## REALTIME UNCERTIFIED ROUGH DRAFT

The realtime draft is uncertified and may be used only for the purpose of augmenting notes and not to use or cite it in any court proceeding or to distribute it to any other parties.

\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

MORNING SESSION - MARCH 8, 2022

(The following proceedings commenced in open court at the hour of 9:03 a.m. with all parties present, the defendant appearing in custody:)

2.1

\* \* \*

THE COURT: We're on the record in 20CR6669,

People v. Estes. My I have appearances of counsel.

MR. DILLON: Khoury Dillon and Isaam Shamsid-Deen for the People.

MR. MUHAISEN: Good morning, Your Honor. Wadi Muhaisen with my client, Mr. Estes, who appears in custody.

THE COURT: Good morning. The matter is set for trial this morning. We have a panel of 100 jurors downstairs who would be ready to come up shortly. At 8:47 p.m. last night, March 7th, I received a communication from Mr. Muhaisen that was shared with --sent to the prosecution advising that yesterday within 24 hours of trial the prosecution had discovered to the defense what was referred to as many gig bites of previously undisclosed discovery. I sent an e-mail back to Mr. Muhaisen copied to the prosecution, thanking him for the heads-up. Mr. Muhaisen indicated he wanted to address that issue and anticipated moving for a

\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

1 continuance.

2.1

Mr. Muhaisen?

MR. MUHAISEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, just to give the Court a time line of the particular disclosures that the defense received, on March 6th there was six discovery disclosures made by the prosecution. Those were smaller in size than the ones that we received yesterday. But there were still six disclosures made -- six bundles I would say. Now, yesterday, March 7th I received notice by e-mail from Denver discover either Evidence.com or the other service they used. I received one notice at 1:04, one at 1:53, one at 1:59, one at 2:06, one at 3:58. I was in federal court yesterday afternoon as I received these links so I wasn't able to ascertain what they were or what size they were.

Last night after I was done with federal court, I attempted to download all five of the new disclosure bundles. The first one was 1.9 gigabytes, the second was 399 megabytes, the third one was 5.4 gigabytes, the fourth was 1 gigabyte, and then the final one was 1.38 gigabytes.

At the end of the day right before the close of business I e-mailed the DAs as this was all downloading to ask what it was, and the response I got

-\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

at 6:46 was that this was also their first time going through them. I asked at 5:30, "How much of this is new?" And the response I got was "All of it."

2.1

Immediately I had my investigator Eric

Hamilton start going through it. It was not possible since last night for us to completely index and I cannot provide the court a full list of what each item is. But I can represent to the Court that as of my last update from him this morning, he was at seven hours of new media, that included Chinese conversations that perhaps may be needed to be translated he indicates there is all new surveillance from at least one of the locations.

He's still going through those. There may be more of those.

There were victim interviews related to at least three of the victims. And all of the pacts that were provided have new body-worn camera, which includes statements made by witnesses and accusers. We haven't had a chance to even index what is all in there but I think it's uncontroverted there's brand new discover being provided to the defense literally on the 11th hour before trial. 400 days after the Rule 16 deadline to disclose such discovery.

I have not had the time to even index what is in this discovery much less analyze it for further

investigation, legal strategy, confer with my client on issues, and my investigator hasn't had a chance to investigate based on this new information.

2.1

This is a total of 9.728 gigabytes of discovery that were provided the night before trial. I know both prosecutors personally. I'm not at all claiming that this was done intentionally or maliciously. But the law is very clear the buck stops with them. And Rule 16 required them to provide this discovery to the defense a long time ago. As soon as practical but not later than 21 days after the defendant's first appearance at the time of or following the filing of charges per Rule 16 1B1. And that was in November of 2020, I believe.

And as the court of appeals has made clear as recently as April of 2021, in People v. Grant, 492 P.3d 345, the prosecution's disclosure obligations apply to information in the possession or control of any others who have been part of a case's investigation and who with reference up to the particular case have reported to the prosecution, Criminal Rule Procedure 16IA3.

(Court reporter clarification.)

MR. MUHAISEN: Simultaneously, Criminal

Procedure Rule 16 IB4 makes it incumbent on the

prosecution to ensure that information flows between the

-\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

prosecutor's office and the various investigative personnel so that the prosecution will have all material and information relevant to the accused and the offense charged in its possession.

2.1

And if the prosecution represents to the Court they just got this from there Denver Police Department, clearly under the rule of Denver Police Department and their investigators and officers fall within this rule. In order for the defense team to be competent and effective per Rules 1.1 and 1.3 of the Rules of Professional Conduct and in order for Mr. Estes to receive effective counsel pursuant to the Sixth Amendment, the defense is requesting that the Court, out of the Rule 16 list of possible sanctions that it may impose, grant a continuance to the defense so that we can get up to speed on what all this discovery is and per sue any investigative leads based on that and also to prepare for trial.

