

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS

120TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

THE STATE OF TEXAS )

v. )

HENRY LEE LUCAS )

CAUSE NO. 43314-120

PRETRIAL MOTIONS

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Heard on

OCTOBER 15, 1986

29

PROPERTY OF ROD PONTON  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
COPY 2

VOLUME 23 of

A P P E A R A N C E S

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

FOR THE STATE:

WILLIAM MOODY  
First Assistant District Attorney  
City-County Building  
El Paso, Texas 79901

RICHARD JEWKES  
Assistant District Attorney  
City-County Building  
El Paso, Texas 79901

CAROL PENNOCK  
Assistant District Attorney  
City-County Building  
El Paso, Texas 79901

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

ROD PONTON  
Attorney at Law  
Suite 505  
Caples Building  
El Paso, Texas 79901

DORIS SIPES  
Attorney at Law  
1011 North Mesa  
El Paso, Texas 79901

CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

WITNESSES

PAGE

STEVE SIMMONS

Direct Examination by Mr. Ponton

3980  
3063

Cross-Examination by Ms. Pennock

3069

RICHARD JEWKES

Direct Examination by Mr. Ponton

3995  
3070

Cross-Examination by Ms. Pennock

3081

WILLIAM MOODY

Direct Examination by Mr. Ponton

4007  
3082

Cross-Examination in the narrative

4033  
3108

Redirect Examination by Mr. Ponton

3111

Recross-Examination by Ms. Pennock

4034  
3111

VIC FEAZELL

Cross-Examination by Mr. Jewkes

4094  
3119

ALPHABETICAL INDEX

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

WITNESSES

PAGE

VIC FEAZELL

Cross-Examination by Mr. Jewkes

4044  
3119

RICHARD JEWKES

Direct Examination by Mr. Ponton

Cross-Examination by Ms. Pennock

3995  
3070  
4000  
3081

WILLIAM MOODY

Direct Examination by Mr. Ponton

Cross-Examination in the narrative

Redirect Examination by Mr. Ponton

Recross-Examination by Ms. Pennock

4007  
3082  
4033  
3108  
4034  
3111  
4036  
3117

STEVE SIMMONS

Direct Examination by Mr. Ponton

Cross-Examination by Ms. Pennock

3908  
3063  
3069  
3999

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

EXHIBITS

<u>NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>MARKED</u>	<u>IDENTIFIED</u>	<u>OFFERED</u>	<u>RECEIVED</u>
D-61	Affidavit			4041 <del>3116</del>	4042 <del>3117</del>
S-45	Motion & Order	3185	4110		
S-46	Letter	3192	4117		

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS

120TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

THE STATE OF TEXAS            )  
  )  
V.                                    )           Cause No. 43314-120  
  )  
HENRY LEE LUCAS                )

                  BE IT REMEMBERED that on the 15th day of October,  
1986, beginning at 9:00 a.m., came on to be heard the  
continuation of pretrial motions in the above styled and  
numbered cause, before the HONORABLE BRUNSON D. MOORE, Judge  
Presiding in and for the 120th Judicial District Court, and  
that the same was reported by Teri L. Yee, C.M., Registered  
Professional Reporter and Certified Shorthand Reporter in and  
for El Paso County, Texas, and that the following proceedings  
were had, to-wit:

1 MORNING SESSION, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1986

2 (The defendant and counsel as previously noted were  
3 present, and the following proceedings were had:)

4 MR. PONTON: Your Honor, we're here on the defense  
5 motion to disniss the indictment due to a grant of immunity.  
6 There were certain conversations held between Mr. Simmons and  
7 Mr. Moody and Mr. Jewkes and Mr. Lucas, I believe, in January  
8 of this year, maybe late last year, and that's the matters I  
9 wish to inquire of Mr. Simmons about.

10 At this time I would ask that the rule be enforced  
11 as to this particular point and that Mr. Moody and Mr. Jewkes  
12 be excluded from sitting in during Mr. Simmons' testimony,  
13 since they each may have to testify as to similar matters  
14 following Mr. Simmons.

15 MR. JEWKES: Your Honor, as to the specifics of  
16 Mr. Ponton's request, I don't know what conversations he's  
17 talking about. I presume he's talking about a session in  
18 which Mr. Lucas at that time was represented by Gary  
19 Richardson. Gary Richardson made the offer to the  
20 prosecution in this case that Henry Lucas wanted to talk  
21 to us informally.

22 Three of us were present, among other people, Mr.  
23 Simmons, Mr. Moody, and myself. We did listen to Mr. Lucas  
24 while he talked.

25 THE COURT: You did not?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. JEWKES: Sir?

THE COURT: You say you did not listen to him?

MR. JEWKES: Oh, we did. We did. We listened while he talked, and as far as Mr. Moody and I being excluded, Your Honor, I think that's patently unfair. We are, with Ms. Pennock, the prosecutors in this case. We have -- I think we have a right to listen to what this witness has to say because this witness will be subject to cross-examination by the State.

