## COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT



THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	)
PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,	) ) SUPERIOR COURT
VS.	) NO. A-090435
JOE HUNT, AKA JOSEPH HUNT, AKA JOSEPH HENRY GAMSKY,	)
DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.	

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY
HONORABLE LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE PRESIDING
REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL

**APPEARANCES:** 

FOR PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT: JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP

STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL 3580 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD

**ROOM 800** 

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90010

FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT: IN PROPRIA PERSONA

VOLUME 30 OF 101 (PAGES 4362 TO 4556 , INCLUSIVE)



ROSEMARIE GOODBODY, CSR NO. 932 SALLY YERGER, CSR NO. 2008 OFFICIAL REPORTERS

## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT WEST C HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

PLAINTIFF,

VS.

NO. A-090435

JOSEPH HUNT,

DEFENDANT.

REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1987

VOLUME 30

PAGES 4362 TO 4556, INCL.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

IRA REINER, DISTRICT ATTORNEY BY: FREDERICK N. WAPNER, DEPUTY

1725 MAIN STREET

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 90401

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

ARTHUR H. BARENS, ESQ.

10209 SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067

AND

RICHARD C. CHIER, ESQ. 10920 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

ROSEMARIE GOODBODY, CSR NO. 932 SALLY YERGER, CSR NO. 2008 OFFICIAL REPORTERS

1	WEDNESDAY,	JANUARY	7, 1987	VOLUME 30	PAGES L	+362 TO	4556
2				A.M.			4362
3				P.M.			4442
4							
5							
6	PROCEEDINGS						
7			•				
8	VOIR DIRE OF PROSPECTIVE JURORS (CONTINUED) 43						4362
9							
10							
11							
12							
13		,					4
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

```
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1987; 10:27 A.M.
  1
      DEPARTMENT WEST C
  2
                                   HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE
                   (APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.)
  3
            MR. BARENS: ON THOSE SUBPOENAS THAT WE --
  5
  6
            THE COURT: I HAVE SIGNED THEM.
            MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
  7
            THE COURT: YOU HAVE SEEN THEM, HAVEN'T YOU?
  8
            MR. WAPNER: NO, I HAVEN'T.
 9
            MR. BARENS: I DON'T BELIEVE THE PROSECUTION OR THE
 10
      DEFENSE HAS TO EXCHANGE SUBPOENA MATERIALS, YOUR HONOR.
 11
            THE COURT: WELL, HE SHOULD KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON.
 12
           MR. BARENS: HE HAS NEVER TOLD US ABOUT ANY SUBPOENA
 13
     THE PROSECUTION HAS EVER ISSUED.
14
           THE COURT: DO YOU THINK IT IS NECESSARY FOR YOU TO
15
16
     SEE THEM?
           MR. WAPNER: I DON'T THINK IT IS REQUIRED, NO.
17
           THE COURT: IF IT ISN'T REQUIRED, THEN YOU DON'T SHOW
18
19
     IT TO HIM.
20
           MR. BARENS: IF YOUR HONOR WISHES TO, I DON'T MIND BUT --
           THE COURT: NO. I AM JUST FOLLOWING PROTOCOL.
21
           MR. BARENS: IF IT IS MADE RECIPROCAL AND I CAN SEE
22
     ALL OF HIS, IT WOULD BE NICE.
23
24
                 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR GUCCIONE ENTERED
25
                 THE COURTROOM.)
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YOU ARE MR. GUCCIONE, IS THAT
26
27
    IT?
28
          MR. GUCCIONE: YES, SIR.
```

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MR. GUCCIONE, WHERE DO YOU LIVE? 1 MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, COULD I HAVE ONE MOMENT? 2 3 THE COURT: YES. (PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.) 4 5 THE COURT: READY? 6 MR. WAPNER: YES. THANK YOU. 7 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WHERE DO YOU LIVE, MR. GUCCIONE? MR. GUCCIONE: LOS ANGELES, YOUR HONOR. 8 9 THE COURT: WHAT PART OF LOS ANGELES? MR. GUCCIONE: RIGHT BETWEEN MARINA DEL REY AND CULVER 10 11 CITY. THE COURT: HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING OR HEARD ANYTHING 12 ABOUT THIS PARTICULAR CASE, EXCEPT WHAT I TOLD YOU IN COURT? 13 14 MR. GUCCIONE: NO, SIR, I HAVEN'T. 15 THE COURT: DOES THE NAME OF THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT, MEAN ANYTHING OR BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB MEAN ANYTHING TO YOU? 16 17 MR. GUCCIONE: NO, SIR, IT DOESN'T. 18 THE COURT: YOU HAVE NEVER HEARD THAT EXPRESSION BEFORE? 19 MR. GUCCIONE: NO, SIR. THE COURT: REMEMBER, I TOLD YOU THAT THE CHARGE AGAINST 20 THE DEFENDANT IS THAT HE COMMITTED A MURDER, MURDER IN THE 21 22 FIRST DEGREE IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY; DO YOU REMEMBER THAT? 23 MR. GUCCIONE: YES. THE COURT: IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY HAS SPECIAL 24 SIGNIFICANCE BECAUSE NOT EVERY MURDER CALLS FOR THE IMPOSITION 25 26 OF THE DEATH PENALTY OR ELIGIBILITY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, EVEN IF IT IS PREMEDITATED AND DELIBERATE AND PLANNED AND 27

EVERYTHING ELSE. IT IS ONLY WHERE A MURDER IS COMMITTED UNDER

CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES --

MR. GUCCIONE: THAT'SRIGHT.

THE COURT: YOU SEE, THAT THEN THE POSSIBILITY OF A
DEATH PENALTY MIGHT COME IN TO PLAY; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. GUCCIONE: RIGHT.

THE COURT: NOW, THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID THAT A MURDER COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, WHICH IS THIS CASE, OR IN THE COURSE OF A BURGLARY OR IN THE COURSE OF A KIDNAPPING OR IN THE COURSE OF A RAPE, IN THE COURSE OF A MOLESTATION OF A CHILD AND THE CHILD DIES, OR TORTURE, MULTIPLE MURDERS, ANY NUMBER OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF THAT KIND, THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID THE DEATH PENALTY MIGHT BE INVOKED IN THAT PARTICULAR CASE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. GUCCIONE: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: SO THE JURY IN THIS CASE -- WHEN I TALK ABOUT
THE DEATH PENALTY, I MEAN THAT IT HAS TWO ASPECTS. THE JURY
HAS A CHOICE IN A DEATH PENALTY CASE BETWEEN RECOMMENDING OR
SUGGESTING OR HOLDING THAT THE DEFENDANT SHOULD SUFFER LIFE
WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THAT MEANS EXACTLY THAT,
HE GOES TO PRISON FOR LIFE WITH NO PAROLE OR IT IS DEATH IN

SO WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, IT WILL

BE ONE OF THOSE TWO. THAT IS WHAT THE JURY HAS TO DETERMINE

IN A DEATH PENALTY CASE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MR. GUCCIONE: YES.

THE GAS CHAMBER.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO, THE JURY SELECTED IN THIS

CASE WILL FIRST DECIDE WHAT WE CALL ON THE GUILT PHASE OF THE

TRIAL -- THERE ARE TWO PHASES. ONE IS THE GUILT PHASE. THE

CTHER ONE I WILL TELL YOU ABOUT.

ON THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THE JURY DETERMINES.

WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY OF THE

MURDER. AND IF IT IS GUILTY, THEN IT IS GUILTY, WHETHER IT

IS GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE.

AND IF THEY FIND THAT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OF HAVING PERPETRATED A MURDER AND IT IS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THE JURY DETERMINES WHETHER IT IS TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN THE SAME JURY GOES INTO A SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL, WHICH IS KNOWN AS THE PENALTY PHASE.

DURING THE GUILT PHASE, THE QUESTION OF PENALTY

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IS NEVER INVOLVED. THE ONLY DETERMINATION IS, IS HE GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY, WAS IT DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY OR WASN'T IT DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

IF THEY SAY YES, IT IS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY THAT HE COMMITTED A MURDER, THEN THEY DETERMINE AS I TOLD YOU, THE PENALTY.

THEN IT WILL EITHER BE LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER. NOW, ON THE SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL WITH THE SAME JURY, THE JURY LISTENS TO ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY THAT THEY HAD NOT HEARD BEFORE FROM THE DEFENDANT AND FROM THE PROSECUTION.

THE DEFENDANT IN ORDER TO MITIGATE HIS OFFENSE, IN ORDER TO AMELIORATE IT OR LESSEN THE OFFENSE PRESENTS AND YOU MUST CONSIDER, EVIDENCE ABOUT HIS BACKGROUND, HIS AGE, HIS EDUCATION, HIS MENTAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITION AND ANYTHING THAT THEY PRODUCE FOR THE PURPOSE OF MITIGATING HIS OFFENSE, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SHOWING FAVORABLE ASPECTS ABOUT HIM, GOOD THINGS HE HAS DONE.

THE PROSECUTION ON THE OTHER HAND, HAS A RIGHT TO SHOW AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, THINGS ABOUT THE DEFENDANT IN HIS PAST AND SO ON AND SO FORTH, WHICH ARE NOT FAVORABLE. SO THE JURY HEARS ALL OF THAT.

YOU ARE NOT TO MAKE UP YOUR MIND ON THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL WHAT THE PUNISHMENT IS THAT HE SHOULD HAVE. YOU HAVE GOT TO WAIT UNTIL AFTER THE SECOND TRIAL. DO YOU UNDER-STAND THAT?

MR. GUCCIONE: THE SECOND PHASE?

THE COURT: THE SECOND PHASE IS THE PENALTY PHASE. THEN

YOU MAKE UP YOUR MIND WHAT PENALTY IF ANY, HE SHOULD SUFFER,

LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. GUCCIONE: YES.

THE COURT: GOOD. AND THAT OF COURSE, YOU WILL BE WILLING TO DO; WON'T YOU?

MR. GUCCIONE: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, WHAT I WILL DO IS TO ASK

YOU A SERIES OF FIVE QUESTIONS. THE PURPOSE OF THOSE

WILL BE TO DETERMINE WHAT YOUR STATE OF MIND IS, EXPLORE YOUR

STATE OF MIND AS TO YOUR FEELINGS AND OPINIONS ABOUT THE

DEATH PENALTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MR. GUCCIONE: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: OKAY. NOW, I TOLD YOU THAT THE FIRST PHASE OF THE TRIAL IS THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE. NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MR. GUCCIONE: NO, SIR.

THE COURT: GOOD. AND DO YOU REMEMBER, I TOLD YOU THAT
THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE ARE THAT
THE CRIME WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. DO YOU
REMEMBER THAT?

MR. GUCCIONE: YES.

THE COURT: THE JURY AS I TOLD YOU, DETERMINES WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH
PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL

DETERMINATION CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE?

MR. GUCCIONE: NO.

THE COURT: OKAY. THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE PENALTY PHASE. THE JURY IS SUPPOSEDLY NOW -- THEY HAVE FOUND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER AND MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. NOW IT IS A QUESTION OF PENALTY.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH

PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO IMPOSE THE DEATH

PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT

THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MR. GUCCIONE: NO. COULD YOU REPEAT THAT AGAIN?

THE COURT: YES. ON THE PENALTY PHASE, YOU HEAR ALL

OF THE EVIDENCE AND SO FORTH. WOULD YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE

FOR THE DEATH PENALTY WITHOUT PAYING ANY ATTENTION TO ANY

TESTIMONY THAT YOU WERE GIVEN ON THE PENALTY PHASE?

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND IN THE SAME WAY, DO YOU HAVE
ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD
AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE,
DISREGARDING OR REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE

MR. GUCCIONE: NO, SIR.

PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE?

MR. GUCCIONE: NO, SIR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE

OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE

AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT

THAT YOU REACH THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MR. GUCCIONE: YES, SIR.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. GOOD MORNING, MR. GUCCIONE. I AM ARTHUR BARENS. I REPRESENT JOE HUNT, THE DEFENDANT IN THIS MATTER.

AND AS WITH THE JUDGE, IT IS MY OBLIGATION NOW TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR OPINION OF THE DEATH PENALTY.

PLEASE UNDERSTAND THAT THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS AND NONE OF US ARE JUDGING YOUR ANSWERS, BUT RATHER JUST EXPLORING YOUR OPINION. YOU CAN NEVER BE WRONG ABOUT YOUR OWN OPINION.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND, SIR, THAT WE WILL NEVER COME
TO THIS QUESTION ABOUT PENALTY UNLESS FIRST DURING THAT

```
GUILT PHASE HIS HONOR REFERRED TO --
1
2
           MR. GUCCIONE: CORRECT.
           MR. BARENS: -- YOU AND THE OTHER JURORS BELIEVE IT
3
     WAS A FIRST DEGREE MURDER.
4
                 YOU SEE, THE WAY THIS SYSTEM OPERATES, DURING
5
     THE GUILT PHASE YOU AND THE OTHER JURORS WOULD HAVE TO BELIEVE
6
7
     THAT THERE WAS A PREMEDITATED MURDER --
8
           MR. GUCCIONE: CORRECT.
           MR. BARENS: -- INTENTIONALLY COMMITTED --
10
           MR. GUCCIONE: CORRECT,
11
           MR. BARENS: -- BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, DURING A
12
     ROBBERY.
13
           MR. GUCCIONE: IF THERE WAS INTENT?
14
           MR. BARENS: YES.
15
           MR. GUCCIONE: RIGHT.
           MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD HAVE TO BELIEVE ALL OF THESE
16
     FACTORS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT BEFORE WE WOULD EVER GET
17
18
     TO A PENALTY PHASE.
19
           MR. GUCCIONE: CORRECT.
20
           MR. BARENS: NOW, ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT YOU WOULD
21
     BE PREDISPOSED IN YOUR OPINION THAT A DEFENDANT UNDER THOSE
22
     SETTINGS SHOULD BE GIVEN THE DEATH PENALTY AS THE APPROPRIATE
     PENALTY FOR THAT TYPE OF A CRIME?
23
           THE COURT: WITHOUT REFERENCE TO THE PENALTY PHASE OF
24
25
     IT, WITHOUT TESTIMONY?
26
           MR. BARENS: I AM ASKING FOR A PREDISPOSITION AFTER
27
     THE GUILT PHASE, YOUR HONOR.
28
```

THE COURT: I ASKED THE QUESTION BEFORE.

WOULD YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH FENALTY
WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY TESTIMONY THAT MIGHT COME IN ON THE
PENALTY PHASE?

MR. GUCCIONE: NO WAY, NO, SIR, NO, SIR.

THE COURT: THAT IS THE QUESTION YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO

ASK.

MR. BARENS: THE WORD "AUTOMATICALLY" IN THE WAY WE USE LANGUAGE IS A WORD THAT MOST PEOPLE WOULD HESITATE TO EVER ANSWER YES TO ABOUT ANYTHING.

MR. GUCCIONE: CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: AND I AGREE WITH YOU, THAT I WOULD HARDLY EVER ANSWER YES TO THE WORD "AUTOMATICALLY" ABOUT ANYTHING MYSELF.

MR. GUCCIONE: NO, NOTHING IS AUTOMATIC.

MR. BARENS: RIGHT.

