

Defendant also argues that the trial court abused its discretion in refusing the jury's request for transcripts of Palasz' testimony. As a rule, the issue of whether to grant or deny a jury's request to review evidence or transcripts of witnesses' testimony lies within the sound discretion of the trial court and will not be disturbed absent an abuse of that discretion.

Transcripts of testimony may be made available to the jury if the jury makes such a request and if the trial court, in its discretion, believes that the transcripts will be helpful to jurors.

Where the jury itself requests the opportunity to examine transcripts of the testimony, the trial court must assume that the jury believes that such review would be helpful.

People v. Modrowski, 296 Ill. App. 3d 735, 747–48, 696 N.E.2d 28, 37 (1998)

---

Defendant further argues that the trial judge should have complied with the jury's request for transcripts of the testimony of Detective Cione and defendant. The determination of whether to grant or deny a jury's request to review transcripts of witnesses' testimony rests within the sound discretion of the trial court.

Absent an abuse of that discretion, the trial court's determination will not be disturbed on review. In the present case, the record indicates that the trial judge invited arguments and objections from both sides. The trial judge listened to the arguments put forth, exercised his discretion, and determined that the best response was to tell the jurors that they had heard the sworn testimony of the witnesses, and that they should continue to deliberate. There is nothing in the record to indicate that the trial judge abused his discretion in denying the jury's request. We therefore find that the trial judge properly exercised his discretion in refusing to provide the requested transcripts to the jury.

People v. Williams, 173 Ill. 2d 48, 87–88, 670 N.E.2d 638, 657–58 (1996)