MR. PONTON: If I could respond, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. PONTON: Ms. Pennock is available to cross-examine the witness on behalf of the State. I anticipate that it's highly likely that Mr. Moody would have to be called as my second witness on this issue after Mr. Simmons, and I believe that's the very purpose of the rule so that witnesses would not be allowed to listen to the testimony of other witnesses and be able to have the benefit of that testimony prior to the second witness testifying.

And I'm only making this request on this specific issue on this immunity agreement or its existence, and as to any other matters, of course, I would not move to exclude any of the attorneys for the State.

Here they are as witnesses. They were parties to conversations, and therefore, I believe it's incumbent upon



1 Ms. Sipes and me to call them to inquire into the existence  
2 and validity of this agreement.

3 THE COURT: Mr. Ponton, how did I ever get to this  
4 point? I thought I was hearing a motion to suppress a  
5 confession.

6 MR. PONTON: With the Court's permission and with  
7 the State's permission, we would like to hear this motion out  
8 of order. I anticipate the testimony of the witnesses to  
9 be brief, probably five minutes or so each. Mr. Richardson,  
10 Your Honor, is also going to be here this morning as the  
11 attorney for Vic Pezell, who has returned today to be  
12 cross-examined by the State.

13 Therefore, he would also be able to testify as to  
14 this issue, and today we have all these people together that  
15 can testify on this issue. I don't anticipate any of it to  
16 be lengthy, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: See, my problem is I don't understand  
18 what that has to do with -- what are you saying here, Mr.  
19 Ponton?

20 MS. SIPES: Does the Court have a copy of your  
21 motion?

22 MR. PONTON: Yes, and I filed it.

23 THE COURT: Well, I've got a copy of it, Mr.  
24 Ponton.

25 MR. PONTON: What I'm saying, Your Honor, is that

1 in the motion I have said that -- and there's an affidavit  
2 from Gary Richardson to attest of what I'm telling the Court,  
3 that Gary Richardson, I believe, entered into certain  
4 discussions with Bill Moody regarding allowing his client,  
5 Henry Lucas, to testify or not testify, to talk about where  
6 Henry Lucas was in May of '83 when Apodaca was killed, and  
7 letting Henry Lucas talking to the D.A.'s office regarding  
8 Henry Lucas's confessions to killing Librada Apodaca.

9 It was Gary Richardson's understanding that if Mr.  
10 Lucas told the truth, if Mr. Lucas's whereabouts could be  
11 confirmed, and if Mr. Lucas then passed a polygraph examination,  
12 that Mr. Simmons and Mr. Moody would dismiss the indictment  
13 against Mr. Lucas.

14 That, I contend, Your Honor, is an informal grant  
15 of immunity and an agreement to dismiss the indictment if  
16 what Mr. Lucas told them, if that two hour long conversation  
17 was true.

18 Therefore, under the authority of Zani v. State,  
19 which I have attached as Exhibit C to my motion, I believe  
20 that if such an immunity agreement is established by Ms.  
21 Sipes and me by a preponderance of the evidence, that then  
22 the burden shifts to the State to prove beyond a reasonable  
23 doubt at pretrial hearings that the agreement is either  
24 unenforceable or the defendant has not lived up to his end of  
25 the agreement.

1           That's what the Court of Criminal Appeals says  
2 regarding immunity agreements in the State of Texas. There-  
3 fore, Your Honor, since I think the existence of it is -- the  
4 informal existence of it is clearly referred to in the first  
5 page of Exhibit B attached to my motion, which is the  
6 transcript of the conversation recorded between Mr. Lucas,  
7 Mr. Simmons, Mr. Moody, and Mr. Jewkes, that Mr. Lucas,  
8 the citizen accused herein, has abided by his end of that  
9 contract.

10           He sat down. He talked to them. He told them the  
11 truth. He told them where he was in May of '83, and he told  
12 them how he came to give the confessions in this case, and I  
13 believe that his testimony in court substantiates much of what  
14 he said in that conversation with Mr. Simmons and Mr. Moody  
15 and Mr. Jewkes.

16           Therefore, under the case law of Zani vs. State,  
17 I believe there was an informal immunity. I don't believe  
18 that Mr. Richardson nor any attorney would allow his client  
19 who is accused of capital murder and who has a potential  
20 death penalty hanging over his head, to sit down and talk  
21 with the district attorney's office on a whim.

22           I believe that of course he would not have allowed  
23 that to happen unless there is an agreement that, well, Mr.  
24 Lucas, if you tell the truth and we can confirm it and you  
25 pass the polygraph, we'll dismiss.

1           With that kind of agreement I believe that someone  
2 would provide their client, and I believe that's exactly  
3 what happened, and that's what I intend to elicit from the  
4 witnesses, if that is the case.

