

# SUPREME COURT COPY

COPY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

_____	)	Calif. Supreme Court
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	)	No. S166168
	)	
Plaintiff and Respondent,	)	Orange Co. Super. Ct.
	)	No. 03CF0441
v.	)	
	)	
MICHAEL A. LAMB,	)	AUTOMATIC APPEAL
	)	
Defendant and Appellant.	)	
_____	)	

Orange County Superior Court Case No. S166168  
The Hon. William R. Froeberg, Judge

SUPREME COURT  
FILED

SEP - 5 2014

Frank A. McGuire Clerk  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

\_\_\_\_\_  
APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF  
\_\_\_\_\_

KATHY MORENO, SBN 121701  
P. O. BOX 9006  
BERKELEY, CA 94709-0006  
(510) 717 2097  
katmoreno@comcast.net

Attorney for Appellant  
By Appointment of the Court of  
Appeal under the California  
Appellate Project's Independent  
Case System

DEATH PENALTY

## TOPICAL INDEX

INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
STATEMENT OF FACTS	8
EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY THE PROSECUTION	
A.    The Concededly Prejudicial and Inflammatory Fox News Exposé of the PEN1 Gang, and Its Penchant for Drugs, Violence, and Weapons Was the Jury's Introduction to the Case.	8
B.    Scott Miller Was Shot and Killed in Anaheim on the Night of March 8, 2002.	22
1.    Miller was found dead in an alley after neighbors heard a loud bang.	22
2.    Appellant was at an apartment near where Miller was killed sometime that night.	23
3.    Evidence that appellant was at Freiwald's apartment the night Miller was killed.	27
4.    A jailhouse informant claimed that appellant admitted killing Miller.	28
C.    On March 11, 2002, Undercover Police Officers Chased Appellant and Rump in a Suspected Stolen Car; Appellant and Rump Abandoned the Car and Entered An Apartment Building Where Appellant Was Seen Firing One Shot Downward from the Balcony.	32

## TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)

1.	Eyewitness testimony.	32
2.	The prosecution's evidence relating to the 9 mm. gun, which was intended to prove premeditated attempted murder, was inconclusive.	37
D.	Appellant's Jailhouse Conversations, Letters And Phone Calls.	40
E.	Expert Gang-Related Testimony .	41
1.	The Fox video was not the overriding factor in Miller's death.	41
2.	The history and culture of white supremacist gangs in general and PEN1 in particular.	42
3.	Expert opinion that appellant and Rump were active PEN1 gang members.	47

## EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY THE DEFENSE

F.	Testimony Relating to Miller's Murder.	48
1.	Billy Joe Johnson testified that he alone killed Scott Miller.	48
2.	Miller and Johnson were at Raphoon's party shortly before Miller was killed.	53
3.	Expert testimony.	57
G.	Defense to the Attempted Murder Charge.	58

## TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)

### PENALTY PHASE – AGGRAVATING EVIDENCE

INTRODUCTION	60
A. Factor (a) Evidence: Circumstances of the Capital Murder.	61
B. Factor (a) Evidence: Victim Impact Evidence.	62
C. Factor (b) Evidence: Prior Acts of Violence.	63
1. The Attempted Murder of Sergeant Helmick.	63
2. At age 19, appellant confronted a beachgoer wearing Doc Marten boots.	63
3. Appellant and two other inmates assaulted inmate Munding with their fists.	63
4. Appellant stabbed an inmate at Chino State Prison in 1999.	65
5. The alleged conspiracy to escape.	66
6. Shanks were found in appellant's cell in 2003, 2005, and 2006.	68
D. Factor (c) Evidence: Appellant Had Three Prior Minor Convictions.	71

**TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)**

PENALTY PHASE – MITIGATING EVIDENCE	71
A.    Appellant's Family Life.	71
1.    The years in Cerritos.	73
2.    The move to Dana Point.	75
3.    The breakup of the family.	83
B.    Expert testimony.	88

**ARGUMENT**

I.    CONDUCTING A SECOND PENALTY PHASE TRIAL AFTER THE FIRST PENALTY PHASE JURY FAILED TO REACH A VERDICT VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS UNDER THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS	90
A.    After Appellant's First Penalty Phase Jury Deadlocked 6/5/1 and a Mistrial Was Declared, Appellant Was Forced to Face A Second Penalty Phase Trial.	91
B.    California's Statute Mandating Retrial Of the Penalty Phase of a Capital Trial Violates the Eighth Amendment Requirements That Punishment Conform to Evolving Community Standards and that the Penalty Determination In a Capital Trial Be an Individualized Decision.	92

## TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)

C.	The California Statute Mandating a Second Penalty Phase Trial Is Vastly at Odds with Evolving Standards of Common Decency and Thus Violates the Eighth Amendment.	94
D.	Retrial of the Penalty Phase Contravenes the Constitutional Requirement that Each Juror Must Make an Individualized Determination.	98
E.	Appellant's Death Sentence Is In Violation Of Federal Due Process.	100
F.	Conclusion.	103
II.	THE ERRONEOUS ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE OF APPELLANT'S ALLEGED PARTICIPATION IN A CONSPIRACY TO SMUGGLE WEAPONS AND INSTRUMENTS OF ESCAPE INTO THE JAIL, AND TO ESCAPE FROM JAIL, EVIDENCE DEEMED INADMISSIBLE BY THE SAME JUDGE AT THE FIRST PENALTY TRIAL, VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL BY JURY AND A RELIABLE SENTENCING DETERMINATION	104
A.	Summary of Facts Below	104
1.	At the first penalty trial, the court deemed the prosecution's evidence insufficient of appellant's alleged conspiracy to be legally insufficient.	104

## TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)

2. After the first penalty jury failed to reach a verdict, the trial court did an about-face and ruled that the same evidence was admissible at the second penalty trial. 107
- B. The Trial Court's Ruling at the First Penalty Trial Was Correct: There Was No Evidence Appellant Entered into Any Agreement to Smuggle Escape Weapons And/Or Instruments Of Escape into the Jail, or Any Agreement To Attempt to Escape from Jail. 109
1. Evidence of violent criminal activity is admissible under section 190.3(b) only if the evidence is sufficient to demonstrate to a rational trier of fact that the accused committed a violent crime. 109
  2. An agreement to commit a crime is the essential element of a conspiracy. 111
  3. The prosecution failed to establish evidence that appellant entered into an agreement to smuggle weapons into the jail and attempt to escape. 112
  4. Even assuming arguendo the evidence was sufficient to infer an agreement, the evidence was insufficient to infer a violent escape attempt. 116
  5. The trial court's rationale for changing its ruling fails on its own terms. 118

## TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)

D.	The Erroneous Admission of Evidence of the Supposed Conspiracy to Smuggle Weapons and To Escape Was Clearly Prejudicial, Especially Given the Fact that the First Penalty Trial Failed To Reach a Verdict Where This Same Evidence Had Been Excluded.	121
III.	THE ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE OF THE FOX VIDEO SHOWING INFLAMMATORY IMAGES AND HEARSAY STATEMENTS BY SCOTT MILLER, OTHER GANG MEMBERS, AND POLICE AND CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS AND DEPRIVED APPELLANT OF HIS FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL, REQUIRING REVERSAL OF HIS CONVICTIONS FOR BOTH THE MARCH 8 AND THE MARCH 11 OFFENSES	124
A.	The Inflammatory Fox Video Was Played for the Jury at Opening Statement at Both the Guilt and the Penalty Trials.	125
B.	The Defense Objected to Admission of the Fox Video At Both the Guilt Trial and the Second Penalty Trial As Irrelevant, Prejudicial, and in Violation of Appellant's Federal Due Process and Fair Trial Rights.	138
C.	The Fox Video Was So Extremely Inflammatory That It Created the Substantial Likelihood that the Jurors Would Use It For an Illegitimate Purpose.	144
D.	The Fox Video Was Inadmissible Given Its Undeniable Prejudicial Impact and Its Lack Of Relevance to Show Either Appellant's Knowledge or His Motive to Kill Miller.	147



## TOPICAL INDEX (Cont'd)

1. The Fox video did not tend to show that appellant knew the PEN1 gang engaged in a pattern of criminal activity. 148
  2. The Fox video did not tend to show appellant had a motive to kill Miller. 149
  3. The case law relied on by the trial court does not support the admission of a videotape of a sensationalized television program. 152
  4. Case law permitting videotape evidence of admissions and crime scenes does not apply to the facts of this case. 153
- E. The Undisputed and Extremely Prejudicial Nature of The Fox Video Required Its Exclusion Even If It Was Marginally Relevant. 157
- F. The Erroneous Admission of the Fox Video Requires Reversal of Appellant's Convictions. 159
1. Both the guilt and penalty phases of the trial were tainted by the presentation of the video in opening statements. 160
  2. The prosecutor's reliance on the Fox video is an indication of prejudice. 163
  3. Appellant's death sentence must be vacated. 164

**TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)**

G.	The Trial Court's Admonition Was Ineffectual And Does Not Redeem the Error or Erase The Prejudicial Impact of the Fox Video.	166
IV.	THE EXCLUSION OF MITIGATING EVIDENCE OF APPELLANT'S MOTHER'S ABUSE AT THE HANDS OF HER FATHER AND TESTIMONY BY A NEIGHBOR AS TO HOW APPELLANT'S PARENTS BROKE HIS SPIRIT VIOLATED HIS FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, THE RIGHT TO PRESENT A DEFENSE, AND PROTECTION AGAINST CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT, BECAUSE THE EXCLUDED EVIDENCE WAS DIRECTLY LINKED TO APPELLANT'S OWN CHARACTER AND THUS ADMISSIBLE UNDER UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PRECEDENTS	171
A.	The Trial Court Erroneously Refused to Permit Multi-Generational Mitigation Evidence That Provided Context for Evidence of Appellant's Mother's Alcoholism and Its Effect on Appellant.	172
B.	The Eighth Amendment Requires Admission Of All Mitigating Evidence Relating to the Defendant's Background and Character.	173
C.	Appellant Has a Constitutional Right to Present Multi-Generational Evidence of Family Dysfunction.	174

**TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)**

D.	Due Process and an Even-Handed Application of The Rules of Evidence Required the Trial Court To Allow Admission of Appellant's Multi-Generational Mitigation Evidence.	177
E.	The Trial Court Erroneously Excluded Classic Evidence of Appellant's Character When It Struck Testimony by Neighbor Bernard Cain That Appellant's Spirit Had Been Broken by His Parent's Treatment of Him.	179
F.	The Exclusion of Relevant Mitigation Prejudiced Appellant.	181

**PENALTY PHASE ISSUES RELATING  
TO PROSECUTORIAL AND JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

V.	THE PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT AT PENALTY PHASE CROSS-EXAMINATION AND CLOSING ARGUMENT VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL, AND HIS PROTECTION AGAINST CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT	183
A.	The Prosecutor's Cross-examination of Johnson Included Attacks on Defense Counsels' Integrity, Accusations and Suggestions of Collusion; and Providing His Own Unsworn Testimony.	185
B.	The Prosecutor's Penalty Phase Argument Was Replete With Improper Assertions, Accusations And Suggestions.	191
1.	The prosecutor repeatedly attacked the integrity of defense counsel.	191

## TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)

2.	The prosecutor repeatedly argued that defense wanted only "one juror" to vote against death, an attack on defense counsel's integrity that ascribed to defense counsel an improper motive and strategy of trying to take the jurors' focus away from the law and the evidence, and also implying that defense counsel did not believe in appellant's innocence of the crime or the propriety of a life rather than a death sentence.	196
3.	The prosecutor repeatedly injected into the argument his personal beliefs and reactions to the evidence in a concerted pattern of improper vouching.	197
	(a) The prosecutor's personal beliefs.	197
	(b) Improper vouching.	200
4.	The prosecutor's argument comparing appellant to Nazi war criminals and contrasting him with Nelson Mandela violated the trial court's ruling.	201
5.	The prosecutor misstated the facts.	202
C.	The Continuous Course of Improper Prosecutorial Argument Requires Reversal of Appellant's Sentence of Death.	203

## TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)

VI.	THE TRIAL JUDGE COMMITTED JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT WHEN HE MADE COMMENTS MINIMIZING THE JURY'S RESPONSIBILITY IN DETERMINING PENALTY BY GIVING MISLEADING AND INCORRECT "STATISTICS" AS TO DEATH ROW INMATES REQUIRES REVERSAL OF APPELLANT'S SENTENCE OF DEATH	207
A.	A Fair Trial in a Fair Tribunal Is a Basic Requirement of Federal Due Process and That Fairness Requires Not Only the Absence of Bias but Even the Probability of Unfairness.	207
B.	The Judge's Comments to the Jurors During Voir Dire Amounted to Error Under <i>Caldwell v. Mississippi</i> .	208
C.	The Judicial Misconduct Was Prejudicial.	214
JURY SELECTION ERROR		
VII.	THE TRIAL COURT'S ERRONEOUS GRANT OF A CHALLENGE TO CAUSE AT THE SECOND PENALTY TRIAL TO A PROSPECTIVE JUROR WHO WAS EQUIVOCAL OR CONFLICTED ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY BUT WHO WAS ABLE TO CONSIDER ALL THE EVIDENCE VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO AN IMPARTIAL JURY, DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION AND A RELIABLE SENTENCING DETERMINATION	216
A.	The Removal of a Prospective Juror Who Was Not Shown to Be Substantially Impaired Requires Reversal Of Appellant's Penalty Trial.	216

**TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)**

- B. Prospective Juror 144 Agreed to Consider All the Facts "On the Fence" About the Death Penalty, and Only Said She Would Not Impose a Death Sentence When She Was Improperly Forced to Give a Yes or No Answer, Explaining That She Understood the Decision to be An Individualized Weighing Based on the Evidence Not A Forced Prejudging "Yes or No." 217
  
- C. A Prospective Juror Can Be Excluded for Cause Only If She Is Unable to Follow the Law and Cannot Consider All Sentencing Alternatives. 220
  
- D. Erroneous Cause Excusal of a Prospective Juror In Violation of Witherspoon and Witt Requires Reversal of the Death Sentence. 226

**CLAIMS RELATING TO THE GANG SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE FINDING AND GUILT PHASE ERRORS**

- VIII. THIS COURT MUST STRIKE THE GANG-MURDER SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE FINDING, ON ITS FACE, AND AS APPLIED IN THIS CASE, AS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VAGUE AND INSUFFICIENTLY NARROWING, IN VIOLATION OF FEDERAL AND STATE DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION GUARANTEES, AND THE PROTECTION AGAINST CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT 227
  - A. Introduction to Argument. 227
  
  - B. The Lack of a Meaningful Distinction Between the Gang Special Circumstance and a First Degree Murder with a Gang Enhancement Renders the Special Circumstance Invalid in This Case. 228

## TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)

IX.	APPELLANT'S CONVICTION FOR CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT MURDER SCOTT MILLER IS UNSUPPORTED BY THE EVIDENCE AND MUST BE VACATED AS VIOLATIVE OF HIS FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS	233
A.	Introduction to Argument.	233
B.	The Prosecution Failed to Present Solid And Credible Evidence that Appellant Entered Into an Agreement to Murder.	236
C.	The Prosecutor's Reliance on the Fox Video as Evidence of the Conspiracy in Urging the Jury to Convict Appellant of Conspiracy Is Further Indication that There Was No Solid and Substantial Evidence that Appellant Entered Into a Conspiracy with the Specific Intent to Kill Scott Miller.	243
D.	Conclusion: Appellant's Conspiracy Conviction Must Be Vacated.	244
X.	THE PROSECUTOR'S REPEATED IMPROPER ARGUMENTS TO THE JURY VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FEDERAL DUE PROCESS AND FAIR TRIAL RIGHTS UNDER THE FIFTH, SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS	245
A.	Introduction to Argument.	245
B.	The Prosecutor's Improper Arguments to the Jury Constituted a Course of Conduct that Deprived Appellant of a Fair Trial.	246

## TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)

1.	The prosecutor improperly attacked defense counsels' integrity by telling the jurors that that the defense presentation was "not fair" and "not right" and that the defense was trying to fool the jurors.	246
2.	The prosecutor improperly vouched for the strength of his evidence by arguing to the jury that based on his own personal experience the case against appellant was unusually strong and "not even close."	254
3.	Conclusion.	256
C.	The Continuous Course of Improper Prosecutorial Argument Requires Reversal of Appellant's Sentence of Death.	256
XI.	THE TRIAL COURT'S REFUSAL TO SEVER THE ATTEMPTED MURDER CHARGE FROM THE CAPITAL MURDER CHARGE VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL	260
A.	Introduction to Argument.	260
B.	The Trial Court Should Order Severance of Otherwise Joinable Offenses When Severance Is Necessary To Ensure the Defendant's Constitutional Rights To Due Process and a Fair Trial.	261



**TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)**

C.	Application of the Guidelines Used in Assessing The Need for Severance Demonstrates that the Joinder of the March 11 with the March 8 Offenses Violated Appellant's Due Process Rights.	262
1.	Evidence of the March 11 attempted murder and the capital murder was not cross-admissible.	263
2.	The inflammatory nature of the police shooting.	266
3.	The spillover effect of the evidence of the police shooting likely influenced the jury on the outcome of the capital murder charge.	267
4.	The March 8 offense was a capital charge.	267
5.	Conclusion.	268
D.	The Denial of Appellant's Severance Motion Prejudiced His Defense as to Both Sets of Offenses.	268

**CLAIM RELATED TO THE ATTEMPTED MURDER OF A POLICE OFFICER**

XII.	THE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED APPELLANT'S SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS BY ADMITTING INTO EVIDENCE AGAINST APPELLANT RUMP'S HEARSAY STATEMENT THAT HE THOUGHT THE DRIVER OF THE WHITE CAR WAS A PAROLE OFFICER	269
A.	Procedural History.	269

## TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)

B.	The Admission of Rump's Statement Against Appellant Violated Appellant's Confrontation Clause Rights Under The Sixth Amendment Because It Was a Testimonial Statement Used for Its Truth and Rump Was Unavailable For Cross-Examination.	271
1.	Rump's Out-of-Court Statement Was Used Against Appellant for Its Truth.	271
2.	The "shared motive" theory relied on by the trial court does not apply to the facts of this case.	276
3.	The admission of Rump's statement violated <i>Aranda/Bruton</i> .	278
4.	Rump's Statement Was Testimonial in Nature Because the Police Tape-Recorded Rump and Appellant For Purposes of Investigating Crime: Its Admission Against Appellant Violated His Confrontation Rights Under <i>Crawford</i> .	279
5.	The Admission of Rump's Statement Also Violated Appellant's Federal Due Process Rights Because It Was Irrelevant To Appellant's State of Mind and Thus Deprived Appellant of a Fair Trial on The Attempted Murder Charge.	281
C.	The Erroneous Admission of Rump's Statement Prejudiced Appellant's Defense to the Premeditated Attempted Murder Charge.	282

**TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)**

XIII.	CALIFORNIA'S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, AS INTERPRETED BY THIS COURT AND APPLIED AT APPELLANT'S TRIAL, VIOLATES THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION	286
XIV.	THE PROCESS USED IN CALIFORNIA FOR DEATH QUALIFICATION OF JURIES IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND WAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN THIS CASE	299
A.	Current Empirical Studies Prove That the Death Qualification Process is Unconstitutional.	300
1.	The statistical research since <i>Hovey</i> .	301
2.	The factual basis of <i>Lockhart</i> is no longer sound.	303
a.	Misinterpretation of the scientific data.	304
b.	Incorrect legal observations.	305
c.	The scientific evidence.	306
B.	Data Regarding the Impact of Death Qualification on Jurors' Race, Gender, and Religion.	308
C.	Prosecutorial Misuse of Death Qualification.	309
D.	Death Qualification in California Violates the Eighth Amendment.	310
E.	The Death-Qualification Process is Unconstitutional.	311
F.	Death Qualification Violates the Right to a Jury Trial.	313

