STATE OF MINNESOTA

DISTRICT COURT

COUNTY OF RAMSEY

SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

State of Minnesota,

FELONY

Motion Hearing

Plaintiff,

VS.

Brian Harry Kjellberg,

Defendant.

File No. 62-CR-21-6868

Transcript of the proceedings in the hearing held in the above-entitled matter came on for hearing February 21, 2023, before the Honorable Leonardo Castro, Judge of District Court, Ramsey County Courthouse, City of St. Paul, Minnesota.

APPEARANCES:

MAKENZIE LEE, Assistant Ramsey County Attorney, appeared for and on behalf of the State of Minnesota. HASSAN TAHIR, Assistant Ramsey County Attorney, appeared for and on behalf of the State of Minnesota.

EARL GRAY, Attorney at Law, appeared with and on behalf of the Defendant.

AMANDA MONTGOMERY, Attorney at Law, appeared with and on behalf of the Defendant.

Court Reporter: Colleen Maloney, Official Court Reporter

(651)266-8194

PROCEEDINGS

THE LAW CLERK: All rise.

THE COURT: You may be seated. Good afternoon, everyone.

MR. TAHIR: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

MR. GRAY: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: All right. All right. So calling Page 1, Line 1, State of Minnesota versus Brian Kjellberg. The matter is here on a motion hearing. If I can have the parties identify themselves for the record, please.

MR. TAHIR: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

Hassan Tahir. With me is Makenzie Lee appearing on behalf of the State.

MS. LEE: Makenzie Lee also appearing on behalf of the State.

MR. GRAY: Good afternoon. Your Honor, Earl Gray, representing Brian Kjellberg who is present and seated in the courtroom.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Amanda Montgomery, also representing Mr. Kjellberg.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, Brian Kjellberg.

THE COURT: All right.

Good afternoon to you, Mr. Kjellberg. And it's Kjellberg not Kjellberg?

Yes, sir. 1 THE DEFENDANT: 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 It's the J that's silent. THE DEFENDANT: 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 All right. Well, let's get started here I quess with the Defendant's motions in limine and notice 6 7 to introduce certain evidence. 8 Okay, as to the motions in limine, I quess, 9 that was filed on January 27th and starting with, I 10 quess, video surveillance exhibits -- to prohibit the 11 police officer witnesses from testifying as to what 12 they hear on surveillance video. 13 First of all, will we have transcripts of any surveillance video? Any video that has audio? 14 15 We will, Your Honor. MR. TAHIR: 16 All right. THE COURT: 17 MR. GRAY: And we will also. 18 THE COURT: All right. So help me understand 19 what the motion is about? 20 There's some surveillance MR. GRAY: Sure. 21 video and audio that will be shown. And in that you 22 can hear some things and you can't hear some things, 23 and we don't want an officer or somebody giving an opinion as to what was said. Let the jury decide what 24 25 they see and what they hear rather than a police

officer or a detective saying, "Yeah, that's where he 1 said this. That's where he said that." That's an 2 3 opinion of the officer. The evidence is what's on that 4 audio and video and not what his opinion is. 5 our position. 6 THE COURT: Okay. And so if there's 7 transcripts, if there's any objections as to what may 8 be on the transcripts, I'd like to handle that 9 beforehand --10 MR. GRAY: Absolutely. 11 THE COURT: -- and not in front the jury. 12 So -- and I guess what we'll do is: 13 there's an objection as to what has been transcribed or 14 whether it's inaudible or not, then I will listen to it 15 and make a decision one way or the other. All right? 16 Okay. That solves that problem. MR. GRAY: 17 THE COURT: All right. And also then on 18 limiting the State's rebuttal argument to what the rule 19 requires, not to rearque the case but to --20 MR. GRAY: Judge. 21 THE COURT: -- but to apply to closing 22 arguments. 23 MR. GRAY: Judge, you've been around a long 24 time, and it's been my experience in the last year or 25 so that rebuttal arguments by the prosecution turn into

1	another final argument. And if that happens here I
2	am not saying it will, but if it does I'd request
3	that we have a surrebuttal. That's all.
4	THE COURT: All right. You don't have any
5	problem with that?
6	MR. TAHIR: No problem with that.
7	THE COURT: Although the same rules apply.
8	The surrebuttal is limited to the same rules of law.
9	MR. GRAY: Yeah, it does.
10	THE COURT: All right.
11	MR. GRAY: Yes, Judge.
12	THE COURT: All right. And as to certain
13	evidence that the Defense intends to introduce, Number
14	One listed on here we have. Character evidence of the
15	Defendant through witnesses listed in the Defense
16	witness list.
17	MR. GRAY: Your Honor, we have seven listed,
18	and we probably will call three or four.
19	Is that right?
20	MS. MONTGOMERY: Mm-hmm.
21	THE COURT: You wouldn't happen to know which
22	three or four those are?
23	MR. GRAY: We don't, Your Honor. Actually,
24	we haven't got everyone's statements from them yet.
25	THE COURT: All right.

