somewhat 134:25	106:15
1	sexual 57:20	84:20 91:9	son 38:9,19 81:10	stamp 44:20,22
1	sexually 125:20	significant 57:5	soon 94:11	stand 6:10 24:18
1	Sgt 51:23,24	69:19 84:22 115:16	sorry 3:5 6:7 17:16	111:13 112:23
1	Shamim 7:17	Significantly 105:13	20:20 29:7 37:10	114:19 118:20
1	share 47:22 73:16	signing 106:23	49:16 52:12 53:19	standard 89:14 93:7
1	she'd 118:2	similar 65:11	53:23 60:20 107:8	111:25
1	she's 42:10 85:18	simple 112:18	126:13 133:9	standards 133:2
1	86:8,9,9 91:6,6	simply 114:19 115:11	sort 4:11 56:1 66:10	standing 111:13
	94:10,14 105:8,8,9	116:2,4 117:8	67:4 89:25 90:7,11	stands 54:16 123:21
1	106:21,24 107:2	118:23 119:14	91:3 98:3	start 31:17,19 71:7
	111:4 120:3,4 121:7	121:18,25 124:25	sought 108:9 124:3	71:15 73:10 85:9
١	130:25	125:9,12 126:3,7	sound 94:14	124:13
	sheet 80:7,15	127:14 128:1	sounds 93:11 94:13	started 21:16 65:1
1	sheets 80:6	129:16	sources 118:2	starting 51:20
I	Sheriff 55:18	single 30:17 38:12	<b>span</b> 105:16	startling 88:1
1	Sherry 137:20	78:5	speak 6:16 16:1 19:2	state 1:4,5 2:20 3:5,6
1	shocked 40:3	sir 17:17,19 23:12	19:15 21:20 33:2,11	3:8 4:6 6:17 17:4
1	shocking 20:17	28:4 36:25 37:17	40:14 42:20 58:13	18:14,17,25 22:23
	shoes 89:7	44:9,25 49:19 50:21	76:3 79:17 86:7	45:22 47:12 61:22
	shoot 4:1	50:25 52:14 60:15	129:2	61:24 62:12 63:10
	short 40:9 41:8,20	60:18,20,21	speaking 105:14	67:8 69:24,24 72:7
	85:11 88:15	sister 42:16,18	speaks 116:22 128:23	72:12 73:7 74:1,11
	shortly 94:9	sitting 20:7 76:17	Special 64:7,9	76:22 77:6 78:8,20
	shouldn't 83:14	111:3 131:25	specific 35:17 100:12	79:18,20,25 80:4,20
L				

# ADN... SYED VS. STATE OF MA. LAND October 25, 2012 BEFORE JUDGE MARTIN P. WELCH

			rage 100
81:3 83:12,14 88:4	109:20 131:11,12	06.2 6 16 10 07.2 5	70.00.70.14.50.10
89:1,2,11,19 90:20	131:15	96:2,6,16,19 97:2,5 112:2 121:20 122:2	70:22 73:14 78:19
91:3 93:7,7,13,15	step-by-step 40:23	135:22	92:7 101:11 106:22
95:1 99:10,21,25	steps 96:22	subject 33:13 42:25	109:12 112:7 132:6
102:15,15 103:2	stet 72:11	49:6	132:9
104:22 108:9 109:3	stipulation 4:18,21	submit 103:10 105:6	surprise 135:24
109:7,24 111:6	stories 15:9,10	106:17 107:1	surprised 27:9,11,20
117:15 119:18	story 41:20 115:8	130:21	40:2,3
121:11 122:11	straightforward	subscribed 137:13	surprising 93:20
124:25 126:17	109:25	subsequent 32:25	surrounding 94:15 surveillance 32:18
127:19 128:9	strangled 116:7	42:22	33:3 36:13
129:20,24,25	123:23	succeed 130:18	suspend 83:1,2,9
