

James Sargent
SGP rev. 3-16-09 10:00 pm
FINAL
NTC Nationals 09

CROSS OF CHRIS JENSEN

JENSEN IS A SLOPPY INVESTIGATOR WHO GOES FOR THE QUICK AND EASY ANSWER TO AVOID THE HARD WORK OF A PROPER INVESTIGATION:

You used to work for the FBI? (9:7)

You worked in their Crime scene investigation unit? (9:6)

Before you started that job, you took a two year course on how to conduct a crime scene analysis?
(9:14)

In that training you learned the *importance* of doing a **thorough investigation**?

And the importance of being careful not to *contaminate* the evidence?

Because you would agree that the conclusions you reach as a CSI are only as good as the evidence you gather?

But after 15 years you became "*disenchanted* with the bureaucracy at the FBI?" (9:17)

You thought they were interfering with the way you did investigations? (9:18)

And in your words you "didn't want to be restricted by all *the silly rules* that the FBI came up with"
(10:10)

BAD FBI REVIEWS: (IF IN***)

In fact, the FBI disciplined you for failing to follow some of those rules? (exh 1)

And for contaminating evidence? (exh 1)

On one occasion you contaminated evidence collected at a murder scene?

You contaminated several objects with your own fingerprints?

And also with your saliva?

After that, you decided to leave that job?

CRAPPY INVESTIGATION DONE IN THIS CASE:

On Saturday, July 7th you went to Judge Canas' chambers to investigate what happened to him?

Police officers were already there working when you arrived? (10:19)

In fact you had to get past the crime scene tape that they'd already put up? (10:19)

Crime scene tape is generally used to keep people out of a crime scene to prevent things like contamination?

Once you got inside, you saw the judge lying in a chair?

And you noticed a strange bruise on the bald spot on his head?

You took a photo of that bruise because you thought it might be helpful to your investigation?

Taking crime scene photos was something you were trained on in CSI school?

And you would agree that crime scene photos can be an important tool to recreate the scene of the crime?

You know that the attorneys may need to rely on those photos in court.

And those photos might be helpful to a pathologist when they are trying to determine the cause of death?

But Ms/Mr Jensen, you don't have that photo of the judge's bruise here to show the jury today?

That's because somehow that photo got **deleted** from your camera before you could print it? (14:12)

In fact, **all of the photos** you took except 1 got deleted?

Getting back to the investigation of Judge Canas' chambers, you also saw a trophy lying next to the Judges' chair? (10:25)

You thought the trophy might be related to the judges' death?

But you didn't even take any photos showing the location or position of the trophy when you found it?

You just went ahead and tagged and bagged the trophy so it could be analyzed for fingerprints?(10:25)

That trophy **was** analyzed for fingerprints?

And you **did** find some prints on it?

But you can't tell the jury **what part of the trophy** those prints were found on?

Can't tell them whether they were found on the **base** of the trophy or the **top part** of the trophy?

But you **can** tell them that you found the judges' prints?

And one fingerprint from John Ward?

You found out that Ward was the other attorney involved in the case Mr. Taylor was trying in Judge Canas' court?

But you concluded that despite the fact that Ward's prints were on the trophy "there was **no way** he killed Judge Canas" (13:2)

Because he was able to **explain** how his prints got on the trophy? (13:5)

You also found Kelly Taylor's prints on the trophy?

But you **never even asked** KT how **his** fingerprints got there?

These fingerprints on the trophy, they weren't all clear prints, were they?

In fact some of them appeared to have been smudged? (14:1)

You don't know whose prints might've been there?

You don't know if an attacker smudged those prints?
Or a police officer smudged those prints?

Or even if **you** might've smudged that print?

TAINTED BLOOD:

You did order a DNA test on a small drop of blood found on the trophy? (11:11)

You wanted to see if it was Judge Canas' blood?

But the results of that DNA test were inconclusive, weren't they? (11:16)

That's because the blood sample had been contaminated with bleach? (11:15)

Now you claim that **you** didn't contaminate that trophy with bleach?

But because of the contamination, the only test the lab **was able to run** on the blood was **a blood type test**?

And they concluded the blood on the trophy was the same **blood type** as Judge Canas? (11:13)

But Ms/Mr. Jensen, you're aware that there are only a few different blood types found in *all humans*?

So it would be fair to say that there are probably thousands of people right here in Armadillo with that same blood type?

But despite that- you concluded *it had to be* the judge's blood and it *had to have been* the result of being struck by the trophy? (11:21)

In your words "in this business *you just put two and two together* and that is what you get" (11:24)

NEVER INVESTIGATED COCAINE IN JUDGE'S SYSTEM: (If cocaine in*)**

Ms/Mr Jensen at some point you found out that a pathologist by the name of Dr. Alex Slabin had done an autopsy on the Judge's body?

She's the Dr. who told you that the blood spot on the trophy was tainted with bleach? (11:18)

But Dr. Slabin *never told you* that she had discovered cocaine in the Judge's blood?

And *these prosecutors* never told you cocaine was found in his blood?

So you were never asked to search his office for cocaine?

Or his home?

You were never asked to check if he had any ties to cocaine dealers?

So it would be fair to say you were never able to do *any investigation* concerning how the Judge might have gotten cocaine in his system?

You're stupid for saying nobody else had a motive.

Part of your job in this case was to identify possible suspects?

According to you, you overturned every stone trying to identify suspects. (13:112)

And you claim you didn't find a single other person with any motive to kill Judge Canas. (13:12)

But, you are aware that Judge Canas has been a judge here for over 25 years. (13:16)

You are aware that he handled criminal cases.

You're aware that many of those cases ended up with defendants being sent to prison(13:20)

But despite that it was still your conclusion that “not a single other person would have any motivation at all to kill the judge” (13:12)

ANYONE COULD’VE GOTTEN INTO THE COURTHOUSE THAT NIGHT, NOT JUST TAYLOR:

Based on your investigation, you concluded that the doors to the courthouse were unlocked for several hours on the night of July 6th? (14:21)

Objection: Hearsay Response:

Investigator, you certainly don’t have any evidence that the courthouse doors **were** locked on the night of July 6th.

So according to you, that would’ve given Mr. Taylor the opportunity to re-enter the courthouse and attack the judge?

But Ms/Mr. Jensen, if the doors were unlocked, that means **anyone** could’ve had access, not just Mr, Taylor, right?

And you certainly didn’t have any security guards tell you they saw Mr. Taylor come back to the courthouse that night?

In fact you don’t have **any witnesses** that saw Mr. Taylor **anywhere near** that courthouse once his hearing was over at 7:00, correct?

JURY CHARGE

You also collected exhibit 4 from the Judges Desk, the jury charge?

You thought it might be important because of the phrase “I’ll burn you for this” (12:8)

You thought that might be evidence that Mr. Taylor had a motive to commit this crime?

That’s because you had heard some **gossip** that Mr. Taylor was upset with how the judge had written that document? (12:12)

Obj: hearsay. Not offered for truth but effect on invest. Jensen in rushing to a conclusion about who had a motive to kill the judge

So “you just figured this was evidence Mr. Taylor was **out to get** Judge Canas?” (12:12)

So you thought you had a possible suspect in the judge’s murder?

As an investigator, one of the things you can do is to interview potential suspects?

But you never bothered to interview Mr. Taylor and ask him what he meant by that statement?

In fact you never tried to talk to him at all?

