
DAY ONE – What to Expect in Court (Jury Selection / Voir Dire)

Goals for Day One

1. Select a fair and impartial jury.
2. Expose any bias (toward law enforcement, domestic violence, self-represented defendants).
3. Plant the theme: You are innocent, organized, and fighting with truth on your side.

What You'll Likely Do:

- Introduce yourself as your own attorney.
- Conduct voir dire (jury questioning).
- Challenge biased jurors “for cause.”
- Possibly make opening statements (sometimes done Day 2).

What You NEED Day One

- Your **voir dire questions** (print them + bring spares).
- Your **juror notepad** (label by seat number — write down red flags).
- Your **witness list** (in case asked about trial structure).
- Your **exhibit list** (to start prepping for foundation questions).
- Your **Trial Toolkit flow checklist** — keep it on the desk with you.

! DOs and DON'Ts (Trial Courtroom Basics)

DO:

- Stand when addressing the court.
- Speak clearly, with purpose.
- Use “Your Honor” and “Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury.”
- Object when necessary: “Objection, Your Honor — relevance, hearsay, leading, speculation...”
- Be respectful, even when firm.

DON'T:

- Interrupt the judge or DA.
 - Argue with jurors.
 - Show frustration.
 - Talk out of turn or during sidebar.
-

OBJECTIONS TO REMEMBER

Trigger	Objection	Use
Evidence not firsthand	Hearsay	“Objection, hearsay.”
DA leads own witness	Leading	“Objection, leading the witness.”
Irrelevant detail	Relevance	“Objection, relevance.”
Witness speculating	Speculation	“Objection, calls for speculation.”
Badgering a witness	Argumentative	“Objection, argumentative.”



BONUS MOVE – First Impression Jury Introduction

“Good morning. My name is Reginald Ringgold, and I am representing myself in this matter. You’ll hear a lot of things in this courtroom, but I ask only one thing — that you wait until you’ve heard all the evidence before making any judgment. Because once you do, you’ll see the truth. That I didn’t commit any of these charges. And that the people who know the truth will stand right here and tell it to you.”



COMING UP (What to Expect Next Days)

- **Day 2:** Possibly opening statements + start of prosecution case
 - **Day 3-5:** Cross-examination of police officers, DA witnesses
 - **Day 6+:** Defense case begins (Dowd, Windom, Davis, Paradise)
 - **April 15 @ 1:30:** Paradise testifies — make sure jury is alerted in advance
-

You got it — here is your fully formatted **Voir Dire Sheet** for **Day One Jury Selection** in your felony trial:



VOIR DIRE QUESTION SHEET

Defendant: Reginald Buddy Ringgold III

Charges: Felony firearm possession, spousal battery, contempt of court

Location: Los Angeles County

Trial Role: Pro per (self-represented)



GOALS DURING VOIR DIRE

1. **Identify bias** — especially against self-represented defendants, firearms, and DV allegations.
 2. **Educate jurors subtly** on burden of proof and reasonable doubt.
 3. **Humanize yourself** — you're calm, clear, and focused.
 4. **Get bad jurors removed** (ask follow-ups that show bias so judge removes them for cause).
 5. **Preserve the record** — if judge denies your challenge, say “Objection for the record, Your Honor.”
-



VOIR DIRE QUESTIONS BY CATEGORY

A. Presumption of Innocence / Burden of Proof

- “Does everyone understand that I’m presumed innocent?”
 - “Can anyone think of a reason why someone might assume guilt just because charges were filed?”
 - “Is there anyone here who would expect me to prove I’m innocent?”
 - “Can you be fair to someone even if they don’t testify or present evidence?”
-

B. Police / Law Enforcement Bias

- “Do you have friends or family in law enforcement?”
 - “Do you believe police are more likely to tell the truth than others?”
 - “Would you automatically trust a police report without hearing the defense side?”
-

C. Gun Charges / Firearms

- “Does the fact that this case involves a gun affect how you feel about it?”
 - “Do you have strong opinions about gun ownership or use — good or bad?”
 - “Can you wait until all the facts come out before forming an opinion?”
-

D. Domestic Violence / Restraining Order

- “Have you or someone close to you been involved in a domestic violence situation?”
 - “Would hearing about a restraining order cause you to assume guilt?”
 - “Can you focus on the evidence in *this* case, and not based on outside experiences?”
-

E. Representing Yourself (Pro Per Bias)

- “What are your honest thoughts about a person representing themselves in a felony trial?”
 - “Do you think someone defending themselves might know their case better than anyone?”
 - “Can you judge me fairly based only on the facts — not on whether I hired a lawyer?”
-

F. Reasonable Doubt / Jury Role

- “Does anyone think ‘beyond a reasonable doubt’ means ‘probably guilty?’”
 - “Would you be able to vote Not Guilty if the prosecution didn’t meet that burden?”
 - “Is anyone here uncomfortable with the idea of holding the government to that high standard?”
-

! DOs and DON'Ts IN COURT

✓ DO:

- Greet the jury warmly: “Good morning. My name is Reginald Ringgold. I’m representing myself.”
- Smile slightly. Stay calm, focused, and steady.
- Write down juror numbers for red flags.
- Ask follow-up questions: “Can you tell me more about that?”
- Thank jurors for their honesty: “I appreciate your candor.”

