

PAGE COUNT OF 50 PAGES

fulness, then you may consider it, together with all other facts and circumstances bearing upon the witness's truthfulness, in deciding whether you will believe or disbelieve this other testimony at this trial. Except as it may bear on this decision, this evidence may not be considered by you in your determination of any fact in this case.

Now, members of the jury, evidence has been received tending to show that at an earlier time the witness, Allen Hall, made a statement which conflicts with his testimony at this trial. You must not consider such earlier statement as evidence of the truth of what was said at that earlier time because it was not made under oath at this trial. If you believe that such earlier statement was made, and that it does conflict with the testimony of the witness at this trial, then you may consider this, together with all other facts and circumstances bearing upon the witness's truthfulness, in deciding whether you will believe or disbelieve his testimony at this trial.

MR. FERGUSON: The witness Jerome Mitchell also testified that he made a previous statement.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, evidence has been received tending to show that at an earlier time the witness, Jerome Mitchell, made a statement which conflicts with his testimony at this trial. You must not consider such earlier statement as evidence of the truth of what was said at that earlier time because it was not made under oath at this trial. If you believe such earlier statement was made and that it does conflict with the testimony at this trial, then you may

consider this with all the other evidence in deciding whether to believe or disbelieve his testimony at this trial.

Members of the jury, as I have previously said, you are the sole judges of the credibility of each witness. You must decide whether to believe the testimony of any witness. You may believe all or any part or none of what a witness testified to. In determining whether to believe any witness you should apply the same tests of truthfulness that you would apply in your everyday affairs. In passing upon the testimony of the witness, the jury ought to take into consideration the opportunity of the witness to see, ^{hear} know, remember the facts or occurrences about which he testified; the manner and appearance of the witness; any interest or bias or prejudice the witness may have; the fairness or want of fairness of the witness; whether his testimony is reasonable. You are the sole judges of the weight to be given any evidence. By this I mean if you decide certain evidence is believable you must determine it in light of all other believable evidence in the case.

Members of the jury, I ask all 12 of the original jurors, are you all feeling all right? Raise your hand. (The 12 raise hands.) In that case the Court will excuse alternate 1, alternate 2 and alternate 3.

You may stand aside.

(The alternates leave the jurybox.)

Members of the jury, you may take the cases and say how you find. You may retire to your room and when you have arrived at your verdicts, please knock on the door and come back in to the courtroom. The Court suggests that in the juryroom that you select a foreman to lead your deliberations. Anything else, gentlemen?

MR. FERGUSON: Your Honor, may we approach the bench?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

(Conference at the bench.)

THE COURT: You may retire.

(The jury retired at 5:20 P M.)

THE COURT: The jury wants pencils and papers.

Is there any objection?

MR. FERGUSON: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there any objection by the State?

SOL. STROUD: No, sir.

THE COURT: Give them a clean tablet with no writing on it and pencils.

(7:47 P M.)

THE COURT: Let the jury come in.

(The jury returned to the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Members of the jury, do I understand

you have some questions you wish to ask for further instructions. Who shall speak for you?

JUROR 1: We want a couple of terms defined for us, the word conspiracy, and -

JUROR 10: Aiding and abetting.

THE COURT: All right. ¹⁷ Members of the jury, a conspiracy is a combination or agreement between two or more persons to do an unlawful act or to do a lawful act in an unlawful way or by unlawful means. Unlawful combination or agreement is the essence of the criminal conspiracy. Thus, a conspiracy is a crime and not its execution.

As soon as the union of wills for the unlawful purpose is perfected, the offense of conspiracy is complete, and no overt act is necessary to complete the crime of conspiracy. ¹⁸

A conspiracy must exist, if it does exist at all, between two or more persons, because one cannot conspire with himself.

It is not necessary that a person, to be criminally liable, be acquainted with all the others engaged in the conspiracy; although to hold one liable as a participant it must be shown beyond a reasonable doubt, that he did some act or made some agreement showing his intention to be a participant.

It is not necessary to constitute a conspiracy that the parties should have come together and agreed in express terms to unite for a common object. A mutual, implied understanding is sufficient, so far as the combination or conspiracy is concerned, to constitute the offense. However, there can be no conspiracy without an agreement or understanding, as neither the fact that two or more persons at the same time intended to do the same or similar act, nor the fact that one knows of the intention of another or others to do a particular act, nor a mere uncommunicated intention to conspire, is sufficient for a conspiracy.

