

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

COPY

THE PEOPLE, )  
)  
Plaintiff and Respondent, )  
)  
vs. )  
)  
WARREN JUSTIN HARDY, )  
)  
Defendant and Appellant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

No. S113421  
Los Angeles County  
Sup.Ct. No NA039436-  
02

SUPREME COURT  
**FILED**

NOV 21 2014

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

Automatic Appeal from the Judgment of the Superior Court  
State of California, County of Los Angeles, No. NA039436-02  
Hon. John David Lord, Judge Presiding

**APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF**

Susan K. Shaler  
State Bar No. 115762  
Professional Law Corporation  
991 Lomas Santa Fe Dr.  
Suite C, #112  
Solana Beach, CA 92075  
Telephone: 858.259.6737  
Fax: 858.345.166

Attorney for Appellant  
WARREN JUSTIN HARDY

DEATH PENALTY



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**JURY SELECTION ARGUMENTS . . . . . 2**

**I. REVERSAL OF THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH IS  
REQUIRED BECAUSE TWO PROSPECTIVE JURORS  
WHO WERE ABLE TO CONSIDER ALL SENTENCING  
ALTERNATIVES AND FOLLOW THE TRIAL COURT'S  
INSTRUCTIONS WERE IMPROPERLY EXCUSED FOR  
CAUSE, IN VIOLATION OF HARDY 'S FIFTH, SIXTH,  
EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS  
TO A FAIR TRIAL, A REPRESENTATIVE JURY, A  
RELIABLE DETERMINATION OF GUILT AND  
PENALTY, AND DUE PROCESS. . . . . 2**

**A. Introduction. . . . . 4**

**B. The Trial Court Erroneously Granted Challenges  
to Two Jurors Who Would Consider Voting Both for  
the Death or Life Without Parole, and Whose Views  
on the Death Penalty Did Not Prevent, or  
Substantially Impair, Any One of Them from  
Considering or Imposing a Sentence of Death. . . . . 6**

**1. The Erroneous Excusal of DD. . . . . 7**

**2. The Erroneous Excusal of KF. . . . . 13**

**C. The Error was Prejudicial as Respondent  
Acknowledges. . . . . 17**

**II. REVERSAL OF THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH IS  
REQUIRED BECAUSE APPLICATION OF THE  
SUBSTANTIAL IMPAIRMENT STANDARD TO  
DETERMINE DEATH-QUALIFICATION OF  
PROSPECTIVE JURORS VIOLATED HARDY'S FIFTH,  
SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT  
RIGHTS TO A FAIR TRIAL, A REPRESENTATIVE JURY,**

A RELIABLE DETERMINATION OF GUILT AND PENALTY, AND DUE PROCESS. . . . . 21

III. HARDY'S CONVICTIONS, AND THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, MUST BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT FAILED TO APPLY THE CORRECT STANDARD TO HARDY'S BATSON/WHEELER MOTION AND ERRED IN CONCLUDING THAT THE CIRCUMSTANCES DID NOT ESTABLISH A PRIMA FACIE CASE OF DISCRIMINATORY USE OF PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES. THE COURT'S RULING VIOLATED THE REPRESENTATIVE CROSS-SAMPLE GUARANTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION, AND HARDY'S FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION, AN IMPARTIAL JURY, A FAIR TRIAL, A TRIAL BY JURY DRAWN FROM A REPRESENTATIVE CROSS-SECTION OF THE COMMUNITY, A RELIABLE FINDING OF GUILT AND SENTENCE, AND FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS UNDER THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS . . . . . 28

A. Introductory Overview. . . . . 29

B. The Trial Court Erred by Finding No Prima Facie Case Because the Record Demonstrates an Inference of Discrimination in the Prosecutor's Peremptory Challenges to Black Prospective Jurors and Alternates. . . . . 33

C. The Prosecutor's Explanations for Using Peremptory Challenges to Remove Prospective Black Jurors Were Pretextual. . . . . 38

1. Defense Counsel Did Not Accept the Prosecutor's reasons. . . . . 38

2. Respondent's Attempt to Manufacture Additional Reasons the Prosecutor Might Have Had Must Be Rejected. . . . .	39
3. The Defense Was Not Required to Commit its Own Batson Error to Remedy the Prosecutor's Race-Based Challenges. . . . .	42
4. Prospective Juror FG. . . . .	44
5. Prospective Juror DB. . . . .	52
6. Prospective Juror MH. . . . .	57
D. Reversal is Required. . . . .	58
<b>GUILT PHASE TRIAL EVIDENTIARY ISSUES . . . . .</b>	<b>60</b>

