

1 use problem. And we disagree that that opens up any
2 prior convictions.

3 We think it's more prejudicial than probative
4 and would only serve to make the jury attempt or want to
5 convict Mr. Walker for the crimes here based on things
6 that happened before.

7 THE COURT: I used some very careful
8 circumspection here in what I allowed Ms. DeYoung to get
9 into in terms of the defendant's prior convictions for
10 selling drugs. And I allowed her to get into only the
11 2004 -- '08 conviction in a case in which Detective
12 Schwein was involved for reasons that I stated on the
13 record before the jury came out.

14 But the way you and your client conducted this
15 redirect examination it leaves the jury with the false
16 impression that he is only a user and that he has
17 received treatment for his use problem. And there's a
18 sort of a vague implication there that that was
19 successful. And, of course, that is a completely false
20 impression as the jury will soon learn because I'm gonna
21 allow Ms. DeYoung to get into the subsequent
22 convictions. And young --

23 MR. SHORT: If I may respond.

24 THE COURT: That you two opened the door for,
25 so there you are.