T	E. MOISON - DA
2	THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and
3	gentlemen.
4	Appears everybody is present. Waive
5	polling of the jury, gentlemen?
6	MR. VARGASON: Yes, Judge.
7 .	MR. MCGRAW: Yes, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Call your next witness,
9	Mr. Vargason.
10	MR. VARGASON: Thank you, Judge.
11	People call Dr. Edward Mofson to the
12	stand.
13	EDWARD MOFSON, a witness called on behalf of the People,
14	after having been first duly sworn, took the witness
15	stand and testified as follows:
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. VARGASON:
17	Q. Good morning, sir.
18	A. Good morning.
19	Q. I am going to ask you some questions and ask
20	that you keep your voice up so the jury won't have any
21	problem hearing you, okay?
22	A. Fine.
23	Q. All right. Would you please tell the jury what
24	your occupation is?
25	A. I am a dentist.

E. Mofson - DX

2

Okay, and where do you practice your profession? Q.

3

Α. My practice is in Syracuse.

4

What degrees do you hold, Doctor? Okav. Q.

5

Α. I hold a Bachelor of Arts degree from Brooklyn College of the College of the City of New York and DDS,

7

6

Doctor of Dental Surgery degree from New York University.

8

0. Okay, and do you have any military service?

9

Α. I served in the United States Army dental corps from July of 1962 right after I graduated from dental

11

10

school until November of 1964.

12

Are you board certified, Doctor? ο.

13

Α. I am board certified in forensic odontology.

14

Will you please explain to the jury what Q.

15

board certified means?

16

Board certification is a method of, of codifying one's qualifications. It's, it's granted by examination.

demonstrating certain activity and expertise in the field

of forensic odontology; and when you reach the necessary

examination which is a two-day written oral and practical

examination which measures your degree of competency in the

qualifications in that area, you are then given an

One must qualify to take the examination by

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

field.

Passing the examination grants certification in

25

the field. The Board requires that anyone who is certified must re-certify by demonstrating continued activity in the field every five years.

Q. Thank you very much.

Are you associated with any professional organizations?

- A. Yes. I belong to the American Dental
 Association, Dental Society of the State of New York and
 the Onondaga County Dental Society, as well as the three
 organizations which constitute the forensic dental
 community, being the Dental Section of the American Academy
 of Forensic Sciences, the American Society of Forensic
 Odontology and the American Board of Forensic Odontology.
- Q. Thank you. Doctor, do you do any consulting work in forensic dentistry?
- A. Yes. I have consulted in forensic dentistry for many counties in the Central New York area, including

 Ulster County -- I will try to remember them all -- Madison County, Oneida County, Jefferson County, Tompkins County,

 Broome County, Cortland County, Cayuga County, Seneca,

 Onondaga.

I may -- pretty complete.

THE COURT: What is forensic odontology?

THE WITNESS: Forensic odontology is that

E. Mofson - DX

part of dentistry that, that, that consists of the, the proper obtaining and handling, the proper obtaining and handling of dental evidence and the proper, the proper -- what's the word I am looking for -- the proper presentation of that evidence in a court of law often or in depositions or in investigations towards the end that justice be done, whether the evidence is properly, properly analyzed and properly presented.

- Q. Very good. Now, Doctor, do you hold any chairmanships?
- A. Yes. I have been chairman since its inception of the Mass Disaster Committee of the Onondaga County Dental Society.
 - Q. Do you do any lecturing?
- A. Yes. I lecture to the staff and residents in the dental program at St. Joseph's Hospital in Syracuse, New York.
- I have lectured to the New York State County Coroners Medical Examiners Association.

I have lectured to the Fifth District Dental Society, which is the dental society which, that component of the dental society of the State of New York which

1	E. Mofson - DX
2	encompasses the Central New York area as well as to local
3	study clubs.
4	Q. And, Doctor, in the past have you had
5	opportunities to examine and evaluate dental findings in
6	or dental evidence
7	A. Yes, yes, I have.
8	Q rather? And in regard to this, have you had
9	opportunities to present dental findings?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. And the Judge has already asked you about
12	forensic odontology. I will ask you, what is the role of
13	an odontologist as an expert witness?
14	A. Well, in my opinion
15	MR. MCGRAW: Objection, Your Honor.
16	A. My role as a forensic odontologist
17	THE COURT: What's the objection?
18	MR. MCGRAW: I have an objection.
19	THE COURT: What's the objection?
20	MR. MCGRAW: What's his role? I think
21	he's explained it.
22	THE COURT: I will allow it in,
23	qualifications as an expert.
24	Proceed.
25	A. As an expert in the field I feel that my role is

E. Mofson - DX

to evaluate the dental evidence and to properly present it in an objective and professional manner such that the truth be found.

MR. MCGRAW: Your Honor, I object to selfserving, that whole last answer to the question. THE COURT: Overruled.

- Q. Doctor, is photography a part of odontology?
- A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Okay, and in what, what manner is it a part?
- A. Well, one of the primary methods of bite mark analysis is to utilize photographs of the bite marks.
- Q. Okay, and is there any specific film you use in obtaining this?
- A. Well there are many films used but 35 millimeter color film is the primary film used.
- Q. Okay. Is there, or maybe you could describe to the jury in doing photographing of bite marks, is there a preferred method in doing that?
- A. Yeah. It's rather, it's not only preferred but there are certain, certain techniques that are critical to the proper analysis of a bite mark. A bite mark must be photographed both full body photographs, so that the location of the bite mark can be oriented, and close up photography of the bite mark.

E. Mofson - DX

The bite mark must be photographed with a scale in the picture because the photograph for analysis purposes will have to be enlarged to a life-size photograph. The use of a scale in the picture enables the picture to be enlarged accurately to life-size.

It, to minimize the distortion in the photograph, the plane of the film and the plane of the bite mark must be kept as parallel to each other as possible.

If the, if the photograph is taken at an angle to the bite mark, then the resulting picture will be a distorted picture of the bite mark.

- Q. Doctor, in doing bite mark analysis, are there any specific questions you ask yourself in preparation?
- A. Well, when I am called in, generally it's because some member of the team that's investigating the incident suspects that bite marks are present; and my first question to myself is: Is this, in fact, a bite mark?

My second question is: Is it a human bite mark?

If I answer those two questions to, positively
to my own satisfaction, I then proceed with the photography
and analysis of the mark.

- Q. All right, and when you are interpreting bite marks, is there anything specific that you are looking for?
 - A. Yes. Their characteristic, shape and size of a

E. Mofson - DX

mark that tells you that it's possibly a bite mark; the semicircular ovoid or arc shape pattern injury; sometimes just bruising; sometimes with marks of individual marks within that arc shape strongly indicate the possibility of a bite mark.

- Q. Okay, and would you please describe to the jury what impression medium means?
- A. An impression medium is any medium that can be used or is used in dental practice, or I suppose you could say any, any medium in which you could impress the teeth if, we are talking about the teeth now, and be left with a negative impression of what the shape and size of those teeth were.
 - O. Is skin considered a medium?
- A. Well, anything that you could bite, and we are talking about impressions of teeth, anything you could bite into and leave evidence, leave a mark of some sort that the teeth bit into that, would be considered a medium. Some mediums, of course, are much more accurate in reproducing the teeth than others are.
- Q. Okay, and how would you evaluate skin as a medium?
- A. As an impression medium, skin is a very poor impression medium.

Q. Why is that?

A. Well, skin is elastic. Anyone ever -- you could take a pencil or a pen point and stick it in your skin and leave a, leave a mark there or a depression in your skin where you -- or your fingernail and in not too many minutes it disappears because the elasticity of, of the skin. So it doesn't hold an impression for a long period of time.

It's also distortable; that is to say, if you made that impression in one position and then took a photograph of it, you would see one type of mark. If you made that same impression in the same place but had your finger twisted around when you made the impression, then brought it back to the original position and photographed it, the mark wouldn't look the same because the skin having been stretched when the mark was made would distort the impression when the stretching was relaxed.

- Q. And in evaluating the bite mark and skin as a medium, is it important to know whether the individual was alive or dead?
- A. Well, some of the factors that go into -- for example, the whole question of distortion, which is the key one in analyzing a bite mark, is what was going on at the time of the bite. Was there a struggle going on? What was the position of the victim and the biter at the time the

E. Mofson - DX

bite was inflicted? Was there movement taking place,
either one or both of the parties, were they moving? Was
the part of the body that was being bitten in a relaxed
position? Was it in a distorted or stretched position?

That is very difficult to tell when you look at, for example, a body with a bite mark on it. The body obviously is, when you see it, is in a relaxed position because that's the way it's been placed for examination purposes; but you can't tell what position the body was in when it was bitten and that may serve to distort the mark that you are looking at.

- Q. And that would have an impact upon the quality or the characteristic of --
- A. That would be an impact on the quality of the mark. It would have an impact on the accuracy of the mark in terms of reflection of the dentition that you are comparing.
- Q. Does it matter where on the victim the bite mark is located?
- A. It often does. The -- a bite mark, for example, on a part of a body that's, the skin is very close to the bone will leave a very different characteristic mark than a bite mark that was made on a part of the body, a very fleshy part of the body, a lot of fat in the area or muscle

tissue in the area.

Also, the surface area that's being bitten reflects itself in how many teeth or how much of the dentition you would expect to be reflected in the mark.

If I could make some sort of an analogy, if I took a stick and wrapped, a broomstick and wrapped a sheet of wax around it and asked you to bite into it, you could get that stick pretty far into your mouth and probably impress into the wax impressions of the teeth going well back into your mouth.

If I took the same sheet of wax and laid it on top of the surface like this and asked you to bite into it, it probably would be very difficult for you to impress more than just a very few of your front teeth because you couldn't grab hold of that surface.

Well, the same thing would be true, for example, if a bite is made on the back or the chest versus a wrist or a calf or an ankle.

Q. Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Did there come a time when you were requested by law enforcement officials in Cayuga County to come to Cayuga County, Doctor?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And what was the purpose of that?

2	Α.		I re	ceive	ed a	call	and	I do	on't		it	was	the	past
	summer o			I am	not	sure	exac	tly	wher	1, ł	ру І	or.	Ross,	
4	Cayuga (Coun	ty.											

- Q. And did you, in fact, respond to Cayuga County?
- A. Yes, I did.

- Q. Where did you go?
- A. I went to the hospital in Auburn. I don't remember the name of it. It's where the county morgue is located.
- Q. Did you have an opportunity to examine someone at the morgue?
- A. Yes. When I got to the morgue, there were several people, including Dr. Ross, in the room and the body of a deceased female on the examining table.
- Q. And were you -- was that individual identified to you as ?
 - A. Was told to me that was , yes.
- 19 Q. And what, if anything, did you observe on

A. Well, it was, the body was laid out on the table, very marked up kind of a body. There were many, many bruises and scrapes and what looked to me like --well, I didn't know what they were, I am not an expert, but large red areas. I thought perhaps they were burns or they

E. Mofson - DX

were abrasions. Several puncture wounds on the body and several bruises that my attention was drawn to particularly by Dr. Ross for, as the reason that she called me and asked me, did I think that these bruises in particular were bite marks?

- Q. Okay, and based upon your examination of did you arrive at an opinion within a reasonable degree of dental certainty as to whether there were bite marks on Sabina?
- A. Yeah. I looked at the marks and based upon some of the characteristics that I mentioned before, my opinion was that the marks that Dr. Ross asked me to look at were, in fact, human bite marks.
- Q. Thank you, and describe for the jury, please, what steps you next took.
- A. I directed to some degree -- there was some photography being done of the marks and I contributed to some degree in my, my feeling about how the photography should have been done, and we did many photographs of the marks that I was examining, color photographs, at different angles and different distances from the marks.
- Q. Okay, and do you have any of those photographs with you here today?
 - A. Yes, I have.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

E. Mofson - DX

(People's Exhibit 59 through 67, photographs, were marked for identification.)