Any objection to that?

MR. TAHIR: Well, Your Honor, I haven't received the statements from the Defense, so I can't really meaningfully respond to what they intend on introducing until I see that, so I think this is not really ripe for a decision at this time. Maybe we can revisit it when I do receive those statements. I'd just like to know the scope of the character witness testimony.

Of course, I believe under the rules they are permitted to introduce evidence of a pertinent character trait such as peacefulness, which is what will be relevant here, but I'd like to take a look at the statements before being heard on that.

THE COURT: Okay. And I assume that's what you're targeting, the pertinent character trait is peacefulness?

MR. GRAY: Yes. And lack of aggression and not -- not easily predisposed into a fight, yeah, peacefulness is -- and we'll call a witness. They'll know our client for a lengthy period of time and they're familiar with him and they would testify in their opinion that he's a peaceful person basically, and he isn't the type of person that would be aggressive.

1 And we would also ask that witness -- besides 2 the opinion -- whether or not they're familiar with 3 Mr. Kjellberg's reputation in the community. And if 4 they say they are, which I suspect they will, then what 5 is his reputation? His reputation is that of 6 law-abiding and peaceful, so that's our -- that's the 7 statements. They're going to be about five-minute 8 testimony on each one. 9 THE COURT: And that seems consistent with 10 what they can introduce. Is that fair to say? 11 MR. TAHIR: Yes, if it's limited in scope to 12 what was just described. I don't think we'll have a 13 problem with that. If it's three witnesses, I think 14 that's fair. Seven were listed. I was going to object 15 to all seven testifying, but if it's just three or four 16 and they're going to be limited to that scope, I 17 shouldn't have a problem with that. But I think we'd like to take a look at an actual disclosure before 18 19 being heard -- a final opportunity to be heard on that. 20 THE COURT: And when can you get those 21 disclosures to Tahir? 22 MR. GRAY: Within --23 MS. MONTGOMERY: Two weeks. 24 MR. GRAY: Two weeks. We have -- our 25 investigator has had a physical problem and wasn't able

to do any work for a while, but he's back now and he'll 1 2 do it and take care of it for us. If he doesn't, I'll 3 have somebody do it. Not a lawyer, of course, but 4 somebody else. 5 THE COURT: All right. Fair enough. 6 Okay. And then we have evidence of the 7 Defendant's prior traumatic brain injury from 2018 through the Defendant's own testimony to show state of 8 9 So you're going to have to help me understand mind. 10 that. 11 MR. GRAY: Well, in 2018, he received a --12 quite a beating and as a result was in the hospital for 13 a traumatic brain injury and is still recovering today 14 actually from that, and when he was assaulted -- it's 15 our position when he was assaulted by the deceased, all 16 he could think about is not hitting his head again 17 because another traumatic brain injury could kill him That's why we're getting into that, Your 18 easily. 19 Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. So it's as to -- okay. So 21 his state of mind --22 MR. GRAY: Yes. 23 THE COURT: -- not what the traumatic brain 24 injury --25 MR. GRAY: No.

1 THE COURT: -- did to him? 2 MR. GRAY: No. But we do have photos of that 3 I don't know how many we're going to use, if beating. 4 any. I think we sent them to them. 5 MS. MONTGOMERY: Yeah, we did. 6 MR. GRAY: They have them. 7 THE COURT: So Mr. Gray, I saw that you had 8 photos. I'm curious what they were. I'm glad they're 9 not brain scans --10 MR. GRAY: No. 11 THE COURT: -- and you're not planning to 12 introduce any expert witnesses? 13 MR. GRAY: No. It's just his state of mind 14 when this incident occurred, and --15 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Tahir? 16 17 MR. TAHIR: Your Honor, I think I'd object to 18 extrinsic evidence being offered about that traumatic 19 brain injury, whether that be photos of the beating 20 that Mr. Kjellberg suffered or any sort of medical 21 records in that regard. Of course he can testify and 22 talk about the fact and explain his state of mind that he had suffered a prior traumatic brain injury. I 23 24 think that's okay. 25 I think when you expand the scope and start

introducing extrinsic evidence about that previous beating that just confuses the issue. I don't know why we'd need to introduce photos of it and go into unnecessary detail about that previous assault. It doesn't have any bearing on this case. It will impassion the jurors. It might make them sympathetic the Defendant unnecessarily.

