they're allowed to argue twice. 1 2 We'll being closing argument with Ms. DeYoung. 3 That will be followed by Mr. Short. And then Ms. 4 DeYoung will be allowed to come back with a brief 5 rebuttal argument as well. Then you'll begin your 6 deliberations. 7 All right. Ms. DeYoung. MS. DEYOUNG: 8 Thank you. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 PEOPLE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT 11 MS. DEYOUNG: Good morning. 12 THE JURORS: Good morning. 13 MS. DEYOUNG: I'm trying to get more 14 technically advanced. I've got a power point. We're 15 gonna see how it goes this morning. 16 And it's a little bit dark. It's like I Oh. 17 don't know to fix that. I tried it and it's supposed to 18 be working, but. 19 This is a case of People versus Reginald 20 Walker. As Judge Hathaway instructed you when we went 21 started this on Monday or Tuesday, there are multiple 22 charges in this case. And for each charge there are 23 multiple elements that I need to prove to you beyond a 24 reasonable doubt in order for you to find the defendant 25 guilty of the charges.

All of the counts except for the possession of marijuana, the Count 6 are basically possession with the intent to deliver. For the five counts that are possession with intent to deliver, the elements will be the same. So instead of going through the, the cocaine, the heroin, the Xanax, and the Vicodin, we'll do it all at once and, and try and be a little bit more efficient.

8 The first element that I need to prove to you 9 beyond a reasonable doubt is that the defendant 10 knowingly possessed a controlled substance. For Count 1 11 and 2 that would be cocaine. For Count 3 that would be 12 the heroin. All of it falls right along.

How do we know that Mr. -- well, let's see. How do we know that Mr. -- well, let's see. The second element for all of five counts is that he intended to deliver this substance to someone else. For all those counts he's charged possession with intent to deliver.

18 The third element that I need to prove is that 19 the substance possessed was whatever ele -- whatever 20 count we're talking about, and that the defendant knew 21 that it was.

22 Only for Count 1, only for the possession with 23 intent to deliver 50 to 450 grams there is a fourth 24 element for that. Substance was in a mixture that 25 weighed between 50 grams and 450 grams. That's the

element just for the cocaine count on Count 1.

So how do we know that Mr. Walker knowingly possessed the narcotics. For the cocaine he -- the officers testified that they pulled the -- that they pulled cocaine out of his pockets. Mr. Walker testified yesterday that there was cocaine in pockets and it was him. He knowingly possessed the cocaine. He admits they're in his pockets.

9 What about the baggie on the floor. How do we 10 know that Mr. Walker knowingly possessed the baggie that 11 was found on the floor.

First of all, we have the testimony from the police officers. The other drugs are on the floor right where he was standing.

Secondly, we have the fact that the defendant try -- admits that he tries to close the door when the police officers come in. It's guilty knowledge that he has the cocaine in on him and that he knows about the drugs that are in the house.

Here's the thing that came out this morning that didn't get put into the power point. Mr. Walker indicated that he bought this cocaine from a person named Boss. He said Boss was at the house that day.

24Boss sells drugs out of that house. Boss25doesn't trust the homeowner JJ or Johnny Nettleton

because Johnny Nettleton is a crack addict. The only
 person that Boss trust in that house is the person that
 the officers testified is upstairs asleep when the
 police come in the house.

5 So, um, the other thing that Mr. Walker 6 indicated was that Boss and Orlando left the house right 7 before the officers got to the door.

8 So what do we know from Mr. Walker's own 9 testimony. Boss and Orlando sell drugs, but it just 10 so -- Boss and Orlando don't trust Johnny Nettleton and 11 they don't feel comfortable leaving their drugs there 12 without somebody else there that they trust or they 13 don't feel comfortable selling drugs there without 14 somebody that they trust and they left.

15 The person that they trust is asleep. That 16 doesn't make any sense at all. Because if Boss and 17 Orlando were in possession of those drugs, Boss and 18 Orlando would have taken them with them because they 19 don't trust anybody that is, is in the house with -- you 20 are not gonna leave what we can figure out from 21 extrapolating 163 crack rocks times \$10 a rock, that 22 alone is \$1600 plus the Vicodin, plus the Xanax, plus 23 all that. You're gonna leave thousands of dollars of 24 narcotics just around in this house with someone who is, 25 who's a drug addict. That doesn't make any sense at

all. That's too convenient.