- Q. Doctor, I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 59 and ask if you could identify that for us, please?
- A. Yeah. It's a photograph of one of the bite marks, one of the marks that we took at that time.
- Q. And does that photograph fairly and accurately depict the bite mark that you saw on the day in question?
- 12 A. Yes, I believe it does.
 - Q. Okay. I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 60 and ask if you could identify that for us, please?
 - A. It's a photograph of another of the marks taken at the same time.
 - Q. Okay, and again, does that photograph fairly and accurately depict the bite mark as you saw it on
- on the day in question?
- 21 A. Yes, it does.
 - Q. Okay. I will show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 61, ask if you could identify that, please?
 - A. That's a photograph of -- in fact, it's a

photograph of the same mark as in the previous photograph and another mark that's located adjacent to it.

Q. Okay, and again, does that photograph fairly and accurately depict the bite mark as you saw it on

- A. Yes.
- Q. I show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 62 and ask if you could identify that, please?
- A. Yes. That's a photograph of the same two marks as in Exhibit 61.
- Q. Okay, and again, does that photograph fairly and accurately depict the bite mark as you saw it on

A. Yes.

THE COURT: Keep your voice up,

Mr. Vargason. You are talking to the witness

and we are having a hard time hearing you.

MR. VARGASON: Very good, Judge.

- Q. I will show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 63 and ask if you could identify that for us, please?
- A. It's a photograph of the bite marks taken at the same time. This bite mark I believe, there are two bite marks in this photograph, one of which is the same as in

Q.

1 E. Mofson - DX 2 People's Exhibit 59. 3 Okay. Does that photograph fairly and 4 accurately depict the bite mark as you saw it on 5 6 Yes, it does. 7 I will show you what's been marked as Q. 8 People's Exhibit 64 and ask if you could identify that, please? 9 10 64 is a photograph of the same two bite marks as Α. 11 in the previous photograph. 12 Okay, and again, does that photograph fairly and Q. 13 accurately depict the bite mark as you saw it on 14 15 A. Yes. 16 I show you what's been marked as People's Q. 17 Exhibit 65 and ask if you could identify that for us, 18 please? 19 A. That is a photograph of the -- a different bite 20 mark that was photographed at that time. 21 Okay, and again, does that photograph fairly and Q. 22 accurately depict the bite mark as you saw it on 23 24 Α. Yes.

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

Doctor, I will show you what's been marked as

E. Mofson - DX People's Exhibit 66 and ask if you could identify that, please?

- A. This is a photograph of the same bite mark as the previous photograph.
- Q. Okay, and again, does that photograph fairly and accurately depict the bite mark as you saw it on
 - A. Yes.

- Q. I will show you what's been market as People's Exhibit 67 and ask if you could identify that, please?
- A. Yes. Another photograph of, the same as the previous two photographs.
- Q. Okay, and does that photograph fairly and accurately depict the bite mark on Sabina Kulakowski as you saw it?
 - A. Yes, I believe so.
- Q. And, Doctor, are those photographs photographs that you took?
- A. Some of these I took. Some of these were taken by Dr. Ross, and perhaps some of them were taken by other investigators at the autopsy.
- Q. Okay, and, Doctor, did you use those photographs in your evaluation or examination of the bite mark?
 - A. Yes, these are the photographs.

E. Mofson - DX

[
2	Q. Very good. Doctor, did there come a time when
3	you were provided with a dentition for purposes of
4	evaluation and examination of the bite marks?
5	A. Yes. I received a set of dental models.
6	Q. Okay. I am going to show you what's been marked
7	as People's Exhibit 24 and ask you just to take a minute,
8	if you will and examine that.
9	A. Okay.
10	Q. Do you recognize that?
11	A. Yes. These, these are the models that were sent
12	to me.
13	Q. You were provided with one model?
14	A. One set, one upper, one model of the upper
15	dentition, one model of the lower.
16	Q. And they were identified to you as being?
17	A. They were identified as belonging to one Roy
18	Brown.
19	Q. Okay, and, Doctor, did you use that model, or I
20	would like to
21	MR. VARGASON: Your Honor, may I approach
22	the bench with counsel?
23	THE COURT: Yes.
24	(Bench conference held as follows:)

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

MR. VARGASON: Judge, I don't want an

Ε.	Mof	con	_	DX
E.	MOL	SOn	_	111

issue to come up on cross-examination. This doctor examined a dentition that was identified to him as the defendant's. Counsel still has in his possession the first impression and I don't believe that the doctor knew at the time that there were two impressions and I'm not certain that he made any distinguishing --

MR. MCGRAW: Your Honor --

MR. VARGASON: -- comments.

MR. MCGRAW: I know that he made his comparisons from the other set that I have and I don't intend to raise on cross-examination any questions or issues in that regard.

MR. VARGASON: Maybe I could ask him that on the record.

THE COURT: Yeah. They are not available, right?

MR. MCGRAW: My doctor's bringing them back with him, Judge.

THE COURT: Yeah. So as long as you agree not to make that issue, that's fine.

MR. VARGASON: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

(Bench conference ended.)

- 11			
- 1	0.	Doctor	_

- A. If I might interject something, I was looking at these models. I noticed it said second pour on these models. Now apparently when these models were made, two sets of models were made. I don't recall whether the models that say second pour on them were, in fact, the ones that I used in my analysis; but I think it's a reasonable assumption that if two sets of models were poured from the same impression, the models are virtually identical.
- Q. Okay, and I believe that we've arrived at an understanding or agreement with defense counsel that, in fact, the models that you examined were the first poured models.
 - A. Yeah.
 - MR. MCGRAW: That's correct, Your Honor.
- Q. Okay, and, Doctor, in response to the request from the Cayuga County law enforcement authorities to do an examination and evaluation, did, in fact, you conduct such an examination with regard to these dental models?
- A. Yes, I did an evaluation of the bite marks. I consider all of this now to be bite mark evidence and I did evaluate this evidence.
- Q. Okay. What was the next step you took, Doctor, with regard to your evaluation?

ļ	Α.		I made	a tra	anspare	ncy of	the o	denti	tion	in o	rder
	to help	me	compare	the	biting	patter	n of	the	denti	tion	with
ŀ	the marl	ks :	in the p	hoto	graphs.						

- Q. Do you have that transparency with you here today?
- A. Yeah. I have, it's a two or a three-step procedure and if you wish, I will go through it.
 - Q. I will get it marked first as --
- A. Okay.

(People's Exhibit 68, Mofson transparency, was marked for identification.)

MR. MCGRAW: Could I, could I see that for a minute?

MR. VARGASON: (handing)

- Q. Doctor, I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 68 and ask if you can identify that, please?
- A. Yeah. This, this is the transparency that I made from those models.
- Q. Okay, and would you describe to the jury, please, how you made that transparency?
- A. Yeah. The method is to take the models of the teeth and place them teeth side down on the copy plate of a copy machine and run a copy. What you get when you do that --

2 may I show this to the jury?

Q. I will get it marked.

(People's Exhibit 69, Mofson photocopy of teeth, was marked for identification.)

- Q. Doctor, I will show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 69 and ask if you could identify that, please?
- 9 A. Yeah. This is the copy that's the, results from putting the dental models in a copy machine and running a copy of it on a plain piece of paper.
 - Q. Okay. Doctor, let me stop you there and ask you, is that an acceptable method in the, in forensic odontology?
 - A. Yeah. This is a method, this is a published method of bite mark analysis.
 - Q. Okay. Proceed, please.
 - A. What you do then is take this copy, reverse it so that you are looking at the back side of the paper and put it against the light box, the box that I use for x-ray viewing or that you might use for looking at slides; and when you do that and the light shines through it, you can see the outline of the teeth.

With a marker I then trace the biting surfaces of the teeth on the back side of this paper so that gives

me an outline, inked outline, and placing that in the copier as an original and using the transparency copy sheets, I then get a copy, a transparent copy of just the outlines of the teeth without the extraneous parts of the models to get in the way of the biting surfaces.

- Q. Okay, and the manner in which you made the transparency, is that an acceptable method --
- A. Yes.
 - Q. -- in forensic odontology?
- 11 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

19

20

22

23

24

25

- Q. And is the transparency, which is People's
 Exhibit 68, substantially in the same condition as when you
 made it?
- 15 A. Seems to be, yes.
 - Q. And, in fact, did you use that in doing your evaluation?
- 18 | A. Yes.
 - Q. I ask you also with regard to People's Exhibit 69, is that substantially in the same condition?
- 21 A. Yes, it appears to be.
 - Q. And you used that in doing your evaluations?
 - A. I used this to make the transparency. Once the transparency was made, there is no more use for this copy paper.

1	E. Mofson - DX
2	Q. And it was the transparency which is People's
3	Exhibit 68 that you used in doing your bite mark analysis
4	A. That's correct.
5	Q and comparison?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Would you please, for the jury, explain to them
8	the it appears to be two sets here, upper or lower or
9	something. Would you explain to the jury what they are and
LO	what they mean to you in forensic odontology?
11	THE COURT: Would it help to use the
12	shadow box?
13	THE WITNESS: Okay.
14	MR. VARGASON: Yeah, it would. We can set
15	that up.
16	THE COURT: Is it in what is the
17	exhibit, its number? Is it in evidence?
18	Any objection to
19	MR. VARGASON: It is not in evidence, yet,
20	Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Right. Before you show it to
22	the jury, it should be in evidence.
23	Mr. McGraw, any objection to it being
24	admitted?
25	MR. MCGRAW: I have no objection.

E. Mofson - DX

MR. VARGASON: I would move it into evidence.

MR. MCGRAW: No objection.

(People's Exhibit 68 was received into evidence.)

MR. VARGASON: Can all the jurors see that okay?

THE COURT: Well, what you can do is -what we normally do is put it up on -- why don't
we move the whole business back in now so he can
walk through there.

Thank you, Carl.

- Q. Doctor, would you please proceed and explain to the jury exactly what is depicted in People's Exhibit 68?
- A. Yeah. This is the transparency of the biting surfaces of the teeth made from these. These represent copies of those dental models that were in that box, models made from impressions of someone's teeth. They are made and reversed this way.

You have to remember that a bite mark is, in fact, a mirror image of the teeth. You lift it up because the bite is this way and when you look at teeth, you look at them this way; but when the teeth impress themselves into what is being bitten, it's a mirror image. So when flipped over this way, that creates a mirror image, the

E. Mofson - DX

type, the tracing of the biting surfaces of the teeth or what one would expect would create the bruise in this orientation in the skin.

This represents the biting surfaces of the upper teeth, the spaces being where the upper teeth on the model are either missing or broken off.

This represents the biting surfaces of the lower teeth.

This type of configuration, this arch form is what's reflected in the bite mark. This arch form, what we call an arch or an upper dental arch, lower dental arch, is what we talk about when we talk about the upper arch or the lower arch, and it too is important because it — oftentimes you can relate positions of teeth to where they fall on that imagined arch line that describes the general pattern of the tooth.

The tooth may be outside the arch line, what we call labial version or on the lip side of the arch line or lingual version, tipped to the inside or tongue side of that arch line. Sometimes that's reflected in bite mark patterns.

- Q. That's fine. Doctor, would you please take out the dentition that you received?
 - A. Yeah.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

E. Mofson - DX

Q. And show the jury in relationship to the upper and the lower arch the teeth which are depicted on that exhibit.

This is the model of the upper arch. Α. This is the upper arch. Now this is, this will, identifies this as being the left side. This is the left side. So, in effect, as I say, it's a mirror image because it was done -if this were biting, it would be biting this way.

So these spaces here represent this broken tooth here, this broken tooth here.

The patterns only go back this far because in most cases a bite does not, a bite mark doesn't show teeth much beyond this part. It's very difficult in biting to get more than, I mean, get what you are biting further into your mouth than that. So that's about as far as the bite generally shows. Oftentimes not even that far. Sometimes only that far. So that's as far as I went, just to keep the confusion to a minimum, number of marks on the tracing.

So this is the upper. This, what looks like less than this corresponding tooth on this side, reflects this tooth which is broken in half; so there is, there's really only half a biting surface. Again, it's a reverse. It's a mirror image, goes down this way.