So it's again a matter of scope. I think in talking about it that that was his state of mind, he didn't want to hit his head again because of this previous traumatic brain injury, that I'm fine with. I have no objection to that. But any sort of extrinsic evidence I'd have to object to.

THE COURT: I'd have to see the pictures --

MR. GRAY: Sure.

THE COURT: -- you don't have those available, do you?

MR. GRAY: Yes. He talked about his previous injury in his lengthy statement, Judge. We do have pictures of them, and if we did introduce a picture -- I haven't totally decided if we wanted to introduce it. But if we did it would only be one or two, Judge.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Your Honor, I could show them to you on my computer, or I could email them to you right now.

1	THE COURT: Why don't you show them to me?
2	MS. MONTGOMERY: Okay. Do you want me to
3	walk up there?
4	THE COURT: Oh, yeah. Bring it up here.
5	That will be fine.
6	MS. MONTGOMERY: It's the same ones we
7	disclosed to you guys up here.
8	THE COURT: I only say that because not every
9	traumatic brain injury is equal. I know some of
10	MS. MONTGOMERY: And I can click on them, but
11	it's just those top row of photos. It basically shows
12	his black eyes.
13	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
14	I would allow you to show two or three of
15	those pictures. I don't find them to be that damaging
16	in any particular way. I think it's helpful to
17	understand the extent of the injury and how that would
18	transfer over to this incident.
19	You do have something in here called the
20	Department of Veterans Affairs letter as it relates to
21	a potential exhibit, and what is that? And I don't
22	find them to be extrinsic as long as
23	MR. GRAY: Yeah, he will say this is my
24	THE COURT: Mr. Kjellberg can lay the
25	foundation.

And this would be to establish that he's 1 2 disabled? 3 100 percent. MR. GRAY: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Okay. And -- now that would be 5 extrinsic evidence because you would need to lay 6 outside foundation for that, but do you have any 7 objections, Mr. Tahir, to -- if he testifies that he could testify he's a disabled veteran? 8 9 MR. TAHIR: That's fine. I think I would 10 object to the letter if it was lacking sufficient 11 foundation, but him testifying about that on his own, 12 that's fine. 13 MR. GRAY: So he can testify that he's a disabled veteran? 14 15 THE COURT: Yes. 16 MR. GRAY: And that's it? 17 THE COURT: Yes. What else would you like to 18 come out of the letter? 19 MR. GRAY: That he's 100 percent disabled, 20 that he had 100 percent from the Navy -- that he 21 qualified for it. It wasn't 10 percent. It was 22 100 percent. 23 THE COURT: And that's fair --24 MR. GRAY: Oh, okay. 25 THE COURT: -- I don't think that's

1 inconsistent with anything. 2 MR. GRAY: Okay. And he also got an 3 honorable discharge. 4 THE COURT: Yeah, I think that's all --5 that's all fair. 6 MR. GRAY: Okay. 7 THE COURT: And then you have pictures of the 8 Defendant's phone, two pictures on the Defendant's 9 phone? 10 MR. GRAY: Yes. The --11 THE COURT: And are these of the scene? 12 MR. GRAY: Yes. 13 MS. MONTGOMERY: Yes, Your Honor. We have pictures of the phone itself showing the back of it 14 15 being cracked. I think we submitted one of the front 16 as well, which we wouldn't need to use, but just the 17 actual phone itself. And then there's also screenshots -- one screenshot of the call list that's 18 19 on our exhibit list showing the calls that were made 20 that evening. And then otherwise there's, I believe, 21 four photos that Mr. Kjellberg took on his phone of the 22 Mercedes vehicle parked in his yard. THE COURT: All right. And what -- what's 23 24 the relevance of screenshot phone calls made that 25 evening?