**TOPICAL INDEX (cont'd)**

G.	Errors in Death Qualifying the Penalty Jury Requires Reversal of the Guilt Verdicts as Well.	315
H.	Conclusion.	317
	CONCLUSION	320
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	321
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	322

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### FEDERAL CASES

<i>Abdul-Kabir v. Quarterman</i> (2007) 500 U.S. 233	174
<i>Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Lavoie</i> (1986) 475 U.S. 813	207
<i>Arizona v. Fulminante</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 279	103
<i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 304	90, 94, 96
<i>Bates v. Bell</i> (6th Cir. 2005) 402 F.3d 635	206
<i>Bean v. Calderon</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998) 163 F.3d 1073	261
<i>Berger v. United States</i> (1935) 295 U.S. 78	185, 190, 256
<i>Blakely v. Washington</i> (2004) 542 U.S. 296	288, 289
<i>Brown v. Borg</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 951 F.2d 1011	163, 182
<i>Bruton v. United States</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 123	270, 278
<i>Buchanan v. Kentucky</i> (1987) 483 U.S. 402	299
<i>Burks v. United States</i> (1978) 437 U.S. 1	245
<i>Caldwell v. Mississippi</i> (1985) 472 U.S. 320	205, 211
<i>Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.</i> (2009) 556 U.S. 868	207-208
<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18	121, 159, 181, 214, 256, 282
<i>Coleman v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 2000) 210 F.3d 1047	212

<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> (2004) 541 U.S. 36	270, 280
<i>Cunningham v. California</i> (2007) 549 U.S. 270	287
<i>Darden v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 168	189, 202
<i>Davis v. Georgia</i> (1976) 429 U.S. 122	280
<i>Davis v. Washington</i> (2006) 547 U.S. 813	320
<i>Donnelly v. DeChristoforo</i> (1974) 416 U.S. 637	184, 185, 204, 245-246, 256
<i>Eddings v. Oklahoma</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 104	173
<i>Estelle v. McGuire</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 62	124, 270, 282
<i>Ford v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 399	96, 102
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 238	93, 98, 228
<i>Godfrey v. Georgia</i> (1980) 446 U.S. 420	184, 228
<i>Goldsmith v. Witkowski</i> (4th Cir. 1992) 981 F.2d 697	168
<i>Gomez v. United States</i> (1989) 490 U.S. 858	312
<i>Gray v. Klauser</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 282 F.3d 633	178
<i>Gray v. Mississippi</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 648	217, 227
<i>Green v. Georgia</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 95	179
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153	99, 173, 210
<i>Hein v. Sullivan</i> (9th Cir. 2010) 601 F.3d 897	190

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### FEDERAL CASES

<i>Abdul-Kabir v. Quarterman</i> (2007) 500 U.S. 233	174
<i>Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Lavoie</i> (1986) 475 U.S. 813	207
<i>Arizona v. Fulminante</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 279	103
<i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 304	90, 94, 96
<i>Bates v. Bell</i> (6th Cir. 2005) 402 F.3d 635	206
<i>Bean v. Calderon</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998) 163 F.3d 1073	261
<i>Berger v. United States</i> (1935) 295 U.S. 78	185, 190, 256
<i>Blakely v. Washington</i> (2004) 542 U.S. 296	288, 289
<i>Brown v. Borg</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 951 F.2d 1011	163, 182
<i>Bruton v. United States</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 123	270, 278
<i>Buchanan v. Kentucky</i> (1987) 483 U.S. 402	299
<i>Burks v. United States</i> (1978) 437 U.S. 1	245
<i>Caldwell v. Mississippi</i> (1985) 472 U.S. 320	205, 211
<i>Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.</i> (2009) 556 U.S. 868	207-208
<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18	121, 159, 181, 214, 256, 282
<i>Coleman v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 2000) 210 F.3d 1047	212
<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> (2004) 541 U.S. 36	270, 280

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)

<i>Cunningham v. California</i> (2007) 549 U.S. 270	287
<i>Darden v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 168	189, 202
<i>Davis v. Georgia</i> (1976) 429 U.S. 122	280
<i>Davis v. Washington</i> (2006) 547 U.S. 813	320
<i>Donnelly v. DeChristoforo</i> (1974) 416 U.S. 637	184, 185, 204, 245-246, 256
<i>Eddings v. Oklahoma</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 104	173
<i>Estelle v. McGuire</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 62	124, 270, 282
<i>Ford v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 399	96, 102
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 238	93, 98, 228
<i>Godfrey v. Georgia</i> (1980) 446 U.S. 420	184, 228
<i>Goldsmith v. Witkowski</i> (4th Cir. 1992) 981 F.2d 697	168
<i>Gomez v. United States</i> (1989) 490 U.S. 858	312
<i>Gray v. Klauser</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 282 F.3d 633	178
<i>Gray v. Mississippi</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 648	217, 227
<i>Green v. Georgia</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 95	179
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153	99, 173, 210
<i>Hein v. Sullivan</i> (9th Cir. 2010) 601 F.3d 897	190



## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)

