ORIGINAL

1	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND
2	STATE OF MARYLAND
3	vs. CT12-1375X
4	KOBINA EBO ABRUQUAH,
5	Defendant.
6	/
7	REPORTER'S OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
8	(Trial on the Merits - Volume I) Excerpt: Motion in Limine
9	Upper Marlboro, Maryland
10	Wednesday, December 11, 2013
11	BEFORE:
12 13	HONORABLE MICHAEL R. PEARSON, ASSOCIATE JUDGE (and a jury)
14	APPEARANCES:
15	For the State:
16	JONATHAN CHURCH, ESQ.
1 7	For the Defendant:
18	ELIZABETH L. CAWOOD, ESQ.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	EVADNEY R. KEY, RPR
24	Official Court Reporter P. O. Box 401
25	Upper Marlboro, MD 20773

PROCEEDINGS

_

p.m.)

(The following is an excerpt from the aforementioned case concerning a motion in limine before the trial commenced.)

* * * *

(Recessed for lunch from 12:20 p.m. to 1:32

THE COURT: Back on the record in State v.

Abruquah, CT12-1375X. Mr. Abruquah is present. Counsel is present.

We have a pending motion in limine from the State. I guess I will hear from you.

MR. CHURCH: Your Honor, the State has moved to exclude two of what the defense noted as expert witnesses from testifying. Essentially, what was being sought was called a reverse robbery, hearing the challenges, the admissibility of firearms and tool mark examination, the science behind it. I think I laid most of it out in my motion; but, essentially, what it boils down to, rather than having the State being gatekeeper in Daubert and Kumho Tires - going back to law school - and Frye-Reed, those cases deal with the admissibility of scientific evidence.

I think the law is very clear that firearms and tool mark identification are generally accepted in the

scientific community. Not only that, but the Court has held that trial courts can take judicial notice of the admissibility of that testimony.

THE COURT: Well, she's not necessarily challenging the admissibility of the firearms evidence. She wants to be able to impeach your representatives with evidence counter to it. That's where your problems lie.

MR. CHURCH: Exactly. And I don't believe that's permissible under the case law. Because if it's the opposite of what's generally accepted in the scientific community, then it would be something not reproducible. With that issue with respect to being the gatekeeper, the other issue is whether the witness is qualified to provide that testimony. I know that will be accomplished by voir dire, but I also challenge that. I incorporate all my objections in my motion.

MS. CAWOOD: We would argue that while we're not presenting a Frye-Reed or Daubert challenge with regard to admissibility of the State's evidence, the opinions the experts would offer, they haven't done any independent testing. That's not really the issue.

It's simply their expert is going to come in and say the bullets were a match. Our experts would say you can't say it's a match. You can only say it's consistent with the firearm.

THE COURT: Why couldn't you flesh that out with cross-examination? How are you going to bring in an expert to render an opinion in a case when the rules specifically state they must have a factual basis for issuing that opinion, and they've done no type of examination, analysis, or done anything in particular in this case in terms of establishing a factual basis for their opinion?

MS. CAWOOD: Because the opinion doesn't require -- in this case, because it's not an opinion that's specific or particular to this firearm or these bullets. It's a general opinion about the fact that an expert cannot say conclusively that it's a match. And it's not even an opposite opinion. It's merely a variation in terms of a continuum of, I guess, scientific certainty.

I think it would be equivalent to say preponderance of the evidence and reasonable doubt, and the experts would merely offer an opinion that one can't say it's a hundred percent match. They can only say it's consistent with. With that, Your Honor, I would submit.

THE COURT: I agree wholeheartedly with the evidence put forth by Mr. Church in his pleadings to the Court. I simply don't think that making general presentations to the jury is going to help the factfinder

1 in making assessments as to what is a fact in this case 2 and what is not. Certainly the arguments, the general 3 impeachment that you're trying to do, would be appropriate 4 in terms of the cross-examination of any witnesses put 5 forth by the State. But just to bring in someone to render a general opinion about the general nature of 6 7 firearms examinations without doing any type of specific 8 test or examination in this case, I'm not going to allow 9 it. 10 Motion in limine is granted. 11 MS. CAWOOD: Just to be clear, I am permitted to 12 cross-examine regarding and to argue regarding those 13 issues? 14 THE COURT: Well, definitely to cross-examine. 15 I'm not going to say argument yet, because I haven't heard 16 exactly what's going to come out, but absolutely you can cross him on it. 17 18 MS. CAWOOD: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 (Whereupon, the excerpt was concluded.) 20 21 22 23 24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Evadney R. Key, an Official Court

Reporter for the Circuit Court for Prince George's County,

Maryland, do hereby certify that I stenographically

recorded the proceedings in the matter of State of

Maryland vs. Kobina Ebo Abruquah, CT12-1375X, on December

11, 2013, before the Honorable Michael R. Pearson,

Associate Judge.

I further certify that the page numbers 1E-1 through 1E-5 constitute an official transcript excerpt of the proceedings as transcribed by me from my stenographic notes to the within typewritten matter in a complete manner to the best of my knowledge and belief.

In Witness Whereof, I have affixed my signature this 16th day of January, 2014.

vadney R. Key,

Official Court Reporter