

SUPREME COURT COPY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

vs.

LORENZO NEWBORN et al,

Defendants and Appellants.

S058734

Los Angeles County Superior
Court No. BA092268

SUPREME COURT
FILED

JUN 6 - 2006

Frederick K. Ohlrich Clerk

DEPUTY

APPELLANT NEWBORN'S OPENING BRIEF

Appeal from the Judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Hon. J. D. Smith, Judge Presiding

Eric S. Multhaup
State Bar 62217
20 Sunnyside Avenue, Suite A
Mill Valley, CA 94941
415-821-6000
Attorney for Appellant Lorenzo Newborn

DEATH PENALTY

TOPICAL INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
APPELLANT NEWBORN'S OPENING BRIEF	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS	7
A. <u>The Prosecution's Case.</u>	7
1. The shooting of Fernando Hodges on the evening of October 31, 1993.	7
2. The Gathering at the Huntington Memorial Hospital after the Hodges' Shooting.	10
3. Testimony regarding the charged crimes on October 31, 1993.	14
a. The surviving victims.	14
b. Other eyewitnesses.	19
c. Forensic evidence.	27
4. The shooting near McFee's residence at Pasadena and Blake.	30
a. Eyewitness testimony.	30
b. <u>Informer DeSean Holmes.</u>	34
5. Newborn's custodial statement to Deputy Keeling.	43
6. McClain's admissions, earlier crimes, and post-offense conduct.	44

a.	McClain’s post-offense admissions to Mario Stevens.	44
b.	McClain’s post-offense admission to Troy Welcome.	45
c.	McClain’s prior shooting of Robert Price, former Crip, on October 28, 1993.	47
d.	McClain’s breach of parole after October 31, 1993.	47
e.	McClain’s flight to Memphis on November 7, 1993.	48
f.	The seizure of guns and ammunition from McClain and Brown on September 12, 1992.	48
g.	McClain’s admissions to James Carpenter in early-November 1993.	49
7.	Karl Holmes’ admission to Derrick Tate.	50
B.	<u>Defense Evidence.</u>	52
1.	Newborn defense witnesses.	52
2.	Karl Holmes’ defense.	58
3.	Herbert McClain’s defense.	63
C.	<u>Prosecution Rebuttal.</u>	65
	PENALTY TRIAL	67
A.	<u>The Prosecution’s Case.</u>	67
1.	Holmes’ in-court outburst.	67

2.	The Halloween shootings on Emerson and Wilson.	67
3.	Prior incidents of violence involving Newborn.	69
a.	Battery of Tanchell Anderson.	70
b.	Battery of Detrick Bright.	71
c.	Battery of Rochelle Douglas.	73
d.	Altercation with Louise Jernigan.	74
e.	Battery of Anedra Keaton.	75
f.	Refusal to follow orders of Officer Monica Cuellar.	76
g.	1986 altercation in Youth Authority.	77
h.	Another altercation in Youth Authority.	77
4.	Prior incidents of violence involving McClain.	78
a.	Attack on inmate in county jail.	78
b.	Possession of firearm and ammunition.	78
c.	Robbery of Bernard Rowe.	79
d.	Possession of firearm.	79
e.	Robbery of Raquel Flores.	80
f.	In-court threat to witness Pattelle.	80
g.	McClain's former testimony about gang retaliation.	81

h.	Assault with a firearm on Robert Price.	81
i.	Threats to courtroom bailiffs.	82
5.	Prior incidents of violence involving Holmes.	83
6.	Victim impact testimony.	83
B.	<u>Defense Evidence in Mitigation.</u>	85
1.	Newborn's presentation.	85
a.	The Louise Jernigan incident.	85
b.	Newborn's difficult upbringing.	86
c.	Law enforcement testimony regarding the absence of reports of a shooting near Blake and Pasadena on October 31, 1993.	90
d.	Photographs of Newborn as a youth.	91
2.	McClain's presentation.	91
3.	Holmes' presentation.	94
	ARGUMENT	96
	GUILT PHASE ARGUMENTS	96
I.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION, AND A REPRESENTATIVE JURY IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE TRIAL COURT'S ERROR IN REFUSING TO REMEDY THE PROSECUTOR'S IMPROPER EXERCISE OF PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES BASED ON RACE AND SEX.	96