132:10 133:22	strangulation 116:23	successful 41:25	Sustained 12:3,19
137:4	strategic 94:18	sufficient 112:9	13:4 100:17
State's 11:22,23	117:15 129:21,21	suggest 51:13	switch 116:12,13
16:10 18:7 19:2,6	130:7	suggested 18:13	sworn 6:14 63:8
19:15,19,19 21:7,9	strategy 39:4	117:25	64:15
22:10 34:25,25 35:3	strength 33:20	suggestion 116:4	Syed 1:1 2:4 3:6,11
41:16 47:11 48:7	115:23 122:17	suggests 118:3	3:24 4:9,16 5:15 6:9
70:1 78:13,16 80:7	123:5	Suite 1:22 63:13	6:12,18,21,25 29:10
80:9,11,13 82:5,8	strengths 78:7	Sullivan 102:18	43:21 49:1 51:17
82:15,20 83:19 89:3	stressed 27:12,13	sum 14:9	56:7 61:2,22 62:2
89:25 90:1,2 92:19	stressful 88:16	summarizing 92:22	84:6,18 90:8 92:11
102:9,10,24 115:23	<b>Strickland</b> 103:18,19	summary 74:7 84:24	93:2 94:16 104:2,6
118:5 125:1 128:16	117:14 121:12	110:9,10	104:9,15,16,20
132:9	133:1,19	supplement 68:11,15	105:3,13,19 107:4
stated 20:8 28:23,23	strictly 135:7	103:10 110:23	108:15,20 109:4,10
37:6 48:21 102:11	strike 78:24	132:22 133:4	111:16 112:11,22
104:16 119:4	strong 16:2 17:1 48:2	supplemental 98:17	112:24 118:7 131:7
122:12 127:24	78:8 90:3 97:4	support 120:20 123:3	135:16 137:4
128:18 129:3,11	stronger 78:17	129:2	Syed's 84:3 85:19
statement 74:23	strongly 115:7	supported 128:20	86:18 89:7,16
111:1 130:14 131:2	struggle 121:5	supporting 36:9	113:16 128:22
statements 35:24	struggled 116:12	supports 117:18	system 66:10 69:18
74:9 106:8 116:8	stuck 15:22 28:22	133:25	70:4 71:14 75:19
129:1	29:20,22 30:1	suppose 82:2 83:13	89:13 134:5
states 64:17,18 118:6	student 23:23 24:1	134:11,12,13	
127:9	38:10 39:20 91:22	supposed 92:2	T
stating 121:18 123:1	94:3	supposedly 35:23	T 61:18
stay 52:1,4	students 117:4,6	84:19 91:12	<b>T.V</b> 10:19 15:18,21
stayed 27:6	120:17,19	suppression 11:5	table 2:1 111:19
steep 84:11	stuff 38:11,19 41:18	supreme 64:18	take 3:19 6:10 7:11
steering 116:13,14	stuffed 124:2	107:19 126:23	19:5 34:22 35:6,6
step 61:1 109:17,18	<b>sub</b> 49:21,25 50:13	sure 6:23 13:21 67:7	35:10,10,11 40:22

## AL.AN SYED VS. STATE OF M. YLAND October 25, 2012 BEFORE JUDGE MARTIN P. WELCH

			rage 101
44:3 46:13 47:1	105:10 108:20	127:20 130:24	41.4.49.17.40.12
51:17 54:22 55:12	111:23 112:12	131:23,25 133:3,9	41:4 48:17 49:13
59:1 61:13 72:11	116:11 120:9 135:9	, ,	66:9 69:8,9 70:2
74:6 76:23 80:14	testifies 6:14 63:8	134:3,6,19 135:8	71:16 74:20 77:5,7
83:14,19 93:1		theory 18:7 19:6	80:19 82:10 83:2,21
109:20 131:9,11	testify 12:16,22 36:24	34:25 35:3,25 47:11	83:25 87:13 90:14
