transcript ! 11/23/2010 +6030 + autile 'I Didn't Do I+ Dear Blog, all hunts so bad just to look at this stuff; things /details about trial clive intentionally or Subconciously jorget - to lessen the pain. On the opening day of the Penalty Phase - which is after the convection, where the Prosecutor tries to severy the jury to vote for the Deatth Penally cl just couldn't stand as it algust 5 creamed out 'el didn't do it. My pain & nerves were even more raw than right row Culile reviewing transcripts). Il Still couldn't believe I rad been convicted & cl had to sit & hear the D. A Try & killing. Wow-clu kurting now as al recall The pained expressions of tears on everyones face, my parent parento, family nembers - even some jurous I was sententeed to LWOP (Life With Out Broke Most people believed it was a 'compromise verdit: meaning - vote to convict - but no death dop dan penalty - because they (jurous) didn't fully believe in Their verdict. Up to ten (10) capital Cases before mine -all were - Death Verdiets & they were convicted of one (1) murder; I was convicted of 3 & The juny couldn't didn't vote for death While I was a college Student, I rever wouldwe believed that anyone could be convicted in a case with so much exculpatory evidence clamaged. I used to Trink those type of claims were made up pleas for help from the public, yet here I sit w LWOP. arrested on 12/1/1996, its' now

11/23/2010. Walder Well You Guss, I trope this moves to at least one day go to your local court o witness a Frial. all too often dot of niejustices occur - because The only people in court - are the Jude, lawyers, defendent & jurous With we public, there's no account abolity In a righ profile case, every Thing is 3 crutinized because the public trus Their eyes on the trial. The Prosecutor who tried the case against me in Alameda County - is now a in the same county. I am a hifer while I still appeal the convection against me Will Respect, Michael Jing

victims' relatives

By Jeah Richman STAFF WRITER

OAKLAND - Prosecutor Stuart Hing had just begun describing the seven gunshots that killed Rhoshima Glass Pippins, her infant son and her unborn fetus when Michael Manjeet Singh — the man convicted of the murders - lost control Thursday.

"I didn't do it!" he sobbed, his weeping growing louder until Alameda County Superior Court Judge Phillip Sarkisian excused the jury for 10 minutes while Singh's attorneys helped him pull himself together.

Singh's outburst contrasted with the raw pain that radiated from Pippins' relatives as they testified about their tragedy.

Grandmother testifies

Anna Young, Pippins' grandmother, wept but kept herself mostly in check Thursday until Hing asked about the day she learned of the murders. What followed was a long, hysterical venting of rage over the loss of her, granddaughten greatgrandson and a great-grandchild yet to be.

fory that awful day, she recounted as her body shook with sobs.

"I'd never heard anything in the world that hurt me so bad, she wailed. "I said, "Why would you tell me something like this? I thought you loved me.' "

She had to retire from her teaching job because the sight of young children reminded her of her loss, she said, and she still finds some small comfort in talking to photos of her granddaughter and great-grandson.

"I don't know how to stop

hurting," she said.

The jury that heard this testimony Thursday had convicted Singh, 24, of Herkeley, two days earlier of murdering Pippins, 22, of Hayward; their sixmonth-old son, Michael Glass; and the 2-month-old fetus Pip-pins carried. The shootings took place at about 2 a.m. on Dec. 1, 1996, in Pippins' car in a Foothill Boulevard supermarket parking lot.

Now the jury must decide whether Singh should serve the rest of his life in state prison without possibility of parole, or be put to death by lethal injec-

Young recounted cradling the body of her grandson - whom the family called "Mike-Mike" while someone fixed Pippins' Her son took the brunt of her ... hair as she lay in the coffin she and her son would share. The grandmother only wanted to see the baby laugh and play as he once had, she said, "but he was so cold."

Sherrie Donaville Mannings, Pippins' mother, said the murders "changed my entire life - I don't even know who I am any-

Crippling grief

Mannings credited Pippins' boyfriend, Willie Williams, with helping her keep open her oncethriving Oakland beauty salon. She and her husband have divorced: she has moved in with her sister and she has been prescribed Prozac to help her grapple with her crippling grief. she said.

