## (CLOSING ARGUMENTS)

MS. KILLEEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Ladies and

2

3

1

gentlemen of the jury, thank you for your patience this
morning while we waited for the availability of the last
piece of Commonwealth evidence. I will get to why that

7 piece is significant, and the Commonwealth wanted to make

sure that you were able to consider it later. I know it's been a bit of a long morning. We actually spent the time

10 usefully completing all the instructions and really did use

11 all that time. Everyone in this courtroom agrees that

Raelyn Balfour, the defendant, killed Bryce Balfour, between the two parties. The defense says it: the Commonwealth says

13 the two parties. The defense says it; the Commonwealth says
14 it. Commonwealth's Exhibit 1, everyone agrees that on March

15 30<sup>th</sup>, 2007, this little boy's life did not have to end this

16 way, on a hospital gurney deceased, dead, his life squan-

dered and gone forever. This case is about Bryce Balfour

and his life and whether his mother's conduct as a caretaker

19 for him constitutes criminal negligence, and the Common-

wealth submits to you that it does just on having left the

21 | child for seven-and-a-half hours in the car, but that's not

22 what you are being asked to consider. You are being asked

23 to consider more than that. The Commonwealth expects that

24 it heavily---well, you saw from the evidence that a big

factual dispute between the two sides is the meaning of the telephone records in the case, of the network record from Alltel and whether the call that the Commonwealth says is to voicemail at 10:44:56 that morning is accurate. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you know that she accessed her phone. She's told you that she did. She told Whitney Huff, I didn't return your call that morning because you normally called me from a different number, and I never returned your call that morning because you normally called me at a different number. She's told you that she is guilty of criminal negligence. She is the mother of the child, and as the mother, she is a caretaker responsible for preserving his safety. There are other caretakers. His father is a caretaker. The babysitter is a caretaker. Teachers and coaches can be caretakers. In this instance, Jarrett Balfour is not charged because he doesn't have some sort of magical or divine responsibility to know where the child is at all times and neither does Mrs. Balfour. It's not the situation of some sort of strict or absolute liability that just because the infant died, she's guilty, but that's not what we're here about. This isn't leaving the child in the car for an hour and coming back and discovering that there was a This is over seven-and-a-half hours, and she picks problem. up her personal cell phone that morning after getting to work not once, but twice. The call to voicemail, number

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| one, and number two, the call she received from Battlecreek, |
|--|
| Michigan, which would appear to be a continuation of the     |
| serious family discussion/family argument going on regarding |
| the nephew's gambling problem, a family discussion that she  |
| chose to begin that day by initiating a call for twenty-nine |
| (29) minutes uninterrupted while coming down 29 South, a     |
| serious emotional discussion about money, a difficult set of |
| issues during rush hour traffic with the nine-and-a-half     |
| month old in the backseat of the car. Mr. Balfour has told   |
| you that Bryce was very groggy that morning, that he was     |
| very quiet compared to normal, that he was normally a very   |
| alert baby. There is some evidence that he was sick.         |
| Neither parent seems to have had any question that, never-   |
| theless, he needed to go to daycare that morning if he was   |
| that different in nature. That's ordinary negligence.,       |
| That's not gross negligence. We're not claiming that that's  |
| gross negligence; however, the Commonwealth would suggest to |
| you that the defendant's statement in the hospital as she's  |
| cradling the dead body of the infant and talking to him and  |
| saying, I'll sing you patty cake every night; you were talk- |
| ing this morning and you fell asleep on mommy, didn't you?;  |
| I'm sorrytells you that at some point after Mr. Balfour      |
| got out of the car, the infant became more alert. There's    |
| no reason to disbelieve that statement. She's at the hospi-  |
| tal under circumstances where she has within two hours pre-  |

viously discovered that she has left her infant in the car all day and the infant has died, and the only sense of the statement to Officer Tabler is exactly that. She, at some point after Mr. Balfour got out of the car, was aware of Bryce talking in the backseat as he usually would be and then just later forgot. The cell phone call --- any cell phone call that was going on for a twenty-nine (29) minute conversation, let alone something that was a serious heavy family discussion, can pull a person's attention out of the car, off the road, and you don't see the turn for, I think the testimony was six miles from the National Ground Intel-The Balfours came four miles down 29 South ligence Center. or 4.8 miles down 29 South to the turn for National Ground Intelligence Center, which was about two hundred (200) feet or so off 29 and then she gets back on 29 and continues down, Mr. Balfour said, six miles to the turn for the babysitter's and this isn't sixty (60) miles an hour. not six minutes. This is during rush hour traffic. This is going to take some period of time longer than five minutes, so there's time to be thinking and to be mindful, and she has put herself in the situation repeatedly and constantly with choices. She has put herself in the situation of being able to forget the infant. She is exhausted because she's That happens to a lot of young parents, had little sleep. but in her case, she has gone out babysitting the night be-

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

fore instead of coming back and going to bed at her usual time of nine or ten, even though she's been sick, Bryce has been sick, work is at push time. She's having difficulties at work managing her time and that's a constant ongoing discussion with her supervisor, and she gets up the next morning and proceeds, and her statement at the hospital is, I should have stayed home. She only had three hours of sleep but it's more than that because she's putting herself in a pattern in a situation, and what you've heard is that work was happening. Well, work happens for adults who work outside the home; it does. Someone who has push time at work, if they have children, still has an obligation for the caretaking of those children, okay? Accountants with tax day coming up on April 15th still have to take care of their children if they have them. The transportation officer for the JAG School, in addition to doing all of the transportation for all of the students at the JAG School, needs to get her child taken to daycare---transported to daycare. is the great irony in this case. There is an 18th Century proverb, shoemakers' wives go barefoot and doctors' wives die young. It has to do with neglecting your core, essential, personal responsibilities. It has to do with being so focused on externals that you neglect what is so essential to you at home, what was the most precious cargo she had, and what you hear is that she has perfectionist tendencies

