



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
STATEMENT OF APPEALABILITY .....	6
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	6
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS	
I. The Capital Crimes	
A. The kidnaping, robbery and killing of the Stinemans .....	13
B. The killing of Selina Bishop .....	23
C. The killing of Jennifer Villarin and James Gamble .....	27
II. The Distribution of Remains .....	28
III. The Police Investigation .....	31
IV. The Autopsy of the Distributed Remains.....	43
V. Prosecution Evidence of Appellant's Character & Background	
A. Mormonism	
1. Brent Halvorsen .....	47
2. Dawne Kirkland.....	51
B. Decadence After Apostasy	
1. George Calhoun .....	53
2. Robin Dawn Stewart (nee Siler) .....	54
3. Tyler Berglund .....	57
4. Keri Mendoza (nee Furman) .....	58
5. Sarah Brents.....	63
6. Lina Richardson .....	64
7. Dawn Godman .....	69

V. Prosecution Evidence of Appellant’s Character & Background

B. Decadence After Apostasy (Cont’d)

8. Kelly Lord..... 85  
9. Dawne Kirkland..... 90  
10. Brent Halvorsen ..... 91  
11. Debra McClanahan ..... 92  
12. Michael Henderson ..... 102  
13. Jeannette Carter..... 102  
14. Selina Bishop and Jennifer Villarin ..... 103  
15. Kabrina Feickert ..... 106  
16. Lynell Simon ..... 107

VI. Victim Impact Evidence ..... 107

VII. The Defense Case

A. Genetic Loading for Mental Illness ..... 108  
B. Childhood and Youth ..... 110  
C. Missionary Years  
1. Appellant’s journal 1989-1990 ..... 113  
2. Companion Missionary Jonathan Taylor..... 120  
3. Mission President Richard & Bonnie Knudsen..... 122  
D. Homecoming, Impact Training, Courtship & Marriage.....123  
E. Treatment at Kaiser by Richard Foster, Ph.D. ....130  
F. Dissolution..... 138  
G. Treatment at Kaiser by Jeffrey Kaye, Ph.D. .... 144  
H. Post-Crime Evaluation by Douglas Tucker, M.D..... 158  
I. Post-Crime Evaluation by John Chamberlain, M.D..... 173  
J. Execution Impact Evidence ..... 200

ARGUMENT

I. APPELLANT’S MOTION TO SUPPRESS ALL EVIDENCE  
OBTAINED FROM THE SEARCH OF HIS HOME SHOULD  
HAVE BEEN GRANTED DUE TO THE SEARCHING  
OFFICERS’ FLAGRANT DISREGARD FOR THE TERMS OF  
THE AUTHORIZING WARRANTS AND THE PROSECUTOR’S  
FAILURE TO SHOW THAT ALL OF THAT EVIDENCE WAS  
LEGALLY SEIZED

Introduction..... 201

A. Historical Facts

- 1. Issuance of Saddlewood Warrant #1 .....208
- 2. Serving Saddlewood Warrant #1.....210
- 3. Issuance of Saddlewood Warrant #2 .....212
- 4. Action after Issuance of Saddlewood Warrant #2 ..... 214
- 5. Application for Saddlewood Warrant #3..... 215
- 6. Continued Search of Saddlewood, 8/8 to 8/15/00 ..... 226

B. Motion to Suppress

- 1. Omnibus motion and response .....227
- 2. Oral argument, stipulations and preliminary rulings..... 229
- 3. First session oral argument on execution of Marin warrants..... 231
- 4. Ruling on the validity of the second Marin warrant .....237
- 5. Request for evidentiary hearing and renewal  
of request for judicial review of everything seized  
from Saddlewood .....239
- 6. Defense assertions that officers flagrantly disregarded  
the terms of the warrants ..... 241
- 7. Further discussion of quantity of items seized and  
procedure for determining facts ..... 243

**B. Motion to Suppress (Cont'd)**

8. Agreement that some or all items listed in defense papers were not described in any warrant .....	246
9. Ruling that Saddlewood warrants authorized unlimited exploratory search of home and seizure of anything on probable cause alone .....	247
10. Briefing and exhibits for June 27, 2003, evidentiary hearing .....	249
11. June 27, 2003 evidentiary hearing	
a. Submission of photos of evidence on disk.....	252
b. Direct Testimony from Detective Nash and Exhibits.....	253
c. Cross examination of Detective Nash .....	262
d. Redirect of Detective Nash.....	269
e. Re-cross of Detective Nash.....	271
f. Direct Examination of Detective Chiabotti and Exhibits .....	272
g. Cross examination of Detective Chiabotti .....	278
h. Redirect of Detective Chiabotti .....	280
i. Recross of Detective Chiabotti .....	280
j. Re-redirect of Chiabotti .....	280
k. Other evidence .....	281
l. Discussion of the Day Planner after close of evidence .....	281
12. Briefs filed after the testimony.....	283
13. Oral Argument Heard July 25, 2003 .....	284
14. Ruling from the Bench July 25, 2003.....	289