After the family was done speaking Thursday, defense attorney William Linehan objected to Young's testimony, which he called utterly and completely out of control." He acknowledged there was little to be done about it, although he said the law that allows these "victim impact statements" during capital cases is inappropriate.

Linehan was able to convince Sarkisian to prevent Hing from showing jurors a videotape of the tombstone at the victims'

grave.

10000-101-10E1129

The defense will begin presenting its case Monday.

```
COURT AT A 995 AND LOST. THEN THEY CHALLENGED THAT
1
    STATEMENT AGAIN FOR A THIRD TIME IN FRONT OF THIS COURT
2
    AND LOST. AND I'M NOT SURE WHEN THEY CHALLENGED THE
3
    STATEMENT BY WAY OF A WRIT IN FRONT OF YET ANOTHER COURT.
4
    BUT THEY LOST AGAIN. SO THEY HAVE ALREADY LOST THIS
5
    CHALLENGE FOUR TIMES. AND THE FACTS HAVEN'T CHANGED. THE
6
    LAW HASN'T CHANGED, SO SINCE THEY ARE MAKING A MOTION FOR
7
8
    THE FIFTH TIME I ASK THAT THE SAME RESULT OCCUR. THEY
    SHOULD LOSE.
9
              THE COURT: IS THE MATTER SUBMITTED?
10
              MR. HING: YES.
11
             THE COURT: MR. LINEHAN?
12
13
              MR. LINEHAN: YES.
              THE COURT: IN THE COURT'S VIEW THIS WAS NOT A
14
     CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION. THE MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL IS
15
16
    DENIED.
               IS THERE ANY OTHER LEGAL CAUSE WHY JUDGMENT
17
     SHOULD NOT NOW BE PRONOUNCED?
18
             MR. LINEHAN: MY CLIENT WISHES TO MAKE A
19
     STATEMENT, YOUR HONOR.
20
            THE COURT: OF COURSE. MR. SINGH?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: THIS MORNING ON THE WAY HERE ON
22
     THE RADIO I HEARD THAT GLEN "BUDDY" NICKERSON AFTER
23
     FIGHTING FOR 15 YEARS WAS RELEASED. HE WAS CONVICTED OF A
24
     DOUBLE HOMICIDE BUT THE QUOTE JUDGE MARILYN PATEL USED
25
     STATED AS SUCH: EVIDENCE THAT "STRONGLY SUGGESTS THAT THE
26
     TRIAL WHICH RESULTED IN A CONVICTION WAS MARKED BY
27
     SUPPRESSION AND DESTRUCTION OF EVIDENCE AND PERJURY BY THE
28
```

STATE'S INVESTIGATORS."

IN THIS TRIAL WE HEARD A WITNESS WAS ASLEEP IN THE PARKING LOT WHERE THE SHOOTINGS TOOK PLACE, WITNESS BY THE NAME OF ROBERT KOLKMANN. HE WAS ASLEEP IN HIS CAR. HE SAID OUOTE I RECALL SLEEPING, THEN BEING WOKE UP BY POPPING SOUNDS. AT SOME POINT CONTEMPORANEOUS TO THE POPS THE BLACK CAR LEFT. I SAW THREE TO FOUR OCCUPANTS FLEEING FROM THE CRIME SCENE. I COULDN'T HAVE SAW PEOPLE FLEEING AND SEE THE BLACK CAR RACING AWAY BEFORE THE POPS BECAUSE I WAS ASLEEP.

THIS MAN SAW THREE TO FOUR PEOPLE. THE POLICE

NEVER SHOWED HIM A LINEUP, NEVER GAME HIM A CHANCE. WHEN

HE CAME HERE AND PARTICIPATED DURING THE TRIAL AS A

WITNESS HE DID SOMETHING THAT THE TRANSCRIPTS DO NOT

CAPTURE. HE LOOKED AT ME AND THE EXPRESSION IN HIS EYES

WAS WOW, THIS WASN'T ONE OF THE THREE TO FOUR PEOPLE I SAW

FLEEING FROM THE CRIME.

