IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

WILLIAMSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 20-CF-596
	)	
JULIA E. BEVELY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

JURY TRIAL

Report of proceedings of the hearing before the Honorable Stephan Green on February 6th, 2023.

APPEARANCES:

JENNIFER MUDGE and
PHILLIP BUTLER
Special Prosecutors
For the People

THERESA THIEN
Public Defender
Williamson County, Illinois
For the Defendant

Amy L. Holloman, CSR
Official Court Reporter
Williamson County Courthouse
Marion, IL 62959

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: The Court calls 20-CF-596, People versus Julia Bevely. Ms. Bevely is in Court with her attorney, Ms. Thien. The State is here by both prosecutors Mudge and Butler. The last bit of business we have to take care of prior to trial is State's Motion to Compel Defendant to make Disclosures and/or a Motion to Bar Testimony of Defendant's Witnesses.

The Court's memory is we had a small discussion with the attorneys on the phone. Potentially this might have resolved over the weekend. If that happened, one of you were going to let me know. I didn't get any messages, so I assume the motion is still pending.

MS. MUDGE: Pending in part, your Honor. If I may?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. Defense did get me by the end of the day the day that we spoke a list of witnesses that she intends to call and a summary of what she expects them to testify to. Um, I would argue that they are all testifying to the character of the accused. And as my motion states, um, lay witness opinion testimony

is improper. These are all people who are family members, who are friends of hers who are going to come in and say, She is a good person. I don't think that she did this, or I have seen her interact with the family. Everything was fine then. And I think that's improper testimony. That being said, my biggest concern on the witness list, and that I would like to address with the Court, I think testimony of the defendant's mother should be barred and here's why. In the summary of what she is to testify about -- and she would be Rene Hightower -- she informed Lieutenant Karl Gusentine prior to the defendant's arrest that the defendant told her what occurred that day. That is absolute hearsay every day of the week. I can bring in her statements from party opponent statements. She cannot elicit testimony about things that her client said. I would ask that Rene Hightower's testimony, at a minimum, be barred.

THE COURT: Okay. So, let's take this up one section at a time. I don't know who allegedly is going to be character witnesses as opposed to some other witness. So, Ms. Thien, I mean, I have your list of witnesses. There is 18 individuals that are listed. Is it your desire that some of these people are going to

testify about the character of your client?

MS. THIEN: Judge, I do have an abbreviated list to read to the jury if you would like that now so we can refer to them specifically?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MUDGE: We did receive a copy of that this morning as well, your Honor.

MS. THIEN: I think both sides have worked to tighten up their --

MS. MUDGE: -- don't forget to add Karl Reich to that.

MS. THIEN: I almost forgot to put my expert on there, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. THIEN: So, to an extent, I agree that there will be some testimony as to Julia's specific history. If that relates to her character, then that would be a spillover effect at best. These lay witnesses that are listed -- I am not speaking about the expert -- are family members. This is a family case, Judge. This involves, um, you know, a couple with kids together with one of those children being murdered. Undoubtedly, all of the lay witnesses will have firsthand knowledge of the family and the family members

as we can see from the State's list as well.

We anticipate them to testify that they have seen the family interact, and I believe all of that is absolutely relevant. This is not just a list of witnesses to say, "I -- I know the defendant. I know her to be of good character."

THE COURT: Isn't that what character evidence is, except, the addition that her character in the community is X, and you lay the foundation as to how the community holds that opinion.

MS. THIEN: Right. I'm not -- that's not what we are tendering any of these witnesses for. They all have firsthand experience --

THE COURT: -- okay.

MS. THIEN: -- with this family as a whole.

THE COURT: So, if someone were to testify that they knew the defendant, had the opportunity to see her interact with the family, and, Gee, I don't believe she could ever do such a thing because she's a loving person, how is that, first, relevant, and isn't that improper?

MS. THIEN: Well, Judge, I wouldn't ask, you know, how could -- can you see this happening or do you believe this. That would definitely be improper. But

through the course of the relationship, seeing the interaction, seeing how Mike and Julia parented the children together, seeing, um, how Julia responds in areas of stress and trauma, I think all of that is firsthand testimony as to --

THE COURT: -- her character.

MS. THIEN: Not just her character, but as to the facts that existed in this household.

THE COURT: Okay. And again, explain to me how that is relevant in a murder case. Her character isn't really at issue. It's factual, isn't it, whether this happened or did not happen, right?

MS. THIEN: Well, Judge, yes. But honestly, in every case, there has to be a why. Not just a -- not just a what.

MS. MUDGE: There absolutely does not. We do not have to prove motive.

MS. THIEN: They do --

MS. MUDGE: -- we don't intend to.

THE COURT: One at a time, please.

MS. MUDGE: Go ahead.

MS. THIEN: But bluntly, Judge, there is not a jury in the world that doesn't want to have some idea, and we have the right to put forward that information.

THE COURT: What information?

MS. THIEN: The fact that this was a blended family. This was, um -- we have no history of animosity. We have no history of violence. We have no history of even arguing. That if they want to present their case that Julia is the one who committed this murder, that it is absolutely out of ordinary as to how this family has functioned up to that very day.

THE COURT: Ms. Mudge?

MS. MUDGE: None of these people were in the household. In fact, some of them are from California and Mississippi, and I am not under any requirement to prove motive. I don't intend to put on an ounce of evidence of motive. Um, I don't intend to put on any evidence that the defendant has ever been violent or had a bad relationship, per se, with the victim in this case. To let them put on evidence that everything was great, when I am not even putting out that everything wasn't great, um, like I said, we're not under an obligation to prove motive. It's not an element of the offense. This character evidence coming from the witness stand from her friends would be highly prejudicial to the jury. Um, and quite frankly, it's not relevant. Like you said, it's the who did it, and

what did they do? Not what kind of person did this. That's not what we have to prove, and that's not what this case is about.

THE COURT: Anything else, Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, under the Illinois Code of Evidence, there is specifically an area that addresses what you refer to as character. This is character plus, in my -- in my opinion, and I think barring these witnesses at this point in the proceeding when we're not even certain what all of the evidence the State is going to introduce, it denies Julia a fair trial.

THE COURT: Well, don't disagree with you there in terms of I don't know what the evidence is going to be, and maybe it's relevant. I will have to say, at least right now, I'm having a hard time seeing the relevancy at this point in time. I am beginning to see a little bit of a difference of what you're trying to say. If there is some evidence that it's not really -- you're trying to say it's not character. You're going to try to say that this is something unusual in terms of the family interaction. To me, it's the same thing as character. I guess I'm going to at this point in time not bar the witnesses until the State has put on

its evidence. We'll re-visit it after the close of the State's case.

With respect to the disclosure, that has been taken care of, correct, Ms. Mudge?

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So, the only issue for the State at this point in time is to bar testimony, it believes, to be character evidence.

MS. MUDGE: And then the second part, testimony from Rene Hightower of the defendant's statements to her.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know that I can bar somebody coming in and testifying. I can certainly say that hearsay is not going to be allowed. That's a different thing.

MS. MUDGE: Sure.

THE COURT: I don't know what other things that witness may testify to, but hearsay isn't going to be allowed.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. I just want to make that clear for the record. I think her coming in and saying the defendant told me something very different, if that comes out -- if that comes out, there is no turning -- there's no turning that one back so.

THE COURT: Well -- and, Ms. Thien, I mean, you are a seasoned trial attorney. You do know -- you know, I would expect that you wouldn't purposely elicit hearsay; I mean, specifically calling that witness for that particular purpose. If that's what's going to happen, then I don't think that's going to be allowed.

MS. THIEN: I agree. I mean, I don't intend to, you know, elicit strictly hearsay and not of the bolstering that Ms. Mudge is correct in stating, right. I can't come forward and say my client made a prior -- that qualifies as hearsay. No question about it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. THIEN: But there was one specific instance. We'll discuss that more before I even attempt to offer it.

THE COURT: Okay. I believe that takes care of all motions that were pending before the Court. I want to make sure that there isn't anything else in the minds of either attorney that needs to be addressed before the jury process begins.

MS. MUDGE: I do have one thing, your Honor, and it's more of a clarification question with regards to the Court's Order on the bite mark evidence.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. MUDGE: Um, the second order -- the order with respect to the defense's Motion to Reconsider, the order says, um, the State can only offer observation evidence of the defendant's obvious teeth irregularities, and that we are not allowed to have our expert testify as to the victim's teeth irregularities?

THE COURT: I believe the Fifth District decision bars me from doing that. At that point, it becomes a little bit more scientific. That individual is going to be doing a comparison analysis. At least right now the State is wanting to offer evidence that the defendant claims that mark was a bite mark, okay?

MS. MUDGE: Right.

THE COURT: All right. I think that you can fairly make rebuttal that there is no way that her bite mark -- well, her teeth made those marks because of obvious irregularities. Beyond that, it gets into comparison. We have a victim's bite; obviously a child. Somebody's going to have to give an opinion that it is a child's bite as opposed to an adult, right?

MS. MUDGE: No.

THE COURT: Yeah. You're going to have somebody have to testify that the mark on that arm matches the victim.

MS. MUDGE: I probably should have been clearer, and I am just being very careful to not violate the Court's order.

THE COURT: And I appreciate that.

MS. MUDGE: Just like what I said, once it comes out of their mouth, the jury can't un-hear that. In this particular case, molds were taken of both the defendant's teeth and the victim's teeth.

THE COURT: Correct.

MS. MUDGE: And I intended to have the expert testify as to both -- what he views on both of those molds -- on -- both on the victim's and the defendant's. Not that the victim's teeth made that bite mark. Just to say what teeth are missing from her cast or mold without regards to the bite mark; without comparing that. Just to say I viewed the victim's dentition casts that were taken, and she is missing the upper two molars of her teeth.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, that is exactly on-point as to what Prante ruled that the comparison -- my issue, even with the amended order, is that the comparison between a patterned injury -- a bite mark -- and Julie's dentition also follows in. Now, I appreciate, right, I

did not prevail on that issue, although, I want it preserved. But this is exactly the type of evidence that is so controversial at this point, and this is just an attempt to backdoor that evidence in and not have the doctor say specifically this matches this, it does not match this, but I will walk you down this primrose path to get you specifically to that point, and then what? Shrug? No, Judge, I think any -- I think you are correct in saying anything involving the victim's dentition absolutely crosses the Prante line, and without -- well, anyway I will stop there.

MS. MUDGE: If I may, Judge, Prante specifically said as to the specific characteristics of the defendant's teeth, this type of evidence is observation evidence and is not subject to Frye. There is no --

THE COURT: -- I agree, which is why I said you can do the defendant's teeth, but you're wanting now to use the victim's teeth. Now hear me out just for a second, okay? I'm a trial Judge. I am bound to follow the Appellate Court decision. That's a Fifth District decision, and as far as I know, it is the only decision out there absent some other cases that allowed that testimony. The Court knows that bite mark evidence has

been allowed for over 50 years. You told me that the case was up with the Supreme Court. At least as of Friday, they hadn't made a decision. I am bound by that.

The difference in this case is we don't need an expert to testify that the wound in question was a bite mark because we're going to assume it is based off the defendant's testimony. The only evidence then, I think, I can allow is observational for the defense. That's what the Appellate Court says. I don't disagree with the State's analysis that really there is not much difference in terms of allowing the victim's teeth to be used at that point, except it's pretty clear to me in the dicta of that case that becomes scientific at that point in time, and I can't do it absent a Frye Hearing. And I already know if I hold a Frye Hearing, the Fifth District is going to say that I should find that the expert doesn't qualify.

MS. MUDGE: Just to clarify, in Prante, the bite mark was on the victim, and they said that the characteristics of the defendant's teeth is observation evidence. In this case, the bite mark is on the defendant. It's my position that the specific characteristics of the victim's teeth are observation

marks and not subject to Frye. It is just flip-flopped in this case as opposed to Prante. The Appellate Court does specifically state that the specific characteristics of the defendant's teeth. Well, in this case, that's reversed, and I take that to mean the specific characteristics of the victim's teeth.

THE COURT: I'll tell you what I'm going to do. I'm going to go upstairs and think about this. I'll be down in ten minutes.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. Thank you, your Honor. I don't mean to cause a last minute issue. I just really -- I want to follow the Court's order and make sure that I am not --

THE COURT: -- I understand, and I appreciate it. Like I said, I do. I will be right back.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD STILL OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Please have a seat. Back on record. Okay. Part of my problem is I don't know what the evidence is. So, to answer the prosecution's question, observational evidence will be allowed. For example, if someone were to testify I have a broken

nose, based upon the fact that the nose is laying on the side of the face, that is observational. But for that person to testify that they have internal damage to the nasal cavity, that would be medical or scientific requiring an expert. If the State is wanting to offer evidence as observational, for example, the casts of the victim's teeth are missing the two front teeth, and they are going to testify relating to the observations but not, "I measured the teeth. They are the same." That is scientific. So, if you're going to offer it, it can only be observational. I will allow that, but I'd like us to be very careful. I don't know what question you're going to ask this individual. So, let's take our time very, very slow, and please talk to your witness that before they answer, there will be an objection from the defense to preserve the issue for appeal, so I would like that witness not to answer immediately. Give the defense time to make their objection and for me to think about the character of the type of question you've asked as opposed to any other, I guess. That's going to be the Court's ruling.

MS. MUDGE: Okay.

THE COURT: So, to the extent that I am reversing myself, in part, observational evidence of the

victim's teeth will be allowed. Only observational; not scientific, over the defense objection.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, I had the opportunity -- first of all, Dr. Wold apparently did not perform or make any kind of a report. We do know that by Ms. Mudge's statement at a prior hearing that he was -- his conclusion is inconclusive, at best, but I have had the opportunity to see the photographs and the exhibits that, I believe, the State wishes to do, which includes, um -- or as have been shown to me, um, the dental molds, the infrared photographs, overlays of, you know, the different diagrams that have been made or produced specifically to lay one set of teeth over the patterned injury versus another, I mean, Prante specifically stated, "We agree with the Court's holding in Ferguson and reject Malone's limited application of Frye. Today in determining whether Frye applies, the Courts examine whether the expert's testimony is the product of a scientific tests or studies. There is no requirement that the scientific methodology employed by the expert involve an intermediate mechanical stage. We find the bite mark evidence is scientific evidence within the

meaning of Frye because it purports to employ a scientific process requiring examination and analysis by an expert trained in interpreting the evidence."

I would suggest -- or I would ask this Court to consider prior to Dr. Wold's testimony that the State make an offer of proof to the Court as to what these diagrams, photographs, etc., that they are going to be relying on so that the Court can make an -- at least have that information prior to ruling.

MS. MUDGE: And just for the record, your Honor, that's fair. I will do so. I will have every photo I'm going to show. The photos that I sent Ms. Thien were prior to us even arguing this ruling at all, so I was being extra careful in what work he did. Now that I have the ruling the observational evidence will be allowed, I will absolutely not even try to show overlay photos. I believe that is confusing and in violation of the order. And I will -- we can maybe take a break before this expert testifies, and I will show the Court and defense every photo I intend to introduce with him and every piece of evidence.

THE COURT: That will be fine. Anything else?

MS. MUDGE: No, sir.

MS. THIEN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. The jury is back watching the video. I will let you guys know when they're ready. We'll have them all brought in.

MS. THIEN: Are we going to go to them, or are you going to bring them to us?

THE COURT: I have to swear in the full panel. Well, the full group first.

MS. THIEN: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: Um, so -- and I have got some people here, so what I am going to ask, those people that are observing, I am going to need that space for my potential jurors. I would ask that if you wish to be in here, it looks like we have enough room over in the jury seating for you to sit there if you want to observe that part of it. You will have to move fairly quickly because what I am going to do is I'm going to have 12 individuals potentially selected for questioning. Eleven of them will be removed, and then I will need the jury box back for questioning. So, then I will need to move you. The rest of the individuals will be removed as well. So, that's what we'll do.

MS. MUDGE: Would you like our shortened witness list to read to the jury?

THE COURT: Yes, if you have one. Yours is multiple pages.

MS. THIEN: You should have mine already, Judge.

THE COURT: No -- yes, I do.

MR. MUDGE: What I did -- and I sent this to the Court with highlights on them.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. MUDGE: I reprinted that for today. So, that is my list then.

THE COURT: That is the one that you submitted earlier?

MS. MUDGE: Correct. So, the highlighted witnesses will be the one --

THE COURT: -- that you call?

MS. MUDGE: Yes.

THE COURT: Anything else? Okay. The Court will be adjourned.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

THE COURT: Go ahead and bring them in.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Be seated. The Court calls

20-CF-596 back in order again.

Good morning. My name is Stephen Green. I am a Judge here in Williamson County. I want to thank you, each and every one of you, for being here. I understand that it's a great inconvenience for you, your family, your employer, but the constitution grants each and every one of us a right to a trial by a jury; those of your peers. That is a bedrock of one of our foundational liberty requirements that everybody enjoys. Our desire today is to have a jury that is to be composed of fair and impartial members of the community. You represent that community. The goal is to find 12 members of that community who will listen to all of the evidence and render a unanimous verdict based only on the evidence without fear, favor or prejudice.

The voir dire process is when you will be asked questions so that the Court and the parties can be assured that you will satisfy this goal. The questions asked of you require a truthful response since your answers are made under oath. There are a variety of reasons that you may not be chosen in this particular case. Do not concern yourself for the reasons if you are excused. Each of the parties and the Court are very grateful for your participation in this process.

Without your participation, our system of justice would not have the respect, which it does, throughout the world. It will be your duty to listen to the evidence and determine the facts of the case. It will be your duty to determine the credibility of the witnesses, as well as, the weight to be given to each witness testimony. Each juror must carefully consider the evidence presented, and when it comes time for deliberation, to carefully consider the positions of your fellow jurors with respect to the evidence.

It will be your duty to follow the law given to you by the Court. You may not agree with the law, but it will be your sworn obligation to follow the law, even if you do not agree with it. You must not discuss the case or any of the evidence presented until you are instructed to do so as the law and the jury retires to deliberate it's verdict at the close of the evidence. It is your duty to report to the Court any attempt to contact you or influence you in any manner. If such an incident should occur, you must immediately report it to me or one of the bailiffs -- my bailiffs, where are they -- who will be attending to you. Do not discuss it with anyone else including the other jurors.

You are to reach a fair and impartial

judgment based only on the evidence presented in open Court using the law which will be given to you at the close of the case. Should there be any publicity with regard to this case, you must not listen to those reports on radio or television, and you must not read any articles in the newspaper prior to reaching the verdict in this case. The only matters which are to enter into your deliberations are your common experiences in life and the evidence which you will hear in this courtroom.

It is my obligation to determine the law. It will be your obligation to determine the result by applying the law to the facts in this case. I will be making rulings during the course of the trial. At times, you will be excused. At other times, the attorneys and I will gather at the bench or outside of your presence. This is a normal procedure for trial. You must not concern yourself with the nature of these interruptions. Any rulings made by me does not and should not indicate what the verdict or result should be reached by you as a juror. The verdict will be your obligation and yours alone based only upon the law and the evidence.

At this time, I will introduce the

attorneys. For the State, Jennifer Mudge.

MS. MUDGE: Good morning.

THE COURT: Phillip Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Good morning.

THE COURT: For the defense, Theresa Thien.

MS. THIEN: Good morning.

THE COURT: And the defendant, Julia Bevely.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.

THE COURT: Clerk, please swear in the protective jurors.

THE CLERK: Would all prospective jurors please rise and raise your right hand.

(PROSPECTIVE JURORS SWORN.)

THE COURT: Please have a seat. Security, please come forward. Everybody raise their right hand.

(BAILIFFS AND SECURITY SWORN.)

THE COURT: At this time, we're going to select 12 individuals. The balance of you will be taken back to the first room that you were in. At that time, I will need my audience to move out of the jury seats. The 12 of you, only one's going to remain in the courtroom. Eleven of you will follow my bailiff to a new location. If you hear your name called, the first person called, wait here until a seat is available for

you. Go ahead.

THE CLERK: Matthew Brumley. Charles Doan. Gregory Stubblefield. Glenna Fofar. Nicholas Freyer. Gail Sesock. Melanie Harp. Ranetta McRill. Adam Fosse. Dylan Ferketich. Lisa Allen. Crystal Duty.

THE COURT: Go ahead and remove the pool back to the assembly room.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

THE COURT: Mr. Brumley, I am going to read to you a list of individuals.

MR. BRUMLEY: Okay.

THE COURT: These are witnesses -- or potential witnesses -- in this case. Nancy Deason, Huck's of Marion, Illinois. Gregory Beasley, Marion, Illinois. Dr. Goldesberry, University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney, a Forensic Pathologist. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, Supervisor, Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, Shift Supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley of Marion, Illinois. Kenneth Marks, Creal Springs, Illinois. Aaron Newlin, Marion, Illinois. Aron Luton, Big Muddy Correctional Center. Dr. David Wold, Bensenville, Illinois. Officer A. Rawlinson.

Detective S. Tomas. Detective T. Coffey. Officer P. Sawicki. Officer A. Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer C. Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer J. Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Lieutenant K. Gusentine. Detective C. Geittmann. Deputy K. Franklin. Deputy A. Anderson. Deputy D. Kelley. Officer Sloan. J. Wilkins. Chief J.D. Barter. Detective Richard Minton. From the Illinois State Police, L. Stewart. From Illinois State Police, Sergeant D. Morris. From Nashville, Trooper Padfield. Illinois State Police Intelligence Analyst Zach Hanratty. Illinois State Police Crime Scene, Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. From the State Crime Lab, Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stewart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

EXAMINATION

BY THE COURT:

Q. Sir, what city do you reside in?

A. Hurst.

Q. What is your occupation, sir?

A. Um, I work as a housekeeper over at Carbondale Hospital basically.

Q. What is your marital status, sir?
A. I'm married.
Q. Your spouse's name?
A. Um, Miranda.
Q. Your spouse's occupation?
A. She's, uh, stay-at-home right now.
Q. Do you have any children above age 18?
A. No.
Q. Do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you so far?
A. Um -- um, I mean, if it's over what had happened with a kid, I mean, that's all I've heard really.
Q. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
A. No.
Q. The attorneys have told me this case could take up to two weeks potentially. Is there anything in the next two weeks that would direct your attention away from this trial if you were selected as a juror?
A. No.
Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case?
A. No.
Q. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

A. No.

Q. Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

A. No.

Q. Out of those witnesses that I have told you, do you know any of the listed witnesses?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before, including grand jury service?

A. No, I never have.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or an immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to that being tried today; that offense being First Degree Murder?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that

are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. No.

Q. There is some principles I'm going to go over with you. They are very, very important.

A. Okay.

Q. Jurors are to abide by these important rules of law in every case. These are those principles. That the defendant is to be presumed innocent of each charge against them. That the defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or each charge unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. The defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against her, and that the charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes, Your Honor.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yep.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on her own behalf?

A. Yep.

Q. Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yep.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instruction regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yep.

Q. Now, I have told you and you have told me that you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant, and this is very important. You have also been told that this case involves the charge of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of this charge that would prevent you from being a fair

and impartial juror in this case?

A. No. Um, I mean, I got to hear all of it. I just go off what I hear here.

Q. Would you, in your verdict, be based solely upon the evidence that is presented here in open Court?

A. Yes, Your Honor.

Q. Now without going into any detail, have you heard anything about this case?

A. Um, all I have heard is it's a case of homicide over a kid. That's -- that's all I have heard.

Q. Did you read anything about this case?

A. No. It's only what all I had heard.

Q. How did you hear about it? Was it television? Radio? Internet?

A. Family and all that. Gossip stuff.

Q. How long ago was it from the time that you heard about this case?

A. Uh, a little earlier I did.

Q. Can you give me an idea how long ago that was?

A. Um, a few hours ago I would say.

Q. Is what you heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I told you about?

A. Um, well, I mean, I have heard some things on what had allegedly happened and all that, but no.

Q. Based upon what you heard, did you formulate an opinion as to the case?

A. Uh, I got to hear it here first.

Q. Do you now have an opinion about the case?

A. Um, no. I want to hear what, um, comes out on each side.

Q. Do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

A. Um, everyone should have a fair trial, and, um, everyone should be able to present their case on the evidence. Everyone's entitled to a fair trial.

Q. Okay. Do you have an opinion at this time as to any issue in this case?

A. No.

Q. Is there anything about what you have heard that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No, your Honor.

Q. If you are selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have heard about this case and instead decide this case only upon the evidence and testimony presented here in open Court?

A. Yes.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be

given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts and evidence and the law presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. As you sit there now, is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. No.

THE COURT: Ms. Mudge.

MS. MUDGE: I am going to turn it over to Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Mr. Brumley, we like to find out a little more information about the people to see if they have any bias or prejudice. So, the Judge has asked you quite a bit of personal questions about marital status. I am going to ask you to kind of give a little more information. So if I were asked, I would say my name's Phillip. I'm single. No kids. Um, I do have a dog that I treat like a kid. In my free time, I enjoy swimming, live music and reading. Can you kind of give us a little more information about yourself like that?

A. Um, I like shooting at the shooting range. Um, I like watching movies a whole lot. I collect Blu-rays. That's my hobbies.

Q. Okay. Um, and the Judge asked you if you have any kids over 18. Do you have any kids under 18?

A. Yes.

Q. How many?

A. Three.

Q. Three. Okay. All right. Um, any animals?

A. Yep.

Q. What kind?

A. Um, a couple of dogs, hamsters, a ginny pig.

Q. All right. Um, thank you. Now, you mentioned

that you have heard some information about this as recently as a couple of hours ago; is that right?

A. Right.

Q. If -- what -- if you're selected to the jury, what you hear in the testimony and evidence doesn't match up with what you've heard, is that going to make it difficult for you to make a decision one way or the other?

A. No. Not at all.

Q. Okay. Thank you. Um, some people, especially now, have strong feelings one way or the other towards people that work for the government. Do you have strong feelings towards any government policies or people employed by the government --

A. No.

Q. -- one way or the other?

A. Um -- um, no, I mean --

Q. Okay.

A. -- no.

Q. And that's fine. We're just looking for your honest answers here. The Judge had asked you if you've -- some questions about if you've had any criminal charges pressed against you in the past?

A. No, I have not.

Q. Has there been anyone in your family, close family member, that has had negative interactions with law enforcement in the past?

A. Well, I mean, I had an aunt who is -- she acts, um, a little crazy and all that. I mean, she's had her haul-ins and all that, but, I mean, that's all I've ever heard of.

Q. Okay. Anything about that relationship with you and things you have heard make you tend to trust or distrust law enforcement one way or the other?

A. No. Not at all.

Q. If you hear testimony that the victim in this case was a minor child, you having children, is that going to cloud your judgment one way or the other?

A. Um, I'm only going to follow what I hear in here.

Q. Okay. All right. Do you have any -- the Judge had told you that this could possibly be a two week trial. Do you have anything in the next two weeks if you're selected for jury service that you would miss such as doctor's appointments or anything?

A. No.

Q. No. And you're employed full-time?

A. Yep.

Q. Work would be able to --

A. -- yeah. It's fine.
Q. -- be fine without you?
A. Sure.
Q. Okay. Do you have any daycare issues with your children if you were selected for the jury?
A. No. That's fine. I can manage it.
MR. BUTLER: I would tender the juror, your Honor.
THE COURT: Ms. Thien.
MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Hi, Mr. Brumley. Um, three kids, you say?
A. Yes.
Q. How old are they?
A. One is um -- um -- um, nine, I think. Um, one is, I think, almost seven or eight. I don't know. I forget. One is four.
Q. Okay. Um, do you and your wife have any children from prior relationships?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Um, sir, do you belong to or regularly attend any church or other community organization here?
A. Um, yeah, I go to church and all that, yeah.

Q. May I ask which one?

A. Um, well, one is Harmony Church. It's over in West Frankfort. Another one is, um -- I can't think of it right now but --

Q. Okay. How about members of your family or close friend circle? Is there -- are they all regular church goers to any particular place?

A. I'm sorry?

Q. Within your family, um, within your, you know, parents, siblings.

A. My wife and kids.

Q. Same one that you do?

A. Right.

Q. Okay. Um, sir, has this case ever been mentioned during any church service that you attended?

A. No. No.

Q. Okay. I know there have been some --

A. -- right.

Q. Are you on social media?

A. Uh, no.

Q. Don't have a Facebook account?

A. Well, I mean, I have it. Um, I don't ever use it cause I honestly hate all that stuff so.

Q. Have you seen anything about this case on

Facebook or on other internet sources?

A. No.

Q. Sir, where do you usually get your news?

A. Um, usually I research articles on my -- on a cell and all that basically.

Q. I mean, we would ask --

A. -- a lot of the time I do.

Q. We use to ask what your TV channel is, but I don't think anybody watches TV news anymore for the most part. Um, and newspapers seem to be a thing of the past as well. You would say mostly it's on internet searches from your phone?

A. Right. Yeah.

Q. Have you read anything there about this case?

A. No. I have only heard what I heard about it. That's it pretty much.

Q. So, you said there was -- I mean, it caught everyone's attention, right?

A. Yeah.

Q. Um, you said the last conversation was this morning before Court. Were you guessing this was the case you might be called into?

A. Yeah. Correct.

Q. Was there any discussion about any of the facts

or anything that you think might have been the facts or anything of that nature?

A. Things I have heard, yes.

Q. Okay. And is any of that going to impact you in any way?

A. No. I mean, what I hear is what I will go off of.

Q. Okay. So, as the Judge asked you, a fundamental principle of our system is that anyone who is sitting in this chair is presumed innocent, and can you -- do you have that understanding as you sit here today?

A. Yes.

Q. And you can keep that all the way through this trial?

A. Yes.

Q. The other big one is that as the defense, we're not required to submit anything. It is up to the State who bares the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt this case. Can you hold the State to that burden?

A. Yes.

Q. How many dogs do you have?

A. Two.

Q. Two. What about the ginny pig? Just the one?

A. Oh, one. Yeah.

Q. I was tortured by a ginny pig as a child. Almost took --

A. -- I only have them because of the kids and all wanted to have one. So, that's the only reason I got one.

Q. Fair enough. Thank you, Mr. Brumley. I don't have any further questions.

A. Okay.

THE COURT: Mr. Brumley, if you don't mind, I would like you to move down to the end.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

EXAMINATION

BY THE COURT:

Q. Mr. Doan, if you don't mind, sit right about there.

A. Here, sir?

Q. Yes, sir. Thank you. This case involves the following charges: First Degree Murder, in that, the defendant, without lawful justification with the intent to kill J.B., a minor born 8-3-09 stabbed with a knife J.B. a minor born 8-3-09 about the body, thereby, causing the death of J.B.

Count II. That on December 5th, 2020,

Williamson County, the defendant, without lawful justification, stabbed with a knife J.B., a minor born 8-3-09, in the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to J.B., a minor born 8-3-09, thereby, causing the death of J.B., a minor.

Count III. That on that same date within Williamson County, the defendant, without lawful justification, stabbed with a knife J.B., a minor born 8-3-09, about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of J.B., a minor born 8-3-09, thereby, causing the death of J.B., a minor born 8-03-09.

I am going to read to you some witnesses -- potential witnesses that may be called. Nancy Deason, Huck's, Marion, Illinois. Gregory Beasley, Marion, Illinois. Dr. B. Goldesberry, University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney, Forensic Pathologist. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, Supervisor at Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervise at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley, Marion, Illinois. Kenneth Marks, Creal Springs, Illinois. Aaron Newlin, Marion, Illinois. Aron Luton, Big Muddy Correctional Center. Dr. David Wold, Bensenville, Illinois. Officer A. Rawlinson.

Detective S. Tomas. Detective T. Coffey. Officer P. Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer J. Francis. Officer Ward. Detective K. Gusentine. Detective C. Geittmann. Deputy K. Franklin. Deputy A. Anderson. Deputy D. Kelley. Officer S. Sloan. Officer J. Wilkins. Chief J. D. Barter. Detective Richard Minton. Officer L. Stewart. Sergeant D. Morris. Trooper T. Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely, Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michelle Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

Q. In what city do you live, sir?

A. I live in rural Carbondale, but it's a Williamson County address.

Q. Your occupation, sir?

A. Retired police officer. Currently director of law enforcement training -- the law enforcement training standards for the southern 27 counties of Illinois.

Q. Your marital status.

A. I'm married.

Q. Your spouse's name and occupation?

A. Behesha Doan. She's a dog trainer; business owner.

Q. Do you have any children above age 18 in Williamson County?

A. I do not.

Q. Do you know anything about this case other than what I have told you so far?

A. I do not.

Q. This trial is expected to take two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life the next two weeks that would draw your attention away from this trial?

A. A very significant event tomorrow that I can explain in private if that's possible.

Q. This event that you have, is it something that you need to attend?

A. It's about me, yeah.

Q. Is there anything else in the remaining time period that would keep you from focusing on the trial?

A. No. Not after tomorrow.

Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved, Ms. Mudge, Phillip Butler, Theresa Thien?

A. I don't believe we've met, no.

Q. Have you or any of your immediate family members

had any personal dealings with any of the attorneys?

A. No. Not that I recall I haven't.

Q. Do you have friends or acquaintances that may work in either one of the attorneys' offices?

A. Not that I'm aware of. I know a few attorneys, but I don't really work with them.

Q. Do you know the defendant Bevely -- sorry, Julia Bevely?

A. I apologize. No, your Honor.

Q. Out of the witnesses I read to you, do you know any of them?

A. Quite a few of them. Quite a few of them are friends and former fellow police officers and clients on the job I do right now. Former students that I have taught as police officers.

Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

A. I have not.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

A. My wife was in her childhood, yes.

Q. What was the crime involved?

A. Sexual assault; rape in Minnesota.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been

convicted of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offence to the one being tried today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by the police or law enforcement agency?

A. About 1400. I say that tongue-in-cheek, but I know hundreds throughout my region. Many are friends.

Q. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

A. I think I would only because my, I guess, it was a bias having -- that's my fiber right now is law enforcement. I have been in it for 46 years between being a police officer and being, you know, the director of police training.

Q. I am going to go over with you some very important principles of law. They are applicable to all cases in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is presumed innocent of each charge against them. That a defendant cannot be

found guilty as to the charge unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf, and is not required to testify. That the defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. And that if -- the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf, and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply that principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against the, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, you have told me you understand the charge. It's not any evidence against the accused. That's very important. You have been told that this case involves the charge of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of this charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No, sir.

Q. Without going into any detail, has anyone -- have you heard or read anything about this case?

A. I read the paper every day. I might have read it, but I don't recall the details.

Q. Did you read about it in the newspaper, just that or --

A. -- I read the Southern Illinoisan every morning without fail.

Q. Did you hear about it on the television?

A. I can't say that I have or I have not. If I did, I don't have a specific recollection of the story, but again, I watch Channel 3.

Q. Have you heard about it through the internet?

A. No. I only read national news on the internet.

Q. Have you heard about it through people talking?

A. No.

Q. Now, how long ago has it been since you read about this case?

A. I'm certain it was over a year.

Q. Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I gave you earlier?

A. Sir, I honestly don't recall the details of the article.

Q. Based upon what you read, did you form an opinion as to this case?

A. Not based on what I read, no.

Q. Do you now have an opinion as to this case?

A. I do not.

Q. Do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict might be in this case?

A. I haven't heard any evidence yet, so the answer would have to be no.

Q. Do you now have an opinion as to any issue in this case?

A. I do not.

Q. Is there anything about what you read in this case -- about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, if you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read about this case and instead decide this case only upon the evidence and the testimony presented here in open Court?

A. Yes.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in those instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts,

evidence, and the law presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. Is there any reason or issue that I have not discussed with you that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. Not that we haven't already discussed, no.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Mr. Doan, first I want to ask you a few things about the people you may know on the jury list. Were all of those law enforcement officers?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So, you didn't know any of the other people?

A. I didn't recognize any of the other names.

Q. Okay. Um, and the law enforcement officers that you recognize, I think, you said maybe about 14 or so?

A. I can mention names. Cindy Geittmann, I worked with her for years and was her trainer at Carbondale PD before she came over here. JD Barter, I trained him. I'm friends with Ramage. Some of the Marion officers -- I don't know them personally -- I trained them.

Q. All right. Anything about that relationship with them that would keep you from being fair and impartial to one side or the other?

A. You know, as I responded to the Judge, I tend to believe that all the police officers are human. We can be flawed. I tend to give a lot more weight to the truthfulness of what a police officer testifies to; myself having been on the witness stand hundreds of times as a police officer. I was -- Judge Schwartz said one time this police officer's got nothing to gain by lying.

Q. Okay.

A. -- which is absolutely the truth. That is absolutely my attitude about it still today in my old age.

Q. Sure.

A. Every police officer that takes that stand, I'm

going to assume they're telling the truth because they've got nothing to gain by lying.

Q. Thank you. Um -- if after -- if you are selected and you have heard all the evidence, if you don't agree that the State has met its burden of proof, would you still find the defendant not guilty?

A. If they didn't meet the burden of proof?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, I have to. I believe in the system. It's only the best system on the planet, you know.

Q. Even if several of your friends testify for the State?

A. Totality of the evidence.

Q. All right.

A. Like I said, I've been in Court a few times.

Q. Would that cause you any problems in those friendships you think in the future that would weigh on you as you sit there and deliberated?

A. I would hope not as long as we were working for the truth.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Mr. Doan, I don't want to get into specifics. You did say that there was a significant event tomorrow, um, that cannot be missed. Is it of a nature that depending on how it goes it may have an effect on your ability to concentrate or attend --

A. -- probably -- yes, for certain. If it goes a certain way, then I'd sit in this box, like, thinking about that the event.

Q. And it's not something --

A. -- it's an employment event.

Q. Okay.

A. It's about my work place, yeah.

Q. Not something that can be rescheduled?

A. No. It's governed by a governing board of 40 people from 27 counties are meeting tomorrow morning at nine o'clock.

Q. And you are the subject of that?

A. I am a party because I am the director of the unit with all the training.

Q. There you go. Okay. Sir, um, you were primarily with the Carbondale Police Department; is that correct?

A. That's correct for 24 years.

Q. I respect you, you know, telling us that, yes, there is, as much as all of us in this room have -- potentially have a bias, even though we will work hard to avoid it. Is that what you were trying to let us know is that because of your law enforcement history you were the training officer for a number of these people, you socialize, that that will be difficult for you to set aside?

A. Setting it aside, I am going to -- I'm trying to figure out how to phrase this. I am going to believe -- unless there is some super-compelling evidence, I'm going to believe everything they say.

Q. Okay. Fair enough.

A. As I said, the old Judge Schwartz told me, police officers got nothing to gain by lying. He said that about me several times.

Q. I remember him both fondly and with a degree of terror. So, yes, I appreciate that.

A. He was fun to go to his house in the middle of the night to sign the search warrants.

Q. No. Not on your life, but thank you very much, sir. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Sir, if you don't mind, move down next to him.

MS. THIEN: Judge, may we approach very quickly?

THE COURT: Yes.

(SIDE BAR.)

(DISCUSSION HELD OFF THE RECORD.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

THE COURT: Right about there, sir. Come a little bit closer to me. Thank you.

Sir, in this case, the defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty. Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-09, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-09, with a knife about the body knowing such act

created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-09, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

EXAMINATION

BY THE COURT:

Q. Where do live, sir, city? Not your address.

A. Johnston City.

Q. Your occupation?

A. I'm a coal miner.

Q. Your marital status?

A. Married.

Q. Your spouse's name and occupation?

A. She -- it's Pam, and she is a case manager for State Insurance.

Q. Do you have any children over age 18?

A. Yes.

Q. Do they reside in Williamson County?
A. Yes, one does.
Q. The name of that person, please?
A. Casey Green.
Q. And where -- what does Casey do for a living?
A. She works at SIU Head Start for kids.
Q. And where does she live?
A. Herrin.
Q. Do you know anything about this case other than what I have told you here today?
A. Just some stuff I seen on TV.
Q. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
A. No.
Q. I have been told that this trial is expected to take about two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life the next two weeks that would take your mind off of this case?
A. No.
Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler, Theresa Thien?
A. No. I don't know any.
Q. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?
A. No.

Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

A. Not that I'm aware of.

Q. Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

A. No.

Q. I gave you a list of witnesses. No, I haven't. I need to read them to you.

A. Okay.

Q. Nancy Deason, Huck's of Marion, Illinois. Gregory Beasley, Marion, Illinois. Dr. B. Goldesberry, University Place Center -- Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney, Forensic Pathologist. Sheila Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley, Marion, Illinois. Kenneth Marks, Creal Springs. Aaron Newlin, Marion, Illinois. Aron Luton, Big Muddy Correctional Center. Dr. David Wold, Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective S. Tomas. Detective T. Coffey. Officer P. Sawicki. Officer A. Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin.

Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Richard Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Officer Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Officer Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Officer Brian Hapack --

MR. BUTLER: -- your Honor, I'm sorry. He's a crime lab person --

THE COURT: He's a crime lab --

MR. BUTLER: -- officer.

THE COURT: Yes, he is. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger.

JUROR STUBBLEFIELD: Were you wanting me to answer on these as we go or at the end?

THE COURT: At the end.

JUROR STUBBLEFIELD: Oh, okay.

Q. Jim Jones. Michelle Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich. Now --

A. -- I know Karl Gusentine from when we was young, and, of course, JD is the Chief of Police in Johnston City. Other than that, I don't know any of them.

Q. Okay. Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any of your immediate family member ever been the victim of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. No.

Q. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

A. No.

Q. I am going to talk to you about some principles of law that are applicable to all cases in which a defendant is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is presumed to be innocent of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty

as to the charge unless the State has proven his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on his own behalf, and is not required to testify. And if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against her, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply that principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply that principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on her own behalf?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Do you understand and accept the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yeah.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yeah.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yeah.

Q. I have told you about the charge, and that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. That's important. You have also been told that this case involves the charges of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of the charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No.

Q. Without going into details, have you heard or read anything about this case?

A. Just what I've seen on the TV.

Q. Did you hear about it on the radio, internet, newspapers or any other source?

A. No.

Q. How long ago has it been since you heard about this case?

A. There was -- it had been on the news that it's

coming to trial today actually.

Q. Is what you heard more detailed than the statement I gave you about the charge?

A. No.

Q. Based upon what you've heard, did you form an opinion, or do you now have an opinion about this case?

A. No.

Q. Do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

A. No.

Q. Do you now have an opinion as to any issue in this case?

A. No.

Q. Is there anything about what you heard about this case that will keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in the case?

A. No.

Q. If you are selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have heard about this case and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in open Court?

A. Yes.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be

given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of the case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

A. Yeah.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. Yeah.

Q. Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. Not that I can think of.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Ms. Stubblefield, the Judge has asked you some

personal questions about your employment; things like that. I want to go in a little more detail on that. You said you had one child over 18?

A. Yes. I have got two children. I've got one that's over 18 in Williamson County.

Q. Okay. So, you have one under 18?

A. No. She is over 18, but she just doesn't live in Williamson County.

Q. Gotcha. Okay. Any pets?

A. Yeah.

Q. Yeah. What kind of pets you got?

A. A dog. Well, actually two dogs and a cat.

Q. All right. What kind of things do you do in your free time?

A. Shop with my wife most of the time.

Q. All right. Um, now, the Judge read to you the potential list of witnesses. And I think you said you knew Karl Gusentine and Chief Barter?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Anything about those relationships that you have knowing them that would prevent you from being fair and impartial to either side?

A. No.

Q. No.

A. I just know JD in passing and Karl. That was when I was young.

Q. Okay. So, you haven't seen Karl Gusentine in years?

A. Last time I saw him was at a -- where you do the roadside -- the traffic stop. That's the last time I seen him. That was probably 12 years ago.

Q. Okay. Do you have any -- without saying what they are -- but do you have any personal strong feelings about people that may work for the government or government policies one way or the other?

A. Meaning? I am not following exactly what you mean.

Q. Well, sometimes people are distrustful of people that work for the government. Sometimes they are more trustful of people that work for the government.

A. No.

Q. Anything that would effect you hearing people from the government testify?

A. No.

Q. Um, if -- you said you found out some information from the television. Was that this morning?

A. No. I think it was -- I think it was either last night or night before just that basically that the case

was coming to trial.

Q. Um, do you -- well, let me ask you this way. Do you believe everything you watch on TV?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Are you able to set aside what you may have heard outside of Court and judge the case based off -- solely off the evidence that you hear if you are selected?

A. Yes.

MR. BUTLER: I would tender Mr. Stubblefield.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Mr. Stubblefield, where do you work at?

A. I work at Night Hawk Coal.

Q. Is that at the -- Percy?

A. Yeah. The main office at Percy. Our portal is just outside of Pinkneyville.

Q. Oh, okay. That's -- that's a bit of a haul?

A. Yeah.

Q. All right. I'm through there all the time. That's where all my family lives. So, you said you have

an adult child that does not live in the county?

A. Yes.

Q. What does that child do for a living?

A. She works at -- she just started at the nursing home in Herrin.

Q. Okay. Um, any close family members employed by any police agency?

A. No.

Q. Sir, do you attend any church?

A. No.

Q. Have you -- do you have any type of social media account? Are you on Facebook? Instagram? Tik Tok?

A. No. I don't have any of them.

Q. Okay. Does anyone within your close circle participate in that?

A. My wife does Facebook, and I'm sure my kids have Facebook.

Q. Does she ever share anything with you about it?

A. She shows me little pictures and different sayings and stuff like quotes and stuff like that, yeah.

Q. Nothing about this case --

A. No.

Q. -- or cases in general?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Sir, you said you've never been on jury duty before, right?

A. No.

Q. Ever been called for it?

A. I've been called for it in Franklin County a long time ago, but I wasn't selected.

Q. Okay. Did you make it to this point --

A. -- yes.

Q. -- where you were actually being questioned?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Was there anything about that prior experience that you're going to bring into this room good, bad or otherwise?

A. No.

Q. This case when it first hit the news back in 2020, there was quite a bit going on about it. Did you follow it at that point?

A. Just I saw bits and pieces on the news.

Q. Did it -- was it a frequent topic of conversation with family and friends?

A. No.

Q. As you sit here today, will that have any impact on you whatsoever?

A. No.

Q. Because you understand, as we sit here right now, Julia is presumed innocent?

A. Right.

Q. And that stays with her through this whole case until the jury goes back to decide?

A. Right.

Q. The other big thing that the Judge asked you about is the defense has no obligation whatsoever to call a single witness. To -- Julia is not required to testify. It's about testing whether or not the State can prove their case beyond a reasonable doubt.

A. Right.

Q. Would you be satisfied with that?

A. Yeah.

Q. And you would be able to do that?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Okay.

MS. THIEN: No further questions. Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Sir, if you don't mind, move one seat down.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

EXAMINATION

BY THE COURT:

Q. Ma'am, the defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty. Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born

8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said act would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

One or more of the following people may be witnesses in this case. Nancy Deason, Marion, Illinois. Gregory Beasley, Marion Illinois. Dr. B. Goldesberry, University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney, Forensic Pathologist. Sheila Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley, Marion, Illinois. Kenneth Marks, Creal Springs. Aaron Newlin, Marion, Illinois. Aron Luton, Big Muddy Correctional Center. Dr. David Wold of Bensenville, Illinois. Officer A. Rawlinson. Detective S. Tomas. Detective T. Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Richard Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes.

Jordan Beverly. Stewart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michelle Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich. Ma'am, what city do you reside in?

A. Pittsburg, Illinois.

Q. Your occupation?

A. Currently a phlebotomist at Heartland Regional.

Q. Are you married?

A. No.

Q. Do you have children over age 18 in Williamson County?

A. No.

Q. Do you know anything about this case other than what I have told you here today?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

A. No.

Q. I have been told that this trial is expected to last two weeks. Is there anything in your life that may occur within the next two weeks that would focus your attention away from this trial?

A. My daughter is having some testing done, and my grandmother is end-stage renal failure. We're taking care of her as well.

Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Therese Thien?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

A. No. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

A. No.

Q. Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

A. On a personal level, no. As a patient, yes.

Q. I read to you a list of witnesses. Do you know any of those witnesses?

A. Yes. I know Theresa Rice.

MS. THIEN: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear that.

MS. MUDGE: I didn't either.

JUROR FOFAR: I'm sorry.

MS. THIEN: I couldn't hear that.

JUROR FOFAR: Theresa Rice.

MS. THIEN: Gotcha.

By The Court:

Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before

including grand jury service?

A. Never.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been the victim of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. No.

Q. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because that witness works in law enforcement?

A. No.

Q. I am about to talk to you about some principles of law that apply in all cases in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is presumed innocent of each charge against them. That a

defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that a defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that the defendant's choice not to

testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, you've told me you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant?

A. Correct.

Q. That's very important. You've also been told that this case involved the charges of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. I don't think -- I don't think so. I have a child myself. Um, I would hate to know that something happened to her similar and there was nothing I could do about it.

Q. Now, without going into detail, you indicated that you knew something about the case. Have you heard about it or read about it?

A. Both.

Q. How did you hear or read about it? Was it on TV? Internet? Radio?

A. All of the above. In my former job, Julia was a patient there, and we saw her during her incarceration.

Q. How long ago has it been since you've heard or read about this case?

A. Yesterday.

Q. Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement I gave you in the charges?

A. No.

Q. Based upon what you read or might have heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

A. No.

Q. Do you now have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you now have an opinion as to any issue in the case?

A. I'm sorry. You said issue?

Q. Yes, ma'am.

A. No.

Q. Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a

fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. I don't think so.

Q. But you say you have formed an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in the case?

A. Yes. It should be.

Q. Are you telling me you think it should be a fair --

A. -- it should be -- it should be fair and impartial.

Q. Okay. But you're not saying you have an opinion as to which way it should be?

A. No. I have not formed an opinion about it.

Q. If you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you might have heard or read about and instead decide this case only on the evidence and testimony which would be presented here in open Court?

A. I will do my best.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Beyond a reasonable doubt if the evidence is there.

Q. If the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. If they can't prove it, not guilty.

Q. Is there any reason or issue that we've not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. No.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Um, Ms. Fofar, am I pronouncing that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Um, you said you have a child?

A. Mm-hmm. Nine years old.

Q. Nine. Um, is there anything about this case

involving a child that would cloud your judgment one way or the other?

A. I wouldn't think so because I would want justice for both parties.

Q. Okay. You said your daughter has some testing coming up?

A. Yes. She is having some health issues. She has, um -- she has an EEG scheduled on Thursday that would take several hours.

Q. Is that something that there would be someone else that could take her to that?

A. There is. Um, I don't know how well she would do with that, but my mother could take her.

Q. Okay. And, um, you say Thursday -- say you are selected as a jury member, and come Thursday your child's having this procedure. Are you going to be thinking about that, or are you going to be able to pay attention to what's said and done here in Court?

A. I would like to think I could be able to pay attention.

Q. Okay.

A. But she is my daughter.

Q. So, you don't really know?

A. I don't really know. I've never been in this

position. I'm sorry.

Q. Sure. And then you also mentioned something about your grandmother; you're taking care of her?

A. Mm-hmm. My mother and I both take care of her. She lives next door, and she is 86 years old, and she is end of life, and we rotate taking care of her during the day and during the nights. I work midnights.

Q. Is that something that someone would be able to do --

A. -- we do have family that could step in.

Q. -- if you were selected? Okay. Would that be weighing on your mind as you sit there, the health of your grandmother?

A. She's been ill for a long time. I mean, yes, I would be sad if something happened to her and I wasn't there but we expect it any time.

Q. Okay. You mentioned you know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

A. Mm-hmm. Not on a personal level.

Q. Okay.

A. Um, I was employed at New Horizons OB/GYN during her pregnancy.

Q. Okay. Anything about that relationship with her that would cause you to be less fair and impartial to

either side?

A. No. She is a patient.

Q. And you said you know a Theresa Rice that was listed?

A. She is a family friend. She use to work with my dad.

Q. Family friend?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. If Teresa Rice testifies, are you going to view her testimony with -- give her testimony more weight because you have that family friend connection?

A. No. Everyone's entitled to their opinion.

Q. Okay. Did you know Rene Hightower?

A. Um, I think I may remember her from years ago. I think she might have worked at Walmart when I worked there --

Q. -- okay.

A. -- but that's been 20 years ago.

Q. Um --

A. -- I don't know that I would recognize her.

Q. Sure. I understand that. Um, the Judge had asked you -- well, I guess, you said you've heard and read about the case?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Have you been following it since it happened?
A. Not really.
Q. Not really?
A. I don't have a whole lot of time.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, I see things on Facebook, and every once in a while I will catch News 3.
Q. Have you ever posted a comment on any of those?
A. No.
Q. Um, anything about what you heard or read -- I think the Judge asked you this -- that would cloud your judgment on the case or --
A. -- no.
Q. -- or make you already have a basis for what your opinion on the case should be right now?
A. No. I take this -- (indiscernible) --
THE COURT REPORTER: -- I'm sorry. I can't hear.
THE COURT: Ma'am, I need you to speak up for the court reporter.
A. I'm sorry. I feel like Facebook is a sounding board for people to put out their thoughts and opinions. I don't take anything on there seriously, and I don't watch enough news to really follow what's been going on;

just hearsay.

Q. Okay.

MR. BUTLER: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Ms. Fofar, from when you knew Julie, um -- another way to ask that question is your prior relationship with her as a patient, does that put her at a particular advantage or disadvantage if you were on this jury?

A. I don't think it would do either because patient confidentiality. You know, you have to put aside certain things in the medical field and treat the patient; not their situation basically. Treat their health; not what's going on around them, at least, in the part that I did.

Q. Fair enough. Are you on any other social media other than Facebook?

A. No.

Q. No Instagram? Snapchat?

A. No.

Q. Technically, I guess, Pinterest is.
A. I love Pinterest.
Q. Yeah. Me too. That is just mostly -- yeah -- scrolling to the end.
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. Do you belong to any church in the area?
A. No. I'm not a member.
Q. Can you tell me approximately when the last time you've heard about this case was that you either saw it on Facebook or people were talking about it?
A. Yesterday on Facebook.
Q. Okay. Do you have any friends, family that regularly comment on such things?
A. No, not really.
Q. Forwarded stories to you to --
A. -- no. No. None forwarded to me.
Q. So, there is actually two important things going on at the same time. Your nine-year-old as an EEG, and it's your grandmother that is in end-stage renal failure?
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. Okay.
MS. THIEN: Thank you. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Go ahead and take the panel into the deliberation room. If you don't mind, please follow my bailiffs.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Is Mr. Butler making the choices or are you?

MS. MUDGE: Mr. Butler will be. If we could have one moment to confer, please?

MS. THIEN: Are we going to do this -- I mean, I understand panels of four, but are we going to question 12 before we do this? Are we going to --

THE COURT: -- well, I would have done it in panels of four anyway. Not in 12, so yes.

MS. THIEN: Oh, I know. I just meant question 12.

THE COURT: Oh. We'll do our panels first.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

THE COURT: I believe the law requires me to do it in panels.

MS. THIEN: Well, we only have seven peremptories, Judge, and it's kind of nice to know who's coming down the line. So, we have always -- in my

experience only -- questioned 12 or more, and then we tender back and forth in panels of four, but I am good either way.

THE COURT: We'll do it in panels of four.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler, it's your panel, sir.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, we would excuse Ms. Fofar and tender the other three.

THE COURT: So you're exercising a challenge?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. First, go ahead and bring the panel back in. Any objection to the challenge?

MS. THIEN: You're exercising a peremptory?

MR. BUTLER: I am.

MS. THIEN: Okay. No.

THE COURT: No objection. Okay.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR.)

THE COURT: Ms. Fofar?

MS. FOFAR: Yes.

THE COURT: You can be excused now, ma'am. Thank you very much for your time and patience. I

appreciate it. You can gather your belongings. If you will follow my bailiff, he will take care of it.

MS. FOFAR: Thank you so much.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Butler, Ms. Thien, the Clerk handed me a note that indicates Nicholas Freyer, the next potential juror, is a defendant in Case Number 22-LA-5. It has a case management conference set on 2-28 at nine o'clock. Do you wish for me to have this individual brought in to determine if it's the same individual and question, or do you wish for the Court to go ahead and excuse?

MS. THIEN: What was the --

THE COURT: It would be the next potential juror.

MS. THIEN: Right. The case is a -- the Number was 22-LM?

THE COURT: LA.

MS THIEN: Gotcha.

THE COURT: It's in excess of $50,000.

MS. THIEN: I think that's a cause, Judge.

MR. BUTLER: Yeah. I agree.

THE COURT: I understand, but my question is do you wish for me to inquire as to whether it's the same person or just go ahead and excuse?

MR. BUTLER: The State would be fine with going ahead and excusing him if Ms. Thien is.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien, are you in agreement?

MS. THIEN: Judge, I am in agreement.

THE COURT: Go ahead and bring Nicholas and then Gail Sesock both.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Freyer?

MR. FREYER: Yes.

THE COURT: You are free to go, sir. I thank you very much for your time and your patience with us. You can gather your stuff. My bailiff will help you do that. Ma'am, I need you to sit there about one seat away from the gentleman that will be to your right. Thank you, ma'am.

EXAMINATION

BY THE COURT:

Q. So, ma'am, the defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasely about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing

the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

One or more of the following people may be called as witnesses in this case. Nancy Deason of Marion, Illinois -- Nancy Deason, Huck's of Marion, Illinois. Gregory Beasley, Marion, Illinois. Dr. Goldesberry, University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney, Forensic Pathologist. Sheila Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley, Marion, Illinois. Kenneth Marks, Creal Springs, Illinois. Aaron Newlin, Marion, Illinois. Aron Luton, Big Muddy Correctional Center. Dr. David Wold of Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelly. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Richard Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zachary Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stewart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole

Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

EXAMINATION

BY THE COURT:

Q. Ma'am, what city do you reside?

A. Herrin.

Q. Your occupation?

A. Teacher.

Q. For what school district?

A. I guess, Williamson. Agapa Christian.

Q. Your marital status?

A. Married.

Q. Your husband's name and occupation?

A. Brent Sesock. Factory worker at Continental.

Q. Do you have any children above age 18 residing in Williamson County?

A. No.

Q. Do you know anything about this case other than what I told you here today?

A. I have heard a little bit on the news early on.

Q. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

A. No.

Q. I have been told that this case is expected to take two weeks. Is there anything in the next two weeks

that may occur in your life that would direct your attention away from this trial?

A. I mean, I'm at a new job. Um, I am having a little -- an asthma flare right now. Um, and I have some history that could conflict things. I have lost a child, um, and I suffer from some PTSD. So, depending on what's said, could be traumatic for me.

Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any profession dealings with any of the attorneys?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

A. No.

Q. Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

A. No.

Q. I gave you a list of witnesses. Do you know any of those individuals?

A. Not that I'm aware of.

Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before

including grand jury service?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

A. Um, no.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. Yes.

Q. Who might that be?

A. Uh, Fuller (ph). Um, I'm sorry. I'm nervous. Jeff Fuller, State cop.

Q. Okay. Now, would you give the testimony of any police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

A. No.

Q. I am going to talk to you about some very

important legal principles, and they apply in all cases in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is presumed innocent of each charge against them. That the defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify, and that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not to testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. You told me you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. That's important. You've also been told that this case involves the charge of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Without going into any detail, you have indicated that you have heard or read something about this case. Did you hear about it on TV? Radio? Internet? Newspaper? People talking? What source?

A. People talking, the TV, internet; a variety of sources.

Q. How long ago as it been since you have heard or read something about this case?

A. About two weeks ago.

Q. Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge I read to you earlier?

A. Yes.

Q. Based upon what you read or heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you now have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you now have an opinion as to any issue in this case?

A. I'm not sure on that question. Can you repeat it?

Q. Yes, ma'am. Do you now have an opinion that you formulated based upon the information you may have read or heard about any issue that may arise in this case?

A. Yes.

Q. Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a

fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. Not necessarily what I read, but I think my past could.

Q. Okay. You have indicated to me that you formulated an opinion about issues, an opinion about what the verdict may be; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. If you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have heard or read about in this case; instead decide this case only on the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in open Court?

A. I'm not sure. I've never been in this position.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Can you say that again?

Q. Yes, ma'am. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. Not that we haven't discussed.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Ms. Sesock, you said you're a teacher?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you teach a certain grade or certain subject?

A. High school math and science.

Q. Math and science. Okay.

MR. BUTLER: Um, I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Um, do you have any children at home?

A. Yes.

Q. And how old are they?

A. One 14 year old.

Q. Without stating what it is, Ms. Sesock, have you -- do you think you have an opinion in this case --

A. -- yes.

Q. -- that you hold strongly?

A. Yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. I have no further questions. Thank you.

THE COURT: Go ahead and take the panel back, please. If all of you would follow them, please.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Butler, still your panel, sir.

MR. BUTLER: I tender that panel.

THE COURT: Very well. Ms. Thien, to you.

MS. THIEN: I would challenge Mr. Doan for

cause, Judge. I think you did admirable in being forthright with the Court, but since he was actually the training officer for most of the witnesses coming through and has also stated while it would not be his intention to let bias in any way influence him --

THE COURT: -- any response, Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Judge, he told the Court that if he didn't agree with how the evidence came in, even if they were officers that he knew or were friends with, he could find a verdict for the defendant. And further, I believe he said he didn't feel like he would have to justify that with other witnesses as well.

THE COURT: Motion for cause will be granted. Okay. It's almost noon-time. I think that the Court should take this opportunity to break for lunch. Give everybody an opportunity to get some time together. If you would not mind, I need to have -- let's just bring back Mr. Doan, and then Ms. -- well, that's the only one that is being challenged.

MS. THIEN: Well, Judge, I don't have four left.

THE COURT: Right. You don't need to.

MS. THIEN: Okay. I was going to say I'm going to make a motion for cause on Ms. Sesock as well.

I think she just flat out said she cannot be fair and impartial.

MR. BUTLER: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: That will be granted. Very well. Everybody knew what I was thinking when I said the name, I guess. So, bring back Ms. Sesock and Mr. Doan.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ma'am, you don't need to go over there. It's okay. Come over this way. I want to thank each one of you for your time here today and your patience with us. You will not be serving as jurors, so I am going to go ahead and excuse you. You can follow my bailiff to get your personal items and you're excused. Thank you.

The Court will be a adjourned until 1:15. I would like the jury brought back -- well, the pool brought back around 1:00. Ms. Thien, you had something you wished to say?

MS. THIEN: No.

THE COURT: You just had that look about you.

MS. THIEN: Well, thank you, Judge.

(NOON RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

THE COURT: We are back on record after lunch.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. This defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act

created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

One or more of these people will be witnesses in this case. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldesberry. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays. She is from Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer A. Rawlinson. Detective S. Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer P. Sawicki. Officer A. Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer C. Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson.

Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Richard Minton. Officer Stewart. Officer Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

EXAMINATION

BY THE COURT:

Q. Ms. Harp, what city do you live in?

A. Carterville.

Q. Your occupation?

A. Um, I'm a real estate agent and a Youth and Family Director at a church.

Q. What church?

A. Murphysboro United Methodist.

Q. Your marital status?

A. Married.

Q. Your husband's name and occupation?

A. Grant Harp. He works for DHS, Williamson County.

Q. Do you have any children over age 18 residing in Williamson County?

A. No.

Q. Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

A. No.

Q. I have been told by the attorneys they expect this trial to take up to two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life within the next two weeks that would draw your attention away from this trial?

A. No.

Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Therese Thien?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

A. No.

Q. Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

A. No.

Q. I gave you a list of potential witnesses. Do you

know any of them?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

A. Twenty years ago in a county up north.

Q. Do you recall what type of case that was; whether it was civil or criminal?

A. It was a criminal case.

Q. Do you remember what charge was involved?

A. It was a molestation case.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

A. Yeah.

Q. When did that occur, ma'am?

A. Oh, very long time ago.

Q. Is there anything about that process that might effect your ability to act as a juror in this case?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Have you or any immediate family ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. No.

Q. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

A. No.

Q. I am going to talk to you about some principles of law that apply in every case in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is presumed innocent of each of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge.

That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against her and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

A. Yeah.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yeah.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yeah.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, I told you that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. You have also been told that

this case involves the charge of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No.

Q. And again, without going into any details, have you heard or read anything about this case?

A. No.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in those instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yeah.

Q. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. Yeah.

Q. Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. No.

Q. Ms. McRill, what city do you reside in, ma'am?

A. Freeman Spur.

Q. Your occupation, ma'am?

A. I work at a factory.

Q. Which factory?

A. Aisin.

Q. Your marital status?

A. Married.

Q. Name of your husband and his occupation.

A. Tom McRill, and he's a -- works at Black Diamond Harley Davidson.

Q. Do you have any children over age 18 residing in Williamson County?

A. No.

Q. Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?

A. Saw it on the news a long time ago.

Q. I'm sorry?

A. Back a long time ago.

Q. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
A. No.
Q. Like I told her, they expect this trial to potentially last two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life within the next two weeks that would draw your attention away from this trial?
A. No.
Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?
A. No.
Q. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work at either of the attorneys' offices?
A. No.
Q. Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?
A. No.
Q. As to the witnesses that I read out loud, do you know any of them?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall how long ago?
A. A couple years ago.
Q. Do you recall what type of case; either criminal or civil?
A. Civil.
Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been the victim of a crime?
A. A ticket, you know.
Q. Is there anything about that, ma'am, that might effect your ability to act as a fair and impartial juror in this case?
A. No.
Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?
A. A ticket, yeah. Yes.
Q. Is that you or a family member?
A. Family member; me nothing.
Q. Is there anything about that that would effect your ability to act as a fair and impartial juror in this case?
A. No.
Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried

today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. Not anymore.

Q. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because that witness works in law enforcement?

A. No.

Q. I am going to go over those same principles -- those same legal principles that apply in every criminal case. Those are as follows: The defendant is to be presumed innocent of each of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify, and if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. That the defendant has to be proven -- his guilt -- beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed

innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand, accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you accept and understand the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. With respect to the charge, I told you it's not any evidence against the defendant. You have been told that the case involves the charge of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of this charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No.

Q. You indicated that you have heard something or read something about this case. How did you hear or read about it? Was it television? Radio? Internet? Newspaper? People talking?

A. Television.

Q. How long ago has it been since you've heard about this case?

A. Years; a couple years.

Q. Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you earlier?

A. No.

Q. Based upon what you heard, did you form an opinion, or do you now have an opinion as to this case?

A. No.

Q. Do you have an opinion now as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

A. No.

Q. Do you now have an opinion as to any issue in this case?

A. No.

Q. Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No.

Q. If selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about this case and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in open Court?

A. Yes.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and the law presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair or impartial juror?

A. No.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien, I think it's back to you.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Ms. Harp, are you on any form of social media? Facebook? Instagram? Pinterest?

A. I recently had an assignment where they made me get my profile on. I just turned that assignment in yesterday but not very much.

Q. Okay. Um, have you seen anything about this case on any type of Facebook?

A. No, not at all.

Q. Okay. Um, you said that you did jury duty up north?

A. Yeah.
Q. What county was that?
A. Coles County.
Q. Oh, okay. How long have you been down here?
A. Since 2011.
Q. Okay. Um, is there anything about that experience that you bring into this room today?
A. No. I mean, I was the 13th. You know, so I just watched, and then I left, so I wasn't even part of the deliberations.
Q. Oh, so you were --
A. -- I was the alternate.
Q. -- the alternate. You had to be there for everything and not get in the game?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Let me see. Do you have any children at home?
A. I have one.
Q. And may I ask how old?
A. He's ten.
Q. Your husband works at DHS?
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. May I ask in what capacity?
A. He's a case worker, so he helps people get food

stamps, link, whatever they call it now.

Q. You said that you or your family had been a crime victim at one point. Could you tell me just a little bit about that?

A. Well, yeah. I mean, I had a molestation case as a child so.

Q. Did that involve any -- and I don't want to -- but did that involve any law enforcement? Was it -- did it go to the police? Did it go to Court?

A. It went to Court --

Q. -- okay.

A. -- yeah.

Q. Is there anything about that experience you think might impact you or that you would bring into the courtroom here if you were on this jury?

A. I don't see how.

Q. Okay. As we sit here today, you understand that Julia is presumed not guilty?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. The fact that she is charged carries no legal weight whatsoever?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Can you and will you hold that presumption throughout the entire trial if you were on this jury?

A. Yeah.

Q. This case does involve the murder of an eleven-year-old girl. Is there anything about that that you would find too disturbing to be able to concentrate and apply -- yeah, apply the law in this case? It is emotional, or it can be.

A. Yeah. Um, you know, it is a disturbing topic, you know, but I think I can be objective if I have to.

Q. We anticipate hearing testimony from a number of police officers, detectives, crime lab technicians. The fact that someone is employed by a crime lab or a police agency, do you have -- will you -- well, you can tell it's right after lunch. I'm just going to start that one all over again. Are you going to give more weight to their testimony than you would to anyone else?

A. No.

Q. Thank you. Ms. McRill?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So, we have a whole list of everyone who received a summons for this jury, and you stated that your husband's name is Tom?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Did he get summoned for this jury as well?

A. He did, but they recused him because they didn't

want us both here. So, I guess he'll serve on another one.

Q. I guess I was, like -- I've actually had that happen before --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- where they were both here at that time, and I just wanted to check that out.

A. Yeah.

Q. It's too bad it's not the lottery, huh?

A. Yeah, I know.

Q. Um, are there any children living in your household?

A. No.

Q. Um, how long have you been at Aisin?

A. Almost nine years.

Q. Okay. And are you a life-long resident of this area?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you hear anything about this case? I think you said something on the news?

A. Like I said, a few years ago when it happened probably, but I go to bed early so I don't watch the news at night.

Q. We know what shift you have to show up so I can

appreciate that, too. Um, are you on social media? Facebook? Instagram?

A. A little bit, basically, which is with my family.

Q. Okay. Have you ever seen anything like -- or about this case --

A. No, I haven't.

Q. -- rolling around? Okay. Did you ever bother with comments that you -- or the comment sections while on Facebook?

A. No. Like I said, it's basically just with my family.

Q. Now, you said you also had some prior jury service, right?

A. Yes.

Q. Where was that? Was that here in this county?

A. Yes.

Q. And that was a civil case?

A. Civil, yeah. I have been called several times.

Q. You really do need to play the lottery. Were they all civil cases?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And is there anything about that experience, good, bad or otherwise, that you believe will follow you into this courtroom?

A. No.
Q. Okay. Overall was it a positive experience?
A. Yes.
Q. You did mention that you have a family member that has been through the process; convicted of a crime?
A. A ticket.
Q. Oh, okay. Traffic tickets?
A. Yeah.
Q. Oh, okay.

MS. THIEN: Thanks. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Ms. Harp, you said you're a real estate agent and you also are the director of what?
A. Youth and Family Ministry.
Q. Okay. What's that?
A. Well, um, I do youth group activities, fund raisers, missions, trips; stuff like that. I organize them.
Q. All right. Um, is there anything in your background whether that's religious or philosophical

reasons that you would have trouble sitting in judgment of someone else?

A. Uh, well, it would have to be in agreement between all of the 12, and, um, if somebody's got -- somebody's got to, you know, help with this.

Q. Okay.

A. I am willing to be one of the 12 that helps with that if called on.

Q. Thank you. Ms. McRill, how about you? Anything religious or philosophical reasons that would prevent you from sitting in judgment on someone?

A. I think I'm fair.

Q. Okay. You've had multiple jury trial experiences?

A. I have been called several times.

Q. Did you get selected for --

A. -- a few of them.

Q. -- a few of them. Do you recall did they go to verdict --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- or did the case get over before the verdict?

A. Yeah. We had -- we went to verdict on one.

Q. And there's nothing about that prior service that would make you be more bias towards one side or the

other?

A. No.

Q. You mentioned you heard or saw something about the case on TV a couple years ago?

A. Yeah.

Q. Nothing since then?

A. No.

Q. If selected, will you be able to put it aside if you remembered what you heard on TV --

A. -- yeah.

Q. -- and judge this based off what you hear in Court?

A. Yes.

MR. BUTLER: I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead and remove the jurors -- the potential jurors.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ms. Thien, it's your panel now. We've got Brumley, Stubblefield, Harp and McRill.

MS. THIEN: Judge, the defense would exercise a peremptory on Melanie Harp.

THE COURT: Okay. I have to wait for my

bailiffs.

I will need you to bring me back Ms. Harp, and then you might as well go ahead and bring me Mr. Fosse.

BAILIFF OLIVER: Just Mr. Fosse?

THE COURT: Just Mr. Fosse.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ms. Harp, come over please, ma'am. I want to thank you for your time and the inconvenience that is put on you. You're going to be free to go. Thank you very much, ma'am.

MS. HARP: Thank you so much.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. You can follow my bailiff. If you need to collect your personal things, he will help you out with that.

MS. HARP: Okay.

EXAMINATION

BY THE COURT:

Q. Mr. Fosse?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty. Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged

offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleges the offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such acted created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

One or more of the following people may be witnesses in this case. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldesberry. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Sheila Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective S. Tomas. Detective T. Coffey. Officer P. Sawicki. Officer A. Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Richard Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Karl Reich.

By The Court:

Q. In which city do you reside, sir?

A. Marion.

Q. Your occupation?
A. UPS driver.
Q. Your marital status?
A. Married.
Q. Your wife's name and occupation?
A. Amy Fosse. She works for Southeastern Electric Co-Op.
Q. Do you have any children over the age of 18 that resides in Williamson County?
A. No.
Q. Do you -- without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I told you here today?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
A. No.
Q. The attorneys have told me that they expect this case to take about two weeks.
A. Okay.
Q. Is there anything in your life that may occur in the next two weeks that will focus your attention away from this trial?
A. No.
Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this

case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler, Theresa Thien?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any of your family -- immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

A. No.

Q. You have been provided with a list of witnesses. Do you know any of those witnesses?

A. Not too much.

Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

A. Never.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. No.

Q. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

A. No.

Q. I am going to talk to you about some very important legal principles that apply in every case in which the defendant is charged. The defendant is to be presumed innocent of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf, and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed

innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yeah.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. I told you that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. That's important. This case involves the charge of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of this charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No.

Q. And again, without going into any detail, have you heard or read anything about this case?

A. No.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in those instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and the law presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Read that again.

Q. Yes, sir. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused

guilty?

A. No.

Q. If the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. But if the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, you would also find the defendant not guilty?

A. Read that again. If the State --

Q. Sure. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and an impartial juror?

A. No.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Mr. Fosse, um, no kids over 18?

A. No.

Q. Any kids under 18 living at home?

A. Yep.
Q. How many and how old?
A. I have got an 11-year-old and an eight-year-old.
Q. Um, I couldn't hear you at first, but your wife works at Southern Illinois Power?
A. Southeastern Electric Co-Op.
Q. There we go. Okay. Sir, are you a life-long resident of this area?
A. I am.
Q. Um, do you have any family or close friends who are in any way involved in law enforcement?
A. No.
Q. No. Okay. How long have you worked at UPS?
A. Twenty-three years.
Q. Oh, wow. Well played.
A. Thank you.
Q. Sir, we're going to hear testimony from a lot of police officers, detectives, crime lab technicians. Just because they work for the police, are you going to give their testimony more weight than you would anyone else?
A. No.
Q. Do you understand we're all human?
A. Yeah.

Q. Okay. Do you or your family belong to any church or civic organization or social clubs?

A. I mean, I go to church, but I don't belong to one particular church, no.

Q. May I ask which one you attend?

A. I attend Aldersgate.

Q. Any, um, you know, like, Elks or VFW?

A. No.

Q. Nothing like that. Sir, if you had to -- if you had to pin it down, what would you say is your primary source of news?

A. I don't really watch the news.

Q. Okay. Fair enough. I mean, it used to be we all would watch, you know what I mean --

A. I don't watch it.

Q. -- the five o'clock news.

A. I just don't watch it. I'm not home when the news is on so.

Q. All right. Are you -- do you have any social media accounts? Facebook? Instagram?

A. I have a Facebook account with no friends that I buy and sell stuff on Market Place. I don't have a profile. Actually I do have a profile. It's my dog.

Q. What -- how do you like to spend your free time?

A. With my kids. I hunt. I farm.

Q. This, um -- this case involves the allegation of the murder of an 11-year-old girl. It's pretty emotional. Is that going to interfere with your ability to keep an open mind and make decision -- and hold your decision till the end of this case?

A. I would think so.

Q. As we sit here right now, Julia is presumed 100 percent innocent. You're okay with that -- or not guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you understand that the State has the sole burden to prove that -- prove her guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you hold the State to their burden?

A. Yes.

MS. THIEN: Thank you. I have no further questions.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Mr. Fosse, I want to clarify a few things because I think maybe some of the questions --

A. -- yeah.

Q. -- were a little confusing for you. The Judge had asked you -- and I think he asked you a couple different ways. But if you feel that the State has met their burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt in this case, what would your verdict be?

A. Like, I am kind of confused in the way you're putting it there. If you prove it -- your evidence beyond a reasonable doubt --

Q. -- yes.

A. -- then I would feel like she was guilty.

Q. Okay. And if you think that we did not prove that?

A. Then she's not guilty.

Q. Okay. As you sit there today, do you have any opinions formed?

A. I do not.

Q. You have been asked if you would give more weight to police testimony because they are police officers. Do you have any ill feelings towards police officers?

A. No.

Q. Are you going to give their testimony less weight?

A. No.

Q. No. Okay. And you said you don't know any

details about the case because you don't read the news?

A. No.

Q. Do you feel you can be fair and impartial to both sides on this case?

A. I do.

Q. And would you judge the evidence and testimony from what you hear here in Court only?

A. Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Go ahead and take him. If you don't mind, please follow my bailiffs.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ms. Thien, the panel is still with you.

MS. THIEN: We are whispering furiously, Judge.

THE COURT: If you need time, that's fine.

MS. THIEN: One more moment. Judge, we have no challenges for cause or peremptory challenges. We will tender the four.

MR. BUTLER: We would accept those four.

THE COURT: Okay. So, the first panel will consist of Brumley, Stubblefield, McRill and Fosse. Go

ahead and bring them back in.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Each one of you have been selected as jurors in this case. As you can tell by the time, this takes a little bit of time. So what I am going to do is I'm going to allow you guys to leave today, but I need you to be back here tomorrow morning at 8:30, okay? You will find the bailiff. They'll make sure that you get to your proper place.

Now, I need you to listen to something. Until this case is submitted to you for deliberation, you must not discuss this case with anyone or remain within hearing of anyone discussing it. You cannot read any newspaper article regarding this case or listen to any radio broadcast concerning this case or TV. After this case has been submitted to you, you must not discuss the case except you must discuss the case only in the jury room when all members of the jury are present. You are to keep an open mind, and you must not decide any issue in the case until it is submitted to you for your deliberation under the instructions of the Court. You can follow my bailiff. He'll help you get your personal things, and I will see you in the morning.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Jennifer, the next four.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in

violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

One or more of these individuals may be witnesses in this case. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldesberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Sheila Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor also at Hyatt. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Richard Minton. Officer Stewart.

Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

EXAMINATION

BY THE COURT:

A. Is it Ferketich?

Q. Ferketich. What city do you live in, sir?

A. Carterville.

Q. Your occupation?

A. Engineering.

Q. For who?

A. Aisin manufacturing.

Q. Your marital status?

A. Married.

Q. Your wife's name and occupation?

A. Tori Ferketich, and she works at the Bank of Herrin.

Q. Do you have any children over age 18 residing in Williamson County?

A. No.

Q. Without going into any detail at all, do you know

anything about this case other than what I have told you here today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

A. No.

Q. I have been told that this case is expected to take up to two weeks. Is there anything in your life that may occur in the next two weeks that would draw your attention away from this jury?

A. Um, I just had a baby, but she's doing well so no.

Q. Would your attention be focused on your child to an extent that it would make it difficult for you to function in this trial?

A. No.

Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

A. Um, I know the -- Sean. State's attorney. My

parents know him. I don't know him that well.

Q. Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

A. No.

Q. Out of the witnesses I told you about, do you know any of those?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. I have some distant cousins that work for the Energy Police Department.

Q. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

A. No.

Q. I am going to talk to you about some very, very important principles of law that apply in cases in which the defendant has a criminal charge. That the defendant is to be presumed innocent of each charge against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to a charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on her own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against her, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes, I understand.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes, I understand.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on its own behalf?

A. Yes, I understand.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has a right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yes, I understand.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. You have told me you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. You've also been told that the charge in this case involves First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No.

Q. You have answered this before, but I want to cover it again. Without going into any detail, have you heard or read anything about this case?

A. No.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence, and the law presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair or impartial juror?

A. No.

Q. Ms. Allen, what city do you reside in?
A. Marion.
Q. Your occupation?
A. I'm retired from DOC.
Q. Your marital status?
A. Divorced.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Divorced.
Q. Do you have any children over the age of 18 residing in Williamson County?
A. No, sir.
Q. Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Like I said to him, this case is expected to take up to two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life within the next two weeks that would focus your attention away from this trial?
A. No, sir.
Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler, Theresa Thien?
A. No.
Q. Have you or any of your immediate family members

had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintance that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

A. No.

Q. Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

A. No, sir.

Q. I read to you a list of witnesses. Do you know any of those witnesses?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been the victim of a crime?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. No.

Q. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because a witness works in law enforcement?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Again, I want to cover some very important legal principles that apply to each defendant that may be charged with a criminal offense. The defendant is to be presumed innocent of each charge against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge. The defendant is not required to offer any evidence on his own behalf, and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against him.

Again, that a defendant cannot be found guilty as to any charge unless the State has proven his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the

charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes, I understand that.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. I understand.

Q. Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

A. I understand.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or not to testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. I do.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have told me that you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. You have also been told that the charge involves that of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No, sir.

Q. Again, without going into any details, have you heard or read anything about this case?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you hear or read about it? Was it television? Radio? Internet? Newspaper? People talking about it? Something else?

A. Radio and newspaper.

Q. Newspaper. How long has it been since you have heard or read about the case?

A. A couple years.

Q. Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you earlier?

A. No, sir.

Q. Based upon what you read, did you form an opinion about this case?

A. No, sir.

Q. As you sit here now, do you have an opinion as to

what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

A. No, sir.

Q. As you sit there now, do you have an opinion as to any issue in the case?

A. No. No, sir.

Q. Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No, sir.

Q. If selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about the case and instead decide this case only upon the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in open Court?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and the law presented in Court?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. No, sir.

Q. Ms. Duty, where do you reside? City only please.

A. Pittsburg.

Q. Your occupation?

A. Retired.

Q. From what?

A. Pepsi Mid America.

Q. Your marital status?

A. Married.

Q. Your husband's name and occupation?

A. David. Coal miner.

Q. Do you have any children over the age of 18 living in Williamson County?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell me their names and occupation?
A. Chris is 36; coal miner. Dillon is 28, and he is -- he is a manager at Aisin.
Q. Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
A. No.
Q. As I told the two of them, this case is expected to last two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life within the next two weeks that would focus your attention away from this trial?
A. No.
Q. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Therese Thien?
A. No.
Q. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?
A. No.
Q. Do you personally know the defendant Julia

Bevely?

A. No.

Q. Do you personally know -- I have already asked you that. You have been told a list of witnesses. Do you know any of them?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been the victim of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. Prison. Does that count?

Q. Yes, ma'am.

A. Yes.

Q. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

A. No.

Q. I am going to go over some very important legal principles that apply in every case in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. The defendant is to be presumed innocent of each charge against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on his own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. You told me that you understand that a charge is not evidence against the defendant. The charge in this case is First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of this charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. No.

Q. Again, without going into any detail, have you

heard or read anything about this case?

A. Yes.

Q. How did you hear or read about it? Was it TV? Radio? Internet? Newspapers? People just talking?

A. TV, internet, people talking.

Q. How long ago has it been since you have heard or read anything about the case?

A. Two years at least.

Q. Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you earlier?

A. No.

Q. Based upon what you read or heard, did you form an opinion or do you now have an opinion as to this case?

A. No.

Q. As you sit there now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

A. No.

Q. As you sit there now, have you formed an opinion as to any issue in the case?

A. No.

Q. Is there anything about what you have heard or read about in this case that would keep you from being a

fair and impartial juror in the case?

A. I know the family of the deceased.

Q. If selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about the case and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which would be presented here in open Court?

A. Yes.

Q. With respect to your knowledge as to the family that may be impacted by this case, is there anything about that that would affect your ability to act as an impartial juror in the case?

A. Yes.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yes.
Q. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there any other reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?
A. No.
Q. Ms. Upshaw?
A. Yes.
Q. What city do you reside in?
A. Marion.
Q. Your occupation?
A. Retired.
Q. From what?
A. Cellular business. I was a sales rep.
Q. Your marital status?
A. Single.
Q. Do you have any children over 18 that reside in Williamson County?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell me their name and occupation?
A. Curtis Drake (ph) engineer for General Dynamics.

Q. Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

A. No.

Q. This case is going to take at least two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life within the next two weeks that will focus your attention away from this trial?

A. No.

Q. Do you know any of the lawyers involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any of your family had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

A. No.

Q. Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

A. No.

Q. I read to you a list of witnesses. Do you know

any of them?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been the victim of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

A. No.

Q. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

A. No.

Q. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

A. No.

Q. I am going to talk to you about some principles

of law that apply in each case in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. The defendant is to be presumed innocent of each charge against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge.

That a defendant is not required to offer any evidence on his own behalf and is not required to testify, and that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on his own behalf?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you understand and accept and will apply the

principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. I have told you about the charge involving First Degree Murder. Is there anything about that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

A. No.

Q. Now, again, without going into any specific detail at all, have you heard or read anything about the case?

A. Yes.

Q. How did you hear or read about it? Was it television? Radio? Internet? Newspaper? People talking?

A. Newspaper and television.

Q. How long has it been since you have heard or read about the case?

A. About two years.

Q. Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you earlier?

A. No.

Q. Based upon what you read or heard, did you form an opinion about the case?

A. No.

Q. As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

A. No.

Q. As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to any issue in the case?

A. No.

Q. Is there anything about what you have heard or read about in this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in the case?

A. No.

Q. If selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about the case and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in

open Court?

A. Yes.

Q. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

A. Yes.

Q. Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

A. No.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien. It's still your panel.

MS. THIEN: Judge, I believe it goes to the State. I tendered. They accepted.

THE COURT: You're right. I apologize. That is exactly right.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Mr. Ferketich, you said you've got a new baby at home?

A. Yes.

Q. Um, is your significant other on leave with the baby?

A. Yeah. She is on leave until February 29th.

Q. Okay. And if you were selected to be a member of the jury, that wouldn't cause any problems with you and her and the baby?

A. No.

Q. Okay. You said you have got some cousins that work for Energy Police Department?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. If -- did you hear any of the names read today?

A. No.

Q. If you were to hear testimony during the trial that there were officers from the Energy Police

Department that may have been involved in this, would that make you -- would you weigh testimony any different if you knew that Energy Police Department was involved in this?

A. No.

Q. Thank you. Ms. Allen?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you say you knew some of the witnesses? Yes?

A. Yes.

Q. Who do you know?

A. Officer Morris. He was number one, and Hightower was in there but his -- I believe his wife was.

Q. Okay.

A. I met her a couple of times.

Q. Rene Hightower?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. I think that's about it; Officer Morris.

Q. And you're retired from the Department of Corrections; is that correct?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. What did you do for them?

A. Correctional Officer for several years, and then the last 12 I did become sergeant. So, I moved up rank

in Chester, Illinois.

Q. Um, Ms. Upshaw?

A. Yes.

Q. You said you heard a little bit about the case about two years ago?

A. Just right after -- right after it happened; whatever came out on the news on TV and newspapers.

Q. And, um, nothing since then?

A. No.

Q. At least that you can recall?

A. No, not that I know of.

Q. All right. And, um, will you -- if you're selected, will you set aside what you heard two years ago or longer and judge this case based off of the testimony and evidence presented in Court?

A. Yes.

Q. And you can be fair and impartial to both sides?

A. Yes.

MR. BUTLER: I have nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Okay. So, well, we'll do the same order. It's Ferketich?

A. Ferketich.

Q. Ferketich. I'm sorry. Um, how long have you been working at Aisin?

A. Um, nine years total.

Q. Oh, wow. Okay. Um, you stated that you had some cousins at Energy PD. May I ask who they are?

A. Um, Brody Jeters, and I think he might be the chief -- um, and his son.

Q. Okay. You said they were distant cousins?

A. Yeah.

Q. The kind that might show up at a wedding but not necessarily every weekend barbecue?

A. Exactly.

Q. Is there anything about that where you would tend to believe a police officer more than, say, anyone else?

A. No.

Q. Sir, are you on social media at all?

A. Yeah. I have Facebook.

Q. Have you seen anything about this roaming around on Facebook?

A. No.

Q. Have you gone looking for any of this on Facebook

--

A. -- no.

Q. -- or other social media?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Um, is there anything about the nature of this case -- especially as being a new parent -- I'll be blunt -- that you think will interfere with your ability to be completely fair and impartial? It's going to be pretty emotional at times.

A. No.

Q. Okay. And, sir, do you belong to any civic organization or church?

A. Not for a long time.

Q. Okay. Ms. Allen, when you were working with DOC, it was up in Chester?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And that's a long haul, isn't it?

A. Yes, ma'am, it is, but it gave me a lot of time to get rid of the work day all the way back to Marion.

Q. That, I can appreciate. Um, how long were you with the department?

A. Twenty-five years.

Q. Is there anything about that experience that you think will impact you when you bring it back in here

into the courtroom?

A. I would hope not. It was hard when I got hired in. They did not want us there so -- the inmates actually treated me better than the staff. It was difficult, and being around that every day gave me a lot of cry time on my way home.

Q. It, um -- it's hard not to bring it home with us at times?

A. Yes, it is. But I enjoyed -- that's why I enjoyed the distance. Well, that and the inmates' families and friends would find me when I lived closer, so I moved away. And it gave me all those miles -- over 500 a week -- to get home and try to get rid of that before I started my home life before I got in my door. It had to leave.