A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	96
1.	Overview.	96
2.	The parties' peremptory challenges by gender and ethnicity.	97
3.	The <u>Batson-Wheeler</u> objection and denial.	99
4.	The continuation of jury selection.	100
B.	<u>The Trial Court's Errors.</u>	102
1.	The constitutional standard.	102
2.	The statistical demonstration of discrimination in this case.	103
3.	The inadequacy of the trial court's response to the motion.	107
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	118
II.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A REPRESENTATIVE JURY BY THE ERRONEOUS EXCUSAL OF JUROR #126 FOR CAUSE.	119
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	119
B.	<u>The Trial Court's Errors.</u>	125
1.	The erroneous refusal to permit defense voir dire.	127
2.	The erroneous excusal for cause.	132
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	133

III.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND HIS RIGHT OF CONFRONTATION IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE TRIAL COURT'S EXCESSIVE RESTRICTIONS ON CROSS-EXAMINATION OF DESEAN HOLMES.	135
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	135
1.	Rulings prior to DeSean Holmes' testimony.	135
2.	Rulings during DeSean Holmes' testimony.	140
B.	<u>The Trial Court's Errors.</u>	147
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	152
IV.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND HIS RIGHT OF CONFRONTATION IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE ERRONEOUS ADMISSION OF INCRIMINATING HEARSAY FROM LACHANDRA CARR.	155
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	155
B.	<u>The Trial Court's Errors.</u>	159
1.	The error in permitting evidence of Carr's grand jury testimony that appellant Newborn was at the hospital.	159
2.	The error in permitting Carr's hearsay testimony as to Bowen's statements to her that appellant Newborn had been at the hospital.	160
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	162

V.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND HIS RIGHT OF PRESENCE BY THE TRIAL COURT’S ROGUE ACTION IN DETAINING WITNESS CARR OVERNIGHT IN THE ABSENCE OF ANY REASONABLE GROUNDS AND IN APPELLANT’S ABSENCE.	164
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	164
B.	<u>The Trial Court’s Errors.</u>	168
1.	The trial court’s error in summarily taking LaChandra Carr into custody.	168
2.	The trial court’s error in conducting the unauthorized proceedings in appellant’s absence.	173
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	175
VI.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE COURT’S REFUSAL TO GRANT HIS MOTION TO SEVER FROM THE OTHER CODEFENDANTS.	176
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	176
1.	Pretrial rulings.	176
2.	Midtrial rulings.	179
a.	Derrick Tate’s implied incrimination of Newborn.	179
3.	Restrictions on cross-examination of DeSean Holmes.	181

4.	Exclusion of Carpenter testimony that McClain attributed the shooting to himself, Holmes, and another person, not Newborn.	183
5.	Incriminating extrajudicial statement from Charles Baker regarding Newborn's involvement in the McFee shooting.	183
6.	McClain's testimony.	183
B.	<u>The Trial Court's Errors.</u>	188
1.	The trial court's refusal to sever based on prejudicial spillover from prosecution witnesses.	188
2.	The trial court's error in refusing to grant a mistrial and severance in light of McClain's testimony.	190
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	193
VII.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT IN THE FORM OF FLAGRANT APPEALS TO THE JURY'S PASSION AND PREJUDICE DURING CLOSING ARGUMENT.	195
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	195
B.	<u>The Prosecutorial Misconduct and the Trial Court's Error.</u>	200
1.	Prosecutorial misconduct in argument.	200
2.	The trial court's errors.	203
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	205

