IN THE SUPREME COURT OF MISSISSIPPI

PAGES NUMBERED 101-700	VOLUME
	EXHIBIT
	ELECTRONIC DISK
	Case #2003-DP-00457-SCT
COURT APPEALED FROM : Circuit Court	
COUNTY: Adams TRIAL JUDGE: Forrest A. Johnson Jr. Jeffrey Keith Havard v. State of Mississippi	
Betty W. Sephton, Clerk	
TRIAL COURT#: 02-KR-0141-J	######################################

. 29

_	IN THE CIRCUIT COOK! OF ADAMS COOK!!, MAGGIOSIFF!
2	
3	STATE OF MISSISSIPPI
4	
5	VERSUS CAUSE NO. 02-KR-141
6	
7	JEFFREY HAVARD DEFENDANT
8	VOLUME FIVE
9	********
10	TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD AND DONE IN A TRIAL IN
11	THE ABOVE STYLED AND NUMBERED CAUSE BEFORE THE HONORABLE
12	FORREST A. JOHNSON, JUNIOR, JUDGE OF THE COURT AFORESAID,
13	AND A JURY OF TWELVE MEN AND WOMEN, ON THE 16TH, 17TH,
14	18TH, AND 19TH DAYS OF DECEMBER, 2002, IN THE CIRCUIT
15	COURTROOM OF THE ADAMS COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI COURTHOUSE.
1 6 ·	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
17	APPEARANCES: Present and Representing the State:
18	HONORABLE RONNIE HARPER District Attorney
19	Sixth Judicial Circuit District Natchez, MS 39120
20	HONORABLE TOM ROSENBLATT
21	Assistant District Attorney Sixth Circuit Judicial District
22	Natchez, MS 39120
23	Present and Representing the Defendant:
24	HONORABLE GUS SERMOS Attorney at Law
25	P. O. Box 621 Summit, MS 39666
26	HONORABLE ROBERT CLARK
27	Attorney at Law
28	Vidalia, LA

29

BY THE COURT: -- Dar that testified, and also Dr. Hayne that what this is commonly caused from is some type of force applied from the outside. believe the first two doctors other than Dr. Hayne were much more clear about this. That it's almost not a direct on trauma but a kind of a glancing trauma that typically causes this with a child of hitting something from the outside. Now, that said, what we're left with and what this Court finds and what this Court sees and has heard evidence-wise is that that may be a possibility. That there could have been some type of sexual battery against this child as to her mouth. Now, first of all, that is possibility, but there's really no evidence that goes to show that that's what happened. The evidence that presented quite frankly in the Court's finding and ruling on this is that from the testimony of these witnesses, it's much more likely that it was something else, some other type of force. That being the situation, clearly, there is not enough evidence in this record to support any type of finding by the jury that there was a sexual battery involving this child's mouth. That being the situation, it would be improper for the prosecution to argue this unless you want the record to reflect that this is something that the jury considered. I think the evidence is clear, and I think you need to be cautious in that regard because there is no evidentiary basis to support that.

27

28

29

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: I am sorry. I misstated my concern was that defense would somehow ask for a jury poll on a specific factual finding.

BY THE COURT: No. That will not be --

BY MR. SERMOS: No, sir. No, sir.

BY MR. HARPER: In other words, what you're saying we will be prohibited from arguing that there was a sexual battery to the mouth?

BY THE COURT: I think that's --

BY MR. HARPER: Which I have no problem --

BY THE COURT: Which the defense is moving for?

BY MR. CLARK: Yeah.

BY MR. HARPER: We don't intend to do that.

BY THE COURT: And the Court is going to grant that, and the Court is going to grant it for the reason I just stated because there's not -- although there's evidence that it is a possibility, clearly it's not a sufficient showing in the law from which a reasonable jury could conclude that --

BY MR. HARPER: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: -- particularly given the nature of the charge. So I am going to grant that request or motion by the defense, and the State will be prohibited from arguing that in any type of way to the jury. The instructions are proper that have been given, but that point is very well taken. So your argument will be limited to the evidence and the reasonable inferences from the evidence which as far as the State's underlying charge of sexual battery,

29

603

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: I would just appreciate some guidance from the Court on whether these witnesses --

BY THE COURT: What I am going to direct is

29

604

Ι

BY THE COURT: Then let's make sure that these three witnesses know that they must remain outside the courtroom. The other witnesses, it will be

permissible that they come in the courtroom.

BY MR. HARPER: Y'all had mentioned earlier you may decide on some others. Obviously, you know, if they're released and --

BY MR. SERMOS: Right.

BY MR. CLARK: That's all we --

BY THE COURT: Y'all just make sure that these witnesses know that they're not to come in the courtroom.

BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor --

BY THE COURT: I don't know any of --

BY MR. SERMOS: With your permission, then I'll walk -- when we go back in there, I'll just go outside the door and tell those two that they can't come in but all the others can.

BY THE COURT: Sure. Absolutely. We'll take a few minutes. Y'all can do that now while I'm numbering the instructions.

(After a short recess, the following was made in the chambers of the Judge, OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: Just for the record, normally all the exhibits are sent back into the jury room with the jury. The Court does have some concern about some of the items that should not probably be touched or handled by jurors, and I doubt if they want to touch or handle. What I intend to do is the exhibits dealing with the blood, the kits, the sexual assault -- the two sexual assault kits and the two sheets

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

will not be sent back into the jury room unless the jury requests to see them. Does either side have any objections?

BY MR. HARPER: No, sir. I think there are three exhibits of blood evidence. There's one -- two kits and then one is just -- I think it's the mother's blood.

BY THE COURT: The mother's vial.

BY MR. HARPER: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: And then there's the two --

BY MR. HARPER: Two --

BY THE COURT: -- sheets.

BY MR. HARPER: -- sheets. Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Does the defense have any objection to that?

BY MR. SERMOS: No, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: What I will do, is I will just not automatically send them back there, but if the jury requested to see them, they will certainly be furnished right away.

BY MR. HARPER: And, Your Honor, the videotape. Obviously, we've submitted the transcript of that also. Are you going to --

BY THE COURT: Not unless they ask to do it, and really there's not enough room to roll that TV in here, but if they want to see it, I'll make arrangements for them to see it.

BY MR. SERMOS: Yes, sir. I think that's good because they -- they may or may not.

PENGAD + 1:600-531-5663 + www.pengad

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28.

29

BY THE COURT: Okay.

(All parties returned to the courtroom, and the following was made IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as you have heard, both sides have rested their respective cases, and what remains to be done is for the Court, myself, to instruct you on what the law is that you're to use and apply in making your decision in this case, and then following that, the attorneys will be allowed to make their final or closing arguments to you. Once that is done, you will retire to the jury room to deliberate and to decide whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty of the charge against him of capital murder. Now, first of all, the Court instructs you on the law by way of reading to you what we refer to as jury instructions. are somewhat lengthy, but keep in mind that once you go back into the jury room to deliberate and decide this case, you will be allowed to take these with you back into the jury room. So at this time, the Court is going to instruct you on the law.

(After the Court having read the instructions, the following was made of record, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, those are the instructions from the Court on the law that you're to use and apply in making your decision in this case. As I said, you will be allowed to take these written instructions with you back to the jury room. At this time, the Court allows the closing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

arguments by counsel for each side. Keep in mind that what the attorneys tell you is not evidence in this case. You heard the evidence by way of the sworn testimony of the witnesses from the witness stand and also any exhibits that have been admitted into evidence which the Court will allow you to go back with you into the jury room. If the attorneys in making their closing or final arguments, if they recall the testimony of the witnesses different from what you recall the witness saying, you're to use your own recollection of what you heard the witness say from the witness stand. So at this time, the Court is going to allow the final or closing arguments, first by the State. Mr. Rosenblatt.

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Thank you, Your Honor. Ladies and gentlemen, in Wilkinson County last year a man was convicted for robbing the main street liquor store, and he took five bottles of Crown Royal, and when the judge asked him why he did it, he looked up at her kind of puzzled and said, "Because I ran out of something to drink". prosecutor I certainly don't approve of that activity, but as a human being I can understand this. It makes some sense to me. This case is not like that. This case I cannot understand. Please don't try to understand this case. We cannot understand what makes a man do what Jeffrey Havard did. We cannot understand the testimony that we've heard from the witness stand. Try not to put yourself in his shoes. Clean-cut looking young man and try to figure out why could he have done something like

```
1
    that. Believe Jeffrey Havard's statement when he tells
 2
    you, "I can't explain it." When the deputies ask him,
 3
    "How do you explain the damage that was done to her rear
    end" what did he say? "I can't explain it." "I don't
 4
    know how -- I don't know of no way to explain it."
 5
 6
    Believe that because there is no way to explain it.
    cannot understand what happened. Again when he says, "I
 7
    am going to ask you one more time, did you molest the
 8
 9
    baby?". "No, I did not." "How do you explain her being
    molested?" "I can't explain it." We don't expect an
10
    explanation for this kind of behavior, for this kind of
11
    activity. Rather than try to understand why, let's focus
12
13
    on what happened because that's our job today. Your job
    as a juror as we told you when this case began is to
14
15
    determine the facts to determine what happened and then
16
    apply those facts to the law that the Judge has given you.
17
    What do we know that happened. The only person, the only
18
    person in the house with the baby. That's correct. Me
    and the baby. The only person in the house, me and the
19
          And what did Jeffrey do? Do you remember after
20
    Becky went to the grocery store and got groceries.
21
22
    came back from the grocery store and what does Jeffrey say
23
    in his statement? Shh. Don't bother her. Don't go in
24
    there. Don't go in where the baby is. Now, ladies and
    gentlemen, I don't know exactly what happened when. I am
25
    not able to tell you when the dastardly deed took place.
26
27
    I know it was some time while Becky was gone. I don't
    know which trip she was gone that he actually did what he
28
    did or maybe both times. I don't know, but I do know when
29
```

Closing Argument - Rosenblatt

she came back from the grocery store, the testimony from 1 the witness stand and by the statement you have here, he 2 told her shh. Don't go in there. Leave the baby alone. But she went in there, made a brief check in the dim light, heard a funny noise, thought that everything was 5 6 She was terribly wrong. When she came back the second time from the Blockbuster, and isn't that 7 interesting. She comes back from the grocery store, 8 groceries in her hand and immediately he hands her \$20.00 9 and says, "Now, go to Blockbuster." Clear across town. 10 This is not a normal family situation. This is not 11 something typically you would expect for the man to say, 12 "You go. Leave me here with the baby." And remember this 13 was a man she had moved with in three weeks before along 14 with her baby. Look at what we do know. When she comes 15 16 back from the Blockbuster, where is Jeffrey? In the 17 bathroom, the door closed. Where else could he be? Could he be standing there when she comes in and finds her 18 child. When she comes in and finds her baby lifeless in 19 the crib, could he be standing there? No. That would be 20 impossible. There's no way he could do that. He's in the 21 bathroom. When she screams and he comes out. Ladies and 22 gentlemen, this is a -- this is a hard case. This case 23 has been filled with emotion, and the Judge has read you 24 an instruction that your decision is not to be based on 25 passion. Your decision is to be based on the facts that 26 came from this witness stand. Ladies and gentlemen, there 27 has still been a lot of emotion in this case, and I don't 28 think you can disregard the emotion you heard from the 29

witness stand. You heard seasoned deputies. You heard medical personnel. I just think of Ms. Murphy, been a 2 3 nurse for thirty years. Nurse Godbold, been an emergency room nurse for ten years, and what did they say? 4 5 seen nothing like it. It affected them. It upset them, what they saw, and every one of them when they saw that 6 7 baby said this baby has been sexually assaulted. This baby has been sexually penetrated. They were shocked. The first thing they did in the middle of their treatment 9 was call the law. This baby has been assaulted. 10 especially the remark that Coroner Lee -- and this is our 11 coroner. I mean, just imagine what he sees, and what did 12 13 Coroner Lee see when he came in there and took one look at 14 that baby and he said something is terribly wrong. 15 Remember the testimony that you heard. You heard from 16 Nurse Godbold, Nurse Murphy. Immediately told you this 17 baby has been penetrated. You heard from Dr. Patterson. 18 Told you the same thing. Every one of them agreeing. 19 then you heard Dr. Dar who along with Dr. Patterson looked 20 into the baby's eyes and said, "I see retinal hemorrhage. 21 This baby is a shaken baby. She's got brain damage. She's 22 in bad trouble." They didn't know the baby had been hurt from Jeffrey. Jeffrey comes to the hospital and says 23 nothing about how the baby could have been hurt. Nothing 24 to aid in the treatment of this child. Only later does he 25 26 give the statement explaining what might have happened to 27 the baby, and nothing at the time when it could have 28 helped. Remember the testimony of Dr. Hayne who told you that this baby died of head trauma of being shaken 29

1 heard what he said. He didn't mean to do that. And what 2 did he do. He denied it at first. The way anybody would do in that situation that had panicked. When you panic, 3 you don't think rationally. You don't think reasonably. 4 You don't think like a normal person would think, and 5 6 that's the way he was. But after a couple of days in jail, he came to -- he realized that he needed to tell the 7 truth. And he told the truth. And you saw it on that 8 9 He told officers there, Officer Manley and another sheriff deputy that were there what happened. 10 cooperated. He gave the blood, the hair, the skin, 11 12 underneath the fingernails samples. He called them. They 13 didn't call him. He called them. Through the jailer to -- could you please let me talk to Major Manley. 14 had to tell the truth, and he wanted to tell the truth 15 16 about what happened on that terrible night. And you saw 17 that truth on that videotape. He cooperated not only by giving the statement. He cooperated by going out to 18 the -- he told them everything about what was going on at 19 the house. He told them about the sheets that they have 20 They had those sheets here in evidence. 21 wouldn't have known all that stuff if it hadn't been for 22 23 If he hadn't told them about it. Ladies and bentlemen, all of that supports what we're saying and what 24 he said to you from the tape that this was a terrible 25 accident. That he didn't mean to do it. He didn't intend 26 to kill this child. He was trying to sooth the child and 27 something tragic happened. There were other witnesses who 28 testified here also through the course of this trial, and, 29

1 violently. A violent shaking would be the equivalent of 2 being in a car wreck, of being dropped from a high height 3 is the injury that this baby suffered to her head. Again shaken violently. And after having been sexually 4 penetrated. Ladies and gentlemen, this has been a hard 5 case in many ways. It's been a hard case emotionally, but - 6 7 it's not a hard case factually. Everyone has agreed on 8 what happened. Every one of our witnesses said 9 immediately when they saw that child, they knew exactly 10 what had happened. This baby was shaken to death having been sexually assaulted, and ladies and gentlemen, don't 11 try to understand it. Don't try to figure out how it 12 13 could have happened. Just know what did happen and render 14 your verdict of guilty of capital murder because that's what this man is over there for doing that to this child. 15 16 BY THE COURT: Mr. Clark. 17 BY MR. CLARK: Thank you, Your Honor. Ladies and 18 gentlemen, we have heard several days of testimony here. 19 BY THE JURORS: Can you speak louder, please. 20 BY MR. CLARK: We've heard several days of testimony 21 here. We've heard various law enforcement officers talk. 22 We've heard various and sundry doctors, nurses, 23 specialists, people like that in the medical profession, 24 and we've heard a taped statement that was given by 25 Jeffrey Havard in this case too about what happened that 26 hight. I'm sure you remember what he said yesterday. 27 That what -- he was like anybody else that had a terrible accident to happen. He panicked. He didn't mean to drop 28

that child. You saw the tape. You saw his reaction.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

yet, if you recall, during each one of the law enforcement 2 officer's testimony, did they say that Jeffrey Havard did not cooperate with them? No. They all said that he did 3 cooperate. Anything that they wanted him to do, he helped 4 them do, and now the State is asking you to find him 5. guilty of capital murder. He told you what happened. 7 told you that it was a tragic accident. He told that he didn't mean for it to happen. Ladies and gentlemen, we 8 9 believe that's the truth.