Q. That, I can respect. Ma'am, you had mentioned that you would be more inclined, you think, to give weight to law enforcement testimony than you would potentially other lay witnesses?

A. Yes.

Q. Right, wrong or otherwise; is that a fair statement?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Okay.

A. That was due to being engaged to a state policeman for numerous years and being with those guys on the other end of the spectrum.

Q. Do you have contacts with anyone in law enforcement, friend groups --

A. -- no.

Q. -- relatives?

A. No.

Q. Okay. But you spent a significant portion of your life involved that way?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Okay. Thank you. Ms. Duty, I do have to ask, and I don't want to bust anything open, but you are familiar or know members of the deceased family?

A. Very well.

Q. Very well. Okay. And, Ms. Upshaw --

A. -- yes.

Q. -- let me see. Are you on social media?

A. Facebook.

Q. Okay. Have you seen anything about this -- about this case, in particular, running around on Facebook?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Is there any local pages you particularly follow that involve any type of, you know, courthouse

feed or crime stories or law enforcement or anything like that?

A. Not really. I just -- what's in the newspapers for the local newspapers.

Q. Okay. Do you belong to any church or civic organization?

A. No.

Q. Is there anything in particular about the nature of this case that you would find disturbing that it would interfere with your ability to sit on the jury? It's going to be pretty emotional.

A. I can't say. Possibly.

Q. Okay. But as we sit here today, right, in the very beginning, Julia is simply accused of something. You understand that she is presumed not guilty. She has a presumption of innocence as we sit here right now.

A. Right.

Q. Okay. You can follow that through this trial?

A. Yes.

Q. And that does not change until the State proves their case beyond a reasonable doubt. Can you hold the State to their burden?

A. Yes.

Q. One of the odd things, although it is a bedrock

of our legal system, is that the defendant and the defense, we don't have to do a thing. We don't have to prove anything. We don't have to disprove anything, and the defense has the absolute right to remain silent. Can you -- or will you hold that against someone if they choose to exercise that?

A. Um, possibly.

Q. Fair enough. Thanks.

MS. THIEN: I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: If you don't mind, please follow my bailiff. He will take you to another location for a little while.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I take and excuse Mr. Ferketich and use our second peremptory on that.

THE COURT: And for what purpose?

MR. BUTLER: For peremptory? Um --

MS. MUDGE: We're not asking for cause on him.

THE COURT: I know.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, to be honest with

you, I have prosecuted some Ferketichs in the past, and that was my sole reason in this area.

THE COURT: Okay. He will be excused.

MS. MUDGE: Judge, for the record, I will say that we looked into his background. I'll just add -- we looked into his background prior to this. It was not consistent with what he reported to us.

THE COURT: I normally don't inquire unless there is Batson issue. There is not one.

MS. MUDGE: Okay.

THE COURT: But I was curious as to why. Okay. Go ahead and bring Mr. Ferketich back. The others still remain.

MS. THIEN: Judge, are we going to be able to have an afternoon comfort break at some point?

THE COURT: Do you need one now? Is that what you're trying to say?

MS. THIEN: Well, I mean, we can do this. It's been a couple of hours.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR.)

THE COURT: Sir, I want to thank you for your time and your inconvenience. You will not be selected as a juror in this case. You can follow my

bailiffs. They will help you get your personal things. Thank you, sir.

MR. FERKETICH: Thank you.

THE COURT: Will five minutes suffice, or do you need more?

MS. THIEN: Give a second to get upstairs and --

THE COURT: Ten minutes?

MS. THIEN: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Ten minutes. We'll take a recess.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: We are back on record. Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, Your Honor. When we broke, I had exercised peremptory number two on Mr. Ferketich. I would be making for cause challenges also on Lisa Allen and Crystal Duty.

THE COURT: Okay. Cause as to Duty?

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, her knowledge of the deceased family. I believe she said she could not

be impartial because of that.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I concur.

THE COURT: It will be granted. Your next cause?

MR. BUTLER: Lisa Allen. I believe she told the Court that she would give greater weight to law enforcement testimony. When asked about that, she explained that due to previous relationship she had with someone with the Illinois State Police, that's how she feels.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I agree.

THE COURT: Be granted. I believe you indicated you wish to exercise a peremptory?

MR. BUTLER: No. I did previously on Mr. Ferketich.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I need you to bring me from Crespi down to Vogt. Crespi, Noakes and Vogt.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(BACK ON RECORD AND STILL OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: The Court has just been informed that a potential juror in the pool has been interviewed

by TV 3. I do not know the name, but one of the security personnel witnessed it and identified that particular potential juror. It would be the Court's belief that that individual should not be in the pool and should be excused. Is there anything that the State feels like I should do other than that?

MS. MUDGE: Absolutely not. I agree.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: This is novel. This is new for me, but you're right. I mean -- I --

THE COURT: To the members of the press that are presently here, I'm -- there is freedom of the press, and I respect that, but there is also very important principles taking place here. And I recognize that the individual that did this is not here, and I'm going to repeat it when I see him. But I respectfully request that there would be no questioning of any potential jurors. That is potentially jury tampering. That is something that someone can be charged with. If you would not mind, go find that individual; bring that individual. We're going to excuse her or him.

MS. MUDGE: Would be it possible to ask --

THE COURT: -- sir, have a seat. One of my security witnessed you questioning a potential juror,

and questioning them outside the presence of the Court. Interviewing any potential jurors is potentially jury tampering. That individual is going to be released by me. I am making a request of you not to question anybody that is in the jury pool or any jurors until after this case is resolved. If it happens again, I will ask the State's Attorney to seek to potentially file charges.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR.)

THE COURT: Ma'am, I thank you very much for your time here today and your attention, and I know it was a great inconvenience. Because of circumstances, I am going to release you. You do not need to come back.

MS. SHAW BARNES: Okay.

THE COURT: There may be another jury next week. You need to call in on Sunday, okay?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.

MS. SHAW BARNES: Thank you.

THE COURT: I do need to know your name.

MS. SHAW BARNES: Bethany Shaw Barns.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE

THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ms. Mudge, did you wish to be further heard?

MS. MUDGE: This has never happened to me either, but if maybe we could --

THE COURT: -- do you wish to have the opportunity to speak with the security personnel about this issue?

MS. MUDGE: May I?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Both of you may.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

THE COURT: Ms. Mudge, do you wish to be heard further?

MS. MUDGE: Just briefly for the record, your Honor, Mr. Butler, Ms. Thien and I spoke with both deputies, and it was reported to us that the potential juror was seen speaking to a member of the press who's wearing a shirt marked with press logo in the hallway. The deputy spoke to both of them and -- because they believed the conversation was improper. Um, at this time, the jurors were not all in their room. They were milling about the hallway. Um, she went back towards where they were milling about the hallway, and the

deputies immediately reported it to the Court. And if that juror went into the room, it wasn't for more than three or four minutes, and the door was not closed and they were not all in there. So, I personally do not believe that we have an issue with that -- any information that she learned from the press or that she gave to the press was brought back and relayed to any potential juror at this time.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I think that's correct, Judge. We did have that opportunity, and that's what it appears to be at this point.

THE COURT: Well, I think that the Court needs to be abundantly cautious, and I think from the questioning here on out, I'm going to ask each potential juror if they are aware of any other juror speaking to anybody. If that individual says yes, then we've got a problem. If I go into it any further, I don't know that that would be a good idea; what was the nature of the communication. But at that point in time, that individual would only be aware unless they saw it or something was said. I guess I am trying to think of ways to cure this. Open to suggestions.

MS. MUDGE: I think -- I would suggest that

for each juror before the questioning happens in this courtroom in public on the record, um, that we go into chambers and ask one question, "Have you spoken to any member of the press" -- two questions -- "are you aware of any other jurors that have spoken to members of the press today," and we come back out and do the questioning as we were. I think that's the safest way to make a record now that this has happened.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Yeah, I agree. I think it would be, um, honestly the cleanest and easiest way to do it; not holding anyone up to any, um --

THE COURT: -- well, rather than having my court reporter run up and down from chambers to here, I think we will question one by one here, that first question. If they pass that, we'll hold that juror, and then we'll ask the next. So, if we bring in four, they'll only be asked that one question individually. If they all say no, they don't know anything, then the four will be brought out and then we question them that way.

MS. MUDGE: I would be okay with taking each one in, and then after we question them, just us all agree on the record that they were asked those questions

and they answered in the negative without making the court reporter run around.

THE COURT: There would be no record of it not unless the court reporter was there.

MS. MUDGE: There would be a record of the three of us saying we were present for that conversation and they said no.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: This is a first, Judge. I really don't know. I mean, we need to know if that is going to have any impact if it was brought to the back. Um, I tend to agree with Ms. Mudge that, you know -- or even if we just bring the four in, right, and ask them just one at time, "Anything go on with the press? No. No. No." Okay. We're good; you know what I mean?

THE COURT: Okay, except if you do that in the group, they're going to make assumptions about that.

MS. THIEN: Well, they're going to make assumptions anyway, Judge, and that probably is happening as we speak.

THE COURT: Well, maybe. I don't know.

MR. BUTLER: What if we were to bring Ms. Shaw -- was it -- back and ask her questions if she told anyone back there anything.

THE COURT: I don't think that matters. Still somebody might have been privy to overhearing something or seeing something. It doesn't necessarily matter whether she communicated. It's what's in the knowledge of any potential juror.

Well, I think what I am going to do is think about it overnight. I don't see any reason, given the time, to try to bring anybody else in till I figure this out. So, I guess, we'll be adjourned, and I will speak to you guys, um, at 8:30. Go ahead and excuse the potential jurors. Tell them to be back here at 9:00 a.m.

(COURT WAS ADJOURNED FOR THE DAY.)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

WILLIAMSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
Vs	)	
	)	No. 2020-CF-596
	)	
JULIA E. BEVELY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Amy L. Holloman, one of the Official Court Reporters in and for the First Judicial Circuit of the State of Illinois, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, complete, and correct transcript of all the proceedings had in the above-styled cause.

Amy L. Holloman

Amy L. Holloman, CSR
Official Court Reporter

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

WILLIAMSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 2020-CF-596
	)	
JULIA E. BEVELY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

JURY TRIAL

Report of proceedings of the Jury Trial before the Honorable Stephan Green on February 7th, 2023.

APPEARANCES:

JENNIFER MUDGE and PHILLIP BUTLER
Special Prosecutors
For the People

THERESA THIEN
Public Defender
Williamson County, Illinois
For the Defendant

Amy L. Holloman, CSR
Official Court Reporter
Williamson County Courthouse
Marion, IL 62959

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: The Court calls 20-CF-596. People versus Julia Bevely. We're outside the presence of any potential jurors. At the end of the day yesterday, a potential issue arose about communication with prospective jurors. It is in that vain that the Court has asked the State to subpoena that individual so that the Court and the parties can inquire of the nature of that communication. Ma'am, I need you to raise your right.

BETHANY SHAW BARNES,

was called as a witness and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: I need you to have a seat here, ma'am. Speak up very loudly. I do need you to state your full name, and then please spell your last name.

MS. SHAW BARNES: Bethany Shaw Barnes. S-H-A-W. B-A-R-N-E-S.

THE COURT: Ma'am, yesterday afternoon were you approached by someone from the press?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Yes.

THE COURT: Is that someone you know socially?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you have a conversation with that individual?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Yes.

THE COURT: What was the nature of that communication?

MS. SHAW BARNES: It mostly was just chit-chat about an event coming up for a foundation that I am involved in.

THE COURT: When you say mostly, what else did it include?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Um, I mean, it was just random as far as -- I mean, I'm assuming that you want to know if it was mostly -- or about this case or any details, and, you know, no. He did mention that there was four jurors selected, but that was the only reference to what was going on. And --

THE COURT: -- I apologize for interrupting. Finish.

MS. SHAW BARNES: That was the only comment to what was going on in this courthouse.

THE COURT: After that communication, did you go back into the jury pool room?

MS. SHAW BARNES: No. I stayed in the

hallway.

THE COURT: After that communication, did you have any communication with any other prospective juror?

MS. SHAW BARNES: I mean, I was standing back there with a group of people. I don't know that I was engaged in conversation; just more along the line of if there's been any updates to anybody else come back or been called back.

THE COURT: During that period of time, did you communicate anything at all to the others about your communication with the reporter?

MS. SHAW BARNES: No.

THE COURT: This communication that took place, where approximately did it take place at?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Um, I guess I talked to him on both of his breaks. So, initially, um, whenever I first realized that, you know, I knew him, it was just out there in the hall whenever you walk out this door to the left, like, where the ceiling is super high, and then the second time he had came out, I was just sitting outside in the sun in the afternoon. And then we walked back in because I wondered if they were on a break to see if our names would be called; then make my way back

to --

THE COURT: So, there were two separate communications?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Yes. Sorry.

THE COURT: Approximately when was the first one; around noon?

MS. SHAW BARNES: No. I'm assuming that maybe you guys had a break that morning. It was after we were released and could go to the restroom, and, you know, walk around out there.

THE COURT: That first communication that took place, what was the substance of that communication?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Just very general and talked about the foundation that I am involved in and that he's covered the news stories for.

THE COURT: So, are you telling me that both communications were the subject of the same material?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Off and on. Um, more 100 percent the first communication. The second communication was -- had to do with that, and then I am trying to think. It was nothing of substance. It was just chit-chat.

THE COURT: That first communication, did it

take place outside of the courthouse?

MS. SHAW BARNES: No. Standing right there in front of where the restrooms and water fountain are.

THE COURT: And then the second communication, where was it at?

MS. SHAW BARNES: So, initially I was sitting outside in the sun, and then he came out. And then once he said he was on recess, I thought I should come back in to see if there was any mobility with the -- if I needed to report anywhere. So, we kind of walked back in, and he came in at the same time. And then we stood there for a second, and I could see all the jurors were not gathering to listen to instruction.

THE COURT: Ms. Mudge, do you have any questions?

MS. MUDGE: Just briefly, your Honor. Um, ma'am, you said that you spoke to him and he communicated to you that four jurors were selected, right?

MS. SHAW BARNES: At the end, yeah, at the second encounter.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. Did you have a conversation with him about what this case was?

MS. SHAW BARNES: No.

MS. MUDGE: Not anything, like, it's a big case, or it's the case where the little girl was killed?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Um, so -- yeah. So, he might -- not this is the case where the little girl was killed. Nothing was said about that. I feel like that's just a -- everybody's aware they're here for that, but it was a reference as I haven't covered a big case.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. He said that to you?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Yeah. Sorry, I guess I --

MS. MUDGE: -- no. That's okay. Um, who initiated the conversation; you or him?

MS. SHAW BARNES: So, the first time it was just like we recognized each other and was like, oh, hey. You know, seeing you here. The second time it was him.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. And do you remember kind of the first thing he said to you then?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Not exactly.

MS. MUDGE: But you do remember him telling you it's a big case?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Mm-hmm.

MS. MUDGE: And he's never covered one like that?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Um, no. He said it is a big case. I haven't covered a big case in years.

MS. MUDGE: Okay.

MS. SHAW BARNES: Um --

MS. MUDGE: -- and how does it come about that he reports -- or that he mentions to the four jurors had been selected?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Oh, I should have paid more attention -- I'm sorry -- to this conversation.

MS. MUDGE: I understand. It's just a conversation, but if you remember.

MS. SHAW BARNES: Yeah. I don't remember exactly, um, how it came up.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. And then after the second conversation, you never went back into a room with jurors again?

MS. SHAW BARNES: No. I went to that corner over there.

MS. MUDGE: And did any other potential jurors mention to you that they spoke with this reporter?

MS. SHAW BARNES: No.

MS. MUDGE: Did you see him speaking to anyone else that was in your group?

MS. SHAW BARNES: No. Whenever he came outside, I was talking to another lady.

MS. MUDGE: You were or he was?

MS. SHAW BARNES: I was. I was already out there whenever he came outside. Um, so, I mean, I guess in the conversation we were standing, like, in a triangle, but then whenever we walked back into -- straight back to the juror --

MS. MUDGE: -- so, for the outside conversation, there was another potential there?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Mm-hmm.

MS. MUDGE: And nothing was discussed about this case or anything at that point?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Not that I recall.

MS. MUDGE: And all your conversations that you had with him inside of this courthouse, it was just you and him?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Mm-hmm.

MS. MUDGE: No other potential jurors?

MS. SHAW BARNES: No.

MS. MUDGE: I don't have anything further, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Just a little bit of follow-up.

Hi, ma'am.

MS. SHAW BARNES: Hello.

MS. THIEN: When you came back in, just to clarify, you did not speak to any of the other potential jurors about the fact that you knew this reporter and/or had spoken to him?

MS. SHAW BARNES: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And we go through life all the time not thinking we have to memorize a brief social encounter, right, but I believe you said before that the conversation that did take place about this case, about the number of jurors who had been chosen and that chit-chat, that occurred once you were inside the building?

MS. SHAW BARNES: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: That did not occur outside when the other lady was getting some fresh air as well.

MS. SHAW BARNES: I don't believe so, no.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MS SHAW BARNES: I don't believe so.

MS. THIEN: Thanks. I have no further questions.

MS. SHAW BARNES: I'm really questioning my memory. I am so sorry.

MS. MUDGE: It's okay.

THE COURT: May she be released from the subpoena?

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Ma'am, thank you for coming. I appreciate it very much. You're free to go. I do need you to call in next Sunday. At least right now there is another trial up. Thank you, ma'am. Ms. Mudge?

MS. MUDGE: Um, just -- I would just like to memorialize for the record how this came about with her coming in today. After Court yesterday, which was a long day for everyone, Ms. Thien and I spoke via telephone in the evening. Um, we were all aware of the Court's concern about potential jury tampering or leaking of anything, and it came to fruition yesterday, albeit not how the Court I'm sure expected it to. So we wanted to both, I believe, make sure that whatever happened with this reporter and this potential juror did not go back, and we both decided that it would be best if we would be able to communicate with her on the record just to ensure before we pick a jury and go through two weeks of trial. So, I sent an Illinois State police officer to her home, and she agreed to come here at 8:30 this morning. And I believe that

summarizes our conversation on the phone.

MS. THIEN: It does.

THE COURT: All right. With respect to what has occurred, the Court still is of the mind I have no choice but to ask each potential juror what, if anything, they saw or what, if anything, they heard. Now, the problem I have now is TV 3, in its infinite wisdom, decided to put on the TV that they had a communication, and that they said that it was not related to the case. But people being people, I don't know who potentially saw that or didn't. Thoughts?

MS. MUDGE: My thoughts would be, um, that each juror also needs to be asked today if they have read that article overnight. And I think before they leave the room, if they have been selected, um, I would request that the Court read the instruction on not reading -- the instruction that says don't read the news.

THE COURT: The admonition was given to them. We gave it to the four that was there.

MS. MUDGE: Yes.

THE COURT: I'm going to be a lot more emphatic about it. I'm very irritated that this has happened. I mean, potentially -- I mean, it is what it

is, I guess. I can't -- I can't change that now. Ms. Thien, any thoughts?

MS. THIEN: Well, there is nothing that's been said here that I disagree with. Um, I am reluctant, without a lot of conversation with Julie, to make any motion regarding this panel. I don't believe that the panel itself has been polluted necessarily. So at this point, I think, what I am hearing is we continue with voir dire. We add a couple questions concerning media. We warn them to not pay attention to the news. Maybe even ask that they refrain from -- if they receive their news from the internet, they also be very careful with that. Not go looking for things, and let's keep going and see where we're at.

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Bevely, this is your trial. It's not my trial. I would like the two of you to have conversation. I don't disagree, at least right now, we have enough to specifically say that there should be a mistrial. But my fear is, as we go along, we're asking individuals these questions. The Court believes there is going to be one or two that watched the news, and that is going to be communicated. Now, people being people, Ms. Thien, we all try to downplay our faults and the things that happen. I am not saying

anybody committed perjury. I am not saying that. I am just saying there is that potential out there, so I would like you to talk to your client. This is your trial. The last thing in the world I want to do is spend the next two weeks going through it, and then we find out we have an issue that we could have cured a long time ago and didn't. So, this is a highly publicized case. We all knew that we were going to have some potential issues. I didn't think this would be one of them, but, ma'am, I want you to talk to your lawyer. I'm going to leave. I'm going to ask the State to leave, too.

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And then you can contact us and let us know her thoughts about this, and then let's talk this out.

MS. THIEN: Will do. Thank you, Judge.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: We're back on the record. Ms. Thien, have you had an opportunity to speak frankly with your client about this issue?

MS. THIEN: Yes, Your Honor, I have, and, um, we've talked about the pros and cons and what we see going on at the moment. Um, our concern moving forward is -- I believe, we've addressed -- is making sure the admonitions stay in place. We ask potential jurors about any media exposure they've had thus far, but she is electing to move forward at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. Then that's what we will do, and I will do the best that I can to communicate that as well. As a side note, yesterday after the end, we were not on record, I shared with you that a potential juror Emily Summers has a small claims case. Her case number is 22-CS-600 -- SC. Sorry. First appearance was set at 2-27 at nine o'clock. She called in this morning, indicated that she had been up last night sick, so was requesting not to come in. Given the fact that she said that she was ill, the Court went ahead and excused her knowing that she would not be able to serve anyway. Is there any issues with that from the defense?

MS. THIEN: No, your Honor. She was going to be excused. We just needed to make sure it was on the record.

THE COURT: So now everybody's been exposed

to the flu. It is what it is. Okay.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, if we may, I believe we have two others. And we did speak about this yesterday, but I don't know if we excused Mr. Lawler. We're both agreeing to excuse him.

THE COURT: We did talk about it. I'm not sure it was on the record. It was by agreement. I do believe it was communicated to him that he would be excused.

MS. MUDGE: And we have one more issue --

MS. THIEN: -- basis just so we have that on the record.

MS. MUDGE: The basis is that Mr. Butler, my co-counsel, has a pending case with Mr. Lawler at the moment.

MS. THIEN: So they are opposing counsel.

THE COURT: Right. And then who else?

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, last night I was informing witnesses on how far we got; let them know that their time schedule had changed a little bit. And one of the witnesses, Adam Rawlinson, informed me that his oldest son Christian Rawlinson is on our jury list. I didn't talk to him at all about anything, but I did want to bring that to the Court's attention. I have

disclosed that to Ms. Thien.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I was made aware of that. It is an interesting spelling of a last name. I'm familiar with how that works with my own. Um, he is seventh from the bottom as far as the order that has been generated, and because his father is a witness in this case, I believe a for cause excusal is appropriate.

THE COURT: Right. I'm not disagreeing. I just want to make sure you're in agreement that we can release him now as opposed to waiting and calling.

MS. THIEN: I don't think we need to make him wait all day again.

MR. BUTLER: The State would agree to that as well.

THE COURT: Well, when my bailiffs get here, we'll ask him to -- we'll excuse him. He'll be excused. Any other issues with the jury?

MR. BUTLER: The for cause challenges for Lisa Allen and Crystal Duty, were they on the record yesterday?

THE COURT: Yes. I believe so.

MS. THIEN: So long as they didn't show up today, I think we're good.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't know where we're at with the jury or anything like that or the pool. I have been speaking about this issue that we have with other people quite a bit, my colleagues. My bailiffs aren't here, but I would like to get started as soon as we can. Oh, actually, I do have one. My screen is in the way.

BAILIFF O'BRIEN: Jennifer is just back here.

THE COURT: Can you check to see if we've got everybody checked in?

BAILIFF O'BRIEN: Absolutely, Judge.

MS. MUDGE: Can I get in that door real quick?

BAILIFF O'BRIEN: Oh, for the restroom?

MS. MUDGE: Yeah.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, how many alternates do we intend to select?

THE COURT: I was going to ask you guys your thoughts.

MS. MUDGE: I think in light of, one, yesterday, and, two, a possible flu, three or four. At

least three just to be safe.

MS. THIEN: Might as well just to be safe, yeah. I mean, if we've got the flu running around in that little over-packed room, it's going to prove to be interesting nonetheless.

THE COURT: The Court was thinking four.

MS. MUDGE: Four would be great. I had one, two-week trial and we got to the alternate number three.

THE COURT: And if we select four, I am not going to release them. I am going to keep them in a separate room.

MS. MUDGE: Oh, okay. Yes.

THE COURT: Do we have everybody else checked in?

BAILIFF OLIVER: Yes. Okay. I just want to clarify --

THE COURT: -- we're going to bring in Crespi, Noakes and Vogt. Upshaw has been questioned.

BAILIFF OLIVER: So, what about Allen and Duty? They were both told to report back. I know we discussed them not being, but they were never told by the Court that they were excused and not to come back.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we can bring them in. We can take care of them. They're not going to be

here.

BAILIFF OLIVER: Okay. So, do want to go ahead and do that?

THE COURT: Yeah. Go ahead and bring --

BAILIFF OLIVER: -- so that would be Allen and Duty, okay.

THE COURT: Do we have everybody else checked in?

BAILIFF OLIVER: Yes.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: I want to thank you both for your time, your patience with us. We've had a lot of discussions on a lot of different things, and I know you had to wait on us, and I appreciate your time. And we don't take this very lightly. We -- very seriously, and I want to let you know you will not be serving as jurors in this case so you will be free to go. I do need you to check back in on Sunday -- at least right now there is another jury trial scheduled -- to check to see if you need to come back. You can follow my bailiffs, collect your personal things and you're free to go for this week. Crespi. Noakes. Vogt.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

THE COURT: Good morning. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful

justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you some potential witnesses who may or may not be called in this case. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldesberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney, Forensic Pathology. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at the Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Richard Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Brian Hapack. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole

Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Ms. Crespi, what city do you live in, ma'am?

MS. CRESPI: Johnston City.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. CRESPI: I am a medical receptionist.

THE COURT: For who?

MS. CRESPI: ASD Primary Care.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I believe there were a couple names that were left off the list. Keia Tate and Melissa Gamboe. They're with the crime lab.

THE COURT: Who?

MR. BUTLER: Keia Tate and Melissa Gamboe.

THE COURT: Okay. You're right. Okay. So, Melissa Gamboe and Keia Tate would also be witnesses. I apologize for leaving those out, and I apologize, ma'am. I heard your occupation; where you reside. Your marital status?

MS. CRESPI: Married.

THE COURT: Your husband's name and occupation?

MS. CRESPI: Um, Bobby Crespi. He is a

correctional officer for Pinkneyville Correctional Center.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over age 18 that live in Williamson County?

MS. CRESPI: No.

THE COURT: Do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?

MS. CRESPI: Yes. I have read about it on Facebook prior to.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. CRESPI: No.

THE COURT: I have been told that this trial is excepted to last up to two weeks. Do you have anything that may occur in your life within the next two weeks that would cause your attention to be focused away from this trial?

MS. CRESPIE: My father may be starting radiation.

THE COURT: When do you anticipate that that may occur?

MS. CRESPI: Um, he goes to his Cancer doctor on the 13th.

THE COURT: Do you know any of the attorneys

involved in the case --

MS. CRESPI: No, sir.

THE COURT: -- Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler, Theresa Thien?

MS. CRESPI: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

MS. CRESPI: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

MS. CRESPI: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

MS. CRESPI: No, I do not.

THE COURT: Out of the witnesses that I read to you and was reminded about, do you know any of them?

MS. CRESPIE: I'm sorry. What did you say?

THE COURT: Do you know any of the witnesses that I read?

MS. CRESPI: Um, I am not sure. I know some people with the same last name or the same names as some of the people. I don't know if it's the same people.

THE COURT: As you sit here right now, you have no recollection as to whether you know them specifically; is that accurate?

MS. CRESPI: That is correct.

THE COURT: Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

MS. CRESPI: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: When did that occur?

MS. CRESPI: Um, my son's 17. I was pregnant with my son when it -- so, he's 18 -- 17, 18 years ago.

THE COURT: Do you recall whether it was a criminal or civil case?

MS. CRESPI: I believe it was civil -- I am not sure. I think it was civil maybe.

THE COURT: Do you recall as to whether or not the jury reached a verdict?

MS. CRESPI: We did, yes.

THE COURT: Was there anything about that process that would effect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

MS. CRESPI: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been the victim of a crime?

MS. CRESPI: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

MS. CRESPI: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

MS. CRESPI: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MS. CRESPI: Just my husband with the Department of Corrections, and my cousin is retired State Police.

THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

MS. CRESPI: I would have to go on facts.

THE COURT: There are some very important legal procedures that are applicable to all cases in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is to be presumed innocent of each of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be

found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charge against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. CRESPI: I understand it.

THE COURT: Will you apply it?

MS. CRESPI: I will try.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. CRESPI: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. CRESPI: I understand.

THE COURT: Will you apply it?

MS. CRESPI: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. CRESPI: I understand.

THE COURT: Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MS. CRESPI: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that again?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MS. CRESPI: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

MS. CRESPI: I can't say that I would.

THE COURT: Mr. Noakes?

MR. NOAKES: Yes.

THE COURT: What city do you reside in, sir?

MR. NOAKES: Marion.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. NOAKES: I manage a travel agency based in Austin, Texas, and I work part-time as a real estate appraiser.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. NOAKES: Married.

THE COURT: Your wife's name and occupation?

MR. NOAKES: Mark Johnson, and he is a -- he manages a team of -- I'm sorry. He works in the tech industry. I don't really understand what he does, but something to do with managing a bunch of people who design -- solution architecture for people.

THE COURT: I don't understand technology that much either.

MR. NOAKES: If I ever need an App, I just let him talk about his job.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over the age 18 residing in Williamson County?

MR. NOAKES: No.

THE COURT: Do you know anything about the case other than what I have said here today?

MR. NOAKES: No. I didn't move here for -- until almost two years ago, so no.

THE COURT: This trial is expected to take something like two weeks. Is there anything that may

occur in your life within the next two weeks that would focus your attention away from this trial?

MR. NOAKES: Yes. And I have been -- I just received a phone call this morning telling me I have been excused from jury duty next week because I have to go to Dallas for a cardiologist appointment and procedure.

THE COURT: Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler, Theresa Thien?

MR. NOAKES: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

MR. NOAKES: Not that I'm aware of.

THE COURT: Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

MR. NOAKES: No.

THE COURT: Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

MR. NOAKES: I do not.

THE COURT: I read to you a list of witnesses. Do you know any of them?

MR. NOAKES: I do not.
THE COURT: Have you ever been selected for jury service before including grand jury service?
MR. NOAKES: I have not.
THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?
MR. NOAKES: No.
THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?
MR. NOAKES: No.
THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?
MR. NOAKES: No.
THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by the police or law enforcement agency?
MR. NOAKES: No.
THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?
MR. NOAKES: No, I would not.
THE COURT: I'm going to cover with you also

some important rules of law at that apply in cases in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is to be presumed innocent of each of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charge against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. NOAKES: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. NOAKES: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. NOAKES: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. NOAKES: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MR. NOAKES: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

MR. NOAKES: Yes.

THE COURT: I told you that this charge involves the charge of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. NOAKES: No.

THE COURT: Without going into any specific detail at all, have you had any communication with the press about this case?

MR. NOAKES: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed any communication of a juror with the press about this case?

MR. NOAKES: No.

THE COURT: Have you heard or read anything about this case?

MR. NOAKES: No.

THE COURT: At the conclusion of the evidence, you would be given written instructions by the Court.

MR. NOAKES: -- I'm sorry --

THE COURT: -- those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of the case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

MR. NOAKES: I'm sorry. I coughed right as you started, and I didn't hear the first part of what you said.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of the case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

MR. NOAKES: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

MR. NOAKES: Yes.
THE COURT: If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?
MR. NOAKES: Yes.
THE COURT: And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?
MR. NOAKES: Yes.
THE COURT: Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?
MR. NOAKES: Not that I'm aware of, no.
THE COURT: Is it Vogt?
MS. VOGT: Vogt.
THE COURT: Vogt. Ms. Vogt, what city do you reside in?
MS. VOGT: Carterville.
THE COURT: Your occupation?
MS. VOGT: Head host at Bob Evans.
THE COURT: Your marital status?
MS. VOGT: Marriage -- married. Sorry.
THE COURT: Your spouse's name and occupation?

MS. VOGT: Pat Vogt. Um, 318 local union.
THE COURT: Do you have any children above age 18 residing in Williamson County?
MS. VOGT: I do.
THE COURT: Can you give me their names and occupations, ma'am?
MS. VOGT: Jonathan Lerch. Head supervisor at Tru-Bilt.
THE COURT: Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?
MS. VOGT: Just on social media.
THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
MS. VOGT: No.
THE COURT: This trial, I am told, is going to last about two weeks. Is there anything that might occur in your life within the next two weeks that would effect your ability to focus on this trial?
MS. VOGT: If it has anything to do with chemo brain, I am still under chemo.
THE COURT: When would your next treatment be?
MS. VOGT: I do -- I take medication now. I

don't do the -- I don't do the actual treatments at the center. I do, um, medication.

THE COURT: Would that be something that you could not do as a juror if you were here in this courtroom?

MS. VOGT: Yeah. I can't focus right as far as getting my words out; what I want to say at certain times.

THE COURT: Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: The witnesses that I read, do

you know any of them?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Have you ever been selected for jury service before including grand jury service?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: About how long ago was that?

MS. VOGT: Um, I just got one on, um, a year ago, I am thinking, and then probably about four years ago after that with one.

THE COURT: Do you recall whether the cases were criminal or civil.

MS. VOGT: I couldn't tell you.

THE COURT: Do you recall whether either of them -- the jury reached a verdict.

MS. VOGT: I do believe, yes.

THE COURT: Was there anything about either one of those times that you served as a juror that would effect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror today?

MS. VOGT: I did not serve because I had -- was taking care of my father, and my father -- my father and father-in-law at the time. I did not come into the jury room to do it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. VOGT: I did not do that, but I was served.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you or any immediate family member ever been the victim of a crime?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: I have to cover those same legal principles that are very important that apply to each and every case in which the defendant is charged with a

criminal offense. That the defendant is to be presumed innocent of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and

will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: You told me you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: You also been told that this case involves the charge of First Degree Murder.

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there anything about the nature of this charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in the case?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Without going into any specific detail, have you been contacted by the press about this

case?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Have you seen the press talk to any potential juror --

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: -- in this case? Have you heard or read anything about the case? You indicated social media; that you saw that. Was that the only way that you learned about the case?

MS. VOGT: Social media, TV and on Facebook, yes.

THE COURT: How long has it been since you last heard or read about the case?

MS. VOGT: I guess, this morning.

THE COURT: Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge I read to you earlier?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you read or heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you form an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you form an opinion as to any issue in the case?

MS. VOGT: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you heard and read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler, I think it's your panel.

MR. BUTLER: Thank, your Honor. Ms. Vogt, I am going to start with you. You mentioned you're under medication right now?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Are some of the side effects --

MS. VOGT: -- yes.

MR. BUTLER: -- cause you to lose focus?

MS. VOGT: Yeah.

MR. BUTLER: So, do you feel if you're selected for jury service over the next two weeks, there will be times when people may be testifying and you're not able to focus?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Ms. Crespi, I believe you said you may know some of the witnesses, but you weren't

sure. Do you recall what their last names were?

MS. CRESPI: One of the officers.

MR. BUTLER: One of the officers?

MS. CRESPI: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. But you don't recall the last name?

MS. CRESPI: Sloan.

MR. BUTLER: Sloan? Okay. If this is the Officer Sloan that you know and you're selected to be a member of the jury, would you give his testimony more weight, less weight or no difference than any other witness because you know him?

MS. CRESPI: No difference.

MR. BUTLER: No difference. All right. Thank you. I believe you said you -- and I'm not going to ask you about what you've read. But you said you knew about the case through Facebook?

MS. CRESPI: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: When was the last time you read anything on Facebook about the case?

MS. CRESPI: Um, I saw something this morning on it as I was scrolling through.

MR. BUTLER: Did any member of the press speak with you about this case?

MS. CRESPI: No, sir.

MR. BUTLER: Did you see the member of the press speaking to any other potential jurors?

MS. CRESPI: No, sir.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. No further questions for that potential jury. Mr. Noakes, you said you have -- you don't know anything about the case, right?

MR. NOAKES: I really don't.

MR. BUTLER: Other than what the Judge has told you?

MR. NOAKES: Right. We lived in Dallas up until May of 2021.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MR. NOAKES: I am not from here. I'm not a big social media person.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MR. NOAKES: I subscribe to the Southern Illinoian to read the obituaries, so I'm getting old.

MR. BUTLER: Gotcha. You said also you got a doctor's appointment next week in Dallas?

MR. NOAKES: I do. I have been waiting. I have Atrial Fibrillation, and I'm going back to see the guy who did the procedure to get rid of it or didn't get

rid of it.

MR. BUTLER: How long has that doctor's appointment been scheduled?

MR. NOAKES: I -- I've been trying to get in to see him for a year, and I was able to land this appointment because somebody else canceled, but, you know.

MR. BUTLER: Gotcha.

MR. NOAKES: It could always be rescheduled.

MR. BUTLER: So it could be rescheduled. There isn't an emergency situation?

MR. NOAKES: It's playing doctor tag with part of life.

MR. BUTLER: If you were selected and you had to reschedule this appointment, would you be thinking about that as you listen to testimony, or would you listen to the testimony?

MR. NOAKES: No. I would listen to the testimony.

MR. BUTLER: All right. I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Ms. Crespi, you have read about this case on Facebook?

MS. CRESPI: Yes, I have.

MS. THIEN: Um, have you followed anyone in particular, read any comments, or has it just been news articles by TV and newspaper?

MS. CRESPI: It's been the news articles, TV.

MS. THIEN: Has it been the topic of conversation amongst family and friends?

MS. CRESPI: Yes, it has.

MS. THIEN: I believe you said that you do not believe that you can be a fair and impartial juror if you were selected on this case.

MS. CRESPI: After what I have read, no.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, and at this point, the presumption of innocence is not something you can extend to Julie? One word answer. I am not trying to --

MS. CRESPI: -- no.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Mr. Noakes, it all boils down to, right, if you were selected on this jury and you had to reschedule a doctor's appointment -- and I truly appreciate how frustrating that can be -- would that be something that you would hold against either the State or the defense?

MR. NOAKES: No, because they've already excused me for it, so, no, it's not something that I would feel --

MS. THIEN: -- okay. It would be one of those facts of life?

MR. NOAKES: (Witness complies.)

MS. THIEN: Okay. And you have not heard or seen anything of significance that would give you an opinion in this case from social media and newspaper?

MR. NOAKES: No. Honestly, I'm surprised that I haven't heard something --

MS. THIEN: -- okay.

MR. NOAKES: -- but no. I just watch ABC nightly news and don't pay any attention to the local news.

MS. THIEN: How long has it been since you -- you said you were from here --

MR. NOAKES: Yes.

MS. THIEN: -- and recently moved back.

MR. NOAKES: Yes.

MS. THIEN: How long had you been away?

MR. NOAKES: Since 1995.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. NOAKES: My mother still lives here, so

I'd come back and visit her.

MS. THIEN: Mm-hmm. And, Ms. Vogt.

MS. VOGT: Vogt.

MS. THIEN: Got it. Um, so, you have been lucky enough to be called for jury duty twice in the last four years?

MS. VOGT: Yeah.

MS. THIEN: But you've never served on a jury?

MS. VOGT: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, you also have seen or followed this case on Facebook?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Without stating what it is, have you formed -- already formed an opinion on this?

MS. VOGT: Yes.

MS. THIEN: And is there -- are you able to set that aside in any way and start fresh with just what happens in this courtroom?

MS. VOGT: No.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, ma'am. I have no further questions, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE

THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Before we begin, I've directed the State's Attorney to issue a subpoena for the news reporter. I am going to think about what, if anything, I can do. In my mind, it's indirect contempt which would require charges. I don't know where I'm going to go with that yet, but it greatly bothers the Court that there was two conversations. I, yesterday, believed there was only one. I just want you guys to be aware. That's going to be something we will be taking up at some point in time. It would be my thought as soon as he is brought here, he can just wait till we're ready.

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir. If I may? I did speak to someone from the Sheriff's Department, um, this morning, um, who said that they are investigating it. I don't know how much I can say but -- as jury -- tampering with a jury case. Um, I informed them that that juror was coming in at 8:30. The investigator who called me is a witness in this case. I informed him that they need to send someone else. He said they do have a detective available that we are not -- isn't even on our witness list. So, I just want the Court to know that there could be an investigation on that end as well. It's not my county. Won't be my case obviously,

but there is someone else looking into this as well, so that the Court is aware.

THE COURT: Okay. Your panel, Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, the State would exercise for cause challenges for Ms. Crespi and Ms. Vogt.

THE COURT: Let's do them one at time.

MR. BUTLER: Yes. Ms. Crespi stated that she could not be fair and impartial multiple times. That she had read several articles through Facebook.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I agree, Judge. I believe she was the one that also stated -- maybe it was Ms. Vogt -- but nothing in this courtroom is going to change her mind.

THE COURT: The State's challenge for cause will be granted. Your next cause?

MR. BUTLER: Ms. Vogt. The reasons would be, again, she stated she could not be fair and impartial. She's already formed an opinion on the case.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I agree.

THE COURT: State's motion for cause would be granted. Okay. We will need Parks and Bullock

brought.

BAILIFF O'BRIEN: Yes, sir.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, the defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offence occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in

violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the fifth day of December, 2020, Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you some witnesses that potentially may testify in the trial.

Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldesberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays. Kendall Mezo. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper

Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

THE COURT: Mr. Parks, what city do you live in?

MR. PARKS: Marion, Illinois.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. PARKS: I'm a construction worker.

THE COURT: For who?

MR. PARKS: My dad.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. PARKS: Single.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over the age of 18 living in Williamson County?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?

MR. PARKS: Yeah.

THE COURT: This trial is expected to take up to two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in

your life in the next two weeks that would take your focus away from this trial?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Do you know any of the attorneys involved in the case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler, Theresa Thien?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: You have been told a list of witnesses. Do you know any of them?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Have you ever been selected for jury service before including grand jury?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being charged today?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: I am going to talk to you about some very important principles of law that are applicable in all cases in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is to be presumed innocent of the charges against them.

That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge. That a defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify, and that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or not to testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be

held against them?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: I told you that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. I also told you that the charge in this case involves the charge of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, without going into any specific detail at all, has the media contacted you in any form?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media talking to any potential jurors?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Have you heard or read something

about this case?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you hear or read about it? Was it TV? Radio? Internet? Facebook?

MR. PARKS: TV and internet.

THE COURT: How long ago was it since you read or heard something about this case?

MR. PARKS: A couple years ago.

THE COURT: Is what you read and heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you earlier?

MR. PARKS: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard or read, did you form an opinion about this case?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you now have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you formulated an opinion about any issue in this case?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you have heard or read about in this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MR. PARKS: Yes.
THE COURT: Mr. Bullock?
MR. BULLOCK: Yes.
THE COURT: What city do you reside in?
MR. BULLOCK: Carbondale.
THE COURT: Your occupation?
MR. BULLOCK: I own my own business and prior retired military.
THE COURT: What's the nature of your business?
MR. BULLOCK: I train athletes.
THE COURT: Your marital status?
MR. BULLOCK: Married.
THE COURT: Your spouse's name and occupation?
MR. BULLOCK: She's a housewife right now cause we've got a two year old and a 13 year old.
THE COURT: Do you have any children over the age of 18 living in Williamson County?
MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.
THE COURT: Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?
MR. BULLOCK: Yes. Just a little bit, sir.

THE COURT: This trial is expected to last two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life the next two weeks that is going to take your focus away from this trial?

MR. BULLOCK: Business, sir.

THE COURT: Other than that?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler, Theresa Thien?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: The witnesses that I read to you, do you know any of them?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I am going to talk to you about

some principles of law that apply in all cases in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. The defendant is to be presumed innocent of each charge against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that the defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You told me you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant.

MR. BULLOCK: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: I also told you that the charge involved in this case is First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of this charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. BULLOCK: I don't think so, sir.

THE COURT: Again, without going into any specific detail at all, have you been contacted by the

media regarding this case?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed any potential juror being contacted by the media in this case?

MR. BULLOCK: Just that lady yesterday that was talking outside.

THE COURT: Did you overhear any portion of that conversation?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Did anybody tell you anything about that conversation?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: So, you have heard or read something about the case previously; is that correct?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: How did you hear or read about it? Was it TV? Radio? Internet? Facebook?

MR. BULLOCK: Social media. The article, it was, like, a week before jury duty was supposed to start. I just read the headlines, and then I told also one of my friends that I was going to have jury duty coming up. And they mentioned that it probably might be for this.

THE COURT: Is what you read or heard more

detailed than the statement about the charge I read to you?

MR. BULLOCK: There was one pertinent fact that wasn't --

THE COURT: -- I don't want you to say it. Based upon what you read or heard, did you form an opinion about the case?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: As you sit there now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Have you formed an opinion about any issue in this case?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you have heard or read about in this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in the case?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: If selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about the case and instead decide this case only upon the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in open Court?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of the case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Will you decide the case only by the facts and evidence and law presented to the Court?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

MR. BULLOCK: Can you repeat that? I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Yes. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Is there any reason or issue

that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MR. BULLOCK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor.

Um, Mr. Bullock, I am going to start with you. You said your address is a Carbondale address. Is that here in Williamson County?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MR. BULLOCK: It's right on the edge.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. We've got to make sure is why we're asking that. Um, and then you said you read a little bit online. You understand that what you read online is not evidence of what happened?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: And would you be able to set aside what you had previously read and just judge this case based off of the testimony and evidence presented in Court?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: Um, if selected, the Judge will read you a list of instructions. Um, would you follow the Judge's instructions?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: Um, even if that includes not giving more weight to testimony of police officers?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: So, you would be able to follow the Judge's orders?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. You mentioned you have a business?

MR. BULLOCK: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: What's that business?

MR. BULLOCK: I do strength and conditioning with teen-age kids and some college kids.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Um, and the Judge had asked you at some point if there would be things that would take your attention away from this case if you're selected?

MR. BULLOCK: Yeah. I'm the only one -- I'm the only one that runs it, so that's the big deal. I usually work after school hours so.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. What do you mean after school hours?

MR. BULLOCK: So, like, kids are in school, so usually from 3:30 on is when I would be --

MR. BUTLER: -- okay. Would that -- if selected to be on a juror -- jury in this case for two weeks possibly from 9:00 in the morning to, say, 5:00 in the afternoon would that --

MR. BULLOCK: -- I can manage it.

MR. BUTLER: You can manage that for your business?

MR. BULLOCK: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. I am going to Mr. Parks. Mr. Parks, you said you knew some close friends and family members who are police officers?

MR. PARKS: Yeah.

MR. BUTLER: And that you would -- I believe, you said you already formed an opinion on the case?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: I kind of asked Mr. Bullock some questions about following the Judge's instructions. Would you follow the Judge's instructions?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: And would you be able to give -- would you -- even if -- well, let me strike that, your Honor. Uh, you said you knew a little bit about the case as well. Is that from reading on social media?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes.

MR BUTLER: When was the last time you read stuff on there?

MR. BULLOCK: A couple weeks ago.

MR. BUTLER: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thanks, Judge.

Mr. Parks, who do you know in law enforcement?

MR. PARKS: My cousin Aaron. He works in Carbondale.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, close with your cousin?

MR. PARKS: Yeah. I see him every year.

MS. THIEN: Do you ever talk about business, jobs, work --

MR. PARKS: -- not usually.

MS. THIEN: -- the interesting stuff?

MR. PARKS: Sometimes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, you did tell the Judge, though, that because of that you would be would -- you would give law enforcement -- police officer testimony more weight than you would anyone else?

MR. PARKS: Yeah.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, and sir, without asking you what it is, you also told the Judge that you do not think you can be fair and impartial in this case.

MR. PARKS: I could be.

MS. THIEN: You could be?

MR. PARKS: Yeah.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Have you already formed an opinion?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And is that an opinion of what you think the verdict should be?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Is there anything that could happen in this courtroom that you think could change that?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Would it be up to the defense to change your mind?

MR. PARKS: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Thanks. Mr. Bullock, I do know a lot of sole proprietors and businesses, and while jury duty they believe is super important, they also know that it's a kick in the business side.

MR. BULLOCK: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Do you have any coverage or anyone that can assist you in this if you were called?

MR. BULLOCK: My wife can facilitate a little bit.

MS. THIEN: Okay. You also stated that you have friends and family in law enforcement?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: And, um, anyone local?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: And may I ask who that would be?

MR. PARKS: My neighbor, there is about ten guys that come to the facility, and then one of my good friends is on the Illinois Swat Team.

MS. THIEN: Okay. So -- oh, wow. So, a lot of law enforcement then hang out at your business as well and train?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: All right. Was there anyone on the witness list that the Judge read you that you were familiar with?

MR. BULLOCK: The Rawlinson last name sounds familiar, but I think he's a conservation officer, so I could be wrong.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And is that someone you

know?

MR. BULLOCK: Like, the conservation Rawlinson?

MS. THIEN: Mm-hmm.

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. BULLOCK: As an acquaintance. Not like a personal friend.

MS. THIEN: If that person -- if that person turned out to be the same one and was called to testify, would you be more likely to, um, give more weight to that person's testimony than you would anyone else?

MR. BULLOCK: No, ma'am. He's kind of a dick. Pardon my language. Sorry.

MS. THIEN: Um -- and I can't comment on that.

MR. BULLOCK: I'm sorry.

MS. THIEN: All good. There was one point when the Judge was talking to you that you said that you had formed an opinion on this case.

MR. BULLOCK: Yeah. I have children.

MS. THIEN: That's going to make it incredibly hard.

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: This is going to be -- no matter how it goes, this is an emotional case.

MR. BULLOCK: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Someone walking into a jury box with a pre-formed opinion, is it something where the defense is going to be required to change your mind?

MR. BULLOCK: No. I think I -- I'm an honest person, so facts are facts. If the evidence is there; the evidence is there.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Can you set aside that opinion completely and totally and walk into a jury box with just generically -- not just this case -- and walk into a jury box with a fresh and open mind?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: And you do understand that Julie is presumed innocent?

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: Just the fact that she is sitting at this table has no legal weight whatsoever.

MR. BULLOCK: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: And you agree that you can presume her to be innocent?

MR. BULLOCK: Mm-hmm. Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: She may or may not testify in

this case.

MR. BULLOCK: I understand that, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: If she does not, would you hold that against her in any way.

MR. BULLOCK: No, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: Thank you. I have no further questions.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: So, earlier I made a statement about issuing a subpoena to the media and directed my bailiff to go tell the State's Attorney to do that. At the time that I did that, I didn't know that there would be an investigation. And I am told that he's already been interviewed. I do not know if the State will file charges or not. If I were to bring him here, he has a right of -- against self-incrimination. As much as I really want to talk to him, I don't think that under the circumstances I should. I leave it in the hands of the State's Attorney. So, I am not going to ask for him to come. Do you have any disagreement, Ms. Mudge?

MS. MUDGE: No. I agree with that, your Honor. And I apologize. I didn't know -- I didn't know

a subpoena was being issued for him.

THE COURT: I didn't know you guys had already talked about the possibility of an investigation.

MS. MUDGE: Yeah.

THE COURT: Do you have any issues, Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you can let Mr. Hampson know that I changed my mind about the subpoena. I don't want to know if he's going to file charges or not. That's not my job. But under the circumstances, I will let him make those decisions.

Mr. Butler, I apologize. I think the panel is to you.

MR. BUTLER: Yes.

THE COURT: Upshaw. Noakes. Parks. Bullock.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, the People would exercise a for cause challenge on Trey Parks. He's already formed an opinion. I believe he said that it would be up to the defense as well to change his mind on that opinion.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I concur.

THE COURT: Okay. If you don't mind, you can bring Mr. Parks back. Bring to me also Mr. Bush.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Parks, I want to thank you very much for your time, your patience with us. I know this is very inconvenient for you and your family. You will not be serving as a juror in this case, so you will be free to go. My bailiff will help you collect your personal items. You do need to call in Sunday. At least right now there is a jury trial scheduled next week, and you may be required to report next week. Thank you, sir.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Bush?

MR. BUSH: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning, sir. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is

alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020 in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020 in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have without lawful justification stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you some potential witnesses in this case. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley.

Dr. B. Goldesberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Sheila Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at the Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Karl Reich.

Sir, in what city do you reside?

MR. BUSH: Marion, your Honor.

THE COURT: And your marital -- what's your occupation?

MR. BUSH: I am retired.
THE COURT: From where, sir?
MR. BUSH: From the U.S. Postal Service.
THE COURT: Your marital status?
MR. BUSH: Single.
THE COURT: Do you have any children above age 18 residing in Williamson County?
MR. BUSH: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?
MR. BUSH: No, I don't, your Honor.
THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
MR. BUSH: No, sir.
THE COURT: Now, this trial is expected to last up to two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life the next two weeks that would take your mind off of this jury trial?
MR. BUSH: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case?
MR. BUSH: No, I don't. I am not familiar with any of them.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

MR. BUSH: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

MR. BUSH: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

MR. BUSH: No, I do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Out of the witnesses that I read to you, do you know any of them?

MR. BUSH: None of them sound familiar, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

MR. BUSH: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: How long ago was that?

MR. BUSH: It was in the late 80's, your Honor. I don't remember the exact year. Maybe '88, '89. It was in Robert County, Florida.

THE COURT: Do you remember if it was a criminal or a civil case.

MR. BUSH: It was a drunk driving case.

THE COURT: Do you recall as to whether or not the jury reached a verdict?

MR. BUSH: Yes, we did, your Honor. We decided he was guilty.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

MR. BUSH: Well, I've had a couple cars stolen, an apartment broken into, but no felonies -- no personal felonies.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

MR. BUSH: I was convicted of drunk driving in 1992 in Broward County, Florida.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged a similar offense to the one being tried today?

MR. BUSH: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MR. BUSH: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more

or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

MR. BUSH: I would be inclined to believe the officer, your Honor.

THE COURT: I want to talk to you about some very important legal principles that apply in all cases in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. The defendant is to be presumed innocent of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge. That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. BUSH: Yes. I do understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Will you apply it?

MR. BUSH: Yes, I would apply it.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and

will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. BUSH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. BUSH: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: And will you apply it?

MR. BUSH: Yes, I would, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that the defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. BUSH: I didn't know that, but I can apply it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MR. BUSH: I can do that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

MR. BUSH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I told you about the charge in this case, and that the charge is not any evidence against the defendant. I also told you that the charge involves the charge of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MR. BUSH: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Again, without going into any specific detail at all, have you been contacted by the media about this case?

MR. BUSH: Oh, no, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to anybody that may be a potential juror about this case?

MR. BUSH: No, your Honor, but I heard about it on television on Channel 3 News this morning.

THE COURT: Without going into detail, have you heard or read anything about the case other than what you just told me?

MR. BUSH: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, the only thing that you have heard about was a report about media speaking to a potential juror?

MR. BUSH: Yes, Your Honor. That's all I've

heard about the case.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard about that, do you have an opinion as to this case?

MR. BUSH: No, your Honor. There really wasn't any information about the case itself.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you heard that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. BUSH: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: If selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have heard about the case and instead decide the case only upon the evidence and testimony which is presented here in open Court?

MR. BUSH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

MR. BUSH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Will you decide the case only on the facts and evidence and law presented in Court?

MR. BUSH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

MR. BUSH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

MR. BUSH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MR. BUSH: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. Mr. Bush, you mentioned you were a juror previously. Were you the foreperson of that jury?

MR. BUSH: No, I wasn't.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Then you also talked about how you had a DUI?

MR. BUSH: Yes, I did.

MR. BUTLER: Is there anything about your interactions with the police or lawyers in that case that would make you bias or prejudice to one side or the other?

MR. BUSH: Well, I don't know, but they made my life miserable.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. So, who's "they"?

MR. BUSH: The penalty was pretty harsh. I was coming from the fire works on the 4th of July, and they got me. They stopped me in one of these roadside sobriety checkpoints, and I failed, and I ended up in jail for three days, and I ended up on probation. I ended up community service; a considerable fine. I thought it was harsh.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. So, um, anything about that going to make you have --

MR. BUSH: -- oh, no. This was 30 years ago. I don't even think about it anymore, but I had to bring it up when I was questioned. It's the only time in my life I've ever had a run-in with the law.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. And, I believe, you also said that if an officer testifies, you would give an officer's testimony more weight.

MR. BUSH: Well, I think a person would be inclined to maybe want to defend themselves with the truth or without the truth being a major objective.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. But my question was more about officers testifying.

MR. BUSH: Yeah. I believe police officers are truthful.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Nothing further.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Well, Mr. Bush, when it comes to that, do you think anyone else who comes in to Court and raises their hand to tell the truth is going to be less believable than a police officer, more believable than a police officer or all the same?

MR. BUSH: All the same. I don't know. I don't know if people would lie to save their own skin under oath or not.

MS. THIEN: Okay. It's also possible, right, that maybe somebody makes a mistake?

MR. BUSH: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, I guess what I am asking is can you keep an open mind --

MR. BUSH: -- oh, certainly.

MS. THIEN: -- to all of the evidence and weigh it out regardless of whether or not a person is police or not?

MR. BUSH: Yes. I could try.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Fair enough. Um, you

heard about a little bit of this case on the news just this morning?

MR. BUSH: Only that a reporter spoke to a juror. I don't know anything other than that. It was a very short news story.

MS. THIEN: Was there anything about that that you think would impact you in your ability to sit if you were selected on this jury?

MR. BUSH: Oh, no. It would have no baring on what I would think.

MS. THIEN: Sir, are you on any form of social media, Facebook?

MR. BUSH: No. Huh-uh.

MS. THIEN: No?

MR. BUSH: I don't have a computer.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. BUSH: I'm not tech savvy.

MS. THIEN: Where do you then get your news primarily?

MR. BUSH: From television or the radio.

MS. THIEN: Fair enough.

MR. BUSH: Newspaper. I read the paper, the Southern Illinoisan, every day.

MS. THIEN: Have you heard anything about --

not what it is -- heard anything else about this case?

MR. BUSH: No, I haven't.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. BUSH: I get my paper a day late because they mail it now, so if it's been in the news, I haven't gotten the paper since the Saturday edition.

MS. THIEN: Right.

MR. BUSH: There is no Sunday and Monday edition.

MS. THIEN: And now the Tuesday edition won't show up until this afternoon.

MR. BUSH: Right.

MS. THIEN: Same thing. Okay. Um, sir, there was one of the principles that the Judge asked you about, and that is the defense is presumed innocent and has no burden whatsoever to put on any kind of case. Julie is not required to testify. It is 100 percent the State's burden to prove their case beyond a reasonable doubt. Is there anything about that? You expressed some surprise. Is there anything about that that puts the defense at a disadvantage?

MR. BUSH: Well, I don't know, but I don't think we would be here if there wasn't a case to be made.

MS. THIEN: Correct. But do you think that means there is a case that's been proven beyond a reasonable doubt or that it remains to be seen?

MR. BUSH: I'm not sure how to answer that.

MS. THIEN: I know. It's kind of a tough one as well. So, if the law says straight up we don't have to call a single witness, we do not have to testify, would you hold that against the defense?

MR. BUSH: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Because the burden is on the State, and you can hold them to that burden?

MR. BUSH: I have heard that, yes.

MS. THIEN: I have no further questions. Thank you.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, the People would use our third peremptory challenge on Mr. Bush.

THE COURT: You can go ahead and bring Mr. Bush back.

MS. THIEN: Afterwards, any chance we might be able to take a morning break?

THE COURT: We are going to right after I

release him.

MS. THIEN: Thank you.

MS. MUDGE: Are there still two jurors back there?

THE COURT: Yeah, and unfortunately Upshaw has been sitting there for quite sometime.

MS. MUDGE: No, I mean, is Amy Crespi -- did we release her?

THE COURT: Crespi was released.

MS. MUDGE: Did we bring her in and do that?

THE COURT: No, I didn't. I forgot to, and I told the bailiffs just to let her go.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. I just want to make sure. Thank you.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR.)

THE COURT: Mr. Bush, I want to thank you very much for your time and patience with us. I know that this is a great inconvenience, but you will not be serving on the jury at this time. And if you would like to follow my bailiffs, they will help you get your personal things. I do need you to call in Sunday. There is a jury trial scheduled next week at least right now.

MR. BUSH: Okay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir.

MR. BUSH: You're welcome.

THE COURT: We'll go ahead and take a 15 minute recess. Watch those potential jurors, please.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Okay. It looks like we need to invite Hittmeier.

MS. MUDGE: Judge, if I may really quickly?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MUDGE: I have evidence and witnesses at the gate at one o'clock. I don't want to make any assumption on behalf of the Court, but could we plan to start evidence tomorrow?

THE COURT: Well, let's talk about that. Are you suggesting we go on until we get a jury tonight? I am open to that.

MS. MUDGE: Just suggesting -- well, yes, I am, but I would just -- I am just thinking I think we all understand we are not going to get to evidence today.

THE COURT: Oh, yeah. That's true. I already told the other panel not to come until tomorrow morning.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. Perfect. That's all I needed to know, but, yes. I do agree with that.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Is it Hittmeier?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: Sir, the defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred or on about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful

justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probably of death or great bad bodily, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you some potential witnesses who may or may not testify in this case. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldesberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at the Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer

Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

Sir, in what town do you reside?

MR. HITTMEIER: Marion.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. HITTMEIER: I am in sales at Electrical Supply Company.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. HITTMEIER: Single.

THE COURT: Do you have any children above age 18 living in Williamson County?

MR HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Do you know -- now don't go into any detail at all, but do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you today?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Now, this trial is expected to last two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life the next two weeks that would draw your attention away from this trial?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?

MR. HITTMEIER: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

MR. HITTMEIER: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

MR. HITTMEIER: I don't. No.

THE COURT: I gave you a list of witnesses.

Do you know any of them?

MR. HITTMEIER: I think I knew one name, but I don't personally know them.

THE COURT: Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members ever been the victim of a crime?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes, I suppose.

THE COURT: Do you recall when that occurred?

MR. HITTMEIER: We had one of our first houses -- apartments got broken into. Some stuff was stolen out of it.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that fact that may effect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: Is it a family member or yourself?

MR. HITTMEIER: Myself.

THE COURT: What crime have you been convicted of?

MR. HITTMEIER: I have been convicted of a DUI. I have been convicted of three DUI's actually.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that fact that may effect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with an offense similar to the one being charged today?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

MR. HITTMEIER: No. I guess my answer would be give them equal amount of weight.

THE COURT: I am going to talk to you about

some principles of law that are applicable to every case in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. The defendant is to be presumed innocent of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That a defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf, and is not required to testify. And that if a defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. HITTMEIER: I understand.

THE COURT: Will you also apply it?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not

required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has a right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: I told you about this charge involving the charge of murder, and the fact of being charged is no evidence of any guilt at all.

MR. HITTMEIER: Okay.

THE COURT: Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Again, without going into any details at all, have you been contacted by the media

regarding this case?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed any potential juror being contacted by the media in this case?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: Have you read or heard anything about this case?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

THE COURT: At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you decide the case only on the facts and evidence and law presented in Court?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

THE COURT: And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.
THE COURT: Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?
MR. HITTMEIER: No.
THE COURT: Mr. Butler?
MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor. Is it Hittmeier?
MR. HITTMEIER: Hittmeier.
MR. BUTLER: All right. You -- one of the questions that the Judge had asked you was if you knew the defendant, and I was a little confused with your answer. Was it, no, or I don't know?
MR. HITTMEIER: No. I don't know the defendant.
MR. BUTLER: Okay. Thank you. And you said you had a house that was previously broken into; you were a victim of a crime?
MR. HITTMEIER: Right.
MR. BUTLER: Was that investigated by the police?
MR. HITTMEIER: The police came, and we did a report.
MR. BUTLER: Was that here in Williamson

County?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes, in Herrin.

MR. BUTLER: Did anything ever come of that.

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

MR. BUTLER: No one was arrested.

MR. HITTMEIER: Correct.

MR. BUTLER: Anything about that make you have any bad feelings toward the police for not arresting someone or prosecutors for not charging someone?

MR. HITTMEIER: No. I guess realistically I kind of assumed that was going to be the outcome. I mean, we don't have, you know, security cameras. I couldn't tell who they should go towards; who it could have been. I mean, we came home and the house had been broken into, and that was that so.

MR. BUTLER: If there were to be the officers testifying in this trial that may have investigated your case, are you going to weigh their testimony more favorably to one side because they investigated your case?

MR. HITTMEIER: No. It's been so long ago. I couldn't even tell you who -- who -- who I talked to. It was many years ago.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Um, and then you said you have been convicted of three DUI's?

MR. HITTMEIER: That's correct.

MR. BUTLER: When were they?

MR. HITTMEIER: Two of them were the early 2000's, so I am going to say 2003 and 2004, I believe. Most recent one was 2013.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. And were those here in Williamson County as well?

MR. HITTMEIER: One of them was. The other two would have been Jackson County.

MR. BUTLER: Anything about the experiences during that, that you would hold against the State or against the defense?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

MR. BUTLER: And if there were to be officers that would testify in this case that may have arrested you for a DUI, would you -- how would you view their testimony?

MR. HITTMEIER: I think the Williamson County would have been 2003, so, again, I wouldn't even remember who it was. But, no, I would not.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. And those DUI's, is that the only criminal cases you've had?

MR. HITTMEIER: I've had others. I have had a driving on revoked somewhere in the middle of, like, 2009 maybe in Jefferson County.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MR. HITTMEIER: In Mt. Vernon, Jefferson County I had a drug charge in early 2000. I want to say 2003 as well in Williamson County.

MR. BUTLER: All right. Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, Judge. Mr. Hittmeier, have you seen anything -- not specifically about what it is -- about this case on social media? News? Newspaper? Anything?

MR. HITTMEIER: No. I don't really look -- if I watch the news, it's usually for the weather, so I don't -- no, I have not.

MS. THIEN: Are you on social media?

MR. HITTMEIER: I am.

MS. THIEN: May I ask if it's Facebook? Snapchat? Tik Tok?

MR. HITTMEIER: Facebook, Instagram mostly for sports.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. HITTMEIER: I follow a lot of the sports, specific athletes, specific sports.

MS. THIEN: Um, and has anything about this case crossed your feed that you recall?

MS. HITTMEIER: No.

MS. THIEN: Sir, do you belong to any church or civic organizations? Clubs? Elks?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

MS. THIEN: VFW? Anything?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

MS. THIEN: Do you have any minor children?

MR. HITTMEIER: I do.

MS. THIEN: May I ask how old they are?

MR. HITTMEIER: I have twins that are eight, and another one is not mine that I've helped raised, and she is 12.

MS. THIEN: And do you all live in the same household right now?

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes. Fifty percent of the time we live in the same household.

MS. THIEN: Families can be complicated.

MR. HITTMEIER: Yeah.

MS. THIEN: Um, you are aware that this case does involve the death -- the murder of a child, an

eleven year old?

MR. HITTMEIER: Right.

MS. THIEN: Is there anything -- obviously this is emotional. Is there anything about that that you believe makes you not impartial?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. There is one of the principles that the Judge talked to you about that the State has the burden to prove this case beyond a reasonable doubt, and you can hold them to that?

MR. HITTMEIER: Correct.

MS. THIEN: The defense, honestly, we don't have to do anything except hold them to that burden. We don't have to call a witness. We don't have to -- Julia doesn't have to testify. Would you in any way hold that against her if that were the case?

MR. HITTMEIER: No.

MS. THIEN: Because she is presumed innocent as we sit here today.

MR. HITTMEIER: Understood.

MS. THIEN: Okay. There is the possibility in this case that you're going to be hearing some scientific testimony; DNA and such. Have you -- some of us do; some of us don't. Do you watch any, you know, TV

shows or true crime Podcast or anything involving --

MR. HITTMEIER: -- I have, sure.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. HITTMEIER: Correct.

MS. THIEN: Um, are you more likely or less likely to put emphasis on any "scientific evidence" as opposed to observational or other kinds?

MR. HITTMEIER: I guess -- I guess I would lean toward slightly more likely. I am not sure about that.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. HITTMEIER: I would say maybe slightly more likely.

MS. THIEN: But you are able to keep an open mind --

MR. HITTMEIER: Yes.

MS. THIEN: -- and listen to everything?

MR. HITTMEIER: Right.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thank you, sir. I have no further questions.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Butler, your panel.

MS. MUDGE: May we have one moment?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

MR. BUTLER: The People would tender that panel, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien, Ms. Upshaw, Noaks, Bullock, Hittmeier?

MS. THIEN: Just one second, Judge. Judge, my first challenge will be to Paula Upshaw. That will be a challenge --

THE COURT: -- wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute.

MR. BUTLER: I'm sorry. You're --

THE COURT: When you say challenge, are you saying challenge for cause or are you saying a peremptory?

MS. THIEN: Uh, this will be a challenge for cause to begin.

THE COURT: Okay. And the basis?

MS. THIEN: It's difficult to recall back because we questioned her right before everything sort of fell apart late yesterday afternoon, but she specifically says that during her questioning that she would hold the defendant's right to remain silent against her if she didn't testify, and there were

several questions about that.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, the State would object. She answered affirmatively to the Zehr principles. Further, I think her statement was only possibly.

THE COURT: That is the Court's recollection, too. She did make a positive statement initially, but upon further questioning, she indicated that she could follow the Zehr principles. Do you have anything further you wish to offer for the purpose of cause?

MS. THIEN: Not for cause, Judge.

THE COURT: Very well. Motion for cause will be denied.

MS. THIEN: The defense will exercise a peremptory challenge to Ms. Upshaw.

THE COURT: I believe that's your second.

MS. THIEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Very well.

MS. THIEN: As to --

THE COURT: If you want to exercise more, I'm fine with that if you wish.

MS. THIEN: We would exercise a peremptory

as to Jared Bullock.

THE COURT: On who? Bullock?

MS. THIEN: Bullock. Yep.

THE COURT: Basis?

MS. THIEN: Um, it is not for a protected purpose, Judge, it was more along the lines of he stated he had formed an opinion. He was partially rehabilitated; not a hundred percent. So, that's why we're exercising a peremptory on him.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Um, Judge, um, he did say he had formed an opinion, but I would just note that he also said he'd follow Zehr principles and would -- I think he said something along the lines of he would take the evidence as it came in and would follow your instructions.

THE COURT: It's the Court's recollection that he did indicate based upon media exposure he formulated an opinion. It's the Court's recollection that he also indicated that if he was selected, he would be able to disregard his opinion. Ms. Thien, anything else you wish to offer?

MS. THIEN: We're exercising a peremptory, Judge.

THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought that you were doing a for challenge. I apologize.

MS. THIEN: I mean, if we were going that way, I am not saying I wouldn't change my mind, but it didn't look like I was going to be successful there so.

THE COURT: That would be the defendant's third?

MS. THIEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you wish to continue, or do you want the refreshed panel?

MS. THIEN: I think at this point we'd like a refreshed panel, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if you don't mind, bring me -- let's see, it's Upshaw, Bullock, Bush --

BAILIFF O'BRIEN: Bush was already dismissed, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- and then we need Charles Edgar brought. Well, we need more than that.

BAILIFF OLIVER: Are we going to do four, Judge?

THE COURT: Well, we still have Noakes, so we need three. Doesn't that get us down to Green?

MS. MUDGE: We have Hittmeier.

MR. BUTLER: And we have Hittmeier.

THE COURT: That's right. We have Hittmeier, too. So, we only need --

MS. THIEN: Yeah. We've not made a decision on that one.

THE COURT: We still need to get down to Green, right? Two. So, we need Edgar and Green brought.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: I want to thank you personally very much for being here. I know that it is very inconvenient for you and very time-consuming, but neither one of you will be serving in this particular jury. I will need you, though, to call Sunday the telephone to check. There is a jury trial that is scheduled next week -- at least right now -- to check to see if you're going to have to serve. On behalf of the attorneys and myself, I thank you very much for your time. You can follow my bailiff, if you need to, to get your personal effects.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

THE COURT: If you don't mind, go on in the box. Gentlemen, the defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged

with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born

8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to now read to you a list of names. These are potential witnesses that may be called in the case. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldesberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa

Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

Mr. Edgar, what city do you reside in, sir?

MR. EDGAR: Makanda.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. EDGAR: I'm retired.

THE COURT: From what, sir?

MR. EDGAR: The Sears appliance repair.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. EDGAR: Widower.

THE COURT: Do you have any children above age 18 residing in Williamson County?

MR. EDGAR: No.

THE COURT: Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?

MR. EDGAR: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MR. EDGAR: No.

THE COURT: I have been told that this trial is expected to last up to two weeks. Is there anything in your life that may occur within the next two weeks that would take your focus away from this trial?

MR. EDGAR: Well, I am a heavy smoker and

not being able to smoke.

THE COURT: So, if you were not able to get frequent smoke breaks but got some, is that going to be a problem that would take your focus away from the trial?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?

MR. EDGAR: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

MR. EDGAR: Might have. My sister that is dead to me is an attorney.

THE COURT: Okay. But not with these specific attorneys, correct?

MR. EDGAR: No, I don't think so.

THE COURT: All right. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of these attorneys' offices?

MR. EDGAR: I don't think so.

THE COURT: Do you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

MR. EDGAR: Nope.

THE COURT: I gave you a list of witnesses. Do you know any of those?

MR. EDGAR: Nope.

THE COURT: Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

MR. EDGAR: Nope.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member of yours ever been the victim of a crime?

MR. EDGAR: I have been robbed a couple of times.

THE COURT: Is there anything about those occurrences that may effect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. EDGAR: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Would that be you or a family member?

MR. EDGAR: A family member.

THE COURT: Without going into great specific detail, do you know what they were convicted of?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: What was that?

MR. EDGAR: Uh, drugs.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that, sir, that may effect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. EDGAR: Not that one, but the other charges that were against them, yep.

THE COURT: Do you think those charges would effect your ability to be fair in this case?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MR. EDGAR: Nope.

THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

MR. EDGAR: There again, because of the history of my son and his problems, I -- wouldn't take a whole lot of weight.

THE COURT: Would you consider the testimony of an officer to be more credible than any other

witness?

MR. EDGAR: No.

THE COURT: Would you find them to be the same and weigh their credibility based on the totality of the evidence you hear?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: I need to talk to you about a couple of principles of law that are applicable in every case in which someone is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is presumed innocent of each charge against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge. That a defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf, and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be

convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that if a defendant chooses not to testify, that cannot be held against them?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering your verdict?

MR. EDGAR: Maybe.

THE COURT: I have told you about the charge in this case. It involves the charge of First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being fair and impartial in this case?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Without going into any specific detail at all, have you been contacted by the media regarding this case?

MR. EDGAR: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media communicating to any potential juror about this case?

MR. EDGAR: No.

THE COURT: Have you read or heard anything about this case?

MR. EDGAR: No.

THE COURT: At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of the case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence, and the law presented in Court?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

MR. EDGAR: Yep.

THE COURT: Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MR. EDGAR: I'd rather not answer that one.

THE COURT: So, there is something we've not discussed that you feel like would effect your ability to be impartial?

MR. EDGAR: Well, truth be known, is with my sister being an attorney that screwed me over financially for her own gain, and other lawyers that I knew through her and through my son's problems with the prosecution, I am not real thrilled with that.

THE COURT: So as we sit here today, none of those attorneys were involved with that --

MR. EDGAR: No.

THE COURT: -- but would it be such that you might hold a grudge against one or more of the attorneys because of what has happened to you in your life?

MR. EDGAR: I don't recognize them.

THE COURT: I understand that, but my

question is this. Given what's happened to you in your life, would you hold a grudge against these attorneys?

MR. EDGAR: Probably.

THE COURT: Thank you for honesty, sir.

MR. EDGAR: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Green, what city do you reside in, sir?

MR. GREEN: Freeman Spur.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. GREEN: I'm a bartender.

THE COURT: For who?

MR. GREEN: Paradise Gaming Parlor.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. GREEN: Single.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over the age of 18 living in Williamson County?

MR. GREEN: No, I do not.

THE COURT: Without going into any specific detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?

MR. GREEN: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MR. GREEN: No, I do not.

THE COURT: Again, I have been told this trial is going to last up to two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life within the next two weeks that would take your focus away from this trial?

MR. GREEN: Not that I can think of, no.

THE COURT: Not technically? Is there something that may effect your ability to focus on this trial?

MR. GREEN: Um, maybe my grandfather. He's in a nursing home right now, and he's supposed to be getting out. But I just don't know when, and I have to take care of him.

THE COURT: When you say you take care of him, is that something you do on a daily basis?

MR. GREEN: Yes. He fell and broke his hip so he can't do anything.

THE COURT: Counsel?

(SIDE BAR HELD OUT OF THE HEARING OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.

THE COURT: I mean, based off what you heard, is there any reason for me to go on?

MS. MUDGE: No.

MR. BUTLER: I don't think so.

MS. THIEN: Yeah.

(BACK ON RECORD INSIDE THE HEARING OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, with the agreement of the attorneys and myself, based upon the answers that you have given, I believe it's in the best interest of you and for the defendant that you be excused from service at this time. So, I am going to let you go. I am going to allow my bailiff to help gather any of your personal items, and you'll be free to go. I do need you to call in on Sunday night to check about whether you need to serve next week, okay? I recognize the inconvenience it's been for you and a lot of time that you have put into this, and I thank you for that.

MR. GREEN: Just fulfilling our civic duty.

THE COURT: We appreciate that. Let's go off record.

(OFF THE RECORD.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

The COURT: Good morning. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged

offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you some potential witnesses that may or may not testify in the trial. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldsberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

Mr. Maurizio, what city do you reside?

MR. MAURIZIO: Carterville.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. MAURIZIO: Overnight stocking at Walmart.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. MAURIZIO: Single.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over the age of 18 residing in Williamson County?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Without going into any detail at all, do you know anything about the case other than what I have told you here today?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: This case, I am told, is expected to last about two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life within the next two weeks that would take your focus away from this trial?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you know any of the attorneys involved, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?

MR. MAURIZIO: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your

immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the lawyers?

MR. MAURIZIO: Um, I believe so. Mike Maurizio, but he's recently passed on.

THE COURT: Okay. But as far as these attorneys --

MR. MAURIZIO: -- no.

THE COURT: -- you have not had any dealings with those?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you know the defendant personally, Julia Bevely?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: I read to you some witnesses. Do you know any of them?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family

member ever been a victim of a crime?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes.

THE COURT: Would that be you or a family member?

MR. MAURIZIO: A family member.

THE COURT: Do you know what crime they may have been convicted of?

MR. MAURIZIO: I think it was a domestic.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that process that would effect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried here today?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of

a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: I need to talk to you about some very special principles of law that apply to a defendant who is charged with a criminal offense. The defendant is presumed innocent of each charge against them. A defendant cannot be found guilty as to that charge unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. The defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify, and that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that if a defendant chooses not to testify, that cannot be held against them?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Will you abide to the -- I'm sorry. Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Now, I have told you about the charge in this case, and that it's no evidence against the defendant. That charge is First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. MAURIZIO: I think so, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Without going into specific detail at all, have you been contacted by the media regarding this case?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media contacting any potential juror in this case?

MR. MAURIZIO: Not personally, no.

THE COURT: Do you have some knowledge of that occurring?

MR. MAURIZIO: I heard about it.

THE COURT: So, the things that you may have heard or read about this case, how did you come by that information? Was it social media? The news?

MR. MAURIZIO: The news, sir.

THE COURT: I'm going to assume it hasn't been too long ago since you heard some information about this case; is that accurate?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you earlier?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Based upon what you may have

heard or read, did you form an opinion about this case?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you form an opinion and as you sit there right now have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: As you sit there now, do you have an opinion as to any issue in this case?

MR. MAURIZIO: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes.

THE COURT: So if you were selected as a juror in this case, would you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about this case and instead decide this case only on the evidence and testimony presented here in open Court?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: I beg your pardon?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes. Am I supposed to -- yes. Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So as you sit there now, do you believe you would be able to set aside any opinion you

may have about this case and instead decide this case solely upon the evidence, the law presented here in Court?

MR. MAURIZIO: No. No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.

MR. MAURIZIO: You're very welcome.

THE COURT: At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I have asked this a couple times. I'm going to ask it again. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes.

THE COURT: If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

MR. MAURIZIO: I'm sorry. I didn't quite understand that one.

THE COURT: So if the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the

accused guilty?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MR. MAURIZIO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Voss, what city do you reside in?

MS. VOSS: Marion.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. VOSS: Finance manager.

THE COURT: For whom?

MS. VOSS: Aisin Electric.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. VOSS: Single.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over the age of 18 residing in Williamson County, Illinois?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Without going into any detail whatsoever, do you know anything about the case other

than what I have told you here today?

MS. VOSS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. VOSS: No, sir.

THE COURT: This case I am told is going to last approximately two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life the next two weeks that would focus your attention away from this trial?

MS. VOSS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

MS. VOSS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: I gave you a list of witnesses. Do you know any of them?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the

witness works in law enforcement?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: I want to talk to you about those important rules of law that apply in all cases which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. The defendant is presumed to be innocent of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. That a defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and

will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I told you about the charge, that being, First Degree Murder. Is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. VOSS: No, sir.

THE COURT: And, again, without going into any specific detail whatsoever, have you been contacted by the media regarding this case?

MS. VOSS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media contacting any potential juror about this case?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. VOSS: Just what I have seen on the news, the Channel 3.

THE COURT: How long ago did you see on the news something about this case?

MS. VOSS: It was back when it happened.

THE COURT: Is what you heard more detailed than the statement about the charges that I gave to you earlier?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard, did you form an opinion or do you now have an opinion as to this case?

MS. VOSS: No.

THE COURT: Do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. VOSS: Yes.

THE COURT: And what's that opinion?

MS. VOSS: That I can't form an opinion

because I don't know.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, everybody's on equal playing field. You have not made your mind up one way or the other.

MS. VOSS: Agreed. Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard, have you formed any kind of an opinion as to any issue in the case?

MR. VOSS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you heard about the case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. VOSS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Now, if you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything that you heard about the case, and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in open Court?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of the case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

MS. VOSS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Is there any reason or issue that we've not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MS. VOSS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

Ms. Voss, I am going to start over here. Are you on social media?

MS. VOSS: I am not on social media.

MS. THIEN: Pardon?

MS. VOSS: I am not on social media.

MS. THIEN: No Facebook? Instagram? Tik

Tok? Pinterest?

MS. VOSS: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, is the only contact or information you've had about this case then what you saw in the news back when it was first reported?

MS. VOSS: That's correct.

MS. THIEN: Have you seen or heard anything about it since then?

MS. VOSS: I have not.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Ma'am, do you have any minor children at home?

MS. VOSS: I don't have any children at home. I have children, but they live in Florida with my mother.

MS. THIEN: Okay. May I ask how old they are?

MS. VOSS: Eighteen and 22.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And you stated you don't have any family, friends, close associates that are involved with law enforcement?

MS. VOSS: That's correct.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And, um, it's a criminal case. There is going to be a lot of law enforcement witnesses. There is going to be a lot of technician

evidence. Are you going to give more weight to law enforcement or science than you will to any lay witness or observational witness?

MS. VOSS: I would regard them as the same.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Keep an open mind as to everyone?

MS. VOSS: I agree.

MS. THIEN: Very good. Ma'am, do you belong to any church, social organization, clubs; anything of that nature?

MS. VOSS: I don't go to church, but I go to the Hub. I work out.

MS. THIEN: Okay. What do you do with your free time?

MS. VOSS: I cook and I garden.

MS. THIEN: Thanks. Um, Mr. Maurizio, you work overnights?

MR. MAURIZIO: I do.

MS. THIEN: Did you work last night?

MR. MAURIZIO: I did not work last night.

MS. THIEN: Shew. Okay. Are you going to be able to take time off? We would hate to see one of our jurors be here paying attention for hours on end only to have to go put in an eight to ten hour shift

overnight.

MR. MAURIZIO: I am not sure how the policy works in Walmart, but I think they would have to give it to me off.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, how are your related to Mike?

MR. MAURIZIO: He's my grandpa's brother.

MS. THIEN: Your grandpa's brother?

MR. MAURIZIO: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Okay. We all knew Mike from the day.

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes.

MS. THIEN: He was a character and his loss remains. Are you on social media?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Can I ask what platforms?

MR. MAURIZIO: Facebook. Tik Tok. Snapchat.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. MAURIZIO: That's pretty much it.

MS. THIEN: Have you seen anything about this case running around on social media?

MR. MAURIZIO: Not on social media, no.

MS. THIEN: Okay. But you have seen stuff

about this case?

MR. MAURIZIO: I've heard. I've heard stuff from people.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. MAURIZIO: People who've been watching the news.

MS. THIEN: A topic of conversation?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yeah.

MS. THIEN: All right. Is there anything about that that has influenced you one way or another?

MR. MAURIZIO: Um, I would say it kind of -- I don't know honestly.

MS. THIEN: All right. This is a hard one, okay, but we were getting different responses, you know what I mean? So -- so, I am going to push just a little bit.

MR. MAURIZIO: That's fine.

MS. THIEN: Um, as you sit here right now --

MR. MAURIZIO: -- mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: -- um, do you have an opinion about this case?

MR. MAURIZIO: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Is it such that you believe that opinion can be changed?

MR. MAURIZIO: I would say no.

MS. THIEN: Is it such that you would -- I'm going to leave it at that, okay. Does it put either side at a disadvantage considering we haven't even started the case?

MR. MAURIZIO: I'm not sure.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. Um, Ms. Voss, you say you work for Aisin?

MS. VOSS: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. A lot of people work there it seems like. You said you saw something on Channel 3 when it happened. Haven't seen anything on Channel 3 since?

MS. VOSS: Correct.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. The Judge was asking if you knew any of the people on the list. He has asked you if you are close friends or family with any attorneys or law enforcement. Um, do you have any negative feelings towards law enforcement about anything? I know sometimes people have their own personal opinions towards law enforcement.

MS. VOSS: I don't have any type of negative feelings.

MR. BUTLER: Wonderful. Okay. So, if there's police officers, you're going to judge their testimony the same as everyone else's?

MS. VOSS: Absolutely.

MR. BUTLER: And you had no social media. Um, is that something recent, or have you not had social media for a while?

MS. VOSS: I don't like social media.

MR. BUTLER: I don't blame you.

MS. VOSS: I stay away from that.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Nothing further.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, um, we would make a motion on Mr. Maurizio for cause.

MR. BUTLER: No objection.

THE COURT: Very well. Do you want to refresh now?

MS. THIEN: Um, now might be a time for a break or -- well, we got through the next couple. Well, are we only -- if we refresh, are we only calling one?

THE COURT: Let's talk about that. That was what I said we were going to do initially, and the State was pretty strong on that opinion, too. It's now 12:30. We only have one panel. I am not opposed to doing four at time -- no more than four at time -- questioning them, and then sending them out. Ms. Mudge?

MS. MUDGE: I'll defer.

MR. BUTLER: Judge, I would be fine with doing that either way. One at a -- bringing the next one by itself or doing four at a time, whether they are in the same panel how we are or not.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I say, let's bring in four at a time; question them. Bring in four at time; question them. Um, that will give us room to work the panels.

THE COURT: Would there be any objection that the Court expands the questioning instead of -- some of the questions can be done by group and require them to raise their hand and then addressing them. Would the State be okay with that?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.

THE COURT: The defense?

MS. THIEN: I think so, Judge. Let's give it a shot, um, and the reason I hedge my bets a little

bit is on some of those we are catching when asked individually, you know, that's when their opinion comes out. But I think let's give it a shot. Let's move this along.

THE COURT: Very well. Go ahead and bring Mr. Maurizio back. We'll release him.

BAILIFF O'BRIEN: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: We'll do the next four.

BAILIFF OLIVER: So, that's McCrary, Winters, Oakley and Harrell?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: Are we going to do them right now?

THE COURT: You don't want to do them right now? So, you want to do just one, or do you want to take a break? You said four.

MS. THIEN: I did say four, Judge, and I didn't want to break too early for --

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR.)

THE COURT: Mr. Maurizio, I want to thank you very much for your time here. I know that it's inconvenient, and I know that it can be stressing, too, for you and your work and your family, but you will not

be needed for this particular jury. However, I do need you to contact that number. Call in Sunday to see if you will need to be serving next week.

MR. MAURIZIO: Okay.

THE COURT: I thank you very much for your time. My bailiff will take you to get your personal effects.

MR. MAURIZIO: Thank you very much. Have a good day. Thank you.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Okay. Back to you, Ms. Thien. You want to do one right now, or do you want to break now and do four?

MS. THIEN: I would prefer to take a lunch break, come back, do four and go, but I am open to suggestions.

MR. BUTLER: That's good with us.

THE COURT: Okay. How much time do you guys need?

MS. MUDGE: Twenty minutes.

MS. THIEN: Oh, yeah. Okay. So, I need enough time to get to my house -- only six blocks away -- give a pill to my cat. Luckily I use baby cat food

so it's easy to do. Are we still on the record, Amy?

THE REPORTER: (Nods yes.)

MS. THIEN: Awesome. Grab a sandwich and race back, so I'm going to need about 45 minutes.

THE COURT: An hour?

MS. THIEN: Yes. An hour. No more than that.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we'll start at 1:30 then.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

MS. THIEN: Thanks, Judge.

(A NOON RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: We're back in Court from recess. Let's go ahead and bring McCrary, Winters, Oakley and Harrell.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged

offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offence occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you a list of names. These may be individuals who will testify potentially in this case. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldesberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

THE COURT: Ms. McCrary, what city do you reside in?