VIII. APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE ERRONEOUS JURY INSTRUCTIONS AND INSUFFICIENCY OF EVIDENCE AS TO THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE FINDINGS.	207
PENALTY ARGUMENTS	213
IX. APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR PENALTY TRIAL IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE ERRONEOUS DECISION TO REQUIRE APPELLANT TO WEAR A STUN BELT, AND THE ERRONEOUS DISCLOSURE TO THE JURY THAT APPELLANT WAS REQUIRED TO WEAR A STUN BELT DURING TRIAL.	213
A. <u>Summary of Facts.</u>	213
1. Facts underlying the trial court’s decision to require the defendants to wear stun belts.	214
2. Facts relating to the trial court’s decision to permit disclosing the use of stun belts to the jury.	219
B. <u>The Trial Court’s Errors.</u>	221
1. The error in requiring stun belts in the absence of evidence of unruly courtroom behavior.	221
2. The error in failing to prevent jury exposure to the stun belts.	227
C. <u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	229
1. The closeness of the penalty determination.	230

2.	The length of the jury deliberations.	231
3.	The adverse inference from the stun belt as undermining the defense argument for life.	232
4.	The improper boost to the prosecutor’s argument in aggravation.	233
5.	McClain’s exacerbation of the prejudice.	235
6.	The inadequacy of the purported limiting instruction.	237
X.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR PENALTY TRIAL UNDER THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE TRIAL COURT’S REFUSAL TO SEVER HIS PENALTY RETRIAL FROM THAT OF CODEFENDANT MCCLAIN, WHO WAS PROCEEDING IN PRO PER AND SPEWING PREJUDICE ON HIS CODEFENDANTS.	239
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	239
1.	Pretrial proceedings.	239
2.	Trial events.	244
a.	Pretrial rulings.	244
b.	McClain’s courtroom conduct in pro per.	246
B.	<u>The Trial Court’s Errors.</u>	263
C.	<u>The Resulting Prejudice.</u>	265

XI.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR PENALTY TRIAL IN VIOLATION OF HIS FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS UNDER THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS BY THE ERRONEOUS ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE THAT WITNESS LOUISE JERNIGAN BELIEVED THAT APPELLANT HAD KILLED HER SON, AND BY THE PROSECUTOR’S REPEATED EMPHASIS ON THIS TESTIMONY IN ARGUMENT.	266
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	266
B.	<u>The Trial Court’s Error.</u>	272
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	276
	1. The unfounded accusation undermined defense counsel’s primary arguments in mitigation.	277
	2. The unsubstantiated accusation was virtually immune to defense rebuttal.	278
	3. The ineffectiveness of the trial court’s instruction.	279
XII.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE TRIAL COURT’S ERROR IN ADMITTING EVIDENCE OF HOLDING CELL GRAFFITI IN THE ABSENCE OF ANY PROOF OF APPELLANT’S AUTHORSHIP OR ENDORSEMENT OF THE WRITING.	280
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	280
B.	<u>The Trial Court’s Error.</u>	283
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	288

XIII.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL UNDER THE VIOLATION OF HIS FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE ERRONEOUS ADMISSION OF A VIDEOTAPE OF CODEFENDANT HOLMES' PROFANE OUTBURST AFTER THE JURY RENDERED HIS GUILTY VERDICT.	290
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	290
B.	<u>The Trial Court's Errors.</u>	293
C.	<u>The Resulting Prejudice.</u>	295
XIV.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR PENALTY TRIAL IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE ERRONEOUS EXCLUSION OF THE FAVORABLE DISPOSITIONS GRANTED TO CODEFENDANTS BOWEN AND BAILEY, AND BY THE UNFAIR PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT IN EXPLOITING THE EXCLUSIONARY RULING.	298
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	298
B.	<u>The Trial Court's Error and the Prosecutorial Exploitations.</u>	299
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	303
XV.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR PENALTY TRIAL IN VIOLATION OF HIS FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE TRIAL COURT'S ERRONEOUS EVIDENTIARY RULINGS REGARDING THE PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE RELATING TO LINGERING DOUBT.	304

A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	304
B.	<u>The Trial Court's Error.</u>	307
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	309
XVI.	APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS, A FAIR PENALTY TRIAL, AND HIS RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT UNDER THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THE TRIAL COURT'S ERRONEOUS RESTRICTION AND DEFENSE COUNSEL'S JURY ARGUMENT REGARDING THE EXERCISE OF MERCY.	310
A.	<u>Summary of Facts.</u>	310
B.	<u>The Trial Court's Error.</u>	313
C.	<u>The Requirement of Reversal.</u>	318
1.	The closeness of the case.	318
2.	The severity of the infringement of a defense argument.	318
3.	The absence of any countervailing jury instruction.	319