BY THE COURT: Mr. Sermos.

BY MR. SERMOS: Thank you, Your Honor. I am going to cover some things -- some of the things Mr. Clark already covered, but I want to review them. That's why we both wanted to be up here so we could give our separate takes on this. One of the things the State has done is just when somebody drives by a lumber yard and sees a huge stack of wood out there. The State has looked at that stack of wood, and they've built a case of capital murder against Jeffrey Havard which they say is supported by the allegations that Jeffrey Havard committed sexual battery upon that baby. We all know it's a tragedy. The baby's death is a tragedy. We're not here to talk about was that a tragedy or not. We know that. The State sees a case of capital murder supported by an alleged sexual battery. However, that's not how we see it. We see something entirely different, and that's what I want to tell you about so you'll have something else to consider. First as you recall, the prosecutor Ronnie Harper prepared you by saying, oh, don't -- don't expect us to show a confession

1 or if we don't show a confession, you know you don't 2 really need it. Well, they didn't have a confession. 3 They had a statement by Jeffrey Havard two days after this 4 happened. Not yesterday and not last week. Two days after this happened last February. Jeffrey Havard didn't 5 have time to concoct a fancy story. He talked to Major 6 7 Manley and told him what went on voluntarily two days 8 after this. There were also no eyewitnesses. Yes, there 9 were a lot of witnesses as to what went on at the hospital 10 and people that did tests. Mr. Harper prepared you for 11 that by saying don't expect any eyewitnesses. Well, they 12 didn't have any eyewitnesses. Jeffrey Havard made the statement as to what happened there. Further, and one 13 thing for you to consider is that after everything was 14 Hone and all these experts talked, we know we've heard 15 about Chloe Madison Britt, but then now we're dealing with 16 17 Deffrey Havard, and if you recall within two days after 18 that, Jeffrey Havard was taken -- blood was drawn, hair 19 was drawn from his head and pubic area, and it was sent 20 bff for testing. You've heard an expert talk about DNA hatching. You've heard an expert state from what Dr. 21 Hayne withdrew from the child at her autopsy from vulvar 22 23 and vaginal and rectal and oral swabs there was no 24 indication on this -- and they call it a sex assault kit 25 or standard rape kit, something like that. There was no ndication and no semen found in her. Also from the 26 examination done on Jeffrey Havard, remember once he was 27 in custody, the State owned his body and they've had it 28 ever since then, and they found not one thing on him that 29

you heard about here in this courtroom. Nothing under his 1 fingernails, none of her skin, nothing from any of her 2 interior passages or her rectum or her anus and one of the 3 doctors -- several of them even talked about all the feces 4 and the diarrhea type feces that was coming out of her in 5 They saw this on her, and I want you to 6 the hospital. remember this. They didn't see this baby four weeks after 7 this allegedly happened. They saw this right after 8 Rebecca Britt came home. They went to the hospital and that's what those doctors saw just literally a few minutes 10 later. Also remember Jeffrey Havard left that house 11 voluntarily. He didn't put the old clothes to wash while 12 he was gone to try to wash away any evidence like the 13 State wanted to get that sly comment onto you awhile ago. 14 He didn't do that. He went to the hospital and once he 15 was there, from there and you recall from the testimony of 16 17 fine officers, he went on into custody. He didn't even get time to go take a shower. There was testimony of, 18 well, he wanted to go take a shower. Well, I don't care 19 20 what he wanted to do, he didn't get to go do it. Adams County Sheriff's Department has had custody of his body 21 since that time, and he never got to take a shower and 22 23 they never -- just think of it like this too when we want to talk about evidence, not about opinion. About 24 evidence, though. They had Jeffrey Havard in the custody 25 from the hospital. It's not my fault. They didn't call 26 me and ask me what they should do. They didn't find 27 anything on him. They didn't look at his penis and say, 28 There's some fecal matter from that young lady, 29 "Ah hah.

that girl, that baby that was killed." They didn't find ı any part of her body or any of her hair or anything from 2 3 her on him and nothing from him on her or in her. one of the reasons when Dr. Hayne testified, we asked him 4 5 because one of the experts had talked about the child's 6 anus was torn. Well, Dr. Hayne said -- I asked him. 7 said what does contusion mean. He said, well, it's bruising and it's got blood underneath. Well, then when 9 the prosecutor went back to help Dr. Hayne testify, Dr. 10 Hayne said, "Well, there might have been some tears, but I 11 didn't notice them." Well, he's the number one expert of the experts and he didn't notice it. 12 The reason that we 13 want to emphasize that is you saw Jeff Havard's video. 14 was bathing the infant. She was obviously wet and slippery. He dropped her. She fell. He stated on the 15 16 video probably three feet, maybe a little higher. I don't 17 know if he was standing up or not because I wasn't there, 18 but that's what he stated happened, and she fell onto the 19 toilet or the toilet bowl or the tank, every which he 20 I don't know how she hit. He said how she hit in 21 the video. Then, yes. He shook her, and he showed you 22 how he shook her on the video, and he said he didn't mean to hurt her. He panicked. That's certainly reasonable to 23 think he would panic. He dropped the child and panicked. 24 25 He rubbed the lotion on her. There's a picture of it in 26 one of the photographs. There was none of that lotion --27 also let me add right here. In fact, one of the deputies, I believe, made a big deal. I know in the video. 28 bne of them was talking about, oh, you rubbed her down 29

with something or maybe it was on the stand here. Well, 1 2 the first thing, was, oh. That lotion. If he had rubbed her down with something and then he inserted some object 3 into her rectum or her anus, it would have some oil or 4 5 lotion on it. There was no statement by any doctor or the nurses up here and none by Dr. Hayne who looked at her 6 7 body when she -- after she passed away and went for an 8 autopsy. No one stated anything about any lotion or any residue of lotion being found in any one of her body 9 orifices anywhere. We're talking about especially her 10 11 rectum or her anal area. Jeffrey Havard said I can't 12 explain it. He told Major Manley that at the interview back almost -- well, ten months ago. The doctors really 13 couldn't explain what happened. They guessed what 14 happened, but here's the other thing and here's the high 15 standard of proof we ask you to hold the State to. 16 They've got -- there are no confessions, no eye witnesses. 17 They've got no tangible physical evidence. Call the lab 18 19 experts and they talked about stuff that was on the 20 sheets. The lady said with the DNA, don't know how long 21 it's been there. Don't know -- was that from when the 22 baby was on the mattress or that sheet three weeks 23 earlier, thirty days earlier, when Rebecca Britt was on 24 the mattress, when Jeff Havard was in there. In other 25 words, they do have some facts they put together from this lumber yard they drove by of facts and put it together to 26 try to convince you that Jeff Havard intentionally put 27 some object in that child's rectum and then essentially 28 29 shook the baby to death. Another point I want to address

because you need to just think about it. The deputies 1 after Jeffrey was at the hospital and taken into custody 2 and then he voluntarily signed a consent search warrant to 3 go back to that trailer that he had left and one of the 4 5 deputies said it was unlocked. The deputies go there. There could have been three of them there. I believe 6 7 there was three from what they said. Fine. There could I don't even know, but they sent about . 8 have been 103. three of them. They eventually -- essentially felt that 9 10 the crime scene was at the hospital and where the child was, and, of course, once she died, her body became part 11 12 of the crime scene. That's how the coroner talked about 13 it. Well, they charged her -- one of the first charged against her was sexual battery, and now they talked 14 15 about -- and you heard Major Manley say when I was trying to get around talking about an object, well, a penis 16 wouldn't do something or it would be -- well, there's one 17 They never brought it up. 18 way and notice this. 19 ever checked his penis. I covered that a minute ago, but 20 no one ever checked. If they thought it was that, hey. 21 They've got all these DNA people at their disposal. 22 have microscopes and they've got magnifying glasses. They've got stuff I can't even think about that can find 23 chemicals and particles and hairs, debris, you name it. 24 But they didn't find anything and didn't go looking for 25 26 it. Here they have this whole mobile home wide open and no one there. Jeffrey Havard is up -- locked up by now 27 They go back in the morning, two or three in 28 probably. the morning and they're going in there, looking and 29

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

standing around in the kitchen, looking at all these groceries and videotapes laying out and things. maybe there wasn't anything there. I say there wasn't anything there anyway, but if they thought there was an object that was put in that baby's rectum, then they should have been looking for an object. Something they could have sent up to the State Crime Lab for all these experts to look over closely and say, ah. Here's Because if they would have found one object something. with some of that child's fecal matter or DNA on it, then they would have had something to come in front of you with and say she's six months old, and we know she didn't go walking around and stick this in herself. We know someone did this to her and that someone was Jeffrey Havard because he was the only one there, but they don't have anything like that. They didn't even -- you heard them say they weren't even looking for anything. thought they had it made, nor did they go back if -- in one of the theories you'd have to think about since they're saying that Jeffrey Havard put some object or penis or some other object with what the instructions the Judge gave you will say. They didn't go back and look for a used condom. Not -- nobody said they did, and they had the trailer there, the mobile home to go looking for. They could have looked around the yard for one, under the trailer, on the roof of the trailer, because there had to be something based on the police and State theory that was the object. In other words, they told you an object. They haven't really shown any hypothesis what the object

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

Strictly guessing. What happened was a horrible, 1 tragic accident, and Jeffrey Havard was really stupid for 2 not immediately calling someone or thinking he knew enough when to decide when a baby was hurt or a baby wasn't hurt and he put the baby back in the bed. But Jeffrey Havard does not deserve to be found guilty of capital murder via б the route of sexual battery because he's stupid and because he had absolutely no idea what he was dealing with in trying to take care of a child of a girlfriend that had been living with him for three weeks. When you go back to consider all these things, please consider the points that we have shown you also about what isn't there because the State has tried to construct a horrible charge, capital murder, it doesn't get any more serious than that, out of a tragedy certainly for the child and obviously for her family. And one more tragedy on top of that of being found guilty on the part of Jeffrey Havard for capital murder isn't going to do anything to make anybody feel The facts simply aren't there to support your finding him quilty of sexual battery and through that for capital murder. And Jeffrey Havard asks you to find him not guilty of the charge of capital murder.

BY THE COURT: Mr. Harper.

BY MR. HARPER: May it please the Court, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: Yes, sir.

BY MR. HARPER: Ladies and gentlemen, I don't know what courtroom Mr. Sermos has been in for the last three days, but he obviously has not been in the same one I've

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

<u>12</u>

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

The evidence in this case is more overwhelming that any I've ever been involved in. We were here Monday morning, talked about the burden of proof in this case, and I asked each and every one of you if you would be reasonable in trying to decide whether you had any doubt as to the defendant's guilt in this case, and every one of you told me that you would. And I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that you're reasonable in this case and you know what the verdict is. I told you that we can't define reasonable doubt for you. Why do you think that is? do you think they didn't let us define that for you? very simple, folks. When this system was created which in my opinion is the greatest judicial system that's ever been created by mankind. When it was created, the founding fathers of this country knew that twelve individual people selected as jurors from all different walks of life, from all different backgrounds, from all different educational levels and experiences and ages had enough good, God-given common sense to listen what came out of that witness stand, to watch the witnesses, look at the evidence, apply it to that law, and make a decision. It's not intended to be that hard. And I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that if you're reasonable and if you use your common sense in this case, it is obvious what the verdict is. Overwhelming. You heard those doctors and nurses. I have -- I've never seen them testify with that conviction. They saw it. They want to act like we didn't even prove a sexual battery. They say we don't have an eyewitness. Well, ladies and gentlemen, we had one but

she ain't never going to be here to tell you what 1 Y'all said that you wouldn't require us to have 2 eyewitness or confessions, but they want to beat us over 3 -- well, they can't show -- they're talking about lumber 4 I don't what that's got to do with anything, but I 5 6 tell you this. If you use your good, God-given common . sense and listen to what's going on, it is an insult to 7 8 your intelligence for him to expect you to believe what he 9 just told you while ago. He must think y'all fell off 10 some turnip truck out here on the street before you got up here. It's ludicrous for you to believe what he told 11 I mean, the deputies, the coroner, everybody told 12 13 you what was wrong with that child's rectum, her anus. And they told you what caused it. It's overwhelming. . 14 15 You're talking about fingernails and skin. There weren't 16 any scratches on that baby. Why would there be skin under 17 his fingernails. And I am going to tell you something, The most overwhelming thing in this case is the 18 folks. statements that man gave to the law enforcement and to the 19 20 people at the hospital. First of all, what does he tell 21 the people at the hospital? He don't know -- he can't tell you. He ain't got any idea what's wrong. 22 23 he tell the law enforcement the night they take him down there and take a statement from him. Told Buddy Frank and 24 John Manley. I don't know what happened. I just gave her 25 a bath and put her to bed. I can't tell you what 26 27 happened. So for one thing we know already, we know that he will lie to protect himself. We know that. 28 admitted that on his statement in the last statement, the 29.