WHAT I AM ASKING FOR, THOUGH, IS WHAT YOUR OPINION OR POSSIBLE BIASES ARE BECAUSE WE ALL, AS PEOPLE, HAVE BIASES.

IF YOU HAD A DEFENDANT WHO HAD BEEN CONVICTED

OF AN INTENTIONAL FIRST DEGREE MURDER, WOULD YOU BELIEVE THAT

THE ONLY APPROPRIATE PENALTY WOULD BE A LIFE FOR A LIFE AT

THAT POINT?

MR. GUCCIONE: NO, SIR.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU HAVE TO KNOW
ABOUT OR DO YOU THINK WOULD BE IMPORTANT FOR YOU TO KNOW ABOUT
BEFORE YOU COULD MAKE THE DECISION ABOUT DEATH IN THE GAS
CHAMBER OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MR. GUCCIONE: WELL, I WOULD NEED TO KNOW THE FACTS
AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

27

28

MR. BARENS: WELL, YOU ARE ALREADY GOING TO KNOW THAT. 1 MR. GUCCIONE: OKAY. 2 MR. BARENS: YOU ARE GOING TO KNOW ABOUT THE KILLING --3 MR. GUCCIONE: YES. 4 MR. BARENS: -- IF A KILLING OCCURRED, YOU KNOW, AFTER 5 A TRIAL. 6 MR. GUCCIONE: CORRECT. 7 MR. BARENS: AND YOU ARE GOING TO KNOW IT WAS INTENTIONAL 8 AND IT WAS PREMEDITATED. 9 WHAT I AM REALLY TRYING TO FIND OUT, KNOWING THAT, 10 WOULD YOU REALLY NEED TO CONSIDER ANYTHING ABOUT THE BACKGROUND 11 OF THE DEFENDANT IN TERMS OF HIS AGE OR HIS LACK OF CRIMINAL 12 RECORD OR HIS CHARACTER, OR WOULD IT BE YOUR OPINION, WHICH 13 YOU ARE ENTITLED TO, THAT IF THE GUY TOOK A LIFE THE ONLY 14 APPROPRIATE PENALTY, IF IT WAS A PREMEDITATED INTENTIONAL 15 16 MURDER. WOULD BE THE DEATH PENALTY? 17 MR. GUCCIONE: NOT NECESSARILY. 18 MR. BARENS: OKAY. WHAT DO YOU MEAN, SIR? MR. GUCCIONE: WELL --19 THE COURT: DO YOU WANT HIM TO CONJURE UP CIRCUMSTANCES 20 WHERE HE WOULD SAY THE DEATH PENALTY WOULD NOT BE APPROPRIATE? 21 22 I DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT QUESTION. MR. BARENS: RESPECTFULLY, YOUR HONOR, I THINK THAT 23 24 IS ENTIRELY PROPER. THE COURT: 1 HAVE ASKED HIM THE QUESTION CATEGORICALLY; 25

THE COURT: I HAVE ASKED HIM THE QUESTION CATEGORICALLY
THAT HE WOULD NOT MAKE UP HIS MIND UNTIL HE HEARS ALL OF THE
TESTIMONY ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE CASE AS TO WHAT
PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED.

WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO DO IS TO GET HIM TO ADMIT

THAT HE WOULDN'T LISTEN TO ANY OF THAT AND HE WOULD

AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. BARENS: IF THAT WOULD BE HIS TRUE OPINION, JUDGE, THAT IS WHAT I WOULD SEEK.

THE COURT: HE HAS ALREADY MANIFESTED HIS OPINION. HE SAID HE WOULD NOT VOTE FOR IT UNTIL HE HAS HEARD ALL OF THE TESTIMONY.

MR. GUCCIONE: I CAN'T -- I CAN'T PREJUDGE HIM.

MR. BARENS: I AM NOT ASKING YOU TO PREJUDGE, SIR.

I AM ASKING FOR YOUR STATE OF MIND, AND NOT YOUR OPINION ABOUT ANY DEFENDANT.

I AM ASKING YOU IF YOU WOULD HAVE A BIAS IN YOUR MIND, GIVEN A SITUATION WHERE THERE WAS AN INTENTIONAL KILLING, WOULD YOU HAVE A BIAS GOING IN AS TO WHAT THE PENALTY SHOULD BE?

MR. GUCCIONE: NO, SIR. I DO NOT HAVE ANY BIAS WHATSOEVER

MR. BARENS: FINE.

WHAT I AM LOOKING FOR, SOME PEOPLE -- AND I AM NOT SAYING THIS IS RIGHT OR WRONG, SIR -- BELIEVE IN THE CONCEPT OF A LIFE FOR A LIFE, THAT IF YOU INTENTIONALLY KILL SOMEONE AND IF IT WAS OUT OF A MOTIVE FOR GREED OR WHATEVER, THAT THAT PERSON, THE ONLY THING WE SHOULD DO FOR THEM IS EXECUTE THEM IN EXCHANGE FOR THAT AND WHAT I AM SEEKING IS IF YOU WOULD HAVE THAT BIAS?

MR. GUCCIONE: NOT NECESSARILY.

MR. BARENS: WHEN YOU SAY NOT NECESSARILY, COULD I
INQUIRE AS TO WHAT YOU MIGHT MEAN BY THAT, SIR? WHAT WOULD

2

3

4

5

6

INDIVIDUAL SIDES.

BE THE FACTORS THAT MIGHT INFLUENCE THAT DECISION IN YOUR MIND? MR. GUCCIONE: WELL, I WOULD HAVE TO WEIGH ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AND TESTIMONY AND SEE THE INDIVIDUALS, REVIEW THE

MR. BARENS: IN OTHER WORDS, YOU WOULD CONSCIENTIOUSLY LOOK AT THE DEFENDANT'S BACKGROUND?

MR. GUCCIONE: THAT'S CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: AS TO WHETHER OR NOT HE WAS THE TYPE OF FELLOW WHO HAD COMMITTED VIOLENT CRIMINAL ACTS BEFORE THAT INCIDENT?

MR. GUCCIONE: WELL, THAT, I ASSUME, WOULD BE PART OF THE PICTURE THAT WOULD BE PRESENTED AS EVIDENCE.

MR. BARENS: THAT WOULD BE IN FACT, SIR, DURING THE PENALTY PHASE.

MR. GUCCIONE: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: THAT IS WHAT HIS HONOR WAS SPEAKING ABOUT --

MR. GUCCIONE: THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: -- IS THAT SECOND PHASE WHERE COUNSEL --

MR. GUCCIONE: I WOULD HAVE TO LOOK AT THAT PICTURE SEPARATELY.

MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU HAD AN OPINION ABOUT THE 1 APPROPRIATENESS OF THE DEATH PENALTY FOR A LONG TIME IN YOUR 2 3 LIFE? MR. GUCCIONE: DID I HAVE THAT PICTURE IN MY MIND FOR 4 A LONG TIME? I HAVE NEVER GIVEN IT ANY THOUGHT BECAUSE I NEVER 5 6 HAD TO USE IT. MR. BARENS: SURE. YOU HAVE NEVER REALLY HAD, UNTIL 7 THIS TIME IN YOUR LIFE, OCCASION TO REALLY ADDRESS THE DEATH 8 PENALTY AS A CONSIDERATION? 9 10 MR. GUCCIONE: THAT'S CORRECT. MR. BARENS: DO YOU REMEMBER VOTING ON IT IN THE ELECTION 11 THAT WAS HELD IN THIS STATE SEVERAL YEARS AGO? 12 13 MR. GUCCIONE: I --MR. BARENS: WHEN IT WAS A BALLOT PROPOSITION? 14 MR. GUCCIONE: I THINK I RECALL NOW THAT YOU MENTION 15 16 IT, YES. MR. BARENS: DO YOU RECALL HOW YOU VOTED IN THAT INSTANCE, 17 18 SIR? 19 MR. GUCCIONE: I VOTED THAT IT SHOULD BE A PART OF 20 THE --21 MR. BARENS: LEGAL PROCESS? 22 MR. GUCCIONE: LEGAL PROCESS, YES. MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. MR. GUCCIONE, DO YOU UNDERSTAND 23 THAT ALTHOUGH THE JUDGE HAS TOLD YOU THERE ARE SOME 19 24 25 CATEGORIES WHERE A DEFENDANT COULD QUALIFY UNDER SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES FOR THE IMPOSITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT 26 27 WOULD ONLY BE IF A JURY DETERMINED THAT?

THERE IS NOTHING ABOUT OUR LEGAL SYSTEM THAT MAKES

THE DEATH PENALTY MANDATORY OR YOU KNOW, YOU MUST GIVE SOME-1 2 BODY THE DEATH PENALTY, NO MATTER WHAT THE CRIME IS. 3 MR. GUCCIONE: THAT'S CORRECT. THERE IS NOTHING IN THE 4 BOOKS THAT SAYS THAT IT IS MANDATORY. MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT WOULD BE A DECISION 5 6 FOR YOU TO MAKE AS AN INDIVIDUAL JUROR? 7 MR. GUCCIONE: THAT'S CORRECT. 8 MR. BARENS: AND YOU WOULD HAVE THOSE TWO CHOICES, LIFE 9 WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE DEATH PENALTY? 10 MR. GUCCIONE: THAT'S CORRECT. 7 7 MR. BARENS: MR. GUCCIONE, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT BECAUSE 12 WE ARE HERE DISCUSSING THE DEATH PENALTY, THERE IS NO REASON 13 FOR YOU TO BELIEVE OR NO IMPLICATION THAT MR. HUNT HAS 14 COMMITTED ANY CRIME WHATSOEVER? - 5 MR. GUCCIONE: THAT'S CORRECT. 16 MR. BARENS: DO YOU BELIEVE THAT, SIR? OR DO YOU HAVE 17 SOME SNEAKING SUSPICION THAT WE WOULDN'T BE HERE TALKING 18 ABOUT THIS UNLESS HE HAD DONE SOMETHING TO BEGIN WITH? MR. GUCCIONE: WELL, THE CASE HAS NOT BEEN PRESENTED 19 20 TO ME TO DETERMINE WHETHER HE HAS OR HAS NOT COMMITTED A 21 CRIME. 22 MR. BARENS: RIGHT. OF COURSE, HE IS ENTITLED TO THE 23 FUNDAMENTAL PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, CONSTITUTIONALLY 24 GUARANTEED TO EVERYONE, INCLUDING YOURSELF, IF YOU WERE A 25 DEFENDANT IN THIS COURTROOM. 26 MR. GUCCIONE: THAT'S CORRECT. 27 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I PASS FOR CAUSE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ANY QUESTIONS?

1 -

MR. WAPNER: YES, JUST A FEW. THANK YOU.

GOOD MORNING, MR. GUCCIONE. I AM FRED WAPNER,

THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY PROSECUTING THIS CASE. DO YOU

HAVE ANY RELIGIOUS OR MORAL CONVICTIONS THAT WOULD MAKE IT

DIFFICULT FOR YOU TO SIT ON A CASE LIKE THIS?

MR. GUCCIONE: NO, SIR.

MR. WAPNER: IF YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM AT THAT

PARTICULAR TIME IN THE CASE, THE UILTIMATE QUESTION YOU ARE

GOING TO BE CALLED ON TO DECIDE IS WHETHER THE DEFENDANT

SHOULD SPEND THE REST OF HIS LIFE IN PRISON OR WHETHER HE

SHOULD DIE IN THE GAS CHAMBER. IS THAT A DECISION THAT YOU

ARE CAPABLE OF MAKING?

MR. GUCCIONE: YES, SIR.

MR. WAPNER: ARE YOU CAPABLE OF MAKING THAT EITHER WAY?

MR. GUCCIONE: YES, SIR.

MR. WAPNER: DEPENDING UPON THE FACTS?

MR. GUCCIONE: CORRECT, SIR.

MR. WAPNER: IS THERE ANYTHING AS YOU SIT THERE, WITH YOUR BACKGROUND, THAT YOU THINK IS IMPORTANT FOR US TO KNOW AS FAR AS YOUR ABILITY TO BE A FAIR JUROR IN TERMS OF THE DEATH PENALTY OR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MR. GUCCIONE: HOW IS THAT QUESTION AGAIN, SIR?

MR. WAPNER: WE DON'T KNOW YOU. IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT YOUR BACKGROUND THAT YOU THINK WE SHOULD KNOW THAT MIGHT BEAR ON YOUR ABILITY TO BE A FAIR JUROR IN THIS PART OF THE CASE, WHEN WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. GUCCIONE: NO, SIR, NONE WHATSOEVER.

MR. WAPNER: PASS FOR CAUSE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. GUCCIONE, BOTH SIDES AND THE COURT AGREE THAT YOU HAVE BEEN QUALIFIED AS A TRIAL JUROR IN THIS CASE.

WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO, IS TO COME BACK AT

1:45 THIS AFTERNOON. GO INTO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM. WAIT

FOR THE OTHER JURORS. WE WILL CALL YOU BACK IN THEN.

MR. GUCCIONE: 1:45? THANK YOU.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR GUCCIONE EXITS THE COURTROOM.)

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR FERRERAS ENTERS THE 1 2 COURTROOM.) 3 THE COURT: IS THAT FERRERAS? 4 MS. FERRERAS: YES. 5 THE COURT: MRS. OR MISS? 6 MS. FERRERAS: MRS., YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: MRS. FERRERAS, WHERE DO YOU LIVE? 7 8 MS. FERRERAS: I LIVE IN HARBOR CITY. 9 THE COURT: HARBOR CITY? 10 MS. FERRERAS: YES. THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER HEARD ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT 11 12 THIS CASE, EXCEPT WHAT I TOLD YOU ON MONDAY? 13 MS. FERRERAS: NO, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THE NAME BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB DOESN'T RING 14 15 A BELL WITH YOU IN ANY WAY? 16 MS. FERRERAS: NO. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU REMEMBER THAT I TOLD YOU 17 THAT THE CHARGE AGAINST THIS DEFENDANT IS THAT HE COMMITTED 18 19 A ROBBERY AND THAT HE COMMITTED A MURDER IN THE COURSE OF A 20 ROBBERY? 21 MS. FERRERAS: YES, SIR. 22 THE COURT: IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY HAS A SPECIAL 23 SIGNIFICANCE BECAUSE NOT EVERY MURDER, EVEN IF IT IS 24 DELIBERATE, PREMEDITATED AND INTENTIONAL, CALLS FOR THE 25 IMPOSITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY. 26 IT IS ONLY WHERE IT IS COMMITTED UNDER CERTAIN 27 SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES LIKE IN THE COMMISSION OF A ROBBERY OR BURGLARY OR RAPE OR KIDNAPPING OR TORTURE OR CHILD IS MOLESTED

AND DIES AND MULTIPLE MURDERS.

ONLY IN INSTANCES OF THAT KIND, SPECIAL INSTANCES,

IS THE DEATH PENALTY APPLICABLE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, IF THE JURY WHICH WOULD

ULTIMATELY BE SELECTED IN THIS CASE -- THEY WILL FIRST HAVE

TO DETERMINE WHAT WE CALL THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL. THEY

FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE

DEFENDANT, WAS HE GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE OR WAS

HE NOT. IF THE JURY DETERMINES THAT HE WAS GUILTY OF MURDER

IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THEY HAVE ANOTHER QUESTION TO

DETERMINE, THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, WAS IT COMMITTED IN THE

COURSE OF A ROBBERY OR WAS IT NOT? THAT IS TRUE OR FALSE.