LATER WE FIND OUT THAT THERE'S A FOOD 4 LESS
RECEIPT WHERE ROSHIMA AND MIKE-MIKE HAD GONE SHOPPING, THE
VIDEO SURVEILLANCE THAT COULD PROVE MY INNOCENCE WAS
DESTROYED. THE HOMICIDE DETECTIVE EDWARD MUNIZ OBTAINED A
VIDEOTAPE OF THE STORE. THIS WAS OBTAINED BECAUSE THE
NAME OF THE CLERK, VICTOR SEELY, WHO MANNED THE CASH
REGISTER WHERE ROSHIMA WENT TO PURCHASE THE BABY FOOD WAS
SHOWN THE LINEUP. AGAIN, HE COULD NOT PICK OUT. THIS IS
SOMEONE WHO CAME IN DIRECT CONTACT WITH ROSHIMA AND THIS
WAS THE PERSON WHO THAT DID NOT PICK ANYONE, HE COULD NOT
PICK ANYONE, SO WE HAD TO RELY ON THE VIDEOTAPE. IT WAS

DESTROYED. WHY WAS THE ONLY SECTION DESTROYED WAS FROM 1 MIDNIGHT TO 2:00 A.M., ABOUT THE CRUCIAL TIME IN QUESTION? 2 MICHELLE FOX HAS BEEN THE ISSUE IN THIS CASE. 3 4 SHE CAME IN HERE AND SHE COMMITTED PERJURY. HER HUSBAND OWNS THE LAB. DURING PRETRIAL MOTIONS WHEN SHE TOLD THE 5 COURT SHE LIED SHE WAS ASKED BY MR. LINEHAN, MY ATTORNEY, 6 7 HOW DO WE KNOW THIS IS AN ISOLATED INCIDENT? SHE RESPONDED YOU DON'T. IT LATER CAME OR ABOUT THE SAME TIME 8 THAT AGAIN HER HUSBAND OWNS THE LAB, A SEMEN SAMPLE WAS 9 TAKEN. IT WAS TESTED, AND NO MATTER WHAT IS SAID ABOUT IT 10 BEING TESTED AND THE IMPORTANCE OF IT OR NOT, THE SEMEN 11 SAMPLE YIELDED THE RESULTS OF INCONCLUSIVE. WHY WAS IT 12 NOT TESTED AGAIN? THE TESTS WERE INCONCLUSIVE. HOW 13 CONVENIENT FOR THE PROSECUTION SINCE IT'S NOT MINE. WHY 14 CAN IT NOT BE TESTED AGAIN? 15 I'M LOOKING IN THE AUDIENCE AND I DO NOT SEE 16 WILLIE WILLIAMS HERE. A DESCRIPTION OF THE CAR SEEN 17 FLEEING FROM THE CRIME SCENE MATCHED HIS CAR. HIS HANDS 18 TESTED POSITIVE FOR MATERIAL CONSISTENT WITH GUNSHOT 19 RESIDUE. HIS ALIBI WAS HE WAS SLEEPING. HOW DO YOU GET 20 GUNSHOT RESIDUE ON YOUR HANDS WHILE YOU ARE SLEEPING? WE 21 KNOW. AND THIS CAME ABOUT DURING THE TRIAL TESTIMONY, THAT 22 WILLIE WILLIAMS IN AN EVENING OF FUN WENT OUT WITH A 23 FRIEND. HE WENT OUT WITH A FRIEND AND KIDNAPPED A 24 PROSTITUTE. HE ATTEMPTED TO RAPE HER. SHE STRUGGLED, IN 25 THE ENSUING STRUGGLE A CAR ACCIDENT HAPPENED. SHE GOT 26 AWAY WHERE ROSHIMA DID NOT GET AWAY FROM HIM. HE HAS AN 27 EXTENSIVE CRIMINAL PAST. HIS CRIMINAL PAST WAS NOT

28

CHECKED BY THE HAYWARD POLICE.

