accordingly.

You may consider proof of a witness's prior conviction of a felony or a crime of moral turpitude as affecting his credibility, but it does not render him incompetent to testify.

If you believe from the evidence that a witness previously may a statement inconsistent with the witness's testimony at this trial, the only purpose for which that statement may be considered by you is its bearing upon the witness's credibility. It is not evidence that what the witness previously said is true.

And, finally, you may infer that every person intends the natural and probable consequences of his act.

Mr. Doucette.

MR. DOUCETTE: Members of the jury panel, for the last four days, you've been listening to the nightmare on Sussex Street.

Back on April the 19th of last year,
Niesha Whitehead was sound asleep in her
bed, until suddenly she was awakened not by

the monster under her bed but by

Mr. No Name and Mr. No Name's Friend. And

it's that nightmare that you've been

listening to for the last four days that

shows that the defendant, Leon Winston, was

Mr. No Name.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you've listened for a long period of time here, probably twenty minutes or so, as the Court read you the instructions, read you the law of the case. And certainly, if it hasn't been mentioned already, sort of to comfort you in the fact that those instructions are written down and you'll have those instructions to take back with you. You didn't have to commit them to memory as they were being read to you.

Those instructions are important.

Number one, they're important because that is the law of the Commonwealth of Virginia. It's not the Commonwealth attorney's law.

It's not the defense law. It's not anybody's law but the law of the state in which we live. It's the law of our society, and so they're important for that

reason.

But they're also important because these are part of the tools that you are going to use in the next period of time, whatever time you think is necessary, to determine this case.

You know, evidence by itself, pieces of evidence by themselves, a lot of times don't amount to a whole heck of a lot.

It's sort of like a brick. A brick is not the same thing as a brick wall. And a number of bricks might not necessarily be a brick wall, they might just be nothing but a pile bricks.

But when we're talking about bricks and we add some mortar to them and we take a trowel and with our own hard effort we put them together, we wind up with not a brick here and a brick there or a brick sort of stumbling and tumbling all over each other, we wind up with a brick wall. So it is in many times with evidence.

Look at the pieces of evidence as a whole, look at them as a wall, not as individual pieces of evidence.

6 |

So in the next few minutes, we're going to talk about the tools that you have to work with when you go back into the jury room.

Now, as I said, the Court has given you those instructions as far as the elements of each particular crime. There are a number of crimes there. There are a number of elements that are associated with each crime.

I don't want to belabor the point in the sense of going over for -- probably literally for hours talking about each and every one of these crimes. I mean, we're talking about case -- of crimes that probably by themselves -- burglary for instance, we'll spend two or three days in law school learning but all the law of burglary. We're not going to go over that today. You have the instructions.

A lot of these instructions are very self-evident as far as what the various elements are concerned. So when you look at something your not just going to get —take burglary as a for instance.

Burglary requires a break-in, which we certainly have in this case. We have the kitchen door kicked in.

Entering, obviously, we have an entry because we have two people inside
Niesha Whitehead's home who have killed her parents with the intent to steal. We know we have the intent to steal because we have evidence from Nate Rorls that the defendant took money as well as cocaine.

While armed with a deadly weapon, again, very simple. We have two people who have been killed with deadly weapons that these two intruders brought with them.

I use that just as a for instance, I'm not going to go over the elements of each and every one of these particular crimes, but I do want to talk about something. And the ones I want to talk about are the capital offenses.

Mr. Petty, is going to work on the technical end. Okay, here we go.

Capital offense, we have -- the defendant is charged with capital murder. And one of the elements that the

1 | 2 |

Commonwealth must prove is that the defendant killed Rhonda Robinson, and that the killing was willful, deliberate and premeditated, and that the killing was of more than one person as part of the same act or transaction. That's one capital offense with which the defendant is charged.

He is also charged with the capital murder on Rhonda Robinson, in which we must prove the defendant killed Rhonda Robinson; and, two, as before, that the killing was deliberate — it was willful, deliberate and premeditated; and, three, that the killing occurred during the commission of attempted robbery.