**C. Why Denial of the Motion to Suppress Requires Relief**

1. Marin Detectives Violated Appellant's Fourth Amendment Rights in Conducting Searches and Seizures Beyond the Scope of Their Warrants .....	293
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

2.	Suppression of all Saddlewood evidence is appropriate due to the flagrant disregard of the terms of the Marin warrants and absence of proof that the same evidence would have been inevitably discovered under the Contra Costa warrant .....	308
3.	No error in denying the suppression motion can be held harmless.....	317
II.	THE COURT’S REMOVAL OF A VENIRE MEMBER MODERATELY OPPOSED TO THE DEATH PENALTY WHOSE ABILITY TO FOLLOW THE OATH AND INSTRUCTIONS WAS NOT SUBSTANTIALLY IMPAIRED VIOLATED APPELLANT’S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW AND AN IMPARTIAL JURY	
A.	The Relevant Facts .....	318
B.	The Removal of JW Violated <i>Gray, Witt, Adams &amp; Witherspoon</i> .....	323
C.	Conclusion .....	331
III.	THE DENIAL OF THE RIGHT TO ASK VENIRE MEMBERS IF THEY COULD CONSIDER MITIGATING FACTORS AFTER EXPOSURE TO THE HORRIFYING CORPSE DESECRATION EVIDENCE THE COURT ALLOWED THE PROSECUTOR TO PRESENT VIOLATED APPELLANT’S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW AND AN IMPARTIAL JURY	
	Introduction .....	332
A.	The Relevant Facts & Procedural History .....	335

B.	The Restrictions Placed on Defense Inquiries Violated Settled Law, Had No Legitimate Purpose, Represented an Abuse of Discretion, Precluded Identification of Jurors Who Would Automatically Impose Death and Violated Appellant's Constitutional Rights .....	355
C.	Reversal is required.....	366
IV.	THE ADMISSION OF PHOTOGRAPHIC AND AUDITORY EVIDENCE OF CORPSE DISMEMBERMENT DENIED APPELLANT HIS RIGHT TO A FUNDAMENTALLY FAIR PENALTY TRIAL IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND STATE CONSTITUTIONAL COROLLARIES .....	370
V.	THE PROSECUTOR'S CLOSING ARGUMENT AND THE TRIAL COURT'S REFUSAL TO GIVE THE JURY APPROPRIATELY SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS RENDERED OUR DEATH PENALTY STATUTORY SCHEME UNCONSTITUTIONAL AS APPLIED, PREVENTED CONSIDERATION OF MITIGATING FACTORS, AND COMPROMISED CONSIDERATION OF MITIGATING EVIDENCE, IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND STATE CONSTITUTIONAL COROLLARIES	
	Introduction .....	382
A.	The Relevant Facts .....	384
B.	Allowing a Prosecutor to Tell a Jury That Applicable Mitigators Do Not Apply Undermines the Standard Instructions, Imparts a Distorted Picture of the Statutory Scheme, Denies the Defendant His Right to a Jury Determination of the Statutory Factors As Well As Consideration of Mitigating Evidence, and Invites Arbitrary and Capricious Application of the Death Penalty .....	390

C.	The Court Was Obligated to Render Curative Instructions .....	404
D.	Reversal is Required .....	407
VI.	THE TRIAL COURT DENIED APPELLANT DUE PROCESS OF LAW AND TRIAL BY JURY WHEN IT INSTRUCTED THE JURY THAT THE IMPACT OF AN EXECUTION ON THE DEFENDANT'S FAMILY MEMBERS SHOULD BE DISREGARDED UNLESS IT ILLUMINATES SOME POSITIVE QUALITY OF THE DEFENDANT'S BACKGROUND OR CHARACTER.....	411
VII.	THE TRIAL COURT'S REFUSAL TO INSTRUCT THE JURY THAT IT COULD DECLINE TO IMPOSE DEATH FOR ANY REASON IT DEEMED APPROPRIATE RENDERED CALIFORNIA'S DEATH PENALTY SCHEME UNCONSTITUTIONAL AS APPLIED .....	415
VIII.	THE EXCLUSION OF PROSPECTIVE JURORS BECAUSE OF UNWILLINGNESS OR IMPAIRED ABILITY TO IMPOSE DEATH VIOLATED APPELLANT'S RIGHT TO AN IMPARTIAL AND REPRESENTATIVE JURY .....	428
IX.	THE DEATH PENALTY AS ADMINISTERED IN CALIFORNIA IS CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT..	440
X.	CALIFORNIA'S FAILURE TO TIMELY PROVIDE CONDEMNED DEFENDANTS WITH HABEAS COUNSEL OFFENDS THE DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION GUARANTEES OF THE UNITED STATES AND CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTIONS AND REQUIRES REVERSAL OF APPELLANT'S CONVICTIONS AND SENTENCE .....	460