THERE IS A CONFESSIONAL THING THE JURY DID NOT HEAR. THIS WAS RECORDED ON THE BUSINESS ANSWERING MACHINE OWNED BY ROSHIMA'S MOM. THE HAIR SHOP. THE CALL WAS MADE AFTER MY ARREST. I WAS ARRESTED ON THE 1ST. THE CALL WAS MADE ON WEDNESDAY THE 4TH, 12-4-96. THE CALLER BRAGGED, HE LAUGHINGLY CLAIMED HE COMMITTED THE CRIME. HE KNEW HE WOULDN'T GET CAUGHT OR TAKEN SERIOUSLY BECAUSE I WAS ALREADY ARRESTED. THIS IS NOT JUST ANY PSYCHO CALLING THE LOCAL POLICE DEPARTMENT. RATHER, THIS IS SOMEONE WHO KNEW ALL THE DOTS AND RELATIONS WITHIN.

THE CALLER ALSO USED A NICKNAME KNOWN ONLY TO CLOSE FRIENDS AND FAMILY. THIS NICKNAME WAS DISCOVERED BY US, THE DEFENSE, DURING PRETRIAL MOTIONS. AFTER LISTENING TO THE TAPE SEVERAL TIMES, NUMEROUS TIMES, WE DISCOVERED THAT THE TAPE WAS PLAYED FAST, YOU CAN'T TELL, YOU HAVE TO SLOW IT DOWN AND LISTEN TO IT AND ONLY THEN DO YOU KNOW THAT A NICKNAME WAS USED. AS A JOKE SOMEONE LEFT A PHONE NUMBER, IT'S HARD TO DECIPHER, BUT AGAIN IT'S A LOCAL PREFIX. SOMEONE PUT ALL THESE DOTS TOGETHER.

BASED ON TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS IT BECAME KNOWN THAT
QUITE PROBABLY A VIOLENT STRUGGLE OCCURRED IN THE
COMMISSION OF THIS HORRIBLE, HORRIBLE CRIME. THAT COUPLED
WITH THE FACT THAT RECENTLY, DECEMBER OF 2000, A GUN WAS
FOUND AT THE MURDER SCENE. THE SAME EYEWITNESS, KOLKMANN,
THAT SAW THREE TO FOUR PEOPLE FLEEING THE CRIME SCENE WHO
AWOKE TO GUNSHOTS, IT IS CREDENCE LENT TO THE THEORY OF
THREE TO FOUR PEOPLE FLEEING ALTHOUGH THE GUN WAS TESTED

AND WAS LATER REVEALED IT WAS NOT THE MURDER WEAPON. ONE OF THE OTHER ASSAILANTS COULD HAVE POSSIBLY BEEN ARMED AND DROPPED IT WHILE FLEEING TO GET INTO THE BLACK CAR THAT SPED AWAY FROM THE SCENE OF THE CRIME.

THE POLICE NEVER DID THEIR JOB. NOT ONLY DID
THEY NOT CHECK WILLIE WILLIAMS'S BACKGROUND, THEY DID NOT
THOROUGHLY SEARCH THE CRIME SCENE. WE HAVE ALL HEARD
CASES WHERE BODIES ARE FOUND A COUPLE YEARS LATER. IN
THIS CASE A WEAPON WAS FOUND YEARS LATER. THEY DID HAVE A
RUSH TO JUDGMENT TO ARREST ME, HOWEVER.

A LOT OF PEOPLE SAY THEY ARE INNOCENT BUT WE SAY
THAT TOO MANY PEOPLE SAY THAT TO LEND CREDENCE BECAUSE YOU
HAVE TO PROVE BEYOND ANY DOUBT, AND THAT IS QUITE A
DIFFICULT TASK TO PROVE. BUT HOW MANY THINGS THAT COULD
PROVE MY INNOCENCE BEYOND ANY DOUBT HAS BEEN ALTERED,
DESTROYED OR SOMEHOW COME UP MISSING UNDER QUESTIONABLE
CIRCUMSTANCES?