taken 6:9 61:15	105:5 122:1 131:2	48:7	90:17,21 92:21,23
talk 18:3 22:23 32:2	testimony 21:2,3 28:6	there's 36:14 51:24	93:23 94:8,18 99:11
	36:8,23 67:24 109:8	72:17 74:10 75:13	101:24 113:21
40:14 94:23 107:13	110:18 111:16	76:19 80:8,12 87:25	115:24 116:1,25
109:7 111:4 113:4	113:15 117:2	88:13 95:20 96:8,9	120:10,16,19
130:25 132:1	118:13,16 119:15	96:9,11,13 101:5,25	122:20 123:17
talked 29:16 39:25	123:8 124:13 128:8	103:14 104:25	126:22 128:11,13
99:1,2 111:3	131:4,20 132:12	107:19 115:7,19	128:23 130:24,25
talking 42:24 46:4	text 4:2 73:12	116:1,4,4 117:5	132:11,20 133:18
81:2 109:2 110:1,2	thank 3:4,12 6:8	121:11,13 126:7	134:8 135:17
111:9 114:18	43:19 45:13 53:3	127:16,17 130:11	thinking 55:14,20,22
120:19 130:10	56:2,20 60:1 61:21	132:4 133:10,14	75:11
teacher 125:20	63:14,16 68:1 97:15	134:12	Third 72:8
teachers 9:25 120:19	100:19,20 101:15	thereof 137:12,13	thirty 7:10 54:8
teaching 66:21,25	103:2 113:23	they're 12:11 16:11	thought 81:11 122:15
technical 46:3	114:12,13,15	19:16 23:1 37:7,11	threatening 38:14
telephone 12:6	129:16,17,19	47:3 51:11,25 52:19	three 26:7 32:13 52:1
tell 12:11,21 22:14,14	., 135:19,20,22,23,25	75:8 83:3,4 90:6,6	56:25 65:7,8 66:16
22:15 29:2,3 30:7	136:1,2	92:1,1 95:3 131:8	66:25 72:5 103:6
32:9 39:4 61:7	that's 3:17 5:8 6:24	they've 71:17 78:10	three-judge 96:10,11
64:25 66:5 68:8	9:5 10:3,13 16:20	109:25	tidbits 33:25
71:5 72:1,11 73:4	16:24 18:16,18 19:7	thing 5:3 29:22 36:11	time 5:1,20 7:19 8:1
76:16 86:22 120:1	19:17,20,21 22:19	40:11 46:5 57:8	8:20 9:11 10:15
Telling 36:2	25:18 27:25 28:25	67:5 74:16 87:18	13:11 17:6,8 18:5,6
tells 16:23 33:15	29:9 32:1 33:15	93:11 97:10 107:15	18:7,11 19:13 21:4
ten 40:10 112:8	34:12,13,19 35:20	107:23 125:15	21:10,22 22:6,22
tend 47:21	36:7 38:3,6 42:24	127:25 130:21	23:21 24:12 30:10
tentatively 3:25	43:16 46:5,10 48:5	132:1	31:11 32:5,25 33:23
tenure 128:23	48:12,12 51:13	things 11:15 27:12,23	33:24 34:3,8,10,17
term 13:21	52:18 55:15 56:10	28:22,24 29:17,18	34:20,23 35:2,17,18
terminated 40:24	56:15 78:1 83:7	29:19 31:14 32:18	35:22 36:4,7,23
terms 84:21 108:4	84:24 88:6,19 89:14	34:2 47:22,22 54:25	37:19,23,25,25
132:21	93:7,17 99:8 102:12	70:20,22 72:6,6	39:17,20 40:17,23
test 110:24 133:21	104:23 107:16	74:9 96:20 106:11	42:12 45:22 46:16
testified 10:14 20:19	108:12,25 110:11	112:3 119:21	46:20 47:24 48:2
20:20,22,24 21:1	110:20,21 111:4,6	122:24 129:5	49:4,9,23 50:10,11
33:18 34:5,6 38:16	112:18 114:1,3,8	130:15	50:22 55:7 56:3,4