**IV. THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, AND THE  
JUDGMENT OF GUILT ON ALL COUNTS SHOULD BE  
REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT  
ERRONEOUSLY EXCLUDED RELEVANT DEFENSE  
EVIDENCE OF THE VICTIM'S BLOOD LEVELS OF  
METHAMPHETAMINE AND ALCOHOL. THE ERROR  
VIOLATED HARDY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF  
LAW UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH  
AMENDMENTS, HIS RIGHTS TO EFFECTIVE  
ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AND A JURY TRIAL  
UNDER THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH  
AMENDMENTS AND THE STATE CONSTITUTION,  
AND THE PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPOSITION OF  
CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE  
EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND  
ARTICLE I, SECTION 17, OF THE CALIFORNIA  
CONSTITUTION. . . . .**

**60**

**V. THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, AND THE JUDGMENT  
OF GUILT ON COUNTS 1, AND 3 THROUGH 8, SHOULD  
BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT**

ERRONEOUSLY ADMITTED TESTIMONIAL HEARSAY BY PERMITTING ONE DEPUTY CORONER TO TESTIFY ABOUT PROCEDURES PERFORMED BY THE DEPUTY'S SUPERVISOR. THE ERROR VIOLATED HARDY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND HIS RIGHTS TO CONFRONT WITNESSES AND TO EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AND A JURY TRIAL UNDER THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND THE STATE CONSTITUTION, AND THE PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPOSITION OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND ARTICLE I, SECTION 17, OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION. . . . . 70

A. The Issue Was Not Forfeited. . . . . 71

B. There Was No Foundation for Djabourian's Testimony About Splinters He Did Not Remove, Did Know Who Did, and Could Not Verify the Location of Extraction. . . . . 72

C. The Issue Presented Differs from that Considered and Decided in *People v. Dungo* (2012) 55 Cal.4th 608. . . . . 74

D. This Court Should Expressly Overrule *People v. Geier* And Reconsider *People v. Dungo*. . . . . 77

1. This Court Should Clarify This Area by Expressly Overruling *People v. Geier*. . . . . 77

2. This Court Should Reconsider *Dungo*. . . . . 79

VI. THE TRUE FINDINGS TO THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER PENAL CODE SECTION 190.2, SUBDIVISION (A)(17), AND THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, SHOULD BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE

EVIDENCE FAILED TO PROVE HARDY COMMITTED ANY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE FELONIES FOR AN INDEPENDENT FELONIOUS PURPOSE. THE ERROR VIOLATED HARDY'S FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW, TO A JURY TRIAL, A RELIABLE GUILT AND DEATH VERDICT, AND HIS RIGHTS AGAINST IMPOSITION OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS. . . . . 93

VII. THE JUDGMENT OF GUILT TO COUNT 2, ROBBERY, SHOULD BE REVERSED, THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE FINDING OF A ROBBERY DURING THE COMMISSION OF A MURDER, AND THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH SHOULD BE VACATED, BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE WAS INSUFFICIENT AS A MATTER OF LAW TO PROVE THAT HARDY TOOK THE VICTIM'S PROPERTY IN A ROBBERY, OR TOOK THE PROPERTY WHILE THE VICTIM WAS ALIVE. . . . . 105

GUILT PHASE INSTRUCTION ISSUES . . . . . 110

VIII. THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, AND THE JUDGMENT OF GUILT ON COUNT 1 SHOULD BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT INSTRUCTED THE JURY WITH AN ERRONEOUS DEFINITION OF FELONY MURDER, WHICH IMPERMISSIBLY PERMITTED A GUILTY VERDICT BASED ON IMPROPER LEGAL THEORIES, IN VIOLATION OF HARDY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, HIS RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL UNDER THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND THE STATE CONSTITUTION, AND THE PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPOSITION OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND ARTICLE I, SECTION 17, OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION. . . . . 110

A. The Issue Was Not Forfeited. . . . . 111

B. The Modified Version of CALJIC No. 8.21  
 Impermissibly Permitted Jurors to Find Hardy Guilty  
 of Murder Based on Several Improper  
 Legal Theories. . . . . 118