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

at work such that she'll focus on what she chooses to focus on to the nth degree and sometimes to the neglect of other things, and on this day, that got in the way of Bryce and that is unacceptable, absolutely unacceptable. It is gross negligence because over seven-and-a-half hours, she never remembers, never remembers. There's a picture of Bryce in her office. That doesn't cue her in and she was in her work She has picked up her personal cell phone, and she doesn't deal with the missed call that is on that phone. The defense has put in some impeachment evidence concerning Detective Roach. What the Commonwealth would suggest to you that the situation means, if anything, is that you might find that feelings were strong in this case and that feelings are strong in this case on both sides. The detective's conduct and actions, if you were to find that he said what the defense has accused him of, his conduct speaks so much louder than his words. What did he do? They've got a pretty much---the police have a pretty much ironclad rule that when they secure a body scene, they're not letting anyone, including bereaved family members, in to see that body, okay? They have no way to know when we're here in this setting and there's a team of defense attorneys on the other side whether cause of death is going to be disputed, okay, whether the preservation of that body is going to be dis-It wasn't disputed here but they can't predict the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

They don't know. Someone might have disagreed with the medical examiner's conclusion. This would not be homicide if Bryce had died of just --- spontaneously died of natural causes, that it somehow turned out that he had had a terminal disease that we didn't know about and happened to expire from that just at the same time that this happened because she would not have caused his death if you had that mere confluence of events. One of the reasons that you wait to charge in a case like this is we're not doctors. don't know. You can make inferences from a gunshot. know if someone has been shot. We can recognize a qunshot wound. We don't know with the infant's body exactly how he died. The detective is not a doctor, okay? He makes an exception, and he lets the parents see the body with supervi-There are other people present. It's a difficult situation. We don't disagree with that. What else does he do? You don't have to rely on the officer's credibility for the statement. That's taken down by a court reporter for you and it's recorded, but listen to his tone. He is kind and gentle and respectful, and he is gathering the information firsthand as he needs to do and quickly as he needs to Which one of you wants to know that the police found or learned of a nine-month old dead in a car having been there for over seven-and-a- half hours and they didn't act quickly to find out how that happened and to make sure it wasn't an

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ongoing problem? That is a community safety problem for sure. Detective Roach and the defense attorneys have different duties in the case. They both have jobs to do and to do well, and Detective Roach did his job in this case extremely well. The defense attorney's job is to defend their client. His job is to investigate and follow where the facts lead, which is exactly what he's done and to protect community safety, which is also what he's done. He's done everything that the community should expect. You may find that there were some strong feelings in the case. That's true. That doesn't mean that he didn't do exactly what he was supposed to do, and it's easy to try and take those strong feelings and twist them and try and tar him up when he's done nothing but treat the defendant with dignity, absolutely nothing. Arrangements were made for her to turn herself in. You've heard that. He doesn't make a charging decision without consultation with the Commonwealth's Attorney in a case of this nature. You heard that. Warrants did not issue that night. They issued later, and they issued with all deliberate speed under appropriate circumstances, and Whitney Huff never met with him. She had no problem with how he was doing his job anyway, but she never met with him and came down for a full meeting to talk about the Instead, the defendant is talking to her about situation. how the lawyer said maybe she could have come back in the

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

middle of the day and put the child in the car in the middle of the day, which she clearly found terrifying and nervewracking, and then over several months there was a lot of, you need to get an attorney, you need to get an attorney, you need to get an attorney and, ultimately, the Balfour family arranges for that by providing Whitney with fifteen hundred dollars (\$1,500) in cash, and she's done nothing wrong and there isn't anything she told you that isn't true. I would challenge you to find one thing that she said that isn't the absolute truth in this case, and she's not influenced by Detective Roach at all, and she called the defendant and she left the defendant a voicemail and that shows up on her phone record. It does not show up on the defendant's phone record because the voicemail system for Alltel is different and it doesn't track by the phone. They don't They only keep track of calls that conkeep track of that. nect through or the defendant making a call including when they call their own voicemail. On the phone records you have seen that the time stamps are different. We don't dis-The time stamps are different between the two pute that. phones. It would appear that the defendant's phone is the one that's off a bit, that it's a bit slow or, excuse me, it's a bit fast. The reason the Commonwealth says that is that Officer Jenkins was there at 16:01. He takes over CPR. She is not doing CPR at 16:01, so if you were to rely on the

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

phone records, she can, in fact, have been making the voicemail calls that defense counsel pointed out he didn't feel could be made in his examination of the Alltel witness, so when Melissa Davis told you, well, she could be wrong, that's not true. It's the network record. The time stamp is off. data for the phone. Officer Jenkins' time of arrival matches up more with Whitney Huff's phone in terms of Whitney Huff is on her phone getting her voicemail at about 3:55. She's talking to the defendant by The defendant is running out of the building and dis-3:58. covering the child by 3:59. You can infer that, and Officer Jenkins is there at 4:01 p.m. It all happens extremely quickly. The defendant screaming and Suttles---Sergeant Suttles is coming out and discovering. This is not a protracted situation and you know from Sergeant Suttles' testimony that the defendant clearly made phone calls during the She called her husband. She called her rescue scene. mother or was attempting to and the repeated calls to voicemail that evening are more than consistent with the crisis situation that was going on. Those calls were made. importantly, what it means is the phone record is correct. The defendant accessed her voicemail. The physical evidence tells you that and the defendant has said so in her state-Now one of the things that counsel in crossexamination of Detective Roach mentioned was there was a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

point in the statement where the defendant says, left a message or didn't leave a message, referring to the babysitter, but then she saw that she had a missed call and then later when the detective does the recap, he describes it as a message. You need to apply your common sense and ordinary experience to the advent of technology that we've had and to people routinely having cell phones. It used to be that if one got a phone message it was audible only, that we just had phone message machines that attached to our landline phones, but now we have a concept, something specifically called a voicemail, which you can call into and get the audible cue, but we also have the missed calls which is a visible cue on the phone, so when one refers to a message, it can be visible. It can be audible. She got the message in the sense that she saw the missed call. She didn't return it. She was busy that day, very busy, but the great stress of the sergeant having yelled at her about the situation with the airline tickets and the fallen soldier in Afghanistan, that's happening after 8:23. She's already left Bryce in the car, so it's not a contributing stressor to having left him in the car, and it's not particularly much of a contributing stressor to failing to remember because it's done in about a half-an-hour, forty-five (45) minutes. By 9:10, I think, or 9:12 was Sergeant Jenkins--excuse me, not Sergeant Jenkins, the sergeant who testified