42:7 45:23 47:13	116:5 118:19 119:9	think 3:13 22:22	60:1,14,17,22 61:6
56:24 71:2 84:18	119:10 126:8,15	25:18 31:25 36:20	62:12 63:3 64:11

### ADNAN SYED VS. STATE OF MA...LAND October 25, 2012 BEFORE JUDGE MARTIN P. WELCH

69:19 73:20 77:8	transcript 1:9,25	134:25 135:7	117:9 134:24
78:11 81:19 82:6,11	2:17 38:13 62:11,15	trouble 50:23	
82:22 87:1 91:15	89:25 98:12 101:1,3	true 7:23 28:20,21	U
92:20,21,22 94:8	109:25 110:10	32:17 46:13 116:5	<b>ugly</b> 74:15
95:23 97:24 103:3	137:10,11	127:10 137:10	<b>ultimately 7</b> 4:2 79:1
104:8 105:16	transcription 1:21,21	truly 114:25 126:6	79:13 99:13,15
108:15 110:15	1:25	trunk 21:13 36:18	Um 55:10 82:18
111:5 112:3,9	Transcriptionist 1:20	124:2	<b>unable</b> 105:22
114:21 115:19	transcripts 98:13,14	trust 41:1	unaccountable 120:7
119:19 120:8,10,11	transfer 54:24	trusted 10:4 16:17	unaware 113:13
120:14 124:18	transpired 126:20	39:1,2	114:4,4,6
125:12,23 126:19	tremendous 54:15	truth 86:23	unchallengeable
130:15	55:3 79:10,10	try 31:14 33:12 40:17	117:16
timely 121:22	trial 2:17 9:16 11:12	44:18 47:21 51:7	undercut 83:12
times 14:11 18:2	14:6,19,19 17:10,24	56:1 72:22 89:19,21	undermines 103:23
65:23 69:25 71:16	18:22 19:24 20:24	89:22 90:13 91:5	underneath 13:21
115:9	20:25 21:16 22:9,13	120:6	underscore 107:21
timing 33:24 34:7	28:12,12,15 31:18	trying 12:11 15:7	understand 11:5,8
today 7:6 52:8 65:13	31:20 33:25 34:24	29:1 96:3 124:7	33:12,13 46:4 49:10
103:12 114:20	35:4,12 36:5 37:4	turn 23:3 28:2 39:23	58:23 69:21 70:22
118:13,16,20	37:16,19,20,20	40:4 43:4,9 46:14	71:11,14 78:19
122:20 123:7,19	38:25 39:2,5 43:22	49:7 69:11 84:2	99:24 113:19
124:14 127:2	46:2,8 47:2,3,5	91:7	understanding 4:18
130:18	48:11,22 49:18	turned 104:19 106:11	14:13 15:17 32:15
today's 103:7	56:14 60:3 62:15	113:5	47:6 48:4,18 49:24
told 4:1 14:16 27:21	65:9 71:5,6 72:2,5,9	turns 91:13	70:9,19 76:18
30:13 32:5,10 33:17	72:9,15,15,16,18,24	twice 72:21	understood 11:23
34:14 39:17 48:1,9	72:24 77:5 83:25	two 3:15 25:22 26:7	16:18,25 34:2 58:14
59:20 82:14 116:9	85:6,9,9,11,19 86:6	29:14,19,23,25 30:8	undisputed 126:8
116:11 118:11	86:11,19 88:3,4,15	31:12,14 32:18	unfortunately 81:24
120:25	91:2 99:21 101:1	39:21 41:15,21	unhelpful 117:3
tomorrow 30:3	103:22 104:21	45:20 55:19 64:3	unique 89:23
topic 42:20	107:10 108:2,17,18	65:9 66:25 69:23	United 64:17,18
total 7:5 12:25	108:23 111:11	75:1 78:11 82:25	University 63:22
totality 70:25 133:25	112:25 113:8	83:8 87:17 95:24	67:3
touch 107:20	115:13 121:15	103:8 104:3 105:5	unnecessary 117:20