**IX. THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, AND THE  
 JUDGMENTS OF GUILT ON COUNTS 1 THROUGH 7,  
 SHOULD BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT  
 INSTRUCTED THE JURY WITH AN ERRONEOUS  
 DEFINITION OF AIDING AND ABETTING LIABILITY,  
 WHICH IMPERMISSIBLY PERMITTED GUILTY  
 VERDICTS BASED ON IMPROPER LEGAL THEORIES,  
 IN VIOLATION OF HARDY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS  
 OF LAW UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH  
 AMENDMENTS, RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL UNDER THE  
 SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND THE  
 STATE CONSTITUTION, AND THE PROHIBITION  
 AGAINST IMPOSITION OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL  
 PUNISHMENT IN THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH  
 AMENDMENTS, AND ARTICLE I, SECTION 17, OF THE  
 CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION. . . . . 123**

A. The Issue Was Not Forfeited. . . . . 124

B. The Instruction Misstated California Law on  
 Aiding and Abetting Liability by Failing to Explain  
 that the Natural and Probable Consequences  
 Doctrine Requires a Nexus Between the Offense of  
 Conviction, the Target and Non-target Offenses, and  
 the Offenses Linked by a Natural and Probable  
 Consequence . . . . . 124

**X. THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, AND THE JUDGMENT  
 OF GUILT ON COUNT 1 SHOULD BE REVERSED  
 BECAUSE THE VERDICT FORM, COMBINED WITH  
 THE JURY INSTRUCTIONS, INCORRECTLY  
 PERMITTED THE JURY TO FIND HARDY GUILTY OF**



FIRST DEGREE MURDER BASED ON A LEGAL THEORY THAT SUPPORTS ONLY SECOND DEGREE MURDER, AND RESULTED IN A WRITTEN VERDICT FORM THAT FAILS TO REFLECT THE FINDINGS OF FACT REQUIRED FOR FIRST DEGREE MURDER, IN VIOLATION OF HARDY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL UNDER THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND THE STATE CONSTITUTION, AND THE PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPOSITION OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND ARTICLE I, SECTION 17, OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION. . . . . 127

A. The Issue Was Not Forfeited. . . . . 128

B. The Verdict Form, for Which the Trial Court Gave No Clarifying Jury Instructions, Resulted in a Guilty Verdict on Count 1 That Likely Rests on an Invalid Legal Theory. . . . . 129

XI. THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, AND THE JUDGMENT OF GUILT TO COUNTS 1 AND 8, AND THE TRUE FINDINGS ON THE TORTURE ALLEGATIONS SHOULD BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT FAILED TO INSTRUCT THE JURY THAT AIDING AND ABETTING LIABILITY AND TORTURE REQUIRED SPECIFIC, NOT GENERAL INTENT, AND THEREFORE THE INSTRUCTIONS IMPERMISSIBLY PERMITTED GUILTY VERDICTS WITHOUT A JURY FINDING THAT HARDY HAD THE REQUISITE SPECIFIC INTENT, IN VIOLATION OF HARDY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL UNDER THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND THE STATE CONSTITUTION, AND THE PROHIBITION AGAINST EX POST FACTO AND THE IMPOSITION OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE

**EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND  
ARTICLE I, SECTION 17, OF THE CALIFORNIA  
CONSTITUTION. . . . . 135**

**A. The Issue Was Not Forfeited. . . . . 136**

**B. Respondent Ignores the Difference Between An  
Aider and Abettor and a Principal, and The Jury's  
Finding that Hardy was Guilty of Murder as an Aider  
and Abettor. . . . . 136**

**C. Aiding and Abetting Murder (or Any Other Crime)  
and Torture Require Specific Intent, But The  
Instruction Failed to Include Those Among the List of  
Offense/Allegations/Circumstances Requiring Specific  
Intent. . . . . 139**

**XII. THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH AND THE  
JUDGMENT OF GUILT ON COUNT 1 SHOULD BE  
REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT  
INSTRUCTED THE JURY IMPROPERLY ON FELONY  
MURDER THAT INCLUDED TORTURE, MURDER BY  
TORTURE, TORTURE AS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE,  
AND TORTURE, BASED ON CHANGES IN THE LAW  
THAT HAD NOT BEEN PASSED AT THE TIME OF THE  
OFFENSES. THE INSTRUCTION IMPERMISSIBLY  
PERMITTED A GUILTY VERDICT BASED ON AN  
IMPROPER LEGAL THEORY, IN VIOLATION OF  
HARDY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW UNDER  
THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS,  
RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL UNDER THE SIXTH AND  
FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND THE STATE  
CONSTITUTION, AND THE PROHIBITION AGAINST EX  
POST FACTO AND THE IMPOSITION OF CRUEL AND  
UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE EIGHTH AND  
FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND ARTICLE I,  
SECTION 17, OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION.  
. . . . . 143**