XI. CALIFORNIA'S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, AS INTERPRETED BY THIS COURT AND APPLIED AT APPELLANT'S TRIAL, VIOLATES THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Introduction.....	463
A. Penal Code Section 190.2 Is Impermissibly Broad .....	463
B. The Broad Application Of Penal Code Section 190.3, Subdivision (a) Violated Appellant's Constitutional Rights .....	465
C. Appellant's Death Sentence Is Unconstitutional Because It Is Not Premised on Findings Made Beyond a Reasonable Doubt ....	466
D. Appellant's Death Sentence Is Unconstitutional Because The Verdict Was Not Premised on Jury Findings Made Unanimously Or By A Majority Or Super Majority of Jurors.....	469
E. Appellant's Death Sentence is Unconstitutional Because The Jury Was Not Required to Make Written Findings .....	472
F. Appellant's Death Sentence is Unconstitutional Because The Jury Instructions Given At His Trial Used Vaguely Restrictive Adjectives In Defining Mitigating Factors .....	472
G. Appellant's Death Sentence is Unconstitutional Because The Trial Court Failed to Instruct the Jury That Statutory Mitigating Factors Were Relevant Solely as Potential Mitigators .....	473
H. California's Death Penalty Violates International Norms .....	474

XII. THE CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF ALL THE ERRORS WAS AN UNFAIR TRIAL AND A DEATH JUDGMENT THAT MUST BE REVERSED UNDER THE 6TH, 8TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENTS TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, AND UNDER STATE CONSTITUTIONAL COROLLARIES .....475

CONCLUSION ..... 478

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL .....479

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

*Abdul-Kabir v. Quarterman* (2007) 550 U.S. 233 .. 378, 392, 395, 400, 408

*Alleyne v. United States* (2013) \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 133 S.Ct. 2151 .... 417, 422

*Andresen v. Maryland* (1976) 427 U.S. 463 ..... 302

*Apprendi v. New Jersey* (2000) 530 U.S. 466 ..... 418, 467

*Arizona v. Hicks* (1987) 480 U.S. 321 ..... 312

*Ballew v. Georgia* (1978) 435 U.S. 223 ..... 469

*Baze v. Rees* (2008) 553 U.S. 35 ..... 423, 426

*Blair v. State* (Fla. Sup. Ct. 1981) 406 So.2d 1103 ..... 375

*Blakely v. Washington* (2004) 542 U.S. 296 ..... 421, 467

*Boyde v. California* (1990) 494 U.S. 370 ..... 400

*Brewer v. Quarterman* (2007) 550 U.S. 286 ..... 364, 379, 407, 408

*Brown v. Payton* (2005) 544 U.S. 133 ..... 404, 406

*C & K Eng. v. Amber Steel Co.* (1978) 23 Cal.3d 1 ..... 435

*California v. Brown* (1987) 479 U.S. 538 ..... 379

*Callins v. Collins* (1994) 510 U.S. 1141 ..... 444, 459

*Chambers v. Mississippi* (1973) 410 U.S. 284 ..... 475

*Chapman v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 18 ..... 318, 381, 409

<i>Cooper v. Fitzharris</i> (9th Cir. 1978) 586 F.2d 1325 .....	475
<i>Cornette v. Department of Transportation</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 63 .....	435
<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> (2004) 541 U.S. 36 .....	417, 420, 421
<i>Creamer v. Porter</i> (5th Cir. 1985) 754 F.2d 1311 .....	294, 305
<i>Crouchman v. Superior Court</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 1167 .....	435
<i>Cunningham v. California</i> (2007) 549 U.S. 270 .....	467
<i>Descamps v. United States</i> (2013) ___ U.S. ___; 133 S. Ct. 2276 .....	468
<i>Donnelly v. DeChristoforo</i> (1974) 416 U.S. 637 .....	476
<i>Eddings v. Oklahoma</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 104 .....	408, 439, 458
<i>Francis v. Franklin</i> (1985) 471 U.S. 307 .....	400
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 238 .....	423, 463
<i>Gardner v. Florida</i> (1997) 430 U.S. 349 .....	379
<i>Georgia v. Brailsford</i> (1794) 3 U.S. 1 .....	434
<i>Gray v. Mississippi</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 648 .....	324, 332
<i>Greer v. Miller</i> (1987) 483 U.S. 756 .....	476
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153 .....	391, 426
<i>Guerra v. Sutton</i> (9th Cir. 1986) 783 F.2d 1371 .....	205, 300
<i>Haraguchi v. Superior Court</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4th 706 .....	363
<i>Harmelin v. Michigan</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 957 .....	471
<i>Harris v. United States</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 545 .....	417