This represents the lower arch. Again, in this

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York

FORM C-100 - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

orientation, this space here represents this space here and these marks being the outlines of the, just the biting surfaces of the teeth as they go around the arch. In this case, from this tooth around to one tooth past the space on this side.

- Q. Doctor, did you prepare a report as pertains to your examination and evaluation?
 - A. Yes, I did.

- Q. And would it help you in describing to the jury what your findings were if you were able to refer to that report?
 - A. Yes, it would.
 - Q. Okay. Do you have that report with you?
 - A. I think it's in the envelope here.

MR. VARGASON: Your Honor, at this point in time I am going to request that the Doctor give his opinion and conclusions as to his findings; and to that end, I would move into evidence People's Exhibit 69 and I would also move into evidence People's Exhibit 59.

THE COURT: Well, let's take them one at a time.

Any objection to 69, Mr. McGraw? MR. McGraw: What's 69?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

F	Mo	fson	_	DX
г	1916)	15011	_	138

THE COURT: That's the photocopy.

MR. MCGRAW: I have no objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. 69 is received.

(People's Exhibit 69 was received into evidence.)

MR. VARGASON: I would also move into evidence Exhibit 59, which is the first photograph.

MR. MCGRAW: Your Honor, I am afraid I am going to have to object to the introduction of the photographs. The Doctor has made very clear the importance of the manner in which the bite marks were photographed and we don't even know which ones he photographed or who photographed others and there's not proper foundation, Your Honor.

MR. VARGASON: Your Honor, the Doctor has examined the photographs and has testified that he examined , he was present during the photographing, some of the photographs he took; but the fact is he used all these photographs in his analysis and he does clearly state that they do fairly and accurately depict the bite marks as he saw them on the day

E. Mofson - DX

in question.

MR. MCGRAW: Your Honor, I have heard all that but I think part of proper fundamental foundation is who took the photograph that he's offering, and particularly in this case, what appears significant to the expertise of the photographer in regard to his findings, I think there's not proper foundation.

MR. VARGASON: Your Honor, it's my understanding when you are moving photographs into evidence, the issue becomes whether that photograph fairly and accurately depicts the condition. The Doctor has already testified that he looks for certain things when he's looking at photographs or bite marks that need to be photographed.

He has looked at these photographs. He's indicated that they do fairly and accurately represent the bite marks as he saw them on the day in question. Therefore, I think he's uniquely qualified to testify to --

MR. MCGRAW: Your Honor, I also think it's significant as part of foundation, and I don't mean to belabor this, but I don't know what the

-		_			
Ε.	$M \sim$	fs	\sim	_	DX
E -	1416 3			_	1110

time or day was that these photographs were taken; and that has some significance as to the accuracy of the photographs as they are depicted. At least I should know that much.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask. When did this occur? You talked -- you came to Auburn in the summer?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

THE COURT: Do you know what day it was, sir?

THE WITNESS: I don't know what date but it must be a matter of some record somewhere.

THE COURT: Would your report reflect that, sir?

THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe it does. My report reflects only the analysis that I made.

THE COURT: I see.

THE WITNESS: No, the date of the photographs is not reflected but that would be the date I suspect of the initial post-mortem examination. I am sure that's a matter of record because I was there at the time in the morgue with Dr. Ross with the local

E. Mofson - DX

investigators at the initial examination of the body so I would expect that that would be the same date as her initial examination at the morgue.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Vargason, maybe we could take a recess. You may have some documents that could refresh the Doctor's recollection as to time, place --

MR. VARGASON: Very good, Judge.

THE COURT: -- who was present, whether or not all of these photographs were taken of his -- in his presence and indeed, what areas of the body that each photograph represents. Because as he identified them, he, I don't think he has yet said how many bites there were or identified -- I don't think he has indicated which exhibits relate to which wound and so forth.

MR. VARGASON: Right.

THE WITNESS: That's in the report, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah, but the jury doesn't have the report, Doctor.

MR. VARGASON: Right.

THE COURT: All right. Take a short

E. Mofson - DX 1 2 recess. 3 MR. VARGASON: Thank you, Judge. 4 (Whereupon court recessed at 10:33 a.m., commenced at 5 10:45 a.m.; defendant present with counsel.) 6 THE COURT: Okay. Bring the jury in. 7 Your objection at this point is sustained. 8 MR. MCGRAW: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 (Jury returned to the courtroom.) 10 THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, 11 the last item before you took a recess was the 12 offer of Exhibit 59 by the prosecution. 13 Objection has been made and sustained. 14 Go ahead, Mr. Vargason. 15 MR. VARGASON: Thank you, Judge. 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. VARGASON CONTINUED: 17 Dr. Mofson, you testified on direct examination, I will try to move this along, that you responded to Cayuga 18 19 County and you went to the morgue at the Auburn Memorial Hospital? 20 2.1 Α. Yes. 22 Okay. Who was present when you arrived? Q. 23 Dr. Ross was present, gentleman by the name of Α. 24 Joe Contrera who is from the Onondaga County Medical 25

Examiner's Office was present and it was Sheriff's deputy present.

- Q. Okay, and do you recall, was that on the same day that you were called to Cayuga County?
 - A. Yes, it was.
 - Q. And do you recall when that was?
 - A. It was the, I think it was the 23rd of May.
 - Q. Okay, and at that time were photographs taken of

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay, and who was taking the photographs to the best of your knowledge?
- A. The best I can recall, the photographs were taken by Dr. Ross and by Mr. Contrera.
- Q. Okay, and were you present during the photographing?
- 18 A. Yes, I was.
 - Q. Okay, and were they taking the photographs at anybody's direction?
 - A. I was, I was, in insofar as the photographs of the bite marks were concerned, I was directing the photographing of the bite marks to be sure that they were done according to the established protocol of photographing bite marks.

- Q. Okay, and while you were present directing the photographing of the bite marks, were you satisfied with the method in which they were being taken?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

Q. Okay, and I am going to show you again a series of photographs.

THE COURT: Well, maybe we ought to do it one at a time, Mr. Vargason, and that way we can get the testimony in and then Mr. McGraw can make whatever objections he wishes to make individually.

MR. VARGASON: Very good, Judge.

- Q. I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 59 which you previously identified as a bite mark on . Is, in fact, that a photograph that was taken while you were present?
- A. Yes, it is.
- Q. And --
 - A. To the best of my knowledge.
 - O. Was that taken at your direction?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. And under your supervision?
- 24 A. Yes.
 - Q. And did you use that photograph in writing a

E. Mofson - DX 1 2 report? 3 Α. Yes. Okay, and do you have that report with you 4 Q. 5 today? 6 A. Yes. 7 And by looking at that photograph can you tell Q. 8 where the bite mark was located on 9 Not by looking at this photograph, but it's in Α. 10 my report. 11 Okay, and would it help you in reviewing your Q. 12 report to identify where on that bite 13 mark was taken? 14 A. Yes. Would you please refer to your report? 15 Q. Okay. 16 This is photograph marked A, my marking. Α. Okay. It was a photograph of the upper left back. 17 18 Of Q. Of 19 A. 20 Okay, and does that photograph fairly and Q. accurately depict the bite mark on the upper back of 21 22 as you saw her on May 23rd? 23 A. Yes. 24 MR. VARGASON: Okay. At this point in 25 time, Your Honor, the People would move Exhibit

- 1		21 1101001, 211
2		59 into evidence.
3		MR. MCGRAW: May I have some voir dire,
4		Your Honor?
5		THE COURT: Sure.
6	PRELIMINARY	EXAMINATION BY MR. MCGRAW:
7	Q.	Sir, I think you've testified on direct
8	examination	that the passage of time is significant in
9	regard to t	the accuracy of the photograph as it relates to
10	any compari	son, correct?
11	A.	I'm not sure I testified as to
12	Q.	Well, is that true?
13	Α.	The passage of time between the infliction of
14	the mark an	nd the taking of the photograph?
15	Q.	Yes.
16	A.	Does have, is a factor in the accuracy of the
17	photograph	, yes.
18	Q.	Can you tell me what date and time this
19	photograph	was taken?
20	Α.	The photograph was taken to the best of my
21	knowledge (on May 23rd.
22	Q.	What time?
23	Α.	Late afternoon, early evening.
24	Q.	Okay.
25		MR. MCGRAW: I have no objection.
	II .	

THE COURT: Okay, and it's the, a photograph of a mark on the left upper back?

THE WITNESS: Upper left back, yes, sir.

THE COURT: Received.

(People's Exhibit 59 was received into evidence.)
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. VARGASON CONTINUED:

- Q. Doctor, I will show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 60 and ask -- I believe you've already identified that, but ask if you could identify that again?
- A. Yes. Photograph B, which according to the report is a photograph of the upper left back of the upper left arm.
- Q. Doctor, I will ask you, was that a photograph that was taken under your direction on May 23rd at the morgue at Auburn Memorial Hospital?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And does that photograph fairly and accurately depict the bite mark as you saw it on that date?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Is that photograph a photograph you used in rendering your report?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And you've identified it as a photograph of the bite mark located on Sabina Kulakowski. Where?

1		E. Mofson DX
2	A. U	oper left arm, back of upper left arm.
3	Q. Ve	ery good.
4		MR. VARGASON: At this point in time, Your
5	Н	onor, the People would move People's Exhibit 60
6	iı	nto evidence.
7	PRELIMINARY I	EXAMINATION BY MR. MCGRAW:
8	Q. I	assume, sir, this photograph was taken at the
9	same time?	
10	A. A	t the same time.
11		MR. MCGRAW: No objection, Your Honor.
12		THE COURT: Okay. Exhibit Number 60 is
13	r	eceived in evidence.
14	(People	's Exhibit 60 was received into evidence.)
15	DIRECT EXAMI	NATION BY MR. VARGASON CONTINUED:
16	Q. De	octor, I will show you what's been marked as
17	People's Exh	ibit 61 and ask if you could identify that,
18	please?	
19	A. P	hotograph C, back of upper left arm. This is
20	the same, sa	me bite mark as in photograph B.
21	Q. A	nd was that photograph taken while you were
22	present at t	he morgue at Auburn Memorial Hospital?
23	A. Y	es.
24	Q. 0	n May 23rd?
25	А. У	es.
	II .	

1		E. Mofson - DX
2	Q.	Was it taken under your direction?
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	And does the photograph fairly and accurately
5	depict the	bite mark on as you saw it on
6	the day in	question?
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	And did you use that photograph in writing the
9	report?	•
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	Or making comparisons with the dentition of the
12	defendant?	·
13	Α.	That's correct.
14	Q.	Okay.
15		MR. VARGASON: At this point in time, Your
16		Honor, People would move Exhibit 61 into
17		evidence.
18		MR. MCGRAW: No objection, Your Honor.
19		THE COURT: Received.
20	(Peop	le's Exhibit 61 was received into evidence.)
21	Q.	Dr. Mofson, I am going to show you what's
22	been marke	d as People's Exhibit 62 and ask if you could
23	identify t	hat, please?
24	Α.	It's a photograph of the same bite mark as in
25	the previo	us photograph, upper, back of upper left arm.