<i>In re Murchison</i> (1955) 349 U.S. 133	207
<i>Jackson v. Virginia</i> (1979) 443 U.S. 307	236
<i>Jamal v. Van DeKamp</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 926 F.2d 918	124
<i>Kansas v. Marsh</i> (2006) 548 U.S. 163	298
<i>Krulewitch v. United States</i> (1949) 336 U.S. 440	168
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 586	173
<i>Lockhart v. McCree</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 162	300, 305, 309-310 315, 319
<i>Maggio v. Williams</i> (1983) 464 U.S. 46	211
<i>McKinney v. Rees</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) 993 F.2d 1378	281
<i>Mills v. Maryland</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 367	99, 100
<i>Mistretta v. United States</i> (1989) 488 U.S. 361	208
<i>Monge v. California</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 721	103, 121, 125, 184
<i>Mu'min v. Virginia</i> (1991) 500 U.S. 415	217
<i>Panzavecchia v. Wainwright</i> (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. Unit B 1981) 658 F.2d 337	261
<i>Parker v. Matthews</i> (2012) ___ U.S. ___ [132 S.Ct. 2148]	193, 249
<i>Penry v. Lynaugh</i> (1989) 492 U.S. 302	94
<i>Porter v. McCollum</i> (2009) 558 U.S. 30	174

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)**

<i>Powers v. Ohio</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 400	312
<i>Pulley v. Harris</i> (1984) 465 U.S. 37	298
<i>Riley v. Taylor</i> (3rd Cir. 2001) 277 F.3d 261	211
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 584	287, 288, 292
<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> (2005) 543 U.S. 551	96
<i>Rump v. McEwen</i> (C.D.Cal. 2011) U.S. Dist.Ct. LEXIS 153605	238
<i>Saffle v. Parks</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 484	98
<i>Sassounian v. Roe</i> (9th Cir. 2000) 230 F.3d 1097	191, 252
<i>Taylor v. Kentucky</i> (1978) 436 U.S. 478	123, 164, 207, 215 260, 285
<i>Taylor v. Louisiana</i> (1975) 419 U.S. 522	313, 314
<i>Tennard v. Dretke</i> (2004) 524 U.S. 274	174
<i>Tennessee v. Street</i> (1985) 471 U.S. 409	276
<i>Tison v. Arizona</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 137	229
<i>Trop v. Dulles</i> (1958) 356 U.S. 86	90, 94, 95
<i>United States v. Booker</i> (2005) 543 U.S. 220	286-87
<i>United States v. Brooks</i> (9th Cir. 2007) 508 F.3d 1205	200
<i>United States v. Carolene Products</i> (1938) 304 U.S. 144	304
<i>United States v. Francis</i> (6th Cir. 1999) 170 F.3d 546	186

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)**

<i>United States v. Frederick</i> (9th Cir. 1995) 78 F.3d 1370	123, 260
<i>United States v. Kerr</i> (9th Cir. 1992) 981 F.2d 1050	168, 199, 255
<i>United States v. Kojayan</i> (9th Cir. 1993) 8 F.3d 1315	185, 245
<i>United States v. Mejia</i> (2d Cir. 2008) 545 F.3d 179	165, 166
<i>United States v. Rodrigues</i> (1998 U.S.App. LEXIS 36919) as amended at (9th Cir. 1999) 170 F.3d 881	258
<i>United States v. Rudberg</i> (9th Cir. 1997) 122 F.3d 1199	199, 205
<i>United States v. Simtob</i> (9th Cir. 1990) 901 F.2d 799	168
<i>Utrecht v. Brown</i> (2007) 551 U.S. 1	220
<i>Walters v. Maass</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995) 45 F.3d 1355	281-282
<i>Wardius v. Oregon</i> (1973) 412 U.S. 470	170
<i>Washington v. Texas</i> (1967) 388 U.S. 14	170-171
<i>Wainwright v. Witt</i> (1985) 469 U.S. 412	221, 227
<i>Webb v. Texas</i> (1972) 409 U.S. 95	179
<i>Wiggins v. Smith</i> (2003) 539 U.S. 510	174, 175
<i>Williams v. Taylor</i> (2000) 529 U.S. 362	174
<i>Witherspoon v. Illinois</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 510	220, 305, 315, 319
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 280	99, 103, 173, 184 204, 210, 310-311

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)

*Yohn v. Love* (3d Cir. 1996) 76 F.3d 508 284

### STATE CASES

*Calderon v. Superior Court* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 933 262

*Harris v. Superior Court* (1992) 3 Cal.App.4th 661 145

*Hovey v. Superior Court* (1980) 28 Cal.3d 1 300, 316

*In re Brian J.* (2007) 150 Cal.App.4th 97 197, 266

*In re Sassounian* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 535 242

*In re Scott* (2003) 29 Cal.4th 783 176

*People v. Abel* (2012) 53 Cal. 4th 891 212

*People v. Albarran* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 214 124

*People v. Alvarez* (1996) 14 Cal.4th 155 262

*People v. Anzalone* (2013) 56 Cal.4th 545 103

*People v. Aranda* (1965) 63 Cal.2d 518 270, 272

*People v. Archer* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 1380 279

*People v. Arias* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 92 268

*People v. Ashmus* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 932 316

*People v. Babbitt* (1988) 45 Cal.3d 660 147

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)