<i>Hicks v. Oklahoma</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 343 .....	392, 402
<i>Hitchcock v. Dugger</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 393 .....	409
<i>Horton v. California</i> (1990) 496 US 128 .....	294
<i>Hovey v. Superior Court</i> (1980) 28 Cal.3d 1 .....	437
<i>Illinois v. McArthur</i> (2001) 531 U.S. 326 .....	310
<i>In re Avena</i> (1996) 12 Cal.4th 694 .....	475
<i>In re Morgan</i> (2010) 50 Cal. 4th 932 .....	451, 452
<i>In re Tahl</i> (1970) 1 Cal.3d 122 .....	330
<i>James v. Commonwealth</i> (Pa. 1825) 12 Serg. & Rawle 220 .....	441
<i>Jeffers v. Lewis</i> (9th Cir 1994) 38 F.3d 411 .....	447, 448, 456
<i>Johnson v. Bredesen</i> (2009) 558 U.S. 1067 .....	442
<i>Johnson v. Texas</i> (1993) 509 U.S. 350 .....	396
<i>Johnson v. United States</i> (1948) 333 U.S. 10 .....	293, 302
<i>Jones v. United States</i> (1999) 526 U.S. 227. ....	417, 422
<i>Kansas v. Marsh</i> (2006) 548 U.S. 163 .....	445
<i>Kennedy v. Louisiana</i> (2008) 554 U.S. 407 .....	422
<i>Lackey v. Texas</i> (1995) 514 U.S. 1045 .....	442
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 586 .....	408
<i>Marks v. Clarke</i> (9th Cir. 1997) 102 F.3d 1012 .....	205, 300
<i>McDonald v. United States</i> (1948) 335 U.S. 451 .....	294

<i>McKenzie v. Smith</i> (6th Cir. Mich. 2003) 326 F.3d 721	365
<i>McKoy v. North Carolina</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 433	470
<i>Millender v. County of Los Angeles</i> (9th Cir 2010) 620 F.3d 1016	298
<i>Mills v. Maryland</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 367	473
<i>Minnesota v. Dickerson</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 366	313
<i>Monge v. California</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 721	471
<i>Montana v. Egelhoff</i> (1996) 518 U.S. 37	475
<i>Morgan v. Illinois</i> (1992) 504 U.S. 719	335, 347, 364, 365, 369
<i>Myers v. Medical Center</i> (D. Del. 2000) 86 F. Supp. 2d 389	308
<i>Myers v. Ylst</i> (9th Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 417	471
<i>Nelson v. Quarterman</i> (5th Cir. 2006) ( <i>en banc</i> ) 472 F.3d 287	409
<i>Nix v. Williams</i> (1984) 467 U.S. 431	316
<i>Ohio v. Roberts</i> (1980) 448 U.S. 56	417
<i>Oregon v. Ice</i> (2009) 555 U.S. 160	469
<i>Oswald v. Bertrand</i> (7th Cir 2004) 374 F.3d 475	365
<i>Pac. Mar. Cen. v. Silva</i> (E.D. Cal. 2011) 809 F. Supp. 2d 1266	295
<i>Payne v. Tennessee</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 808	373, 378, 379
<i>Payton v. New York</i> (1980) 445 U.S. 573	310
<i>Penry v. Johnson</i> (2001) 532 U.S. 782	407, 408
<i>Penry v. Lynaugh</i> (1989) 492 U.S. 302	408

<i>People v. Anderson</i> (2001) 25Cal.4th 543 .....	466
<i>People v. Avila</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 491 .....	473
<i>People v. Barnett</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 1044 .....	455
<i>People v. Bemore</i> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 809 .....	411
<i>People v. Bennett</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 577 .....	412
<i>People v. Blair</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 686 .....	465
<i>People v. Boyette</i> (2002) 29 Cal.4th 381 .....	352
<i>People v. Bradford</i> (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 1229 .....	205-309
<i>People v. Brown</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 382 .....	466
<i>People v. Brunette</i> (2011) 194 Cal. App. 4th 268 .....	363
<i>People v. Butler</i> (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 847 .....	362
<i>People v. Cahill</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4th 478 .....	436
<i>People v. Carrington</i> (2009) 47 Cal. 4th 145 .....	295, 306
<i>People v. Carter</i> (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1114 .....	455
<i>People v. Cash</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 703 .. 333, 334, 348, 352, 356, 357, 366, 367, 369	
<i>People v. Champion</i> (1995) 9 Cal.4th 879 .....	352
<i>People v. Clark</i> (1990) 50 Cal.3d 583 .....	352
<i>People v. Coffman</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 1 .....	348, 351, 358
<i>People v. Cole</i> (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 1439 .....	405
<i>People v. Coleman</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 749 .....	352