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to that material, and then it's 9:42:11 that Whitney Huff is leaving a voicemail. It is important ---you are going to see several instructions. One of the ones that the Commonwealth wants to talk about is the character instruction that's been offered to you that says that you may consider, you're not required to consider, but you may consider the character of the defendant in assessing guilt or innocence. That instruction doesn't make a whole lot of sense under the defense theory of the case because the defense is going to tell you that she was negligent, so they're not saying that she is of such good character and such a good mom and such a conscientious person that she couldn't make this mistake. They're just saying that it couldn't be gross, willful, wanton and culpable negligence because of how good she is. Justice has got to be blind in this case. That's a big deal here. We have to make---you should make the same decision for this caretaker that you would make for a different caretaker, and the point here is caretaker, not that she's mom and has suffered a loss. If Whitney Huff in all of her stresses and all of her economic problems had gotten so caught up in work or what was going on that day that she had left Bryce in the car for over seven-and-a-half hours, the same decision, even though that's someone doing it to some-She doesn't get a pass because she did one else's child. this to her own child. Ms. Balfour does not get a pass for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| doing this to her own child as opposed to someone else's     |
|--|
| child. The same decision. The same decision that you would   |
| make for a person who is described to you as a high achiev-  |
| ing, high accomplishing person whose stresses are coming     |
| from the fact that they maintain good employment even though |
| there's other information that they really are not meeting   |
| the expectations that their employer needs them to meet re-  |
| garding hours and stress levels and being there during busi- |
| ness hours to be a customer service person. The same deci-   |
| sion forversus the person who gets so stressed out be-       |
| cause they're working three part-time jobs and have multiple |
| kids. The same decision. Justice has to be blind in this     |
| case. It does not matter that the loss is her own child.     |
| That's a sentencing issue. That's not a guilt/innocence      |
| issue here. One of the reasonswe raise our children in       |
| families. It's part of our freedom in this country and in    |
| this community. We have what we refer to as our self-        |
| evident truths, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. |
| This is a different situation than the automobile accident   |
| situation, okay? With respect to the wide, wide world and    |
| bystanders, we need to avoid injuring them, but with respect |
| to the infant, to our children, we have to preserve and pro- |
| tect them and enhance them and raise them up to become full  |
| adult members of the community. The state doesn't do it for  |
| us and we wouldn't want them to. What a horrible thing, but  |

it is a bond of trust within the community. The community has the right to expect that we do not encounter one of the community's children in a car dead after seven-and-a-half hours. We have the right to expect that. That that does That that --- if it happens under the circumnot happen. stances presented here, is criminally unreasonable conduct and it is gross, wanton and culpable negligence. One of the jury instructions refers to callous disregard, and it puts in parenthesis the definition of unfeeling. On the elements the Commonwealth has to prove that the defendant killed That's not in contest. What's in contest Bryce Balfour. here is item number two, that the killing, although unintended, was the direct result of negligence so gross, wanton and culpable as to show a callous, meaning, unfeeling indifference, disregard of human life. Okay. Well, only part of The first part is agreed to. The killthat is contested. ing was unintended, and it's the direct result of negli-The question is, was that negligence criminal negligence. Unfeeling indifference includes the mindlessness gence? that is present in this case, putting one's self in the situation of being able to just forget the child out of the combination of circumstances presented here. It is sevenand-a-half hours of mindlessness. The usual situation, probably the most classic involuntary manslaughter case is the vehicle situation where it's --- meaning a crash, an acci-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

dent, someone is killed in a car accident, DUI, and even though that person has been drinking and has put themselves in the car, how does that killing happen? It happens in a flash, in a flash, in an instant. It's momentary. son's driving may be erratic. There is a body of case law concerning when a person who is unconscious in a vehicle, falls asleep while driving, can be convicted of involuntary manslaughter, and if there is nothing else but the unconsciousness and they had no notice of it, no reason to think that there's a problem, they cannot be. This case is different for a couple of reasons: one, there is the affirmative situation to take care of the child. It's not the bystander wide, wide world avoid injury situation. She needs to protect and preserve the infant. Two, it's not a momen-It's seven-and-a-half hours of it, and with optary lapse. portunities to remember and never doing so, so to come back to our self-evident truths, it breaks a bond with the community for this to happen. The infant had a right to life, a right to grow up and die of old age and to develop his talents and his abilities and to learn joy and to learn love and to learn disappointment because that comes, too, in life and maybe to learn suffering because that comes, too, in life, but he had a right to life and she---her role was to bring him up into that life. We raise our children in families, and we have to trust parents to be able to follow ba-

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

sic standards and this case violates that. This is negligence of a sort that the law pays attention to because we cannot have it. It's not---we were talking about freedom. It's not illegal to talk on a cell phone while driving. It's a free country and it's not illegal, but it is demonstrative. It can be demonstrative of very poor judgment and poor choices and this was under all of the circumstances. This is not being stopped at a stoplight and calling to quickly get directions while waiting through a long light and this is not a call, hey, I'm running late, I'll be there in five minutes, bye. This is a serious, heavy, family discussion having to go on right then, emotional and agitated about it, about a nephew's gambling problem. When I talked about what we wanted for Bryce in terms of growing up, that part would be what I would refer to as the pursuit of happiness, so we've talked about what freedom means in this context and we've talked about what pursuit of happiness means and we've talked about his right to life. We ask you to find Raelyn Balfour guilty of involuntary manslaughter based on all of the circumstances that you see here. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Zwerling, are you going to close for the defense?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ZWERLING: Thank you, Your Honor. A baby is dead and somebody must pay. Bryce is dead. You heard it from Detective Roach and you just heard it from most of Ms.

Killeen's closing argument. Right to life, right to grow The baby is dead; somebody must pay. Ms. Balfour must old. pay. Well, on one level she will pay. She'll pay for the rest of her life, but that's not what this case is about. Please don't be blinded by the fact that this beautiful baby boy is dead and died in a car having been left there by Mr. The Court has instructed you time and time again, and you will have it in there. The fact that she left him in the car, the fact that she left him in the car long enough for him to die from the heat that built up, in and of itself, is not enough to justify a conviction for involuntary manslaughter. That is not enough because it doesn't show that she had a callous disregard for the welfare of She killed her pride and joy. She did it acciden-Bryce. tally and Bryce's death is in every way a tragedy, but not every tragic event is a crime. It's been agreed that it was an accident. It was inadvertent; she didn't mean it. not like she left him intentionally in that car saying, well, you know, it's only fifty (50) degrees out right now, he'll be okay, and go into work and never coming back to check on him. That would show a callous disregard for the life of her child, but she forgot he was in the car. act of forgetting something is an involuntary act. You don't intentionally forget something because then it isn't something you've forgotten. It's something you're ignoring.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

