

**PAGE COUNT OF ~~50~~ PAGES**

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 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 John W. Menth, 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 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.

MR. FERGUSON: May we approach the bench?

Your Honor, as to the remaining defendants

Vereen, McKoy, Wright, Moore and Epps, we will

stipulate for the record that the jury may be polled as to them jointly.

Q Julian Wooten, the jury has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore, and Joe Wright in bills of indictments number 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674 and 1677, respectively, and<sup>in</sup> which the are 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 cases of the State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment number 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679, respectively, in which they are charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building and the 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 cases of the State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James JcKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment number 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674 and 1677, respectively, in which they are 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 cases of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictments number 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679 respectively, in which they are charged with burning Mikes' 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 cases of the State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of in-

dictment number 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674, 1676, respectively, 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 cases of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment numbers 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679, respectively, in which he is charged with burning Mike's Grocery Store building with 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 cases of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James Jckoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment numbers 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674 and 1677, respectively, 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 cases of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment number 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679, respectively, 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 cases of State of North Carolina Versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright bills of indictment number 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674 and 1677, respectively, 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 Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment numbers 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679, respectively, 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 cases of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment numbers 1665, 1671, 1674 and 1677, respectively, in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A Yes, it is.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Agnes Day, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the cases of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment

i numbers 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679, respectively,  
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 cases of the State of North Carolina  
versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, REginald Epps,  
Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment  
numbers 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674 and 1677, respectively,  
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 cases of State of North Carolina  
versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, REginald Epps,  
Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment  
numbers 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679, respectively,  
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 cases of the State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment numbers 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674 and 1677, respectively, 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 cases of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment numbers 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679, respectively, 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 cases of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictments numbers 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674 and 1677, respectively, in which he is charged with conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons. Is this your verdict?

A. Yes.

Q. Gzetchen Simmons, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the cases of the State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright 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. Beey Cox, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the cases of the State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment numbers 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674 and 1677 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 cases of State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictments numbers 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679 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 cases of the State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment numbers 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674, 1677 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 cases of the State of North

Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictments 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679 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 cases of the State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment numbers 1665, 1668, 1671, 1674 and 1677 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 cases of the State of North Carolina versus Willie Earl Vereen, James McKoy, Reginald Epps, Wayne Moore and Joe Wright in bills of indictment numbers 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676 and 1679 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 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. 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 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. 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 Ann Shephard in 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. 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 Ann Shephard in the bill of indictment number 13168/<sup>in</sup>which she is charged with accessory before the fact of the burning of 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 Ann Shephard in 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. 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 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. 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 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. 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 Ann Shephard in 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. 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 Ann Shephard in 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. 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 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. Is this your



verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

Q Pearce Ann Colvin, your Foreman has returned with a verdict of guilty in the case of the State of North Carolina versus Ann Shephard in 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. 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 Ann Shephard in 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. Is this your verdict?

A Yes.

Q Do you still assent thereto?

A Yes.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, the Court wishes

to express its sincere appreciation for your services here these several weeks. You may now be discharged. You now go.

(The jury was dismissed.)

(Conference at the bench.)

MR. FERGUSON: If your Honor please, we would like to be heard by the Court on certain motions that we will make and also on the question of sentencing.

THE COURT: Do you want to be heard now or later tomorrow morning?

MR. FERGUSON: Tomorrow morning would suit our purposes better.

THE COURT: Do all of you gentlemen concur in this?

ALL ATTORNEYS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Does the State concur?

SOL. STROUD: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Let the defendants be in custody.

We'll take a recess until tomorrow morning, Sheriff, at 9:30.

(The Court recessed at 9:40 P M.)

October 18, 1972

10:13 A M.

(All attorneys were present except Mr. Becton.  
All defendants present.)

THE COURT: Are you ready?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor, on  
behalf of each of the nine defendants as to each  
charge we move to set aside the verdict as being  
contrary to the greater weight of the evidence.

THE COURT: Motion denied. (EXCEPTION NO.

MR. FERGUSON: We would move the Court for an arrest  
of judgment as to each judgment as to each charge.

THE COURT: Motion denied. (EXCEPTION NO.

MR. FERGUSON: We move the Court for a new trial  
as to each defendant as to each defendant as to  
each charge.

