

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

Aug 11 2020

Appeal from Beaufort County

Honorable Kristi F. Curtis, Circuit Court Judge

SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

COURTNEY ELIZABETH BROCK,

APPELLANT

APPELLATE CASE NO 2019-001848

RECORD ON APPEAL

KATHRINE H. HUDGINS
Appellate Defender

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General

South Carolina Commission on Indigent
Defense
Division of Appellate Defense
PO Box 11589
Columbia, SC 29211-1589
(803) 734-1330

MELODY J. BROWN
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General
Rembert Dennis Building
1000 Assembly Street, Room 519
Columbia, SC 29201

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

INDEX

INDEX i

TRIAL TRANSCRIPT DATED OCTOBER 21-24, 2019.....1

 JURY SELECTION.....7

TESTIMONY

 JESSICA BROWN (IN CAMERA)67

 SEBASTIAN LUPPINO (IN CAMERA).....70

 MICHELE POLIZZI (IN CAMERA).....73

OPENING REMARKS BY THE COURT.....78

OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. SWANSON86

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. WALKER93

TESTIMONY

 ALLYSON MOREIRA104

 MARK BAIRD106

 BRETT JOHNSON.....113

 JEFF KNIELING121

 MIKE PERKINS.....125

 PAT MURPHY129

 BRANDON COOLER.....132

 JENNIFER MILLS139

 AMANDA REDDISH143

 DONNIE WILLIAMS172

 WAYNE JORDAN.....181

ADAM ZSAMAR.....	187
JENNIFER SNIDER.....	191
HANNAH SEIGLER.....	218
JASON MALPHRUS	228
COLLOQUY WITH THE DEFENDANT ON HER RIGHT TO TESTIFY	243
JONI SKIPPER.....	254
JEFF CROOKS.....	290
JOHN DONAHUE.....	317
THE STATE RESTS	347
MOTION FOR A DIRECTED VERDICT.....	348
RULING OF THE COURT	351
COLLOQUY WITH THE DEFENDANT ON HER RIGHT TO TESTIFY	352
TESTIMONY	
COURTNEY BROCK.....	354
CHRISTINE SHOENER	444
BRANDON SCARBOROUGH.....	452
STACEY JACKSON	470
THE DEFENSE RESTS	477
JACKSON V. DENNO HEARING.....	482
TESTIMONY	
JASON MALPHRUS (IN CAMERA)	485
RULING OF THE COURT	506
RENEWAL OF MOTION FOR DIRECTED VERDICT	510

RULING OF THE COURT510

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MS. SWANSON511

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MR. WALKER.....527

REPLY CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MS. SWANSON.....555

CHARGE ON THE LAW558

VERDICT574

SENTENCING580

MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL581

RULING OF THE COURT581

INDICTMENTS AND SENTENCE SHEETS.....583

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL588

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 seeking to do is put Investigator Malphrus back on the
2 stand, and to actually admit the, the video into
3 evidence, is that correct?

4 MS. SWANSON: That's correct. In the alternative,
5 you know, I mean, that is, that is what I seek to do.
6 In the alternative, I could elicit testimony, but I
7 think that, you know, giving the complete picture to
8 the jury is the, the best way to go about it, and what
9 the State requests to do is enter that video interview
10 laying the foundation and such as an admission by a
11 party opponent under 801(b)(2)(a). This is the party's
12 own statement.

13 Statement, again, is defined, under 801, as an
14 oral or written assertion. Admissions by party
15 opponents are not hearsay. Therefore, they are
16 admissible evidence to rebut the defense's case that
17 the defense just put up.

18 This is not 613(b), which, actually, specifically
19 states it does not apply to 801(b)(2). It does not
20 apply to admissions by a party opponent. So, I do not
21 have to go through that process of informing the
22 Defendant of the time, substance, place of the
23 statement in order for her to admit or deny it.

24 So, the State's position is that the jury has the
25 right to consider the differences between what she told

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 law enforcement, and what she testified to on the
2 stand. These are all of her statements. Defense has
3 been aware of the entire time. I didn't know I would
4 want to seek to enter these until she took the stand,
5 as well as family members, and the defense presented
6 the case.

7 These statements are voluntary. Therefore,
8 admissible. They are not hearsay. They are offered to
9 rebut the Defense's case. They are probative, and they
10 are relevant, and they should be before the jury to
11 weigh as properly admitted.

12 Thank you.

13 THE COURT: Mr. Walker.

14 MR. WALKER: What I'm hearing her say is we'd like
15 to hear the defense case, and then put up another case
16 to rebut it. The State, for anything factual that's
17 stated in that interview that they thought was good for
18 them or an admission, one, could have been admitted in
19 their case in chief. It's where they're supposed to
20 enter their good information.

21 Two, could have waited and gambled on the fact
22 that the Defendant was gonna take the stand and then
23 ask the Defendant about it. Neither of those things
24 happened.

25 She just told she thinks she has -- the jury has

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 the right to hear the differences, which is impeachment
2 for credibility, which takes it out of an admission,
3 and, again, that is -- that's all consistent with what
4 she's said. I mean there's gaps, but there's nothing
5 crazy different in there.

6 But I mean, obviously, they disagree with me
7 there, but they're seeking -- she literally she said
8 the jury has the right to hear the differences. That's
9 why I want to put that in, and that is impeachment.

10 It is not an admission. There's, there's nothing
11 factual that she's admitting to there that they could
12 not have gotten into without this coming -- they
13 limit -- they could of just asked it. They could of
14 either played the thing -- well, the Judge has found
15 it's voluntary. So, I guess you would of found it
16 voluntary if they'd done it pretrial. They could of
17 done that and said oh, this is a great fact for us, we
18 want to play this, or they could have said, oh, the
19 Defendant's testifying. Let's ask her about this. And
20 then if she -- then, you know, if she denies it, we've
21 already done our Jackson v. -- our Jackson v. Denno
22 hearing, and we're ready to impeach her, which they did
23 not do.

24 And now, and now they're really seeking to have --
25 just go here, let me play this video, and this is the

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 last thing you hear. Of course, there's clearly
2 improper things on there. He's commenting on, you
3 know, if he believes my client's being honest or not,
4 and other things like that. We don't have a redacted
5 version. And, of course, even if it were an admission
6 at this point, the, the format is so prejudicial of, of
7 just playing it cause that's not how you impeach.

8 You, you ask the person did you say that, and it's
9 not oh, did you give an interview that's completely
10 different, let's play the whole interview. Did you
11 tell X. Yes, I said X or no, I didn't say X. And then
12 you play 15 seconds of her either not saying -- of her
13 saying that's when she denied it or you don't play a
14 video at all if she said she did it.

15 And, again, to basically say, well, I wanted to
16 wait to see what they're going do before I decide to
17 have my evidence ready, well, I'm sorry, you didn't do
18 it that way. But you don't get a second bite at the
19 apple. We're -- we've been always preparing our case,
20 and I have prepared for this eventuality. My client's
21 watched all these videos, and had they had a Jackson v.
22 Denno, would have been ready to answer questions about
23 that. But they did not do that.

24 They, they made their bed, and I don't think they
25 can show any reason, extraordinary reason, that, that

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 now they should be able to come back. I mean we have
2 the rules of evidence for a reason. It governs how
3 this stuff is supposed to happen, and just kind of make
4 up a new, a new way to get in evidence because they
5 don't like how things are going.

6 And so, the, the rule -- even denotes to Rule 802,
7 right?

8 801(b)(2), you read it, right? And denotes in the
9 rules talk about admissions of the party's
10 admissible -- well, basically, in the context of
11 discussing the case, as they discuss the cases where
12 basically they are statements against interest are
13 admissions in the criminal context, and I don't know.
14 I haven't read it all, but I kind of think that would
15 be the thrust of what we would say.

16 So, where the statement is not against interest,
17 which the State conceded that they weren't at the
18 beginning, at the pretrial stage of this trial, they're
19 not admissions, and, they're again, back to the
20 foundation rules, 613.

21 But the, the factual -- I don't -- again, if they
22 wanted to play this entire video, the time to do that
23 would of been in their case. If they want to come back
24 and ask my client questions about it, the, the immense
25 prejudice of the last thing of the jury hearing is them

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 berating my client about these videos in the defense
2 stage of the trial after a day and four witnesses have
3 passed since my client was on the stand. Without the
4 surrounding context and the fresh memory of what she
5 just said or that she might refer back to something.
6 That -- you know, again, that prejudice, to me, is not
7 something I created. That, that was their decision
8 making process that created the prejudice in the trial,
9 and such that, you know, certainly object and move for
10 a mistrial. Well, I would object, you know, if you let
11 it here. But it's, it's just a mess, and it's a mess
12 of their creation.

13 THE COURT: Thank you. I'm finding that the
14 video's not admissible. I do think that the, the
15 purpose that the State seeks to introduce the video is
16 for impeachment of her testimony, and 613(b) requires
17 that the witness be given an opportunity to explain or
18 deny the statements, which she certainly would not get
19 given the fact that this is reply.

20 I certainly understand the State's position. I
21 don't think that the statements constitute admissions
22 by a party opponent, but whether it could have been
23 introduced in the State's original case, I'm really not
24 gonna address that except to say that I do think that
25 it has to be an admission for it to fall under

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 801(b)(2). But I think even under 801(b)(2), allowing
2 it in rebuttal, without the defendant getting an
3 opportunity to explain, would be highly prejudicial.
4 But really the basis for my ruling is the State was
5 seeking to use them at -- use it for impeachment under
6 613(b), but extrinsic evidence, prior inconsistent,
7 inconsistent statement is not admissible at this point
8 without her having the opportunity to explain or deny
9 the statement.

10 So, that's my ruling, and my feeling is that would
11 apply to all of the statements that she's made
12 previously.

13 Let's take a break cause I need a break, and let's
14 take about ten minutes so we can come back and
15 determine if the State still has witnesses they want to
16 put up. If you don't, is everyone's resting, then I'll
17 hear additional motions at that time.

18 MS. SWANSON: Okay. Your Honor, and with all due
19 respect, I just want to make sure I have your ruling
20 right. Your position is that 801(d)(2), the definition
21 of admission would be a confession or a self-serving
22 statement?

23 THE COURT: Some kind of statement against
24 interest, yes, ma'am.

25 MS. SWANSON: Okay. Even though the rule does not

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 at all say that?

2 THE COURT: It says that it is an admission by a
3 party opponent. And so my ruling would be, first of
4 all, that that video did not give an admission, but,
5 more importantly, that the State, the State is seeking
6 to introduce it for the purpose of impeachment. It is
7 not admissible as extrinsic evidence of a prior
8 inconsistent statement under 613(b) without her having
9 had an opportunity to explain or deny the statement, and
10 that's my ruling.

11 MS. SWANSON: Okay. And just for the record,
12 613(b) does specifically state it does not apply to
13 801(d)(2) which---

14 THE COURT: I'm aware of that.

15 MS. SWANSON: Thank you.

16 THE COURT: That's my ruling.

17 MS. SWANSON: Thank you.

18 THE COURT: We will be in recess for 10 minutes.

19 (The Judge exits the bench at 10:55 a.m.)

20 MS. SWANSON: Your Honor, the defense is just
21 panning through a PowerPoint that I plan on using in my
22 closing just to make sure there's nothing that we need
23 to address. We're on the last, on the last slide.
24 It's short.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 (Pause.)

2 THE COURT: Does the State have any additional
3 witnesses?

4 MS. SWANSON: No, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Let's talk about jury charges.
6 You've got my draft of proposed charges. Any additions
7 or exception from the State?

8 MS. SWANSON: No additions or exceptions.

9 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

10 MR. WALKER: None, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: So we're ready to go into closings?

12 MS. SWANSON: Yes, Your Honor.

13 MR. WALKER: As soon as my client's back in the
14 courtroom.

15 THE COURT: Sure.

16 (Pause.)

17 THE COURT: Okay. We do need a verdict form. And
18 you're requesting, requesting any lesser included
19 offenses?

20 MR. WALKER: No, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: State's gonna open in full on the
22 facts and law. Mr. Walker, you'll go---

23 MR. WALKER: Just like in the old days.

24 THE COURT: ---second, and then Ms. Swanson will
25 get a reply strictly on anything that you have raised

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 in your closing.