touched 123:18	123:21 128:14,19	107:3 112:4,20	unusual 116:24 121:3
tower 114:24 115:10	128:21 129:3	113:8 126:22	unwitnessed 120:7
track 27:7 59:21	130:15,17 131:10	135:24	upset 40:16,19
118:10,20	134:10	type 19:3 24:3 33:14	Urick 68:23 106:14
tragic 90:15	trials 81:13 85:23	67:1 90:17 134:22	106:15,21 109:8
transcribed 137:9	88:15	134:24	110:13,14 116:25 127:23
TRANSCRIBER'S	tried 52:4 106:17	typed 120:22	use 11:19 12:11 46:12
137:1	110:23 119:1	typical 79:24 109:1	use 11:19 12:11 40:12
	L	(1)	Į,

47:17 71:18 91:11	116:22 128:23	28:14,17 33:14	124:21,23
96:4 111:4 114:24	voluntary 51:23	34:16 39:16 45:16	whit 87:14
usually 74:7 80:3,17	volunteer 67:3	47:10 66:10 69:4,5	who's 5:11 62:2
87:25 91:25	volunteered 94:7	70:20 77:10 80:1,11	69:14 70:21 110:3
utilized 124:9	vs 3:6 61:22 76:20,21	80:25 84:15 86:4	Wilds 20:19,22,23
utterly 117:3	103:18,19 119:11	94:14 102:4 104:10	21:6,12 36:2,11,24
	133:4,6,11,22	106:11 108:3 115:7	37:23 38:1,17,21
V		121:11,15 135:3	45:22 47:13 111:12
v 1:3 126:23,24	W	ways 69:23 75:21	115:6,8,12,21 116:8
Valcom 133:11	Wait 94:7	80:2 112:21	116:11 124:2,4
<b>value</b> 130:20	waiting 109:1	<b>We'll</b> 61:14 79:22	Williams 72:20
values 65:11	waive 103:11	82:13	133:22
Van 64:12 65:3,4	Walker 64:3,11 65:3	we're 5:19 7:6 77:5	willing 79:14 113:3
various 71:3 99:2	65:4	81:13 82:20 88:13	willingness 34:22
Vasbinder 133:4	<b>Wanda</b> 49:17 85:13	89:4 91:8 102:4	win 47:2,3 77:5
vast 66:7,7	want 3:12 4:16 11:17	111:9 127:7	window 34:9 116:11
Veeney 119:11,14	13:14 14:18 25:24	we've 32:8 107:17	winter 7:11
130:10	30:6 36:22 46:14	112:19	wish 39:15 103:10-
verdict 103:24	55:9 61:10 73:1,2	weaker 78:10	126:11
115:14	73:22,22 76:23	weaknesses 78:8,12	wished 129:2
verified 104:13	77:23 79:21 85:7	week 28:14 59:14	wishes 67:8
verify 27:8 94:12	86:11 89:2,11,21	weeks 21:17 49:15	witness 3:24,25 4:9
versus 38:3 48:24	90:25 92:6 95:12	59:9 103:8 105:6	4:13 5:5 6:10,13,18
69:22 83:6 85:6	99:10 109:3 111:6	118:18	17:16,19 21:1,7
137:4	121:2 126:9 132:21	weigh 77:21	24:16,18 29:13 36:8
victim 90:9,15 116:20	wanted 99:10 123:6	weight 85:4	37:11 43:16 54:15
122:22 124:8,12	129:14 132:6,19	WELCH 1:12	60:21 61:3,4,8 62:5
victim's 31:1	wanting 89:3	<b>Wenner</b> 64:7,10	63:7,12 84:23 91:8
victims 125:18,18	wants 81:8,9 89:2	went 16:12 19:18	91:9,11 92:3,4 93:3
126:19	94:2 120:24	23:5,8 27:5,7 30:21	93:16,19,22,23,24
video 1:24 40:18	Warden 51:25	38:9 43:17 47:5	94:20 95:10,11