XVII. PETITIONER WAS DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS, A FAIR PENALTY TRIAL, AND HIS RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT UNDER THE STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS BY THE FAILURE OF PENAL CODE SECTIONS 190.2 AND 190.3 TO REQUIRE THAT THE JURY FIND THE EXISTENCE OF AGGRAVATING FACTORS UNANIMOUSLY AND BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AS A PREREQUISITE TO THE IMPOSITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY AND BY OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL DEFECTS.	320
CONCLUSION	323
CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT	324
APPENDIX A: CHART OF JURY SELECTION PROCESS	A-1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CASES CITED</u>	
<u>Alford v. United States</u> (1931) 282 U.S. 687	150
<u>Apprendi v. New Jersey</u> (2000) 530 U.S. 466	321
<u>Batson v. Kentucky</u> (1986) 476 U.S. 79	103
<u>Benedith v. State</u> (Fla. 1998) 717 So.2d 472	211
<u>Bray v. Peyton</u> (4th Cir. 1970) 429 F.2d 500	172
<u>Bruton v. United States</u> (1968) 391 U.S. 123	161, 162, 178
<u>California v. Brown</u> (1987) 479 U.S. 538 (in fn. 8)	317
<u>Campbell v. Rice</u> (9th Cir. 2004) 408 F.3d 1166	173
<u>Chapman v. California</u> (1967) 386 U.S. 18	152, 206
<u>Clark v. Brown</u> (2006) ___ F.3d ___, 2006 U.S. App. Lexis 13320 (in final judgment, p. 320)	322
<u>Darden v. Wainwright</u> (1986) 477 U.S. 168	200

<u>Davis v. Alaska</u> (1974) 415 U.S. at 308	148
<u>Deck v. Missouri</u> (2005) 544 U.S. 622	221, 232
<u>Delaware v. Van Arsdall</u> (1986) 475 U.S. 673	152
<u>Enmund v. Florida</u> (1982) 458 U.S. 782	210
<u>Esparza v. Mitchell</u> (6th Cir. 2002) 310	321
<u>Estelle v. McGuire</u> (1991) 502 U.S. 62	276
<u>Fernandez v. Roe</u> (9th Cir. 2002) 286 F.3d 107	105
<u>Fowler v. Sacramento County Sheriff's Department</u> (9th Cir. 2005) 421 F.3d 1027	148
<u>Furman v. Georgia</u> (1972) 408 U.S. 238	322
<u>Gall v. Parker</u> (6th Cir. 2000) 231 F.3d 265	200
<u>Godfrey v. Georgia</u> (1980) 446 U.S. 420	322
<u>Gonzalez v. Pliker</u> (9th Cir. 2003) 341 F.3d 897	224
<u>Gregg v. Georgia</u> (1976) 428 U.S. 153	515

<u>Hawkins v. Comparet-Cassani</u> (2001) 251 F.3d 1230	226
<u>Herring v. New York</u> (1975) 422 U.S. 853	318
<u>Holbrook v. Flynn</u> (1986) 475 U.S. 560	322
<u>Illinois v. Allen</u> (1970) 397 U.S. 337	223
<u>In re Anderson</u> (1968) 69 Cal.2d 613	133
<u>In re Jesus B.</u> (1977) 75 Cal.App.3d 444	171
<u>In re Martin</u> (1987) 44 Cal.3d 1	171
<u>In re Sakarias</u> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 140	232, 302
<u>Jackson v. Virginia</u> (1979) 443 U.S. 307	211, 284
<u>Johnson v. California</u> (2005) ___ U.S. ___, 125 S.Ct. 2410	102, 105
<u>Johnson v. State</u> (Nev. 2002) 59 P.3d 450	321
<u>Kentucky v. Stincer</u> (1987) 482 U.S. 730	173
<u>Lilly v. Virginia</u> (1999) 527 U.S. 116	161