LABER GOND FORMA @ PENGAD - 1-600-631-5965 - www.pwngad.com

video statement. That he lied when he talked to them the first time. So we know he'd like to protect himself. 2 3 Sermos says he didn't have time to concoct a story. What was he doing up there sitting in that jail cell. What do you think he was doing, knowing what was wrong with that 5 baby and what they were finding down there at that 6 hospital. What do you think he was doing? He was trying to figure out a lie to tell -- to protect, to cover what 8 9 he knew they were going to find, and I submit to you that when he gave that video statement in the written statement 10 that you're going to have a copy of two days later, that 11 that's what he was trying to do. Continue to lie to 12 13 protect himself. Tell just enough to make the physical 14 facts fit what he's trying to say, but, folks, he couldn't explain the sexual battery. They asked him over and over 16 and over again in that tape, and he kept saying, "I can't . . 17 explain it. I don't know. I just can't explain how that happened." There ain't no other way to explain it than to 18 19 admit that he committed sexual battery, ladies and gentlemen. No other way. I tell you I've been 20 prosecuting up here for fifteen years, and I've seen 21 .22 confessions and statements. I have never seen a more incriminating statement from a person trying to deny that 23 they committed a crime in my life. Never. What does he 24 admit in this statement. First of all, he openly admits 25 26 the shaking. Of course, he wants you to think it was some accident. He just shook her like this. You heard what 27 Dr. Hayne said would have to happen for this shaking to 28 cause the injuries that baby had, but he admits that 29

because he's got to. What else is he going to say. But 1 2 it was an accident. He was panicking. But he admits to the shaking. He admits -- it's on page eighteen, and 3 4 y'all got a copy of the transcript. He admits the 5 opportunity. That he's the only one that had the 6 opportunity to commit the battery and the killing. 7 says, "I know I was the only one home. It was just me and the infant there. Me and Chloe." He's the only one that 8 9 had the opportunity by his own admission. What else does 10 he admit in the statement. He admits in the statement, 11 and he don't want to, but he's trying to cover himself, 12 trying to keep that lie where he can cover himself. 13 admits the penetration. Says, "I just wiped her down 14 between the legs like normal, inside of her buttocks." 15 And the police officer said, "You said earlier that your 16 finger may have slipped or you may have wiped her a 17 little bit too hard." He says, "It's possible. Maybe I 18 was too rough with her. Maybe I went too far in on her." 19 He admits it, ladies and gentlemen, but they want you to 20 believe this house of cards they're building over here. 21 -And this to me the most incriminating thing he says in 22 this statement, folks. They ask him did he do it, and I 23 couldn't believe this when I heard it. Says how do you 24 explain the damage that was done to her rear end. He 25 said, "I can't explain it. I don't know." Do you think 26 you've done it. And he said and I quote, "I don't think I did it. I don't recollect doing it. I don't remember 27 doing it." Folks, if you hadn't done that, you'd be 28 29 saying, hell, no. I didn't do it. You wouldn't be not

recollecting doing it or not remembering doing it or not 1 thinking you did it. That ain't reasonable. That ain't 2 common sense. Ladies and gentlemen, I submit to you what 3 happened out there that night was very simple. Now, I'm not making any accusations. I don't know if anything had 5 ever happened with that child before, but that night he 6 got carried away or something, and he hurt that child more 7 than he intended to in this sexual battery. He hurt her. 8 You heard him talking about how she was injured in her 9 rectal area, and what does a child do -- what's the only 10 11 defense an infant baby has got when something like that happens to them? They scream. They don't just cry, 12 They scream in pain. When they're in pain, they 13 folks. scream. And what's he going to do then? She's screaming. 14 He's injured her. Stop her. I got to stop her from 15 screaming. Well, he stopped her all right. She ain't 16 screaming now. And then what does he do? Now, he's not 17 only injured her rectally, but he shook her so hard that 18 results in her death. What is he going to do then? 19 going to clean her up. He washed her up and cleaned her 20 21 up. Get rid of this evidence. Talking about DNA and DNA on the sheet with both of them's DNA in it, and he -- want 22 to talk about there ain't no DNA on her. My, gosh, the 23 nurses said that's the cleanest baby they had ever seen in 24 their life. Clean her up. Get the evidence out of that. 25 26 I don't know. He may have taken a shower then himself. He kept asking Ray Brown. Maybe he didn't think he got 27 clean enough. I don't know. He was in the bathroom when 28 29 Becky got home. Clean her up and lie. Put her in the

bed. Don't go in there and wake her up. She's asleep. 1 2 Put her up. Do you know what happened? No, I ain't got any idea. I don't know what happened. Overwhelming. 3 This is not hard, folks. And I want to say this, too. 4 They want to talk about the police didn't do this and the 5 police didn't do that. You know, the Judge read you the 6 instructions. You know, they keep -- we didn't find some 7 object. It says penetration with a body part or an object 8 or whatever. They didn't know what -- they're out there 10 trying -- they don't know what -- and I don't know what he 11 I can't tell you what he used. I don't have to 12 tell you what he used. All I have to prove is that he did it with whatever, and they keep talking about what 13 injuries. Asked Dr. Hayne -- how ever so slight the 14 penetration. Even the slightest penetration is sufficient 15 to warrant a conviction. And my goodness, he wants to ask 16 17 you why they didn't look for a condom. Do y'all actually 18 think that somebody that would commit this crime would take the time and safety to put on a condom to do it. 19 20 That's an insult, folks. An insult to you. Reasonable. It's not that hard. I have confidence in 21 Common sense. I have confidence in this system. And it's with 22 23 that confidence that I'm going to submit this case to you 24 on behalf of the People of the State of Mississippi and 25 ask you to go back into the jury room and deliberate it, and return a verdict of quilty of capital murder because, 26 27 ladies and gentlemen, that's what the evidence warrants. That's justice in this case. That's justice for that 28 Thank you. That's all I have. 29 child.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

BY THE COURT: All right. Now, ladies and gentlemen, it's time for you to deliberate and to decide this case. You will be allowed to take with you the jury instructions that I read to you previously. Also the exhibits, and also there will be some paper and pencils or pens for you to write Now, on the exhibits, I won't send all the exhibits back. Some of these sheets and items dealing with the kits and the blood, I am not going to send those back. If y'all want to see those, just let the bailiff know and I'll get those back for you Also the video will be available if you desire to look at that, there is a transcript in evidence of that, but because that is so bulky and we have to pretty much do that out here, that won't go back in there with you. But if you want to look at the video again or if you want to see these sheets or kits, assault kits, that were placed into evidence, just let the bailiff know and I'll be sure to send them back there so you can look at them. Now, this is just a suggestion, but what you may consider doing the first thing is to select from among yourselves a foreperson. This person's vote counts no more than everyone else on the jury, but it is helpful if you have a foreperson presiding over the deliberations. That way everybody doesn't talk at the same time and also when you get ready to start taking votes, that's real helpful. So that's just a suggestion. Now, your verdict must be unanimous.

1

2

has to be unanimous. One of the instructions tells Whichever way it may be, either to find the defendant quilty of capital murder or not quilty, when all twelve of you agree upon a verdict in this case, you're to write it out on a separate sheet of One of the instructions, Number 19, I'm going to place it on top. It tells you exactly how to do Whichever way it may be, but when all twelve of you agree upon a verdict in this case. You write it out on a separate sheet of paper and you knock on the door so that the bailiff will know that you have reached a verdict in this case. Now, Mr. Hammett, as the alternate, you will not go back into the jury room with them. You have been here in case something had happened to one of the jurors, and we did right off the bat have something happened to one of the jurors, a problem with her foot. You'd be surprised how often something happens, and that prevents us from having to stop and come back another time and start the trial all over again. I do very much appreciate your duty that you have served in this case, your attendance, but you will not go back into the jury room and you will be discharged. You'll be allowed to go check out of your room and to get your belongings, and somebody will be glad to assist you with that, but I do want to very much thank you for your attentiveness in this case and for your attendance, and if you need any type of excuse, the clerk's office will be glad to assist you with that.

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

So at this time, I am going to direct that the jury retire to the jury room to deliberate and decide this case.

(The jury retired to the jury room at approximately 2:40 p.m. At approximately 3:20 p.m., a knock was heard on the door, signaling the jury had reached a verdict.

The jury returned to the courtroom, and the verdict of guilty of capital murder was read. The Court polled the jury, and the following was made of record, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: Let the record show that the Court on its own motion and initiative has caused the jury to be polled and has received an affirmative response from each and every one of the twelve jurors that this, in fact, their verdict, and, therefore, it will be entered as the unanimous verdict of the jury. All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I want you to listen to me very carefully. Because the defendant has been found guilty of capital murder, it will be necessary to proceed further with what's known as a sentencing phase to determine whether or not the defendant should receive the penalty of death in this case or not. Now, under the law, it would necessary for us to take a pretty substantial recess at this point of at least about an hour. It will be some further testimony, probably three or four witnesses. I have been trying to gauge that. testimony, additional testimony, should not be very

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

29

lengthy. I will say certainly less than an hour. The Court would also have to give a few additional instructions on the law, and then the attorneys will be allowed to make some further arguments to you and then you will retire to the jury room to deliberate and decide that issue. Now, my question is this. It's 3:30. As I said, we would have to take about an hour recess before we could get started on that, and clearly this would take us past five but not a lot past five to move on with this. Of course, I have no way of anticipating how long your deliberations could My question to you is this. Would you prefer that we go ahead and proceed on, and let's take this hour recess and come back and go ahead and try to conclude the case today, or would you prefer that we go ahead and recess and let you go on and spend the night at the Eola and come back and start with the sentencing phase tomorrow. It appears to me we don't have a lot more left, but, again, I have no idea about what time that would conclude. I guess what I am going to do. This is just your personal feelings and everything. Those of you that are of the opinion that you'd like to go ahead and take this hour recess now and go ahead and proceed on with the sentencing phase today, would you please raise your hand if you have an opinion that you'd rather do that.

27 (Jurors raise hands.)

BY THE COURT: If you have a strong opinion that you'd rather just stop for the day and come back

tomorrow. Anyone of that or --

2 (A juror raises his hand.)

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

· 24

25

26

27

28

29

BY THE COURT: Okay. Let the record show that the Court has made this inquiry of the jury, and I find that by far substantially most of the jurors would like to go ahead and proceed. And it is an early hour today. So I will say this. going to push anybody, any of you past the point where you get tired today or anything because I am not going to that. So what I am going to do, is we're going to take a recess about a hour, and what I want the jurors to be allowed to do, Mr. Vines, why don't we let them go the chancery courtroom at the I don't want anybody down there except for the jurors and bailiffs, your personnel. If they'd like to get a cold drink, let's get them some cold drinks, maybe if they want a snack or something like that, we'll do that, but let's do that, and we'll do that. It's necessary under the law that we take this recess at this time, and then we'll go ahead and proceed and see how the time goes, but, again, I am not going to push anybody, particularly not the jurors, past the point of being tired today. So let's do this. want everybody else to remain where you are, and let's let the jurors go down at the end of the hall. Do any of the jurors have anything back in the jury room?

(The jury is excused down to the chancery courtroom at approximately 3:30.)

27

28

29

BY THE COURT: Now, let me say this before we The Court is going to take about an hour recess. I am going to need to see the attorneys in a recess. little while before, and we'll go over some instructions or other matters. For all the spectators here. Let me say this, ladies and I can't begin to put myself in either one of your families' position. I realize we have family and friends on behalf of the victim here. I realize we have family and friends on behalf of the defendant. All I am going to tell you is this is a court of law. That's the way it's going to be conducted, and I just cannot under the law allow any disruptions of the court proceedings. So let's please keep that in mind. We're going to take about an hour recess before we start in on the sentencing phase, and I will need to see the attorneys in about ten minutes or so. I'll give y'all a break before we do that.

(The following was made in the chambers of the Judge,
OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: Let the record show that the Court is in chambers with counsel for each side and also the defendant. The jury on the guilt innocence phase of this trial after due deliberations did return into open court a verdict finding the defendant guilty of capital murder. The Court on its own motion and initiative polled the jury and determined that the verdict was unanimous. Because

of the reasonably early hour of the day, being 3:30 when this was returned, the Court explained to the jury the basic process that remained in the case, and the jury was nearly unanimous in their desire to take a recess and proceed with the sentencing phase Therefore, the Court declared at least an today. hour recess and is allowing the jurors in a separate secure location being sequestered with the bailiff to have some refreshments and to take a recess before we proceed with the sentencing phase. The Court's purpose at this time is to go over the proposed jury instructions even though there is still evidence to put on in the sentencing phase, but the Court does not anticipate lengthy evidence on either side during the sentencing phase. So the Court wanted to take this opportunity to allow counsel for each side the opportunity to state their specific objections for the record as to the proposed jury instructions on the sentencing phase. All right. First of all, the Court will take up the State instructions and then the defendant's instructions and pursuant to law, either side that has an objection to an instruction that is being granted will be required to state their specific objections into the record. Now, the Court has been provided with an amended or revised --

BY MR. HARPER: S-8, I believe, Your Honor.

ON INSTRUCTION S-8: BY THE COURT: S-8 by the State. Mr. Sermos, Mr. Clark, have y'all received that?