1	E. Mofson - DX
2	Q. And
3	A
4	Q. Okay, and is that a photograph that was taken
5	while you were present at the morgue on May 23rd?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And was that taken at your direction?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And is it, does it fairly and accurately depict
10	the bite mark on as you saw it on May
11	23rd?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Did you use that photograph in doing any
14	evaluation and writing the report?
15	A. Yes.
16	MR. VARGASON: Thank you very much.
17	People would move Exhibit 62 into
18	evidence, Your Honor.
19	MR. MCGRAW: No objection, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Received.
21	(People's Exhibit 62 was received into evidence.)
22	Q. Dr. Mofson, I am going to show you what's
23	been marked as People's Exhibit 63 and ask if you could
24	identify that, please?
25	A. This is a photograph of the upper left back
	LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

1		E. Mofson - DX
2	which show	s two bite marks, one of which is the same as in
3	the first	photograph, another mark adjacent to it.
4	Q.	Okay. Was that photograph taken on May 23, 1991
5	at the mor	gue at Auburn Memorial Hospital?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	And was that taken at your direction?
8	A.	Yes.
9	Q.	And does that photograph fairly and accurately
10	depict the	bite mark as you saw it on May 23rd at the
11	morgue?	
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	And did you use that photograph in doing any
14	evaluation	or analysis of the bite marks on
15		and the dentition of the defendant?
16	Α.	Yes.
17		MR. VARGASON: Okay. People would move
18		photograph, People's Exhibit 63 into evidence.
19		MR. MCGRAW: Could I see it, please?
20		MR. VARGASON: (handing)
21		MR. MCGRAW: No objection, Your Honor.
22		THE COURT: Received.
23	(Peop	le's Exhibit 63 was received into evidence.)
24	Q.	Doctor, I am going to show you what's been
25	marked as	People's Exhibit 64 and ask if you could identify
	1	ISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

1 E. Mofson - DX 2 that, please? 3 Α. It's a photograph of the upper left back, same 4 two bite marks as in the previous photograph. 5 Q. And was that photograph taken on May 23, 1991 at 6 the morgue while you were present? 7 A. Yes. 8 0. And was it taken at your direction? 9 Α. Yes. And under your supervision? 10 Q. 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. And does the photograph fairly and accurately depict the bite mark on 13 as you saw it on that day? 14 15 Α. Yes. 16 Q. With regard to the area of her body? 17 Α. Yes. 18 And did you use that photograph in arriving at Q. your opinions, conclusions and writing your report? 19 20 Α. Yes, I did. 21 People would move Exhibit MR. VARGASON: 22 64 into evidence. 23 No objection, Your Honor. MR. MCGRAW: 24 THE COURT: Received. 25 (People's Exhibit 64 was received into evidence.)

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter

Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York

-		L. MOISON DA
2	Q.	Doctor, I will show you what's been marked as
3	People's Ex	whibit 65 and ask if you could identify that,
4	please?	
5	A.	Photograph of a mark on the left thigh.
6	Q.	And does is that a photograph that was taken
7	on May 23,	1991 at the morgue at Auburn Memorial Hospital
8	while you w	were present?
9	A.	Yes, I was.
10	Q.	Is this a photograph depicting a bite mark on
11	Sabina Kula	akowski?
12	A.	Yes.
13	Q.	And is it in substantially the same condition as
14	it was	
15		MR. VARGASON: Or strike that.
16	Q.	Does the photograph fairly and accurately depict
17	the bite ma	ark as you saw it on the day in question?
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	And did you use that photograph in doing your
20	analysis o	f the dentition of the defendant and the bite
21	marks on	?
22	Α.	Yes, I did.
23		MR. VARGASON: At this point in time the
24		People would move Exhibit, People's Exhibit 65
25		into evidence.
	1)	

1		E. Mofson - DX
2		MR. MCGRAW: Could I see it, please?
3		MR. VARGASON: (handing)
4		MR. MCGRAW: No objection, Your Honor.
5		THE COURT: 65 is received in evidence.
6	(Peopl	e's Exhibit 65 was received into evidence.)
7	Q.	Doctor, I will show you what's been marked as
8	People's Ex	shibit 66 and ask if you could identify that,
9	please?	
10	A.	That is a photograph of the same mark as the
11	previous ph	notograph.
12	Q.	Okay, and was that photograph taken while you
13	were preser	nt?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	And was that at the morgue at Auburn Memorial
16	Hospital or	May 23rd?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	Was it taken of a bite mark on
19		
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	Was it taken under your direction?
22	A.	Yes.
23	Q.	Doctor, does that photograph fairly and
24	accurately	depict the bite mark on as you
25	saw it May	23rd?

Α.

Correct.

1 E. Mofson - DX 2 Yes. Α. Did you use that photograph at arriving at any 3 Q. conclusions or analysis with regard to the dentition of the 4 defendant and the bite mark on 5 6 Α. Yes, I did. 7 MR. VARGASON: At this point in time, Your 8 Honor, we move People's Exhibit 66 into 9 evidence. 10 No objection, Your Honor. MR. MCGRAW: 11 THE COURT: Received. (People's Exhibit 66 was received into evidence.) 12 13 Doctor, I will show you People's Exhibit 67 and Q. ask if you could identify that, please? 15 Α. Photograph of the same bite mark as the previous 16 two photographs. 17 Okay, and was that photograph taken while you 0. 18 were present? 19 Α. Yes. 20 Q. Was that on May 23, 1991? 21 Α. Yes. 22 At the morque? Q. 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. At Auburn Memorial Hospital? 25

1	E. Mofson - DX
2	Q. While Dr. Ross and Joe Contrera were present?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Was it taken at your direction?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And does that photograph fairly and accurately
7	depict a bite mark as you saw it on on
8	the day in question?
9	A. Yes, it does.
10	Q. Did you use that photograph in doing your
11	analysis of the bite marks on and the
12	dentition of the defendant, Roy Brown?
13	A. Yes.
14	THE COURT: I am sorry, what, where was
15	that located?
16	THE WITNESS: That's the left thigh, Your
17	Honor. That's the same bite mark as the
18	previous two.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
20	MR. VARGASON: At this point in time,
21	People move Exhibit 67 into evidence.
22	MR. MCGRAW: No objection, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Received.
24	(People's Exhibit 67 was received into evidence.)
25	Q. Doctor
	LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

THE COURT: Well, excuse me. Then are you, just to summarize at this point, Doctor, there was a bite mark on the left thigh, two marks on the upper left back, and a mark on the upper left arm?

THE WITNESS: Two marks on the upper left arm, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Two marks on the upper left arm. Okay. Thank you.

- Q. Doctor, did you use the dentition, which has been previously marked as an exhibit and offered into evidence and identified by you, together with the transparency, which has also been accepted into evidence, together with the photographs in writing a report?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay, and that report you have here with you today?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And would it help you in explaining your findings if you were able to refer to that report?
 - A. Yes, it would.

MR. MCGRAW: Objection, Your Honor. I have an objection. He hasn't testified to anything that he would need to refresh his

E. Mofson - DX

recollection by the report other than a broad --

THE COURT: I understand that, but it, the Court overrules the objection. It's normal that a, when a physician testifies that he may make reference to his report, which is certainly available to you, Mr. McGraw. So I will allow him to utilize his report in connection with his testimony.

MR. VARGASON: Thank you, Judge.

Q. Dr. Mofson, I am going to ask you to go through People's Exhibit 59, which is received in evidence, and explain to the jury, please, what findings or conclusions you arrived at in comparing the bite mark evidence and the dentition supplied by the defendant.

MR. MCGRAW: I object to the form of the question, Your Honor. If he's asking for an opinion rather than a conclusion, it might be appropriate in the proper question; but I think a conclusion is an -- improper from an expert who is offering his opinion.

THE COURT: Okay.

- Q. Doctor, did you do an analysis?
- A. I did an analysis.
- Q. Okay.

E. Mofson - DX 1 Yes. 2 Α. Q. And prepared a report? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Okay. I am going to ask you to please first 5 Q. 6 explain to the jury what your findings were with regard to 7 the bite marks depicted in the photograph and the transparency which is a representation of the defendant's 8 9 dentition. 10 My findings in the comparison of this photograph 11 with the dentition are that this photograph --12 THE COURT: Well, wait a minute, Doctor. 13 I don't want you to read the report. 14 THE WITNESS: No, I'm not reading it, Your 15 Honor. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Then slow down because 17 we have to --18 Α. Okay. Okay, that this bite mark is entirely 19 consistent with the dentition represented by these models 20 and those transparencies. 21 Okay, and would you explain to the jury, please, Q. 22 how you arrived at that finding? 23 I probably could do it better if I could show --Α. 24 Q. Yes, sure. 25 The method that's used to analyze these marks is Α.

E. Mofson - DX

to superimpose this transparency which I described to you before over the marks to see whether, in fact, the bruising corresponds to the presence — to the positioning of the teeth that would have made the mark had, in fact, this dentition created this mark; and in analyzing this mark, we find that in this case the bruising in this, which I determined to be the upper arch, is consistent with the positioning and the shape of the teeth present.

Also, the absence in these two areas of significant bruising corresponds with the areas in which there are no teeth present in the upper arch in this case and in the lower arch.

The shape of the arch, the size of the arch is entirely consistent with the shape and size of both of these dental arches.

The position of the bruises and the position of the, absence of bruises is consistent with the position of the teeth and the absence of teeth in the dental arches.

- Q. And, Doctor, I believe you testified that you arrived at a conclusion?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you have an opinion?
- A. Yes. In my opinion this bruise is entirely consistent with this dentition. Entirely consistent that

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 E. Mofson - DX 2 this dentition made this mark. 3 Q. Very good. Doctor, and in doing your analysis of the bite marks and also in regard to the dentition that 4 was supplied to you and the photographs, I will show you 5 what's been marked as People's Exhibit 61 and ask if you 6 7 could -- ask if you arrived at any conclusion --8 MR. VARGASON: Or strike that. 9 Q. -- ask if you made any findings with regard to 10 the dentition that was supplied and the bite marks depicted 11 in that photograph? 12 This is the upper left arm? THE COURT: 13 THE WITNESS: This is upper left arm. 14 Q. And just so that the jury --THE COURT: And 59 was the upper left 15 back? 16 17 MR. VARGASON:

Thank you, Your Honor. That was my next question.

Doctor, would you tell the jury where People's 0. Exhibit 59, which is in photograph A, was located on

This bite mark that I just showed you is an --Α. is a photograph of the, this is a photograph of a mark on the upper left back.

This photograph is a photograph of marks on the

upper, back of the upper left arm.

- Q. Okay, and would you please demonstrate to the jury what your findings were with regard to that?
- A. Using the same technique of superimposition of the transparency on the bruises, you find a consistency of the size and shape. There are two marks in this photograph, this a fainter one and this one. The fainter mark and the more distinct mark.

The size and shape of the dental arch is entirely consistent with the size and shape of the bruises.

The presence of the bruising and the spaces between the bruising is consistent again with the presence and absence of teeth in the arch.

This mark here right under this tooth which has a broken tip on it, this is a break in the skin and these bruises over here under these teeth in the lower arch.

- Q. Doctor, I am going to ask you to stand back a little bit so the alternates can also --
- A. I can find a place to be so that everybody can see. Kind of difficult.

The consistency of the shape and size of the arches and the positioning of the bruises that correspond with the position of the teeth and the absence of the bruising that corresponds with the spacing in the dentition

2 | is all consistent with this dentition and the marks.

- Q. Doctor, did you arrive at an opinion within a reasonable --
 - A. Yes.

- Q. -- degree of dental --
- A. In my --
 - Q. Let me finish.
- A. I am sorry.
- 10 Q. -- within a reasonable degree of dental
 11 certainty as to the source of those bite marks?
 - A. Yes. In my opinion, these bite marks are entirely consistent with the dentition depicted in this transparency.
 - Q. Thank you, and, Doctor, I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 62, previously identified by you as a bite mark of the upper left arm. I would again ask that you explain to the jury your findings with regard to that.
 - A. These, these two marks are, in fact, the same two marks as the previous photograph and so the analysis and the comparison of the transparency would be the same in terms of the size and shape of the arch and the bruising compared to the size and shape of the dentition as depicted in the transparency, as well as the position of the bruises

E. Mofson - DX

and the spaces where, where there are no teeth in the dentition. All consistent in comparing transparency with the photograph of the bite marks.

- Q. And did you arrive at an opinion within a reasonable degree of dental certainty --
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. -- as to the source of that bite mark?
- A. Yes. In my opinion these bite marks are entirely consistent with the dentition depicted in this transparency.
 - Q. Doctor, I will show you what's been marked as -THE COURT: Doctor, let me ask a question,
 and I am, of course, I am listening from up here
 and not seeing the pictures, but in looking at
 the photograph, what shows a bruise on the
 photograph as to a non-bruise?

THE WITNESS: Coloration, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Bruise?