And we have a third kind of capital murder which the defendant is facing, that the defendant killed Anthony Robinson, that the killing was willful, deliberate and premeditated, and, once again, the killing occurred during the commission of robbery or attempted robbery.

Now, you notice that willful,

5 |

You have an instruction that tells you what willful, deliberate and premeditated means. And it's in quotes there, because on the instruction -- on the law it's also in quotes as well, because the willful, deliberate -- willful, deliberate and premeditated, three words saying the same thing. What it means is a specific intent to kill adopted at some time before the killing but which need not exist for any particular length of time.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you may recall during the voir dire process, that questioning process during the first day, the defense, for the most part, asked all if not -- most, if not all, of you whether or not you would put us to the test on the issue of willful, deliberate and premeditated.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that's fine. That's part of what we must prove. That's part of our burden. We gladly accept that burden because the evidence is there. The evidence is there abundantly.

Note from the instruction need not exist for any particular length of time. What it must be is a specific intent to kill, that the defendant intended to kill Rhonda Robinson, that the defendant intended to kill Pooh Robinson. That intended to kill Pooh Robinson. That intent could have been formed the second before he pulled the trigger. It doesn't mean, as might be suggested to you, that premeditated means going out and plotting and planning for days or weeks in advance before that as far as that specific intent to kill. All it has to do is exist for some period of time, as small as a second, before the actual act is committed.

So the Commonwealth, I said to you, we have evidence of abundant as far as the issue of specific intent to kill.

Well, how do we know that? How do we know what was going on in the defendant's mind?

Well, we can infer that every person intends the natural and probable consequences of their acts. We intend what we do. We do what we intend. Now,

sometimes accidents do happen, but you look at the facts and determine whether or not it was intentional or accidental.

How about wound number one on Pooh Robinson?

Gunshot wound to the back of the head coming out his eye.

How about wound number two?

Right below his right ear coming out of his mouth.

How about wound number three?

Grazing his cheek, going down into his chest, going through all the various organs of his body, as described by Dr. Venuti, until she could ultimately find that nine millimeter bullet somewhere in his abdomen area.

How about wound number four?

A shot to the right shoulder.

At what point do you suppose the defendant is delib -- he's got the specific intent to kill?

He's squeezing the trigger over and over again.

What's the natural and probable

1

consequence of aiming a gun at somebody and pulling the trigger repeatedly, over and over again? What's the natural probable consequence?

> That you intend to kill him. How about wound number five?

This is the shot to the lower abdomen. This is the shot that Dr. Venuti told you had the stippling around it. This is the shot that Dr. Venuti told you was somewhere in the range of less than twenty-four inches.

So not only do we have a firing of shots over and over again into Pooh Robinson, but we have shots fired from a close distance, within twenty-four inches.

How about wound number six?

A shot in the back, left shoulder. Nine millimeter bullet recovered from wound number six, as well.

> How about shot number seven? Through the right thigh.

Again, now we have nine shots -excuse me -- seven shots. And I'm not even

17

18

21

20

22

23

24

25

going to show you this picture of wound number eight, because wound number eight, the one to the base of the penis that came into his left thigh, that was a thirty-eight that was recovered from that particular shot. So not even counting that, we have seven shots fired over and over and over again.

When do you suppose the specific intent to kill was formed?

I submit to you that it was on the first shot, because the first shot was followed by a second shot, by the third shot, by the fourth shot, by the fifth shot, by the sixth shot, by the seventh shot, boom, boom, boom, boom.

What did Carrie Wirges say?

She heard a number of shots in succession.

What is the natural and probable consequence of pulling a trigger of a gun pointed at close range at a person?

You intend to kill them.

So when the defense challenged us, if you will, at the time of voir dire to say,

okay, hold the Commonwealth to proving that the killings were willful, deliberate and premeditated, ladies and gentlemen, we've proved that in spades.

Oh -- before you put the cap on -- that's wound number seven.

Let's talk about Rhonda.

Wound number one, shot to the head, nearly blew her brains out. Didn't quite go through the skull, but a shot to the top of the head coming right back out.

How about wound number two?

Shot to the chin, right in the face.