MS. MCCRARY: Energy, Illinois.
THE COURT: You're occupation?
MS. MCCRARY: Cashier.
THE COURT: Where at?
MS. MCCRARY: Huck's.
THE COURT: Your marital status?
MS. MCCRARY: Single.
THE COURT: Do you have any children over the age of 18 residing in Williamson County?
MS. MCCRARY: No. Over the age of 18?
THE COURT: Over the age of 18.
MS. MCCRARY: No.
THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
MS. MCCRARY: No.
THE COURT: Mr. Winters, the city that you reside in?
MR. WINTERS: Carterville.
THE COURT: Your occupation?
MR. WINTERS: Self-employed.
THE COURT: Doing what, sir?
MR. WINTERS: Lawn care.
THE COURT: Marital Status?
MR. WINTERS: Single.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over the age of 18 residing in Williamson County?

MR. WINTERS: Yes, a daughter.

THE COURT: Could you state her name and occupation?

MR. WINTERS: Haileona (ph) Winters. Um, she is unemployed.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MR. WINTERS: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Oakley, what city do you reside?

MS. OAKLEY: I live in Herrin.

THE COURT: Your occupation, ma'am?

MS. OAKLEY: I am retired.

THE COURT: From where?

MS. OAKLEY: From GTE Verizon.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. OAKLEY: I'm a widow.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over age 18 residing in Williamson County?

MS. OAKLEY: I have a stepson, Bill Oakley. I have grandchildren. Do you want them, too?

THE COURT: Are they over age 18?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. OAKLEY: I have six grandchildren. Sorry.

THE COURT: No. Congratulations.

MS. OAKLEY: Thank you. Uh, George R. Holton (ph). John Holton. Heather Brown -- oh, she lives in Cape, so mark her off. Kirstan Tolbert. How many is that? Three? Four? I'm sorry. Oh, and -- no. Just -- that's it.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: Ms. McCrary, I don't think I asked you. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. MCCRARY: No, I do not.

THE COURT: Ms. Harrell?

MS. HARRELL: Yes.

THE COURT: What city do you reside in?

MS. HARRELL: Carterville.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. HARRELL: HR Administrator. Marion Toyota.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. HARRELL: Divorced.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over the age of 18 living in Williamson County?

MS. HARRELL: Yes, I do. A daughter, Jessica Pool, also in Carterville. Um, a son, Jared Frye, lives in Marion. And, um, my youngest son Tyler Harrell, he works for the State Police.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. HARRELL: No.

THE COURT: I am going to ask some questions to you all as a group, okay? If it does apply to you, I want you to raise your hand for me so that we can address it. Now, I've been told that this trial is going to last approximately two weeks. Is there anything that may occur in your life within the next two weeks that would cause your focus to be away from this trial? If so, raise your hand. Ms. Harrell?

MS. HARRELL: Um, I'm HR Administrator at work. I do payroll every two weeks. I'm the only person that does payroll. Um, that would be tomorrow, the first day, and then two weeks from that. That is weighing heavy on my mind today for tomorrow.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Winters?

MR. WINTERS: Just work.

THE COURT: Just work?

MR. WINTERS: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: Do any of you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealing with any of the attorneys?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand.

Now, I read to you a list of witnesses. Do any of you know any of those witnesses? If so, raise your hand?

MS. HARRELL: I have a question about Aaron Newlin. It could have been an employee at Toyota, if it

is the same person.

THE COURT: Okay. Any others?

MS. HARRELL: No.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Harrell. Have any of you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service? Ms. Oakley, about how long ago was that?

MS. OAKLEY: About 10, 11 years ago. Then about 20 years ago.

THE COURT: All right. Do you recall whether they were a civil or criminal case?

MS. OAKLEY: They were civil.

THE COURT: Do you recall as to whether each of them went to a verdict?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes. Both of them.

THE COURT: Anything about either one of those trials that might effect your ability to act as a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. OAKLEY: Not that I can think of.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime? Ms. Oakley?

MS. OAKLEY: I worked in a grocery store that was robbed. Two guys walked in and stuck a gun in my belly, and I give them all the money in the cash

register.

THE COURT: I think I would, too.

MS. OAKLEY: Yeah.

THE COURT: Anything about that that might effect your ability to act as a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: Ms. McCrary?

MS. MCCRARY: And, um, my mother was raped by her father, and I was a victim of a sexual assault.

THE COURT: Anything about any of that that might effect your ability to act as a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. MCCRARY: I guess not, no.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Do any of you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency? Mr.

Winters?

MR. WINTERS: Well, my girlfriend, she works at dispatch in West City.

THE COURT: Ms. Harrell?

MS. HARRELL: My son Tyler works for -- he's a trooper.

THE COURT: Would any of you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand.

MS. HARRELL: Can I say that if it were my son, it's, like, yes, absolutely.

THE COURT: You would believe your son more than anybody else?

MS. HARRELL: I would believe him because I know him.

THE COURT: Well, I don't think your son is going to be testifying. What about other law enforcement personnel? Would you treat their testimony the same as any other individual?

MS. HARRELL: Yes.

THE COURT: I want to talk to you about some

very important legal principles that apply in every case in which a defendant is charged with a criminal offense. The defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them. A defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges against them unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that or each charge. The defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Ms. McCrary? Is that right, Mc Crary?

MS. MCCRARY: Close.

THE COURT: Well, tell me right. I would like to try to get it right.

MS. MCCRARY: You got it. McCrary.

THE COURT: McCrary, okay. Ma'am, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against him, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. MCCRARY: I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant guilty

beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. MCCRARY: I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. MCCRARY: I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or not to testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. MCCRARY: I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Winters, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. WINTERS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. WINTERS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. WINTERS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. WINTERS: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Oakley, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against him and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on his own behalf?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the

defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against him?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Harrell, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. HARRELL: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. HARRELL: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. HARRELL: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. HARRELL: Yes.

THE COURT: Will each of you agree -- now if you cannot do this, I want you to raise your hand again for me. Will you each agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be? Can each one of you do that?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: Will each of you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, I have told you that this case involves the charge of First Degree Murder, and having a charge is not any evidence of guilt at all. But I need to know is there anything about the nature of the charge, First Degree Murder, that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. WINTERS: Not knowing all the facts or the evidence.

THE COURT: Well, the facts and the evidence will be presented in open Court. What I am questioning is the mere fact that there is a charge that deals with First Degree Murder, does that fact affect your ability to be fair and impartial?

MR. WINTERS: No.

THE COURT: Now, I am going to ask questions of you each individually again. First, I do not want you to go into any detail at all. I just want you to answer the question. Ms. McCrary?

MS. MCCRARY: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: Has the media contacted you about this trial?

MS. MCCRARY: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to any potential juror about this trial?

MS. MCCRARY: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Winters, has the media contacted you, sir?

MR. WINTERS: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed anybody being questioned by the media that is a potential juror?

MR. WINTERS: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Oakley, has anybody at all contacted you at all about this trial?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media or anybody talking to any potential jurors?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Harrell, has the media or anybody contacted you about this trial?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed anybody from the media or otherwise talking to any potential juror about this case?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: Ms. McCrary?

MS. MCCRARY: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you know anything about this case other than what I told you earlier?

MS. MCCRARY: Um, just that it's on Facebook.

THE COURT: So you've heard some information?

MS. MCCRARY: I don't have Facebook. I have heard hearsay that it's on Facebook.

THE COURT: All right. So, there's been conversation that you overheard or taken part of; is that correct?

MS. MCCRARY: Overheard.

THE COURT: As you sit there today -- well, first, how long ago was that conversation?

MS. MCCRARY: It was yesterday.

THE COURT: Is what you heard any more detailed than what I told you here today?

MS. MCCRARY: No.

THE COURT: Based on that conversation, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. MCCRARY: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. MCCRARY: I understand what a fair and proper verdict should be, yes.

THE COURT: So, are you saying that the verdict should be based upon the evidence presented in Court?

MS. MCCRARY: Correct.

THE COURT: Have you formulated an opinion about any issue in this case?

MS. MCCRARY: Just that it's very serious. That's it.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you have heard that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. MCCRARY: No, I don't think so.

THE COURT: If you're selected as a juror in

this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have heard about this case, and instead decide this case only on the evidence and testimony which would be presented here in open Court?

MS. MCCRARY: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Winters, without going into any detail, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MR. WINTERS: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you hear or read about it on TV? Radio? Newspaper?

MR. WINTERS: TV.

THE COURT: How long ago was that, sir?

MR. WINTERS: Yesterday.

THE COURT: Is what you saw on the television more detailed than the statement I read to you about the charge?

MR. WINTERS: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MR. WINTERS: The only thing that I questioned was whenever the media said something about the DNA, and that's where my mind's been.

THE COURT: Based upon the information that

you have heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MR. WINTERS: No.

THE COURT: Do you, as you sit there now, have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MR. WINTERS: Yes.

THE COURT: What is that opinion?

MR. WINTERS: Um, the facts won't lie. The facts will tell the truth.

THE COURT: Are you telling me that you will listen to the facts of the evidence that would be presented in open Court to reach a decision?

MR. WINTERS: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you made any opinion about any issue in this case based upon what you heard?

MR. WINTERS: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in the case?

MR. WINTERS: No.

THE COURT: If you are selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have heard or read about the case and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which would

be presented here in open Court?

MR. WINTERS: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Harrell?

MS. HARRELL: Yes.

THE COURT: Without going into any specific detail at all, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. HARRELL: I have.

THE COURT: Did you hear about it or read about it on television? Internet? Conversation with people? In what form did you have information?

MS. HARRELL: Originally when it happened, I read what was put out in the media about it. Um, and I haven't looked at it since then, but there's, like she said, lots of Facebook talk. Lots of, you know, people's -- people's stories about it.

THE COURT: How long ago do you think it has been since you might have read or heard something about the case?

MS. HARRELL: A couple of years.

THE COURT: Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you earlier?

MS. HARRELL: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you might have read or heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. HARRELL: I didn't, no. I mean, I didn't form an opinion about guilt or not. It's just a personal emotional.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. HARRELL: Repeat that. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Sure. As you sit there right now with the information you may have read or heard, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. HARRELL: Okay. I do know what a fair and proper verdict should be. It should be based on the facts presented in Court.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, have you formed any opinion about any issue in the case?

MS. HARRELL: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in the case?

MS. HARRELL: Um, I know the Mandrell family, the grandfather. His family grew up with them.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that relationship that would effect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. HARRELL: I have to say no based on my faith that it would not, but I want that to be known.

THE COURT: If you are selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about the case and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in open Court?

MS. HARRELL: Yes.

THE COURT: Again, these are questions to each of you as a group. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of the case. Will you each follow the law as given in the instructions.

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you each decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Oakley?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror? If so, raise your hand so we can talk about it.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Judge, it was inadvertent. I don't think you asked Ms. Oakley about her media exposure.

THE COURT: I didn't.

MR. BUTLER: I don't think you did either, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's not good. Well, Ms. Oakley, without going into any specific detail at all, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you hear or read about it?

MS. OAKLEY: WSIL news last night.

THE COURT: Is what you heard on the news any more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you earlier?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard, did you form an opinion as to this case?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: Do you now have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: Have you formed an opinion about any issue in the case?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you heard that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

THE COURT: If you are selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have heard, and instead decide this case only on the evidence and testimony which would be presented here in

open Court?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Good afternoon. Bare with me. You're the first group after lunch. Um, Ms. McCrary, you are not on Facebook?

MS. MCCRARY: I have Facebook, but I normally don't get on it, so I misspoke earlier.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Are you -- are you on any other social media?

MS. MCCRARY: No.

MS. THIEN: Have you seen anything about this case on social media?

MS. MCCRARY: Not personally, no.

MS. THIEN: But you said there had been some talk amongst --

MS. MCCRARY: -- neighbors.

MS. THIEN: -- neighbors and friends.

MS. MCCRARY: Yeah. My neighbors last night were talking about how Facebook's been talking negatively. That's all I really heard.

MS. THIEN: Did, um, that impact you in any way?

MS. MCCRARY: Um, I guess no. I don't

believe so. I don't think that in any way impacted me. It's just hearing about. It's a very serious case, and I have a nine-year-old daughter myself, so it's very emotional.

MS. THIEN: This is going to be a very emotional case, and the facts are going to be very difficult. Do you think that you will be able to, um, separate that?

MS. MCCRARY: I think, yeah, I could. Do I want to be able to -- I don't know if I would be able to -- I could definitely handle it and separate the two, but I don't know I personally could handle the case, if that makes sense, for two weeks for hearing about it. Just seems kind of stressful.

MS. THIEN: Okay. If, um -- do you think that could impact your view?

MS. MCCRARY: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And how about your ability to stay focused on exactly what's happening here in the courtroom?

MS. MCCRARY: Um, I don't think it would effect anything, but there is always a possibility.

MS. THIEN: Do you think hearing about this case will place either the State or the defense at a

disadvantage in any way?

MS. MCCRARY: No.

MS. THIEN: Mr. Winters, you're self-employed?

MR. WINTERS: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Is there anyone that's going to be able to take care of your business if you are called out for two weeks?

MR. WINTERS: No.

MS. THIEN: Is that going to impact you economically, financially?

MR. WINTERS: Yes, it could.

MS. THIEN: Um, I mean, we are in the season where either it's all in or all out right now. Do you have work lined up for the next couple of weeks?

MR. WINTERS: Oh, yeah.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, you said your girlfriend works with the West City Police?

MR. WINTERS: Mm-hmm. She is a dispatcher there.

MS. THIEN: How long has she done that?

MR. WINTERS: I think around eight or ten years now.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, do you have any

friends or family that are in law enforcement?

MR. WINTERS: My grandfather and my mom both retired from the Department of Corrections.

MS. THIEN: How long ago?

MR. WINTERS: My mom, let's see here, just a few years ago. I think she was 58, so it's probably been about five years now. My grandfather's been retired for probably since the 90's or early 2000's.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Did they both work at the same place?

MR. WINTERS: My grandpa worked at Vienna, and then my mother, she retired from Shawnee which is right there.

MS. THIEN: Next door but different.

MR. WINTERS: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Okay. With that background in law enforcement, do you believe that you would be more likely to believe or credit testimony from law enforcement than you would from any other party?

MR. WINTERS: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Do you think that would impact you?

MR. WINTERS: I don't know.

MS. THIEN: Don't know. Okay. Um, there is

a possibility that this or other cases, right, do involve DNA. You expressed an opinion about that.

MR. WINTERS: Well, just what I've read in the news where they were talking about the DNA.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. WINTERS: So, it's been on my mind since I read that.

MS. THIEN: And has that question or topic -- I am trying to figure out a way to phrase the question, so bare with me for just a minute, okay? Um, has that influenced you in an opinion or what you expect to hear in this case?

MR. WINTERS: If it was true, it might.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. WINTERS: So, I mean -- I mean, why was it said that there was DNA?

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. WINTERS: I mean, how can they put that on there?

MS. THIEN: Do you by any chance remember the source of that?

MR. WINTERS: I think it was on WSIL.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And, of course, you mentioned there was something on TV last night.

MR. WINTERS: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Did that influence you in any way?

MR. WINTERS: No, not really.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thank you, sir.

MR. WINTERS: You're welcome.

MS. THIEN: Ms. Oakley, that must have been a traumatic experience when you were working at the grocery store. How long ago was that?

MS. OAKLEY: Fifty years.

MS. THIEN: Fifty years.

MS. OAKLEY: But I still remember.

MS. THIEN: Oh, yeah. Was it investigated by the police?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Was anyone ever prosecuted?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Did that leave you with a more favorable, less favorable or neutral opinion of the police?

MS. OAKLEY: Probably neutral. I felt they did their job.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Ma'am, are you on any form of social media? Facebook --

MS. OAKLEY: -- Facebook, but I never seen the stuff that she is talking about. I must run in a different circle of people.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MS. MCCRARY: I haven't seen online yet. I just heard it from a neighbor.

MS. THIEN: Have you participated in any conversation about this case --

MS. OAKLEY: -- no.

MS. THIEN: -- in the past?

MS. OAKLEY: Huh-uh.

MS. THIEN: Ma'am, are you a member of any church, social organization?

MS. OAKLEY: No.

MS. THIEN: What do you do with your free time?

MS. OAKLEY: Grand-kids.

MS. THIEN: Fair enough. And there is a number of them here locally, right?

MS. OAKLEY: Yes. Yes. Quite a few.

MS. THIEN: Ms. McCrary, I didn't ask you that either. Do you belong to a church or any social organizations or clubs?

MS. MCCRARY: Not at the time, no.

MS. THIEN: How about you, Mr. Winters?
MR. WINTERS: No.
MS. THIEN: Ms. Harrell?
MS. HARRELL: Yes.
MS. THIEN: I understand your son works for the Illinois State Police?
MS. HARRELL: That's right.
MS. THIEN: Is he a trooper?
MS. HARRELL: Yes.
MS. THIEN: And where -- which district does he work out of?
MS. HARRELL: Well, now he's in the super district, but he originally started in 22 down in Ullin.
MS. THIEN: Okay. How long has he been with the State Police?
MS. HARRELL: I believe this is his third year.
MS. THIEN: Do you know if he's ever had any contact with this case even remotely?
MS. HARRELL: I don't know, but I highly doubt it.
MS. THIEN: Okay. At least it hasn't come up in conversation.
MS. HARRELL: No, it has not.

MS. THIEN: Ma'am, you said that you are the person in charge of everyone getting their paychecks this week; is that right?

MS. HARRELL: We have two different payrolls. I work biweekly payroll, and somebody else who does the monthly payroll. So, I'm the solo on the biweekly.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, is there anyone else who could cover that for you?

MS. HARRELL: That would depend on the monthly -- the comptroller having the availability to do that.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MS. HARRELL: I mean, yeah.

MS. THIEN: Do you think that will interfere or could potentially interfere if you were chosen to serve on this jury?

MS. HARRELL: Well, it would definitely be a major inconvenience, but I can't say that, you know -- a lot of people want their paychecks.

MS. THIEN: Exactly. Okay. Ma'am, are you on any form of social media? Facebook? Instagram? Anything like that?

MS. HARRELL: I have Facebook, and I have

Instagram that I rarely get on. My daughter's on it so --

MS. THIEN: I, too, am of the Facebook demographic. Um, have you seen anything about this case?

MS. HARRELL: I have not; not on Facebook. I am what I call a Facebook snob. Friends have to request it. Pretty tight. I don't like anybody on my feed.

MS. THIEN: Fair enough, but you have been made aware of this case in the media; is that correct? You have read about it or seen it on TV?

MS. HARRELL: Just originally a couple years ago.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MS. HARRELL: That was just -- yeah. I am trying to think if that was TV.

MS. THIEN: You're also friends with the family in this case; is that correct?

MS. HARRELL: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MS. HARRELL: It's like -- I'll clarify that the -- we lived next door to each other growing up. And once they moved to Crab Orchard, we stayed in Marion.

So our parents still stayed in touch, and then over the years though, like, junior high and high school, you know, lives get busy and you don't see people as much. Um, so I am not going to say, like, we're weekly, you know. Like, it's been a while since I have even seen them.

MS. THIEN: Are you friends on Facebook?

MS. HARRELL: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Knowing that the subject matter of this case does involve the immediate family of good friends from your childhood --

MS. HARRELL: -- yeah.

MS. THIEN: -- um, do you believe that would make making a decision in this case or listening to this evidence difficult?

MS. HARRELL: In all honesty, I think it -- I think it would. I mean, I want to be a fair and honest person regardless of what's going on, but I cannot answer that and say that it wouldn't have some impact on me.

MS. THIEN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. Um, Ms. Harrell, I will go ahead and start with you since we ended with

you. Um, the family that you're friends with, who's family is that?

MS. HARRELL: Um, the Mandrell family consisted of Hubert and Dorris, the parents. Steve and Bruce and Treva (ph).

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MS. HARRELL: And, um, so Steve is the grandfather.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Um, and you also said your son works for the State Police. If there are State Police troopers and investigators that testify during the course of this trial, are you going to view their testimony any differently because they may work with your son?

MS. HARRELL: I would have to say no.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Um, the payroll issue, you have described it bimonthly is your --

MS. HARRELL: -- it's every two weeks; biweekly.

MR. BUTLER: Biweekly.

MS. HARRELL: Yeah.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. And that is due tomorrow?

MS. HARRELL: I work -- it usually takes me

a full day on Wednesday to prepare it, and then Thursday morning it gets the recheck and gets sent off for payroll so it will hit the bank accounts Friday morning.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Uh, if you were selected to be on this jury, you think your company still would get the paychecks out somehow?

MS. HARRELL: They're going to have to. They're going to have to.

MR. BUTLER: Would you be sitting there thinking about that, or would you be thinking about the evidence and facts of the testimony?

MS. HARRELL: I would have to say, of course, I would think about it, but if I am here, I am here. And that would have to -- you know, I would try to keep my mind focused on what's at hand.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HARRELL: You're welcome.

MR. BUTLER: Um, Ms. Oakley, you said you were retired from Verizon?

MS. OAKLEY: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: What did you do for them?

MS. OAKLEY: Um, I was a service rep. I talked to people about moving their phones or even with them about their bill.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MS. OAKLEY: I also worked as a secretary. I worked in the sales office.

MR. BUTLER: If there is evidence that gets presented during the trial that involves Verizon, is that going to skew your judgment one way or the other?

MS. OAKLEY: Not that I can think of. Now, I am talking about the land line.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MS. OAKLEY: Not the cell phone Verizon.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MS. OAKLEY: Yeah. I worked for the land line side of it.

MR. BUTLER: And when you talked about being robbed, you said the person that did that was arrested?

MS. OAKLEY: Uh-huh.

MR. BUTLER: Do you know were they prosecuted?

MS. OAKLEY: Um, it was too young men from Canada.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MS. OAKLEY: And I -- they arrested them, and they went -- their dad got them out of jail, and they went back to Canada. So, I appeared before the

grand jury to testify because they evidently couldn't get them back.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MS. OAKLEY: Yeah. He paid their bail and got them out on bail, and -- yep.

MR. BUTLER: Anything about that -- I know you were asked about if that would change your view towards law enforcement. What about towards attorneys because there was probably a prosecutor and a defense attorney.

MS. OAKLEY: They were both agreeable. I didn't have any problems with him.

MR. BUTLER: So, you had no ill --

MS. OAKLEY: -- no, ill effects, no. I was younger then.

MR. BUTLER: Sure. Thank you.

MS. OAKLEY: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: Um, Mr. Winters, you said you do have work scheduled for these next two weeks?

MR. WINTERS: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: And you're self-employed. Do you have employees?

MR. WINTERS: No.

MR. BUTLER: So, if you don't do this work,

it don't get done?

MR. WINTERS: It don't get done.

MR. BUTLER: Will they hire someone else to do it?

MR. WINTERS: I could lose the job.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. And would you be thinking of that if you're sitting there for two weeks as opposed to thinking about the facts?

MR. WINTERS: I'll be thinking about whether my bills are going to get paid or not.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Would that have an impact upon you listening?

MR. WINTERS: It might not.

MR. BUTLER: It might not?

MR. WINTERS: It might not.

MR. BUTLER: Ms. McCrary, you said you've got a nine-year-old daughter?

MS. MCCRARY: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: And this case may be stressful to hear for two weeks?

MS. MCCRARY: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. BUTLER: Sure. I understand that. Do you think you can do that if you are selected?

MS. MCCRARY: Yeah. I can handle anything

but --

MR. BUTLER: -- okay.

MS. MCCRARY: -- I just wanted it to be clear.

MR. BUTLER: Sure. Um, you also mentioned you were a victim a crime?

MS. MCCRARY: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Um, I am not going to ask any details of that other than was someone arrested?

MR. MCCRARY: No.

MR. BUTLER: No. Okay. Anything about that make you have ill feelings towards law enforcement?

MS. MCCRARY: No.

MR. BUTLER: All right. I have no further questions.

BAILIFF O'BRIEN: You guys can follow me.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ms. Thien, I think the panel is yours. I believe it's Noaks, Hittmeier, Voss, McCrary.

MS. THIEN: Judge, the defense will use its fourth peremptory on McCrary.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. THIEN: Noakes, Hittmeier, Voss and

Winters. Judge, we would like to challenge Mr. Winters for cause.

MR. BUTLER: No objection.

THE COURT: Okay. Be granted. That gets you down to Oakley.

MS. THIEN: Judge, we will tender.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: We would accept those four, your Honor.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon. I want to address the three of you first. I want to thank you very much for your time --

MR. BUTLER: -- Judge, before we do anything, can we have a side bar?

THE COURT: Yes.

(SIDE BAR HELD OUTSIDE THE HEARING OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

MR. BUTLER: Judge, I don't believe Ms. Harrell has been excused yet. I think she is still a potential for the next panel.

MS. THIEN: Yeah. She's still on the bubble.

THE COURT: Ms. Harrell needs to go back.

(END OF SIDE BAR.)

THE COURT: Take Ms. Harrell back. As I was saying, I want to thank you for your time here. I want to thank you very much. I know it's very inconvenient in your life, and I know that it can be very stressing as well. You will not be needed for jury service this week. However, it is my understanding that jury service may be needed next week, so I will need you to contact that telephone number Sunday to check to see if you will have a jury trial at that time. You can follow my bailiff. He will take you to get your personal effects. Thank you. You're free to go.

The rest of you have been selected to serve as jurors in this case. At this time, my Clerk is going to swear you in. I need you to stand and raise your right hand, please.

(JURORS SWORN.)

THE COURT: You can have a seat for just a moment. What I am about to say is very, very important. Until this case is submitted to you for you to deliberate together, you must not discuss the case with anyone. That means family. That means friends. Employer. Nobody. You cannot remain in hearing of

anyone discussing that. If you hear anybody discussing the case, you need to move away immediately. And if that happens, you're to notify the bailiffs. I am specifically instructing you not to read the newspaper articles regarding this case. I am specifically telling you not to watch TV about any newspaper or TV article that may be about this case at all. You are not to listen to any radio broadcast concerning this case at all.

After this case has been submitted to you, you must discuss this case only in the jury room when all the members of the jury are present. You are to keep an open mind, and you must not decide any issue in the case until it is submitted to you for deliberation under the instructions of the Court. If anybody approaches you and wishes to discuss with you any aspect of the case, you are to notify my bailiffs immediately and move away from that person. I am going to excuse you now allowing you to go home for the evening. I would expect you guys to be back here at nine o'clock in the morning sharp. You can follow my bailiff. She will take you to get your personal effects, and I will see you tomorrow.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE

THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURY.)

MS. MUDGE: Judge, may we take five?

THE COURT: Sure.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act

created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you a list of potential witnesses in this case. Please listen to them. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldesberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. Dave Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy

Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

THE COURT: Ms. Dillon, what city do you reside in?

MS. DILLON: Johnston City.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. DILLON: I'm a hair stylist.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. DILLON: Single.

THE COURT: Do you have any children above age 18 residing in Williamson County?

MS. DILLON: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. DILLON: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Anderson, what city do you reside in?

MS. ANDERSON: Johnston City.

THE COURT: Your occupation?
MS. ANDERSON: I'm a -- we farm.
THE COURT: Your marital status?
MS. ANDERSON: Married.
THE COURT: Your husband's name and occupation?
MS. ANDERSON: Bill Anderson. Farmer, and we also own Anderson Crop Insurance.
THE COURT: Do you have any children above age 18 residing in Williamson County?
MS. ANDERSON: Yes.
THE COURT: Can you give me their names and occupation?
MS. ANDERSON: Brent Anderson, farmer. Grant (ph) Anderson, self-employed.
THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
MS. ANDERSON: No.
THE COURT: Ms. Jackson, what city do you reside in?
MS. JACKSON: Carterville.
THE COURT: Your occupation?
MS. JACKSON: Student.
THE COURT: Marital status?

MS. ANDERSON: Single.
THE COURT: Do you have any children above age 18 residing in Williamson County?
MS. ANDERSON: No.
THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
MS. ANDERSON: No.
THE COURT: Ms. Parker, what city do you reside?
MS. PARKER: Cambria.
THE COURT: Your occupation?
MS. PARKER: Overnight stocker at Walmart.
THE COURT: Marital status?
MS. PARKER: Single.
THE COURT: Do you have any children above the age --
MS. PARKER: -- no.
THE COURT: -- 18 residing -- okay. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
MS. PARKER: Huh-uh.
THE COURT: This is to each and every one of you. This case is expected to last something like two weeks. I need to know if there is going to be anything in your life that may occur in the next two weeks that

would take your focus away from this trial. If so, raise your hand. Ms. Jackson?

MS. JACKSON: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: What would that be?

MS. JACKSON: Um, my adoptive mother is having surgery. She has Cancer so she has to get surgery, and I am taking care of her.

THE COURT: Do you know when that is expected to occur?

MS. JACKSON: The 20th, I believe.

THE COURT: Ms. Parker?

MS. PARKER: Physical therapy.

THE COURT: When does that take place?

MS. PARKER: Monday, Tuesday, every two weeks.

THE COURT: Is that physical therapy for you?

MS. PARKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Again, this is to each one of you. Do any one of you know the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?

GROUP ANSWER: No.

THE COURT: Have any of you or your

immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys? If so, raise your hand. Ms. Jackson?

MS. JACKSON: Um, I believe my biological father, his attorney is Terry? Is that your name?

MS. THIEN: I go by Terry.

MS. JACKSON: Terry, okay. I believe that she is his attorney.

THE COURT: Okay. Do any of you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Do any of you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Now, I read to you a list of witnesses. Do any of you know any of those witnesses? If so, raise your hand. Ms. Anderson?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes. I know Cindy McGee and possibly Deputy Anderson. I don't know which -- what's his first name.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Dillon?

MS. DILLON: Um, I mean, I don't personally know JD Barter, but I do know JD Barter.

THE COURT: You know him as the Chief of Police for Johnston City?

MS. DILLON: Yes.

MS. PARKER: I also know him.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MS. PARKER: He went -- like, he went to my church to, like, make sure it was secure in Johnston City. I haven't been there in a while.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Parker.

MS. PARKER: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: Have any of you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Have any of you or your immediate family members ever been convicted -- been a victim of crime? Ms. Jackson?

MS. JACKSON: Um, I think my biological mother has a case going on currently, and my father, and me myself. I have a few cases with -- not with them currently, but I have a few cases open with Williamson County -- or in Williamson County.

THE COURT: Thank you. Have you or any of your immediate family members ever been convicted of a crime? Ms. Dillon?

MS. DILLON: Um, both of my parents are felons.

THE COURT: Anything about that --

MS. DILLON: -- no.

THE COURT: -- just a minute. Anything about that, ma'am, that may effect your ability to act as an impartial juror in this case?

MS. DILLON: No. They were all drug charges.

THE COURT: Ms. Jackson?

MS. JACKSON: Um, my biological father, he's a felon. I think he has one felony.

THE COURT: Anything about that that may effect your ability to act as an impartial juror in this case?

MS. JACKSON: Possibly.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works for law enforcement? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Now, I want to discuss with each one of you individually some very important legal principles that apply in all cases in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense.

The defendant is to be presumed innocent of the charges against them. A defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge or charges.

The defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify, and that if the defendant elects not to

testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Ms. Dillon, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. DILLON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. DILLON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. DILLON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that if the defendant's choice not to testify is used, that cannot be held against them.

MS. DILLON: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Anderson, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against

them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Jackson, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be

convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Parker, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. PARKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. PARKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and

will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. PARKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. PARKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Will each of you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: Everybody announces yes. Will each of you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate yes.

Now, I have told you about the charge, that being, First Degree Murder. I have also told you that charge is not any evidence of guilt at all, but I need to know is there anything about that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that that would be so. I'm going to question each of you individually now, and I want you to listen to me. Only answer my question, okay? I do not want you to go into any specific detail at all.

Ms. Dillon, has the media contacted you at all about this case?

MS. DILLON: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media discussing this case with any potential jurors?

MS. DILLON: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Anderson, have you been contacted by the media regarding this case?

MS. ANDERSON: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media contacting any potential jurors in this case?

MS. ANDERSON: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Jackson, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. JACKSON: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media talking to anybody that is a potential juror about this case?

MS. JACKSON: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Parker, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. PARKER: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media discussing this case with any potential jurors?

MS. PARKER: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Dillon, again without going into any specific detail, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. DILLON: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you hear or read about it? Where was the source?

MS. DILLON: Um, Facebook.

THE COURT: How long ago has it been since you read about it on Facebook?

MS. DILLON: Um, for the first couple of months after it happened.

THE COURT: Is what you read more detailed than the statement about the charges that I read to you today?

MS. DILLON: Slightly.

THE COURT: Based upon what you read, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. DILLON: No.

THE COURT: As you sit here now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. DILLON: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there now, have you formulated any issue -- opinion about this case?

MS. DILLON: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. DILLON: No.

THE COURT: If you are selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have heard or read about the case, and instead decide this case only on the evidence and testimony which is presented here in open Court?

MS. DILLON: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Anderson, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you acquire that information?

MS. ANDERSON: The news and also her

grandfather goes to our church; the victim's grandfather.

THE COURT: How long ago has it been since you heard or read about this case?

MS. ANDERSON: Um, at the time of the incident.

THE COURT: Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Based upon what you read or heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. ANDERSON: At that time, yes.

THE COURT: As you sit there now, ma'am, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. ANDERSON: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there now, do you have an opinion as to any issue in the case?

MS. ANDERSON: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. ANDERSON: No.

THE COURT: If selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about this case and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in open Court?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Jackson, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you acquire that information?

MS. JACKSON: The news.

THE COURT: How long ago has it been since you heard or read anything about the case?

MS. JACKSON: Um, two weeks or so; recently.

THE COURT: Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you earlier?

MS. JACKSON: Somewhat.

THE COURT: Based upon what you might have read or heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. JACKSON: On first knowledge of the case, yes.

THE COURT: As you sit there now, do you

have an opinion about this case?

MS. JACKSON: No.

THE COURT: Do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. JACKSON: No.

THE COURT: Have you formed an opinion about any issue in the case as you sit there now?

MS. JACKSON: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in the case?

MS. JACKSON: No.

THE COURT: If you're selected as a juror in the case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have heard or read about the case, and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in open Court?

MS. JACKSON: No?

THE COURT: I want to make sure because you look like you're hesitating. I want to make sure I have your answer. I am going to restate it, okay? If you're selected to act as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard whatever it was you might have heard, whatever you might have read about the case, and instead

make decisions and decide the case only upon the evidence and testimony presented here in open Court?

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Parker, have you heard or read anything about the case?

MS. PARKER: No.

THE COURT: To each one of you, I need you to verbalize out loud, please. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate yes.

Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate positively.

If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate yes.

And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the

accused not guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would.

If this applies to you, I want you to raise your hand for me. Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. Ms. Dillon, you said you're a hair dresser?

MS. DILLON: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Is that something that you have appointments set up for the next two weeks?

MS. DILLON: Um, I work at a walk-in based salon. We only do walk-ins. We don't take appointments.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. So nothing work schedule wise would interfere?

MS. DILLON: No.

MR. BUTLER: All right. Um, you also mentioned you had heard about this and knew slightly more details than what the Judge read, but you will be

able to set that aside and -- if you are selected -- and judge the case based off of what you hear here in Court only?

MS. DILLON: Um, yeah. I have seen both sides' arguments on Facebook, like, when it all was starting and whatnot and so there was --

MR. BUTLER: And by that, you mean people talking on both sides?

MS. DILLON: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. BUTLER: And you understand that it may just be hearsay?

MS. DILLON: Right. It may be hearsay, but I know there's -- there is always more to the story than what the news puts out there.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. You said your parents have had some legal problems in the past?

MS. DILLON: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: Anything about that, that would cause you to be more fair to one side or the other?

MS. DILLON: No.

MR. BUTLER: Nothing about those experiences that you would hold against the attorneys, either prosecutor or defense attorney?

MS. DILLON: I was very young --

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MS. DILLON: -- so I was not around for any of that stuff.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Um, Ms. Anderson?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: You said you heard about the case because -- one reason is you go to church with the victim's grandfather.

MS. ANDERSON: I think it's great-grandfather, yes.

MR. BUTLER: Great-grandfather. Would you be able to set that aside, and -- if you are selected in this case, and just go off what you hear here in Court?

MS. ANDERSON: I believe in the legal system, so I will do it.

MR. BUTLER: Do you feel like because you have that relationship with the grandfather that you would have to justify anything you did here in Court later on to him?

MS. ANDERSON: No.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Ms. Jackson?

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: You said you're a student?

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Where are you going to school?

MS. JACKSON: John A.

MR. BUTLER: John A. Do you have classes scheduled for the next couple of weeks?

MS. JACKSON: Uh, yeah. I have my full month.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. So, any worries about missing class if you're selected for this?

MS. JACKSON: Um, no. I'm online, so I have my own time to do it. So, I have a test and everything on certain days --

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MS. JACKSON: -- but other than that.

MR. BUTLER: Wonderful. You said your mother also has surgery scheduled for the 20th?

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: If this case is resolved before that, do you have any issues, um, that would cause you to think about those issues as opposed to what's being said or shown here in Court?

MS. JACKSON: Um, as it gets scheduled closer, I am not sure that -- they're kind of a mess right now. So, if it finishes before then, that would be fine, but I am not sure if that will move forward,

move back. Whatever it will do. She doesn't really have a schedule, but that's when they expect to do it.

MR. BUTLER: So, it's not really scheduled then for the 20th?

MS. JACKSON: It's scheduled for the 20th, but if they are able to move it to an earlier date, then they would. Right now they are just waiting, I think, for a urologist. They're waiting for a urologist to get there, and they might get there earlier, later. I'm not exactly sure when.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. So, there is a chance that they could call and say they have an opening?

MS. JACKSON: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: All right. Um, you said Ms. Thien currently represents your father?

MS. JACKSON: Yes. I am not sure if his case is closed. I don't really communicate with him. Um, I don't know if it's still ongoing or not, but from what I believe, she was on his case or is on the case.

MR. BUTLER: Is there anything about that relationship that would cause you to give a preference to one side or the other?

MS. JACKSON: Possibly. It's violent. He has prior convictions for beating women and drugs and

all types of stuff. And I'm pretty sure the case that he is on is the exact same thing of that in the past. So, possibly.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Um, and I think you said at one point that his history may effect your ability to be fair?

MS. JACKSON: Yeah. Um, as I said I don't like -- I don't communicate with him much because I have a negative relationship with him, so from his convictions is kind of what made me have that relationship with him.

MR. BUTLER: Well, okay. And you have had some legal trouble you said, right?

MS. JACKSON: It's -- basically it's with -- kind of the same thing with my father. It's custody stuff; being in a courtroom. I was a foster child for a little bit. Um, I was an abused child when I was little, so it's kind of like a mix of that.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Is there anything about that that would make you be less fair to one side or the other here?

MS. JACKSON: A little. I'm tearing up now.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Well, I'm done asking you questions. I'll go on. Thank you. Ms. Parker, you

didn't know anything about the case, right?

MS. PARKER: No.

MR. BUTLER: Are you on Facebook or any kind of social media?

MS. PARKER: I have Facebook, but I'm not connected to most social media, like, news and stuff like that.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Um, and then you said you have physical therapy on Mondays and Tuesdays?

MS. PARKER: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: Is that something that is going to set you back if you miss?

MR. PARKER: No. I can reschedule if I have to.

MR. BUTLER: You could reschedule those if you have to. All right. Thank you. Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Thanks, Judge. Um, Ms. Dillon, this case was all over Facebook.

MS. DILLON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Um, did you ever comment on it or comment on your friends' comments?

MS. DILLON: No. I -- I mean, anything

controversial, I mind my business just because it always starts arguments that never end.

MS. THIEN: Well, I know, and there's nothing quite like a Facebook flame out.

MS. PARKER: I know.

MS. THIEN: But, I mean, you know, we all have a little bit of a public presence --

MS. PARKER: -- right.

MS. THIEN: -- um, on social media, and in taking a quick look, you know, you just had some mutual friends that made a lot of comments about this case. Did you -- were those the comments you're talking about; the conversations that you followed?

MS. PARKER: Honestly, like I said, I see the posts -- I don't -- I have three kids, so I don't spend a lot of time digging into things on Facebook.

MS. THIEN: Mm-hmm.

MS. PARKER: Um, I'll read the first paragraph and scroll on a lot of times.

MS. THIEN: Yeah, that's fine. Thank you.

MS. PARKER: I just -- honestly I scroll a lot now.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, you have three kids at home?

MS. PARKER: I have three kids at home.

MS THIEN: How old are they?

MS. PARKER: Um seven, almost two and four months.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, if you were on this jury, would child care be an issue for you?

MS. PARKER: No. My mom keeps my children for me while I work anyway.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Ms. Dillon, you had a case a year or so ago?

MS. DILLON: Yes, I did.

MS. THIEN: And that was here in this county?

MS. DILLON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Um, how did that resolve?

MS. DILLON: Um, my little brother dropped the charges.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MS. DILLON: I got in a fight with him.

MS. THIEN: I don't want to get into too much, you know what I mean, but it is a brush with the system.

MS. DILLON: Right.

MS. THIEN: Is there anything about that

case or about your participation in Court that you think will influence you in any way in this case?

MS. DILLON: I don't think so. It was always I came in -- well, it got continued. It was never --

MS. THIEN: -- yeah.

MS DILLON: -- and then one day I came in and it was dropped on, like, the second or third time, so it was kind of like a traffic ticket almost it felt like.

MS. THIEN: Yeah. Well, and Court during the time of Covid was always interesting as well.

MS. DILLON: Yes, it was.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, all right. So with the information that you have heard out there -- good, bad or otherwise, you know what I mean? We don't -- none of us live in a bubble. Um, did you form any opinions along the way or have any questions?

MS. DILLON: At the very beginning, you know, the way it comes out --

MS. THIEN: -- mm-hmm.

MS. DILLON: -- anybody that can say they generally -- if they heard about, didn't form some type of opinion is -- but I also know that there's that and

then there's -- I don't know what I am trying to say here. There is always -- there is two arguments, and you will only get the hearsay on Facebook, and the news only puts out a certain part of everything. So, I know that there is a lot that I don't know about the case. So, I think presented with all the evidence I would be able to be open-minded either way.

MS. THIEN: Okay. I guess another way to ask that, would you be able to ignore all of the stuff that was out there before that you have been exposed to --

MS. DILLON: -- yes.

MS. THIEN: -- and only take into consideration what you hear here in the courtroom?

MS. DILLON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. I'm just going to kick this one out there as well. Did I represent either of your parents at any point?

MS. DILLON: Not as far as I know.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MS. DILLON: Um, my dad had a bald guy one time I remember, and other than that, my mom's trouble was in Kentucky.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Well, you never can tell.

MS. DILLON: And my dad's, like, he was in trouble -- from like the time I was two, he was in prison already. And he was just there. I don't know who his attorney was.

MS. THIEN: Fair enough. Thank you. Um, Ms. Anderson?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: I believe -- and I am going to ask my colleagues here to correct me -- I believe the deputy that will be called to testify is Aaron Anderson.

MS. ANDERSON: I don't think there is any connection.

MS. THIEN: You don't think there is any relation or someone that you may know?

MS. ANDERSON: Not from a deputy.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Fair enough. You said you didn't know Anderson or --

MS. ANDERSON: -- with the name Anderson, I just didn't know.

MS. THIEN: Okay. You said you have one grown son who is also in farming and another who is self-employed?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Doing what?

MS. ANDERSON: He's a machine-shop type of thing.

MS. THIEN: Oh, okay. Runs his own shop?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: May I ask what church you attend?

MS. ANDERSON: Pittsburg Free Will Baptist.

MS. THIEN: Okay. I know -- we all know that when this case was first reported, there was, um, a lot going on. Did you, um, participate in any church activity or vigil or anything to, you know, show your support for --

MS. ANDERSON: -- yeah. We had an alter prayer.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And, um, you still all attend the same --

MS. ANDERSON: -- yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And would you say that you are socially acquainted then with Jade's grandfather?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes. His --

MS. THIEN: -- oh, great-grandfather.

MS. ANDERSON: I think it's actually great-grandfather, but, um, his cousin is actually the

caregiver to my in-laws.

MS. THIEN: Okay. That could make a pretty difficult situation --

MS. ANDERSON: Yeah.

MS. THIEN: -- keeping everything neutral here while still respecting the family that you're friends with; is that a fair statement?

MS. ANDERSON: That's fair.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And, ma'am, you said that in the -- when this first came out, you had formed an opinion?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, because there's no question that this case --

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: -- it was all over there.

MS. ANDERSON: Yeah.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, is that still something that you hold?

MS. ANDERSON: Um, I hadn't really, until today, thought about it since that time.

MS. THIEN: Mm-hmm.

MS. ANDERSON: I really hadn't. I have not had an opinion since the early time.

MS. THIEN: Right. You also said that you were privy in the beginning to more details than what came out here in the courtroom today.

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Um, was that also from your contact with the family?

MS. ANDERSON: Um, more so with -- no, not really the family but with it happening in our community.

MR. THIEN: Mm-hmm.

MS. ANDERSON: Just people in the community.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Jackson, this is -- I may or may not be your father's lawyer, but I don't know.

MS. JACKSON: Yeah. I'm not sure.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Is that -- or if that were the case, would that put -- would that put the defense at a disadvantage?

MS. JACKSON: I believe it would.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And do you believe that that is the situation where you may not be able to remain fair and impartial?

MS. JACKSON: I would try my best, but in the moment, I'm not sure if I would be able to.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Well, it's one of those things neither side wants to be at a disadvantage, you know what I mean?

MS. JACKSON: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Neither of us wants to start, you know, two steps behind and have to prove more.

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Um, but if that's the case, that's the case.

MS. JACKSON: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Do you think that that prior Court activity -- I don't want to get too personal -- will impact your abilities in this case?

MS. JACKSON: I -- yeah. I would say yeah.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Did you ever see this case or anything on social media?

MS. JACKSON: What I saw was just on the news probably two or three weeks ago. I done forgot. Um, just basically bringing it back up into the public's eye.

MS. THIEN: Because the case was getting ready for trial?

MS. JACKSON: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

MS. THIEN: I mean, it's probably not a

secret back there to the people --

MS. JACKSON: -- probably not.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, has that caused you any concern about your ability to sit on this jury?

MS. JACKSON: Not as of now. When I first heard it, I heard it, had thoughts, and then went on with business. And then hadn't thought about it since -- from today.

MS. THIEN: Thanks. Ms. Parker, um, you have not heard anything about this case?

MS. PARKER: Huh-uh.

MS. THIEN: From any source?

MS. PARKER: Nope.

MS. THIEN: Not even the talk at work, Did you hear what I saw on the news --

MS. PARKER: -- no. I work at Walmart, and I am on overnights, so I don't really pay too much mind what's going on.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MS. PARKER: I pretty much keep to myself.

MS. THIEN: Fair enough.

MS. PARKER: Less drama, less interaction the better.

MS. THIEN: Um, do you have any kids at

home?

MS. PARKER: If you count dogs, cats -- no.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And you have not served on jury before?

MS. PARKER: Nope. This is the first time.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Have you ever had any interaction with the Court system; any reason to be in a courtroom?

MS. PARKER: No.

MS. THIEN: This is the first for everything?

MS. PARKER: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Okay. So, um, do you pay attention to any, I don't know, programs, TV shows, movies that involve, you know, true crime or, you know, legal --

MS. PARKER: -- not really --

MS. THIEN: -- police procedurals?

MS. PARKER: No. It's more like my mom's stage. She likes criminal things. I'm, like, I don't want to watch those.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, what would -- what would be something that you would remember seeing?

MS. PARKER: Um, I'm not really sure. I

don't really pay attention to TV much.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Ms. Parker, what do you do with your free time?

MS. PARKER: Um, hike, fishing, outdoors.

MS. THIEN: You said you were familiar with JD Barter?

MS. PARKER: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, if he were to testify in this case, would you give his testimony more weight, less weight, the same?

MS. PARKER: No. There is no conflict with that. I would rather see what's actually proved in Court than be on the side of somebody else's defense.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Now, and as the Judge explained, the defense doesn't have to prove anything.

MS. PARKER: Nope.

MS. THIEN: The State has 100 percent of the burden, and you can hold the State to that burden?

MS. PARKER: Yep.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: We've got Harrell, Dillon, Anderson and Jackson.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, we would exercise a for cause challenge on Ms. Jackson.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: That gets you to Harrell, Dillon, Anderson and Parker.

MR. BUTLER: The State would like to use our fourth peremptory on Ms. Parker.

THE COURT: I believe that's your fourth. Okay. We need to bring in four new individuals. We can bring Jackson and Parker back to excuse. We'll need Cook, Stewart, Bennett and Clouser.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ladies, I really do appreciate your time and your patience with us. I know that this is something that takes a lot of time out of your life. On behalf of the attorneys and Ms. Bevely, I thank you very much for that. You are not going to be needed for this particular service, so I am going to release you. But I do need you to call in Sunday to see if you might have to serve the following week, okay? So you can

follow my bailiff. He'll help you retrieve your personal items. You're free to go.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This

alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I'm going to read to you a list of potential witnesses that may be called in this case. Please pay attention to it. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldsberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawiki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel

Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Ryan Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy Magee. Michael Hughes. Jordan Bevely. Stewart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

THE COURT: Mr. Cook, in what city do you reside?

MR. COOK: Marion.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. COOK: Divorced.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over age 18 residing in Williamson County?

MR. COOK: Yes.

THE COURT: Their names and occupation, please.

MR. COOK: Rohan Cook, Assistant Recruiter For Army National Guard. My daughter is 18, but she resides here but goes to school at U of I. Her name is Alanna (ph).

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MR. COOK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Anderson, what city do you reside in? I'm sorry, Ms. Stewart. I'm sorry.

MS. STEWART: Marion.
THE COURT: Your marital status?
MS. STEWART: Single.
THE COURT: Your occupation?
MS. STEWART: I work at Target.
THE COURT: Do you have any children over the age of 18 that resides in Williamson County?
MS. STEWART: No, sir.
THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
MS. STEWART: No.
THE COURT: Ms. Bennett, in what city do you reside?
MS. BENNETT: Marion.
THE COURT: Your occupation?
MS. BENNETT: Retired.
THE COURT: From what, ma'am?
MS. BENNETT: Teaching.
THE COURT: Marital status?
MS. BENNETT: Widowed.
THE COURT: Do you have any children age 18 or over that live in Williamson County?
MS. BENNETT: One. A daughter.
THE COURT: Her name and occupation, please?

MS. BENNETT: Melody Sheffer. Retired teacher.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. BENNETT: No.

THE COURT: Is it Clouser?

MR. CLOUSER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: What city do you reside?

MR. CLOUSER: Carterville.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. CLOUSER: School teacher, junior high and coach.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. CLOUSER: Married.

THE COURT: Your spouse's name and occupation?

MR. CLOUSER: Brooke Clouser, social worker.

THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 or over residing in Williamson County?

MR. CLOUSER: No. One daughter about to be two years old.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MR. ClOUSER: No, sir.

THE COURT: I am going to ask a series of questions to each one of you. If it applies to you, I need you to raise your hand for me so we can address it. This trial is expected to last a couple of weeks. What I need to know is if there is anything in your life that may occur within the next two weeks that would take your focus away from this trial. If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Do any of you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they do. Have any of you or your immediate family members had any profession dealings with any of the attorneys?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they have. Do any of you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys offices?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they do. Do any of you personally know the defendant Julia Bevely?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they do. I read to you a list of witnesses. Do any of you know any of the witnesses that I read? Mr. Cook?

MR. COOK: Chris Ramage is a close friend of mine and Cady Carter is a patron of mine.

THE COURT: Anybody else?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Have any of you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they have. Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they have. Have you or any of your immediate family members ever been convicted of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they have. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they have.

Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they do. Would any of you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because a witness works in law enforcement?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they would. I need to talk to each one of you individually about some very important principles of law that apply in every case in which the defendant is charged in a criminal offense.

The defendant is presumed innocent of each charge against them. A defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge. The defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify, and that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Mr. Cook, do you understand and accept and

will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. COOK: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. COOK: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. COOK: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. COOK: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Stewart, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. STEWART: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before the defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. STEWART: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. STEWART: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. STEWART: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Bennett, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. BENNETT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle that -- and will apply the principle, that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. BENNETT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. BENNETT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. BENNETT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Clouser, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. CLOUSER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. CLOUSER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. CLOUSER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that the defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. CLOUSER: Yes.

THE COURT: And you will apply that principle?

MR. CLOUSER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: This is to each one of you. I need you to verbalize out loud for me. Will you all agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicated they would. Will you each agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicated that they would. Now, each one of you told me that you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. Now, that's very important. You have also been told that this case involves the charge of First Degree Murder. I

need to know is there anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in the case? If that's so, please raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Mr. Cook, you know me. Is there anything about my relationship or past relationship with you that would effect your ability to be a juror in this case?

MR. COOK: I don't fathom, so no.

THE COURT: Ms. Bennett, you also know me. Is there anything about that past relationship that may effect your ability to act as an impartial juror in this case?

MS. BENNETT: No.

THE COURT: I am going to ask you each some questions individually. I do not want you to go into any detail at all. Mr. Cook, has the media contacted you about this case?

MR. COOK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media discussing this case with any potential juror?

MR. COOK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Stewart, has the media

contacted you at all regarding this case?

MS. STEWART: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media discussing this case with any potential juror?

MS. STEWART: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Bennett, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. BENNETT: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media discussing this case with any potential juror?

MS. BENNETT: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Clouser, has the media contacted you about this case?

MR. CLOUSER: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media discussing this case with any potential juror?

MR. CLOUSER: No.

THE COURT: Again, without going into any detail at all, Mr. Cook, have you read or heard anything about this case?

MR. COOK: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Stewart, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. STEWART: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Bennett, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. BENNETT: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Clouser, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MR. CLOUSER: No.

THE COURT: At the conclusion of the evidence, each of you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you each follow the law as given in those instructions?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. Will you each decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. If the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. Now, if there is any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror, I need you to raise your hand so we can address it.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor. Mr. Cook?

MR. COOK: Yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: So you know a couple of the witnesses. One was Officer Ramage.

MR. COOK: Yeah.

MR. BUTLER: If he were to testify in this case, would you give his testimony more weight because you have that knowledge of him or less weight or judge it the same as everyone else?

MR. COOK: I respect him, but don't really know much about his -- he never discusses his professional life.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MR. COOK: Yeah. We do barbecues together; things like that.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. So, would you give him less weight, more weight or the same as everyone else?

MR. COOK: I would try to be unbiased.

MR. BUTLER: Unbiased. Okay. Thank you. You said he's been to barbecues with you?

MR. COOK: We do mixology together, yes. So, we just trade out homes to go back and forth and mutual friends.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. And then the other person you said you knew on the list, who was that?

MR. COOK: Cady. That was my girlfriend, and had started kind of seeing one of my friends.

MR. BUTLER: Anything about that relationship if she were to testify --

MR. COOK: -- I have no idea how she is even related to any of this.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Um, I think you said you didn't know -- hadn't heard anything about the case. Your son --

MR. COOK: -- Rohan.

MR. BUTLER: He's an Army recruiter.

MR. COOK: Assistant recruiter for Army National Guard.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. If there is testimony

during this case from other people with military service, is that going to make you judge their testimony --

MR. COOK: -- he is as equivalent as law officers. He's even testing for county, State and city.

MR. BUTLER: So, you judge their testimony the same as everyone else?

MR. COOK: It's all the same. They are professional.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Stewart, um, you said you didn't know anything about the case, as well. The Judge asked if you had any children over the age of 18. Do you have any under 18?

MS. STEWART: (Nodding yes.)

MR. BUTLER: How many?

MS. STEWART: One. She is 13.

MR. BUTLER: Thirteen. The fact that the victim in this case is an 11-year-old girl, will that cause you any problems in sitting in judgment on this case?

MS. STEWART: I don't believe so.

MR. BUTLER: You would be able to be fair and impartial to both sides?

MS. STEWART: I believe so.

MR. BUTLER: All right. Thank you. Ms. Bennett, you're a retired teacher?

MS. BENNETT: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: What did you teach?

MS. STEWART: Um, mostly elementary, some junior high and reading.

MR. BUTLER: So, a little bit of everything.

MS. BENNETT: (Nodding yes.)

MR. BUTLER: Okay. You didn't know anything about the case?

MS. BENNETT: No.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. Mr. Clouser?

MR. CLOUSER: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: You said you're a teacher?

MR. CLOUSER: Yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: What do you teach?

MR. CLOUSER: Um, junior high, PE and health. I'm also the basketball coach.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Um, if you missed Court -- or missed school yesterday and today, are they going to be able to have subs for you if you're selected to this jury?

MR. CLOUSER: That would be my biggest worry, but I would hope so.

MR. BUTLER: Would you be sitting there during the trial if you are selected thinking about that, or would you be focused on what's being testified to?

MR. CLOUSER: I would do my best to focus. I mean, if I'm here, I'm focused on what you're saying, what everyone is saying.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. And you said you had a two-year-old daughter?

MR. CLOUSER: She will be two March 5th.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. No further questions.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Mr. Cook, are you on any form of social media? Facebook? Instagram --

MR. COOK: -- all social media.

MS. THIEN: All of it.

MR. COOK: Well, there is some new things I'm not on. I know this sounds funny. I don't do Tik Tok.

MS. THIEN: Fair enough. Um, have you ever run across any mention of this case on social media?

MR. COOK: On social media, the page, Justice for Jade, yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, and have you ever commented on that?

MR. COOK: No. I realized I hadn't even liked it.

MS. THIEN: Okay. It would just show up because maybe because other friends on your feed --

MR. COOK: -- honestly, there was a -- there was a sign in the neighbor's yard, and I forgot all about it, and looked it up and realized who that was.

MS. THIEN: Okay. All right. Did you then do any looking into what this case was at that time, or do you know how long ago that was?

MR. COOK: This has been -- this has been August, and frankly I didn't realize that this whole thing had not transpired. That it was just something that came up in our lives -- my ex-wife and I personally -- cause our son, they were friends on the school bus.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. COOK: My youngest son, Rick. He's 15.

MS. THIEN: Fifteen. And was friends with Jade?

MR. COOK: Yeah. They were -- lived on the same bus route.

MS. THIEN: Okay. All right. Has your son

ever mentioned this or the impact that it had or --

MR. COOK: -- yes.

MS. THIEN: -- talked or whatever.

MR. COOK: He doesn't like to talk about it.

MS. THIEN: He doesn't like to talk about it or hasn't?

MR. COOK: He will not talk about it.

MS. THIEN: Will not talk about it.

MR. COOK: We tried to when he was that age. He wouldn't talk about it.

MS. THIEN: Okay. All right. That's got to be kind of difficult.

MR. COOK: He was going through some difficult things at the time, so, yes, it was difficult for him. Outside of that, it was something else.

MS. THIEN: So you think none of that would have an impact on your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

MR. COOK: I would like to say that I would not be, but maybe that's not a fair thing to say. So, maybe the answer to your question is no. Maybe I would not be. I hate saying that.

MS. THIEN: No. I know. We're all only human. You know, I mean, that's the best we can do.

Um, we think we might be talking about a different Cady Carter. This one is spelled C-A-D-Y.

MR. COOK: It's possible. This is a mother of four that has been recently divorced or a different one.

MS. THIEN: Okay. A different one. Um, thanks. Ms. Stewart, are you on any form of social media?

MS. STEWART: Yes.

MS. THIEN: May I ask which ones?

MS. STEWART: Facebook and Instagram mainly.

MS. THIEN: Mainly? Okay. Did this case ever show up across your feed?

MS. STEWART: No.

MS. THIEN: Do you follow any of the local crime reporting or courthouse watches or anything of that nature?

MS. STEWART: No.

MS. THIEN: No? Okay. You have a 13-year-old daughter?

MS. STEWART: I do.

MS. THIEN: Where does she go to school?

MS. STEWART: Marion Junior High School.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Did she go to school with

Jade?

MS. STEWART: Um, I believe so, but they didn't know each other, I believe.

MS. THIEN: When this -- when this occurred, they would have been -- yeah -- pretty much maybe close to the same grade?

MS. STEWART: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Did it have any effect on your daughter?

MS. STEWART: Not to my knowledge, no. She didn't know her. I mean, the fact that it happened may have, but we spoke about it and it wasn't -- didn't effect her.

MS. THIEN: Okay. At the time, there was quite a bit of activities and events like at schools and churches and such. Did you or your daughter participate in any of those?

MS. STEWART: I don't think so.

MS. THIEN: Don't think so? Okay. So, this is -- um, as you know, I mean, it does involve the charge of murder. There is three counts. Only one case. Um, and it does involve a child. Emotionally and intellectually do you think that your place in life would make you a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. STEWART: Um, I believe so. I don't believe it has any effect on me to make a judgment on the case following the law.

MS. THIEN: And you could concentrate solely on the facts as they are presented here in Court?

MS. STEWART: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Bennett, are you on any form of social media?

MS. BENNETT: No.

MS. THIEN: No. No Facebook? No Instagram? Anything like that?

MS. BENNETT: No.

MS. THIEN: Where do you get your news?

MS. BENNETT: Well, Fox News mostly.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Do you pay attention to any local news? Any local station? Newspaper?

MS. BENNETT: Not too much.

MS. THIEN: Not too much? Okay. Do you attend any church or are you a member of any social clubs?

MS. BENNETT: The Baptist church.

MS. THIEN: Here in town?

MS. BENNETT: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Which one?

MS. BENNETT: Up here on Main Street.
MS. THIEN: First Baptist?
MS. BENNETT: Mm-hmm.
MS. THIEN: Okay. As a member or an attendee --
MS. BENNETT: -- just an attendee.
MS. THIEN: Okay.
MS. BENNETT: I am not a member there.
MS. THIEN: -- um, was Jade or her family ever the topic of not just conversation but services or vigils or anything that you saw while you were attending First Baptist?
MS. BENNETT: No.
MS. THIEN: Okay. And I don't remember the answer to this. Have you ever had any prior jury service?
MS. BENNETT: In Jefferson County about ten years ago maybe.
MS. THIEN: Okay. And could you tell me what kind of case that was?
MS. BENNETT: It was a traffic accident.
MS. THIEN: Was it criminal or civil?
MS. BENNETT: Civil.
MS. THIEN: And did you deliberate all the

way to a verdict?

MS. BENNETT: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Is there anything about that experience that you're going to carry into this courtroom one way or another that will impact you?

MS. BENNETT: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. It's been a long couple of days so far. Is there anything about this experience that you think is going to impact you and your ability?

MS. BENNETT: Long days, but, you know, I haven't had any problems.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thanks. Ms. Clouser, how long have you been teaching?

MR. CLOUSER: Twelve years.

MS. THIEN: And have you always been at -- well, where do you teach, I should ask?

MR. CLOUSER: Carterville Junior High.

MS. THIEN: I thought -- I just wrote down junior high and that you lived in Carterville. I guess I was assuming they were together.

MR. CLOUSER: You're correct.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And you have been there the whole time?

MR. CLOUSER: The first eight I was at Tri-C

elementary. So, kindergarten through 3, and then I moved up --

MS. THIEN: Gotcha.

MR. CLOUSER: -- four years ago.

MS. THIEN: And, um, you said you have not heard anything about this case before?

MR. CLOUSER: No.

MS. THIEN: Are you on any form of social media?

MR. CLOUSER: Yes. Facebook and Twitter.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And has this case ever crossed your feed?

MR. CLOUSER: No.

MS. THIEN: Have you ever seen anything or do you follow any local --

MR. CLOUSER: No.

MS. THIEN: -- news watcher's kind of thing?

MR. CLOUSER: No. Basically just have Facebook for family and have Twitter for sport's scores and stuff like that.

MS. THIEN: Okay. So, you were teaching in this area and teaching junior high when this case first came up. Did it ever become a topic of --

MR. CLOUSER: -- no.

MS. THIEN: -- concern or conversation at your school?

MR. CLOUSER: Not being in the same town, we -- kids really don't talk about what's going on in other towns.

MS. THIEN: Did this become a topic between you and your family, friends at all when it occurred?

MR. CLOUSER: No.

MS. THIEN: No? All right. And, sir, do you belong to any church or civic organization or clubs or even informal ones?

MR. CLOUSER: No. I'm not a member of any church.

MS. THIEN: No church? No, um, rotary? Things of that nature?

MR. CLOUSER: No.

MS. THIEN: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Cook, based upon what you might have read about the case on the internet, was that any more detailed than the statement I read to you here today?

MR. COOK: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you read, did

you formulate any opinion about this case?

MR. COOK: No. When it all came out, we knew it was a horrible thing that happened.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have any opinion about this case?

MR. COOK: No opinion. Mostly emotion.

THE COURT: Do you have any opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should in this case?

MR. COOK: Should be whether the State proves one way or the other.

THE COURT: As you sit there now, have you made an opinion about any issue in this case?

MR. COOK: Opinion -- the emotion -- I just can't I don't think.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you read or heard that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. COOK: No, because it has to be based on the evidence.

THE COURT: Now, if you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about the case and instead decide the case only upon the evidence and testimony which would be presented here in open Court?

MR. COOK: Only upon the evidence.
THE COURT: Mr. Butler, anything on that?
MR. BUTLER: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Ms. Thien?
MS. THIEN: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)
MR. BUTLER: Judge, Ms. Harrell, Ms. Dillon, Ms. Anderson and Mr. Cook, we would tender those.
THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Thien, the panel's to you.
MS. THIEN: Judge, I am going to begin --
MS. MUDGE: -- I don't think this is accurate. I'm sorry. I just want to make sure we're doing this right.
MS. THIEN: Okay.
MS. MUDGE: I think that we ended on Ms. Harrell, and it's Ms. Thien's turn to tender to us.
MS. THIEN: -- oh --
MS. MUDGE: I do.
MR. BUTLER: -- yep. I think you're right.
MS. MUDGE: We struck --
MS. THIEN: -- right, and Ms. Harrell was

the last one on the bubble.

MS. MUDGE: We had our four up to Ms. Harrell. That's when we almost accidently brought her in. So, I think it is Ms. Thien's turn to tender.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. THIEN: We're going to need a moment, Judge.

THE COURT: Sure.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

MS. THIEN: Whenever you're ready, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm ready.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Judge, we would begin by making a motion for cause for Tina Harrell; basis for which is the emotional response and the long time family relationship with the victim's family in this case.

THE COURT: Any response from the State?

MR. BUTLER: Judge, I don't believe she said that there was going to be a problem with her sitting on this even with a family relationship. I think this was a grandfather or great-grandfather. It seemed pretty tenuous to me, but still she indicated she could be fair and impartial. Um, she answered the Zehr principles all in the affirmative, so I would object to a for cause challenge on this.

THE COURT: Any response?

MS. THIEN: It was important enough for her to volunteer that information, and it was important enough to say that it could be an uncomfortable situation.

THE COURT: The Court doesn't recall her saying it was an uncomfortable situation. She did indicate that there was a family relationship. She did indicate that it would be a concern for her, but she overall did affirmatively indicate that it would not be something that would interfere with her ability to be an impartial juror. Your motion for cause will be denied.

MS. THIEN: Judge, before I start exercising peremptories, I would like to make a motion for cause for Karen Anderson.

THE COURT: Basis?

MS. THIEN: She stated specifically that she had formed an opinion. That she goes to church regularly with Jade's grandfather. That she participated in some activities about -- or at the time, an alter prayer and such, and did acknowledge that making a decision in this case -- I think I may have confused the two. I think she is the one that said that would be an incredibly difficult situation for her. I

think -- I think at this point that is the basis for cause.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Judge, in this case with Ms. Anderson, she said she can decide based on what she hears and sees in Court. Um, she stated she has no opinion on the issues or guilt of the defendant even if she may have formed one initially when she first heard about this. I believe she was pretty adamant about the jury process and about how the jury hears what's in Court and they make their decision about that. So I would ask the Court to deny the for cause motion.

THE COURT: What about her involvement in activities that would be sympathetic to the victim?

MR. BUTLER: With regard to the church, um, your Honor, with regard to that, again she also stated that -- well, I could be getting this confused with the last one as well. But she again stated that she could put that aside, and I believe I asked her -- she said she wouldn't have to justify that with anyone.

THE COURT: Ms. --

MS. MUDGE: -- if I may add, your Honor. She didn't even know if it was the grandfather or great-grandfather, so she doesn't know the specifics of

the relationship. She quote -- I quote, "I believe in the legal system," is the last thing she said. And she said she participated in an alter prayer. Now, that's just a prayer at church with -- if you're at church and they announce it, they pray. So, I don't believe she had any specific interactions with who she doesn't even know is a great-grandfather or a grandfather to the victim.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I beg to differ, Judge. I think she may not know whether it was grandfather or great-grandfather, but knew him by name. Knew them enough to know that they still participate together. They still attend the same church functions and are socially acquainted. Maybe not much outside of the church, but socially acquainted. And I think that in itself raises an issue of bias and prejudice.

THE COURT: I think we all have bias and prejudices. Some of which we are not even aware of, and that's inherent in us. I think she was honest and forthright with her answers. In the end, she did say that she would follow the Zehr principles. That she believed in the justice system. I think a person like that would be more honest about any verdict than someone

else recognizing the potential issues and overcoming them like she did here today. Your motion for cause will be denied.

MS. THIEN: Judge, at this time the defense will exercise its fifth peremptory on Tina Harrell.

THE COURT: Okay. That gets you Dillon, Anderson, Cook, Stewart.

MS. THIEN: We exercise a peremptory on Cook.

THE COURT: Okay. That gets you Dillon, Anderson, Stewart, Bennett.

MS. THIEN: We tender, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: You're Honor, the People would use our next peremptory challenge on Ms. Bennett.

THE COURT: That gets you down to Clouser.

MR. BUTLER: Is that me again, your Honor?

MS. THIEN: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. I would tender that panel, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, at this time I think we're up to our last peremptory?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: We will exercise it on Mr. Clouser.

THE COURT: Okay. You can bring in Harrell, Jackson, Parker, Cook, Bennett, Clouser to be dismissed. We'll bring them up here. And then we have Slaughter, Baize, McPherson and Boles.

BAILIFF OLIVER: Okay. Judge, Jackson and Parker, those were -- they were already.

THE COURT: We've already let them go. Okay. We still have Harrell, though, right?

BAILIFF OLIVER: Yes. It's just Harrell, Cook, Bennett and Clouser is what I have to be let go.

THE COURT: Bennett, Clouser, Cook and Harrell. Okay. Bring them in to excuse.

MS. THIEN: Judge, I'm going to need just a moment.

THE COURT: Wait a minute before you bring them in. Is there an issue the Court needs to be informed of.

MS. THIEN: Judge, I'm letting the prosecution know that we have one juror coming up, Mr. Baize, and I am letting the State know that I -- I am known to Mr. Baize. I represented Peter Kerrigan. It began as a murder case. It resulted in a reckless

homicide. Mr. Baize had made numerous public comments about not believing that that was what he believed justice should be. I don't know if he will associate the two.

MS. MUDGE: Can I ask what year?

MS. THIEN: And I am out of peremptories, so that's why I wanted to mention that before we let anybody else go.

MS. MUDGE: What year was that?

MS. THIEN: It's been a few years because Pete's back. Early 2000 -- Sheilah, can you look?

THE CLERK: Peter, right?

MS. THIEN: Yeah.

MS. MUDGE: Oh, I found it. 06-CF-584?

MS. THIEN: That sounds right.

THE CLERK: You also had him on another one; a '22 case.

MS. THIEN: But Mr. Baize would not have anything to do with that.

THE CLERK: Right.

MS. THIEN: There was just a lot of public comment at the time.

MS. MUDGE: I have no reason not to believe Ms. Thien, but if we could inquire of him -- you know,

if we want to do it separately so as to not do it in front of a panel, I would be okay with that.

THE COURT: Okay. Bring the ones that we're going to excuse and bring only Mr. Baize.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: On behalf of both the attorneys and the defendant and myself, I want to thank you for your time, your patience and your understanding with this process. At this point in time, you will not be needed for this particular jury, but I will need you to call in Sunday to determine whether or not you will be needed next week. You can follow my bailiff. He will help you get your personal things. You are free to go. Thank you very much.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: With the agreement of the parties, for Mr. Baize, I would like to just begin with any kind of relationship or feelings he may have with you before we spend a lot of time with him. Is that acceptable?

MS. THIEN: Could be. I don't know if he

will put me together with it. I just know that at the time --

THE COURT: -- what was the name of the case?

MS. THIEN: Kerrigan. The defendant's name was Kerrigan.

MS. MUDGE: Peter Kerrigan.

MS. THIEN: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: Okay.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Baize.

MR. BAIZE: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: It's been a long day.

MR. BAIZE: And it's not over yet.

THE COURT: No. That's true. Before I begin, sir, I would like to ask a few questions of you, okay?

MR. BAIZE: Yeah.

THE COURT: Are you familiar with the prosecution of a gentleman by the name of Kerrigan?

MR. BAIZE: I don't believe I know anybody by that name.

THE COURT: Do you happen to know any of the

attorneys that are here present today?

MR. BAIZE: I have laid eyes on the public defender, but I don't know her.

THE COURT: Do you have any opinions about Ms. Thien?

MR. BAIZE: Pardon me?

THE COURT: Do you have any opinions about Ms. Thien?

MR. BAIZE: About Misty?

THE COURT: Ms. Thien. This public defender.

MR. BAIZE: Oh, no. I don't. I was here with a girlfriend a few years ago, and I just recognized her as the public defender. That's all.

THE COURT: Did you have any involvement with any cases that she might have been involved in?

MR. BAIZE: No.

THE COURT: Okay. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with

the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you some individuals who may testify in this case. I need you to pay attention to their names. Nancy Deason. Gregory

Beasley. Dr. B. Goldsberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, Supervisor at Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold of Bensenville, Illinois. Officer A. Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffee. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stewart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

THE COURT: Sir, in what city do you reside?

MR. BAIZE: I reside in Williamson County but I have a Herrin address. I live just outside the city limit of Herrin.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. BAIZE: I'm retired but still working part-time as a truck driver.

THE COURT: And what was your retirement from?

MR. BAIZE: I hit age 65. I retired.

THE COURT: Well, I meant from what job.

MR. BAIZE: Oh, truck driving.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. BAIZE: I've been divorced for 20 years.

THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 or over that reside in Williamson County?

MR. BAIZE: Yes.

THE COURT: Can you tell me their names and occupation?

MR. BAIZE: Michelle is in Johnston City. She is currently unemployed. My son Joey lives with me. He's 47, and he is employed by a contractor who cleans Carbondale schools. He does janitor work in a Carbondale school, but he's employed by a private contractor. And I don't know the name of that employer. He's not employed by the school system, and that's it for the ones that live in Williamson County.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any pending

lawsuits or cases?

MR. BAIZE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Now, I have been told that this trial may last up to two weeks. What I need to know, is there anything that may be occurring in your life within the next two weeks that would take your focus off this trial?

MR. BAIZE: Actually since I have retirement income coming in and a very nice employer, it wouldn't hurt me a bit to miss two weeks at work.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you know any of the attorneys involved in the case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien; if you have any recollections.

MR. BAIZE: I don't know them, nor, any of the names you read to me a few minutes before that.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

MR. BAIZE: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

MR. BAIZE: No.

THE COURT: Do you personally know the

defendant Julia Bevely?

MR. BAIZE: No, I don't.

THE COURT: I think you told me this. I want to make sure. I read to you some names. You don't know any of them?

MR. BAIZE: I recognize some of the last names, but I didn't know the individuals.

THE COURT: Have you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

MR. BAIZE: I have been -- I've had jury duty twice before this. Once was a coroner's jury inquest, and the other time was, I believe, much like this except when I called the phone number to check in, I was never asked to show up.

THE COURT: In those cases, did your cases go to a verdict?

MR. BAIZE: Pardon me?

THE COURT: Did you as part of the jury reach a verdict?

MR. BAIZE: In the -- with the coroner's jury, yes. They told us of people who have died, and a lot of them were car accidents, and wanted to know if we thought it was an accident or somebody did anything criminal. And that way we gave our opinion on those.

THE COURT: That other jury that you were in, was it a civil case or a criminal case?

MR. BAIZE: I am telling you I received a letter saying that I had jury duty coming, but when I called the number the day before, I was not required to show up.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BAIZE: So, out of three times, one was coroner's jury, one time my presence was not requested. I was just kind of on standby, and then there is this time.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been a victim of a crime?

MR. BAIZE: I have. I've had things stolen from me.

THE COURT: Was there anything about that that might effect your ability to act as an impartial juror in this case?

MR. BAIZE: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

MR. BAIZE: I have been convicted of misdemeanor battery, and that was back in the early -- it was 30 years ago.

THE COURT: Was there anything about that, that may effect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. BAIZE: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

MR. BAIZE: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MR. BAIZE: No, sir.

THE COURT: I want to talk to you about some legal principles. They are applicable in all cases in which a defendant is charged with a criminal offense. The defendant is to be presumed innocent of each charge against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge. The defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf, and is not required to testify. And that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them. Sir, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant

is presumed innocent of the charges against her, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. BAIZE: Yes, I can do that.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. BAIZE: Yes, I understand that.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on her own behalf?

MR. BAIZE: I do understand that.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. BAIZE: I understand that.

THE COURT: Will you agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

MR. BAIZE: Yes, I agree.

THE COURT: Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

MR. BAIZE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I told you that this case, the charge is First Degree Murder and that the charge itself is not any evidence against the defendant. But I need to know if there is anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. BAIZE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Now, listen to me. Without going into any specific details, I want you just to answer the question. Has the media contacted you at all regarding this case?

MR. BAIZE: Not -- not at all.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media questioning any potential juror about this case?

MR. BAIZE: No.

THE COURT: And again, without going into any detail at all, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MR. BAIZE: I saw a report on Channel 3 News just that this case was selecting jurors. That's all they told me.

THE COURT: How long ago was it since you had that information?

MR. BAIZE: It was last evening.

THE COURT: Is what you heard more detailed than the statement about the charge I read to you earlier?

MR. BAIZE: Please ask that again.

THE COURT: Sure. Is what you heard on the TV more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you earlier?

MR. BAIZE: Uh, they mentioned it was a murder trial and that they were selecting jurors.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard, did you form an opinion about the case?

MR. BAIZE: No, and I certainly already knew that you were selecting jurors. I spent all yesterday sitting in that room over there.

THE COURT: Well, as you sit there now, do you have an opinion about this case?

MR. BAIZE: Sometimes I would tend to think it worst happens to an 11-year-old than an adult, but in the sake of fairness all the way around, I can still be fair. I haven't heard the slightest bit of evidence anyway at all. I just know we're here.

THE COURT: Okay. So, have you formed an opinion about what a fair and proper verdict should be

in this case?

MR. BAIZE: No, I haven't.

THE COURT: Have you formed an opinion about any issue in this case?

MR. BAIZE: No.

THE COURT: Now, is there anything about what you heard or read about in this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. BAIZE: I have honestly thought about that, and the answer is no.

THE COURT: So, if you're selected as juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you might have heard or read about the case and instead decide the case only by the evidence and testimony which will be presented here in open Court?

MR. BAIZE: Yes, I can do that.

THE COURT: At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

MR. BAIZE: Yes.

THE COURT: Will you decide the case only on

the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

MR. BAIZE: Yes.

THE COURT: If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

MR. BAIZE: Yes.

THE COURT: And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

MR. BAIZE: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. BAIZE: I think not. I don't think there is.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien, I think it's your panel.

MS. THIEN: Okay. You know me enough to recognize me, Mr. Baize, but other than that, there is no other --

MR. BAIZE: -- I've never spoken a word with you before.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Fair enough. Um, sir, has any member of your family ever been involved or a

victim in a murder case before?

MR. BAIZE: No, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: No, ma'am? Okay. I had something that was brought to my attention that may be wrong. But no grandchild of yours was the subject of a --

MR. BAIZE: -- yeah.

MS. THIEN: Well, now I hate to bring it up.

MR. BAIZE: Um, one of my grandchildren -- how long ago. At least -- about 20 years ago, my daughter left her boyfriend to be the babysitter while my daughter went to work. Apparently he shook that little boy who was not yet two years old. And the boy was missing his mommy and was crying and wouldn't be quiet. The guy shook him. That boy died. I was in St. Louis Children's Hospital, and I watched him die.

MS. THIEN: Sir, is there anything about that experience or that case now that we're talking about a case -- a murder case that also involves a child that you believe would impact your ability to be a fair and impartial juror?

MR. BAIZE: I really thought about these things; just being here and knowing that I might, you know, be here in this room, and I don't think I have any

problem with being fair.

MS. THIEN: And you can treat both the defense and the prosecution equally in this case?

MR. BAIZE: Yes. That's how I am supposed to do it. That's what I can do.

MS. THIEN: I am kind of asking you, sir.

MR. BAIZE: Yeah. I can do that.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, and you understand as we sit here today, that Julie is presumed innocent? That she is simply accused of something.

MR. BAIZE: I didn't know that is how the law works.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And you will hold the State to their burden of proving the case beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. BAIZE: Yes, ma'am. I can do that.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, sir. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: I have no questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and take him.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ms. Thien? I don't want to talk about the panel. I want to talk about him only.

MS. THIEN: Okay. It did come to my attention when we were looking at things that was the case it seemed that it was not -- not that it wasn't important -- but it was something playing on Mr. Baize's mind. And honestly, it doesn't sound like he associates me with that case from, you know, back in 2006-2009. I just wanted the Court to be aware of that because at the time, it was sort of a thing.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Judge, I am sorry. Was there a for cause challenge for him?

THE COURT: No. I am not talking about the panel right now.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

THE COURT: I am just talking about him, okay. I don't mind sharing. I will share some of the thoughts I have. I have an attorney that indicated that this individual posted some things negatively about that case. I think he honestly didn't think about that case, and now his memory has been jarred. And Ms. Thien is somebody he recognizes, and one of the concerns I have is when he puts two and two together --

MR. BUTLER: -- sure.

THE COURT: Your thoughts?

MR. BUTLER: I have some similar thoughts that the Court has and some concerns as well, your Honor, and maybe some more concerns as well than the Court expressed.

THE COURT: Based upon the representation of Ms. Thien, would the State have any objection if I excused him?

MR. BUTLER: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien, would you have any objection if I excused him?

MS. THIEN: Judge, I wanted to make a full disclosure as to what I believed, and this is based on something from in the past. Other than that, no. I just wanted to make the Court aware.

THE COURT: You're an officer of the Court, and I take you at your word. Every one of the attorneys actually. Okay. So, before we take care of that business, let's talk. It's a quarter till 5:00. The defense is out of peremptories. I can bring another four in here, and we can talk to them if you guys wish. You're beeping.

MS. THIEN: I will have to take a little --

a little bit of a break to take care of the beeping, and a comfort break would not be unwelcome.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. THIEN: But ten minutes.

THE COURT: I understand. We've made them sit here all day. Is there any concerns about the Court keeping them longer? Typical work week ends at 5:00. I don't mind sharing my thought that people get tired. Their memory effects themselves sometimes and they get in a hurry, and I don't want us to be in a hurry. I will do what you guys request, but it's got to be something that you guys agree on. I tend to think -- and I hate to say it -- we should break for the night and come back in the morning and start as soon as we can. I would tell them to have them here at 8:30, and we start at 8:30. I have told the other jury members to be here at 9:00. They can be shepherded to the other -- another place away from us until we get this done. Your thoughts, Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Could I have a second to confer with counsel?

THE COURT: You can.

MR. BUTLER: Judge, I am fine with that; breaking for the evening and coming back early in the

morning.

THE COURT: And just to be clear, I am still ready. I can continue on, but I just want to make sure. I am just sharing my thoughts of how it may effect our pool.

MR. BUTLER: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, I agree with everything you say. The other thing I have to -- I have a concern with -- obviously my speech at this point. We still have a large pool, and they have been there now two full days. There is no question that has got -- I am also concerned about making them come back on day Number 3 instead of being able to start fresh. You with --- does that make sense?

THE COURT: Yes, it does.

MS. THIEN: I am also beginning to be very concerned about timing. We knew voir dire would be an issue, and it has proven to be. We really thought a day and a half, two tops would take care of it. The State has been very accommodating with the fact that I have an expert scheduling issue where he is available on Friday as late as we need to go, but if the State's not to the point in their case to not object to me calling a

witness out of order, it's for nought. My client -- my expert is not available for the entire week after, and now we are talking about the possibility of taking a big break in the middle. If you want to go back to the room and say, look, we're getting close. I want to know how many of you would have an objection or if --

MS. MUDGE: -- that's not a bad idea.

MS. THIEN: Are you willing to hang around so we can finish this up and I won't make you come back tomorrow. And honestly if they give you the answer we can't take it anymore, we want out of here, that's our answer. But if they're willing to hang out for another 45 minutes or hour, I say let's press on.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. MUDGE: And we could get the alternates --

MS. THIEN: Yeah.

MS. MUDGE: -- out of our panel.

MS. THIEN: Let's just keep going.

THE COURT: All right. So, we will break to give you some time to take care of the things you need to take care of, and I'll see when you get back. Hopefully it's within ten minutes. With the agreement of both parties, I will go in to the jury pool room and

see -- make the statement just along the lines that you've indicated, and I'll come back and report.

MS. THIEN: Sounds good.

THE COURT: Okay. Before we do that, why don't you go ahead and bring back Mr. Baize.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR.)

THE COURT: Mr. Baize, I want to thank you very much for your time and your patience with us today. I want to inform you that you will not be needed for jury service at this time, but I do need to you to call in Sunday to check to make sure that there is not another jury next week, okay?

MR. BAIZE: The way I understand it, I have to call in the next three Sundays; is that correct?

THE COURT: No, actually -- actually no. You have only got two more that you would have to call in, okay?

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE

THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: The Court is back in session. The Court did go and talk to the jury pool, and did so democratically and they voted. And they want to go home now. However, we've got two issues. There is a potential juror Culp is her name. C-U-L-P, Raina. She has a dental appointment tomorrow morning to get her tooth pulled at 7:30. I want to know if there is any objection from either side to allow her not to be here. My thought is, she'll be in pain, and not in a good mood. Does the State have an objection for me letting her go?

MR. BUTLER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the defense?

MS. THIEN: No, Judge. It's been painful enough. I don't think we need to add to it.

THE COURT: Very well. We will do that. Second issue, there is a gentlemen further down. He is, one, two, three, four -- the seventh from the bottom, Mr. Goodwin. He starts a job in Texas as a foreman starting Saturday and is expected, I think I was told, to work six weeks.

BAILIFF OLIVER: Yes.

THE COURT: Does anybody have any issue with

me allowing him to go? I don't think we would even get to him.

MR. BUTLER: No objection from the People.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Then again with our luck, no. No objection.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and let her know she can go, and she will be excused but to call in.

BAILIFF OLIVER: Okay.

THE COURT: I did tell them to be here sharp at 8:30. We are going to be here in Court ready to go at 8:30. We will still do panels of four. As much as I'd like to do more, but we're going to continue the way we have been doing it. Does the State still wish to have four alternates?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. Yes. That would be the State's request.

THE COURT: Very well. We have already talked about it, Ms. Thien. Do you have any -- would you want four alternates?

MS. THIEN: The way our luck's been going, three or four, yes. I think we would need to do that. Um, in the past when it came to alternates, usually we would do two. One strike per. Um, in this case if it's

if four, two strikes per -- if that sounds fair to everybody -- and we'll pick the alternates from the same pool and go as quickly as possible?

MR. BUTLER: That's fine with the People.

THE COURT: That's what we'll do. Okay. Everybody enjoy their everything. I will see you tomorrow.

(COURT WAS ADJOURNED FOR THE DAY.)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

WILLIAMSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
Vs	)	
	)	No. 2020-CF-596
	)	
JULIA E. BEVELY,	)	
	)	
Defendannt.	)	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Amy L. Holloman, one of the Official Court Reporters in and for the First Judicial Circuit of the State of Illinois, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, complete, and correct transcript of all the proceedings had in the above-styled cause.

Amy L. Holloman

Amy L. Holloman, CSR
Official Court Reporter

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

WILLIAMSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 20-CF-596
	)	
JULIA E. BEVELY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

JURY TRIAL

Report of proceedings of the Jury Trial before the Honorable Stephan Green on February 8th, 2023.

APPEARANCES:

JENNIFER MUDGE and PHILLIP BUTLER
Special Prosecutors
For the People

THERESA THIEN
Public Defender
Williamson County, Illinois
For the Defendant

Amy L. Holloman, CSR
Official Court Reporter
Williamson County Courthouse
Marion, IL 62959

INDEX

Witness	Cynthia Geittmann
Direct Exam by Ms. Mudge	185
	Charles Welge
Direct Exam by Ms. Mudge	187
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	202
Redirect Exam by Ms. Mudge	209
	Sam Ward
Direct Exam by Ms. Mudge	210
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	217
	Aaron Anderson
Direct Exam by Ms. Mudge	224
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	233
	Dustin Kelley
Direct Exam by Ms. Mudge	235
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	242
	Justin Francis
Direct Exam by Mr. Butler	245
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	256
	Adam Rawlinson
Direct Exam by Mr. Butler	259
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	266

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: The Court re-calls 20-CF-596. It is the third day of jury trial. Still in jury selection. The defendant is present with her attorney. State's also present by both of the representatives for the State. I don't know if you watched the news. We got a jury.

Um, my memory is we've got three. The defense exercised their last peremptory, and then you're going to get four alternates, so I am going to call the next five to help us move along. I don't want anybody being in a hurry. That's not my comment, but at the same time, I am mindful of deadlines that the defense had suggested yesterday. Okay. So, if I am correct, we have Slaughter, McPherson, Boles, Piercy, Bangs. That would be the next five. Is that what you guys agree to?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Has everybody checked in?

BAILIFF OLIVER: Um, we are still waiting on -- the only ones out of the three that are on the bubble that are here is Karen Anderson. We're still waiting for Megan Dillon and Abigail Stewart. And I haven't

done any sort of roll call in the assembly room yet.

THE COURT: Let's go ahead and do the roll call first. Hopefully the others will show up. We won't start till we get those things taken care.

BAILIFF OLIVER: Okay. Do you want me to just start with those first five that we're going to call --

THE COURT: -- see if they are there.