THE WITNESS: Discoloration. Bruise is darker, discolored. Bruise reds, shades of blues, reds, almost black in some cases depending on the intensity of the bruises.

THE COURT: I see. Okay. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: In some cases breaks in the

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

skin as well.

THE COURT: I see. Thank you.

- Q. And, Doctor, just to follow up on that, what accounts for the, the redness in the areas that you indicated there was an absence of a tooth?
- A. Well, there are several factors that could account for that. We spoke earlier about the distortion that occurs in a bite mark depending upon the movements, the relative movement taking place between the biter and the person being bitten.

Also, the consistency of the tissue being bitten, and a mark such as this that has a large reddish area in the center is felt to be indicative of a sucking type of a bite mark. That creates what we call ecchymosis or reddening of the tissue within the arch. That could well result in a dragging of the skin along the surface of the teeth during the -- so the mark would result in a broad, broader type of a bruise rather than a sharp bruise that would be almost a tracing of the tooth. The reaction to the skin would be over a broader area and would give one a broader or a -- well, I don't want to say a bleeding but kind of a diffusing of the marks of the individual teeth as a result of movement of the tissue.

Q. Doctor, I am going to show you what's been

marked as People's Exhibit 63 and received into evidence and identified by you, ask just to remind the jury where that bite mark is located on Sabina Kulakowski?

- A. This is the upper left back --
- Q. Okay.

б

- A. -- in this photograph.
- Q. Doctor, did you make any findings with regard to that bite mark depicted in that photograph?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Would you explain to the jury what those findings were?
- A. Yes. The findings -- in fact, based on my analysis with the marks using the same technique as I showed you in the other marks, I find this mark to be completely consistent with the size, shape of the dentition and the placement and absence of teeth as depicted in the transparency.
- Q. Would you show that to the jury, please, so they can see?
- A. Yes, place to stand. The lower dental arch in this case I am not sure you can see, but the size and shape of the bruising, of the dentition is very consistent with the tracings.

The absence of a bruise where there's no tooth

<

E. Mofson - DX

present; the, I spoke earlier about a tooth that may be a little bit outside or inside the arch, very clear mark in my opinion right here of this tooth which is somewhat outside the arch and I think gives us a very clear outline in this particular case of that particular tooth there.

Again, size and shape completely consistent with the opposing arch in that bite.

Q. And, Doctor, did you arrive at an opinion within a reasonable degree of --

THE COURT: Again, keep your voice up, Mr. Vargason. I know you are talking to him --

MR. VARGASON: Right.

THE COURT: -- but the rest of the courtroom would like to hear.

- Q. Did you arrive at an opinion within a reasonable degree of dental certainty as to the source of that bite mark?
- A. Yes. In my opinion this bite mark is completely consistent with the dentition shown in this transparency.
- Q. Thank you. Doctor, I will show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 64 which you have previously identified, and again, I am going to ask that you refresh the jury's memory of where you identified that bite mark on Sabina?

- A. This photograph is the same as the two bite marks I just showed you, upper left back. It's the same two marks as in the previous photograph.
- Q. Okay, and did you -- I believe you testified that you did a comparison of that with the transparency?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. With the dentition of the defendant. Would you please explain to the jury and show them what your findings were with regard to that comparison?
- A. Again, by overlaying the transparency on the mark, we see the complete consistency of the shape of the arch, of the size of the arch and of the presence of bruising areas and the absence of a bruise which corresponds to the absence of a tooth in that particular case. Again, size and shape, consistency of the opposing arch.
- Q. And, Doctor, let me ask you, and particularly with regard to that photograph, is each and every tooth as depicted in there depicted, or as depicted on the transparency, People's Exhibit 68, identified in the photograph?
- A. In this particular photograph in fact there's quite a very good representation of the teeth in the lower dental arch. We can see almost certainly one, two, three,

E. Mofson - DX

four, five individual teeth and a bruise which corresponds to the two center lower teeth.

The upper arch does not show every individual tooth but in the case like this, again, given distortion, given curvature of the tissue, one does not necessarily expect every tooth in the arch to mark itself equally as every other tooth in the arch does.

- Q. And would that be consistent with what you testified earlier as to what the surface was that was being bitten?
- A. I'm not sure whether in this particular case it's a function of the surface so much as it's a function of the shape of the tissue, the curvature of the tissue and motion that might have been taking place.
 - Q. Very good, Doctor.

MR. MCGRAW: What number is that exhibit?
THE WITNESS: This is 64.

- Q. I believe I asked you, if I didn't I will ask you again, Doctor, did you arrive at an opinion within a reasonable degree of dental certainty as to the source of that bite mark depicted in that photograph?
- A. Yes. In my opinion that bite mark is completely consistent with the dentition depicted in the transparency.
 - Q. Okay. Doctor, I will show you what's been

marked as People's Exhibit 60 and ask if you would refresh our memory as to where that photograph or where that bite mark depicted in that photograph was located on Sabina?

- A. This is a photograph of the back of the upper left arm.
- Q. Okay, and did you do some comparisons of the bite mark depicted in that photograph with the dentition supplied by the defendant?
 - A. Yes, I did.

- Q. Okay. Would you explain to the jury, please, and use the photograph and your transparency, the findings that you made with regard to that?
- A. Yes. Again, using the same technique of overlaying the arch on the bruise, we find a consistency of the size and shape of the arch, marks where there are teeth, no marks in fact where teeth are missing.

A much less distinct impression of the lower arch in this case. This I attribute to the curvature of the arm as the tissue falls away from the biting plane, heavier on this side and lighter as the arm curves towards the under part of the body, towards the, where it meets the chest wall.

Q. And, Doctor, I want to ask you to direct your attention to the top of the photograph here and ask if you

E. Mofson - DX

could explain to the jury what is depicted in here? It appears to be a dark, much darker area, and what -- whether you have an opinion?

- A. This area here which is a rather darker and elongated kind of bruise in this particular area is in my opinion indicative of a scraping that takes place or that took place in this particualr instance of those two front teeth which on the transparency or which you can see on the model stand by themselves, and I believe that that type of bruise indicates a scraping or a movement of the skin along the surface of those two teeth resulting in the elongated type of a bruise in the location of those two upper front teeth.
- Q. And, Doctor, did you arrive at an opinion within a reasonable degree of dental certainty as to the source of the bite mark on as depicted in that photograph?
- A. Yes. In my opinion the bite mark depicted in this photograph is consistent with the dentition and the transparency.
- Q. Very good. Doctor, I will show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 65, previously received into evidence and identified by you, and again, I am going to ask that you refresh our memory as to where that bite mark

_	11		
2	lwas	located	on

- A. This is the bite mark of the left, taken of the left thigh.
 - Q. And, Doctor, did you use that photograph in making any findings?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. Okay. Would you explain to the jury what those findings were?
 - A. With --
 - Q. With, yes.
 - A. Again, using the transparency overlay to overlay the bite mark, I find the pattern of bruising, the size and shape of the bruise to correspond with the size and shape of the dental arch, bruising where there are teeth present, heavy bruising under this broken tooth over here, bruising here and I find this to be consistent with the size and shape of this dental arch.
 - Q. And, Doctor, did you arrive at an opinion within a reasonable degree of dental certainty as to the source of the bite mark?
 - A. Yes. In my opinion this bite mark is consistent with this dentition.
 - Q. Okay. Doctor, I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 66 and again, I am going to

2 ask if you could refresh our memory as to where that bite 3 mark was located on ?

- A. This mark is the photograph of the same mark as the one I just showed you, the photograph, the same mark of the left thigh.
 - Q. Did you use the transparency --
- A. Yes.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. -- in evaluating that?
- 10 A. Yes, I did in the same way.
 - Q. Okay. Would you please explain to the jury, please, the findings?
 - A. Using the transparency to see if there's a consistency, if there is a fit of the dentition to the mark, we find that the pattern of the teeth overlay the bruises quite consistently in terms of size, shape and location of teeth and bruise marks.
 - Q. And, Doctor, do you have an opinion within a reasonable degree of dental certainty as to the source of that bite mark?
 - A. Yes. I believe this bite mark is consistent with the dentition in this transparency.
 - Q. Doctor, I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 67 and again, I am going to ask that you refresh our memory as to where that bite mark was

E. Mofson - DX

2 | located on Sabina?

- A. This is a photograph of the same mark as I just showed you in the previous two photographs, left thigh.
- Q. Did you use that photograph together with the transparency of the dentition in making any findings?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And would you please explain to the jury and demonstrate --
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. -- what those findings were?
- A. Using the transparency again in the same way, I find that again, size, shape and presence of bruising where there are teeth is consistent with the dentition depicted in the transparency.
- Q. Okay. Doctor, I am going to ask you, did you arrive at an opinion within a reasonable degree of dental certainty as to the source of that bite mark?
- A. Yes. In my opinion this bite mark is consistent with the dentition shown in the transparency.
- Q. Okay. Doctor, I am going to ask you with regard to all the bite marks that you examined on
- , were some of the bite marks that you looked at and did the comparisons on the transparency of the dentition of the defendant, did some of them lend themself

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

1 E. Mofson - DX 2 to say easier comparisons? 3 Α. Yes. They did. Okay, and would you please go through the 4 Q. photographs and identify those photographs to the jury that 5 6 you found were better suited or depicted a bite mark that 7 gave rise to an opinion from you as to the consistency? 8 Α. The photograph, this is Exhibit 59, one of the

Q. Can I have that, please?

photographs on the upper left back is a very clear

photograph of both dental arches, upper and lower; and it

shows with some clarity the spacing and bruising that was

consistent with the location and so forth of teeth in the

- 15 (handing) Α.
- 16 Q. Okay.

dental arches?

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

Photograph C, this is the back of the upper left Α. arm.

19 THE COURT: Well, there is a number on it, 20 Doctor.

> Oh, I am sorry, Number 61. THE WITNESS: THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Upper left arm again, the pattern of tooth marks Α. and spaces were consistent. Also, the irregularity of this tooth in what we call the labial version, as I mentioned

E. Mofson - DX

before, tooth slightly outside of the arch form.

Exhibit 62 is a photograph of the same mark as 61 and so the characteristics are the same. So it, it analyzed out the same way as the previous photograph did given bruising and spacing and size.

Photograph Number 63 of the upper back shows again a good depiction of some individual teeth and a space which led to a very good comparison with the dentition.

Q. Doctor, were there any bite marks that were photographed that lended themselves to a more difficult comparison?

MR. MCGRAW: Objection, Your Honor. He's testified as to his findings. I don't think it's appropriate to testify as to -- in answer to that kind of question, what's more difficult and what's easier.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. MCGRAW: He's given his opinion.

THE COURT: I understand. I think the question is, and it's certainly, I think is within his province that some impressions may be easier to distinguish than other impressions. He's indicated those that appeared more prevalent or obvious and now he's asking for the

E. Mofson - DX 1 reverse of that. So I will allow him to 2 testify. 3 4 MR. VARGASON: Thank you, Your Honor. 5 The photographs 65, 66 and 67, which are all of Α. 6 the thigh, while one of the arches shows quite a good 7 consistency with the arch in the transparency in terms of 8 size, shape, presence of bruising, the opposing arch does not show as good an overlay, as good a consistency with 9 10 the, with the dental transparency. 11 This is what is referred to as maybe a consistency, as an explainable consistency in that I 12 13 believe in my opinion while, while with distortion of the 14 tissue, the curvature of the thigh as it falls away from 15 the plane of the bite, the possible distortion of the tissue given the motion and even the possibility that that 16 tissue was held in the hands at the time it was bitten 17 18 would, would lead to a great distortion. MR. MCGRAW: Your Honor, I object. 19 Overruled. 20 THE COURT: 21 MR. MCGRAW: He's -- it's hypothetical. 22 THE COURT: Yes, it is. MR. MCGRAW: There is no evidence or 23 24 testimony to support that.

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 1302

THE COURT:

I agree but it's -- he's an

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

E. Mofson - DX

expert and he's giving his opinion. It's up to the jury to evaluate. Overruled.