29

28

29

BY MR. CLARK: Yes, sir. 1 BY THE COURT: 2 Okay. 3 BY MR. HARPER: Your Honor --BY THE COURT: Yes, sir. 4 BY MR. HARPER: We would -- ask to withdraw, 5 move to withdraw S-8. I guess we could call this one б 7 S-8 A or would you rather --BY THE COURT: Yes. I will label this S-8 A. 8 9 sure will. BY MR. SERMOS: Excuse me, Your Honor. 10 11 ask one question. 12 BY THE COURT: Yes, sir. 13 BY MR. SERMOS: May I ask the State or ask the Court to ask the State what was the main difference 14 in the one they withdrew and --15 The one before had certain 16 BY MR. HARPER: information that was left out of it that we were 17 waiting to see what the evidence had shown to 18 19 determine what the aggravating factors and that type thing or mitigating factors, and now they've been 20 21 plugged in there basically. Those were substituted in there. 22 23 BY MR. SERMOS: Okay. Thank you, sir. It was incomplete in its 24 BY MR. HARPER: 25 previous form. 26 27

BY THE COURT: The Court has reviewed this instruction, and it appears to be the proper sentencing instruction to be submitted by the Court on the sentencing phase. First of all, it sets out

in part A that the jury must first unanimously find 1 2 beyond a reasonable doubt that one or more of what's 3 often referred to as the, I believe, Enmund, E-n-m-u-n-d, factors, which is that the defendant 4 5 actually killed Chloe Madison Britt or attempted to kill or intended to kill. That a killing take place 6 or contemplated that lethal force would be employed. 7 8 Of course, in this case the only one that's really applicable is number one. That the defendant 9 10 actually killed Chloe Madison Britt. The nature of 11. the capital murder charge against the defendant in 12 this case is as set out in the indictment and as provided by law is that the killing was done with or 13 without a design, deliberate design or intent to 14 There is still a requirement under Enmund that 15 the jury find that his actions did result in the 1,6 death of the alleged victim. That he did actually 17 18 kill the victim whether it be with or without intent or design to do so. It goes on further to provide in 19 sub part B that the mitigating circumstances do not 20 outweigh the aggravating circumstances. 21 This is the It sets out the aggravating circumstances 22 23 provided by statute that can be considered. are set out as, one, that the -- whether the 24 defendant is guilty of capital murder of Chloe 25 Madison Britt. Whether the capital offense was 26 committed with the defendant while engaged in the 27 commission of or an attempt to commit sexual battery 28 29 which is the alleged underlying felony, and three,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

whether the capital offense was especially heinous, atrocious, or cruel. The Court has examined this and finds that these would be the three proper aggravating circumstances and the only ones that the jury would be allowed to consider. Previously as the record will reflect, the State initially indicted the defendant on alternative underlying felony of child-This was stricken by amendment made at the beginning of the trial without objection. However, I do recall at that time defense moved the Court because that was being deleted, and they were electing to go forward on the underlying felony of sexual battery only. That the child abuse should not be a part of the record which the Court has so ruled, or should not be part of the evidence in this case, and also that should not be an aggravating factor because it was no longer in the indictment as it is amended. So that would not be a problem and that is not included in this. Furthermore, the instruction sets out that the jury must find beyond a reasonable doubt one or more of the aggravating circumstances which that is the law. If they do not, then they are to return a verdict or a sentence of life imprisonment which this instruction sets out. If the jury does find beyond a reasonable doubt one or more of the statutory aggravating elements, then they are to proceed to consider mitigating elements or circumstances. These are also listed by statute,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

and there are two listed in this which the Court finds would be the two proper to include. that there are some -- clearly there's unlimited amount of number of possible mitigating circumstances that may fall within two which is the catch-all I am not aware of any other statutory provision. ones that the defense may have that should be considered. I'll be glad to hear from them about that, but clearly you can set out a number or argue a number of them that would fall under two which may not be covered by statute but clearly are a potential mitigating circumstance. If they further find that one or more of those elements of mitigation exist, then the instruction further correctly instructs the jury that they have to determine that the mitigating circumstances do not outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstances. If they find that the mitigating circumstances outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstances, then the jury shall not impose the death sentence. Sub part C then sets out the possible alternative verdicts. Number one, in the event that the jury determines to return -impose the death penalty, that must set out and write and find the aggravating circumstances and list those in addition to the Enmund factor which has already been addressed, and then further state that they find that they are insufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstances, and then the foreman signs the verdict. It further provides a

blank if they find that life imprisonment is the proper sentence, or if they are unable to unanimously agree on punishment, there's a blank to determine that. It appears to the Court that this does properly set out the law in that the burden is on the State to prove existence of aggravating circumstances beyond a reasonable doubt. However, the only -- that is only as to the existence of aggravating circumstances, and then by law as this instruction sets out, they determine that the mitigating circumstances are insufficient to outweigh or overcome the aggravating circumstances. All right. Now, at this time, I will hear any objections for the record by the defense to this instruction.

BY MR. SERMOS: I have no objection, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: It does -- the Court has very carefully considered and does appear to do that. So it would be the Court's intention to grant this at the proper time.

BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor, may I add one thing? I presume with the granting of this instruction that the heinous, atrocious and cruel definitions in this other --

BY THE COURT: Yeah. We can address that.
That's a model instruction --

BY MR. SERMOS: I just want to make sure.

BY THE COURT: I'm going to allow you -- I will reserve the right for you to state your specific objections to that. The Court has carefully

considered that. That there has been a lot of litigation about that. The Court has carefully considered in light of the evidence, and the Court does find that there is an evidentiary basis in this case for the Court to consider that as one of the aggravating circumstances. In other words, I find that a reasonable jury could find beyond a reasonable doubt that that aggravating circumstance does exist in this case. For the reasons that this is a sixmonth-old infant victim, small child, there's been clear testimony as to a very traumatic or severe injury to her anus or rectum due to some type of penetration. Also there's evidence of a very severe, violent shaking of her body which she clung to life apparently for some period of time. Was resuscitated and ultimately apparently died from excessive bleeding in the -- or hemorrhage from her brain and swelling of the head and facial area. circumstances testified -- I am not going to go fully. These are in the record, but I do feel like in this case this is a case where the evidence is there that the jury can consider this as a aggravating factor primarily due to the nature of the injury to this minor child what clearly was -- would have been something that would meet this statutory language.

BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor, may I ask you one thing?

BY THE COURT: Yes.

29

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

26

27

BY MR. SERMOS: I know you're probably -- so we are going on to the next one. The State did not withdraw S-9. That's still going forward, correct?

BY MR. HARPER: That's correct.

BY MR. SERMOS: Thank you.

ON INSTRUCTION S-9: BY THE COURT: S-9 is the proper instruction. There has been a lot of litigation about what is the proper instruction and when this is proper for the jury to consider. This does appear to be the latest one approved by our court. So at this time I will allow any objections for on the record by the defendant to S-9.

BY MR. SERMOS: One moment, please, Your Honor. Yes, Your Honor. I would object on the record to S-9 under the Eighth through the Fourteenth Amendment of the US Constitution that the heinous, atrocious, and cruel instruction and any definition of it especially in this instruction is confusing to jurors, and that there should be a constitutional question as to actually what is heinous, atrocious, or cruel, and what would be unnecessarily tortuous to a victim, and I would object on that basis, the Eighth through the Fourteenth Amendment.

BY THE COURT: Okay. It will be granted over those objections.

BY MR. SERMOS: Yes, sir.

ON INSTRUCTION S-10: BY THE COURT: All right.

Then S-10 appears to be a proper instruction. That

it's not merely a counting process to determine

aggravating circumstances versus mitigating circumstances. As I understand the law, there could be as many as three aggravating circumstances in this case, and the jury could find -- or one juror could find the existence of a mitigating circumstances that in their opinion that overcame or outweighed the aggravating circumstances. So I think this is proper. So any objection to S-10?

BY MR. SERMOS: No, Your Honor.

ON INSTRUCTION D-18: BY THE COURT: All right. Now on the defendant's instructions that have been submitted in the event of a sentencing phase which we are now facing. Is any objection to D-18 by the State?

No, sir. BY MR. HARPER:

BY THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Your Honor, the only objection we would have is in paragraph number three where it says, "by explaining all four potential steps." And then there are subsequent instructions which call this step -- refer to themselves as step three, for example, which are inappropriate mercy instructions. So we would object to that. of the phrase "by explaining all four potential steps. "

BY MR. SERMOS: We would ask then, Your Honor, if it helps, if that's the main thing, we just put -could we just ask the Court to change about explaining these steps or --

PENGAD - 1-600-631-8989 0

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

26

27

28

1	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: It's in paragraph two also.
2	BY MR. SERMOS: Right.
3	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: It may be because there may
4	be at least
5	BY MR. SERMOS: There are four, but I understand
6	that it can be confusing. If you would like, Your
7	Honor, where it says two in paragraph two it says,
8	"four steps" "at least four steps" we can just put
9	several steps.
10	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: That would be fine.
11	BY MR. SERMOS: Is that fine, Mr. Rosenblatt? If
12	the Judge
13	BY THE COURT: Change it to what, now?
14	BY MR. HARPER: May be several instead of at
15	least four.
16	BY MR. SERMOS: Right.
17	BY MR. HARPER: Several steps.
18	BY MR. SERMOS: That's right.
19	BY THE COURT: There may be at least several
20	steps. Okay. I'll so amend that instruction.
21	BY MR. HARPER: And then the next paragraph,
22	Your Honor, by explaining
23	BY MR. SERMOS: These steps.
24	BY MR. HARPER: the potential steps instead
25	of all four potential steps.
26	BY THE COURT: And the potential steps. And the
27	defendant is agreeable to these two slight
28	amendments?
29	BY MR. SERMOS: Yes, Your Honor.

1	BY THE COURT: With that, are there any other	
2 .	objections of the State?	
3	BY MR. HARPER: No, sir.	
4	BY THE COURT: All right. Then granted.	
5	That's D-18.	
6	ON INSTRUCTION D-19: BY THE COURT: Any	
7	objections by the State to D-19?	
8	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: No objection, Your Honor.	
9	BY THE COURT: All right. D-19 will be granted.	
10	ON INSTRUCTION D-20: BY THE COURT: Any	
11	objection to D-20.	
12	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Your Honor, we would object	
13	to D-20. It's a mercy instruction. Because it's	
14	encouraging the jury to disregard the aggravating	
15	circumstances	
16	BY MR. HARPER: Primarily in the second	
17	paragraph, Judge.	
18	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: The whole second paragraph	
19	is basically a mercy instruction.	
20	BY THE COURT: Well, the	
21	1	
21	BY MR. HARPER: The second	
22	BY MR. HARPER: The second BY THE COURT: Just a second. Just a second.	
22	BY THE COURT: Just a second. Just a second.	
22 23	BY THE COURT: Just a second. Just a second. The first sentence of the second paragraph, "You may	
22 23 24	BY THE COURT: Just a second. Just a second. The first sentence of the second paragraph, "You may find a sentence of death is inappropriate even if	
22 23 24 25	BY THE COURT: Just a second. Just a second. The first sentence of the second paragraph, "You may find a sentence of death is inappropriate even if there's only a single mitigating circumstance and	
22 23 24 25 26	BY THE COURT: Just a second. Just a second. The first sentence of the second paragraph, "You may find a sentence of death is inappropriate even if there's only a single mitigating circumstance and multiple aggravating circumstance." That's a correct	

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

BY THE COURT: The second sentence in the second 1 "You may also find that death is not 2 warranted even though there are one or more 3 aggravating circumstances and not a single mitigating 4 5 circumstance." Now, it's my understanding that 6 that's not the law. That the jury does -- the jury 7 has to find at least a mitigating circumstance or they should find a mitigating circumstance. 8 9 BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor, I didn't bring my --I understand law never instructs the jury that they 10 have to find for death no matter what --11 BY MR. HARPER: But our argument is that this 12 is like a nullification instruction. That is the law 13 14 that they don't have to do that, but you are --15 BY MR. SERMOS: Okay. BY MR. HARPER: -- not -- you can't instruct them 16 17 as to that. BY MR. SERMOS: Okay. 18 BY MR. HARPER: You follow what I am saying? 19 20

BY MR. SERMOS: Okay. So you're talking about that second --

BY MR. HARPER: Second sentence really on down to the bottom of the page.

BY MR. SERMOS: Nor does aggravated -- find that you would require a sentence of death. Well, that is --

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: That's correct.

BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor, what I would -- may I make a proposal, Your Honor?

BY THE COURT: Well --

BY MR. SERMOS: Whatever you have in mind.

BY THE COURT: Yes, sir. All right. I don't find the word mercy in here, and I understand -- I believe the weighing process again is the jury has to find aggravating circumstances at least one or more beyond a reasonable doubt or that's it.

BY MR. HARPER: Right.

BY THE COURT: The jury has no burden on it to find mitigating circumstances. There is no burden beyond a reasonable doubt to find mitigating circumstances, but if the jury finds an aggravating circumstance, it's my understanding and appreciation of the law that they must find that the mitigating circumstances are insufficient to overcome the aggravating circumstances in order to return the death penalty, and you can't just -- this borders on mercy. It borders on mercy, but I'm going to grant this instruction.

BY MR. HARPER: As is, Your Honor?

BY THE COURT: As is.

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Thank you, Your Honor.

ON INSTRUCTION D-21: BY THE COURT: Does the State any have objection to D-21.

BY MR. HARPER: It is a mercy instruction, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: I do find this is a mercy instruction. I am going to refuse this instruction for that reason.

1.2

1	ON INSTRUCTION D-22: BY THE COURT: D-22.
2	BY MR. HARPER: We have no objection.
3	BY THE COURT: That will be granted.
4	ON INSTRUCTION D-23: BY THE COURT: Any
5	objection to D-23?
б	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Yes, Your Honor. We don't
7	find that the law states presumption of no there
8	is no presumption that life is the proper sentence.
9	BY MR. HARPER: Or presumption that there are no
10	aggravating circumstances.
1.1	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: I would cite the Court to
12 ·	Watts v. State, 733, 214. The summary of the case.
13	Likewise, the defendant is not entitled to an
14	instruction that the defendant enters the sentence
15	phase with the presumption that a life sentence is
16	the proper sentence.
17	BY THE COURT: Okay. The Court does find that
18	this is not the proper statement of the law, and the
19	Court is going to refuse Instruction D-23.
20	ON INSTRUCTION D-24: BY THE COURT: D-24.
21	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: No objection, Your Honor.
22	BY THE COURT: That will be the granted.
23	ON INSTRUCTION D-25: BY THE COURT: All right.
24	D-25.
25	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: No objection, Your Honor.
26	It would be a difficult one minor objection is the
27	emphasis on the word "individual," but that's a minor
28	point.

I will allow that.

That will be

granted.

ON INSTRUCTION D-26: BY THE COURT: D-26.

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Your Honor, again we have a mercy instruction. They're asking for sympathy and mercy to be considered. We have no objection to the use of the word "fairness" in the fourth sentence, but after that, it talks about sympathy and mercy.

BY THE COURT: The Court finds this is an improper statement of the law, and the Court is going to refuse Instruction D-26 for the reference to what would be referred to as a sympathy or mercy instruction.

BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor, may I ask the Court one question?

BY THE COURT: Yes, sir.

BY MR. SERMOS: I want to make sure and ask it in here. Does the Court have any problems if during -- especially during the closing part of the sentencing if I state to the jury that this Court will never order -- will never instruct you that you must sentence the defendant to death. Is that a --

BY THE COURT: That's a correct statement.

BY MR. SERMOS: Okay. I just want to make --

BY THE COURT: And let me say this for the record. I understand the very seriousness of this nature, and I'm not going to tie anybody's hands about argument in this case. The only hands that will be tied will be the State's hand because it will very -- the law about what you can and can't argue

will be very strictly adhered to. The only thing is just you cannot argue to the jury that it is the law that mercy is something they can consider --

BY MR. SERMOS: Right.

BY THE COURT: I mean, mercy can be argued in a way, but you can't instruct them that that is the law, and, clearly, you can't instruct that because you're absolutely right, Mr. Sermos. That is the law. There is never an instance that mandates a death sentence, and I believe I referred to that on voir dire at some point, but you're absolutely correct, and I find no problem with doing that.