2 MS. SWANSON: Yes, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: You want to go ahead and bring the
4 jury in. Thank you. Actually let's hold off on the
5 jury for just one moment.

6 Mr. Walker, you want to renew your motions for
7 directed verdict now that both the State and defense
8 have rested their case?

9 MR. WALKER: I do, Your Honor. Thank you, and, of
10 course, trial objections throughout.

11 THE COURT: And all on the same grounds that you
12 raised previously?

13 MR. WALKER: Yes, sir.

14 THE COURT: Ms. Swanson, do you want to respond to
15 that at all?

16 MS. SWANSON: Your Honor, I stand on the previous
17 argument. Thank you.

18 THE COURT: Thank you. So, the renewed motion for
19 directed verdict is denied. I do think there is
20 sufficient circumstantial evidence in this case to go
21 to the jury. Thank you.

22 Now we're ready for the jury.

23 THE BAILIFF: Yes, ma'am.

24 THE COURT: And Andy is going to hand you a
25 proposed verdict form.

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF JASON MALPHRUS BY
MS. SWANSON

1 MS. SWANSON: No objection from the State.

2 MR. WALKER: None from defense.

3 THE BAILIFF: The jury is entering the courtroom,
4 Your Honor.

5 (The jury enters the courtroom at 11:10 a.m.)

6 THE BAILIFF: The jury is seated, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you
8 for your patience. We had a number of issues of law
9 that we needed to address. We're gonna move right into
10 the closing arguments of the attorneys.

11 Ms. Swanson.

12 MS. SWANSON: Thank you, Your Honor. May it
13 please the Court.

14 Why? It's a question that the victims and the
15 families of victims struggle with everyday. Why? And
16 it's something that you guys probably want to know as
17 well as jurors. And while the State may not need or be
18 required by the law to prove, prove motive, what was
19 the motive here?

20 Well, I hope that Amanda Reddish's testimony went
21 into some insight as to where a drug addict's head
22 lies, and how far they will go, and what they don't
23 care about when they're seeking that high. Bad choices
24 are an every day occurrence in the world of a drug
25 addict. Hanging around Brian Walls is just one of

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 those bad choices, and he certainly added fuel to the
2 fire if you will.

3 Surely you have heard the parental advice about
4 getting mixed up in the wrong crowd. Well, Courtney
5 became the wrong crowd. Remember that drug use was
6 rampant. Courtney was strung out. She didn't claim
7 that she had ever been on a bender before because she
8 took a nap after using meth, but that does not make it
9 not a bender.

10 Okay. And she was prone to make bad choices when
11 she got high. That is no defense though. And the
12 Judge will tell you, if you voluntarily take drugs, you
13 are responsible for any criminal act that you commit.

14 All right. So, bear that in mind. Remember
15 Courtney did talk about how Friday and Saturday night
16 leading up to Teresa's murder were party nights, and
17 then things really seemed to calm down Sunday and
18 Monday. You know, all they did was smoke marijuana.

19 Well, I guess they were out of drugs, because when
20 does the party ramp back up?

21 Tuesday, when Ms. Teresa died. When she got her
22 pills. Some time late Monday night, early morning
23 hours of Tuesday. They ran out of drugs, and they went
24 to get some. Got to keep the party going.

25 This is not the case of wrong place at the wrong

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 time. The events revolving around Teresa's murder span
2 the course of days, different locations, different
3 county.

4 How is Courtney consistently in the wrong place at
5 the wrong time? I would say four different wrong
6 places.

7 Let's think about that. 126 Falls Road, the
8 murder scene, Howard Johnson, the rape scene, the 1999
9 Camry, the stolen car, and then Chesterfield County,
10 the getaway heading to the state line with Brian trying
11 to sell pills because they ran out of get away money.
12 She's handing him the pills to sell. She's taking that
13 label off of the bottle because remember her DNA was on
14 that bottle. She's helping in all this.

15 So, the defense wants you to believe that she was
16 in the wrong four places at the wrong four times. How
17 unlucky could one girl get? She doesn't even consider
18 herself an unlucky person. That's just ridiculous.

19 Courtney made horrible choices that led her to
20 being, to being in these spots and participating in
21 this plan from the beginning. She is involved from the
22 beginning. Stealing the pills, wrapping the victim in
23 duct tape, using the pills, trying to cover it up,
24 taking the discarded duct tape from the murder scene,
25 and putting it in her backpack, and then trying to get

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 away.

2 She and Brian also took the victim's cell phone so
3 nobody could locate that. You know, the house ends up
4 torched. I guess, you know, the black guy, John
5 Priester, was gonna be the fall guy for that. He
6 didn't even get to, you know, go on the joyride to the
7 county line trying to get away, and using all those
8 pills or sell them.

9 Now, the Judge is going to explain to you what
10 circumstantial evidence is. There is circumstantial
11 evidence. There is direct evidence. Very rarely do we
12 have eye witnesses to a heinous murder such as this.
13 You know, it doesn't take place in someone's front
14 yard.

15 Okay. When the case is based on circumstantial
16 evidence, which this one is, there must be substantial
17 circumstantial evidence that points to the defendant.
18 In this case, we actually have three defendants,
19 although, you're analyzing the evidence as it pertains
20 to Courtney. But I would submit to you, all three were
21 involved, all three from the beginning, and all of this
22 evidence points to all three of them including
23 Courtney.

24 Judge Curtis is also going to talk to you about a
25 accomplice liability, which is also referred to as the

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 hand of hand is the hand of all, something I mentioned
2 in opening. And that means that if more than one
3 person sets out to accomplish an unlawful act, then all
4 present are as guilty as the one that strikes the fatal
5 blow. And Courtney was not just merely present. She
6 wasn't just observing this horrible murder take place
7 or observing the body being wrapped up or observing
8 Brian fleeing in the stolen car. She was intricately
9 involved in all of this.

10 She wrapped her up in that bedding, and duct taped
11 her right up along with the other two. Teresa may not
12 have even been dead yet. The pathologist testified
13 that she could have been smothered from something soft.
14 She certainly didn't die from natural causes. She was
15 duct taped at the wrist, beaten, rolled up in blankets,
16 face covered, duct taped around each end. She died as
17 the result of homicidal violence at the hands of
18 Courtney Brock, Brian Walls, and John Priester.

19 Now, we heard a lot of testimony, testimony about,
20 you know, Sunday, December 4th, Monday, December 5th,
21 and it's hard to hear all of those dates and kind of
22 put them altogether. So, I've got a very brief
23 PowerPoint that I'd like to show you at this time just
24 to go over the timeline. And if you want to turn your
25 attention right there.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 All right. So, we're gonna start on Saturday,
2 December 3rd of 2016. Amanda Reddish testified for
3 you. She told you she gives Teresa a ride home from
4 Wal-Mart. Teresa had refilled her prescription. Brian
5 asked if she has her pills when he comes over to Teresa
6 and tells Amanda to grab them.

7 So, at this point, on Saturday, Brian, and
8 presumably everyone at Falls Road, knows that Teresa
9 has a brand new stack of prescription pills. Courtney
10 testified that Saturday was a party night, and, in
11 fact, her aunt Christine had baby Marley at her house
12 that night so she could party as much as she wanted to.

13 Next slide. Sunday, December 4th of 2016. Amanda
14 takes Tera to 130 Falls Road to hang out with Brian.
15 Amanda sees Courtney and is everyone's partying.
16 Amanda tells it's drugs and drinking. At some point,
17 Courtney, Brandon, and the two boys borrow Amanda's car
18 to go somewhere. Who knows where they want. Maybe
19 they went to get cigarettes, drinks, who knows, drugs.
20 Hannah, on Sunday, has her last conversation with her
21 mother.

22 Now, Courtney, on the other hand, testified that
23 this was a lazy day. She maybe smoked some marijuana,
24 did some home improvement projects with some duct tape,
25 and Aunt Christine testified that she brings Baby

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 Marley back around noon that day, and that was the last
2 time that she saw Courtney when she reported her
3 missing.

4 Okay. Monday, December 5th of 2016. Amanda stays
5 on Lady's Island with Brandon's mother, Tera, using
6 drugs all day. All right. Remember. Amanda said I
7 didn't even go to the Bon Aire neighborhood that day.
8 I was on Lady's Island. I don't know what was going on
9 over there. I didn't see Courtney.

10 Courtney puts herself at Falls Road all day. She
11 said she was arguing with Brandon, and they were making
12 the decision to break up.

13 Now, late Monday night, early Tuesday morning,
14 what happened to Teresa?

15 Next slide.

16 Well, Tuesday is party time. We've got marijuana.
17 We've got pink crystal meth, and a hotel party at the
18 Howard Johnson's.

19 Next slide. Courtney testifies that she begins
20 the day at 6:00 a.m. with Brian Walls using marijuana
21 and meth. Around 2:00 p.m., Brian and Courtney call
22 and text Amanda about a ride. They are together.

23 Now, when Courtney testified, she did not
24 acknowledge remember anything about that. They tell
25 her that they have pills. They being Courtney and

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 Brian, who are together, have pills. Hum. Wonder
2 where they got those pills?

3 Amanda shows up at 130 Falls Road to find an angry
4 Brandon with baby Marley. This is about 2:00, 3:00 in
5 the afternoon she testified. Brandon and Amanda then
6 try and get in touch with Brian and Courtney to no
7 avail. Brandon starts sending about 20 unanswered
8 angry texts to Brian. He knows they're together.

9 Meanwhile, Brian, Courtney, John Priester, and his
10 boys secure a ride, get a hotel room to party at the
11 Howard Johnson's. Brian leaves with the owner of the
12 car, comes back yelling, and the crew hops in the car
13 to then drive down a dirt road in Charleston, and throw
14 stuff out of the car all of which is apparently on the
15 up and up according to Courtney because he just simply
16 borrowed the car. I have no idea what's going on.

17 Yeah, I didn't know what was in the car. Yeah, we
18 had been driving around for about nine hours, but no
19 clue what's in the car.

20 Brian and Courtney ditch the two boys and Priester
21 back in Beaufort County in Gray's Hill, and then head
22 to the North Carolina border. Next slide.

23 Let's get out of here. Next slide.

24 Wednesday, December 7th, 2016. Around 10:30,
25 neighbor sees Kyle and Xavier with John Priester

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 together by Teresa's house. Brian's sons act as a
2 lookout while Priester torches it. Around 11:00 a.m.
3 is when the fire trucks come, and they find Teresa
4 Seigler, black and blue, beaten, wrists bound with duct
5 tape, that includes prints, palm print from Courtney
6 Brock, fingerprint from John Priester, and Brian Walls'
7 DNA.

8 11:00 p.m., Chesterfield County locates Courtney
9 and Brian about four hours from Beaufort in a stolen
10 car with duct tape, Teresa's pills, Teresa's purse,
11 Teresa's debit card, and Teresa's phone. Courtney's
12 DNA is all over these pill bottles belonging to Teresa
13 as well as wadded up duct tape. Teresa's debit card is
14 in that backpack that has her belongings in it. Her
15 backpack. Brian's DNA is also on various pill bottles
16 and duct tape as well. John Priester's DNA is on that
17 debit card.

18 Nest slide. And so we are here present day in
19 court, Courtney's day in court. Courtney testifies
20 that, after studying the State's evidence for three
21 years, her memory has improved. At this point, one of
22 the three defendants has been convicted of Teresa
23 Seigler's murder, and, of course, her family continues
24 to seek justice as does the State.

25 At the beginning of the case I told you that

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 Courtney, Brian, and John all left a little bit of
2 truth behind despite the attempt to get rid of all of
3 the evidence including Teresa's body, which had been
4 doused with gasoline. Remember, Jennifer Mills
5 testified that there was gasoline present, not only on
6 the bedding that Teresa was on in the master bedroom,
7 but the carpet outside of the master bedroom, and the
8 pink nightgown that she was wearing.

9 Who do you think came up with that idea because
10 that arson didn't happen until Brian and Courtney were
11 alone in that stolen car. The paranoid Bonnie and
12 Clyde that were on the run, all meth-ed up, thinking
13 about, oh, God, what did we leave behind? We could
14 have left evidence behind. We could of left
15 fingerprints behind. Thank God Priester's back in town
16 cause we're gonna call him and get him to torch it.