<u>Morgan v. Illinois</u> (1992) 504 U.S. 719	131, 315
<u>Morris v. Ylst</u> (9th Cir. 2006) ___ F.3d ___, 2006 U.S. F. Lexis 11465	299
<u>Murtishaw v. Woodford</u> (9th Cir. 2001) 255 F.3d 926	231
<u>Olden v. Kentucky</u> (1988) 488 U.S. 227	147
<u>Oregon v. Guzek</u> (2006) ___ U.S. ___, 126 S.Ct. 1226	307
<u>Paulino v. Castro</u> (9th Cir. 2004) 371 F.3d 1083	105, 107
<u>Pennsylvania v. Ritchie</u> (1987) 480 U.S. 39	147
<u>Penry v. Lynaugh</u> (1989) 492 U.S. 302	314
<u>People v. Aranda</u> (1965) 63 Cal.2d 518	176
<u>People v. Beardslee</u> (1991) 50 Cal.3d 68	294
<u>People v. Bell</u> (1989) 49 Cal.3d 502	206
<u>People v. Belmontes</u> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 744	298, 299
<u>People v. Boyer</u> (2006) ___ Cal.4th ___, 2006 Cal. Lexis 5397	284, 308

<u>People v. Carrera</u> (1989) 49 Cal.3d 291	298, 299
<u>People v. Cash</u> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 703	127, 128, 133, 135
<u>People v. Cleveland</u> (2004) 32 Cal.4th 704	193
<u>People v. Duncan</u> (1991) 53 Cal.3d, ____ 9955	317
<u>People v. Duran</u> (1976) 16 Cal.3d 282	225, 226
<u>People v. Ervin</u> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 48	192, 265
<u>People v. Fletcher</u> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 451	161
<u>People v. Gaines</u> (1997) 54 Cal.App.4th 821	302
<u>People v. Heard</u> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 946	134
<u>People v. Heishman</u> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 147	294
<u>People v. Hill</u> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 800	206
<u>People v. Jenkins</u> (1979) 91 Cal.App.3d 579	297
<u>People v. Johnson</u> (1980) 26 Cal.3d 557	284

<u>People v. Johnson</u> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 1302	102, 104, 211
<u>People v. Jurado</u> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 72	294
<u>People v. Lewis</u> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 334	316, 317
<u>People v. Mar</u> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 1201	224, 225, 226, 229, 230
<u>People v. Massie</u> (1967) 66 Cal.2d 899	192
<u>People v. McPeters</u> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 1148	316
<u>People v. Miranda</u> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 340	161
<u>People v. Morris</u> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 1	274
<u>People v. Nicolaus</u> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 551	316
<u>People v. Panah</u> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 395	205
<u>People v. Phillips</u> (1985) 41 Cal.3d 29	284
<u>People v. Reeder</u> (1987) 82 Cal.App.3d 543	190
<u>People v. Roberts</u> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 271	162

<u>People v. Robertson</u> (1982) 33 Cal.3d 21	273
<u>People v. Rodriguez</u> (1996) 50 Cal.App.4th 1013	276
<u>People v. Sakarias</u> (2005) 22 Cal.4th 596	317
<u>People v. Snow</u> (1986) 44 Cal.3d 216	118, 119
<u>People v. Sturm</u> (2006) 37 Cal.4th 1218	228
<u>People v. Turner</u> (1984) 37 Cal.3d 302	192
<u>People v. Varona</u> (1983) 143 Cal.App.3d 566	302, 309
<u>People v. Vieira</u> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 264	128, 129
<u>People v. Watson</u> (1956) 46 Cal.2d 818	276, 288
<u>People v. Zemavasky</u> (1942) 20 Cal.2d 56	275, 276
<u>Powell v. United States</u> (D.C. Cir. 1982) 455 A.2d 405	200
<u>Province v. Ctr. for Women's Health and Family Birth</u> (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 1673	231
<u>Ring v. Arizona</u> (2002) 536 U.S. 84	320, 321