BY MR. SERMOS: I have one more question, Your Honor, with another statement. Does the Court have any reservations or instructions against me or any of the defense stating to the jury that even if you think he deserved to die, you can still show him mercy and sentence him to life imprisonment without parole?

BY THE COURT: Well --

BY MR. SERMOS: I mean, do you have --

BY THE COURT: I --

BY MR. SERMOS: I feel I can make that, but I want --

BY THE COURT: You may so argue that.

BY MR. SERMOS: I just don't want to do it and then get --

BY THE COURT: I understand. I'm going to allow you some leeway because this is clearly a very, very

serious matter. 1 2 BY MR. SERMOS: Thank you, sir. ON INSTRUCTION D-27: BY THE COURT: What about 3 D-27? 4 BY MR. HARPER: No objection to 27. 5 BY THE COURT: That will be the granted. 6 7 ON INSTRUCTION D-28: BY THE COURT: D-28. BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Your Honor, we would object 8 to D-28 in that basically it's a repeat of S-10. 9 10 BY MR. SERMOS: I withdraw that, Your Honor. BY THE COURT: I believe it is the same. 11 will be withdrawn. D-28. That's already covered. 12 ON INSTRUCTION D-29: BY THE COURT: D-29. 13 14. This appears to be an incorrect statement of the 15 law. It says only if each and every juror finds beyond a reasonable doubt that death is the only 16 appropriate punishment --17 BY MR. SERMOS: I withdraw that, Your Honor. 18 BY THE COURT: Okay. So that will be withdrawn. 19 20 That's not a proper statement of the law. Okay. 21 believe that's all the instructions. Again, this is for the purpose -- even though both sides have not 22 rested during the sentencing phase, I did want to go 23 24 ahead and cover that. Does either side have any other instructions for the sentencing phase? 25 BY MR. SERMOS: No, Your Honor, but when you're 26 finished --27 BY MR. ROSENBLATT: No, Your Honor. 28

BY MR. SERMOS: -- I have a question for the

Court.

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

26

27

BY THE COURT: Certainly.

BY MR. SERMOS: Obviously I know Mr. Harper will let me know if there's a disagreement. I understand that Mr. Havard could chose to testify during the sentencing phase. I am not saying we're recommending that, but I would ask the Court to give him instruction on that.

BY THE COURT: All right. Mr. Havard, let me What is usually referred to as the guilt or innocent phase has been concluded and whether you agree with it or not, the jury has found you guilty of the crime of capital murder. I know your attorneys have explained this to you, but what remains is the sentencing phase for the jury consistent with the law and the evidence to decide whether or not to impose the death penalty or life imprisonment. You have a right to testify on this phase of the trial if you desire to do so. I do want to advise you about what the issue is in this case. The issue at this point is what the proper penalty So it wouldn't necessarily be proper for you to testify and to go back through arguing your guilt or innocence of this, but very clearly you have every right to testify as a witness, to -- you know -- ask the jury -- you know -- to decide on life rather than death. And your attorneys can confer with you, but you have that same right to either testify or not testify at this phase. So I want you to understand

that just because you didn't testify in the other, you still have that option to do so. You understand that?

BY THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Okay. And, again, let the record show he did say that he understood that, and again, Mr. Havard, this is your choice. I don't care what your attorneys advise you. If you desire to do that at this phase of the trial, you will be allowed to do that, but you understand we're not going back and relitigating the issue of whether you're guilty or not because the jury has spoken on that. So you think about it, and if you want to testify on this phase, then you certainly -- just let the Court know. If you want to be called as a witness and your attorneys won't call you, all you have to do is just raise your hand and get my attention and I will do that, but think very carefully about it. Again, they're the professionals here to advise you, but you're the one that is the defendant in this case. So that's ultimately your decision to make. Okay.

BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor, could it be on the record too, that if he did testify that still he would be subject to cross-examination by Mr. Harper.

BY THE COURT: That's right. He is subject to cross-examination, but, again, it would be -- the issue here would be the sentence, the proper sentence in this case.

BY MR. CLARK: In other words, he couldn't go

29

28

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

26

back and ask questions about why you did it or something like that then, correct?

BY THE COURT: It would be subject to --

BY MR. CLARK: Go through --

BY MR. HARPER: To what he says --

BY THE COURT: -- to objection. I would have no idea what he would say and I hate to rule --

BY MR. CLARK: Right. Right.

BY THE COURT: But this is -- right. It would have to be limited to the issue. As long as he stuck to the issue what's involved, then I wouldn't allow the State to go back and relitigate that.

BY MR. SERMOS: May I add one thing, Your Honor?
BY THE COURT: Yes, sir.

BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor, I spoke with the two witnesses we intend to call downstairs, Ms. Cheryl Harrell and Ruby Havard. Cheryl Harrell is Jeff's mother. Ruby Havard is the grandmother, and there's a certain degree of unhappiness there, and especially grandmother indicated she was going to try to -- she didn't tell me she was going to try to talk about it here, but she's still having problems with the guilt phase of the trial, and I just wanted the Court to know if I call her, and she starts going out of bounds, I mean, I will -- I'm not going to lead her that way, and I would ask the Court to immediately stop her.

BY THE COURT: Let me say this, Mr. Sermos. I understand exactly what you are saying. I understand

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

there's strong feelings on this, and I will certainly allow every leeway possible under the law, but I will try to confine --

BY MR. SERMOS: Right.

BY THE COURT: -- this to the issues involved. I'm going to do this. I'm going to give you an opportunity -- if you need a little more time before we get started, let's take it, but I don't want -- I want the jury to remain where they are until I ask for them to be brought back. You can confer with your witnesses and talk to Mr. Havard and make a determination of whether he desires to testify, and if y'all will let me know something in about fifteen or twenty minutes, no later than about fifteen or twenty minutes --

That's fine. BY MR. SERMOS: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: When you're ready to proceed. (After a short recess for the defense attorneys and the defendant to confer, the following was made OUT OF THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: Let the record show that the jury after due deliberations did return a verdict finding the defendant guilty as charged of capital The Court on its own motion and initiative murder. polled the jury and found the verdict to be The Court has now taken a recess in unanimous. excess of an hour and has had the jury removed to a different location sequestered by themselves in the courthouse where they have refreshments available to

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

them. At this time, again, it's before five o'clock. 1 2 It's a quarter to five 5 at this time. So I am going 3 to ask the attorneys. First, is the State ready to proceed with the sentencing phase of this? 4 BY MR. HARPER: Yes, Your Honor. 5 6 BY THE COURT: And is the defense ready to 7 proceed with the sentencing phase? BY MR. SERMOS: Yes, Your Honor. 8 9 BY THE COURT: Then at this time, I am going to ask that the jury be brought back into the courtroom 10 and seated in the jury box. 11 12 (The jury is brought back into the courtroom.) 13 BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the 14 jury, it's time to proceed with the sentencing phase 15 of this trial, the jury having found the defendant guilty of the crime of capital murder by unanimous 16 17 verdict. Now, first of all, does either the State or defense desire to make any type of opening 18

> BY MR. HARPER: No, Your Honor. No opening statement.

statement or comments at this time?

BY THE COURT: What about the defense?

BY MR. SERMOS: No opening statement, Your Honor.

Okay. Then at this time, the BY THE COURT: Court is going to ask, who does the State call as your first witness on the sentencing phase of this trial?

BY MR. HARPER: Your Honor, before we call the

witness, we would move the Court under or pursuant to the laws of the State of Mississippi to introduce the testimony, the evidence, and all exhibits that were previously introduced in the guilt phase of this particular trial. We would ask that they be entered into evidence in the sentencing phase in support of the aggravating circumstances that we intend to -- that we have presented to the Court in this --

BY THE COURT: That's all the testimony and evidence?

BY MR. HARPER: Everything from the guilt phase. Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Any objection to that?

BY MR. SERMOS: No, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: All right. That is the law.

That will be allowed. So let the record show that
the Court is directing that all the evidence and
testimony that was produced in the guilt or innocence
phase of the trial will be admitted into evidence on
the sentencing phase of the trial. Ladies and
gentlemen, you're to consider the same evidence that
was brought forward in the previous aspect of this
case now on the sentencing phase. All right. What
does the State have next?

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Your Honor, the State would call Mrs. Lillian Watson.

BY THE COURT: Lillian Watson?

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: All right. Lillian Watson.

•	Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Watson 657			
1	LILLIAN WATSON,			
2	having been duly and legally sworn, answered			
3	questions on her oath as follows, to-wit:			
4	BY THE COURT: You may have a seat. Mr.			
5	Rosenblatt, you may proceed.			
6	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Thank you, Your Honor.			
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION			
8	BY MR. ROSENBLATT:			
9	Q. Mrs. Watson, would you tell the jury your			
10	relationship to the parties in this case, to Becky and to			
11	Chloe Madison Britt? .			
12	A. I am Rebecca's mother, and I am Chloe's grammy.			
13	Q. How many children do you have, Mrs. Watson?			
14	A. I have two children and two stepchildren.			
15	Q. Would you tell us a little bit about your			
16	relationship with your granddaughter.			
17	A. That's really easy. I was there when she was			
18	born, August the 29th. She weighed seven pounds, seven			
19	ounces. She was born at eleven o'clock. I cut the cord,			
20	and from there, it was a bond.			
21	Q. Becky was alone. I mean, except for you, she			
22	didn't have a husband there?			
23	A. That's correct.			
24	Q. So you were her support basically.			
25	A. That's it.			
26	Q. And what was your relationship in that with			
27	Maddie after that point?			
28	A. With Maddie she lived with me for, I guess,			
29	about four months, and I had another granddaughter, Allie,			

Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Watson

who was four months at the time Maddie was born. They
both lived with me. Every night, I bathed them. I put
them both to sleep. They were my babies. And we had a
good relationship. After Becky moved, I would babysit
from time to time or I would have to -- you know -- I
would call and say I want my time. I am fighting for my
time with my babies.

- Q. What was your relationship with Becky during this time?
- A. We had a good relationship. You know, when she came home, we were -- she was -- we were going to have this baby, and we were very excited and looking forward to Maddie being born. We had -- you know -- we're mother and daughter. We're very, very strong.
- Q. You obviously had some worries and concerns, though, didn't you?
- A. Of course. That's a very difficult thing for a young woman to take on having a child at her age and on her own trying to raise it. It's very difficult, and I knew it would be a difficult thing for Becky, but -- you know -- Becky was determined this is mine. I am going to raise her. I'll take care of her. I want your guidance, but I can do this.
- Q. What steps did you take to support her in that decision to raise Maddie?
- A. Well, she came home to live with me, and she stayed with me. She actually helped me because I had Allie at that time, and Becky was pregnant and Becky stayed at home and took care of Allie. And we talked

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

24

25

26

27

	· .
	Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Watson 659
1	everyday about you know the baby and the future and
2	what she was going to do and you know the plans of
3	those two being raised together and being like sisters to
4	one another and you know that was the plan. For
5	those girls to be close.
6	Q. What was your reaction when she moved in to
7	Natchez?
8	A. I didn't want her to move. I didn't want her to
9	move out with me, but Becky is a very independent person,

- and she from day one said I want to my raise daughter. want to take care of my daughter. It will be my responsibility, mama. It won't be on you. understood.
- I didn't clarify for the jury. You live in Ferriday.
 - I do live in Ferriday. Α.
- And you drive back and forth every day to Q. Natchez --
 - Α. To Natchez Community where I work.
- 20 Q. You're an ICU nurse?
 - Α. I am a ICU nurse.
- Becky having moved to Natchez, what steps did 22 Q. you take to try to help the situation? 23
 - Well, I was paying for Maddie Moo's day care. She stayed at the same day care with Allie and Becky --
 - And what day care was that? Q.
 - At Grace United Methodist. I loved it there A. because Allie had been there for a while, and Becky had gone over and visited and talked with the people there.

Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Watson 60

She wanted Maddie there. We wanted them to be together,

and I continued to pay for that. You know, I wanted to be

able to help her as much as I could because it's kind of

difficult to find a job and have a baby and do all the

things that she wanted to do.

- Q. During the time when Becky was in Natchez and you were helping with the day care, did you ever have any physical contact with Maddie. Did you ever get to see her?
- A. I saw her every day. Every day that I went to day care, I would see her, and then Becky would bring her -- you know -- to my house. I would get my Saturdays when I was off to be able to keep her and babysit with her and spend the day. Sometimes Becky would just come spend the day with me, and we'd play with both girls.
- Q. Mrs. Watson, what has the last ten months been like for you?
- A. That's hard to describe. I went from one day of having two beautiful granddaughters, one blond and blue eyed and dark haired brown eyed, opposites of each. One calm and sweet and the other one just rambunctious and everywhere all at once.
 - Q. Which is which?
- A. Allie was my rambunctious one. Maddie Moo was the sweetheart that always just smiled. Allie loved kiss her, and she tolerated anything Allie wanted to do. From that day, we went to complete horror. Having to hold my daughter in my arms and trying to comfort her and just say you know, Becky. You can't go back. You can't look back.

29

3

Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Watson

You can't blame yourself. I couldn't blame myself, but I

wanted to.

- Q. You went to the hospital that night.
- Uh-hum. And, you know, you always -- you do 4 that. You do the back and forth thing of I should have 5 6 done this. I should have done that. We had to go through a lot of that, and then just really sort of hiding out. 7 Just trying to heal our wounds which has been impossible 8 9 It's like the wounds have been on hold for my entire family. My father -- when I told my father -- he's 10 been a minister as long as I can remember, and when I told 11 12 him what had happened to Maddie, he didn't know all the He just knew that Maddie had died and somebody 13 had killed her, and when I told her he said, "I've lived 14 15 I don't want to be here." And my father passed too long. 16 away November 5th. To say how this has impacted on my 17 family is -- it would take me all day, and I don't want to 18 do that, but Maddie was more than a little picture of a beautiful little girl. Maddie was -- when I saw her the 19 very first time when I cut the cord, Maddie was a little 20 21 five year old standing on a stage waving at her kindergarten graduation. Maddie was a sixteen year old 22 23 trying out for the drill team like her mommy did and 24 smiling that beautiful smile across at me. Maddie Moo, not this picture that you see, and I saw all 25 those things the moment she was born, and all those things 26 27 were taken away from us.
 - Q. Mrs. Watson, the jury has to make a determination in this case, but if you would tell us in

1 your view, what do you see as an appropriate outcome from 2 this case?