1 MS. MONTGOMERY: Just --MR. GRAY: Go ahead. 2 3 It would just be to show the MS. MONTGOMERY: 4 sequence of events and how everything happened with him 5 calling the police and calling the tow company just 6 prior to this interaction happening. 7 THE COURT: It all sounds relevant. MR. TAHIR: Yes, that's fine, Your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 And then there's pictures of the no parking 11 signs as well? At least that's what on my list. 12 MS. MONTGOMERY: Yes, Your Honor. We have 13 quite a few of them that are also in the State's 14 discovery. I think the State would agree that they're 15 relevant to the scenario and what happened that 16 evening. 17 THE COURT: All right. And then we have the 18 photo of Mr. Arundel Stewart. Is that a booking photo? 19 MR. GRAY: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Yeah, that's not coming in. 21 Well, our position, Your Honor, is MR. GRAY: 22 that they -- and this seems to be the only State in the They get to show a picture of 23 union that allows it. 24 Mr. Stewart in the spark of life, and I'm sure that 25 that picture of Mr. Stewart is going to look quite

favorable to him. Because of that, we should have a chance at least to rebut what he looked like prior to this incident that night and some -- you know, in the beginning you'd show a picture and that was that. Now, it seems like every person that's ever been a victim is -- ends up being canonized a saint. Depending on what the spark of life witness says, if she just shows a picture of him, then that's fine and doesn't say much. Because as I understand it, the mother wasn't with him anyway. But if it gets too deep into it, we do have a picture of a booking photo of him a month before this on a felony domestic assault.

That leads into another one: That the motive -- our position, the motive for Mr. Stewart to not wait there for the cops to come and the tow truck was because he was on conditional release in -- Sherburne County?

MS. MONTGOMERY: Mm-hmm.

MR. GRAY: Yeah, Sherburne County for a felony domestic assault. Now, we're not going to attempt to get in the felony domestic assault unless some -- unless the State wants to, but with respect to the conditional release, he had -- as you know, Your Honor, you have various conditions and one of them is to remain law-abiding, and no possession of drugs and

no taking of drugs.

Part of our position is going to be that, first of all, this -- autopsy, the toxicology, shows that he was taking marijuana. Plus that -- when he ran down to the -- after the injury, when he ran down to the white car, our client will testify that he saw him -- he was getting up at the time. He saw him down at the car giving whoever was in the car something out of his pocket. Whether that was drugs or whether it was a weapon, whatever it was, we would argue that he -- at this time at night that he was not law-abiding as these conditions require --

THE COURT: -- so --

MR. GRAY: -- which gives him a motive not to wait for the cops.

THE COURT: So when they recovered the body and they recovered the car -- I'm assuming they recovered the car as well? Was the car searched? Were there any drugs found in the car?

MR. TAHIR: I believe so, Your Honor. If I could just consult with my Co-counsel. They searched the vehicle, Your Honor. No narcotics or weapons were found inside the vehicle and not on his person either.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GRAY: But he wasn't -- he was in a house

two doors down. His car was parked in my client's area, but -- so there wouldn't be any drugs in the house -- in the car. There would be on his person leaving the house two doors down.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Your Honor, the car that we're talking about that was handed -- possibly handed off something is a car that left the scene immediately right after. It wasn't the Mercedes that was on the property that was later searched. The white car left the scene with a different driver and then came back to the house. I don't know -- maybe we will learn where that white car went.

THE COURT: And what time of the day was it?

MR. GRAY: 8:30 at night -- 8:00, 8:30.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Tahir? Let's first start with the photos, because we're kind of transitioning.

MR. TAHIR: Yes, the State doesn't intend on canonizing the decedent as a saint. We're not going to go beyond what spark-of-life testimony is intended for under Minnesota case law. So I don't think we will get to a point where -- the Defense seems like they want to use that photo to rebut the spark-of-life witness testimony. I don't think we'll get there.

In terms of the motive that they're offering

to explain the sequence of events, I don't see what the 1 photo does to help in that regard. Everything that 2 3 they're saying -- they can certainly offer evidence of 4 that and argue it, that's fine, but I don't see what 5 the photo does in terms of helping them make that case. 6 All it does is, again, inflame the passions of the 7 jury, seeing the victim in a -- presumably a jumpsuit. 8 I haven't seen the booking photo. I'm sure it's in our 9 file. 10 Forgive me, I've only been on this case for 11 ten days. But I don't see what the booking photo on 12 its own does in order to allow Mr. Kjellberg to present 13 that defense to a jury. It is a simple 403 objection 14 on my part. I don't think it's relevant, and all it 15 does is confuse the issue and inflame the passions of 16 the jury. 17 THE COURT: And you're limiting to -- I'm assuming one picture of the alleged victim? 18 19 MR. TAHIR: We might have two. But yes, 20 there will be one. If Your Honor limits us to one, we 21 will only introduce one.