17 So, they get him to take care of that little
18 detail while the boys, Xavier and Kyle, act as lookouts
19 making sure that it gets done. Despite being in a
20 trailer fire, experts are able to find some forensic
21 evidence even though John Donahue testified that that's
22 probably about the worst place to preserve DNA. And
23 through that forensic evidence, as we discussed, there
24 is a link with all three to the murder of the victim.

25 Now, Courtney showed you how she thought her print

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 ended up on that duct tape. I'm sure you recall this
2 crazy demonstration that she did, and, and claims you,
3 you routinely do for, for home improvement. It doesn't
4 make sense that she is going over to a trailer that
5 does not, in any way belong to her, other people are
6 renting from Brian Walls, and have paid him for it.
7 Why, on Sunday, is she, as she claims, suddenly going
8 over there to do this bizarre home improvement project
9 with duct tape that she doesn't use all of, and then
10 rolls back up, and this is what goes missing, and this
11 is what John and Brian used to the wrap up Teresa.

12 Tell me what sense that makes, and who uses duct
13 tape in that manner. I mean it just doesn't make
14 sense. What is this picture frame?

15 I mean, if it were even close to the truth and
16 she's got her palm prints all over it as she's wrapping
17 it up, wouldn't we find multiple palm prints from
18 Courtney because it's the palm prints that are placed
19 on the nonadhesive side that the adhesive side picks up
20 when it's wound around the blanket. And then there's
21 Courtney's DNA all over Teresa's empty Morphine and
22 Clonazepam bottles, and the unlabeled bottles that we
23 spoke about that she handed to Brian because he was
24 trying to sell pills in it.

25 The label from the Tizanidine bottle that had been

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 removed from that bottle, her DNA. Well, it's not
2 Brian only trying to sell pills as they're, you know,
3 in Chesterfield, in the getaway car, trying to get even
4 farther away, and make some money. It's Courtney too.
5 The wadded up duct tape that was in Courtney's
6 backpack, another attempt to cleanup the remnants of
7 the crime that they wanted not to be linked to.

8 Now, let's talk about Dr. Skipper's testimony for
9 a minute. The time and manner of death. So, Teresa's
10 body was in a state of decomposition when law
11 enforcement got there. She had been dead.

12 All right. She didn't die in the fire. She had
13 died sometime prior to, and the fire was Wednesday
14 morning. Pathologists confirmed that, you know, the
15 pictures taken at the ER were consistent with having
16 been dead for a period of time, 24, 36 hours. You
17 know, it's difficult for them to say because it's
18 determined -- it is determined by a lot of
19 environmental factors. But by the time she had her
20 autopsy done on December 8th, she was able to say she
21 was significantly decomposed.

22 And we talked about how, late Monday night, early
23 hours of Tuesday morning, may sense because then it is
24 party on from early Tuesday morning, and that party
25 morphed into the whole Chesterfield getaway. Speaking

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 of which, you can consider flight in your deliberations
2 as consciousness of guilty. Found in a stolen Camry in
3 Chesterfield County, bordering North Carolina.

4 Courtney says she has no friends there, and Brian just
5 wanted some company while he was gonna go try and get
6 his old job back.

7 Can you imagine having an interview with Brian
8 Walls having been messed up, not sleeping for days in
9 Chesterfield County? I mean, really? He's going to
10 get his old job back? Does that sound plausible? Does
11 that sound like a reasonable explanation to be in
12 Chesterfield to you? And don't forgot it. Courtney
13 and Brian are essentially fleeing with murder kits in
14 their backpacks.

15 They've got duct tape. They've got rope. They've
16 got gloves, and then they have the murdered victim's
17 belongings. Courtney's backpack, the Trailmaker
18 backpack.

19 Now, when Lieutenant Jordan, in Chesterfield,
20 testified, I asked him, prior to the inventory search,
21 did you see any backpack in the passenger side. Yes.
22 There was a black backpack on the passenger's side.

23 All right. So, while it may have been moved up to
24 the passenger's seat when they did an inventory search,
25 it was in the passenger's side with Courtney Brock.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 Okay. It also has items belonging to Courtney.
2 Of course, she doesn't know anything about how it's
3 gotten there, but, you know, all of her makeup. She's
4 got her Victoria's Secret bag. There's women's shorts
5 and pants that she thinks probably do belong to her.

6 Let's see. There is a brush, some white rope.
7 Women's gloves came out of this backpack. Balls of
8 duct tape came out of this backpack. Pills belonging
9 to Teresa came out of this backpack. State 64 is a
10 picture of, of everything that came out of this
11 backpack, and then, out of the front pocket, came
12 Teresa's debit card that John Priester had also touched
13 at some point because his DNA's on that.

14 Now, Brian's backpack is in the trunk, but, you
15 know, it kind of looks bad for him too. Black tape,
16 white rope, there's a black dress in there. I don't
17 know. Maybe that was Courtney's too or, I don't know,
18 maybe it was something that he was into. Underwear,
19 pants, gloves, some wisdom cards, ironically, and then,
20 of course, Teresa's purse, in the car, all her stuff.
21 Her name's on everything.

22 No idea that it was in there. No idea how her DNA
23 could of gotten on those pills except for she does
24 remember now that she probably handed Teresa her pills
25 sometime on Saturday or Sunday.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 So, credibility of the witnesses. What do you
2 need to judge the credibility of the witnesses who
3 appeared on the stand?

4 All you need is your common sense. This ain't
5 hard.

6 All right. I mean what makes sense? You guys are
7 reasonable people. We have to stay reasonable. This
8 is a reasonable standard that everyone is held to in
9 this courtroom. Who has a reason to lie? Who has
10 something to lose? Who has something to gain? Who
11 told inconsistent stories?

12 Before, before I hand it over to Mr. Walker, I
13 want to address the, the Brian Walls, the scary guy
14 theme that was sort of playing out through the defense
15 at least during cross-examination, during my
16 case-in-chief. She told you herself yesterday that she
17 was not scared of Brian Walls, and while I may find
18 Brian Walls a scary guy, and most people would, there's
19 no evidence that Courtney did. She lived with him.
20 She let her six month old baby live with him. She hung
21 out with him all the time. And should the defense try
22 and argue it, there's simply no evidence that she was
23 somehow held against her will or made to do anything.

24 All right. There's just nothing in the record.
25 In your deliberations and formation of the facts have

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 to be based on what was actually presented as evidence
2 in this courtroom.

3 I mean you don't pack a bag to be kidnapped,
4 right? She didn't appear to be in distress when they
5 were found in Chesterfield. She was sitting in the car
6 with Brian supposedly talking, and, you know, there was
7 plenty of duct tape, rope, stuff like that. You know,
8 if he was gonna tie her up and make her do anything or
9 keep her against her will, he certainly had the tools.

10 And remember when Brian asked Amanda to grab those
11 pills from Ms. Resa, and she said no, and then he just
12 dropped it, he didn't threaten her. He didn't make her
13 do anything. I mean he had some horrible ideas, but
14 everyone that was wrapped up with him made that choice
15 to be there.

16 And, lastly, I want to remind you that this is a
17 court of record. If there's something I say or
18 Mr. Walker says that does not compute with your
19 recollection of the testimony and you want to rehear
20 it, you can.

21 All right. I'm gonna turn it over to Mr. Walker
22 now, and after he addresses you, I'll get the chance to
23 come back up briefly, I will make it brief, only to
24 respond to any new things that are brought up in his
25 arguments to you. I do want to thank you for your

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 patience and attention. This is a complex case, and I
2 want you guys to get it right. Thank you.

3 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Walker.

4 CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

5 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please
6 the Court?

7 Again, I want to reiterate to you that Courtney
8 did not have anything to do with the death of
9 Ms. Seigler. I want to say that because, as I'm
10 talking to you and going over some of the arguments she
11 made, I'll be pointing out that, even if Courtney did
12 do some of the things they think she did, it still
13 wouldn't prove it. I don't want you to think that I'm
14 conceding in any way that she was involved, because she
15 wasn't.

16 You've heard a lot of evidence. I told you you
17 would. I'm sure it was an eyeopener to you. You've
18 heard about how people live that maybe some folks would
19 not have imagined that's how they live. We have talked
20 about drug use and the lifestyles of drug users. We've
21 talked about the murder of Ms. Seigler. We've talked
22 about a subsequent rape of Ms. Payne. We talked about
23 driving to Chesterfield. We talked about driving to
24 Charleston, and we've talked about bad choices.

25 That's a lot of evidence, and this looked a lot

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 more impressive yesterday when they had it wrapped
2 around the bench, but they've entered all this
3 evidence, and I could go through ever single piece of
4 the evidence and say this is why they have entered it.
5 This is what it proves or this argument they're saying
6 that it proves, and why it does or doesn't prove that
7 argument. But I want to survive the week and not have
8 y'all kill me and still have a voice left.

9 I don't think we need to do that cause we need to
10 focus down on what's important, and remember what's
11 important, what our focus is, the State has said that
12 Courtney killed Teresa or helped someone do it. I'm
13 not here to argue whether she's involved in a rape or
14 fleeing or using drugs or any of that stuff. Was she
15 there in the room helping to the kill -- killing Teresa
16 or helping someone to do it. That is the focus.

17 You're here to -- about a murder. Not about the
18 crazy goings on that seem to revolved around Brian
19 Walls. And I think, when we're focused on that
20 question, ultimately you'll be able to decide the case
21 based on one thing, and that's going to be your opinion
22 of the fingerprint that was found on the tape wrapping
23 the blanket that was around Ms. Teresa's body cause
24 that is the only piece of evidence out of all of this
25 that puts her in that room with Ms. Teresa when she's

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 killed, which, by the way, we're not exactly sure when
2 that is or exactly how, how it happened.

3 And we're not really sure how Courtney did it, but
4 she must have been involved. There's certainly
5 something -- but before we get into all of that about
6 what we need to think about, why the fingerprint is
7 gonna be this positive thing for you to focus, whose
8 what, and where, I wanted to talk to you about how we
9 will each talk to you about the facts, and how we
10 wanted you to -- the facts we wanted to view for it.
11 And I said, well, you know, they're kind of gonna want
12 to spin it one way, and we're gonna spin it the other.
13 But spin is probably not the best word.

14 I think what the difference is is how we would
15 like you to do this in the end. The State wants you to
16 time a maximalist view of the evidence. They want you
17 to say, well, the State's theory is not precluded by
18 the evidence. Therefore, we're gonna go with their
19 view. I want you to give the strictest most critical
20 view and say what is the only thing that I can
21 definitely say happened from this piece of evidence,
22 and are there any other reasonable explanations for it.
23 Does it, in fact, prove whatever argument is being made
24 or it tends to disprove whatever argument's being made?
25 And where, when you're looking at a piece of evidence

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 and are different interpretations of what that means,
2 that you should give, you should decide that difference
3 in favor of Courtney.

4 Now, why should you do that? Why should you
5 prefer that specific, critical, narrow view of viewing
6 the evidence over a maximalist kind of think it could
7 of happened that way, and it does support the State's
8 theory? Why should you pick one or the other?

9 Well, that's because that's the way our system is
10 set up. When you came in on Monday, sat out there, and
11 the Judge asked you a lot of questions. Do you know
12 me, Courtney, heard of this case. They want people
13 that are impartial, and don't know anything about it.
14 Don't have a bias. Don't have a home team. Sit you in
15 the box, and automatically that changes. The Judge
16 will tell that you're to consider Courtney to be
17 innocent beyond a reasonable doubt until the State has
18 proven her guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

19 So, when you're sitting in that box, you're not
20 looking at the party going, Ms. Courtney, she could be
21 innocent. She might not be innocent. I don't know
22 cause the State they might be right. I don't know.
23 We're just gonna play tennis. You kind of see which
24 way it leans. Just one way or the other. That's not
25 what the law is.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 The law says, when you sit there and you take your
2 oath, then you are to consider Courtney Brock to be
3 innocent until proven beyond a reasonable doubt.
4 You're not sitting at a tennis match watching. You're
5 sitting in the student section behind the end zone
6 cheering for Courtney until they move you into the
7 other end zone, into the other student section. If
8 they don't get it all the way down there, any doubt is
9 resolved in favor of Courtney.

10 So, that's kind of the starting assumption, the
11 framework and mindset I'd ask you to bring to your view
12 of the evidence when you're discussing with each other
13 in your deliberations.