Cross-Examination on Sentencing Phase - Watson

- A. I am not a vengeful person. My father was a minister, and I was always taught to not be vengeful. I was also taught an eye for an eye as I know most of you were. I am not here for revenge for Maddie, but I am here for justice for Maddie. Justice means her life was taken, and there's only one way that we can find justice for Maddie. A life for a life.
- Q. Thank you, Mrs. Watson. Mrs. Watson, if you would answer any questions that the defendant's attorneys have for you.

BY THE COURT: Cross-examination.

BY MR. SERMOS: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SERMOS:

- Q. Yes. Mrs. Watson, it's obvious that you were certainly generous in many ways, especially paying for the day care for Chloe Madison Britt. Let me just ask you this. If you haven't been willing pay for the day care, what would -- where would Chloe have been during the day?
- A. Well, Becky would have kept her which is -- you know -- she did that at home and she kept my baby, and she kept Chloe at home initially.
- Q. Did you ever take care of Chloe Madison or Maddie as you call her. Did you take care of her on the weekends ever?
- A. Just if I asked if I could have her and she would come over and see me because there are lots of

	cross-Examinación on sencencing Phase - wacson
1	grandparents involved here, and so you have to kind of
2	take a number but not often. Sometimes Becky would bring
3	her over and just spend the day with me, and one Saturday
4	I think I kept her overnight. I only got to keep her
5	overnight one time after she moved from the house, but
6	Becky had you know she was kind of jealous of her
7	time, too. She wanted to spend time with her.
8	Q. It is fair to say that she mainly wanted to
9	spend time with her at night and after the day care time
10	and on the weekends then?
ll :	A. Well, I don't know if that would be fair to
L2	say. I know that when Chloe was ill and she was very ill
13	one time, Becky had a virus. Chloe had a virus.
4	Everybody in the house had a stomach virus, and I was
15	working, and Becky allowed her to her Mama Sita's, to her
16	grandma Lynn's, and she kept her for a few days, and she
7	told her, she said, "Becky, I can keep her longer. You're
.8	sick. You're so sick." But Becky said, "No. I want my
19	baby. I want my baby back." And she took her back home
20	with her.
21	BY MR. SERMOS: One moment, please, Your Honor.
22	BY THE COURT: Yes, sir.
23	(Mr. Sermos and Mr. Clark confer.)
24	BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor, we have no more
25	questions.
26	BY THE COURT: Is there any redirect?
27	BY MR. ROSENBLATT: No, Your Honor.
28	BY THE COURT: You may step down and remain in

the courtroom at this time.

he didn't live with us. He moved away when he was

Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Harrell

witnesses on this sentencing phase?

BY THE COURT: Does the State have any other

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Your Honor, having adopted

BY THE COURT: So with that, would the State now

My son and I have always been close, even though

the prior record, the State would have nothing

rest at this point on the sentencing phase?

(Witness steps down.)

further.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

664

28

Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Harrell thirteen years old because of a school problem. He had 1 seen something that happened at a school, and we decided 2 to let him come live here because of that, but we have 3 always been close. Every chance he took, he came to see 4 us. And we've never -- there's never been any problems 5 with us as far as our relationship goes. ٠6 7 Q. Let me ask you this. What year was Jeffrey born? 8 9 He was born in '78. And how many years did he live with you? 10 Q. 11 Thirteen years. Α. Okay. And did Jeffrey's biological father live 12 Q. 13 at home with you that whole time, or did you -- were you remarried or what? Would you tell the jury --14 No. He never knew his father until he was -- I 15 Α. think sixteen, but he only met him briefly, and father --16 17 his real father never had anything to do with him. 18 never raised -- did anything of the raising. He never . 19 supported him. Was Jeffrey born out of wedlock? 20 Q. Ά. Yes, he was. 21 And how old were you when he was born? 22 Q. 23 A. I believe I was nineteen. Yes. Nineteen. 24 Q. All right. And then when he was a year old, did you get married to somebody? 25 Yes. 26 Α. And who did you marry? 27 Q.

I married Gordon Harrell, Junior.

Are you still married to him?

29

28

A.

Q.

- 1 A. Yes, I am.
- Q. Did Jeffrey live with you and Gordon?
 - A. Yes, he did.

12

16

- Q. And where did he live with you all? What city or cities?
- A. We lived in Laplace, Louisiana, and we have lived in Chattanooga, Tennessee. When he moved to -- moved here, we lived in Laplace.
- 9 Q. Okay. And you said earlier, I believe, that he 10 came to live here at age thirteen?
- 11 A. Yes.
 - Q. That was here, meaning in Natchez?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And who did he come to live with?
- 15 A. With my parents.
 - Q. And what are their names, please.
- 17 A. It's Billy and Ruby Havard.
 - Q. And how long did he live with them?
- 19 A. Until he became of age. Twenty-one.
- Q. And over the years after he left, from the age
 of thirteen he came down here, did he stay -- did you and
- he stay in, shall I say, constant communication with each
- 23 other?
- A. Yes. We did. He came on several occasions
- 25 trying to find a job in Chattanooga on two or three
- 26 different occasions, but the jobs that he wanted just
- 27 | weren't there.
- Q. And then he came back down here; is that right?
- 29 A. That's correct.

```
Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Harrell
             Had you ever been to the mobile home on 33
1
   Montgomery Road where he was living at the time after this .
2
   incident happened, the death of Chloe Britt?
3
        A.
             Before? .
4
             Yes. Had you ever been before?
5
        Q.
```

Now, would you tell the jury, Mr. and Mrs. Q. William Havard, William and Ruby, is their house located on that same road.

Yes.

- Yes, it is. 10 Α.
- And it's near there, isn't it? 11 Ο.

Yes, I have.

12 Α. Yes.

Α.

6

7

8

9

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

- 13 Q. We know this is difficult for you, too.
- 14 Α. Yes, sir.
- .15 Let me just ask you this. Would you please tell Q. the jury why you as Jeffrey's mother basically ask them or 16 17 beg them, why do you want them to allow him to live and not sentence him to death? 18
 - Because I know in my heart that he's a very Α. kind, tender-loving person. I have three grandbabies. Well, I've got one that's due just any time now, and I've -- my oldest grandbaby has Down's Syndrome, and my son loves that baby. He has taken up for her on different occasions when people have made fun of her and said things about her. He had called me on one occasion when he was on the river on the boat and told me about this. And Deffrey loves children. When his youngest brother, half brother, was born, he was in California with my

father-in-law was on a truck, and when he came home to --

PENGAD + 1-400-631-5089 • www.punged.com

CASER BOND FORMA (

Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Havard

	Direct Ex	amination on Sentencing Phase - Havard 669
- 1	BY MR. CL	ARK:
2	Q.	Would you tell us your name, please.
3	A.	Ruby Havard.
4	Q.	Where do you live, Mrs. Havard?
5	Α.	36 Montgomery Road in Natchez.
6	Q.	And to whom are you married?
7	A.	When was I was married?
8	Q.	To whom are you married?
9	A.	Oh, William Eugene Havard.
10	Q.	And he lives there with you?
11	A.	Yes, he does.
12	Q.	What relation are you to Jeffrey Havard?
13	A.	He's my grandson.
14	Q.	Okay. Where does he live?
15	, A.	Sir?
16	Q.	Where did he live prior to this crime?
17	A.	He lived at 33 Montgomery Road.
18	Q.	Okay. What kind of dwelling was that?
19	А.	It was a trailer.
20	Q.	And who provided that trailer for him?
21	A.	We did. His grandparents.
22	Q.	You and your husband?
23	A.	Right
24	Q.	Who lived there with him?
25	A.	He lived there by hisself until the first of
26	February,	and Rebecca Britt moved in with him.
27	Q.	With her baby, Chloe.
28	A.	With her baby.
29	Q.	And while she lived there, who provided her with

28

29

A.

night.

Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Havard 1 a place to live? We did. Jeffrey asked us if she could -- if he 2 Α. could move her and the baby in the trailer because of the 3 circumstances where they were living. 4 Y'all --5 Q. 6 A. Prior to that. 7 Y'all allowed them to live there? Q. We did. Α.` 8 And y'all paid the bills? 9 Q. 10 Ά. We paid the utilities, part of the groceries. Okay. And they didn't pay you any rent? 11 Q. 12 Α. No, sir. 13 Q. How long has Jeffrey been living there at that 14 trailer? 15 A. About a year and a half or two. I am not quite 16 sure. He was living there prior to the time that Ms. 17 Q. Britt and her baby moved in? 18 19 A. Right. 20 Q. And at that time was he working? 21 He was working for Carline Boat line out of --Α. right below Baton Rouge, at Geismar, I believe. 22 23 Q. And that was a -- on the Mississippi River? Right. 24 Α. 25 Q. And tributaries. Would he work -- what were his hours? Do you know? Do you remember? 26

He worked seven days on and seven days off.

Sometimes he worked in the day time and sometimes at

They had swing shifts.

Direct Examination on Sentencing Phase - Havard

Q. I see. And, Mrs. Havard, could you please tell the jury why you think that Jeffrey should not be given the death penalty?

Jeffrey is my grandson. Jeffrey stayed with me the first year of his life. Then he went to live with his mother, and when he was twelve years old, he asked us if he could come back and live with us. He liked the schools here. He had always loved us. I guess because he had bonded with us when he was young. Jeffrey is a loving person. He loves children. He has two nieces that he dearly loves. He had pictures of these two nieces in his billfold. He took those pictures out and put the baby --Chloe's picture in his billfold. He has two pictures of Chloe in his billfold, and he dearly loved that baby. He even told me that he had planned to ask Ms. Britt to marry him so you could take care of her and the baby because she had nowhere else to go. He -- she asked her mother to come back home and live with her, and they did not let her come back home to live with them. She was moved in there off of Itasca Drive at the first of February with him. Her and the baby. I lost a son twenty-four years ago, and I pray that y'all can see fit to spare his life because I do not want to lose another -- practically a child because he's been with me since he was twelve years old.

Q. Thank you, Mrs. Havard.

BY MR. CLARK: We tender the witness.

BY THE COURT: Any cross-examination?

BY MR. HARPER: No questions, Your Honor.

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

29

.

27

28

29

BY THE COURT: You may step down, ma'am, and you remain in the courtroom if you so desire. (Witness steps down.)

BY MR. CLARK: That's all we would have, Your Honor.

BY THE COURT: Would the defense rest on the sentencing phase?

BY MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: Okay. Would the State finally rest on the sentencing phase?

BY MR. HARPER: Yes, sir. The State would finally rest at this time.

BY THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, both the State and the defense have rested on the sentencing phase of this case. What remains is for the Court, myself, to give you further instructions on the law dealing with the sentencing phase of this trial. Following that, the attorneys will be allowed to make additional arguments to you than were made previously. This will be on the sentencing phase of this trial, Once that is done, you will retire to the jury room to deliberate and to return a verdict in this case. Now, again, the Court instructs you on the law by way of reading to you what we refer to as jury instructions and, again, you will be allowed to take these with you back into the jury room once you retire to decide a verdict on the sentencing phase.

(After the Court having read the instructions, the

Closing Argument on Sentencing - Rosenblatt

following was made of record, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: Now, ladies and ger

BY THE COURT: Now, ladies and gentlemen, those are the additional instructions of the law that you're to use and apply in deciding the punishment to be imposed upon the defendant in this case on the sentencing phase. At this time, the Court is going to allow further or additional arguments by counsel. Again, you're to use your own recollection of what the individual witnesses had to say in this case. First the State. Mr. Rosenblatt.

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Your Honor, may I approach the bench?

BY THE COURT: Yes, sir.

(Mr. Rosenblatt retrieves an instruction.)

BY MR. ROSENBLATT: Ladies and gentlemen, this is the sentencing phase in the trial. The Judge just mentioned briefly the instructions. I'm going to call your attention to the Instruction Number 10. That's the last instruction he read to you. What I want to call your attention to is the form of the verdict. It's not overly complicated, but it does have to be done in a particular form. That's in Subsection C of S-10. It tells you the form of the verdict, plus being one of three forms. It can look one of three ways. They're itemized. One, two, or three. Okay. Now, to impose the death penalty under number one, your form of the verdict would look like this. This has to be written on a separate sheet of paper and signed by the foreman. It will say that we, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable

❷

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

Closing Argument on Sentencing - Rosenblatt 674 doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder. This takes you back to subsection A. Now, there are a lot of different crimes that fit capital murder, and so these factors won't apply to every case, but it's necessary in every death penalty case regardless of the facts that one of these four factors be found. I would suggest to you that the first factor that the defendant killed Chloe Madison Britt is the factor you would find because we feel like that's what the evidence has proven and that's what your prior verdict has determined. There are other types of case where these other factors come into play, but in the first section then, you would go back to subsection A and you would find that, A, that the defendant has actually killed the victim, Chloe Madison Britt. Then you would go on to the next section that says next "We, the jury, unanimously find the following aggravating circumstances." And that is in subsection B, and in subsection B, we have listed three aggravating circumstances. First, that this defendant has been found guilty of capital murder, which we feel is self-evident. Number two, that that capital offense was committed while the defendant was engaged in the crime of sexual battery, which we also feel is self-evident, and, then, number three, whether the capital offense was especially heinous, atrocious, or cruel, and the Judge has read you a separate instruction. You'll have it to take back with you on exactly what it means to say something is heinous, atrocious and cruel. Now, in one sense, every death has an element of cruelty to it,

1. but in another sense, there are some deaths -- and that's what that instruction will tell you -- that are especially 2 heinous, atrocious, and cruel. That will be for you all 3 4 to recall the evidence that was presented to you today. You recall that evidence about how this baby died and what 5 was happening to this baby before she died to decide if 6 indeed that factor, that additional aggravating factor of 7 heinous, atrocious, or cruel, would apply. 8 section down here, in this number one, would be what your 9 verdict would look like. You would write each factor that 10 you find. That is guilty of capital murder. 11 That the capital murder was committed during the offense of sexual 12 battery, and, finally, that was it was, if you find this, 13 14 that it was especially heinous, atrocious, or cruel, and 15 having done that, then you say this these aggravating 16 factors exist beyond a reasonable doubt and are sufficient 17 to impose the death penalty, and that there are insufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the 18 aggravating circumstances. Now, if you find mitigating 19 20 circumstances, you don't have to list those anywhere. 21 They can be -- as the defense lawyers will tell you in 22 just a minute, they can be virtually anything to be a mitigating or a lessening circumstance, but if you find 23 those three aggravating circumstances, they do have to be 24 25 listed on the verdict. Okay. You have list the 26 aggravating circumstances. You don't have to list the mitigating circumstances, and, of course, there are two 27 other forms either that you find that the death penalty 28 should not be imposed and the defendant should be 29

Closing Argument on Sentencing - Rosenblatt

Closing Argument on Sentencing - Rosenblatt sentenced to life or that you're unable to reach a But one of those three -- and they're 2 3 numbered -- three, two, one in Instruction Number 10, one of those three forms of the verdict would be used. Ladies 4 and gentlemen, this is not an easy job that you all have, 5 but there are many times in society when called on to 6 7 perform tasks that aren't easy. I think of our service men in Uzbekistan, for example. You're called on many 8 9 times to perform a service as citizens that pushes us out 10 of our comfort zone so to speak, but in doing this 11 service, I just urge you to recall the victim in this 12 There are victims and there are victims, and ladies and gentlemen, I would submit to you today that Chloe 13 Madison Britt is the ultimate victim in the sense that she 14 was helpless. She did not provoke this to happen to 15 There is just -- it's just hard for me to put 16 herself. 17 into words what I feel when I see what happened to this 18 precious baby girl. And just keep that in mind as you 19 perform this task that we are here in a sense to protect our citizens. And, ladies and gentlemen, this victim was 20 a loved child. She was loved by her family, and what 21 impressed me during the testimony was she was even loved 22 23 by those who just came into contact with her. especially think of Ms. Amanda Goodwin on the stand with 24 tears in her eyes, talking about this child that was in 25 her day care center. I think of Dr. Dar who was at home. 26 She wasn't on call, and they called her to say one of your 27 patients is in the hospital, and she said who is it, and 28 they told her it was Chloe Madison Britt, and what did she 29

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

Closing Argument on the Sentencing - Sermos say? I will be there. And she was. That's the affect 1 this child had on those around her, and I think it's 2 appropriate to consider as we consider the sentence of the 3 Now, ladies and gentlemen, I assure you this is not 4 This is not a happy result for Mr. Harper 5 a happy thing. It's not a happy result certainly for Mr. Havard. 6 It's not a happy result for the victim's family, but it's 7 a just result, and that's what we are here for is justice. 8 Thank you. 9 10

BY THE COURT: Closing arguments by the defense.