THE COURT: Yeah, I think one is sufficient.

And who will be testifying in regards to the spark of life? Will it be his mother?

22

23

24

25

MR. TAHIR: It will be his mother, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, at this time the photo is excluded. If at some other time you want to raise the issue, we can bring it up there.

And again -- so let's move on then to the Sherburne County court records.

MR. GRAY: Yes. On the register of actions we have his conditional release, and what we want to offer is: On November 29th of 2021, which was almost the date of this, he was released from jail on conditions. We don't intend to get into the fact that it's a felony domestic assault. But one of his conditions was that he remain law-abiding, that he not use or possess of firearms or dangerous weapons, and those are the two that we would argue give -- gives him a motive.

He's -- it's that night. He's got his car there. He's taken marijuana. We know that by the toxicology. And he didn't want to wait for the cops. So he punched our client four or five times, three or four times, and my client -- our client went down.

And before he was punched the last time, he did put a knife in him. He thought he had put it in his stomach but apparently -- the medical examiner said it was in his chest and heart. And he put it in there

once and the guy got up. Mr. Stewart got up and ran 1 2 down to this white car. And after he saw the white 3 car, the white car took off very fast and then he ran 4 all the way past Mr. Kjellberg's house and up to 5 another house two doors down, and that's the house 6 where he came from, and went in there when the 7 ambulance came and picked him up. He then went to the 8 hospital, and during the hospital visit he died. 9 THE COURT: How -- and how do you plan to 10 introduce that? 11 MR. GRAY: Well, we'll just get a certified 12 copy of this register of actions and white out 13 everything but that. 14 THE COURT: Okay. And who would you 15 introduce it through I guess is what I am saying? 16 Well, if it's a certified copy, I MR. GRAY: 17 hopefully wouldn't have to introduce it through 18 anybody. 19 THE COURT: Do you agree? 20 MR. TAHIR: I do, Your Honor. He won't have 21 to call a foundational witness and as long as the 22 relevant redactions are made, I don't have a problem I think it's fine. 23 with that. 24 THE COURT: All right. Fair enough. 25 Okay, and that I think clears the exhibits.

1	So exhibit numbers. How many exhibits are you planning
2	on having?
3	MR. TAHIR: I can't give you an exact number,
4	Your Honor. Possibly close to 100.
5	THE COURT: Okay. So can you have Exhibits 1
6	through 200 and then you can start with Exhibit 201?
7	MR. GRAY: Okay. To 1,000?
8	THE COURT: To as far as you can go, all
9	right. We hope it's not 1,000.
10	MR. GRAY: No, I
11	THE COURT: All right. Next we have the
12	character evidence of the alleged victim, specifically
13	relating to the self-defense claim, and who was the
14	aggressor.
15	MR. GRAY: Yes. And we we don't have any
16	of that. We would withdraw that.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. GRAY: And we've covered the booking
19	photo. So the THC levels, that's in the autopsy. The
20	toxicology is in there.
21	THE COURT: All right. And do you have any
22	objection to that? I mean, it's in the autopsy. I'm
23	assuming you're introducing the autopsy reports.
24	MR. TAHIR: Correct. I have no objection to
25	that as long as we don't go into what those THC levels

1	mean in terms of impairment or anything like that
2	without laying foundation for such an opinion. If it's
3	just that the THC in his system that's fine.
4	THE COURT: All right. Do you plan on
5	eliciting what those THC
6	MR. GRAY: I've heard so many different
7	opinions about the THC levels after somebody dies. I
8	probably won't. If I do, I'll surely give notice ahead
9	of time, but depending on what expert you talk to, you
10	never get the right answers.
11	THE COURT: Or maybe not the answer you want?
12	MR. GRAY: Well, that's true, too.
13	THE COURT: All right. As far as
14	MR. GRAY: I'm assuming that the State isn't
15	going to call somebody to
16	MR. TAHIR: No. No, we will not.
17	MR. GRAY: Okay.
18	THE COURT: All right. As to Number 6,
19	impeachment evidence of the following witnesses: A
20	Mr. McMath, Larry McMath?
21	MR. GRAY: Yes. Larry McMath has a second
22	degree assault from 2016.
23	THE COURT: Do you have any objection to
24	that?
25	MR. TAHIR: No, Your Honor. I think that's