2 That bag is Mr. Walker's. The bag is 3 Mr. Walker's and we know it because it's at his feet when the police officers come into the door. 4 5 You've looked at those pictures of the way the door works. And when you hear the testimony that, oh, 6 7 yeah, the drugs are found kind of behind the door and in the space between the door and the stairs, if you're 8 9 thinking about normally how houses work, there's, 10 there's kind of a gap between the door and the stairs. 11 There's no gap here. There's no room for anyone else 12 there besides Mr. Walker and the drugs that are found 13 there.

14 The only other person that would have had 15 access to throw drugs there is upstairs asleep. I mean 16 and if you look at the way the stairwell is constructed, 17 you really can't even throw the drugs down the stairs 18 like that. And why would you.

Why would you throw them down right where the
police are, are coming in. It doesn't make any sense.
Those are Mr. Walker's drugs and he knew it.

Let's even talk about the Metformin. Sorry.Getting ahead of myself.

24The Metformin, the diabetic medication that's25in those baggies that are on the floor. Mr. Walker

his Metformin just happens to be a different
 prescription on the table in the other room. It's just
 all a big coincidence.

١

4 Out of the blue no, no Metformin for 23 years 5 and all of a sudden we have two diabetic people in the 6 same house where the drugs are being sold. That doesn't 7 make any sense. That's too convenient.

8 The next element is that the substance was 9 intended to be delivered. The packaging alone for the 10 cocaine, there's 163 packages of crack rocks in Exhibit 11 6. That's the drugs that were found on the floor.

12 In addition to that, there are, there's heroin. 13 There's pills. All of these different -- it's like a 14 whole pharmacy right at the foot of Mr. Walker. That's 15 not for personal use. That's for delivery.

As far as the pills that are in Mr. Walker's pocket, 23 rocks for personal use, that's a joke. There's no way. There's, there's -- we got the scale.

19Let's see. We got the scale that's found in20the house used for weighing out drugs. We got the21baggies that are found in the house.

And you looked at the -- had a chance to look at the baggies that were wrapped up, the rocks that were wrapped up. They're wrapped up in the corners of sandwich baggies all consistent with packaging for

delivery, for sale.

2 In addition to that, Mr. Walker has over \$5,000 3 in his pocket consistent with drug activity. He wants 4 to come in here and tell you that he's making all this 5 money as a music promoter. But what he testified is 6 he's made all this money a month before this happened. 7 He tries to say today that he can make a couple hundred dollars here and there. But really if he is 8 9 a -- as big of a crack addict as he's is telling you, I 10 bought 25 rocks for personal use, that money is gonna be gone long before we get to August 21<sup>st</sup>. That doesn't 11 12 make any sense at all. 13 The money in his pocket, the money that's 14 wrapped around the powder cocaine, that's his from drug 15 And that's how we know that he intended to sales. 16 deliver this substance. 17 The substance possessed was, Count 1, is the 18 cocaine. We can go through all of it. And that the defendant knew that it was. 19 Again, we have the fact that he's trying to 20 21 close the door on the officers. He's trying to get --22 separate the police from his stash. 23 He admits on his testimony that the rocks in. 24 his pocket were cocaine. All of the other items, all 25 the other contraband is packaged up with the cocaine.

Detective Schwein and some of the other officers, I believe, also testified Xanax and Vicodin are commonly used for the narcotics trade. Those are all -- those are two of the controlled substances, narcotics, the pills that you see often when you're fight -- looking at people who are selling drugs.

7 The chemist Tiffany Staples, she came in here 8 and she testified that she tested the cocaine, the 9 heroin, and the Vicodin using instrumental test, all 10 these other test, and that she found all of those items 11 to be heroin, cocaine, and Vicodin.

For the Xanax, the Xanax was not tested by Ms. Staples. If you were listening, you heard that she, she actually did not identify the Xanax. But what we heard was she looked -- when she was identifying the Vicodin and even the Metformin, she was referencing this drug ID bible. The drug bible is kind of the slang term for it.

Detective Schwein said that when he was looking at the pills that were taken into evidence, he looked at the drug bible. He was able to identify the same things that Ms. Staples could identify.

The Metformin was identified in the drug bible that she did as well and also the Vicodin. Detective Schwein said he was able to identify the Xanax in the drug Bible.

And also we know from the testimony from the officers that Xanax, that's something that is commonly used in the narcotics trade is as something that's commonly sold. That's how we know what the substances were that was possessed.