THE COURT: Motion denied. (EXCEPTION NO.

MR. FERGUSON: And again we would renew motions  
for mistrial based upon errors committed during  
the entire trial.

THE COURT: Motion denied. (EXCEPTION NO.

MR. HUNEVOL: Your Honor, I'd like to make the  
same motions.

THE COURT: Motions denied. (EXCEPTION NO.  
/I'll hear you.

(Mr. Ferguson argued to the Court on behalf of  
the nine defendants.)

(Mr. Hunevol argued to the Court on behalf of Ann Shephard.)

(Sol. Johnson argued to the Court on behalf of the State.)

(Sol. Stroud argued to the Court on behalf of the State.)

(During the argument by Sol. Stroud the following transpired:)

SOL. STROUD: Also one of them has a criminal charge arising out of a later incident. They are on bond on these charges, but I do feel like I need to bring your attention to these charges.

MR. FERGUSON: Object to that.

THE COURT: Overruled. Go ahead. (EXCEPTION NO.)

SOL. STROUD: The defendant Shephard, your Honor, is charged, along with three others - four others, with conspiring to burn four places of businesses on the 9th day of February of 1971 some three days after Mike's Grocery Store building was burned. The defendants Chavis and Patrick are charged with conspiracy to murder Harvey Edward Cumming on the 7th day of February, 1971, which would be the Sunday following the burning of Mike's. The defendants Jerry Jacobs, Willie Earl Vereen, Joe Wright, Ben Chavis, Marvin Patrick, James McKoy and Connie Tyndall are charged with assault

on emergency personnel at 5th and Nun Street on the evening of the 6th of February, 1971, So charges are pending against them, and in addition the defendant Chavis is charged with an offense in March of 1971, some month or so after the incident in February with being an accessory after the fact of the murder of Clifton Eugene Wright.

(Sol. Stroud concluded his argument to the Court on behalf of the State.)

(Mr. Ferguson argued to the Court on behalf of the nine defendants.)

THE COURT: Mr. Ferguson, what is the month and year the birthdate of Mr. Vereen?

DEFENDANT VEREEN: December 5, 1953.

THE COURT: And Mr. Jacobs.

DEFENDANT JACOBS: May 23, 1952.

THE COURT: Mr. Patrick.

DEFENDANT PATRICK: May 30, 1952.

THE COURT: Mr. Moore.

DEFENDANT MOORE: November 5, 1952.

THE COURT: And Mr. McKoy.

DEFENDANT MCKOY: December 11, 1953.

THE COURT: And Mr. Wright.

DEFENDANT WRIGHT: December 25, 1952.

THE COURT: And Mr. Epps.

DEFENDANT EPPS: August 20, 1953.

THE COURT: Mr. Vereen, you are now 18 years of age?

A Yes, sir.

THE COURT: How old were you on February 6, 1971?

A 17.

THE COURT: In 1665, IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT that the defendant be imprisoned for the term of not less than 3 nor more than 5 years in the State's Prison to be assigned to work under the State Department of Correction.

In case number 1667, IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT that the defendant be imprisoned for the term of not less than 20 nor more than 24 years in the States P rison to be assigned to work under the State Department of Correction. Have a seat. Mr. Jacobs, will you stand up? How old were you on February 6?

A I was 18 and a half.

THE COURT: In case number 1662, IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT THAT the defendant be imprisoned for the term of not less than 3 nor more than 5 years in the States Prison to be assigned to work under the State Department of Correction.

In case number 1664, IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE

COURT that the defendant be imprisoned in States Prison for a term of not less than 20 nor more than 24 years to be assigned to work under the State Department of Correction.

In the case of Mr. Tyndall, would you please stand up? IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT the defendant be imprisoned for the term of not less than 4 nor more than 5 years in the States Prison to be assigned to work under the State Department of Correction. That is in case number 1659.

In case 1661, IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT that the defendant be imprisoned for a term of not less than 22 nor more than 26 years in the States Prison to be assigned to work under the supervision of the State Department of Correction.

Mr. Chavis, would you stand up? In case number 1665, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT the defendant be imprisoned for a term of not less than 25 nor more than 29 years in the State's Prison to be assigned to work under the State Department of Correction. That is in 1665. In 1663, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS that the defendant be imprisoned for not less than 4 nor more than 5 years in the States Prison to be assigned to work under the State Department of Correction.