1	relevant evidence. The Court File Number is
2	27-CR-16-468, and, yeah, I think he can be impeached
3	about that.
4	THE COURT: And we won't be going into the
5	facts of that
6	MR. GRAY: No.
7	THE COURT: just that he has convicted of
8	a felony and what the felony is, and when it was.
9	MR. GRAY: Yes.
10	THE COURT: Okay. How about Marcel McMath?
11	MR. GRAY: He has a conviction for
12	terroristic threats well, it used to be called
13	terroristic threats. Now it's threats of terror.
14	THE COURT: Threats of violence, yeah. And
15	where what year was that in?
16	MR. GRAY: That's recent, isn't it?
17	MR. TAHIR: It's, I believe
18	MS. MONTGOMERY: 2021.
19	MR. TAHIR: The conviction was last year,
20	Your Honor, February of 2022.
21	THE COURT: You got a file number for that?
22	MR. TAHIR: Yes, 62-CR-21-6411.
23	THE COURT: Any objection to that?
24	MR. TAHIR: No.
25	THE COURT: All right. And a Mr. Ronald

1 Stewart? MR. GRAY: We don't have any for him, do we? 2 3 MS. MONTGOMERY: (Shakes head.) 4 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I guess that 5 covers all of yours, I believe. I noted you listed -- the State listed 48 6 7 witnesses. You're not calling 48 witnesses, right? 8 MR. TAHIR: No, Your Honor. I believe we'll call about a dozen. 9 10 THE COURT: Okay. You may want to narrow it 11 down for them as well, which ones. 12 MR. TAHIR: We will certainly endeavor to do 13 that. THE COURT: All right. And on your exhibit 14 15 list you have "photographs", and anything specific 16 about that -- those photographs? 17 MR. TAHIR: I don't think so, Your Honor. Of course, some of them will be autopsy photos, which we 18 19 can have a conversation about. They will be limited in 20 scope just to show where the injury was and just an 21 overall image of the decedent after his death, so the 22 jury can see where the wound was. We don't intend on going overboard and 23 24 introducing those. I don't think there are any other 25 So essentially they're photos that were taken issues.

1	by the forensic services unit at the scene, documenting
2	where certain items were found and how the police
3	department conducted its investigation.
4	THE COURT: All right. And I assume you have
5	those, Mr. Gray? Any objection to any of those photos?
6	MR. GRAY: No well, I don't know how many
7	of the autopsy pictures they're going to show, but I
8	don't have any objection.
9	THE COURT: All right. And we'll limit
10	those, of course.
11	MR. TAHIR: Yes.
12	THE COURT: And then you have recorded
13	statements. I'm assuming those are statements of
14	Mr. Kjellberg?
15	MR. TAHIR: That's correct, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Along with the transcripts?
17	MR. TAHIR: That's correct.
18	THE COURT: And generally, the way I do it is
19	assuming let's just say that the recording is
20	Exhibit 5, then the transcript is Exhibit 5A.
21	MR. TAHIR: Understood.
22	THE COURT: And the transcripts don't go back
23	to the jury, okay?
24	And then you have written reports. You're
25	not introducing any written reports?

1	MR. TAHIR: I don't believe so, Your Honor,
2	unless something unusual happens. But no, the State
3	does not plan on introducing any written reports.
4	THE COURT: And then we have 911 calls. Are
5	we stipulating to the foundation
6	MR. GRAY: Yes.
7	THE COURT: of those 911 calls? So you
8	don't have to call the 911 operator.
9	MR. TAHIR: If there is a stipulation we will
10	not call that extra witness.
11	THE COURT: And we have on here the weapon.
12	What exactly is the weapon?
13	MR. TAHIR: It's a tool of some kind. I
14	haven't seen it in person. It kind of looks like a
15	screwdriver, almost, which is sharpened at the end.
16	I'm not exactly sure what it is, but it's not really a
17	knife or a traditional weapon so to speak. It looks
18	more like a screwdriver.
19	THE COURT: Okay. And then the camera
20	footage. Again, if there's any audio, you would bring
21	transcripts with that?
22	MR. TAHIR: Yes, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	What do you refer to what exactly is
25	surveillance video? What were you surveilling?