14 So, what is -- how do you decide innocent or
15 guilty beyond a reasonable doubt? I misspoke. I want
16 to make sure I clear that up. There's no video.
17 You're not -- you don't have to find her innocent. You
18 are to consider her innocent. She doesn't have to
19 prove anything to you. And I'm sorry I misspoke. The
20 State, which has the burden that they accepted, that
21 they will prove to you each and every element of
22 murder, Courtney Brock did that murder, beyond a
23 reasonable doubt, and what does that mean?

24 So, you may have served on a civil jury in the
25 past where both sides kind of presented, and that is

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 kind of like the tennis match because the standard for
2 a jury in a civil case is 50 percent plus a little.
3 Whoever has a little more evidence is the winner.
4 Preponderance of the evidence. So, in a civil trial
5 you win if you prove that your position was more
6 probable or more likely than the other side's.

7 That's something you can kind of keep an eye out
8 for when you are deliberating or when you are thinking
9 about the facts for yourself. You're hearing yourself
10 say, well, this might have happened, or this could have
11 happened, or maybe, or possibly, or probably, those are
12 not guilty verdicts. You have to be firmly convinced
13 that this is what happened before you can -- you have
14 to be firmly convinced that Courtney Brock is a
15 murderer before you can find her guilty. That's that
16 much higher standard.

17 Each element of the crime beyond a reasonable
18 doubt, which is a doubt that would cause a person to
19 hesitate to act in making an important life decision
20 because this is certainly an important life decision
21 for Courtney. You have to be firmly convinced that
22 what the State says happened is, in fact, what
23 happened. As you are thinking through it, there are no
24 other reasonable scenarios to, to explain what the
25 evidence is. No other theories that aren't excluded by

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 the evidence.

2 It's not what probably happened. It's not what
3 the State suspects happened. It's not whether the
4 other, the other does disprove -- excuse me. It's not
5 that the evidence does not disprove or eliminate the
6 State's theory of the case cause we should all have
7 enough respect for the State to think, if they had a
8 piece of evidence that would disprove their case, they
9 wouldn't of brought it.

10 But again to the burden of proof, it's not our job
11 to disprove it. It's their job to prove it. You need
12 to be able to say to yourself, when you go home to
13 night, I'm confident in my decision. I can live with
14 it based on the facts that were presented to me by the
15 State, and I don't believe you'll be able to do that if
16 you were to find her guilty cause they haven't met
17 their burden of proof.

18 Let's talk about what occurred, and about the
19 people involved. Brian Walls, we agree, terrible guy.
20 Guy at the center of it all. He's like the sun.
21 Everybody's (sic) knows everybody through Brian. He's
22 the, the glue to all of this, and what have we learned
23 about him?

24 When Hannah Seigler was asked who could of done
25 this to your mom, Brian Walls. She knew it was Brian

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 Walls. Brian Walls is a crazy drug addict. Amanda
2 Reddish said he's very crazy when he's using. Others
3 confirmed that. Amanda Reddish said he has bad ideas
4 when he's using. Brian Walls is a murderer. He's been
5 in this courtroom convicted of the murder in Teresa
6 Seigler.

7 His DNA is at the crime scene on the piece of tape
8 with Courtney's fingerprint. He knows about that pill
9 bottle in the car cause Courtney said, hey, he asked me
10 to get that pill bottle out and hand it to him. He's
11 driving the car. He's the one kind of deciding where
12 everybody's going.

13 He's a rapist. Currently charged with rape of
14 Ms. Payne, which he had no problem doing. I guess if
15 you murder somebody, what's raping somebody a couple of
16 days later? You heard Amanda say he's into bondage.
17 He threatened rape, choked her. Brian is bad people.

18 He's a thief. He wanted to steal Teresa's drugs.
19 The State brought that out. He stole Ms. Payne's car
20 after he raped her, and fled after raping her. Fled
21 after murdering her.

22 The fact that Courtney's with him just means that
23 she with him. She hasn't raped anybody. She hasn't
24 murdered anybody. She's just with Brian Walls, and
25 she's probably with him more in this period because

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 she's going through a breakup from her stepson, which
2 maybe, normally, leaves her adrift as far as rides, and
3 how she's would spend her time.

4 The State wants you to say they're Bonnie and
5 Clyde. There's no relationship other than a familial
6 one. She thinks of -- he's the grandfather of her
7 daughter. She grew up around him. She's known him for
8 her entire life. She didn't wake up some day and oh,
9 yes, look at this guy, I'm gonna hang out with him.
10 She has been -- he has been a constant presence in her,
11 her life for all of it.

12 If you've been around something your whole life,
13 maybe you're used to it. Maybe what someone that
14 hasn't experienced this lifestyle or just finding out
15 things in the first place would say, oh, no, I'm not
16 gonna make friends with these people. I'm gonna put --
17 you heard she's known him her entire life. Grew up
18 with his stepson, was in a five-year relationship with
19 his stepson, had an infant child, that she considered
20 him to be her -- that child's grandfather, and he was
21 helping them with a place to live.

22 You heard Brandon say, Well, that's better than
23 being homeless. I mean, it's sad that that is their
24 safety net, but she didn't choose from what she's got.
25 Brian's a drug addict, a murderer, a rapist. He's got

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 a history of criminal behavior. How does he knew John
2 Priester? He met him in prison. He said, well, hey,
3 gets out and come live with me.

4 John Priester's is a recent addition. Courtney
5 doesn't know him. Only knew him when she came to Falls
6 Road to live. Again, has no history of crime. Just
7 locked up with Brian. He's a physically violent
8 person. You know, you can see where he was beaten.
9 Who's the, who's the only person that had beaten up on
10 anybody? That's John Priester. Fighting with his
11 girlfriend. Physically. He's a thief.

12 Donnie Williams told you the neighborhood had a
13 bunch of break-ins recently. It was the boys. Saw the
14 boys putting trunks, trunks -- TVs in the trunk of the
15 car.

16 Also Mr. Priester's DNA was on Ms. Seigler's debit
17 card. And, of course, he's a murderer and an arsonist.
18 Charged with both of those. His fingerprint was found
19 with Ms. Seigler, but where is his fingerprint found?
20 Actually it's on her person, on her body. That duct
21 tape around her wrist has John Priester's fingerprint,
22 and you haven't heard anybody testify that they have
23 ever seen John Priester using duct tape for anything
24 else. He's an arsonist.

25 Kyle confessed that he, and Xavier, and John went

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 over to that trailer Wednesday morning and lit it on
2 fire or they looked for -- look out and Johnny -- John
3 set it on fire. Courtney wasn't in there that morning
4 when that house caught on fire.

5 Who tries to cover up crimes? The person that
6 committed it. John Priester. Witnesses saw them. And
7 then we have Courtney. You remember your Sesame
8 Street? I don't know if they still do it. When I was
9 a kid, they had this segment one of these things is not
10 like the other. Courtney doesn't get in trouble. She
11 hasn't been to -- doesn't use prison to make new
12 friends. Courtney doesn't use drugs or did at the
13 time.

14 But what did Amanda Reddish say about that?
15 Unlike Brian Walls, who's a crazy drug user, who's --
16 said he was very crazy when he uses drugs, what did she
17 say about Courtney? Courtney was very lively, happy,
18 joyous when she wasn't using drugs. And when she
19 wasn't, she's a quiet person.

20 So let's focus in on our facts. Which ones matter
21 for your decision?

22 Now, Ms. Swanson said she was in four wrong
23 places, at the murder scene, at the rape scene, stolen
24 car in Chesterfield. Let's focus down, cause there's
25 only one place. Was she at that murder scene when

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 Ms. Teresa Seigler was murdered? That other stuff
2 doesn't matter.

3 It doesn't matter whether Courtney Brock was mom
4 of the year. It doesn't matter whether she could
5 remember a phone call. It doesn't matter whether her
6 drug addled memory didn't quiet sink up with other
7 people's drug addled memory. It doesn't matter whether
8 she should have gotten into or out of a car with Brian
9 Walls two days after Ms. Seigler was dead. Remember
10 also the doctor said 36 to 48 hours before we found
11 her. So, that's kind of our time.

12 So, when she's getting out of a car on Wednesday
13 morning dropping off Kyle, the things that you are
14 worried about have already happened. The facts that
15 should matter are the ones, that matter to you, should
16 be the same ones that matter to the State. They had
17 the timeline of who was where and with who when they
18 arrested her in Chesterfield. Arrested John right
19 after the arson. They had arrested Brian there in
20 Chesterfield for raping Ms. Payne. He's in jail for
21 that. Arrested John Priester for arson, for burning
22 that trailer. He was in jail for that in December.

23 So what kept the State from charging all three of
24 them with murder? Ms. Swanson asked that question.
25 Why did you wait until February to serve the murder

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 warrant? And what was the response? Believe me here,
2 if they had enough to serve all the warrants, they
3 would have. So, what they had before February was not
4 enough. Why did you serve the murder warrants? When
5 we got the forensic results back and the autopsy back.
6 That got them the murder charges.

7 So, let's discuss those things cause they had to
8 have those things to get the murder, you-all have to
9 have those things to get the murder. Why the autopsy?
10 Well, if they've done an autopsy and she'd died of
11 natural cause, just some fluke natural cause, well,
12 there wouldn't even be a murder regardless of the
13 robbery or what else, kidnapping that happened. It was
14 a natural cause death, you're not get anywhere charged
15 with murder. So, we got autopsy back, homicidal
16 violence is the cause of death, so, keep on trucking
17 with the murder charge.

18 So that brings us to the DNA. Everything that the
19 they matched Courtney Brock's DNA to came out of the
20 that car in Chesterfield. Again, there was a lot of
21 talk about the pill bottles. Okay. But, again,
22 Ms. Seigler's been dead for a day and a half, two days
23 at least, when they get all this stuff with DNA in
24 Chesterfield.

25 The only thing that puts -- connects Ms. Brock to

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 the room, and the body, and Ms. Seigler, at the
2 murder -- time of the murder, and the murder scene is
3 (inaudible) of the DNA. That's all the DNA that
4 they've talked about was from that car, was from the --
5 again, it's crystal clear, none of Courtney Brock's DNA
6 is found in the room of Ms. Seigler. But oh, the fire
7 is a terrible place to preserve DNA. So, you can, you
8 know, probably all assume that's why we don't have it.
9 They've got Brian Walls DNA off the same tape they got
10 her fingerprint on. So, they can get DNA. At least
11 some.

12 So, that's not -- so, just wipe out the
13 possibility of getting DNA cause they didn't. You
14 would think, if they could get his off that tape, they
15 could get hers. And, you know, I want to talk about
16 this when I get to my case.

17 So, the State's theory of the DNA, DNA, DNA, and
18 that's kind of -- I talked to you about that a little
19 bit in opening. Sometimes -- even in (inaudible),
20 sometimes you have a theory of the case where DNA is a
21 golden book, it answers all the questions. The
22 question that's trying to be answered -- asked -- the
23 question being asked is answered by DNA. Then you have
24 it where it doesn't tell me much.

25 This is the second case. It doesn't tell you

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 much. This is what I'm talking about, concessions for
2 the sake of argument. Let's pretend they had a video
3 from Chesterfield of Courtney Brock wearing
4 Ms. Seigler's purple purse on her head, chucking pills
5 out of those bottles, and throwing duct tape around,
6 that wouldn't tell you a single thing about where she
7 was two days ago. Their theory is that the DNA shows
8 possession of Teresa Seigler's items. Well, so what?
9 She's had plenty of time to acquire them, and is in
10 close contact with the people that did. She testified
11 that Brian Walls regularly provides pills to people,
12 and whatever drugs he has, he's happy to share them
13 with family and close friends. He used to give rides
14 to Amanda Reddish or get them, get rides from her.

15 But they want to say well, the DNA shows that she
16 was in possession of Teresa Seigler's items, and they
17 want you to infer from that that she's the one that
18 stole them, and there's a big disconnect of those two
19 things. They -- she wants you to jump over that gap,
20 and take a maximalistic view from that evidence. Of
21 course, if she's the one that stole them, then that
22 means, of course, she must of been present when they
23 were stolen. And, again, that's just not what that
24 evidence shows.

25 Possession two days after murder is not being

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 present and participation in that murder. It's barely
2 suspicious.