IF IT IS TRUE, THEN WE HAVE A SECOND TRIAL. THAT IS, WE HAVE A SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL. THAT IS KNOWN AS THE PENALTY PHASE.

NOW, AT THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THE QUESTION OF PENALTY NEVER BECOMES INVOLVED IN ANY WAY, NEVER MUST BE CONSIDERED.

IT IS ONLY ON THE PENALTY PHASE THAT YOU THEN HAVE
TO CONSIDER AFTER HEARING THE TESTIMONY, WHETHER OR NOT HE
SHOULD EITHER BE IN PRISON FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF
PAROLE AND THAT MEANS EXACTLY THAT -- NO PAROLE -- OR SHALL
IT BE DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER?

YOU WILL THEN HEAR TESTIMONY FROM THE DEFENSE AND FROM THE PROSECUTION. THE TESTIMONY BY THE DEFENDANT WILL BE TO SHOW -- YOU MUST CONSIDER HIS BACKGROUND, HIS AGE, HIS EDUCATION, HIS MENTAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITION, ANYTHING THAT

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

16

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

TOUCHES HIM AS A PERSON, ALL THE THINGS ABOUT HIS LIFESTYLE AND EVERYTHING THAT HAPPENED UP UNTIL THIS TIME AND EVERYTHING THAT MAY BE FAVORABLE THAT THE DEFENDANT WILL TRY TO SHOW FOR PURPOSES OF GETTING YOU TO BE LENIENT IN THE PENALTY THAT WILL BE IMPOSED UPON HIM.

THE PROSECUTION ON THE OTHER HAND, WILL SHOW UNFAVORABLE ASPECTS ABOUT HIM. THE PURPOSE OF THAT IS TO SHOW THAT HE IS NOT ENTITLED OR DESERVING OF ANY CONSIDERATION FROM THE JURY. ALL OF THOSE FACTORS, INCLUDING THE FACTS THAT YOU LEARNED DURING THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL WILL BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION. YOU ARE NOT TO MAKE UP YOUR MIND AS TO WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO HIM AFTER YOU FIND HIM GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, UNTIL YOU HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE TESTIMONY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. FERRERAS: I UNDERSTAND THAT.

THE COURT: ON THE PENALTY PHASE?

MS. FERRERAS: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: OKAY. I AM GOING TO ASK YOU FIVE QUESTIONS. THE PURPOSE OF THOSE QUESTIONS WILL BE TO EXPLORE YOUR MIND AND TRY TO ASCERTAIN HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY. OKAY?

MS. FERRERAS: OKAY.

THE COURT: NOW, THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE GUILT PHASE. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. FERRERAS: CAN YOU PUT THAT IN A DIFFERENT QUESTION, YOUR HONOR? BECAUSE THE QUESTION DOESN'T SEEM TO BE SO CLEAR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY? MS. FERRERAS: UH-HUH. THE COURT: WHATEVER THAT OPINION IS, WOULD THAT PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY? MS. FERRERAS: I DON'T THINK SO. 

1 THE COURT: OKAY. ARE YOU SURE ABOUT THAT? 2 MS. FERRERAS: YES, YOUR HONOR. 3 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, THE SECOND QUESTION IS IN 4 THE SAME WAY, EXCEPT, DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION OF THE DEATH 5 PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM 6 MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY 7 OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING 8 THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY? 9 MS. FERRERAS: OKAY. THIS IS HOW I UNDERSTAND THE 10 QUESTION --11 THE COURT: IT IS THE SAME AS THE FIRST QUESTION EXCEPT 12 THAT I TOLD YOU, DO YOU REMEMBER, THAT YOU FIRST DETERMINE 13 WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY OF MURDER 14 IN THE FIRST DEGREE. 15 AND IF YOU FIND IT TO BE SO, THEN YOU DETERMINE 16 WAS IT TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE 17 OF A ROBBERY. THAT IS THE SECOND PART OF THE GUILT PHASE. 18 MS. FERRERAS: SO, YOU ARE SAYING --19 THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH 20 PENALTY, WHICH WOULD INTERFERE WITH YOUR MAKING A FINDING OF 21 THAT KIND? 22 MS, FERRERAS: NO. 23 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS 24 PRESUPPOSE THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN CONVICTED OF MURDER 25 IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND THAT IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A 26 ROBBERY. NOW, YOU ARE CONSIDERING THE PENALTY. DO YOU UNDER-27 STAND THAT?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

THE COURT: YOU ARE CONSIDERING THE PENALTY. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM -- THAT WOULD RATHER, CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF WHAT TESTIMONY YOU HAVE HEARD OR ANY TESTIMONY WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. FERRERAS: NO. 1 WOULDN'T USE THE DEATH PENALTY
TO INTERFERE WITH THAT. NO, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WELL, I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU MEAN WHEN YOU SAY YOU WOULDN'T USE THE PENALTY TO INTERFERE WITH IT.

MS. FERRERAS: WELL, THIS IS HOW I APPRAISE YOUR

QUESTION. YOU ARE QUESTIONING ME, HAVING NO KNOWLEDGE OF THE

DEATH PENALTY, WILL I USE THAT AS -- TO MAKE MY PENALTY FOR

THE -- REPHRASE IT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, YOU ARE CONSIDERING THE PENALTY, WHAT IT IS GOING TO BE. ALL RIGHT? ARE YOU GOING TO AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY AND NOT PAY ANY ATTENTION TO ANY OF THE TESTIMONY WHICH WAS GIVEN ON THE PENALTY PHASE?

MS. FERRERAS: NO, NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IN THE SAME WAY, WOULD YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY TESTIMONY THAT YOU MIGHT HAVE HEARD IN THE PENALTY PHASE?

MS. FERRERAS: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE

ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS

CASE AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

N

4 ω

S

σ

9 σ

<del>1</del>0

25

3

1 4 A

17 16

<del>2</del>

19

2 20

22

23

25

26

27

28

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

GOOD MORNING, MRS. FERRERAS.

MS. FERRERAS: GOOD MORNING.

MR. BARENS: I AM ARTHUR BARENS AND I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT, AND IT IS MY DUTY AT THIS STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS TO, ALSO AS THE JUDGE DID, ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY.

PLEASE UNDERSTAND THAT NONE OF US ARE JUDGING
YOUR ANSWERS AND THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY
QUESTIONS. YOU COULD NEVER BE WRONG ABOUT YOUR OPINION.

MS. FERRERAS: OKAY. YOU JUST HAVE TO PUT UP WITH ME BECAUSE SOMETIMES THE QUESTIONING --

THE COURT: PARDON ME? WHAT WAS THAT?

MS. FERRERAS: I JUST TOLD HIM THAT HE WOULD JUST HAVE
TO PUT UP WITH ME AS FAR AS SOMETIMES THE QUESTIONING.

THE COURT: YOU DON'T QUITE UNDERSTAND --

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

THE COURT: -- EVERYTHING THAT IS SAID?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND I AM ASKING YOU TO PUT UP WITH ME, TOO, OKAY?

WITH THAT IN MIND, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AS A GENERAL IDEA IN OUR SOCIETY?

MS. FERRERAS: WELL, DEATH PENALTY IS SOMETHING THAT YOU DON'T SENTENCE A PERSON JUST BECAUSE YOU HEARSAY (SIC) THAT HE HAD COMMITTED A MURDER. YOU HAVE TO STUDY THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE COURT REPORTER: PLEASE REPEAT.

MS. FERRERAS: THE CIRCUMSTANCES. THE COURT: THE CIRCUMSTANCES? MS. FERRERAS: YES, AND THE FACTS THAT IS LAID OUT TO YOU AND EVEN -- EVEN WITH THE FACTS, EVEN WITH THE CIRCUMSTANCES, YOU CANNOT JUST SAY, YES, SENTENCE HIM FOR DEATH PENALTY. YOU REALLY HAVE TO STUDY IT. MR. BARENS: YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT HIS BACKGROUND? MS. FERRERAS: YES, EVERYTHING. YOU HAVE TO STUDY ALL, ALL OVER SITUATION. MR. BARENS: THAT IS EXACTLY --THE COURT: YOU SEE, MR. BARENS ASKED YOU, DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION, DO YOU BELIEVE IN IT OR DON'T YOU BELIEVE IN IT? MS. FERRERAS: YES, I DO BELIEVE IN IT BUT --THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, FINE. BUT WHAT? MS. FERRERAS: BUT UNLESS IT IS, YOU KNOW, THAT YOU HAVE STUDIED ALL OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT THAT PERSON IS REALLY TO BE SENTENCED FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU WANT TO CONSIDER AS WELL, WOULDN'T YOU, THE PERSON'S AGE, IF HE COMMITTED A CRIME OR WHETHER HE HAD EVER COMMITTED A CRIME BEFORE, WOULD YOU WANT TO CONSIDER THAT AS WELL? MS. FERRERAS: AS TO MY DECISION? MR. BARENS: YES, MA'AM. MR. FERRERAS: YES. MR. BARENS: AND DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT BEFORE YOU WOULD EVER GET TO THAT, THAT THIS TRIAL PROCEDURE TAKES PLACE IN TWO PARTS; DID YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT THE JUDGE MEANT BY THAT?

MS. FERRERAS: YES, UH-HUH.

28

24

25

26

MR. BARENS: DID YOU UNDERSTAND IT WOULD BE FIRST CALLED
A TRIAL WHICH IS CALLED THE GUILT PHASE TO SEE WHETHER OR
NOT A MURDER WAS EVER COMMITTED AND WHETHER OR NOT YOU BELIEVED
THERE HAD BEEN A PREMEDITATED MURDER BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT
BEFORE YOU AND THE REST OF THE JURY WOULD EVER GET TO THE
SECOND PHASE, THE PENALTY PHASE?

MS. FERRERAS: OKAY. COULD YOU REPEAT THE LAST PART OF YOUR QUESTION?

MR. BARENS: WELL, YOU SEE, THE PROCEDURE THAT THE LAW
SETS UP IS THAT THERE ARE TWO PARTS TO A TRIAL. YOU MAY NEVER
GET TO THE SECOND PART. THE SECOND PART IS THE PENALTY PHASE,
THAT IS WHERE THIS ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY WOULD COME UP,
BUT YOU MIGHT NEVER GET TO THAT BECAUSE DURING THE FIRST PHASE,
THE GUILT PHASE, UNLESS YOU AND THE OTHER JURORS ALL BELIEVE
THAT JOE HUNT HAD COMMITTED A MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE THAT
WAS PREMEDITATED AND INTENTIONAL, UNLESS YOU BELIEVED THAT
BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND VOTED GUILTY, YOU WOULD NEVER
GET TO THE SECOND PHASE, THE PENALTY PHASE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND
THAT?

MS. FERRERAS: UH-HUH.

MR. WAPNER: IS THAT YES?

MS. FERRERAS: YES. I AM SORRY.

MR. BARENS: NOW, IN THAT SECOND PHASE, DO YOU UNDERSTAND YOU WOULD HAVE TWO CHOICES?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND THE TWO CHOICES WOULD BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE -- MS. FERRERAS: UH-HUH, YES.

MR. BARENS: -- OR THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. FERRERAS: YES, SIR.

MR. BARENS: WHAT I AM LOOKING FOR IS, WOULD YOU HAVE

ANY BIASES OR ANY OPINIONS, STRONGLY HELD BELIEFS THAT WOULD

MAKE YOU WANT TO VOTE ONE WAY OR ANOTHER BEFORE YOU HEARD

ANY TESTIMONY ABOUT THE BACKGROUND OF THE DEFENDANT, EVEN

THOUGH YOU HAD ALREADY FOUND HIM GUILTY OF A MURDER, BEFORE

YOU MADE A DECISION ABOUT LIFE OR DEATH?

MS. FERRERAS: NO.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, DO YOU HAVE ANY RELIGIOUS OR

PHILOSOPHICAL BELIEFS THAT INFLUENCE YOUR VIEW OF THE DEATH

PENALTY?

MS. FERRERAS: NO, I DON'T THINK YOU SHOULD USE THAT TO MAKE YOUR JUDGMENT.

MR. BARENS: JUST BASED ON WHAT YOU HEAR IN THE COURTROOM?

MS. FERRERAS: YES, SIR.

MR. BARENS: NOW, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH I AM HERE TALKING TO YOU ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AND THE JUDGE DID AND THE PROSECUTOR WILL IN A MOMENT, THAT THERE IS NO REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE THAT JOE HUNT DID ANYTHING WRONG AT THIS POINT IN TIME.

MS. FERRERAS: OKAY, CAN YOU REPEAT THAT AGAIN, PLEASE?

MR. BARENS: MS. FERRERAS, DO YOU BELIEVE, AS YOU SIT

HERE NOW, THAT JOE HUNT PROBABLY DID SOMETHING WRONG OR I

WOULDN'T BE TALKING TO YOU ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AND THE

JUDGE WOULDN'T BE TALKING TO YOU ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. FERRERAS: WITHOUT HEARING HIM, WITHOUT HEARING THE FACTS?

MR. BARENS: YOU HAVEN'T HEARD ANYTHING SO FAR.

MS. FERRERAS: NOTHING.

MR. BARENS: EXCEPT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT YOUR VIEWS ON THE DEATH PENALTY.

YOU DON'T BELIEVE HE HAS DONE ANYTHING WRONG?
MS. FERRERAS: NO.

MR. BARENS: YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT I MEAN WHEN I USE THE EXPRESSION "PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE"?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT UNDER OUR LEGAL SYSTEM THAT ALL DEFENDANTS ARE ENTITLED TO, JUST LIKE YOU WULD BE OR ANY MEMBER OF YOUR FAMILY, A PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE ANY TIME YOU ARE CHARGED WITH A CRIME.

28

MS. FERRERAS: YES, SIR. 1 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE FACT THAT YOU ARE 2 CHARGED WITH A CRIME DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN YOU DID A CRIME? 3 MS. FERRERAS: YES, SIR, I UNDERSTAND THAT. 4 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 5 (MS. FERRERAS NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.) 6 MR. BARENS: SO YOU APPRECIATE THAT WE ARE JUST GOING 7 THROUGH A PROCESS HERE WHERE THE LAW SAYS THAT THIS IS THE 8 TIME WHERE WE HAVE TO ASK YOU ABOUT THAT IN THE SYSTEM? 9 MS. FERRERAS: YES, SIR. 10 MR. BARENS: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 11 MS. FERRERAS: YES, SIR. 12 MR. BARENS: ARE YOU COMFORTABLE WITH THAT? 13 MS. FERRERAS: YES, SIR. 14 MR. BARENS: OKAY, HAVE YOU EVER THOUGHT ABOUT THE DEATH 15 PENALTY BEFORE YOU CAME HERE AS A POSSIBLE JUROR ON THIS CASE? 16 MS. FERRERAS: YES, SIR. 17 MR. BARENS: WHEN WAS THAT THAT YOU THOUGHT ABOUT IT? 18 19 MS. FERRERAS: EVEN -- EVEN WHEN I BECOME A JUROR. MR. BARENS: WERE YOU A JUROR BEFORE? 20 21 MS. FERRERAS: NO. MR. BARENS: JUST IN THIS CASE? 22 23 MS. FERRERAS: JUST IN THIS CASE. MR. BARENS: WHAT I AM ASKING IS, BEFORE YOU CAME HERE 24 25 TO DISCUSS THIS CASE WITH US, HAD YOU EVER THOUGHT ABOUT THE 26 DEATH PENALTY BEFORE THAT TIME?