If you ignore something, that's different than forgetting it and not remembering it is also involuntary. You don't control when you're going to remember something and when you're not, so the fact that she didn't remember it is an involuntary act, and it doesn't show a callous disregard for the well-being of her child. Neither of them do and that's what the Court has instructed you. Leaving him in the car, leaving him in there long enough to die is not involuntary manslaughter because it doesn't show callous disregard for the life of the child. She somehow came to believe that day that she had dropped him off at Whitney's, and had she dropped him off at Whitney's as she did whenever it was her responsibility up to that day, Bryce was in a place where it was safe, ht was sound, he was loved and he was happy, and she didn't have to worry about him once she got to work, so not remembering he was in the car is understandable when you understand that she believed he was in daycare once she got to work. Now, what you have to decide is whether or not she is quilty of manslaughter, not whether she is guilty in some other moral or any other type of way for the death of her child because she is responsible for the death of her child. She was his mother. I want to talk about the jury instruction for a second, and Ms. Killeen is right as to what the focus of this case is about. It's about whether you can find beyond a reasonable doubt that Bryce's death was the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

direct result of her negligence that was so gross and wanton and culpable as to show a callous disregard of human life. Are you convinced beyond a reasonable doubt from the circumstances presented that she had a callous disregard for the life of her child? - and that's what this case is about. Now how could something like this happen? You know, we have to use hindsight to try to reconstruct how this happened. How could somebody forget? - and that's a question that I'm sure we'll ask ourselves and have asked ourselves. one, we had a break in the ordinary routine of her life. This is a week where she only had one car, so unlike the other nine months of Bryce's life or eight months that he was going to Whitney for daycare, when she---when it was her turn to take Bryce to daycare, she would make one stop after she leaves the house at the daycare center down Route 29 and get back on 29 and go down to work. That routine was broken this week and on three days, not Monday because Monday Jarrett had a different way of getting to work so Monday was part of the old routine. Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and this day she made an extra stop coming down from Ruckersville and that would be to drop Jarrett at work, so she'd go down 29, make the stop off of 29, drop him off and then go to the daycare center, make a second stop, and then go to work, so she was doing something that was unusual, not part of her routine, not part of hear automatic pilot.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Bryce's seat was in a different place. Typically, actually always, you heard her husband Jarrett testify, he would place the child in the car seat behind the passenger where he would be visible. This day the only day ever, he was not placed there. He was placed directly behind her where he was not visible to her, so that was a break in the routine. Bryce was never quiet. He was very active in the morning. This day was different. Yes, he was up and about and interacting with the parents in the home, but once he got to the car, he fell asleep. He was quiet. Jarrett said he didn't hear him the whole time on the drive to his place of work. That was a break in the routine. You know, no noise, not visible, you've heard the expression out of sight, out of mind. Unfortunately, to some extent that's a real factor in our lives. We, oftentimes, rely on cues to remind us of things, but this is worse. What happened on that day was worse because there was not one car seat, there were two car The Eddie Bauer seat which he had used---they had seats. used for Bryce for a short period of time, a couple of weeks, about three weeks earlier, was in the car, and it was where Bryce would normally be behind the passenger and the second seat was invisible to Lyn during the drive. It was behind the driver's seat, so when she got to work, if she saw the empty car seat, the Eddie Bauer behind the passenger's side, that would have been the only time in nine

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

months that an empty car seat didn't mean no baby in the car, the only time that would have been the message the empty car seat was not truthfully conveying. What kind of day was she having? She was having one of the worst days ever. Clearly, it got a lot worse but she had lack of sleep that week and you heard that she was getting harass---some harassment or some lecturing at work about not keeping reqular hours, about taking time off to go to the doctor, to sleep in, to take Bryce to the doctor. They wanted her eight-to-five, so there was pressure on her to not call in sick, to get to work. She had lack of sleep that week, but that night in particular, one, Erika Conely calling the night before in an emergency situation. She called up and said, can you help me? My dog, I've got to get him to the I've got to get him there now. It's an emergency. Can you come and watch Samantha? - and she said yes. is not a situation where she said oh, hey, I'm going to go to a movie tonight or I want to earn some more money so I'm going to go see if I can get a babysitting job. This is a response to a call for help from not only a neighbor but a neighbor whose husband was in Iraq serving our country, and this is a patriotic woman, as you must know by now, and she did not say no. That night, what else happened the night before this occurred? The call from mom worried about her grandson, Raelyn's nephew, Jeff Willis. Whether or not he

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

had a gambling problem, in fact, who cares? The point was the family was suffering a crisis situation because Jeff's father was taking money out of his 401K plan to pay for his household expenses and his mortgage. You know how desperate that is because you know the penalties involved in taking money out of a retirement fund, and the son was getting the father to lend him money to pay his bills out of his 401K plan and the family was distraught about that, and who do they call? They call Raelyn and she says, I'll deal with it, I'll help, and she does. She does it out of concern and caring for her family and the well-being of her family. She's not doing it out of callous disregard for her child's welfare. Whitney Huff, the same night, Thursday night, she and Jarrett are---have been asked to see if they can come up with fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000) immediately for Whitney Huff to keep her and her business afloat, and you heard Ms. Huff testify how this isn't the first time she's gone to them for help, you know, and you've heard why they have always been there for her. Not only are they good friends and is it their nature, but this is Bryce's second mother. She spends as many waking hours with Bryce probably as Jarrett or Lyn did. Maybe that's an exaggeration but enough so that when Bryce got there in the morning, he'd be happy to see her and when he --- of course, when they arrived, he was happy to see them. They didn't want to lose her