AFTER I FINISH SPEAKING I'M SURE MANY PEOPLE
WILL SPEAK. THE PROSECUTOR CAN SAY WHATEVER HE WANTS, BUT
NO MATTER WHAT RHETORIC HE SPEWS FORTH IT CAN'T AND WON'T
NEGATE CERTAIN VITAL AND CRUCIAL ISSUES SURROUNDING THE
CASE AND EACH ASPECT AS WELL AS THE TOTALITY OF
CIRCUMSTANCES.

I HAVE NOW SEEN HOW THE SYSTEM HAS WRONGLY DID

DR. SAM SHEPPARD IN OHIO AND RUBEN "HURRICANE" CARTER.

THE DEFENSE, WE, WE HAD TO MAKE THE BEST OUT OF THE WORST.

THE TRIAL AGAINST ME WAS A MOCKERY OF JUSTICE. GLEN

NICKERSON WAS RELEASED, BUT FOR 15 YEARS AND DURING HIS

TRIAL HE HAD TO ENDURE THE HATRED OF THE VICTIM'S FAMILY BECAUSE THEY THOUGHT HE DID IT. HE IS NOW FREE.

THE PROSECUTION HAD NO RESPONSE TO THE MOTIONS FILED BY THE DEFENSE. THIS EVIDENCE WAS UNEARTHED LATER. OUR MOTIONS WERE NOT GRANTED BECAUSE THEY ARE ALWAYS ARE ROUTINELY DENIED, AND THE PROSECUTORS KNOW THAT. JUST YESTERDAY IN THIS VERY COURTHOUSE A MAN WHO IS FACING A CHARGE OF RAPE CAME IN HERE AND HE IS ALSO FIGHTING FOR A MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL. THE PROSECUTOR IN THAT CASE HAD TO GO GET AN ATTORNEY BECAUSE HE OR SHE SUBORNED PERJURED TESTIMONY.

IN MY FOUR AND A HALF YEARS WHILE I HAVE BEEN INCARCERATED I HAVE SEEN MANY THINGS. I HAVE SEEN PEOPLE COME, FIGHT CASES. I HAVE ENDURED A LOT BUT I'VE ALSO SEEN ANOTHER MAN FIGHTING A RAPE CHARGE. THE WOMAN WHO TESTIFIED AGAINST HIM AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING LATER SHE HAD A DIARY IN WHICH SHE WROTE DURING THE CRUCIAL TIME I SENT A MAN UP TODAY. I LIED DURING A HEARING. THESE ARE THE CASES THAT COME THROUGH COURTHOUSES. UNLESS THAT GIRL'S MOTHER DID NOT TURN IN THAT DIARY THAT ISSUE WOULD HAVE NEVER COME TO LIGHT. THERE ARE CERTAIN ISSUES THAT WILL NEVER COME TO LIGHT BECAUSE THERE'S NO WAY TO GET TO THEM. IT'S NO WAY UNLESS SOMEONE, FOR EXAMPLE, LIKE IN THE RAPE CASE I JUST MENTIONED, THAT GIRL'S MOM, SHE MADE HERSELF HAVE THE HEART TO TURN THAT OVER TO THE DEFENSE.

RECENTLY IN TEXAS THIS WEEK'S TIME MAGAZINE,
WHEN THE EVIDENCE LIES, FORENSIC SCIENTISTS ARE LYING ALL
THE TIME, IT IS NOW REVEALED. WHEN MICHELLE FOX LIED SHE

LIED DURING A PRELIMINARY HEARING IN FRONT OF JUDGE GARY PICETTI DURING 1997 AND DID NOT COME TO LIGHT UNTIL THIS YEAR. THE D.A. SHE CHOSE TO CONTACT WHEN SHE FIRST MADE THOSE ALLEGATIONS WAS A DIFFERENT DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, NOT MR. HING, BUT SOMEONE ELSE.

AGAIN, A QUOTE USED WHEN JUDGE MARILYN PATEL FREED GLEN NICKERSON AFTER 15 YEARS IN HIS BATTLE FOR JUSTICE SHE SAID RECENT EVENTS TAKEN TOGETHER RAISE SERIOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CONFIDENCE THAT CAN BE ACCORDED IN THIS CONVICTION.