MR. TAHIR: So there is a video that we intend to introduce from -- it's kind of like a Ring doorbell. I'm not exactly sure what type of surveillance camera setup it is. But it's on a garage that's nearby that captured some of this incident, not in the greatest detail, but it also picks up some of the audio, so some of the conversation that was taking place between the decedent and Mr. Kjellberg.

So that's the surveillance video that I'm thinking of, and I think that's what we intended when we put it down here. There might be other surveillance -- and again I apologize. I've been on the case for a very short period of time, but it's just surveillance video on that block that shows at least in part the moments leading up to the encounter, and one video in particular shows what happened during the encounter as well.

THE COURT: All right. And then we already discussed spark of life photos and of course the curriculum vitae of Dr. Froloff.

All right. And then we have the State's motions in limine. Shall we just go through them one by one? That's probably easier -- not quicker but probably easier.

MR. GRAY: Judge, on the first page -- I have

1	no problem with the first three.
2	THE COURT: All right. So no objection to 1,
3	2, and 3.
4	MR. GRAY: Number 4, except for the prior
5	convictions we just discussed, I think that's those
6	are the only character evidence under 608 that we'll
7	be providing.
8	THE COURT: All right. And that covers 609
9	as well so there is no 404(b) notices
10	MR. GRAY: No.
11	THE COURT: from either of the parties,
12	right?
13	MR. TAHIR: No, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right. So that covers 6 as
15	well. And then we already discussed 7 under 609. And
16	then Number 8, Mr. Gray?
17	MR. GRAY: Well, we're going to have a
18	questionnaire, so I'm not going to give them any
19	You want to handle it?
20	MS. MONTGOMERY: Your Honor, just in regard
21	to the questionnaire that we provided the Court, there
22	was two additional questions in relation to
23	self-defense that we were requesting.
24	The original one we added, Number 22, that
25	was also by the Defense, adding that. However, the

1	State objected to the additional two that we provided
2	by email, and we're still requesting those be added to
3	the questionnaire.
4	THE COURT: I think I ruled on that, didn't
5	I?
6	THE LAW CLERK: I can't remember off the top
7	of my head.
8	THE COURT: So there was two of them and what
9	I did was eliminated one and modified the second one.
10	MS. MONTGOMERY: Oh, I apologize. I missed
11	that.
12	THE COURT: Can you take a look in your
13	email, because I am fairly sure I sent it to you.
14	THE LAW CLERK: Yeah. This would have been
15	on the 16th, correct?
16	THE COURT: I couldn't tell you that.
17	THE LAW CLERK: Okay.
18	THE COURT: But it was probably after Firkus,
19	so probably the 16th.
20	MR. TAHIR: So the parties sent the email on
21	the 17th, on Friday.
22	THE LAW CLERK: Okay. Let me see did it
23	go directly to my email?
24	MS. MONTGOMERY: No. It was sent to the 2nd
25	Judge Castro email.

1 THE COURT: And Colleen may have sent it to 2 me, and then I may have sent it to you. 3 THE LAW CLERK: "I would not agree to 4 question 22, and do not disagree with the two questions 5 below. I would substitute Question 22 for the 6 following: At the end of the case, the Court must 7 instruct you on the law of self-defense. Would you be 8 able to follow the Judge's instructions on law of 9 self-defense and not what you believe the law should or 10 should not be?" 11 MR. GRAY: Yes, that's fine. 12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So we'll 13 modify that -- the questionnaire to reflect that. 14 THE LAW CLERK: Okay. 15 THE COURT: All right. Of course, no 16 objection to Number 9? 17 MR. GRAY: No, I don't object to that. 18 THE COURT: I get this a lot. On Number 10. 19 MR. GRAY: Do you really think it's possible 20 Judge, that -- no, I don't -- I'm not going to ask 21 those questions. 22 THE COURT: Okay. All right. All right, 23 Number 11 about punishment, of course. 24 MR. GRAY: No. I don't think there are any constitutional issues for 12 --25