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

child-caring situation by having her go out of business or go bankrupt, so they were willing to pay in advance Bryce's daycare bills from nine months through kindergarten. that's extraordinary. Were they doing that because they had a callous disregard for the well-being of their son? Obviously not, so what else was going on in her life? get to work, I just want to ask you to think about this. Not a single one of those major stressors, and remember, they weren't able to deal with Whitney's problem that night because of this emergency from the dog lady and so they didn't have an answer for Ms. Huff, an added stressor. They would have to deal with that and tell her that they hadn't made up their mind, they needed more time. Not a single one of these things did they go out and look for. They didn't call Whitney and say, hey, Whitney, what can we do to help you? We want to give you money. They didn't say that to Jeff Willis. I mean, it wasn't---he was already in default on money he had borrowed before. They didn't call mom and say, hey, how are things going? Isn't there anything we can do to help what's going on up there? They get the call. She gets the call, help us, help us, help us. At work, we have all these things coming down at one time. You have the double class graduation coming up which doubles the amount of what is normally a lot of work for her to do, and on top of that, on top of that you have the screw-up with this fam-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ily of the fallen hero, the mom, the dad and the step-mom. Now that wasn't even her responsibility---her area of responsibility, but Sergeant was tasked to do it and take care of it and get them down here and make sure everything was fine, and he called around and looked around and everybody said, Lyn Balfour, that's the lady you go to. If you need help in this kind of an area, she's the go-to-gal and he goes to her and she doesn't blow him off and say, I can't do it, I've got too much work to do. You know, if they don't get down here, they don't get down here to see their son memorialized school at the school. She says, of course, I'll help and she does, and then despite her best efforts there's another screw-up that morning, that morning and nobody can fix it. Sergeant Nelson who is at the airport can't fix it. The emergency people in New Jersey can't fix it. Finally, at 8:52 they get a hold of Lyn on her business She's just arrived at work and crisis number one for the day. Her day is on. Her business day is on. now in full business day mode dealing with this crisis and she does. She deals with it and they get off on time. didn't ask for that either. That came to her. Now, I said that this was a tragedy. I don't think many people would disagree with that, and like all tragedies, there's someone, usually a main actor in the situation who has a tragic flaw which inevitably will lead to the devastation that follows.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| Lyn had a tragic flaw and it did lead to her forgetting      |
|--|
| Bryce and his dying, and her tragic flaw is epitomized in    |
| her e-mail tag which is one of the exhibits that you'll have |
| when you go back there. No is not an option. Whenever she    |
| sends out an e-mail, no is not an option. Tell me, tell Lyn  |
| Balfour how hard I have to work to get a yes. The fighting   |
| men and women deserve no less. This was her motto at work.   |
| This was her motto in life and this was her tragic flaw.     |
| She couldn't say no and she didn't say no and she just took  |
| on too much responsibility, and it cost her her son's life   |
| and it ruined her life and that of Jarrett and anybody who   |
| knowsknew Bryce. You saw how many people couldn't dis-       |
| cuss the situation without tearing up. This mayI mean,       |
| this was her tragic flaw, but her attempts and her desires   |
| to help these people, to help everyone who called upon her   |
| was not callousness. It was not in callous disregard for     |
| the welfare or the safety of anybody, especially her son.    |
| It was driven by a motive to do good, to be helpful, not     |
| harmful. Her compassion should not be turned into a crime    |
| even though it led to tragic results. Now hindsight, we all  |
| have 20/20 hindsight, but there's no evidence that she saw   |
| that helping everybody was going to lead to the loss of her  |
| son's life or that, had she seen it, had she recognized that |
| danger, that she would have disregarded it. There's no evi-  |
| dence of that. The Commonwealth has proven no evidence.      |

You know enough about her from hearing people who know her testify to know that her son meant everything to her and she was not callous in any way about his life. I want to turn to Detective Roach for a second. A baby is dead and someone has to pay for it. This thought overrode Detective Roach's duty to keep an open mind and follow the evidence to wherever it led. Now, he may not remember sharing this thought with Whitney Huff, but Whitney Huff remembered it. struck her and it scared her because there were two people to choose from, her and Lyn. He was going to try and charge Ms. Balfour with everything he could even before he interviewed her. He may not remember saying this to Specialist Steele, but Landon Steele who came here from Iraq to testify, he did remember Detective Roach saying that. possible motive would he have to come here and lie about it? What's his relationship to Ms. Balfour other than to have been present on the scene as a responder and at the hospital trying to comfort her when she was curled up in the fetal position crying about the death of her son? But look at what Detective Roach did. Look at his actions, Ms. Killeen says. He goes up and within an hour of her discovering her son in the car, that's when he chooses to separate her from the family and friends and put her in a room and that's when he interviews her, and how does he start this interrogation? He gives her her Miranda warning. Well, that's fine and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that's proper, but he introduces them as this is a formality I have to go through, a formality. It is not a formality. This is a very serious event when you tell somebody that they have the right to remain silent and all the other things that are contained in the Miranda warning, and that's why they're required to give it. It's to make people realize that something of significance is about to happen, an interview about a crime that they are suspected of having committed, and she is completely disarmed. She is in total grief and shock as you've heard from the descriptions of people who were at the hospital, and you listened to the tape recording and I'm going to play it for you. to her answers. Now these answers he considers to be a complete confession. That's what he tells Captain Anderson. Now he doesn't remember telling that to Captain Anderson. Captain Anderson does remember it. He does remember Detective Roach saying to him, well, I should go --- I'm going to go talk to the husband, Jarrett, but I really don't even have to because she's given me a full confession and, of course, the full confession when you hear it, you'll see that it is simply what the Court told you is not enough for manslaughter. She acknowledges she left him in the car. She forgot he was there. She killed him. She also says, I remember dropping him off. I killed my child. She's struggling with the competing things that are going on in her

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

head, her memory that she dropped him off, and her realization that that is not an accurate memory because the child was in the car and the child died. Can we play that? Before we do, Your Honor, do we have the twelve (12) copies of the transcript?

THE COURT: They should all be right together. It may be simpler if we do that (unintelligible). Technically I don't know whether that is going to---I'm going to leave it to you.

MR. ZWERLING: Okay. It might be easier to understand the words because sometimes they're hard to hear. If you could just pass these around.