XIII. THE JUDGMENT OF GUILT TO COUNT 2, ROBBERY, THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE FINDING OF THE COMMISSION OF ROBBERY DURING A MURDER, THE FIRST-DEGREE MURDER CONVICTION, AND THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH SHOULD BE VACATED, BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT FAILED TO INSTRUCT THE JURY ON THE LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSE OF THEFT, IN VIOLATION OF: (1) HARDY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW UNDER THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS; (2) HARDY'S RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL UNDER THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS, AND (3) THE FEDERAL AND STATE PROHIBITIONS AGAINST IMPOSITION OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT . . . . . 147

A. The Invited Error Doctrine Does Not Apply. . . 148

B. The Trial Court Committed Error by Failing to Instruct the Jury on Theft as a Lesser Included Offense to Robbery. . . . . 150

XIV. REVERSAL ON COUNT 1, AND THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, IS REQUIRED BECAUSE THE INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN BY THE TRIAL COURT MISSTATED THE LAW, BY FAILING TO INSTRUCT THE PROSECUTION HAD TO PROVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THE ABSENCE OF UNREASONABLE HEAT OF PASSION OR PROVOCATION THAT RENDERED HARDY UNABLE TO DELIBERATE AND PREMEDITATE, AND THEREBY VIOLATED HARDY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL UNDER THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND ARTICLE I, SECTIONS 7 AND 15 OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION. . . . . 158

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

XVI. THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE FINDING THAT HARDY COMMITTED MURDER IN THE COMMISSION OF RAPE WITH A FOREIGN OBJECT, AND THE JUDGMENTS OF GUILT ON ALL COUNTS SHOULD BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT IMPERMISSIBLY FAVORED THE PROSECUTION BY INSTRUCTING 35 TIMES USING THE PROSECUTION'S UNDULY PREJUDICIAL CHARACTERIZATION OF THE FOREIGN OBJECT, IN VIOLATION OF HARDY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL UNDER THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND THE STATE CONSTITUTION, AND THE PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPOSITION OF CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, AND ARTICLE I, SECTION 17, OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION. .... 165

PENALTY PHASE ..... 171

XVII. THE JUDGEMENT OF DEATH SHOULD BE REVERSED BECAUSE, OVER DEFENSE OBJECTION, THE TRIAL COURT ADMITTED IRRELEVANT NON-STATUTORY EVIDENCE IN AGGRAVATION, AND THEREBY VIOLATED HARDY'S FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND A REASONABLE DETERMINATION OF PENALTY. ... 171

XVIII. THE JUDGEMENT OF DEATH SHOULD BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT PRECLUDED CROSS-EXAMINATION OF A PROSECUTION WITNESS CONCERNING A PRIOR INCIDENT DURING WHICH HARDY'S SON SUFFERED A STABBING INJURY. THE ERROR DENIED HARDY THE RIGHT TO PRESENT MITIGATING EVIDENCE DURING THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL, AND THEREBY VIOLATED HARDY'S FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO CONFRONT WITNESSES, PRESENT EVIDENCE, DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND A REASONABLE DETERMINATION OF PENALTY. .... 178

XIX. THE PROSECUTOR'S USE OF DIFFERENT AND WHOLLY INCONSISTENT THEORIES AT THE PENALTY PHASES OF THE SEPARATE TRIALS OF HARDY AND HIS SEVERED CO-DEFENDANT KEVIN PEARSON VIOLATED HARDY'S TRIAL AND DUE PROCESS RIGHTS UNDER THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND ALSO RESULTED IN A VIOLATION OF THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT PROHIBITION AGAINST CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT REQUIRING VACATION OF THE DEATH PENALTY SENTENCE. .... 182