I instruct you also that a conspirator is responsible for the acts of his confederate in promoting the object of a conspiracy. In other words, members of the jury, any act done by a party to an unlawful conspiracy, in furtherance of, and naturally flowing from, which is connected with, and grows out of, the common design, is the act of each and all of the conspirators.

One who enters into a criminal conspiracy to accomplish some unlawful purpose forfeits his independence and jeopardizes his liberty, for, by agreeing with another or others to do an unlawful thing, he thereby places his safety and security in the hands of every

member of the conspiracy. The acts and declaration of each conspirator, done or uttered in furtherance of the common, illegal design, are admissible in evidence against all. Everyone who enters into a common purpose or design is equally deemed in law a party to every act which had before been done by the others, and a party to every act which may afterwards be done by any of the others in furtherance of such common design. Any act done by a party to an unlawful conspiracy, in furtherance of and naturally flowing from, which is connected with, and grows out of the common design, is the act of each and all of the conspirators.

Now members of the jury, aiding and abetting, I instruct you that where two or more persons aid and abet each other in the commission of a crime, both being present, both are principals and are equally guilty. A person aids and abets in the commission of a crime within the meaning of this rule when he shares in the criminal intent of the actual perpetrator and renders assistance or encouragement to him in the perpetration of a crime. In order for one to aid and abet in the perpetration of a crime, he must do something that incites, encourages or assists the perpetration of it (the crime).

The person in the commission cannot be said to have incited, encouraged or aided the perpetration unless the intention to assist was in some way communicated

to him. A person aids when being present at the time and place he does some act to render aid to the actual perpetrator of the crime. Though he takes no direct share in its commission, an aider or abettor is one who, *being present* gives aid and comfort, commands, assists, another to commit a crime; a person who being present by word or conduct incites another to commit a criminal act or who so far as to be present of the knowledge of the person actually committing the crime for the purpose of assistance, if necessary, as an aider or abettor. When two or more persons aid and abet each other in the commission of a crime and all are present when the crime is committed, they are all principals and are equally guilty.

Our Court has held that all who are present, either actually or constructively, at the place of the crime and are either aiding, abetting or advising in its commission or are present for such purpose to the knowledge of the actual perpetrator or principals and are equally guilty. An aider and abettor encourages another to commit a crime.

Now are there any other questions? Members of the jury, you may retire.

(The jury retired at 7:55 P M.)

THE COURT: Let the jury come in.

(The jury returned to the courtroom at 8:18 P M.)

THE COURT: Madam Clerk, get the verdict.

CLERK: Will you stand, please? (Jury stands.)

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of North Carolina vs. Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes, ma'am.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

(Response: Yes.)

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery store building and contents thereof with incendiary device, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

(Response: Yes.)

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the

case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in the bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in the bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in the bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in the bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in the bill of indictment number 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the

case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in the bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen in the bill of indictment number 1665 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen in the bill of indictment number 1667 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus James McKoy in the bill of indictment number 1668 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus James McKoy in the bill of indictment number 1670 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store Building and contents thereof with incendiary device, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the

case of State of North Carolina versus Reginald Epps in the bill of indictment number 1671 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

FOREMAN: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

FOREMAN: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Reginald Epps in the bill of indictment number 1673 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Wayne Moore in the bill of indictment number 1674 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Wayne Moore in the bill of indictment number 1676 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Joe Wright in the bill of indictment number 1677 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Joe Wright in the Bill of indictment number 1679 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in the case of State of North Carolina versus Ann Shephard in the bill of indictment number 13168 in which she is charged with accessory before the fact of the burning of Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device, have you agreed upon a verdict?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: What say you? Guilty or not guilty?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

CLERK: So say you all?

Response: Yes.

THE COURT: Would you have a seat, members of the jury?

(Jury seated in the jurybox.)

MR. FERGUSON: If your Honor please, we would

like to have the jury polled as to each defendant as to each charge.

MR. HUNEVOL: Your Honor, I make the same motion.

THE COURT: Madam Clerk, would you poll the jury?

CLERK: Will Juror Number 1, Mr. Wooten stand please? Julian Wooten, as foreman you have returned a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is that your verdict?