<i>People v. Bacigalupo</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 457	292
<i>People v. Bain</i> (1971) 5 Cal.3d 839	188
<i>People v. Bean</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 919	262
<i>People v. Boyd</i> (1985) 38 Cal.3d 762	110, 117, 120
<i>People v. Boyde</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 212	118, 119, 120
<i>People v. Bracamonte</i> (1981) 119 Cal.App.3d 644	168
<i>People v. Butler</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 847	271
<i>People v. Carr</i> (2006) 190 Cal.App. 4th 475	231
<i>People v. Carrington</i> (2009) 47 Cal.4th 145	293-95
<i>People v. Catlin</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 81	233, 295
<i>People v. Champion</i> (1995) 9 Cal.4th 879	157, 212
<i>People v. Clair</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 629	110
<i>People v. Collins</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4th 175	189, 202, 288-89 292-97
<i>People v. Cox</i> (1991) 53 Cal.3d 618	157
<i>People v. Cummings</i> (1993) 4 Cal.4th 1233	263
<i>People v. D'Arcy</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4th 257	289, 291-293, 296
<i>People v. Davis</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 510	189, 202

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)

<i>People v. Day</i> (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 405	123
<i>People v. Diaz</i> (2014) 227 Cal.App.4th 362	144-147, 161, 169
<i>People v. Drolet</i> (1973) 30 Cal.App.3d 207	112
<i>People v. Duarte</i> (2000) 24 Cal.4th 603	271
<i>People v. Dykes</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 731	204-205
<i>People v. Ewoldt</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 380	264, 265
<i>People v. Fields</i> (1983) 35 Cal.3d 329	300-301, 316
<i>People v. Frazier</i> (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 30	122
<i>People v. Fuentes</i> (1986) 183 Cal.App.3d 444	122, 181
<i>People v. Gallego</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 115	102, 120, 122
<i>People v. Gionis</i> (1995) 9 Cal.4th 1196	191, 252
<i>People v. Grant</i> (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 579	269
<i>People v. Green</i> (1980) 27 Cal.3d 1	259
<i>People v. Greenberger</i> (1997) 58 Cal.App.4th 298	272, 273
<i>People v. Guzman</i> (2000) 80 Cal.App.4th 1282	163, 164, 258
<i>People v. Harris</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 310	154, 156
<i>People v. Hawthorne</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 43	290

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)**

<i>People v. Herrera</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4th 613	230
<i>People v. Herrera</i> (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 1456	236
<i>People v. Herring</i> (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 1066	191, 252
<i>People v. Hidalgo</i> (1947) 78 Cal.App.2d 926	189
<i>People v. Hill</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 800	123, 164, 183, 187-188, 191 204, 206, 215, 246, 252, 255-257, 260, 285
<i>People v. Hill</i> (1995) 34 Cal.App.4th 727	263
<i>People v. Hines</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 997	212
<i>People v. Hole</i> (1983) 139 Cal.App.3d 431	276
<i>People v. Homick</i> (2013) 55 Cal.4th 816	245
<i>People v. Humphrey</i> (1996) Cal.4th 1073	123
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (2013) 57 Cal.4th 250	111
<i>People v. Jones</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 119	191
<i>People v. Kasim</i> (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 1360	185, 245
<i>People v. Kelly</i> (2007) 42 Cal.4th 763	227
<i>People v. Killebrew</i> (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 644	114, 116, 165
<i>People v. Kirkes</i> (1952) 39 Cal.2d 719	188-189
<i>People v. Lancaster</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 50	117

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)**

<i>People v. Laursen</i> (1968) 264 Cal.App.2d 932	168
<i>People v. Lee</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4th 620	236
<i>People v. Lewis &amp; Oliver</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 970	180
<i>People v. Lindsey</i> (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 112	205, 284
<i>People v. Lightsey</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 668	116
<i>People v. Livingston</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1145	280
<i>People v. Lucero</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 692	212
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (2010) 47 Cal.4th 911	257
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (1984) 36 Cal.3d 816	122, 181
<i>People v. Mason</i> (1991) 52 Cal.3d 909	119, 110
<i>People v. McWhorter</i> (2009) 47 Cal.4th 318	286, 288, 294
<i>People v. Mejia</i> (2013) 211 Cal.App.4th 586	231
<i>People v. Mendoza</i> (2000) 24 Cal.4th 130	212, 288, 295
<i>People v. Mil</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 400	283