XX. THE CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF GUILT AND PENALTY PHASE ERRORS WAS PREJUDICIAL AND

WARRANTS REVERSAL OF HARDY'S DEATH  
SENTENCE. .... 186

XXII. THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH SHOULD BE SET  
ASIDE BECAUSE: (1) THE CALIFORNIA DEATH  
PENALTY STATUTE, AS A MATTER OF LAW,  
VIOLATES THE RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW IN  
THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF  
THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, AND ARTICLE  
I, SECTION 15 OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION,  
THE GUARANTEE OF THE RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL  
IN THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF  
THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, AND ARTICLE  
I, SECTION 15 OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION,  
THE PROHIBITION AGAINST THE IMPOSITION OF  
CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THE  
EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND  
ARTICLE I, SECTION 17 OF THE CALIFORNIA  
CONSTITUTION; AND (2) THE IMPOSITION OF DEATH  
PENALTY, AS A MATTER OF LAW, VIOLATES THE  
AFOREMENTIONED CONSTITUTIONAL  
PROVISIONS ..... 187

XXIII. THE JUDGMENT OF DEATH, AND THE  
JUDGMENT OF GUILT ON COUNT 1 SHOULD BE  
REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT  
IMPROPERLY INSTRUCTED THE JURY THAT AN  
AIDER AND ABETTOR CAN BE GUILTY OF FIRST  
DEGREE PREMEDITATED MURDER UNDER THE  
NATURAL AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES  
DOCTRINE, WHICH IMPERMISSIBLY AND  
UNCONSTITUTIONALLY PERMITTED A GUILTY  
VERDICT BASED ON AN IMPROPER LEGAL  
THEORY. .... 188

CONCLUSION ..... 197

CERTIFICATE OF APPELLATE COUNSEL ..... 198

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### FEDERAL CASES

<i>Ali v. Hickman</i> (9th Cir. 2009) 584 F.3d 1174 . . . . .	36
<i>Batson v. Kentucky</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 79 [106 S.Ct. 1712, 90 L.Ed.2d 69] . . . . .	passim
<i>Beck v. Alabama</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 625 [65 L.Ed.2d 392; 100 S.Ct. 2382] . . . . .	150
<i>Bennett v. Scroggy</i> (6th Cir. 1986) 793 F.2d 772 . . . . .	146
<i>Boyd v. Newland</i> (9th Cir 2006) 467 F.3d 1139 . . . . .	29
<i>Boyde v. California</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 370 [108 L.Ed.2d 316; 110 S.Ct. 1190] . . . . .	133, 141
<i>Bradshaw v. Stumpf</i> (2005) 545 U.S. 175 [135 S.Ct. 2398, 162 L.Ed.2d 143] . . . . .	183, 184
<i>Briggs v. Grounds</i> (9th Cir. 2012) 682 F.3d 1165 . . . . .	45
<i>Brown v. Board of Education</i> (1954) 347 U.S. 483 [98 L.Ed. 873, 880, 74 S.Ct. 686, 38 A.L.R.2d 1180] . . . . .	3
<i>Brown v. Sanders</i> (2006) 546 U.S. 212 [126 S.Ct. 884, 163 L.Ed.2d 723] . . . . .	103, 104
<i>Bullcoming v. New Mexico</i> (2011) 564 U.S. ____ [131 S.Ct. 2705, 180 L.Ed.2d 610] . . . . .	70, 77, 83, 85, 87
<i>Calderon v. Thompson</i> (1998) 523 U.S. 538 [118 S.Ct. 1489, 140 L.Ed.2d 728] . . . . .	183
<i>Castellanos v. Small</i> (9th Cir. 2014) 766 F.3d 1137 . . . . .	31

<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18 [87 S.Ct. 824, 17 L.Ed.2d 705]	17, 111
<i>Chiarella v. United States</i> (1980) 445 U.S. 222 [100 S.Ct. 1108, 63 L.Ed.2d 348]	16
<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> (2004) 541 U.S. 36 [124 S.Ct. 1354, 158 L.Ed.2d 177]	passim
<i>Crittenden v. Ayers</i> (9th Cir. 2010) 624 F.3d 943 [challenge of the only black prospective juror]	36
<i>Dunn v. United States</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 100 [99 S.Ct. 2190, 60 L.Ed.2d 743]	15
<i>Fields v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 1997) 125 F.3d 757	117
<i>Francis v. Franklin</i> (1985) 471 U.S. 307 [85 L.Ed.2d 344; 105 S.Ct. 1965]	139
<i>Gibson v. Ortiz</i> (9th Cir. 2004) 387 F.3d 812	134, 139, 141
<i>Gray v. Mississippi</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 648 [107 S.Ct. 2045, 95 L.Ed.2d 622]	16, 18, 19, 20
<i>Heno v. Sprint / United Management Company</i> (10th Cir. 2000) 208 F.3d 847	36
<i>Hernandez v. New York</i> (1991) 500 U.S. 352 [111 S.Ct. 1859, 114 L.Ed.2d 395]	38
<i>In re Winship</i> (1970) 397 U.S. 358 [90 S.Ct. 1068, 25 L.Ed. 2d 368]	161
<i>Jackson v. Virginia</i> (1979) 443 U.S. 307 [61 L.Ed.2d 560, 99 S.Ct. 2781]	105, 134
<i>Jacobs v. Scott</i> (1995) 513 U.S. 1067 [115 S.Ct. 711, 130 L.Ed. 2d 618]	183