I WILL NEVER STOP FIGHTING FOR MY INNOCENCE.

EVEN MORE RECENTLY, MAY 29, 2001, THERE'S ANOTHER MURDER

TRIAL CURRENTLY HAPPENING IN HAYWARD. A JUDGE TOLD

MICHELLE FOX, AND I QUOTE, I WILL NOT QUALIFY YOU AS AN

EXPERT IN ANYTHING AND BANNED HER FROM TESTIFYING IN THAT

MURDER TRIAL. THE NAME OF THAT JUDGE, JUDGE GARY PICETTI,

THE SAME JUDGE THAT WAS MY PRELIMINARY HEARING JUDGE.

THE GUN FOUND AT THE SCENE OF THE CRIME, AGAIN, ALTHOUGH NOT ACTUAL MURDER WEAPON, IT LENDS CREDENCE OF KOLKMANN'S EYEWITNESS, THE ONLY EYEWITNESS TESTIMONY OF SEEING THREE TO FOUR PEOPLE FLEE THE CRIME SCENE.

ANOTHER ISSUE THAT HAS COME TO LIGHT SINCE MY
CONVICTION IS DURING THE TIME OF THE MURDERS WILLIE
WILLIAMS WAS ENGAGED TO ANOTHER WOMAN WHILE HE WAS LIVING
WITH ROSHIMA. HE WAS ENGAGED TO HER AND SHE WAS PREGNANT,
AND THAT WAS A REPEATED SOURCE OF CONFLICT. THIS IS THE
STUFF THAT BAREFIELD WAS -- SHE WAS -- EVERY TIME SHE WAS
ASKED ABOUT ANY COUNSELING BETWEEN ROSHIMA AND WILLIE

WILLIAMS SAYING THEY ARE ALWAYS ARGUING ABOUT THAT STUPID STUFF QUOTE.

FINGERPRINTS. SEVERAL DETECTIVES TESTIFIED THAT
MY PRINTS WERE ON A SET OF PAPERS. THESE SET OF PAPERS
ARE CUSTODY PAPERS. THIS IS WHAT INMATES HAVE TO DEAL
WITH. WHEN THE FINGERPRINT TECHNICIAN TOOK THE STAND NOT
ONLY DID HE SAY NONE OF MY FINGERPRINTS WERE ON THE PAPERS
IN QUESTION, HE REPUTED THE TESTIMONY OF THREE HOMICIDE
DETECTIVES THAT SAID MY FINGERPRINTS WERE ON THE PAPER OR
THAT THEY FOUND THEM. THERE ARE WRITERS EVERYWHERE, NOT
JUST IN OAKLAND, AS WE ARE HEARING IN TRIAL COURT.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT ELSE I CAN SAY. I'VE SAID IT
BEFORE AND I'LL SAY IT AGAIN, I'M INNOCENT. I DON'T KNOW
WHAT POSSIBLY I CAN DO TO THE VICTIM'S FAMILY. I DIDN'T
DO THIS HORRIBLE CRIME. YOUR ANGER IN ME IS MISPLACED.

JUST LIKE ALL THESE PEOPLE IN HERE WHO ARE WRONGLY
CHARGED, TRIED AND CONVICTED, THEY TOO FACE VICTIMS'
FAMILIES IN TRIAL. SHERRIE, YOU KNOW THE TYPE OF PERSON I
AM AND THE TYPE OF PERSON I WAS WHEN I DATED YOUR
DAUGHTER. YOU KNOW THAT. I YOU KNOW I ALWAYS TREATED HER
WITH RESPECT.