And because her chin was tucked in such a fashion, it went through her chin and into her neck, through her heart and down through her body, going out her back.

How about wound number three?

To the back of the neck, coming out the front.

These three shots taking place after Pooh Robinson is killed on the steps, does the defendant have a specific intent to kill then?

Ladies and gentlemen, after firing all

those shots at Pooh Robinson, he's now fired three shots at close range at Rhonda Robinson as she's fleeing with her children because he doesn't want any witnesses.

What's his intent there?

His intent is the natural and probable consequence to his act of firing multiple shots at a person from close range.

What's the proof that the defendant did it? What's the proof that he was Mr. No Name?

Well, we know from Niesha that both men that were in her house, both in her house, both Mr. No Name and Mr. No Name's Friend were black males.

The defendant is a black male.

We know from Niesha that the -- one of the men that was in her home had a tattoo of a dog on his arm.

We know from Investigator Gearhardt, going over to take a picture of the defendant, that the defendant has a picture -- or excuse me -- a tattoo of dog-like animal on his arm.

We know from Niesha that both men were wearing black.

We know from Tranika Turner that the defendant was wearing at least a dark, a navy blue, very black-looking sweatshirt when she picked him up a short time later at the carwash.

We know from Dewanna Jones that this same blue -- navy blue, dark sweatshirt was the bag -- one left in the bag in her closet.

And just to tie it up just even a little more tightly to the defendant, when the defendant is arrested, he has in his possession or at least leaves in Tranika's house a set of keys, one key that matches Dewanna Jones' apartment and one that matches Robin Wilson's apartment next-door.

What else do we know?

We know from Niesha that there were two. It wasn't just one black male, it was two black males.

What do we know from the evidence?

We know that during the course of that night that the defendant was together with

Kevin Brown. And we've seen pictures of Kevin Brown, and Kevin Brown is a black male, as well.

What else do we know that puts the defendant together with Kevin Brown, that puts him -- that corroborates with what Niesha has to say?

We have that trail running up
Westover Boulevard. We have the
thirty-eight, we have the doo rag, we have
the bandanna, we have the gloves all strewn
about Westover Boulevard.

And how do we know that those are associated with this particular case?

Well, the thirty-eight matches up by ballistics tests to the bullet that was found in Pooh Robinson's left thigh. We know that the doo rag has the DNA on it of Kevin Brown. We know that the gloves have the DNA of Kevin Brown, the defendant and David Hardy.

We know from David Hardy that the -- that Kevin Brown had borrowed those gloves several days later [sic].

We know from Carrie Wirges that a

person that she described running up
Westover Boulevard was holding onto his
pants, but she described him as being a
black male with a black top running very
quickly up Westover Boulevard, matching the
description that what we saw in the
7-Eleven video.

We have Tim Smith, who says that
Kevin Brown and another black male were
with him in his cab a short time before the
killings took place. They had gone over to
Sussex Street. They had gone over and
shook the windows there or checked the
windows to see if anybody was home and then
went over 7-Eleven where Kevin Brown was
caught on videotape.

We have the testimony of
Michelle LipFord, who knows both the
defendant and Kevin Brown, who says that
she took them over there not once but
twice, once going over to 410 Sussex Street
and having nobody be home and going out -back and going to the 7-Eleven where we see
Kevin Brown on the video again, going back
to her home and then going back to

Sussex Street, where she lets them out and they disappear, and she hears shots.

So we know that the defendant was together with Kevin brown that whole night.

We also know from Niesha that the two men had guns. And to back that up, we have Robin Wilson.

Keep in mind Robin Wilson, who really doesn't know the defendant well, but the defendant leaves his nine millimeter Glock lookalike with Robin Wilson to hold, his nine millimeter Glock lookalike that he calls Robin Wilson after his arrest to say: Do you still got it? Are you still holding it?

That nine millimeter that later is matched up as the murder weapon.

And in addition to that, we have Nate Rorls saying: I saw the gun. It looked like a Glock.

Let's talk about Nate Rorls.

Nate Rorls, you remember, is this fellow from the D.C. area, who's been charged by the federal authorities. He has a long time that he's facing. He does not

want to face that particular fourteen-year sentence that he talked about. And so he's doing what he can to cooperate with law enforcement.