<i>Johnson v. California</i> (2005) 545 U.S. 162 [125 S.Ct. 2410, 162 L.Ed.2d 129] .....	32, 33, 34, 35, 41
<i>Kaley v. United States</i> (2014) ___ U.S. ___ [134 S.Ct. 1090, 188 L.Ed.2d 46] .....	53, 54
<i>Kesser v. Cambra</i> , 465 F.3d 351 .....	45
<i>Mathews v. United States</i> (1988) 485 U.S. 58 [108 Southern Ct. 883, 99 L.Ed.2d 54] .....	162
<i>McNeiece v. Lattimore</i> (9th Cir. 2012) 501 F. App'x 634 .....	81
<i>Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts</i> (2009) 557 U.S. 305 [129 S.Ct. 2527, 174 L.Ed.2d 314] .....	70, 77, 87
<i>Miller-El v. Dretke</i> (2005) 545 U.S. 231 [125 S.Ct. 2317, 162 L.Ed.2d 196] .....	40, 42, 45, 46
<i>Mitchell v. Kelly</i> (6th Cir. 2013) 520 F. App'x 329 .....	80
<i>Morales v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 1996) 85 F.3d 1387 .....	117
<i>Morse v. Hanks</i> (7th Cir. 1999) 172 F.3d 983 .....	36
<i>Mullaney v. Wilbur</i> (1975) 421 U.S. 684 [95 S.Ct. 1881, 44 L.Ed.2d 508] .....	160, 161
<i>Muller v. Oregon</i> (1908) 208 U.S. 412 [52 L.Ed. 551, 28 S.Ct. 324] .....	3
<i>Nardi v. Pepe</i> (1st Cir. 2011) 662 F.3d 107 .....	80, 81
<i>Powers v. Ohio</i> (1990) 499 U.S. 400 [111 S.Ct. 1364, 113 L.Ed.2d 411] .....	33
<i>Rawlins v Georgia</i> (1906) 201 U.S. 638 [50 L.Ed. 899, 26 S.Ct. 560] .....	46

<i>Reagan v. United States</i> (1895) 157 U.S. 301 [39 L.Ed. 709, 15 S.Ct. 610] .....	167
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 584 [122 S.Ct. 2428, 153 L.Ed.2d 556] .....	134
<i>Ross v. Oklahoma</i> (1988) 487 U.S. 81 [108 S.Ct. 2273, 101 L.Ed.2d 80] .....	18, 19, 20
<i>Salve Regina College v. Russell</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 225 [111 S.Ct. 1217, 113 L.Ed.2d 190] .....	116
<i>Snyder v. Louisiana</i> (2008) 552 U.S. 472 [128 S.Ct. 1203, 170 L.Ed. 2d 175] .....	59
<i>United States v. Andrews</i> (9th Cir. 1996) 75 F.3d 552 .....	121
<i>United States v. Clemons</i> (3d Cir. 1988) 843 F.2d 741 .....	37
<i>United States v. Collins</i> (9th Cir. 2009) 551 F.3d 914 ..	34, 36, 37
<i>United States v. Esparza-Gonzalez</i> , 422 F.3d 897 .....	36
<i>United States v. Ignasiak</i> (11th Cir. 2012) 667 F.3d 1217 ..	79, 88
<i>United States v. James</i> (2d Cir. 2013) 712 F.3d 79 .....	81
<i>United States v. MacKay</i> (10th Cir. 2013) 715 F.3d 807 .....	81
<i>United States v. Moore</i> (D.C. Cir. 2011) 651 F.3d 30 .....	79
<i>United States v. O’Looney</i> (9th Cir. 1976) 544 F.2d 385 .....	128, 130, 131
<i>United States v. Reed</i> (9th Cir. 1998) 147 F.3d 1178. ....	129
<i>United States v. Unruh</i> (9th Cir. 1987) 855 F.2d 1363 974 cert. den. (1988) 488 U.S. 974 .....	146