- The possibility that that part of the body was held in the hand at the time of the bite in this manner, (indicating) hand pressure would tend to greatly distort the position of the tissue. When released, that tissue goes back to the normal position. The mark left by the bite would be a rather distorted mark and would not expect to be consistent in an overlay comparison with the size, shape, position of the teeth.
- 0. And in your opinion, Doctor, is that what is generally represented in that photograph?
 - I believe that explains the apparent --Α. MR. MCGRAW: Objection, Your Honor, speculative.

THE COURT: It is.

MR. MCGRAW: Hypothetical, no evidence to support that in this trial.

THE COURT: Well, overruled.

- People's Exhibit 67, is that the photograph Q. which you are testifying to?
- 67, yeah. These three photographs are of the Α. I believe that is an explanation of an same bite. apparent, an apparent inconsistency that one might, one

1	E. Mofson - DX
2	might find in comparing the upper arch in this bite to the
3	transparency. There is no inconsistency in the comparison
4	of the lower arch in this photograph.
5	MR. VARGASON: Very good. Thank you,
6	Doctor.
7	No further questions, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Mr. McGraw?
9	MR. MCGRAW: Thank you.
10	THE COURT: Just wait a moment. We've got
11	some spectators coming in and
12	Did you have your coffee yet? Let's take
13	a recess. I think that might be a good idea.
14	Court will stand in recess.
15	(Whereupon court recessed at 11:27 a.m.; commenced at
16	11:44 a.m.; defendant present with counsel.)
17	THE COURT: Okay. Bring the jury in,
18	please.
19	(Jury returned to the courtroom.)
20	THE COURT: Proceed, Mr. McGraw.
21	MR. MCGRAW: Thank you, Your Honor.
22	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MCGRAW:
23	Q. Dr. Mofson, there came a time where you were
24	employed by the Cayuga County District Attorney to make

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

these examinations; is that correct? Back in May of 1991

23

24

25

E. Mofson - CX 1 2 you were employed by the District Attorney? 3 Well, I was asked by the medical, the Medical 4 Examiner of Cayuga County to evaluate these. How many times in the course of your career have 5 Q. 6 you testified in a criminal case, sir? 7 A. Five times. 8 Five times, and most of your work consists of 9 making comparisons to dental records to deceased for 10 purposes of identification, correct? 11 Α. Most of my work, yes, but the courtroom 12 testimony has been, in all but one case has been bite mark 13 evidence. 14 Bite mark comparisons? Q. 15 Α. Bite mark evidence, yes. 16 You testify on some occasions for the prosecutor Q. 17 and some occasions for the defense? 18 Α. That's correct. 19 How many times have you testified for a Q. 20 prosecutor in a criminal case? 21 Four times. A.

Q. And for the defense?

A. One time.

Q. And you are paid for your services; are you not?

A. Paid for the time that I spend on the case.

1		E. Mofson - CX
2	Q.	Sure.
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	How much are you paid by the Cayuga County
5	District	Attorney for your services?
6	A.	We've not determined a fee at this point in
7	time.	
8	Q.	Well, do you have a general fee that you
9	charged?	
10	A.	I have an hourly fee.
11	Q.	Pardon?
12	A.	I have an hourly fee depending upon the number
13	of hours	I spend in a case.
14	Q.	Well, what's your hourly fee generally?
15	A.	One hundred and fifty dollars.
16	Q.	And you expect reimbursement or compensation
17	from the	District Attorney in exchange for your services,
18	correct?	
19		MR. VARGASON: Your Honor, I am going to
20		THE COURT: Sustained in that form.
21		MR. VARGASON: object. This, this,
22		it's not appropriate.
23	Q.	All right. Now I believe you've testified on
24	direct ex	mamination that the skin is not a very good surface
25	for this	type of analysis and comparison, correct?
	II .	

_		L. MOISOR CA
2		MR. VARGASON: Objection, Your Honor. He
3		didn't say that.
4	Α.	No.
5		MR. VARGASON: It was this type he just
6		indicated generally.
7	,	THE COURT: Sustained in that form. I
8		don't think that was the testimony.
9	Q.	Let me ask you this. Are you acquainted with a
10	forensic o	dontologist, Dr. Lowell A. Levine?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	Have you read any literature in respect to this
13	type of an	alysis prepared by and published by Dr. Levine?
14	A.	I've read some of Dr. Levine's articles.
15	Q.	There aren't too many forensic odontologists in
16	the countr	y, are there?
17	Α.	I believe as of the last certifying examination
18	there were	about 100.
19	Q •	All right.
20	Α.	Certified odontologists in the country.
21	Q.	Are you acquainted with a Dr. Homer Campbell of
22	New Mexico	?
23	A.	Yes, I am.
24	Q.	Have you read any of his literature?
25	Α.	No, I don't believe I've read anything he

			_
2	nubl	ist	ned.

1

3

4

5

6

7

12

13

14

15

16

22

23

24

25

- Q. Have you published anything yourself in regard to this type of analysis?
 - A. No, I have not.
- Q. Have you published anything in regard to forensic odontology?
- A. Except for some, an article on some unusual radiographic or x-ray findings that were published some years ago in the Journal of Oral Surgery and Oral Pathology.
 - Q. Now would you agree with me that bite marks discovered may have changed their size and shape considerably from the time of the infliction?
 - A. No, I would not agree with that.
 - Q. You wouldn't agree with that?
- 17 | A. No.
- Q. Would you agree with me that if left on a dead body or just prior to dead, skin alteration in appearances will be entirely different? Do you agree or not agree with that?
 - A. Different than what?
 - Q. If left on a dead body or just prior to dead, skin alterations in appearance will be entirely different from the time the infliction of the bite mark from -- to

A.

1 E. Mofson - CX 2 the time of the examination? 3 Yes, I think, I think the passage of time is a 4 factor in the appearance of the bite mark, if that's what 5 you are getting at. 6 Q. Well, I am asking you if left on a dead body or 7 just prior to death, skin alteration appearance will be 8 entirely different; do you agree or disagree with that? Α. Well, I am not sure. 10 MR. VARGASON: Objection, Your Honor. 11 Α. You mean prior to death as compared to --12 THE COURT: Wait, wait. 13 MR. VARGASON: As compared to when? 14 THE COURT: I will sustain the objection 15 in that form. 16 Q. Let me ask you this. You are aware that the body cools after death, aren't you? 17 18 A. True, yes. 19 Q. Skin contracts with the cooling? 20 A. I -- that may be. I don't know. 21 You don't know? Q. 22 A. No. 23 Well, if that were the fact, that would Q. 24 certainly alter the bite mark evidence; would it not?

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

If the contraction of the skin was discernible

5

E. Mofson - CX

amount in terms of dimensionally speaking, then it would alter the bite mark, yes.

- Q. Do you agree with me that bite marks show changes and become distorted when the posture of the victim changes?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Are you aware in this particular case that there is some evidence that the, that the, that the remains of Sabina were moved physically after the infliction of bite marks? Were you aware of that?
- A. I wasn't aware of that specifically but it's certainly believable hypothesis.
- Q. Well, do you agree then that the bite marks show changes, become distorted when the posture of the victim changes, correct?
- A. I believe that bite marks could show changes of distortion, yes.
- Q. And do you agree that human skin is a poor medium for bite mark registration?
 - A. Yes, I think that's fair to say.
- Q. What information were you provided prior to your examination and photography of the bite marks at the morgue in regard to any of the investigation?
 - A. Prior to my seeing the body at the morgue?

- A. I received a call from Dr. Ross who simply said that they had a victim. I don't recall whether she said it was a suspected homicide victim or not, and they have some marks that they think might be bite marks and could I come to the morgue and look at them and give my opinion.
- Q. In your opinion when you examined those bite marks, did it happen that the bite marks represented teeth to skin?
 - A. Yes.

Yes.

0.

- Q. Anything that would come between the teeth and the skin would in many respects distort those marks; isn't that correct?
- A. It could, yeah, it could have an effect on the sharpness or the accuracy of the distinctivity, if that's a word, of the mark, yes.
- Q. It's something that you would certainly consider in forming any opinion in regard to comparisons, correct?
- A. Something that would come into consideration, yes.
- Q. Nobody told you anything about a cotton nightshirt that was worn by the victim at any time, did they?
 - A. No. I wouldn't expect a cotton nightshirt would

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021 the truit

Q.

Α.

25

E. Mofson - CX 1 distort to any great degree a bite mark. 2 It's a rather 3 thin piece of material. Well, did you ever examine any cotton shirt in Q. 4 regard to your testing? 5 Not in this case, no, sir. 6 A. The cotton or any fabric between the teeth and 7 Q. 8 the bite mark would certainly have some relevance in your examination and your ultimate opinion; would it not? 9 Could make a difference. 10 Α. MR. VARGASON: Objection, Your Honor. 11 asked and answered. He testified he didn't 12 13 expect that a cot --MR. MCGRAW: He just said it could make a 14 difference so I would --15 THE COURT: I will let it stand. 16 Nobody told you anything about a nightshirt, did 17 Q. 18 they? 19 A. No. Now I guess you told us that you took that 20 Q. dentition and you put it on a Xerox machine; is that 21 22 correct? 23 Α. Copying machine, yeah. 24 What kind of copying machine?

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

It was a, a -- what's the brand of the copy

E. Mofson - CX

╢,

machine? Slips my mind but it's one of the large well-known brand copying machines. The brand name escapes me.

- Q. All right. So you placed those dentitions on a copy machine and you came up with this; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - O. Did you make a copy of this?
- A. I don't believe -- I think that's the original one. I don't believe there is a copy. There may be a copy of that.
 - Q. Well, you are a dentist, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You would never use such a procedure in, for use in making dentures for somebody, would you, a copy machine?
- A. Well, copy machine gives you a two-dimensional copy so obviously you can't make dentures off a two-dimensional device. When we make dentures and we make impressions and pour models, in essence, models are three-dimensional copies of mouth.
 - O. That is correct, taken from the mouth, correct?
 - A. Taken from the mouth.
- Q. You are aware, are you not, that the copy machine is going to distort in size some respects what is placed on it?

- A. Well, that's the reason for the scale that that copying machine, to, to ascertain as near as possible that that is an undistorted copy.
- Q. Well, did you make that finding from looking at this scale?
 - A. Yeah.

- Q. In what respect was the copy that you made on the Xerox or whatever machine distorted in size from the actual dentition?
- A. By visual comparison of the scale that's depicted in that photograph to that copy, there was no apparent distortion.
 - Q. You made that examination?
- 15 A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. You mean you could tell from this ruler here that this tooth was exactly the same size that is represented in that exhibit?
 - A. No, no. The ruler is used by comparing the ruler to the ruler. The assumption is made then that if that part of the copy is dimensionally accurate, then the whole copy is.
 - Q. Well, are you telling us that your examination somehow proved that the size depicted by the Xerox machine or whatever machine it was, was exact and precise as the

Q.

1 E. Mofson - CX 2 size of dentition? 3 Α. Within the limits necessary to do a bite mark 4 comparison, yes, sir. Q. Well, how much bigger was this tooth as 5 6 reproduced by the copy machine than the tooth that appears there? 7 Α. I don't believe it's any bigger. 8 9 Q. Did you make any effort to make that determination? 10 11 Α. None other than comparing the scale. 12 Are you aware that when you make a copy of a ο. 13 document or anything else on a copy machine, there is 14 distortion in size? I'm not aware of that. 15 16 It's not something you considered, did you? 17 Yeah, I considered it. That's the reason I used Α. 18 the scale in the copy. I see, but you told us the scale here couldn't 19 Q. 20 tell us if there's any difference in the size of this 21 tooth? 22 MR. VARGASON: Objection, asked and 23 answered three times. 24 THE COURT: Sustained.