A. Yes. Y

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Julian Wooten, as Foreman of the jury you have returned a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis, in the bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Julian Wooten, the jury has returned a verdict of guilty in the case -

THE COURT: What are you asking him now?

SOL. STROUD: May we approach the bench, your Honor?

(Conference at the bench.)

(Clerk continues polling the jury as follows:)

Q You may have a seat, Mr. Wooten. Mr. Jones, Juror Number 2. James Leland Jones, your Foreman has returned a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Leland Jones, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Have a seat. Josephine Williamson, your Foreman has

returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Josephine Williamson, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. James Bradley Sutton. James Bradley Sutton, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Bradley Sutton, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Meredith. James Meredith, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Meredith, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with

burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with Incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Agnes Day, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Agnes Day, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes, it is.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes, I do.

Q Sue Murphy, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina ver-

sus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons.

Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Sue Murphy, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Paul Ward, Paul Ward, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Paul Ward, your Foreman has returned with a verdict

of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1655/ⁱⁿwhich he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Gretchen Simmons, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Gretchen Simmons, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Betty Cox, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Betty Cox, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in the bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Pearcie Ann Colvin, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with

conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Percy Ann Colvin, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q John W. Menth, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1653 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q John W. Menth, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North

Carolina versus Benjamin Franklin Chavis in bill of indictment number 1655 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Julian Wooten, as Foreman of this jury has returned the verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in the bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Julian, Wooten as Foreman of the jury has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Leland Jones, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Leland Jones, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Josephine Williamson, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent there to?

A Yes.

Q JOSEPHINE Williamson, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in the bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is that your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Bradley Sutton, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Bradley Sutton, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of Indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with in-

incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Meredith, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Meredith, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Agnes Day, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656

in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Agnes Day, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Sue Murphy, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Sue Murphy, your Foreman has returned with a verdict

of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Paul Ward, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Paul War, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is that your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q Gretchen Simmons, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Gretchen Simmons, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Betty Cox, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Betty Cox, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Pearcie Ann Colvin, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Pearcie Ann Colvin, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary

device. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. John W. Menth, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1656 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. John W. Menth, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Marvin Patrick in bill of indictment number 1658 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Julian Wooten, as Foreman this jury has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1659 he is charged with conspiracy to assault

emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Julian Wooten, this jury has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in the bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. James Leland Jones, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in the bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. James Leland Jones, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina

versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Josephine Williamson, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Josephine Williamson, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Bradley Sutton, your Foreman has returned with

a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons.

Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Bradley Sutton, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Meredith, your Foreman has returned with a verdict fo guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Meredith, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Agnes Day, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Agnes Day, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store Building and contents thereof with incendiary device.

Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Sue Murphy, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personell with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Sue Murphy, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in the bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Paul Ward, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in the bill of indictment number 1659

in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Paul Ward, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Gretchen Simmons, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you still assent thereto?

A. Yes.

Q. Gretchen Simmons, your Foreman has returned with a

verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Betty Cox, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Betty Cox, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Pearcie Ann Colvin, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Pearcie Ann Colvin, your Foreman has returned wiht a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q John W. Menth, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in bill of indictment number 1659 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your

verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q John W. Menth, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Connie Tyndall in the bill of indictment number 1661 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Julian Wooten, the jury has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in the bill of indictment number 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Julian Wooten, the jury has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1664

in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Leland Jones, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs, bill of indictment number 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Leland Jones, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs, bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Josephine Williamson, your Foreman has returned with

a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in the bill of indictment 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons.

Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Josephine Williamson, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Bradley Sutton, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry JaCobs in bill of indictment number 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Bradley Sutton, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Meredith, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personell with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q James Meredith, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Agnes Day, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Agnes Day, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Sue Murphy, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Sue Murphy, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Paul Ward, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Paul Ward, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store Building and contents thereof with in-

endiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Gretchen Simmons, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Gretchen Simmons, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Betty Cox, your Foreman has returned a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1662 in which he

is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes,

Q Betty Cox, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and contents thereof with incendiary device. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Pearcie Ann Colvin, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in the bill of indictment number 1662 in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Pearcie Ann Colvin, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Jerry Jacobs in bill of indictment number 1664 in which he is charged with burning Mike's