(Audiotape was played at this time)

MR. ZWERLING: I'm going to cut it off there. You have the whole transcript and recording with you. What's missing from that statement that does not elevate it to the crime of manslaughter is anything remotely indicating a callous disregard for the welfare of her child when she made that tragic mistake when she forgot her child, so let's look at what facts the Commonwealth has given to you to argue to you that she did act with callous disregard for her child---what they think they have proven beyond a reasonable doubt that she has acted in callous disregard for her child. One,

she had a beer or two the night before when she was babysit-Well, certainly having a beer or two nine hours before these tragic events has nothing to do to show a callous disregard for her child's life. Not the picture in her office. You know, she didn't forget she had a child. didn't forget she had a son. She forgot that she hadn't dropped him off at the daycare center. Seeing a picture of her son as she did everyday somewhere in her office reminded her that he was at Whitney's, that she had a son and she'd see him that night, not that she had forgotten him in the car. There's no evidence that it went click, oh, my god, he's in the car, I'll go get him in a few hours. not even going to argue that, so what's the point of the picture? The fact it lasted seven hours before she discovered her child, seven hours is because that's how long it took her to see the missed call, and you heard her talk about it at a time when she had no time to prepare a defense, when she was completely beating herself up for having killed her child. She says, I saw the missed call on my phone and I returned it. What time was that? It was late. in the afternoon. We know what time that was. It was at 3:13 in the afternoon or 3:11 depending upon Alltel time or Sprint time, and she leaves a message, what's up? By that time, it was too late. She gets a call back a half-hour later, just before four or just at four, and, who has Bryce?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Where's Bryce? You have Bryce. No, Jarrett forgot to drop I dropped him off. No, he's not here. Oh, my him off. god. Oh, my god. That is when she realizes her mistake at four o'clock. I don't think that you can argue differently. Let me go into these phone records because I don't understand fully how they actually think that this lady from Alltel's interpretations are correct or what they're going to ask you to draw from it, but we're going to deal with that The cell phone call with her nephew, now that in a second. is a very significant event, and it probably is what caused her to go on automatic pilot during that ride in, but who among us has not had an important phone call that they took while they were driving their car? Now perhaps we shouldn't use the cell phone when we drive, but it's not against the law. Virtually everybody does it and every now and then the call becomes emotional or upsetting or important, having to do with work, family, the health of somebody. These things happen, and maybe it is negligent of us to drive and talk on It is not a callous disregard for the welfare of the phone. others because if it were, we're all guilty. The (unintelligible) is callous disregard. Talking on the phone does not show a callous disregard even if you have a child in your car or your parent or your loved one, and it would not be right for us to hold her to a higher standard than we hold ourselves or to others, even though in this case, she

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

forgot her son and even if that was the reason, in part or mostly, how she wound up at the school believing she had made that one stop and dropped him off, seeing the empty seat, thinking normal day, Bryce is okay, go to work, boom, Sergeant Nelson and the day goes from there. Now the Alltel lady, when she first testified---I think it's Ms. Davis. I'm going to call her the Alltel lady so it's clear who I'm talking about, the woman who came from Alltel. first testified, she said there are two reasons calls get forwarded, one, you set your phone to call forwarding and that's not an issue in this case; two, she said, someone calls your phone and you don't answer it and it gets forwarded to voicemail. That's what she said originally and we submit that is exactly what these records show, and we'll go through that, but then she changed that and said, no, our records don't pick up when somebody calls you and it gets forwarded to voicemail. The only thing it does show is when you call for your messages, then it shows you were forwarded to voicemail. She said our records don't ever reflect anywhere, even in our network records, that it --- that you're actually calling voicemail, and we don't---we don't keep record of it and we don't bill you for it. Well, we know they put it on your bill because the March 14th phone record for Ms. Balfour, this is D5, number fourteen (14). know if you can see this, but this is Ms. Balfour's phone

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| records, call to voicemail, the number called and there it   |
|--|
| is, her number. She called her number and it registered as   |
| voicemail. These records, and these have been gone through   |
| by Ms. Davis from Alltel and Ms. Huff, are accurate as they  |
| reflect what's on the bills. They show that calls were for-  |
| warded, one, two, three, four, five forwarded calls that     |
| day. It doesn't record the number; in other words, who is    |
| calling you. It doesn't say your number either, right. For   |
| some reason their fabulously accurate records, upon which    |
| you're being asked to convict Mrs. Balfour, lists these      |
| calls as long distance even though they either came from Ms. |
| Whitney Huff's phone or from Lyn's phone, both 434 numbers.  |
| I'm going to go through these with you. I'm going to hope-   |
| fully be able to show you, and I don't know if you can       |
| you'll have a copy of these in with you and you'll also have |
| this larger version. I'll start at the top and work my way   |
| down and then I'll pick it up. Thank you. All right.         |
| You'll see that these calls from 4:01, 4:05, 4:14, 4:22 are  |
| all treated the same as the one in the morning, forwarded,   |
| they were all long distance, no number is recorded, duration |
| of time is here and the time is here. Now we know that       |
| Sprint and Alltel have differenttheir times are off.         |
| The Commonwealth has now conceded that, so let's usethey     |
| say that Alltel is the accurate one. All right, let's go     |
| with Alltel. What times does the oh, my god call come in?    |

This is the oh, my god call. It comes in at 4:24. She says that's the start time. It lasts a minute and twenty-three (23) seconds, so now it's 4:01:47, okay? Now, this is when Ms. Balfour is in her office learning for the first time that she didn't drop her son off. This is also when Jenkins, Officer Jenkins, by stipulation testifies he arrives and takes over the CPR. I think you can either disregard this entire set of phone records or you can disregard Officer Jenkins recollection because, clearly, at 4:01 she's up in her office. I'm going to put this down for a second because I want to talk about that for a second. Ms. Balfour is in her office. From four to 4:01, oh, my god, oh, my god, and she runs to the parking lot. She runs down the hall, down the stairs, past the loading dock into the parking lot to her car and you have a diagram. You can see it's about, and the testimony it's about seventy-five (75), a hundred (100) feet away, gets to the car, opens the passenger side door, pulls out her son, brings him around---I mean, from the driver's side over to the passenger's side, puts him down, starts giving him CPR. When she's not giving him air, she is wailing. She is wailing. Pump, pump, pump, breath, breath, breath and we hear it on the 911. You heard Ms. Babatunde talk about how she heard those screams from around the other side of the building. You heard Sergeant Suttles talking about them, Major Anderson, lots of people

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

told you about it. She finds her child. She goes and gets She's giving CPR. Sergeant Suttles comes over and for a long time can't get her to back off so she can give CPR. Then Officer Jenkins arrives and then she gets off and what is she doing? She's standing there and she is inconsolable. You heard people testify to that. Major Anderson has testi-They were trying to comfort her. fied he saw her. not able to be comforted. The Commonwealth wants you to think, based on the testimony of Ms. Davis, that at 4:24 she is calling voicemail---4:04 she's calling voicemail; 4:08 she's calling voicemail; at 4:16---4:17 she's calling voice-I want you to think about this. This is the very time she's either giving CPR to her child or standing there screaming for help in the presence of all these people, and there's clearly no one saying, oh, and she was just picking up her messages. For that reason alone, I would submit these calls are not from Lyn Balfour to her answering machine, but I think we can establish for you as if we had a burden, which we don't, that these are from Ms. Huff. Let's look at Ms. Huff's phone records, okay? Now the times are different somewhat. She's making an outgoing call. This is the four o'clock call. We'll use the Sprint times---I mean, the Alltel time because that's what the Commonwealth wants This is the oh, my god call and then she testified to use. that the phone went dead. She calls back, what, two minutes

