1	CAUSE NUMBER F15-00411-L	
2	APPELLATE CAUSE NO. 05-17-00235-CR FILED IN	
3	THE STATE OF TEXAS * IN CRIMINAL DISTR DATAS , texas	.S
4	8/9/2017 6:02:55 PM	
5	Clerk CHRISTOPHER DUNTSCH * DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	*****	
11	REPORTER'S RECORD 2 FEBRUARY 2017	
12	VOLUME 8 ****	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	BE IT REMEMBERED that on the 2nd day of	
20	February, 2017, the above-styled and numbered cause came	
21	before the HONORABLE CARTER THOMPSON, Judge presiding, in	
22	Criminal District Court Number 5, held in Dallas, Dallas	
23	County, Texas, and the following proceedings were had:	
24		
25	Proceedings reported by machine shorthand	
	KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIMMONSCSR@YAHOO.COM	

1	<u>APPEARANCES</u>
2	
3	MICHELLE LEE SHUGHART - 24044559
4	STEPHANIE COLE MARTIN - 24031963 JACLYN O'CONNOR-LAMBERT - 24049262
5	JUSTIN LYN MCCANTS - 24046380 JUSTIN TYLER JOHNSON - 24054522 ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY.
6	ASSISIANI DISTRICI ATTORNET. 133 N. Riverfront Blvd. LB 19
7	Dallas, Texas 75207
8	
9	FOR THE STATE;
10	
11	MELINDA JOAN LEHMAN - 24043957 ATTORNEY AT LAW
12	701 Belknap Fort Worth, Texas 76102
13	
14	RICHARD FRANKLIN — 24053209 ROBBIE SAYLE MCCLUNG — 00789772
15	MCCLUNG & FRANKLIN 2150 S. Central Expressway
16	Dallas, Texas 75070
17	
18	FOR THE DEFENDANT.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
۷)	

1	CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX 2 FEBRUARY 2017		
2	VOLUME 8		
3		PAGE	VOLUME
4		NUMBER	NUMBER
5	Proceedings	5	8
6	Arraignment	7	8
7	Opening Statements		
8	By Ms. Shugart	8	8
9	By Ms. McClung	14	8
10	MS. MARY EFURD: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT	RECROSS	
11	20 36		8
12	DR. ROBERT HENDERSON: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT	RECROSS	
13	37 138 152 161	158 162	
14			
15	MR. ROBERT PASSMORE DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT	RECROSS	
16	164 181		
17			
18	Court Reporter Certification	190	8
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIM	MONSCSR@YZ	AHOO.COM

4

1	EXHIBIT INDEX 2 FEBRUARY 2017				
2		VOLUME 8			
3					
4	STATE'S EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	OFFERED	ADMITTED	VOL
5					
6	No. 1 No. 2	Picture of Dr. Duntsch Picture-Mary Efurd Boo		 37	8 8
7	No. 3 No. 4	Picture-Mary Efurd Fac Picture-Mary Efurd Sca	æ 34	37 37	8 8
8	No. 5 No. 12-22	Symptoms Chart-Efurd Photo-spinal anatomy	33 49	33 49	$\otimes \otimes $
9	No. 23 No. 24	Animated video Photo-spinal anatomy	60 49	60 49	8 8
10	No. 25 No. 26-31	CD Photos from SX No. 25	108 117	108 117	8
11	No. 34 No. 37	Email Symptoms Chart-Passmor	130	130 182	8
12	No. 38 No. 42	Photo-Passmore (face) X-ray Passmore (fronta	179	179 179	8
13	No. 90 No. 181	Peer review file Model of Spine (DPO)	129 102	129 102	8
14	No. 182	Efurd Medical Report 5 Photo-spinal anatomy	133 49	133 49	8
15	No. 196 No. 197	Images from SX No. 7 Model of cervicle spir	74	74 55	8
16	110. 197	(DPO)	ie 55	55	O
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