MS. FERRERAS: OKAY, I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU ARE SAYING.

25

26

27

28

YOU MEAN FROM HEARING, FROM HEARING THE CASE? MR. BARENS: NO, NO. BEFORE YOU CAME HERE TO BE A MEMBER OR A POSSIBLE PART OF THIS JURY, EARLIER IN YOUR LIFE, YOU KNOW, BEFORE LAST WEEK OR WHENEVER IT WAS THAT YOU WERE FIRST ASKED TO COME HERE FOR JURY DUTY, HAD YOU EVER THOUGHT ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY BEFORE IN YOUR LIFE? MS. FERRERAS: YES. MR. BARENS: WHEN WAS THAT THAT YOU THOUGHT ABOUT IT? MS. FERRERAS: IT HAS BEEN A WHILE. I WOULD SAY ABOUT THREE MONTHS.

MR. BARENS: WAS THERE A PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU THOUGHT ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY EARLIER?

MS. FERRERAS: WELL, WHEN THE VOTINGS CAME UP, YOU KNOW, REGISTERING FOR VCTINGS.

MR. BARENS: WHEN YOU REGISTERED TO VOTE?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. BARENS: WAS THERE SOMETHING ABOUT REGISTERING TO VOTE THAT MADE YOU THINK ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. FERRERAS: WELL, YEAH, BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, WHEN YOU ARE GOING TO VOTE AND THERE IS AN ISSUE OF DEATH PENALTY, NOW THAT HAS SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT BECAUSE THAT IS A DECISION, YOU KNOW, THAT MAKE A DIFFERENCE.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THE DEFENSE WOULD RESERVE, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. HAVE YOU ANY QUESTIONS?

MR. WAPNER: I HAVE A FEW.

MRS. FERRERAS, WHERE IS HARBOR CITY -- I DON'T

KNOW THAT -- IS THAT A LONG WAY FROM HERE OR IS IT CLOSE TO 1 HERE? 2 MS. FERRERAS: IT IS ABOUT 16 MILES. IT IS THE 3 SOUTH BAY AREA. 5 MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU BEEN ON JURY DUTY BEFORE? MS. FERRERAS: NO, NO. 6 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK THAT YOU WOULD HAVE ANY PROBLEM 7 WITH LANGUAGE IF YOU WERE LISTENING TO WITNESSES TESTIFY. 8 DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD HAVE ANY PROBLEM UNDERSTANDING WHAT 9 10 THEY WERE SAYING? MS. FERRERAS: WELL, SEE, WHEN -- WHEN USUALLY -- IN 11 MY OTHER DAYS WHEN I AM BEING ASKED, I GET NERVOUS. IT IS 12 13 MY OWN PERSONAL THING. MR. WAPNER: SO YOU ARE SAYING IF YOU WERE JUST SITTING 14 15 THERE LISTENING TO SOMEBODY ELSE --16 MS. FERRERAS: THEN I WOULDN'T BE NERVOUS. 17 I AM JUST, I CAN TELL YOU HONESTLY, THAT I AM 18 NERVOUS EVEN WHEN I CAME IN EVEN YESTERDAY. 19 THE COURT: EVERYBODY WHO TAKES THE STAND IS NERVOUS 20 SO YOU ARE NOT ALONE IN THAT. 21 MS. FERRERAS: THAT IS WHY, THE QUESTION, EVEN THOUGH 22 I UNDERSTOOD IT, IN THIS CASE I WANT TO MAKE SURE I REALLY 23 UNDERSTAND IT AND NOT GET CONFUSED BECAUSE OF MY NERVOUSNESS. 24 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. WE APPRECIATE THAT. 25 26

5A-1

MR. WAPNER: YOU SAID THAT YOU WOULD HAVE TO CAREFULLY STUDY THIS QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY. THAT IS VERY UNDERSTANDABLE. WHEN YOU ARE DECIDING THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OF THE CRIME OF MURDER, THE LAW SAYS THAT THE PROSECUTION IS REQUIRED TO PROVE HIS GUILT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. AND THAT IS THE SAME IN A MURDER CASE OR IN A DRUNK DRIVING CASE OR IN ANY CASE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IF YOU ARE SITTING ON THIS CASE AND BECAUSE YOU KNOW THAT YOU MIGHT HAVE TO DECIDE THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY LATER, WOULD YOU REQUIRE THE PROSECUTION TO PROVE THE CASE MORE THAN BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. BARENS: NO. NO, I OBJECT. I BELIEVE THE JUDGE WOULD INSTRUCT THE JURY AS TO WHAT THE STANDARD OF PROOF IS, JUST LIKE THE JUDGE WOULD INSTRUCT ON CONSIDERING EVIDENCE DURING THE PENALTY PHASE.

THE COURT: BUT, YOU PERMITTED THAT QUESTION ANY NUMBER OF TIMES BEFORE. THERE WERE NO OBJECTIONS TO IT. I THINK IT IS PROPER AT THIS POINT.

MR. WAPNER: WHAT I AM GETTING AT MS. FERRERAS IS, ARE
YOU GOING TO REQUIRE MORE PROOF BECAUSE IT IS A DEATH PENALTY
CASE THAN YOU WOULD IF IT WAS NOT A DEATH PENALTY CASE?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: WHY?

MS. FERRERAS: BECAUSE IT IS THE DEATH PENALTY AND IT
IS NOT SOMETHING THAT YOU GIVE, SENTENCE TO A PERSON LIKE

WHAT I SAID EARLIER, WITHOUT STUDYING ALL OF THE OVERALL 1 CIRCUMSTANCES AND FACTS. 2 MR. WAPNER: LET ME INTERRUPT YOU FOR ONE SECOND BECAUSE 3 I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION I AM 4 5 ASKING YOU. REMEMBER WHAT THE JUDGE TOLD YOU ABOUT THE TWO 6 DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE CASE? 7 MS. FERRERAS: YES. 8 MR. WAPNER: DID YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? g 10 MS. FERRERAS: YES. MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. NOW, I WANT TO TALK TO YOU 11 ABOUT THE FIRST PART OF THE CASE WHERE YOU ARE DECIDING WHETHER 12 THE PERSON IS GUILTY OR NOT. THAT DOESN'T HAVE ANYTHING TO 13 DO WITH THE PENALTY, DOES IT? 14 15 MS. FERRERAS: NO. MR. WAPNER: AND IF THE JUDGE TOLD YOU WHEN YOU WERE 16 DECIDING THAT PART OF THE CASE, THAT YOU COULDN'T EVEN THINK 17 ABOUT WHAT THE PENALTY WOULD BE, COULD YOU DO THAT? 18 MS. FERRERAS: OKAY. YOU ARE ASKING ME IF -- TO THINK 19 20 FOR PENALTY? MR. WAPNER: NO. LET ME TELL YOU WHAT I AM ASKING YOU. 21 THE COURT: WELL, I THINK THAT WE OUGHT TO HAVE A 22 CONFERENCE. DON'T YOU THINK SO? PLEASE WAIT OUTSIDE FOR 23 24 A MOMENT. 25 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR FERRERAS EXITED THE COURTROOM.) 26 THE COURT: I THINK THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR IS HAVING 27

DIFFICULTY WITH THE LANGUAGE. I DON'T THINK WE OUGHT TO

28

QUALIFY HER AS ONE OF THE JURORS IN THIS CASE. 1 DO YOU FEEL THAT WAY ABOUT IT? 2 3 MR. BARENS: JUST A MOMENT, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: YOU HAVE NOT PASSED FOR CAUSE? 4 MR. BARENS: I RESERVED IT. BUT I HAVE NOT EXPRESSED 5 AN OPINION SINCE I RESERVED. 6 THE COURT: IF YOU ARE NOT GOING TO AGREE TO HAVE HER 7 EXCUSED, WE WILL HAVE HER BACK IN AND WE WILL FINISH IT UP. 8 9 LET'S NOT WASTE ANY TIME. 10 MR. BARENS: IF YOU WOULD. I WITHDRAW MY RESERVATION AND PASS FOR CAUSE. 11 MR. WAPNER: I WOULD LIKE TO FINISH ASKING HER QUESTIONS. 12 13 THE COURT: BRING HER IN, WOULD YOU PLEASE? (PROSPECTIVE JUROR FERRERAS RE-ENTERED 14 15 THE COURTROOM.) THE COURT: SORRY TO KEEP YOU WAITING. BUT WE HAD SOME 16 17 OUESTIONS THAT CAME UP. I WANTED TO TALK TO COUNSEL ABOUT THE SITUATION. 18 MR. WAPNER: KEEP IN MIND NOW ABOUT THE TWO PARTS OF 19 THE CASE. NOW, I AM ASKING YOU ABOUT THE FIRST PART. IN 20 21 THE FIRST PART, YOU HAVE TO DECIDE WHETHER THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT OF MURDER, WITHOUT CONSIDERING WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN 22 TO HIM IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 23 24 MS. FERRERAS: CAN YOU SAY THAT AGAIN, PLEASE? 25 MR. WAPNER: YES. WHEN YOU ARE DECIDING WHETHER THERE WAS A MURDER AND WHETHER THE PERSON ON TRIAL DID THE MURDER, 26 27 YOU HAVE TO DECIDE THAT CASE BASED ON THE FACTS THAT ARE PRESENTED TO YOU. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 28

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: AND THE JUDGE WILL TELL YOU THAT WHEN YOU ARE MAKING A DECISION AS TO WHETHER THERE WAS A MURDER AND WHETHER THE DEFENDANT DID IT, YOU CAN'T THINK ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO HIM, IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DOES THAT MAKE SENSE TO YOU?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IN OTHER WORDS, IF YOU BELIEVE THAT A MURDER WAS COMMITTED AND YOU BELIEVE THAT HE DID IT, YOU CAN'T VOTE TO ACQUIT HIM JUST BECAUSE YOU DON'T WANT HIM TO GET THE DEATH PENALTY, FOR EXAMPLE.

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MS. FERRERAS: YES. 1 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 2 MS. FERRERAS: YES. 3 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND THE LAW REQUIRES THE PROSECUTION AND THAT IS ME, TO PROVE TO YOU BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT 5 THAT HE IS GUILTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IS THE STANDARD 6 OF PROOF THAT IS REQUIRED? 7 MS. FFRRERAS: YES. 8 MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. AND SO, WILL YOU LET ME SEE 9 IF I CAN EXPLAIN IT TO YOU? I WILL TRY TO USE AN EXAMPLE. 10 ASSUME THAT THERE IS SUCH A THING AS ABSOLUTE PROOF, THAT 11 YOU COULD PROVE SOMETHING ABSOLUTELY. AND THERE IS ON THE 12 BOTTOM. NO PROOF AT ALL. AND SOMEWHERE ELSE ON THAT SCALE, 13 IS PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. ARE YOU WITH ME? 14 15 MS. FERRERAS: YES. 16 MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. ARE YOU GOING TO REQUIRE THE PROSECUTION TO GIVE YOU MORE PROOF, MORE EVIDENCE THAN IS 17 REQUIRED BECAUSE YOU KNOW, IT IS A DEATH PENALTY CASE? 18 19 MS. FERRERAS: YES. MR. WAPNER: AND NOW LET ME ASK YOU THIS. I AM TALKING 20 ONLY NOW ABOUT THE GUILT PART OF THE CASE. YOU ARE STILL 21 GOING TO REQUIRE THE PROSECUTION TO GIVE YOU MORE PROOF BECAUSE 22 23 YOU KNOW THAT THE DEATH PENALTY MIGHT BE SOMEWHERE IN THE 24 BACKGROUND? 25 MS. FERRERAS: YES. 26

MS. FERRERAS: LIKE I SAID BEFORE, THE DEATH PENALTY IS SOMETHING THAT YOU DON'T JUST SENTENCE TO A PERSON WITHOUT

MR. WAPNER: WHY?

27

28

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: HOW WOULD YOUR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, THAT

HEARING ALL OF THE FACTS. EVEN WHERE THERE WAS PROOFS (SIC)

OR RATHER EVIDENCE THAT WAS HANDED TO YOU, YOU STILL NEED

MORE FACTS BECAUSE IT IS THE PERSON.

HE IS GOING TO BE SENTENCED FOR DEATH PENALTY.

AND FOR OTHER REASONS AT THE LATER PART, FOUND OUT THERE IS

OTHER FACTS THAT CAN BE USED, SO AS NOT TO SENTENCE HIM DEATH

PENALTY, THEN YOU HAD GIVEN THIS PERSON THE WRONG JUDGMENT.

MR. WAPNER: YOU SAID THAT RELIGIOUS OR MORAL BELIEFS
SHOULD HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH IT. DO YOU HAVE SOME RELIGIOUS
OR MORAL BELIEFS THAT WOULD AFFECT YOU? LET ME ASK YOU THIS.
DO YOU HAVE SOME RELIGIOUS OR MORAL BELIEFS THAT HAVE SOMETHING
TO DO WITH THIS QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. FERRERAS: YES. BUT I WOULDN'T USE IT.

MR. WAPNER: COULD YOU US WHAT THEY ARE?

MS. FERRERAS: OKAY. WELL, I AM A CATHOLIC. AND AS

A CATHOLIC, TO MY UNDERSTANDING, THAT IT IS NOT RIGHT TO HAVE

A PERSON KILLED FOR ANY REASON.

NOW, IN GIVING A JUDGMENT AS TO DEATH PENALTY,

I WOULDN'T USE THAT BECAUSE THAT WOULDN'T BE FAIR FOR THE

PERSON, FOR THE OTHER PEOPLE, EITHER.

MR. WAPNER: WHEN YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM, IF IT GETS
TO THAT PART OF THE CASE, YOU WILL BE CALLED ON TO RENDER
YOUR OWN, INDIVIDUAL VERDICT AS TO WHETHER THE DEFENDANT SHOULD
SPEND THE REST OF HIS LIFE IN PRISON OR WHETHER HE SHOULD
DIE IN THE GAS CHAMBER. ARE YOU CAPABLE OF MAKING THAT
DECISION?

YOU SHOULDN'T TAKE A LIFE, AFFECT YOUR ABILITY WHEN YOU GET DOWN TO THE QUESTION OF YOU, YOURSELF, MAKING THIS DECISION? HOW WOULD YOUR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS ENTER INTO YOUR ABILITY TO MAKE THAT DECISION?

MS. FERRERAS: I WOULD NOT USE MY BELIEF AS FAR AS RELIGIOUSLY AS TO MAKE A JUDGMENT ON THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. WAPNER: AND IF YOU HEARD THE WHOLE CASE AND YOU BELIEVED THAT THE APPROPRIATE VERDICT WAS DEATH, COULD YOU RENDER THAT VERDICT?

MS. FERRERAS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE A CHALLENGE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AGAIN, I WILL ASK YOU TO WAIT OUTSIDE, MRS. FERRERAS.