<i>People v. Cook</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 566 .....	472
<i>People v. Crandell</i> (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 833 .....	391, 393, 394, 399, 410
<i>People v. Croswell</i> (N.Y. Sup. 1804) 3 Johns. Cas. 337 .....	432
<i>People v. Davenport</i> (1985) 41 Cal.3d 247 .....	397, 473
<i>People v. Edelbacher</i> (1989) 47 Cal.3d 983 .....	463
<i>People v. Eubanks</i> (2011) 53 Cal. 4th 110 .....	300
<i>People v. Fairbank</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1223 .....	466
<i>People v. Falsetta</i> (1999) 21 Cal.4th 903 .....	405
<i>People v. Fauber</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 792 .....	472
<i>People v. Fields</i> (1983) 35 Cal. 3d 329 .....	335
<i>People v. Fields</i> (1983) 35 Cal.3d 329 .....	352
<i>People v. Flood</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470 .....	436
<i>People v. Foster</i> (2010) 50 Cal. 4th 1301 .....	392, 396
<i>People v. Gallegos</i> (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 612 .....	246
<i>People v. Ghent</i> (1987) 43 Cal.3d 739 .....	474
<i>People v. Griffin</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 536 .....	467
<i>People v. Haley</i> (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 283 .....	329
<i>People v. Hamilton</i> (1989) 48 Cal.3d 1142 .....	473
<i>People v. Hawthorne</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 43 .....	466
<i>People v. Heard</i> (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 946 .....	331



<i>People v. Hernandez</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 835 .....	392
<i>People v. Hernandez</i> (2012) 53 Cal. 4th 1095 .....	462
<i>People v. Hill</i> (1974) 12 Cal.3d 731 .....	317
<i>People v. Hillhouse</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 469 .....	473
<i>People v. Holt</i> (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 619 .....	401
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 717 .....	311
<i>People v. Jones</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 1084 .....	397
<i>People v. Kaurish</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 648 .....	352
<i>People v. Kennedy</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 595 .....	466
<i>People v. Kirkpatrick</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 988 .....	352, 356
<i>People v. Knoller</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 139 .....	363
<i>People v. Kraft</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 978 .....	238, 239
<i>People v. Lee</i> (2011) 51 Cal. 4th 620 .....	456
<i>People v. Lucero</i> (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 1006 .....	394, 409
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (2009) 47 Cal.4th. 399 .....	327, 328
<i>People v. McDowell</i> (2012) 54 Cal. 4th 395 .....	456
<i>People v. Medina</i> (1995) 11 Cal.4th 694 .....	471
<i>People v. Mendosa</i> (2000) 24 Cal.4th 130 .....	352
<i>People v. Mickey</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 612 .....	352
<i>People v. Mickle</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 140 .....	409

<i>People v. Millwee</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 96 .....	329
<i>People v. Milner</i> (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 227 .....	395
<i>People v. Miranda</i> (1987) 44 Cal. 3d 57 .....	391
<i>People v. Morgan</i> (2007) 42 Cal. 4th 593 .....	394, 404, 406
<i>People v. Murray</i> (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 305 .....	311
<i>People v. Noguera</i> (1993) 4 Cal.4th 599 .....	352
<i>People v. Ochoa</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4th 353 .....	411
<i>People v. Ochoa</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4th 353 .....	412
<i>People v. Ochoa</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 398 .....	352
<i>People v. One 1941 Chevrolet Coupe</i> (1951) 37 Cal.2d 283 .....	435, 436
<i>People v. Pearson</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 306 .....	325, 326, 331, 332
<i>People v. Pearson</i> (2013) 56 Cal.4th 393 .....	398, 403
<i>People v. Pinholster</i> (1992) 1 Cal.4th 865 .....	352
<i>People v. Pollock</i> (2004) 32 Cal. 4th 1153 .....	397, 398
<i>People v. Ramos</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 494 .....	330
<i>People v. Riccardi</i> (2012) 54 Cal. 4th 758 .....	330
<i>People v. Rich</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 1036 .....	352
<i>People v. Riel</i> (200) 22 Cal.4th 1153 .....	352
<i>People v. Rios</i> (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 351 .....	208, 317
<i>People v. Riser</i> (1956) 47 Cal.2d 566 .....	438

<i>People v. Robertson</i> (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 21 .....	395
<i>People v. Rodrigues</i> (1994) 8 Cal.4th 1060 .....	326,329
<i>People v. Rogers</i> (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 826 .....	402, 405
<i>People v. Rogers</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 1136 .....	358, 360-362
<i>People v. Ruiz</i> (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 589 .....	392
<i>People v. Schmeck</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 240 .....	463
<i>People v. Seaton</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 598 .....	352
<i>People v. Smith</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 334 .....	409, 412
<i>People v. Smithey</i> (1999) 20 Cal.4th 936 .....	411, 412
<i>People v. Snow</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 43 .....	474
<i>People v. Solomon</i> (2010) 49 Cal. 4th 792 .....	375
<i>People v. Stanley</i> (1995) 10 Cal.4th 764 .....	464
<i>People v. Stewart</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 425 .....	325
<i>People v. Superior Court (Humberto S.)</i> (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 737 .....	363
<i>People v. Taylor</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 719 .....	470
<i>People v. Thomas</i> (2011) 52 Cal. 4th 336 .....	330
<i>People v. Tully</i> (2012) 54 Cal. 4th 952 .....	335
<i>People v. Turner</i> (1984) 37 Cal.3d 302 .....	376
<i>People v. Valdez</i> (2012) 55 Cal. 4th 82 .....	333, 357, 367
<i>People v. Visciotti</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 1 .....	352