1	<u>PROCEEDINGS</u>
2	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, before
3	we start official proceedings, I have a couple of
4	announcements to make. First of all, if anyone here is
5	familiar with or conversant with someone who is going to
6	be testifying, I don't want anyone in the public to
7	communicate what's been going on in court to someone who
8	will be testifying. All right?
9	You are free to talk to other
10	non-witnesses, but witnesses or perspective witnesses to
11	this trial should not be having conversations about
12	what's transpired during trial.
13	Does anyone have an issue with that?
14	(No response)
15	THE COURT: Okay. Do not talk to a
16	witness about what's been going on in court. All right.
17	Let's line them up.
18	THE BAILIFF: All rise.
19	(Within the presence of the Jury)
20	THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated.
21	Ladies and gentlemen, before we proceed any further, I
22	need to have you sworn in as members of the Jury.
23	Raise your right-hand.
24	(Jury sworn by the Court)
25	THE COURT: Thank you very much. Ladies

and gentlemen, before we start testimony, I need to go through some housekeeping details. First of all, it's permissible to bring into the jury box whatever soda, coffee, water you like. Just keep up with it in the jury box.

22.

Also, you're permitted to take notes during the course of the trial, with two provisos, one of which is you keep your notes to yourself. The notes that you take are to refresh your own memory, not somebody else's memory.

Secondly, during deliberations you're not allowed to take notes back in the jury room with you.

The Court has a computer program called realtime, actual transcriptions of the testimony as it's happening. That helps the Court pick out points of law that might crop up during the course of the trial and address those later on and speed things up. So if you see myself or any other judge looking at a computer screen a lot, that's what's going on.

Lastly, we're going to be taking mid-morning and mid-afternoon breaks, so you're not going to be in the jury box for more than an hour, hour and ten minutes at a time.

Lastly, you may have noticed there is a lot of publicity in this case, TV cameras, that kind of KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIMMONSCSR@YAHOO.COM

1 thing. Please rest assured that no one is going to film 2. you. The cameras are here to photograph the lawyers and 3 the witnesses, not the Jury, so you're not going to be on 4 The media has been instructed not to film television. 5 you. 6 All right. State may proceed. 7 MS. SHUGART: Thank you. 8 MS. MCCLUNG: At this time defense would 9 invoke the rule. 10 (Rule invoked) 11 THE COURT: The rule has been invoked. 12 Both sides are to instruct their witnesses accordingly. 13 ARRAIGNMENT 14 MS. SHUGART: Good morning, Ladies and 15 I'm going to read you the indictment. 16 tells the State what it is we have to proffer, and it 17 alerts the defendant to what he has been charged with. 18 (Reading) "In the name and by the 19 authority of the State of Texas, the Grand Jury of Dallas 20 County, Texas, duly organized at the July term, A.D. 21 2015, of the 363rd Judicial District Court of said 2.2. county, upon it's oath do present that in and to said 23 court at said term that Christopher Daniel Duntsch, 24 hereinafter called the defendant, on or about July 25th 25 of 2012, in the County of Dallas, State of Texas, did KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIMMONSCSR@YAHOO.COM

1	unlawfully then and there intentionally, knowingly,	
2	recklessly and criminally negligently cause serious	
3	bodily injury to Mary Efurd, an elderly individual of 65	
4	years of age or older, hereinafter called the	
5	complainant, by mal-positioning an interbody device and	
6	mal-positioning a pedicle screw and amputating the left	
7	L5 nerve root, and said defendant did use a deadly	
8	weapon; to wit, hands and surgical tools and a pedicle	
9	screw, during the commission of the offense."	
10	Signed by the Foreman of the Grand Jury	
11	and by then District Attorney of Dallas County, Texas."	
12	THE COURT: To that indictment how does	
13	the defense plead?	
14	MS. MCCLUNG: Dr. Duntsch pleads not	
15	guilty, Judge.	
16	THE COURT: Proceed.	
17	OPENING STATEMENTS	
18	MS. SHUGART: Five years ago Mary Efurd	
19	had back pain. At the age of 75 she went to the doctor,	
20	and she ended up at the Texas Neurosurgical Institute,	
21	the offices of one Dr. Christopher Daniel Duntsch.	
22	Ultimately, on July 25, 2012, Mary ended	
23	up having surgery and being operated on by the defendant	
24	at the Dallas Medical Center. But what happened there	
25	nobody could have conceived of.	
	KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIMMONSCSR@YAHOO.COM	

You see, her doctor, the man she put her trust into to cut into her back, put spinal fusion hardware in the muscle, not in the bone where it belongs but in the muscle.