## (PROSPECTIVE JUROR FERRERAS EXITS THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: YES?

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I THINK THAT MS. FERRERAS IS
CHALLANGEABLE FOR CAUSE BECAUSE I THINK IT IS CLEAR TO ME FROM
THE TENOR OF HER ANSWERS THAT WHEN SHE SAID AN ANSWER TO MR.
BARENS' QUESTION, "YOU HAVE TO REALLY STUDY IT AND REALLY HAVE
ALL OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES," I THINK THAT IT IS UNMISTAKABLY
CLEAR THAT SHE IS GOING TO REQUIRE MORE PROOF THAN THAT OF
BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND SHE IS GOING TO TREAT THIS CASE
DIFFERENTLY THAN SHE WOULD TREAT A CASE THAT WASN'T A DEATH
PENALTY CASE AND FOR THAT REASON, SHE COULD NOT GIVE THE
PROSECUTION A FAIR TRIAL IN THIS CASE.

THE COURT: I THINK SHE HAS A LOT OF DIFFICULTY,

EXTREME DIFFICULTY WITH THE LANGUAGE AND UNDERSTANDING IT.

I AM AFRAID VERY MUCH THAT ALL THROUGHOUT THE TRIAL SHE WILL

CONTINUE TO HAVE THAT DIFFICULTY AND I AM GOING TO SUSTAIN

THE CHALLENGE.

MR. BARENS: MY UNDERSTANDING THEN, YOUR HONOR, WOULD BE THAT THE CHALLENGE IS UPHELD ON THE BASIS OF A LANGUAGE ISSUE?

THE COURT: THE LANGUAGE ISSUE, TOGETHER WITH WHAT

COUNSEL HAS INDICATED. HE SAID THAT SHE REQUIRES A GREATER

DEGREE OF PROOF ON A DEATH PENALTY CASE THAN SHE WOULD ON A

NON-DEATH PENALTY CASE.

MR. BARENS: MAY I MAKE A RESPONSE ON THE RECORD?

THE COURT: IT IS ALREADY ON THE RECORD.

MR. BARENS: I WAS GOING TO MAKE A RESPONSE AS TO MY

1 POINT OF VIEW ON THAT SUBJECT. 2 THE COURT: YOU DON'T HAVE TO DO THAT. 3 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: GET HER BACK IN, PLEASE. 5 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR FERRERAS ENTERS THE 6 COURTROOM.) 7 THE COURT: MRS. FERRERAS, WE THINK THAT YOU WOULD 8 QUALIFY AS A JUROR IN SOME OTHER TYPE OF CASE BUT NOT THIS ONE, SO YOU WILL GO TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AND TELL THEM 9 10 THE JUDGE SAID YOU WILL BE A GOOD JUROR ON SOME OTHER CASE BUT NOT THIS ONE. WILL YOU DO THAT? 11 12 MS. FERRERAS: OKAY. 13 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU. 14 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR FERRERAS EXITS THE 15 COURTROOM.) 16 THE COURT: I AM CURIOUS AS TO WHY YOU WITHHELD YOUR 17 PASSING FOR CAUSE UNTIL AFTER WE GOT THROUGH. 18 MR. BARENS: I HAD A CHANGE OF HEART, YOUR HONOR. 19 THE COURT: I HAVE A GOOD IDEA AS TO WHY YOU DID. 20 MR. BARENS: WHY IS THAT, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: I WILL TELL YOU ABOUT IT SOME OTHER TIME. 21 22 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR HANNA ENTERS THE 23 COURTROOM.) 24 THE COURT: IS THAT MR. HANNA, IS THAT YOUR NAME? 25 MR. HANNA: YES, SIR. 26 THE COURT: WHERE DO YOU LIVE, MR. HANNA? 27 MR. HANNA: I LIVE IN PANORAMA CITY IN SAN FERNANDO 28 VALLEY.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER HEARD ANYTHING OR READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS CASE, EXCEPT WHAT I TOLD YOU ON
MONDAY?

MR. HANNA: NO, SIR.

THE COURT: DOES THE NAME BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB REGISTER WITH YOU. DOES IT IN ANY WAY RING A BELL?

MR. HANNA: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, NOW I AM GOING TO READ TO YOU

BRIEFLY WHAT THE CASE IS ABOUT AND THEN ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS.

THE PURPOSE OF THOSE QUESTIONS WILL BE TO DETERMINE WHAT YOUR

ATTITUDE IS TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY.

FIRST, YOU KNOW THAT THE CHARGE AGAINST THE

DEFENDANT, AND IT IS ONLY A CHARGE -- YOU UNDERSTAND, OF COURSE,

THAT MERELY BECAUSE HE HAS BEEN CHARGED WITH AN OFFENSE DOESN'T

MEAN HE IS GUILTY OF ANYTHING, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT; DO YOU

UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. HANNA: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, HE HAS BEEN CHARGED BY THE PEOPLE WITH THE COMMISSION OF A CRIME OF MURDER AND THAT IT IS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE.

IT IS ALSO CHARGED THAT HE COMMITTED THAT MURDER IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

YOU REMEMBER, I INDICATED TO YOU ON MONDAY THAT
THERE ARE CERTAIN OFFENSES FOR WHICH THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID
THAT THOSE PARTICULAR TYPE OF OFFENSES, MURDER OFFENSES WHERE
THERE ARE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ENTAILED, CALL FOR OR MAY
QUALIFY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. HANNA: YES.

7 A

THE COURT: A FIRST DEGREE MURDER WHICH IS COMMITTED

IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY OR IN THE COURSE OF A BURGLARY OR

A ROBBERY, AS IN THIS CASE, A BURGLARY OR A RAPE OR A KIDNAPPING

OR A CHILD MOLESTATION WHERE A CHILD DIES, AND TORTURE,

MULTIPLE MURDERS, A NUMBER OF OTHERS, THERE ARE ABOUT 19 OF

THEM, WHEN WE HAVE THOSE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THEN THE JURY

WHICH IS SELECTED IN THE CASE DETERMINES THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE

OF THE DEFENDANT, IS HE GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY OF MURDER?

MR. HANNA: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: NOW, WITH THAT AS A PRELIMINARY, I AM GOING

TO ASK YOU FIVE QUESTIONS. THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS RELATE

DEGREE, THEN THE QUESTION THEY HAVE TO DECIDE IS WHETHER OR NOT IT IS TRUE OR FALSE, WHETHER IT IS TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY AND THAT IS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE.

IF THEY SAID THAT YES, IT IS TRUE, IT WAS

COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN THAT SAME JURY THEN

HEARS FURTHER TESTIMONY, FURTHER EVIDENCE ON THE CASE FROM

THE DEFENDANT AND FROM THE PROSECUTION. AND THAT IS WHAT WE

CALL THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL WHERE THAT TESTIMONY WILL

BE ADDUCED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PERSUADING THE JURY FROM THE

DEFENDANT'S STANDPOINT THAT HE HAS -- YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO

CONSIDER HIS AGE, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS PHYSICAL AND MENTAL

CONDITION AND ANYTHING THE DEFENDANT SHOWS YOU WHICH WOULD

BE FAVORABLE TOWARD HIM SO THAT THE ULTIMATE PENALTY OF DEATH

IN THE GAS CHAMBER IS NOT IMPOSED.

AND THE PROSECUTION WILL SHOW AGGRAVATING

CIRCUMSTANCES, THINGS ABOUT HIM WHICH ARE UNFAVORABLE, SO THAT

THE ULTIMATE PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED UPON THE DEFENDANT.

SO THE JURY HEARS ALL OF THAT TESTIMONY BEFORE

IT SHOULD MAKE UP ITS MIND AS TO THE PENALTY UNTIL THEY HAVE

HEARD ALL OF THE TESTIMONY.

WHEN THEY HEAR ALL OF THE TESTIMONY, THEN THEY

GO TO THE JURY ROOM AND THEN DELIBERATE AS TO WHAT THE PENALTY

SHOULD BE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

```
OR -- RELATE TO THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, GUILTY OR NOT
1
    GUILTY: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY,
2
    WHATEVER IT MAY BE, THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN
3
    IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE
5
    DEFENDANT?
                 DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY,
6
    WHATEVER IT IS, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM
7
                                                     BEING AN
    IMPARTIAL JUROR IN DECIDING THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE
8
    DEFENDANT?
          MR. HANNA: WELL, MY OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY,
10
11
    I AM AGAINST IT.
          THE COURT: YOU ARE AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY?
12
13
          MR. HANNA: YES, SIR.
          THE COURT: UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES?
14
15
          MR. HANNA: YES.
16
          THE COURT: NO MATTER WHAT KIND OF A CASE IT IS, YOU
17
    ARE AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY?
18
          MR. HANNA: YES.
          THE COURT: THAT IS WITHOUT ANY DOUBT, IS THAT RIGHT?
19
20
          MR. HANNA: YES, I AM AGAINST IT.
21
          MR. BARENS: IF I MIGHT, YOUR HONOR.
22
          THE COURT: GO AHEAD.
          MR. BARENS: GOOD MORNING, MR. HANNA.
23
24
          MR. HANNA: GOOD MORNING, SIR.
           MR. BARENS: I AM ARTHUR BARENS AND I REPRESENT THE
25
    DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT SITTING AT THE END OF THE TABLE, THE
26
27
     YOUNGISH MAN THERE.
```

IT IS MY DUTY TO ASK YOU QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DEATH

27

28

PENALTY AND NOW, SURPRISINGLY ENOUGH, I AM GOING TO COME FROM 1 A PERSPECTIVE THAT YOU WOULD NEVER IMAGINE AS A DEFENSE LAWYER 2 3 THAT I WOULD TALK TO YOU ABOUT. YOU SEE, THE WAY THE LAW IS SET UP, IF YOU SAY --4 MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I OBJECT TO COUNSEL TELLING HIM 5 WHAT IS GOING TO QUALIFY HIM AND WHAT WON'T. HE CAN ASK THE 6 QUESTION AND GET THE ANSWER. BUT TO TELL HIM WHAT IS GOING TO 7 8 GET HIM ON OR KEEP HIM ON, IS IMPROPER. MR. BARENS: I THINK THE GENTLEMAN IS ENTITLED BY LAW 9 AS A CITIZEN OF THIS COUNTRY TO KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON HERE. 10 11 THE COURT: LET'S NOT MAKE ANY SPEECHES, WILL YOU, 12 PLEASE? 13 MR. BARENS: I THINK HE IS ENTITLED TO KNOW WHAT IS 14 GOING ON HERE. 15 THE COURT: ASK THE QUESTION. HE HAS CATEGORICALLY SAID, WITHOUT QUALIFICATION THAT UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD HE 16 VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. AND YOU WANT TO CHANGE HIS MIND? 17 MR. BARENS: I WOULD LIKE HIM TO APPRECIATE THE 18 CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH THAT RESPONSE LEAVES HIM, YOUR HONOR. 19 20 THE COURT: GO AHEAD. 21 MR. BARENS: THAT IS ALL I TRIED TO DO. 22 MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT I AM OBJECTING TO, IS TO TELL -- IS TO GIVE THIS JUROR INFORMATION 23 WHAT RESPONSES ARE GOING TO GET HIM ON THE JURY AND 24 AND 25 RESPONSES ARE GOING TO KEEP HIM OFF THE JURY.

THE PURPOSE IS TO ASK THE QUESTION AND TO GET AN ANSWER AND I DON'T THINK IT IS PROPER TO GIVE THIS JUROR INFORMATION AND THAT IS THE OBJECTION ON THAT BASIS.

MR. BARENS: WHERE IS IT WRITTEN ANYWHERE, ANYTHING THAT WOULD SUPPORT THAT PROPOSITION?

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, ASK YOUR QUESTION, IF YOU WOULD, PLEASE, ABOUT HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY. JUST ASK HIM ABOUT THAT.

MR. BARENS: I DECLINE. I PASS. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, ANY QUESTIONS?

MR. WAPNER: LET ME JUST INQUIRE OF THE COURT OR COUNSEL,

AT THE RISK OF STIRRING UP A CAULDRON. IS COUNSEL DECLINING

TO ASK THE QUESTION BASED ON SOME FEELING THAT HE HAS BEEN

PROHIBITED FROM ASKING IT?

THE COURT: I AM NOT PROHIBITING HIM FROM ASKING THE QUESTION. IF HE WANTS TO ASK THE QUESTION, HE CAN.

MR. BARENS: I BELIEVE I HAVE BEEN ADVISED THAT I CANNOT ADVISE A JUROR AS TO THE STATUS OF THE LAW, BASED ON THEIR ANSWERS AS TO WHETHER THEY WOULD QUALIFY AS A JUROR OR NOT IN THIS COURTROOM.

THE COURT: THIS JUROR HAS TESTIFIED THAT THAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THOSE INQUIRIES. HE HAS TESTIFIED WITH RESPECT TO HIS ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY. HE HAS CATEGORICALLY SAID THAT HE IS UNALTERABLY OPPOSED TO THE DEATH PENALTY, NO MATTER WHAT THE FACTS ARE, NO MATTER WHAT THE CIRCUMSTANCES ARE. DO YOU WANT TO ASK HIM ABOUT THAT? GO AHEAD.

MR. BARENS: WE DECLINE. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

MR. WAPNER: MR. HANNA, ARE THERE ANY CIRCUMSTANCES
WHERE YOU CAN SEE YOURSELF VOTING TO IMPOSE A PUNISHMENT OF
DEATH ON SOMEONE?

MR. HANNA: I BELIEVE YOU KNOW, THAT IF THE PERSON

ACTUALLY -- I CANNOT SAY LIKE THE JUDGE TOLD ME, WE DON'T KNOW

YET IF HE IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY. SOMEBODY SAID THAT THE

PERSON HAS COMMITTED A CRIME. THERE IS GUILT. THERE IS

MISTAKE.

I CANNOT GIVE HIM THE OPPOSITE OF HIS MISTAKE AS A MISTAKE AGAIN TO KILL HIM, TO REFLECT AS HIS ATTITUDE, TO DO THE SAME THING.

I FIGURE 1 KNOW WHAT IT IS, THAT THIS MAN HAS A PROBLEM. THERE IS A PROBLEM.

WE CAN THINK OF IT TO SOLVE THAT PROBLEM. IF THIS MAN IS SICK, UNDER DOPE OR SOMETHING AGGRAVATED THIS MAN TO LET HIM GO THAT FAR, TO COMMIT A DEATH CRIME, WHAT ARE THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT LED THAT MAN TO GO THAT FAR, TO LIFT THE GUN? OKAY.

THE PERSON CAN GET ANGRY IN LESS THAN A SECOND,
TO PULL THE TRIGGER AND COMMIT THIS CRIME.

THE COURT: NO. THERE IS NO ANGER INVOLVED. YOU MUST ASSUME THAT HE DELIBERATELY, WITH MALICE AND INTENTIONALLY, PREMEDITATEDLY PLANNED TO KILL SOMEBODY AND HE KILLED HIM DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

THEN YOU HAVE TO CONSIDER WHAT SHOULD BE DONE.

SUPPOSE YOU ARE ON THE JURY. SUPPOSE YOU FIND THAT HE

DELIBERATELY, INTENTIONALLY KILLED SOMEBODY DURING THE COURSE

OF A ROBBERY.