<i>People v. White</i> (1994 Colo. Supreme) 870 P.2d 424 .....	375
<i>People v. Whitt</i> (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 620 .....	391, 397
<i>People v. Williams</i> (1971) 22 Cal.App.3d 34 .....	476
<i>People v. Williams</i> (2013) 56 Cal.4th 165 .....	411, 461
<i>People v. Williams</i> (2013) 58 Cal.4th 197 .....	464
<i>People v. Zambrano</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 1082 .....	334, 359, 362, 375
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 584 .....	417, 419, 425, 467
<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> (2005) 543 U.S. 551 .....	474
<i>Rosales-Lopez v. United States</i> (1981) 451 U.S. 182 .....	347, 365
<i>S. Union Co. v. United States</i> (2012) 567 U.S. ____; 132 S.Ct. 2344 ...	468
<i>Sims v. Dept. of Corr. &amp; Rehab.</i> (2013) 216 Cal.App. 4th 1059 .....	441
<i>Smith v. Texas</i> (2007) 550 U.S. 297 .....	408
<i>Sparf v. United States</i> (1895) 156 U.S. 51 .....	431
<i>Spears v. Mullin</i> (10th Cir. Okla. 2003) 343 F.3d 1215 .....	378
<i>Stanford v. Texas</i> (1965) 379 U.S. 476 .....	313
<i>State v. Spreitz</i> (1997) 190 Ariz. 129 .....	377
<i>Taylor v. Kentucky</i> (1978) 436 U.S. 478 .....	475
<i>Tennard v. Dretke</i> (2004) 542 U.S. 274 .....	408
<i>Trevino v. Thaler</i> (2013) __ U.S. __, 133 S. Ct. 1911 .....	461
<i>Trop v. Dulles</i> (1958) 356 U.S. 86 .....	474

<i>Tuilaepa v. California</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 153 .....	390, 392, 466
<i>United States v. Adjani</i> (9th Cir. Cal. 2006) 452 F.3d 1140 .....	300
<i>United States v. Berry</i> (9th Cir. 1980) 627 F.2d 193 .....	476
<i>United States v. Brown</i> (1965) 381 US 437 .....	413
<i>United States v. Burr</i> (C.C.Va. 1807) 25 F. Cas. 49 .....	430
<i>United States v. Crozier</i> (9th Cir. 1985) 777 F.2d 1376 .....	306
<i>United States v. Ewain</i> (9th Cir. 1996) 88 F.3d 689 .....	302, 307
<i>United States v. Foster</i> (10th Cir. 1996) 100 F.3d 846 ..	205, 303, 304, 316
<i>United States v. Heldt</i> (D.C. Cir. 1981) 668 F.2d 1238 .....	205, 300, 301
<i>United States v. Hitchcock</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 286 F.3d 1064 .....	303
<i>United States v. Kojayan</i> (9th Cir. 1993) 8 F.3d 1315 .....	403
<i>United States v. Liu</i> (2d Cir. 2000) 239 F. 3d 138 .....	314
<i>United States v. Matias</i> (2d Cir. 1988) 836 F. 2d 744 .....	314
<i>United States v. Medlin</i> (10th Cir 1988) 842 F.2d 1194 .....	310
<i>United States v. Metter</i> (E.D.N.Y 2012) 860 F.Supp.2d 205 .....	315
<i>United States v. Necochea</i> (9th Cir. 1993) 986 F.2d 1273 .....	476
<i>United States v. Place</i> (1983) 462 U.S. 696 .....	310
<i>United States v. Rettig</i> (9th Cir. 1978) 589 F.2d 418 ...	206, 208, 294, 295, 297, 302, 304, 316
<i>United States v. Sedaghaty</i> (9th Cir. 2013) 728 F.3d 885 .....	300, 303, 304
<i>United States v. Tamura</i> (9th Cir. 1982) 694 F.2d 591 .....	301

<i>United States v. Taveras</i> (E.D.N.Y. 2008) 584 F. Supp. 2d 535 .....	378
<i>United States v. Taveras</i> (E.D.N.Y. 2007) 488 F. Supp. 2d 246 ...	375-381
<i>United States v. Taveras</i> , (E.D.N.Y. 2006) 436 F. Supp. 2d 493 .....	378
<i>United States v. Wallace</i> (9th Cir. 1988) 848 F.2d 1464 .....	476
<i>Uttecht v. Brown</i> (2007) 551 U.S. 1 .....	332, 366
<i>Wainwright v. Witt</i> (1985) 469 U.S. 412 .....	324, 325, 330, 347, 364
<i>Walton v. Arizona</i> (1990) 497 U.S. 639 .....	417, 419
<i>Wardius v. Oregon</i> (1973) 412 U.S. 470 .....	366
<i>Whren v. United States</i> (1996) 517 U.S. 806 .....	294
<i>Witherspoon v. Illinois</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 510 .....	324, 328, 330, 335
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> , 428 U.S. 280 .....	407, 410, 423
<i>Woodward v. Alabama</i> (2013) ___ U.S. ___, 134 S. Ct. 405 .....	424
<i>Zant v. Stephens</i> (1982) 462 U.S. 862 .....	464