3 But the evidence doesn't even prove that. DNA on
4 the pill bottles, the tape that came from the book
5 bags, and Ms. Seigler's purse in the Camry. Again, all
6 through the car. Nothing relates that back to, to her
7 being present when Ms. Seigler was killed.

8 The State was fired up about the balled, balled up
9 tape in the bag saying that extra tape. You haven't
10 heard a single piece of evidence that that tape was at
11 the crime scene, that that ties back to the crime
12 scene. In fact, I think of those two pieces of tape,
13 only one of them is silver duct tape. One might be --
14 or I might be wrong. But I think only one of them is
15 actually consistent with silver duct tape. There's
16 zero evidence. It's pure conjecture as to when that
17 tape even got in the bag, much less who put it there,
18 much less that it came from Teresa Seigler's house.

19 She told you, Yes, I -- Brian asked me to hand him
20 the pill bottle and I did, and that has her DNA on it.
21 She told you, or I guess she answered Ms. Swanson's
22 question about why her DNA might be in the purse. She
23 said, Well, she did ask me a few days before -- well,
24 fairly recently, but before Sunday, to hand her pills
25 out of her purse. So, maybe that's the way, but she's

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 just speculating. But I submit to you that wouldn't
2 matter. It's not only way it could have gotten on
3 there.

4 You heard a lot of talking from Dr. Donahue, and
5 there was a lot of numbers, and he did some explaining
6 for us, and he told us about transfer DNA. If I touch
7 something, somebody else touches it, and I touch
8 somewhere else, and you can find that DNA where I
9 touched. And the inverse is true, right? When an
10 object touched something, that I touched, then it will
11 be on that. We know that object was there.

12 Now, what's in that bag? Well, let's start with
13 the car. She says she was in this car with Brian, you
14 know, for a day basically, I guess. Between the night
15 before until they are stopped in Chesterfield County.
16 Moving around. She said that, when they left Beaufort
17 from the hotel and Brian was all fired up, that John
18 Priester was in the front seat where that black bag
19 was, where the debit card Ms. Seigler was with his DNA
20 on it, and that Brian told him to switch seats. So,
21 she came into the front seat by that bag after John.
22 And she told you she had put stuff in the car when they
23 got in it leaving Falls Road. But she didn't put that
24 stuff in that bag. She told you people got out at the
25 hotel. She told you they stopped after they left the

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 hotel, and the boys and Brian were rummaging through
2 things in the car, and in the trunk, moving things
3 around, throwing some things out. And then, of course,
4 when they're stopped in Chesterfield, Chesterfield
5 Police had to go through it before Beaufort forensics
6 people got a chance at it.

7 But what we have here, what's in this bag, it's
8 her Victoria's Secret's bag, which yeah, that's mine.
9 I use it all the time. That's mine. I'm not sure how
10 it got in that bag, but it's mine, and it's got her
11 items in it. It's a little makeup kit you saw. People
12 carry those around. They're in your bathroom. I don't
13 know. Not mine. But ladies, you carry it to your
14 bathroom. You put in your purse. And, if you're
15 traveling, you put it in your bag with your clothes.

16 And then she has clothes in the bag. What did --
17 as Johnny said, what's a great thing when we want to
18 collect DNA? Items of clothes. Ball cap. So we swab
19 the ball cap. And he told you the analogy, you know
20 something like when he paints the wall at his house,
21 and his kid touches that wet wall, and gets a little
22 bit on his hands, and it transfers to somewhere else.
23 We've got a bag with personal, intimate hygiene
24 products in an environment normally like the bathroom
25 where you're gonna have lots of DNA. It's always with

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 her. She carries it around. You got her clothes in
2 the bag.

3 Those pill bottles and tape weren't brushed up
4 against the wall. They were thrown in the paint
5 bucket. You would expect to find her DNA on it. But,
6 again, even if she was dancing around, that wouldn't
7 answer the question we need answering. Was she there
8 murdering or helping someone else to murder Ms.
9 Seigler, which brings her back, as I said in the
10 beginning, to one thing. Her fingerprint on the tape
11 around the body.

12 As I said before, when you got all the evidence, I
13 think you've heard the State's evidence, that you will
14 find that have only proved, at most, if you'd given
15 them the benefit of the doubt, the crime off accessory
16 after the fact, which I'll explain to you, as the crime
17 happens, then you come in later and help them. You
18 charge them with accessory after the fact. And why is
19 that? Cause this is a weird case where we don't know.

20 We have Ms. Seigler being dead for a long time
21 before they're called out to this fire, and we know
22 that perpetrators that come back to the scene of the
23 crime because that's who set the fire. You think
24 about, you know, every movie show and book you've ever
25 read, a crime novel, what gets wrapped in a blanket or

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 a tarp or a roll of carpet? A body, to dispose of it.

2 In fact, Ms. Swanson, what'd she tell you just
3 now? Ms. Seigler may not have even been dead yet when
4 she was rolled in that blanket. She concedes there's a
5 possibility she was not dead when she was rolled in
6 that blanket, and there's nothing -- no evidence can
7 tell you when that body was rolled in that blanket.
8 So, on the State's evidence alone, they can't -- you've
9 kind of got the choice between two crimes, and not --
10 and the one that they're asking you to find Courtney
11 mixed up in is the maximalist view of the evidence.
12 That would, to me, quote, unquote prove accessory after
13 the fact. But that's the State's case.

14 You've heard from Courtney. So you know there's a
15 reasonable explanation for how that fingerprint got on
16 there. You heard how her palm print got on that tape.
17 A reasonable, non-criminal explanation that fits the
18 facts. There's no contradiction. People -- three
19 people -- you've got three people verifying and confirm
20 that they had seen her using the tape.

21 Ms. Swanson is somehow mystified as to what you
22 can use duct tape for or why one would want to. Fix
23 holes, saggy floors, picture frames. That's the beauty
24 of that tape, you can use it to fix anything. And she
25 testified she was trying to make it a little better

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 than it is. I lived there. We lived between the house
2 on Falls Road and the house on Bon Aire, and that's
3 where we can have one complete set of utilities. Bon
4 Aire's nicer. It doesn't have water. It's easier to
5 sleep there, but we have to haul water from Falls Road.

6 Somehow these guys on Bon Aire just completely
7 somehow contradict Courtney, but what did she say?
8 Brian was kind of just do this scam where he'd rent out
9 the place to people. You heard testimony these were
10 the latest scams. They hadn't yet moved in, that
11 Courtney still had access to the house, had gone back
12 there to put her babies and her stuff together in
13 preparation for finding some sort of new living
14 arrangement now that they were breaking up.

15 She still slept there. These guys didn't live
16 there or sleep there or anything. The State doesn't
17 want you to believe them. Must be making that up once
18 you -- uncontradicted. She looked at all the police
19 reports with me, and viewed everything, and went over
20 her case, and came up with this story, and they
21 convinced three people to come on the stand and lie for
22 her. And, of course, the question, again, the tape,
23 the fingerprint on the tape.

24 And I'm saying that it got put on outside the
25 murder scene. They're saying it got put on there. The

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 only -- if it was -- the evidence that we could, you
2 know, help solve that question, and, of course, whose
3 job is it to provide that evidence? The State of South
4 Carolina.

5 You heard the fingerprint expert testify. I
6 talked to Captain Birdy (phonetic). He told me the
7 only swab for DNA was on the tape, not the blanket
8 around the tape. What if the Sheriff's Office had
9 swabbed that blanket around the tape? Then I'd be
10 arguing, well, it didn't happen. Her fingerprint got
11 put on back at Falls Road, and they would go, ah ha,
12 but we have her DNA on the blanket next to the tape
13 proving that it was put on simultaneously.

14 Who made the choice not to make that test?
15 Specifically the Sheriff's Department. And now they
16 want you to make that jump for them. It could go
17 either way. We didn't do the complete investigation we
18 needed to do. How hard is it really to swab a few more
19 Q-tips? I mean he was literally right there swabbing
20 right on the tape on the blanket. Another Q-tip, I'll
21 swab that too. But was specifically told not to do
22 that. And that -- had they developed a profile of
23 Courtney Brock, that would solve the State's problems.
24 They have a problem of -- or, again, no DNA. And then
25 we'd still be here arguing. But there's a, there's

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 a -- there was a potential way to answer this question
2 in favor of the State. They didn't take it. But now
3 they want you to kind of gloss over that, and go with
4 them on the assumption.

5 And, of course, we've been over the report. You
6 know, this is all concocted. You know, she's just got
7 a reason to lie. There's no really way, by the way,
8 any Defendant -- the whole point of the trial they've
9 said they are not guilty. So, if someone is truly not
10 guilty, someone is lying. There's no way for a jury to
11 differentiate between them, absent some other source
12 of, you know, extrinsic evidence as to the credibility.
13 But the fact that the defense comes in and says they
14 are not guilty, of course, the State -- theoretically
15 the State is prosecuting everybody they bring in here,
16 and they -- everybody they bring in for trial says they
17 are not guilty. So, they think every person they bring
18 in for a trial is lying to them.

19 That's not really a reason. Think about why we're
20 here. They want to make it say, oh, she just reviewed
21 this stuff, and reviewed this stuff, and come up with
22 something, and that, you know, you shouldn't believe
23 her. There's no real reason other than you just
24 shouldn't believe her.

25 Well, think about that. The State wants to make a

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 big deal about us remembering more details, but that is
2 perfectly reasonable and understandable.

3 First of all, she has had time and read these
4 reports, and those reports are other people's points of
5 view on what happened, and other reports and witnesses
6 they talked to. And, as you read, you get a bigger
7 picture. You look through it. Repetition jogs memory.
8 And, of course, I would guess that being charged with
9 murder does wonders to sharpen the mind.

10 Remember when the fingerprint expert was asked by
11 Ms. Swanson how that fingerprint got on the tape, and I
12 objected cause I wasn't sure where she was going with
13 that, but the Judge said that's not a question to ask.
14 And we heard about this fingerprint not on the tape,
15 you know. Everyone would think you put it on this
16 sticky tape, and that's where the fingerprint was, I
17 would think. But no, that's not, not what we're
18 dealing with.

19 She said, No, this is, this is actually the
20 fingerprint that was on the, the smooth side, the
21 backside, and this came back, back over on a palm print
22 when we took it off and it's reversed. And that's how
23 we know that's how that is. And I, I asked him about
24 that. New to me. I wouldn't have thought that was
25 possible. I don't know if y'all would have thought

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 that was possible. I said, Well, is that in your
2 report? He said, No, but it's in my notes. That's not
3 even in his report, and I didn't know about it. He
4 said, Well, if I didn't know about it from his report,
5 Courtney Brock didn't know about it.

6 MS. SWANSON: Objection, Your Honor. May we
7 approach?

8 THE COURT: Sure.

9 (Off-the-record discussion held.)

10 MR. WALKER: The State seems to think that
11 Ms. Brock, on the one hand, is a drug addled, can't
12 make right decisions, bad mom, tapes up the floor for
13 no reason. Who does that? Barely existing through
14 life kind of person, but then can somehow come up with
15 a story that fits all the facts and that's the story
16 that she needs to comes up with, and convince other
17 people to do it just because.

18 Now, the State has been keen to bring up
19 Courtney's bad choices. And she's made some bad
20 choices. Using drugs is generally a bad choice I would
21 say. I think that we all agree. And maybe she should
22 have gotten out of that car when Kyle and Xavier and
23 John did, but she's known Brian her whole life, and he
24 is a father figure to her. And she doesn't know the
25 guy that they're getting out, out of the car with. And

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 so, maybe -- yeah, so -- but, again, she was -- she
2 could have made a better choice.

3 Could have just stayed home when they all went
4 partying. Certainly could have made better parenting
5 choices. Yeah, she has made some bad choices.

6 Let's talk about her good choices. She's made
7 some good choices too. She is a high school graduate.
8 Made it through high school. At the time this happened
9 she had been in a relationship with a young man she'd
10 known her entire life for five years. Started dating
11 in high school. Didn't get pregnant in high school and
12 drop out, been in a relationship for five years before
13 they had a child together.

14 She works. Has a healthy, happy baby that she's
15 coparenting admirably, it would seem, with Brandon.
16 Managed to maintain a good relationship with the
17 father, father of her child. Certainly I think we're
18 are all aware that there are some relationships that
19 end and the other party will be more than happy for
20 anything bad to happen to that other person. But
21 they're doing a good job together, and sometimes good
22 choices aren't available. Sometimes it's about the
23 least bad choice.