5           And therefore, if there was an immunity agreement,  
6 then Mr. Lucas can't be prosecuted, and that's why I filed  
7 the motion yesterday because Mr. Richardson was coming in  
8 today as counsel for Vic Feazell. I request to hear this  
9 motion briefly out of order, Your Honor.

10           THE COURT: Do you all have anything further, Mr.  
11 Moody?

12           MR. MOODY: Well, just a couple of points, Your  
13 Honor, very briefly. I do not think this motion needs to be  
14 heard out of order as far as the State's witnesses are  
15 concerned. Mr. Simmons, myself, Mr. Jewkes, we're here  
16 all the time. If they want to put on their other testimony  
17 about Mr. Richardson, I don't have any problem about that.

18           But what they're stating, and of course, the case  
19 that they're citing to the Court is a case entirely different  
20 from this case. It's a case wherein immunity agreements  
21 were put forward and made clear, and in this case you notice  
22 there's no way they've even reached that point.

23           There was never any immunity agreement in this  
24 case. There's a tape recording of that conversation. Of  
25 course, that was I guess the reason, part of the reasons that

1 we tape recorded it so that we would know and we could be  
2 able to prove what he said and what was said at that meeting  
3 with Mr. Henry Lucas.

4 And clearly throughout -- I mean, Mr. Richardson  
5 states repeatedly, "I don't think you're in a position to make  
6 that determination on this point about whether you want to  
7 dismiss."

8 THE COURT: Let's don't get into that, Mr. Moody,  
9 at this time. I want to find out why, you know, you  
10 shouldn't be called to testify or why you shouldn't be asked  
11 to step out of the room.

12 MR. MOODY: Well, the issue of having to step out  
13 of the courtroom, I don't see any precedent for removing the  
14 State's attorney from this case. There's other people that  
15 are allowed to sit in on the case. Obviously, defense sits  
16 in on all the testimony.

17 The defense attorneys, if we tried to call them  
18 as witnesses in some regards, why they'd be screaming and  
19 yelling that you can't take us out of the courtroom and not  
20 make us a witness.

21 You know, what they're doing is they're trying to  
22 remove the State's counsel from the case so that we cannot  
23 effectively cross-examine these witnesses, and that is  
24 exactly what they're trying to do. They know there was no  
25 immunity agreement. I mean, it's obvious from the face of

1 the transcript that they had, which has been in their  
2 possession for a long time.

3 When he tried to put words in Mr. Jay Armes' mouth  
4 the other day and said, oh, Mr. Moody said so and so. Then  
5 Mr. Armes, who is no great fan of the district attorney's  
6 office --

7 THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this question.  
8 Assuming, and I'm looking to the future, now, I'm not looking  
9 at what's happening today. I'm looking to the future of this  
10 case, and assuming this case ever was appealed to a higher  
11 court. There's certainly going to be something written about  
12 whether you and Mr. Jewkes should have been here when this  
13 question came up.

14 And I would hate to think that we were going to  
15 lose the case on some kind of technicality like that. You  
16 know, most of the time we lose our cases on technicalities.  
17 We don't lose them on the hard facts. Technicalities are  
18 the things that the courts are looking at when we get up to  
19 the appellate courts.

20 And that's where most of the cases are reversed.  
21 They're not reversed on the facts generally. They're reversed  
22 on some technical point that we missed.

23 You know, I don't see how it would hurt you. I  
24 don't know that it would help Ponton, but I can't imagine  
25 how it could hurt anybody, you know, to tell what they know

1 about this statement. I haven't read the full statement, but  
2 I did read part of it, and I just --

3 MR. PONTON: And I'm not trying to exclude them for  
4 any other part of this trial.

5 THE COURT: I understand that, Mr. Ponton. You  
6 know, Mr. Ponton, I understand a lot about this case. I  
7 understand that you're putting on a fact case here for a  
8 motion to suppress a confession. I understand all that, and  
9 if you think I'm not a little upset with it, you're wrong.

10 And I'm just about ready to cut you off. Do you  
11 understand that? I want you to understand something.

12 MR. PONTON: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: That I'm getting a little tired of it.  
14 Mr. Moody, I'm going to ask you and Mr. Jewkes to please step  
15 out, and if he indeed wants to call you, that will be fine.  
16 Ms. Pennock is very capable and can handle this, and I think  
17 just for the -- it possibly will be the best thing that we  
18 could do at this point in time.

19 MR. JEWKES: Does Mr. Ponton intend to put me on  
20 the witness stand?

21 THE COURT: I have no idea.

22 MR. PONTON: Mr. Jewkes, I can't say at this time.  
23 I may, based upon the testimony elicited from Mr. Simmons  
24 and Mr. Moody.

25 MR. JEWKES: All right, sir.