BAILIFF OLIVER: Okay.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

BAILIFF OLIVER: So we have all three now back there, and the first five are here.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and bring them in.

BAILIFF OLIVER: Okay.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Good morning. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with

the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you some names. These are potential witnesses that may be called in the case. Please pay attention. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley.

Dr. B. Goldsberry. University Place Dental Center is where he is from. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays, supervisor at Hyatt Global Corporation, Human Resources. Kendall Mezo, shift supervisor at Hyatt. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Lutton. Dr. David Wold. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stewart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michelle Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

THE COURT: Ms. Slaughter, where do you reside? What city, ma'am?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Johnston City, Illinois.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. SLAUGHTER: I am retired.

THE COURT: From where, ma'am?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Here from Social Security.

THE COURT: And where did you work before you retired?

MS. SLAUGHTER: I retired when I was a housekeeper.

THE COURT: Okay. Your marital status?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Separated.

THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 or over that live in Williamson County?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Could you give me their names and occupation?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Amy Melvin. Um, she was a housekeeper, too.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. SLAUGHTER: No.

THE COURT: Mr. McPherson, what city do you reside in?

MR. MCPHERSON: Herrin.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. MCPHERSON: I am not working right now.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. MCPHERSON: Divorced.

THE COURT: Do you have any children age 18 or over that live in Williamson County?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Could you give me their names and occupation?

MR. MCPHERSON: Chad McPherson, and he owns McPherson Enterprises.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MR. MCPHERSON: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Boles, what city do you reside in?

MS. BOLES: Marion.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. BOLES: Retired.

THE COURT: From where?

MS. VOLES: The VA Hospital, FAA, and Kennedy Space Center, NASA.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. VOLES: Divorced.

THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 or over that live in Williamson County?

MS. BOLES: Mm-hmm, a daughter.

THE COURT: Her name and occupation?

MS. BOLES: Jacqueline Boles, and she is retired from hair dressing.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. BOLES: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Piercy, what city do you reside in?

MS. PIERCY: Marion.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. PIERCY: Um, I'm a biller.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. PIERCY: I'm married.

THE COURT: Your spouse's name and occupation?

MS. PIERCY: Nathan Piercy. He works at Continental Tire.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over age 18 living in Williamson County?

MS. PIERCY: Yes.

THE COURT: Could you give me their name and occupation?

MS. PIERCY: Carley Piercy. She works at the Hub.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. PIERCY: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Bangs?

MS. BANGS: Yes.

THE COURT: What city do you reside in?

MS. BANGS: Marion.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. BANGS: I'm a stay-at-home mom.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. BANGS: I am married.

THE COURT: Your spouse's name and occupation?

MS. BANGS: His name is Tyson Bangs. For the last year he's been a correctional officer at Menard Penitentiary. Before that, he was a brick layer.

THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 over --

MS. BANGS: -- no.

THE COURT: No. Okay. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. BANGS: I do not. My husband does.

THE COURT: Okay.

The next set of questions are going to be as

a group. If it applies to you, I need you to raise your hand so we can address it. I have been told that this case is expected to last two weeks, so I need to know if there is anything that may occur in your life within the next two weeks that would take your focus away from this trial. If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Do any of you know the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler or Theresa Thien?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Have you or any member of your immediate family had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Do any of you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. I read to you a list of potential witnesses. Do you know

any of the witnesses? Mr. McPherson, you think you do?

MR. MCPHERSON: Eggemeyer.

THE COURT: Okay. Your relationship -- how do you know him?

MR. MCPHERSON: Just -- I am not really sure. Just encountered before.

THE COURT: Okay. Not a close acquaintance; just someone you know?

MR. MCPHERSON: Right.

THE COURT: Have any of you ever been selected for jury service before? That includes grand jury service.

MS. BOLES: I was called in Florida, but they didn't select me.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Boles. No one else indicates that they were. Have you or an immediate family member ever been the victim of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they were. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Have you or any immediate family member ever been

charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Do you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency?

MS. BANGS: Uh, prison.

THE COURT: Ms. Bangs, your husband. You identified that. Anybody else?

MS. BANGS: No.

THE COURT: Would you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement? If that applies, please raise your hand?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Now, I am going to question you again separately. I got to go over some very important rules of law that apply in all cases in which the defendant is charged with a criminal case. The defendant is to be presumed innocent of the charges against them. A defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt

as to that charge. The defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify. And that if a defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Ms. Slaughter, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. SLAUGHTER: I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. SLAUGHTER: I agree.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. SLAUGHTER: I agree.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept the principle and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. SLAUGHTER: I agree.

THE COURT: Mr. McPherson, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that the defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Boles, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charge against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. BOLES: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. BOLES: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. BOLES: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that the defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. BOLES: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Piercy, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. PIERCY: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant guilty

beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. PIERCY: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. PIERCY: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that the defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. PIERCY: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Bangs, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. BANGS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. BANGS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not

required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. BANGS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. BANGS: Yes.

THE COURT: This is to you as a group. Again I need you to verbalize a response to these. Will you each agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. Each of you have told me you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. That's very important. I have also told you this case involves the charge of First Degree Murder. What I need to know is if there is anything about that charge that would

prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

GROUP ANSWER: No.

THE COURT: One indicates that it would. Now, I am going to question you again individually. Listen to my question. Only respond to my question. I do not want you to go into specific detail at all. Ms. Slaughter, has the media contacted you regarding this case?

MS. SLAUGHTER: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to any potential jurors about this case?

MS. SLAUGHTER: No.

THE COURT: Mr. McPherson, has the media contacted you about this case?

MR. MCPHERSON: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed any of the media speaking to any potential jurors in this case?

MR. MCPHERSON: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Boles, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. BOLES: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to anyone about this case?

MS. BOLES: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Piercy, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. PIERCY: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to anyone about this case?

MS. PIERCY: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Bangs, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. PIERCY: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to any potential jurors about this case?

MS. PIERCY: No, I have not.

THE COURT: Okay. Again, I will ask a series of questions. I do not want you to go into any specific detail.

Ms. Slaughter, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you find your information? Was it on television? Radio? Internet? What source?

MS. SLAUGHTER: TV and radio.

THE COURT: How long ago since it's been --

since you heard -- last heard or read something about the case?

MS. SLAUGHTER: This morning.

THE COURT: Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge I read to you earlier?

MS. SLAUGHTER: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. SLAUGHTER: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there now, ma'am, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. SLAUGHTER: The law.

THE COURT: Ma'am?

MS. SLAUGHTER: The Court law.

THE COURT: According to the law. You have not made your mind up yet?

MS. SLAUGHTER: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you formed an opinion about any issue in the case?

MS. SLAUGHTER: No.

THE COURT: Mr. McPherson, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you hear about it? Was it television? Radio? Internet?

MR. MCPHERSON: Social media and internet news sites.

THE COURT: How long ago has it been since you last read something or heard something about the case?

MR. MCPHERSON: I saw something yesterday.

THE COURT: Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement about the charge I read to you earlier?

MR. MCPHERSON: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you read or heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MR. MCPHERSON: Um, I started reading from that -- from the day it happened, so I do have somewhat of an opinion, yes.

THE COURT: Do you have an opinion today as you sit there now as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Slaughter, is there anything about what you heard or read about this case that would

keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. SLAUGHTER: No.

THE COURT: Now, if you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about the case?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yes.

THE COURT: Would you decide the case only on the evidence and testimony presented here in open Court?

MS. SLAUGHTER: On the evidence, yes.

THE COURT: Mr. McPherson, is there anything about what you read or heard about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MR. MCPHERSON: I believe so.

THE COURT: Ms. Boles, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. BOLES: When it happened, I think. Probably saw something on TV, but that's all.

THE COURT: So, was the last time you got any information about the case a couple years back?

MS. BOLES: Yes.

THE COURT: Is what you heard more detailed

than what I read to you about the charge?

MS. BOLES: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard, did you form an opinion as to this case?

MS. BOLES: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. BOLES: No.

THE COURT: Have you formed an opinion about any issue in the case?

MS. BOLES: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you heard or read in this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MS. BOLES: No.

THE COURT: Now, if you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you might have heard about the case?

MS. BOLES: Yeah.

THE COURT: Would you decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which is presented here in open Court?

MS. BOLES: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Piercy, have you heard or read anything about the case?

MS. PIERCY: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you gain your information?

MS. PIERCY: TV. Internet.

THE COURT: How long ago was it since you last heard any information about this case?

MS. PIERCY: A few days ago.

THE COURT: Is what you heard or read more detailed than the statement about the charge that I read to you today?

MS. PIERCY: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you read or heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. PIERCY: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you now have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. PIERCY: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you heard or read in this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. PIERCY: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Bangs, have you heard or

read anything about this case?

MS. BANGS: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: When was the last time you gained any information about this case?

MS. BANGS: Last week a friend had shared a screen shot of the post stating when the trial was starting. It was the same day she knew I was starting jury duty.

THE COURT: What source did you gain your information from?

MS. BANGS: That was from a news post on Facebook.

THE COURT: So, the last time you gained any information was a week or two ago?

MS. BANGS: Mm-hmm. Yes, sir.

THE COURT: The information that you might have read, is it more detailed than the statement I read here today?

MS. BANGS: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you read, did you form an opinion about the case?

MS. BANGS: No, I have not.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict

in this case should be?

MS. BANGS: Do I -- no, I don't have any opinions either way.

THE COURT: As you sit there now, have you formed an opinion about any issue in this case?

MS. BANGS: No, I have not.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MS. BANGS: No.

THE COURT: If you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have heard or read about the case and instead decide this case only upon the evidence and testimony presented here in open Court?

MS. BANGS: Yes.

THE COURT: This will be to each of you as a group again. I need you to verbalize an answer to it.

At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in Court?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: Can you say that again?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. Now, is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed here so far that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror? If so, raise your hand, please?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No ones raises their hand. Ms. Thien, I think it's to you.

MS. THIEN: I can take it, Judge, but I

don't think it is. I think it's to the State.

MR. BUTLER: I'll take it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BUTLER: Um, Ms. Slaughter, you said you heard about the case on TV?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: When was that?

MS. SLAUGHTER: When it happened.

MR. BUTLER: And nothing since?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Well, yeah. Every once in a while, but I was, like, listening to the weather; not paying attention really.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. And have you talked about this case with anyone?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Well, yeah. Somebody asked me a couple questions. I said I didn't know.

MR. BUTLER: Gotcha. All right. Thank you. Mr. McPherson, you said you knew Detective Eggemeyer?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yeah.

MR. BUTLER: Is that -- I think your exact words were "you encountered him."

MR. MCPHERSON: I think he's from my home town, so that's how I would know him.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Anything about you

knowing him if you're selected to serve on the jury that would prevent you from being fair and impartial to one side or the other?

MR. MCPHERSON: No.

MR. BUTLER: And I think you mentioned you already formed an opinion on the case.

MR. MCPHERSON: Yeah. I tend to probably be a news junkie. So, from the minute it happened, based on the proximity to my home, um, based on social media release and stuff, I followed it really closely.

MR. BUTLER: I think you said you have been reading it since it happened?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: You understand that what you have read on the internet may not be the evidence that is presented here?

MR. MCPHERSON: I understand that.

MR. BUTLER: Do you think you would be able to set that aside, or has your opinion been formed at this point?

MR. MCPHERSON: I think I am -- probably would be -- have a difficult time being impartial.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Boles, you lived in Florida at some point?

MS. BOLES: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: When did you move back to the area?

MS. BOLES: Two thousand and four. I retired from NASA in 1998, and then I worked on -- for a cruise ship just until I could get back. I was born and raised here.

MR. BUTLER: Gotcha. Okay. Um, and you've heard something about the case on TV?

MS. BOLES: Honestly, no. I remember when it happened. I don't watch the local news hardly at all, so I have not seen anything on the news.

MR. BUTLER: Seen anything on Facebook or any other --

MS BOLES: -- I don't do social media, no.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MS. BOLES: No.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

MS. BOLES: Thank you.

MR. BUTLER: Ms. Piercy, I think you said you had also formed an opinion in the case. Is that based off of, I think, you read or seen in the news?

MS. PIERCY: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: And you think you would be able

to set aside that opinion and judge the case on the facts presented in Court, or is your opinion formed at this point?

MS. PIERCY: I believe my opinion is formed at this point.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. Ms. Bangs?

MS. BANGS: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: You said you're a stay-at-home mom?

MS. BANGS: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: How many kids do you have?

MS. BANGS: I have a two-year-old, I have a seven-year-old and three-year-old.

MR. BUTLER: Seven and three. If you are selected to the jury, would someone be able to watch them?

MS. BANGS: Yes. Yes. Between family and friends, we have got it taken care of.

MR. BUTLER: So, you wouldn't have any problems sitting here, focusing on what's being testified to --

MS. BANGS: No.

MR. BUTLER: -- as opposed to thinking about your kids at home?

MS. BANGS: No. They are at school.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. And your husband works for the Department of Corrections?

MS. BANGS: Yes. He started a year ago.

MR. BUTLER: And that's kind of law enforcement. So, if there are law enforcement officers that testify here in this trial, are you going to give their testimony more weight, less weight or judge it the same?

MS. BANGS: I would take it the same as anyone else.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. No further questions.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Ms. Slaughter, you said you heard something mentioned on the news this morning --

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yeah.

MS. THIEN: -- jury selection was still going on?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yeah. Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: Is there anything about what you have seen or heard outside of the courtroom that you're going to bring into the courtroom --

MS. SLAUGHTER: -- no.
MS. THINE: -- to make up your mind?
MS. SLAUGHTER: No.
MS. THIEN: Are you on any form of social media? Facebook?
MS. SLAUGHTER: Facebook sometimes. I get on it, but I am too busy cleaning.
MS. THIEN: Okay. Has this case been the topic of conversation among family and friends?
MS. SLAUGHTER: No.
MS. THIEN: Ma'am, where do you get your news from? Just TV and radio?
MS. SLAUGHTER: I love radio. I love music, so it would be there.
MS. THIEN: Thanks. Mr. McPherson, where is your home town?
MR. MCPHERSON: DuQuoin.
MS. THIEN: Okay. I was going to say Eggemeyer is a name -- I'm from up in Randolph County originally.
MR. MCPHERSON: -- yeah. Spinnerule. DuQuoin.
MS. THIEN: -- yeah. And I always ask, "Where you from?" Do you know Carl Eggemeyer

specifically?

MR. MCPHERSON: No.

MS. THIEN: No. You just recognize the name as being regional.

MR. MCPHERSON: Yeah.

MS. THIEN: Ms. Boles?

MS. BOLES: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Are you on social media?

MS. BOLES: No.

MS. THIEN: No. Not at all?

MS. BOLES: No.

MS. THIEN: No Facebook?

MS. BOLES: No.

MS. THIEN: Instagram?

MS. BOLES: No.

MS. THIEN: Pinterest?

MS. BOLES: I have Facebook on my computer, but I rarely get on it, and it's just for my family.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Where do you get your news from?

MS. BOLES: News magazines until they took it off the TV. I do watch Fox News quite a bit. I just don't watch local news for some reason.

MS. THIEN: Okay. You said you had one

daughter over the age of 18 living here?

MS. BOLES: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: She is retired from hair styling?

MS. BOLES: Yes. She is 58.

MS. THIEN: And do you have any grandkids living around here?

MS. BOLES: No.

MS. THIEN: Is it Ms. Bangs?

MS. BANGS: Yes.

MS. THIEN: You said your husband's been working with the Department of Corrections since -- for about a year?

MS. BANGS: January he started.

MS. THIEN: Um, you, he or both of you, do have any friends in law enforcement?

MS. BANGS: No.

MS. THIEN: No? Okay. You said a friend of yours shared a post on Facebook?

MS. BANGS: Yes. She texted me a screen shot of the post that said that the jury trial -- or the trial was starting on February 6th at 9:00, and her son goes to school with mine so she knew that I wasn't going to be able to pick up my kids. So she is, like, your

jury duty starts on this day, so I think this might be what you're doing.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Do you recall what the screen shot was of?

MS. BANGS: It was WSIL.

MS. THIEN: WSIL?

MS. BANGS: Yeah.

MS. THIEN: Um, and that was on Facebook?

MS. BANGS: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Are you on any other forms of social media?

MS. BANGS: I don't get on it often.

MS. THIEN: And have you seen anything else about this case on social media? News?

MS. BANGS: No, I don't watch the news.

MS. THIEN: Discuss with friends and family; anything like that?

MS. BANGS: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Butler, I believe it's Dillon, Anderson, Stewart, Slaughter.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, the People would exercise our sixth peremptory on Slaughter.

THE COURT: Okay. That gets you down to McPherson.

MR. BUTLER: I would make a for cause challenge for Mr. McPherson. His opinion is already formed. He said he's been reading about the case since it happened, and I asked him if he could set aside what he read, and he said it was formed.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I agree.

THE COURT: The State's motion for cause granted. That gets you down to Boles.

MR. BUTLER: The State would ask to exercise our last peremptory challenge on Ms. Boles.

THE COURT: Very well. That gets you down to Piercy.

MR. BUTLER: The State would make a for cause challenge on Ms. Piercy. Again, she said she could not be fair and impartial. Her opinion is already formed.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I agree.

THE COURT: Very well. It gets you down to

Bangs.

MS. BANGS: I would tender the panel.

MS. THIEN: We accept.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's do it this way. Bring back Slaughter, McPherson, Boles and Piercy. We'll excuse them. Then I need -- well, go ahead and take -- do we have security that can be sitting outside of the attorney witness room outside of eight? No? Take them upstairs to the jury deliberation room behind three.

BAILIFF O'BRIEN: The ones that have been picked?

THE COURT: The ones that are part of the panel.

BAILIFF OLIVER: Do we -- I'm sorry. Do we want to go ahead and bring them in, give them their badges so they can be sworn in, or do you want to wait on that?

THE COURT: Well, they are going to be traveling outside. Maybe that's a better practice to do to have the badges. Let's bring in the ones that we are going to excuse first. Then we will bring them in.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: On behalf of Ms. Bevely and the State and the defense, myself included, I want to thank you very much for your time. I understand that this is a great inconvenience for each one of you, and we appreciate the time that you have dedicated towards this service. It's very important. You will not be needed for this particular jury. Um, I am told that the jury trial that was next week is not going, so you're going to get a week off. But there is, as of right now, another jury trial set. So, you do need to call in to check to see if your service will be needed in a week -- a little bit more than a week, okay? My bailiff will take you to help you get your personal effects. Thank you very much.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

THE COURT: Good morning, lady's. I need to inform you that you have been chosen for jury service. At this time, I need you to stand. I am going to ask my clerk to swear you in. Please stand. Raise your right hand.

(JURORS SWORN.)

THE COURT: Thank you. I need to tell you something for just a moment. Listen to me, please.

While this trial is going on, you're not to talk to anybody. At this courthouse if somebody approaches you, even if they are wanting to say hello, you move away from them. Do not engage in any kind of conversation whatsoever. If anybody tries to approach you to discuss this case or anything at all, you are to notify my bailiffs immediately and move away from that person.

UNIDENTIFIED JUROR: That's her?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Those are my bailiffs. And security, any law enforcement personnel that happen to be close by, they count, too, okay?

Now, until this case is submitted to you to deliberate, you must not discuss this case with anyone. That means your spouse, your child, your friend. No one. You are not to remain in hearing of anybody talking about this case. If that happens, you move away. You are not to read the news. You're not to watch the television about any stories related to this case whatsoever. You're not to listen to any radio broadcast or go on the internet or look about anything about this case. After this case has been submitted to you, you must discuss the case only in the jury room when all members are present in that room with you. You're to keep an open mind. You must not decide any

issue in the case until it is submitted to you for your deliberation under the instructions of the Court. Okay. If you will follow my bailiff, he will take you to your new sitting place.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Okay. We need to do alternates. We need Dutton, Rolape, Siddon, Zielke.

MS. THIEN: I was just going to let the Court know that I am socially acquainted with Francis Zielke. We're part of the same -- I haven't been there in a couple of years -- but the same stitch/knitting kind of thing. I didn't know if that would be an issue. I know we're tight on time. I don't think it would be. I haven't actually spoken to her in a couple of years, but I wanted to get that out there if we wanted to add one more potentially.

THE COURT: What is the name?

MS. THIEN: Zielke.

THE COURT: Zielke. Thank you. Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: I think we can see how that goes with the questioning, your Honor.

MS. THIEN: I just wanted it to be out there.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you. Just the four?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Well, we got to pick four. You each got two strikes now. You want to bring more than four? I'm getting deadpanned. We'll just bring four.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act

created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you a list of potential witnesses who may testify in this case. Please listen to the names. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. B. Goldsberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays. Kendall Mezo. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy

Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

THE COURT: Ms. Dutton, what city do you reside in?

MS. DUTTON: Marion.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. DUTTON: I am retired.

THE COURT: From where, ma'am?

MS. DUTTON: The last place was Department of Transportation.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. DUTTON: I am single.

THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 or above residing in Williamson County?

MS. DUTTON: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. DUTTON: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Rolape, what city do you reside in?

MS. ROLAPE: Marion.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. ROLAPE: I am retired.

THE COURT: From where, ma'am?

MS. ROLAPE: WPS Medicare.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. ROLAPE: Single.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over age 18 in Williamson County?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

THE COURT: Their name and occupation, please?

MS. ROLAPE: Anthony Buckner (ph), and he's unemployed right now.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. ROLAPE: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Zielke, what city do you reside in?

MS. ZIELKE: Herrin.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. ZIELKE: I am a school social worker for

Franklin Jefferson Special Education District.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. ZIELKE: Married.

THE COURT: Your spouse's name and occupation?

MS. ZIELKE: Ernest Zielke. He is retired from the postal service.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. ZIELKE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Siddon? Is it Siddon?

MS. SIDDON: I'm sorry. Lab tech.

THE COURT: Okay. Where do you live?

MS. SIDDON: Carterville.

THE COURT: You're a lab tech for who?

MS. SIDDON: Christopher Rural Health.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. SIDDON: Single.

THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 or older that live in Williamson County?

MS. SIDDON: Yes.

THE COURT: Their name and occupation?

MS. SIDDON: Dillon Blackburn, and he's a cook, and Morgan Sivinski (ph). She works at Herrin ER.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. SIDDON: No.

THE COURT: Okay. The next set of questions I am going to ask to the group as a whole. If it applies to you, I need you to raise your hand. Now, I have been told that this trial is going to last approximately two weeks. What I need to know is if there is anything that may happen in your life within the next two weeks that would take your focus away from this trial? If so, raise your hand for me.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that would be a problem. Do any of you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler, or Theresa Thien? Yes, ma'am, Ms. Ziekle.

MS. ZIELKE: I know Theresa Thien.

THE COURT: The nature of your relationship, ma'am?

MS. ZIELKE: It's very casual. We sometimes knit together in the same location.

THE COURT: Is there anything about your relationship with her that would effect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. ZIELKE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you or any one of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No ones indicated that is so. Do any of you have any friends or acquaintances that work in either of the attorneys' offices?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they do. Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they do. You have been told by me a list of witnesses. Do you know any of the witnesses that I read?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they do. Have any of you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service?

MS. ZIELKE: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Zielke, how long ago you think?

MS. ZIELKE: Early 2000's.

THE COURT: What kind of case was it? Was

it a civil or criminal?

MS. ZIELKE: I believe it was a criminal case.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that process that you think would effect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

MS. ZIELKE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Did that case go to a verdict?

MS. ZIELKE: Yes, it did.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been the victim of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Have you or any immediate family member -- oh, wait a minute.

MS. DUTTON: I'm sorry. I don't know how bad of a crime, but we have had our house broken into three times.

THE COURT: Ms. Dutton, when did that occur, you think?

MS. DUTTON: The last time was a year ago, December 5th.

THE COURT: So, is there anything about those things that you feel like would effect your

ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

MS. DUTTON: No, I suppose not.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Oh, I'm sorry, ma'am.

MS. ROLAPE: Yes. My son.

THE COURT: And, Ms. Rolape, is there anything about that that would effect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

MS. ROLAPE: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being charged here today?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Do any of you have relatives or close friends that are employed by police or law enforcement agencies? Okay. Ms. Dutton?

MS. DUTTON: I have a son-in-law who is retired from city police officer in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Rolape?

MS. ROLAPE: Um, my ex-sister-in-law that I was married to her brother for 23 years, she is an Illinois State Detective.

THE COURT: Okay. So, would any of you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because the witness works in law enforcement? Ms. Dutton?

MS. DUTTON: I support the police all the way.

THE COURT: So, if an officer were testifying, do you believe that that testimony would be more believable simply because they are in law enforcement?

MS. DUTTON: Yes, I think so.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am. I need to cover some principles that are very, very important that apply in every case in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge. A defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and

is not required to testify, and that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Ms. Dutton, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. DUTTON: Yes.

THE COURT: There was a long hesitation, so I want to make sure I understand where you're at. There is no wrong answer. I just want the truth. We all do. Is there something about the fact that someone is charged with a crime that in your mind would lead them to -- lead you to believe that they are probably guilty?

MS. DUTTON: Well, I think it would depend on the case. You know, what you knew about it, and I would have to weigh it at the time.

THE COURT: As we sit here now, is the defense and the State on equal footing?

MS. DUTTON: I'm sorry. Would you repeat that?

THE COURT: As we sit here right now, is the State and the defendant on equal footing in terms of what the proof might or might not be?

MS. DUTTON: That's difficult because when this happened, I did a lot of reading about it so that --

THE COURT: -- I would appreciate if you don't go into any detail about what you read at this time, okay?

MS. DUTTON: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: That's okay. Thank you, ma'am. Ms. Rolape, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charge against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before the defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. ROLAPE: Say that again, please?

THE COURT: Sure. Yes, ma'am. Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that

the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. ROLAPE: So, are you saying, like, they don't have to testify? They don't have to say anything; is that what you're --

THE COURT: -- yes, ma'am.

MS. ROLAPE: I -- I am not sure how to answer that. I mean, I would say yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

THE COURT: So, does that help you with respect about the defendant not being required to offer any evidence?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes, it does.

THE COURT: All right. So, if -- that principle you would apply. There would be no requirement for the defendant to offer anything if they chose to. You can accept that principle; is that accurate?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Zielke, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. ZIELKE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable degree?

MS. ZIELKE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. ZIELKE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. ZIELKE: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Siddon, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. SIDDON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. SIDDON: I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. SIDDON: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. SIDDON: Yes.

THE COURT: This will be to you as a group. I need you to verbalize your response to it, okay? Will you each agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. Will you agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a

verdict?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. Now, each one of you told me you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. You've also been told that this case involves a charge of First Degree Murder. What I need to know is if there is anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case. If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No ones raises their hand. Now, I am going to question you some more individually. With the next set of questions, I just want you to answer the question. I do not want you to go into any specific detail. Ms. Dutton, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. DUTTON: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media discussing anything with any potential juror?

MS. DUTTON: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Rolape, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. ROLAPE: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to any potential jurors?

MS. ROLAPE: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Zielke, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. ZIELKE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to any potential jurors?

MS. ZIELKE: I have not.

THE COURT: Ms. Siddon, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. SIDDON: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to any potential jurors in this case?

MS. SIDDON: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Dutton, without going into detail at all, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. DUTTON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: From where did you get that information?

MS. DUTTON: When it happened, I read various articles in the newspaper.

THE COURT: Was that the last time that you

received any information about the case?

MS. DUTTON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So, that's been a couple years ago?

MS. DUTTON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Is what you read more detailed than the statement about the charges that I read to you?

MS. DUTTON: It's media. You can't always believe it to be full truth. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: I understand that, but my question is did it give you more information than what I told you here today?

MS. DUTTON: No, sir.

THE COURT: Is what you read something that caused you to form an opinion about this case?

MS. DUTTON: Yes, I'm afraid so.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. DUTTON: Yes.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, have you formed an opinion as to any issue in the case?

MS. DUTTON: I'm sorry. Please repeat that.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. As you sit there

right now, have you formed an opinion about any issue in this case?

MS. DUTTON: I feel I have.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you might have heard or read that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. DUTTON: I'm a mother, so yes.

THE COURT: Now, if you're selected as a juror in this case, are you telling me you will not be able to disregard what you've read or heard?

MS. DUTTON: I think I am saying it would take a lot to change my mind.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. DUTTON: Sorry.

THE COURT: No, that's fine. It's okay. Ms. Rolape, without going into any specific detail, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you gain your information; from what source?

MS. ROLAPE: Um, the media when it first came out, and people talk.

THE COURT: How long ago since the last time you heard about something relating to this case?

MS. ROLAPE: It was right after I got the summons to be a juror. I saw an article on the internet that said that the jury was going to be selected.

THE COURT: Now, is what you read or what you might have discussed or heard more detailed than the statement that I read about the charges in this case?

MS. ROLAPE: A little bit.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard or read, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. ROLAPE: I have tried not to.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, have you formed an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in the case?

MS. ROLAPE: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, have you formed an opinion as to any issue in the case?

MS. ROLAPE: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you might have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. ROLAPE: I want to say no because I haven't heard everything about the case.

THE COURT: Do you think you can keep an open mind and listen to the evidence that is presented

in open Court and make a decision solely based on what you hear in Court?

MS. ROLAPE: I will do my very, very best to do that, yes.

THE COURT: Well, if you're selected as a juror, are you going to be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard about this case and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony presented in open Court?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes, I would.

THE COURT: Ms. Zielke, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. ZIELKE: Yes.

THE COURT: From where did you get your information?

MS. ZIELKE: When it first happened from the media news source. Also, when I got the jury summons, I saw that the trial was going to happen.

THE COURT: So, the last time you received any information about this case is when you received a jury summons a couple of weeks back?

MS. ZIELKE: Yes.

THE COURT: Is what you might have read or heard any more detailed than the charges I read to you

here today?

MS. ZIELKE: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you might have heard or read, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. ZIELKE: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. ZIELKE: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, have you formed an opinion about any issue in this case?

MS. ZIELKE: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you heard or read that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. ZIELKE: No.

THE COURT: So, if you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you may have read or heard and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony presented in open Court?

MS. ZIELKE: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Siddon, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. SIDDON: Yes.

THE COURT: From where did you get your information?

MS. SIDDON: It was just a post on the internet.

THE COURT: How long ago have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. SIDDON: It was when it first happened.

THE COURT: So is it fair to say the last time you received any information about the case was approximately two years ago?

MS. SIDDON: Yeah.

THE COURT: Is what you might have heard or read more detailed than the charges I read to you here today?

MS. SIDDON: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you read or heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. SIDDON: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict in this case should be?

MS. SIDDON: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, have

you formed an opinion as to any issue in this case?

MS. SIDDON: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you might have heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MS. SIDDON: No.

THE COURT: So, if you're selected for this case, will you be able to disregard anything that you may have read or heard about the case and instead decide the case solely on the evidence and testimony presented here in open Court?

MS. SIDDON: Yes.

THE COURT: The next set of questions is going to be to you as a group as a whole. I do need you to verbalize a response. At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of the case. Will you each follow the law as given in the instructions?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. Will you each decide the case only on the facts and evidence and law presented in Court?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: They all indicate that they would. Is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror? Now, if there is, please raise your hand so we can deal with it.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Judge, I believe this panel would go to Ms. Thien.

THE COURT: No, we're --

(SIDE BAR HELD OUTSIDE THE HEARING OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

(BACK ON RECORD WITHIN THE HEARING OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor. Ms. Zielke, I am going to start with you since you know Ms. Thien. Can you explain how you know her a little more?

MS. ZIELKE: Uh, we're both knitters and occasionally we would knit in the same knit shop.

MR. BUTLER: How long has that relationship been?

MS. ZIELKE: A couple years; two or three years.

MR. BUTLER: Have you ever talked to her about any cases?

MS. ZIELKE: Not really.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. About how often would you meet or see each other knit together?

MS. ZIELKE: I haven't seen Ms. Thien for several months.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MS. ZIELKE: It's probably been maybe six months at least.

MR. BUTLER: Um, now since you have that relationship with her -- you said you didn't know myself or Ms. Mudge; is that correct?

MS. ZIELKE: That is correct.

MR. BUTLER: Would you say we're on an equal

footing or because you have that relationship with her already that the defense has an advantage at this point?

MS. ZIELKE: I believe you're equal.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Thank you. Um, I think you said that you heard about the case when it first happened, and then again you read an article about it once you got the summons?

MS. ZIELKE: I don't really listen to media. I've got burned out during Covid, so I don't listen to the news much. I just saw that there was a trial coming up, and I assumed that it was this trial.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Rolape?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: You said your ex-sister-in-law was with the State police?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Is that Mary K?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Um, I know you said ex. Is there anything about that relationship that if you heard testimony from officers with the State Police that would give one side or the other more benefit?

MS. ROLAPE: No.

MR. BUTLER: No. And you had heard about

the case, I think, it was media and people talking?

MS. ROLAPE: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: And I think one of your answers to the Judge's questions you said you would do your very, very best to decide the case based off of the evidence and facts presented in Court; does that sound right?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Um, you had previously mentioned that you had heard some stuff about the case. So, will you be able to set that aside, what you heard, and just judge everything based on what you hear in Court?

MS. ROLAPE: Oh, yeah.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Dutton, you said you are a retired Department of Transportation worker?

MS. DUTTON: Yes, but before that I worked for the Department of Corrections. I was at the supermax prison.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Anything about that experience that would make you favor one side over the other?

MS. DUTTON: Other than it was a dreadful

experience. It wasn't pleasant there at all.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Um, but you're not going to hold anything that happened or unpleasantries that happened there against the defense or the prosecution?

MS. DUTTON: No. That doesn't actually apply here. It's just that the experience of working there. I think it kind of has something to do with your mind.

MR. BUTLER: Sure.

MS. DUTTON: -- who -- the people who don't obey the law.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Ms. Siddon, where did you say you were from?

MS. SIDDON: I am originally from Plainfield, Illinois.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Here in the county? I'm sorry, I missed where you said.

MS. SIDDON: It's in Will County.

MR. BUTLER: But you live here in Williamson County now?

MS. SIDDON: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. And what details you said you heard about were less than what the Judge read to you earlier?

MS. SIDDON: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Ms. Dutton, we don't need to get into what it is, but you told the Judge that based on what you read and heard about this case and what you followed, that you do have an opinion?

MS. DUTTON: I feel like I do, yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MS. DUTTON: As a mother, I feel like I do.

MS. THIEN: And if there were a -- no evidence whatsoever at this point in this courtroom -- I am not asking you to say what it is, okay, but if someone was to ask you, um, guilty, not guilty, would you have an answer?

MS. DUTTON: I'm sorry. Would you repeat the question?

MS. THIEN: That was difficult. Um, I am going to wipe that one out and start again. Is either side starting from a disadvantage in having to convince you of an outcome in this case?

MS. DUTTON: Yes. I think one side is going

to have to work a lot harder than the other. Sorry.

MS. THIEN: We're only human, and it's been a long three days so thank you very much. Ms. Rolape, you said your son had some trouble with the legal system at some point?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Is that in any way going to effect you from sitting on this case?

MS. ROLAPE: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, can I ask how long ago that's been?

MS. ROLAPE: Three years. Close to three years.

MS. THIEN: You said that your sister-in-law Mary K is -- the former sister-in-law with the Illinois State Police.

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Did you guys have a close relationship?

MS. ROLAPE: We did.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Still do or was it --

MS. ROLAPE: We don't see each other like we use to, but, I mean, she's still my family.

MS. THIEN: Gotcha. Is that -- that's kind

of hard to set aside if you're listening to others give testimony that may also be from the State Police. Do you think you would be more likely to give more weight to a police officer's testimony than you would to anyone else?

MS. ROLAPE: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. I did catch a little hesitancy during some of the questions. They are written by lawyers so bare in mind that as well. But under our system, Julie has the absolute right not to say a word in this courtroom; do you understand that?

MS. ROLAPE: Yes.

MS. THIEN: And you will not hold that against her?

MS. ROLAPE: No. That is the law that I can't, and I would not.

MS. THIEN: The flip side is she has the absolute right not to testify. Would you require her to do that in your own mind before you could make a decision?

MS. ROLAPE: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Not a trick question.

MS. ROLAPE: Pardon me?

MS. THIEN: Nothing. I said no trick

questions here. At the same time, the State bares the burden to prove this case beyond a reasonable doubt. The defense has no burden to prove anything except to demand that they do that. So, if -- not likely -- but if the defense puts on zero evidence, would you hold that against us?

MS. ROLAPE: It seems like the question is am I going to follow the law on this?

MS. THIEN: Right.

MS. ROLAPE: And, yes, I would follow the law. If that is what the instructions given has said this is the law, then that's what I would have to follow.

MS. THIEN: Very good. Thank you.

MS. ROLAPE: You're welcome.

MS. THIEN: Ms. Zielke, the fact that we know each other casually from sitting and stitching from, you know, several years ago, does that put me at an advantage or disadvantage if you were chosen to hear this case?

MS. ZIELKE: I don't think so.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And, um, other than the news post that came around saying that this case was getting ready to go to trial, have you followed anything

either in the newspaper, TV, Facebook, internet about this case?

MS. ZIELKE: Um, I don't watch the news. I don't read a newspaper, and I have seen a casual post on Facebook.

MS. THIEN: Did that effect you in any way?

MS. ZIELKE: No.

MS. THIEN: Have you ever commented on it, like, on Facebook?

MS. ZIELKE: Oh, no.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thanks. Is it Siddon or Siddon?

MS. SIDDON: Siddon.

MS. THIEN: Thank you. Ms. Siddon, you saw this on Facebook when it first started as well?

MS. SIDDON: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Have you seen anything else about this case?

MS. SIDDON: Yeah, I think I did see something that it was coming up.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Well, the last couple of days there's been some things out there as well. I didn't know if you had seen or heard any of that?

MS. SIDDON: No.

MS. THIEN: No? Okay. And I also missed it. You said you're a lab tech?

MS. SIDDON: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Where at?

MS. SIDDON: Christopher Rural.

MS. THIEN: Pardon?

MS. SIDDON: Christopher Rural Health.

MS. THIEN: Thank you. I have no further questions.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, are we going one by one on these?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. So, Ms. Dutton's first?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: I would make a for cause challenge on Ms. Dutton. I mean, she was very adamant that her opinion's formed, and it would take a lot from one party to change her mind.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I concur.

THE COURT: Motion for cause will be

granted. That gets you to Rolape.

MR. BUTLER: I would tender Ms. Rolape.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, the defense would exercise a peremptory.

THE COURT: That gets you down to Zielke.

MR. BUTLER: The People will exercise --

THE COURT: -- well, it's not your turn. It's hers. I figured that's what you'd do, but it's her turn.

MS. THIEN: Well, then I'll tender.

THE COURT: Of course you will.

MR. BUTLER: The People would exercise a peremptory, your Honor.

THE COURT: That gets you to Siddon. Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: We would tender Ms. Siddon.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. THIEN: We accept.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and bring in Dutton, Rolape and Zielke. Just those three.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ladies, on behalf of everybody

here, I want to thank you very much for your time and your patience with us. I know that this has taken a lot out of your personal lives, and I and the parties all appreciate that. You will not be selected for jury service at this time. So, you will be allowed to follow my bailiff to get your personal effects. I was told that there is not a jury trial next week, so you get a week off. However, I do need you to call in the following Sunday to check in to make sure that there is not a jury trial going on at that time. At least right now I know that there is. And, again, thank you very much for your service.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ms Thien, I was hopeful that we wouldn't get to this but we have. The next one on the list would have been Ms. Shaw Barnes. Ms. Barns, as you guys recall, was subject to communication by an individual while she was a prospective juror. Apparently that happened twice based upon her testimony that we took. By agreement, everybody agreed that that individual could be released.

MS. THIEN: Yes. That's what I recall.

THE COURT: Right. I want to make sure --

absolutely sure there is no issue at this point in time because she potentially could have been an alternate in the case.

MS. THIEN: I am not saying much, Judge, but I think that needs to be made part of the record. I think we're good.

THE COURT: That's why I wanted you to take the opportunity to speak with your client. The reason why I am making a big deal out of this is that lady so far was the only lady -- or only person of color that we've had in this particular jury pool that came up. So, I'll leave if you need to. I want you to talk to your client. I want to make absolutely sure that there is not an issue.

MS. THIEN: Judge, I didn't know if that was -- if we wanted to make sure there was not a Batson issue in place, and I will say that Julia and I have had the opportunity to speak about that. Um, I don't believe that anything that happened at this point would raise a Batson issue, and while we would have liked to have been able to question her as a potential juror, we understand there was a reason outside of everyone's control, and because of actions by a media person, that prevented that from happening. I think our record is

very clear on that. So, if that helps at this point Judge, that was our position, and I believe it still is.

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to take this opportunity to speak to everybody that is out in this audience. Nobody is to approach my jury for any purpose whatsoever. You want to talk them? You can after their jury service. I don't care if you want to say hello. You don't. If they come to you to try to talk to you, I need you to move away from them. This is very serious, and I just want to protect the process.

Okay. So, we're going to go ahead and leave Siddon in there right now, and then we need the next four. I want to remind you each you only have one peremptory left.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009,

stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you a list of potential witnesses that may be called in this case. Please pay attention to the names. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. Goldesberry from University Place

Dental Center. Dr. Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays. Kendall Mezo. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Arron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenrak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

THE COURT: Ms. O'Bright, in what city do you reside?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Johnston City.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. O'BRIGHT: I work as a parent liaison at the Washington Middle School in Johnston City.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Married.
THE COURT: Your spouse's name and occupation?
MS. O'BRIGHT: Aaron O'Bright. He's a machine machinist in Herrin, Illinois.
THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 or older that reside in Williamson County?
MS. O'BRIGHT: No.
THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
MS. O'BRIGHT: No.
THE COURT: Is it Sikorski?
MS. SIKORSKI: Sikorski.
THE COURT: Ms. Sikorski. Ma'am, in what city do you reside?
MS. SIKORSKI: Energy.
THE COURT: Your occupation?
MS. SIKORSKI: I'm retired.
THE COURT: From where, ma'am?
MS. SIKORSKI: From SIU.
THE COURT: Your marital status?
MS. SIKORSKI: Divorced.
THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 or older that live in Williamson County?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes. I have a daughter in Herrin.

THE COURT: Her name and occupation?

MS. SIKORSKI: Her name is Amber Wiedman she is a pharmacist at Marion Walgreens.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. SIKORSKI: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Watson, what city do you reside?

MS. WATSON: Herrin.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. WATSON: Restaurant general manager at Kentucky Fried Chicken in Herrin.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. WATSON: Divorced.

THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 or older that live in Williamson County?

MS. WATSON: Yes, I do. My nineteen year old, Blake Watson.

THE COURT: And what does he do or she?

MS. WATSON: Blake works at the Postal Service, UPS, and he works for Barry Watson Electric during the day of Herrin.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. WATSON: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Hill-Tibbs, where do you reside?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Carbondale.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: I am a self-employed horse trainer.

THE COURT: Marital status?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: I'm married.

THE COURT: Your spouse's name and occupation?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Seth Tibbs, and he is a self-employed horse farrier.

THE COURT: Do you have any children 18 or older?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: I hope not.

THE COURT: Why, I think you would know.

MS. HILL-TIBBS: No, I don't.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: I do not.

THE COURT: The next set of questions I am

going to ask you as a group. Now, if it applies to you, I need you to raise your hand so that we can deal with it.

Now, I have been told that this case is going to last approximately two weeks. So, what I need to know is if there is going to be anything that may occur in your life the next two weeks that would take your focus away from this trial. If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they would. Do any of you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler, Theresa Thien? None -- oh, okay. Yes, ma'am. Ms. O'Bright?

MS. O'BRIGHT: I use to work with Phillip Butler in Franklin County.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that relationship that would effect your ability to be fair or impartial in this case?

MS. O'BRIGHT: I don't believe so, no.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates they do. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that presently work in either of the attorneys' offices?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they do. Do any of you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: None one indicates that they do. I read to you a list of witnesses. Do you think you know any of those witnesses? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises a hand. Have any of you ever been selected as a juror before including grand jury service? Ms. Sikorski?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

THE COURT: When was that?

MS. SIKORSKI: It was probably somewhere between 2006 and 2008.

THE COURT: Do you remember what kind of case? Was it criminal or civil?

MS. SIKORSKI: It was criminal.

THE COURT: Did you get a verdict?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes, we did.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that process that effects your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. SIKORSKI: I don't think so.

THE COURT: Ms. Watson, I think you raised your hand.

MS. WATSON: I can't recall the date it was, but it was a civil, and it was settled.

THE COURT: Okay. So you sat --

MS. WATSON: -- one day thing, yeah.

THE COURT: So, the fact that you didn't get to deliberate or anything like that is that going to effect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

MS. WATSON: No.

THE COURT: No?

MS. WATSON: No.

THE COURT: Have any of you ever -- or any of your family members ever been a victim of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with the similar offense to the one being charged here today?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Do any of you have any relatives or close friends that are employed by the police or law enforcement agencies? Ms. Watson?

MS. WATSON: Chief of Police in Herrin and -- yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. Would any of you give the testimony of a police officer or other law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply because that witness works in law enforcement?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they would. I want to talk to you about some legal principles that apply in every case in which the defendant is charged with a criminal offense. That the defendant is to be presumed innocent of each of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to those

charges. The defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf and is not required to testify, and that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Ms. O'Bright, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charge against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Sikorski, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Watson, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. WATSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. WATSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. WATSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. WATSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Hill-Tibbs, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be

convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

THE COURT: The next set of questions I need you to verbalize out loud as a response, please. Will you each agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. Will you all agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would.

Now, each of you have told me you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. I have also told you the charge in this case is First Degree Murder. What I need to know now is if there is anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case? If so, raise your hand.

MS. WATSON: I have an 11-year-old child -- a 12-year-old child.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't want you to go into any detail. So, are you trying to tell me because of the nature of this case you would have a problem hearing this case?

MS. WATSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Watson.

MS. WATSON: You're welcome.

THE COURT: Attorneys?

(SIDE BAR HELD OUT OF THE HEARING.

OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Are you guys fine if I don't ask her any more questions? She was about to break.

MS. THIEN: I think that would put the rest of the pool at risk as well.

MR. BUTLER: Yeah. I am fine with that,

Judge.

(BACK ON RECORD INSIDE THE HEARING OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: The next set of questions I am going to address you individually. I don't want you to go into any detail at all. Ms. O'Bright, have you been contacted by the media regarding this case?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to any potential juror in this case?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Sikorski, has the media contacted you in this case?

MS. SIKORSKI: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media questioning any potential witnesses -- excuse me -- jurors in this case?

MS. SIKORSKI: On Monday when I was walking back from the bathroom, I did see a gentleman from Channel 3 talking to one of the prospective jurors. I did not hear anything that was said. I just walked past them.

THE COURT: That was going to be my next question. So, you did not hear any of the

communications?

MS. SIKORSKI: Nope. I just walked by. I saw his jacket. I thought, oh, he's from Channel 3.

THE COURT: After you saw that, did anybody tell you what that conversation was about?

MS. SIKORSKI: No, and I didn't say anything to anyone.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Hill-Tibbs, has the media contacted you at all about this case?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: No.

THE COURT: Did you witness the media questioning any potential jurors in this case?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: No.

THE COURT: Again, without going into any specific detail at all, Ms. O'Bright, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you gain that information; from what source?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Um, the news originally.

THE COURT: When you say the news, you mean the television? Radio? From what source?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Facebook, I believe.

THE COURT: Okay. How long ago was it since

you might have read something on Facebook about this case?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Um, I read, I guess, earlier in the year that they were -- that it was set for trial.

THE COURT: Is what you read more detailed than the statement I read about the charges here today?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

THE COURT: Based on what you read or might have heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, have you formed an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, have you formed an opinion about any issue in this case?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you might have heard or what you read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So, if you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard

anything you may have read or heard about the case and instead decide the case only on the evidence and testimony which would be presented here in Court?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Sikorski, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you gain that information, ma'am?

MS. SIKORSKI: Television.

THE COURT: How long ago?

MS. SIKORSKI: It was when it originally happened when it was first in the news.

THE COURT: So, is it fair to say it's been a couple years?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

THE COURT: Is what you heard on the television more detailed than what I read to you in the charges here today?

MS. SIKORSKI: No.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. SIKORSKI: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do

you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict in this case should be?

MS. SIKORSKI: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, have you formed an opinion about any issue in this case?

MS. SIKORSKI: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you heard about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MS. SIKORSKI: No.

THE COURT: So, if you were selected as a juror in this case, would you be able to disregard anything you might have heard or read about the case and instead decide the case only upon the evidence and testimony presented here in Court?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Hill-Tibbs, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you gain that information? From what source?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: My cousin's family at Christmas.

THE COURT: So, how long ago? This past

Christmas?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: No. When it happened.

THE COURT: Is what you discussed or heard more detailed than the statement I read to you here today?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: No.

THE COURT: Based upon that discussion or what you might have heard or read, did you form an opinion about the case?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you heard or read about the case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

THE COURT: So, if you're selected as a juror in this case, are you telling me you cannot disregard what you might have heard, read or discussed in this case?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes, I would have to say so.

THE COURT: Okay. This is to all of you again as a group. I do need you to verbalize a response for me.

At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. Will you decide the case only on the facts and evidence and law presented in Court?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. And if the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. So, now I need to know is if there is any reason or issue that we have not discussed that would prevent you

from being a fair and impartial juror. If there is, please raise your hand?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one raises their hand. Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor. Ms. O'Bright, um, can you please tell everyone how you know me?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes. I use to work at the Franklin County Circuit Clerk's office when Mr. Butler was an Assistant State's Attorney, and then also the State's Attorney in Franklin County.

MR. BUTLER: And our relationship, have you been at my house?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

MR. BUTLER: Have I ever been to yours?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

MR. BUTLER: You have -- well, you said now you're working at Washington Middle School?

MS. O'BRIGHT: That's correct.

MR. BUTLER: So, you do have some experience with Court procedure?

MS. O'BRIGHT: That's correct, yes.

MR. BUTLER: Um, anything about that work

experience that you would give some preference to one side or the other?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

MR. BUTLER: You would be fair and impartial?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Anything about working with me previously that would make you more or less fair to one side?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

MR. BUTLER: And you said you read about this on Facebook --

MS O'BRIGHT: -- yes.

MR. BUTLER: -- when it originally happened, but you have not formed an opinion?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Correct.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Sikorski, you said you're retired from SIU?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: What did you do there?

MS. SIKORSKI: I was the assistant director for the Head Start Program.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. How long were you working there?

MS. SIKORSKI: I worked there about 22 years. Um, I was originally a teacher, and then moved into the administrative role.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Now, I assume you probably work with children.

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes. Our children are between the ages of three and five.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. The fact that there is a minor child being involved in this case, is that going to make you more or less favorable to one side since you worked with children?

MS. SIKORSKI: I don't know that it will make it more or less favorable. I think it will make it more difficult. I don't know.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Let me rephrase that then. So, with your experience working with children, would you say you're coming in here and one side has an advantage to begin with or are both sides on equal playing field?

MS. SIKORSKI: I would say equal.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. Ms. Hill-Tibbs, you said you lived in Carbondale?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Is that in Williamson County?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes, barely Williamson County.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. I just need to make sure, and you're a horse trainer?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: Now, you mentioned that you had heard about this through a cousin?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Is that cousin in any kind of law enforcement?

MS. HILL-TUBBS: No. Relation of the family.

MR. BUTLER: Relation of the family?

MS. HILL-TUBBS: Cousin by marriage; so I am not related but she is.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Now, the Judge asked you -- one of his questions is that if the State failed to prove their case beyond a reasonable doubt, if you would find the defendant not guilty. So, you would still find the defendant not guilty even though at this point you have an opinion?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: I have the opposite opinion.

MR. BUTLER: Well, I am not asking what your opinion is.

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Um, can you repeat the question, please?

MR. BUTLER: Okay. So, even though you have an opinion right now --

MS. HILL-TIBBS: -- yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: -- you would be able to follow the Judge's instructions?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Let me do it that way. Okay. Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Ms. O'Bright, how long ago was it that you worked at the Circuit Clerk's office?

MS. O'BRIGHT: I left there in, um, October of 2021.

MS. THIEN: And while you were there, did you ever have the opportunity to preside over a trial as the clerk?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No, not a trial.

MS. THIEN: How about interacting with Mr. Butler on a daily basis?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Were you one of the criminal

Court clerks?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. So, we're not expected to, you know, park our lives outside the courtroom when we come in, you know, to serve on a jury or to participate, but is there anything about that, I don't know, inside knowledge you think would place either side at an advantage?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No. I don't believe so.

MS. THIEN: Okay. So, this is -- do you have any minor children at home?

MS. O'BRIGHT: I do. I have three.

MS. THIEN: And how old are they?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Five, nine and 12.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And where do they go to school?

MS. O'BRIGHT: All Johnston City; different schools.

MS. THIEN: When this case was first reported in the news, did it have an affect on you?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Did it have potentially an affect on your children?

MS. O'BRIGHT: I don't think my children are

aware or were aware at the time.

MS. THIEN: At the 12-year-old point, I didn't know if that was something that had come up as a point of conversation.

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

MS. THIEN: Had the 12-year-old tried to talk to you about it?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

MS. THIEN: I am not trying to press into any details. When the Judge first asked if you had formed an opinion, there was a bit of a pause. I know you're thinking about it. Is this something that you're going to be able to put aside completely in order to listen to the evidence and only make your decision based on what's here in the courtroom?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Are you on -- you said you were on Facebook?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Are you on any other form of social media?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Instagram, and I have Snap Chat.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Has anything about this

case crossed your feed recently?

MS. O'BRIGHT: Other than what I mentioned earlier about seeing when the case was set for trial.

MS. THIEN: And, um, do you know the source of that post?

MS. O'BRIGHT: No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Do you know if it was from an actual news outlet, or if it was from some other member of the community?

MS. O'BRIGHT: It was from a news -- I follow a couple different news pages, so I believe it was from the news source.

MS. THIEN: Thank you. Um, Ms. Sikorski, are you on social media?

MS. SIKORSKI: Facebook.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And have you seen anything about this case cross your Facebook feed?

MS. SIKORSKI: No.

MS. THIEN: No? Um, do you follow any, you know, local news, local -- maybe not professional news, but local groups that discuss the news?

MS. SIKORSKI: No.

MS. THIEN: No? Okay. So, the only contact of this was when it was first reported?

MS. SIKORSKI: On the television, yes.
MS. THIEN: It was fairly news-worthy at the time. Did you form any kind of opinion?
MS. SIKORSKI: Not really, no. I just thought it was going to be a -- probably a long, difficult case.
MS. THIEN: And with being in day three of your experience, I imagine you were right. Um, ma'am, you said you have an adult daughter here in Marion. Do you have any grandchildren?
MS. SIKORSKI: I do. Um, I have a 14-year-old granddaughter and a 12-year-old grandson.
MS. THIEN: Do they live here locally?
MS. SIKORSKI: They live in Herrin.
MS. THIEN: In Herrin.
MS. SIKORSKI: My daughter also lives in Herrin. She works in Marion.
MS. THIEN: Gotcha. When this case hit the news, was it something that your grandchildren were aware of?
MS. SIKORSKI: No.
MS. THIEN: Had any discussion with them?
MS. SIKORSKI: No.
MS. THIEN: Okay. And you were chosen to

serve on a jury back in '06, '08 somewhere in there?

MS. SIKORSKI: Somewhere in there.

MS. THIEN: It was a criminal case?

MS. SIKORSKI: It was a criminal case?

MS. THIEN: Was it here in Williamson County?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes, it was.

MS. THIEN: How long did that trial last?

MS. SIKORSKI: I believe we were there a full week.

MS. THIEN: A full week. Okay. Is there anything about that experience you think will color this one? Every trial is different.

MS. SIKORSKI: No.

MS. THIEN: Can I ask you just generically speaking what kind of case it was?

MS. SIKORSKI: It was, um, the gentleman was charged with molestation of his girlfriend's daughter --

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MS. SIKORSKI: -- who was a young teen at the time.

MS. THIEN: And, um, what was the verdict?

MS. SIKORSKI: Guilty.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thanks. Ms. Hill-Tibbs,

you actually have a relation -- a cousin by marriage --

MS. HILL-TIBBS: -- yeah.

MS. THIEN: I know -- I am just trying to make sure I don't -- that is related to the family in this case?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

MS. THIEN: And this was a topic of conversation at the holidays?

MS. HILL-TIBBS: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And because of that, have you followed anything about this on --

MS. HILL-TIBBS: -- I have not.

MS. THIEN: -- social media?

MS. SIKORSKI: I have not.

MS. THIEN: Are you on social media?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

MS. THIEN: May I ask which --

MS. SIKORSKI: -- uh, Facebook, Instagram, Snap Chat, and I honestly have not seen anything about it except for this morning. I saw an old feed from this past week that was talking about this.

MS. THIEN: Okay. All right. And you said you're employed as a horse trainer?

MS. SIKORSKI: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Are you self-employed or do you work for --

MS. SIKORSKI: -- I am self-employed.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thank you very much. I have no further questions, your Honor.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Ms. O'Bright I would tender.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: We will exercise our peremptory on Ms. O'Bright, Judge.

THE COURT: That gets you to Sikorski.

MS. THIEN: We would tender Ms. Sikorski.

MR. BUTLER: People would accept.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler, back to you. Watson.

MR. BUTLER: I would make a for cause challenge.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I agree.

THE COURT: So does the Court. Motion granted. That gets you to Hill-Tibbs.

MR. BUTLER: I would tender.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, I make an argument on cause. Ms. Hill-Tibbs specifically stated she had formed an opinion, that she cannot be fair and impartial, and despite efforts by the State, I believe that that places the defense, by her own admission, at a significant disadvantage. That it would be the defense's responsibility to change her mind. And even though it may be a relation by marriage, she is related to the family in this case, and I do not believe that that would qualify her to sit on this jury.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Judge, she stated she could follow the rules as the Court instructed her, and that if we failed to prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt, she would find the defendant not guilty. I would object to the for cause challenge. The relationship, I believe, was a cousin of her husband. I would argue that is a tenuous relationship.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. BUTLER: No.

THE COURT: Motion for cause will be granted. Okay. If you don't mind, bring in O'Bright, Watson, Hill-Tibbs.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Ladies, I want to thank you very much for your time and your patience with us. I know that this has been a long time for you guys to spend three days, and I appreciate all your service. I am speaking on behalf of the attorneys and Ms. Bevely when I say this, and including me. You will not be chosen for this particular jury at this time. I am going to allow you to go, and you can follow my bailiff. He will allow you to get your personal effects. Now, I have been told that there is not a jury trial next week. However, there is one the week after, so you will need to call in to see if your service is going to be needed again. And, again, I thank you very much. Thank you.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

THE COURT: We need Baker, McCluskie, Teal, Mausey.

MS. THIEN: Judge, may we ask for a morning comfort break at this point? We have been at it for a little better than two hours. I think it would be well appreciated by everyone.

MS. MUDGE: Agreed. No objection.

THE COURT: Very, very short.

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Five minutes.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

THE COURT: Baker, McCluskie, Teal, Mausey.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Good morning. The defendant, Julia Bevely, is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder. She has pled not guilty.

Count I. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification and with the intent to kill Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, stabbed Jade Beasley about the body with a knife, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count II. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing such act

created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

Count III. First Degree Murder. This alleged offense occurred on or about the 5th day of December, 2020, in Williamson County, Illinois. The defendant is alleged to have, without lawful justification, stabbed Jade Beasley, a minor born 8-3-2009, with a knife about the body knowing said acts would cause the death of Jade Beasley, thereby, causing the death of Jade Beasley in violation of the law.

I am going to read to you a list of potential witnesses who may testify in this case. Please listen to the names. Nancy Deason. Gregory Beasley. Dr. Goldesberry from University Place Dental Center. Dr. Marissa Feeney. Shiela Beasley. Rene Hightower. Jennifer Kays. Kendall Mezo. Jessica Bradley. Kenneth Marks. Aaron Newlin. Aron Luton. Dr. David Wold from Bensenville, Illinois. Officer Rawlinson. Detective Tomas. Detective Coffey. Officer Sawicki. Officer Hrenak. Detective Eggemeyer. Officer Ramage. Officer Welge. Officer Sloan. Officer Francis. Officer Ward. Detective Gusentine. Detective Geittmann. Deputy Franklin. Deputy Anderson. Deputy

Kelley. Officer Sloan. Officer Wilkins. Chief JD Barter. Detective Minton. Officer Stewart. Sergeant Morris. Trooper Padfield. Zach Hanratty. Daniel Glover. Matthew Deschamps. Keia Tate. Brian Hapack. Melissa Gamboe. Cindy McGee. Michael Humes. Jordan Bevely. Stuart Ridelburger. Jim Jones. Michele Jones. Nicole Lamothe. Cady Carter. Rene Hightower. Theresa Rice. Dr. Karl Reich.

THE COURT: Mr. Baker, what city do you reside in, sir?

MR. BAKER: Marion, Illinois.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. BAKER: I work at Auto zone. I am a manager.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. BAKER: Married.

THE COURT: Your spouse's name and what do they do for a living?

MR. BAKER: Erin Baker, and she's a cook.

THE COURT: Do you have any children over age 18 residing in Williamson County?

MR. BAKER: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MR. BAKER: No, sir.
THE COURT: Ms. McCluskie, what city do you live in?
MS. MCCLUSKIE: Herrin, Illinois.
THE COURT: Your occupation?
MS. MCCLUSKIE: School teacher.
THE COURT: For what school?
MS. MCCLUSKIE: Johnston City.
THE COURT: Your marital status?
MS. MCCLUSKIE: Married.
THE COURT: Your spouse's name and occupation?
MS. MCCLUSKIE: He's a funeral director. Currently unemployed.
THE COURT: Do you have any children age 18 or above residing in Williamson County?
MS. MCCLUSKIE: I have one that's in college, but when he comes home for the summer he resides with us.
THE COURT: And your child's name?
MS. MCCLUSKIE: Gavin.
THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?
MS. MCCLUSKIE: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Teal, in what city do you reside in?

MR. TEAL: Carterville, Illinois.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MR. TEAL: Correctional officer.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MR. TEAL: Married.

THE COURT: Your spouse's name and occupation?

MR. TEAL: Terry Teal. She is a homemaker.

THE COURT: Do you have any children age 18 or above that reside in Williamson County?

MR. TEAL: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MR. TEAL: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Mausey, what city do you reside in?

MS. MAUSEY: Marion.

THE COURT: Your occupation?

MS. MAUSEY: Retired.

THE COURT: From where, ma'am?

MS. MAUSEY: I drove a school bus for 40 years.

THE COURT: Your marital status?

MS. MAUSEY: Divorced.

THE COURT: Do you have any children age 18 or above residing in Williamson County?

MS. MAUSEY: Grandchildren.

THE COURT: Are they 18 or above?

MS. MAUSEY: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: Yes?

MS. MAUSEY: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: Can you give me their names and what they might do for a living?

MS. MAUSEY: Well, there is only one right now. James Smith. He goes to SIU.

THE COURT: Do you have any pending lawsuits or cases?

MS. MAUSEY: No.

THE COURT: The next set of questions I am going to ask you as a group. If it applies to you, I need you to raise your hand so that we can talk about it, okay? So, I have been told that this case is going to last approximately two weeks. So, what I need to know is if there is anything that may happen in your life the next two weeks that would take your focus away from this trial. If so, raise your hand?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Do any of you know any of the attorneys involved in this case, Jennifer Mudge, Phillip Butler, Theresa Thien?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they do. Have you or any of your immediate family members had any professional dealings with any of the attorneys?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Do you have any friends or acquaintances that work in any of the attorneys' offices?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they do. Do you personally know the defendant, Julia Bevely? Ms. McCluskie, you do?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: I know she came to our school when she was in 8th grade.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that relationship that would make you a -- well, that would affect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: I had her brother Jordan in class that, I think, is on the witness list, and I

currently have her nephew in class currently.

THE COURT: But will that effect your ability to be fair and impartial?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Um, I think probably currently having her nephew probably would.

THE COURT: I read to you a list of witnesses. Do any of you know any of those witnesses?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that they do. Have any of you ever been selected for jury service before to serve as a juror including grand jury? Ms. McCluskie, you have? About how long ago was that, ma'am?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Um, it was '92, so quite a while ago.

THE COURT: Do you remember what kind of case? Was it a criminal or civil case?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: It was illegal dumping in Jackson County.

THE COURT: Do you recall as to whether or not the jury reached a verdict?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that prior service that would effect your ability to be fair and

impartial in this case?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: No.

THE COURT: Have you or any of your immediate family members ever been a victim of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Have you or any immediate family member ever been convicted of a crime?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Have you or any immediate family member ever been charged with a similar offense to the one being tried today?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they have. Do you have any relatives or friends that are close to you that are employed by any police or law enforcement agency? Mr. Teal?

MR. TEAL: I mean, I am a correctional officer, so I have got several friends in law enforcement.

THE COURT: Would any of you give the testimony of a police officer or law enforcement officer more or less weight than any other witness simply

because the witness works in law enforcement?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: No one indicates that they would. I am going to go over some very important rules of law that are applicable in all cases in which the defendant is charged in a criminal offense.

That the defendant is to be presumed innocent of each of the charges against them. That a defendant cannot be found guilty as to the charge or charges unless the State has proven their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to that charge.

That the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf, and is not required to testify, and that if the defendant elects not to testify, that fact alone cannot be held against them.

Mr. Baker, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. BAKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. BAKER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. BAKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that the defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. BAKER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. McCluskie, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Teal, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed to be innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MR. TEAL: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. TEAL: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MR. TEAL: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has the right to testify or to not testify, and that a

defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MR. TEAL: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Mausey, do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is presumed innocent of the charges against them, and that a charge is not any indication of guilt?

MS. MAUSEY: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that before a defendant can be convicted, the State must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

MS. MAUSEY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant is not required to offer any evidence on their own behalf?

MS. MAUSEY: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand and accept and will apply the principle that the defendant has a right to testify or to not defendant, and that a defendant's choice not to testify cannot be held against them?

MS. MAUSEY: Yes.

THE COURT: The next set of questions I am going to ask you as group, but I need you to verbalize

an answer to it.

Will you each agree to abide by the Court's instructions regardless of any personal opinion you may have as to what the law is or should be?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. Will you each agree to be fair and impartial in rendering a verdict?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. Now, each of you told me you understand that a charge is not any evidence against the defendant. You have also been told that the charge in this case is First Degree Murder. What I need to know is if there is anything about the nature of that charge that would prevent you from being a fair and impartial juror in this case? If so, raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody indicates that it would be an issue. The next set of questions I am going to ask you each individually. I do not want you to go into specific detail. Just please answer the question.

Mr. Baker, has the media contacted you about this case?

MR. BAKER: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to any potential jurors in this case?

MR. BAKER: No.

THE COURT: Ms. McCluskie, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: No.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media discussing this case or questioning any potential jurors?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Teal, has the media contacted you about this case?

MR. TEAL: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media questioning or talking to any of the potential jurors in this case?

MR. TEAL: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Mausey, has the media contacted you about this case?

MS. MAUSEY: No, sir.

THE COURT: Have you witnessed the media speaking to any potential juror in this case?

MS. MAUSEY: No.

THE COURT: Again, I don't want you to go into detail at all. Mr. Baker, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MR. BAKER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: How did you gain that information; from what source?

MR. BAKER: Facebook; news media.

THE COURT: How long ago was it since the last time you gained any information about the case?

MR. BAKER: This morning.

THE COURT: Is what you read or heard more detailed than the statement that I read to you on the charge here today?

MR. BAKER: No, sir.

THE COURT: Based upon what you might have read, did you form an opinion about this case?

MR. BAKER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MR. BAKER: Um, could you repeat that one more time?

THE COURT: Yes, sir. I would be happy to. As you're sitting there right now, have you formed an

opinion as to what the verdict should be in this case?

MR. BAKER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you read in this case that would keep you from being an impartial juror?

MR. BAKER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So, if you're selected as a juror in this case, are you telling me you could not disregard what you might have read; is that correct?

MR. BAKER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. McCluskie, again, don't go into any detail. Have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes.

THE COURT: How did you gain the information; from what source?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Um, news and off Facebook.

THE COURT: When you say news, do you recall from what source?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Television; newspaper articles.

THE COURT: So, how long ago was it from the last time that you gained information about this case?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: This morning.

THE COURT: Is what you might have heard or read more detailed than what I read to you in the charges here today?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Um, no.

THE COURT: Based upon what you read or might have heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Can you say that one more time?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. As you're sitting there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be at this time?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: No, I do not.

THE COURT: Have you formed an opinion about any issue in the case?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: No, I have not.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you heard or read about this case that would keep you from being a fair and impartial juror?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: No. I do not believe so.

THE COURT: So, if you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard what you might have read or heard about the case and instead decide the case only upon the evidence and testimony presented here in open Court?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Teal, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MR. TEAL: Yes.

THE COURT: From where did you get your information?

MR. TEAL: Conversation; hearsay.

THE COURT: How long ago was it since you had a conversation about this case?

MR. TEAL: Probably two weeks.

THE COURT: Is what you heard or discussed more detailed than the statement about the charge I read to you?

MR. TEAL: No.

THE COURT: Based upon that discussion or what you might have heard, did you form an opinion about this case?

MR. TEAL: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do

you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be?

MR. TEAL: Can you repeat the question one more time?

THE COURT: Yes, sir. As you sit there right now this morning, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be?

MR. TEAL: No.

THE COURT: Have you formed an opinion about any issue in this case?

MR. TEAL: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that discussion or what you might have heard that would keep you from being an impartial juror in this case?

MR. TEAL: No.

THE COURT: So, if you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you might have heard or discussed about the case and instead decide the case solely on the evidence and testimony presented here in open Court?

MR. TEAL: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Mausey, have you heard or read anything about this case?

MS. MAUSEY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: From where did you get your information?

MS. MAUSEY: TV. The news.

THE COURT: How long ago was it from the last time that you obtained information on the case?

MS. MAUSEY: Um, Monday night.

THE COURT: Is what you heard or read more detailed than what I read to you as to the charge in this case?

MS. MAUSEY: No, sir.

THE COURT: Based upon what you heard or read, did you form an opinion about this case?

MS. MAUSEY: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, do you have an opinion as to what a fair and proper verdict should be in this case?

MS. MAUSEY: No.

THE COURT: As you sit there right now, have you formed an opinion about any issue in this case?

MS. MAUSEY: No.

THE COURT: Is there anything about what you might have heard or read that would effect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

MS. MAUSEY: No.

THE COURT: So, if you're selected as a juror in this case, will you be able to disregard anything you might have heard or read about the case and instead decide this case only upon the evidence and testimony presented in open Court?

MS. MAUSEY: Yes.

THE COURT: This will be questions as to the entire group. I do need you to verbalize a response for me, please.

At the conclusion of the evidence, you will be given written instructions by the Court. Those instructions contain the law that you are to apply to the facts of this case. Will you follow the law as given in the instructions?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. Will you decide the case only on the facts, evidence and law presented in open Court?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. If the State proves the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate they would. And if

the State fails to prove the allegations beyond a reasonable doubt, will you find the accused not guilty?

GROUP ANSWER: Yes.

THE COURT: All indicate that they would. Now, is there any reason or issue that we have not discussed here today that we need to talk about that would effect your ability to be fair and impartial? If there is, please raise your hand.

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Nobody raises their hand. Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor. Ms. McCluskie, I am going to start with you. You said you're a school teacher?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: And where is that at?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Johnston City, Illinois.

MR. BUTLER: What do you teach?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Math.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. For a certain grade?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Sixth and seventh grade.

MR. BUTLER: Sixth and seventh, and you said there is some family members of the defendant in your class?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: And I think you said that would effect your ability to be fair and impartial?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: I believe it would, yes.

MR. BUTLER: So, you feel like sitting in judgment of one of your student's family members would be tough for you?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: I believe it would.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. Now, Mr. Baker, you said you already have an opinion formed on this case based off what you read?

MR. BAKER: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: And you're not able to set that aside?

MR. BAKER: It would be tough.

MR. BUTLER: Right. Mr. Teal, you work for the Department of Corrections?

MR. TEAL: Correct.

MR. BUTLER: Where at?

MR. TEAL: Pinkneyville Correctional Center.

MR. BUTLER: Pinkneyville. Um, anything about working for Pinkneyville that's going to make you give more preference to one side or the other?

MR. TEAL: Not that I can think of.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. Um, do you have any -- I think the Judge asked if everyone had children under -- or over 18. Do you have kids under 18?

MR. TEAL: I have children under 18.

MR. BUTLER: How many?

MR. TEAL: Two.

MR. BUTLER: Two. What are their ages?

MR. TEAL: Five and nine.

MR. BUTLER: Okay. And Ms. Mausey?

MS. MAUSEY: Mausey.

MR. BUTLER: Mausey. You say you have heard about this a little bit on the television?

MS. MAUSEY: Mm-hmm.

MR. BUTLER: But no opinion's been formed; is that correct?

MS. MAUSEY: Not till I hear everything.

MR. BUTLER: All right. Thank you so much. No further questions.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Ms. McCluskie, do you remember Julie from when she went to junior high?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Vaguely.

MS. THIEN: Vaguely.

MS. MCCLUSKIE: I teach sixth and seventh grade. I believe she came when she was in eighth grade. I do have friends that had her in class.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, has this case been a topic of conversation with your friends or with associates?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Um --

MS. THIEN: -- not what about, but has it been a topic?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes.

MS. THIEN: I understand you also taught Jordan when he was in junior high school?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Yes. I have been there a long time.

MS. THIEN: And Xavier is Jordan's son?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Correct.

MS. THIEN: And he's a current student?

MS. MCCLUSKIE: Correct.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Mr. Baker?

MR. BAKER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: Not to push for anything specific, but with what you are bringing into this courtroom would it put either side at a disadvantage? Would either side have more to prove to you in order to

change the opinion you already have?

MR. BAKER: To be honest, yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: Fair enough. I appreciate it.

MR. BAKER: Yeah. No problem.

MS. THIEN: Mr. Teal, how long have you worked at Pinkneyville?

MR. TEAL: I have been in Pinkneyville a little over a year, but I have been with the department for nine.

MS. THIEN: I was about to say before then where were you at?

MR. TEAL: I was at Menard.

MS. THIEN: Menard. That's a haul up there. And, so, you were there for what? Eight? Seven?

MR. TEAL: Eight years.

MS. THIEN: Okay. You said you have a lot of friends in law enforcement. Not just Department of Corrections but with other police agencies as well?

MR. TEAL: Um, yeah.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, and would you say -- and it happens to all of us -- that would form your primary social group; most of the individuals --

MR. TEAL: -- honestly, no. I mean, they are more acquaintances than friends I would say.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. TEAL: So, no.

MS. THIEN: It does give us a bit of perspective working inside the criminal justice system. Um, I think from an officer's standpoint, from an attorney's standpoint, do you believe that working within the system would place either side at even the slightest advantage?

MR. TEAL: Um, honestly I don't believe so.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. TEAL: Um, I don't believe so.

MS. THIEN: You said this has been a topic of conversation a couple of weeks ago?

MR. TEAL: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: Did that conversation involve any of the alleged facts or anything that had been reported on the news?

MR. TEAL: Just alleged murder. Um, I am not sure what all was discussed.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Was it because jury summons went out?

MR. TEAL: Mm-hmm.

MS. THIEN: This case had already been announced it was getting ready to go to try.

MR. TEAL: Yeah. I think that was the primary thing.

MS. THIEN: Sir, are you on any form of social media? Facebook? Instagram? Twitter?

MR. TEAL: Yeah. I'm on Facebook.

MS. THIEN: Pardon?

MR. TEAL: I'm sorry. I'm on Facebook --

MS. THIEN: Okay.

MR. TEAL: -- but I don't frequent it so.

MS. THIEN: I am, too, but I will admit it, it tends to be something that I will open up in case I'm bored or need sometime to, you know, fill or trying to avoid something I have to do.

MR. TEAL: Sure.

MS. THIEN: Have you seen anything about this case on Facebook?

MR. TEAL: No.

MS. THIEN: Do you follow any local crime feed?

MR. TEAL: Um, I think I have Herrin Street Crimes on Facebook, but I haven't seen anything from that in quite sometime.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, sir. Ms. Mausey, do you have any form -- are you on social media?

MS. MAUSEY: Facebook.
MS. THIEN: Facebook. Anything else?
MS. MAUSEY: Instagram, but I rarely check on it.
MS. THIEN: I am not quite of the Instagram age, but although I do have Pinterest. Do you have Pinterest?
MS. MAUSEY: No.
MS. THIEN: No? Okay. So, ma'am, you primarily get your news then from the -- like, the nightly news, the TV news?
MS. MAUSEY: Yeah, nightly news.
MS. THIEN: Okay. Have you seen anything about this case on Facebook?
MS. MAUSEY? Nightly news, yeah.
MS. THIEN: No, I mean -- I was talking on Facebook itself?
MS. MAUSEY: No. I haven't really looked.
MS. THIEN: Okay. Um, do you know if any of your friends or relations have posted anything about this case on Facebook that you would have seen?
MS. MAUSEY: No.
MS. THIEN: No? Okay. And you have, um -- is it your grandson that is a student at SIU?

MS. MAUSEY: Yes.
MS. THIEN: Okay.
MS. MAUSEY: I have a granddaughter there, too.
MS. THIEN: Pardon?
MS. MAUSEY: I have a granddaughter at SIU, but she lives in Carbondale.
MS. THIEN: Oh, okay. Um, you have two grandkids at SIU at the same time?
MS. MAUSEY: Yeah. Age difference there. One's a junior; one's a freshman.
MS. THIEN: Great.
MS. MAUSEY: And another grandson in Korea.
MS. THIEN: With the service?
MS. MAUSEY: Yes.
MS. THIEN: Yeah. Um, are any of your children residing in the Southern Illinois area?
MS. MAUSEY: I have a daughter in Carbondale.
MS. THIEN: Okay. What does she do for a living?
MS. MAUSEY: She is a school teacher.
MS. THIEN: Thank you. I have no further questions.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: With regard to Mr. Baker, the People would make a for cause challenge for him. He stated his opinion's been formed based off what he's read. He would not be impartial. He could not disregard what he read, and I think when Ms. Thien asked him, he said one side would be at a disadvantage to start with.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I agree.

THE COURT: Motion will be granted. That gets you to McCluskie.

MR. BUTLER: The People would challenge her for cause as well. She had the defendant's nephew in her class. She testified that would be tough for her to sit in judgment of a student's nephew, and that would effect her ability to be fair and impartial.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: I agree, Judge.

THE COURT: It will be granted. That gets you to Teal.

MR. BUTLER: I would tender Mr. Teal.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, he's actively employed in law enforcement. We would challenge for cause based solely on that reason.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Judge, I would object to that. He stated he could be fair and impartial. Further, he stated most of his law enforcement friends or family were just mere acquaintances. They ran in different circles.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien, anything further?

MS. THIEN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Motion for cause will be denied.

MS. THIEN: As the defense is out of peremptory challenges, we will tender.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler, Mausey?

MR. BUTLER: We would accept.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: We accept.

THE COURT: Okay. At this time, please bring me back in Baker and McCluskie.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: On behalf of everybody, the

attorneys and Ms. Bevely, myself, I want to thank you for your time. I know that it's been a long three days, and we greatly appreciate your service here. You will not be selected for jury service at this time. I am going to let you go back with the bailiff so you can get your personal effects. You will be free to leave. I have been told there is not a jury needed next week. However, there is still one the following week, so I will need you to call back in on that Sunday to check to see if your service will be needed. And, again, I greatly appreciate your time. Thank you.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS.)

THE COURT: Okay. At this time, I want the panels brought. Siddon. Sikorski. Teal and Mausey also brought. For right now, that will be okay. We'll have to discuss where we are going to have to seat them.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: I do need everyone in the box to rise. Each one of you, please, raise your right hand.

(JURORS SWORN.)

THE COURT: Okay. So, as you can tell by the badges, you have been selected as jurors in this

case. Given the hour, we're going to take a break for lunch. You're going to hear me say this a lot. It's very important, okay? You're not to talk to anybody about this case, not even amongst yourselves at this time, not until this case is submitted to you to deliberate after you have heard all of the evidence. You must not discuss this case with anybody or remain in hearing of anyone that might be talking about this case. If you're approached by anyone, you notify any one of the security or the bailiffs immediately, and you are not to engage in conversation. You are not to read any newspaper article or TV article or listen to any radio about anything to do with this trial.

After the case has been submitted to you, you must then discuss the case only in the jury room when all of the members are present. You are to keep an open mind, and you must not decide any issue in the case until it is submitted to you for deliberation under the instructions of the Court.

At this time, if you will follow my bailiff, he will take care of your lunch.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: At one o'clock, I intend to make

my final comments to the jury before Opening Statements at that time. Now, some of that is going to be dependent on when they get their lunch, okay? But it would be my anticipation we start at one o'clock.

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Before we leave again -- have a seat. Ms. Thien, with respect to the jury selection process, does the defense have any motions it wishes to make in any respect dealing with the selection of the jury?

MS. THIEN: (No audible response.)

THE COURT: I'll ask it in a different way since I get the puzzled look.

MS. THIEN: The puzzled look, yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure. Does the defense believe that any portion of the selection process was improper, unfair to the defense? I'm focusing on what happened in terms of the communication?

MS. THIEN: Oh, I think we have covered that, Judge. I mean --

THE COURT: -- I want to make sure now that we've completed the entire process that the defense is satisfied that to the best of their ability and to the

State's ability they have gotten a fair and impartial jury.

MS. THIEN: Judge, we've done the best we can with the facts on the ground. So, yes, we're prepared to go forward. I know that's a wishy-washer answer. Bluntly, I ran out of peremptories. There may be an issue or two that I wish to preserve later as far as cause. I'm not prepared to address that at this time.

THE COURT: I'm not asking about that.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Other than that, I think we have done the best we can. We're ready to go.

THE COURT: Okay. Very well. The Court will be adjourned.

(NOON RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Let's go on record. The Court re-calls 20-CF-596, People versus Julia Bevely. Ms. Bevely is in open Court. The attorneys are present. We are outside the presence of the jury. The first thing I want to talk to you about, I intend to read the preliminary cautionary -- the new one -- 1.01-A and

1.01-B, the implicit bias. I know you didn't ask for it, but I would like to read it. Is there any objections?

MS. MUDGE: None.

MS. THIEN: No, sir.

THE COURT: The second thing, um, I want your help. I don't have a problem with law enforcement being here, but I do have a problem with law enforcement being right over there. That's too heavy of a presence in my opinion.

MS. MUDGE: Were they over here?

THE COURT: Well, yeah, when I walked in, there was quite a few. I don't know if they're going to be in here or not, but I want help, especially from you. If they come back in, I would like them to be somewhere else other than there. Is there any objection?

MS. MUDGE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: Judge, I actually -- that was the issue I was going to bring up of having the sheriff and the chief deputy standing right over us when we already have --

THE COURT: -- well, we've got --

MS. THIEN: -- he stepped out --

THE COURT: -- one person over there.
MS. THIEN: -- since then.
THE COURT: That's all I want. If they come in, they can be somewhere else. I don't care. That's fine, but just not there.
MS. THIEN: Thank you.
MS. MUDGE: I will walk out and tell them now.
THE COURT: If you don't mind, I would greatly appreciate that.
MS. MUDGE: I will.
THE COURT: You guys ready?
MS. THIEN: As we'll ever be, I reckon.
MS. MUDGE: Sure.
THE COURT: Okay. I'll give you an opportunity to go talk to the law enforcement.
(OFF THE RECORD.)
(BACK ON RECORD.)
(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)
THE COURT: Be seated, please. Members of the jury, you've been sworn to try this case. By your verdict, you will decide the disputed issues of fact. I will decide the questions of law that arise during the

trial, and before you retire to deliberate at the close of the trial, I will instruct you on the law that you are to follow and apply in reaching your verdict. You should give careful attention to the testimony and evidence as it is received and presented for your consideration. You should not form or express any opinion about the case until you have retired to the jury room to consider your verdict after having heard all of the evidence, the closing arguments of the attorneys and after I read the jury instructions to you.

During the trial, you must not discuss the case amongst yourselves, nor, with anyone else or permit anyone to discuss it in your presence. You must avoid reading newspaper headlines and articles related to the trial. You must also avoid seeing or hearing television or radio comments or accounts of the trial while it is in progress.

You must not go to the scene to view or to do any investigation on your own. To do so, would result in a mistrial.

You have the right to take notes during the course of this trial. Notepads have been provided to you for your convenience. You do not have to take notes. Whether you take notes or not, it is entirely up

to you. You may use your notes to refresh your memory at the appropriate time. Your notes are for your use only and not for anyone else's use or reference. Do not show your notes to anyone else at any time. This admonishment is specific and refers to other jurors and includes the time when you are deliberating your verdict. You should rely on your own memory of the evidence. If your notes conflict with your memory, you are free to use your own memory of the evidence. Your notes will not leave the courtroom or jury deliberation room. They will be collected by the bailiff when you leave for lunch and at the close of Court day. At the end of trial, and after your verdict has been rendered, the notes will be collected by the bailiff and destroyed. No one will be allowed to look at your notes before they are destroyed.

Now, the trial is about to commence. I will now instruct you as to the law regarding some of your duties during the trial and deliberations. You should not do any independent investigation or research on any subject or person relating to the case. What you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence. This includes any press, radio, television programs, and it also includes any information available

on the internet. Such programs, reports and information are not evidence, and your verdict must not be influenced in any way by such material. For example, you must not use the internet, including Google, Wikipedia or any other type of sources that you might otherwise use to search for any information about the case or the law which applies to the case or the people involved in the case, including, the defendant, witnesses, lawyers and Judge.

During the course of the trial, do not communicate with, provide information personally, in writing or electronically, to anyone about this case; not even your own family or friends, courtroom personnel and also not even amongst yourselves until instructed otherwise. You must not provide any information about the case to anyone by any means at all, and that includes posting information about this case, or your thoughts about it on any device or internet site including chat rooms, blogs, or even other place or any other social networking website such as Twitter, Facebook or any other means. You cannot use any electronic devices or services to communicate about this case, including, cell phones, smart phones, lap tops, internet and any other tools of technology. The use of

such devices or services in connection with your duties is prohibited.

The lawyers, parties and witnesses are not permitted to speak with you about any subject, even if it's unrelated to the case, until after the case is over and you are discharged from your duty as jurors.

We all have feelings, assumptions, perceptions, fears and stereotypes about others. Some biases we are aware of, and others we might not be fully aware of which is why they are called implicit biases or unconscious biases. Our biases often effect how we act favorably or unfavorably toward someone. Biases can effect our thoughts, how we remember, what we see and hear, who we believe or disbelief and how we make important decisions.

As jurors, you are being asked to make important decisions in this case. You must resist jumping to conclusions based on personal likes or dislikes. You must not let bias, prejudice, public opinion influence your decision. You must not be biased in favor or against any person because of their race, ethnicity, national ancestry, religion, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability or socioeconomic status. Your verdict must be based solely on the evidence

presented.

At this time, we are beginning with the Openings Statements of the attorneys. An Opening Statement is not evidence and should not be considered by you as evidence. It is simply a statement by a lawyer as to what they expect the evidence will show. Any statement made by an attorney that is not supported by the evidence should be disregarded. Ms. Mudge.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

OPENING STATEMENTS

BY MS. MUDGE:

Jade Beasley was 11 years old. She loved playing Minecraft, and as a little girl, she liked to play Lego's. She was very artistic and creative. She especially enjoyed being around her family, her cousins and her siblings. She loved animals, and her life was taken in a very brutal manner way too soon.

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Jennifer Mudge. My trial partner, Phillip Butler, and I represent the People of the State of Illinois and, thereby, the citizens of Williamson County. We spent the last two and a half very long days asking you all a lot of questions, and now it is your turn to ask us questions. And you should ask us two questions: What

and how. What are we going to prove to you, and how are we going to do that beyond a reasonable doubt. What we are going to prove to you is that this defendant, who was Jade's step-mom, brutally murdered her with a knife. And how are we going to do that? We're going to do that from the evidence. All of the evidence comes from right here. That's how we're going to prove it. You heard many times that the defendant is presumed innocent, and she is. She is as she sits here today. She is every day she walks into this courtroom. She is presumed innocent for every minute of this trial through Closing Arguments, and we are going to ask that when this case is finished and you walk back to the deliberation room, you take that presumption away from her because we will prove our case beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant deserves a fair trial, and Jade deserves justice.

So, what are you going to hear over the course of the next week or so? You're going to hear a lot. You're going to hear that the defendant spoke to the police about what happened on the day of Jade's murder, and then witness by witness, and piece of evidence by piece of evidence, you are going to know that everything she said to the police was a lie.

Jade was born in 2009. Her mother and her

father split up when she was a little girl; about three years old. They did not have a Court order for custody. Um, for split divorced parents of one child, they got along remarkably well. Every other Monday, Jade went to the other -- the other parent's house. Dad's one week; mom's another week. They were flexible. If mom wanted to pick her up for something, dad would let her, and vice versa. It was a good relationship.

In 2013, when Jade was a little girl, her dad Mike met the defendant. They quickly moved in together. The defendant had her own son that was around Jade's age. Over the course of the years, Mike and the defendant had two more children. At the time of the murder, there were two little girls around the age of two and three in the home.