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

later, two and a half minutes later. Here's a call coming in about that same time because this is the beginning and we don't know when it ended, about the same time being forwarded to voicemail. Ms. Huff said I called and she didn't answer, and it went over to voicemail and I left a message. Her records show seventy-three (73) seconds of duration, okay? They show forty (40). Okay, well, it takes times--once she breaks the dial tone, her company is billing her. They're keeping track, so she has to dial the number. has to connect. It has to go up and go over there and start ringing and then it gets forwarded and that takes, I submit, forty-three (43) seconds. Look at the next one, almost identical, seventy-three (73) seconds, thirty-eight (38) seconds. This is at five after or eight after depending upon whose clock you're using. The next one, forty-two (42) seconds and this is six, so the difference here, this is easier. This is about thirty-three (33) seconds and the difference in this is thirty-nine (39), so it's about thirty-nine (39) seconds. You can see these all match up. These all make perfect sense. Ms. Huff calls and it gets forwarded to voicemail and that's what these records reflect. Not only does it make common sense, it's the only thing that makes sense because we know darn well she was---Ms. Balfour wasn't calling her voicemail. Now, once we understand that, then let's go up to this one. This is the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

call that the Commonwealth wants you to hang her on. is the callous disregard, according to them, at 9:44. Whitney calls and this is where she's leaving the message. Where is Brycee (sic)? Seventy-six (76) second call and, of course, this one is about thirty-four (34) seconds shorter, almost identical. Times are a little off but not by much. These are about a minute and a half to two minutes off. minute and a half would make this exactly the same time. Long distance forwarded, just like all of these long distance forwarded. What a coincidence that every time Ms. Huff is calling and leaving a voicemail on Mrs. Balfour's phone, Ms. Balfour is picking up her messages. lieve that? Do you believe that beyond a reasonable doubt, or do you believe that this is Ms. Huff's calls being forwarded to Ms. Balfour's voicemail. That's the only thing that makes any sense at all, and I would be comfortable if I had the burden of proof of that fact to you beyond a reasonable doubt but I don't have any burden of proof. to prove that this is an unreasonable interpretation of these records and they have to prove that beyond a reasonable doubt, and the judge has instructed you as to that and I'll read that to you in a second. And there's a March 30th bill as well and you'll see---I may have it buried in my Here's another exhibit. This is the billing record papers. for Ms. Balfour's personal cell phone, which includes the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

30th of March, and you will see that all these calls, none of them to her own phone and none of them like the one on the 14th indicating that she called voicemail, and to her credit, Ms. Davis from Alltel did acknowledge that she could be wrong about what these records show and she is. dence in this case, ladies and gentlemen --- here's the jury instruction I was going to mention to you. Let me read it to you. With respect to the phone record evidence, if you find that the facts are susceptible to two different interpretations, one of which is consistent with the innocence of the defendant, you cannot arbitrarily adopt the interpretation which incriminates the defendant. Instead, the interpretation more favorable to the defendant should be adopted unless it is untenable, under all the circumstances, and the evidence, in toto, not only must be consistent with guilt but it has to be inconsistent with every reasonable hypothesis of innocence and ours is not unreasonable. The act of leaving her in the car---leaving the child in the car is not enough, so what are we left with now that that telling phone record I think has been pretty much put to rest? This is a case, ladies and gentlemen, that never should have been brought. Yes, there's a dead baby. Yes, Lyn Balfour is responsible for it. Being under criminal charges has forced her to defend her actions that day in a court of law, actions that are indefensible in her life. She doesn't want

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to and has never defended the fact that it wasn't her fault that her son is dead. Now we're defending whether she is a felon, a criminal here before you. You must determine whether she acted in callous disregard for the life of her son. Lyn Balfour, ladies and gentlemen, is a good soldier. She is a good employee. She was a good mother, still is a good mother. She is a compassionate person. She is a person who, up until this tragic event, didn't understand the need to say no to people in trouble, to people who came to her for help. Her son paid for that blindness but not willful blindness. She is paying for it. I ask you to understand that whatever she is, she is not a criminal. didn't criminally neglect her son. She didn't do what she did out of callous disregard for his well-being, but out of love and desire to help people without understanding that I thank you. she was overwhelmed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Ms. Killeen, rebuttal from the Common-wealth?

MS. KILLEEN: Yes. Mr. Zwerling has said several things that are a misunderstanding both of what I said in closing and also of the evidence that was presented to you. Understand, please, that the Commonwealth is not required to prove a case to a defense attorney's satisfaction. He has an obligation to defend his client. I'm required to prove the case to the jury. It's a decision for you. This is a

case involving an infant who was left in a car for over seven-and-a-half hours. That does not, on a good day, compute to simple negligence. It's a good bit further than an oops by a country mile, but we haven't presented to you a case that only involves leaving the child in the car for seven-and-a-half hours. There is more to it than that, a great deal more to it than that. If Ms. Balfour is so confident that the infant is safe at daycare, so certain in that unshakeable belief that he is at Whitney Huff's, then you can see disregard because isn't she as a parent supposed to be available for an emergency? How is it that Ms. Huff is to reach her if something happens? - and the fact that Jarrett Balfour normally calls her on her work phone or on her work cell phone because of the problems they had regarding the use of her personal cell at work doesn't mean that that was her course of dealing in practice with Whitney Huff, and Whitney Huff has been very clear she rarely called the defendant at work. It was unusual, and when she called the defendant on a cell phone, she called her on her personal cell phone. The Alltel phone is not correct. Alltel phone is fast. When it says it's four o'clock, it's It's more like 3:58. That's how you know that when not. Officer Jenkins arrives at 16:01, at 4:01 p.m. and the CPR efforts cease that it's the defendant's phone that is incorrect on the time, and Alltel is in the business of making