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

And then from that scientific procedure you took

1			E. Mofson - CX
2 .	this	thing	that came out of the copying machine, correct?
3		A.	Yes, sir.
4		Q.	And you laid an overlay over it; is that
5	corre	ect?	
6		A.	No, that's not correct.
7		Q.	What did you do?
8		A.	Tracing of it on the back side of the paper.
9		Q.	You traced this, didn't you?
10		A.	Yes.
11		Q.	That came out of the copy machine?
12		A.	Yeah, on the paper, yeah.
13		Q.	And that's how you arrived at this overlay,
14	thro	igh th	at scientific
15		A.	That's a published accepted procedure in bite
16	mark	analy	sis.
17		Q.	Who, who published that procedure, Lowell
18	A. L	evine?	
19		A.	No, not Lowell Levine.
20		Q.	Who?
21		A.	Can't give you the name. It's a, in a
22	publ	icatio	n called the Publication of the American Society
23	of F	orensi	c Odontology.
24		Q.	Okay, all right. Can you give me some cite on

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

that, some scientific article suggested that you use some

unknown machine to reproduce --

- A. I could, I could cite it if I had an opportunity to look at the publication.
- Q. All right. Now isn't it accepted principle and scientific accepted principle that upon examination of a bite mark for the odontologist or somebody to take a silicone impression of that bite mark?
 - A. Not necessarily.
- Q. Well, wouldn't that be a more acceptable process of reproducing the bite mark from the victim?
- A. In, in the, I would say in the somewhat unusual case where the bite mark is clearly three-dimensional, then taking an impression of the bite mark might have some value.

In a case where a bite mark is two-dimensional, in essence, bruising and no indentations or valleys or anything like that, an impression would be worth less.

- Q. Are you saying there was no indentation in any part of the bite mark you examined in this case?
- A. I think there is one mark where there is a breaking of the skin under one of the teeth; but for all intents and purposes, these are not indented marks.
- Q. The body has contours, correct? It's rounded in some places?

- 1	1	
2) A.	Yes
4	Α.	162

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

25

- Q. That's not reflected in a photograph of a flat surface, is it?
 - A. No, it's not.
- Q. The use of silicone to represent and preserve that bite mark would certainly have its advantages in that circumstance, would it not?
- A. Well, it would, it would certainly reproduce the contours, the contours that you are referring to; but in the case of a two-dimensional bite mark, there would be no reference to the mark itself in the impression.
- Q. Well, we don't know that because we don't have a silicone reproduction, do we?
 - A. Not of these marks we don't, no.
- Q. And you told us that you ignored the back teeth, in layman's terms?
- 18 A. Yes.
 - Q. In regard to this --
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. -- thing that you reproduced from the Xerox?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Is there any reason you could not have prepared all the teeth from this Xerox thing that you produced?
 - A. By prepared, you mean reproduced in the tracing?

E. Mofson - CX 1 2 Q. Sure. 3 A. No, no reason. You just didn't do it? ο. I could have done it. I didn't do it. 5 Α. 6 And what you got is photographs showing a flat Q. 7 surface, correct? 8 Α. Correct. 9 Q. Although there are contours on the body, 10 correct? 11 Α. Correct. 12 And what you've got is a flat surface from the Q. 13 Xerox machine, correct? 14 Α. Correct. 15 And your overlay was prepared as a result of Q. 16 lying this plastic thing over the Xerox copy, correct? 17 It was prepared in accordance with the --A. 18 Accepted standard --Q. 19 -- accepted standards. Α. 20 -- from -- and did it ever occur to you to Q. 21 preserve those bite marks by the use of silicone 22 impressions? 23 Α. In this case, that I did not feel it would be 24 worthwhile to do that. 25 ο. You've read about that --

E. Mofson - CX A. Oh, yes. Q. -- in the professional journals, have you not?

- A. Certainly, certainly. Also about the limitations in its use.
- Q. Did you bring silicone with you for that purpose when you made this examination?
 - A. Didn't bring it with me but it's certainly readily available if I felt it was necessary.
 - Q. You are principally employed in this profession as a dentist; is that correct?
- 12 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. This you do occasionally on the side, right?
- A. This I do whenever the occasions arise and so my services are requested.
 - Q. You also tell us that relevant to the accuracy of the bite mark is the position of the body at the time of the infliction of the wound, correct?
- 19 A. That's a factor, yes.
- Q. Whether there is a struggle, whether the skin is stretched, correct?
- 22 A. All those are variables, yes.
- Q. And those variables, were you provided any information in regard to --
- 25 A. No, sir.

- ↑	E. MOISON - CA
2	Q those possibilities?
3	A. No, sir.
4	Q. So I assume if the skin is stretched, from what
5	you say, the accuracy of the bite mark is questionable,
6	correct?
7	A. Correct.
8	Q. I presume from what you've told us that if there
9	is a struggle, depending on the position of the victim,
10	that may have something to do with the accuracy of the bite
11	mark left, correct?
12	A. May have, yes.
13	Q. And again, human skin is a poor medium for bite
14	mark comparison, is it not?
15	A. A well, yes, it's a poor medium as compared
16	to certainly many other materials.
17	Q. Now you've testified, you showed this overlay
18	that you prepared from a Xerox copy about consistency,
19	correct?
20	A. Um hum.
21	Q. And again, your opinion might change if you were
22	aware that there was the bite marks were inflicted
23	through a clothing, correct?
24	MR. VARGASON: Objection, Your Honor.
25	He's already testified to that.

1	E. Mofson - CX
2	THE COURT: Sustained.
3	Q. That may change your opinion, correct?
4	MR. VARGASON: Objection, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Sustained.
6	Q. And you found some photographs that you fit into
7	your overlay that you took from the Xerox to be consistent;
8	is that correct?
9	A. That's correct.
10	Q. And you found some to be not consistent,
11	correct?
12	A. No, that's not correct.
13	Q. Didn't you give us some explanation as to the
14	bite marks on the thigh, why they didn't fit into your
15	Xerox copy here?
16	A. Oh, okay. Inconsistent but explainably so in my
17	
-,	opinion.
18	opinion. Q. In your opinion?
18 19	Q. In your opinion?
18	Q. In your opinion? A. Yes, sir.
18 19 20	Q. In your opinion? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you know from anything that you've learned,
18 19 20 21	Q. In your opinion? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you know from anything that you've learned, from any investigator or anybody else the position of
18 19 20 21 22	Q. In your opinion? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you know from anything that you've learned, from any investigator or anybody else the position of Sabina's body when the bite marks were applied to her
18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. In your opinion? A. Yes, sir. Q. Do you know from anything that you've learned, from any investigator or anybody else the position of Sabina's body when the bite marks were applied to her thigh?

E. Mofson - CX

- A. No, I don't.
- Q. So -- but you explained it, correct?
- A. I -- it's a possible explanation.

MR. VARGASON: I am going to object to that, Your Honor. That isn't what he said on direct examination.

THE COURT: It's a hypothetical explanation. To that --

- Q. How do you arrive at that explanation? On what basis, on what information that was provided to you, this thing about holding with two hands and biting, how do you arrive at that?
- A. I arrive at that by, by experience of an analysis of bite marks, by knowledge of how the teeth bite and the, and the characteristics of skin.
- Q. So what you are saying is when you find an inconsistent bite mark, you arrive at it from your experience that somebody held the thigh and bit it?
- A. No. When you find -- there are inconsistencies that are explainable and there are inconsistencies that are not explainable.
- Q. So you have dreamed up an explanation in this case, haven't you, somebody held the thigh and bit?

MR. VARGASON: I am going --

E. Mofson - CX 1 2 THE COURT: Sustained as to the form of that question, Mr. McGraw. 3 0. You didn't base that opinion on anything that 4 5 was told to you or that you know, correct? I didn't base that opinion on anything that was 6 Α. 7 told to me, that's correct. 8 Are you aware that Dr. Homer Campbell had an 0. 9 opportunity to examine those bites on the thigh? 10 Α. I am. 11 Q. Was that discussed with the District Attorney 12 before your testimony here? 13 Α. I knew that he had seen those bites, yes. Were you aware that he excluded the defendant? 14 Q. 15 Objection, Your Honor. MR. VARGASON: 16 THE COURT: Sustained. Mr. McGraw, that's 17 improper, highly. 18 Q. Did you have any discussions --19 THE COURT: Wait just a moment. 20 Ladies and gentlemen, I direct you to 21 disregard that question in its entirety as being 22 improper. 23 Q. Did you have any discussions with the District 24 Attorney or anybody else prior to your testimony about 25

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York

those bite marks that were found on the thigh of Sabina

Kulakowski?

1.5

- A. We discussed all the bite marks.
- Q. All right. Did you have any significant conversation regarding the findings of the bite marks on the thigh?
- A. No. I don't think we had any conversation regarding those marks that were exceptionally different from the other marks.
- Q. Well, did you, did you discuss your opinion as explainable inconsistency with the District Attorney?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. Today?
 - A. Not today.
 - Q. Recently?
- A. I don't know. A week, two. I don't know when we met. I don't really, I don't recall how long ago it was that we met and we discussed this case.
- Q. You told us on direct examination not only that skin is a poor medium for bite mark but the bony portions are more difficult to make an analysis on how a bite mark appears, like a back?
- A. No, I didn't say that. I said they would appear different. Different consistencies, different surface contours, different underlying structures would result in

E. Mofson - CX

different appearing marks. I don't know where one necessarily would be more or less difficult than the other to analyze.

- Q. Well, did, did you tell us on direct examination, and correct me if I am wrong, that a bite mark into the fleshy area of the body is more susceptible to an accurate comparison than bite marks on less fleshy parts of the body?
 - A. I don't believe I said that.
 - Q. Well, is it true?
 - A. I don't believe it's necessarily true.
- Q. And you didn't tell us that on direct examination?
 - A. I don't think so.
- Q. How do you explain your testimony to this jury that this thing that you took from the Xerox and made the overlay is consistent or fits with the examination of these photos? How do you explain that?
 - A. I am not sure I understand the question.
- Q. Well, let me ask you this: The likelihood of change of the bruising or bite marks is greater if the victim's posture is changed, correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Passage of time would have a great deal to do

with the accuracy or with the bite mark impression on the body, correct?

- A. Passage of time would affect the appearance of the mark, yes.
- Q. Yes, and we know in this case that your examination occurred several hours after the victim was found, correct?
- A. It appears to be that's true, yeah, I guess. I don't know exactly when the victim was found.
- Q. Well, hypothetically, if the victim were found at approximately 2:15 the evening before the afternoon of your examination, there would be a passage of several hours, correct?

MR. VARGASON: I am going to object to this because there is no evidence in the record to that.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. VARGASON: In fact, it's quite different.

MR. MCGRAW: I don't understand, Judge.

THE COURT: I don't think that's -- the

premise is not based in any evidence that's

before this Court I don't think.

Q. You don't know how rapidly the body cools, do

LISA M. CLARK, Official Court Reporter Cayuga County Courthouse, Auburn, New York 13021

	2	vou.	after	death	3
--	---	------	-------	-------	---

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

22

23

24

- A. I think it would depend upon the environment in which the body is --
- Q. Correct. You don't know what the difference in the temperature was from the time that they found Sabina until the time that you made these examinations, correct?
 - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Very important, isn't it, that you, that you take photographs of the bite marks on the victim, very important?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. That it be done properly?
- 14 | A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Do you have some expertise in photography?
- 16 A. Yes, I think so.
- 17 Q. Why didn't you take the photographs?
- 18 A. Why didn't I take the photographs?
- 19 | O. Yes --
- 20 A. I didn't have the photographic equipment. I don't carry it with me.
 - Q. Do you know if any of the people that took the photographs as it relates to your analysis and opinion had any expertise in photographing?
- 25 A. I don't know.

E. Mofson - CX

- Q. Photography?
- A. I don't know that.
- Q. Well, back to my original question, would you expect the bite mark to be precisely and exactly as it was in the condition at the time it was inflicted, taking into consideration all these circumstances, moving the body, passage of time, bite marks, being a poor medium?
- A. I would not expect the bite mark when examined under the circumstances under which it was examined to be exactly and identically unchanged from what it was at the time it was inflicted.
- Q. Any of these -- but in this case, did you find it that way?
- A. Well, I don't know what it looked like at the time it was inflicted. I can't make that comparison.
- Q. All right. Well, from the time that you examined it and made your analysis, you are aware of all these circumstances, correct?
 - A. What circumstances is that?
- Q. The length of time, moving the body, that sort of thing?
 - A. Well, obviously, yes.