On the day of December 5th, 2020, Jade had spent the week at her dad's and the defendant's home. December 5th was a Saturday. Jade's mom had made plans to go pick Jade up. Jade's mom had another child as well, and it was her second birthday party. Jade knew she was being picked up at 1:00. Her mom, Jessica, tried to text her. Tried to call her. She is an 11-year-old girl. She didn't respond. Mom figured that was typical, but she was on her way to go pick Jade up

for the party. Couldn't get a hold of Jade, so she called the dad, Mike. Hey, Jade's not responding to me. We got to get to the birthday party. Mike said, okay. Let me call the defendant. On that day, the defendant was home working from home. She worked for Hyatt. Jade was home. The two little girls were with grandparents, and they had been for two days. Her son was with his biological father. Jade's mother was going to pick up Jade. Turns the corner, and all she sees is flashing lights. And she doesn't know what's going on. And when she pulls into the driveway, a lot of lives were changed forever, and Jade's, the evidence will show, was ended a good amount of time before the flashing lights got there.

A 911 call was made at 12:24 by the defendant. At 12:24 p.m., she calls 911. She reports that she had gone out and came home and a man had broken into the home and she found Jade bleeding and dead. It's 12:24 on a Saturday. Police are around nearby during the day. Marion Police get the dispatch. Williamson County Sheriff's Department gets the dispatch. Everyone starts heading there. Two officers in two separate cars; they are actually together talking when they hear it come out. What they hear is a man

dressed in black broke into a home. Eleven-year-old girl stabbed. They're hustling. On their way, they see someone in all black walking down the road. They radio to each other. "I'm going to the home. You go check on the person in black." Checked on the person in black. It's a female walking her dog. So they both head to the home. The first officer gets there. You will hear his testimony. He's alone, and he doesn't know much. He walks into the door -- the front door of the residence, and the first thing he notices is a massive amount of blood, and he also notices that it's dry, and that it looks like candle wax, is how he describes it. He goes into the home. He finds the defendant. She is on the phone in the kitchen with 911. He says, "Where is your kid?" She is not responding to him. He has to ask her again. She points towards the bathroom. He heads to the bathroom. On his way to the bathroom, he notices more blood and lots of it. It's on the walls. It's all over the floor. He gets to the bathroom. The door is shut. Not all the way, but it's shut to a crack. He opens the bathroom door. There is blood everywhere. Jade is in the bathtub. The water is running. The drain is stopped. The bathtub is half way full of cold water. Jade is slumped over. He goes to pick her up to

try to revive her. He notices that she is cold to the touch. He pulls her out of the bathtub and into the hallway where he has more room for some lifesaving measures on Jade. He looks down at her to perform CPR, or whatever he needs to do, and he notices one large cut to her chest. And he specifically notices that cut is not bleeding, and that the water in the bathtub is clear. He also notices the defendant who did not follow him into the bathroom. She is sitting on the floor leaning up against the kitchen cabinets. She does not speak to him except for these words; "Is she dead?"

Another officer arrives. Again, they don't know what's going on. They see the defendant sitting on the floor, and Jade is laying in the hallway cut to pieces while someone's doing CPR on her. So that officer takes the defendant, gives her a blanket and takes her to the front porch. Another officer arrives on-scene. He begins CPR. He does it for a good amount of time on her. Other officers arrive; they cleared the residence. They are looking for the guy. They don't find him. EMS gets there. They take over the lifesaving efforts with Jade. At that point, they all know it's futile. She's dead. So, the officers spread out. Multiple agencies begin to converge on this

residence. It's a dead 11-year-old, and she's been murdered, so they come and converged on this house.

The officer who was performing CPR on her, immediately goes to his car, he gets his riffle. He finds a storm shelter or shed nearby, kicks in the door looking for the guy. Doesn't find anything. He goes through a wooded area. Can't find anything. He finds a cornfield to the east of the house. Walks through that for about 45 minutes. You figure if you see that amount of blood -- I'm sorry -- the police officer figures if you see that amount of blood in the house and someone ran away from this house on foot, they're going to have blood on them. They're going to leave a trace, so they are looking for the man. It's a chaotic scene to say the least. At the same time all this is happening, mom pulls up to pick up her daughter. Officers speak to mom a little bit. A short time later, dad arrives, and they're canvassing. Detectives are called out. They call K-9 units out to look for the man, and they speak to the defendant a little bit while she is on the front porch. They get this information from her. "I went into town. I came home. A guy was coming out the door. He tried to stab me. He had a black hoodie and black gloves on." That's all they know. Blonde hair. They

take the defendant to the police department to talk to her. They want more information. They want to find out what happened. She gives the police an interview. She speaks to them. You will see that interview. You will see it on the screens in front of you. You are the judges of that interview. That is evidence for you to view and you to judge, and you will see the interview the defendant gave to the police. She says a few things that catch their attention. She says she got off of work early that day. She went to Walmart in Carbondale, and she tells them what route she took. She drove her Nissan Pathfinder. It's a dark gray Nissan Pathfinder. It's the only car that was at the house when they got there, and it's her car. She gets to the Walmart parking lot, she realizes she forgot all of her credit cards. She does not get out of her car. She turns around -- she stays in her car, and goes back home. She comes home. The screen door is shut. The front door is open, and a man comes out. He's in black. Now she says he has a ski mask, and he's holding a knife, and she tries to grab it from him. They noticed wounds on her hands. She does have wounds on her hands, but they aren't wounds on her palms. They are wounds on the side of her hands. They are not bleeding. She has a scrape

in between her eyes. She has a scrape on her chin; a small scrape. And she has a mark on her arm, and that catches their attention as well. So, they ask her about it. She says, "I self-harm. I bit." She says she bit herself on the arm. They asked her when she did that. She said in the middle of the night last night. You can imagine their suspicion, so they call the local dentist in town. The dentist came in and took molds of the defendant's teeth to make casts out of them. Then they went to the morgue where Jade was, and they took molds of Jade's teeth as well.

Police form a major case squad of some sort, and they work at the Sheriff's Department for a number of days to try to corroborate or disprove the defendant's statement. Well, let's see if we can find her. It's 2020. Everybody leaves a trace somewhere. Let's get some surveillance cameras. Let's get her cell phone. So, they do that.

The first thing, she says she got off work early. Works for Hyatt; logs in and out on her own computer from home. She was scheduled to work that day from 7:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. She was scheduled for a break at 9:30 a.m. to 9:45 p.m. She took that break from 9:30 to 10:15 a.m. She logged back on, and at

11:05 she asked for unapproved time off. At 11:07, that was granted. She logged off and didn't log back in.

They go to the Walmart. From the defendant's home, Walmart is about 19 miles. It takes approximately 32 to 33 minutes to get to Walmart. So they canvas the businesses for about that 19 miles trying to get some surveillance footage. Officers are sitting there, watching surveillance footage, looking for a gray Nissan Pathfinder. Nothing. Everybody knows Walmart has cameras, so let's go to Walmart and get those cameras. They do that. She tells them where she parked in the Walmart parking lot. They get the footage from Walmart. Two different angles of that area in the parking lot. They watch it for hours during the times that she says she was there. No Nissan gray Pathfinder that goes and pulls in and then just leaves. It's not there.

What they do find is on Khoury League Road, which is about a half mile from the defendant's home, there is a house. The house has a surveillance camera outside of it, and they find that at 11:36 a.m., a gray Nissan Pathfinder goes westbound heading into Marion. Fietsam Road, just down the street a little bit, another house with cameras. At 11:38, a gray Nissan Pathfinder

westbound into Marion. At 11:42, Huck's gas station. They pulled the footage from there. A gray Nissan Pathfinder pulls up to the gas pumps, does not get gas, but a woman dressed in dark clothes gets out and throws away trash bags. Back to Fietsam Road at 11:46 eastbound. Back to Khoury League Road at 11:48 eastbound heading home. So, they have been to Huck's. They have seen her. She threw away trash. They go to Huck's and say let's pull the trash. In an unfortunate turn of events, Huck's said the garbage guys just came. It's at the landfill. They go to the landfill. Twenty officers for two days. They try to estimate where that trash from Huck's would have been. They will testify that the trash is compacted when it's put into the landfill. Not only is it compacted at a seven to one ratio, but it's compacted with contaminated soil as well. They are looking for a needle in a haystack in a landfill. They find a couple of items of evidence. They do not believe that it can be submitted for testing. Not only is it in a landfill, but it's in a landfill compacted with soil.

Then they get to her cell phone. Two things on her cell phone. One, the GPS location. Two, the content of the cell phone. First, the GPS location. It

shows an approximate location of where her phone would have been. 11:36 she moved from the house. 11:36-39, she is turning on to Khoury League Road where that residence is that has the surveillance of her going westbound. At 11:37-50, she is driving past the house on Fietsam Road. Just before 11:42 -- I say she -- but her cell phone is at or near Huck's in Marion. And the cell phone turns around and goes right back home.

At 11:53, her cell phone is at or around her home. 911 was called 31 minutes later. Then, the content of her phone. Her husband worked at Cracker Barrel. This is Covid, December, 2020. Restaurants aren't happening. He went to work at 7:30 a.m. that morning. He was supposed to get off at 2:00. At 10:39, she texted him and said, "Are you off." At 11:23, he texted her back and said, "No. I am scheduled till 2:00, but doubt I make it past 1:00." She immediately replied to him and said, "Oh. Okay." That's at 11:23. Thirteen minutes later her cell phone is on the move going to Huck's because she knows he's coming home early.

Crime scene was obviously called to the scene. You're going to hear from the crime scene investigator who processed nine different scenes.

First, he went to the jail, or the police department, where she was being interviewed. He went in to take pictures of the mark on her arm where she said she bit herself on. He wanted to take a swab of that mark to see if anything could come from that.

Second place he went is to the home to take crime scene photos to document the diagram of the scene; the crime scene itself.

The third place he goes is to the autopsy. He gets the fingernail scrapings from the victim, Jade.

The fourth scene he goes to is back to the home. And why does he go back a second time? To spray what they call LCV, and he will explain it to you better than I can. LCV is a substance you put on something that the naked eye cannot see blood on, but it will react to the presence of blood. He sprayed parts of the house.

In the master bathroom, the defendant's bathroom, there wasn't much physical blood the day before. He sprayed LCV on it, it lit up. LCV reacted all over the master bathroom sink.

Fifth scene he processes is the defendant's car. He notes two different places where there is what they call a red, blood-like substance where he thinks it

might be blood; one on the steering wheel cover and one little spot on the interior driver's door. He swabs that to have it tested. He goes back to the home to check the vinyl floor that has been sprayed with LCV for possible footprints. He goes back to the morgue to get sample footprints from Jade's feet. He goes back to see the defendant three days later to take pictures of her arm as the wound was healing, and then he goes and gets footprint impressions of the defendant to compare to the footprints that were found in blood in the kitchen.

You will hear from a blood spatter expert. He's been a long time blood spatter expert, and he's called to scenes to testify to how the blood is put in the house; how it got here. There is a transfer versus a spatter. A transfer is if I have blood on my hands and I do this, I've transferred it onto this object. A spatter is if I have blood on my hands and I do this, it spatters onto the scene. He noted 51 points in the house of transfers and spatters. He doesn't test the blood, but he will tell you that presuming that all of that blood in the house belongs to one person, that means that that one person was in an active state of bleeding while moving throughout the home.

You will hear from a dentist; a forensic

odontologist. He is a dentist who specializes in observation testimony of human teeth for court purposes. He observed three things.

MS. THIEN: -- Judge, subject to my objection.

(SIDE BAR HELD OUTSIDE THE HEARING OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: I don't know what you are getting ready to say, but be careful.

MS. MUDGE: I will. I promise.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. THIEN: Okay.

(PROCEEDINGS BACK WITHIN THE HEARING OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Noted.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor. The forensic odontologist looked at three things. One, the pictures that the crime scene investigator took of the marks on the defendant's arm.

Two, the molds or casts that they took from the defendant's teeth.

Three, the molds or casts that they took from Jade's teeth. He will testify as to his observations, and you will determine what they mean.

You will hear from multiple people at the Illinois State Police Crime Lab who tested evidence that was collected. In sum -- and I am not the expert, and I do not intend to put words in their mouth. But, in sum, they will testify, one, the blood that was tested in the home was all Jade's.

Two, they looked at the two footprints left in blood, which was Jade's, and those footprints matched Jade's. Jade was stepping in her own blood in her house.

Three, they tested the swab that the crime scene investigator took from the defendant's mark on her arm. It contained the victim, Jade's, DNA.

They tested two spots from inside of the defendant's car; the steering wheel cover and the interior door. Blood was indicated on those. Then it was sent to DNA, and the defendant's DNA is in that blood. They tested Jade's fingernail scrapings, and the defendant's DNA was in that as well.

You will hear from the forensic pathologist who performed the autopsy on Jade's 11-year-old body. She will tell you that the manner of death was homicide, and that the cause of death was loss of blood due to the wounds. She had blood in her chest that stopped her

lungs from breathing. She will further tell you that there were 104 wounds to Jade's 11-year-old body. Sharp, blunt-force wounds, defensive wounds, scrapes and penetrating, sharp wounds to Jade's body.

The evidence that we will present from the stand tells the story of Jade's last moments, and she fought, and the defendant did not tell the truth.

After you have heard all of the evidence, the People of the State of Illinois will ask that you find this defendant guilty of First Degree Murder. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

OPENING STATEMENTS

BY MS. THIEN:

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of Julia Bevely and myself, thank you. This has been a very, very long process just to get us to this point. I'd say in this room right now we probably have a combined experience of maybe 80 years in the law business, and none of us have actually been through this long of a jury selection process. I know your patience was tried, but your effort and your duty is truly appreciated.

Oddly enough, there is only a few things, evidence wise, that we disagree with that Ms. Mudge presented to you.

Now, Julie Bevely and Mike Beasley were in a seven year committed relationship. They both had a toddler -- toddler-ish -- child from a prior relationship; that will be Jade, who was Mike's daughter, and Jayden, Julia's son. Together over this time period, they built a home together. They built a life together. They had a couple more kids. Babies. Little ones. They worked very, very hard to make a good life and make their blended family work, and they were successful. No drama with ex's. No drama with family. Everyone was able to talk to each other, work out the schedules, and by all -- all accounts, this is a rarity.

Now, let's remember back to December of 2020, right? We were in the midst of the pandemic; here locally, as well, right? Um, no vaccines for those who wanted them. We were still having mask mandates. We were still lining up to get into different stores once in a while. The schools were a mess. The restaurants open one day; closed the next. It was an incredibly stressful time for everyone, but this family was making it through this. They were still doing all right.

Now, let's go to specifically December 5th of 2020. It was one of those warm winter days. Maybe not as warm as what we have right now, but, you know, 40's. Maybe it touched 50. Mike was working at Cracker Barrel. He went in at 7:00. Um, Julie -- he clocked in at 8:00. Julie started -- she had been working from home for several years before for Hyatt. All of the equipment is there. Myla and Rayne, the baby girls, were with grandparents. Jayden was having his weekend with his dad. Jade was the only one there. There is a text that occurs at 10:39 or so, "Are you coming home," from Julie to Mike. The evidence is also going to show that the one who started that text thread was Mike who was at work. And an hour, half hour before, it's very slow at that point. He sends a funny. I don't remember what it is. But, you know, as one does when one is bored. Julie responds with, "This is weird. You're supposed to be a cook at Cracker Barrel," which any of us who've ever worked in a restaurant knows that could be an incredibly high stress, high -- fast-moving environment. "Are you coming home?" This is not something that is out of the ordinary.

You're going to hear that Julia still had time on the books. She took that time, and she got off

early. And she was going to go and do some shopping. Now, she knew that Jade was going to be, you know, picked up by her mom no later than one o'clock for a birthday party. She knew that, you know, Mike would be home no later than 2:00. She doesn't make it. She discovers that along the way she does not have her debit cards with her. There is a stop at Huck's. I want you all to listen to all of the evidence that comes through and where that information made it to the police. We believe that will prove to be incredibly important.

She returns home, and she finds everyone's absolute worst nightmare. There is someone in her house. That someone is dressed in black wearing a mask, armed with a knife. There is a struggle at the front door. You are going to hear that during the course of that struggle, Julie suffers a minor injury. She goes -- the man runs. She goes into the house. The first stop right inside the door is the master. She grabbed something for her hand. She looks around, and you unfortunately will have the opportunity to see the pictures of what she found in this house. It is horrific, and it is awful. There is blood everywhere. She goes to look for Jade. Jade is found by Julie in the back bathroom with horrible wounds and unresponsive.

And you will hear from the officers and from Julie that she goes in to what she called a panic, shutdown mode. She calls 911. By the time the detective arrives, Julie has been moved from the kitchen area right inside the house to the front porch. She has no shoes. She is wrapped in a blanket that one of the officers picked up off of the couch. And this is something I want you to pay very close attention to is all of the evidence that's presented.

She speaks with the officers at the scene. She obviously agrees to go back with them, and she does make a statement. She cooperates with the police. They take photographs of her. She holds the measuring device to make sure that they are accurate. They asked to take swabs. Of course. Here. Here. Where ever they want. She is there to assist in this. But remember, ladies and gentlemen, what it is that she just walked out of.

For some odd reason, between when the detectives arrived and when they made it back to the Sheriff's Department, that very same early afternoon, Julie was no longer a suspect -- walk into a situation like this -- and obviously we all know every one who is there is a potential suspect -- she becomes the suspect. And every action taken afterwards is to build a

circumstantial case against her, and that is what you're going to hear.

What you are not going to hear is there is any evidence of a weapon that was used that has been located. You're not going to hear any evidence of Julie being in blood-covered clothes, or her hair being wet, or any physical evidence whatsoever.

You are going to hear some reliable forensic evidence in the form of DNA. And, again, I'm going to ask you to pay particularly close attention to this. You will hear from Dr. Karl Reich who is an expert in this field. He fully examined the State Police file; all over 800 pages of it. And he will assist us in putting this evidence -- in understanding this evidence and putting it in perspective. As to any of Julie's DNA that was located under Jade's nails, the total amount is less than one nanogram. That amounts to 120 cells. I think we can all remember back to 8th grade science class. This is absolutely invisible to the eye. It is referred to as what's known as household DNA. It is what you pick up if you share the same dish towel, if you graze your hand across upholstery when you reside in the same house. Ladies and gentlemen, in this dusty courtroom, I imagine we've all picked up, unfortunately,

some environmental DNA just right here.

As to the DNA that they say they located on Julie's arm, the State failed to do the most basic test available, and that is to test whether or not the source of that DNA was blood, saliva, urine or semen. There are specific tests for all four of those things. The problem is, as you're going to hear the evidence, that test must be performed before the extraction of the DNA from the swab. If you start the DNA test, you cannot go back and retest that.

It is important to know from the DNA test what the proportions are. As this evidence comes forward, I am truly hoping I can keep this straight for you as well. It can get a little complicated, but I think we're all going to do our best to make it as fully understandable as possible.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are asking you to do no more than what you promised to do during voir dire. Follow the evidence. Keep an open mind throughout this entire proceeding. Do not make up your mind until you have heard everything, and hold the State to its burden to prove this case beyond a reasonable doubt. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Mudge?

MS. MUDGE: Yes. The People would call Cindy Geittmann.

THE COURT: Come forward and the Clerk will swear you in.

CYNTHIA GEITTMANN,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please state your full name, spell your last name, and please speak loudly enough that all can hear you in the courtroom.

THE WITNESS: Detective Cynthia Geittmann, spelled C-Y-N-T-H-I-A. Geittmann, G-E-I-T-T-M-A-N-N.

THE COURT: Ms. Mudge, you may inquire.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. MUDGE:

Q. How are you employed?

A. I am employed at Williamson County Sheriff's Office.

Q. How long have you been so employed?

A. Over ten years.

Q. And what was your position on December 5th of 2020?

A. Detective.
Q. And for the case we're here for today, were you the case agent in this case?
A. I was.
Q. Okay. Amongst the many things that you did, was one of them to retrieve the 911 call that was made?
A. That's correct.
Q. How are 911 calls preserved by your department?
A. They are preserved by Marion Police Department. They receive 911 calls at their agency. We notified them that we needed this call saved and downloaded for us to retrieve a copy of it.
Q. And did you do that in this case?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And the 911 calls at the Marion Police Department, are they kept in the ordinary course of business?
A. They are.
Q. Have you reviewed the 911 call in preparation for your trial today?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And you also reviewed it during the investigation?
A. Yes, I have.

Q. I am going to show what's been marked as People's Exhibit 1.

MS. MUDGE: May I approach the witness?

THE COURT: You may.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Do you recognize this?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. What is that?

A. This is the 911 call from December 5th, 2020.

Q. And that's the original download of that 911 call?

A. It sure is.

Q. After you listened to it in preparation for trial, does that 911 call truly and accurately depict everything you heard on that call that you downloaded on December 5th of 2020?

A. That is correct.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, I would move to admit and publish to the jury the audio of the 911 call.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: It will be admitted, and you may publish.

MS. MUDGE: I will be playing it.

(911 CALL PLAYED AT THIS TIME.)

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Is that the sum and substance of the 911 call that you retrieved in this case?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. And there were no other 911 calls made?

A. No, not in reference to this call.

MS. MUDGE: I have no further questions for this witness at this time, but she may be re-called

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, on this subject matter, I have no questions.

THE COURT: Very well, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: I understand that Detective Geittmann will be testifying about other things later.

THE COURT: You may step down.

MS. THIEN: Judge, before we do the next -- this podium --

MS. MUDGE: -- I am going to move it. I apologize.

THE COURT: Let's go ahead and move it now.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you. I apologize.

THE COURT: Ms. Mudge, you may call your

next witness.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you. The People would call Officer Charles Welge.

THE COURT: Sir, come forward. Raise your right hand to be sworn by the Clerk.

OFFICER CHARLES WELGE,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please have a seat over here, sir. I need you to speak loudly so that everybody can hear you. Please state your name, and spell your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: My name is Chuck Welge, W-E-L-G-E.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY Ms. MUDGE:

Q. Where are you employed?

A. Marion Police Department.

Q. How long have you been at the Marion Police Department?

A. Approximately five years.

Q. Were you a police officer anywhere before then?
A. I was.
Q. Where was that?
A. Saline County Sheriff's Office.
Q. How long have you been a police officer?
A. Just under 20 years.
Q. Were you on duty for the Marion Police Department on December 5th of 2020?
A. I was.
Q. What shift were you working that day?
A. Day shift.
Q. And what were the natures of your duties; were you on routine patrol?
A. I was.
Q. In uniform like you are today?
A. That's correct.
Q. And in a squad car?
A. I was.
Q. Okay. At about 12:25 p.m. on that day, were you dispatched to 11304 Songbird Road?
A. I was.
Q. And where were you, first of all, when the call came out?
A. We were on Old Creal Springs Road.

Q. When you say "we", who do you mean?
A. Myself and Officer Sloan.
Q. Sloan?
A. Yes.
Q. He was in a separate car?
A. He was.
Q. So, how did the call come out to you?
A. Dispatch advised that they had a female on the phone stating that there was an 11-year-old child that was unresponsive.
Q. How far away from the house were you and Officer Sloan?
A. Approximately seven minutes.
Q. How long -- so, it took you seven minutes, or did you go lights and sirens?
A. Oh, yeah. We ran code.
Q. It's safe to say it took you about seven minutes?
A. Approximately.
Q. Okay. Were you at some point on your way there made aware about a suspect description?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was that?
A. On our way to the scene, dispatch advised us that there was possibly someone in black clothing that had

left the residence.

Q. On your way to the home, did you see someone in black clothing?

A. I did.

Q. And what did you do after you saw that person?

A. I advised Officer Sloan that was directly behind me that there was a person in black clothing just off to the east of us on Buckley Road.

Q. And did one of you stop to check that person?

A. Officer Sloan -- Officer Sloan diverted and inquired on that. I continued on to the scene.

Q. Okay. And did Officer Sloan report to you about the person on foot?

A. Yes.

Q. And who was that?

MS. THIEN: Objection. This is going to be hearsay.

THE COURT: Sustained.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. Um, you spoke to Officer Sloan. Without getting into what he said to you, after that, he checked on that person, correct?

A. I did.

Q. Okay. When you got to the home, were there any

other first responder's there?

A. Not at that time.

Q. I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 25.

MS. MUDGE: May I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Do you recognize that?

A. I do.

Q. And what is that a picture of?

A. This is Khoury League Road and Songbird Road.

Q. Does that map accurately depict an overhead view of the scene that you responded to?

A. It does.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, I would request permission to publish at this point?

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: You may.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. I am putting it up on the screen for you. Let me know when you see it, officer, please?

A. I do see it, yes.

Q. There is a way for you to mark on that screen.

THE COURT: Before you begin, let's make sure all of the juror's videos are working except for that one. I know. Okay. I apologize for interrupting. Go ahead.

MS. MUDGE: That's okay.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. If you take your finger -- may I approach and show him?

THE COURT: You may.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Could you please circle where the address on Songbird Road is on that map?

A. Sure. (Witness complies.)

Q. So, that's the residence. Can you please use your finger and show what road you came up; how you came to the residence?

A. Um, sure. It's the -- you really can't see it on this map, but this right here is the Y where Khoury League and Songbird meet. I came up northbound on Songbird approaching there.

Q. And turned into the residence?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay.
A. Pulled right into the driveway.
Q. Okay.
MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, if I could have that screen-shotted and mark it as Exhibit 25-A.
Q. So, when you get to the --
THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Wait. I want to make sure it's saved. Can you get anything?
THE CLERK: No.
THE COURT: Get me John Murray down to Courtroom 6, please. Did you get anything imported in at all?
THE CLERK: No. John showed us the other day and that was it.
THE COURT: Let me try it one more time. We did test this before we began.
MS. MUDGE: I'll withdraw admission of this exhibit. As long as the jury can see what he is pointing out, I can continue with my questioning, if that's okay?
THE COURT: It's your case. So if that's what you wish to do, we can move forward.
MS. MUDGE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Let me know when Mr. Murray gets

here.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. Thank you.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. I forgot where I was. So, no first responders at the home?

A. That's correct.

Q. How many vehicles in the driveway?

A. I believe one.

Q. How did you enter the house?

A. Through the front door.

Q. When you approached the front door, was it open or closed?

A. The screen door was closed, and the interior door was open.

Q. So you walked through the screen door?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. What's the first thing that you noticed when you walk into the home?

A. Um, I noticed a female in the kitchen area on the phone.

Q. And do you see that female that you saw that day in the courtroom today?

A. I do.

Q. Could you please point her out and say something

that she's wearing for the record?

A. Uh, black shirt at the defense desk.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, if the record can reflect the witness has identified the defendant?

THE COURT: So noted. Ms. Mudge, just a moment.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

THE COURT: Do you want to go forward?

MS. MUDGE: I would like to, please.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Go ahead.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. You've identified the defendant. Let's back up to when you walk into the front door. What do you see before you see the defendant, if anything?

A. Um, as soon as you walk into the doorway, there is large piles of blood that are on the floor in front of the door as you go into the residence.

Q. Do you remember what type of floor it was?

A. Um, I think it was -- some of it was like a hard surface and then some mixed.

Q. Okay. And, um, did you note anything about that blood?

A. That it was dried in piles or puddles.

Q. Dried in puddles?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Did you describe how you saw it in your police report?

A. I think I just described it as dried blood.

Q. Okay. Then after you see the dried blood -- I'm sorry. Which way in the house do you walk?

A. I walk into the living room, and then as a field of view, from there.

Q. Okay. Did you see the defendant?

A. Yeah, I did.

Q. What is she doing?

A. She was on the phone.

Q. Did you speak to her?

A. I did.

Q. What did you say?

A. I asked her if there was anybody in the house, and then I asked her where the child was.

Q. Did she respond to you?

A. She said back there and pointed.

Q. Okay. Did you have any further conversation with her at that time?

A. I asked her again, like, you know, where the child was, and again, she pointed to the rear of the residence and said the bathroom.

Q. So, the first time you asked her, did she respond?
A. Yeah. She said back there.
Q. Okay. And the second time she said bathroom?
A. That's correct.
Q. And did you then head to the bathroom?
A. I did.
Q. Where do you have to walk to get to the bathroom?
A. Just across the living room through the kitchen and then to the bathroom area.
Q. What did you notice as you're walking to the bathroom?
A. There was a large amount of blood that's on the walls, the floors; um, everywhere throughout the house.
Q. Was that blood dried like the first blood you saw?
A. It was.
Q. Did you get to the bathroom?
A. I did.
Q. No other police officers there at the time?
A. Not yet.
Q. When you get to the bathroom, is the bathroom door open or shut?
A. It's kind of cracked open.

Q. Cracked open all the way or --

A. -- no. It's kind of pulled to but not shut. You could see, like, through the doorway.

Q. And did you open the door?

A. I did.

Q. And what did you see when you got in the bathroom?

A. It was a very bloody scene inside of the bathroom. There was blood that had been dried all over everything in there. It was -- yeah.

Q. And did you find Jade the victim?

A. I did.

Q. Where was she?

A. She was in the tub.

Q. And describe for the jury how she was positioned in the tub?

A. She was laying, um, on her feet kneeling with her hand on the side of the tub with her head in her hands facing the doorway where I came in.

Q. Did you notice anything else about the tub?

A. The water was on. I turned that off, and it had filled with clear liquid.

Q. Clear liquid?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you note if the water was cold or warm?
A. I don't recall touching it.
Q. What did you do next?
A. I tried to touch the child to see if she would respond, which I had no response, and then pulled the child from the tub.
Q. When you pulled her from the tub, what was her condition at that point?
A. She was extremely cold, um, and not responsive.
Q. Any signs of life at that point?
A. No.
Q. Okay. You pulled her from the tub. Where did you take her to?
A. To the floor there in the bathroom.
Q. Okay. And what do you notice when you put her on the floor?
A. I kind of checked her for, you know, injury. Um, I pulled her shirt down in the, um, front where I seen a large gaping hole in her chest cavity.
Q. Okay. And was that gaping hole bleeding at the time?
A. It was not.
Q. At some point, did you move her out of the bathroom?

A. Officer Sloan arrived at that point, and we jointly pulled her from the bathroom into the little hall area, um, and tried to perform lifesaving measures.

Q. Why did you pull her into the hallway area?

A. There was more room for both of us to work on the female.

Q. Did you begin lifesaving measures?

A. We did.

Q. And what was that?

A. CPR.

Q. Did you notice anything about the wound as you started CPR?

A. Yes.

Q. And what was that?

A. Um, while doing CPR, from the wound there was a diluted bloody consistency that was coming from the wound.

Q. Was it blood?

A. It was watery -- more watery consistency.

Q. Okay. While you're working on Jade, did you see the defendant again?

A. I do.

Q. Where is she then?

A. She is sitting in front of us in front of the

kitchen cabinets.

Q. On the floor?

A. On the floor.

Q. And do you speak to her?

A. I don't.

Q. Does she say anything to you?

A. She does.

Q. What does she say?

A. Is she dead.

Q. Is she dead. Did you answer her?

A. I did not.

Q. What was her demeanor at that time?

A. Uh, silent.

Q. Was she crying?

A. Not -- not that I seen.

Q. Did she say anything else to you?

A. She did not.

Q. At some point, did she leave that position?

A. Officer Sloan then left about the same time that EMS had got there. Officer Ward had escorted the female to the front door area.

Q. Others took over lifesaving measures with Jade?

A. Yeah. Paramedics arrived.

Q. What did you do then?

A. We just canvassed the area to see if we could find anybody in the area.

Q. Um, you were -- were you made aware other people were coming to canvas the area as well?

A. Yeah. Several other officers.

Q. What did you personally do to canvas the area?

A. I just made sure there was nobody else in the residence, and then there is a exterior building that we walked through and just kind of combed out and looked. We also had a couple of K-9 officers that was doing field searchs.

Q. And as you were canvassing the area around the home, did you notice blood anywhere outside of the home?

A. I did not.

MS. MUDGE: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THINE: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Good afternoon.

A. Good afternoon.

Q. Officer Welge, I am going to start with the People's Exhibit Number 25. Is it still up on your screen there?

A. It is.

Q. Okay. Um, you know I can be a bit of a directional idiot, but in this particular photograph, is the top of it north, the bottom south?

A. It appear -- it appears to be, yes.

Q. Okay. Um, and that doesn't zoom out a lot, but can you tell me where in relation to this photo that's in front of you Buckley Road is located?

A. Sure. Yes. If you -- I know you really can't see the Y down here.

Q. Okay. But are we talking down at the bottom of the --

A. -- yeah, so on this one, you can actually see the road that connects it. So, if you come back this way, this road comes this way, and Buckley kind of shoots off of it --

Q. Okay.

A. -- back up.

Q. So, can you give me an approximate distance from Songbird Road, from Julie and Mike's, to Buckley Road where this person you saw in the black hoodie?

A. I don't have it. I didn't measure. I have no clue.

Q. Oh, no, I'm -- we don't get the benefit of a map,

so are we talking --

A. -- a short distance.

Q. -- a couple of blocks?

A. A short distance.

Q. Okay. Um, you did not stop to talk to that person; is that correct?

A. That's correct. I did not.

Q. You were the first officer on the scene?

A. I was.

Q. And you are not equipped with any type of body camera now or then; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. So, we're not able to see exactly what it is that you saw, but would you say this went fairly quickly for you to get inside the house and to the bathroom in order to find the victim and start giving aid?

A. Very quickly.

Q. Okay. You first see Julie. She is still on the phone; is that correct?

A. She is.

Q. And she is on the phone with 911?

A. She is.

Q. And are you in communications with dispatch at this point through your pack?

A. Not once inside the house, I am not.
Q. Okay. So, you get inside the house. You notice immediately there is blood right inside the door?
A. Yes.
Q. Um, would you describe this residence? From the front door, it's the living room, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then there is the kitchen directly to the side?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it visible? Do you see the kitchen from the door?
A. It is open, yes.
Q. You are at the screen door. You walk through. You immediately see where Julie is.
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. From there, she points, still on the phone with 911, to the back bathroom, correct?
A. She points to the back of the residence; that's correct.
Q. Okay. From where the kitchen is, what is the distance to the bathroom and the bedrooms to the "back of the residence"?
A. Sure. Um, I didn't measure it, but within view.

Q. Okay. Can you see? If you were in Julie's position in the kitchen, could you see directly in that hallway to the bedroom doors, the bathroom door and the back area?

A. Sure.

Q. Okay. Again, sir, I -- I appreciate the seriousness of what you saw, but you could not take any time to take any photographs of the scene as you saw it before you gave first aid, correct?

A. No.

Q. Absolutely. From there, you took Jade -- you got her out of the tub?

A. Yes.

Q. And, um, did you stop there on the bathroom floor?

A. Yes.

Q. Again, appreciating how difficult it is to tell time under these circumstances, how long would it have been before Officer Sloan and EMS arrived?

A. I don't speculate.

Q. Moments?

A. Yeah. Not long.

Q. Okay. And that's when you and Officer Sloan moved Jade into the hallway?

A. That's correct.

Q. At this point -- and, again, rightfully so, you're not making any efforts to "preserve a scene"? You were rendering -- or attempting to render lifesaving treatment measures?

A. My focus was saving the child, yes.

Q. Yes. The first wound that you noticed was the large wound to Jade's chest; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. Did you notice any others immediately at that point in time?

A. That was our main concern.

Q. Okay. Um, when you first arrived and saw her on her knees over the side of the tub, was her chest in the water or in the tub?

A. No.

Q. Okay. And the water itself did not come up over her back or anything like that?

A. No.

Q. Once the EMS arrived, you turned it over to them, correct?

A. Yes. Lifesaving measures was released to them.

Q. Okay. At that point, did you then step outside of the residence to begin your -- basically your next

assignment; to survey the area?

A. Once EMS was there, we did a final walk-thru of the residence and then outside; that's correct.

Q. Okay. And by the time you came outside, Julie was already outside on the front porch; is that correct?

A. Officer Sloan assisted her out there; that's correct.

Q. Okay. Was she wearing a blanket around her at the time?

A. I believe Officer Sloan gave her a blanket.

Q. When you first saw her -- first saw Julie, was she wearing that blanket?

A. No.

Q. It's silly a question, but could you recall what she was wearing?

A. No.

Q. Okay. You did a walk-thru of the outbuilding? Did I catch that correctly?

A. It was, like, a building that sat just right behind it.

Q. Right. Um, large shed/barn like --

A. -- yes.

Q. -- kind of thing? Okay. And is that the extent of the canvas that you participated in?

A. Yes.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, sir. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Redirect?

MS. MUDGE: Just one, your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. MUDGE:

Q. Have you ever seen this much blood at a crime scene before?

MS. THIEN: Objection.

MS. MUDGE: It's relevant.

THE COURT: That may be. It's beyond the scope. Sustained.

MS. MUDGE: Then I have nothing.

THE COURT: Sir, you may step down. You may call your next witness.

MS. MUDGE: The People would call Officer Sam Ward.

THE COURT: Please raise your right hand and be sworn by the Clerk.

SAM WARD,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Sir, please have a seat here. I need you to state your full name, please spell your last name for the record, and please speak up loud enough that everyone can hear you.

THE WITNESS: My name is Sam Ward, W-A-R-D.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. MUDGE:

Q. Where are you employed?

A. At the Marion Police Department.

Q. How long have you been employed there?

A. Seven and a half years.

Q. How long have you been a police officer?

A. Um, close to eight.

Q. Where were you before?

A. Williamson County.

Q. On December 5th of 2020, were you on duty?

A. I was.

Q. What was the nature of your duty that day?

A. Patrolman.

Q. In a marked squad car?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And in your uniform?

A. Yep.
Q. What shift were you working that day?
A. Uh, it's called a flex shift. It's from 12:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.
Q. So, you had just come on?
A. I did.
Q. At around 12:25 p.m. that day, were you dispatched to 11304 Songbird Road?
A. I was.
Q. And how did that call come out to you?
A. It came out as a disturbance. Um, a family member had arrived home and found a juvenile female unresponsive.
Q. How quickly did you get to the Songbird Road house?
A. I believe it took me seven minutes.
Q. Who was there as far as law enforcement goes when you arrived?
A. Officer Welge and Officer Sloan.
Q. And what did you do when you first got to the house?
A. I approached the residence to the front door.
Q. Front door?
A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And what did you see when you walked up to the house?

A. Officer Sloan was walking out a female by the name Julia Bevely.

Q. Okay. Do you see that female in the courtroom today?

A. I do.

Q. Could you please point her out and state something she is wearing to identify?

A. She is sitting right here next to Ms. Theresa Thien. I can't see what she is wearing.

MS. MUDGE: If the record could reflect that the witness has identified the defendant?

THE COURT: So noted.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. Um, you see Sloan walking her out, and then what do you do next?

A. I made entry to the residence.

Q. When you see the defendant with Officer Sloan, what was her demeanor?

A. Uh, she appeared to be upset; tears in her eyes.

Q. Did you speak to her at that point?

A. I did not.

Q. You go into the home, and what do you see in the

home when you first go in?

A. Um, a lot of blood in the main entryway of the residence leading to the kitchen and bathroom.

Q. What did the blood look like?

A. Uh, it was coagulated. Another term for that is candle wax form. It's dried blood basically.

MS. THIEN: I'm sorry. I missed that whole --

THE WITNESS: -- coagulated.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Did any of it appear fresh?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Where do you go after you walk into the home and see the blood?

A. I see Officer Welge standing towards the back of the residence where the bathroom's located.

Q. What is he doing?

A. Standing over a juvenile female.

Q. Okay. Where is the juvenile female laying?

A. To the main entryway to the bathroom face up.

Q. Outside of the bathroom?

A. Outside the bathroom.

Q. What do you do next?

A. I began performing CPR on the female.

Q. And did you notice anything about the wounds or the injuries to the female?

A. Yes. She had a very large what appeared to be a stab wound in the upper chest cavity.

Q. Did you notice anything about that wound?

A. It was not bleeding currently.

Q. When you started CPR on her, did that change?

A. It did.

Q. What happened after you started CPR?

A. Blood started coming through the open wound, and I covered it up with my hands.

Q. Describe the condition of the juvenile female when you found her?

A. Uh, she was cold to the touch, unresponsive, not breathing.

Q. You're performing CPR on her. How long did you do that for?

A. Eight minutes.

Q. Eight minutes? Who relieved you from that?

A. I believe the county ambulance service once they arrived on-scene.

Q. So, you leave them to work on the victim. What do you do next?

A. I left the residence to retrieve my patrol riffle

from my squad car.

Q. Why were you doing that?

A. We were going to canvas the area for a suspect that had left the scene on foot.

Q. What did you know about the suspect at the time?

A. Um, hardly really anything.

Q. Did you know if you were looking for a male or a female?

A. We knew it was a male.

Q. So, you get your riffle. Where do you go next?

A. Uh, me and a few of the deputies, we made our way to the south residence from the victim's home where there was a storm shelter.

Q. And did you check the storm shelter?

A. We did.

Q. How did you get into it?

A. We forced entry with a kick to the door.

Q. Kicked the door in?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Did you find anything in there?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Where did you go next?

A. We made our way back to the victim's residence and walked east behind the residence. We found a barn

behind the residence, and we searched that.

Q. Okay. And was anything in there?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. What did you do next?

A. I continued my progression towards the east side of the residence through a wooded area and into a what appeared to be -- what would have been a cornfield if it was in season.

Q. Did you walk through the cornfield?

A. I did.

Q. And did you notice anything as you walked through the cornfield?

A. There was no boot prints or footprints or anything that looked to be disturbed in the cornfield that somebody would have fled the scene.

Q. Approximately how long did you walk through the wooded area in the cornfield?

A. All together, I believe 45 minutes.

Q. Did you notice any blood anywhere?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Did you see any indication in the cornfields since it was down that anyone had recently been there?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. When you responded to the home, did you see

anyone walking on foot?

A. Uh, I did.

Q. You did? And who was that?

A. It was an older couple walking a dog off of Khoury League Road.

Q. Were you made aware of what route your co-workers took?

A. I believe they came off of Norman Road and took Khoury League. I took a different route.

Q. Okay. Why did you take a different route?

A. Um, dispatch had put out over the air that a suspect was fleeing the scene. I knew that there was already two units traveling one direction. I decided to take a different route in order to hopefully find the suspect leaving the scene.

Q. And the only people on foot that you found, you said, was an elderly couple?

A. I believe so, yes, ma'am.

Q. Okay.

MS. MUDGE: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Officer Ward, so you took a different route; is that correct?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And could you tell me where you started from?

A. Yes. I began on Deyoung --

Q. -- okay.

A. -- which is 13. I traveled east all the way to 166. I then traveled north on 166 to Khoury League Road. Then I traveled west off of 166 on to Khoury League.

Q. So, this couple walking that you encountered, that was before you ever reached the residence?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And did you stop to converse with them?

A. No, ma'am. I did not.

Q. Did you tell anyone at all prior to today that that occurred?

A. Um, yes, I believe so.

Q. Did you put it in any kind of written report?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Did you send any other officer back to locate that couple to see if they had seen anything?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Do know if any other officer ever went back to that couple to ask if they had seen anything?

A. I -- no. I do not believe so.

Q. And you did prepare a written report in this case; did you not?

A. I did.

Q. Okay. In that written report, did you state that -- or you stated that there was a large amount of blood located in the main entry, correct?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. You did not write as to the status of that blood whether it was coagulating or anything like that, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. But in your opinion, it was --

A. -- in my professional opinion.

Q. -- beginning to coagulate?

A. It was dried blood, yes, ma'am.

Q. Okay. And you immediately went back to assist Officer Welge?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. You were back there for approximately, what, eight minutes before EMS showed up? Do I have that right?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Okay. Now, while you were administering CPR or -- let me strike that and back up. When you first encountered Jade, was she laying then on her back?

A. Yes, she was. Face up.

Q. Could you visibly see the wound to her chest?

A. Through the shirt, yes, I could.

Q. And it was not actively bleeding at that point?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. But when you began to administer CPR it did, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. Indicating that Jade had passed prior to you starting CPR; is that fair?

A. That's fair, yes, ma'am.

Q. Where was the storm shelter located?

A. To the residence south of the victim's home.

Q. Okay. Um, immediately south? Is it a storm shelter that was at Julia and Mike's or was it a storm shelter for the neighbors?

A. It's -- I believe, it's the storm shelter to the neighbors because the neighbor gave us permission to kick in the door to it.

Q. Oh, okay. Um, and who were those neighbors?

A. I do not recall. I did not ask for their names.
Q. While you were present at that point, did any --
A. -- I believe --
Q. -- of the other deputies speak with them?
A. I believe so, yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. Um, but that storm shelter was such that it had to be kicked open or -- kicked open in order to open the door?
A. Right. We didn't know if it was barricaded or if it was locked. We couldn't tell.
Q. Okay. It just wasn't --
A. -- it wasn't opening.
Q. Okay. Sir, this was December 5th of 2020, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the status of the wooded area, is it a mix of trees? Is it leaves on the ground? Leaves on the trees?
A. It's a -- it's a wooded treeline --
Q. -- okay.
A. -- directly to the east of the house.
Q. And how much of that area did you cover?
A. All of it.
Q. Was that with other officers as well?

A. Uh, that was myself.
Q. And I'm also -- are you still looking at the same --
A. -- yes.
Q. -- picture of everything -- you can see there? The cornfield itself?
A. Once I made it through the wooded treeline, I could see the entirety of the cornfield. And I walked the treeline and the cornfield; not the entire cornfield.
Q. Okay. All right. Um, but at that point, being December, the corn was already out, right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. It was just the stubble that was left?
A. Uh, correct.
Q. You personally did not view any physical evidence from that area; the treeline and the field?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Were any other officers out searching that same area?
A. There were. Um, I am unsure where exactly their location was at. We were communicating through via radio.
Q. Okay. Uh -- thank you, sir. I have no further

questions.

THE COURT: Redirect?

MS. MUDGE: No. Thank you.

THE COURT: Sir, you may step down.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: At this time, the Court will take a short recess. Ten minutes.

THE CLERK: Please rise for the jury.

THE COURT: Before you guys leave, listen to me for a second, and I am going to do this every time that you leave. Until this case is submitted to you for deliberation, you must not discuss this case with anyone or remain within hearing of anyone discussing it, read any newspaper article regarding this case, listen to any radio broadcast concerning this case. After this case has been submitted to you, you must discuss the case only in the jury room when all of the members of the jury are present. You are to keep an open mind, and you must not decide any issue in the case until it's submitted to you for your deliberation under the instructions of the Court. Thank you. We're adjourned.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE

THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Ms. Mudge, you may call your next witness.

MS. MUDGE: We call Officer Aaron Anderson -- Deputy Aaron Anderson.

THE COURT: Sir, come forward. Please raise your right hand.

AARON ANDERSON,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Sir, please have a seat over here. I need you to state your full name. Please spell your last name, and make sure you speak loud enough that everybody can hear you.

THE WITNESS: Aaron Anderson. A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. MUDGE:

Q. Where are you employed?

A. I'm employed with the Williamson County Sheriff's Department.

Q. How long have you been employed there?
A. Five years.
Q. What's your job title?
A. I'm a patrol sergeant.
Q. Were you employed with Williamson County Sheriff's Department on December 5th of 2020?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And what was the nature of your employment on that date?
A. Um, I was a patrol deputy assigned to field training.
Q. Field train?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. So you were training a new officer?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And did you have an officer with you on that day?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. You're in uniform in a marked squad car?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. What shift were you on?
A. I was on day shift; 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Q. Okay. At approximately 12:24 on that date, did you get a call to 11304 Songbird Road?
A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. How did that call come out?
A. Initially it came out as a possible home invasion.
Q. Okay. Were you receiving radio traffic from your Sheriff's Department?
A. Well, we received radio traffic from Marion Police Department who does our 911.
Q. So you're getting radio traffic from Marion?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Did you, um -- as you were in route, did you hear K-9 officers being dispatched as well?
A. We requested K-9 to head that way.
Q. Okay. About how long did it take you to arrive to the scene?
A. Approximately ten to 15 minutes.
Q. And who was present when you arrived as far as first responders go?
A. As I was approaching the house, Deputy Kelley and I kind of crossed and arrived at the same time. Marion Police Department Officers Welge and Officer Ward were on-scene, as well, and officer Sloan and then Williamson County Ambulance was also on-scene.
Q. When you pulled up to the house, did you see the defendant in this case?

A. Yes.
Q. And what was she doing?
A. Um, she was on the front porch kneeled down with a blanket over her weeping.
Q. Okay. And you said she was weeping. Anything else about her demeanor?
A. Um, no. She didn't say anything. Just weeping.
Q. Okay. What did you do next after you were on the front porch?
A. As soon as I arrived on-scene, walked up to the house and entered through the west main door into the residence.
Q. The front door of the home?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. And what did you see as you got into the house?
A. As soon as I stepped in the house, I seen multiple blood splatters on the floor that appeared to be wax like -- like a flower petal.
Q. Okay. Where was that?
A. As you walked right in the main door on into the living room.
Q. Okay. Have you ever seen anything like that before?

A. Not in my 13 years.
Q. Have you ever seen that much blood before?
A. In my 13 year career, I've never seen that much blood.
Q. Did you see the victim, Jade Beasley, at that time?
A. Um, as I entered the living room, we continued through the house into the kitchen which is just north of the living room. And as you come through the kitchen, I seen her on the ground with her back on the ground receiving CPR.
Q. Who was giving her CPR?
A. Officer Ward.
Q. Officer Ward. Okay. What was the status of the victim at that point?
A. Um, at that point, the victim, she was lifeless, pale. Just laying on the floor receiving CPR.
Q. And what do you do? What are your duties there?
A. So, at that point, I asked one of the officers on-scene if the house had been searched yet for any possible -- anybody else in the house, and they stated no. So, myself and my field trainee deputy, we cleared the house. Made sure nobody else was inside.
Q. Okay. Um, when you say cleared the house, did

you see every room?

A. Yes, we walked in -- well, we didn't walk in every room. We cleared the whole house. There were certain rooms I had to clear without physically stepping in, so every room was physically checked and nobody else was in the house.

Q. Did you see blood anywhere outside the front entryway?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Where did you see blood?

A. Immediately in the front entryway in the living room, in the kitchen, in the northeast corner bedroom, in the bathroom, and then the bathroom was just -- the bedroom just south of that.

Q. All of those rooms that you just said and all the blood that you saw, was it all in the same state that you described in the front entryway?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Dried?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Okay. Was there any room that you cleared that appeared to not have blood in it?

A. Um, the master bedroom and bathroom I didn't see any blood.

Q. And you walked into that?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. What did you do after you cleared the home?
A. After clearing the home, I asked Officer Ward if he needed help with CPR at this time, and he stated yes.
Q. He said yes?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. So, you took over CPR?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. Approximately how long did you do CPR on Jade?
A. Approximately two to three minutes.
Q. Did you notice anything about the wounds on Jade?
A. Um, there was no blood coming from any of the wounds.
Q. From any of them?
A. No.
Q. About how many wounds did you notice on her?
A. Um, originally just a few. Later EMS rolled her body over and we noticed a few more on her back.
Q. Why did you stop doing CPR?
A. Um, I honestly got tired, and my field training officer stepped in and took over.
Q. And you said EMS turned her on her side.

A. Yes. A little bit later.
Q. And what did you notice then?
A. Um, a few -- a few marks on, like, her upper back.
Q. Okay. Um, did EMS transport Jade out of the home after that?
A. Um, it took a little bit longer. After I did CPR, I went outside and maintained scene security. Made sure no one came in the house. That's when EMS asked me to come back in to look at the wounds that they found when they rolled her over.
Q. Um, you said you maintained scene security. Who was outside? Were there more people outside then when you went back out?
A. When I went outside -- excuse me. When I came -- first came in, Officer Sloan was outside maintaining the security, and then I went outside after performing CPR when United Medical Response arrived on-scene. There was multiple officers and detectives on-scene.
Q. Okay. And did you speak to anyone outside that wasn't a first responder?
A. I did a little later.
Q. Who was that?
A. Um, Jade's mother arrived on-scene, Jessica

Bradley.

Q. Okay. And did you tell her what was going on?

A. Um, I didn't tell her what was going on. We just asked her what she was doing there.

Q. And did any other family members come on-scene?

A. Jade's father, Gregory Beasley, showed up a little bit later.

Q. After Jade is in the ambulance and being taken away, what do you do next?

A. At that point, we provided scene security and put crime scene tape up around the house.

Q. Okay. Um, after you secure the home with crime scene tape, what do you do next?

A. At that point, Lieutenant Detective Gusentine asked myself and my field training officer if we could canvas the area; see if anybody had any videos or any testimony of anything that happened.

Q. And did you do that?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. For -- where did you go?

A. Uh, we first started north on Songbird north of the residence and asked just a few houses north. It being in the county, it is kind of a distance away. So, we checked a few houses. And then from there, we went

south on Songbird, and then east and west on Khoury League Road.

Q. And did you locate any cameras at -- on homes there?

A. No, we did not.

MS. MUDGE: I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Deputy Anderson, who was your field trainee that day?

A. Deputy Franklin.

Q. Okay. He's still with the Sheriff's Department, right?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Yet no longer a trainee, though?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Okay. How many houses did you and Deputy Franklin check? Can you give me a rough guess?

A. I can give a rough guess. Deputy Franklin has the notes on that. Uh, six to eight.

Q. Okay. Was anyone actually home?

A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And did you make record of who you spoke with?
A. Deputy Franklin did.
Q. Okay. But no cameras were located at that time?
A. No, ma'am.
MS. THIEN: I have no further questions. Thank you.
THE COURT: Any redirect?
MS. MUDGE: No. Thank you.
THE COURT: You may step down, sir. You may call your next witness.
MS. MUDGE: The People would call Deputy Dustin Kelley.
THE COURT: Raise your right hand, please, to be sworn in by the Clerk.

DEPUTY DUSTIN KELLEY,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please have a seat here, sir. State your full name, please spell your last name for the record, and please speak loud enough for everyone to hear.
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. Justin Kelley.

K-E-L-L-E-Y.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. MUDGE:

Q. Where are you currently employed?

A. I'm currently employed with the Williamson County Sheriff's Office.

Q. How long have you been employed there?

A. Almost ten years.

Q. What is your current position there?

A. I'm currently now a detective with the Sheriff's Office a part of the Williamson -- Williamson County Major Case Squad.

Q. Were you employed with the Sheriff's Department here on December 5th of 2020?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. What was -- what was your job then?

A. At that time, I was a patrol deputy.

Q. Were you in uniform?

A. Yes.

Q. In a marked squad car?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. What shift were you working that day?

A. I'd been working day shift which would have been 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Q. And were you dispatched to 11304 Songbird Road?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. How did that call come out to you?

A. Marion dispatch through the Marion Police Department would have notified the Williamson County Sheriff's Office. At that time, that would have been Deputy Anderson and Deputy Franklin's zone, so they responded. And due to the nature, I also responded to assist.

Q. Okay. What do you mean due to the nature?

A. It came out as, um, kind of like a burglary in progress with possible injuries, and then as I started responding, Deputy Anderson advised me over the radio that I needed to step up my response due to the -- there being an 11-year-old victim with multiple stab wounds.

Q. Okay. And did you step up your response?

A. Absolutely.

Q. How quickly did you get to the house?

A. I don't know minutes, but quickly and safely as possible.

Q. Who was there when you arrived, first responders?

A. At that point, I believe there was at least three

Marion police officers, and I believe the Williamson County Ambulance pulled in just prior to my arrival.

Q. When you got to the scene, did you see the defendant?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. What was she doing?

A. At that point, she was standing on -- excuse me. She was sitting on the deck of the residence which would be on the west side of the residence covered in a blanket.

Q. Did you speak to her at that point?

A. At that point, I did not.

Q. What did you do?

A. At that point, I entered the residence.

Q. And what did you see when you got in the house?

A. Upon entering the residence, I observed right inside the residence which would be kind of a living room slash dining room area. I observed a large amount of blood. Some of the blood was coagulated. I know right on the back side of the door that I entered, which would be on the interior of it, I remember seeing blood smeared on the door handle. Um, I continued through the residence which would have been kind of continued through the living room into the kitchen area. There

was blood all through the house, and then once I kind of got in the kitchen, I could see Officer Sam Ward with the Marion Police Department performing CPR on the victim.

Q. Have you ever seen that much blood before?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. After you go to the residence and you're inside, at some point do you step outside?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And what's your point in stepping outside?

A. At that point, due to the nature of the call coming out that somebody had ran out of the residence, I wanted to speak with the defendant to try to get information about the possible suspect at that time.

Q. And did she talk to you?

A. She did.

Q. Okay. What did you ask her about?

A. At that point, she identified her name to me and also identified the victim on the inside as her step-daughter. Provided me her name and, I believe, date of birth. I asked her if she could tell anything in reference to the suspect or what happened. She told me she had left the residence. When she left the residence, the victim was sleeping. At that point, she

left the residence to go to town. At some point, she realized she left her debit card/credit cards and such at home. Returned home. When she returned home, the storm door was open or partially open, and then the main door was closed. As she approached the residence to enter, she advised she had described him as a white male with a black hoodie on, gloves exit the residence. At that point, the suspect attempted to stab her, and she showed me an injury on one of her hands, and then we continued speaking. And then she advised me the -- nobody else should have been in the residence. Her, I believe, boyfriend at the time would have been at work at Cracker Barrel in Marion, and then the other children were not present at the residence.

Q. Did you ask her which direction this man ran off to?

A. I did.

Q. What did she say?

A. She could not give me any information on which way the suspect would have ran -- the alleged suspect.

Q. Did she mention anything to you about him having a ski mask or a mask on his face?

A. Not that I recall.

Q. And did you ask her about the knife or describe

the knife?

A. I did. I asked her if she could describe it, and she could not provide any description.

Q. Um, you said you saw a cut on her hand?

A. Correct.

Q. What did it look like?

A. I would describe it as kind of like a clean cut with a knife. I did not observe it to be actively bleeding.

Q. Did you offer her medical attention?

A. I did. She declined it.

Q. You notified detectives at your department about this?

A. I would have called on-call Detective Cindy Geittmann in reference to it.

Q. Okay. Explain what that process is and why you do that?

A. Uh, in reference to this case, obviously once I saw the victim's body and the amount of blood, I did believe this was going to be a homicide, and due to the detectives being lead homicide certified and having more resources than a patrol deputy, I would have contacted her.

Q. On the scene, did you also speak with the

victim's biological mother?

A. At some point during the -- I was there for a lengthy amount of time. The mother did arrive on-scene of the victim.

Q. Um, were you present when Jade was brought out in the ambulance?

A. I was present when she was carried out by the medical staff from the residence to the -- I guess you'd describe it as the front yard.

Q. And were you with Jade's mother at the time?

A. I was standing in the area, yes, ma'am.

Q. And did you see anything? Did you notice anything with Jade being transported out?

A. When Jade was brought outside of the residence, um, she had been carried down the steps on a cot. When this cot hit the ground, I remember Jade's arm falling from her body just with gravity; you could just tell she was not alive or conscious.

Q. And did Jade's biological mother react to that?

A. She did.

Q. How?

A. Historically crying. I believe she called her husband.

MS. MUDGE: I have no further questions,

your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Detective Kelley, um, did you record the conversation that you had with Julie on the front porch?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. And how long would you say that that conversation occurred?

A. Um --

Q. -- was it pretty brief?

A. I would say no more than five minutes.

Q. And at that point was, um -- was she wearing any shoes?

A. I do not believe so, no, ma'am.

Q. She was wrapped in a blanket?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Still appeared to be upset?

A. She was making a whimpering noise or possibly crying. At that point, her head was down where I could not see her visible reaction.

Q. Do you recall the time you would have arrived approximately?

A. I believe the call came in at 12:24. I would have been near Herrin Road and Route 148. I am going to say -- I'm going to be on the safe side and say 15 to 20 minutes.

Q. Yeah. Probably. You were still present when Detective Geittmann arrived; is that correct?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. All right. Now, when Ms. Mudge asked you whether or not Julie stated that the person coming out, whether that person was wearing a mask at that point, and you stated you do not recall; is that correct?

A. I don't recall her mentioning one.

Q. Okay. But did you specifically ask her, or do you recall specifically asking about a mask?

A. At this time, I do not recall.

Q. Just give me a description or what you remember --

A. -- yes, ma'am.

Q. -- was that the conversation?

A. I think I also asked her if she knew the male leaving the residence. She stated she did not.

Q. Okay. Now, earlier you stated that you recall the conversation that Julie told you the storm door was opened but the main door closed?

A. Yeah. It was -- she described it as being shut. The storm door would have been open, and what I consider the main door would have been closed.

Q. It wasn't the opposite of that?

A. Not that I -- not that I recall.

Q. No? Okay. Um, but you were not the first officer that spoke to her; is that correct?

A. I do not remember if any of the Marion officers spoke with her or not.

Q. Okay. And at the time you appeared, had you had the opportunity to review the 911 call?

A. At the time I responded?

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Okay. Thank you, officer.

MS. THIEN: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Any redirect?

MS. MUDGE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Sir, you may step down. You can call your next witness.

MR. BUTLER: Sergeant Justin Francis.

THE COURT: Raise your right hand. The Clerk will swear you.

SERGEANT JUSTIN FRANCIS,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Thank you. Please have a seat over here. Please state your full name, spell your last name for the record and make sure you speak up loudly so everyone can you.

THE WITNESS: Gotcha. Sergeant Justin Francis, Marion Police Department. Last name is F-R-A-N-C-I-S.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. You've already answered some of my questions. You said Marion Police Department?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And a sergeant, so how long have you worked for Marion?

A. Uh, I've been at Marion 13 years.

Q. And do you have any prior law enforcement experience before that?

A. Yeah, about four years.

Q. Okay. So, approximately 17 years of law

enforcement experience then?

A. Correct.

Q. And you said you're a sergeant. What are your job duties?

A. I oversee the patrol function on day shift and K-9 division.

Q. Okay. And you said the K-9 division. So, do you have a K-9 dog?

A. Correct. I'm a K-9 handler, and I oversee our K-9 division as well.

Q. What kind of training have you had on that?

A. Uh, it's ongoing from the years of having a K-9. I've been a K-9 handler for 11 years. Went through the basic K-9 handler school, and then ongoing training every year since.

Q. All right. Your K-9 that is your partner, what is the K-9's name?

A. Loeki.

Q. And can you spell that for the record?

A. L-O-E-K-I.

Q. Thank you. How long has Loeki been your partner?

A. I was partnered with Loeki in 2012, so about 11 years.

Q. Okay. And does Loeki have some training as well?

A. Correct.

Q. What kind of training does Loeki have?

A. She's a dual purpose narcotics, apprehension, tracking, um, articles searches.

Q. Okay. Well, can you explain what that is?

A. Yes. It's the -- the narcotics part of it is obviously the sniffing of any narcotic substance illegal in nature. The dual purpose aspect of that is our dog's ability to be able to track suspects, Alzheimer's patients, children -- anything of that nature -- locate articles and then area search of a suspect or a person that's in an area downwind.

Q. Okay. And when you say locate articles, what are you talking about there?

A. Any articles of human odor. So, essentially with that type of training, you can put any article, a set of keys, coins, firearm, glove, anything you want out into a field in any area whatsoever; deploy the dog to locate that article.

Q. All right. Uh, Sergeant Francis, what about your training? You said you have constant training. What are you trained in?

A. I have had numerous trainings over the years, but as far as the K-9 goes, I went to a what they consider a

basic K-9 school to start with which is 240 hours with the K-9 itself, and then with that, we're federally required to do 16 hours every month. Thereafter, the dog's been certified every single year. So, the totality of all those hours I can't tell you without having that in front of me.

Q. Sure. Thank you. Um, now, I want to take you back to December of 2020. Were you on duty on December 5th of 2020?

A. Yes.

Q. And, um, at some point, were you dispatched to a residence on Songbird Road?

A. Correct. Yes. I was at the hospital on-call, and got a call that there was a dispatch called on Songbird.

Q. And what was the address?

A. I think it was 11304, I believe.

Q. And do you recall approximately what time you were dispatched to that residence?

A. I believe it was somewhere around 12:20, 12:25.

Q. All right. What was -- what was the reason that you were dispatched there?

A. Uh, dispatch called me, basically said that they were sending my crew -- my guys and girls that were

working to the report of a unresponsive juvenile female that was at that location.

Q. Okay. And when you say "your guys," you mean because you're the --

A. -- my guys and gals that I supervise on the day shift.

Q. All right. Uh, so do you recall approximately what time you arrived on the scene?

A. Uh, I don't have it in front of me but probably within -- I was at the hospital, so probably within ten to 12 minute arrival time.

Q. Okay. And what did you do during this investigation?

A. As I was going to that location, there was relayed via radio that there was possibly a suspect that had fled the scene. I initially went to the area of that location and deployed my K-9 in an attempt to locate the suspect.

Q. Okay. Um, I am going to approach --

MR. BUTLER: I would ask permission to approach the witness, your Honor.

THE COURT: You may.

Q. I am showing you what's previously been marked as People's Exhibit 25. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes. An aerial image of the location.

MR. BUTLER: And, your Honor, at this time, I would ask that I publish that exhibit to the jury.

THE COURT: The paper, or do you want to put it on the screen?

MR. BUTLER: I would ask to put it on the screen.

THE COURT: Sure. For the record, it has been published.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. Now, Sergeant Francis, um, you said you deployed your K-9 to do a search. What area, if any, on this map did you search?

A. Uh, if this is a true north, south, east, west directional map with north being the top, the area of where you're looking at here would be off -- where Exhibit 25 is, which would be the southwest coordinate on this map, would be just off of the map. There is area off of Buckley Road that leads back up into the strip pit. It would be the bottom left corner of this map.

Q. So, on the screen where it says Exhibit 25, that's part of the area where you --

A. -- yes, leading up to the -- it would be the left side off of the screen. Up to Exhibit 25 and then south of that.

Q. Okay. Um, approximately how long did you search the area?

A. Uh, probably a good hour and a half.

Q. And, um, when I say you, I also mean your partner Loeki. Um, what -- what are you looking for with regard to what your dog is doing?

A. So, with the K-9 when you're looking for a track or area search, you're looking for a distinct change of behavior in the dog's behavior. So, when you deploy the dog, you're going through a ritual of giving the dog the command to know it's looking for a suspect. So, when this dog is out at the end of the leash or off lead if you're in a thick area, this dog is looking for any odor, human odor fear pheromone, disturbed vegetation to start to track to locate the suspect.

Q. Okay. Are they looking for anything on the ground?

A. Yeah. Their -- their -- part of their training is they come across an article that has human odor on it, they will alert to it by either laying on it or sitting near it to let us know that it's there.

Q. Okay. During your search, did Loeki alert on to anything?

A. No.

Q. And, um, approximately how large of an area would you say you searched?

A. Uh, without having those -- without having the actual measurements, I can give you a guesstimate.

Q. Yeah. That's what I'm asking for.

A. We're probably looking at a -- I'm going to guess maybe a ten acre area from basically Buckley Road and Spring Garden, which is going to be off the bottom left corner -- there is a building there -- all the way up to the back side of that strip pit, and then there is a church. Kind of that whole area.

Q. Okay. Um, were you the only officer with a K-9 that was performing the search?

A. Uh, no. US Fish and Wildlife handler Adam Rawlinson and K-9 Nat were actually with me. They were in a different area, but we were in the same location.

Q. So, they were searching a different area than you were?

A. Correct, yes.

Q. At some point, did you meet up with them?

A. Correct. Yeah. After we had checked our area, I

met back up with handler Rawlinson just on the other side of the road from where the victim/suspect residence is on the west side.

Q. Okay. And you told me that your K-9 partner had -- did not alert on any articles. Did it alert on anything?

A. No. I never got a change in behavior to even imply that any person, whether it be disturbed vegetation of someone walking through there or fear pheromone or any of that had even transpired and went through the area where I was at.

Q. Okay. You mentioned disturbed vegetation there. What is that?

A. These easiest way to explain it for someone who is a non-handler is if you take grass, for example, and you smell grass, it has a distinct smell to it. But if you take your hand and you smash it, like, you're walking on it, grass smells differently. The same reason when you cut your yard, you can smell it for several days. Dogs are trained to go after that distinct smell, that disturbed vegetation of a suspect stomping on grass as they walk or they run and that change of odor that comes from that disturbed vegetation.

Q. Okay. Thank you. Has your partner been successful in the past with locating people?

A. Oh, yeah.

Q. Yes.

A. Yes.

Q. How often do you get called out to locate people?

A. Um, I've had -- over the years with this dog, I've had excess of 300 successful tracks.

Q. Three hundred successful tracks over the years?

A. Yes.

Q. Thank you. Did you go inside the scene?

A. No. I never went inside the residence.

Q. Okay. Now, can you explain to the jury how a K-9 can be looking for a scent if it does not have a sample of that scent already?

A. Yeah. Correct. Uh, so, there is two different types of dogs you're looking at. Tracking and trailing are the two different types of dogs. Trailing is usually what you see on TV with, like, a bloodhound. A bloodhound is looking for a distinct odor. We give them the suspect's sweatshirt, victim's sweatshirt, whatever we want, and we want them to find that person specifically. With our type of K-9, we're looking for really three different things. You're looking for

disturbed vegetation which is what we described where somebody has walked through a specific area and they disturb the general odor of that grass, weeds, gravel, whatever it may be. It's changed the surface sample, the smell of what that is. The second is a fear pheromone. Any human that has committed a crime, they're dumping adrenalin, a fear pheromone. It's very distinct when a dog gets in that odor that they are trailing or tracking that odor. And then the third is just human odor in general. Um, cologne, dead skin cells. When you're walking, you're constantly dumping skin cells. Which as minute as that sounds, a dog can actually pick that up. So, that odor itself is just that dog getting into that odor to track that. Police K-9's aren't -- the blood hounds are -- but our type of K-9's are not trailing dogs or tracking dogs. They are not looking for a specific scent. They are looking for human odor of one of those three types to track.

Q. Okay. So Loeki, if I understood you right, is a tracking dog?

A. She's -- yes, a dual purpose tracking dog, correct.

Q. All right.

MR. BUTLER: I have no further questions,

your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Sergeant Francis, has it really been 13 years at this point?

A. It has been a long time.

Q. Um, you still have the map up in front of you?

A. I do, yes.

Q. Okay. So if I recall this correctly, you primarily covered a ten acre area that would have been under the Exhibit 25 sticker?

A. Correct.

Q. And then south and west?

A. Yeah. So, if you're looking -- if you're looking at this right under 25 --

Q. -- uh-huh.

A. -- there is actually another body of water, but it would be directly underneath that. So, there is two big bodies of water if you look at this thing from an aerial map. I think it's an actual old strip pit, and then Buckley --

Q. -- is that large green area that we see, is that

the strip pit?

A. No.

Q. Is that a body of water?

A. That's water, yes.

Q. Okay. So the actual area was even further south?

A. Just a little bit south of Exhibit 25, yes.

Q. Okay. And, um, the other area you said was up around across the road from Songbird -- or from the residence?

A. The area that Adam Rawlinson checked? Is that what you're referring to?

Q. Oh, I was confused. I thought you would check that as well?

A. No. That was another handler to check that area.

Q. Okay. So, is that the closest to this area that you checked?

A. Yeah. So, if you blow this map up, essentially there is a church that is right at the end of Buckley Road. That is as far close to the residence as I got with the dog.

Q. Okay. And, um -- I mean, Loeki's been with you for a long time, right?

A. Correct.

Q. Um, and that dogs, like people, are not perfect

or infallible?

A. That's correct.

Q. Um, at that point, we can say that Loeki did not detect an odor, but we cannot say that there was not one -- or not someone who had been through that area? Just that Loeki did not detect it.

A. I would -- I would confidently say that I did not come across an area that there was an odor.

Q. Okay. Because Loeki did not alert to you?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. I guess what I am saying is it's impossible to prove a negative, right? I mean, Loeki is being -- as good as of a dog as she is, right, is not infallible?

A. It's not a perfect science. Nothing is.

Q. Okay. Did you -- were any articles located?

A. No.

Q. No trash? No nothing?

A. The dog wouldn't alert to old trash that no longer has human odor on it.

Q. Okay.

MS. THIEN: I have no further questions. Thank you.

THE COURT: Any redirect?

MR. BUTLER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sir, you may step down. The State may call their next witness.

MR. BUTLER: The People would call Adam Rawlinson.

THE COURT: Sir, come forward. The Clerk will swear you in. If you would raise your right hand.

ADAM RAWLINSON,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please have a seat over here, sir. State your full name, please spell your last name and please make sure you speak up as loud as you can so everybody can hear you.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. My name is Officer Adam Rawlinson. Last name R-A-W-L-I-N-S-O-N.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Um, Officer Rawlinson, where are you employed?

A. I am employed with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Q. How long have you been employed there?
A. I have been in federal law enforcement 23 years starting next month.
Q. Twenty-three years in federal law enforcement. Do you have a title?
A. I am the Chief of the National K-9 Program for the US Fish and Wild Life Services.
Q. Chief of everyone in the U.S.?
A. Uh, we have eight K-9 teams nationwide from Alaska to Alabama and everywhere in between. I program manage that program.
Q. And that's out of Washington D.C.
A. I'm a D.C. employee, but I live here in Southern Illinois.
Q. Gotcha. Uh, Officer Rawlinson, you -- well, I want to take you back to December 5th, 2020. Did you have a K-9 partner back then?
A. I did. My position is also a Federal Wildlife K-9 Officer. My partner is now retired, but at that time, I did have K-9 Nat.
Q. Nat? And is that spelled N-A-T-E?
A. N-A-T.
Q. Okay. Um, how long were you and Nat partners?
A. Nat and I partnered up in 2011, so ten years was

the total time. He retired in late December of '21.

Q. Okay. So, a little over a year he's been retired?

A. Yes. Yeah.

Q. Um, now on December 5th of 2020, were you requested to assist in an investigation in Marion here in Williamson County?

A. I was. My, at that time, zone officer for this area -- which we changed that title to patrol captain -- requested that I went to the Marion area off of Songbird to possibly assist in a K-9 deployment.

Q. Okay. And, um, did you go?

A. I did.

Q. Do you recall approximately how long you were there?

A. I arrived approximately one o'clock, and I departed at around 2:15 p.m.

Q. Okay. And did you conduct a search there with your K-9 partner Nat?

A. I did. We received information that the assistance would be in deploying my partner to track and trail a possible suspect, and I did do that.

Q. Okay. Um, could you explain to the jury track and trail, what that is?

A. With my partner, as he was trained from a very young age over in Europe, and then brought to the United States to search for human odor, um, and also vegetation or ground disturbance and to follow that human odor or fresh ground disturbance and vegetation disturbance.

Q. Did Nat require having a specific scent ahead of time?

A. He does do scent identification -- or he did, but that's not mandatory. Most times we do not have a scent article, and this time we did not.

Q. Okay. And I am --

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I would request permission to approach the witness.

THE COURT: Yes.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. I am handing you what I previously marked as People's Exhibit 25. Do you recognize that?

A. I do. Yes, sir.

Q. And how are you able to recognize that?

A. Um, I can see where I parked my K-9 patrol truck and also where my partner and I deployed to track and trail.

Q. Okay. And on that photograph, I think it's also on your screen now. Is it?

A. It is.

Q. Can you describe where you and your partner did your tracking?

A. Looks like there is two older ball fields. There is a little gravel strip on the west side of Songbird. We parked in that gravel strip. He was deployed -- it was called a half circle cut or deployment, and so we started to the west of that parking space, went over to almost to the strip cut and then continued southwest.

Q. Okay. And there was another officer with his K-9 unit there as well, correct?

A. In the area, yes.

Q. Is there any problem when there are multiple dogs in the same area?

A. Uh, we were separated. He was more towards the southwest. We weren't together at any time.

Q. Okay. You said you were there approximately an hour and 15 minutes?

A. We were, yes.

Q. Did Nat ever alert on anything?

A. I did not receive a change of behavior from K-9 Nat that would lead me to believe that we would start a track or trail from that deployment.

Q. Okay. What types of changes of behavior does Nat

show or did Nat show?

A. Uh, specifically for Nat because he was my partner for ten years -- they're all dogs, so some have different characteristics on what that change in behavior is. But with him, he quickly will turn his head in the direction where that odor would be that he detected. He will start pulling a little longer and stronger. He's on a 30 foot lead or leash, and so it gives him a lot of room to be able to investigate, if you will, and discover that odor. Um, he'll have increase in breathing, a little bit more rigid, and his tail will wag a little faster than normal. And then also, like I mentioned, his change in breathing and his pulling is the most obvious.

Q. Okay. And did you notice any of that?

A. I did not.

Q. Approximately do you know how large of an area you and Nat searched?

A. If you cut all that area, I roughly say two to three acres.

Q. Okay. And that doesn't count what Sergeant Francis and his partner searched, does it?

A. No. We weren't in the same area.

Q. Okay. Um, your partner Nat, you say

approximately ten years?

A. Correct. We were together for ten years.

Q. Was -- did Nat have occasion to track individuals without a scent prior?

A. As far as a scent article?

Q. A scent article. Sorry, yes.

A. Yes. Hundreds of times. Our job being a game warden is we use our partners to locate people in a faster way. And being that, we do it a lot. And so his reps or times of being deployed to do that active locating someone is quite a bit.

Q. Okay.

A. Especially in the ten years that we were together.

Q. Okay. Now, I think I asked you about Nat's training, and you said he was trained in Europe?

A. Yes. He started in Europe in the Slavic Republic, and then was selected there. He had a little bit of pre-training in his disciplines and skills. He was flown over to the North Carolina; in a kennel in North Carolina. He spent about eight weeks in what they call pre-training also learning his disciplines and skills and what he is going to do for us and our service. And then I joined him for six weeks to start

that introduction and get that pre-training, and then we continued our training on the job and also every two weeks a certain amount of hours as recommended to keep our skill-set up.

Q. And that is you and --

A. -- that is correct. After the six weeks, we're together. We're together from then on out. We're still together with me at our residence.

Q. Did you ever go inside the residence?

A. I did not.

Q. Okay. So you wouldn't have seen the scene?

A. No.

Q. Um, Nat's retired. You still have him?

A. He is. We're lucky enough with our service and our policy we get the option to adopt, if you will. And, yes, he is one of my five kids.

MR. BUTLER: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. What breed of a dog is Nat?

A. Nat is a Belgium Malinois.

Q. Oh, okay. Beautiful.
A. Thank you.
Q. Now, Officer Rawlinson, um --
MS. THIEN: May I approach the witness?
THE COURT: You may.
By Ms. Thien:
Q. I would like to take a look at the exhibit because I am not 100 percent. If you can use the piece of paper, maybe we will try to figure out. Can you point to me on this where you parked your vehicle?
A. Uh, right here in the gravel patch on top of the old ball fields.
Q. Okay. And the area that you searched is this area right there?
A. We went to the west and back into here and back.
Q. Okay. Um, did you do anything on the interior?
A. Uh, some of the ball field area we did at first, um, to kind of get warmed up, if you will. But it is very little. It was mostly on that outside area.
Q. That area itself doesn't appear to have much vegetation as far as trees or anything, large boulders or anything of that nature. It's a pretty flat area.
A. Um, there is quite a bit of vegetation, if you will.

Q. Right.
A. It's not far from the old strip cuts and things like that.
Q. Okay.
A. Um, but as far as boulders or what you just described, I would say no.
Q. Was any -- did you or to your knowledge any other K-9 officer, K-9 deploy to any area around here?
A. I can only speak to what we deployed to do, and that was that area that we just pointed out and discussed.
Q. Okay. Very good. Um, I would like to try an experiment, if we may very quickly, unless, you don't object to me asking the officer to point -- I know we're having problems downloading -- the actual area using the screen, or I can try to throw it on the overhead projector.
MS. MUDGE: Go ahead, and have him point.
MS. THIEN: All right.
MS. MUDGE: I don't object.
By Ms. Thien:
Q. Have you worked one of these before?
A. Um, no. I'm not sure other than a screen.
Q. All right.

A. Do I draw on a line?
Q. If you don't mind me coming in?
A. Sure.
Q. Yes. So, we are going to -- Judge, is this on?
THE COURT: You're on.
MS. THIEN: Okay.
MS. MUDGE: You just hit it and --
MS. THIEN: Okay. I'll get you started.
By Ms. Thien:
Q. Does that work?
A. That's pretty close.
Q. Great. Can you point out for the jury where you parked your vehicle?
A. Um, I don't know if it's going to move when I start this or it's going to start from where you pointed at.
Q. Let's give it a shot and see.
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. Can you move it backwards?
THE COURT: You can take your finger off of it, if you're wanting to move it to any specific location and then tap it again.
THE WITNESS: I can tap it again, okay. Continue to tap it, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

THE WITNESS: It's not drawing a line.

MS. THIEN: Wonderful technology. I'm going to come over and do it again, and see if we can make this work quickly. Can you start -- there we go. Now, if I hit clear, it may clear out your prior --

THE COURT: -- it's not saved anyway.

MS. THIEN: Okay. So we will clear it, and now it should be good to go. And if you can put your finger down and draw away. Does that work? Okay.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. If we have it up now, could you point and mark where you parked your vehicle?

A. I will. Here -- there we go.

Q. There we go.

A. Well, it started. Bare with me.

Q. No worries. Thank you for baring with me.

A. If you can tell, it's not a straight line that I am trying to draw. It's not doing that, so I'm sort of giving it some points here. That would be my end area approximately, and then we worked our way back up to the truck after that towards Songbird.

Q. Okay. I see. So we do have, like, around the two ball fields. Um, I think we now have a good idea,

and that was the only area that you deployed with Nat?

A. That's correct.

Q. All right. So, in that particular area, no scent was depicted?

A. No. I had no change of behavior.

Q. Okay. Again, most K-9's, like most people, not infallible. The fact that Nat did not detect a scent does not necessarily mean there wasn't one there. Just that he was never in odor; is that a fair statement?

A. Ma'am, I think you need to maybe possibly restate the question. I am not sure what you're asking.

Q. Don't worry about it. I withdraw the question. Thank you.

MS. THIEN: I have nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any redirect?

MR. BUTLER: No.

THE COURT: Sir, you may step down.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Your next witness.

MS. MUDGE: That's our fourth.

THE COURT: That's your fourth.

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the

jury, I was told that their next would be a very long witness. I believe that this would be an excellent time for us to break. So, again, listen to me. Until this case is submitted to you for deliberation, you must not discuss this case with anyone. That means spouse, family, friends. No one. Nor can you remain within the hearing of anyone discussing it. You cannot read any newspaper article regarding the case. Can't listen to any radio broadcast concerning this case. You cannot watch a TV, commercial or program or report about this program. After this case has been submitted to you, you must discuss the case only in the jury room when all the members of the jury are present. You are to keep an open mind, and you must not decide any issue in this case until it is submitted to you for your deliberation under the instructions of the Court.

Now, before I dismiss you, I have a question for you. Would any of you have any difficulty being here by 8:30 tomorrow morning?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Very well. I need you to report to my bailiffs by 8:30 tomorrow morning. You can follow the bailiff.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: I expect the attorneys to be here at 8:30 as well, and we'll start shortly after that.

MS. THIEN: Will do.

THE COURT: The Court will be adjourned.

(COURT WAS ADJOURNED FOR THE DAY.)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

WILLIAMSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
Vs	)	
	)	No. 20-CF-596
	)	
JULIE E. BEVELY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Amy L. Holloman, one of the Official Court Reporters in and for the First Judicial Circuit of the State of Illinois, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, complete, and correct transcript of all the proceedings had in the above-styled cause.

Amy L. Holloman

Amy L. Holloman, CSR
Official Court Reporter

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

WILLIAMSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 20-CF-596
	)	
JULIA E. BEVELY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

JURY TRIAL

Report of proceedings of the hearing before the Honorable Stephan Green on February 9th, 2023.

APPEARANCES:

JENNIFER MUDGE and PHILLIP BUTLER
Special Prosecutors
Springfield, Illinois
For the People

TERRY THIEN
Public Defender
Williamson County, Illinois
For the Defendant

Amy L. Holloman, CSR
Official Court Reporter
Williamson County Courthouse
Marion, IL 62959

INDEX

Witness	Matthew Deschamps
Direct Exam by Ms. Mudge	4
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	113
	David Wold
Direct Exam by Ms. Mudge	134
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	147
	Carl Eggemeyer
Direct Exam by Ms. Mudge	154

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: The Court re-calls 20-CF-596, People versus Julia Bevely. The defendant is in open Court with her attorney. The State is present as well. We are in the State's case in-chief. Ms. Mudge, ready to proceed?

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien, are you ready?

MS. THIEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Bring in the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Ms. Mudge, you may call your next witness.

MS. MUDGE: The People would call Matt Deschamps.

THE COURT: Sir, come forward, please. The Clerk will swear you in.

MATTHEW DESCHAMPS,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please have a seat over here. I

need you to state your full name for the record. Please spell your last name, and when you speak, I need you to speak as loudly as possible so everyone can hear you.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. My name is Matthew Deschamps. D-E-S-C-H-A-M-P-S.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. MUDGE:

Q. Where are you currently employed?

A. I currently work with the Illinois State Police.

Q. How long have you been with the Illinois State Police?

A. I have been with the State Police for nine years.

Q. What is your current position there?

A. Right now I'm assigned to the Crime Scene Investigations Unit. I have been there for five and a half years.

Q. So, you were on the Crime Scene Unit on December 5th, 2020?

A. Yes.

Q. What are some of your job duties as a Crime Scene Investigator?

A. My primary duties are to respond to calls for

service to crimes scenes, and then to document the scene, the evidence, through photographs, notes, sketches, collect evidence and then compile reports.

Q. And what was your position before you became a crime scene investigator with the State Police?

A. Before being assigned the crime scene, I worked the road as a trooper in District 5.

Q. And what kind of training do you have to go through to become a crime scene investigator after you're a trooper?

A. Um, once you're a State Trooper, an opening would have to open up within the crime scene unit, and then we'd apply and interview for the position. Once selected, you go through a six month on-the-job FTO program with crime scene, and you're not certified. You haven't passed or completed the FTO program unless you complete as least the six-month training. After that, you have to be certified through the IAI which is an international organization that certifies crime scene investigators. So, all those steps are required in order to fully be considered a CSI with the State Police.

Q. And are you certified as a crime scene investigator?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Is it mandated from the Illinois State Police that you complete ongoing training?

A. Yes. In order to keep our certification with the IAI, as a crime scene investigator, we have to do annual training for us. We do a one week long training once a year called our in-service training.

Q. As part of your training, do you also get training in blood spatter?

A. Yes.

Q. And why is blood spatter important in your job?

A. Many crimes involve bloody events. It's important that we're able to identify these to be able to accurately document them for reports and then also document them in a way they can be analyzed at a later date if necessary.

Q. How many crime scenes approximately have you processed?

A. Approximately 700.

Q. Are they all deaths?

A. No. I would argue around -- I would estimate probably about 300, I would say, deaths, and the other 400 being property crimes.

Q. And do you work in a certain area of the State?

A. I'm assigned to Region 4 which covers 36 counties mostly the southern end of Illinois.

Q. Williamson County is included in that?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. Okay. In your role as a crime scene investigator, explain to the jury -- well, let me ask you this first. Are you doing the same things as detectives at a scene?

A. No. My job is -- I work hand-in-hand with the detectives, investigators, the responding officers. I use information -- obviously when I'm -- when I'm responding to a scene, typically the crime or the event has already happened. So, I am responding after the fact. So, I meet with responding officers, investigators to get a kind of a full scope of the case and then any pertinent information that will help me, I guess, best prepared once I enter the scene to identify evidence and process the scene.

Q. So, they kind of tell you what they've have got, what you should look at, what maybe points you want to document?

A. Correct. Um, I'm not -- I don't interview. I respond and then document.

Q. Okay. Um, on December 5th of 2020, were you

involved in the death investigation of Jade Beasley?

A. Yes.

Q. In Williamson County?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Do you write a report and take notes for every scene that you go to?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. And in this case, how many scenes did you process?

A. I responded to nine scenes.

Q. And, um, collected evidence, took photographs and wrote reports and notes for each?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Okay. Let's start with Scene 1. What was the first place you responded to?

A. The first place I responded to was the Williamson County Sheriff's Office where the defendant was. I was asked to respond there and photograph the defendant, and then take notes and collect evidence and create a report.

Q. What time did you respond there?

A. I believe it was approximately 4:00, 4:30, 5:00 in the afternoon.

Q. Okay. I'm going to show you what's previously

been marked as People's Exhibit 47 through 61 for identification purposes.

MS. MUDGE: Judge, prior to Court starting today, I, um, showed defense counsel all my photos to save a little bit of time for the jury.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. MUDGE: May I approach?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Please take a look at those photos, and when you're done looking through them, let me know. And I have a power point with this as well after those.

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Okay. Do you recognize all of those photos?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you take all those photos?

A. Yes.

Q. Do they fairly and accurately depict the scene at the Williamson County Jail, um, on December 5th, 2020, when you responded there to Scene 1?

A. Yes, I do.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, at this time I move to admit and published Exhibits 47 through 61.

THE COURT: Any objection?
MS. THIEN: No objection, your Honor.
THE COURT: They will be admitted and you may publish.
MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Can everybody see on their screens? Okay.
By Ms. Mudge:
Q. I am showing you what's been marked as People's Exhibit --
THE COURT: -- I don't have you connected. Now I do.
MS. MUDGE: It shows I'm connected.
THE COURT: Ready?
MS. MUDGE: Yep.
THE COURT: Can everybody see?
MS. MUDGE: There it went. Okay. The first one did not have the exhibit numbers on them, and this one did.
By Ms. Mudge:
Q. Okay. I am showing you what's previously been marked as People's Exhibit 47. People's Exhibit 47, what are we looking at here?
A. This is what we call our gray card photo. That's

the first photo that we take in our sequence of photos when we respond to a scene. So, it's got our case information, date, time and then the scene indicator.

Q. People's Exhibit 48, what is that?

A. This is a photograph of the defendant.

Q. And that's as you saw her on December 5th?

A. Yes.

Q. People's Exhibit 49?

A. This is a photograph of the back of both of the defendant's hands.

Q. Okay. Um, do you note anything specific about her left hand fingernails?

A. There appears to be a red, blood-like substance on -- on her hands and fingernails.

Q. People's Exhibit 50?

A. Same thing. This is the interior, I believe, of the left hand. Again, you see the laceration on the first finger, and then some looks like a small laceration in the palm and then some, again, RBLS on the hand.