THEN YOU HAVE TO CONSIDER WHETHER OR NOT HE SHOULD SUFFER DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER OR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.

IS YOUR MIND SUCH THAT UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES, WOULD YOU VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. HANNA: NO, SIR. I CAN'T.

THE COURT: YOU WOULDN'T? IS THAT IT?

MR. HANNA: YES. I CANNOT VOTE FOR IT.

THE COURT: NOW, REMEMBER, THERE IS NO QUESTION OF DOPE INVOLVED. THERE IS NO QUESTION OF ANYTHING LIKE THAT INVOLVED. IT IS JUST A DELIBERATE MURDER DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

THE JURY HAS TO DETERMINE WHAT SHOULD BE DONE WITH HIM. UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES, WOULD YOU VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. HANNA: YES, SIR.

MR. BARENS: THE DEFENSE ONLY RESPECTFULLY SUBMITS THAT
THE PROPER INQUIRY IS WHETHER OR NOT THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR
COULD CONSIDER THE DEATH PENALTY, NOT WHETHER OR NOT HE COULD
VOTE FOR IT.

1 BELIEVE FRAMING THE QUESTION THAT WAY, IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH CASE LAW. BUT I SUBMIT THE MATTER.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. YOU WILL BE EXCUSED.

THEM YOU ARE QUALIFIED AS A JUROR ON SOME OTHER CASE BUT NOT ON THIS ONE.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR HANNA EXITS THE COURTROOM.)

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR JANIS ENTERS THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: I TOLD COUNSEL THAT I KNOW YOU. YOUR FATHER WAS ONE OF MY CLOSE FRIENDS, A JUDGE THAT IS RETIRED NOW.

SO, THEY KNOW YOUR BACKGROUND.

WHAT I WILL DO FIRST OF ALL, I WILL ASK YOU THIS.

JUST TELL US WHERE YOU LIVE, FOR THE RECORD.

MS. JANIS: I LIVE IN LOS ANGELES AT 10870 VICENZA WAY.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DID YOU EVER READ OR DO YOU KNOW

ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS CASE OR HAVE YOU EVER HEARD ANYTHING

ABOUT THIS CASE?

MS. JANIS: 1 DON'T KNOW. THE COURT: WELL, DOES THE EXPRESSION "BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB" RING ANY BELL WITH YOU? MS. JANIS: NO. THE COURT: BOYS AT THE HARVARD SCHOOL THAT GOT TOGETHER AND HAD SOME BUSINESS ARRANGEMENTS? MS. JANIS: OH, YES. THE COURT: WHAT IS THAT YOU REMEMBER ABOUT THAT? MS. JANIS: THAT IS ABOUT IT. THE COURT: IS THAT ABOUT IT? WHATEVER YOU HEARD, WOULD THAT -- HAVE YOU MADE UP YOUR MIND ABOUT ANYTHING ONE WAY OR THE OTHER? YOU HAVE NOT MADE UP YOUR MIND WHETHER OR NOT THE MAN IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY? MS. JANIS: NO. 

THAT THE CHARGE WAS AGAINST THE DEFENDANT? YOU KNOW THE CHARGE. HE IS JUST CHARGED. THERE IS NO GUILT OF HIS GUILT WHATEVER.

THE CHARGE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IS THAT HE

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU REMEMBER WHAT I TOLD YOU

THE CHARGE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IS THAT HE

COMMITTED A MURDER AND IT WAS A MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE

IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. NOW, I POINT OUT THAT IN THE COURSE

OF A ROBBERY HAS SOME SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE BECAUSE THE

LEGISLATURE HAS SAID THAT IN A NUMBER OF CASES WHERE THERE

IS A MURDER COMMITTED AND PARENTHETICALLY, MERELY BECAUSE A

MURDER IS COMMITTED DOESN'T MEAN THAT IT CALLS FOR THE DEATH

PENALTY. IT HAS GOT TO BE COMMITTED UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL

CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID THAT A MURDER COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY OR A BURGLARY OR A RAPE OR A KIDNAPPING OR 19 OTHERS, MULTIPLE MURDERS AND SO ON AND SO FORTH, THEN THE DEATH PENALTY MAY BE IN ORDER, DEPENDING UPON WHAT THE FACTS ARE AND THE JURY'S DETERMINATION.

SO, THE JURY THAT WILL BE SELECTED IN THIS CASE
WILL DETERMINE FIRST, WHAT WE CALL THE GUILT PHASE. THEY WILL
DETERMINE FIRST, WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OF
MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE. IF HE IS, THEY SO FIND, THEN THE
SECOND, COLLATERAL QUESTION THEY HAVE TO DETERMINE IS WHETHER
THAT MURDER COMMITTED -- IS IT TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS
COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

BECAUSE THAT THEN QUALIFIES FOR A POSSIBLE DEATH
PENALTY. WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, THERE ARE TWO
ASPECTS OF THE DEATH PENALTY. ONE IS LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY

OF PAROLE AND THAT MEANS EXACTLY THAT, LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY

OF PAROLE, NO PAROLE. HE STAYS IN PRISON FOR THE REST OF HIS

LIFE.

OR, IT COULD BE DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER. OKAY?

SO, IF THE JURY HAS DECIDED IT WAS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE

IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN THAT SAME JURY HEARS

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY BOTH FROM THE DEFENDANT AND THE PROSECUTION.

THE PURPOSE OF THAT ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY -- AND WE CALL IT

THE PENALTY PHASE -- AND THE FIRST ONE IS GUILT OR INNOCENCE.

IN THE PENALTY PHASE, THE DEFENDANT AND THE JURY -THE JURY MUST CONSIDER EVERYTHING ABOUT THE DEFENDANT, HIS
AGE, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS EDUCATION, HIS ABSENCE OF ANY PRIOR
CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OR CONDUCT AND EVERYTHING THAT MIGHT BE
FAVORABLE ABOUT HIM.

THE PURPOSE OF ALL OF THAT IS TO TRY TO GET THE

JURY TO GIVE HIM THE ULTIMATE PENALTY. AND THE PROSECUTION

ON THE OTHER HAND, WILL SHOW AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, I

ASSUME, THINGS THAT ARE UNFAVORABLE ABOUT THE DEFENDANT, THAT

HE IS A BAD MAN AND THINGS THAT HE HAS DONE IN THE PAST WHICH

WERE WRONG, SO THAT THE JURY WOULD NOT EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION

AND GIVE HIM THE LESSER PENALTY.

THEN THE JURY DELIBERATES IN THE JURY ROOM AND MAKES UP THEIR MINDS AS TO WHICH OF THE TWO PENALTIES IT SHOULD BE, IF AT ALL. NOW, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES OF QUESTIONS. THERE ARE FIVE OF THEM. THE PURPOSE OF THOSE QUESTIONS WOULD BE TO EXPLORE YOUR STATE OF MIND AND YOUR FEELINGS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY.

NOW, THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE GUILT

PHASE. FIRST, DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION AS TO THE DEATH PENALTY,
WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN
IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE
DEFENDANT?

MS. JANIS: NO.

THE COURT: THEN THE OTHER PART OF THAT ALSO IS, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION ON THE DEATH PENALTY, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MS. JANIS: NO.

THE COURT: NOW, THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE PENALTY. IT IS ON THE ASSUMPTION THE DEFENDANT WOULD BE FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND WITH SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH
PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH
PENALTY, IRRESPECTIVE OF OR REGARDLESS OF THE EVIDENCE WHICH
MAY BE PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. JANIS: NO.

THE COURT: AND THE SAME WAY WITH RESPECT TO LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. JANIS: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND OF COURSE, THAT THE ISSUE

OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE
AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT
THAT YOU REACH THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. JANIS: YES.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING, MISS

JANIS. I AM ARTHUR BARENS. I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, JOE

HUNT.

AND AS WITH HIS HONOR, IT IS MY DUTY AT THIS STAGE

OF THE PROCEEDINGS, TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR POINT

OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY. I AM SURE THAT YOU APPRECIATE

AND UNDERSTAND THAT THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO

ANY OF MY QUESTIONS AND NONE OF US ARE JUDGING YOU ON ANY OF

YOUR ANSWERS, BUT SEEK ONLY YOUR OPINION. YOU CAN NEVER BE

WRONG ABOUT YOUR OPINION.

WITH THAT IN MIND, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE

DEATH PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY?

MS. JANIS: I AM AT A STAGE RIGHT NOW, WHERE FRANKLY,

I AM OPEN TO THE POTENTIAL FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. BUT I AM

NOT A PROPONENT OF THE DEATH PENALTY. IS THAT A SUFFICIENT

ANSWER?

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD BE OPEN-MINDED?

MS. JANIS: I GUESS THAT IS IT, YES.

MR. BARENS: WELL, THAT IS ALL WE ARE LOOKING FOR.

MS. JANIS: YES.

MR. BARENS: AS YOU KNOW, HIS HONOR EXPLAINED THAT THERE ARE TWO PHASES TO THE TRIAL. AND IF YOU BELIEVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT WITH 11 OTHER JURORS, THAT IN FACT, A FIRST

DEGREE HOMICIDE HAD OCCURRED DURING THE COMMISSION OF A
ROBBERY AND BY THAT I MEAN AN INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED MURDER,
IT WOULD THEN BE YOUR DUTY TO MAKE A DECISION ABOUT WHETHER
THE DEFENDANT, DURING THE PENALTY PHASE, SHOULD BE GIVEN LIFE
WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR THE DEATH PENALTY. DO YOU
UNDERSTAND THAT THAT IS THE SETTING THAT WOULD BE EXISTENT
AT THAT POINT IN TIME?

MS. JANIS: RIGHT.

6

MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO CONSIDER FACTORS

CONCERNING THE DEFENDANT'S BACKGROUND AND WHETHER OR NOT HE

HAD A PRIOR CRIMINAL RECORD AND HIS AGE AT THE TIME THE CRIME

WAS ALLEGEDLY COMMITTED IN DECIDING WHETHER OR NOT HE SHOULD

LIVE OR DIE?

MS. JANIS: YES.

MR. BARENS: THOSE WOULD BE RELEVANT FACTORS YOU WOULD CONSIDER IN FACT?

MS. JANIS: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU EVER HAD A STRONGER OR MORE

DEFINED OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY THAN YOU DO AS YOU

COME BEFORE US IN THIS SETTING?

MS. JANIS: AH, I THINK SEVERAL YEARS AGO, I WAS VERY MUCH OPPOSED TO THE DEATH PENALTY AND I THINK IT HAS ONLY BEEN IN RECENT YEARS, UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE I HAVE HAD MY UNDERSTANDING THAT IT WAS EVER AN ACCEPTABLE DECISION.

MR. BARENS: ARE YOU ABLE TO EXPOUND FOR ME AT ALL AS
TO WHAT YOU MEANT IN YOUR REFERENCE TO CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES
WHERE IT WOULD BE APPLICABLE OR ACCEPTABLE?

MS. JANIS: WELL, I GUESS IN THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE
YOU SEE THAT IT IS A PREMEDITATED CRIME, WHERE THERE IS A
PERSON WHO IS CLEARLY A MENACE TO SOCIETY, HAS COMMITTED OTHER
CRIMES.

IT IS A WHOLE RANGE OF CIRCUMSTANCES THAT I THINK WOULD INFLUENCE MY THINKING ON THAT.

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD HAVE TO CONSIDER ALL OF THOSE FACTORS BEFORE COMING TO A DECISION.

NOW YOU UNDERSTAND THAT NOTHING IN THE LAW MAKES

THE DEATH PENALTY MANDATORY FOR ANY SORT OF CONDUCT; DO YOU

UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. JANIS: I ASSUME. YOU ARE TELLING ME THAT IS THE CASE, THEN THAT IS WHAT I UNDERSTAND.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, ACCEPT WHAT I TELL YOU BECAUSE THE

JUDGE, I BELIEVE, WOULD CONFIRM THAT. ALTHOUGH THERE ARE

19 CATEGORIES OR SO OF OFFENSES THAT COULD QUALIFY A DEFENDANT

UPON CONVICTION FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT IS STILL A

DECISION THAT JURORS HAVE TO MAKE DURING A PENALTY PHASE WHETHER

ONE GETS DEATH OR LIFE, THAT IS A JURY DECISION, NOT BY

LEGISLATIVE MANDATE OR FIAT; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. JANIS: OKAY, YES.

MR. BARENS: IT IS STILL IN THE HANDS OF THE JURY.

MS. JANIS: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: NOT A JUDGE OR --

MS. JANIS: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: -- OR THE LEGISLATURE.

WOULD YOU BE CAPABLE OF VOTING FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT
WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE IF YOU BELIEVED A DEFENDANT
HAD COMMITTED A PREMEDITATED MURDER DURING THE COURSE OF A
ROBBERY?

MS. JANIS: I THINK IT WOULD DEPEND ON OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES AS WELL.

MR. BARENS: ALL OF THOSE OTHER FACTORS --

MS. JANIS: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: -- THAT WOULD BE ARTICULATED DURING THE SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

•

MS. JANIS: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: IF I MIGHT INQUIRE, DO YOU FEEL THAT THERE IS ANY BEARING ON THE FACT THAT YOUR FATHER WAS A JUDGE THAT MIGHT MAKE YOU MORE INCLINED TO LISTEN TO THE PROSECUTION THAN YOU MIGHT BE TO THE DEFENSE OR, VICE VERSA, FOR THAT MATTER?

MS. JANIS: MY FATHER BECAME A JUDGE AFTER I HAD ACTUALLY MOVED OUT OF CALIFORNIA AND I WASN'T HERE TO HEAR HIM DISCUSS ANY OF THESE ISSUES AND HE WAS A MUNICIPAL JUDGE, NOT A SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE.

MR. BARENS: I APPRECIATE THAT.

I THINK YOU CAN UNDERSTAND WHY I FELT OBLIGED TO MAKE THE INQUIRY, MA'AM.

ASKING YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AND THE JUDGE DID AND MR. WAPNER WILL, THAT THERE IS NO IMPLICATION FROM THAT OR REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE IN ANY WAY THAT WE ARE SAYING THAT MR. HUNT IS GUILTY OF ANYTHING BECAUSE THE LAW PROCEDURALLY REQUIRES THAT WE MAKE THE INQUIRY AT THIS JUNCTURE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. JANIS: YES, YES.

MR. BARENS: AND YOU ARE COMFORTABLE WITH THE CONCEPT

OF THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE THAT WE WOULD ALL HAVE AS

DEFENDANTS, THAT BECAUSE SOMEONE IS ACCUSED OF A CRIME DOESN'T

MAKE YOU BELIEVE THEY HAVE COMMITTED A CRIME.

MS. JANIS: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

(MS. JANIS NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME, MA'AM. WE PASS FOR CAUSE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: GOOD MORNING, MRS. JANIS.

MS. JANIS: GOOD MORNING.

MR. WAPNER: I AM FRED WAPNER. I AM THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY WHO IS PROSECUTING THIS CASE.

THERE IS OBVIOUSLY A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THINKING ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AS A THEORETICAL OR POLITICAL ISSUE AND ACTUALLY BEING CALLED UPON TO RENDER A VERDICT ON THE DEATH PENALTY.