Now, I'm sure the defense is going to get up and say, ah, he's just a snitch.

But he is -- can only tell what he knows. And what he knows is corroborated not by what he might wish it to be, but by the hard facts of this particular case. And the reason that Nate Rorls knows about this is because it was told to him by the defendant, a person who has been -- he has been introduced as as brothers. They're close.

But what the defendant did, what Leon Winston did, on Sussex Street on the night of the 19th of April goes beyond the bounds of brotherhood. The cold-blooded killing of two individuals is way beyond anything that is covered by brotherhood.

What does Nate Rorls tell us?

He tells us that the defendant calls him and says I slumped two people.

Slumping means killed.

Yeah, sure, right. Yeah, come on.

Yeah, that's just -- you're just bragging a
little bit, right? Right, Leon? Right,

Toot -- Tootee? -- I guess is what he was
called by Nate -- you're just bragging?

No, man. I slumped two people.

And he gets up there, he being the defendant, gets up there to Woodbridge the next day, and he goes to see Nate Rorls at that house.

And Nate tells you that when he shows up, he's with a girl.

And what does Tranika tell us?

Yeah, I was with him. In fact, I met
Nate -- Nathan she called him. I met
Nathan, just a short period of time, went
back out in the car.

What else does Nate tell us?

There were kids in the car, three kids, the girls, two kids, and the defendant's daughter.

And what does Tranika say?

Yep. I had two of my kids with me, and we picked up the defendant's daughter.

Nate says it was in a Pontiac -- she

was in a Pontiac.

really not.

2

That's what she says Pontiac.

Nate says Tranika was introduced to

3

me, and I was introduced to her as

4 5

Leon Winston's brother, even though I'm

6

And what Tranika say?

8

9

7

introduced to me as my brother -- as Leon's

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, when I met Nathan, he was brother.

Well, Nate goes on and he tells us that the defendant at that point starts telling him what happened. And he says, well, me and dude -- or me and my codefendant, we killed Pooh -- or Pooh Bear, he says, and, of course, we know that Anthony Robinson's nickname is Pooh, and some woman.

Of course, obviously from what you've listened to for last four days, we know that to be the case.

Nathan tells us she was pregnant. Dr. Venuti confirms that.

Nate tells us the defendant told him that his codefendant chased Pooh down the

stairs.

3 |

We've got a thirty-eight caliber
bullet that's in the speaker downstairs,
not upstairs downstairs, just like -- just
as Nate said.

We've got Nate saying that they -- that the codefendant shot Pooh in the stomach.

Wound number eight, the base of the penis out the scrotum and into the left thigh, that's -- stomach.

Nate says that Pooh then ran up the stairs yelling we're being robbed. Nate -- or excuse me -- Pooh's body is on the stairs. Nate says at that point the defendant told me he shot Pooh in the chest and in the upper body, in the head.

Yeah, that's what Dr. Venuti said.

Nate says the defendant told him he used a Glock, showed him the gun.

Gun was recovered, Glock lookalike.

Nate says the defendant told him that he fired a number of shots, fired multiple shots.

Yeah. Not only do we have that from Dr. Venuti, we have that from all the shell casings and the bullets recovered at the scene and from the bodies.

Nate says that the defendant told him that he took money and cocaine.

Yeah. Well, there's some leftover money there, there's some leftover cocaine in the house, and the defendant showed him his share of the money and showed him his share of the cocaine.

Nate tells us the defendant told him that will he, Leon Winston, killed the woman to leave no witnesses after killing Pooh Robinson, which is the sequence just as Niesha described it.

But, ladies and gentlemen, we don't stop with just all the matches as far as the physical evidence is to what Niesha had to say. We don't stop with just what Nate Rorls had to say the defendant told him. We have science. We have hard, cold intellectual science.

David Gibbs testified yesterday that the thirty-eight revolver that was

recovered, he compared that to bullets one fifteen and three hundred. Bullet one fifteen is a bullet that's recovered from the speaker downstairs at 419 [sic] Sussex Street. And Mr. Gibbs said that the bullet that was recovered from that speaker was fired from that thirty-eight revolver.