BY MR. SERMOS: Thank you, Your Honor. obviously a very hard afternoon, the decision that's confronting you right now. When the prosecutor, Mr. Rosenblatt, uses the word aggravating and mitigating circumstances, obviously the main concentration of what I talk to you about would be mitigating circumstances. You've heard the aggravating circumstances as you listened to the evidence that was offered by the witnesses and whether they were experts, nurses, or whatever. Mitigating is something that will lessen the affect of the aggravating circumstances obviously, and mitigating circumstances can be anything that you find in your mind or in your heart or in your soul that enables you and causes you to want to lessen the impact of any aggravating circumstances you may find. I mean, it's been obviously documented here that this young child died a tragic death at a very young age of six months. That is an aggravating

circumstance, and Mr. Rosenblatt explained that to you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

Closing Argument on the Sentencing - Sermos However, there are certainly certain things you can look at in making your decision, whether it's the testimony of the grandmother, Mrs. Watson, and what she said, or the testimony of Jeffrey Havard's mother, Cheryl Harrell, and what she said about why she would ask you and why she did ask you to spare her son's life, and also the testimony of the grandmother, Ruby Havard, who basically raised Jeffrey during his entire teenage years. When you go back in there, I simply don't know all the things that will be going through your mind about what you decide about the circumstances that are in the instructions the Judge gives you, and I won't even try to fit it on that, but there's two main things I want you to think of when you go back there because I realize even that you have already reached your decision on the guilt phase and you found him guilty of capital murder, but there's two things that you can each individually look at. And one of those primary things that I would ask you to look at is this. One thing you never hear this Judge tell you is or any law tell you in Mississippi is that you have to sentence Jeffrey Havard to death. You may do it and you can do it, but there is no law or no order or no instruction telling you that you have to sentence him to death. The second part of that as you consider this and just consider everything you've heard today is this. Even if you determine Jeffrey Havard should die for what he did because of what you heard today and because of what you have seen and thought about, even if you determine that that's what should happen, you can still show him mercy and sentence him to life in prison

	Closing Argument on the Sentencing - Harper 67
1	without parole, and that means he would never, ever get
2	out under the laws of the State of Mississippi. And
3	that's what he asked you to do. Go back, whether it's
4	because of mitigating circumstances and combination with
5	the decision whether it's emotional or factual or
6	whatever, to determine how you reach the decision to
7	sentence him to life without parole and not death. Thank
8	you very much.
9	BY THE COURT: Any further argument of the
10	defense?
11	BY MR. CLARK: No.
12	BY THE COURT: Okay. Is there any rebuttal
13	argument by the State?
14	BY MR. HARPER: Yes, sir. Please the Court,
15	Your Honor. May I proceed, Your Honor?
16	BY THE COURT: Yes, sir.
17	BY MR. HARPER: Ladies and gentlemen, it's no joy for
18	me to be here today. This has been a very difficult case
19	for me. You know, people like to feel like you know
20	they like their job, but it's you know certainly no
21	joy in coming up here in this courtroom of trying to
22	convict people of serious crimes, and it's especially no
23	joy to come up here and ask you or any jury to impose the
24	death penalty on somebody. It's not joyful. It's no fun,
25	but you know we have as I talked about earlier, a very,
26	very great system of justice in this country, and I feel
27	like that I performed a service. That I do a part in
28	making it work. It's not always easy, but I feel like

it's important, and I get some satisfaction from that.

PENGAD = 1:800-631-6989 = www.pangad.com

Closing Argument on the Sentencing - Harper 680 I said, sometimes it's very difficult. Y'all have a duty 1 and a part to play in this, too, and I know that it's very 2 3 I know that it is. But it doesn't work unless we do what we're supposed to do. And when I had the privilege of being elected to this office, I took an oath to serve justice, and y'all watched witnesses come in 6 here. They all took oaths to tell the truth, and I feel like they did. I am going to remind you of one more oath, 8 ladies and gentlemen. Y'all took an oath. When you came in here on Monday morning in voir dire to tell the truth, 10 11 and I asked you several questions. The Judge asked you 12 some questions, and one thing he asked you was are you opposed to the death penalty, and not one of you raised 13 your hand. Not one of you. He told you it's not any 14 problem with it, and there's certainly nothing wrong if 15 you feel that way, but you need to tell us now if you are 16 opposed to it, and not one of you raised your hand. And 17 18 he asked you another question. Probably the most 19 important one. He asked you if you were selected to serve on this jury and asked -- if you returned a verdict for 20 capital murder, would you consider the death penalty in 21 this case, and every one of you said that you would do 22 that. And, ladies and gentlemen, I am going to hold you 23 to your oath today. I am going to hold you to your oath. 24 It's not easy, but it's got to be done. On behalf of the 25 People of the State of Mississippi and the family of Chloe 26 Madison Britt, I am asking you to return the death penalty 27 28 in this case. The death penalty is the ultimate penalty. You know, there are some crimes that are simply just so 29

29

	Closing Argument on the Sentencing - Harper 683
1	terrible and inhuman that there's really only one penalty
2	that's justice. Only one. And that penalty is the death
3	penalty. And I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that
4	this case is one of those. Chloe Madison Britt was a real
5	person. A living, breathing human being, an infant with
6	her whole life ahead of her with all that that
7	encompasses. You know, sometimes I think we get jaded by
8	television and movies we see, movies about people getting
9	killed, but, folks, this is real life, and that little
ΓÒ	girl is gone, and that family out there is going to suffer
11	for the rest of their lives until they're gone because of
12	that. They got a true loss. So what is justice? If
13	we're not opposed to the death penalty in some cases when
14	it's warranted, then what case is it? If not this case,
15	what case is it? We're not opposed to it. We think it's
16	warranted in some cases. Well, if not this case, which
۱7	one? That's my question to you. Tom made allusion that
18	we all have duties that are difficult. You know, he
19	talked about people going to war. People go over there to
20	kill and be killed to protect us so that we're safe. Our
21	democracy. These law officers, John Manley and Ray Brown,
22	Buddy Frank. They go out every day with a gun strapped on
23	them
24	BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor, we object to this.
25	This is not really pertinent.
26	BY THE COURT: I am going to sustain that
	-Lingtin by that lime to that last lime of

BY THE COURT: I am going to sustain that objection to that line, to that last line of argument. Let's go ahead and proceed.

BY MR. HARPER: They go out and risk their lives

Closing Argument on the Sentencing - Harper 682 every day, and they never know what's going to happen when 1 they go out there. So everybody has got difficult duties, ladies and gentlemen. We just have to accept them, and I 3 am asking you to accept yours today. It's not something 4 that you asked for. It's not easy, but I am asking you on 5 behalf of society to impose the death penalty in this case because, as I said before, if not in this case, which 8 one? Tom -- the Judge read you the instructions. talked to you about mitigating and aggravating circumstances, and it's all in the instructions, but 10 ladies and gentlemen, I talked to you this morning about 11 this earlier today. It's all just common sense. 12 read it, it's very, very simple to understand. And I have 13 confidence that you will understand it, difficult as it 14 15 is. You know, in this country we have the freedom to do with our lives what we choose, to make our own individual 16 decisions about what we think what we ought to do, what 17 ought not to do. But I am telling you, ladies and 18 gentlemen, when Jeffrey Havard chose to commit this 19 horrible crime to take the innocent, precious life of 20 Maddie Britt, to take her away from her family, he made a 21 decision himself that very day and that very decision was 22 to forfeit his right to live. That's what he decided. He 23 did it to himself. Don't let anybody tell you that it's 24 your fault or that you got any concerns or guilt about 25 being here because the only reason we're all here is 26 because of that man sitting right down there. 27 sorry for his family, his mother, and his grandmother. 28

have great sympathy for them, but they're here because of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

Closing Argument on the Sentencing - Harper So don't let anybody tell you that this is your It's his decision, and he made that decision on February the 21st of 2002. He's got nobody to blame but himself for it, and I'm asking you on behalf of the People of the State of Mississippi to return to the jury room and deliberate, go back there and deliberate the case and return the death penalty. The death penalty that Jeffrey Havard had every right to expect when he knowingly and willingly in cold blood on February the 21st of this year, sexually assaulted that little infant baby and then shook her so violently that it caused injury serious enough to take her life. He chose that himself, ladies and Thank you, Your Honor. gentlemen.

BY THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it's time for you to retire to the jury room to deliberate and to determine the sentence in this case. Again, you will be allowed to take these additional instructions on the law that I read to you. Also there's some additional paper that you have and may need and some pen and pencils, and also the same evidence has been reintroduced. So the same exhibits that were in there previously, if y'all will take those back in there. So I'm going to direct that the jury retire to the jury room. Ladies and gentlemen, again, one of the instructions tells you exactly how to return your verdict, whichever way it Just follow the instructions exactly on may be. It is necessary that it be written out on a separate sheet of paper, and in this case it must

29 · also by signed by the foreperson of your jury. Thos will be the instructions of the Court. You will be directed back to the jury room.

(The jury retires to the jury room at approximately 5:45 p.m. to deliberate the case. At approximately 6:40, a note was sent to the Judge, and the following was made of record, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: Let the record show that the Court has all counsel present, the jury having sent a note to the Court through the bailiff. The Court has allowed the attorneys to read the question which is as follows. This will be preserved for the record. Says, "Please define life without parole. One, will he spend the rest of his life in prison or will he ever be eligible for parole. Question" -- this says number two, I guess. "Three, can the law be changed to allow him parole in the future?" All right. Any comments for the record? The State will go first.

BY MR. HARPER: Whatever the Court feels appropriate. I don't have any suggestion.

BY MR. SERMOS: Okay. Your Honor, what I -BY THE COURT: Let me say this. It would be -BY MR. CLARK: Whatever you want to do.

BY THE COURT: It's the Court's understanding that number one, if matters can be answered, they should always be answered truthfully to the jury. There are clearly some questions that can't be answered. It would be my inclination to give you a chance to object to anything before it goes, but it's

my inclination to respond that life without parole means life in prison without any eligibility for It essentially says the same thing, but it does, I think, answer the first two questions more adequately about it that life without parole means life in prison without any eligibility for parole. Now, the last question is, of course, the more difficult question. The Court would answer this with a statement that it would be up to the legislature to determine any changes in the law in the future.

BY MR. SERMOS: May I ask the Court one thing. Possibly consider one additional --

BY MR. SERMOS: Would be to go up to -- like you said, it would be up to the legislature, and I don't know if you want to put it, but "then the legislature would also determine if any new law was to be applied retroactively."

BY MR. HARPER: I don't think that would be a correct statement of the law.

BY MR. SERMOS: I'm just asking.

BY MR. HARPER: I think if they pass something, it ~-

BY THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. HARPER: I think it would be applicable -- what I'm wondering is -- I would suggest adding which they have the prerogative to do.

No, No. This is what the Court BY THE COURT:

24

25

26

27

28

29

is inclined to do. Everybody listen very carefully. 1 The Court intends to respond as follows. Life 2 . 3 without parole means life in prison without any eligibility for parole. It would be up to the 4 5 legislature to make any future changes in the law. 6 You may state your objections. 7 8

BY MR. SERMOS: The only thing I would ask, Your Honor, is the Court consider without eligibility for parole or earlier release of any type. I mean, may be that would be confusing, but I think -- what do you think, Robert?

BY MR. CLARK: I think --

BY THE COURT: I could add "or early release."

BY MR. SERMOS: Or early release for any reason.

The only problem is it's always BY THE COURT: subject to a governor's --

BY MR. CLARK: But --

BY THE COURT: I don't want to get into that. Just a second. Based on the suggestion of the defense counsel, the Court would be willing to add "or early release." "Any eligibility for parole or early release."

BY MR. SERMOS: Yes, sir.

BY THE COURT: So this will be what the Court will write. "Life without parole means life in prison without any eligibility for parole or early It would up to the legislature to make any future changes of the law. Any objection to that?

LASER BOND FORM A 😥 PENOAD - 1-800-631-6959 - www.pengad.com

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

BY MR. CLARK: Could you say life without parole means you die in prison?

BY MR. SERMOS: I think just what you got is --I like that.

Okay. That will be how the BY THE COURT: Court will respond. I will write this in my hand on the note, and it will be preserved for the record. (The note was sent in by way of the bailiff, and at

approximately 6:40, another note was sent out and the following was made of record, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: Let the record show that is it now approximately ten minutes until seven o'clock The Court has received a note p.m. in the evening. from the jury by way of the bailiff that reads as "Due to extreme fatigue, we the jury follows. request a recess until tomorrow morning at such time we will continue with the deliberation process, " signed Cindy Ethridge. It's the Court's intention to bring the jury back in the jury room at this time and to allow to them to recess and to honor this request for the evening. So that will be the action of the So everybody just remain seated. Mrs. Bailiff, bring the jury back in.