Q. What is RBLS?

A. RBLS is what we use in a crime scene. It stands for red, blood-like substance. So, or commonly blood. Um, you can also see some here underneath the

fingernails. Specifically that -- the ring finger. It's pretty evident.

Q. People's Exhibit 51, what is that?

A. This is a scaled photograph of the laceration on that first finger of the left hand.

Q. People's Exhibit 52?

A. This is the inside of the right hand showing the lacerations on the small finger. Again, you can see some RBLS on the thumb a little bit. You can see underneath the fingernail of the thumb.

Q. What is People's Exhibit 53?

A. This would be a scaled photograph of the abrasion or laceration on the side of the hand.

Q. People's Exhibit 54, what are we looking at here?

A. This was a reported bite mark on the right forearm of the defendant.

Q. And People's Exhibit 55?

A. A scaled photograph of the bite mark on the right forearm.

Q. And People's Exhibit 56?

A. Again, another photograph of the scaled photograph of the bite mark.

Q. People's Exhibit 57?

A. Same bite mark. Right forearm without a scale.

Q. People's Exhibit 58?
A. Um, that closer image with a scale involved.
Q. People's Exhibit 59?
A. This was a laceration on the defendant's chin with a scale.
Q. People's Exhibit 60?
A. A laceration abrasion above the left eye of the defendant.
Q. And People's Exhibit 61?
A. This is a photograph of some more RBLS, red blood-like substance, on defendant's pants.
Q. Other than that, were her clothes appeared -- let me rephrase that. Other than that, did you notice any other substances or stains on her clothing?
A. I did not notice any other significant stains.
Q. Thank you. Did you also collect evidence from that scene?
A. Yes.
Q. And, um, how do you go about collecting evidence from the scene?
A. Um, depending on the type of evidence, in this instance, I believe, her clothing was collected. That was recorded by Williamson County Sheriff's Office. Evidence that I collected, um, was fingernail scrapings.

I swabbed -- I took, uh, swabs of RBLS on her hands. And then the reported bite marks, I swabbed that also.

MS. MUDGE: If I may have continuing permission to approach?

THE COURT: Yes, of course. Both sides.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. I'm going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 2 and 3 for identification purposes. Do you have a knife?

A. I do.

Q. Okay. What is People's Exhibit 2?

A. This is, uh, an evidence bag. This is baring my initials, my badge number and the date. Can I read the description?

Q. Yes.

A. Okay. Um, sealed paper bag containing one pair of buccal swabs collected from Julia Bevely.

Q. What is a buccal swab?

A. A buccal swab is what we use to collect DNA from -- it's a cheek swab. So we collect DNA from sterile swabs that are run inside the mouth of the individual, and then they are collected that way.

Q. To later submit for testing and comparison?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. What about People's Exhibit 3?

A. Again, this is an evidence bag sealed. My seal is still not broken. My initials, my badge number and the date, December 5th, 2020. Um, evidence description, sealed paper bag containing two individually packaged pairs of swabs with potential DNA. One pair collected from a bite mark located on Julia Bevely's right arm. One pair from a bite mark located on her left arm.

Q. May you please open Exhibit 2 and 3?

A. (Witness complies.) Do you want me to do them one at a time or open them both?

Q. You can open both.

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. And People's Exhibit 2, what do you see there?

A. Um, this is a pair of swabs which I collected. This would have been the buccal swabs collected from the defendant.

Q. Is it in substantially the same condition as when you collected it?

A. Yes, it appears so.

Q. What about People's Exhibit 3?

A. These are the swabs from the bite marks. This one -- the two individually packaged pairs. This pair is marked right arm mark. This is marked left arm mark.

Q. Are they in substantially the same condition as when you collected them?

A. Yes. You can -- I can see that they have been analyzed for testing, but yes.

Q. So, after you collect those, how do you submit them for testing? What do you do with them?

A. Once I collect the swabs, they are put back in these sleeves to preserve the integrity of the DNA that's on the swab. Then they are placed in a bag and sealed up, initialed by myself, and then the item of evidence is turned over to the investigating agency to submit to the lab as their investigation continues.

Q. Okay. What time did you depart Scene 1 at the Williamson County Sheriff's Department?

A. I believe it was around 7:00 p.m.

Q. Okay. And, um, did you go to another scene straight after that?

A. Yes. After responding to the jail -- Sheriff's Office, I was asked to respond to the primary scene of the victim's residence.

Q. And what was that address?

A. I would have to refer my notes to confirm the address. From my reports. I'm sorry. These are my reports.

Q. Yes. You can refer to your reports for the address?

A. It's 11304 Songbird Road in Marion.

Q. And what time did you arrive on Scene 2?

A. Um, I arrived around 7:15 p.m.

Q. And did you collect evidence and take photographs of Scene 2 as well?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

MS. MUDGE: I am going to get Scene 1 out of your way so that we keep everything separate for the Clerk. Do you want these to stay out?

MS. THIEN: That would be great. I promise not to mix them all up.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. Um, how do you -- when you go to a residence, how do you process a home, in general?

A. So, when I arrived to the scene, first thing I do is I meet with whoever the on-scene officer is to receive a briefing. And then I take my gray card photograph, which is that first picture, just documenting the location, the time, the date, um, case number, relevant information, and then I begin with the overall photographs. So, in this instance, I started

with the gray card, and then overall photographs of the property, the residence, out buildings, and then I would slowly work my way in. If there is outbuildings, photograph into the outbuildings, and then typically I go through the primary entrance, the front door, as my leading in photograph, and then I work my way through the house in a consecutive kind of path just to make sure that I'm not doubling photographs.

Q. And did you do a sketch of the home?

A. Yes. In any crime against a person case, we're actually required to do a sketch, so a sketch was completed.

Q. And you said you took photos?

A. Yes.

Q. I am showing you what's been marked People's Exhibit 62 through 179? If you can take a look at these, please, and let me know when you're finished?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Have you viewed them all?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recognize all of those photos?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. And did you take all those photos?

A. Yes.

Q. And do they fairly and accurately depict the scene at 11304 Songbird Road on December 5th?

A. Yes, they do.

Q. And I think you were there through the night as well, so December 6th as well?

A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, at this time I would move to admit and publish People's Exhibit 62 through 179.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the gallery, what may be depicted at this time is of a sensitive nature. I need to have decorum in my courtroom. If it is a subject matter that you feel like you cannot handle, you are free to leave, and you are also free to avert your eyes. You have leave to publish.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor. I am connected.

THE COURT: No. You were, and then you dropped off.

MS. MUDGE: I am connecting.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, and you're gone.

You're back.

MS. MUDGE: Can everyone see?

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. I am showing you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 62. What is this?

A. This is the first photograph that I took at Scene 2, again, depicting the date, time, location, case number.

Q. People's Exhibit 63, what do we see here?

A. This is an overall photograph of the front of the residence.

Q. People's Exhibit 64?

A. This would be a mid-rage photograph of the front of the residence leading to the front entry door.

Q. And People's Exhibit 65?

A. This is a photograph of the front entry door into the residence living room.

Q. And you observed the door?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you notice any signs of forced entry?

A. I did not notice any signs of forced entry.

Q. Thank you. People's Exhibit 66?

A. This is a photograph of the interior side of the screen door -- or the storm door. This photograph is to

document the state of the door as I found it.

Q. People's Exhibit 67?

A. Uh, this is to document some spots of dirt or debris that were on the door and to show that this was examined and not blood.

Q. People's Exhibit 68?

A. Another photograph of the same.

Q. Um, what we see here, is it red blood-like substance?

A. No. This would not be referred to as RBLS. This was a brown kind of like a dirt substance.

Q. People's Exhibit 69?

A. Again, showing the -- basically showing the exterior portion of the entry way, so we're looking at the outside -- or the inside portion of the storm door. The -- kind of the exterior jam and the exterior side of the entry door documenting that no RBLS or signs of damage were observed in any of those areas.

Q. People's Exhibit 70?

A. Same thing; to document the lack of RBLS or damage.

Q. People's Exhibit 71?

A. Exterior side of the front entry door to document lack of RBLS or damage.

Q. People's Exhibit 72?

A. Same. Lack of RBLS or damage.

Q. So, the spots you see at the bottom of that door are not red, blood-like substance?

A. No. I'm sorry.

Q. Go ahead.

A. No. This -- this was not RBLS. It is dirt. Smudges. Looks kind of similar to my front door.

Q. People's Exhibit 73?

A. Same. It's like a grease smudge or a dirt smudge on the outside of the door just documenting again. Here you can see the handle area of the door and the dead bolt area. We've got no -- there is no damage observed near the jam or near those areas of the door and then also no RBLS documented here.

Q. This is the exterior of the front door?

A. Yes. This is the exterior of the front entry door.

Q. People's Exhibit 74?

A. This is looking with that front entry door open into the living space. This is a photograph showing the floor and that entry matt just inside of the front entry door.

Q. Exhibit 75?

A. So, this is a photograph of the strike side jam of that front entry door. So, to the left is -- you can see the wooden deck. So, there is the exterior. To the right is the interior of the home, and then that black is weather stripping running between the jam. And so that's kind of showing the dividing line of the interior portion of the jam and the exterior portion of the jam. And then we've got this RBLS substance here on the interior portion of the jam but nothing on the exterior portion.

Q. People's Exhibit 76?

A. This is the interior side of the front entry door.

Q. People's Exhibit 77?

A. This is the floor just inside depicting obvious RBLS on the floor, walls and door inside the entryway.

Q. Seventy-eight?

A. This is a close-up picture of the interior side of the front entry door handle. Again, you can see RBLS all over the handle, and then it actually has a hair that you can see kind of affixed to the handle.

Q. Seventy-nine?

A. This is -- so just inside of the entry when you're walking into the house, the master suite -- the

master bedroom/bathroom was just inside to the right. So, this is the entry door to the master bedroom.

Q. Okay. People's Exhibit 80?

A. This is the floor leading into the master bedroom. This is showing that there are -- there is obvious RBLS on the floor spanning into the -- from the living room into the master bedroom.

Q. Is the carpet part at the top of that photo, is that where the master bedroom starts?

A. Yes.

Q. People's Exhibit 81?

A. This is a leading photograph showing that I am moving into the master bedroom.

Q. Eighty-two?

A. This is RBLS stains located on the carpet inside the master bedroom floor.

Q. Eighty-three?

A. This is a photograph showing when I am standing inside the master bedroom looking into the master bathroom.

Q. Eighty-four?

A. And then this is showing RBLS on the carpet of the master bedroom just outside of the master bathroom. So, yep. RBLS drops on the carpet right -- right

outside of the bathroom door -- or the bathroom floor.

Q. People's Exhibit 85?

A. This is an overall photograph of the master bathroom, um, just showing entry and the condition of the room.

Q. People's Exhibit 86?

A. This is a photograph of the master bathroom sink. I noticed RBLS stain there on the sink.

Q. People's Exhibit 87?

A. Another closer picture of that RBLS stain on the sink.

Q. And this is the master bathroom?

A. This is the master bathroom, yes.

Q. Eighty-eight?

A. So, that is standing inside that entry way to the master bedroom. Now I am looking into the open area of the house. This is the living room portion leading through to the kitchen, but this is the first photograph that I am showing coming out of the master bedroom leading to -- towards the rest of the house.

Q. Eight-nine?

A. This is standing in the same place and looking down to show that there are RBLS stains on the floor and on this child's walker leading this way and spanning

into the living room.

Q. People's Exhibit 90?

A. Same photograph depicting the RBLS on the floor just outside the master bedroom leading to the living room.

Q. Ninety-one?

A. Similar photograph.

Q. Ninety-two?

A. Um, this is a little bit further into the living room to show that the RBLS stains continued. On the floor, um, a picture there on the couch, um, and then continuing towards the north end of the house was the kitchen.

Q. People's Exhibit 93?

A. Um, this is the floor of the living room leading -- scanning towards the kitchen, and you can see RBLS stains along the floor and kind of living room orientation spanning from the living room to the kitchen.

Q. Ninety-four?

A. Um, this is an overall photograph of the living room into the kitchen. You can start to see some RBLS on the garbage can there and on the floor spanning into the kitchen.

Q. Ninety-five?

A. This is an overall picture of the kitchen, um, to document the state of the room, and then also you can see -- RBLS is seen again here on the garbage can and then on the floor in the kitchen.

Q. Exhibit 96?

A. This photograph is taken just to the left of the previous one. So, facing the kitchen, um, we've got the floor with some RBLS on it and then a doorway leading to an office area.

Q. Ninety-seven?

A. This is a close-up of the previous picture just getting a better photograph of some of the RBLS stains that were on the floor.

Q. Ninety-eight?

A. RBLS on the garbage can and on the floor in the kitchen.

Q. Ninety-nine?

A. Um, showing here that there were was some RBLS stains as high as that paper bag which was stacked on top of that garbage can.

Q. One hundred?

A. This is a book that was open and lying on the island counter.

Q. One hundred and one?

A. This is a closer image of the red, blood-like stains that were on the floor leading up to the garbage can.

Q. One hundred and two?

A. This is a leading photograph showing that I'm about to move down -- further down through the kitchen, and then it also depicts RBLS on both the -- kind of the left side floor and the right side floor are red, blood-like substance stains spanning the kitchen going north.

Q. One hundred and three?

A. Again, depicting the stains on the -- of the right side of the floor and the left side of the floor spanning from the kitchen to the -- towards the north end of the house.

Q. And Number 104?

A. Closer-up photograph.

Q. Exhibit 105?

A. So, this is showing the north end of the kitchen, and then showing that there is a kind of a small hallway off to the left there. There is RBLS stains you can see on the floor just kind of between the kitchen and the hallway area. Yep.

Q. Exhibit 106?

A. Showing that there was RBLS also even in front of the oven, the stove, just showing more locations of red, blood-like substance.

Q. Exhibit 107?

A. This depicts -- it shows some red, blood-like stains going around the island also, so just another documented area of stains within the residence.

Q. One hundred and eight?

A. This is, um -- this refrigerator is located at the north end of the kitchen just kind of between the kitchen and that hallway area. Um, this is a deposited blood pattern stain. So, I documented that.

Q. Okay. People's Exhibit 109?

A. This is the -- that hallway area. We've got the victim's bedroom to the far left; the bathroom where the victim was reportedly discovered in the center. Um, we've have got a toy room, I think, and another bedroom up to the north here, and then this hallway area. We've got -- there is some medical equipment or devices observed there on the floor which was reportedly left by responding EMS.

Q. People's Exhibit 110?

A. We've got a -- this is that hallway area near the

north end of the hallway. There is a heavy concentration of blood, um, depicting that area before any processing or anything is done, and then also confirming and depicting some of the medical devices that were there from the responding EMS.

Q. Exhibit 111?

A. This is another photograph now showing that hallway, the floor -- blood on the floor and then that there are also blood stain patterns on the walls also.

Q. The door that you see in the left -- on the left of that picture, what bedroom is that?

A. This is the north bedroom, I believe, Jayden's bedroom. That's the victim's sibling's bedroom.

Q. And there is a sign outside the door. Does it say Jayden on it?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Okay. Exhibit 112?

A. So, this is a photograph looking down on -- there is a large deposit of blood in this area, whereas, throughout the rest of the house the pattern -- the stains were somewhat spread out, small and circular. Here there was a heavy, heavy concentration of blood, so obviously we're documenting this as best -- as it is before any processing, any swabbing, any labeling, any

analytic photographs. We need to get good, overall pictures of this area.

Q. And is the door we see here Jayden's bedroom door?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Exhibit 113?

A. This is, again, a blood stain pattern on the wall. That's Jayden's bedroom to the left. The picture that we just seen on the floor, the heavy concentration on the floor, is just beneath it. Um, this is a -- it's like a transfer pattern. This is a non-spatter pattern that is observed on the wall there.

Q. As you were processing this scene, did a blood spatter expert come to the scene as well?

A. Yes. Um, we were all trained in documenting and recording of blood, and then we also become a blood stain pattern analyst, which I am not. That requires different training certification. And after walking through this house with the amount of blood and the amount of patterns and the fact that it was kind of encompassed the whole residence, there was -- it was a little bit out of -- it was beyond my scope. I believe that it required more than just my photographs and documentation. I actually requested a blood stain

pattern analyst to respond.

Q. Thank you. Exhibit 114?

A. This is showing staining right above that heavy concentration in the hallway of blood. You can see some bare footprints there on the -- I would say the left side of the pattern. So, I am documenting that. There was bare footprint impressions and then the concentration of blood.

Q. The gate that we see at the top right, what does that lead into?

A. That gate leads to like a laundry room and then a rear entry door to the residence.

Q. Exhibit 115, which bedroom is this?

A. This is the -- standing in the hallway looking into the victim's bedroom.

Q. Exhibit 116?

A. Again, the victim's bedroom.

Q. Exhibit 117?

A. This is a showing that there are red, blood-like stains. You can see there on the gym shoe. So we've got red, blood-like stains also in the victim's bedroom.

Q. Exhibit 118?

A. A closer-up photograph.

Q. Exhibit 119?

A. This is showing again -- this is the victim's bedroom. It is showing red, blood-like stains on the mattress, on the plastic bag here, some items near the end table, lap top. So, documenting red blood stains in the victim's bedroom.

Q. Exhibit 120?

A. Again, more RBLS stains on the victim's laptop in the victim's bedroom.

Q. One hundred and twenty-one?

A. Documenting RBLS on the victim's bed and documenting the condition of the bed. It appears unkempt, unmade. Sheets kind of partially pulled back and RBLS is beneath -- is on that white sheet, and the red sheet appears to be kind of be disheveled. RBLS on the pillow case.

Q. Next photograph?

A. And then, um, showing that there is actually -- some blood patterns were actually deposited on, um, vertical services; not just horizontal services showing this blood in motion and landing or coming in contact with the wall or the window at a certain level also.

Q. Is that red, blood-like substance on the blinds?

A. Yes.

Q. Exhibit 124?

A. This photograph is standing near where the bedroom was in the victim's bedroom looking towards the hallway. And the closet -- the closet there and then the doorway to the left is the doorway to the hallway, and you can see from this photograph that there is blood stain patterns on that wall behind the door.

Q. Exhibit 125?

A. Again, showing that there is blood stain patterns on the exterior side of the door of the victim's bedroom door and also on the interior side of the door.

Q. Exhibit 126?

A. This is the exterior or the hallway side of the door of victim's bedroom depicting those blood stain patterns.

Q. One hundred and twenty-seven?

A. Same picture; exterior side of the victim's bedroom door.

Q. And Exhibit 128?

A. So, this is standing inside the victim's bedroom with the door closed. So, this is showing that there is blood stain patterns coming outside the door, but there is also blood stain patterns on the inside of the door. You can see it there above and below the door knob, and then also back behind the door which would indicate the

door was closed at some point in order for the blood to be able to be transferred in that area of the wall behind the door.

Q. Exhibit 129?

A. Again, this is the back side -- or the bedroom side of the victim's bedroom door.

Q. The inside?

A. The inside, yes.

Q. Exhibit 130?

A. This is a straight-on photograph of the -- that back wall -- that wall behind the victim's bedroom door. And you can see there's different types of blood patterns here. There is the deposited pattern which appears to have some movement, and then there is smaller stains that were moving through the air. So, we've got kind of a mix of spatter and non-spatter here.

Q. Exhibit 131?

A. This is a photograph looking into the bathroom. Um, this is the bathroom where the victim was reportedly discovered in the bathtub.

Q. Exhibit 132?

A. So this is looking into the bathroom, um, encompassing the floor, toilet, vanity and then the shower area.

Q. Exhibit 133?
A. This is the exterior of the bathroom door depicting the blood stains on the bathroom door.
Q. Exhibit 134?
A. This is just inside the bathroom on the floor showing the blood stains on the floor and the concentrations.
Q. What is the black thing on the floor?
A. I believe that's a wash rag.
Q. Exhibit 135?
A. Again, there is just now coming up. So, I am sequencing so we can take this picture and then realize the next one in sequence. Um, I just kind of move the camera up from the last position to show the concentration and locations of the blood stain patterns, um, and the area surfaces that they -- that they encompass.
Q. Is what we see, the cabinets on the right, the red substance?
A. Yes. That's red, blood-like substance on the vanity top.
Q. Okay. Exhibit 136?
A. Uh, again, here we can see the floor, the wall to the left which has a blood pattern -- blood stain

pattern on it, and then the toilet had several different types of patterns exhibited on it.

Q. Exhibit 137?

A. So, this is showing the vertical surface in the bathroom, the shower stall and then the wall and then the RBLS patterns that are deposited there.

Q. Exhibit 138?

A. Showing the blood stain patterns that were on the bathroom sink, bathroom cabinet. Again, you can see the toilet.

Q. One hundred and thirty-nine?

A. This is showing the face of the cabinet and that the -- that blood stain pattern that's on the top surface of the cabinet was dripping down the edge of the face of the vanity.

Q. One hundred and forty?

A. Uh, close-up of the toilet and the blood stain patterns that were observed on it. We've got -- some patterns were deposited, and then some other patterns were spatter.

Q. Exhibit 141?

A. Photographs showing that that spatter pattern which are the smaller drops on the toilet also seemed to coincide with those on the garbage can, in the garbage

can and on the toilet paper roll to show area of movement.

Q. Exhibit 142?

A. This is the floor and the items just outside the bathtub showing blood stains on those items on the floor and then on the outside surface of the tub.

Q. Exhibit 143?

A. This is a blood stain pattern inside the bathroom shower stall. Again, we've got various patterns here; appears to be a transfer and then some smaller spatter stains.

Q. Exhibit 144?

A. Again, blood stain deposits on the shower stall.

Q. Exhibit 145?

A. These are more blood stain patterns deposited in the stall. This one specifically has movement within the stain, and it has a pattern similar to that of fingers or hand.

Q. I am going to go back to 143 for a moment. Um, at the bottom of that photograph, is the drain on the tub?

A. The drain was not -- the drain was not in place when I arrived. The tub was empty, and the drain was not installed.

Q. Okay. And did anyone report to you how that came about?

A. Um, I was told --

MS. THIEN: -- objection. Hearsay.

MS. MUDGE: It goes to course of conduct. Why he did what he did. That's how he does his job. It's what they report to him. It's not offered to prove the matter -- for the truth of the matter asserted.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. MUDGE: -- when you got there, was the tub --

THE COURT: -- wait a minute. Wait a minute. Ms. Thien?

MS. MUDGE: Oh, I thought you said sustained. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Nothing to add.

THE COURT: Okay. It will be sustained.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Was the tub full or empty when you got there?

A. The bathtub was empty. It was reported to me that upon EMS response, the tub had water in it and was full and the water was running. However, when I arrived, the tub was empty and plug was not in place.

It was reported to me that during the course of removing the victim, the plug was removed either intentionally or accidentally and then the water turned off.

Q. Okay. We left off 145, so what is 146?

A. Um, this is the -- again, we've got the portion of the shower stall to the right, and then the bathroom wall there to the left with deposited blood stain patterns on the wall.

Q. People's 147?

A. This is a close-up of the previous picture, and then you can see to the left there is deposited blood stain pattern similar to that of a hand print on the wall.

Q. One hundred and forty-eight?

A. So, this is depicting a blood stain pattern different than those of deposited patterns. This has the small drops with directionality which would indicate that the spatter and that they are moving through the air before they struck the wall; versus the one beneath it which is a deposited pattern, um, which that blood was not moving through the air before it hit the wall. It was deposited on to the wall.

Q. Exhibit 149?

A. Again, showing just the bottom half of these

patterns; the spatter and non-spatter blood stain patterns.

Q. And 150?

A. This is showing the kind of the length of that non-spatter pattern along the wall and then some movement and, um, the -- kind of the shape and design of that pattern. The pattern there, specifically near the center, where you've got some motion in the straight lines, appears to be some -- would be a pattern similar to that of, like, hair or a head.

Q. One hundred and fifty-one?

A. So, this is directly above that pattern that is spanning the wall, and here's a -- these are two bloody patterns both appearing similar to hands and with motion.

Q. Exhibit 152?

A. This is the -- we're seeing the outside of the bathroom door and then the inside interior wall of one of those handprint stains.

Q. And 153?

A. This is directly behind the bathroom door, so the bathroom door is now closed, and then this is depicting a high concentration pattern here with, uh -- you can see that the deposit -- that the pattern was deposited

on the wall -- talking about the largest one kind of on the farthest left -- almost looks similar to, like, the dorsal side of the body. Um, and then a high concentration is evident where these -- blood is moving downward from the stain.

Q. Exhibit 154?

A. This is the floor directly kind of beneath that stain and directly inside of the bathroom showing blood stain patterns on the interior side of the bathroom door.

Q. Exhibit 155?

A. Interior side of the bathroom door with it closed. You can see blood stain patterns on the inside of the door and then also on the -- near the light switch.

Q. And 156?

A. This is, uh, just a straight-on picture of that blood stain pattern on the inside of the bathroom door.

Q. Exhibit 157?

A. Same thing; a straight-on. These are for documentation of the side -- or the pattern that's there near the center of the interior side of the bathroom door, and then it also shows there is RBLS on the door handle also.

Q. And 158?

A. This pattern is near the slight switch, um, and then you can see some pattern similar to those fingerprints -- or similar to those made by fingers and then also with motion within the stains.

Q. One hundred and fifty-nine?

A. This showing the -- obviously, we can see the RBLS stains on the shower stall wall, and then also showing that inside the tub itself, this is how the tub appeared when I arrived on-scene.

Q. One hundred and sixty?

A. This is a head-on or straight-on shot of RBLS patterns inside the shower stall.

Q. One hundred and sixty-one?

A. Um, this is the vehicle that was parked outside the residence; I believe the defendant's vehicle. It was going to be processed at a later time, so I was asked to photograph -- photograph, document. So, yes, this is the defendant's vehicle.

Q. So your -- well, you took -- is it safe to say you took a large amount of photos of this house?

A. Yes.

Q. And these are not -- it's not comprehensive -- these photos that you have today are not comprehensive

of all the photos you took of the house, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. And as you're in the house, are there any rooms that you didn't notice any RBLS in?

A. Um, I did not -- I did not notice RBLS in the office area which was at the room -- if you're walking into the kitchen, it was the first room to the left. I didn't notice any RBLS in that room. I did not notice RBLS in Jayden's room which was -- in the hallway, we had -- there was a heavy concentration of blood on the floor, on the walls, and then there was Jayden's room just off that hallway. There was no RBLS observed or documented inside that room. Then there was, like, a common toy room, an open room, just off that hallway, and I didn't notice RBLS into that room. There was some on the outskirts where it met the hallway. Uh, other than that, then the master bath -- master bedroom closet was a walk-in closet. I didn't observed RBLS in the closet.

Q. So, you're outside now with the vehicle. Um, I think you started saying this, but did you intend to process this vehicle?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And where did you take it to do that?

A. Um, the -- once it's decided it's going to be processed, it's secured with evidence tape. I document the exterior/inside of the vehicle. Then I seal all the doors, hatches, anything that can open with evidence tape, initial it, and then it's towed to a secured indoor facility. This was towed to -- this vehicle was towed to Vernell's in Marion, and it was secured inside a locked building.

Q. Okay. People's Exhibit 162?

A. Oh, I'm sorry. Um, this is the, um, the pass -- the rear passenger side of the defendant's vehicle. Part of the overalls again just like I do on a house with the overall pictures, I do the same thing with a car. I will take pictures all the way around, and then work my way in and take pictures on the inside also.

Q. Exhibit 163?

A. Front passenger side of the defendant's car.

Q. Exhibit 164?

A. This is the -- documenting the license plate that was on the defendant's vehicle.

Q. One hundred and sixty-five?

A. Uh, this is the rear driver's side of the defendant's vehicle.

Q. One hundred and sixty-six?

A. This is the driver's door open looking into the driver's area of the vehicle.

Q. One hundred and sixty-seven?

A. This is an RBLS stain located on the gear shifter.

Q. One hundred and sixty-eight?

A. Uh, this is a photograph, again, of the front entry door; the exterior side of the front entry door of the house.

Q. One hundred and sixty-nine?

A. This is a imprint just outside of the front entry door on the deck.

Q. One hundred and seventy?

A. This is a scaled photograph of that imprint with a label.

Q. This -- I'll go back to 169. So, that's a close-up of that?

A. Correct.

Q. And this is an exterior of the home?

A. Correct.

Q. And you said that you observed outside of the home and the outbuildings as well?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. As far as being outside of the home, did

you observe any blood around the home other than this spot?

A. There was -- there was one documented blood stain on the deck step. There was a small, circular stain. I believe it was B-12.

Q. And that was the farthest from the house that you saw --

A. -- correct.

Q. -- RBLS?

A. Yes. That was the farthest blood stain pattern that we located.

Q. We did 170. One hundred and seventy-one?

A. This is going again the hallway where the large concentration of blood was.

Q. And 172?

A. So, I have got markers down on the floor indicating areas where bare footprint marks in blood were observed on the floor.

Q. One hundred and seventy-three?

A. Uh, this would be one of the -- we'll call it a bloody footprint -- Imprint B. And this is with the directionality of the imprint, this is walking away from the hallway.

Q. Towards --

A. -- towards the kitchen, main living area, master bath, bedroom. Towards the whole south end of the house.

Q. One hundred and seventy-four?

A. Again, you can see here Imprint C and D footprints in blood. Um, again, directionality, um, indicating movement towards the south end of the house away from the hallway.

Q. One hundred and seventy-five?

A. Closer-up images of B and C of the bloody footprints.

Q. One hundred and seventy-six?

A. This is showing Imprint E in blood. Yeah. That's a close-up again showing the directionality leading towards -- leading towards the south end of the house away from the heavy concentration of the blood in the hallway.

Q. Okay. And for the record, that's 177, right?

A. Yes. That's what it says.

Q. And 178?

A. Uh, this is showing where I had marked Imprint F, a footprint in blood, at the end of the -- that concentration.

Q. So, we saw the pictures in the beginning of this

spot, and now we're looking at you marking it. What are you marking it for?

A. Um, so these are areas -- once I go through obviously and document the scene, um, every scene that we respond to in crime scenes, we document it as it is. So as we see it, we take pictures. We don't manipulate anything, move anything, process anything. We take pictures in situ, as we call it, as it is. So, some of those pictures that we saw before were those initial photographs. This area is what it looks like right now. I think in one of the pictures we saw earlier, you could see a bloody footprint, which is now -- we're going to go back and say, okay, I -- I identify this as evidence. We're going to label it. We're going to go back and focus on this. So, that's where these labels come in, after the overalls are done, to show specific items.

Q. One hundred and seventy-nine?

A. This is a close-up here of Imprint F which is bare, bloody footprint near that -- the heavy blood accumulation on the floor.

Q. Okay. Did you also collect physical items from Scene 2 at the residence?

A. Yes.

Q. I am going to show you what's been marked as

People's Exhibit 4 for identification purposes. Would you please take a look at that?

A. Um, this is a piece of evidence collected by me. I've got my evidence tape that is here, here and here, um, all three of which have been broken in order to -- for processing, my name and initials and the date and --

Q. -- I'm sorry. Go ahead and read the label and what you wrote?

A. So, the item description, sealed cardboard box containing two black handled knives. One collected from the kitchen sink. One collected from the dish strainer next to the sink.

Q. And you collected those?

A. Correct.

Q. May you please open that?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Oh, is it open? I'm sorry.

A. Yes.

Q. I apologize. Um, so, that box was sealed with how many different tapes?

A. When I just opened it now, my evidence -- my original evidence tape was on there broken because it was opened up for analysis, and then this yellow tape here was sealed. I had to cut that with my knife, and

this one is open. So, my original seals were open. This yellow one which had a date of January 21st, '21, was open, and then this one which was marked April 16th, 2021 was sealed.

Q. What is the yellow tape?

A. The yellow tape is the labs, science lab -- or the Metro East lab where we send our evidence for analysis.

Q. And can you please open that box and tell me if you recognize what's inside of it?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Knives, okay.

A. Two knives.

Q. Are they in substantially in the same condition that they were when you collected them?

A. Yes.

Q. You said they came from the kitchen?

A. Uh, yes.

Q. Okay. And you meant to collect those to submit for testing, right?

A. Correct.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, at this time, I would move to admit and publish People's Exhibit -- whatever I just said.

THE COURT: Four.
MS. MUDGE: Four. Okay.
THE COURT: Ms. Thien?
MS. THIEN: No objection.
MS. MUDGE: If you could just, please, show the jury what's in there. Hold it up.
THE COURT: It will be admitted.
MS. MUDGE: Sorry.
THE COURT: It's okay, and you may publish.
By Ms. Mudge:
Q. Okay. If you're at a scene, um, what do you do -- do you take measures to not contaminate the scene?
A. Yes. Um, certainly we -- we always are wearing gloves. We change our gloves frequently to try to avoid cross-contamination or contamination of any kind. The being -- obviously the involvement that we have in scenes and the amount of evidence we handle, collected, deal with, there is always -- always a potential for contamination. Um, for us in crime scene with the State Police, we actually have to -- part of -- part of being able to be a CSI, you have to submit your DNA to go on file in the data base in case there is ever a cross-contamination or contamination where a DNA profile is identified but unknown. They want to be able to say,

okay, hey, this is -- you know, this lab personnel, this is CSI so-and-so, this is -- so, as a CSI, one of the precautions they take -- our command takes -- is to insure that all of our DNA is on file so that if there is an unknown DNA hit or contamination, they can identify whether or not it was an employee or something like that.

Q. So, if they identify DNA and it happens to be yours and you have contaminated that -- if they didn't have your DNA, it would just be an unknown?

A. Correct.

Q. All right. Um, if you have inadvertently contaminated a scene, are you made aware of that?

A. Yes.

Q. In this particular case and with this exhibit, were you made aware that you possibly had contaminated that?

A. I was.

Q. Okay. Um, is it a big process when you do that?

A. It was quite a -- quite a process. Lots of paperwork, memos and corrective actions.

Q. And how -- based on your training and experience, how would you have contaminated these knives?

A. So, um, when I was told that my DNA had been a

hit on these knives, obviously my response was, I was wearing gloves. I was -- processed hundreds of scenes. Um, I never had anything like that happen. So, going through discussion -- I was on the phone with lab personnel, obviously my supervisors, I'm kind of recreating the collection process, and one of the knives -- you can't see probably from that distance -- but had a lot of scratches -- scrapes. Almost looked like it was scraped clean. So I was looking extremely closely trying to see if there was any blood-like substance in the hilt or any small amounts that I couldn't see just from here. So, I held it close because I was really examining it, and then obviously I collected -- I was swearing gloves at the time. Um, so after explaining my collection process to the lab personnel, the analyst was, like, it's 100 percent possible that your DNA just from being that close, your breathing, your breath can absolutely deposit DNA on to that the item.

Q. You were not wearing a mask at the time?

A. I was not wearing a mask.

Q. Okay. Okay. Let's go to -- okay. What time did you depart the residence? You got there you said at 7:15? What time did you leave? You got there at 7:15 p.m. on 12-5. What time did you leave?

A. Um, it was around 4:00 a.m. the next day.

Q. Okay. Scene 3, what is the next place you go?

A. Uh, I believe the next place that I responded to was the victim's autopsy, and that was in Marion, the Williamson County Morgue.

Q. Okay. Is it common procedure for the crime scene investigator to go to the autopsy?

A. Yes. Any death investigation that we're involved in, if an autopsy is performed, we are required to attend and collect evidence.

Q. And, um, do you take your own photos at autopsies?

A. I -- it -- depending on the pathologists. Some pathologists prefer to take their own photographs. Others prefer us to take them. The pathologist working this case specifically prefers to take her own photos. So, I am present while she takes all of her photographs, and at the end, she provides me a copy.

Q. And, um, what things do you go to an autopsy to collect?

A. Um, we actually -- our policy mandates that we will collect, um, a standard's kit which includes a blood standard, buccal swabs, fingernail scrapings, full head hair, combed head hair, full pubic hair, and then

we have to collect all the clothing. Um, and then if a sexual assault kit is -- if there is any indication or suspicion of sexual assault, or -- we would collect a sexual assault kit also. We also collect palm and fingerprints of every victim.

Q. And what about fingernail scrapings?

A. Finger scrapings, yep. We collect those as part of our -- what we call our post mortem kit. It comes in an envelope of pre-sealed items that we collect.

Q. Okay. Um, so, the photos that were taken, were taken by the pathologist assistants?

A. The pathologist herself actually.

Q. And you were there when she took them?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 80 through 199 (sic). Can you please take a look at these photos?

THE COURT: Did you say 180 through 189 --

MS. MUDGE: -- eighty through 99.

THE COURT: I miss-heard. I thought you said 199.

MS. MUDGE: 180 through 199.

THE COURT: I did hear the 199.

BY Ms. Mudge:

Q. Have you had an opportunity to look at those photos?

A. Yes.

Q. And do those photos fairly and accurately depict what you saw -- part of what you saw at the autopsy of Jade Beasley?

A. Yes.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, at this time, I would move to admit and publish 180 through 199.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: They will be admitted, and you may publish.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Again, I will remind the gallery that this may contain sensitive material. You're free to avert your eyes. You're free to leave, but please maintain decorum.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. I am showing what is marked as People's Exhibit 180. What is this?

A. This is the pathologist's gray card. Again, they follow similar protocols we do. Their first photograph is going to be the gray card depicting date, time, case

number, relevant information to show that this is the first photograph of their photographs that would come after.

Q. And this is the day after the crime at 9:30 a.m.?

A. Correct.

Q. People's Exhibit 181?

A. This is the photograph of the victim's body bag depicting the name, the seal.

Q. One hundred and eighty-two?

A. This is a close-up of the seal. Again, the name and date.

Q. One hundred and eighty-three?

A. This is the initial photograph after -- once the bag is opened. The state of the body as we saw it initially as the bag was opened.

Q. And the lifesaving measures that were taken are still in place?

A. Correct.

Q. Specifically 184, what do we see in this photo?

A. This is the victim's shirt. Once it was removed, it's placed out so it could be photographed to document any damage, any blood stains, anything of that nature.

Q. And did you notice damage to the shirt?

A. Yes. There were several cuts in the shirt.

Q. People's Exhibit 185?

A. So, this is that same photograph with a backing placed inside the shirt to have a contrast of color. There on the top of the photograph you can see cuts in the fabric allowing the white background to show through, and then also you can see some in the center near the bottom of the photograph. And then near that the bottom side of the neck, what would be the left side of the neck area of the shirt, there is some more cuts there.

Q. One hundred and eighty-six?

A. This is a close-up of those that I was just talking about near the collar showing cuts in the fabric.

Q. One hundred and eighty-seven?

A. Again, a closer-up image with the scale.

Q. One hundred and eighty-eight?

A. These cuts are on the -- what would be underneath the right arm -- or front right arm cuts in the fabric.

Q. One hundred and eight-nine?

A. A close-up of those cuts.

Q. One hundred and ninety?

A. This is showing that cut in fabric near the -- along the front, left side of the shirt.

Q. One hundred and ninety-one?
A. And then a close-up of that cut.
Q. One hundred and ninety-two?
A. This is the victim's bra.
Q. Did you notice any marks on that as well?
A. There were cuts in the bra also.
Q. One hundred and ninety-three?
A. Another photograph of -- this is the back side of the shirt showing cuts in the fabric to the back side of the shirt also.
Q. One hundred and ninety-four?
A. Here we are showing several cuts through the shirt through the fabric there above the left shoulder, upper back.
Q. One hundred and ninety-five -- oops. It skipped. One hundred and ninety-five.
A. Um, I believe that's that same area but this is showing cuts in the fabric.
Q. One hundred and ninety-six?
A. This is a showing cut in the fabric of, I believe, the right sleeve right here. This would be near the shoulder.
Q. One hundred and ninety-seven?
A. Again, this is the victim's bra.

Q. One hundred and ninety-eight?
A. This is a cut through the fabric of the bra.
Q. One hundred and ninety-nine?
A. Another image there with that contrast and background to show the cut to the fabric.
Q. Okay. And you said you collected physical items from the autopsy as well?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm going to show what's previously been marked as People's Exhibit 6 for identification purposes.
THE COURT: Before we do that, the Court needs to take a little comfort break.
MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: As I told you before, I will read this each and every time that you leave here, and I know it's repetitive, but it is very, very important.
Until this case is submitted to you by -- for you to deliberate, you must not discuss the case with anyone or remain within hearing of anyone discussing it. You're not to read any newspaper article regarding the case, watch any TV, news cast regarding this case, listen to any radio broadcast concerning this case. After this case has been submitted to you, you must discuss the case only in the jury room when all the

members of the jury are present. You are to keep an open mind, and you must not decide any issue in the case until it is submitted to you for deliberation under the instructions of the Court. Again, I remind you if anybody approaches you to engage conversation with you, do not talk to them. Notify my bailiff or security immediately. You may take the jury.

THE CLERK: Please rise for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: You can be seated. We will take a 15 minute break to allow the jury to also have a comfort break.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: You guys ready?

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You ready?

MS. THIEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Go ahead and bring the jury back in.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE

THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Ms. Mudge, you may continue.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. From Scene 3, the autopsy, you collected physical exhibits -- physical evidence, as well, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. I'm showing you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 6. Um, can you take a look at that and tell me what it is, if you recognize it?

A. I do recognize it. This is sexual assault -- or a sexual evidence collection kit that my seal is on it here, my initials, badge number, date. Those seals have been broken indicating that it's been open for analysis. And then we've got two tabs here both placed by lab personnel. One has been broken and dated and had been resealed. It's still intact and also dated.

Q. And what all does that sexual assault kit contain?

A. Um, as I read from the label, sealed cardboard box containing one sexual assault kit containing head hair comings, pubic hair comings, fingernail scrapings, oral swabs, vaginal and anal swabs and a blood card.

Q. Will you please open that?

THE WITNESS: Gloves?

MS. MUDGE: Do we have any gloves in here?

MR. BUTLER: We've got some.

THE WITNESS: Inside there is -- each of those things that I just said out loud are individually packaged in their own envelopes to prevent contamination, and then there is a check mark here of what it was that I had collected.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Are the envelopes inside of there sealed?

A. They are not. They are envelopes within envelopes.

Q. And is that how you collected them?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. Are they in substantially the same condition as you collected them --

A. Yes.

Q. -- as they were when you collected them?

A. Yes, they were -- or yes, they are.

MS. MUDGE: Okay. Your Honor, the People would move to admit People's Exhibit 6.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: That will be admitted.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. And you arrived at the autopsy at 9:24 a.m. on December 6th. What time did the autopsy conclude and you departed the scene?

A. Can I refer to my report just to confirm the time?

Q. Yes.

A. I cleared the scene approximately 5:30 p.m.

Q. On that same day -- we will move on to Scene 4 -- where did you go after the autopsy?

A. After the autopsy, I responded back to, um, the victim's residence.

Q. And what was your purpose for doing that?

A. Uh, the -- after seeing -- after processing the residence the first time, it was sealed and secured so I could attend the autopsy. Often we like to go to an autopsy to see what kind of evidence is collected, observed at an autopsy and then return back to the scene. It often gives us an idea of what to better look for. Um, in this case, one of the things we had measurements now of the actual lacerations on the body, so it gave us an idea of some knives to photograph; things like that. And then also to administer -- I did

-- in Scene 1 -- or the first time that I went to the scene, I documented all the visible blood; all the red, blood-like stains that you could see with the naked eye with photographs and labels. Now, I was going to go back and spend some time spraying Leucocrystal Violet which is a, uh, a chemical that we use to enhance blood, enhance blood patterns. And then also it will help us to detect latent blood so any trace amounts of blood that aren't visible to the naked eye, and it also -- it even reacts with blood that's been cleaned or mixed with cleaner. So, if there is any attempt to clean a bloody area, it would still react with any trace amounts of blood in those areas also. So, I went to spray LCV throughout the scene.

Q. And that's something that you spray?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And if it's going to react to whatever it reacts to, what happens -- what do you see after you spray it and it reacts?

A. Once you -- once you spray it -- on whatever surface if it's a positive reaction with blood, it will actually turn the -- it will turn the area containing the reactant in the blood to a purple color.

Q. And did you focus on a certain part of the home?

A. Uh, I focused on looking for footwear, so I sprayed the floors. Um, I was not -- let's say, I focused on the hallway area leading from the hallway where some of those bloody footprints were in the hallway that we could see -- that I could see with my naked eye. Um, as those get farther away, um, the amount of blood on the foot becomes less and less, so that transfer becomes less and less evidence. So, I focused on the kitchen floor leading into the living room, um, the master bedroom area. Just kind of that floor surface from that hallway where the primary amount of blood was, and then out towards the front of the home.

Q. And did you find places that reacted to the LCV?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you photograph those?

A. Yes.

Q. I am going to show you what's been marked as -- and bare with me here -- 200, 202, 209-211, 213-214, 218-220, 223-228, 230-232, 234, 238, 239, 246-247, 249-252, 254-256, 259-263, 268-269, 271 and 206?

THE COURT: Okay. You're going too fast for me. 262 to --

MS. MUDGE: -- 269.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MUDGE: And then 271.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MUDGE: And 206.

THE COURT: Thank you.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Can you take a look at those photographs, please?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Do you recognize those photographs?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Did you take all those photographs?

A. I did.

Q. And did they fairly and accurately depict the scene on December 6th of 2020?

A. Yes, they do.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, at this time, the People would move to admit and publish those photographs.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: Okay. Give me a moment. They are admitted, and you may publish.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. I'm showing you what's been marked People's Exhibit 200. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes.

Q. What is it?

A. Again, this is the gray card of Scene 4; first photograph that I took at the scene.

Q. People's Exhibit 209?

A. This is a photograph of the kitchen of the victim's residence looking down toward the hallway where the large accumulation of blood was. Um, this is showing the floor before LCV was applied, and you can see that here down the, kind of, center, left side of that picture. There are no visible blood stain patterns other than some of the drips or the circular patterns that we saw in the previous photos.

Q. Okay. And 210?

A. So, this is standing on the opposite end of the kitchen now, the hallway, and looking towards the front of the house after LCV. Same area from a different point of view. You can see LCV reaction on the floor there at the bottom, Scene 1, and then about half way up you can see purple on the floor. That's also another reaction appearing similar to bare footprints. LCV reactions going in the direction from the hallway toward

the front of the house.

Q. Two hundred and eleven?

A. This is showing that we're moving up, moving forward. Again, this would be LCV reaction similar to bare footprints.

Q. Two hundred and thirteen?

A. Here's a close-up of that LCV reaction; bare footprint in latent blood.

Q. Two hundred and fourteen?

A. Showing up from that -- from this area where you can see the scale at the bottom scanning up. You can see purple areas on the floor leading towards the front of the residence. These are more bare footprint imprints in blood leading towards the front of the house?

Q. Two hundred and eighteen?

A. Um, this is another bare footprint -- footwear -- or footprint impression imprint on the floor with LCV reaction.

Q. Two hundred and nineteen?

A. This is showing that these LCV reaction bloody footprints continue from the hall -- or from the kitchen into the living room.

Q. Two hundred and twenty?

A. Continuation -- or similar to the last photo.

Q. Two hundred and twenty-three?

A. This is a transition from the kitchen, which is to the right of the photograph, and then into the living room, which is to the left, showing these latent -- or these LCV reaction bare footprints continue in the direction of the front of the house.

Q. Two hundred and twenty-four?

A. This is a close-up of one of the imprints with a scale.

Q. Two hundred and twenty-five?

A. This is showing -- you can see that there is purple leading from the bottom of the photograph up towards the front in between the red couch and the brown chair. Um, just showing where the reactions continue throughout the house, and then where I am going to continue to photograph.

Q. Two hundred and twenty-six?

A. The same. Showing the footprint reaction there and LCV on the floor.

Q. And 227?

A. This would be a close-up of that previous picture, the bare footprint; the LCV reaction on the floor.

Q. Two hundred and twenty-eight?
A. Same.
Q. Two hundred and thirty?
A. This is the LCV reaction bare footprint in blood just north of -- or just in front of that brown chair. The directionality pointing towards the front area of the house.
Q. Two hundred and thirty-one?
A. This is that close-up that we just saw. This is a mid-range of that same footprint in LCV.
Q. Two hundred and thirty-four?
A. This is showing the floor, um, looking at the -- you can see the front main entry door up there to the top right, and then the master bedroom entrance is there on the top left. And you can see the -- so, everywhere there is purple, is an LCV reaction that was not visible on the initial scene. So, these were -- if you were to go back and you compare photos to Scene 2, the first entrance, these images that -- these spots are not visible. Once the LCV was applied throughout the house and the floors, these stains became visible. So, this is a documentation to show, okay, this area, here's -- we got a lot of reaction here, and I will go into specific imprints and patterns. But compared to my

initial photographs at the scene, these areas you can't see these patterns.

Q. Two hundred and thirty-seven?

A. Again, so we're -- here we've got -- showing some patterns that I will get close-ups, and then the master bedroom is up right there at the top of the photograph.

Q. Two hundred thirty-eight?

A. This is a close-up. So, you can see this bare footprint in LCV in the previous photograph. Also, this is a closer-up picture of that. Master bedroom is just above the photograph out of frame.

Q. And 239?

A. This is a close-up of that LCV bloody footprint.

Q. Two hundred and forty-one?

A. This is showing, um -- on the bottom, we've got the bloody footprint we were just looking at, the LCD reaction. And then above it, you can see another bare footprint toward -- with directionality toward the master bedroom, and then you can see some reactions there just outside the master bedroom threshold and even some purple reaction on the carpet just inside. So, this is just showing that there was latent blood reaction outside with directionality into the master bedroom with bare footprints.

Q. Two hundred and forty-six?

A. These are basically two footprints in LCV reactions right outside the master bath -- or master bedroom, sorry. And then in the carpet there, you can see a purple discoloration just inside the doorway to the master bedroom, and that's positive LCV reaction there.

Q. The carpeted area that we're looking at is the master bedroom?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Two hundred and forty-eight?

A. This is that purplish area in the carpet with a scale and a closer photograph. You can see kind it's kind of rounded, elongated along the sides similar to the heal end of a foot.

Q. Two hundred and forty-nine?

A. So, that is that same reaction stain near the scale at the bottom showing that I am going to move forward to the next LCV reaction which is further inside the bedroom towards the bathroom.

Q. Two hundred and fifty?

A. This is, again, an overall just showing the interior. You can see the purple stain there inside the threshold.

Q. Two hundred and fifty-one?

A. Now here you can see the scale near the center of the photograph. That's showing where I am about to go. There was LCV reaction there, so in order to show its relation to the room, that's what this photograph is showing.

Q. Two hundred and fifty-two?

A. All right. So, looking here you have got the LCV reaction, the purple, on the carpet in the master bedroom. The bathroom is just above this photograph to the left, so we've got one in the entryway and one here, um, positive LCV reaction in the carpet.

Q. Two hundred and fifty-four?

A. This is showing the relation of that LCV reaction to the master bathroom.

Q. Two hundred and fifty-six?

A. This is a labeled -- just labeled and scaled photograph of that LCV reaction.

Q. Two hundred and two?

A. This is a -- the entry way to the -- or this is looking into the master bathroom. You can see on the floor purple positive LCV reactions on the master bathroom floor which were not visible on my initial entry or photographs.

Q. Two hundred and fifty-five?

A. So, here we're looking just inside the master bedroom/bathroom which I did apply LCV with. It received positive reaction with the purple coloration which is also a presumptive confirmatory test for a presence of blood. Um, here none of these stains were visible to the naked eye when I first responded to the scene. After being -- after LCV applied, they became visible. You can see several different types of patterns here. Several appear to have some kind of a texture motion to the patt -- to the stains, the patterns. Some are circular. Um, but, yeah, so that's a LCV reaction right inside the master bathroom.

Q. Two hundred and fifty-nine?

A. This is the label that I assigned to this pattern for sketching purposes and report writing purposes. It's the same area of the floor. You can see a little bit more on the top of that -- that latent reaction in the blood with motion and then another motion beneath it.

Q. Two hundred and sixty?

A. This is kind of a close-up of the -- the west end of that pattern with a scale and a label.

Q. Two hundred and sixty-one?

A. This is a scaled photograph of the label of the portion of the stain that's got that motion and almost a textured deposit to it or textured makeup.

Q. Two hundred and sixty-two?

A. Again, the -- we've got the one with motion going one direction, and the other motion going the other direction. Both of those LCV reactions to latent blood on the floor that were not visible the first time I came through the house.

Q. Two hundred and sixty-three?

A. Close-up with the scale of the -- that upper pattern.

Q. Two hundred and sixty-eight?

A. There is the master bathroom sink. Um, if you remember the first time that I went through the house, um, and photographed the master bathroom sink, there was this darker purple area here cause this is after I had applied LCV to the sink. That darker purple larger spot next to the label, I observed that the first time through as an RBLS pattern in the sink. Um, now coming through the second time where I was using LCV, um, I sprayed the sink also and then received a reaction. Obviously, what you see here. It did, as you can see, positively react to the stain that I saw the first time,

and then also several areas around the sink. Some with motion down into the sink, and then even some of -- there was a reaction on the faucet itself.

Q. Two hundred and seventy-one?

A. Uh, this is where the same picture, same master bathroom sink, starting to incorporate labels for documentation purposes, report writing purposes, but this depicts positive LCV reaction in the sink.

Q. Two hundred and six?

A. This is a close-up of the faucet. You can see right there at the end there is a purple kind of almost a crescent moon, half circle type shape right at the end that was a positive reaction with LCV.

Q. And 269?

A. That is that close-up of that same kind of that spot on the faucet with a label and a scale so that -- for documentation purposes later on. None of this was visible my first time through.

Q. And you said that you took swabs from the master bathroom near the vanity?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And were those swabs sealed and submitted -- or possibly submitted to the lab for testing?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. I am showing you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 9. Can you take a look at that and tell me what the label says?

A. So again, this is evidence sealed by me, initialed, badge number, date. My seal is intact. The evidence description reads sealed paper bag containing one pair of swabs collected from LCV reaction at D-1 on the master bathroom floor near the vanity.

Q. May you please open that?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. How is it sealed as it is now?

A. It is -- my seal is intact. My seal has not been broken. This yellow seal which is placed by the lab is also intact and dated. This indicates -- and I can see a staple underneath the seal. This indicates that the label had opened the package here, done their processing and resealed it and dated it, and it's been secured since.

Q. Okay. Go ahead.

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Does it appear to be in substantially the same condition as when you collected it and submitted it?

A. Yes, it does. I can see it's been analyzed. It is marked D-1 which is the label that I affixed it to at

the scene, and then you can see the purplish color on the swab still from the LCV that was -- as I collected it from the LCV reaction.

Q. All right.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, the People would move to admit Exhibit 9.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: Exhibit 9 will be admitted.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. Your next scene is what we are calling Scene 5; the fifth place that you responded to. What is that?

A. Um, Scene 5, was when I responded to process the defendant's vehicle at Vernell's towing.

Q. Okay. And what was the date of that?

A. Um, December 7th.

Q. I'm showing you what's been marked as People's Exhibits 272-282. Can you take a look at these photos?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Did you take those photographs?

A. Yes.

Q. And do they fairly and accurately depict the scene of the processing of the crime -- of the car on

December 6th at 11:04 a.m.? I don't think that date is right.

A. It isn't. I believe it was December 7th.

Q. December 7th. Okay. Do they fairly and accurately depict the scene as you processed the vehicle?

A. Yes.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, the People would move to admit and publish 272-282.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: They will be admitted, and you may publish.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. We're looking at 272. What is that?

A. So, this is the gray card again. The first picture that I take before I go to any scene. Document Scene 5, vehicle one. The date is wrong which is noted in my report. The correct date is December 7th.

Q. But the time was 11:04 a.m., correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Two hundred and seventy-three?

A. All right. This is an image of defendant's

vehicle inside the locked garage at Vernell's towing showing the front passenger area of the car. I go around and, again, I take my overalls, insure that it is in the same exact condition it was the last time I saw it before I process it.

Q. Two hundred and seventy-four.

A. Skipping to the driver's seat -- or the driver's area compartment of the vehicle. Um, this is showing the steering wheel, steering wheel cover, and you can see some of the center console there also of the defendant's vehicle.

Q. And did you notice anything about the steering wheel cover that made you want to do further testing?

A. There was RBLS, red, blood-like substance, suspected blood on the steering wheel cover. Um, there was also some that we observed the first time I went to the residence on the gear shift.

Q. Exhibit 257?

A. This is that kind of near the center of that white diamond. You can see a red, blood-like stain there.

Q. Exhibit 276?

A. This is close-up of that same stain with a scale.

Q. And 277?

A. Another red, blood-like substance on the steering wheel cover.

Q. Two hundred and seventy-eight?

A. And then that same stain with a scale.

Q. Two hundred and seventy-nine?

A. This is the red, blood-like substance that was observed on the gear shift at the residence before the vehicle was sealed. It's that blood stain pattern with a scale.

Q. And Exhibit 280?

A. This is red, blood-like substance on the interior driver's door panel; interior driver's door armrest.

Q. Two hundred and eighty-one?

A. This is the exterior driver's door handle, um, with an LCV reaction on the -- again, after I processed this vehicle for visible blood, the things that I could see, I went to try to see if there is anything that I couldn't see. Anything that wasn't visible to the naked eye, so I did use LCV in this vehicle, the driver's compartment area, the outside of the driver's door, and there was a positive LCV reaction on the driver's exterior door handle.

Q. And 282?

A. That is the positive reaction; the purple color.

Q. And you said you swabbed the interior of the vehicle --

A. Yes.

Q. -- to submit for testing?

A. Yes.

Q. I am showing you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 12. Could you please read the label on that?

A. Yep. Again, my seal intact, initialed, badge number, date. Description -- evidence description reads sealed paper bag containing three individually packaged pairs of swabs selected from unknown red stains. One pair from the gear shifter. Two from the interior driver's door. One was from the stain toward the front of the vehicle, and one was from the stain towards the rear of the vehicle.

Q. And you also collected the steering wheel cover?

A. Yes.

Q. I am showing you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 13. Would you read what is on the label there?

A. This is, again, my seal, name, initials, badge number, date. Evidence label reads sealed paper bag containing the steering wheel cover baring red unknown stains collected from steering wheel of vehicle Number 1.

Q. Would you please open, um, Exhibit 12?
A. (Witness complies.)
Q. And what is that?
A. We have three individually packaged pairs of swabs. One is labeled gear shift, one is labeled toward front, and one is labeled toward rear.
Q. Do they appear to be in substantially the same condition as when you collected it?
A. Yes.
Q. And was it sealed with lab tape?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And would you please open 13?
A. (Witness complies.)
Q. And what is that?
A. This is the steering wheel cover collected from defendant's vehicle. It's been -- you can tell it has been processed. This area here is one of the RBLS stains that I observed. It has been circled and cut out. This area over here has been circled.
Q. You did not do that?
A. I did not do that.
Q. And was that bag sealed by the lab?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Okay. Other than the cutouts for testing, is

that in substantially the same condition as when you collected it?

A. Yes.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, the People would move to admit Exhibit 12 and 13.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: They will be admitted.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. You also went to the sixth scene on December 7th of 2020. That's at 11304 Songbird Road. So, this is your third time at the home?

A. Yes.

Q. What is your purpose for going to the home for a third time?

A. To document, um, administer LCV in other areas to try to get specifically latent evidence and bare footprints and/or fingerprints. Um, and then, you know, collect -- collect that evidence as I found it. So, it's to administer more LCV for the purpose of specifically looking for ridge detail. Ridge detail on footprints. Ridge detail in fingerprints. So, on the wall where we saw RBLS appeared to be handprints, I would spray LCV in the fingertip areas, palm areas cause

LCV actually enhances the blood stain pattern and makes the detail much easier to see. So, my intention going back this time was to really focus on trying to collect ridge detail evidence with LCV.

Q. And after you processed this home for a third time, both originally with LCV and with LCV for ridge detail, did you sketch -- you take your original sketch and put in that sketch what reacted to LCV in the home?

A. Yes. So, again, we're required to do a sketch for any crime against a person, so I completed a sketch encompassing this entire residence and then items of evidence and areas of interest.

Q. Is that sketch to scale?

A. It is not to scale.

Q. Okay. I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 283 through 288, Exhibit 291, Exhibits 294 and 295, Exhibits 297 and 298, Exhibit 300 and Exhibits 304-305. Let's start with Exhibit 283. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes.

Q. And what is that?

A. This is a -- the sketch that I made of the residence.

Q. And for demonstrative purposes, does that fairly

and accurately depict the layout of the home along with the LCV reactions that you obtained from within that home?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Now I will show you the other exhibits that I listed. If you could take a look at those, please?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Do you recognize those photographs?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you take those yourself?

A. Yes.

Q. And do they fairly and accurately depict the scene of the residence as you saw it and processed it on December 7th of 2020?

A. Yes, they do.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, at this time, I would move to admit and publish those photos.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: They are admitted, and you may publish.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, do you show that I am on?

THE COURT: I show that you're on. It keeps coming on and off. Right now I have your previous.

MS. MUDGE: I am going to try to disconnect and reconnect.

THE COURT: I have your home screen.

MS. MUDGE: Okay.

THE COURT: Now I have got your files.

MS. MUDGE: Okay.

THE COURT: Yes. Yes, ma'am.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you. I didn't realize that it had to wait for you to put it on here.

THE COURT: Oh, yeah. I look at it first before I send it out.

MS. MUDGE: Okay.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. I'm showing you what's 284. What is that?

A. This is the, again, the gray card first photo that I took at Scene 6 back at the residence.

Q. And 283?

A. This is a photograph of the sketch that I compiled for the scene. It shows the layout of the house.

Q. Okay. There is a lot on here.

A. Yes.

Q. So, if you could kind of, for the jury, explain where the front door would be positioned here and how you go in the order that you process the home?

A. Okay. So, the front door is -- at the very bottom left, you see a bed, that's the master bedroom. Just north of that bed to the left, is the front entryway. So, we've got where the blood starts -- the red circle start on the lower third portion on the left side, that's the front door. And then that blood stain pattern, if you remember from the first time we entered the house, they were kind of circular and they kind of spanned down through the kitchen, two sides by the island, and then down into the hallway, and then into the victim's room. So, that circular red dots are referred to RBLS patterns B-1 through B-12. Um, and the -- we got the layout of the house, obviously, and then we've got back in the -- towards the top end of the diagram, that heavy accumulation of imprint -- or the heavy accumulation of blood is there in the hallway. We've got some -- Imprint F -- I think, C, D, E -- those bloody footprints that were visible to the naked eye are depicted there, and then we've got the heavy accumulation of blood in the bathroom depicted by that red kind of irregular shape. And then we've got those

red circles in the victim's bedroom. Anything in purple is the LCV -- is indicating LCV reactions. So basically if you took the purple out, I did not see any of that purple my first time through. Um, the red was visible. The purple was not. So then, the LCV reactions when I came through, you know, we can -- that sketch depicts the footprints in their directionality. Um, and then in the master bathroom, we see the irregular shapes there on the floor and on the sink.

Q. Thank you. Exhibit 288?

A. So, this is going back to those three labels on the floor I had placed, um, to indicate that was one of the LCV reactions that I wanted to come back to focus on because I believe that it held good ridge detail. Um, so if you think back to the first time we're looking at LCV reactions with the bloody footprints going -- leading through the kitchen towards the front of the house, this is one of those that we've already seen. Now I am going back to re-examine it for latent -- for latent evidence. The longer LCV sits, it actually becomes a permanent dye and it hardens. Because when it's applied, it's wet. And as it dries, you can actually get better detail. So coming back later would give me the best opportunity to see if there was latent

rig -- or ridge detail in those LCV reactions.

Q. Exhibit 291?

A. So, this is a close-up of that area, again, those labels. Labeled imprint -- or Latent 2.

Q. Exhibit 294?

A. So, this is a specific area of that pattern where I was able to develop ridge detail whether it's a toe or the front, kind of, ball of your foot, I couldn't say. But it is very obvious and evident that there is ridge detail in that LCV reaction, so I was capturing that with photographs.

Q. Exhibit 295?

A. Again, here's the -- looking into the hallway after LCV had been applied. So, we have got these previously not visible stains in blood. This one right off the corner of that white freezer is where I'm going to go in and take some closer pictures.

Q. Two hundred and ninety-seven?

A. That's a closer picture of that. You can kind of see what appears to be toes and the ball or front of a foot.

Q. Two hundred and nine-eight?

A. Um, kind of another toe area here in the center of that pattern indicating movement or over-stepping in

this area. That spot of the area, the stain had the best ridge detail.

Q. Three hundred?

A. Same. Same pattern; LCV reaction with a scale. Imprint 3.

Q. Three hundred and three?

A. Just getting in closer. Um, you can start to see ridge detail specifically near kind of the upper lighter area of the stain.

Q. Three hundred and five?

A. Again, kind of in the upper area of the photograph you can see some lines and actual ridge detail there which is what I was interested in to potentially match to a known imprint.

Q. Three hundred and four?

A. Again, a close-up there of the photograph where you can see swirls and loops, and you can see ridge detail pretty clearly there in the LCV reaction.

Q. Two hundred and eighty-five?

A. This is the area by -- this is the living room looking into the master bedroom. So this is the floor just outside the master bedroom -- the master bedroom is towards the top of the photograph -- labels of areas that I had found had decent ridge detail, and I was

going to go in and examine to find where I could find the best possible evidence.

Q. Two hundred and eighty-six?

A. It is here, Latent Number 1. Um, photograph of the area that I determined had the best ridge detail, and just a close-up of it with a scale and the label.

Q. Two hundred and eighty-seven?

A. Again, here you can see the ridge detail from the LCV reaction. You can see the lines and the ridges.

Q. Okay. Thank you. You also collected, um, three items of physical evidence from this Scene 6?

A. Yes.

Q. And what did you collect?

A. Um, I collected -- can I refer to my report?

Q. Why don't we do it this way. I am going to show you what's marked as People's Exhibit 14, 15 and 16. Um, what is 14?

A. Uh, evidence sealed with my initials, seal unbroken, date. Evidence label reads sealed paper bag containing one pair of swabs collected from Imprint F located at the north end of the hallway.

Q. And that -- you collected that?

A. Correct. I collected the swab from Imprint F.

Q. And what about 15?

A. Again, my seal unbroken. Evidence description reads sealed paper bag containing one pair of swabs collected from Imprint G located on the living room floor near the front door.

Q. And 16?

A. Sixteen, sealed cardboard box containing three pieces of flooring each baring latent ridge evidence collected from bare footprints located on the floor. Two collected from the kitchen floor, latent Number 1 and Latent Number 2, and one collected from the living room floor, Latent Number 1.

Q. Okay. Could you please -- well, first of all, are 14, 15 and 16 sealed with your tape and the lab's?

A. Fourteen and 15 are two sets of swabs. My seals are still intact. Here, the packages have been opened for analysis at the lab. So, they were open here. They were resealed by lab personnel signed and dated. No seal is broken on either of these two swabs.

Q. Okay. And what about 16?

A. Sixteen, the box, it has the flooring with the ridge detail, the evidence. My seals are broken so it could be analyzed at the lab, and then it's been resealed with lab tape, signed and dated, and those seals are not broken.

Q. Could you please open all three and tell me if they are all in substantially the same condition as when you collected them from Scene 6?

A. This is Exhibit 15. Swab G. It is in similar or substantial similar state as when I collected it.

Q. Okay. And then 15 (sic)?

A. Uh, a swab says Imprint F.

Q. And is it in substantially the same condition as when you collected it?

A. Yes.

Q. And 16?

A. I'm going to hold these up. They were originally taped and placed, and after analysis, they are placed in here. Here's the pieces of the flooring, um, that was cut up for analysis that had the ridge detail.

Q. You cut those pieces up?

A. I cut them from the floor, yes.

Q. Okay. So, it's in substantially the same condition as when you collected it from the home?

A. It is. There are four pieces here. I collected three. The lab has initialed -- circled, initialed and marked, so they may have taken one piece and cut it into two for analysis.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, the People would move to admit Exhibits 14, 15 and 16.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: They will be admitted. Can the attorneys approach for just a moment?

(SIDE BAR HELD OUT OF THE HEARING. OF THE JURY.)

(BACK ON RECORD INSIDE THE HEARING OF THE JURY.)

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. Let's move to Scene 7. That is December 8th of 2020. You responded to the county morgue?

A. Yes.

Q. What's your purpose for going to the county morgue?

A. Um, after collecting ridge detail evidence at the residence and the footprints, I wanted to try to be able to get some standards -- some known standards to match them to, so I responded to the morgue to collect photographs of the victim's feet with scales so that they could be analyzed and compared to what I had collected at the residence. I also photographed dental impressions that were collected previously.

Q. Okay. Did you also collect, um, powdered footprints of the victim from the morgue?

A. Yes. Um, so I collected powdered -- after photographing the victim's feet, um, with scales, I dusted powder and collected physical imprints of her foot impressions.

Q. I am showing you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 17. Could you please take a look at that.

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. What does it say?

A. Um, my evidence tape is intake, initialed and signed -- or initialed by me. The evidence description says -- or reads sealed paper bag containing one set of powdered footprints collected from the victim at the Williamson County Morgue.

Q. Would you please open it?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. What is in there?

A. This is one of the footwear imprints; left foot. This is my initials circled here. Um, powdered right foot. My initials circled here. These are the powdered footprints that I collected at the morgue.

Q. Okay. And are they in substantially the same condition as when you collected them?

A. Yes.

Q. And it's got your seal on it and then the label has been sealed as well?

A. Correct.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, at this time, the People would move to admit Exhibit 17?

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. And then we're on to Scene 8. That is on December 8th of 2020. You responded to the Johnston City Police Department?

A. Yes.

Q. And what is your purpose for going there?

A. Um, I was requested to respond to the police department to photograph the defendant's -- the bite marks -- reported bite marks on the arms with an IR camera.

Q. What is IR?

A. So, it's infrared. We use an infrared laser -- I'm sorry -- an infrared light and an infrared lens. Um, the infrared photograph allows us often to see subcutaneous bruising and some -- there are some other

benefits to it, but specifically in this case, we're looking for -- to be able to enhance the -- or enhance the quality of the image of the bite marks and see, um, you know, any subcutaneous bruising around that.

Q. I am going to show you what's been marked -- so when you're taking these photos, it's three days after the crime?

A. Correct.

Q. I'm going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibits 332 through 342 and Exhibit 376. Could you please take a look at those?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Do you recognize those photographs?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you take all those photographs?

A. I did.

Q. Do they fairly and accurately depict the defendant and the wound to her arm on December 8th of 2020?

A. Yes.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, the People would move to admit and publish 332 through 342 and 376.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: They'll be admitted, and you may publish.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. I'm showing you 332. What is that?

A. This is the gray card; first photograph I took at Scene 8.

Q. Exhibit 333?

A. The first photograph I took of the defendant at Johnston County -- or Johnston City Police Department.

Q. Three hundred and thirty-four?

A. This is a photograph of the bite mark on the right forearm.

Q. Three hundred and thirty-five?

A. Another photograph of the same bite mark with the scale.

Q. Three hundred and thirty-six?

A. This is the left arm. This left forearm, these scratches, abrasions were not present the first time that I observed the defendant at the Williamson County Sheriff's Office.

Q. Exhibit 337?

A. Another photograph showing those abrasions on the left forearm.

Q. Three hundred and thirty-eight?
A. Same abrasions with a scale.
Q. Three hundred and thirty-nine?
A. This is an IR photograph. You can see the bite mark. The thing with infrared photography is sometimes it aids and sometimes it isn't. But, so, you can see the bite mark is a darker shade on the forearm.
Q. Three hundred and forty?
A. This is the bite mark. Again, you can see kind of the outline along the scale and then moving up, bite mark, infrared photograph with the scale.
Q. Three hundred and thirty-four?
A. Another infrared photograph with a different exposure.
Q. Oh, I apologize.
A. Yep. Same bite mark on the right arm with a scale.
Q. Three hundred and forty-two?
A. This is the left arm where those scratch marks were. Those appearing recent lacerations/abrasions on the left forearm.
Q. Three hundred and forty-three?
A. Same area -- or same arm.
Q. Oh, I'm sorry. This is 376. It says 343 on the

slide, which I will change, but the physical exhibit is 376. What's in this photo that you see on the screen now?

A. This is the left, inner forearm where those apparent recent scratch marks and abrasions were; infrared photograph with a scale.

Q. Okay. Um, you just told us that you went to the morgue and collected Jade's footprints. Did you do the same for the defendant?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And would that be your Scene 9?

A. Yes. That is ninth scene that I responded to.

Q. Okay. And where did you respond to?

A. I responded to the Williamson County Jail.

Q. Um, and how did you collect the defendant's footprint standards?

A. Um, I collected -- I collected both powder footprints and inked footprints. For the powdered footprints, I dusted the bottom of the defendant's feet with black powder and had her walk on a lifter for each foot, and then did a similar thing with the ink. Rolled the bottom of the defendant's feet with black ink, and then had her walk each foot on a lifting pad lifter and then collected her foot impressions that way.

Q. Okay. I am going to show you what's been marked as Exhibits 377 and 378. Let's start with 377. What is on the label of that?

A. Um, item description is sealed paper bag containing one set of powdered footprints collected from the suspect's feet.

Q. And what about Exhibit 378?

A. The item description is sealed cardboard box containing one set of inked footprints collected from the suspect's feet.

Q. And is your tape and the State Police Crime Lab tape on there?

A. Yes.

Q. What is it sealed by?

A. Um, my -- the bag is -- my seal is intact and unbroken, um, and then the evidence -- or the crime lab personnel tape is intact and unbroken, dated. And then on the box, um, my seals have been broken. The lab's seals are intact and unbroken.

Q. Can you please open them both?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Is it in substantially or similar condition as when you collected it from the defendant?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. These are right and left powdered footprints. My initials, badge number, date, and then an R and an L depicted on the back.

Q. Okay. And what about 378?

A. These are the inked footprints of the defendant, right and left. Again, my initials, badge number and date are on the back along with an R and a L to depict right and left. These are the inked footprints.

Q. And are they in substantially the same condition as when you collected them?

A. Yes.

Q. Um, one more thing, from Scene 1, your first scene when you, um -- no, I'm sorry. Scene 2, when we were talking about the footprints, did you do a gel lift of a footprint in RBLS which is Imprint F on your diagram from the hallway floor?

A. Yes.

Q. I am showing you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 5. Could you please -- well, what is it sealed by?

A. Uh, both my evidence tape is intact, and then also the crime lab's evidence tape is also intact.

Q. Okay. Could you please open that?

A. (Witness complies.) The description is -- yep -- one gel lift of a footprint in RBLS Imprint F collected from the hallway floor. This is that imprint that was closest to Jayden's room near the heavy accumulation of blood in the hallway.

Q. And what is that?

A. This is the -- a gel lift of footwear Imprint F.

Q. In substantially the same condition as when you collected it?

A. Yes. I've got a direction arrow indicating north Imprint F, my initials and badge number on the back.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, the People would move to admit Exhibit 5.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

MS. MUDGE: Um, I would also move to admit People's Exhibits 2 and 3 which have been testified to. I just forgot to admit.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: They will be admitted.

MS. MUDGE: No further questions for this witness, your Honor.

THE COURT: Exhibits 377 and 378?

MS. MUDGE: I would move to admit those.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: Be admitted.

MS. MUDGE: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Okay. Given the time, I think we're going to go ahead and break for lunch. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, again, I remind you until this case is submitted to you for your deliberation, you must not discuss the case with anyone or remain in hearing of anyone discussing it. You're not to watch TV about it. You're not to read any newspaper article regarding the case. Nor, listen to any radio broadcast about the case. After this case has been submitted to you, you must discuss the case only in the jury room and only when all the members of the jury are present. You are to keep an open mind. You must not decide any issue in the case until it is submitted to you for your deliberation under the instructions of the Court. Please rise for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Okay. I think we will try to

come back here at about 1:15. That should allow their lunch to arrive and give them approximately an hour, so Court will be adjourned till 1:15.

(NOON RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Court calls 20-CF-596. People versus Julia Bevely. The Court took a recess for lunch. Ms. Bevely, her attorney and the State is present. We're still in the State's case in-chief of the State. A small conference was had outside of the presence of the jury. It's my understanding at this time by agreement we are going to go ahead to do an offer of proof as to a particular witness; is that correct?

MS. MUDGE Yes, sir.

MS. THIEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Are we also going to have that person's testimony directly after, or are we going to do cross-examination of the last witness?

MS. THIEN: I would still prefer to cross-examine the last witness.

THE COURT: Oh, I know, but I'm just asking how we're doing this.

MS. MUDGE: Um, I believe Ms. Thien is going to cross-examine the last witness, and we have a stipulation to be read and then that witness.

THE COURT: Very well. You may go ahead with your offer of proof.

MS. MUDGE: Okay, your Honor. The State would be calling Dr. David Wold who is a Forensic Odontologist. Um, he has viewed multiple items to testify as to his observations in this case. He has viewed the molds that were taken of the defendant's dentition. He has viewed the molds that were taken of the victim's dentition. He's made observations as to both of those. Um, he has also viewed injuries to the defendant's arm; both IR photos and non-IR photos. He did enhance some of those photos via Photo Shop. Um, and the People would be asking him a few questions based on his observations alone. Um, and that is, first off, would it be reasonable considering the orientation of the mark on the defendant's arm that that wound would be self-inflicted. Um, his answer is based on his observations of the pictures and the dentition in the pictures. It is not based on scientific methods. It is based on his, like I said, observation of where the upper ar -- upper arch versus lower arch is on the arm.

Um, the State would also be asking him about the force of the injuries. He did review photos taken on December 5th of 2020, as well as, photos on December 8th of 2020. Um, and he will testify to his observations of the photos as to the force -- or the amount of force it would take to cause that wound, via, a bite mark. Um, we would also be asking him if he sees any place on the injuries knowing that the defendant has already said that that injury is a bite mark and that she caused that herself by biting her arm, is there any place on the injury where there wasn't a tooth that impacted the skin. Um, and we anticipate him to testify as to his observation of the photos of the arm for that as well. And he has noticed irregularities in the victim's teeth based on her molds and casts, as well as, the defendant's teeth.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Judge, I am going to object. I have several to make. The first one -- and it had been the subject of several hearings that we have done so far -- is that in light of People versus Prante, this evidence, as a whole, is currently inadmissible.

Second, the only way that this patterned jury -- or patterned injury mark is identifiable as

potentially a bite mark is by an admission by the defendant. There is no basis for the dentist to even be able to do that absent a Frye hearing, absent reversal of People versus Prante.

Third, what Prante stands for is that bite mark comparison for identification is currently inadmissible. I appreciate the State's many efforts to introduce this, but what they are doing is simply attempting to do the very same thing prohibited by Prante with the exception of asking the ultimate question. It requires, if admissible, specific knowledge to compare an otherwise unidentified mark on skin with particular dentition. And that is what the State is attempting to introduce, and we believe that that in light of the current status of the law is inadmissible.

THE COURT: Any response?

MS. MUDGE: Just briefly. The ultimate, um -- I have told the Court this before. Dr. Wold will not be comparing either sets of molds or casts to the actual injury. He is simply noting his observations to aid the jury in coming to a determination on that.

THE COURT: Well, the Court's ruled, and for the record here today, the Court does not believe Prante stands for the proposition that it's inadmissible. That

case was a post conviction petition in which the Court questioned the scientific analysis of bite mark comparisons. I do believe that much of the dicta of that case indicates that that Court would never accept it as a scientific method, but that a Court should have a Frye Hearing to determine whether or not it would be admissible. Here, however, assuming a bite mark is made and it is human, there is no scientific analysis. That's the statement that allegedly is going to come into evidence. Based upon that, observational evidence is admissible. Prante specifically says that. And the Court believes that obvious dissimilarities is something that can be received in evidence. So, over the defendant's objection, the Court is going to allow that testimony to go forward.

MS. THIEN: If I can simply complete the record, Judge --

THE COURT: -- yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: -- when we get to that point in the trial, I would like the record to indicate my continuing objection.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: I may have a few additional just based on what we hear; not previously raised. I am not

-- I do not intend to interrupt or draw undue attention to this by continuing to make those objections so long as the Court is aware -- or will mark this as a continuing objection.

THE COURT: The Court will make an observation now that it is a continuing objection. Nor will I bar you from objecting depending upon the answers that are given. I don't know what they are going to be, and they may be objectionable for a variety of different reasons. Very well.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: We need your witness back. Please have a seat, sir. Go ahead and bring the jury in.

THE CLERK: Please stand for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Please have a seat. First of all, I want to apologize to you about how speedy Jimmy Johns is. We won't be using them again. So, Ms. Thien, you may inquire.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Good afternoon, investigator.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I am going to try to keep this along the same lines so that I don't get confused, you don't confused, and our jury doesn't get confused as to the order in which we approach this, okay?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. All right. Um, just a few things background wise. You are employed by the Illinois State Police?
A. That's correct.
Q. And your services can be used by any and all policing agencies within your district by a request?
A. That's correct.
Q. And it is based upon your training and qualifications?
A. The -- my position?
Q. Yes, that you would be requested as the CSI?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And your job then is to first be briefed by the case agent; is that correct?
A. That is -- once we receive a call for service, we will get in touch with a representative of the requesting agency to get a briefing of the case.
Q. An idea of what you're walking into?

A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Does that also help you in determining what supplies you need to bring with you?
A. It can.
Q. Okay. So in this case, may I ask, do you recall who first briefed you on this?
A. Um, I would have to refer back to my notes. I can tell you it's probably one of three or four of the Williamson County investigators.
Q. Okay. Before we go that far, would your briefing very have occurred here at the Williamson County Sheriff's Department?
A. That would be the in-person briefing. Initially when we're activated, we receive a phone call which has a brief synopsis of the nature of the call that we're receiving, and then I would go in route and then physically meet in person with somebody.
Q. Okay. Let's start there. So, you arrived here at the Williamson County Sheriff's Department somewhere after 4:00 p.m.; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And at that point, was a suspect in this case identified to you?
A. She was -- the defendant was entered as a suspect

in my report, yes.

Q. Okay. And your first contact with this case was in an interview room at the Sheriff's Department?

A. Correct.

Q. Um, earlier -- we call the whole building the jail but that houses the investigative unit of the Williamson County Sheriff's Department, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So, this was up on the second floor in an interview room that your first contact with Julie occurred?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Okay. At that point, you had collected a buccal swab. I always say buccal, which I know it's wrong.

A. I used to say that also.

Q. Oh, good. So, I wouldn't be entirely wrong. All right. Um, during the course of this contact, you also, I believe, collected swabs from Julie's right hand and her left hand; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And from her nails?

A. Um, RBLS from the hands and then fingernail scrapings.

Q. Okay. And also a swab of what appeared to be -- or could be a RBLS from her nails, correct?

A. Correct. Yep.

Q. Once that physical evidence is collected and bagged, taped -- or sealed and labeled, what do you do with it at that point?

A. Once -- once I collected an item of evidence and it is packaged and sealed and initial by myself, um, it's considered secure at that point. And then it remains in my custody until I turn it over to a person from the investigating agency.

Q. Okay. So, at that point, you then give the physical items back to the Sheriff's Department?

A. Correct.

Q. All right. Um, do you have any recommendation as to what items should or should not be tested forensically?

A. There will be discussions.

Q. But ultimately it's not your call. It would be the call of the investigating agency. In this case, the Sheriff's Department?

A. Correct, being that the evidence goes from my custody to the investigating agency's custody, ultimately they would decide and be responsible for

submitting evidence to the lab for analysis.

Q. Okay. It was not until after 7:00 p.m., is that correct, that you then arrived at the, um, residence?

A. Yes. I believe that's correct.

Q. Again, you took a vast number of photos?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. We have had the opportunity review those, but you also collected a lot of physical evidence during that first initial trip; is that correct?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Does that include what we marked -- or what you have in your report as Lab Item 6, a paper bag containing 78 additional sealed paper bags containing swabs from red, blood-like substances found throughout the residence marked A-1 through A-39?

A. If I can just correct a little bit just semantically -- and this is because the way we write our report so there were --

Q. -- fair enough.

A. -- seventy -- seventy-eight total. Thirty-nine individually packaged pairs of swabs. So, if you remember, every time I pulled out a swab from a bag, there's a pair per package. So, when we collect swabs, we collect them in two.

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. So, there was a total of 78 swabs within the bag individually packaged in pairs.

Q. Got it. That also would have been turned over to the Sheriff's Department?

A. Yes.

Q. Item Number 7, 30 additional -- well, okay. What was Item Number 7?

A. Item Number 7 if I can read it from my report --

Q. -- please do.

A. -- um, additional description, sealed paper bag containing 11 pairs of swabs. One pair collected from each RBLS labeled B-1 through B-11, and four pairs of swabs collected from RBLS B-12 individually packaged, collected from the residence.

Q. So at this point, we have -- if my math is correct -- 108 swabs? If we divide that in half, that would be the actual number of sites since you took two swabs from each site?

A. Correct. Whatever the correct number of individual swabs divided by two, would be the number of pairs.

Q. All right. So, at least 54 different samples of red, blood-like substance throughout the residence you

collected on that first evening you were there?

A. I believe so, yes.

Q. All of those would then have been turned over to the Sheriff's Department?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. You collected additional physical evidence; did you not?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. That included the knives that we saw before?

A. Correct. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Um, I am going to touch on that briefly. So, it was reported to you that those two kitchen knives did contain a DNA profile that matched your own?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Were you informed as to whether or not there was any other DNA located on either of those two knives?

A. I was -- I don't -- I don't recall. I know the purpose of me being contacted about the DNA result was specifically the contamination that I had left on the item.

Q. And contamination is just a fact of life in this business. We -- you do everything you can to avoid it; it does occur.

A. Yes.

Q. But in this point, they said having it close enough to your face to breathe on it could have been sufficient to leave this amount of DNA?

A. Yes, ma'am. Again, I don't know the amount of DNA that was in the analysis, but my discussion with the DNA analyst at the lab was, yes, having it close to your face and breathing can deposit small respiratory particles onto any item and then which can also contain DNA.

Q. The other items of physical evidence collected, including a sandal, a flip-flop, a blanket, a red towel worn by Julie -- or used by Julie, you did collect and bag those items as well?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And you turned them over to the Sheriff's Department?

A. Correct.

Q. Were there any other kitchen knives located in the kitchen while you were present?

A. Yes.

Q. And is there a reason why none of the other knives were collected?

A. Um, all the knives in the residence were

photographed with a scale. And then the reason -- the only two knives that I noticed that appeared to be out of place -- for instance, there was a knife block in the kitchen with knives in it with the slots missing or knives in a drawn. These two knives -- one was in the dish strainer, I believe, where you would put them after they were washed, and the other one was inside the kitchen sink with other dirty dishes.

Q. Gotcha.

A. So, it drew my attention. Um, so I focused on those as far as collection. The rest of the knives were all looked at in the house and photographed.

Q. Fair enough. During this initial scene, we did see a photograph specifically from the back bathroom where Jade was located that did appear to be a handprint on the wall. Do you recall that, Photograph Number 147?

A. I do recall that photograph.

Q. Did you take a DNA swab of that?

A. I believe so. I would have to refer to my notes to confirm --

Q. -- would you take a look --

A. -- the label of the --

Q. -- and make sure?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. I couldn't find it.

A. Um, I may have to bounce back and forth with my eyes here if that's okay. Um, so, the lab Item Exhibit 6, the swabs of RBLS-A which, um, going through the scene, all the blood stain patterns are labeled and marked. The non -- non-spatter stains are labeled A-1 through A-39, that one that you're talking about specifically being non-spatter, more of a transfer of placement stain, was labeled in the A's. And referring to my report, there were seven individually labeled RBLS stains on the south wall of the bathroom which is where that handprint would be, and swabs were collected from all of those stains.

Q. Okay.

A. So, safe to say yes. A picture with that stain and a label coordinated with the report would confirm which swab was taken from that standard.

Q. And that would have been one of the 78?

A. Yes, one of the 39 pairs from RBLS-A.

Q. All right. But, again, your job is not to decide what goes to the lab or even to deliver it to the lab. It's to deliver it to the Sheriff's Department who would make that decision?

A. In this case, all the evidence -- what I do, I am

able to bring things to the lab. In this case, everything was turned over to the Sheriff's Department.

Q. We're now going to switch over to -- I believe, we were referring to it as Lab Scene 4 when you -- Lab Scene 3 was going to the autopsy. Four is back to the house with the LCV?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Okay. I just want to make sure I didn't confuse it more than -- more than I already have. So LCV, this is an aerosol spray?

A. Uh, this is a -- it's a mixture. And as far as the science of it, I don't -- can't testify to the scientific make-up of LCV, but it is -- comes in a sealed kit, and we mix it together, form the solution and then it is -- it's not aerosol. It's not compressed. So, it's a -- a -- a spray bottle.

Q. Okay. And does it only react to the presence of human blood?

A. That would be a question for a scientist. Um, as far as my training and my experience, it reacts to blood every time, and it is what we consider presumptive -- a presumptive test. So, if there is a positive reaction with LCV, it is determined that is likely to be assumed blood until proven not. So, for our cases, it is a

presumptive test. When we get a reaction, it's assumed blood. Even if mixed with cleaning chemicals -- the -- the LCV reacts specifically with the hema in the blood. So, once it reacts with blood, it will turn that purple color even if the blood's been diluted or mixed with a cleaning agent.

Q. And is the use of LCV in any -- does a positive LCV indicate how long that sample may have been present or when it was deposited?

A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. And it can make an invisible spot glow, essentially, to tell you that at that point there is the possibility that blood is present?

A. The -- it will also reacts to latent -- latent, which is the stains you don't see, and then if you were spray it on visible blood stain, it would also turn purple.