91:14 137:7	119:11	64:6,8,9,10 65:2	97:13 100:20,22,25
Virginia 105:9	Warden's 51:24	109:13	103:13 104:2,6,10
virtually 117:15	warrant 60:2	weren't 83:18	104:22 105:7
virtue 103:11	warrants 133:16	what's 23:9 24:21	106:13,15 107:6,12
visit 2:12 5:13 13:11	Washington 5:11	25:24 26:3 29:18	111:1,12,13 112:23
14:5 16:9,22 27:22	103:18,20	43:14,25 51:9 65:15	113:3,3 117:13
31:12 33:1	wasn't 15:13,15 17:1	74:14 77:24,25 78:4	119:9,13,18 120:2
visited 5:15 13:15	21:17 35:3 47:14	80:20 88:23 89:11	120:14 121:5
104:15,20	48:21 83:22 91:22	97:10 108:20 109:2	129:22,23 130:4,8
visiting 9:21 vital 115:2	94:6 122:12 124:22 132:7	109:3,9 111:5 125:8	130:12,14 131:23
voir 67:8,19		whatsoever 38:23	132:5 137:13
voir 67:8,19 volumes 98:18	watch 15:18,18	126:8 132:16	witnessed 38:14,14
volumes 98:18	way 10:5,11 16:21	whereabouts 118:22	witnesses 2:2 3:15
×	JI.	ls .	I

### AL...AN SYED VS. STATE OF Mr. /LAND October 25, 2012 BEFORE JUDGE MARTIN P. WELCH

	ĭ	<u> </u>	
4:3,7 12:16,22	wrote 26:4 27:21	Z	<b>199103042</b> 3:6 61:22
75:19 78:10 84:25	46:19,22 87:16		<b>199103042-046</b> 1:6
95:7,12 102:16	92:11 105:20 107:3	0	137:5
103:3,12 104:24	- V	<b>046</b> 3:7 61:23	<b>1999</b> 7:12 8:8 26:5,6
115:2,4,5 117:7	X		26:22 31:3,5 35:20
118:6 129:24 130:1	X 35:11 47:15 48:23	1	65:12 80:5,16 81:19
131:1	Xerox 73:21	1 2:20 26:5,22 44:23	96:3 101:19 118:7
woman 98:2 116:24	Y	63:12 102:9,11,25	119:25
123:24	yeah 24:5 27:24 46:1	118:5 119:25	
won't 67:22 90:23	51:7 84:20 113:17	<b>10</b> 2:17 62:9,9,10,14	2
Woodlawn 7:22	year 50:17,20,21,22	62:22 63:1 65:25	<b>2</b> 43:11,15
117:4 118:7 120:17		99:10 129:13	<b>2/25/00</b> 2:17
word 11:19 19:22	57:14,17 64:10,13	130:18,19,20	2:00 4:1
36:11 38:3 39:2	66:1 82:2,2 90:14 94:10	<b>10-page</b> 70:15	<b>2:15</b> 27:4 32:12 34:8
47:17 93:1 99:14,16		100 2:5 41:8	48:13 120:8
words 45:15 135:15	years 7:4,7 35:11	<b>102</b> 2:20,23	<b>2:20</b> 92:22,24
135:16	47:16,24 48:17,19	<b>10432</b> 1:7 3:7 61:23	<b>2:30</b> 61:11,12,14
work 16:8 63:23	48:24 50:1,8 52:1,2	137:5	<b>2:36</b> 21:11 34:9 35:18
64:11 65:2 74:13	52:2,2,2 57:15 65:5	<b>11:00</b> 71:10	35:25 36:6,12,13,16
76:7,7 86:8,11	66:1,8,16,20,20	<b>11:30:20</b> 3:2	36:23 37:19 38:1,2
88:14 129:21	78:2 79:21 87:21	114 2:24	48:14 92:23 105:15
worked 13:20 14:2	89:3 95:25 96:7,8	<b>11th</b> 3:14 133:9	115:16
-32:1 51:4 63:25	96:10,16 99:3,10	<b>12</b> 65:25 73:2 75:7,14	<b>2:40</b> 27:6 32:12 92:22
64:1,2 105:9	112:8,8 125:19,19	88:13	2:44:55 61:16
working 32:23,23	125:19 129:13	<b>12:30</b> 55:8	2:45'ish 32:12