DURING TRIAL I DIDN'T WANT TO BRING THIS ISSUE

UP BECAUSE IT INVOLVED ROSHIMA'S DAUGHTER, BUT I FEEL

COMPELLED TO SAY DURING TRIAL I MENTIONED ABOUT TRIAL

TRANSCRIPTS CAPTURE AND DON'T CAPTURE. MR. HING WAS GOING

TO PRESENT THE TESTIMONY OF SACHE, ROSHIMA'S OLDER

DAUGHTER. SHE HAD SAID A FEW THINGS ABOUT SOMEONE NAMED

MICHAEL MISTREATING HER MOTHER. WHEN SHE TOOK THAT STAND

THE FIRST THING SHE DID WAS LOOK AT ME AND SMILE. THE 1 MICHAEL SHE WAS TALKING ABOUT WAS HER OWN FATHER BEATING 2 HER MOM. THAT GOES TO SHOW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN 3 PERCEPTION AND REALITY AND HOW LITTLE THINGS NEED TO BE 4 THOROUGHLY RESEARCHED BEFORE ANYONE IS CHARGED. I WAS 5 FACING THE DEATH PENALTY. IT HAS BEEN AN EXTREMELY DIFFICULT AND TRYING 7 TIME FOR EVERYONE INVOLVED AND BY NO MEANS -- AND BY NO 8 MEANS IS IT JUST DIFFICULT FOR ONE PERSON'S FAMILY, IT'S DIFFICULT FOR BOTH THE VICTIMS' FAMILY AND IT'S DIFFICULT 10 FOR MY FAMILY AS WELL. BUT I AM INNOCENT. AND I'VE SAID 11 IT BEFORE AND I WILL SAY IT AGAIN AND I WILL ALWAYS FIGHT 12 FOR MY INNOCENCE. I WILL NOT GIVE UP. 13 IN CONCLUSION, I'D LIKE TO THANK MY FAMILY FOR 14 ALL THEIR LOVE, SUPPORT AND ALL THE OTHER SUPPORTERS IN 15 THE AUDIENCE FOR REPEATEDLY HELPING ME, OFFERING ME 16 ENCOURAGING WORDS. I LOVE YOU ALL. 17 THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. SINGH. 18 MR. HING, DID YOU HAVE ANYTHING FURTHER? IS THE 19 MATTER SUBMITTED? 20 MR. LINEHAN: I DCN'T KNOW IF THERE'S A MEMBER 21 OF THE FAMILY WHO WISHES TO SPEAK. APPARENTLY THERE IS. 22 THE DEFENDANT'S AUNT: YOUR HONOR, I AM MICHAEL 23 SINGH'S AUNTIE. MICHAEL SINGH IS INNOCENT. HE DIDN'T DO 24 THAT. THE NIGHT MICHAEL WENT TO SEE ABDULLAH I WAS THERE 25 BECAUSE -- WHY I DIDN'T COME ON THE STAND BECAUSE I AM 26

HONOR. I'LL SAY EVEN THOUGH I LEAVE THIS COURT MY NEPHEW

REAL BLOOD TO HIM AND NOBODY WILL TAKE MY WORD, YOUR

27

28

1	DAYS FROM TODAY'S DATE. IF YOU DO APPEAL AND YOU ARE
2	UNABLE TO HIRE A LAWYER THE APPELLATE COURT WILL APPOINT A
3	LAWYER TO REPRESENT YOU ON APPEAL FREE OF CHARGE. YOU
4	ALSO HAVE A RIGHT TO A FREE TRANSCRIPT AND A RECORD OF THE
5	NECESSARY PROCEEDINGS IN THIS COURT. THE WRITTEN NOTICE
6	OF APPEAL MUST BE TIMELY FILED NO LATER THAN 60 DAYS FROM
7	TODAY'S DATE.
8	DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW TO BEGIN AN
9	APPEAL?
10	THE DEFENDANT: MY ATTORNEY SAID HE WILL DO IT
11	HIMSELF.
12	THE COURT: FINE.
13	ALL RIGHT, THEN. THERE BEING NOTHING FURTHER,
14	THE SHERIFF IS ORDERED TO DELIVER THE DEFENDANT TO THE
15	CUSTODY OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
16	TO BE IMPRISONED PURSUANT TO THIS JUDGMENT AND SENTENCE
17	AND PURSUANT TO LAW.
18	COURT IS ADJOURNED.
19	(END OF PROCEEDINGS.)
20	
21	a a
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	