Mr. Gibbs also compared that thirty-eight revolver with the thirty-eight caliber slug that was taken from Pooh Robinson's body, and he says that the slug that was taken from Pooh's body was fired from the thirty-eight caliber revolver, once again tying Leon Winston with Kevin Brown.

But, of course, that's not the only gun that's compared. We've got the nine millimeter that was recovered from Robin Wilson that the defend — that Robin Wilson said was given to him to hold by the defendant. And we have Mr. Gibbs comparing that with bullets three-o-one and three-o-two, bullets that came from Pooh Robinson's body.

5

We also have Mr. Gibbs comparing the nine millimeter with the shell casings that were fired and recovered throughout the house. Bullet three o-one and -- excuse me -- which is from wound number six and bullet three-o-two, which is from wound number three on Pooh Robinson, were fired from the nine millimeter that was recovered from Robin Wilson's apartment that Robin Wilson said the defendant gave him to hold.

And the shell casings that were found strewn about the house at 419 [sic]
Sussex Street were fired from the nine millimeter handgun that was given by the defendant given to Robin Wilson to hold.

And then we have Nicole Harold.

Now, Ms. Harold is the DNA expert, and she talked about not just the gloves, which are Item Number 200, as the young lady who talked today did. She talked about a number of things. She talked about the DNA from the gloves as Item 200. She talked about DNA from the black bandanna. She talked about the DNA from this jacket right

here. And she talked about the DNA from the nine millimeter handgun.

Now, as far as the gloves are concerned, the gloves that are found at the scene, she said there's a mixture there, and some of the stuff in there is weak.

And she said that — based on the matches that she was able to find and the profiles that she was able to develop and the program that she ran it through, she said that the odds of finding a random match unrelated to the defendant, just finding someone randomly that had those same characteristics and those same loci, is one in one point one billion in the black race.

Now, the young lady who came in today and testified for the defense said that, no she used the wrong calculations. No, the -- the odds should be one to one hundred and ninety-five.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, one to one ninety-five sounds pretty certain to me.

One -- it's not one to one point one billion, but one to one ninety-five sounds real good.

Now, is it beyond a reasonable doubt?

That's for you to decide. But we don't stop at 200.

The defendant's DNA is on the black bandanna that's found going up Westover.

Now, it was -- there weren't any calculations for that because of the other calculations that she -- Ms. Harold provided us.

The DNA that's found on four-o-three, the DNA that is found on four-o-three she testified is consistent with that of the defendant, Leon Winston. And the degree of probability that you'd find someone randomly with those same characteristics at the same loci would be one and greater than six billion, which is approximately the population of the world, may very well be in the quadrillions or sextillions or numbers that she said that I've never even heard of, but there's no sense in going past six billion because there's only approximately that many people in the world.

And she talked about the DNA that she

found on the pistol grip of the nine millimeter, Item Number 400, from the skin cells that came from this particular grip. And she testified that, number one, when she was able to recover the skin cells from the grip of this pistol, there was no mixture. On some of the other items, especially on those gloves, it was a problem because it was a mixture and she's trying to figure out whose it was. But here, on this gun, there is no mixture. And she developed a profile of the DNA that's on this gun, and she developed the profile of the defendant.

And, ladies and gentlemen, what did she find?

In the FGA locus, the value was twenty-two twenty-two. In the FGA locus from the nine millimeter gun, it was twenty-two twenty-two.

In the TPOX locus, Leon Winston, it was in inconclusive. On the nine millimeter, it was inclusive.

D eight S one one seven nine from Leon Winston, a fourteen and a fourteen.