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. And then once the reaction -- the turning purple is the reaction. So, once we get a reaction whether it's on visible blood or latent blood, that reaction because LCV is a presumptive test is, for our means, we can presume that is blood.

Q. And that's how you're --

A. -- yes.
Q. -- going to treat it for collection purpose?
A. Yes, ma'am. So, if I receive a positive, we're going to collect that as blood --
Q. -- right.
A. -- and until proven not.
Q. Okay. But, again, that test doesn't tell -- or that presence of the purple does not tell you when it was deposited or how much is there; is that correct?
A. Wherever the reaction is purple, is where there was trace amounts of blood because that was the reaction. So if it's purple, there -- it is safe to presume that there are -- there is blood wherever it's purple.
Q. Are there different shades of purple to determine how much is actually there?
A. Uh, no. And if you remember through the pictures, the purple is pretty consistent throughout every stain.
Q. Now, you said you also on occasion have been able to use this to enhance ridge patterns that would be present maybe in bare footprints. Possible also for handprints or for fingerprints?
A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And did you treat the handprint in the bathroom with the LCV?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And were you able to get any ridge marks from that?

A. I was not.

Q. Okay. Now, with the fact that most of this that you -- not most but in the other area of the house; the living room, master bedroom area, right? Um, most of the presence -- presumptive presence of blood was based upon LCV, correct? You could not see that by the naked eye?

A. There was visible blood on those floors in the master bed -- master bedroom and throughout the living room. Um, those were the smaller circular stains. Those were visible to the naked eye. The actual patterns that appeared to be footprints, were not visible until LCV was --

Q. -- right.

A. -- sprayed.

Q. So, if it is not visible to the human eye because maybe it was such a small amount or a spread of a small amount, and can that then be transferred from one position to another and still glow with the LCV?

A. Um, are -- so, are you saying if there is stain deposited, um, can that stain be lifted and moved?

Q. Sure. So, I step through, right, I am stepping --

A. -- okay.

Q. -- I step in an area that maybe has some visible red, blood-like substance and maybe some invisible substance, I keep to walk -- or I keep walking, I would then bring that with me. It would not otherwise be visible.

A. Correct. It would continue to leave until it was completely dry or removed.

Q. So, um -- thank you. Do you have any test to determine the existence of cleaning products or cleaners or anything like that?

A. Uh, no.

Q. And didn't use any -- okay.

A. In order to test the presence of other chemicals, it would have to go in the lab and be analyzed, I would imagine, specifically for those chemicals but --

Q. Nothing on-scene that you would be able to determine that?

A. No, we are just --

Q. LCV wouldn't do that?

A. We're just trained that it will react to the presence of blood even if there are cleaning agents mixed with the blood.

Q. Okay. Have you ever tried that before?

A. I have not.

Q. Let's go to the car. Um, if I have this correct, there was a small piece on the steering wheel cover that was visible as a potential blood stain; is that correct?

A. I believe there were two. But, yes, there were small -- two small RBLS areas on the steering wheel.

Q. And, again, is there any way for you to determine when they were deposited?

A. No.

Q. There was a -- we saw that picture as well -- a very small LCV reaction on the door handle; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And that was swabbed and collected?

A. Yes.

Q. And, again, given to the Sheriff's Department?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. Now, you stated that there were swabs from a stain toward the front and the stain toward the back in the vehicle?

A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Where at was that?
A. So this is on the, um -- the interior driver's door panel where, like, your arm rest would be?
Q. Mm-hmm.
A. There is a side that you usually use your leg to kick out when you're opening the door.
Q. Right.
A. So right there, there was two RBLS stains. One was more towards the front -- oriented more towards the front end of the car, and one was more oriented towards the rear of the car. So, that's just the differentiation --
Q. -- but still from the front door or --
A. -- from the interior of the driver's door, yes.
Q. Okay. All right. I am going to clump these next ones together, okay? You did have the opportunity at the very first time to take photographs of Julia as well?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And this was at the Sheriff's Department.
A. Yes.
Q. Sometime after 4:00 p.m., 4:30 p.m.?
A. Correct.

Q. And during that -- actually, did Julia assist you at some point by holding the scale device?

A. Yes.

Q. And, um, something under to help with focusing the camera?

A. Uh, I don't remember that, but I do believe that there were times I had asked her to hold the scale to be less invasive.

Q. And she was cooperative during all of that, correct?

A. Um, she -- yeah. She held the scales.

Q. And you were called back then several days later to take some additional photographs?

A. Yes.

Q. And that was at the Johnston City Police Department?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. All right. From all of the areas that you are calling footprints that were located, there were only two. One gel lift that you extracted; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And two pieces of the linoleum?

A. Three pieces of the --

Q. -- was it three?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. All right. Did you collect any other lifts or prints from this residence?

A. Yes. Um --

Q. Where are they?

A. There was a gel lift collected from an imprint near the front door.

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. And then -- that is the only other gel lift that, I believe, I collected.

Q. And, again, those would all be delivered -- all delivered to the Sheriff's Department?

A. Yes.

MS. THIEN: I may be just about done with it, believe it or not. Hold on a second. That's it. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Any redirect?

MS. MUDGE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Sir, you may step down. Thank you very much. The State may call their next witness.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, at this time, the State would ask that a stipulation, which has been marked Exhibit 27, be read to the jury.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

MS. MUDGE: May I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

Members of the jury, this is a stipulation by the parties regarding Dr. Bryan Goldsberry, DMD. The parties hereby stipulate to the following: That Dr. -- well, that Bryan Goldsberry is a dentistry practitioner in Carbondale, Illinois. That on December 5th, 2020, at the request of law enforcement, Dr. Goldsberry responded to the Williamson County Sheriff's Department and obtained dental impressions from the defendant, Julia Bevely. That on December 7th, 2020, at the request of law enforcement, Dr. Goldsberry responded to the Williamson County Morgue and obtained dental impressions from the victim, Jade M. Beasley.

That on December 8, 2020, Dr. Goldsberry issued a prescription for dental impressions to be made into dental molds. That on December 9th, 2020, dental molds from the impressions of both the defendant, Julia Bevely, and the victim, Jade M. Beasley, were created, logged into evidence properly and labeled Numbers 100, 101, 102 and 103 respectively.

MS. MUDGE: The People would call Dr. David

Wold.

THE COURT: Sir, come forward over here. Face my Clerk. Please raise your right hand to be sworn in.

DR. DAVID WOLD,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Sir, I need you to sit here. I need you to state your full name. Please spell your last name. Most importantly, I do need you to speak up loud enough that everybody can hear you.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: And you can pull that mic towards you if you need to.

THE WITNESS: My name is --

THE COURT: -- you may inquire.

THE WITNESS: My name is David A. Wold. W-O-L-D.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. MUDGE:

Q. Good afternoon?

A. Good afternoon.
Q. How are you employed?
A. I'm a general dentist.
Q. And where is that?
A. My office is in Bensenville, Illinois.
Q. How long have you been a general dentist?
A. I am starting my 40th year.
Q. Um, what is your educational background starting at college?
A. At college, I received a BA in Biologic Science at Southern Illinois University right here, and then I got a Bachelor's of Science from the University of Illinois, College of Dentistry and a Doctorate of Dental Surgery at University of Illinois, College of Dentistry.
Q. Okay. And you have been employed as a dentist the entire time?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Are you board certified as a dentist?
A. A general dentist isn't a board specialty, but I am board certified as a Forensic Dentist through the American Academy of Forensic Science.
Q. I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 36. What is that?
A. This is my CV; my curriculum vitae.

Q. Is that updated and accurate?
A. It -- uh, May 13th -- I think I have an update since then, but I believe this is -- it was accurate as of the date of May 13th.
Q. Okay. Um, the CV lists case work that you have done. Explain a little bit about that.
A. So, I do case work for coroners' offices, and that's mostly identifications, but I have done some case work through a county in child abuse cases, and I have done dental age estimation cases for counties as well.
Q. Do you belong to any professional organizations?
A. I do.
Q. And what are they?
A. The American Academy of Forensic Science I belong to. I am a fellow for that academy. I belong to the American Dental Association, the Chicago Dental Society and the Illinois State Dental Society. And I am also a Diplomat for the American Board of Forensic Dentistry.
Q. What is forensic odontology?
A. So, forensic odontology is the legal aspects of dentistry. So, collecting and preserving dental evidence, and analyzing it, and reporting on it, and coming to court.
Q. Are you board certified in Forensic Odontology?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. How do you become board certified in that?

A. It's a rigorous amount of training. You need to be qualified by doing certain tasks; case work tasks. It took me 15 years to get that much case work accumulated. And once you're board eligible, it's a series of testings and some written testing, some essay-style testing, short answer and then oral boards.

Q. And when did you become board certified in Forensic Odontology?

A. February of 2022.

Q. And how about continuing educations and certifications? Um, it looks like you received some more degrees after the education you talked about before.

A. I have a lot of certifications through dentistry and through other activities that I do for the emergency response teams for Illinois. More medical response than forensic response.

Q. Okay.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, at this time, I would tender Dr. Wold as an expert in Forensic Odontology.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: All subject to my prior record, Judge.

THE COURT: The Court will show your continuing objection. The Court will find that he qualifies as an expert in the field of Forensic Odontology.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Doctor, for this particular case, were you asked to view items of evidence in order to come to Court and testify about your observations?

A. I was.

Q. Okay. Let's go through what you were given to take a look at. What were you given?

A. Initially, it was just photographs.

Q. Photographs. And were you made aware when those photographs were taken?

A. Yes.

Q. And at some point, were you given other items to ana -- observe?

A. After I reviewed the photographs, I met with Detective Geittmann through the Williamson County Sheriff's Department in Champaign, and she transferred dental models to me.

Q. Dental models?
A. Dental models and impressions actually.
Q. Okay. And did you have -- who were these departmental models from -- of?
A. There -- there was one set of models from the defendant, Julia Bevely, and one set of models for Jade Beasley.
Q. And have you been in possession of those models since you received them until you just set them on my table?
A. Correct, I have.
Q. I'm going to show you what's been marked as -- what has been labeled as People's Exhibit 22 and 23 for identification purposes.
MS. MUDGE: May I approach the witness, your Honor.
THE COURT: Of course, continuing.
By Ms. Mudge:
Q. Could you open that and tell me if that's what -- the molds that you took a look at in this case?
A. Yes. These are them.
Q. And when you make an observation as to the molds, do you just observe those molds or do you do something else?

A. Uh, I -- so these are the master casts I'm giving, and if I do any kind of analysis or work with these, I duplicate -- first thing I do is duplicate these, and I have got a process that I duplicate that's a methodology that's recommended by the ABFO, the regulating body for our certification. And then I put the master casts back their box and leave them untouched.

Q. To preserve the originals?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. And those are the original master casts?

A. These are the originals, yes.

Q. Okay. When you were given photos, um, were you given both IR and non-IR photos to look at?

A. Yes. I was -- I don't know the total exactly, but I think it was about 107 photos.

Q. Okay. I'm going to show you what's previously been marked as People's Exhibit 379 through People's Exhibit 389. Can you please take a look at these photos, and let me know when you're finished with the photos?

A. Okay.

Q. And were you made aware that the crime scene investigator took these photos?

A. Uh, I just knew some -- they came in two series. One's from 12-5 and one's from -- 12-5-2020 and a series from 12-8-2020. And I wasn't sure if they were from the Sheriff's Department on 12-5 and the Illinois State Police on 12-8. I wasn't sure who took what.

Q. But in your analysis of this case, did you use -- did those photos aid you in making observations about this case?

A. I'm sorry?

Q. Did those photos aid you?

A. Aid me?

Q. Aid you?

A. Yes. Yes. I thought you said age me.

Q. Probably that, too.

MS. MUDGE: Um, you're Honor, the People would request permission to publish Exhibits 379 through 389?

THE COURT: Are you going to offer them?

MS. MUDGE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Thien, any objection?

MS. THIEN: Just subject to my prior.

THE COURT: Very well.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Before we discuss the photos, doctor, were you

made aware, um -- these photos are of the defendant, Julia Bevely, in this case. Were you made aware that she made a statement that she had bit herself on the arm?

A. I heard that originally, and, uh, it was confirmed later on.

Q. And you, in fact, viewed the portion of the video where she said, "I bit"?

A. I saw a written excerpt from that. I didn't see the video itself.

Q. Okay. So, knowing that the defendant had made a statement that she bit herself on the arm -- let's go to Exhibit 379. What do you see in this photo originally that you observed?

A. So, on this photo, I -- it would be considered an orientation photo, and she has both forearms extended. And on her right forearm, I can see a partial injury on her right forearm, and I see a little circular -- partial circular injury on the right forearm, and I see a linear injury on her left forearm.

Q. Okay. And Exhibit 380, what do you see here?

A. So, I see a pattern injury on her right forearm that, um, through further analysis it was confirmed it was a human bite mark.

Q. And Exhibit 381 --

MS. THIEN: -- I have to object to that, your Honor.

THE COURT: That will be sustained.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Exhibit 381, just what is your observation of the first picture on the physical exhibit?

A. So, right there, uh, she has her arm down by her side, and I can see, um, the -- a pattern injury on her right forearm.

Q. And what about the second picture on that exhibit?

A. So, that is the same picture. It is cropped and enlarged slightly, and it also is enhanced to black and white.

Q. And did you enhance that?

A. I did.

Q. How do you go about enhancing that?

A. So, I use Adobe Photo Shop to do all my photographic enhancements.

Q. Okay. And the third photo on this?

A. Third photo was still the same injury that was -- that is from the Photo Shop right there, and it's just enlarged to show the area that we're looking at.

Q. And you said that you observed the orientation of the injury. Doctor, based on your observations, would it be reasonable that that injury that you observed is self-inflicted?

A. Based on the position of the arm and the angulation of the arches, it is not reasonable to me that that would be a claim of self-infliction.

Q. Can you tell from looking at that photo where the upper dentition is and where the lower dentition is?

A. I can.

Q. And where would it -- where is the upper dentition?

A. So, the upper dentition is, if you're looking straight at this, it's further to the left and higher up on the arm. Those are larger teeth as opposed to the lower dentition that's represented inferior to that closer to her body.

Q. And Exhibit 382, what do you observe there?

A. That is a bite mark as well; same bite mark.

Q. Okay. Based on these photos, did you make any observations about the force of the injury at this angle, once again, assuming that it is a bite mark?

A. Assuming this is a bite mark, uh, it was a forceful bite in the matter of fact that, uh, it's not

just the biting edges that contacted the teeth. And it's easy to see when it's enhanced as well, but I can see it on here. The inside part of the upper teeth, the lingual surfaces, they also marked with the compression of the tissue. So, it was a forceful bite, and on the lower arch, which is down in the lower part of the picture to the right side, I can see some abrasions where biting edges actually cut into the tissue.

Q. And Exhibit 383, do you see the same thing?

A. I do.

Q. And Exhibit 384?

A. I do; same thing.

Q. Where is the upper dentition in the second picture?

A. So, the upper dentition is next to the scale.

Q. Okay. Thank you. And I'm going to show you Exhibit 385. Is that an enhanced photo of this injury as well?

A. It is. It is cropped, rotated and enhanced, uh, yes.

Q. By you in Photo Shop?

A. By me in Photo Shop.

Q. Okay. Doctor, based on your observation of this photo, and all of the photos in this presentation,

assuming this is a bite mark, do you see anywhere on the enhanced image anywhere on the injury where there wasn't a tooth that impacted the skin?

A. I do.

Q. And where would that be?

A. So, that area would be -- looking straight at this image, it would be high up to the -- to the right and the top of the photo.

Q. I'm going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 386. Um, what does that picture show you?

A. Those are the upper and lower casts of the defendant, Julia Bevely.

Q. I am going to show you Exhibit 387. What does that show you?

A. These are the upper and lower casts of Jade Beasley.

Q. Do you notice any irregularities on Jade Beasley's casts?

A. I see a missing tooth on the upper right canine side. Upper right on this photo would be -- if you're looking straight at it, it would be to the left. That's her upper, right canine. And on the opposite side, I see a canine just partially erupting through the tissue.

That would be on the right side looking straight at this photo.

Q. And Exhibit 388, what do we see here?

A. So, this is a side view of her upper and lower dentition, and it is the right side, and you can easily see a missing tooth in the number six canine area.

Q. And when you say "her", this is Jade Beasley?

A. This is Jade Beasley's casts.

Q. Thank you. And lastly, Exhibit 389, does that photo show you anything different from the prior photos?

A. Um, no. I see the same thing on this photo as well.

Q. Thank you, doctor.

MS. MUDGE: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Cross-examination?

MS. THIEN: Very briefly, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Good afternoon, doctor?

A. Good afternoon.

Q. Um, we saw a couple of photographs here of the plaster models that you made. Are those from the originals, or are these from the ones that you created

from the originals?

A. Uh, the photographs are the duplicate models.

Q. Okay. And when someone is making a mold -- bare with me only because I've unfortunately, as most of us have, had to do it personally. Um, it starts with some type of plastic. We call it something --

A. -- impressions.

Q. -- bite into, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. And it's designed to get all of your teeth at an equal pressure?

A. Correct.

Q. And then after -- they take that out. That goes to a specialist who then makes the plaster or raw casts?

A. Correct.

Q. And these casts for them to be effective, not just here but in dentistry, it does require an equal pressure and good contact in order to make a good mold?

A. It's the -- people don't bite into them. As dentists, we place them over the arches and we hold them until they're set.

Q. It feels like we bite, but, yes --

A. -- yeah.

Q. -- and I respect that and I appreciate that,

Doctor. Um, human skin is not the same; is that correct?

A. It's not the same as teeth.

Q. Is not the same as the -- as the medium that you use to make the mold from, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. Um, human skin can be based -- can be different based upon a person's age, yes?

A. Yes.

Q. Athleticism; whether, you know, we're hard or soft?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. And by position, as well, right? Um, is that a fair statement?

A. Position of biting?

Q. Yes.

A. Correct.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, doctor. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Any redirect?

MS. MUDGE: No redirect, but I would move to admit Exhibits 22 and 23.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: Only subject to my prior

objections, Judge.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Those will be admitted. Sir, you may step down.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MS. MUDGE: May we approach together?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. THIEN: Oh. Are we going back up?

(SIDE BAR HELD OUTSIDE THE HEARING OF THE JURY.)

MS. MUDGE: Our next witness is the statement of the defendant. Um, it could maybe take --

THE COURT: -- let's talk about that.

MS. MUDGE: Okay.

THE COURT: I don't have a problem doing it. What about you? It's going to be over an hour and a half.

MS. MUDGE: It's an hour and 57 minutes long.

THE COURT: It's two hours. I can inquire of the jury if you want me to. They had to sit a long time waiting for their lunch.

MS. THIEN: Well, they did.

THE COURT: But at the same time, I am mindful of everybody's schedule in terms of witnesses

coming in.

MS. THIEN: Well, and I have someone driving in from Chicago this afternoon that I was hoping to find some time to get in here with the equipment. We may or may not be able to do that with everything.

THE COURT: Well, if we take a break, are you going to have that opportunity?

MS. THIEN: We can figure that one out. How it would impact --

MS. MUDGE: -- I need a five minute break anyway because I have to call Eggemeyer. I just realized I sent him home. Not home, but across the street so he's got to get here. So if we could take a five minute break, we can start the statement then.

THE COURT: Let me ask the jury about this, okay? Are you guys agreeable to that?

MS. MUDGE: Sure.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Yeah. Yeah.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE HEARING OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'm told that the next piece of evidence will take two hours. I am very mindful of the time that you had

to sit and wait for your lunch and how boring that must have been with nothing to do. I am willing to push on if every one of you are willing to do that. Both parties are willing to do that, but they are also respectful of your time as well. If you have obligations and things that you feel like that may distract your attention away from the next set of evidence, I would like to know about it. So, do you guys want to push forward or you want to quit now? I'm seeing a lot of heads shake yes. Anybody shaking a head no? I don't see any. I do need to just take a five minute break so that people can call to have children taken care of. So, if you don't mind, we will take the jury out for just a moment.

THE CLERK: Please rise for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Court's adjourned.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

THE COURT: You guys good to go?

MS. MUDGE: Yes.

MS. THIEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Stand for the jury,

please. Back on record.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Be seated, please. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, a video will be introduced into evidence. This video has been edited at the request of the Court and by the agreement of the parties. You should consider the evidence contained in the video as it is played and not concern yourself with what may be contained in any edited portion. Ms. Mudge.

MS. MUDGE: Yes, your Honor. First, I would move to admit People's Exhibit 36 which is Dr. Wold's CV.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THINE: No objection.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

MS. MUDGE: And the People would call Carl Eggemeyer.

THE COURT: Please face the Clerk to be sworn in, sir.

CARL EGGEMEYER,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Thank you. Please have a seat here, sir. Please state your full name, spell your last name and please speak loudly enough so everybody can hear you.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. My name is Carl Eggemeyer. E-G-G-E-M-E-Y-E-R.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. MUDGE:

Q. Where are you employed?

A. With the Williamson County Sheriff's Office.

Q. How long have you been with the Williamson County Sheriff's Office?

A. Two months.

Q. How long have you been a police officer?

A. Seventeen and a half years.

Q. What is your current position with the Sheriff's Department?

A. I am the investigation's commander, a member of the Illinois Child Death Task Force, a member of the Williamson County major case squad, and the lead evidence custodian.

Q. Were you a police officer on December 5th of

2020?

A. Yes.

Q. And where were you a police officer?

A. Marion Police Department.

Q. What was your position there at that time?

A. Detective, member of the Illinois Trial Death Task Force, a member of the Williamson County Major Case Squad and assistant evidence custodian.

Q. Were you called to assist in the case we're here for today?

A. Yes.

Q. Among other things, were you assigned to interview the defendant in this case?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. What date did you interview her on?

A. December 5th, 2020.

Q. What did you do before you interviewed the defendant?

A. Gathered information from on-scene officers.

Q. And was she transported straight from the home on Songbird Road to this interview?

A. Yes.

Q. And where did this interview take place?

A. At the Williamson County Sheriff's Office.

Q. Was the entirety of your conversation with the defendant audio and video recorded?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Were there times when you would leave the interview room and come back and leave the defendant in there alone?

A. Yes.

Q. And approximately how long did your entire interview with her last?

A. With breaks, it was approximately three hours.

Q. Okay. And you are aware that this video has been edited for purposes of trial, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And have you viewed the edited version of this video in its entirety?

A. Yes.

Q. I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 24. Is that what you viewed for trial purposes that has been edited?

A. Yes.

Q. And what is on that disc, the edited interview of the defendant, does it fairly and accurately depict the substance of your conversations with the defendant on December 5th of 2020?

A. Yes.

MS. MUDGE: Um, your Honor, the People would move to have admit and publish Exhibit 26.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: Only subject to my prior objection, Judge, no.

THE COURT: Yes. It will be admitted and you may publish.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. What is the exhibit number on there?

A. Twenty-four.

Q. Twenty-four. I apologize.

(PEOPLE's EXHIBIT NUMBER 24 WAS PLAYED FOR THE JURY AT THIS TIME.)

THE COURT: At this time, we are going to stop for the evening. Now like I told you before, and I will repeat it over and over because it is extremely important. Until this case is submitted to you for your deliberation, you must not discuss this case with anyone; not your family, not your friends, not media. No one. You're not to remain in hearing of anyone discussing this case. You are not to watch any television news articles, read any newspaper or other article on the internet or any source. Not to listen to

radio broadcasts of anything concerning this case. After this case has been submitted to you, you must discuss the case only in the jury room when all the members are present. You are to keep an open mind and you must not decide any issue in this case until it is submitted to you for your deliberation under the instructions of the Court. Remember, if anybody approaches you to try to discuss any portion of this case, you walk away. You notify security or the bailiffs immediately. Have a good evening. I will see you tomorrow morning at 8:30. Rise for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: The Court is adjourned.

(Court was adjourned for the day.)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

WILLIAMSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
Vs	)	
	)	No. 20-CF-596
	)	
JULIA E. BEVELY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Amy L. Holloman, one of the Official Court Reporters in and for the First Judicial Circuit of the State of Illinois, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, complete, and correct transcript of all the proceedings had in the above-styled cause.

Amy L. Holloman

Amy L. Holloman, CSR
Official Court Reporter

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

WILLIAMSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 20-CF-596
	)	
JULIA E. BEVELY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

JURY TRIAL

Report of proceedings of the hearing before the Honorable Stephan Green on February 10th, 2023.

APPEARANCES:

JENNIFER MUDGE and PHILLIP BUTLER
Special Prosecutors
Springfield, Illinois
For the People

TERRY THIEN
Public Defender
Williamson County, Illinois
For the Defendant

Amy L. Holloman, CSR
Official Court Reporter
Williamson County Courthouse
Marion, IL 62959

INDEX

Witness	Cindy Geittmann
Direct Exam by Ms. Mudge	4
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	14
	Melissa Gamboe
Direct Exam by Mr. Butler	26
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	39
	Keia Tate
Direct Exam by Mr. Butler	48
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	65
	Brian Hapak
Direct Exam by Mr. Butler	81
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	106
Rebuttal by Mr. Butler	179
	Karl Reich
Direct Exam by Ms. Thien	122
Cross-exam by Mr. Butler	159
Redirect Exam by Ms. Thien	172
	Marissa Feeney
Direct Exam by Mr. Butler	184
Cross-exam by Ms. Thien	203

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: The Court goes on the record. The defendant is in open Court with her attorney. The State is present as well. We are still in the State's case in-chief. Please bring the jury in, and please rise for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Ms. Mudge, your case.

MS. MUDGE: The People would call Cindy Geittmann.

THE COURT: Ma'am, please face the Clerk. Raise your right hand to be sworn.

CYNTHIA GEITTMANN,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Thank you. Please have a seat over here. I need you to state your full name, spell your last name for the record and please speak up loudly so everybody can hear you.

THE WITNESS: Detective Cindy Geittmann --

Cynthia Geittmann. Spelled G-E-I-T-T-M-A-N-N.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you, your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. MUDGE:

Q. Good morning. This jury has heard from you before, um, but could you please remind them where you're employed?

A. I am employed at the Williamson County Sheriff's Office.

Q. And how long have you been a police officer?

A. Over 22 years.

Q. And what is your position there?

A. Currently a detective.

Q. And I believe you testified before that you were the case agent in this case?

A. That is correct. Lead case officer for this.

Q. Okay. Just explain, if you can, what a case agent does? What's your role in an investigation like this?

A. In an investigation like this, the lead case officer is the one that basically takes control and directs other officers, agents in areas of concern or investigation. So, we lead officers into -- we give

officers ideas on where to go or -- and what we're looking for to obtain information.

Q. And after they obtain information or don't obtain information, do they report that back to you?

A. Yes, they do.

Q. Okay. Explain how you have a case -- a major case like this set up logistically at your department?

A. At our department, we are incorporated as a major case squad -- a part of the major case squad which includes all of the major -- well, all of the police agencies within Williamson County. And all of those agencies have or use a detective in some sort of form; either a chief or detective. And all of those individuals are part of the major case squad, and we also incorporate the use of Illinois State Police investigations with the major case squads when we activate those squads.

Q. And when they are working on this case and they are out in the field and they come back to work, they work at your department?

A. They do.

Q. Okay. How many agencies did you have in this particular case that were assisting you?

A. In this case, we had maybe a handful -- over --

over six agencies.

Q. Approximately how many officers did you have working on this case?

A. Three to four dozen.

Q. And for how many days was the major case activated?

A. The major case squad was activated at least a week, week two and a half in reference to this case.

Q. In this case, did you assign certain officers to check surveillance cameras in certain areas?

A. Yes, we did.

Q. Um, specifically what areas did you focus on?

A. The areas that we focused on initially was the area of Songbird Road to the Carbondale Walmart which is approximately just over 19 miles.

Q. And what did you assign officers to do with regard to checking for surveillance between Songbird Road and Walmart?

A. We were looking for home -- residential security video of the roadways that were along those routes, as well as, business security videos of Route 13 which encompasses a large amount of business areas.

Q. And why did you do that?

A. To look for the route that Julia said that she

had taken.

Q. And did officers, in fact, obtain surveillance footage -- some -- from that 19 mile stretch?

A. There was several security systems and video obtained in reference to that route.

Q. When they download that information or get that information, let's say, how do they go about viewing it? Do they come back to the department?

A. If they don't review it at the business home, they will bring it back to our department and review it in our training room, which is a large facility with access for computers to be plugged in and view security videos.

Q. And in this case you, in fact, responded to the scene?

A. I did.

Q. It was a Saturday. Were you on duty?

A. I was on-call which is on-duty, yes.

Q. And when you arrived on-scene, it was after most of the first responders?

A. That is correct.

Q. Was the ambulance and Jade still there or had they been gone?

A. The ambulance was parked in the driveway, and

Jade was still inside the house when I arrived.

Q. Did you come across the defendant when you came on-scene?

A. I did.

Q. Okay. Where was she?

A. When I arrived on-scene, she was seated on the front porch just rocking back and forth crying.

Q. Was someone with her?

A. There was. Officer Sloan from Marion Police Department was with her at that time.

Q. How was she sitting on the front porch?

A. She was seated. Her -- her bottom was flat on the porch, and her feet were sticking upright. As I was walking up the steps, she was covered in a blanket, and she was just rocking -- her torso was rocking back and forth.

Q. And did you speak with her?

A. I did.

Q. Um, what did you notice about her that got your attention that perhaps she was a suspect?

A. Initially when I first walked up, I saw the bottoms of her feet, and I had -- I was contacted by Officer Kelley to respond to the scene. He said it was -- if I can, may I go back?

Q. Yes.

A. He said it was an unresponsive female with possible stab wounds at the residence. So -- and when I approached the scene, I noticed the front door was open but Julia was sit -- seated on the porch -- on the floor of the porch, and I could see the bottoms of her feet, and they were completely clean. There were no markings at all on the bottoms of her feet. And I thought, well, if she was inside the scene -- I could see inside the door, and I saw blood inside the door. And I figured if she had gone in that front door, she had to step in some blood. Her foot would have some kind of blood --

MS. THIEN: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Sustained.

By Ms. Mudge:

Q. Okay. So, you noticed her feet were clean, and you spoke with her. Did you have an opportunity at the time to observe the wounds on her hand and arm?

A. I did.

Q. Did you ask her to see them?

A. I did.

Q. Did she show them to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Were they visible when you approached her?
A. They were not.
Q. Why?
A. Because she had a blanket wrapped around her. She had a red towel in her hand. She was grasping onto the red towel.
Q. So, you asked to see her wounds?
A. I did.
Q. And did you see those wounds?
A. I did.
Q. And to the wounds on her hand, what did you notice about them?
A. I noticed there were lacerations on the sides of her hands, and when she opened up her hands to show me her palms, at that time I noticed bite marks on the inside of her right forearm.
Q. And that mark that you saw on her right forearm, um, did it appear fresh?
A. It did.
Q. And did you notice scratches on her face as well?
A. I did.
Q. And did they appear fresh?
A. They were.
Q. At some point, did you also meet with Gregory

Michael Beasley, the defendant's live-in boyfriend and Jade's father?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And what was your purpose for meeting with him?

A. We spoke with him upon his arrival at the scene after Jade was pronounced dead by the coroner and notified him, along with Jade's mother, Jessica Bradley, that Jade had died as a result of the injuries.

Q. The jury saw the defendant's statement with the police yesterday. Were you the other person in the room interviewing her?

A. Yes, I was.

Q. Okay. After her interview, was she released from custody?

A. Yes, she was.

Q. And when did you arrest her for this?

A. She was arrested on December 9th.

Q. That was four days later?

A. That is correct.

Q. Did you later speak with Jade's father Mike to obtain his DNA?

A. I did.

Q. And did he allow you to sample his DNA?

A. He did.

Q. And what is the purpose of getting his DNA?
A. While Julia was incarcerated, she gave birth to a child, and I wanted to obtain his DNA to either say that he was or was not the paternal parent -- fraternal parent of the child that she gave birth to.
Q. And you were intending to submit this to the lab?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you submit it to the lab?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you get his DNA; what means did you use?
A. By buc -- buccal swabs.
Q. Okay. Buccal swabs?
A. Yeah. Yeah. Cheek swabs.
MS. MUDGE: May I approach?
THE COURT: You may.
MS. MUDGE: Thank you.
By Ms. Mudge:
Q. I am going to show you what's marked People's Exhibit 19. Would you take a look at that, and what does the marking on the outside say?
A. It says biological standard collection kit, and the standard collected from Gregory Michael Beasley.
Q. I left you gloves up there. If you don't mind putting the gloves on, and do you have something to open

it with?

A. Yeah.

Q. Before you open it, how is it sealed?

A. It's sealed with evidence tape. This is evidence tape that I placed on the container once the buccal swabs were obtained, and then the yellow evidence tape was, once it was sent to the lab, they reseal it with a yellow tape.

Q. Okay. Go ahead.

A. (Witness complies.) There is -- this is where the standard kit is inside of this container.

Q. Okay.

A. It also has Gregory Michael Beasley's name on it and the date of collection, August 27th of '21, also sealed. My seal and then the lab seal.

Q. Okay. Can you open that, please?

A. (Witness complies.) And this is the container the buccal swabs are placed in. Do you want me to pull them out?

Q. Did you put it in that container?

A. Yeah.

Q. Is that container in substantially or similar condition as when you submitted it to the lab?

A. Yes.

MS. MUDGE: Your Honor, I would move to admit People's Number 19.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

MS. MUDGE: Thank you. I have no further questions?

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Good morning. Detective Geittmann, how long have you been with the Sheriff's Department?

A. I have been with the Sheriff's Department over 11 years.

Q. Okay. And as a detective?

A. As a detective, approximately five.

Q. And prior to this case, have you ever been a lead agent in a homicide investigation before?

A. No, I have not.

Q. This is the first one?

A. That is correct.

Q. Okay. Um, when you first appeared on-scene, Julie was already outside of the house; is that correct?

A. That is correct.
Q. And she was wrapped in a blanket?
A. She had a blanket wrapped around her torso.
Q. Okay. Like a -- it was December 5th?
A. Yes.
Q. Winter?
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. Not incredibly cold, correct? Would you recall it being maybe in the 40's -- high 40's?
A. I think it was 40's/50's that day.
Q. But she was not wearing a coat?
A. No.
Q. She was not wearing shoes?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Um, do you know where that blanket came from?
A. Inside the house I would assume.
Q. Okay. Would you characterize it as possibly like a fleece throw that someone would have on the couch?
A. Yes.
Q. And in her hand was a red towel, like, a small hand towel or like a large bath towel?
A. Like a kitchen towel; a medium sized kitchen towel.

Q. And did you collect both of those items ultimately as evidence or have them collected?

A. I believe they were collected, yes.

Q. From your first contact with Julie -- and you had conversation with her on the porch -- is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. And she showed you her hands and her arms?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. You noticed what appeared to be a patterned injury?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you notice any other evidence of self-harm?

A. I did at that time.

Q. Would you describe that?

A. On her left arm, I noticed a cut mark across the wrist area.

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. And it was a raised scar in that area, and there was a tattoo also in that area -- actually two tattoos; a design and a name.

Q. Okay. Um, did Julie voluntarily go with you or with an officer to the Sheriff's Department to be interviewed?

A. Yes, she did.

Q. Was she escorted up to an interview room in the department?

A. She was. She was escorted up into our evidence -- sorry -- our interview Room Number 3.

Q. Okay. This is not part of the jail facility, correct? She was not under arrest at that point?

A. No, she was not. This is just an interview room completely on top of the jail. The jail is in the basement part of the facility, and our offices are on the top floor of our facility.

Q. All of us who work here refer to the building as the jail?

A. Yeah.

Q. But it houses all of the Williamson County Sheriff's Department, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. Offices, investigative offices, training rooms, interview rooms, evidence rooms, administrative rooms, secretarial, everything?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. Um, but you did, as a matter of course because she was there, advised her of her Miranda rights?

A. I did.

Q. And you and Detective Eggemeyer conducted an interview?

A. Yes, we did.

Q. We had the opportunity to view an edited portion of that, um, interview yesterday, but it took out most of the breaks. Not all; but most.

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Do you recall -- or can you tell me what time you -- or Julie entered that interview room?

A. I believe -- I think it was after 2:00.

Q. Okay. And from that time, she would have been either at the scene or with law enforcement; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. And do you recall -- or I will refresh there. Was it somewhere in the neighborhood of maybe 4:30 or after when CSI Deschamps came in to take photographs and swabs?

A. I know he came in after we had started our interview with Julia, and I don't know what exact time he came in, but it was after we had started our interview. Basically in the middle of our interview.

Q. She was in that room for well over three hours; isn't that a fair statement?

A. I would say so.
Q. Okay. It was a long afternoon?
A. It was.
Q. And afterwards, um, Julie was allowed to go home?
A. She was.
Q. There was also another time -- I believe, that would have been on the 8th of December -- that Julie was asked to give further photographs; is that correct? That would have occurred at Johnston City.
A. Yes. Oh, are you talking of the --
Q. -- of the --
A. -- the marks.
Q. -- of the arms and the hands and all of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, a couple of days later --
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. -- she is requested to go to Johnston City, and she complies with that as well?
A. She did.
Q. Okay. Now, detective, as the lead case officer in this case, it is your duty to not just make assignments or pass out leads, as it's called, for other officers to go and collect information and to answer questions, but it is also your responsibility to collect

all of the evidence; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. Every piece of physical evidence would have at least come into your jurisdiction. You were the one that decides what goes to the lab for testing, correct?

A. Incorrect.

Q. Who does make that decision?

A. At that time at the beginning of the trial, we were using the Williamson County State's Attorney's Office, and Assistant State's Attorney Lisa Irvin was the one that directed me on what evidence to send to the State Police lab for testing.

Q. Do you have any independent discretion in your own investigation to determine what items should or should not be tested or what items you would suggest be tested?

A. I suggested items, and by my training, it was -- I was supposed to use her as the final decision on what items were taken to the State lab.

Q. In the interview, Julie gave swabs of her hands, correct?

A. Mmm, I believe so.

Q. And swabs of her nails?

A. Correct.

Q. And scrapings of her nails, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And those items were never sent to the lab for testing; is that also correct?
A. They were sent to the lab for testing at a later date.
Q. Do you recall when that was?
A. That was not too long ago actually.
Q. Detective, is it possible that you are confusing that with --
A. -- oh. I'm sorry.
Q. -- the nail specimen taken from Jade?
A. Yes. I am sorry.
Q. Okay. So, as we sit here today, were any of the swabs of Julie's hands or nails that were collected on that day, that December 5th, forwarded to the lab for testing?
A. They were. Julia's swabs were -- swabs and scrapings were sent off shortly thereafter the incident.
Q. Were they ever tested?
A. They were. They were tested. May I recall -- may I refresh my memory?
Q. Well, um, do you believe you may be mistaken on this?

A. You've got me a little confused right now.
Q. I'm sorry. I do not intend to do that. Do you have something that could refresh your recollection with you?
A. Yes. May I look at that?
Q. If you would, and tell me when your recollection has been refreshed.
THE COURT: Ms. Thien, just a moment.
(SIDE BAR HELD OUTSIDE THE HEARING OF THE JURY.)
(END SIDE BAR.)
THE COURT: I apologize. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: This may take a moment. We had numerous lab reports sent. Okay. I am refreshed.
By Ms. Thien:
Q. Sorry. Did you find any indication that specifically the swabs that were taken from Julie's hands and fingernails were ever submitted to the lab for testing?
A. They were submitted, but the fingernail scrapings were not examined.
Q. Were the swabs from her hands ever examined?
A. May I refresh?
Q. Do you have any report back from any -- or from

the Illinois State Lab stating that they had completed an examination whether for biology or for DNA of Julie's hands? Not her arm; her hands.

A. I don't recall of Julie's hands, no.

Q. The blanket that she was wrapped in, was that ever submitted for any type of testing?

A. I do not believe so.

Q. The dish towel or the towel in her hand?

A. I do not believe so.

Q. While Julie was at the Sheriff's Department voluntarily speaking with you, you asked if she was wearing the same clothes as she was wearing when she -- when she was at the house; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. And that would be outerwear, a T-shirt and leggings?

A. Correct.

Q. Did you ask to -- if she would consent to you collecting her clothing?

A. I did.

Q. There was at one point what appeared to be a red, blood-like stain on her pants. Were her clothes ever submitted for any type of testing?

A. I do not believe so.

Q. When you first, um -- strike that. Before leaving home to the Sheriff's Department, did you instruct anyone to go inside and get her a sweatshirt or something to wear?

A. I did. She was -- she appeared cold. I asked her if she would like a piece of clothing, a sweatshirt and some shoes, and she said yes, so I had deputy Dusty Kelley go inside -- just right inside the front door and obtain a hooded sweatshirt and a pair of shoes.

Q. Okay. Now, you were the -- actually you were the person that collected the buccal swab from Mike Beasley; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. He and the minor Jayden were the only two males living in the residence at the time this occurred, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. Yet, you did not collect Mike's DNA until August 27th of '21?

A. That is correct.

Q. So for all of the testing, all of the -- specifically for biology and DNA, Mike's standard was never submitted for comparison at that time or at least until August 27th of 2021?

A. That is correct.

Q. As the case agent, as the lead officer, you testified that you sent a number of other officers out to collect surveillance cameras if available; is that -- is that accurate?

A. Surveillance video, yes.

Q. Oh, yeah. I guess you wouldn't actually go grab the cameras off the building. It wouldn't do anybody no good. Um, do you recall was that primarily the State Police, or did it involve other agents or officers involved?

A. It involved not only the State Police but local -- some of our local agents -- or detectives from around the Williamson County area. Detectives from Herrin, detectives from Energy, um, Johnston City. A lot of officers went out because there was a large area to cover.

Q. And that would have been after the interview with Julie?

A. That was, yes.

Q. And at that point, the purpose was to document Julie's course of travel?

A. That is correct.

MS. THIEN: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Any redirect?
MS. MUDGE: No, thank you.
THE COURT: Ma'am, you may step down. You may call your next witness.
MR. BUTLER: The People would call Melissa Gamboe.
THE COURT: Ma'am, please come forward. Face my Clerk and raise your right hand to be sworn.

MELISSA GAMBOE,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please have a seat over here. State your full name. Please spell your last name for the record, and I do need you to speak up loud enough so everybody can hear you.
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. Hello. My name is Melissa Gamboe. G-A-M-B-O-E.
THE COURT: You may inquire.
MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Ms. Gamboe, could you please tell us where you're employed?

A. I work for the Illinois State Police at the Metro East lab in Belleville.

Q. In what capacity?

A. I'm a fingerprint examiner.

Q. And is that a specific field?

A. Yes. There are different disciplines within the lab, but I am specialized specifically in friction ridge skin.

Q. Okay. And you said fingerprints, are there other friction ridge skin prints that you could be examining?

A. Yes. That includes footprints; the skin on the bottoms of the feet.

Q. So instead of saying fingerprints, is it sometimes called latent prints?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Um, and how long have you been employed in the field of latent prints?

A. I have been with the State -- it will be 28 years in April.

Q. I have here --

MR. BUTLER: May I have permission to approach the witness?

THE COURT: Yes.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. I am handing you what I marked as People's Exhibit 35. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And how are you able to recognize that?

A. That's my curriculum vitae.

Q. And what is a curriculum vitae?

A. Basically it states my education and experience.

Q. Kind of like a resume?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. Um, so you mentioned education and experience. Do you have formal education?

A. I was a student at Carbondale Southern Illinois University and graduated with a Bachelor of Science Degree. And then I was hired by the State of Illinois, and they provide a training program very specialized and specific to the study of friction ridge skin and comparison and supervise case work.

Q. Okay. So, that specialized training, is that something that is ongoing or was it one training?

A. It's a two-year program specific to making an examiner proficient to do the job, and then once we've been trained to competency and we have been certified with the State to do the job, then we do ongoing proficiency testing and training according to our needs.

Q. Okay. And what are your official duties?

A. I receive evidence from local agencies and process that evidence to visualize fingerprints or footprints -- latent prints, and once I visualize them and recorded them through either lifting or photography, then I will do a comparison and either eliminate or identify. And then once I have done that, then I will write a report and can testify as needed.

Q. And have you previously testified as an expert in the field of latent prints in Illinois?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. Any other courts?

A. Federal Court but also in Illinois.

Q. Okay.

MR. BUTLER: Um, your Honor, at this time, I move for the witness to be qualified as an expert in the field of latent prints.

MS. THIEN: Accepted, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. The witness will be qualified as an expert in the field of latent prints.

MR. BUTLER: And now I would move for the admission of People's Exhibit 35.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

MR. BUTLER: I am retrieving that curriculum vitae and giving that to the Clerk.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. What is a latent print?

A. A latent print is a recording of the friction ridge skin either on the palms of your hands, fingers, soles of your feet or toes. That skin is very specialized. It does not have oil glands. It only has sweat pores, and the sweat pores develop early on in fetal development, and then skin grows over that in ridge formations. And those ridge formations form, like, growth patterns like arches, loops or whirls which you've probably seen and heard about before. And then within those growth patterns, there are smaller patterns, such as, a bifurcation where one ridge flows and it splits, or you get one ridge flowing in the middle of two other ridges and it just stops, and we call it a ridge ending. Sometimes you get just one pore that's really big, and it looks just like a dot between ridges. So those features are never in a repeating arrangement within the friction ridge skin. So that's what we could use as a means of identification when we look at friction ridge skin.

Q. Would that be individualized -- individualizing characteristics?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Um, what is an ink print?

A. An ink print -- well, sometimes it's digital now, so we don't always call them ink prints anymore. But a known standard is one that's intentionally recorded from a specific individual. Um, often times it's for job applications or sometimes when somebody's arrested; whatever the reason may be. A person comes in and they are specifically recorded for comparison purpose.

Q. And some of those prints, are they using the substance other than ink?

A. Um, sometimes it's a digital recording. So, it's just like a digital camera that records a roll. Sometimes it's ink, but those are the two most common forms.

Q. Okay. And how do you do the comparisons?

A. So, when I do a comparison, I will -- once I have visualized a latent print and recorded it, or it was submitted to me as an already recorded image, I will look at that unknown print, and I will put it next to a known print. Now, I used to use magnifiers in the old days, but now we've got computers. So I will scan it

into the computer, and I can put both images up on the screen. So, I can look at them side-by-side, and there will be an unknown and a known, and the individualizing characteristics like the ridge endings or the bifurcations or the dots, all those things along with the shapes of the ridges, the flow of the ridges, I will look at all those things in the unknown. Look to see where they are, and how many ridges are there, like, a ridge count from one event to the next, what is the shape. And then I look at the known standard and see can I find that same area. Can I find that same arrangement in the same pattern, the same formation. And, so, I will look back and forth, and, um, I don't really have a standard point count, but I will look to see that there is everything that's available in the unknown, is it available in the known. Can I see all those same points in the same arrangements, same spacial features. Um, and so if I can, if there is enough sufficient quality information in the unknown that matches up to the known, then I can conclude that they were made from the same source.

Q. Thank you. Um, now, were you presented with items of evidence to compare in the case you're here testifying for today?

A. Yes.
Q. And did you do that comparison?
A. I did.
Q. After you completed your comparison, did you generate a report?
A. Yes.
Q. I am showing you what I marked as People's Exhibit 41. Do you recognize that?
A. Yes.
Q. And how are you able to recognize that?
A. It has all the correct case information, but at the end of the report, I have my signature.
Q. Okay. And that is the case that we're here for today?
A. Yes.
Q. What were you asked to analyze?
A. Um, I was -- I received from a local agency a gel lift, three pieces of vinyl flooring and then footprint standards.
Q. Okay. I am going to hand you some evidence. These have already been admitted. Let me know if you need some gloves?
A. Yes. I didn't bring any today.
Q. And for the record, I am presenting Ms. Gamboe

with People's Exhibit 5, People's Exhibit 17, People's 377 and 374 (sic).

MS. THIEN: I'm sorry. That last one was 374?

MR. BUTLER: Three hundred and seventy-one.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. Ms. Gamboe, could you state if you recognize those items?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And, um, People's Exhibit 5 there, um, how are you able to recognize that?

A. By the item number from the DFS tag, which is the Department of Forensic Science, the tag Item Number 18. I have my initials and the date that I received this package.

Q. Okay. And you referred to an Item Number 18. I called it People's Exhibit 5?

A. Right.

Q. You had a different numbering system at that time; is that correct?

A. Yes. That's the laboratory system -- numbering system, so I know it as Lab Item 18 --

Q. -- okay.

A. -- which is State's Exhibit 5.

Q. And, um, is there some exhibit tape sealing that at the bottom?

A. Yes. This yellow tape at the bottom is where -- after I open it, I re-seal it, and then I place my initials and the date that it was sealed.

Q. All right. Thank you. What is in People's Exhibit 5?

A. It's a gel lift.

Q. And this gel lift you referred to as 18, did you find that suitable for any comparisons?

A. No, I did not.

Q. And why is that?

A. Um, it's -- you can see on here what appears to be a foot impression, but inside that major overall impression, I would be looking for the friction ridge skin to show signs of ridge detail. And there is just no ridge detail with any individualizing characteristics in it to be able to compare it to somebody.

Q. You can return that back to the bag. I don't think I've offered -- asked you this yet.

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Um, your findings that you have put in your report, did you make those findings within a reasonable degree of scientific certainty?

A. Yes.
Q. All right. And that includes the People's Exhibit 5 and how it wasn't suitable for comparison?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Did you find anything that was suitable for comparison?
A. On a different item.
Q. Okay. What item was that?
A. And that would have been Item 36 -- well, Lab Item 36, which was three pieces of vinyl flooring.
Q. Okay. And, um, I think that's --
A. -- it's not one of these, is it? No.
Q. No. I'm sorry. I gave you the wrong number. Three hundred and seventy-eight I am taking back from the witness. That is the wrong number.
A. That was one of the items I received, however.
Q. Okay. I will give it back to you then. I'm also handing the witness People's Exhibit 16.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, um, what is included in People's Exhibit 16?
A. It was labeled as vinyl floor tile. These appear to be, like, luxury vinyl tile pieces that had been joined, and you can see the ridging where it snaps

together. And this is a larger piece that the back of the floor is no longer attached. It's just the top layer, and there appears to be friction ridge marks all over it that you can't really tell what they are exactly, whether it's fingers or toes, but there are marks.

Q. Okay. And you said you received three pieces there. Um, how many pieces did you find suitable for comparison?

A. Well, there were two prints that were suitable for comparison, and they were both on this one item.

Q. Okay. And, um, did you -- I am done asking you about showing that item. Um, I will close that up. Now, you haven't talked about what you compared those to yet, so what did you get that you compared those items to?

A. So, I received footprint standards from two individuals, and I compared to the first set of standards that were submitted which were prints from Jade Beasley.

Q. Okay. And did you make any findings with regard to the vinyl flooring with the standards of Jade Beasley?

A. Yes. I concluded that the unknown latent

impressions on that tile were made by the same person that made the standards submitted to me marked Jade Beasley.

Q. Okay. And, um, you said that was two prints on the same piece?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Um, the items that you compared those to, did you also compare them with any known standards from Julia Bevely?

A. I did not because I made the identification so they couldn't have been made by anyone else.

Q. Thank you. Um, and you said that was on one piece of vinyl flooring?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Did you find any suitable comparisons on the other pieces?

A. They were too small. There were indications that there was ridge detail, but the pieces of tile were too small really to have much luck with producing something that was suitable for comparison.

Q. And did you memorialize all this in your report?

A. Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, at this time, I would move for the admission of People's Exhibit 41?

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: Technically, Judge, the report would be hearsay. The testimony is what we are here for. That would be my only objection.

THE COURT: So, is that an objection?

MS. THIEN: I guess so.

THE COURT: That will be sustained.

MR. BUTLER: Um, I have no further questions. I can retrieve that evidence, unless you want to use it?

MS. THIEN: Um, if we can leave the box for just a moment.

MR. BUTLER: Yeah.

THE WITNESS: The box with the tile?

MS. THIEN: Yeah. We're going to talk about the tile for just a moment.

MR. BUTLER: For the record, I am returning People's 5, 17, 377 and 378 to the clerk.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Ms. Gamboe, if you would, take a look at the piece of tile we've been talking about?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. That appears to be, um, stained purple; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you know what caused that to occur?

A. I don't know exactly. It appears to have been processed with leucocrystal violet which is common to be used by crime scene personnel, but I don't know that definitively.

Q. Fair enough. If it were processed with LCV, would that enhance the ridge detail or possibly enhance the ridge detail and make it visible to the naked eye?

A. Yes, it can.

Q. But you then took that item and scanned it into whatever magic computer you use for your analysis?

A. Well, I use a digital scanner rather than do a photograph --

Q. Okay.

A. -- because, um, it's easier to put it on a scanner and scan it rather than it is to take an overall shot because of the resolution that we have to get. I would have only been able to get tiny areas and had to take numerous photographs of this same area, and the resolution would not have been of high enough quality

had I done an overall shot. So, it's easier to scan it because I can scan at a higher resolution. So, it's kind of like still taking a photograph.

Q. Right. But you're also able to see the whole thing at one time?

A. Right.

Q. Zoom in; zoom out?

A. Right.

Q. It would actually probably be better than a photograph at this point?

A. It's -- it's the same thing; just a different format. So, yes. It's easier, but I could have done either and it would have been the same.

Q. The first comparison that you made was with the known standards of Jade Beasley; is that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. And based on your experience, you observed the items and believe they were made by the same person?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And none of the items submitted to you -- let me strike that. Were these the only items that were submitted to you for footprint analysis?

A. Yes.

Q. Any of them associated with Julie Bevely?

A. No.

MS. THIEN: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Any redirect?

MR. BUTLER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ma'am, you may step down.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BUTLER: I am going to retrieve the item of evidence, your Honor --

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. BUTLER: -- and return that to the clerk.

THE COURT: The State may call their next witness.

MR. BUTLER: The People would call Keia Tate.

THE COURT: Ma'am, please come forward. Face my Clerk. Raise your right hand to be sworn.

KEIA TATE,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please have a seat over here. I need you to state your full name. Please spell your

last name for the record, and please make sure you speak loud enough for everyone to hear.

THE WITNESS: Keia Tate. T-A-T-E.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Ms. Tate, where are you employed?

A. I am employed with the Illinois State Police Crime Lab in Belleville, Illinois.

Q. And how long have you been employed there?

A. I have been at the Illinois State Police since January of 2001.

Q. What's your position?

A. I am a forensic scientist in the biology DNA section.

Q. And as a forensic scientist, what do you do?

A. I am a forensic biologist, therefore, I identify biological stains or collect biological fluids or evidence collected from evidence from crime scenes.

Q. And I am handing you what I've previously marked as People's Exhibit 34. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes.

Q. How do you recognize that?

A. It's my curriculum vitae.
Q. Okay. Um, is that up-to-date?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. That curriculum vitae, does that state what your education is?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your education?
A. I have a Bachelor's of Science Degree in microbiology from Western Illinois University, as well as, additional course work in biochemistry from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
Q. Okay. Um, do you have specialized training?
A. Yes.
Q. And what kind?
A. I received two years of training from the Illinois State Police in biology, DNA analysis and in identifying body fluid stains, as well as, DNA analysis on samples.
Q. And, um, that training, what does that consist of?
A. Training consisted of mock case work, as well as, supervised case work, testing evidence, Court testimony, written course work and taking tests, etc.
Q. Okay. And you received training in identifying

blood?

A. Yes.

Q. What -- what's the purpose of analyzing something for a blood stain.

A. The purpose of analyzing evidence is to indicate whether or not is it, in fact, blood or not.

Q. And how -- how -- well, can you explain how blood stains are indicated in the lab then?

A. Can you ask that again? I'm sorry.

Q. Could you explain how blood stains are indicated in the lab?

A. Yes. Blood stains are indicated in the labs through chemical testing. We use three colorless chemicals placing one to two drops on the suspected stain and looking for a pink color change. If a color change happens, it's indicative of being blood. If there is no color change, it's negative for the indication of blood.

Q. Is there a certain amount of stain that is needed for this testing?

A. Very, very small amounts.

Q. And what conclusions can be reached about a suspected stain?

A. That is -- that it is indicative of being blood,

or it is not indicative of being blood.

Q. And once -- once -- well, if you get something -- an item of evidence that is indicative of being blood, what do you do with that at that point?

A. A portion of that stain, or the entire amount of that stain, depending how much stain is there, is then preserved inside of a small tube and it awaits DNA analysis.

Q. And when you receive something that's only swabs, what do you do with those?

A. If something is only swabs, there is no testing needed. That swab, either a portion of that swab or that entire swab, is then also preserved inside of a tube where it awaits DNA analysis.

Q. Do you look for any other biological specimens other than blood?

A. Yes. Depending on the case coming in and the case story or case scenario or what is requested, we can test for other body fluids.

Q. Like saliva?

A. Correct.

Q. Semen?

A. Correct.

Q. Um, other types of bodily fluids?

A. Correct.
Q. Okay.
MR. BUTLER: Now, your Honor, at this time, I would move to have the witness qualified as an expert in the field of forensic biology.
THE COURT: Ms. Thien?
MS. THIEN: Accepted, your Honor.
THE COURT: The Court will then find that this witness is an expert in the DNA analysis of body fluids.
MR. BUTLER: Thank you.
By Mr. Butler:
Q. Ms. Tate, did you receive some items of evidence to do testing on with the Illinois State Police Crime Lab on the case you're here testifying about?
A. Yes.
Q. Several items?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And based off of your analysis or your procedures, did you generate a report --
A. Yes.
Q. -- for each time you processed some evidence?
A. Yes. With each examination, there were more than one report that was issued.

Q. Okay. I have several items of evidence here that I am going to ask that you go through, and tell me if you recognize these items. I will start with People's Exhibit 2. Can you tell me if you recognize that?

A. May I put on some gloves?

Q. Oh, yes. Sorry.

A. I have got a pair.

Q. Oh, you've got your own? Okay. They haven't been worn yet so.

A. Yes, I recognize this.

Q. And what is that item?

A. It is labeled as sealed paper bag containing one pair of buccal swabs collected from Julia Bevely.

Q. How are you able to recognize that?

A. My markings are on the bag; meaning my date and initials are listed here.

Q. And inside that bag, what is located?

A. There were buccal swabs. Swabs that simply look like cotton swabs.

Q. And what did you do with those?

A. I proceeded to preserve a portion of the swab inside of a tube. The tube was marked with the laboratory case number, the item number, and my initials and it was preserved for DNA analysis.

Q. And was that sent off to the DNA analysis section of the crime lab?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And are you able to recognize that by any markings?

A. Yes.

Q. And which markings?

A. My date and -- the date and my initials are on the evidence tape, as well as, the agency label.

Q. Okay. Thank you. I am going to show you People'S Exhibit 3. Can you tell me if you recognize that?

A. Yes.

Q. How are you able to recognize that?

A. Again, my markings, the date and my initials are on the packaging.

Q. And, um, what is that item?

A. It is labeled as sealed paper bag containing two individually packaged pairs of swabs with potential DNA. One pair collected from a bite mark located on Julia Bevely's right arm. One pair from a bite mark located on her left arm.

Q. Okay. Um, when you receive those items, could you explain to the jury what you did?

A. When I received this item, I proceeded to open up the packaging, observe what was on the inside. There, again, were swabs located on the inside. The swabs were then preserved inside of a tube for DNA analysis.

Q. And, um, those swabs, did you do anything to test for saliva?

A. No.

Q. Why was that?

A. Typically with the Illinois State Police when saliva is the indication of a stain potential, we will preserve as much of the stain on those swabs as possible. So, we will limit doing testing on those and send them forward to DNA to preserve any potential DNA that may be on the swabs.

Q. Is there potential if you did the testing for saliva that it could interfere with the DNA testing?

A. No.

Q. No? Would it decrease the amount of the sample then?

A. Potentially, yes.

Q. Okay. And is that why it was chosen not to test for saliva?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. The next item -- well, let me ask

you, you said there was one labeled right arm, one labeled left arm, one pair of swabs for each?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you send samples of those off for DNA analysis?

A. Yes.

Q. One of each swab?

A. Um, I would have to reference my notes, but I believe both swabs were sent on for DNA analysis. The potential is with saliva, not knowing how much stain may actually be there and you can't visually see it, I would preserve all of the swabs to potentially get as much DNA collection for DNA analysis as possible.

Q. Okay. And all of these items that you're going to testify today to, did you do any DNA analysis on them?

A. I did not do DNA analysis, no.

Q. That would be another witness --

A. Yes.

Q. -- that would talk about that? Um, now I am handing you what's previously been admitted as People's Exhibit 6. Can you see if you recognize that?

A. Yes.

Q. And how are you able to recognize that?

A. My markings are on this item as well, the date and my initials.

Q. And what is that item?

A. This is an Illinois State Police sexual assault evidence collection kit.

Q. Can you open that and tell us what's in that?

A. There are several pre-labeled envelopes inside of the kit.

Q. Okay. And, um, did you open any of those envelopes and do any kind of preservation?

A. Yes.

Q. Um, what -- what did you preserve for testing?

A. With the first examination, um, I preserved portions of four of the envelopes. One marked as blood on filter paper. One marked as anal specimens. One marked as oral specimens, and one marked as vaginal cervical specimens.

Q. Okay. And the one marked as blood, would that be the blood of Jade Beasley?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. And, um, were samples of those items sent off for -- preserved and sent off for DNA analysis?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you use the same procedure you have

previously talked about when you did the preservation of those samples?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, you mentioned on the first examination, so does that mean there was a second examination?

A. Yes.

Q. And the second examination, when did that happen?

A. I would have to look at my notes to have a date for when that occurred.

Q. Do you have your notes with you?

A. Yes.

Q. Would that refresh your recollection?

A. Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I'd ask permission for the witness to refresh her recollection?

THE COURT: Granted.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. Let me know once your recollection is sufficiently refreshed.

A. Okay. The second examination occurred on September 13th, 2022.

Q. Okay. And during that examination, what were you asked to look for?

A. During that examination, I was asked to examine

the fingernail scrapings -- or specimens that were inside of the sexual assault collection kit.

Q. And, um, are those scrapings or the envelope for them still in the collection kit?

A. Yes.

Q. Um, those scrapings, were they labeled --

A. Yes.

Q. -- as to which hand they came from?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Uh, and when you have scrapings, do you do anything different with that as opposed to with a swab or with any other articles when you preserve for DNA?

A. Yes. With this particular set of fingernail specimens that were collected, inside of the main envelope there is two envelopes labeled right hand, left hand. Inside each of those envelopes was a wooden stick. This wooden stick is generally used to scrape underneath the victim's fingernails. So with the wooden sticks inside of those, I proceeded to use a wet cotton swab to swab the wooden sticks to collect any debris that may have been collected with -- onto the wooden stick. That swab was then allowed to dry. The dry swab was placed inside of a tube, and that tube was preserved for DNA analysis.

Q. All right. Thank you. And then you sent it off to another section of the crime lab?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. Um, did you examine anything else in the sexual assault kit?

A. No.

Q. All right. I am going to ask -- you have got a glove off. I will go ahead and close that and return it. Um, did you receive any items from the State Police that were labeled as hairs?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you do any kind of testing on the hairs that you received?

A. The hairs were examined under a microscope.

Q. And, um, what were your -- what were the results from examining those?

A. While examining the hair, the purpose is to see if there is any hair root or tissue attached to the hair. This is what is needed to perform DNA analysis. After the microscopic examination, there was no roots or hair tissue attachment observed on the hairs, therefore, no further examination was done with the hairs collected.

Q. All right. Um, there was nothing more that you

could do at that point; is that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. I am now handing you what has previously been admitted as People's Exhibit 12. Can you state if you recognize that?

A. Yes.

Q. And how are you able to recognize that?

A. The date and my initials are on the packaging.

Q. And, um, what is that exhibit?

A. This exhibit is labeled as sealed paper bag containing three individually packaged pairs of swabs collected from unknown red stains; one pair from the gear shifter, two pairs from the interior driver's door, one from stain toward front of vehicle, one from stain toward rear of vehicle.

Q. Okay. So, there were several swabs in that package --

A. -- correct.

Q. -- when you received it? What did you do -- well, did you do anything with those swabs?

A. Item 30 -- I would have to look at my notes. Some items were tested and some items were not, and I can't recall if Item 30 was actually tested or not tested.

Q. Okay. Would that refresh your recollection?
A. Yes.
MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I'd ask that the witness be allowed to refresh her recollection?
THE COURT: Granted.
By Mr. Butler:
Q. Is your recollection sufficiently refreshed at this point?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So, what -- did you do anything with those swabs in that item?
A. Yes. I proceeded to open up the brown paper bag, observed there were swabs inside of there with reddish, brown staining. Therefore, I proceeded to do -- perform blood testing on the swabs to see if they were indicative of being blood.
Q. And what were the results?
A. They were positive for the indication of blood.
Q. Okay. Um, and this was from the car -- or the vehicle according to the label; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Um, were they all indicative of blood?
A. Yes.
Q. Um, and when you come to your -- well, I will go

on. Thank you. I am now -- now handing you what has previously been admitted into evidence as People's Exhibit 13. Can you tell us if you recognize that item?

A. Yes.

Q. And how are you able to recognize that?

A. The date and my initials are on the packaging.

Q. Okay. Um, other than it being opened in Court, does it appear to be the same as when you packaged it?

A. Yes.

Q. And what is that item?

A. This item is labeled as sealed brown paper bag containing steering wheel cover baring red unknown stains collected from the steering wheel of vehicle Number 1.

Q. All right. When you received that item, can you tell the jury what you did with that?

A. I proceeded to cut the brown paper bag open, observe the contents on the inside, as well as, take photos of the inside. I have circled stain that was observed on steering wheel cover and proceeded to test those stains for blood.

Q. And was blood indicated?

A. Yes.

Q. And were samples collected and preserved and sent

off for DNA analysis?

A. Yes.

Q. And these findings that -- blood indicated, do you make that finding within a reasonable degree of scientific certainty?

A. Yes.

Q. Thank you. Now, was that all you tested for this case?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Um, now I am going to hand you People's Exhibit 4 that has been previously admitted. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes.

Q. How are you able to recognize it?

A. The date and my initials are on the box.

Q. And could you open that, please?

A. Yes. (Witness complies.)

Q. What is in the box?

A. It contains two knives.

Q. And was that what it contained when you retrieved or received it?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. What did you do with those knives?

A. I proceeded to observe the knives, take photos of

the knives and write down description of the two knives inside.

Q. Okay. Did you do any kind of testing on the knives to see if there was blood?

A. Yes.

Q. And was blood indicated on one of the knives?

A. On one of the knives, yes.

Q. But on the other there was no blood?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. Um, were samples sent -- preserved and sent off for DNA analysis?

A. Yes.

Q. Later did you do something else with those knives?

A. Yes.

Q. What was that?

A. I collected a second set of swabs from the knife that had blood indicated on it.

Q. And why was that?

A. There was a contamination issue that was reported out, and so a new sample had to be collected and preserved for DNA analysis.

Q. Okay. And the contamination issue had been with the crime scene investigator; is that your

understanding?

A. That is my understanding.

Q. All right. Um, so what was the point in doing another swab then?

A. The point in doing another swab was to see if we could get a clean collection sample so, therefore, the knife was re-submitted. I took a second swabbing of the other side of the knife blade that I had not swabbed previously to try to obtain a clean sample of the stain collected from the knife.

Q. All right. And was that sent off for analysis?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. I didn't ask you to get those knives out. I know you asked me not to have you hold them. I will ask you to close the box though. Thank you. All right. I am now handing you what's previously been admitted as People's Exhibit 9. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes.

Q. How are you able to recognize that?

A. The date and my initials are on the packaging.

Q. And what is that?

A. This is labeled as sealed paper bag containing one pair of swabs collected from LCV reaction at D-1 on the master bedroom floor near the vanity.

Q. Okay. LCV, what is that?

A. I can't remember what that stands for. It's a re-agent that crime scene uses to test blood when they are out in the field.

Q. Does that have any -- does that do anything with your testing, the LCV?

A. Yes. For whatever reason, LCV is made up -- the chemicals in that particular re-agent reacts with the chemicals that we use in the laboratory, therefore, interfering with our chemical testing. So, whenever it's marked that it's been field tested, we do not then perform blood testing in the laboratory. The swabs are simply sent off for DNA analysis. The chemicals they use out in the field do not interfere with DNA testing.

Q. Okay. Thank you. So -- so, because this was field tested, you did not test that for the presence of blood?

A. Correct.

Q. It was just preserved and sent off to the next agent?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. Now, I am handing you what I marked -- what has been admitted as People's Exhibit 14. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes.
Q. How are you able to recognize it?
A. The date and my initials are on the packaging.
Q. And what is that?
A. This label is labeled as sealed brown -- sealed paper bag containing one pair of swabs collected from Imprint F located at the north end of the hallway.
Q. From Imprint F, that's -- you don't know what Imprint F is or D-1 or G, do you?
A. I do not.
Q. These are labeled by someone else?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And, um, would that have been tested for the presence of blood?
A. There was no blood-like substance observed on the swab, therefore, the swabs were simply preserved for DNA analysis.
Q. Okay. I am now handing you People's Exhibit 15. Do you recognize that?
A. Yes.
Q. And, again, is that because it has your name and date and initials on it?
A. Correct.
Q. And what is that item?

A. This item is labeled as sealed paper bag containing one pair of swabs collected from Imprint G located on the living room floor near the front door.

Q. And was there any testing for the presence of blood done on those?

A. Item 35 -- or Laboratory Item 35, I believe so. I would have to refer to my notes for confirmation.

Q. Would that refresh your recollection?

A. Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I would ask that the witness be allowed to refresh her recollection.

THE COURT: Granted.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. Was it tested for the presence of blood?

A. It was not.

Q. Okay. Is that because that was another LCV field test?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. So, did you preserve that and send it for DNA then?

A. Yes.

Q. All right.

MR. BUTLER: I am going to retrieve that

item. I am returning these items momentarily back to the clerk.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. Ms. Tate, you were submitted several other items for testing that we haven't talked about today; is that fair to say?

A. Yes.

Q. Um, and did you use the same procedures on those that you used -- that you have talked about if it was a field test with LCV you would have preserved that for DNA?

A. Correct.

Q. And sent it on?

A. Yes.

MR. BUTLER: If I could have one second, your Honor?

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, at this time, I would move for the admission of People's Exhibit 34, the curriculum vitae?

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

MR. BUTLER: I am providing that to the

clerk, and I would tender the witness.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Good morning, Ms. Tate?

A. Good morning.

Q. As I was following along with your testimony, apparently I thought it was important to shuffle all of my papers, so bare with me for just a second. We're going to get this train back on the track. So, ma'am, you've been employed by the State Police for better than 20 years at this point?

A. Correct.

Q. And have you always worked in the area of biology?

A. Yes.

Q. Your primary function is to examine items that are submitted to you, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. You're not an investigator. You don't tell anyone what items may be helpful in an investigation to go get them and bring them to you. They are brought to you.

A. Correct.

Q. From that, we know a number of items were submitted, and the first step for you is to determine whether or not there is the presence of human -- let's call it fluid. Blood? Saliva? Semen? Urine? Something of that nature?

A. Whether there is fluid or not. My testing doesn't indicate if it's human or not.

Q. That's where I was going to head. So, you have a chemical test that you are able to do to put on a red, blood-like substance or any substance -- or any item really --

A. Correct.

Q. -- to test for the presence of blood?

A. Correct.

Q. But that is not necessarily only human blood; it is just for an item contained in all blood?

A. Correct.

Q. And that's called a presumptive test?

A. Correct.

Q. So, if I hit an item with the one or two drops, they turn pink, we can presume there is some blood present on that item?

A. Yes.

Q. We don't know what blood, whose blood, and at that point in time, is -- are we able to determine how much is there?

A. No.

Q. In the items that were submitted to you, was there any item -- let's strike that and start again. As items are submitted to you, do they have a description?

A. Yes.

Q. And where does that description come from?

A. I am not sure who enters the description on the labels. Typically the labeling on the packaging is from the agency, so it's presumed a detective or agent typed in the description, and then I basically almost copy and paste that description into my notes.

Q. You stated that some of the testing that you decided to perform may be based on the information you are given about the case or the case story?

A. Correct.

Q. And how does that information get to you?

A. That information can be relayed several ways. Uh, one, simply via the paperwork that is submitted with the case when it's submitted into the laboratory. Sometimes we have what we call case reviews where the laboratory will meet with the particular agency to

discuss the situation or circumstances of the case they are submitting, and we can determine what is the best route for testing and what they want done with particular samples that they are wanting to submit to the lab.

Q. Do you recall what happened in this case?

A. In this case, there was a case meeting with the laboratory and the agency.

Q. And were you a part of that meeting?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you recall who brought that information or who represented the investigation or the investigating agency?

A. I cannot remember the particular individuals, um, in the case meeting.

Q. But that individual is telling you and the science team what evidence, in particular, they are looking for or they want to know about?

A. Yes.

Q. In the course of your work on this case, you, um, put together several reports?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. And that contains the description of the item like we discussed before. Was any item submitted to you

that was referred to as any type of substrate control; skin swab, um, with no other description to be used as a basis that would have come from Julie Bevely?

A. Can you ask that again?

Q. I can try.

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Um, all of the items that were submitted to you for testing is in your report?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you receive anything that was labeled either a blind test or a skin test, or I have heard it referred to as a substrate control?

A. No. If I am understanding correctly, I did not receive any swabs that would have come in labeled as a blind or substrate swab.

Q. Okay. Everything that was submitted, they wanted to know -- or wanted to know exactly what was located, if anything?

A. Yes. What, if any, biological fluid could be on those swabs, yes.

Q. Okay. Now is it -- well, obviously it's not just items or swabs that are submitted. Physical items of evidence are also submitted to you to see if you can determine whether or not there is some human biological

matter?

A. Correct.

Q. Were -- were you given any items of clothing from specifically Julie Bevely to examine?

A. No. I don't believe so.

Q. Were you given any items such as a blanket or towel to examine?

A. No.

Q. Were you given any envelopes that would have been labeled as swabs from Julia Bevely's hands, nails or nail scrapings to examine?

A. No. I don't believe so.

Q. Now, when -- I am going to take a look so we can have a reference here at Laboratory Report Forensic Biology Number 1. Do you have a copy of that with you by any chance?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. There is here a Lab Item Number 5 that was described as sealed brown paper bag containing swabs said to be of a bite mark from Julia Bevely's arms. Next to test result, it's entered preserved?

A. Yes.

Q. How does one preserve? Is that where you're just taking the entire swab or a portion of that swab? What

do you do with that?

A. Yes. Preserved simply means taking a portion or the entire swab and placing it into the tube, closing the tube up, and then marking it with a laboratory case number, item number and my initials, and then that tube is then saved and preserved for DNA analysis.

Q. Is there anything added to it at that point? Any preservative, any liquid, anything chemical in nature?

A. At that point, no.

Q. The swab comes out of the little sleeve directly into a sterile container and labeled?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, that was specifically marked -- or information given to you that that was assumed to be -- or presumed to be -- or at least described as -- the swab of a bite mark?

A. Correct.

Q. Did you perform any test to test for the presence of saliva?

A. No.

Q. Now, that test is available, is it not?

A. Yes.

Q. Um, in fact, there are, what, at least four commercial reliable testing kits available in the

country? Does the lab only use one of those or multiples?

A. I am not sure how many tests are available. We do use one test in the laboratory for saliva testing.

Q. And I believe you testified that if that were done, it would not interfere with the actual presence of DNA?

A. Correct.

Q. And if that were done, it would not necessarily decrease the amount of DNA that was present on that swab?

A. It wouldn't decrease the amount of DNA on the swab, but it lessens the amount of DNA that I am sending -- a possible DNA that I could be sending on to DNA. If I am cutting off a portion of that swab to use for saliva testing, then that's less of a swab than going on to DNA analysis.

Q. What would the difference be between testing for the presence of saliva and your receiving a swab that has already been field treated with LCV?

A. LCV is specifically used for blood testing, and the difference with doing testing or not is typically with blood testing and blood swabs, I can physically visually see the amount of stain on that swab. With

saliva, because it is a clear fluid, I can't physically see how much is on that swab or any is on that swab to collect. So, not knowing if there is any on there or how much is on there, Illinois State Police's vision is to preserve as much of DNA if there's any there for DNA analysis. With blood, I can physically and visually see how much stain is on that swab, and so I know how much of that I can use for testing and still have enough for DNA analysis. With saliva testing, I don't know how much is there, if any is there, for me to still be able to retain for DNA analysis. Therefore, we tend to prefer to not do the testing and save it for DNA analysis.

Q. So, if I have this right, a swab comes to you. It has a visible stain. You can test for the presence of blood. That does not interfere with the presence of DNA, right?

A. Correct.

Q. Um, is it possible to test that swab without making a cutting because essentially that's what's happening from the field, right? They take a swab with LCV. You do nothing more with it because that -- that test for presumptive presence of blood is already done. You immediately preserve it for DNA. I guess what I am

having a difficult time comprehending is why that same rule would not apply for a test like this where specifically the question asked, because they are identifying it as a bite mark, for the presence of saliva.

A. Well, again, with -- so when the swabs in the field were tested with this chemical, typically blood is a range from, you know, reddish to a brownish color stain, so I can physically see that. When they do the LCV testing, it turns the entire swab blue.

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. So I no longer see how much blood is on that swab. The entire swab now is blue, so I am not sure exactly where on the swab blood is at, how much blood is on there. So, that swab is just completely preserved for DNA analysis. With -- and I can simply take a small cutting if I were to test that for blood testing.

Q. But -- I don't mean to interrupt, but at that point, you don't because the chemicals used in the field actually would interfere -- if I heard you correctly -- with the test you would perform in the lab?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. I'm sorry if I interrupted.

A. No. I was just going to add with, um, swabs

coming in with the indication of saliva possibly being there, again, not knowing what side of the swab was used for this saliva collection, so I don't know if I do cut off a snippet to test for saliva, am I cutting on the right side that the saliva could have been on or was it on the opposite side of the swab. That's why when there is a stain that you physically initially can't see, it's hard to know where to test. So, we -- our preference is to preserve what's there, if anything is there, for DNA analysis.

Q. Once that swab -- or once that sample is preserved and it is sent for DNA extraction, is there any possibility after the DNA extraction is performed for you to go back and then test for the actual source of that DNA; whether it be blood, saliva or any other bodily fluid?

A. Only if a portion of that original swab was preserved for DNA analysis; so there's some still remaining on the original swab. If the entire swab is then preserved, you cannot go back and then perform additional testing.

Q. If the entire swab is used, the extraction destroys any other possibility. It is at that point solely used for DNA?

A. Correct.

Q. When you see a swab that's been presented in that purple stain that has been previously tested with LCV, do you have any information as to whether or not the field chemicals used actually also pick up oxidizing agents; cleaners such like that?

A. I am unsure with that particular re-agent that they use in the field.

Q. Now, just for clarity purpose, you were given way back on -- or delivered -- your report was written -- let me start that one all over again, if I may. You have Report Number 1, forensic biology, and your report was dated 12-9-2020; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. The next set of items delivered to you included the box with the two knives and some other swabs -- we're not going to go into specific -- but just basically a collection of swabs, and that report was generated on February 4th of 2021?

A. Correct.

Q. In May of '21, you did receive the knives back after the contaminating event was discovered. And you did, again, take a swab for that; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, the next action was not taken by you until September -- or just this past September. September of '22; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And that was specifically to examine the envelope containing the fingernail specimens of Jade --

A. Correct.

Q. -- the deceased.

MS. THIEN: If I could have just a moment, we might be about there.

(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)

MS. THIEN: Thank you, ma'am. I do not believe I have any other questions.

THE COURT: Redirect, Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ma'am, you may step down. At this time, the Court is going to take a 15 minute recess. Members of the jury, again, until this case is submitted to you for your deliberation, you must not discuss this case with anyone or remain within hearing of anyone discussing it. You're not to read any newspaper article, watch any TV news report or listen to any radio broadcast concerning this case. After this case has been submitted to you, you must discuss the

case only in the jury room when all the members of the jury are present. You are to keep an open mind, and you must not decide any issue in this case until it is submitted to you for your deliberation under the instructions of the Court. Please rise for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: The Court will be in recess.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: We're back on the record in 20-CF-596. We're still outside the presence of the jury. The attorneys had a small conversation with me about procedure. It is agreed between the parties that today the defense will be able to call their expert out of order; is that accurate?

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

MS. THIEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It is also agreed that out of order the State will be able to recall their expert as rebuttal evidence directly thereafter; is that accurate?

MS. THIEN: It is.

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Also was discussed was the probability that the autopsy testimony would occur this afternoon. Discussion was had about the sensitive nature of those photographs, and the opinions of the attorneys and the Court is that there would not be published to the gallery those photographs; is that accurate?

MS. MUDGE: Yes, sir.

MS. THIEN: It is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Very well. You may bring in the jury. Please rise for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Please be seated. The State may call their next witness.

MR. BUTLER: The People would call Brian Hapack.

THE COURT: Sir, come forward. Face my clerk. Raise your right hand to be sworn.

BRIAN HAPACK,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please have a seat over here, sir. I need you to state your full name. Please spell your last name for the record, and please make sure you speak loud enough that everybody can hear you.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Brian Hapack. H-A-P-A-C-K.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Mr. Hapack, can you tell us where you're employed?

A. Yes. At the Illinois State Police, Metro East Lab.

Q. And in what capacity.

A. I'm a forensic biology DNA analyst.

Q. And how long have you been so employed?

A. About 25 years.

Q. What are your duties as a forensic biologist DNA analysis?

A. I analyze items of evidence for the presence of biological materials, attempt to identify those materials and potentially who they came from.

Q. What's your educational background?

A. I have an Associates from Lincoln Land Community College. I have a Bachelor's in biology and chemistry from Illinois College. I'm also a graduate of St. John's Hospital School of Clinical Laboratory Science.

Q. Okay. I'm going to ask that you raise your voice a little bit if you don't mind.

THE COURT: Why don't you pull that mic up towards you.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. All right. Thank you. Um, and just in case not everyone heard you, can you state your background?

A. Yes. I have an Associate's from Lincoln Land Community College. I have a Bachelor's in biology in chemistry from Illinois College. I am also a graduate of St. John's Hospital School of Clinical Laboratory Science.

Q. Okay. And I am handing you what I previously marked as People's Exhibit 33. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. And how are you able to recognize that?

A. It is my curriculum vitae.

Q. Did you prepare it?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And, um, that has things like your educational background in it; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Is that an up-to-date curriculum vitae?

A. Yes, I believe, it is.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I'd move for the admission of People's Exhibit 33.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

MR. BUTLER: I am giving that to the clerk.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. All right. You told us where you were educated. Do you have any specialized training?

A. Yes. I have completed training programs in the area of forensic biology and DNA analysis with the Illinois State Police.

Q. And, um, are you a member of any professional organizations?

A. Yes. The American Academy of Forensic Scientist.

Q. And what percentage of your time do you spend working on forensic biology?

A. One hundred percent of my time.

Q. Do you know an estimate of how many examinations

you have done over the years?

A. Probably upwards of 5,000 or so cases. Um, each which would have required multiple different kinds of analysis within them.

Q. Okay. Five thousand cases, so multiple items of evidence submitted in each case?

A. That's correct.

Q. All right. Have you ever been qualified to testify as an expert witness in the fields of forensic DNA?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. How many times?

A. About 74 times.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I move that the witness be qualified as an expert in Forensic DNA.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THINE: We accept, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. He will be so qualified.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. What is DNA?

A. DNA is the chemical compound that's contained in most cells of the body that contains all of the genetic

information.

Q. And how do we get that?

A. We inherit it from our parents.

Q. Where is DNA found?

A. DNA is present in most cells in the body. There are some cells that don't have DNA component, but generally speaking, things like blood, saliva will have a DNA component to them.

Q. Okay. Does DNA differ from person to person?

A. With the exception of identical twins it does.

Q. Okay. What is meant by the term forensic DNA analysis?

A. So, in forensic DNA analysis, you will analyze items of evidence that are collected from a crime and determine the DNA profiles that are present within them and then compare those to DNA profiles of individuals who are victims or suspects in the crime to determine who could or could not have contributed the evidence profiles.

Q. Okay. What is the first step you complete in order to obtain a DNA profile from an item of evidence?

A. So, the DNA process is a multiple step procedure. The first step of which would be DNA extraction. In here we're going to introduce chemicals to the cells to

break them open and separate out the DNA from all the other non-DNA components such that at the end of it, we will have an unknown amount of DNA in a tube. The step following that then would be quantitation where we will determine the amount of DNA that's present there. Following that, we'll load a specific amount of that DNA into an amplification procedure that will make millions of copies of the specific areas of the DNA that we're interested in for the purposes of identification. After that is completed, a portion of that amplified product will be loaded onto an instrument that will separate out all those fragments based upon their size. The software program associated with that will assign each fragment a number. The collection of numbers in all the different locations we look at collectively is the DNA profile.

Q. Okay. Um, what happens when you've obtained a DNA profile?

A. So, once we get the DNA profile, we will then compare it to the DNA profile of known standards that were from individuals involved in the case.

Q. And does this occasionally eliminate suspects?

A. Yes, it can.

Q. And can it also match a suspect?

A. Yes, it can.

Q. All right. And if someone is matched, how is that phrased in DNA analysis?

A. It would be called cannot be excluded.

Q. Okay. And, um, if someone is not a match, what is that called?

A. It would be called excluded.

Q. Okay. Is there also a term used that is inconclusive?

A. Yes.

Q. And what does that mean? It's pretty self --

A. -- inconclusive would mean that the results were such that no interpretation could take place.

MS. THIEN: I'm sorry. I missed that.

THE WITNESS: No interpretation of the DNA results could take place.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. Okay. Um so, what happens if a suspect cannot be eliminated?

A. If they cannot be eliminated, then the statistical rarity of that DNA profile in the general population will be calculated to communicate how rare that profile is.

Q. And, um, are there any kind of controls that are ran during the analysis to insure accuracy?

A. Yes. There are controls that follow every step of the process; both positive and negative controls, in addition, to a blank sample that will have no DNA -- nothing in it that we run through the entire procedure and analyzed at the end to insure that no DNA was detected in that.

Q. Okay. Um, are these procedures that you described, are they generally accepted in the scientific community?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. And are there any professional standards that your lab has to adhere to?

A. Yes. Our laboratory is ISO 17025 accredited. So, we will be inspected for adherence to guidelines within the field.

Q. Okay. Can you say that ISO --

A. -- it's ISO 17025 is the standards that the inspection occurs to. And our laboratory system is inspected to make sure that we're following all those guidelines.

Q. Okay. Thank you. Now, I want to get into the evidence. And I'm not going to put the evidence in front of you today. We have seen it previously, but were you submitted items -- or were there items

submitted to the Illinois State Police Crime Lab in the case you're here testifying for DNA analysis?

A. Yes, there were.

Q. And, um, we have heard Ms. Tate's testimony earlier about her preservation of certain items. Once they are preserved and sent off for the analysis, it sounds like there is computer programs involved. What do you get?

A. Basically at the end of it, you will get a -- what's called an electropherogram or EPG for short. In that contains the data readout of the DNA, and that can be uploaded into our computer system and individuals from different laboratories can then perform interpretation on those cases.

Q. Okay. And after you've got the results, you go through them, and do you generate a report based off of those results?

A. That's correct.

Q. And in this case, did you generate four reports?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Okay. And those reports include your findings; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Um, and your findings on each of those, did you

make those within a reasonable degree of scientific certainty?

A. Yes.

Q. So, I want to talk about your first report. Um, that, I believe, you've have got labeled as Report Number 5; is that correct?

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. But that's your first report?

A. That's my first report.

Q. And what date was that report generated?

A. December 17th, 2020.

Q. Okay. And, um, your findings in that report, the first -- first -- the first item was the swab of the defendant; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. And that's just to obtain one person's profile; is that right?

A. Yes. To obtain that profile for comparison.

Q. The next item that you did analysis of, was that what was labeled as swabs of bite marks from Julia Bevely's arms?

A. Yes, it was.

Q. And could you explain if there were more than one sample there?

A. Yes. There were two separate samples from that same source.

Q. Okay. And, um, those samples, was one from a right arm according to the label and one from a left arm according to the label?

A. I believe they were.

Q. Okay. Now, we haven't got into this yet, but is it possible to have more than one profile in an analysis?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. And what is that called when that happens?

A. It would be called a mixture.

Q. Okay. And specifically I want to talk with you about 5-A according to your report. That was a swab alleged to be from a bite mark. How many contributors did you find in the DNA profile?

A. It was a mixture of two contributors.

Q. And were you able to determine -- well, I guess first I better ask, did you assume any contributors?

A. Yes. Because these were swabs of Julia Bevely's arms, we would assume that we would be collecting her DNA onto that swab, so we can assume that her DNA profile is going to be one of the two DNA profiles there. So when we do our interpretation, we will look

at the DNA that's originating that could not have come from her to determine the other foreign contributor.

Q. Okay. Were you able to determine if there was a profile in the other former -- in the other contributor?

A. Yes. I was able to deduce a foreign profile at ten of the locations that we look at.

Q. How many locations do you look at?

A. We look at 23 different ares for purposes of identification.

Q. Okay. Is there a standard number that you have to find that matched to rule someone out or to match with someone?

A. There is not a certain number. The more locations that we identify, the more rare that profile will be in the general population. But as we identify less, then it would become more common in the general population.

Q. Okay. And what are these locations called?

A. They are called loci or locus.

Q. Okay. And loci, that's L-O-C-I; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Um, what are you looking for on these loci?

A. So at each -- at each loci an individual will have two components of information, and those are called

alleles. And those components can be different or they can be the same component in a double dose. You basically would inherit one of those from your mother and one from your father. So, when we look at locus, we're looking at what alleles are present there. And in a situation like this where we are doing a deduction, we will know the contribution of the assumed person. And so we will look at alleles that could not have originated from the assumed person.