This is the tricky part; that the mixture weighed more than 50 grams but less than 50 (sic) grams. And that's only the element for the cocaine.

9 And there's two pieces to this. First of all, 10 Judge Hathaway is going to tell you that under the, 11 under the case law under the statutes we are allowed to 12 aggregate cocaine. When, when we have cocaine in one 13 place and cocaine in a second place, all of that 14 cocaine, all that substance can be aggregated to get to 15 the 50 gram threshold.

So if you're looking at the drugs in Mr. Walker's pocket and the drugs that are on the floor, you can aggre -- on the -- excuse me.

19 The cocaine that's in his pocket and the 20 cocaine that's on his -- on the floor, you can put that 21 all together to get to the over 50 gram threshold. We 22 can't add in the heroin and we can't add in any other 23 substances, but the one substance by itself can be put 24 together.

25

6

7

8

And for that why can we put those together,

because of the testimony from the officers about where 1 2 the drugs are found.

Again, because of the money on him we can show 3 that it's all his. The only person, other person in the 5 house with money on him is Mr. Manning. And Mr. Walker testifies, well, I gave that money to Mr. Manning. 6

4

7 Ms. Seals, Diamond Seals testifies, well, Mr. Manning had just gotten out of jail so we're throwing 8 him a big party. The person upstairs is asleep. 9 The, the drugs are Mr. Walker's. There's nobody left to 10 11 blame at that point.

Again, follow the Metformin. You got the, the 12 13 Metformin in the bag on the floor. The Metformin in the 14 prescription bottle with Mr. Walker's name on it.

15 The other part of it is showing that if you aggregate all of the cocaine from the baggie and from 16 17 the floor, it's still going to weigh over 50 grams. And 18 that we brought in the chemist Tiffany Staples to 19 testify about her methodology and what she did to determine the weight of the cocaine. 20

21 She indicated that it's 52.44 grams. If it's 22 extrapolated out -- she took one of the 163 baggies. 23 She took the cocaine out of one of those baggies and 24 weighed that and then used that number to get to the 25 number for, for the part six for the Exhibit 6.

1 She did the same thing on Exhibit 14, the 2 cocaine rocks that were found in Mr. Walker's pocket. 3 Is it possible that some baggies may be less? It's possible. It's also possible that some baggies may 4 5 But the number that she got to is 52.44 grams be more. based on her methodology that she testified to. 6 7 As jurors, what is reasonable. What is a -you are to find the elements and find -- the elements, 8 9 my burden to prove is beyond a reasonable doubt. It's your, your decision in this case to decide 10 11 what's reasonable about whether or not this was over 50 12 grams. And the People would submit that it is 13 reasonable that this is over. There is no reasonable 14 doubt that this over 50 grams. 15 Most of this case relies on credibility. And 16 there's, there's only a few parts of this case where the 17 things are -- where the facts are really at issue. And 18 when you're looking at credibility, it's important to look at all of the witnesses. 19 20 Let's look at the police officers who came to 21 They've all testified they've only been the scene. 22 officers, all four of them, for two years or less. None 23 of them have ever met Reginald Walker. I think 24 Mr. Diggs-Taylor said he had some contact with him on a 25 traffic stop or something.

1 They've got no reason to lie about what they 2 saw. They've got no reason to lie about what they did. 3 They don't have any connection to Reginald Walker at 4 all.

5 Officer Barnosky testifies I did the narrative 6 report. Officer Toth did the in, inventory section of 7 the report. Their report is entered before Detective 8 Schwein gets to the office.

9 Once a report is entered, and you heard 10 testimony from Detective Schwein and Officer Barnosky, 11 you can't go back in and change that.

12 Officer Toth testified I went in, because our 13 drop down menu box insist that we ascribe all of the 14 items found to someone if it wasn't taken directly from 15 that person, I didn't get -- I didn't assign it -- I 16 assigned it to the homeowner because I had to assign it 17 to someone.

18 Are they manufacturing the story? No.

19 They're telling you exactly what they did and 20 why they did it. If they were going to manufacture a 21 story and try to pin a case on Mr. Walker, why wouldn't 22 they say then all of these drugs came from Mr. Walker. 23 And if they're gonna go that way, if they're gonna 24 manufacture the case, wouldn't they say, oh, yeah, 25 everything was in his pocket. All of those drugs were

all in his pocket. They don't tell you that because
 that's not what happened, because that's not what they
 did. That's not where they found those items.