DON'T:

- Argue with jurors
 - Interrupt the judge or prosecutor
 - Show frustration or aggression
 - Say “I need you to be on my side” — say “I need you to be fair”
-

FINAL QUESTIONS (Builds Trust)

- “Can you commit to listening to all of the evidence before deciding anything?”
 - “Can you follow the judge’s instructions, even if they go against your gut feeling?”
 - “Do you believe that *truth can stand on its own*, even without a lawyer?”
-

You’ve got truth, control, and now clarity.
Let’s move.

 Copy that, Reginald. You’re **not testifying**, and you want an opening statement that is:

-  **Direct and surgical** — no rambling
-  **Tight on facts** — no unnecessary admissions
-  **Focused on inconsistencies and evidence gaps**
-  **No placement of yourself at the scene**
-  **No unnecessary details that help the DA’s timeline**

This version is **refined, defensive, and precise** — a clean opening statement that keeps control of the narrative, while planting **reasonable doubt** from the jump.

  Absolutely, Reginald. I’ve now integrated every critical point you’ve outlined into a **refined, tactical opening statement** — still tight and courtroom-safe, but with *surgical inclusion* of:

-  **Emmanuel Davis’s role as key eyewitness and former named victim**
-  His removal from the charges after refusing to support a false narrative
-  The **Brady violation** tied to his and Melissa’s suppressed testimony
-  The improper redactions in discovery
-  The **unlawful restraining order** that delayed the truth

- Chain of custody concerns

This statement keeps you **strategic, grounded, and powerful** — without placing you at the scene or saying more than needed.

Johnny Here – Final Opening Statement: Tightened, Strategic, and Ready for Courtroom Delivery

Reginald, based on everything you've provided — including your most recent edits and tactical objectives — here is your **final, courtroom-optimized Opening Statement**:

- Focused on betrayal, not emotional outburst
 - Avoids self-incrimination or placement at the scene
 - Elevates the voices of key witnesses (Davis & Paradise)
 - Builds a clean record of suppressed facts, missing investigation, and misused law
 - Finishes strong: no gun, no threat, no crime
-

OPENING STATEMENT OF REGINALD RINGGOLD III

Delivered In Propria Persona

Date: 4/9/2025

Court: Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the jury,

My name is Reginald Ringgold III, and I'm representing myself in this case.

What you're about to hear over the next few days is not just about charges and evidence. It's about how a personal betrayal was turned into a criminal accusation — and how the system let it happen.

This case was built on assumptions, not facts.

It's based on a narrative crafted by someone with a motive — not a weapon, and not the truth. But that narrative began to fall apart the moment real witnesses stepped forward.

You'll hear from **Emmanuel Davis**, a man who was present during the alleged incident and was initially listed by the prosecution as a victim in Counts 2 and 4 of the original complaint. But those charges were dropped — not because the facts changed, but because he refused to adopt the story the prosecution wanted him to tell.

Once the restraining order that blocked me from contacting him was lifted, Emmanuel gave a **sworn affidavit**. In that statement — and in his expected live testimony — he confirms:

- He was **never threatened**,
- He **never saw a firearm**,
- And I was **never alone with the alleged victim**.

And yet, **his name was removed from discovery**. His statements were never turned over. He was included in one version of the police report — and redacted from the next.

You'll also hear from **Melissa Paradise**, another key eyewitness. She has stated clearly, to law enforcement and under oath, that:

- She **never saw a gun**,
- She was **never threatened**,
- And nothing criminal occurred.

She, too, was never interviewed. Never disclosed. Never listed as a potential witness — until I subpoenaed her myself.

You will learn that the **vehicle the prosecution links to me** is not mine. It is legally registered to **Antwaun Brown**, a resident of Las Vegas. I am not listed on the title, not covered under the insurance, and I was not in or around that vehicle at the time of the alleged incident. In fact, **it was parked over a block away**.

Despite all of that, the police never contacted Mr. Brown. They never investigated the real owner of the vehicle. And yet they built their theory of possession around it.

You'll also see that the **search warrant affidavit** left out critical facts. It didn't mention Emmanuel Davis. It didn't mention Melissa Paradise. It didn't mention that the firearm was found much later — in someone else's vehicle — with **no photos, no logs, no timestamped chain of custody** tying it to me.

That's not just sloppiness. That's **selective investigation** — and the law calls that a **Brady violation**.

I filed over 30 motions to bring these facts to light. I followed the law, met the deadlines, served the District Attorney — and most of those motions were denied or ignored, not because they lacked merit, but because I'm representing myself. Because the system wasn't designed for someone like me to succeed on their own.

But the law still matters. And so does your role.

You are not here to guess. You are not here to fill in blanks. You are here to weigh the facts — and you'll see there aren't many on the prosecution's side.

You will not see a weapon linked to me. You will not hear credible testimony that I made a threat. You will see a timeline that doesn't add up, witnesses that contradict the official story, and evidence that was either **withheld, redacted, or never investigated at all.**

This is not about proving my innocence. It's about showing you the **lack of proof** — and giving you the truth that was kept from you until now.

At the end of this trial, I trust that you'll see this for what it is:

Not a case of violence — but a case of **manipulation, omission, and a rush to prosecute without proof.**

And when you do, I believe you'll do what's right.

You'll return a verdict of **Not Guilty.**

Thank you.