Q. Okay. So in this case, you were looking at alleles that could not originate from Julia Bevely?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. With this specific item?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. And, um, you said you deduced that there were ten STRI -- or STR loci?

A. That's correct.

Q. So, ten matches then of the 23?

A. Yes. At ten areas I identified alleles that were the same as -- that were not -- not originated from Julia Bevely.

Q. Okay. Um, and were you able to determine that those ten STR loci were in line with Jade Beasley?

A. Yes, they did. They did match the same

information that Jade Beasley possessed.

Q. What kind of statistical frequency? You said once you have a match, you plug that into a computer for frequency?

A. Yes. The statistical rarity of that foreign DNA profile in the general population is such that I would expect it to occur in about one out of 160,000 individuals.

Q. Okay. Again, that was the first swab of the bite mark you tested. There was tests done of another swab of bite marks on another arm. Did you determine if there were more than one contributors there?

A. Yes. There was two contributors in the other swab.

Q. And again, same procedure. You talked about the last swab you assumed Julia Bevely's profile as a contributor?

A. That's correct.

Q. The other contributor, who did you determine that to be?

A. So, in this -- in this swab, I was able to deduce a 20 STR loci foreign contributor. Jade Beasley cannot be excluded as the source of that. The statistical rarity of it is such that I would expect it to occur

once out of every 240 quintillion individuals.

Q. Quintillion?

A. Yes.

Q. How many zero's is that?

A. That would be 18 zeros.

Q. Eighteen zeros. Do you know approximately how many people live in the world?

A. There are about eight billion people in the world.

Q. Okay. You also examined for analysis purpose some swabs from a sexual assault kit; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Those swabs, did they have more than one contributor?

A. No, they did not.

Q. Did they all then come back to Jade Beasley?

A. Yes, they did.

Q. Um, I do want to touch on a little -- well, no. I'm going to go on. You also -- well, did you perform other tests or other analysis in this first report?

A. Yes. There were -- there were other swabs that I analyzed, yes.

Q. Um, some of those swabs, were they swabs from -- that allegedly, according to the labels, come from a

vehicle?

A. Yes. That's correct.

Q. And specifically I'm talking about what you referred to as Lab Item 30; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. All right. And I said I wasn't going to do this, but I think I need to do this once. Do you recognize that item?

A. Yes. This appears to be Item 30 --

Q. Okay.

A. -- as submitted to the lab.

Q. And those would be the swabs from the vehicle?

A. Yes.

Q. Thank you. That would be People's Exhibit 12. All right. There were multiple different samples in that swab according to your report; is that correct?

A. Yes. I have two different samples taken of that.

Q. Um, the first sample, what were the results?

A. So, 30-A was the designation I gave it. There was a single contributor identified. It was a female contributor. Julia Bevely cannot be excluded as the source of that.

Q. And how many STR loci did you determine there?

A. There were 22 STR loci.

Q. Okay. And was that the same results with the sample 30-B or the second swab from the vehicle?

A. Yes. It was the same result.

Q. Okay. Were there also analysis done on portions of a steering wheel cover?

A. Yes, there were.

Q. And what was the results of those?

A. So, the steering wheel cover contained a mixture of two contributors. There was a major female DNA profile. Julia Bevely cannot be excluded as the source of that. There was also a minor DNA profile identified at four loci. Gregory Beasley cannot be excluded as that.

Q. Okay. And Greg Beasley not being excluded from that minor profile, that wasn't included in your first report; is that accurate?

A. That's correct.

Q. Did you do some more analysis later on once you -- later on?

A. Yes. At the time, I did not have his standard for comparison, and it was later submitted and a comparison was done.

Q. Okay. And you said that was four STR loci?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Did you generate a report with regard to your findings on that?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Okay. Four STR loci seems to me like a smaller number than 20 STR loci; is that fair to say?

A. That's correct.

Q. But is there anything that says you can't make a match based off four STR loci?

A. No. You can make an association. If you did a statistical calculation, it would decrease. It would be more common in the general population. In this instance, we didn't do a statistical calculation on this.

Q. You did not?

A. I did not.

Q. Okay. So, that was your first set of items that you analyzed in this case. Did you do anything with a DNA preserve from a knife?

A. Yes.

Q. And what did you -- what results did you get from that knife?

A. So, I believe there were, uh, multiple samples collected from the knife. Um, sample 8-A was an inconclusive mixture of at least two people. Sample 8-B

contained a mixture of at least two people in which a major male was identified at 18 loci.

Q. Okay. So, let's talk about that a little bit. Um, was that later determined to be a contamination issue --

A. Yes, it was.

Q. -- with a crime scene investigator?

A. Yes, I believe it was.

Q. Okay. Um, and the other results that were tested with the knife that first time you said was inconclusive?

A. Yes. The other -- the other examination was another -- a mixture of at least two, and it was inconclusive.

Q. Okay. Did you analyze some swabs from a master bathroom floor near the vanity?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And what was your results of that?

A. So, the result was that there was a mixture of two contributors. A major female DNA profile was identified at 16 loci. Julia Bevely cannot be excluded as the source of that DNA. The statistical rarity of that in the general population is such that it could be -- I would expect it to be found in one and 770

sextillion individuals.

Q. Now many zeros is that?

A. It escapes me at the moment.

Q. A lot?

A. It's a lot.

Q. Okay. You said there were two. Was there a minor profile?

A. There was a minor DNA profile at nine STR loci. Jade Beasley cannot be excluded as the source of that. The statistical rarity there is such that I would expect it to occur in one and 2.4 million individuals.

Q. All right. Did you also analyze the results from the swabs from an item labeled Imprint F? I believe that would be Item 34 --

A. Yes, I did.

Q. -- in your lab item numbers? And what was the results of that Imprint F?

A. So that contained a single contributor, a female. Jade Beasley cannot be excluded as the source of that DNA. The statistical rarity is such I would expect it to occur at one in -- out of 85 septillion individuals.

Q. Okay. Again, is that a large number?

A. Very large number.

Q. Okay. What about swabs that came from the living

room floor near the front door?

A. Uh, yes. I did examine those as well.

Q. And what were your results there?

A. That was a mixture of two contributors. There was a major female DNA profile at eight STR loci. Jade Beasley cannot be excluded as the source of that DNA. The statistical frequency is such that I expect it to occur in one out of every 2.8 billion people. There was also a single STR locus minor DNA profile identified. Greg Beasley does possess that same DNA component. No statistics were calculated on that.

Q. Okay. Um, and you say that was just one STR loci?

A. Yes. It would be very common in the general population.

Q. Okay. And that was later tested again; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Is that because you did not have the known standard for Greg Beasley at first?

A. Yes. At the time, I did not have the standard.

Q. Okay. Now, I want to go to your last report. This is about fingernail scrapings; is that fair to say?

A. Yes.

Q. And there were multiple -- well, there were two different sets of scrapings that were analyzed?

A. That's correct.

Q. Um, the first set you've labeled as 20 E-1 lab item, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Um, 20 E-1, what were your finding on that?

A. So, in 21 -- 20 E-1 there were two contributors present. And here again we performed a deduction where we assumed one of the contributors was Jade Beasley. Since the samples were taken from her fingernails, we would expect her DNA to be present on them. We were able to identify a minor DNA profile at 9 STR loci. Julia Bevely cannot be excluded as the source of that. The statistical frequency of that in the general population is such I would expect it to occur in one out of every 950 million individuals.

Q. Okay. And then the other sampling from the other hand of the fingernail scrapings, did you make any findings with regard to that?

A. Yes. There was a single contributor that Jade Beasley cannot be excluded as the source of.

Q. Okay. So, I want to talk about, um, kind of -- I got a few questions. What is degradation?

A. So, degradation is where the size of the DNA particle breaks down, and you would visualize that when you're looking at the results on the EPG. They would begin to decrease in their relative heights as you move from the left to the right because the right side represents the larger loci where the DNA fragments are larger, and they are the ones that would be most susceptible to breaking down first.

Q. Okay. Is degradation common?

A. Degradation is inherent in forensic samples. They're not pristine samples, so there's always some element of it that could possibly be there.

Q. Okay. And what about PCR inhibition? What is that?

A. So, PCR inhibition would be interference in the process by some sort of chemical or contaminate that's inherit in the environment, and it would prevent the reaction from occurring and decrease or prevent you from getting a result.

Q. Okay. And is that common?

A. It's not that common. In our quan, we do have a control that is meant to detect the presence of inhibition. It's a -- it's a sample that needs to attain a certain value. And if that value is increased

or absent, it clues us in that there could be an inhibitor present. And then we can take steps to try and dilute the sample and dilute that out or purify it with additional extractions.

Q. Okay. Was there any PCR inhibition in items involving this case?

A. Uh, no.

Q. Okay. When you receive an item, do you have any idea if there is going to be DNA on it at all?

A. I do not.

Q. Okay. And you don't collect the items; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. So, do you just take them as they come?

A. Uh, yes.

Q. Okay. Um, are there variables that you're aware of, though, through your training and experience that could limit or prohibit the amount of DNA collected on a swab?

A. Um, there are any number of possible variables, um, that could exist that might influence that. It's difficult to say in any given situation what might actually be occurring. You know, how the substrate is that a stain might be on might prevent it from being

removed adequately if you're using a swab, per se. But there is all kinds of possible scenarios that could be at play.

Q. Does it matter to your analysis where the swab is done if it's -- say for instance the bite mark swab, does it matter for you where the investigator swabbed that?

A. Well, if we assume that there is a bite mark there and the -- you would want to make sure that specific area was swabbed as thoroughly as possible.

Q. Okay. But you would have no idea on how thorough a crime scene investigator on any item of evidence swabbed something?

A. No, I would not.

Q. And --

MR. BUTLER: If I can have one second, your Honor.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. You didn't -- did you label these swabs bite marks?

A. I did not, no.

Q. Okay. That's not your term?

A. No, it is not.

MR. BUTLER: I have no further questions,

your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Let me see. I think I did better this time not stirring everything together.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Good morning, Mr. Hapack?

A. Good morning.

Q. Illinois College class of '87. You are Illinois College class of --

A. -- uh, it'd be '96.

Q. Okay. Big separation. Um, you have been with the Illinois State Police for how long?

A. Twenty-five years.

Q. All right. Have you ever worked for any laboratory agency doing forensic analysis outside of law enforcement?

A. I have not.

Q. When these samples are given to you -- they come to you, how are they received? Are they already prepared by the separate technician who's done the collection?

A. Yes, generally.

Q. In this particular case, was there any identification of possible source of the DNA on any of the samples that we discussed today?

A. On any of the samples?

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. Well, we -- we don't identify the source, per se. We just give a statistical rarity of the DNA in the general population.

Q. Oh, I'm sorry, sir. I -- I -- I didn't mean to mislead you. So, you receive Item Number 5. From Item Number 5, you pull out 5-A and 5-B which are two separate sets of swabs said to be of a bite mark from an individual's arms, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, at that point, has the source material of that swab been identified to you as either blood, saliva or any other source?

A. Oh, um, in this instance, no. I had no information as to the possible biological fluid that might be present.

Q. Now, from this one in particular, you did determine that there were two contributors?

A. Yes.

Q. Were you able to identify the amount that each

contributor gave to the sample?

A. That -- that's not a calculation that we would normally do. When we look at an electropherogram, we will make a general assessment of is there a major contributor versus a minor. In there, we're generally looking at a ratio between the two. That's at or around three to one, as well as, the peak heights being above our stochastic threshold. But we don't report the specific percentage of contributor for each component. It's not a procedure that we have.

Q. Okay. When you examine the peak heights on the electropherograms to determine a major and minor contributor, um, does that -- do the heights of the peaks indicate to you any amount or proportionate amount that each contributor gave?

A. So, in order to call major, we're going to have to observe that three to one ratio. Um, so the degree to which somebody is ten percent or 15 percent is not something that we would normally calculate. Um, and the problem with that is that it can vary depending on each individual location you look at. And if you have something such as degradation occurring and peak heights dropping, you can have those percentage contributors tend to move from clearly separated to approximately

equal in level.

Q. But that's something you can take into account because you actually see that sloping degradation across the chart or the electropherogram. You can see when it's happening; is that correct?

A. You can visualize it, yes. But you can't necessarily look at a single location and be 100 percent confident that you're observing a 25 percent contributor versus a 75 percent contributor. And I wouldn't be allowed to report that anyway without consulting with my technical leader and getting approval for that and getting it peer reviewed.

Q. I'm going to jump around a little bit. And again, I don't mean to confuse. I am trying. So, a sample comes to you. The first step is extraction; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. From there, um, following purification, you go on to quantification?

A. Yes.

Q. And that's when you're measuring how much total DNA this source has given you?

A. Yes. Total DNA.

Q. From that, that's where you take the next steps

to separate -- well, amplify -- but to separate out who could potentially give this amount or give this DNA?

A. So, the information we get from the quant would be how much total DNA is there, and we would also get a general idea of a relationship between how much male DNA might be there versus total DNA. Then we would make a decision based on that of how much actual DNA we would amplify. We generally will target .5 nanograms. That is a level of amplification that our studies have shown us is likely to give a complete result.

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. And then we won't really have an idea -- a solid idea of what percentage or major/minor relationships exist until we get the end readout in the form of an electropherogram.

Q. When you look at that electropherogram and you compare the peak heights that you see as to each contributor, are there no conclusions that you can begin to form about who provided what to that sample?

A. We do, and we do that in the form of determining whether there was a major contributor there or a minor contributor there. And we looked for at or around a three to one ratio between them, but we don't perform a calculation that says that this major contributor

represents 75 percent of the DNA. That is not a calculation that's within our procedures manual.

Q. Is there a reason for that?

A. Um, I mean, I didn't write the procedures manual.

Q. Fair enough. I was just curious. So, when -- strike that, please. On each of the samples provided to you for specifically 5-A and 5-B -- I am going to use the lab numbers. Not the exhibit numbers. We're talking about the arm swab from Julie, all right?

A. Okay.

Q. You were able to get a full profile of Julie Bevely, yes?

A. Yes. She was -- we assumed that she was one of the contributors here.

Q. And there was a good sample or a good amount that you could attribute in each one -- maybe not as much -- attributed to Jade, correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. But you have no information that you can share with us as to the potential source of that DNA; whether it was blood, urine, skin, saliva?

A. No. There is nothing in the DNA result that tells us anything about the particular body fluid that it may have been.

Q. When two people live in the same home, drive in the same car, is it likely that they will have about their persons DNA of the other household occupants?

A. So, when people cohabitate, they are known to potentially transfer their DNA between each other. It is something that has been observed.

Q. You were asked specifically to examine a box that contained two kitchen knives; is that correct?

A. Yes. I received samples.

Q. Oh, I'm sorry, the samples. That's right. You received samples, Lab Item Number 8, and did you, um -- were you able to create a profile from the sample that you received?

A. So, um, the two samples, 8-A from the knife, was a mixture of at least two individuals. The profile was determined to be inconclusive. In 8-B there was a mixture of at least two individuals, but a major male DNA profile was identified there.

Q. And that ultimately was identified through CODIS as being an employee of the Illinois State Police?

A. Yes.

Q. And was there then -- or did you take part in any investigation as to a potential contamination?

A. Um, I was never informed who it was. I know that

there was some investigation into it, but that would have been conducted by my managers and our DNA technical leader, so I wasn't specifically involved in that.

Q. Well, we had Agent Deschamps -- excuse me, CSI Deschamps testify, and he told us that in seeking out the source of the contamination, he was informed that holding the item close to examine it visually, and he breathed sufficiently on it, that that left a measurable amount of DNA.

A. So, whether -- whether that is what specifically happened or not, is unknown. There is a lot of variables that might explain it. But if you were unmasked and you were talking closely over an item, especially if you were to cough or sneeze or something to that effect, it's potential that that would be a way that you could deposit your DNA there.

Q. Okay. I want to turn now to Lab Item 30, if I may. That would be swabs collected from a vehicle.

A. Yes.

Q. Were you given any information as to whose vehicle it was or who was the primary driver of that vehicle?

A. Yes. I believe that Julia Bevely was the owner and driver of the vehicle.

Q. And from the swabs, were you able to determine or did anyone tell you exactly how much of a sample was collected?

A. Um --

Q. -- talking about LCV sample from a --

A. -- as far as how much DNA was detected there?

Q. How much of the sample?

A. Oh, I don't know --

Q. Don't know.

A. -- the specific. If it was the whole steering or a portion, I don't know exactly.

Q. Okay. But the only detectable DNA was Julie's from Item 30; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. All right. Now, as to Item 32-A, that would be the steering wheel cover. Your original report indicated that from the sample that was given to you, there were two contributors, correct?

A. Correct.

Q. A major contributor, Julie?

A. Correct.

Q. A minor contributor at four loci, at that point, was that sufficient -- the four loci -- sufficient to make an identification or to include someone in the

group?

A. At that point, I compared it to the standards that I had, which was Julie and Jade, and they were excluded. I later received additional standards; one of which was from Gregory Beasley.

Q. I will get there in just a second. The four loci, while not much --

A. -- correct.

Q. -- right, um, it is sufficient for exclusionary purposes so that you knew right away in the first report that -- that Jade did not -- or Jade's DNA did not contribute to that amount?

A. Yes. Yes. She was excluded.

Q. Later it was determined that possibly Mi -- Gregory Michael Beasley was a contributor of the four loci?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, let's talk about briefly Item 35-A, and what was that originally identified to you as?

A. So, 35-A was described as swabs said to be from the living room floor near the front door previously tested with LCV.

Q. And you were able to determine the major contributor; is that correct?

A. Yes.
Q. And that was?
A. It was a female major DNA profile at eight loci. Jade Beasley cannot be excluded.
Q. However, someone was excluded; is that correct?
A. Yes, Julia Bevely.
Q. Now, at the time, you identified a one STR locus that excluded both Julia and Jade; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Why?
A. It is not a DNA component that they possess. They could not have donated it.
Q. Was there anything in particular about that DNA component that said that they could not? Was that by any chance a sex marker?
A. Um, I would have to look it up to be sure.
Q. Do you have something you could use to review your --
A. Yes.
Q. -- refresh your memory?
A. Yes.
MS. THIEN: -- with the Court.
THE COURT: -- of course.
By Ms. Thien:

Q. Let me know when your memory has been refreshed.
A. I am having trouble locating it. Sorry.
Q. You know what, I'm going to withdraw that question, sir, because it's not a trick.
A. I have it. I just found it.
Q. Oh, you do? Oh, great. Has your memory been refreshed?
A. Yes.
Q. Please answer the question.
A. No. It was not a sex marker. It was an allel at D-16 which is one of the locations that we look at.
Q. Okay. Um, you later determined that Mike Beasley -- Gregory Michael Beasley could have been a contributor of that?
A. Yes. He possessed that same piece of information at that locus.
Q. But it's still only one loci?
A. Only one, yes. It would be very common in the general population.
Q. How common?
A. Uh, I don't -- I didn't calculate a statistic for that comparison. I believe, um, he had access to the item and could potentially have donated his DNA to it.
Q. But we do know at that marker place, did you say

D-16 --

A. -- yes.

Q. -- that neither Julie nor Jade possessed that particular marker?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. Finally, you did do an examination of samples that were sent to you labeled 20-E divided into 20-E-1 and E-2, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And the date on that report is?

A. October 5th, 2022.

Q. And that was -- or that was reported to you as being fingernail scrapings that were preserved; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. And, again, did you attempt to measure the overall amount of DNA that was collected?

A. As far as how much was swabbed from the --

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. -- collected?

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. No. I was not involved in that collection.

Q. Okay. Well, I'm sorry then. When it came to you, the extraction was performed, quantification

occurs. That's the total amount of DNA --

A. -- total amount, yes.

Q. -- from that sample --

A. -- correct.

Q. -- that was given to you?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. And from that, did you look at anything to determine the proportion of DNA that could have come from the two contributors?

A. There, again, it would be similar to the situation that we talked about before where we look for a major/minor relationship. However, in these, we are doing what's called a deduction where we'll assume that the DNA profile from the person from whom the fingernails were collected, we're going to assume that their DNA is there --

Q. Safe deduction.

A. -- and we're going to look for alleles in DNA components that are -- could not have originated from them. And that's how we will deduce the foreign contributor. And that's the type of interpretation we perform here.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, sir. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Any redirect?

MR. BUTLER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sir, you may step down. The food is on the way, so the Court is going to take a break at this time. So I want to, again, admonish the jury please until this case is submitted to you for your deliberation, you must not discuss this case with anyone or remain in hearing of anyone discussing it. Cannot watch TV about this article. Can't read anything, internet, book, anything, newspaper about this case. You can't listen to the radio about this case. After the case has been submitted to you, you must discuss the case only in the jury room when all the members of the jury are present. You're to keep an open mind. You must not decide any issue in the case till it's submitted to you for your deliberation under the instructions of the Court. Please rise for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: The Court will be in recess. Let's shoot for about 1:15.

(NOON RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: The Court re-calls 20-CF-596. People versus Julia Bevely. We're still in the case in-chief of the State, but by agreement, I think we indicated this before, the defense was going to go ahead and offer the testimony of their DNA expert at this time out of turn by agreement with the Court telling the jury that the State has not rested. That we're doing this as an accommodation for the witness. Is that accurate?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. THIEN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's rise for the jury, please.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Be seated, please. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the State has not rested their case. However, the defense wishes to offer some evidence at this time to accommodate their witness. This is being done by an agreement. Ms. Thien, you may call your witness.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, the defense calls Dr. Karl Reich.

THE COURT: Sir, please come forward and face my clerk. Raise your right hand to be sworn.

DR. KARL REICH,

was called as a witness on behalf of the Defendant, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please have a seat here, sir. State your full name. Please spell your last name for the record, and please make sure you speak up loud enough that everybody can hear you.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. My last name is Reich. R-E-I-C-H. First name Karl. K-A-R-L. Middle initial A?

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Dr. Reich, what do you do for a living?

A. I manage a non-governmental forensic DNA laboratory located in suburban Chicago.

Q. And how long have you -- is this Independent Forensics DNA Testing and Technologies?

A. That's the name of the laboratory.

Q. And how long have you been with this laboratory?

A. Since it's inception in the Fall of 2002.

Q. Sir, can you give us an idea of your educational

background?

A. I have an undergraduate degree in Chemistry from Cornell University. I have a PhD, um, in molecular biology from UCLA. My thesis work was completed at Harvard Medical School by a quirk. And I have a post doctoral training at the Institut Pasteur in Paris and for the Chief of Infectious Diseases at Stanford Hospital.

Q. And have you held any other positions in academia?

A. I was a Howard Hughes research fellow also at Stanford Medical School for a number of years after my post doc, but the rest of my work has been in the industry.

Q. Sir, have you published in the field?

A. Yes. I've had the opportunity to publish articles, journals and in journals and abstracts for all of the fields I have worked in which includes forensic DNA.

Q. Have you been qualified as an expert in the area of forensic DNA and forensic biology?

A. I have.

Q. Could you tell us where?

A. I believe it's 21 states and the District of, um,

Columbia. I think that's correct.

Q. Sir, do you only testify for the defense?

A. I answer the phone. So, most of the work that our laboratory receives for case review comes from the defense bar. Most of the samples we receive, come from law enforcement.

Q. Has the proportion changed over the 20 years that you have been in this business?

A. It has. Um, still the majority of the samples come from law enforcement, and still the majority of the case review comes from the defense. But more recently there have been more requests from State's Attorney's offices. They now have -- I should say many of them have instituted what's called conviction integrity units. These are sub groups, I am told, of the State's Attorney's office. And they have -- we work with about half of dozen of those offices reviewing cases and doing testing, so technically they come from the State's Attorney's office.

Q. When you say you answer the phone, um, you were in consulting as well as testing, and you do not weed out one side or the other?

A. Never. I have not done so, and do not intend to.

MS. THIEN: Judge, may approach the witness?

THE COURT: You may.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. Sir, I am going to show you what I marked as Defendant's Exhibit Number 1 and ask if you can identify that for us?

A. Yes. This is my scientific resume. Sometimes called a CV, and it's a list of where I have worked, my education, my publications that have been accepted, abstracts. There is training classes we have provided. There are a list of continuing education, meetings and where I have been accepted as an expert and provided testimony either in Court or in deposition.

Q. Is that fairly up-to-date?

A. Near enough. Near enough for us.

Q. Fair enough. Thank you.

MS. THIEN: Judge, at this time we would move to admit Defendant's Exhibit Number 1.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. BUTLER: No.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

MS. THIEN: And, your Honor, at this time, we would tender Dr. Reich as an expert in forensic DNA and forensic biology.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: No objection.

THE COURT: Then the Court will receive him as such.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. Dr. Reich, what -- what is forensic DNA?

A. You heard a little bit of the description today from the State's analyst, and it is the -- can be divided actually into two sections. One would be called forensic biology. Sometimes called serology, and that's the screening and testing for body fluid identification. And then the other part would be called DNA profiling. And that's an attempt to get genetic information for identity. So, the two parts compose all of forensic DNA; the biology part and then the profiling part.

Q. In this case in particular, did you review the State's file?

A. Yes. So, I receive what's call discovery. So, this is paperwork and electronic computer files which are accumulated by the forensic laboratory as they process their samples. They make a record of their work, and that's part of the discovery process that I receive and examine.

Q. Are you familiar with the process and procedure of the State Police Crime Lab?

A. Yes, I am certainly for the Illinois State Police, and there are approximately 350 crime laboratories in the United States. I can't speak for all of them, but I can say I have reviewed probably from well over 100 of those laboratories.

Q. What is DNA?

A. So, DNA is an acronym. It stands for the name of the molecule that retains the information that makes all of our cells and makes us who we are.

Q. We heard a little bit before about the process of collecting and processing DNA. Um, could you run through the process to get to the profile that we're going to be talking about?

A. I can try. So, everyone has their own way of describing it, but the steps are pretty uniform. So, as described, the first step is called extraction. And because DNA is very tightly held by biological material, by the cells, we need to do something rather strong to force the cells to release their DNA. So the analogy I generally use is of an egg, and we're interested in the yoke. And how do we get the yoke in extraction? We take an eight pound sledge hammer, and we smash the egg.

And this makes a mess. We have the shell and the white and the yoke and the bits of the hammer that fell off. We then have to do a second step to get rid of the debris and the broken shell and everything else that we made in the first step. And if that sounds backwards, we don't have a choice. We have to do those first two steps. So, that's extraction, and then, um, purification. The next step, as was described, is quantification. Estimating how much DNA, how much yoke, we recovered through the first two steps. And the modern DNA quantification methods provide several pieces of information. They provide an estimate of the amount of total DNA and the amount of male DNA in that sample. There is other information in there as well, but, in general, those are the two estimates we receive. So, now we know how much DNA we've recovered, and the DNA, the amount, is generally one drop. So, think of a leaky faucet, and it's going drip, drip, drip. One of those drops is essentially the volume of the liquid we've recovered at the end of steps one and two. And that's in a tube that's about three times bigger than that one drop of liquid to give you a sense of what we have. We then take a commercial kit and do an amplification in a dedicated machine called a thermocycler, and the kit is

like going to the market and getting, um, say brownie mix. All the components you need to make the brownies are in the box. All the components we need to do the amplification are the in commercial kit. What we need to add is some of the purified DNA that we recovered. And so we know how much there is, we can figure out how much we should put into the recipe for amplification.

Q. The purpose of amplification is to grow the source -- or grow it big enough to see and analyze?

A. Grow is an interesting term.

Q. Okay.

A. I would say we're making copies of the areas we're interested in. So, the DNA molecule that we have is about three billion base pairs long, and we are only interested in some very small segments that are scattered around the DNA. So, we end up looking -- if we get all of the data -- at about 3,000 base pairs out of three billion total, okay. So, that's the amplification process. Only some certain defined sections are amplified; copied many times as was described.

Q. What is a full DNA profile?

A. So, that has to do with the commercial kit that we're going to use to analyze those specific regions,

and those kits have a certain number of genetic elements that they test. And if you get results from all of them, then you have what's called a full profile. If for various reasons you don't get data from every one of those genetic markers, every one of those regions, then by definition you have a partial profile. So, the minimum number of markers we have to examine is 20. Twenty, and that was defined by the FBI. And the commercial manufacturers have added a couple more to make their kit more sellable. So, they can be 22 or 23 or 24 depending on which kit you're using. But the minimum, according to the FBI as of January 1st, 2017, was 20.

Q. I have seen in some of the documents and reports submitted by the State that looked at and declared 20 loci as being a -- I'm sorry. Strike that. Twenty-two as being a full profile.

A. Correct. So, that's because in that commercial kit, there are the 20 mandated, plus, additional ones that that manufacturer put in to make more sales.

Q. If you are looking at a profile that has all 22 genetics markers, that would be a full profile?

A. That would be a full profile as is required now.

Q. And can you use that to identify a person

associated with that?

A. Um, yes. You do use the profile in a comparison.

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. So, the analogy I use for profile is of a phone number. The DNA profile is a series of numbers in order. Your phone number is a series of numbers in order. If you give someone the full phone number, country code, area code, city code, block code, extension, one phone on the planet will ring. If you have a full profile, according to the FBI, all 20 markers, then you have enough information to uniquely identify one person from all others. You can also -- in fact, you have to -- provide a statistical analysis of the strength of the comparison you've just done. We've compared the profile we obtained to the profile from the reference standard in the case. That -- there are a number of statistics that are approved. You have to provide one under the standards that laboratories operate in the U.S. And, so, that number can be very big if you have a full profile.

Q. Okay. If you have a profile of ten loci, would that be analogous to only having ten numbers of this 20 digit phone number that you dial?

A. Near enough. I won't say that the 20 and 20 are

the same, but the concept is similar is that you're missing data out of the whole profile. You're missing some of the digits in your phone number.

Q. It reduces the odds of identifying or being able to compare this ten loci sample to the general public? Did I mess that up?

A. You mentioned the word odd. So, the odds in something is actually the ratio of two probabilities, and so we're not going to use that word.

Q. Okay.

A. It does reduce the strength of the statistical calculation, and it introduces some level of doubt as to the identity statement you've made. All 20 essentially eliminates doubt, according to our standards. And as you go from, say, 20 to 19 to 18, all the way down, more and more, you lose the statistical power of that method.

Q. However, that is still -- or can be -- important information?

A. Absolutely. You can use the information as is required, and sometimes the absolute identity is not the most important factor in a profile.

Q. Now, as you examined the file in this case, did you notice any problems with the process used by the State, or is it fairly uniform and was sufficient for

your needs as well?

A. My needs were to review the results; not to actually perform any testing, so that's important.

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. And what the Illinois State Police did is well within the normal standards that all laboratories use to do all the steps we talked about earlier, extraction, purification, quant, amp and analysis. So, there is some variation that is possible in each one of those steps, but what ISP does is well within the middle ground of what everybody us does.

Q. Okay. Is it possible to determine the source of DNA from the extraction and analysis that is performed?

A. So, I want to be careful about source because that was a question that was asked earlier.

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. So, there is two ways of thinking about source. One is who is it from, and the other is what is it from. And the what refers to blood, saliva, semen, urine, sperm or feces. Those are the forensic body fluids and cells we can identify versus who it came from. So, I don't know what you mean by source yet.

Q. I would like to talk about what?

A. Okay.

Q. Okay. Um, are there tests that can be performed on a sample to determine the source -- the what -- that sample is from?

A. Certainly. That's called forensic biology, or the older term serology.

Q. Was that performed in the examination of the swabs in this case that are attributed to -- um, we keep calling them bite marks -- the patterned injury on Julie?

A. No. There was no body fluid testing performed on those two swabs.

Q. Once you review the results from that then, you are only looking at DNA, but you cannot tell where it is from?

A. Let's rephrase that. Let's call it what it's from.

Q. Yes.

A. We know who it might have come from, but we don't know what body fluid might have provided the DNA.

Q. Some of these things that you describe are -- correct me if I'm wrong -- DNA rich?

A. You're referring to body fluids?

Q. Yes.

A. Absolutely. So, this is a very well,

long-studied field, and we know exactly how much DNA is contained in blood, how much is in saliva, how much is in semen if sperm are present, roughly. We know how much is in seminal fluid if no sperm are provided, etc. So, that's well understood.

Q. Is it possible to find DNA in skin sells?

A. Yes. So, here you're talking about handled objects or things that have nearly been touched without an obvious body fluid.

Q. Would that be as DNA rich as an actual body fluid?

A. No. So, I want to be also careful because urine is one of our body fluids, and it's a weak source of DNA, but blood, saliva, and we're going to argue today semen, are the rich sources of DNA. That is, they have lots DNA per volume of material.

Q. In the course of your review, did you also examine the electropherograms that were produced by the State specifically from the item -- we're going to call it 5-A or 5-B -- which is the swab from Julie's arms?

A. I did.

Q. Would seeing those help explain, um, the amount and quality of DNA that we're talking about in this case?

A. I think visualizing it will be very informative.

MS. THIEN: May I approach?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. Doctor, I am going to show what I first marked as Defendant's Exhibit 2 and Defendant's Exhibit 3. Do you recognize those documents?

A. I do.

Q. Would you tell me what they are?

A. Um, well, I'm the only one that can see them, but these are two pages from the forensic DNA discovery materials that were provided to me in this case. They are four panels of a DNA electropherogram produced by the Illinois State Police, Metro East Laboratory.

Q. I am going to stop you for just a moment before I throw it up on the screen. Um, is there something on these documents that identify the sample we're actually talking about?

A. Absolutely. I was getting there.

Q. Oh, sorry.

A. The electropherogram is labeled with the sample name which is DFS 20-040735. That's the laboratory case number for ISP, and it is sample 5-B, as in boy.

Q. Okay.

MS. THIEN: Judge, if I may, I'm going to try to throw this up on the document scan.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. We are going to be able to see these in panels of one. Can you see that, doctor?

A. I can see that.

Q. Okay. Can you tell us what we're looking at?

A. So, this is an electro -- this is one panel of a four panel EPG, as was described, or electropherogram. However you would like to describe it. If we can understand one panel, we examine all four panels identically. So, there is a lot of information here. There is a long, narrow rectangle in the middle with numbers across the top and numbers to the left.

Q. Would that be this rectangle right there?

A. Go up and back around. That's the rectangle we're discussing.

Q. Very good.

A. And so above that rectangle are these other rectangles with these strange names. So, the first one is amelogenin. It's a very long name, and it doesn't fit into the box, and the software squeezes in some of it anyway. The next box is the D-3 locus. The next one is D-1, D-2, D-10, etc. Those are the names of the

genetic elements we are testing in the profile. What we are interested in, in is this electropherogram, are the peaks or spikes or needles that you see. They are blue color, if you make it out on your screen. And they are -- I am pointing, but you can't see that -- so that's the first one. That's a marker in amelogenin. It tells us that there is an X marker in this which tells us this is from female contributor. There is no Y in that amelogenin, so there is no evidence here of a boy who would have a Y chromosome. Next you can see peaks at the D-3, D-13, D-1 -- pardon me -- D-2, D-10, etc. So, those peaks are the results of the amplification we talked about earlier. And you will notice that some of the markers have two peaks, like, D-3. Some of them have four peaks. You can just barely make them out in D-1 or in D-13. Some of them have three, like, Penta E all the way to the right. That tells us there is at least two contributors to this sample.

Q. We see here underneath the series of boxes that also contain information?

A. Correct. So, those are the boxes put there by the software that makes this picture. This is -- eventually it was a screen shot, and that's what the software produces, and then we copy that or it copies it

for us. So, underneath each of the peaks that the software recognizes is a data box. The little box with the three numbers top, middle and bottom. And so that's the information we have about each of the peaks that are present. Some of those boxes have been outlined in yellow by the Illinois State Police. What I need you to notice is that many of the peaks are all roughly the same height within one marker. So, if we look at the D-1 marker, which has four peaks, I am going to read off the profile that is generated at D-1, that's 15, 16, 16-3, and 17-3. And you will see they are all roughly the same height. How do I know that? First of all, you can tell by looking at it, and the second number in the box tells us the peak height. So, 311, 335, 389 and 497. So for our purposes, those are all roughly the same peak height value, and so we know that the amount of DNA from those two people is roughly the same.

Q. Is -- well, I got lost in the -- in the story there for a minute, doctor. So, with that information, what can we glean from that? What is that telling us?

A. It tells us that the two contributors gave approximately the same amount of their individual DNA to this sample. We know there is two people on this at a minimum, and we know the amount of DNA that each one

gave is approximately the same; 50/50.

Q. In this particular case that you, um, reviewed, that -- these profiles or these identifications, would be for Julie Bevely and for Jade Beasley --

A. -- that's correct.

Q. -- correct? And both of their -- using the one as the example, I should say, right?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. This is one area of the potential 22 -- we're only looking at one -- um, but you're telling us that proportionately both people gave the same or -- or -- yeah. Gave the same amount of DNA?

A. That's correct. So, the peak height is proportional to the amount of DNA that went into the recipe to amplify.

Q. Okay.

A. And so, if each gave roughly the same amount of DNA, we would expect their peak heights to be roughly the same, and we can see that that's the case for D-1 and D-13 right away. The numbers in the box accentuate that observation or give us a quantitative analysis of that. So, roughly 50/50 between the two contributors on the swabs taken from the defendant's arms.

Q. I am going to move this up now to show the second

graph, and could you tell us what we're looking at here and whether it's important to what we just discussed?

A. Certainly. So, it's actually the next panel in the electropherogram. This is all one electropherogram, and we're looking at the next dye set, which is green. I don't know if that's easy to see on the screen, and the simplest way is to look at the middle marker D-2. You can see four peaks. They are roughly the same peak height. You can also look at Penta D which is all the way off to the right. Again, the peaks are roughly the same. So, it's confirming the fact that we have 50/50 of both. Now somebody is going to look at D-16 all the way to the left and say you got one there that's much taller than the other. And the answer is it is but because it's very likely that that marker, which is marker 12, has both a marker from the defendant as well as the victim. And, so, both of those peaks have stacked on top of each other so it's double height. It reconfirms that they are roughly 50/50 also at D-16.

Q. Doctor, I am going to, for completeness sake, run through the rest of these panels, if I may?

A. So, this is a continuation of the same electropherogram. This is a dye that is actually yellow, but yellow doesn't show up on the screen so the

software renders it as black. And so, again, let's look at the middle marker D-7 because it's the simplest to explain to start. You have four peaks. Profiles 8, 9, 11 and 12, and the markers are 850 and 830 versus 560 and 1000. So again, you add them up, you're roughly at 50 percent. We have the same allele stacking issue at Tho 1, the first marker to the left. And at VWA, you will notice that the tallest peak is approximately double the height of the other two confirming, again, we have base stacking, and we have roughly 50/50 between the two. There is a slight anomaly at Tpox, which is all the way to the right, which was noted by ISP. It happens. It doesn't really change the results from all of the rest of the markers.

Q. And lastly, the last panel.

A. So, here this is a fourth panel in this particular commercial kit. And so, again, we have base stacking -- allele stacking. If you look at D-12, it's the simplest. It has four identified peaks. It has roughly 1900 units from one contributor and roughly 2400 in another. Roughly 50/50 again. We have allele stacking at D-8 and FG-8.

Q. Allele stacking basically, right, if I have this right, all of our loci have two alleles associated with

it?

A. We inherit two alleles.

Q. One from --

A. -- mom; one from dad.

Q. Um, the alleles themselves are not infinite. There is only a certain number that repeat --

MR. BUTLER: -- Your Honor, I'm going to object to the questioning. Thi is a -- she is leading the witness.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MS. THIEN: I am.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. What, um -- what impact does that have on allele stacking, or could you explain to me what that is?

A. Sure. So, we inherit our solo DNA from each of our parents as has been described. And the profiles -- we'll just take them as numbers. We can describe what they are in detail, but you either get a nine or a ten or an eight or a seven from mom, and the same thing from dad. If both mom and dad gave you an eight, you only have allele eight. And the way we measure that is by the length, as was described earlier. And so an eight from mom, is the same length as your eight allele from dad, and so both of those eights on top of each other on

the electropherogram and so the peak is taller. And that's what we mean by allele stacking.

Q. When we're looking at this, we already know that there was no source testing prior to extraction. No determination as to whether this was, you know, blood or saliva or skin. So, we can't do that, but with this information, doctor, can you give us an opinion as to what it could be?

A. I believe the information is available.

Q. What is it?

A. We know that the amount of DNA from the skin of the defendant -- because that's where the swab is from -- is roughly equal to the amount of DNA taken from the victim because we're looking at the electropherogram and the peaks are roughly the same height. We know it comes from the skin. We know there is not much DNA from that, so there is not much DNA from the victim.

Q. Would that argue -- strike that. If we were comparing skin DNA to, say, blood DNA, would these peaks still be equal?

A. Um, no. The blood is a much richer source of DNA than skin swabbing as would be saliva. Those are rich sources. Over 20 times more DNA would be expected from blood or saliva than would from a skin swab.

Q. Is a reasonable scientific conclusion then in this particular instance that the source --

MR. BUTLER: Objection. It's leading.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MS. THIEN: I will rephrase. Let me think on that for a second.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. What would a reasonable scientific conclusion be, Doctor?

A. That the amount of DNA from both contributors is the same, and it's unlikely that either of the DNA comes from a rich source, like, saliva or blood.

Q. From your examination of -- at my best count is well over 800 pages of documentation, was there anything that you found in the file that would argue against that conclusion?

A. No. The ability to calculate the amount of DNA from the quant, which we were given, and from the electropherograms, which were also provided, is standard. It's the same kind of calculation that's made to determine major from minor as was described. But here we're taking an additional step to go backwards to the original evidence about what it might mean.

Q. When individuals share a home together, is it

likely that they would have DNA of other members in the household --

MR. BUTLER: Objection. Leading.

MS. THIEN: -- on them?

THE COURT: I'm not so sure that one is. I don't think it suggest an answer. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Um, I would put it differently. If you're in the same household, you are going to have DNA of every member of the household on yourself, on what you wear, on your dinner plates, on your glasses, your cutlery. You swab a surface, you swab the rug, you're going to get everybody who's in that household.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. If I wrapped myself in a blanket that was picked up off the sofa, likely, that I would have picked up DNA from that from anyone else who would have used that blanket?

A. Yes. I would put it a little differently. I would say whatever DNA is on the blanket and you have wrapped yourself in it, is a good chance of transferring from the blanket on to you.

Q. Now, there were a series of other items that were tested in this case that you reviewed for us, but at

this time, what I would like to do is switch to, um, the next one I would like to speak about, and that would be fingernail swab and scrapes from Jade. I think that is described as Lab Item 20 E-1. Did you have the opportunity to review those reports?

A. I did. They arrived later, but they also came with their own discovery packet.

Q. And did that information -- their own discovery packet. You had the opportunity review the same policies, procedures, extraction, everything as you did in the first set?

A. I did.

Q. Doctor, I am going to show you what I have just marked as Defendant's Exhibit 4 and 5. I am going to ask if you recognize those?

A. I do.

Q. And what are they?

A. I am going to start with naming them this time because I didn't get that right last time.

Q. Sorry.

A. So, this is from Illinois State Police Case Number DFS 20-04-07-35, but it's sample 20-E, as in Edward, one.

Q. And over those two pages, are we looking at the

four panels of the electropherogram that was generated from the samples?

A. We are.

Q. I am going to throw those up again. Okay. Doctor, can you tell me what we're looking at?

A. I'm hoping this is a little more familiar. This is, again, one of the four panels of the electropherogram. It's the panel that is with the blue dye. Again, the long, narrow rectangle in the middle has the DNA profile peaks, spikes or needles, however, you want to describe them, and there are data boxes underneath the identified peaks from the software. There are also some red boxes which were put in by the Illinois State Police, and I am responsible for the blue arrows.

Q. This -- these arrows and this -- oh, sorry. That one's not on the screen yet.

A. Yes.

Q. This is yours and these are yours?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. Everything in red is from the State Police?

A. As provided in the discovery packet.

Q. Very good. What are we looking at?

A. We are looking at the electropherogram of 20-E. We know from the amelogenin marker, that first one to the left, that this is from females. We know that because there is more than two peaks, two data boxes in the loci, it's a mixture. And we can, again, see here there are peaks that are significantly bigger than other peaks which are significantly smaller.

Q. We've heard that referred to as a major contributor and a minor contributor?

A. That's correct. That was described quite accurately earlier. The Illinois State Police makes that designation based on the peak height, how tall that peak is, and if you don't sort of believe your eyes, the middle number in the data box tells us the peak height, and that's referring to the vertical scale off to the left that goes zero, 8,000 to 16,000 would be the top of the box.

Q. So, this number here in this box, 378, that describes the peak height?

A. It does.

Q. And that describes the amount of DNA at that point or a proportion of the DNA?

A. It's a proportional figure. It isn't an amount of DNA at all. Do not think that, but it is in

proportion to the amount of DNA that is provided. So if you move your pen down to the next box, so that's allele called 11, and that is the peak. You can just barely see. The ten is to the left of it, and you really can't see it. It's buried in the line at the bottom. But peak ten is, let's count it, 400 units tall. Peak 11 is 1500 units tall, so that's approximately three and a half to four times more height out of 11 than it is from ten.

Q. Would that apply in every box that we're looking at here, the second number?

A. The second number is always the peak height for every box in this electropherogram, and the ratio between the little peaks and the big peaks is going to vary a little bit, but we can actually do the math and calculate what that is.

Q. Does this indicate a mixture of DNA from both Julie and Jade?

A. It does.

Q. Before we do that, I am going to move to the second graph and ask -- still on Defendant's Exhibit Number 4 -- and ask if you can tell us what we're looking at here?

A. Certainly, so technically this is the same

electropherogram. It's the next panel. So we're looking at a different set of markers in the green dye, and I have put in the blue arrows to show the minor contributor. And those are also were identified by the Illinois State Police in the yellow highlighter. That's their marking. And so, the simplest way is to take the middle marker D-2. You can clearly see there are two taller peaks. One, it goes small, larger, small, larger. And so, the two larger peaks are approximately 1600 and 1200 units tall. And the little peaks are approximately 300 and 427 units tall. So, that's approximately five or four times difference in peak height.

Q. Is this showing a mixture of DNA of Julie and Jade?

A. It is.

Q. Can you assign the major contributor here?

A. You can and the Illinois State Police has. So, let's start, if you would like to do this, in the green dye all the way to the left in the D-16 marker --

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. -- there are three identified peaks by the software; allele calls 12, 13 and 14. It's -- just by inspection, just by observing it, it's clear there are

two tall peaks and one much smaller peak. So, 12 and 13 are clearly the bigger peaks. The 14 is obviously the smaller peak, and so we've got 4600, 2500 and 500. So, it's anywhere from nine times more to five times more major than it is minor.

Q. We're going to come back. I am going to show you what I marked as Defendant's Exhibit 5 which would be the third of the pherogram -- EPM --

A. EPG.

Q. -- EPG in the series.

A. Correct. So, here we really only have two markers that we have a comparison for; Tho 1, and VWA. And so for Tho 1, we have two peaks. One at 5700 and one at 4400. And then one at essentially 900 or so. So, that's, I don't know, five times the difference the range. For VWA, we have 2200 and 2600 and we have 336, so that's more in the seven and eight range in terms of major to minor.

Q. And just finally the last one.

A. So, this is the last dye set in this electropherogram. We only have one example here we can determine which is D-19, which is essentially in the middle. We have the major profile are the two larger outer peaks, 12 and 15. And there is a 14.2 which is a

perfectly good marker between the two, and here the range is about four to one.

Q. There is a note on here at the very bottom. Can you tell me what we're talking about there?

A. So, this is a note from the Illinois State Police, and it says it's a mix of two. So, here they are referring to the number of contributors. There is an apparent major. I think that's very clear, and it's consistent with the victim. My understanding is this is taken from her fingernails. So, perfectly good assumption that her profile would be present, and the note continues, it says, "degrades unresolved to the right." And this refers to the decrease in peak heights as you go from left to right. I believe that was discussed earlier by the State's analyst, and you can see that if you would take an imaginary ruler and put it to the top of the peaks to the left and make it go to the tops of the peaks to the right, you will see that it slopes downwards. In lab slang, we would call that a ski slope just because that's the shape. And that's either the DNA is damaged or the PCR is not working at full strength. And so, then they are going to assume the victim's profile. It's from her nails, and that's what they've done.

Q. Does it change anything in what we have been talking about here today?

A. Not at all.

Q. Okay. So we just went through, like, a lot of numbers, okay, um, and a lot of comparisons, and as we know, that's not my strength. Um, however, what is a conclusion that you can draw from this information that we just reviewed?

A. The conclusion that you can draw -- well, there is two. One is the identity of the individuals, which I think is not really in dispute. So the question is what can we learn from the amount of DNA that's present. And the answer is how much DNA under the victim's fingernail comes from the defendant.

Q. You prepared for me a little chart to explain. Would this help in explaining this to me at this point?

A. I guess we're going to find out.

Q. Okay. Doctor, I am going to show you what I marked as Defendant's Exhibit Number 6. Are we ready to go there?

A. Certainly.

Q. All right. The difficult part is figuring out how to get most of it on the screen at once, which I don't think is going to happen, and still be visible.

Judge, can you see that well, or should I zoom it back down and make it larger?

THE COURT: You're asking the wrong person.

MS. THIEN: Oh, no. No. Can you read it?

THE COURT: I can read, yes.

MS. THIEN: Okay. And it's clear?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, on mine.

MS. THIEN: Let's start with that then. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: I don't have it on my screen.

THE COURT: No. I haven't set the preview.

THE WITNESS: Ah, I'm sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: I was waiting for her to orient it.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. Not everything is on there, Doctor. I'm going to be perfectly blunt. I can't figure out how to make that work and still make it readable for everyone. Um, we talked about the fact that there was, late in the game, some DNA that was located under Jade's nails. Proportionally, how much belongs to Jade and how much belongs to Julie?

A. So, that's what this calculation is aimed at helping everyone figure that out. Okay. So, we can do

this -- so first of all, the peak heights are calculated by the software, and that box is the middle number. So, we can take those numbers and work with them. So, the first piece of information we would need is the amount of total DNA that was recovered from sample 20-E-1.

Q. And that we talked about was -- comes from the quantification step in the overall analysis, right?

A. It does, and that's provided in the discovery packet. So, the Illinois State Police has a system. It's a dedicated instrument with its own commercial kit, etc., etc., and they provide that number in the discovery packet.

Q. How much DNA was isolated in this case?

A. So, it calculates out to 7.7 nanograms. I can go over how we do that if you want, but that's the final number.

Q. What's a nanogram?

A. Yeah. A nanogram is the measure of DNA that we use and that the molecular biology lab uses, and it's one billionth of a gram. And I am sometimes asked to bring that in to some human terms. So, think of a sugar packet that you open up, spill out your sugar, and there is about -- I don't know -- between 1500 and 2500 little sugar crystals in that packet. It turns out there is

different sized packets in the United States. We won't go there. If you take one of those sugar crystals and you divide it by a thousand and then we divide that by ten, you have a nanogram. So, it's not very much material, but that's what we're use to working with in the laboratory.

Q. And the total amount that was recovered in this case was 7 point -- approximately 7.7?

A. From this sample. Not this case. This particular sample; 7.7 nanograms.

Q. Of that, how much is attributed to Jade and how much is attributed to Julie?

A. So, we're going to try and use the ratio between the two peaks that we saw on the electropherogram to modulate the total amount of DNA into those two parts. Part one, from the victim, and part two, from the defendant, okay?

Q. Okay.

A. And so the question is when you add up all of those electropherogram peaks, how are you going to do that? There is no perfect way, but it's roughly ten percent of the DNA came from the defendant.

Q. From the information that we have here, would that -- this amount of DNA indicate that the source of

this is blood?

A. It's not consistent with blood.

Q. Why?

A. We can calculate how much DNA that ten percent or so of the total is, and it's about .8 nanograms. We'll just round it up. And so, one microliter of blood -- think of a drop of blood that's the size of a period at the end of a sentence on a piece paper that you have typed -- no one types -- but that you print. That's a microliter of blood, and that's 20 nanograms of blood -- of DNA. Pardon me. And here we have less than one. So, it would be a very, very small amount of blood to equal that, and that's not consistent.

Q. What would it be consistent with?

A. Skin; every day DNA that you pick up, touch.

Q. So, how much is .8 grams of DNA?

A. So, you asked me how much was a nanogram?

Q. Yeah.

A. So, that's not easy. I came up with another volume, a microliter, and that wasn't helpful either. So, I was trying to find a way of explaining how much DNA is .8 nanograms. And so most people have seen a cell even in their high school biology class. So, we know what the DNA content is of a single cell, and I

know how much DNA I'm calculating. So, how many cells is that? And it's about 120 cells, and you can't see a stack of 120 cells without a microscope. It's too small.

Q. That amount, is that consistent with what someone can pick up touching any surface?

A. Yes. It's -- think of your amount of DNA on a fingerprint when you sort of leave your fingerprint on the mirror or on the lens of your glasses. That's the ballpark we're talking about.

Q. Okay. Would that amount of DNA be indicative of something that might have occurred from, say, a physical violent fight?

A. I think the expectation would be if one had scraped someone in a violent assault, there would be a lot more under their fingernails. There could be blood; much more DNA tissue than this.

Q. -- than this. I may be close to wrapping up. Lab Item 20-E-1, which was the right hand -- right hand envelope, and 20-E-2, a left hand envelope, we did get information from both of those; did we not?

A. There was DNA profiles developed from both.

Q. Under the left hand envelope, only Jade's DNA was found under Jade's nails?

A. That was a single source profile from the victim.
Q. Okay.
MS. THIEN: Sir, I have no further questions. Thank you.
THE COURT: Cross-examination.
MR. BUTLER: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Reich?
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Um, you were hired by the defense on this case, correct?
A. I was.
Q. And did they provide you with the discovery materials after the State provided them with that?
A. Uh, yes, they did.
Q. Okay. And the materials that you reviewed, um, did you include all of them in your reports that you wrote?
A. I made a list of the materials that were provided to me under discovery.
Q. Okay. And, again, those are listed in your report?
A. They should be.

Q. Okay. Uh, did you bring your report with you today?

A. I did.

Q. Or reports, I guess I should say.

A. They are right here, and I am sure you have copies of those.

Q. I do. One of the things that I wanted to ask you, on Page 1 of your first report where you're listing the materials, you've listed Illinois State Police Division of Forensic Service, Metro East Laboratory, laboratory report date 12-16-20?

A. It's 12-9. There's one in the middle, yes.

Q. Yes. Um, and that date, would you have got that from the report?

A. I think so. If I put it in inaccurately, it would have come from the materials.

Q. So, is there a chance you put that in inaccurately?

A. Of course.

Q. Okay.

A. I'm human. I make errors. Absolutely.

Q. We all do. Um, did you receive any other materials other than what's listed in your reports to review?

A. No. Sometimes I get autopsy reports which are not in the discovery. I don't believe I got that. I didn't get crime scene photos in this either. Um, I think this is pretty clear.

Q. Okay. Um, did you receive the video statement from the defendant?

A. No.

Q. Or a transcript of that?

A. No.

Q. And any crime scene reports?

A. Not that I remember, no.

Q. Okay. Any reports from the investigating agency?

A. Certainly not.

Q. So, would you say you received a complete discovery amount in this case?

A. Yes. So, maybe I need to specify. Under the Illinois State Supreme Court Discovery Rule 417, the proponent of the DNA has to provide a list of materials. That's what I request, and that's what I -- and I get a subset of those materials every time I review a case in Illinois.

Q. Okay. But that does not include the police reports, crime scene --

A. -- it does not.

Q. -- okay. So, you don't get everything --
A. -- it's stuff from the lab.
THE COURT: One at time, please.
THE WITNESS: Excuse me, your Honor.
MR. BUTLER: I'm sorry.
By Mr. Butler:
Q. Um, so, you don't receive everything about the case?
A. Certainly not. I am a forensic DNA. I don't do ballistics. I don't do documents. I don't do chem (ph). I don't do talks. Just the forensic DNA.
MR. BUTLER: May I have permission to approach the witness?
THE COURT: Of course.
By Mr. Butler:
Q. Doctor, I'm going to hand you what I marked as People's Exhibit 390 for identification purposes. Can you take a look at that?
A. Okay.
Q. And, um, the date of that report, is that included on there?
A. Uh, 09-28-2022.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I'll take that back. Now, your report that you generated, I didn't see that as a

report that was turned over to you to review?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. So, then the defense would not have given you this report?

A. I don't believe I saw that one before, so either it wasn't included in the packet or I missed it. Those are the two choices.

Q. Okay. Thank you. Now, I think Ms. Thien had asked you under direct, but I want to make sure, was there anything that you saw in the procedure that the State Police did in doing these samplings or analysis such as the re-agent or the kits; anything wrong with that?

A. No. My understanding is that the lab didn't do the sampling. That would mean taking the swab to collect. I believe they just received swabs, and so I don't know what was done to sample, and that was mentioned earlier, too. But, no, they processed it the way ISP processes all their samples.

Q. All right. Thank you. Um, you had a problem in your report with the labeling of swabs as from bite marks; is that fair to say?

A. Probably. I mentioned that I -- that the use of the term is not scientific.

Q. Okay. You don't think Illinois State Police should use that term?

A. I don't think anyone should use that term.

Q. Okay. Even if the police have information from a defendant that it was a bite mark?

A. The science does not allow the determination of a mark as coming from a bite. You can describe it as you want, but there is no way to say that that came from a bite, and there is certainly no way to compare bite marks.

Q. So, the police then should not take a defendant at their word?

A. Why else do we do testing --

MS. THIEN: -- Judge, I am going to object as to relevance. I mean, I agree with the parties, but I think this is beyond the scope.

THE COURT: It is. At least at this point.

MR. BUTLER: I'll move on. Wait. Are you saying it's beyond the scope or are you saying --

THE COURT: It is beyond the scope, the question you just asked. The earlier one, no, it is not.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. Um, Doctor, we'll go ahead and get into this. Are you being paid to testify?

A. I hope so.

Q. Okay. Have you been paid for the review of the materials?

A. I don't remember. I will certainly invoice for the time and work. I don't recall if payment has already been received. I'd be surprised. Usually I wait till the case is adjudicated to submit an invoice.

Q. Okay.

A. Not always.

Q. Well, do you know how many hours you worked on this case?

A. I can give you an estimate.

Q. Okay.

A. So, typically a case review will take between six and seven hours, and we charge $300.00 an hour. So, that's $1800.00 to $2100.00 depending on the case.

Q. Okay.

A. If we write a report, that can be anywhere from four to six hours in addition. Here there was one reasonable length one and one short one, so let's say seven hours just to round it up.

Q. Okay. I'm going to stop you there. Do you

charge the same amount to write your report as you do to review the materials?

A. I charge by the time involved.

Q. Okay. So, $300.00 an hour?

A. The amount is the same --

Q. -- okay.

A. -- per hour.

Q. So, another $2100.00?

A. Sure.

Q. And then do you get paid per hour to testify?

A. That's more complicated, but in general it's a flat fee unless it's a hearing in which case it doesn't take up the whole day.

Q. Okay. And what's your flat fee?

A. Twenty-five hundred.

Q. All right. Um, and are there any other charges that you put, or does that flat fee include, like, hotel, travel?

A. The flat fee does not include travel because it could be anywhere in the country. So, air fair, mileage, hotel, that gets added. That's an expense item, if you will, and that's per receipt.

Q. Air fair, mileage, hotel?

A. Correct.

Q. Per diem for food?

A. Almost never. I have to eat no matter where I am.

Q. Okay. So, your business, Independent Forensic DNA Testing and Technology?

A. Just -- you can just call it Independent Forensics.

Q. Okay. And you said you've been there since it's inception --

A. Correct.

Q. -- in 2020 -- or 2021? I'm sorry, 2002.

A. It's okay. The Fall of 2020. The Fall -- you got me doing it. The Fall of 2002.

Q. I'm sorry. I confused you there, and I confused myself. Um, do you own that business?

A. I own a percentage.

Q. How much of a percentage?

A. Fifty-three point eight.

Q. So, when you are reviewing materials, writing reports, testifying and you get paid, does that go towards the company, does that go to you?

A. One hundred percent of all revenue goes to the company --

Q. Okay.

A. -- of everything we do.
Q. And you yourself do the testing of samples?
A. I haven't done that in a number of years, but I did.
Q. How many years has it been since you have done that?
A. This is 2023. Probably a decade.
Q. Okay. And is there a standard number of loci that are required to make a match?
A. I'm not going to let you use the word match.
Q. Okay.
A. So, forensics doesn't use a match, and the State's analyst mentioned it's not excluded, and then he gave up trying to change it. So, the original mandate by the F.B.I. was 13 markers announced in December of '97. As of January 1st, 2017, that number went to 20. That's the minimum number of markers the FBI demands be tested.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you a little bit different then. Um, is there a minimum number of loci that are required before an analyst can say someone cannot be excluded?
A. No, there isn't, and that depends --
Q. -- thank you.

A. -- on the laboratory.

Q. Thank you. Um, and the amount of DNA recovered from the sample, does it, by itself, inform the quality of the DNA that is obtained?

A. No, it does not.

Q. In your first report where you're talking about the analysis done on the swabs of what the State Police have labeled bite marks, now you state that there is no way to determine when or how the DNA was deposited on the arm of the defendant; is that correct?

A. That's correct; not from the DNA.

Q. All right. Your next report about the scrapings, would you agree there is no way to determine when or how the DNA in that came in?

A. Same argument.

Q. All right. Thank you. And there are variables that are out there that can determine a quantity of DNA on a sample; is that fair to say?

A. There are lots of variables.

Q. Such as, if the crime scene investigator swabbed the right spot?

A. Certainly. If you miss the spot, you miss the spot.

Q. Sure. All right. Thank you.

MS. BUTLER: Your Honor, I am going to try to use this technology. I think I'm ready.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. Now, when you were testing -- or testifying earlier, I think you said that this X here means that both contributors were female?

A. It does. It means there is no male there.

Q. Okay. I'm returning that to the defense. Now, you were talking about trying to determine the total amount of DNA, and then you said something to the effect try to use to modulate? What -- what -- do you know what I'm talking about there?

A. Not --

Q. You kind of lost me at modulate when you said that. I don't know for sure what it was you're talking about?

A. Okay. So, I am going to make a guess here, if that's allowed. So, we know how much total DNA is there because the Illinois State Police measures it in their quantification. So, that number is provided. The question is how much DNA is there from each of the contributors. That's what we've been discussing. So, the electropherogram modulates the amount of DNA that's present.

Q. -- I am just asking -- can you tell us what you mean by that?

A. I just did.

Q. Modulate, what does that mean?

A. It modulates how you think about how much each of the individuals contributed to the sample.

Q. Okay. And it's your testimony that based off of what you reviewed both -- and now I am talking about the swab 5-B, again -- but both the defendant and the victim proportionally gave the same amount of DNA to that?

A. That's correct. Roughly is what --

Q. -- roughly. And again, that -- that has variables that could change that as well; is that not true?

A. We are all stuck with the samples that are provided. If you want to go back and say the wrong samples were taken, everything is wrong. If you want to say they didn't take the right area, everything is wrong. All we have are the data that was provided from the samples that were given to the lab.

Q. And degradation, that would effect samples as well; is that correct?

A. It can. You saw the effect of either inhibition

or degradation on the electropherogram where the peaks are larger to the left and smaller to the right.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. BUTLER: No further questions.

THE COURT: Redirect.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Dr. Reich, you're in business, right?

A. I'm sorry?

Q. You are in business?

A. I am.

Q. And being in business means you take on clients and you charge them by the hour?

A. For case review, we have a whole different system for samples that are provided, but yes.

Q. Um, much the same as attorneys work? Have you retained an attorney lately?

A. I -- I know how attorneys work. They charge by the hour.

Q. A lot of businesses do that; do they not?

A. Many. Certainly.

Q. Now, in this case, you are not asked to actually conduct any testing. You were asked to review, um, all

of the testing that was done by the State Police?

A. That's correct.

Q. And with all of the information that was given to you, do you believe that there was anything vital missing that would change your testimony today?

A. Body fluid testing, but that wasn't done.

Q. Okay. Um, you were shown a particular report that was not necessarily listed, so I am going to -- can I use yours? Thank you -- show you what was marked as People's Exhibit 390 and have you take a quick look at that.

A. Right. This is what I was handed by the State a few minutes ago.

Q. Yes.

A. All right. So, I don't recall seeing this, but it's just a listing of items of evidence. There is no forensic DNA profile results here. There is an answer to one of the questions I had --

Q. -- okay.

A. -- which was -- which was the right hand and which was the left hand. And so, I don't recall seeing these pages. I could have missed them. It doesn't change the results. It just changes which is one left versus two right.

Q. And specifically on this it does say that the forensic biology department collected samples from the fingernail specimen; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. But no other testing is indicated by this report?

A. Correct.

Q. Does that change any part of your testimony?

A. It does not. Same electropherograms; same results.

Q. Now, you were asked was there any male DNA located in the samples.

MR. BUTLER: Objection. That is not a question that was asked.

THE COURT: It sort of was. I'll allow it.

THE WITNESS: What I recall is a specific electropherogram where the amelogenin marker was at. There were samples that had --

MS. THIEN: -- hold on, doctor. Hold on.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. I am going to show you what I have marked as Defendant's Exhibit Number 7.

A. Right.

Q. Can you identify that for us?

A. Sure. It's an Illinois State Police forensic power quant -- it's the quantification -- work sheet and it's a table, and it describes a series of samples 20-E-1, 20-E-2 and some controls.

Q. Is there anything on there marked Y?

A. Um, yes. So, this is the data sheet from the quantification --

Q. Mm-hmm.

A. -- and there are four lines for each sample that has been tested using this method.

Q. Okay. What does that tell us, if anything -- if anything?

A. There are values associated with the four tests that the quant provides.

Q. Okay.

A. One of them is labeled Y.

Q. Is that a male marker?

A. That is the male marker.

Q. And does it have any amount shown there?

A. It does.

Q. How much?

A. It's 0.0007 nanograms per microliter.

Q. But still present?

A. Still measured by the machine.

Q. Sufficient to use for a complete DNA profile -- or to -- I am going to mess up the word. Is it sufficient in order to take further analysis like we've seen so far?

A. I am not sure I understand your question.

Q. I am not sure I understand my question.

A. Are you asking whether analyze --

THE COURT: There is not a question to you. Sir -- sir. Let defense counsel ask you the question.

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

By Ms. Thien:

Q. Is there enough there for further testing?

A. Certainly.

Q. Um, any of the information given to you indicate that any further testing was taken on that?

A. None.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, sir. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Sir, you may be excused.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. THIEN: Judge, at this time --

THE COURT: Ms. Thien?

(SIDE BAR HELD OUTSIDE THE HEARING OF THE JURY.)

(BACK ON RECORD INSIDE THE HEARING OF THE JURY.)

MS. THIEN: Your Honor, at this time the defense moves to admit Exhibit 2 through 7.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. BUTLER: No.

THE COURT: Two to seven will be admitted. Ladies and gentlemen, I was discussing with them an appropriate time to take a break and everybody agrees it's now. So, until this case is submitted to you for deliberation, you must not discuss the case with anyone or remain in hearing of anyone discussing it. Can't watch a TV article, TV program about this case, read any newspaper article, internet article, can't listen to the radio on anything at all about this case.

After this case has been submitted to you, you must discuss the case only in the jury room when all the members of the jury are present. You are to keep an open mind, and you must not decide any issue in the case until it is submitted to you for your deliberation under the instructions of the Court. Please rise for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Take a 15 minute break. The Court will be in recess.

(RECESS.)

(BACK ON RECORD.)

THE COURT: Go ahead and bring in our jury. Please stand for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD INSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: Be seated. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the last bit of testimony that you saw was part of the defendant's case, and I talked about that being done at that time to accommodate a witness. The State also has the opportunity to offer rebuttal evidence, and normally that's done at the end of the trial -- towards the end of trial. But to accommodate their witness, a portion of their rebuttal is going to be offered now. It is not evidence in their main case, and the defense has the opportunity to continue to offer additional evidence to be considered. You may call your witness.

MR. BUTLER: The People would call Brian Hapack.

THE COURT: Sir, I will remind you, you are under oath. Please have a seat, and speak into that

microphone. Thank you.

REBUTTAL EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Mr. Hapack, you sat in and heard Dr. Reich's testimony; is that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. And what can you tell me about the calculation that he did?

A. Well, there are a number of issues when you try to translate a nanogram amount of DNA into a number of cells. There is some unknowns in that that can't be taken into account. For example, there is no situation where you would start with 100 cells, extract them and get 100 cells' worth of DNA. There is always going to be some percentage efficiency to the extraction where there is loss to the process. And so, that would be the first potential issue that you don't know what that percentage of efficiency of the extraction is. Um, in addition to that, you don't -- if you try to relate that to a forensic sample, you don't know the completeness of the collection technique. Was 100 percent of the material recovered during the sampling? Was there nooks and crannies in whatever it was that was being sampled that, you know, couldn't be reached by a swab or

whatever was being used to collect it. Um, so, that would be another situation where you can't fully account for an unknown. And you also don't know what type of cell you're talking about. Um, the example assumed that you're dealing with fully nucleated cells. Uh, skin cells don't have nucle -- nuclei. They don't have DNA. As they move to the surface of your skin, they shed their nucleolus, and they fill with a substance called keratin. It hardens to protect you from the environment. Now, some of their DNA is going to be there still, but they do not have nearly the amount of DNA that you would find in something like a sperm cell or a white blood cell. So, it would take a vast amount more of those skin cells in number to equate the amount of DNA that you would have in something like a white blood cell.

Q. Okay. Um, are there other variables that could matter in that calculation?

A. Um, those are the ones offhand that I can think of. The calculation would -- would be sufficient to calculate the minimum number of fully nucleated cells that -- under ideal conditions.

Q. So that --

A. -- that almost never would happen.

Q. So, that calculation is the minimum number in an ideal situation?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. Um, is it also a factor to figure out what happened after the sample was deposited on the item?

A. Uh, yes. Um, one thing to keep in mind is the DNA result itself, it tells us what the DNA profile is. And from that, we can make a determination of who could or could not have contributed. We can tell you how rare it is in the general population, but it doesn't tell us anything about how or when that transfer occurred. And there can be an infinite number of variables that could effect how much DNA you recover, and we simply don't know what those are. So you can't translate an amount of cells or a DNA result into an activity level event with any degree of accuracy.

Q. And when you say activity level event, what are you talking about there?

A. I mean, you can't tell whether the DNA was transferred as a result of casual contact, or environmental, or a violent struggle. There is nothing -- there is nothing inherent in that DNA result that tells you the specifics of what happened. Those are unknowns.

Q. Okay. And when you say unknown, another unknown is what happened after the deposit of the sample onto the article or --

A. -- correct.

Q. -- or person?

A. You would not know the specific event that happened to cause the transfer, and you also have no knowledge of what might have happened between when that transfer occurred and when that sample was collected.

Q. Does water have any effect on that?

A. Water could. Biological fluids are water soluble, and water would serve to dilute stains and dilute fluids and make them more difficult to recover.

Q. Okay.

MR. BUTLER: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Cross-examination?

MS. THIEN: No. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. Sir, you may step down. The State may call their next witness in their case in-chief.

MR. BUTLER: The People would call Dr. Marissa Feeney.

THE COURT: Ma'am, please come forward. Face my clerk. Please raise your right hand to be

sworn.

MARISSA FEENEY,

was called as a witness on behalf of the People, and being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Please have seat here. Please state your full name. Please spell your last name for the record, and please the best you can speak up loudly so everyone can hear you.

THE WITNESS: Yes. My name is Marissa Feeney. M-A-R-I-S-S-A. Feeney. F-E-E-N-E-Y.

THE COURT: You may inquire.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUTLER:

Q. Um, you said your name is Marissa Feeney. Do you have a title?

A. A doctor.

Q. And is that a medical degree?

A. Yes.

Q. Um, are you currently employed?

A. I am not.

Q. What are you currently doing?

A. I am currently a law student at SIU.

Q. Okay. Um, I'm handing you what I've previously marked as People's Exhibit 32. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. And what is that?

A. It's a curriculum vitae. It's a list of my qualifications and previous jobs and other work-related activities.

Q. Okay. And, um, Dr. Feeney, what kind of education do you have?

A. Um, I have got a Bachelor's Degree in biology and chemistry from SIU in Edwardsville. I attended medical school at SIU School of Medicine and received a doctor of medicine from them. And then after that, I did a one-year residency in obstetrics and gynecology in Stanton Island, New York, but then I changed specialties, and I did a four-year residency in anatomic and clinical pathology also in New York. Following that, I did a one-year fellowship in forensic pathology all in the office of the chief medical examiner in New York City.

Q. Okay. Are you board certified?

A. I am board certified in anatomic, clinical and forensic pathology.

Q. And, um, have you previously been qualified as an

expert to testify?

A. Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, at this time, I move to have the witness qualified as an expert in forensic pathology.

MS. THIEN: We accept, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. The Court will as well.

MR. BUTLER: And I will move for admission of People's Exhibit 32.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. Dr. Feeney, were you asked by the Williamson County Sheriff's Office to perform an autopsy on a minor child Jade Beasley?

A. I was asked by the coroner to do so.

Q. The coroner asked you to do that?

A. Yes.

Q. And, um, this was a couple of years ago; is that fair to say?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Um, where was that autopsy performed?

A. It was done at the Williamson County Morgue here in Marion.

Q. And I am going -- I am going to have you look at a series of photos. These first four have already been admitted. They are People's 180, 181, 182, and 183. I don't want you to say anything about them. Just look at them.

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. The next set I have previously marked People's Exhibit 343 through 361. Can you look at those?

A. (Witness complies.)

Q. Do you recognize those photographs?

A. Yes.

Q. How are you able to recognize them?

A. They were photographs that I took of this case during the autopsy.

Q. Okay. And, um, are those true and accurate depictions of the photographs you took?

A. Yes.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, at this time I would move for the admissions of People's 343 through 361.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No objection.

THE COURT: Just a moment, please. They are admitted.

MR. BUTLER: And at this time, I would ask to use the technology to publish to the jury.

THE COURT: Granted.

By Mr. Butler:

Q. I will come back here so I can look at them, too, Dr. Feeney --

THE COURT: Just a minute.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

THE COURT: My apology. Go ahead.

Q. Dr. Feeney, do you have an exhibit up on the screen?

A. I do.

Q. And that's People's Exhibit 180; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that also one of the photographs that I had you look at?

A. Yes.

Q. And what are we looking at there?

A. That's a photograph of an illuminated card that I photograph before every case just documenting the case number, the date and time and where -- which county has asked me to do the case.

Q. Okay. And when someone is -- comes into a morgue and you're going to perform an autopsy, how does that person come to you?

A. Usually they are in a refrigerated section before I arrive.

Q. Okay. I'm going to go to the next photograph. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes.

Q. And that's People's 181; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. How -- what are we looking at there?

A. This is photograph of the blue body bag that the decedent was in and shows the orange seal on that bag.

Q. Okay. So that bag was sealed when you arrived?

A. Yes.

Q. And 182, what are we looking at there?

A. That's a close-up of the orange seal through the two zippers on the bag.

Q. So after you photograph this, what -- what -- what's your next step? Do you unseal it?

A. I do.

Q. Okay. I am showing you what's now on the screen as People's 183. What are -- what are we looking at there?

A. It's an overall picture of the upper part of the body just as it looked as I first opened the bag.

Q. Okay. And there is things on Jade in this photograph in her mouth. Are those items used to attempt to save her life by the first responders?

A. Yes. Those are medical interventions.

Q. Um, so what happens when you open up a body bag? Do you take those medical interventions out? What do you do? What's your next step?

A. The first thing I do is document everything photographically the way that it arrives, and then we collect any evidence that might need to be collected before we get really started.

Q. So, let me stop there. When you say "we collect evidence", are you talking about evidence with the Illinois State Police sexual assault kit?

A. Yes. They are there, and we work together to collect things as we remove the medical items and clothing from the body.

Q. And do you perform some of those swabs?

A. Yes.

Q. Which ones?

A. Um, generally they will have me do the vaginal or anal swabs, and sometimes they will have me do the oral

swabs as well.

Q. Okay. And after you've collected all the evidence, I assume, that includes clothing?

A. Yes.

Q. What is your next step?

A. Once the clothing is removed, then we -- I will clean the body and photograph again to document anything on the surface of the body, any injuries that I see or scars or tattoos or identifying marks.

Q. And is that the procedure you used in this autopsy?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. So, I'm going to go to the next slide. This is what's just been admitted as People's Exhibit 343. Can you tell us what we're looking at there?

A. So, that's a photograph of the deceased lying face down. Um, it's showing the injuries on her back.

Q. And how many injuries are there to the back?

A. Numerous.

Q. Okay.

A. There are a number of major ones, and then there are quite a number of the smaller ones.

Q. Okay. Well, let's talk about the major ones.

You -- after completing this autopsy, did you generate an autopsy report?

A. I did.

Q. And did that note the different injuries to Jade Beasley?

A. Yes. I documented the injuries in a report.

Q. And, um, how did you break those injuries up in your report?

A. Um, in general, I will group them when there are this many wounds with like injuries, so all of the sharp injuries, all of the blunt injuries will be kind of put together. And then within those groups, um, in geographical areas on the body. So it might be, like, the upper right back, upper left back, chest, hands, just to make it easier to read it.

Q. I am handing you what I have marked as People's Exhibit 31. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes.

Q. And what is that?

A. It's a copy of my autopsy report and three diagrams that I prepared in this case.

Q. And does that -- does that have your findings in it as well?

A. Yes.

Q. And the findings that you made in this case, are they within a reasonable degree of medical certainty?

A. I mean, they're -- most of them is just documentation of what I see. There is not a lot of interpretation of it.

Q. You do make a finding as to the cause of death, though; do you not?

A. Yes.

Q. And is that within a reasonable degree of medical certainty?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. What was the cause of death?

A. Um, I gave the cause of death in this case as penetrating lung injuries with hemopneumothoraces due to stab and incised wounds of torso, neck and extremities.

Q. Okay. Can you explain that to us about what that means?

A. So, the decedent had sustained stab and incised wounds. These are injuries that are produced by a sharp instrument. Stab wounds are injuries that go further or deeper into the body than they are on the skin surface. An incised wound is just another way to say a cut which is usually longer on the skin surface and then it goes deep into the body. So, these stabbed and incised

wounds were found on her torso, which is the trunk of the body, the neck and the extremities. Basically it was the upper extremities in this case.

Q. When you say upper extremities, you mean hands and arms?

A. Yeah, arms --

Q. -- arms.

A. -- as opposed to legs, yes.

Q. Okay.

A. Um, these injuries went in -- a few of these injuries went into the chest cavities and went into the lungs causing some bleeding into the chest cavities, as well as, some air escaping from the lungs into the chest cavities. And the combination of that blood and air collecting into the chest cavity, along with blood loss from all of the wounds, is what has caused her death.

Q. And the manner of death, is that homicide?

A. I would consider it to be a homicide.

Q. You would?

A. I would.

Q. Okay. I'm going to ask that you speak up just a little bit more, if you could, okay, or get a little bit closer to the microphone. So your report, you note several different sharp injuries?

A. Yes. She had, um -- it's kind of far away -- um, over 100 sharp injuries in this case.

Q. Okay. And of those sharp injuries, are some what you consider major?

A. Yes.

Q. And about how many of those?

A. Approximately 15 of those were relatively major sharp injuries.

Q. Are we looking at any of those sharp injuries on Exhibit 343?

A. Yes. The clusters of wounds at the upper back were relatively major injuries.

Q. Okay. What about the wounds on the lower back?

A. Those were -- even the one that is gaping towards the bottom of the screen are relatively shallow injuries in respect they only went into the subcutaneous fat as opposed to going into any vital organs.

Q. Would those injuries have contributed to Jade Beasley's death?

A. Since all of the injuries were bleeding and bleeding was one of the mechanisms that led to the death, yes, I would say they all contributed but maybe not as much as the ones that went into the lungs themselves.

Q. Okay. Thank you. I am going to go on to the next exhibit People's 344. What is this?

A. That's a close-up picture showing the cluster of wounds on the upper right back. There are six larger stab wounds there, as well as, a number of smaller superficial wounds clustered in there.

Q. And how deep were those wounds?

A. Um, the cluster of six wounds in the upper back had estimated depths of penetration of approximately one inch to four inches.

Q. Okay. Thank you. The next exhibit, 345, can you tell us what we're looking at there?

A. So, that depicts two major stab wounds that were on the upper left back, as well as, a number of smaller superficial wounds around it.

Q. Okay. Um, the one wound kind of looks jagged. Is there anything that you can tell us about that?

A. Um, generally we see this sort of appearance when there is movement while the injury is being sustained, so suggesting that either the assailant or the victim is moving at the time and so the knife is not going just in and out but rather kind of twisting at the same time to produce that type of pattern.

Q. And how deep were these wounds?

A. So, the estimated depths of these wounds was five to seven inches.

Q. And did any of her wounds that we talked about so far, did they penetrate through the lungs?

A. So, the upper back wounds, several of them penetrated the right and left lungs.

Q. All right. Thank you. Exhibit 346, what wound is this?

A. I believe this is the gaping one that we saw on the left flank or lower back area.

Q. Okay. And 347?

A. Another two smaller wounds that we saw on the lower back area that were more superficial and just into the fat.

Q. All right. Did she have wounds on her chest?

A. She did have a cluster of wounds on her chest as well.

Q. Okay. Actually before we get to the chest, I want to ask you this next Slide 348, what are we looking at there?

A. So, this is a photograph of the skin. It's that cluster of the six wounds that we saw on the upper part of the back. And, um, basically what I have done here is to cut the skin around those wounds to release the

tension on that. There is a lot of tension on the skin, and so when you are -- when you have a break in that skin, it kind of gapes open because of the elastic properties of the skin. So, it's kind of difficult to see the exact characteristics of the instrument that caused that wound. But if you're able to release that tension, you can kind of see these are all slit-like injuries. And that is consistent with being stabbed with a -- like an instrument such as a knife.

Q. Okay. And Exhibit 349, what is this?

A. A similar process where I have drawn on the wounds on the upper left back. You can see those two larger wounds have now collapsed and you can kind of see those characteristics a little bit more readily.

Q. Okay. Thank you. Now, we will go on to the chest wounds. Exhibit 350, can you tell us what we see here?

A. This is a photograph of the head and shoulder area and the upper chest showing a large wound on the interior right shoulder, as well as, a cluster of wounds on the mid chest and a number of smaller, very superficial sharp injuries on the face, neck and chest region.

Q. All right. Any of these wounds penetrate through

the lungs?

A. So, of the four wounds in the -- on the chest, one of them penetrated into the chest cavity and did go into the right lung.

Q. Exhibit 350, what is this?

A. So, that's a gaping stab wound of the interior right shoulder. You can see that it is angled, so it does indicate there was some movement while this injury was being sustained. This wound went in about two to three inches but was only into the subcutaneous fat. It did not penetrate into the cavity.

Q. All right. Exhibit 352, what -- what is this?

A. This is a photograph of the back of her left hand.

Q. Okay. And 353?

A. Same thing. Just a photograph of the hand showing some sharp injuries on the back of her hand and one on the left thumb.

Q. Three hundred and fifty-four, is that a different angle of the left thumb?

A. Yes. This is showing the palmer surface of that left hand with, again, a wound injury on the left thumb.

Q. All right. What about 355? What do you see there?

A. This shows two sharp injuries along the palmer surfaces of the left pinky and ring fingers. Um, appear to be cuts across those surfaces.

Q. And those cuts, um, do you have any opinion on -- if those are defensive wounds?

A. These are the types of injuries that we would consider to be defensive type wounds. In the case where you're involved in a physical altercation and there is a knife involved and you might reach up to try to grab that knife to stop it, you can sustain wounds that would look similar to this on the palm of the hands, the thumb and the fingers.

Q. Thank you. Exhibit 356, what are we looking at there?

A. This is a photograph of the right forearm showing a couple of cuts on the lower part of that forearm.

Q. Three hundred and fifty-seven?

A. And this is the right hand showing the -- a couple of similar cuts on the right index finger.

Q. And are those similar to defensive wounds again?

A. Yes, I would consider those to be defensive type injuries.

Q. All right. Three hundred and fifty-eight?

A. Again, from the right hand showing the palmer

surfaces of the right index and middle fingers with additional sharp injuries.

Q. Three hundred and fifty-nine?

A. This is a photograph of her neck. The front of her neck shows a number of superficial injuries. There are some scrapes. There is one shallow stab wound on her upper left neck. There is a scrape under the chin and few other minor sharp injuries, as well as, some bruising that we did note on the anterior neck.

Q. Okay. Exhibit 360, what are we looking at there?

A. So, this is a photograph of the chest cavity. The -- in the middle going straight up and down is the spine. You can see the -- kind of ribs going off to either side, and, um, this is after the organs have been removed so you can see the back of the chest cavity. You can see the -- some slits back there where it shows where the knife has penetrated between the ribs and into the chest cavity.

Q. Okay. And Exhibit 361?

A. This is a close-up shot of one of the lungs. You can see the -- there are cuts in the lungs that have been made by one of the wounds that's gone into the chest cavity and penetrated the lungs.

Q. All right. Thank you. Now, you noted several

injuries in your report. I didn't show all the injuries -- uh, or we didn't put in exhibits for all the injuries. But, in total, how many wounds did you note?

A. In total, I documented at least 104 sharp injuries to the body.

Q. Did Jade have any other problems with her otherwise?

A. Medically speaking, she appeared to be otherwise healthy.

Q. Okay. And do you also have x-rays done?

A. We do.

Q. And what is the point of that?

A. Uh, in cases of sharp injuries, we just want to do full body x-rays or at least x-ray any parts where there are sharp injuries just to make sure that there aren't any small pieces of an instrument that might have broken off in the body and be retained that we would want to collect as evidence.

Q. Okay. Did you find any fragments in this case?

A. No.

Q. No foreign bodies?

A. No.

Q. All right. Um, I want to talk about there were a couple wounds you said appeared that there could be

movement, um, from -- would that be movement from the victim or movement from the assailant?

A. It could be from either one or both.

Q. Okay. And how many wounds to the hands did you note?

A. I noted five to the left hand, and three to the right hand.

Q. The wounds to Jade's chest, um, I believe your testimony was there was four stab wounds?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it possible that there was more than four stab wounds?

A. It is possible if they're going into the same hole, but I think, you know, what we're counting when we look at wounds is what we see on the skin surface. So, I may only see one on the surface, but there may be several tracks under that wound in the body if there's been some removal of the knife part way and then thrust forward again. So, we might see more internally than there is visible externally.

Q. Okay. And to be fair, you performed the autopsy. You don't make a determination or anything on who possibly could have committed this murder?

A. No.

MR. BUTLER: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Cross-examination.

MS. THIEN: Very briefly, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. THIEN:

Q. Doctor, how tall was Jade?

A. I measured her lying down on a table which is not completely accurate but I measured her as being 63 inches or about five foot three.

Q. And when you said not entirely accurate, is that could go either way; a little bit shorter, little bit taller or is this --

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And how much did she weigh?

A. Uh, the weight was 130 pounds.

Q. All right. You did note in your report that while you documented all of the injuries, there is no way for you to determine the order in which they were received?

A. That's correct.

Q. Many of these would have bled profusely?

A. Yes, I would expect so.

MS. THIEN: Thank you, doctor. I have no

further questions.

THE COURT: Any redirect?

MR. BUTLER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ma'am, you step down. Thank you.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, for the record, I'm going to gather these items of -- or these exhibits and return them to the clerk. I would move to admit People's Exhibit 31, the autopsy report. I believe that that is self-authenticating as well, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. THIEN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: It will be admitted.

MR. BUTLER: And I also have -- I have what I marked as People's Exhibit 370. I would move for admission of that. It's a State of Illinois Certificate of Death for Jade Beasley.

THE COURT: And just so the record is clear, I thought I heard you say you had no objection?

MS. THIEN: Correct.

THE COURT: It will be admitted. You guys can approach.

(SIDE BAR HELD OUT OF THE HEARING OF THE JURY.)

(END SIDE BAR.)

THE COURT: It's been a long week. I have been told at this time, by agreement of the parties and the Court, we're going to stop. Give you guys a little bit of break especially since it's a Friday. Monday is a holiday, so you will not be needed that day. My bailiff has letters for you per your request if you desire them. I do need you to be back here on Tuesday, though. I need you back in your jury room by 8:30.

Now remember, during this time period that you're away from the courthouse, if anybody approaches you at all, media or otherwise, and asks you anything about this case, you are not to talk to them. If that does occur, you are to report it as soon as you possibly can to the bailiff or security. That means you do not talk to friends about this case, your spouse, brother, sister, nobody. Until this case is submitted to you for deliberation, you must not discuss the case with anyone or remain within hearing of anyone discussing it. You cannot watch any news broadcast concerning this case. You cannot read any newspaper, internet article regarding this case. You're not to listen to any radio broadcast concerning this case. After this case has been submitted to you, you must discuss the case only in

the jury room when all members of the jury are present. You are to keep an open mind, and you must not decide any issue in the case until it is submitted to you for deliberation under the instructions of the Court. Have a nice weekend. Rise for the jury.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY.)

THE COURT: See you guys Tuesday. The Court will adjourned for the weekend.

(COURT WAS ADJOURNED FOR THE WEEKEND.)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

WILLIAMSON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
Vs	)	
	)	No. 20-CF-596
	)	
JULIA E. BEVELY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Amy L. Holloman, one of the Official Court Reporters in and for the First Judicial Circuit of the State of Illinois, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, complete, and correct transcript of all the proceedings had in the above-styled cause.

Amy L. Holloman

Amy L. Holloman, CSR
Official Court Reporter