2

3

6

5

7

9

11

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defendant's. It originated with him. It did not originate with the defendant.

Your Honor, as I conclude, I think both sides of this case, and the terrible sorrow and tragedy that they're confronted with, you have two parents. Blakleys have lost their daughter. And I know they will grieve forever. I would do that if it were my daughter. The Kimbles, him being a pastor and her his wife, having only two sons, have lost both of their sons. None of those parents are quilty of any wrongdoing. Apparently they've all tried to be good parents. The Kimbles have raised their children in church, just as the Blakleys. And yet, those two sides have this in their future. One has lost their daughter. The others have lost both sons. And I submit that a life forever in prison is sometimes worse than death. And they face this on a loaded issue each morning. And, Your Honor, somewhere in between that lies justice. Where that is, I don't know. I simply ask in your wisdom that you consider all of these factors, and enter judgment that comes from the judge in a position that rises above all of us, and I feel you will do your very best to do that. And I thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel.

MR. PANOSH: Your Honor, we have submitted a sentencing memorandum. As to the second degree murder

case set forth in our memorandum, we submitted the aggravating factor of premeditation and deliberation should apply. We've set forth State versus O'Neal specifically supports that position. We tell Your Honor that when the defendant stood before you and pled quilty, he said he was in fact quilty of murder, he was in fact quilty of conspiracy to commit murder, and thereby he admitted that it was premeditated and deliberate murder. And I tell Your Honor that that day he knew exactly what he was doing because he stood before you and distinguished between the 1995 offenses, when he said I'm in fact guilty, and the 1998 offenses, where he said these I'm pleading quilty to because it's in my best interest. We submit there's adequate evidence for the aggravating factor of premeditation and deliberation.

We submit as to the murder that the aggravating factor of pecuniary gain applies. We've submitted State versus Griffin and State versus Manning to support our position.

Your Honor, there's no question in this case he intended to collect the three existing life insurance policies on his wife--two where he was named beneficiary, and one where Patricia's mother was named beneficiary that he thought he was the beneficiary. And he also intended to try and collect on that \$200,000 application

that he put in just weeks before her murder.

As to the first degree arson, we submit that that first degree arson was committed for the purpose of covering up the murder. That would be an aggravating factor as set forth in State versus Barnes, which is in our memorandum.

As to the solicitation to commit murder, we submit the aggravating factor that the defendant committed this offense to destruct or hinder law enforcement exercise of a government function. And that's supported by State versus Brown. We'd also submit that the fact that it was a solicitation to commit a named witness applies to six of these cases, and that is supported by State versus Brown.

Your Honor, as to the supposition that Mr. Stewart was in fact just playing him to get everything that he could out of him, that might be true. It might be true that Mr. Stewart intended to gain money from the defendant. But the key here, Your Honor, is that the time the defendant gave Mr. Stewart this list of names, at the time he gave him these diagrams, he fully intended that these people be killed. He fully intended that there be a plot to escape from this courtroom, from this courthouse. And we would submit that is another aggravating factor. He intended to come in here. He

- -

planned the death of courtroom personnel, people we work with, we know, we respect. He planned to come in here and totally disrupt our system and kill the bailiffs and the courtroom personnel, anyone else who got in his way.

Your Honor, Mr. Stewart did get early release. He was released, all the evidence shows he was released about two weeks early for the sole purpose of allowing us to go down there and execute that search warrant and getting him out of that prison facility. There's not one shred of evidence to show that before he made this statement he had any promises. And he certainly had no promise of early release. And Your Honor knows that the law requires that if there was a promise, we would have had to disclose it to counsel. We haven't done so because there was no promise.

Your Honor, in sentencing this defendant, I ask you to take into consideration all the wonderful things you've heard said about Patricia. I don't intend to repeat them. I couldn't say them as eloquently as her family has. I ask you to take into consideration that he has no remorse. Not one shred of remorse for what he has done either to Patricia, her family, or those people he named to be killed.

You heard all this evidence about this public show of affection that the defendant had with his wife

right up to the time of her execution. That just shows you not a mitigating factor, that shows that he's a cold blooded murderer. He planned this and he had the ability to hug and kiss his wife knowing that he was about to kill her to collect the insurance money.

This defendant, Your Honor, lives in a world of bombs and silencers and sniper rifles. He just feels that anybody who gets in his way, he should be able to eliminate. We ask you to sentence him remembering that. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Mr.

Zimmerman, are you prepared to tender your sentencing
memorandum?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: We don't have it at this
point in time, if Your Honor please. If Your Honor would
be kind enough to consider a short recess, I'll check one
more time and see what the problem is. This witness has
been subpoenaed since two weeks ago. And she was just
deathly ill yesterday. I apologize for having the phone
ringing in the courtroom. That was her calling me
yesterday. She couldn't get out of the bed. It's this
flu going around, and I can understand it because I had
some of that before I had my other problem.

MR. PANOSH: May we approach?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.