2.2.

And he didn't stop there. He cut off a nerve so her foot hangs there, and he put one of these pedicle screws to where it's touching the spinal canal.

The hospital was so appalled by what he had done that they removed him from the case, brought in another surgeon to fix it, and kicked him out of the hospital.

Now, the other surgeon who came in, Dr. Robert Henderson, when he saw what the defendant had done, he was so disgusted by it that he didn't think the person who had done it was even a doctor. He thought it was an imposter who had done this, and he had to go check to find out.

After you hear from Mary Efurd and Dr.

Robert Henderson, we're going to go back in time, and I'm going to show you patient after patient that the defendant injured and knew he was injuring, before he even ever got to Mary Efurd.

Lee Passmore is going to come in here and tell you that he had a sharp pain in his back, but after his surgery with the defendant he woke up, and he was KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIMMONSCSR@YAHOO.COM

numb from the waist down, and he was in more pain than he was before the surgery.

2.

22.

The very next surgery was Barry
Morguloff. Barry Morguloff is going to come in here and
tell you that when he woke up from his surgery, he
couldn't control his foot, and he was in so much pain
that he would wrap a towel around his foot and was trying
to pull it up to alleviate the pain, and when he tried to
tell the defendant about it, the defendant didn't do
anything.

Another surgeon had to eventually come in and remove that hardware because it was lose, it wasn't tightened down, and that surgeon had to remove bone fragments that were pushing on Barry Morguloff's nerves causing him that pain.

After Barry, you're going to hear from Jerry Summers. Jerry Summers will not be here in person like the rest of the witnesses. You will see him on the screen from a deposition that we took a few weeks ago in Memphis, Tennessee.

You see, Jerry could not come to Texas.

Jerry could not walk. Jerry cannot dress himself or feed himself because of what the defendant did.

They were friends. They grew up together in Memphis, Tennessee. They played football together.

And when the defendant finished his medical training and 1 2. his residency and his fellowship, he came here to Texas 3 to start his practice. Jerry came with him to help him. 4 Jerry worked for him, Jerry lived with him, Jerry ran his 5 errands. 6 But Jerry had a back problem, and on 7 February 2, 2012, Jerry walked into Baylor Plano 8 Hospital, but when he woke up from his surgery with the 9 defendant, he could not feel his arms or legs, but he 10 could feel the pain. 11 You see, Jerry became an incomplete 12 quadraplegic, meaning he couldn't move anything, but he 13 can still feel everything. 14 Right after his surgery the defendant did 15 not take care of him, did not take him right back into 16 surgery and fix it. Instead, he went to operate on 17 somebody else. 18 Jerry lay there for hours until the 19 defendant came back and decided, yeah, he probably needs 20 another surgery, so let's take him back in. By then it 21 was too late. 22. A few weeks later the defendant operated 23 on Kelly Martin, his very next surgery after Jerry 24 Summers. Kelly Martin was a schoolteacher, and she 25 wanted to get her back fixed before they went on a

cruise. At the age of 54, she walked into Baylor Plano Hospital. She never made it out.

2.

2.2.

You see, the doctor she trusted to cut into her back cut through the skin, and he cut through the back muscles, and he cut through his entire spinal column, and he cut through the ligament on the other side of the spinal column that holds it together, and he slashed a major blood vessel, and she bled to death.

Her husband will come in here and tell you that when they delivered the news, the defendant would not look him in the eye.

Baylor Hospital forced the defendant to take a leave of absence from operating, and he knew he was never going to operate there again.

He resigned from the hospital, so that it wouldn't have to be reported to the national databank where everybody could see it, and he covered his tracks by hiring an attorney.