MR. VARGASON: Objection, Your Honor.

He's already testified that --

- Q. All right, and these casts of dentition show all the teeth that were apparently present in Mr. Brown, correct?
- A. I would assume so. I've never had the opportunity to examine Mr. Brown.
- Q. Well, let me ask you this: For purposes of further analysis and comparison, would it be helpful to you if Mr. Brown were to provide a bite mark, not a dental cast, but a bite mark for your examination and comparison?
- A. I'm not sure it would be valuable because unless, unless the bite mark could be, could be inflicted under the same circumstances on which the bite mark we are comparing is inflicted, then there would be again a whole host of variables we have to contend with.
- Q. A whole host of variables, whether or not the skin was stretched, whether or not this was part of a violent confrontation, all those things that are important for the -- to determine --
 - A. Yes.

- 21 Q. -- the accuracy, correct?
- 22 A. Correct.
- Q. And you don't know of your own knowledge
 precisely how the bite marks were inflicted, under what
 conditions, correct?

E. Mofson - CX 1 2 Α. Correct. So you are saying that if you -- he provided 3 Q. you, or if he provided the police back then a bite mark to 4 human skin, that it may or may not be valuable in your 5 analysis and examination? 6 7 MR. VARGASON: I am going to object to 8 that, Judge. 9 THE COURT: Sustained. 10 MR. VARGASON: Way outside the scope. 11 The overlay that you have prepared from your Q. Xerox machine doesn't fit your transparency, does it? 12 What transparency are you talking about? 13 Α. This one, the Xerox machine transparency. 14 Q. 15 Α. Which overlay now are you talking about? 16 This photograph, this transparency. Q. THE COURT: Well, wait a minute. 17 18 photograph? 19 Q. Exhibit Number 68 and Exhibit Number 64. 20 Does not fit? Α. 21 Right. Q. I think I testified that it was consistent. 22 Α. You did. Do I have the transparency in the 23 Q. 24 proper position for the comparison? 25 May I refer to my report and see? Α.

- 1		
1		E. Mofson - CX
2	Q.	No. Just look at the exhibits.
3		THE COURT: No.
4	A.	I would rather look at the report so I will make
5	sure and se	ee what
6	Q.	Exhibit 64, okay?
7		THE COURT: There is a letter on it. What
8		letter is on the back?
9	Q.	Exhibit F or your marked F.
10	A.	May I take these and see?
11	Q.	Sure.
12	A.	Okay.
13	Q.	Square peg, round hole, isn't it, Doctor?
14	A.	No. It's a matter of getting the orientation
15	correct.	
16	Q.	I see.
17	A.	It fits.
18	Q.	I see.
19	Α.	That's the orientation (indicating).
20	Q.	Lower jaw?
21	Α.	Lower jaw.
22	Q.	That fits?
23	Α.	That fits dimensionally and shape wise. That's
24	a distorti	on in my opinion. There is an absence of
25	bruising i	n those areas, corresponds with the missing

1	E. Mofson - CX	
2	teeth.	
3	Q. That overlay is not consistent nor does it fi	t.
4	with that bite mark, does it?	
5	A. I believe it's consistent.	
6	MR. VARGASON: Objection, Your Honor.	The
7	witness has testified	
8	THE COURT: Sustained.	
9	MR. MCGRAW: May I show the jury, Your	
LO	Honor?	
11	THE COURT: No.	
12	Q. What you are telling us is that Exhibit 64,	
13	which is marked F, and this overlay are consistent, is t	hat
14	your testimony?	
15	A. I think that's what I testified.	
16	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, at the	is
17	point in the trial Dr. Mofson has given his	
18	opinion. Mr. McGraw has the right to	
19	cross-examine him.	
20	Summations to the jury will be done at	
21	some later date. At that time he can ask you	ı to
22	look at particular pieces of evidence and so	
23	forth; but that's, this is not that point in	the
24	trial when summations take place.	
25	Q. Can you explain to me how Exhibit Number 67,	а

2	picture	of	a	bite	mark	, is	consistent	with	your	Xerox
3	overlav	in	tŀ	ne los	wer ia	w?				

- A. The lower jaw is the area we spoke of as distortion earlier on in my testimony, of possible distortion, possible stretching of tissue.
- Q. Based on some opinion that you have that maybe somebody held the thigh with both hands, is that the area we are talking about?
- A. That's a possible explanation, yes.
 - Q. Doesn't even come near it, does it?
- 12 A. I see it as consistent.
- 13 Q. You do?

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Yes, sir, I do. I have testified to the fact that I do.
- Q. You wouldn't want to testify that that distortion, whatever you call it, would disqualify
 Mr. Brown as the person who inflicted that bite, would you?
- 19 A. Go over that again for me, please.
 - Q. You wouldn't want to provide testimony here that that distortion as you have explained it and the difference between the overlay and the teeth marks would disqualify Mr. Brown as the person having inflicted that bite wound, would you?

MR. VARGASON: Your Honor, I am going to

1	E. Mofson - CX
2	object.
3	THE COURT: I will sustain it in that
4	form.
5	MR. VARGASON: If he wants him as his own
6	witness
7	MR. MCGRAW: No, I don't want him as my
8	own witness.
9	Q. The pictures, the dentition, that was provided
10	you for your comparison and analysis to your knowledge or
11	did you provide that same information and those same
12	exhibits to anybody else for an examination?
13	MR. VARGASON: Objection.
14	Q. Did you send them any place?
15	MR. VARGASON: Objection, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Sustained, not relevant.
17	MR. VARGASON: Totally irrelevant.
18	THE COURT: Sustained.
19	Q. Did you consult
20	THE COURT: Sustained. We are not going
21	to argue about it.
22	MR. MCGRAW: I have nothing further.
23	Thank you.
24	(People's Exhibit 70, Manual of Forensic Odontology,
25	was marked for identification.)
	II

E. Mofson - RDX

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. VARGASON:

- Q. Dr. Mofson, on cross-examination there was considerable discussion about the procedure that you use in arriving at this transparency. I am going to show you what's been marked as People's Exhibit 70 and ask if you could identify that?
 - A. Yes, I can.
 - Q. And what is it?
- A. The Manual of Forensic Odontology published by
 The American Society of Forensic Odontolgoy.
- Q. Is that a publication that is respected within the field of forensic odontology?
- 14 A. Yes, it is.
- 15 Q. Is that a publication that you yourself have 16 read?
- 17 | A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

18

19

20

- Q. And does that publication contain any discussion whatsoever concerning the method in which you employed to arrive at these?
- 21 A. Yes, it does.
- Q. And is, is that the source from which you obtained or arrived at a determination as to use this method?
- 25 A. Yes, it is.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1		E. Mofson - RDX
2	Q.	Thank you very much, Doctor.
3		MR. MCGRAW: May I see that, please?
4		MR. VARGASON: Sure (handing).
5		A couple more questions if I may, Judge?
6		THE COURT: Okay. Are you going to offer
7		that?
8		MR. MCGRAW: Go ahead.
9		MR. VARGASON: Oh, I am sorry. I thought
10		he was going to request a voir dire of that or
11		something, Judge.
12		THE COURT: I didn't know you had offered
13		it.
14		MR. VARGASON: I have not offered it.
15		THE COURT: Okay. Then he's not entitled
16		to a voir dire.
17		MR. MCGRAW: I just wanted to look at it.
18		Excuse me.
19	Q.	Doctor, tell us I believe you testified on

ified on cross-examination as pertains to the use of silicone. us what the limitations, if any, there are.

Silicone is a very accurate impression material. Α. It's very often used in dental impressions for making dental prostheses, crowns and what not. It gives a very accurate representation of a three-dimensional object.

E. Mofson - RDX

If we are dealing with two-dimensional surface, flat skin surface containing bruising, the only thing that the silicone would reproduce would be the contour of the skin surface. It would show nothing of the bruising.

- Q. And you testified here that a lot of these were bruising; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- So what use would silicone have with regard to 0. examining those bite marks?
- Α. Well, in my opinion, these bite marks did not indicate the use of an impression technique. That's why I didn't suggest using it at the time I examined the marks.
- 0. Doctor, let me ask you, and there was a great deal of discussion on cross-examination about the time elapsed here --
 - Α. Um hum.
- -- and that it's important to examine the bite Q. marks as soon after, would that be a fair statement?
 - Α. Well, that would be, yeah, ideally, yes.
- Do you ever get to examine the bite marks while Q. the bite marks or the biting is occurring?

MR. MCGRAW: Objection.

> THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. VARGASON: Thank you.

25

E. Mofson - RCX

MR. MCGRAW: Could I see the book, please?

MR. VARGASON: Do you want to read it now?

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. MCGRAW:

- Q. Silicone shows the contours of the body, doesn't it, where the bite mark appears?
 - A. Shows the contours, yes.
 - Q. Yes, and that's important, isn't it?
- A. Well, it depends on what you want to use silicone. If you want to represent the contours of the body, silicone would do so. Silicone would not represent the bite mark unless the bite mark were a three-dimension bite mark.
- Q. You gave us some explanation as to why a bite mark wasn't consistent, because somebody may have held the thigh in this -- and contoured the body, correct?
 - A. Okay.
- Q. And you explained that away by talking about the contour of the body, did you not?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Well, the silicone preservants of that bite mark would have been important to support or --
- A. But you couldn't, you wouldn't have been able to visualize the bite mark in the silicone.
 - Q. You would have the -- you wouldn't be able to

1	E. Mofson - RCX
·2	visualize any bite mark in the thigh, is that what your
3	testimony is?
4	A. In the silicone impression of the thigh.
5	Q. So there was no depression whatsoever of the
6	skin, is that what your testimony is?
7	A. That's right.
8	Q. In any of the bite marks there was no depression
9	of the skin?
10	A. No. I think there was some breakage of the skir
11	in one or possibly more of them, of the marks.
12	Q. There is a difference between the word
13	depression and breaking the skin, isn't there?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. There could be a depression of the skin visible
16	and apparent without having the skin broken, correct?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And silicone would have showed that, would it
19	not.
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Somebody tell you before you came to the
22	hospital not to bring your silicone because there's no
23	depressions in the skin from the bite marks?
24	MR. VARGASON: Objection, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Overruled.

E. Mofson - RCX

- A. Subject never came up about bringing silicone or not bringing silicone in the phone call that I received.
- Q. Exhibit Number 70 is a manual that you are familiar with; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Some chapter in here that supports using a Xerox machine?
- A. I don't think it's the -- they use it by brand name but yeah, copying machines are referred to.
 - Q. Where is that?

THE COURT: Well, it would be improper to refer to an exhibit that's not in evidence,

Mr. McGraw, so if you want to offer it, that's fine.

MR. MCGRAW: Well --

THE COURT: But it's not in evidence at this point.

MR. MCGRAW: If I were given an opportunity to examine it thoroughly, Judge, I might just make that offer, not as to one chapter but as to all of it.

A. Yes.

MR. MCGRAW: I don't think the Judge wants you to answer the question.

1	•
2	THE WITNESS: Oh, I see.
3	MR. MCGRAW: Could I look at it over the
4	noon break, Your Honor?
5	THE COURT: Sure.
6	MR. MCGRAW: Do we keep the Doctor
7	available for cross-examination in that regard?
8	THE COURT: No. No, I am not going to do
9	that.
10	MR. MCGRAW: Well, then it wouldn't all
11	right. Make it essentially
12	THE COURT: He has not made reference to
13	it. You, in your cross-examination you asked
14	him for the reference. He has provided you with
15	that reference. I don't think now
16	MR. MCGRAW: Well, my position is, my
17	position is that's a professional manual with
18	lots of information and material in it, and I
19	might want to use it to cross-examine him in
20	other areas, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Well, anything further?
22	MR. MCGRAW: No, Your Honor.
23	MR. VARGASON: Nothing further, Judge.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Doctor, you are
25	excused. Thank you very much.