**California Statutes**

Code of Civil Procedure §229 .....	437
Code of Civil Procedure §232 ..	324
Evidence Code §350 .....	376
Evidence Code §352 .....	376
Health & Safety Code §11378 .....	8
Penal Code §135 .....	6

Penal Code §182, subd. (a)(1) .....	6
Penal Code §187 .....	6
Penal Code §190.2 .....	7, 359, 463
Penal Code §190.3 .....	382, 383, 387, 389, 393, 399, 464
Penal Code §209 .....	7
Penal Code §211 .....	6-8
Penal Code §212.5(a) .....	7, 8
Penal Code §236 .....	6
Penal Code §459 .....	6
Penal Code §460 .....	6, 8
Penal Code §518 .....	6, 7
Penal Code §520 .....	7
Penal Code §654 .....	12
Penal Code §1074 [repealed] .....	437
Penal Code §1239 .....	6
Penal Code §1538.5 .....	6, 208, 227, 311, 317
Penal Code §12022 .....	8

**Constitutions**

Cal. Const., Art. I, §24 ..... 436

Cal. Const., art. VI, § 11 ..... 6

U.S. Const. Art. I, § 10 ..... 413

U.S. Const. Art. I, § 9 ..... 413

U.S. Const., First Amendment ..... 314

U.S. Const., Fourth Amendment ..... 237, 293, 300-314

U.S. Const., Fifth Amendment ..... 351, passim

U.S. Const., Sixth Amendment ..... 328, passim

U.S. Const., Eighth Amendment ..... 351, passim

U.S. Const., Fourteenth Amendment ..... 351, passim

**Other Authorities**

Alarcon, *Executing the Will of the Voters?: a Roadmap to Mend or End the California Legislature's Multi-billion-dollar Death Penalty Debacle* (2010) 44 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 41. .... 452

Alarcon, *Remedies for California's Death Row Deadlock* (2007) 80 S. Cal. L. Rev. 697 ..... 449, 450, 452

Alexander, *A Brief Narrative of the Case and Trial of John Peter Zenger* 78-79 (Stanley N. Katz ed., 2d ed. 1972) ..... 431

Amar, *America's Constitution* (2005) ..... 433

Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* ..... 418, 430



Booth, <i>The False Prophet</i> (2008) .....	372
California Commission on the Fair Administration of Justice Final Report (June 30, 2008) .....	451, 458
California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, <i>Condemned Inmate List</i> .....	458
California Secretary of State, Statement of Vote, November 2012, Prop. 34 <a href="http://www.SOS.CA.Gov/elections/sov/2012-general/soc-complete.PDF">www.SOS.CA.Gov/elections/sov/2012-general/soc-complete.PDF</a> ...	438
CALJIC No. 8.85 .....	382, 384, 385
CALJIC No. 8.85 .....	411, 415
CALJIC No. 8.88 .....	415
Cohen & Smith, <i>The Death of Death-Qualification</i> (2008) 59 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 87 .....	428
Coke, <i>The Compleat Copyholder</i> § 33 (1630) .....	441
Denniston, <i>When simplicity won't do</i> , SCOTUSblog (Mar. 3, 2014) <a href="http://www.scotusblog.com/2014/03/argument-analysis-when-simplicity-wont-do">www.scotusblog.com/2014/03/argument-analysis-when-simplicity-wont-do</a> [as of March 31, 2014.] .....	443
Federalist 83 (Hamilton), reprinted in <i>The Federalist Papers</i> 491, 499 (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961) .....	434
Fisher, J., <i>Categorical Requirements in Constitutional Criminal Procedure</i> (2006) 94 Geo. L.J. 1493 .....	424
Fraley, Marin Independent Journal, <i>Serial Killer Naso's Death Sentence Revives Capital Punishment Debate</i> .....	426
Garvey, Stephen P., <i>Aggravation and Mitigation in Capital Cases: What Do Jurors Think?</i> , 98 Colum. L.Rev 1538 .....	379
Gray, <i>Facing Facts on the Death Penalty</i> (2010) 44 Loy. L. Rev. 255...	454