<u>Rock v. Arkansas</u> (1987) 483 U.S. 44	191
<u>Rushen v. Spain</u> (1983) 464 U.S. 114	175
<u>Silva v. Woodford</u> (9th Cir. 2002) 279 F.3d 825	316
<u>Simmons v. South Carolina</u> (1994) 5112 U.S. 154	301
<u>Smith v. Duckworth</u> (7th Cir. 1988) 856 F.2d 909	171
<u>Snyder v. Massachusetts</u> (1934) 291 U.S. 97	174
<u>State v. Flieger</u> (Wash. Ct. App. 1998) 955 P.2d 872	223
<u>Szuchon v. Lehman</u> (3rd Cir. 2001) 273 F.3d 299	132
<u>Tison v. Arizona</u> (1987) 481 U.S. 137	209, 210, 211 213
<u>Tolbert v. Page</u> (9th Cir. 1999) 182 F.3d 677	105
<u>Turner v. Marshall</u> (9th Cir. 1995) 63 F.3d 807	105
<u>United States v. Banuelos</u> (9th Cir. 2003) 322 F.3d 700	321
<u>United States v. Durham</u> (11th Cir. 2002) 287 F.3d 1297	223, 224, 229

<u>United States v. Gagnon</u> (1985) 470 U.S. 522	173
<u>United States v. Green</u> (D.Mass. 2004) 324 F.Supp.2d 311	264
<u>United States v. Higgs</u> (4th Cir. 2003) 353 F.3d 281	315, 319
<u>United States v. Joseph</u> (5th Cir. 2003) 333 F.3d 487	222
<u>United States v. Mahasin</u> (8th Cir. 2006) 442 F.3d 687	223, 229
<u>United States v. Old Chief</u> (1997) 519 U.S. 172	150, 151
<u>United States v. Paguio</u> (9th Cir. 1997) 114 F.3d 928	231
<u>United States v. Schuler</u> (9th Cir. 1987) 813 F.2d 978	231
<u>United States v. Tootick</u> (9th Cir. 1991) 952 F.2d 78	192
<u>United States v. Tory</u> (9th Cir. 1995) 52 F.3d 207	295
<u>Viereck v. United States</u> (1943) 318 U.S. 236	200
<u>Wainwright v. Witt</u> (1985) 469 U.S. 412	127, 130, 134
<u>Williams v. Runnels</u> (9th Cir. 2006) 432 F.3d 1102	104, 105

<u>Woodson v. North Carolina</u> (1976) 428 U.S. 280	315
<u>Zafiro v. United States</u> (1993) 506 U.S. 534	192
<u>STATUTES CITED</u>	
Evidence Code section 352	244, 274, 276
Evidence Code section 402	219, 256, 257
Evidence Code section 1235	158, 159
Penal Code section 190.2(b)	252
Penal Code section 190.3	245
Penal Code section 190.3(b)	227, 226, 273, 282, 282, 283, 284
Penal Code section 190.4(e)	7, 272, 280
Penal Code section 193(b)	289
Penal Code section 422	272, 276, 285, 286
Penal Code section 1044	228
Penal Code section 1050.1	243
Penal Code section 1054	140
Penal Code section 1118	283
Penal Code section 1332	169, 170, 173, 174

ERIC S. MULTHAUP
State Bar 62217
20 Sunnyside Avenue, Suite A
Mill Valley, CA 94941
415-821-6000
Attorney for Appellant, LORENZO NEWBORN

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

<u>PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,</u>	} No. S058734
Plaintiff and Respondent,	
vs.	} Los Angeles Superior Court No. BA092268
LORENZO NEWBORN,	
Appellant.	

APPELLANT NEWBORN'S OPENING BRIEF

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On March 15, 1994, appellant Newborn was indicted by the Los Angeles County Grand Jury for three counts of murder and six counts of attempted murder as follows:

Indictment No. BA092268 charged Newborn, Aurelius Bailey, Herbert McClain, Solomon Bowen, and Karl Holmes with the October 31, 1993 murder of Steven Coates, accompanied by personal firearm use allegations against