In case of Mr. Patrick 1658, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS that the defendant be imprisoned in the States Prison for a term of not less than 22 nor more than 26 years to be assigned to work under the supervision of the State Department of Correction.

In 1665, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS that the defendant be imprisoned in the States Prison for a term of not less than 4 nor more than 5 years to be assigned to work under the supervision of the State Department of Correction.

Wayne Moore. JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS in case number 1676 the defendant be imprisoned in the North Carolina Department of Correction for a period of not less than 20 nor more than 24 years that he be assigned to work under the supervision of the States Prison. 1674, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS the defendant be imprisoned in the States Prison for a period of not less than 3 nor more than 5 years to be assigned to work under the supervision of the State Department of Correction.

James McKoy. In case number 1670, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS that the defendant be imprisoned in the States Prison for a term of not less than 20 nor more than 24 years to be assigned to work under



the supervision of the North Carolina Department of Correction. In case number 1668, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS that the defendant be imprisoned in the States Prison for a term of not less than 3 nor more than 5 years to be assigned to work under the supervision of the State Department of Correction.

Mr. Joe Wright. Mr. Wright, would you stand up? In case number 1679, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS that the defendant be imprisoned in the States prison for a term of not less than 20 nor more than 24 years to be assigned to work under the supervision of the State Department of Correction.

In 1677, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS that the defendant be imprisoned in the States Prison for a term of not less than 3 nor more than 5 years to be assigned to work under supervision of the N. C. Department of Correction.

Mr. Epps, would you stand up? In case number 1673, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS that the defendant be imprisoned in States Prison for a term of not less than 20 nore more than 24 years to be assigned to work under the supervision of the North Carolina Department of Correction.

In 1671, JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS that the defendant

be imprisoned for a term of not less than 3 nor more than 5 years to be assigned to work under the supervision of the North Carolina Department of Correction.

Mrs. Shephard, would you stand up, please?

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IS that the defendant be imprisoned in the States Prison in quarters assigned for female prisoners for a term of not less than 7 nor more than 10 years.

MR. FERGUSON: If your Honor please, as to each defendant as to each charge we give notice of appeal. We would ask the Court to set a reasonable bond on appeal.

MR. HUNEVOL: As to Mrs. Shephard we give notice of appeal and request a reasonable bond.

THE COURT: Notice of appeal is recorded. In the case of Mr. Vereen appearance bond is fixed in the sum of \$40,000.00. In the case of Mr. Jacobs the appearance bond is fixed in the sum of \$40,000.00. In the case of Mr. Tyndall the appearance bond is fixed in the sum of \$45,000.00. In the case of Mr. Chavis the appearance bond is fixed in the sum of \$50,000.00. In the case of Mr. Patrick the appearance bond is fixed in the sum of \$45,000.00. In the case of Wayne Moore the

the appearance bond is fixed in the sum of \$40,000.00. In the case of Mr. McKoy the appearance bond is fixed in the sum of \$40,000.00. In the case of Mr. Joe Wright the appearance bond is fixed in the sum of \$40,000.00. In the case of Mr. Epps the appearance bond is fixed in the sum of \$40,000.00. In the case of Mrs. Shephard the appearance bond is fixed in the sum of \$20,000.00. Now, gentlemen, do you wish for me to fix in the case of Mr. Chavis the appeal bond? It is set at the sum of \$300.00. There will be no necessity for appeal bond as far as the other defendants are concerned. Now, Mr. Ferguson, do you gentlemen wish for me to set the time in which to prepare the case on appeal?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, your Honor, we would ask for a maximum time in light -

THE COURT: Of course, you know that can be extended.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: What would you suggest?

MR. FERGUSON: I think the maximum time you could give now would be 90 days for it to be docketed. So I could suggest 60 - 20 at this time.

THE COURT: The defendants and each of them are allowed 60 days to prepare and serve case on appeal. And the State is allowed -

MR. JOHNSON: The most we could, your Honor.

THE COURT: 30 days after such service to prepare and serve countercase. Now you gentlemen understand that this can be extended.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.

REPORTED AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

*Josephine L. Seila*

-----  
Josephine L. Seila,  
Official Court Reporter  
P O Box 718  
Selma, N. C. 27576.