<i>Hall v. Florida</i> , United States Supreme Court Case No. 12-10882, March 3, 2014 Oral Arg. Transcript .....	442
Hostettler, <i>Criminal Jury Old and New: Jury Power from Early Times to the Present Day</i> (2004) .....	431
Howe, <i>Can California Save Its Death Sentences? Will Californians Save the Expense?</i> (2012) 33 <i>Cardozo L. Rev.</i> 1451 .....	439
Kozinski & Gallagher, <i>Death: The Ultimate Run-On Sentence</i> (1995) 46 <i>Case W. Res.</i> 1 .....	425, 448, 449, 458
Lanier & Acker, <i>Capital Punishment, The Moratorium Movement, and Empirical Questions: Looking Beyond Innocence, Race, and Bad Lawyering in Death Penalty Cases</i> (2004) 10 <i>Psych. Pub. Pol. &amp; L.</i> 577 .....	455
<i>Legal Papers of John Adams</i> (L. Kinvin Wroth & Hillier B. Zobel eds., 1965) .....	433
Quigley, <i>Capital Jury Exclusion of Death Scrupled Jurors and International Due Process</i> (2004) 2 <i>Ohio St. Crim. L.</i> 262 .....	428
Stinneford, <i>The Illusory Eighth Amendment</i> (2013) 65 <i>Am.U.L. Rev.</i> 437. ....	441
Stinneford, <i>The Original Meaning of "Unusual": The Eighth Amendment as a Bar to Cruel Innovation</i> (2008) 102 <i>Nw. U. L. Rev.</i> 1739 .....	441
Sullivan, <i>Efforts to Improve the Illinois Capital Punishment System: Worth the Cost?</i> (2007) 41 <i>U. Rich. L. Rev.</i> 935 .....	455
Story, <i>Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States</i> .....	418
The Complete Anti-Federalist .....	421
The Selected Writings and Speeches of Sir Edward Coke 563, 564 (Steve Sheppard ed., 2003) .....	441
Works of John Adams .....	422
Zimring&Hawkins, <i>Capital Punishment &amp; the American Agenda</i> (1980) .....	447

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

<b>THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE</b>	)	<b>CAPITAL CASE</b>
<b>OF CALIFORNIA,</b>	)	
	)	<b>No. S132256</b>
<b>Plaintiff/Respondent,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>(Contra Costa</b>
	)	<b>Superior Court</b>
<b>GLEN TAYLOR HELZER,</b>	)	<b>No. 3-196018-6)</b>
	)	
<b>Defendant/Appellant.</b>	)	

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Appellant Glenn “Taylor” Helzer robbed two and killed five people between July 31 and August 3, 2000, after several years of self-medicating his bipolar disorder with crystal methamphetamine, alcohol, Ecstasy, and other psychedelic drugs. Aided by his younger brother, Justin Helzer, and their friend, Dawn Godman, appellant believed that such crimes against a very small number of people were part of God’s plan for them, and would fund a drug-distributing sex club, and ultimately, a “Transform America” program under which appellant could end human suffering.

Appellant’s family was devoutly Mormon, as was appellant, until his

mid twenties. Godman was a recent convert. All three believed that appellant was a prophet of God; that God wanted them to do what they did; and that their crimes were not morally wrong, though illegal.

Five years earlier, when appellant was 25 and working as a stockbroker at a Dean Witter office in Concord, appellant sought counseling for depression at Kaiser's local facility. Dr. Richard Foster conducted an intake interview and saw appellant several times afterwards. Appellant reported that he needed help coming to terms with the discrepancy between his wife's and his own levels of sexual desire and related marital problems, and with depression "about the issue" Dr. Foster saw "grandiosity" and "self-inflation" and "narcissistic features" in appellant's personality, but not enough to diagnose any disorder.

The second time appellant saw Dr. Foster, appellant presented a "highly detailed plan to find an ideal woman who wanted sex daily. He was going to run an ad in Brazil, interview 80 to 120 applicants, choose 35 and date them. And based upon that, make a two year contract ... to make sure that he had sex daily." At their last meeting, which was a little less than five years before the capital crimes, appellant "was then convinced that the only way to avoid his misery was to leave his wife."

Dr. Foster expected appellant would have difficulty leaving his wife

"because another feature of narcissism is that you desperately crave the approval and admiration of others. Appellant "was very attuned to not wanting to disappoint his wife, not wanting her to be left. ... I saw, one, there was some capacity for empathy. He could put himself in her shoes. And secondly, that he just couldn't stand to have anybody think ill of him or be disappointed in him." He did not see appellant again. A decade later, Dr. Foster explained the system in which appellant came to him:

There's a certain atmosphere at a managed care facility like Kaiser, and that atmosphere is to find a piece – a very limited piece of somebody's problem that can be dealt with in short-term therapy. . . . [T]here's a real motivation, a demand actually, to find some limited treatable piece.

In a private clinical practice, Dr. Foster explained, he "might have done considerable work evaluating the possibility of a mood disorder, bipolar disorder, which grandiosity and narcissism is a feature as well. ¶ That was just not done in the Kaiser setting. This man came in for a treatment and evaluation of a sexual issue, and for possible depression around that, and that would be the role that I was expected to perform. ¶ So coupled with what I learned later, and knowing that I was focused in just on the presenting problem, because that's the way one works within the Kaiser system, and knowing this additional information about individual