(The jury is brought back into the courtroom.)

BY THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I have received your request, and that certainly will be honored. I know it's been a long day. This is a very important decision. I do not want to rush you in any way. Therefore, this

LASER BOND FORMA

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

will be honored. You will be allowed to recess and go back to the Eola and have your evening meal and stay there tonight, and we will resume deliberations at nine o'clock in the morning. I want to give you plenty of time to get a good night's sleep and have time to have your breakfast in the morning, and what will happen is you will come back over here in the morning and continue with your deliberations. Now, one thing, you are not to deliberate among yourselves, two of you or more of you, like that, because the only deliberations that are to take place are back in the room. So now that you are recessing for the night, talk about anything you want to, but not about the case. Don't resume your deliberations even among smaller groups of yourself until in the morning. So at this time, I want the jury to be allowed to leave before anyone else and you'll resume your deliberations at nine o'clock in the morning.

(The jury is excused.)

BY THE COURT: I want the jury room to be locked or secured tonight because I believe the evidence is in there. We'll secure the evidence for tonight. Court will be in recess. The jury will be brought back in the morning at nine o'clock, and the deliberations will resume at that time. So is there anything further we need before we recess this evening? Court will be in recess.

(Court was recessed for the day and at approximately nine o'clock on Thursday, December 19th, the following was

made of record, to-wit:)

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

26

29

BY THE COURT: Let the record show that the jury having retired to deliberate on the sentencing phase of this case yesterday evening after a period of deliberations, sent a note to the Court requesting that they be allowed to recess for the evening due to fatigue. The Court found that request to be well taken and granted the request, and the jury was allowed to retire, and, again, they have been sequestered all evening and are back in the courtroom to resume their deliberations at this time today. Now, ladies and gentlemen, there is one matter I do want to bring to your attention before you resume with your deliberations. The State has elected to withdraw one of the aggravating factors that you were advised about yesterday as far as the law. remaining -- what that means is that you'll only be allowed to consider the two remaining aggravating factors that are set out in the Court's instructions So when you go back into the jury room before you start your deliberations, if you will send out by way of the bailiff Jury Instruction Number 10 which has number 10 written in at the top, I need to make one correction on that before you start your deliberations. So at this time I'm going to direct that you return to the jury room to resume your deliberations, and if the bailiff will get that from the jurors.

(The jury retires into the jury room at approximately 9:05

27 28

a.m.)

UASER BOND FORMA

PENDAD + 1,800-631-6989 + www.penged.com

BY THE COURT: Let the record show that the jury has now retired to the jury room to continue with their deliberations. For the record, this morning prior to reconvening court, the Court met with counsel for the State and the defendant, and the State announced that it was withdrawing number one of the aggravating factors in the sentencing instruction which has been marked number 10 at the top which reads as follows: "One, where the defendant is quilty of the capital murder of Chloe Madison Britt." remaining two aggravating factors were the commission of the crime where the capital offense committed while in the commission of sexual battery, and whether the offense was especially heinous, atrocious or cruel. The Court essentially found that the State's withdrawal of this number one was well taken because the only two aggravating factors that should be allowed to be considered would be number two and number three. Therefore, that's why the record will show that this was withdrawn from consideration, and the Court has taken the Instruction Number 10 by way of the bailiff and has marked through number one on that instruction. This would be under part B and has initialed that, and because the State is withdrawing one of the aggravating factors that was set out, and there's only two remaining, the Court perceives of no prejudice whatsoever to the defense to really limit the aggravating factors from three to two.

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

further statements on the record by either side for that?

BY MR. HARPER: No, sir.

BY THE COURT: And as the jury was instructed, they will only be allowed to consider the two remaining aggravating factors that are set out in that instruction. The Court will be in recess while the jury is in deliberation.

(At approximately 9:45 a.m., a note was sent to the Judge by way of the bailiff, and the following was made of record, to-wit:)

Let the record reflect that the BY THE COURT: Court has received a note from the jury by way of the bailiff that states as follows: "What happens to the defendant if the jury cannot agree on a sentence? Who decides his sentencing and what will it be?" Court has conferred with both counsel for the defendant and also counsel for the State, and the Court is responding to the note as follows: "In that event, the Court would sentence the defendant to life without parole, " signed Forrest A. Johnson, Circuit This is the language preferred by counsel for the defendant, and that will be the response of the Court and I will return this note with the response to the jury by way of the bailiff.

(The note is sent in by way of the bailiff. At approximately 10:25, a knock was heard on the door, signaling the jury had reached a verdict.)

BY THE COURT: Madame Bailiff, has the jury

CASER BOND FORMA (

.10

reached a verdict in this case?

BY BAILIFF ANGELETHY: Yes, they have, Judge.

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, again, keep in mind that this is a court of law. I understand the emotions involved in this on both sides, but let's please respect the fact that this is a court, and I cannot allow any outburst of emotions, whatever the verdict of the jury may be. At this time, I am going to direct that you bring the jury back into the courtroom. Have them seated. They don't have to worry about being seated in any particular order. You may do that at this time.

(The jury is brought back in, and the following is made of record, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: The Court is going to read this verdict. The verdict of the jury is as follows. We, the jury, unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the following facts existed at the time of the commission of the capital murder. A, one, that the defendant actually killed Chloe Madison Britt. Next, we, the jury, unanimously find that the aggravating circumstances of -- below that -- that the capital offense was committed while the defendant was engaged in the commission of or an attempt to commit sexual battery. Additionally that the capital offense was especially heinous, atrocious or cruel exists beyond a reasonable doubt and are sufficient to impose the death penalty and that there are insufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

aggravating circumstances, and we further find unanimously that the defendant should suffer death, signed Cynthia Ethridge, foreman of the jury. Ladies and gentlemen, under the law, it is necessary that I make certain that this is unanimous. You don't have to say anything, but I am going to point to you one at a time, and if this is your verdict, just nod your head yes. Give me some type of affirmative sign. If this is not your verdict, let me know and give me a negative sign.

(The Court polls the jury and the following was made of record, to-wit:)

BY THE COURT: Let the record show that the Court on its own motion and initiative has caused the jury to be polled and has received an affirmative response from each of the twelve jurors that this is, in fact, the verdict of the jury, and, therefore, it will be accepted as the verdict of the jury. Now, the Court is going to ask at this time, does the State have any further victim's statement or anything of that nature?

BY MR. HARPER: The Court will indulge me just a moment, Your Honor.

(Mr. Harper conferred with family of the victim.)

BY MR. HARPER: No, Your Honor.

Okay. Then at this time, I am BY THE COURT: going to ask that the defendant come forward with counsel.

(The defendant and counsel approach.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

BY THE COURT: Does the defendant have anything to say before the Court proceeds further with sentencing?

BY THE DEFENDANT: I am innocent of this.

BY THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it is my policy and practice. I never praise, I never criticize a jury's verdict. That is our system I strongly believe in. Now, to the jury, I will tell you this. What is said back there in that jury room during your deliberations in private, that is private. You don't have to tell anyone what goes on back there or what is said back there unless you want to. Do each of understand that? Now, you have performed a very difficult duty as citizens of this county and state. It's not very pleasant what you have been through, and I recognize that. Most citizens go through their entire life without having to perform a duty such as you have had to perform. In my opinion, this is the most difficult duty that a citizen is ever called upon to perform short of military service in time of war. What you need to do, you need to put this behind you and need to go on with your lives, realizing that you did not volunteer for this duty. Someone had to serve as jurors in this case, and by random selection, that lot fell upon you, and you performed your duty. Now, to the family of the victim, I would say this. We don't know why some things happen in life. Every question is not going to be answered for us this side of the

28

29

River Jordan. No person or action that anyone can take can bring back Chloe Madison Britt back to this earthly life. You have to realize that. You can take comfort in knowing that because of her age, she died totally sweet and innocent, passing through this life without the sins that we all seem to all accumulate sooner or later. She is in a better place My strong advice to you is that you cherish her memory, but you put this behind you and you move on with your lives. Don't cling to bitterness, hatred, or revenge while waiting for the sentence of this Court to be carried out. In doing so, you would only allow the defendant's actions to continue to hurt Now to the defendant's family. I would say this. We don't know why people do some of the things they do in life. You can't explain some actions by any form of reason. You need to continue to care about the defendant, to love him, and most importantly to pray for him, but don't confuse that with justice. And do not be upset with his attorneys. I am going to tell you the evidence in this case was overwhelming. In the defendant's statement that he gave severely limited what they could do in this case. They did all they could to try and spare his life. Accept what has happened, and accept that society justice has been rendered and go on with your lives. Now to the defendant. when you think that you have seen everything and that you have seen or heard of the absolute low point of

LASEH BOND PORMA

PENDAD - 1-800-631-6964 www.pengad.com

evil and human depravity, someone like you comes along and shows us a new low in human behavior. I would hate to face my maker with the blood of an innocent child on my hands. Jeffrey Keith Havard, for the capital murder of Chloe Madison Britt, I hereby sentence you to be put to death by lethal injection by the State executioner, and may God have mercy on your soul. I want the jury to be allowed to leave before anyone else is, and I want the bailiffs to assist them in checking out of the hotel. I want the defendant to be allowed a few moments to say his goodbys to his family members, and then he'll be transported pursuant to law immediately to death row at the Mississippi State Penitentiary at Parchman.

27.

1	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF ADAMS COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI
2	
3	STATE OF MISSISSIPPI
4	
5	VERSUS CAUSE NO. 02-KR-0141
6	
7 .	JEFFREY KEITH HAVARD, DEFENDANT
.8	
9	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
10	TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD AND DONE IN A GUILTY
11	PLEA IN THE ABOVE STYLED AND NUMBERED CAUSE BEFORE THE
12	HONORABLE FORREST A. JOHNSON, JUNIOR, JUDGE OF THE COURT
13	AFORESAID, SOLE PRESIDING, ON THE 3RD DAY OF FEBRUARY,
14	2003, IN THE CIRCUIT COURTROOM OF THE AMITE COUNTY,
15	MISSISSIPPI COURTHOUSE.
16	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
17	
18	APPEARANCES:
19	Present and Representing the State:
	HONORABLE DEBORAH BLACKWELL Assistant District Attorney
21	Sixth Circuit Judicial District Natchez, MS 39120
22	
23	Present and Representing the Defendant:
	HONORABLE GUS SERMOS Attorney at Law
	P. O. Box 621 Summit, MS 39666
26	Canalate, 196 33000
27	
28	

23

24.

25

26

27

28

29

BY THE COURT: The Court is going to call Case Number 02-KR-0141 of the Circuit Court of Adams County, Mississippi, in the matter of the State of Mississippi versus Jeffrey Keith Havard. Let the record show that this defendant was previously indicted and charged with capital murder. This cause came on for trial in the Circuit Court of Adams County this past December. Following a four-day trial, the defendant was found guilty of capital murder, and the jury imposed a sentence of death. motion for a new trial was timely and properly filed by counsel following the sentence and order of the Court, and this matter comes on today on the motion for new trial with counsel being present, the Honorable Gus Sermos, and also assistant district attorney, Deborah Blackwell for the State. Sermos, you may proceed with your motion.

BY MR. SERMOS: Yes, Your Honor. On the motion for judgment not withstanding the verdict or in the alternative for a new trial, the defendant Jeffrey Havard through his attorney asks the Court to either grant him a new trial due to the weight of the evidence literally being -- I'll put it this way, Your Honor. The evidence was certainly not sufficient either by the overwhelming weight of it which did not support the verdict, and also in its sufficiency and the standard of that would, of course, be for the same standard that is applied to a motion for JNOV which is what this is or a motion for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

a directed verdict, and we would state for the defendant that even with all the evidence that was testified to, including the defendant's statement, that it was simply not sufficiently shown due to the fact that there was no signs of trauma found on the That any DNA or anything else that exhibited that he may have caused the damage to the child, especially the damage around her anal area, as the jury found, and we would also state that the new trial should be granted because a jury properly needs to weigh, or reweigh in this case, the evidence or actually the lack of evidence due that there was a statement by the defendant that he had shaken the baby, but there was never an admission by him that he either intended to kill the baby or cause damage to the baby, and that anything that happened certainly must have been accidental. Therefore, we submit to the Court that the Judge either direct a verdict of acquittal, or, in the alternative, the Judge order that Jeffrey Havard receive a new trial.

BY THE COURT: Does the State care to make any response to that?

BY MS. BLACKWELL: No, sir.

BY THE COURT: Let the record show that the Court has very carefully considered this motion. This was a very serious matter that proceeded to The Court made extensive rulings on the trial. record regarding the matters that counsel referred to, and, for the record, I refer back to the Court's

29

rulings during the course of the trial and proceedings. The Court finds that the State very clearly did produce ample evidence to justify the submission of the case to a jury. The jury, apparent to the Court, carefully considered this matter, found the defendant quilty of the charge of capital murder. The Court is not going to go back through all the evidence because that's already been done on the record, but I do find that very clearly there was ample evidence to support the jury's finding of the defendant being quilty of the charge of capital murder not withstanding the argument that was just made by counsel. So the Court is going to deny and overrule the motion for judgment not withstanding the verdict or in the alternative for a new trial in each and every respect as set out by the defendant in his motion, and that will the order and ruling of the Court. And, Mr. Sermos, if you will submit the Court an order on that. I will be glad to sign that.

BY MR. SERMOS: Your Honor, may I approach now?

BY THE COURT: Yes, sir. That will the Court's ruling on the matter.

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Melanie G. Murray, Official Court Reporter in and for the Sixth Circuit Court District of Mississippi, do hereby certify that the within and foregoing seven hundred and eleven (711) pages contain a full, true, and correct transcription of my notes and tapes, to the best of my skill and ability, of the proceedings had and done in the STATE OF MISSISSIPPI VERSUS JEFFREY KEITH HAVARD,
#02-KR-0141 heard in the Circuit Court of Adams County, Mississippi, Courthouse on December 16, 17, 18, 19, 2002, and following on February 3, 2002.

I do further certify that my certificate annexed hereto applies only to the original and certified transcript. The undersigned assumes no responsibility for the accuracy of any reproduced copies not made under my control or direction.

WITNESS my signature, this the 9th day of April, 2003.

Melanie G. Murray

Melanie G. Murray 9 Primrose Lane Natchez, MS 39120

COURT REPORTER'S BILL \$1422.00