Rule 16 sets out a list of possible sanctions the Court may impose. Such as ordering the prosecution to permanent the discovery or inspection of materials not previously disclosed, granting a continuance, prohibiting the prosecution from introducing in evidence the material not disclosed, or crafting a different sanction has the Court deems just under the

\*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

circumstance.

2.1

I only know that I can ask for a continuance out of those four Your Honor, I would ask leave to supplement my request with a written motion for additional sanctions based on what we find out from what's in the discovery. Remember, Your Honor, this trial was supposed to start the last day of January, I believe. Had we gone forward, the defense would have gone forward without all of this information. And so I think that we need a continuance just to make sure we have everything.

We don't have the confidence that even with this disclosure we have everything based on a 400 day delay by the People in this case. So based on all of the above and on Mr. Estes's right to effective counsel, due process, Rule 16, and the case law and discovery disclosures, we are requesting a continuance of the trial so that we can effectively represent our client. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Muhaisen.

Mr. Dillon, Mr. Shamsid-Deen?

MR. DILLON: Thank you, Judge. I offer this

Court no excuses. I can only provide an explanation.

As this Court is aware, in January of this year the lead

prosecutor in this case was resigned from our office and

-\*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

I was asked to take over this case. This case has consumed me since the beginning of February. This case consists of seven separate GO reports, general offense reports, from two different jurisdictions.

2.1

2.4

How it works is all of the cases are to be linked through the Denver Police Department's computer symptoms and everything is sent over to our office for discovery to defense. As I have been diving into this case, every week, usually a couple times a week, I have found witnesses that were not endorsed, items from the police department that were not discovered and as I discovered those things, I immediately endorsed witnesses or sent over items in discovery.

Most recently on February 26th we learned in one of the GO reports that was a Denver case when we were doing a query for some evidence that we knew should be there and did not have, our investigator went into the Denver Police Department system and found some items in Evidence.com that were inexplicably not sent over to us ands not linked to the other cases that we already had discovery so. So we sent that over in February but I understand defense didn't get it until March because --

Or was it --

-- March 6th because the link was sent

-\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

improperly.

2.1

Yesterday as we were looking for some photographs that aware referenced in a crime scene analyst report, our investigator found those photos in addition to some body-worn camera that had not come over. So we immediately disclosed those yesterday.

Frankly, Judge, I don't know what a gigabyte or megabyte is, but I can tell you the information that was sent over to the defense involves a case that happened on November 9th where there were three alleged victims. There are a total of 22 minutes of body-worn camera interviews that were disclosed. The contents of those interviews are, of course, contained in those officers' statements, but the body-worn camera we had not seen. In the discovery we found yesterday with the alleged victim Haiyan Yi, there are 35 minutes worth of body-worn camera from three different police officers. Again, information that was included in their statements but we did not have the body-worn camera.

There's also a video recording of the showing of photo arrays and, of course, that is documented in the reports that the arrays were shown. The arrays were discovered, but the actual video taping of the showing of those arrays was sent over.

There's also external video of a neighboring

store that shows a white Pontiac driving in a parking lot, which Denver Police Department believed was the defendant's vehicle.

2.1

So this was all sent over late in violation of Rule 16. And we have spoken with Mr. Muhaisen about potential remedies. We won't use the the information -- select the jury, give them questionnaires and give them today and tomorrow to review the videos but that's simply not adequate in his view and I think that's fair.

So I don't think we can object to a continuance. We are prepared to go forward today, but this information was turned over late.

THE COURT: Thank you.

To say that I am distressed and appalled is understating it. For context, let me explain since we resumed jury trials after the last COVID pause, out of the last three cases, this is the second time this has happened in this courtroom on a case that was supposed to start trial in February literally the day before trial. 179 photos, if my memory serves correctly, of the alleged crime scene in an attempted murder case, which had not been previously discovered to the defense was discovered, necessitating a continuance.

The information that Mr. Muhaisen has recited that you have recited, including the surveillance victim

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

interviews, body-worn camera interviews of both the alleged victims and witnesses, photos, although referred to or perhaps mentioned in the reports or supplemental reports of the DPD are not in the Court's view a substitute for actually being able to observe the videos or surveillance or interviews themselves because what may seem significant to a police officer or detective in his, her, or their summary of something, whether it's a presentation of a photo ID lineup or a spontaneous statement that an alleged victim or witness may have made that didn't strike the officer as that important but may from the context of the lawyer be critical is something that in the Court's view cannot be substituted for or discounted by simply saying, Well, they had reports that this stuff was done but did the have the actual body-worn camera interviews, statements of witnesses and alleged victims, surveillance, photos, et cetera.