LET ME ASK YOU TO PUT YOURSELF IN THE SITUATION OF A JUROR IN THIS CASE. YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM AND YOU HAVE ALREADY DECIDED THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OF MURDER, THAT IT HAPPENED DURING A ROBBERY AND YOU HAVE LISTENED TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ON THE PENALTY PHASE AND NOW YOU ARE TRYING TO DECIDE WHAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT IS.

YOUR ONLY TWO CHOICES WOULD BE LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER. GIVEN THOSE TWO CHOICES, DO YOU THINK THAT IS A DECISION YOU ARE CAPABLE OF MAKING?

MS. JANIS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONGLY HELD RELIGIOUS,

MORAL OR PHILOSOPHICAL BELIEFS THAT WOULD BEAR ON YOUR ABILITY

TO RENDER A VERDICT ON THIS ISSUE?

MS. JANIS: NO.

MR. WAPNER: THE THINGS THAT YOU HAVE HEARD OR READ

ABOUT THIS CASE, DO YOU REMEMBER WHERE YOU READ OR HEARD ABOUT

THEM?

MS. JANIS: PROBABLY IN THE LOS ANGELES TIMES.

MR. WAPNER: AND DO YOU REMEMBER WHETHER YOU READ ONE
ARTICLE OR MORE THAN ONE?

(MS. JANIS SHAKES HER HEAD FROM SIDE TO SIDE.)

MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE TO ANSWER OUT LOUD SO SHE CAN WRITE IT DOWN.

MS. JANIS: OH, NO.

I AM SORRY.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. I TAKE IT, YOU DON'T HAVE A REALLY STRONG RECOLLECTION OF ANY OF THE FACTS IN THOSE ARTICLES?

MS. JANIS: NO.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I WILL PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: MRS. JANIS, BOTH SIDES HAVE PASSED FOR CAUSE.
WHAT THAT MEANS IS THEY FEEL, AND THE COURT FEELS, THAT YOU

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MRS. KAPES, WHERE DO YOU LIVE?

MS. KAPES: IN SANTA MONICA.

THE COURT: AND LAST MONDAY, YOU HEARD ME SUMMARIZE

THE NATURE OF THE CASE WE ARE ABOUT TO TRY, CERTAIN ASPECTS OF IT.

MS. KAPES: YES.

THE COURT: JUST TO REPEAT IT BRIEFLY, THE CHARGE AGAINST

THE DEFENDANT -- AND REMEMBER IT IS A CHARGE AND A CHARGE

DOESN'T MEAN THAT HE DID IT. IT HAS TO BE PROVED THAT HE

DID DO IT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.

THE CHARGE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IS THAT HE COMMITTED A MURDER IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

NOW, IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY HAS A SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE BECAUSE NOT EVERY MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE IS PUNISHABLE BY DEATH OR BY LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. THAT MURDER MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, DONE UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

I TOLD YOU MONDAY THAT, AS IN THIS CASE, THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE IS THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, AND YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KAPES: YES.

THE COURT: AND THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID THAT OTHER
KINDS OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES MAY CALL FOR THE IMPOSITION
OF THE DEATH PENALTY AND THOSE ARE MURDERS COMMITTED IN THE
COURSE OF A BURGLARY, KIDNAPPING OR RAPE OR MOLESTATION OF
A CHILD, MULTIPLE MURDERS, TORTURE AND SO FORTH. IT IS ONLY
WHERE THERE IS SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT THE DEATH PENALTY
MIGHT BE APPLICABLE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

(MS. KAPES NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: SO THE JURY SELECTED IN THIS CASE WILL FIRST

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

10 FO

24 25

26

27

28

DETERMINE WHAT WE CALL ON THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THEY WILL FIRST DETERMINE THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT, DID HE OR DID HE NOT COMMIT A MURDER OF THE FIRST DEGREE?

IF HE DID NOT, THAT IS THE END OF THE CASE.

IF HE DID, AND IT IS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THEY HAVE TO ANSWER A SECOND QUESTION: WAS THAT MURDER COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY? IS IT TRUE OR IS IT FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, WHICH IS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE.

IF THEY DECIDE IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN THE SAME JURY HEARS MORE EVIDENCE ON A SECOND TRIAL, SO TO SPEAK, WHERE THE DEFENSE AND THE PROSECUTION WILL INTRODUCE OTHER EVIDENCE THAT THEY HAVEN'T HEARD BEFORE.

THAT OTHER EVIDENCE ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT WILL BE THINGS WHICH ARE FAVORABLE TO HIM SO THAT THE JURY WOULD NOT GIVE HIM THE ULTIMATE PENALTY OF DEATH. THINGS ABOUT HIS BACKGROUND THAT YOU MUST CONSIDER. HIS AGE YOU MUST CONSIDER, ABSENCE OF ANY CRIMINAL RECORD, IF ANY, THAT YOU MUST CONSIDER AND HIS PHYSICAL AND MENTAL CONDITION AND HIS BACKGROUND AND CHARACTER, THOSE ARE THINGS YOU HAVE TO CONSIDER WHICH MIGHT BE FAVORABLE TO HIM.

THE PROSECUTION WILL HAVE A RIGHT TO SHOW TESTIMONY WHICH WOULD BE UNFAVORABLE TOWARD THE DEFENDANT. WE CALL IT AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES. THE JURY HEARS ALL OF THAT.

BUT BEFORE THEY HEAR ALL OF THAT, THEY CAN'T MAKE
UP THEIR MINDS AS TO THE PENALTY. THEY CAN'T MAKE UP THEIR
MINDS THEN.

THEN, THEY RETIRE AND DELIBERATE AND COME IN WITH A VERDICT, WHATEVER IT MAY BE. NOW, WHEN I TALKED ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, IT HAS TWO ASPECTS. ONE IS LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KAPES: YES.

THE COURT: OKAY. NOW, WHAT I WILL DO IS, ASK YOU FIVE QUESTIONS. THOSE QUESTIONS WILL BE FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXPLORING YOUR MIND AND ASCERTAINING WHAT YOUR FEELING IS AND YOUR ATTITUDE IS TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY. OKAY?

NOW, THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE GUILT PHASE OF THE CASE. DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION WHATEVER IT MAY BE, AS TO THE DEATH PENALTY, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM IMPARTIALLY RENDERING A VERDICT AS TO THE GUILT OR THE INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. KAPES: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND DO YOU REMEMBER THE SECOND PHASE OF THAT? IF YOU FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, IS IT TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, APPLIES.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THAT PHASE OF

IT, WHICH WOULD IN ANY WAY, PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING A FINDING ON THAT QUESTION?

MS. KAPES: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS RELATE
TO THE PENALTY PHASE. WE ASSUME THAT THE JURY HAS FOUND HIM
GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS IN THE COURSE
OF A ROBBERY. NOW, THESE TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE PENALTY
PHASE OF IT.

DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION WITH RESPECT TO THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. KAPES: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND THE SAME THING. DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED IN THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. KAPES: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND OF COURSE,
THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE
IN THIS CASE AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY
IN THE EVENT WE REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THE PENALTY
PHASE?

MS. KAPES: YES.

MR. BARENS: GOOD MORNING, MS. KAPES. I AM ARTHUR BARENS. I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT.

MS. KAPES: HOW DO YOU DO.

0 B

MR. BARENS: IT IS MY OBLIGATION TO ASK YOU YOUR
POINT OF VIEW ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AT THIS POINT. PLEASE
UNDERSTAND THAT THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY
QUESTIONS.

NO ONE IS JUDGING YOUR ANSWERS BECAUSE YOU CAN'T
BE WRONG IN YOUR OWN OPINION. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE
APPROPRIATENESS OF THE DEATH PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION
IN OUR SOCIETY?

MS. KAPES: I FEEL THAT IT IS CORRECT IN CERTAIN CASES.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU HELP ME UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU MEAN

BY "CERTAIN CASES"?

MS. KAPES: THEY HAVE TO BE VERY EXTREME, SOMETHING THAT

I FEEL WOULD BE VERY VIOLENT, THOUGHT OUT PERHAPS OR IN A

VIOLENT ACT, PREMEDITATED.

MR. BARENS: ORAY. WOULD YOU FEEL THAT IN EVERY CASE
WHERE YOU HAD SOMEONE COMMIT A VIOLENT MURDER THAT WAS
PREMEDITATED AND INTENTIONAL, THAT THE ONLY APPROPRIATE PENALTY
WE SHOULD GIVE A DEFENDANT IN THAT INSTANCE, WOULD BE THE DEATH
PENALTY?

MS. KAPES: NOT NECESSARILY. NOT NECESSARILY. I FEEL THAT I WOULD HAVE TO KNOW ALL OF IT TO UNDERSTAND IT.

MR. BARENS: BY "ALL OF IT" DO YOU MEAN YOU WOULD HAVE
TO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT THE BACKGROUND OF THE DEFENDANT, LIKE
WHETHER OR NOT HE HAD EVER COMMITTED A VIOLENT ACT BEFORE OR
HIS AGE AT THE TIME THE CRIME WAS COMMITTED OR SOMETHING ABOUT
HIS CHARACTER?

MS. KAPES: THAT, OF COURSE.

MR. BARENS: JUST BECAUSE A MAN HAD COMMITTED LET'S SAY -AND I AM JUST SPECULATING HYPOTHETICALLY OR PHILOSOPHICALLY
WITH YOU NOW, JUST BECAUSE THE INDIVIDUAL HAD IN YOUR MIND,
COMMITTED A FIRST DEGREE, INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED MURDER,
ARE YOU SAYING THAT YOU WOULD HAVE TO CONSIDER OTHER FACTORS
BEFORE YOU COULD DECIDE WHETHER HE WOULD LIVE OR DIE?

MS. KAPES: THAT WOULD BE A PART OF MAKING MY DECISION.

THE CASE THAT WAS BEING TRIED WOULD HAVE TO BE THE MAIN REASON

FOR MY DECISION, EITHER WAY.

MR. BARENS: NOW, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE JUDGE HAS EXPLAINED TO YOU, THAT WE'LL NEVER GET TO HAVING TO MAKE THAT DECISION OR THIS EVALUATION UNLESS YOU HAVE FIRST BELIEVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, THAT THE DEFENDANT COMMITTED A FIRST DEGREE MURDER DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MS. KAPES: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD ALREADY HAVE THAT STATE OF MIND?

YOU WOULD BELIEVE THAT THE PERSON HAD INTENTIONALLY AND

WITH PREMEDITATION, COMMITTED A MURDER DURING A ROBBERY?

MS. KAPES: YES.

MR. BARENS: NO ACCIDENT, NO JUSTIFICATION, NO NOTHING.

IT WAS JUST MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE.

MS. KAPES: YES.

MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU SAY THAT PERHAPS THE BEST LANGUAGE
WOULD BE THAT IT WOULD BE SOMETHING YOU COULD CONSIDER AS AN
ALTERNATIVE?

MS. KAPES: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND I THINK THAT IS ALL YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO DO AS A JUROR ON THIS CASE, IS DETERMINE WHETHER YOU COULD CONSIDER BOTH ALTERNATIVES, LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH, WITH AN EQUALLY OPEN MIND.

NOW, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH WE ARE HERE TALKING TO YOU ABOUT YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY AND THE JUDGE DID AND THE PROSECUTOR WILL, THAT THERE IS NO REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE, BECAUSE WE ARE HERE HAVING THIS DISCUSSION, THAT JOE HUNT HAS DONE ANYTHING WRONG?

MS. KAPES: SORRY. REPEAT THAT.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH THE JUDGE AND MYSELF AND MR. WAPNER MOMENTARILY, ARE ASKING YOU ABOUT YOUR POINT OF VIEW AS TO THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT FROM THAT, THERE IS NO REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE MR. HUNT HAS DONE ANYTHING WRONG?

MS. KAPES: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T BELIEVE BECAUSE WE ARE HAVING
THIS DISCUSSION, OR DO YOU, THAT HE MUST HAVE DONE SOMETHING
WRONG OR WE WOULDN'T BE HERE TALKING TO BEGIN WITH?

MS. KAPES: ARE YOU REALLY ASKING MY OPINION AT THIS

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO, JUST YOUR OPINION.

MS. KAPES: NO. I AM SAYING, YOU ARE NOT ASKING ME SPECIFICALLY FOR THAT? YOU ARE ASKING ME MY OPINION ON THIS?

5

6

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: GOOD MORNING, MRS. KAPES.

MS. KAPES: GOOD MORNING.

MR. WAPNER: I AM FRED WAPNER.

MS. KAPES: HOW DO YOU DO?

MR. WAPNER: I'M THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY WHO IS PROSECUTING THIS CASE.

I KNOW YOU CAN'T EXACTLY QUANTIFY WHEN YOU CHANGED YOUR OPINION ON THE DEATH PENALTY.

DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA HOW LONG OR HOW MANY YEARS YOU FELT THAT WE SHOULDN'T HAVE IT AND FOR HOW MANY YEARS YOU FELT THAT IT IS ACCEPTABLE UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES?

MS. KAPES: AS A YOUNG WOMAN, I REMEMBER QUITE CLEARLY BEING AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY.

I REALLY COULDN'T TELL YOU. OVER THE YEARS IT SEEMED ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS IF I WOULD HEAR OF A PARTICULAR CRIME THAT WAS COMMITTED, THAT I WOULD HAVE DOUBTS AND THEN IN THE LAST FEW YEARS, I WOULD SAY I HAVE BECOME AWARE THAT MY FEELINGS HAD CHANGED AND THAT NOW I FEEL AT TIMES WHEN I HEAR OF A CRIME, WELL PUBLICIZED THAT MY OPINIONS ARE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY FOR THAT PARTICULAR CRIME, THAT IT IS CORRECT AS FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

HOW MANY YEARS, I COULDN'T TELL YOU, SIR.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY.

MS. KAPES: THERE ARE MANY YEARS IN BETWEEN THAT I DON'T THINK I WAS AWARE EITHER WAY, PAID MUCH ATTENTION.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY.

MS. KAPES: I AM SORRY.

27

MR. WAPNER: I THINK I UNDERSTAND. I DON'T NEED TO KNOW EXACTLY THE NUMBER OF YEARS.

MS. KAPES: I COULDN'T TELL.

MR. WAPNER: I WANT TO TAKE IT OUT OF THE ARENA OF THE PAPERS AND THINKING ABOUT IT IN THEORY AND BRING IT DOWN TO WHAT YOU MIGHT ACTUALLY BE FACED WITH IN THIS CASE IF YOU ARE A JUROR AND THAT IS, YOU MIGHT BE CALLED UPON TO MAKE THE DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT SHOULD LIVE OR WHETHER HE SHOULD DIE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KAPES: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IS THAT A DECISION YOU THINK YOU CAN MAKE?

MS. KAPES: YES.

MR. WAPNER: I REALIZE IT IS A VERY, VERY DIFFICULT

DECISION TO PUT ANYONE IN BUT IF YOU ARE ON THE JURY AND YOU

DECIDE LATER THAT YOU CAN'T MAKE THAT DECISION, IT IS TOO

LATE TO TELL US ABOUT IT.