104:18	130:18,19,20	<b>12:43:42</b> 61:16	20 47:23 48:17,19
works 71:14	yesterday 109:14	<b>129</b> 2:23	66:1 79:21 96:10
world 41:18 95:4	York 1:22	<b>13</b> 35:20 118:7	99:11,22
123:3	you'd 10:15 17:22	1301 1:22	2000 44:12,23 49:25
worst 77:25 78:1	83:19	<b>13th</b> 28:20 29:4,7	50:20,21,23 62:17
97:10	you'll 5:3 6:10 54:24	31:2 56:22 57:25	80:5,16 81:19 96:3
worth 128:13	you're 7:8 35:9 47:20	59:3,6,17 60:13	97:21 102:20
wouldn't 22:12 33:22	73:15 75:11,14	118:17 120:8	129:14
54:1 55:4 58:3	77:10,20 84:15	14 7:7	<b>2006</b> 49:12
89:21 95:20 97:9	109:1,24 110:2	14th 29:25	<b>2012</b> 1:14 137:6
104:17 110:4,5	132:4	<b>15th</b> 29:25	2013 137:14
115:20 123:9,9	you've 46:6 50:23	<b>17</b> 48:1 84:9 90:12,16	<b>21</b> 34:9,12 114:20
135:3	56:7 68:7,8 78:14	17-year 69:15	<b>21093</b> 1:23
writes 119:25	87:22 93:21,23	17-year-old 16:21	<b>21202</b> 63:13
writing 81:15	134:4	33:14 110:2 132:15	22 66:8
written 5:10 106:6	young 47:20 48:3	134:4,20 135:4	<b>2470</b> 63:13
114:17 120:23	66:22 69:14,17 70:2	17-years-old 108:15	<b>25</b> 1:14 2:13 48:17
	1 (11.17) 116.7/1117.0	14000 (4.15	62,17,00,2,00,12
135:22	91:12 116:24 117:8 your's 122:17	<b>1990</b> 64:15	62:17 89:3 90:13

### AL.AN SYED VS. STATE OF M. /LAND October 25, 2012 BEFORE JUDGE MARTIN P. WELCH

			rage 100
05/1 50 11	= 00 115 01		1
<b>25th</b> 59:11	<b>7:00</b> 115:21		
<b>26</b> 2:14	<b>75</b> 66:11,11 110:10		
<b>28</b> 8:8 26:6			
28th 31:5	8		
<b>2nd</b> 120:23	8 2:15 43:25,25 45:4		
	45:9,11 133:3		
3	8:00 120:8		
3/30/2000 44:9	<b>80</b> 118:5 129:23		
<b>3:00</b> 5:7 27:6	130:6		
<b>30</b> 47:23 48:19 49:13	8th 137:14		
50:8,9,14,18 53:10			
90:14 112:13	9		
	90 64:24 79:15 95:23		-
<b>326</b> 133:22			
35 98:18	95:24		
<b>367</b> 133:22	<b>95</b> 107:24 134:17		
<b>379</b> 133:23	97 2:5		
319 133:23	<b>99</b> 97:21 102:21,22		
4	<b>9A</b> 51:12,20 52:13,23		
<b>4-263</b> 73:9,9	53:2		l .
<b>4:37:34</b> 136:3	<b>9A-L</b> 2:16 53:5		
<b>45</b> 2:15 71:11	<b>9I</b> 52:11		
4th 102:19 109:13	<b>9J</b> 52:11		1
	<b>9K</b> 52:11		I
5	<b>9L</b> 51:15 52:12,13,23		1
5 2:12 5:20,25 6:2,7			
	9th 31:3		1
101:19			ł.
<b>50,000</b> 78:2			1
<b>53</b> 2:16			
56 2:4			
5th 133:10			1
			1
6			
6 2:4,12,13 24:22		-	1
25:7,11,13 28:3			
	1	ľ	
60 2:4 50:9,14 83:1,2			
83:9	1		
601 1:22	1		,
63 2:5,17			
	1		
<b>65</b> 62:18 66:11	1		
66 62:18			
6th 133:5			
	1	1	
7		1	li di
		1	
7 2:14 25:25 26:1,3,9		l	
1 00444604	III)	I .	(1)
26:14,16,21			II.