I don't know the reason why in two of three cases that this Court has -- serious cases that this Court has tried to get to trial in the last six weeks. This precise problem has happened. Someone needs to get to the root of it. I am going to communicate with the district attorney to let her know, and whether that is further communications and fixing issues with Chief

ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

Pazen of the police department or their IT department or Evidence.com or whatever the answer is, I don't pretend to know. But this is simply unacceptable. Plain and simple, unacceptable, gentlemen.

2.1

I have 100 people sitting downstairs who wasted their morning, time, gasoline, their parking money who are going to be discharged today. We have interpreters both in the Chinese language interpreters, both in Cantonese and Mandarin, who have been paid for their service during the trial, where that money will literally be burned and wasted, not to mention counsel time and preparation, not to mention the difficulty of resetting cases on a Court's already overwhelming docket, and inconvenience to everybody.

I am simply nonplussed that this should be a second time in a matter of weeks that this precise issue occur and we're not talking about one piece of paper or one supplemental report or something. We're talking about chunks, large amounts of important evidence that the prosecution didn't even know about and I cannot fathom how that could be, and whoever was handling the case is before -- before you became involved, Mr. Dillon and Mr. Shamsid-Deen, that there are references to body-worn camera, if anybody had bothered to read the reports, they would know they didn't have that

\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

information and should have asked.

2.1

And in my view, there is absolutely no excuse. I know everybody is busy. But there's no excuse for saying, "Gee, this report references a body-worn camera interview of alleged victim number one, but we don't have that anywhere in our files. Where is it? Let's go ask." That clearly did not occur and was either the result of somebody in the DA's office not reading the reports or if the reports were read, not acting on them. Both equally excusable.

This is a very serious case for Mr. Estes.

It's a very serious case for the victims. And under different circumstances I would simply dismiss the case at this point for the, what I view, as inexcusable and unjustifiable disclosure of these large amounts, chunks of information, less than 24 hours before trial is set to begin. I think that might be an overreaction on my part to simply dismiss the case, but I thought about it it, because I'm frankly that angry that here I am -- here we are for the second time in six weeks dealing with precisely the same issue, huge chunks of information that were obvious.

We're not talking about a video from someone's door bell three blocks away that was serendipitously discovered or that low and behold someone comes into

-\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

2.1

awareness of it the day before trial. We're talking about stuff that was obvious that by simply reading the reports and comparing it to what video or body-worn camera video or interviews were available, someone should have and clearly could have said, "We don't have," and they didn't do it.

And I don't know where the responsibility -precisely on whose shoulder or shoulders the
responsibility lies, but it is apparent to me that it
would be a -- would be manifestly unfair to the defense
and to Mr. Estes to say that Mr. Muhaisen should review
large amounts one interview, 22 minutes, and I assume
that's just scraping the bottom of the barrel, between
while doing jury selection, while reviewing jury
questionnaires, while picking a jury and be ready to
start with the trial tomorrow with great reluctance
because of all the wasted time and money, which is
ultimately not mine, not the judicial department's.
It's the people's money, and it's just been thrown out
the window for no legitimate reason except sloppiness or
laziness. Those are the only two explanations.

The Court feels compelled to grant the motion for the continuance. And I do appreciate the prosecution's candor as well as the prosecution's acknowledgment that a continuance was essential in this

case to avoid doing a grave injustice not only to Mr. Estes but to the alleged victims and most importantly to the system.

I'm speaking, Mr. Estes.

2.1

And if there's anything that needs to be said, your lawyer can tell him, and he can say it to me. I will grant the motion for continuance. I said I don't want to do things behind people's back or look like I'm being a crotchety old man and going and tattletaling to the district attorney, but with this being the second occurrence in three trials over the last several weeks, I am sending District Attorney McCann an e-mail.

Counsel will be copied on it so you know what's said and letting her know I am nonplussed that this has occurred the second time just in this courtroom.

And, golly, if it's occurring in Courtroom 5H, I can't fathom or believe in the other eight or nine criminal divisions that they've all been free from this type of situation. And it's up to the district attorney's office and the Denver Police Department to fix this problem, to address why this has happened, to do a root-cause analysis and to fix it and make sure it doesn't happen again.

If we get to a new trial date and something similar occurs in Mr. Estes's case, I'm putting the

prosecution on notice right now that I will give very serious consideration to simply dismissing the case and dismissing all charges against Mr. Estes.