<i>United States v. Vasquez-Lopez</i> , 22 F.3d 900	36, 77, 81
<i>Uttecht v. Brown</i> (2007) 551 U.S. 1 [167 L.Ed.2d 1014, 127 S.Ct 2218]	5
<i>Wainwright v. Witt</i> (1985) 469 U.S. 412 [105 S.Ct. 844, 83 L.Ed.2d 841]	21, 22, 27
<i>Wardius v. Oregon</i> (1973) 412 U.S. 470	167
<i>Williams v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 1995) 52 F.3d 1465	94, 95
<i>Williams v. Runnels</i> (9th Cir. 2006) 432 F.3d 1102	44, 83
<i>Witherspoon v. Illinois</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 510 [88 S.Ct. 1770, 20 L.Ed.2d 776]	passim

#### STATE CASES

<i>Banmah v. State</i> (Fla. 2012) 87 So. 3d 101	81
<i>Blanton v. Curry</i> (1942) 20 Cal.2d 793	157
<i>Commonwealth v. Avila</i> (Mass. 2009) 912 N.E.2d 1014	79
<i>Commonwealth v. Reavis</i> (Mass. 2013) 992 N.E.2d 304	79, 82, 89, 90, 91
<i>Considered and Decided in People v. Dungo</i> (2012) 55 Cal.4th 608	passim
<i>Cuesta-Rodriguez v. State</i> (Okla. 2010) 241 P.3d 214	80
<i>Dungo and People v. Lopez</i> (2012) 55 Cal.4th 569	74, 77, 78, 81
<i>Ernst v. Searle</i> (1933) 218 Cal. 233	16

<i>Highler v. State</i> (Ind. 2006) 854 N.E.2d 823 .....	36
<i>Hollamon v. State</i> (Ark. 1993) 846 S.W.2d 663 .....	36
<i>In re Sakarias</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 140 .....	184
<i>Logacz v. Brea Community Hospital, et al.</i> (1999) 71 Cal.App.4th 1149.....	160
<i>Malaska v. State</i> (Md. 2014)216 Md. App. 492 .....	79, 87, 88
<i>Martinez v. State</i> (Tex. 2010) 311 S.W.3d 104 .....	80
<i>Maxwell v. Powers</i> (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 1596 .....	160
<i>Pao Ch'en Lee v. Gregoriou</i> (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 502 .....	157
<i>People v. Abilez</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 472 .....	97, 98
<i>People v. Anderson</i> (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 430 .....	156
<i>People v. Babbit</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 660 .....	67, 68
<i>People v. Barton</i> (1995) 12 Cal.4th 186 .....	148, 150, 156
<i>People v. Battle</i> (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 50 .....	168
<i>People v. Birks</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4th 108 .....	156
<i>People v. Bouzas</i> (1991) 53 Cal.3d 467 .....	157
<i>People v. Brents</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 599 .....	101, 102, 103
<i>People v. Breverman</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142 .....	153
<i>People v. Campos</i> (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 1228 .....	170
<i>People v. Carasi</i> (2008) 44 Cal.4th 1263 .....	59

<i>People v. Carpenter</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 312 . . . . .	100
<i>People v. Castillo</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1009 . . . . .	113
<i>People v. Chiu</i> (2014) 59 Cal.4th 155 . . . . .	188, 189, 190, 193, 195
<i>People v. Chun</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 1172 . . . . .	189
<i>People v. Cleveland</i> (2004) 32 Cal.4th 704 . . . . .	113
<i>People v. Croy</i> (1985) 41 Cal.3d 1 . . . . .	113
<i>People v. Cunningham</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 926 . . . . .	17, 69
<i>People v. Daniels</i> (1991) 52 Cal.3d 815 . . . . .	168
<i>People v. DePriest</i> (2007) 42 Cal.4th 1 . . . . .	107, 108
<i>People v. Dunkle</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 861 . . . . .	114
<i>People v. Dyer</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 26 . . . . .	184
<i>People v. Edwards</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 787 . . . . .	67, 68, 90
<i>People v. Edwards</i> (2013) 57 Cal.4th 658 . . . . .	82
<i>People v. Fierro</i> (1991) 1 Cal.4th 173 . . . . .	174, 175
<i>People v. Frye</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 894 . . . . .	106
<i>People v. Green</i> (1980) 27 Cal.3d 1 . . . . .	passim
<i>People v. Guerra</i> (2006) 37 Cal.4th 1067 . . . . .	99, 196
<i>People v. Guiton</i> (1993) 4 Cal.4th 1116 . . . . .	110
<i>People v. Guiuan</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 588 . . . . .	117
<i>People v. Gutierrez</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 1083 . . . . .	49