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

money on their cell phone contracts and the records situation is set up accordingly. They're not, from the evidence presented to you, completely incompetent as to what it is that they do and what it is that they track and Ms. Davis was very clear. If the defendant calls her own voicemail, that shows as a call forwarded. The only other way to forward a call is---doesn't---would look different on that network record and it has to do with forwarding your own cell phone to another number. Ms. Huff cannot call in and have a reflection that she was forwarded to voicemail, and notice that the record that's pointed out doesn't have Ms. Huff's number as calling it. You've heard testimony that the defendant, in addition to being in hysterics, was also trying desperately to reach her husband. You've heard her husband say that she's the one he talked to. He couldn't hear her at first. You know that by 4:12 word has gone around through NGIC to Whitney Huff. This happened very, very fast and by 4:01, the defendant is done administering CPR. That's not happening. She's trying to reach people and she's calling people and calls are coming in and she's checking and she's also --- she's trying to call her mother and trying to call her husband. It's how you know that the defense's interpretation of the physical---of the physical evidence, the phone records, is, in fact, untenable, and you know from the defendant's statement that she saw the missed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

call. One of the things that you heard in the evidence dur-1 2 ing the Commonwealth's case was the defense being able dur-3 ing---well, the part where the prosecutor---when the Common-4 wealth was calling the witnesses to get statements in be-5 cause they were excited utterances. They have special reli-6 ability. Everything that was said at that hospital that 7 night is an excited utterance with that reliability, includ-8 ing everything that Ms. Huff said to Detective Roach. 9 has very special quarantees of truth. She saw a missed call 10 and she saw it at least once that morning, but she had 11 picked up her cell phone twice---12 MR. ZWERLING: Judge, I'm objecting to this. 13 She's intentionally misstating the evidence. There is no 14 evidence that she said she saw it that morning. She saw it 15 in the afternoon when she called, and that's what it says on 16 the tape recording that they listened to at Ms. Huff's. 17 She said she saw the missed call. MS. KILLEEN: 18 It doesn't say when at all. It's an inference. 19 MR. ZWERLING: Well, she just said it --- she said 20 it in the morning. 21 THE COURT: I'm going to let the jury sort it out 22 and I think they can. You can go ahead and proceed. 23 MS. KILLEEN: Correct. 24 THE COURT: I can't---I'm not---it's a jury ques-

tion as to what, and I don't think it's an intentional mis-

statement. I think it's an interpretation and the jury may not agree with it or they may. I don't know, so go ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. KILLEEN: She picks up her cell phone twice that morning. We know that from the phone records. tells Detective Roach that she saw the missed call. She She told Whitney Huff, I didn't return doesn't say when. your call that morning because, so all of that evidence comes in and leads to a conclusion she had seen the missed She may not have understood that it was Whitney call. Huff's number. You heard that Whitney Huff had a new cell phone number. That may have had something to do with her exhaustion, or she may---there is---we have never said from all of our evidence presented that we ever thought that she actually heard the voicemail that was left for her nor have we ever said, as counsel suggested in his closing, that she had to pay just because Bryce was dead. The Commonwealth has told you specifically that is not true. We do not say that. You have a decision to make on behalf of the community as to whether this was criminally negligent. Zwerling talks about Ms. Huff's tragic flaw. The Commonwealth is not sure that everyone in the world has a strong enough personality to have a tragic flaw, but, evidently, Ms. Huff (sic) does. She has this great belief and persistence that you see from her tag, and what does her tag in her e-mail go to? It goes to the fighting men and women.

Bryce was not one of the fighting men and women. He was her infant son. Life is a series of choices. It's a series of judgment calls. It's a series of compromises. immune or excused from having to make those calls, and she's not excused from having to make the compromises on time that we all have to make as adults every day. If your job is so demanding and your desire for good deeds are so demanding and your thing is to say yes, you've got to do that in a way that you don't leave your son in peril in a car that rapidly rises in heat and it's a virtual certainty that the infant left there and not remembered dies and he did. Balfour, in all of her stress and all of her difficulties and all of her tenaciousness had accidentally left the infant at home in his crib, it would have been negligent and Bryce might have been cranky and he might have been tired and he might have been hungry and he might have been a lot of things, but he probably wouldn't be dead. The car is a dangerous instrumentality. It is a machine around which you must watch your small child. You cannot put yourself in a situation of setting out, having prepared the diaper bag, if that was her habitual thing and we find the diaper bag there, having set out to deliver him to his daycare provider and then just forget. She knows she's exhausted. told you that in the statement and you have the contributing and combining forces. It would have been different if she

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

had been sick and under medication. That's a different situation but she's engaged in a series of voluntary circum-She knows she's under the gun at work. It's push stances. time and they're not happy about the way she's expending her She goes out to baby-sit from about eight to eleven, but upon getting home at eleven, she doesn't come to bed until one and the infant is up, as he often was, and then when she gets up in the morning, she resumes the family discussion, this time very intensively with the nephew and she places the call. Mr. Zwerling said, who among us hasn't gotten an important call? That's not what happened here. She made that call. That's a choice. That's a judgment call and any one little piece on its own maybe doesn't come out to criminal negligence, but all of it together does. Bryce Balfour was a member of the community and he shouldn't have died in this way and the manner was criminally negligent, but more importantly, the one thing---there is only one thing that we can say about every person in this community and every person in this courtroom and that is this. All of us, everyone of us, come into life as helpless infants who are completely reliant on a parent or caretaker to raise us up and preserve our safety and teach us to live and love and experience life. Everyone of us has that in common and the only other thing we have in common is that we will someday die. He didn't have to die like this, shouldn't

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

have died like this, and the conduct was criminally negli-gent, and the Commonwealth asks you to find the defendant, his mother and caretaker, guilty of involuntary manslaugh-ter. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the decision is in your hands. The defendant, the Commonwealth and the life of Bryce Balfour is in your hands. 

## STATE OF VIRGINIA AT LARGE:

I, Julianne Lee, Notary Public in and for the State of Virginia at Large, having been so duly commissioned and qualified, do certify that the foregoing hearing was so duly taken by me at the time and place specified in the caption hereof, said witnesses having been so duly sworn.

I do further certify that said hearing was correctly taken by me by mechanical methods and that the same was accurately written out in full and transcribed into the English language by Sarah W. R. Lane and that said transcript is a true, accurate and correct record of the testimony by said witnesses.

I further certify that I am neither attorney nor counsel for or related to or employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto or financially interested in this action.

My commission expires April 30, 2009.

Given under my hand and seal this  $7^{\text{th}}$  day of July, 2008.

Notary Public - 312312

LANE'S COURT REPORTERS, INC. 401 8<sup>th</sup> STREET NE CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA 22902