A few months later he finally found another hospital to take him, but he didn't tell them about his last two patients and those results, and his very first week there he had two catastrophic outcomes on the same day.

On July 24, 2012, Floella Brown, at the age of 64, walked into Medical Center, and she also never KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIMMONSCSR@YAHOO.COM

walked out. The defendant took off too much bone on her spine and cut her vertebral artery, depriving her brain of the oxygen-rich blood that it needed, and over night she had a stroke.

2.

22.

And the next morning the defendant was called in early to take care of her. He didn't take care of her. He decided he needed to go operate on Mary Efurd, that first patient that I told you about so — as well as brain is swelling, and she is beginning to die.

He goes into Mary Efurd's surgery, and he is arguing with hospital personnel because he wants to drill a hole in her brain, something that he had never shown them that he was even qualified to do and that they, under no circumstances, were going to allow him to do.

Seven hours later he finally transferred Floella Brown to another hospital that could do this procedure, and at the end of the day Floella was, essentially, brain dead, and Mary could no longer walk.

For seven days doctors and patients and nurses, medical advisers and other hospital personnel are going to come in here and tell you everything the defendant knew before he picked up a scalpel and touched Mary Efurd with it.

You're going to hear the carnage he KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIMMONSCSR@YAHOO.COM

1	caused was not a mistake or an accident or just
2	malpractice but that he ignored 17 years of medical
3	training and continued to operate, and he was aware of
4	all the injuries that he had caused these patient, and he
5	knew what he was capable of, and he knew that the next
6	patient he walked into he was going to maim or paralyze
7	or kill.
8	At the end of the trial, you're going to
9	find him guilty. We're all going to agree as a group
10	that he intentionally operated on Mary Efurd and that he
11	knowingly caused her serious bodily injury. That's not
12	going to be the question. The question that you're going
13	to have is why didn't he stop? Why didn't he stop?
14	You may be able to find the answer, and
15	you may not, but whatever his motivation was, when he
16	stepped into that operating room, he knew that he was
17	hurting Mary Efurd while he was operating on her, and
18	before he even went in there, he knew that he was almost
19	certainly going to cause her injury.
20	THE COURT: Defense.
21	OPENING STATEMENTS
22	MS. MCCLUNG: May it please the Court,
23	counsel for the state.
24	Ladies and gentlemen, you knew when some
25	of you came in here on Monday, some of you came in here

on Tuesday, and some of you came in here yesterday and filled out those questionnaires, you knew this was not going to be a typical criminal case. There were some issues with this.

2.

2.2.

There had been publicity about this, there had been talk about this, and that's why it took us three days to finally get down to the 14 of you to listen to all the evidence, and that's the point, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Ms. Martin gave a very interesting hypothesis, or metaphor, that's probably a better word, for what a case is. She called it a cake. She said that the elements that are in that indictment that was just read to you, again, are just the ingredients of a cake.

Well, we all know from common sense that cakes are made two ways, and that's not any different in the way a criminal case comes to the District Attorney's Office.

Criminal cases can come two ways. They can come from a police officer investigation, getting a 911 call, or a citizen complaint, and a police officer goes out and starts talking to witnesses, does an investigation, brings them in, videotapes interviews, takes notes, goes out and finds facts, finds evidence, issues search warrants, all sorts of things like that, KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIMMONSCSR@YAHOO.COM

and then brings an entire package, kind of like that box of different kinds of cake mix you find at the store, brings it all and lays it on the desk of an assistant district attorney. That's one way.

2.

2.2.

There is another way. A citizen can come and complain to the District Attorney's Office and say there needs to be an investigation. And so on their own they can begin to put that cake together, with what few ingredients they can pull from that interview from that citizen complaint.

One of the things we also know about cakes is when you rush them, when you don't have all the ingredients or the ingredients aren't very good anymore, or maybe it's just not really all there, that sometimes, when you pull that cake out of the oven, there is a big, huge gap. It's just not enough. It can't stand by itself.

And what I'm referring to is the case that's actually in front of you, the indictment that was actually read. It's not enough.

Their concern is they can't get to criminal negligence, they can't get to reckless, they can't get to knowing, and now you know that's where they want to be, if you haven't figured it out.