24 You heard Brandon say, We didn't have anywhere
25 else to go. We would be homeless if we weren't there.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 Yeah, Court -- some of Courtney's choices are
2 definitely why we're here. If she was making better
3 choices, and being around better people, she wouldn't
4 be caught up in this, and that's what it is. She's
5 caught up. Remember back in the '80s, '90s, knows what
6 I'm talking about, tuna fishing. Around these schools
7 of tunas. Put giant nets out and they catch the tuna.
8 And that's what the State has done, they've cast the
9 net for the murders of Teresa Seigler.

10 But what's around tuna? Dolphins. They eat the
11 tuna. They're in close proximity to the tuna. And
12 that net scoops them up too. And here -- and here we
13 are, absent an explanation, it's great. So, I'm not
14 saying that they shouldn't have looked at her as a
15 suspect, as a suspect, but it's her being around Brian
16 Walls, and John Priester, and Kyle, and Xavier, and
17 having nowhere else to go. And then all being crowded
18 in, DNA going everywhere, and all that matters is the
19 State says, I'm going to use this. Let's all ride
20 together. Daryan Payne, Brian Walls, John Priester,
21 Kyle Walls, Xavier, Courtney in a little Toyota just
22 crammed in like a clown car, and just go down.
23 Everybody's on top of it and every -- each other.
24 Everyone is between each other.

25 Those bad choices, you know, of course, really

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 ultimately, using drugs, going with them partying with
2 these drugs is probably the most immediate bad choice.
3 Of course, it's not all about choices. They explained
4 that Courtney didn't choose to be born to Brian Walls'
5 mother's best friend. She didn't choose to be
6 associated with Brian Walls. That's where fate placed
7 her. He's been a constant presence in her life for her
8 entire life. And the dumpster fire that is Brian Walls
9 has finally scooped her up, and that's why we're here.

10 Where fate placed her, she was probably never
11 going to be a Noble prize winning medical researcher.
12 She's not gonna marry the mayor's son or the banker's
13 son. She's not gonna take fancy vacations. No. Hey,
14 where do you want to go? Let's go rent a hotel at the
15 beach or go to a resort, or let's take the family to
16 Disney World. That's not really an option for Courtney
17 Brock. Howard Johnson's is a resort.

18 That's the life that she was born into, and she's
19 making it through it. She's doing a good job. She has
20 a job. She's working. She's taking care of her
21 daughter. And she came up here and she answered every
22 question that was asked. Did everything that was asked
23 of her. Courtney Brock has told you how her
24 fingerprints might be on that tape.

25 Fate put her in the presence of Brian Walls, and

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE DEFENSE

1 now her fate is in your hands.

2 REPLY CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

3 MS. SWANSON: Thank you. All right. I don't want
4 to keep y'all much longer because I know that you're
5 ready to hear the law from the Judge and start
6 deliberating about this case. But there are a few
7 points that I want to address that Mr. Walker brought
8 up.

9 Okay. Brian Walls has been a constant presence in
10 Courtney's life, and this is her fate. Well, he has
11 been a constant presence and influence in her life by
12 her choice. 130 Falls Road was a hot bed of criminal
13 activity. Mr. Walker talked about that. Xavier, Kyle,
14 John, Brian, everybody was a criminal except his
15 client, Courtney. But you know what? Brian Walls was
16 her friend and drug buddy.

17 He also talked about when murder warrants were
18 taken out. Why they weren't taken out in December?
19 Well, that's because, although law enforcement had a
20 working theory, they wanted solid, scientific, forensic
21 evidence to corroborate the circumstantial evidence.
22 And so they waited and then, when we got the evidence
23 that placed Courtney, John Priester, and Brian Walls at
24 the murder scene, that's when murder warrants were
25 taken out.

REPLY CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 DNA. DNA in a burning trailer, hard to come by,
2 but we got some. But you know what? That palm print
3 is even better, and the reason it was preserved was
4 because it was in-between layers of tape that found the
5 murder victim.

6 That palm print is not just merely suspicious. It
7 proves Courtney's participation and presence at the
8 murder scene. It corroborates the circumstantial
9 evidence that they flee, that they're found with the
10 dead woman's stuff.

11 Courtney has so many convenient excuses to explain
12 away every single bad fact, and none of them are true.
13 I agree with Mr. Walker that she probably couldn't come
14 up with this story on her own. She probably did have
15 help, and guess who helped her? People helped her in
16 the courtroom this week. Her family.

17 The defense case rested on Courtney's testimony
18 and her family's testimony. Mr. Walker also wants you
19 to believe that Courtney packed everything in that bag
20 except the dead woman's belongings and the duct tape.
21 Is that reasonable? And even though he says she had
22 nothing to do with any of this, she wasn't even at the
23 murder scene, she could maybe be guilty of accessory
24 after the fact.

25 Well, listen carefully to accomplice liability.

REPLY CLOSING ARGUMENT BY THE STATE

1 The hand of one is the hand of all, because if they go
2 in there to steal pills, or if that is the intention
3 and it turns into a dead body, even if Brian Walls beat
4 that woman or smothered her, they're all responsible
5 for that death.

6 The duct tape explanation that Mr. Walker says is
7 a perfectly reasonable explanation. Well, it, it fits
8 the evidence a little too well don't you think?

9 He brings up swabbing the blanket would have
10 proven whether or not she was at the scene. Oh, no, it
11 wouldn't have. You know why? Because she got on the
12 stand and said she had been staying at Ms. Resa's
13 place. Oh. No. I just sat on the bed and DNA
14 transferred. That's how that got there. That wouldn't
15 of proven anything. Her palm print on the dead woman,
16 yeah, that does prove she was there.

17 So, Brian. Brian's a drug addict and a convicted
18 murderer. Today I'm asking you to make Courtney Brock
19 a convicted murderer, and find her guilty of Teresa
20 Seigler's death. Thank you.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, you've
22 heard all the testimony and the evidence in this case.
23 It's now my duty to instruct you on the law that
24 applies. The indictment charges the Defendant with
25 murder.

JURY CHARGE

1 THE BAILIFF: Your Honor, one's having difficulty
2 hearing you. Is the microphone on?

3 THE COURT: Yeah, I just turned it on.

4 THE BAILIFF: Okay.

5 THE COURT: The indictment charges the Defendant
6 with murder. I remind you that the fact that the
7 Defendant was arrested, charged, and indicted in this
8 case is not evidence, and can not be considered by you
9 as evidence of guilt nor does it create any presumption
10 or inference of guilt. This document is simply the
11 formal written instrument which contains the charges
12 against the Defendant. It's the formal document by
13 which this case is brought into court.

14 The Defendant has pled not guilty to this
15 indictment, and that plea puts the burden on the State
16 to prove the Defendant guilty. A person charged with
17 committing a criminal offense is never required to
18 prove herself innocent. I charge you that it's an
19 important rule of law that the Defendant, in a criminal
20 trial, no matter what the seriousness of the charge may
21 be, will always be presumed to be innocent of the crime
22 for which the indictment was issued unless guilt has
23 been proven by evidence satisfying you of that guilt
24 beyond a reasonable doubt.

25 This presumption of innocence does not end when

JURY CHARGE

1 you begin your deliberations, but it accompanies the
2 Defendant throughout the trial unless or until you
3 reach a verdict of guilt based on evidence satisfying
4 you of that guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

5 The presumption of innocence is not mere legal
6 theory. It's not just a legal phrase. It is a
7 substantial right to which ever defendant is entitled
8 unless you, the jury, are satisfied, from the evidence,
9 of the Defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

10 Now, what is a reasonable doubt in the law? It's
11 the kind of doubt for which you can give a reason.
12 It's also described as the kind of doubt that would
13 cause a reasonable person to hesitate to act. Proof
14 beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you
15 firmly convinced of the Defendant's guilt.

16 There are few things in this world with we know
17 with absolute certainty, and, in criminal cases, the
18 law does not require that proof overcomes every
19 possible doubt. If, based on your consideration of the
20 evidence, you are firmly convinced that the Defendant
21 is guilty of the crime charged, you must find the
22 Defendant guilty. If, on the other hand, you think
23 there is a real possibility that the Defendant is not
24 guilty, you must give the Defendant the benefit of the
25 doubt and find her not guilty.

JURY CHARGE

1 I remind you that, during this trial, you and I
2 have certain duties to perform. As the trial judge,
3 it's my responsibility to preside over the trial of
4 this case, and I also have the duty to rule on the
5 admissibility of the evidence offered during this
6 trial. You are to consider only the competent evidence
7 before you. You are to consider only the testimony
8 which has been presented from this witness stand, and
9 the exhibits which have been made a part of the record
10 in this case.

11 I have the additional duty to charge you the law
12 applicable to this case, and, as the presiding judge, I
13 am the sole judge of the law. It is your duty, as
14 jurors, to accept and apply the law as I now state it
15 to you. If you already had some idea as to what the
16 law is or what the law ought to be, and it does not
17 agree with what I now tell you the law is, you must
18 abandon your previous idea because you're sworn to
19 accept the law as I state it to you now and apply it.

20 In every case tried before a jury, the jury
21 becomes the sole and exclusive judges of the facts of
22 the case. A judge can not comment on or make any
23 statement to the trial jury about the facts in a case.
24 As you are the sole fact finders, you are not to infer
25 from what I've said during the progress of this trial

JURY CHARGE

1 in ruling on the admissibility of evidence or otherwise
2 or anything that say now during the course of this
3 instruction to you that I have any opinion about the
4 facts of the case. The law does not allow me to have
5 an opinion about the facts. This is a matter solely
6 for you, the jury, to determine. As jurors, it's your
7 duty to determine the effect, value, weight, and truth
8 of the evidence presented during this trial.

9 Now, there are two types of evidence which are
10 generally presented during a trial, direct evidence and
11 circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence directly
12 proves the existence of a fact, and does not require
13 deduction. Direct evidence is the testimony of a
14 person who claims to have actual knowledge of a fact,
15 such as an eye witness.

16 Circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of
17 facts and circumstances indicating the existence of a
18 fact. Crimes may be proven by circumstantial evidence.
19 The law makes no distinction between the weight or
20 value to be given to either direct or circumstantial
21 evidence nor is a greater degree of certainty required
22 of circumstantial evidence than of direct evidence.

23 You should weigh all of the evidence in this case.
24 However, to the extent the State relies on
25 circumstantial evidence, all of the circumstances must

JURY CHARGE

1 be consistent with each other, and when taken together,
2 point conclusively to the guilt of the accused beyond a
3 reasonable doubt. If these circumstances merely
4 portray the Defendant's behavior as suspicious, the
5 proof has failed.

6 After weighing all of the evidence, if you are not
7 convinced of the guilty of the Defendant beyond a
8 reasonable doubt, you must find the Defendant not
9 guilty. The State has the burden of proving the
10 Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. This
11 burden rests with the State regardless of whether the
12 State relies on direct evidence, circumstantial
13 evidence, or some combination of the two.

14 Now, necessarily, you must determine the
15 credibility of the witnesses who have testified in this
16 case, and credibility simply means believability. It
17 becomes your duty, as jurors, to analyze and evaluate
18 the evidence and determine which evidence convinces you
19 of its truth.

20 In determining the believability of the witnesses
21 who have testified in this case, you may believe one
22 witness over several or you may believe several
23 witnesses over one. You may believe a of the testimony
24 of a witness, and reject the remaining part of the
25 testimony of that same witness. You may believe the

JURY CHARGE

1 testimony of a witness in its entirety or you may
2 reject the testimony of a witness in its entirety.

3 You may consider whether any witness exhibited to
4 you any interest, bias, prejudice, or other motive in
5 this case. You may also consider the appearance and
6 manner of the witness while on the witness stand, what
7 their demeanor was while on the witness stand.

8 The Rules of Evidence ordinarily do not permit,
9 permit witnesses to testify to opinions or conclusions.
10 An exception to this rule exists for witnesses that we
11 call expert witnesses. This is a witness who, by
12 education, or experience, or training, has become
13 expert in some art, science, profession, or calling.
14 And they may state an opinion as to relevant and
15 material matter in which they claim to be an expert.
16 And they can also state the reasons for their opinion.