1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	MR. GRAY: that I know of.
3	THE COURT: And 13?
4	MR. GRAY: No, I'm not he's going to
5	testify anyway, so no. That's okay with us.
6	THE COURT: 14, as to the not guilty plea?
7	MR. GRAY: Yeah, that's okay with us.
8	THE COURT: 15?
9	MR. GRAY: 15 is fine. 16 is fine. 17 fine.
10	I assume the prosecution will also follow that law.
11	THE COURT: Yeah.
12	MR. TAHIR: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Most of these apply to both
14	sides.
15	MR. GRAY: Okay. 18 is fine, spark of life
16	we've discussed. Self-defense we've handled.
17	THE COURT: So this one is a little more
18	complicated. Number 20, prohibiting the Defendant
19	Defendant's attorney from commenting during jury
20	selection or opening statements upon either the issue
21	of law of self-defense or refusing to instruct the jury
22	until such time that the Defendant has met his burden
23	going forward. That's a that's a real difficult
24	burden to put on the Defense.
25	MR. TAHIR: I will make this easy. Your

1 Honor, we're going to withdraw that. This is a 2 self-defense case. I think both parties will be 3 talking about it from the get-go, so. 4 THE COURT: All right. Sounds good. Number 20 is withdrawn. I mean, certainly if they 5 6 don't meet their burden, they don't get the instruction, but -- and I think that was the last one. 7 8 And we are scheduled for trial. What day? March 27th. 9 MS. LEE: 10 That's a Tuesday, right? THE COURT: 11 that start on a Tuesday? Is the Monday a day off? 12 MR. TAHIR: It is. 13 MS. LEE: It is a Monday. THE COURT: So generally what I'd like to 14 15 do -- and I'm open to your suggestions as well -- is 16 that we bring in the jury in the morning. I give them 17 some preliminary instructions. I have them fill out a questionnaire. Then when they're all done, I send them 18 19 home. 20 We make copies of the questionnaire, get 21 copies to you folks, and we try to then -- if --22 assuming we get the questionnaires to you in time, we 23 can get together that same day in the afternoon and 24 decide which jurors we can all agree should be removed

for cause, and then that would be our first batch.

25

1 The second decision is which jurors we need 2 to voir dire individually, and then bring those jurors 3 in to voir dire individually and then bring in the rest 4 of the panel to voir dire as a group. 5 Any objection to that? 6 MR. TAHIR: No, Your Honor. 7 MR. GRAY: No. 8 THE COURT: Okay. And so generally as far as timing, I always ask the lawyers to get here at 8:30. 9 10 I ask --11 I know it might be a little early for you, 12 Mr. Gray. 13 MR. GRAY: No, no. I can't sleep at after 6:00 at my age. 14 15 Well, perfect then. THE COURT: 16 And then I have the jurors get here at 8:45. 17 So if there are any issues that we need to deal with before we bring out the jurors, we can do that. 18 19 course, things are less complicated given that 20 Mr. Kjellberg's not in custody. That makes things a 21 lot less complicated as far as where we can be and how 22 we can proceed. And then we start as soon as we can after all of the jurors are here. 23 24 MR. GRAY: Okay. 25 As far as alternates, I don't THE COURT:

1	anticipate us well, what do you think? Two?
2	MR. GRAY: Yeah.
3	MR. TAHIR: Two is fine, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Anything else?
5	MR. TAHIR: I can't think of anything, Your
6	Honor. Thank you.
7	MR. GRAY: I can think of nothing.
8	Amanda?
9	MS. MONTGOMERY: No, thank you.
LO	MR. GRAY: Nothing from me.
L1	THE COURT: All right. I guess we're good
L2	then. We'll see you on the 27th. If anything comes
L3	up we can do stuff also through Zoom if something
L4	comes up that we need to deal with right away, or have
L5	a phone conference.
L6	MR. GRAY: I hear my friend was visiting you
L7	last week, a guy named Friedberg.
L8	THE COURT: Yeah, he was around for a long,
L9	long time.
20	(The proceedings concluded at 2:13 p.m.)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

STATE OF MINNESOTA)
COUNTY OF RAMSEY)

I, Colleen Maloney, an official court reporter for the Second Judicial District, in and for the County of Ramsey, State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcript of my original stenograph notes which were transcribed into writing by computer-aided transcription, taken relative in the aforementioned matter on February 21, 2023, in the City of St. Paul, County of Ramsey, and State of Minnesota before the Honorable Leonardo Castro.

Signed this 6th day of October, 2023.

s:/ Colleen Maloney

Colleen Maloney
State Official Court Reporter
Ramsey County Courthouse
15 West Kellogg Boulevard
Chambers 1350
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102
Colleen.Maloney@courts.state.mn.us