<i>People v. Mills</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4th 158	212, 288, 290, 292, 293, 296
<i>People v. Mejia</i> (2013) 211 Cal.App.4th 586	231
<i>People v. Minifie</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1055	163, 182
<i>People v. Moore</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4th 1104	110, 117
<i>People v. Morales</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 34	259
<i>People v. Morris</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 1	242
<i>People v. Nolan</i> (1932) 126 Cal. App. 623	189
<i>People v. Osband</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 622	268
<i>People v. Phillips</i> (1985) 41 Cal.3d 29	108, 110
<i>People v. Powers-Monachello</i> (2010) 189 Cal.App.4th 400	114
<i>People v. Ramos</i> (1986) 37 Cal. 3d 136	211
<i>People v. Ray</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 313	290
<i>People v. Riggs</i> (2008) 44 Cal.4th 248	153, 154, 156
<i>People v. Samayoa</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 795	246
<i>People v. Sandoval</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 155	263
<i>People v. Scheid</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1	142, 152
<i>People v. Schmeck</i> (2005) 37 Cal.3d 240	286, 288
<i>People v. Scott</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 452	157

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)

<i>People v. Stewart</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 425	222, 320
<i>People v. Sturm</i> (2006) 37 Cal.4th 1218	211, 212
<i>People v. Superior Court (Quinteros)</i> (1993) 13 Cal.App.4th 12	236, 237
<i>People v. Taylor</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4th 574	94, 287, 291-94, 296-297
<i>People v. Thomas</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 908	177
<i>People v. Thompson</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4th 79	293-95, 297
<i>People v. Tully</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 952	116
<i>People v. Turner</i> (1990) 50 Cal.3d 668	142, 152
<i>People v. Vance</i> (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 1182	257
<i>People v. Vargas</i> (1973) 9 Cal.3d 470	205, 284
<i>People v. Watson</i> (1956) 46 Cal.2d 818	164
<i>People v. Welch</i> (1999) 20 Cal.4th 701	212
<i>People v. Whalen</i> (2013) 56 Cal.4th 1	212, 227
<i>People v. Williams</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4th 153	197
<i>Raven v. Deukmejian</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 336	304
<i>Skaggs v. Commonwealth</i> (Ky. 1985) 694 S.W.2d 672	92
<i>Williams v. Superior Court</i> (1984) 36 Cal.3d 441	261-262

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)**

**CALIFORNIA STATUTES**

Evid. Code, section 210	147
Evid. Code, section 352	140, 269
Evid. Code, section 764	234
Evid. Code, section 1101	263
Evid. Code, section 1200	271
Evid. Code, section 1230	271, 272
Pen. Code, section 186.22	5, 229
Pen. Code, section 187	4-5, 229
Pen. Code, section 190.2	4, 229, 232
Pen. Code, section 190.3	passim
Pen. Code, section 664	5
Pen. Code, section 667	4
Pen. Code, section 667.5	6
Pen. Code, section 954	261
Pen. Code, section 1118.1	234
Pen. Code, section 1149	93
Pen. Code, section 12021	4-5

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)

Pen. Code, section 12021.1	4
Pen. Code, section 12022.53	5
Pen. Code, section 12031	4
<b>FOREIGN STATUTES</b>	
18 U.S.C.A. section 3593(3) (West Supp. 1995)	97
21 USCA section 848(1) (West Supp. 1995)	97
A.R.S. §13-752(K)	97
Ala. Code, § 13A-5-46(g)(2009)	92, 97
Ark. Stat. Ann. § 5-4-603(c) (1993)	97
Col. Rev. Stat. § 18-1.3-1201(2)(b)(II)(d) (2003)	97
Del. Code Ann., tit.11, § 4209 (c)(3)(b)(1) (2009)	92, 97
Fla. Stat. Ann. 921.141(2) (2009)	92, 97
Ga. Code Ann. § 17-10-31.1(c) (Supp. 1994)	97
Id. Code § 19-2512(7)(c) (2003)	97
Ind. Code Ann. § 35-30-2-9(f) (2009)	92
Kan. Stat. Ann. § 21-4624(e) (Supp.1994)	97
La. Code Crim. Proc. Ann. art. 905.8 (West Supp. 1995)	97
Miss. Code Ann. § 99-19-103 (1994)	97

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED ( cont'd)**

Mo. Ann. Stat. § 565.030(4) (Vernon Supp. 1995)	92, 97
NH Rev. Stat. Ann. § 630:5(IX) (Supp. 1994)	97
Nev. Rev. Stat. § 175.556 (2003)	97
Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 175.556(1) (2009)	92
NC Gen. Stat. § 15A-2000(b) (Supp. 1994)	97
Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2929.03(D)(2) (Anderson 1993)	97
Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 21, § 701.11 (West Supp. 1995)	97
Or. Rev. Stat. §§ 163.150(1)(e), 163.150(1)(f), 163.150(2)(a) (2001)	97
Pa. Stat. Ann. tit. 42, § 9711(c)(l)(v) Purdon Supp. 1995)	97
SC Code Ann. art. 37.071(2)(g) (Vernon Supp. 1995)	97
SD Codified Laws Ann. §§ 23A-27A-4 (1988)	97
Tenn. Code Ann. § 39-13-204(h) (1991)	97
Tex. Crim. Proc. Code Ann. art. 37.071(2)(g) (Vernon Supp. 1995)	97
Utah Code Ann. § 76-3-207(4) (1995)	97
Va. Code Ann. § 19.2-264.4 (1990)	97
Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 10.95.080(2) (Supp. 1995)	97
Wyo. Stat. § 6-2-102(e) (Supp. 1994)	97