17 In this trial, you've heard expert testimony i the
18 field of forensic pathology, fingerprint analysis, and
19 DNA analysis. You should consider any expert opinion
20 received in evidence in this case, and like any other
21 evidence, give it the weight you think it deserves. If
22 you decide that the opinion of an expert witness is not
23 based on sufficient education and experience or if you
24 conclude that the reasons given in support of the
25 opinion are not sound or that the opinion is outweighed

JURY CHARGE

1 by other evidence, you may disregard the opinion
2 entirely.

3 An expert witnesses testimony is to be given no
4 greater weight than that of other witnesses simply
5 because the witness is an expert. Further, you're not
6 required to accept an expert's opinion even though it's
7 not contradicted.

8 The Defendant in this case is charged with murder.
9 The State must prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that
10 the Defendant killed another person with malice
11 aforethought. Malice is hatred, ill will, or hostility
12 towards another person. It is the intentional doing of
13 a wrongful act without just cause or excuse, and with
14 an intent to inflict an injury or under circumstances
15 that the law will infer an evil intent.

16 Malice aforethought does not require that malice
17 exists for any particular time before the act is
18 committed, but malice must exist in the mind of the
19 Defendant just before and at the time of the acts -- at
20 the time the act is committed. Therefore, there must
21 be a combination of the previous evil intent and the
22 act.

23 Malice aforethought may be either expressed or
24 inferred. These terms, express and inferred, do not
25 mean different kinds of malice, but merely the manner

JURY CHARGE

1 in which the malice may be shown to exist. That is
2 either by direct evidence or by inference from the
3 facts and circumstances which are proved.

4 Expressed malice is when a person speaks words
5 which express hatred or ill will for another or when
6 the person prepared beforehand to commit the act which
7 was later accomplished. For example, lying in wait for
8 a person or any other act of preparation going to show
9 that the deed was within the Defendant's mind would be
10 expressed malice. Malice may be inferred from conduct
11 showing a total disregard for human life.

12 If facts are proved beyond a reasonable doubt
13 sufficient to raise an inference of malice to your
14 satisfaction, this inference would simply be an
15 evidentiary fact to be considered by you, the jury,
16 along with the other evidence in the case, and you may
17 give it the weight you decide it should receive.

18 If a crime is committed by two or more people who
19 are acting together in committing a crime, the act of
20 one is the act of all. A person who joins with another
21 to commit an unlawful act is criminally responsible for
22 everything done by the other person which happens as a
23 probable or natural consequence of the acts done in
24 carrying out a common plan and purpose.

25 For example, two people can be guilty of killing

JURY CHARGE

1 another person when only one of the two had a gun,
2 there was only one bullet, and only one of the two
3 fired the shot that caused the death. If two or more
4 people are together acting together, assisting each
5 other in committing the offense, the act of one is the
6 act of all or is sometimes said the hand of one is the
7 hand of all.

8 Prior knowledge that A crime is going to be
9 committed without more is not sufficient to make a
10 person guilty of that crime. Mere knowledge that
11 another person is going to commit a crime, even if the
12 Defendant was present when the crime was committed, is
13 not sufficient to convict the defendant as a principal.
14 Guilt as a principal is shown by actual or constructive
15 presence at the scene as a result of prior arrangement.
16 Therefore, the finding of a prior arranged plan or
17 common scheme is necessary for a finding of, a finding
18 of guilt as a principal. The State must prove, beyond
19 a reasonable doubt, by competent evidence, evidence the
20 theory of the hand of one is the hand of all.

21 A principal in a crime is one who either actually
22 commits the crime, or who is present, aiding, abetting,
23 or assisting in committing the crime. When a person
24 does an act in the presence of and with the assistance
25 of another, the act is done by both. Where two or

JURY CHARGE

1 more, acting with a common plan or intent, are present
2 at the commission of a crime, it does not matter who
3 actually commits the crime, all are guilty. Again, the
4 hand of one is the hand of all. Present at the
5 commission of a crime means to be sufficiently near to
6 aid and abet and assist in the commission of the crime.
7 However, mere presence at the scene of a crime is not
8 sufficient to convict one as a principal on the theory
9 of aiding and abetting.

10 Intent is also a necessary element. There must
11 have been a common design or intent to commit the
12 crime, and the crime must of been committed with the
13 person aiding and abetting by some overt act. Intent
14 means intending the result which actually occurs. Not
15 accidentally or involuntary. Intent may be shown by
16 acts and circumstance -- act and conduct of the
17 Defendant, and other circumstances from which you may
18 naturally and reasonably infer intent. The State must
19 prove these elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

20 I further charge you that when voluntary
21 intoxication has not produced permanent insanity, it is
22 not a defense to a crime. A person who voluntarily
23 becomes intoxicated is just as responsible for the acts
24 committed while intoxicated as when the person is not
25 intoxicated.

JURY CHARGE

1 Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to excuse you
2 to the jury room to begin your deliberations. We are
3 gonna send you with all of the exhibits and also with
4 the verdict form. I'm going to go over that verdict
5 form with you now. It's a very simple for. You'll see
6 the caption at the top. It states, as to the charge of
7 murder, we, the jury, unanimously find the Defendant,
8 and then there are two choices. Please don't read
9 anything into the order in which these choices appear.
10 One has to be first, and one has to be second.

11 You have a choice of guilty or not guilty. Once
12 you have deliberated and reached a unanimous verdict,
13 you will indicate in the appropriate box your verdict.

14 Ms. Foster, you'll sign on behalf of the jury
15 panel once you've completed your deliberations.

16 Any additions or exceptions from the State?

17 MS. SWANSON: None from the State.

18 THE COURT: And from the defense?

19 MR. WALKER: None, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm gonna
21 dismiss you now. I'll going to ask that you not begin
22 your deliberations until we bring, bring you the
23 exhibits.

24 THE BAILIFF: May they bring their notebooks, Your
25 Honor?

JURY CHARGE

1 THE COURT: You may.

2 THE BAILIFF: Follow me and bring your notebooks.

3 (Jury exits the courtroom at 12:55.)

4 THE BAILIFF: They jury's clear, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Swanson, Mr. Walker, if I
6 can get you-all to gather the exhibits together, and
7 make sure we have everything to send back.

8 MS. SWANSON: Yes, Your Honor.

9 (Jury deliberations begin.)

10 *(Whereupon, Court's Exhibit No(s). 2-3 marked for*
11 *identification and received in evidence.)*

12 THE COURT: We have two notes from the jury. I'll
13 address the second one first. This has been marked as
14 Court's Exhibits 3. It says Sam needs to make a phone
15 call to cancel a doctor's appointment. One of the
16 jurors apparently had a doctor's appointment at 3:30 I
17 believe that said that he needs to call and cancel.
18 I've already given him permission to go ahead and
19 cancel that doctor's appointment.

20 Court's Exhibit 2 is a letter from the foreperson.
21 It's got several questions. The first is can we get
22 the text messages and phone records for Tuesday.
23 That's the first question. The second question says
24 can we also get the refill dates from pill bottles.
25 The third says can we get a description of Teresa's

COLLOQUY

1 size and the exact locations of the duct tape on the
2 body. Duct tape location from Brock palm print, and
3 then the last says description of the law pertaining to
4 malice or the last paragraph read by the Judge.

5 So, my feeling on Questions 1, 2, and 3, can we
6 get the text messages and phone records for Tuesday is
7 requesting facts not in evidence. Can we also get the
8 refill dates from the pill bottles. Same issue. The
9 third, can we get a description of the Teresa's size
10 and exact locations of the duct tape on the body. Duct
11 tape location from Brock palm print. Again, that's
12 asking for me to make a comment on the facts that I
13 cannot make.

14 The last one, description of the law pertaining to
15 malice or the last paragraph read by the Judge. I
16 guess let me hear from y'all on what you think -- well,
17 anything you want to tell me about our response to any
18 of the questions I've read, and your thinking
19 certainly.

20 MS. SWANSON: Thank you. As it pertains to the
21 request for evidence, I would just like the -- I
22 wouldn't want the Court to say it's not in evidence. I
23 would just like to Court to say you have all of the
24 evidence that was admitted, and, then as to description
25 of malice, I mean I guess they're asking to be

COLLOQUY

1 recharged on murder. I know you can't just recharge a
2 paragraph. So -- and then, you know, do they need to
3 be recharged on everything or just murder?

4 THE COURT: Do you have a position, Mr. Walker.

5 MS. SWANSON: I, I would -- if you're gonna
6 recharge on murder, I would ask that you also recharge
7 hand of one.

8 MR. WALKER: I don't have any objection to the
9 wording she asked -- you know, they must rely on what
10 they heard, you know, and then I don't, I don't object
11 to them being recharged on murder or hand of one,
12 and --.

13 THE COURT: Well, let me ask y'all this. I know
14 some judges routinely send a copy of the jury
15 instructions back to the jury room. How do you feel
16 about that?

17 MR. WALKER: I have no objection.

18 MS. SWANSON: I have no objection.

19 THE COURT: The only change that I'll make is just
20 this one has the word murder highlighted, and we will
21 give them a copy that does not have the word murder
22 highlighted.

23 With respect to the first three questions then, I
24 will instruct them that they have received all the
25 testimony and all, and all the evidence, and that

COLLOQUY

1 that's what they should consider during their
2 deliberations.

3 Okay. If you want to bring the jury on in for me?

4 (The jury enters the courtroom at 2:20 p.m.)

5 THE BAILIFF: The jury is entering the courtroom,
6 Your Honor. The jury is seated, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, I do have
8 your questions, which, for the record, we've marked as
9 Court's Exhibit 2, which states can we get the text
10 messages and messages for Tuesday. Can we also get the
11 refill dates from pill bottles. And can we get a
12 description of Teresa's size, and the exact locations
13 of the duct tape on the body, duct tape location from
14 Brock palm print.

15 As to those three question, my instruction to you
16 is that you've received all of the evidence and
17 testimony that has been presented in this case, and
18 that is what you should be considering in your
19 deliberations. Neither I nor the attorneys can now
20 make a comment to you, comment to you or give you
21 further evidence with regard to the facts of the case.

22 As to your last question, the description of the
23 law pertaining to malice, or the last paragraph read by
24 the Judge, we are going to prepare a copy of my jury
25 instructions to send back to the jury room with you so

JURY QUESTION

1 you'll have that written copy of my jury instructions.

2 Thank you.

3 (The jury exits the courtroom at 2:22 p.m.)

4 THE BAILIFF: The jury's clear, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Any objection to the instructions
6 given to the jury?

7 MS. SWANSON: None from the State.

8 MR. WALKER: None from the defense, and may I just
9 suggest maybe send two copies back so, when people are
10 discussing what they mean, then they have them to
11 reference.

12 THE COURT: Yes, that's fine.

13 Okay. We'll be in recess.

14 THE COURT: Thank you. You may have a seat.

15 Okay. We're ready for the jury?

16 MS. SWANSON: The State's ready.

17 MR. WALKER: Yes, Your Honor.

18 THE BAILIFF: The jury is entering the courtroom,
19 Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Thank you.

21 (The jury enters the courtroom at 3:30 p.m.)

22 THE COURT: I understand the jury has reached a
23 verdict, Ms. Foster?

24 THE JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: If you would please hand the verdict

VERDICT

1 form to the bailiff.

2 I do have the jury's verdict, and it states, as to
3 the charge of murder, we, the jury, unanimously find
4 the Defendant, guilty.

5 Let me ask, ladies and gentlemen, is this your
6 verdict?

7 THE JUROR: Yes, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Anything from the State?

9 MS. SWANSON: Nothing from the State.

10 THE COURT: Mr. Walker.

11 MR. WALKER: We ask that the jury be polled, Your
12 Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay. If you'll please poll the jury.