<i>People v. Hardy</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 86 . . . . .	141
<i>People v. Heard</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 946 . . . . .	6
<i>People v. Hernandez</i> (1988) 47 Cal.3d 315 . . . . .	148
<i>People v. Hill</i> (1992) 3 Cal.4th 959 . . . . .	2
<i>People v. Hillhouse</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 469 . . . . .	113
<i>People v. Horning</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 871 . . . . .	150
<i>People v. Houston</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 1186 . . . . .	128
<i>People v. Howard</i> (1992) 1 Cal.4th 1132 . . . . .	35
<i>People v. Hudson</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 1002 . . . . .	141
<i>People v. Huggins</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 175 . . . . .	97
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 1302 . . . . .	32, 33, 58
<i>People v. Jones</i> (2003) 29 Cal.4th 1229 . . . . .	175
<i>People v. Kaurish</i> (1990) 53 Cal.3d 648 . . . . .	6
<i>People v. Kelly</i> (1992) 1 Cal.4th 495 . . . . .	106
<i>People v. Kraft</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 978 . . . . .	67, 68
<i>People v. Leach</i> (Ill. 2012) 980 N.E.2d 570 . . . . .	81
<i>People v. Lee</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4th 620 . . . . .	112
<i>People v. Lewis</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 334 . . . . .	169
<i>People v. Lewis</i> (Mich. 2011) 806 N.W.2d 295 . . . . .	79, 155
<i>People v. Lucas</i> (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 721 . . . . .	169

<i>People v. Manriquez</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 547 .....	117
<i>People v. Marshall</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 1 .....	98, 99
<i>People v. Mayfield</i> (1997) 14 Cal.4th 668 .....	141
<i>People v. McClellan</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 367 .....	116
<i>People v. McCoy</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 1111 .....	137
<i>People v. McKinnon</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 610 .....	148
<i>People v. McKinzie</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 1302 .....	40
<i>People v. McNamara</i> (1892) 94 Cal. 509 .....	169
<i>People v. Mendoza</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 1114 .....	121
<i>People v. Mills</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4th 158 .....	31, 40
<i>People v. Moore</i> (1954) 43 Cal.2d 517 .....	167
<i>People v. Moore</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4th 1104 .....	172
<i>People v. Morante</i> (1999) 20 Cal.4th 403 .....	137
<i>People v. Mouton</i> (1993) 15 Cal.App.4th 1313 .....	168
<i>People v. Nero</i> (2010) 181 Cal.App.4th 504 .....	138
<i>People v. Osband</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 622 .....	129
<i>People v. Panah</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 395 .....	169
<i>People v. Pearson</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 306 .....	7, 71, 72, 131
<i>People v. Pearson</i> (2013) 56 Cal.4th 393 .....	71
<i>People v. Phillips</i> (1985) 41 Cal.3d 29 .....	172, 174

<i>People v. Prieto</i> (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 226 .....	114
<i>People v. Randle</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 987 .....	162
<i>People v. Renteria</i> (2001) 93 Cal.App.4th 552 .....	115
<i>People v. Riccardi</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 758 .....	18, 19, 20
<i>People v. Riel</i> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 1153 .....	93, 94
<i>People v. Rodrigues</i> (1994) 8 Cal.4th 1060 .....	67, 68
<i>People v. Rogers</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 826 .....	158
<i>People v. Russell</i> (1953) 118 Cal.App.2d 136 .....	106
<i>People v. Santana</i> (2000) 80 Cal.App.4th 1194 .....	167
<i>People v. Sattiewhite</i> (2014) 59 Cal.4th 446 .....	40, 41
<i>People v. Seden</i> (1974) 10 Cal.3d 703 .....	120, 149
<i>People v. Slaughter</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1187 .....	115
<i>People v. Smith</i> (1992) 9 Cal.App.4th 196 .....	114
<i>People v. Smithey</i> (1999) 20 Cal.4th 936 .....	114
<i>People v. Stewart</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 425 .....	6
<i>People v. Stitely</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 514 .....	66, 67, 149
<i>People v. Streeter</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 205 .....	35
<i>People v. Tapia</i> (1994) 25 Cal.App.4th 984 .....	148
<i>People v. Tilley</i> (1901) 135 Cal. 61 .....	129
<i>People v. Valdez</i> (2004) 32 Cal.4th 73 .....	147, 148, 149