2.1

I don't think that is necessarily the appropriate or just result, but I think Rule 16 embodies the principles of Brady versus Maryland and the fact that our system cannot function and cannot go forward without a fair and complete and full disclosure to the defense of all potentially exculpatory as well as inculpatory information and that is in the possession of the district attorney or by extension the police department, and I just want everybody on notice that I expect that evidence pertaining to this case will be reviewed with a metaphorical fine tooth comb, and we'll not have any similar occurrence when the case is reset for trial.

Carol, if you can let the jury commissioner know to excuse the jurors.

The Court, having granted the continuance, notes a new speedy trial date of September 8th, 2022.

And it's not ideal, but I simply don't have any place to slot this trial because of the COVID backup and the fact that I'm set with anywhere between two to six cases per week through mid August including on each of those weeks except for next week, and I don't think next week would

\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT \*\*\*\*\* ROUGH DRAFT

give you enough time to be prepared, Mr. Muhaisen?

MR. MUHAISEN: Absolutely not.

2.1

2.4

option I have, but I have either a first-degree murder case, an attempted first-degree murder, sexual assault or sexual assault on a child case every single -- included in those two to five to six cases every week per week until mid August. So the best date I can give you, and I hope this will work with Mr. Muhaisen, is August 23rd and I know that's close to speedy, but that's the best I can do.

MR. MUHAISEN: Defense is available.

THE COURT: We'll set the case for two-week trial beginning August 23rd, 2022. We'll set the case for a pretrial conference on August 7th at 8:30.

The Court grants Mr. Muhaisen's request for leave to request additional sanctions. I'm not saying I will or won't grant them, but will certainly consider additional sanctions once the appropriate people get to the bottom of why something this significant with this much information should raise -- should have raised it less than 24 hours before trial and will consider any other appropriate sanctions that may be indicated under Rule 16.

Was there anything else the prosecution wanted

for the record today?

2.1

MR. DILLON: Only that, Judge, I did not mean to be ambiguous in any way. It is my responsibility. So the Court's anger and is frustration should be directed at me, as I agreed to take on this case. So in your communications with my boss, Ms. McCann, I want to be clear this was my responsibility and the -- these things not happening timely is my fault.

THE COURT: Well, yes and no, Mr. Dillon, in the sense I know you just got assigned or took over the case in February. This is stuff that -- those who were previously involved in the case including Ms. Drasan, Ms. Forest, as I said, there's -- there are only two possible explanations, and I think those were the two primary attorneys involved in the case. Ms. Forest and Ms. Drasan, neither who are still with the Denver District Attorney's Office, but there are only two possible explanations that I see.

Explanation number one is that the written reports weren't read, and the discovery wasn't reviewed to realize that things as significant as a 22-minute interview of an alleged victim who will be testifying in the case hadn't been discovered, and that is either sloppiness or simply not doing your job in terms of not even bothering to read the discovery on a case where the

```
****** ROUGH DRAFT ****** ROUGH DRAFT ****** ROUGH DRAFT
    prosecution is attempting to convict Mr. Estes of
1
2
    charges which if convicted of, will likely result in
    incarceration for the remainder of his life. I find
3
4
    that inexcusable. I appreciate you acknowledging your
5
    responsibility and I'm not disagreeing with you,
    Mr. Dillon, I agree.
6
7
              But I think this case reflects that
8
    Mr. Estes's first appearance before this Court was on
    November 23rd, 2020, a year and a half ago. And there's
    absolutely nothing that in my mind were those in
10
11
    references are in the reports but the actual interviews,
12
    body-worn camera, surveillance, photographs, all of
    that, were not obtained until less than 24 hours before
13
    trial. Doesn't just fall on your shoulders.
14
15
              Was there anything the defense wanted for the
    record?
16
17
              MR. MUHAISEN: Your Honor, what was the
18
    pretrial conference you said?
19
              THE COURT: August 7th at 8:30, but if that
20
    doesn't work with you, I will reset that.
2.1
              MR. MUHAISEN: If I'm not mistaken, that's a
22
    Sunday.
23
              THE COURT: I'm sorry. It may be. I don't
24
    have the August calendar up, so I was looking on my
```

25

phone.

```
****** ROUGH DRAFT ****** ROUGH DRAFT ****** ROUGH DRAFT-
               MR. MUHAISEN: Monday --
1
2
               THE COURT: I was looking at 2023. I
3
    apologize. That would be August 8th. Thank you for
 4
    catching that and correcting me.
 5
               Let me make sure I didn't mess up. August
 6
    23rd is a Tuesday. So that will be our trial date.
7
    Thank you, folks.
 8
               (The proceedings concluded at 9:41 a.m.)
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
               ROUGH DRAFT ****** ROUGH DRAFT ****** ROUGH DRAFT
```