They want to be at knowing and

intentionally, and to do that they're going to bring you Mr. Summers. To do that, they're going to bring you Mr. Morguloff. They're going to bring you other individuals who have had surgery with him, character evidence, other extraneouses, so that you can push yourself up that hill, just the way you would take frosting and fill in that hole or maybe add another layer of cake to cover up the deficits in the first layer and make it really look pretty.

2.

2.2.

Because the indictment alone you might not think is that big a deal, so they can't wait 'til punishment. They're going to do it before you ever get there so they can be sure that this beautiful cake that they've given you is exactly what you decide you want to take to your party without checking it out, without looking at how the ingredients are put in, without listening to the people and deciding, do they have a reason to tell me the truth? Do they have a reason not to? Is this an adequate enough investigation? Is this enough to call someone a criminal or not?

Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't believe that you're that gullible. I don't believe you're those kind of people, or you wouldn't be sitting here right now. I think you're all individuals with intelligence, common sense and the ability to discern what is criminal KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIMMONSCSR@YAHOO.COM

and what is not, to discern what is put in there to influence your sympathies, to play on your emotions, to get you to be concerned about the public instead of facing the facts.

2.

2.2.

Because remember what we said. There is a difference between punishment and guilt or innocence.

Guilt or innocence is supposed to be about the facts. Do they have the facts to get you to those?

Because what you can tell is it's not about the who, because they — they know that Dr. Duntsch is the one that did the surgery on Ms. Efurd. They know that. That's a done deal. They know the surgery was done. They know that Ms. Efurd is the one that it was done to. They know the problems that went wrong with the surgery.

But you have to remember back to some of the things that were said in voir dire. When we're talking about surgery and we're talking about consent, there are risks in surgery.

They don't want you to think that this is just one of those risks that failed, so they bring you more to persuade you it's not a risk, to persuade you that he knew, that he did it intentionally. They want to keep pushing you with the emotion and draw you away from the facts.

The fact that you're supposed to be focusing on is Mary Efurd and whether or not it was criminal negligence, reckless, knowingly or intentional.

22.

You have to be able to adjust your mind and not just start glopping on that frosting that they're going to want you to you put on. You're going to have to look at it as it's being made and determine whether or not any those other surgeries mean anything to you or not or whether it's just what it is. It's just stuff. It's distracting you from the case itself.

Ladies and Gentlemen, this case is going to be more about you using your reason and common sense and weighing the evidence. As things come in and are admitted in front of you, you're going to have to look at each piece of evidence and decide whether, to you, that is important or not, because they're going to want you to believe that everything they say is important.

But you have got to have your own mind, because as we said in voir dire, you are the exclusive judges, exclusive judges, of each and every fact that is put in front of you.

You get to decide the weight. The Judge decides the admissibility, but you get to decide the weight you want to give it, each one of you, and you decide whether it means what they say it means, and you KELLY SIMMONS, CSR 214-906-4715 K.SIMMONSCSR@YAHOO.COM

1 get to throw out what you think is not a tool anymore, 2 that it's just qunk, it's just trash, and it doesn't have 3 anything at all to do with your determination. 4 It's not like the tool box that Ms. 5 Martin kept talking about in punishment. You actually can say, you know what, I'm putting this right over here. 6 7 It doesn't mean anything. That's your job. 8 They're going to give you enough to cover 9 you up. They're going to give you enough to hide what's 10 really there. It's your job to scrape away the frosting, 11 scrape away the decorations and really look and see, as 12 Ms. Martin said, if they've got a guilty cake. 13 Thank you. State, call your THE COURT: 14 first witness. 15 MS. SHUGART: Your Honor, the State calls 16 Mary Efurd. 17 MARY EFURD, 18 A witness called by the State, having been duly sworn 19 by the Court to tell the truth, testified on her oath 20 as follows: 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION 2.2. BY MS. SHUGART: 23 Can you please introduce yourself to the jury? Q. 24 Α. My name is Mary Efurd. 25 Q. Mary, can you tell us how old you are?