14 THE CLERK: Juror Number 392, is this your
15 verdict?

16 THE JUROR: It is.

17 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

18 THE JUROR: It is.

19 THE CLERK: Juror Number 306.

20 THE JUROR: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Is this your verdict?

22 THE JUROR: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

24 THE JUROR: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Juror Number 286.

VERDICT

1 THE JUROR: Yes.

2 THE CLERK: Is this your
3 verdict?

4 THE JUROR: Yes.

5 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

6 THE JUROR: Yes.

7 THE CLERK: Juror Number 342.

8 THE JUROR: Yes.

9 THE CLERK: Is this your verdict?

10 THE JUROR: Yes.

11 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

12 THE JUROR: Yes.

13 THE CLERK: Juror Number 56.

14 THE JUROR: Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Is this your verdict?

16 THE JUROR: Yes.

17 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

18 THE JUROR: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Juror Number 314.

20 THE JUROR: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Is this your verdict?

22 THE JUROR: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

24 THE JUROR: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Juror Number 102.

VERDICT

1 THE JUROR: Yes.

2 THE CLERK: Is this your verdict?

3 THE JUROR: Yes.

4 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

5 THE JUROR: Yes.

6 THE CLERK: Juror Number 82.

7 THE JUROR: Yes.

8 THE CLERK: Is this your verdict?

9 THE JUROR: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

11 THE JUROR: Yes.

12 THE CLERK: Juror Number 257.

13 THE JUROR: Yes.

14 THE CLERK: Is this your verdict?

15 THE JUROR: Yes.

16 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

17 THE JUROR: Yes.

18 THE CLERK: Juror Number 145.

19 THE JUROR: Yes.

20 THE CLERK: Is this your verdict?

21 THE JUROR: Yes.

22 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

23 THE JUROR: Yes.

24 THE CLERK: Juror Number 86.

25 THE JUROR: Yes.

VERDICT

1 THE CLERK: Is this your verdict?

2 THE JUROR: Yes.

3 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

4 THE JUROR: Yes.

5 THE CLERK: Juror Number 183.

6 THE JUROR: Yes.

7 THE CLERK: Is this your verdict?

8 THE JUROR: Yes.

9 THE CLERK: Is it still your verdict?

10 THE JUROR: Yes.

11 THE COURT: Anything further before we release the
12 jury?

13 MS. SWANSON: Nothing from the State.

14 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I
15 want to thank you very much for your time, for your
16 attention this week. You've done a great service to
17 your community in your service as jurors.

18 This does exempt you for jury service for the next
19 three years. If you were to get a juror summons, if
20 you'll let the clerks of -- office know that you've
21 already served. That does serve as an exemption for
22 three years.

23 I'm gonna go ahead and release you. Again, I want
24 to thank you very much for your service this week. You
25 are free to go at this time. You are welcome to

JURY RELEASED BY THE COURT

1 remain. If you'd like to come to the back of the
2 courtroom, that's perfectly fine as well.

3 Again, thank you so much.

4 THE BAILIFF: Follow me please.

5 (The jury exits the courtroom at 3:34 p.m.)

6 THE COURT: Okay. I'm glad to hear from the State
7 and the Defendant on sentencing, and, Mr. Walker, we're
8 just handing you a copy of the verdict form in case you
9 wanted to actually see the verdict form.

10 MS. SWANSON: Your Honor, I -- obviously you've
11 heard all the facts of the case, and that the Defendant
12 had no prior record. The victim's daughter does not
13 wish to address the Court. I do feel like I should
14 tell Your Honor that Brian Walls received a sentence of
15 40 years after his conviction. You know, I, I -- the
16 State does feel that he was the most likely the ring
17 leader, although, obviously, Courtney Brock is
18 responsible for everything as well, and the State would
19 leave the sentence in, in Your Honor's discretion.

20 THE COURT: Mr. Walker.

21 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

22 Courtney's 25 years of age. As you heard, she's
23 working at Sonic, living with her boyfriend, and her
24 grandmother in Ridgeland, has a beautiful three year
25 old daughter. Her family was here in support all week.

SENTENCING

1 Her grandmother passed away on Monday night. Her
2 mother has taken family members to the viewing, which
3 is today, and was hoping to be back in time for the
4 verdict, but certainly has the support of her family as
5 you saw.

6 As you've heard the State's theory, and we would
7 certainly agree that Brian Walls and also John Priestler
8 were the primary movers in this incident. Brian Walls,
9 again, under, under their theory, received a 40 year
10 sentence. Also had prior convictions. I believe prior
11 statutory rape or some sort of sex offense. I know
12 he's on the registry and did prison time for that.
13 Obviously, he still has a pending rape charge and a
14 kidnapping relating from his -- the events following
15 this.

16 Understanding what the, the minimum sentence is,
17 and, Your Honor, and -- that Your Honor can give, we'd
18 ask the Court impose that sentence. I would also say
19 that Ms. Brock was never offered anything other than
20 the minimum sentence as a resolution of this matter.

21 THE COURT: Does Ms. Brock or anyone else wish to
22 make a statement to the Court?

23 MR. WALKER: I don't think she has anything to
24 say, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: The jury has rendered its verdict and

SENTENCING

1 has spoken. There's really no winners in this. I feel
2 for the Seigler family, and I appreciate that you've
3 been here all week when I know it cannot have been easy
4 to sit through another trial. So, I'm very sorry for
5 the circumstances.

6 Ms. Brock, I'm sorry for your circumstances as
7 well. I'm gonna give you the 30 years given the fact
8 that you do not have any prior record. I'm taking that
9 into consideration certainly, and your young age at the
10 time this happened. But the Sentence of the Court is
11 that you're sentenced to the Department of Corrections
12 for a term of 30 years.

13 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Thank you.

15 MS. SWANSON: Your Honor, I just wanted to make
16 sure that we didn't need to take up a motion for a new
17 trial at this point or are you gonna file it later,
18 Mr. Walker?

19 MR. WALKER: I'll just make it now. The grounds
20 that the evidence presented to the jury was -- did not
21 rise to the level that -- I say only probable cause --
22 I can't think of it at the moment, but I'll preserve
23 those motions that I made previously that were
24 overruled certainly related to the testimony of the
25 medical examiner, and we'd move that she be given a new

SENTENCING

1 trial. Also based on the questions that were asked.
2 They had doubts. They wanted more information than
3 they had, and realized, you know, and said, we would
4 argue, leaned the wrong way. And the lack of
5 information given.

6 THE COURT: Your motions are denied at this time.
7 I will leave the record open. If you want to submit
8 anything additional to the Court, certainly you've got
9 the right to do that.

10 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: All right. We are adjourned.

12 MS. SWANSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 (Whereupon, the trial concluded.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENTENCING

1

2 CERTIFICATE

3

4 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA:

5 COUNTY OF BEAUFORT:

6 I, MONA L. MANLEY, Court Reporter, certify that I was
7 authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing
8 proceedings and that the transcript is a true and complete
9 record of my stenographic notes.

8

DATED this 22nd day of February, 2020.

9

10

11

Mona L. Manley /s/

12

MONA L. MANLEY
Official South Carolina Court Reporter
Circuit Reporter for the 14th Circuit
(850) 893-6662
mmanley@sccourts.org

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

WITNESSES

J Malphrus- BCSO

DOCKET NO. 2017GS0700327

The State of South Carolina

County of Beaufort

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

June Term 2017

hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

THE STATE

vs.

Courtney Elizabeth Brock

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

2017A0710400043

Indictment For

Murder

SC Code: 16-3-10

CDR Code: 0116

Defendant

Witness:

C.C.C. PLS. and G.S.

Nally B. Brown

Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date:

JUN 3 2 2017

VERDICT

True Bill

Foreperson of Petit Jury

Date:

INDICT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF BEAUFORT

)
)
)

INDICTMENT

2017GS0700327

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on June 22, 2017, the Grand Jurors of Beaufort County present upon their oath:

Murder

That in Beaufort County, South Carolina, on or about December 5, 2016 through December 6, 2016, the Defendant, Courtney Elizabeth Brock, along with Co-Defendants, did, with malice aforethought, kill Teresa Seigler and Teresa Seigler did die as a proximate result of her actions, all in violation of Section 16-3-10, et al. of the Codes of Law of South Carolina.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.



Solicitor

True B

WITNESSES

BCSO T. CALHOUN

DOCKET NO. 2017GS0700327

The State of South Carolina
County of Beaufort

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

August Term 2019

I hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

THE STATE

vs.

Courtney Elizabeth Brock

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

2017A0710400043

AMENDED
Indictment For
Murder

SC Code: 16-3-10

CDR Code: 0116

Defendant

True Bill

Witness:

C.C.C. PLS. and G.S.

[Signature]
Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date: AUG - 8 2019

VERDICT

Guilty

[Signature]
Foreperson of Petit Jury

Date: 10-24-19

INDICT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF BEAUFORT)

INDICTMENT
2017GS0700327

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on August 8, 2019 the Grand Jurors of Beaufort County present upon their oath:

Murder

That in Beaufort County, South Carolina, on or about December 5, 2016 through December 6, 2016, the Defendant, Courtney Elizabeth Brock, along with Co-Defendants, did, with malice aforethought, kill Teresa Seigler and Teresa Seigler did die as a proximate result of her actions, all in violation of Section 16-3-10, et al. of the Codes of Law of South Carolina.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.



Solicitor

True Bill

30 to life

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF Beaufort

STATE

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 16-3-10-GS-10-0000

Courtney Brock VS

AW#: 20174571000000

AKA:

Date of Offense: 10-10-16

Race: W Sex: F Age: 25

S.C. Code §: 16-3-10

DOB: [REDACTED] SS#: [REDACTED]

CDR Code #: 00

Address:

City, State, Zip:

DL#

SID#

*CDL Yes No CMV Yes No Hazmat Yes No

SENTENCE SHEET

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was

CONVICTED OF or PLEADS

TO: MURDER

In violation of § 16-3-10 of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 000

NON-VIOLENT VIOLENT SERIOUS MOST SERIOUS Mandatory GPS §17-25-45 (CSC w/minor 1st or CSC w/minor 3rd)

The charge is: As indicted, Lesser Included Offense, Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury. (def.'s initials)

The pleas: Without Negotiations or Recommendation, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State.

[Signature] #72934
Solicitor SC Bar #

[Signature] #72535
Attorney for Defendant SC Bar #

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the State Department of Corrections County Detention Center, for a determinate term of 30 days/months/years or under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed _____ years and/or to pay a fine of \$ _____; provided that upon the service of _____ days/months/years and or payment of \$ _____; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for _____ months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: _____
 The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code §24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by SCDOC.

The Defendant is to be placed on Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.
Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 922, it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Domestic Violence) to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION: Deferred Def. Waives Hearing Ordered PTUP _____ days/hours Public Service Employment

Total: \$ _____ plus 20% fee: \$ _____
Payment Terms: Set by SCDPPPS Obtain GED Attend Voc. Rehab. Or Job Corp. _____

Recipient: _____ May serve W/E beginning _____ Substance Abuse Counseling

*Fine: PD Application fees 40
§14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%) \$ _____
§14-1-211 (A)(1)(Conv. Surcharge) \$100 \$ 100
§14-1-211 (A)(2)(DUI Surcharge) \$100 \$ _____
§56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment) \$12 \$ _____
§56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test) \$25 \$ _____
Proviso (Public Def/Probation) \$500 \$ _____
§14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding) \$25 \$ 25
§14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge) \$150 \$ _____
§50-21-114 (BUI Breath Test Fee) \$50 \$ _____
§56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment) \$40/ea \$ _____
3% to County (if paid in installments) \$ _____

Random Drug/Alcohol Testing Fine may be pd. in equal consecutive weekly/monthly pmts. of \$ _____ Beginning _____ \$ _____ Paid to Public Defender Fund

Other: _____
 Appointed PD or appointed other counsel, Proviso requires \$500 be paid to Clerk during probation and shall be collected before any other fees.

TOTAL \$ 1685
Clerk of Court/Deputy Clerk [Signature]
Court Reporter: Mona Manley
Presiding Judge Krish Cook
Judge Code: 2762
Sentence Date: 10-24-2019

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL FOR APPELLANT

Counsel for appellant certifies that this Record on Appeal contains all material proposed to be included by any of the parties and not any other material and that this Record on Appeal complies to the best of my ability with the April 15, 2014 order from the South Carolina Supreme Court entitled "Revised Order Concerning Personal Identifying Information and Other Sensitive Information in Appellate Court Filings."

Respectfully Submitted,

RECEIVED

Aug 11 2020

SC Court of Appeals



Kathrine H. Hudgins
Appellate Defender

South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense
Division of Appellate Defense
PO Box 11589
Columbia, S.C. 29211-1589

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

This 11th day of August, 2020.