1 Nine millimeter gun, a fourteen and a 2 fourteen. 3 The VWA locus, Leon Winston, sixteen 4 sixteen. Nine millimeter gun, sixteen 5 sixteen. 6 I'm going to try to give it my best 7 shot. Amelogenin -- amelo whatever it is, 8 the locus, XY. Nine millimeter, XY. 9 Penta E, Leon Winston, twelve fifteen. 10 Nine millimeter, twelve fifteen. 11 D one eight, S five one, Leon Winston, fifteen fifteen. Nine millimeter, fifteen 12 13 fifteen. 14 D two one, S one one, Leon Winston 15 thirty-two point two. Nine millimeter, 16 thirty-two point two. 17 TH zero one, THO one, Leon Winston, 18 seven seven. Nine millimeter, seven seven. 19 D three, S one three five eight, 20 Leon Winston, sixteen sixteen. Nine millimeter, sixteen sixteen. 21 22 Penta D, Leon Winston, inclusive. 23 Nine millimeter, inclusive. 24 CSF one, PO, inclusive on 25 Leon Winston. Nine millimeter, inclusive.

D one six five five three nine,
Leon Winston, nine nine. Nine millimeter,
nine nine.

D seven S eight two zero,

Leon Winston, nine ten. Nine millimeter,
nine ten.

D one three S three one seven, Leon Winston, eleven twelve. Nine millimeter, eleven twelve.

D, looks like five -- this is like a reading class or eye exam -- D five S eight one eight, Leon Winston, eleven twelve.

Nine millimeter, eleven twelve.

The odds that we randomly find somebody with those same matches at the same loci is one in greater than six billion, which is the world population.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I said to you when I began, it's now time to take the bricks and the mortar and the trowels and put the wall together. We submit to you that that wall has already been built for you, that you have been given all the evidence that you need to go back into the jury room and say without any shadow of a

doubt Leon Winston is Mr. No Name.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's the old, saying, it goes back two hundred and some years, it goes: Evil triumphs when good men do nothing. Evil triumphs when good men do nothing.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have the tools today through the efforts of the Lynchburg Police Department and other agencies, during course of these last four days, we have given you the tools to go back into the jury room and come back with only one guilty -- one verdict that is supported by the evidence, not supposition, not guessing, but the hard, cold facts that have seen the light of the day. And that one verdict is, Leon Winston, you're Mr. No Name.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Doucette.

Mr. Drewry, Mr. Berger.

MR. BERGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen.

I appreciate your patience.

The Commonwealth is asking you to

explain.

But we know that the defendant told him the type of gun that was used, the Glock lookalike.

No A A A A	less this
man toli Reballow	
We	luence of
events t	nt with
what act	se,
because	tter than
Niesha,	her
mother m	oout
the defer ROLLS about Brown	
running downstairs shooting the man in the	
groin coming upstairs and then having to	
shoot Rhonda because he wasn't going to	
leave no witnesses. And that is	what fits
with the facts.	
THE COURT: You need to wran	o it up.

THE COURT: You need to wrap it up, Mr. Petty.

MR. PETTY: Thank you.

The one witness that they did present with some credibility was the lady that testified about the DNA.

And I asked her, you remember: You

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

agree with everything else Nicole Harold said except whether the probability is a hundred percent or ninety-seven point five percent?

She said yes, I did.

That means that she agrees that his DNA is on that gun.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, when I started talking with you several days ago about this case, I told you about Niesha. And I told you about Niesha being in that closet holding the door tight, scared. we talked about how she finally worked up the nerve to leave that closet with her younger sister and how she stepped over the body her mother and how she walked down those steps and had to step over the body of her stepfather, seeking help. And she sought help.

The police department came, and the police department began an investigation, and she got help. And they brought that evidence to us, and we tried to help her. And now we have presented that evidence to you, and we ask you to help her.

Ladies and gentlemen, at this point the evidence in this case calls out for justice, for justice for Niesha and her sister. The evidence calls for the conviction of this man sitting right here for that willful, deliberate and premeditated murder of the parents of these two kids. That must be your verdict if justice is to be done.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes this stage of the trial. It's time to turn it over to you.

I suggest the first thing you do when you get back in the jury room is to select one of your number to preside over your deliberations, and then in a business-like manner consider the Court's instructions and the evidence. I remind that your verdict must be unanimous on each count.

We have a number of counts, and I'm going to go over them just briefly with you. We've got three counts of capital murder, and you'll have three verdict forms with respect to each of those counts. One