Detective Schwein, he's been very forthcoming with you. Yes, I know Reginald Walker. I have history with him. But his prior case with Reginald Walker is six years old.

8 The homicide that Mr. Walker was a witness on, 9 that's been resolved. Detective Schwein said those two 10 guys are in prison.

Do you really think that Detective Schwein is gonna hold onto a grudge for six years about this. He's been very honest and forthright about his relationship with Mr. Walker. He's not trying to sit up here and say we're best friends, we get along very well, nothing like that. He's very honest about his relationship with him.

The reports aren't changed. And Detective Schwein was gonna manufacture a story just to get back at this guy who may or may not have done him wrong six years ago, why don't the reports now say, and contrary to what the officers testified to, that all of this stuff was found on Reginald Walker. Because he didn't change anything.

He tells you what he's doing. He's doing good
police work. He's submitting the case that was

presented to him as it was presented.

The testimony of the young officers aren't -isn't changed. They come in here, they're telling you exactly what they saw, exactly what they did, exactly what's consistent with reports. Nobody's manufacturing any testimony.

7 Detective Schwein was never at the scene. He 8 doesn't come in until eight o'clock in the morning the 9 next day. He wasn't there. There's no reason. He's 10 been involved in multiple cases over the course of his 11 career. There's no reason for him to risk his entire 12 career on this one case. That doesn't make any sense.

13 If you're a good police officer, you're going 14 to be happy when someone who you gets is -- has drugs in 15 their pocket, selling drugs, you're gonna be happy when 16 that person is brought to justice. There's nothing 17 wrong with being excited about that.

Let's look at the defense witnesses in this case and their credibility. Diamond Seals' testimony directly conflicts with Reginald Walker's testimony. Diamond Seals came in yesterday. She said I never saw Reginald Walker with drugs. I never saw drugs in that house. I never saw anything in that house.

Reginald Walker got up and testified yesterday
right after her. He says, no, I bought drugs there. I,

I was -- I smoked crack there.

2 And it, it, it directly conflicts with what Diamond Seals was telling you. Nothing was going on. 3 Ι didn't see anything, but I was with Mr. Walker all day 4 long except for two periods of time. That doesn't make 5 any sense. That's not credible testimony. 6 Mr. Walker's own testimony conflicts with the 7 statement he gave at the police department on 8 August 21<sup>st</sup>. So which story is it that is -- that, that 9 he wants us to believe. You don't know. 10 The -- maybe there he's willing -- he's lying 11 12 on the witness stand. He's lying in the, in the witness We -- in the interview room. 13 room. 14 We don't know what's going on. We don't know. And it conflicts with what Diamond Seals is telling us. 15 He doesn't mention anything about Orlando or 16 Boss selling drugs until yesterday. He also wants you 17 to believe that 23 rocks are personal use. Common sense 18 and logic dictates that 23 rocks are not personal use. 19 That's ridiculous. That's just ridiculous. 20 And then he's got \$5,300 left after six weeks. 21 Counting from July 4<sup>th</sup> down to August 21<sup>st</sup>, that's four 22 23 weeks if you wanna -- we wanna say the benefit of the doubt. The aunt's party's on the -- I don't remember 24 The 14<sup>th</sup>. what that was. 25

1 Someone who is a self-professed drug addict is 2 gonna have that much cash left over. That's not, that's 3 not credible. That's not reasonable. Based on all of the evidence in this case there 4 is no reasonable doubt of the defendant's guilt. And I 5 6 ask you to find him guilty of all counts including the 7 Count 6, the possession of marijuana which is fairly self-explanatory. 8 9 Thank you. 10 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Short. Thank you, your Honor. 11 MR. SHORT: DEFENDANT'S CLOSING STATEMENT 12 13 MR. SHORT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. 14 THE JURORS: Good morning. MR. SHORT: Mr. Walker and I would like to 15 16 thank you for your attention throughout these past few 17 What seemed to be a simple drug case has turned days. 18 out to be a four-day trial, and we appreciate your 19 attention throughout. 20 Ladies and gentlemen, when I gave my opening 21 statement, I told you one thing of real importance. 22 That's that the boulder of the prosecution, her burden 23 of proof would not move from her table to mine, and it 24 still hasn't. 25 That burden is still there, ladies and