MS. KAPES: I UNDERSTAND.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONGLY-HELD RELIGIOUS OR MORAL BELIEFS THAT YOU THINK WOULD AFFECT YOUR ABILITY TO RENDER A VERDICT ON A CASE THAT INVOLVES THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. KAPES: I DO.

MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU TELL US ABOUT THAT?

MS. KAPES: I FEEL THAT IT IS WRONG TO TAKE A HUMAN

LIFE, THAT -- THAT TO HOLD THAT RESPONSIBILITY IN SUCH A CASE

IS TO DO IT WITH A VERY CLEAR CONSCIENCE AND TO BE VERY, VERY

SURE THAT IT IS THE ONLY THING, THE ONLY DECISION TO BE MADE

BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT WITHIN MYSELF, AND I ALSO REALIZE

THAT IT IS A TREMENDOUS RESPONSIBILITY BUT ONE THAT I FEEL,

IF I AM CALLED UPON, I MUST MAKE, BUT IT IS SOMETHING THAT

I WOULD HAVE TO DO UNDER -- WITH TREMENDOUS CARE TO THE VERY

BEST OF MY ABILITY.

MR. WAPNER: ABSOLUTELY. AND NEITHER SIDE WOULD WANT
ANYTHING LESS --

MS. KAPES: YES.

MR. WAPNER: -- FROM YOU.

THE REAL QUESTION IS THAT I WOULD LIKE YOU TO SEARCH YOURSELF AND BE ABLE TO ANSWER IS, WHEN IT GETS DOWN TO THE NITTY-GRITTY AND YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM, DO YOU THINK THAT YOUR BELIEF THAT IT IS WRONG TO TAKE A HUMAN LIFE WOULD OVERRIDE YOU AS A JUROR TO BE ABLE TO RENDER A DEATH VERDICT IF YOU FOUND THE FACTS AND THE LAW JUSTIFIED IT?

MS. KAPES: I DON'T THINK SO, SIR.

THE COURT: WHAT?

MS. KAPES: I DON'T THINK -- BELIEVE THAT THAT WOULD

BE THE CASE. IT WOULD NOT OVERRIDE ME, YOU KNOW, MY FEELING

OF HAVING TAKEN A LIFE. IN OTHER WORDS, I WOULD NOT SHIRK

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS I SAW FIT WITH A CLEAR CONSCIENCE TO

SAY THAT A DEATH PENALTY SHOULD BE RENDERED.

MR. WAPNER: AND SO IF YOU FELT THAT THAT WAS THE APPROPRIATE VERDICT AND YOU VOTED FOR THAT VERDICT ALONG WITH 11 OTHER PEOPLE, YOU COULD LIVE WITH YOURSELF AFTERWARDS?

MS. KAPES: I PRAY SO. I -- I PRAY SO, THAT I WILL

HAVE DONE IT BECAUSE I HAVE SEARCHED MY SOUL AND MY CONSCIENCE

AND THAT WAS THE ONLY RIGHT DECISION TO MAKE.

I CAN'T TELL YOU, SIR. THAT IS THE BEST I CAN

TELL YOU.

I HAVE THOUGHT OF IT VERY -- A LOT SINCE I WAS TOLD THAT I MIGHT SERVE AND I BELIEVE THAT I WOULD BE ABLE TO SAY YES TO THE DEATH PENALTY.

I AM NOT SURE HOW ELSE TO TELL YOU BECAUSE I CAN'T TELL YOU.

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE A FEW OTHER QUESTIONS
FOR THIS JUROR BUT CONSIDERING THE HOUR --

THE COURT: WELL, LET'S GET FINISHED WITH THE QUESTIONS.

-6

3

5

6

MR. WAPNER: I WANT TO TAKE YOU AWAY FROM THE PENALTY

PHASE OF THE CASE FOR A MOMENT AND GET INTO THE GUILT PHASE.

WHEN YOU ARE DECIDING THE QUESTION OF GUILT OR INNOCENCE, THE LAW REQUIRES THE PROSECUTION TO PROVE THE DEFENDANT GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT; WOULD YOU REQUIRE MORE PROOF THAN THAT BECAUSE YOU KNOW THAT YOU MIGHT BE CALLED ON TO DECIDE THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY SOMEWHERE DOWN THE LINE?

MS. KAPES: I HAVE A QUESTION ON THAT. HOW CAN I POSSIBLY ASK FOR MORE THAN YOU GIVE ME?

MR. WAPNER: ALL I AM SAYING -- YOU CAN ALWAYS ASK FOR MORE THAN I GIVE YOU BUT BY THE TIME YOU ARE ASKING, IT IS GOING TO BE TOO LATE BECAUSE YOU WILL ALREADY BE IN THE JURY ROOM AND I WON'T BE ABLE TO GIVE YOU ANY MORE.

BUT WHAT I AM SAYING IS THE JUDGE WILL TELL YOU THAT THE PROSECUTION IS REQUIRED TO PROVE THE CASE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KAPES: YES, SIR.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY, PUT YOURSELF IN THIS SITUATION: YOU ARE DECIDING A MURDER CASE AND YOU NEVER DID HEAR ANY OF THIS STUFF ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AND AS FAR AS YOU KNOW, THERE IS NO QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY AND SO YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM AND YOU ARE DECIDING A MURDER CASE AND YOU HAVE HAVE DECIDED AFTER CAREFUL DELIBERATION THAT THE EVIDENCE PROVES THE DEFENDANT GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND YOU ARE JUST ABOUT TO RENDER YOUR VERDICT AND SOMEONE COMES INTO THE JURY ROOM AND SAYS "NOW LET ME JUST ADD THIS ONE ADDITIONAL FACT, THIS IS GOING TO BE A DEATH PENALTY CASE,"

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

WOULD THAT CHANGE YOUR MIND ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF PROOF? MS. KAPES: NO. MR. WAPNER: YOU WOULDN'T REQUIRE ANY MORE PROOF JUST BECAUSE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY? MS. KAPES: NO. MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I WILL PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, BOTH ATTORNEYS HAVE PASSED FOR CAUSE AND THAT MEANS THAT THEY FEEL AND I FEEL THAT YOU ARE OUALIFIED TO SIT AS A TRIAL JUROR IN THIS CASE. MS. KAPES: I SEE. THE COURT: WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO IS TO COME BACK AT 1:45 IN THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM. GO INTO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AND I WILL HAVE YOU ALL BACK HERE AND I WILL GIVE YOU FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS AS TO WHAT TO DO, ALL RIGHT? MS. KAPES: THANK YOU. NO.

THE COURT: BY THE WAY, I DID ASK YOU WHETHER YOU HAVE READ OR HEARD ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THE CASE AND YOU SAID

MS. KAPES: I DID NOT, NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU.

MS. KAPES: THANK YOU.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPES EXITED THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: WE HAVE GOT 16 MORE PROSPECTIVE JURORS TO QUESTION THIS AFTERNOON AND TOMORROW MORNING, I THINK WE CAN FINISH WITH THAT NUMBER, CAN'T WE, DO YOU THINK?

MR. BARENS: I BELIEVE SO, YOUR HONOR.

MR. WAPNER: 1 THINK SO.

THE COURT: AND THEN AFTER THAT, WE WILL GET ALL OF

THE JURORS BACK IN. I WILL TELL THEM THAT WE EXPECT TO FINISH

BY TOMORROW AFTERNOON AND HAVE THEM COME BACK AT 1:45 TOMORROW

AFTERNOON.

MR. BARENS: YES.

COULD I ASK A PROCEDURAL QUESTION, YOUR HONOR?

THE COURT: YES.

MR. BARENS: WE HAD, AS I RECALL, TEN OR ELEVEN

PROSPECTIVE JURORS LEFT FROM THE PRIOR PANEL PRIOR TO THE

HOLIDAY RECESS. THE DEFENSE WOULD PRESUME THAT WE WOULD

PROCEED WITH THOSE TEN OR ELEVEN.

THE COURT: I THINK THAT THAT WOULD BE THE DESIRABLE
THING TO DO FOR THIS REASON: THEY HAVE SAT THROUGH ALL OF
THE ENTIRE TRIAL AND WE DON'T NEED TO GO THROUGH THE WHOLE
QUESTIONING WITH THEM AGAIN. WE WILL ASK THEM WHETHER OR
NOT THEY HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS AS THEY
WERE SEATED HERE ALREADY.

MR. BARENS: I THINK IT WOULD BE BETTER TO ASK THEM FIRST. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

THE COURT: WE WILL SELECT FROM THAT NUMBER FIRST.

MR. BARENS: BECAUSE, OBVIOUSLY, I THINK, YOUR HONOR WOULD AGREE, IT COULD SAVE US A LOT OF TIME BECAUSE WE HAVE MORE QUALIFIED PROSPECTIVE JURORS.

THE COURT: THE REMAINING JURORS WILL BECOME THEMSELVES EDUCATED DURING THE COURSE OF THAT EDUCATION.

MR. BARENS: ONE HOPES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU WANT THOSE ORDERS THAT

I HAVE SIGNED? MS. BARENS: YES, WE DO. (AT 12:06 P.M. A RECESS WAS TAKEN UNTIL 1:45 P.M. OF THE SAME DAY.) 2 3 5 

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1986; 1:50 P.M.

DEPARTMENT WEST C HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE

(APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.)

THE COURT: IT WILL BE STIPULATED THE DEFENDANT IS

PRESENT. COUNSEL ARE PRESENT. I BET ALL OF YOU WON'T BE

SURPRISED IF I TELL YOU THAT WE HAVE NOT FINISHED GOING

THROUGH THE NEW JURORS. I KNOW IT IS A SURPRISE TO YOU.

WELL, WE HAVE TO ANTICIPATE THAT WE WILL PROBABLY
FINISH BY TOMORROW AFTERNOON. BUT TO BE ON THE SAFE SIDE,
WHAT WE WILL DO IS TO ASK ALL OF YOU PRESENTLY SEATED IN THE
JURY BOX AND ALL OF THE OLD ONES AND ALL OF THE NEW ONES AS
A MATTER OF FACT, ALL OF YOU COME BACK. WE WILL SURELY BE
READY FOR YOU MONDAY MORNING. THAT WILL BE MONDAY MORNING
AT 10:30. ALL OF YOU PLEASE BE IN THE OURY ASSEMBLY ROOM READY
TO PROCEED IN THIS CASE. SORRY ABOUT THAT.

HAVE A VERY PLEASANT WEEKEND. I AM SORRY THAT

IT HAS BEEN EXTENDED AS MUCH AS IT HAS. THOSE ARE THE

FORTUNES OF WAR.

ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR BEING HERE.
WE WILL SEE YOU AT 10:30 NEXT MONDAY MORNING.

(PROSPECTIVE JURORS EXIT THE COURTROOM.)

```
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, NOW THERE IS A NOTE BY MRS. CRAMER.
1
     DO YOU MIND IF I SHOW IT TO COUNSEL?
2
           MS. CRAMER: NO. OH, NO, I DON'T.
3
           THE COURT: AS I HAVE TO GET THEIR APPROVAL.
4
                 (NOTE HANDED TO COUNSEL BY THE CLERK.)
5
                 (UNREPORTED COLLOQUY BETWEEN COUNSEL.)
6
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU, MRS. CRAMER, THANK
7
     YOU VERY MUCH. BY CONSENT OF BOTH COUNSEL --
8
           MS. CRAMER: I AM SORRY TO INCONVENIENCE ALL OF YOU.
9
           THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. YOU ARE EXCUSED.
10
          THE CLERK: WAS SHE EXCUSED?
11
          THE COURT: YES.
12
           MR. WAPNER: THE RECORD WOULD REFLECT SHE IS EXCUSED
13
     BY STIPULATION OF THE PARTIES?
14
15
           THE COURT: YES. THAT IS ELEANOR CRAMER.
           MR. WAPNER: AND THE NOTE SHE SUBMITTED WILL BE PART
16
17
     OF THE RECORD?
           THE COURT: WE REALLY DON'T HAVE TO. I WOULD RATHER
18
19
     NOT HAVE IT.
20
          MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT.
           MR. BARENS: I WOULD STIPULATE IT NOT BE A PART OF THE
21
22
     RECORD.
23
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
24
                 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR KEENAN ENTERED
25
                 THE COURTROOM.)
26
           THE COURT: THAT IS MRS. KEENAN, IS IT?
27
           MS. KEENAN: MISS.
           THE COURT: MISS KEENAN, WHERE DO YOU LIVE?
28
```

14 F

13-2

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: THEY SAID THAT -- THEY CLAIMED THEY SAW

THE MAN WHO WAS KILLED SUPPOSEDLY?

MS. KEENAN: RIGHT. I READ THAT, TOO.

THE COURT: WHAT ELSE?

MS. KEENAN: LET'S SEE. WHERE DID I STOP? THE MURDER WAS ALLEGEDLY DONE TO EXTORT MONEY FROM THE VICTIM. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER HE HAD MONEY OR NOT. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT I READ HE WAS A CON MAN.

THEN, I HAVE ALSO READ THERE WAS ANOTHER MURDER IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, AN IRANIAN WHOSE SON, APPARENTLY, WAS IN THE BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB. THERE IS A BODY CONNECTED WITH THAT.

I DON'T THINK I KNOW ANY MORE. I THINK THAT IS OUITE A BIT. BUT THAT IS ALL I KNOW.

THE COURT: HAVING READ ALL OF THAT, HAVE YOU MADE UP YOUR MIND AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT WHO IS CHARGED WITH THE MURDER OF LEVIN, WHOSE BODY HAS NOT BEEN FOUND?

MS. KEENAN: NO.

THE COURT: YOU WOULD KEEP AN OPEN MIND?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

THE COURT: YOU KNOW THAT MANY TIMES YOU READ THINGS IN THE NEWSPAPERS AND SOMETIMES IT MAY BE RIGHT BUT MANY TIMES IT MAY BE WRONG. SO THEREFORE, YOU CAN'T FORM ANY IMPRESSION OR REACH ANY CONCLUSION FROM WHAT YOU HEAR.

THE NEWSPAPER IS LIKE ANYTHING ELSE. THEY SELL TO MAKE MONEY. SO THE MORE SENSATIONAL IT IS, THE MORE PAPERS THEY CAN SELL. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

IT IS NOT THAT IT MEANS THAT EVERYTHING THAT IS PRINTED IN THE NEWSPAPER IS WRONG OR FALSE. BUT SOMETIMES IT CAN BE WRONG.

MAYBE SOME OF THE FACTS WHICH WERE GIVEN, WERE PROBABLY NOT RIGHT, ANYHOW. SO, YOU FORGET EVERYTHING THAT YOU READ, WILL YOU?

DO YOU THINK YOU CAN CLEANSE YOUR MIND OF THAT SORT OF THING AND JUST HEAR THE EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE?

MS. KEENAN: I BELIEVE SO. I MEAN, I COULD CERTAINLY
TRY. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER IT IS ACTUALLY POSSIBLE TO FORGET
EVERYTHING YOU HAVE READ.

THE COURT: BUT, IF YOU I ASKED YOU TO, WOULD YOU TRY?

MS. KEENAN: I WOULD TRY.

THE COURT: AS MUCH AS IT IS HUMANLY POSSIBLE FOR YOU TO DO SO?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW THEN, YOU KNOW WHAT THE
DEFENDANT HERE, IS ACCUSED OF, IS COMMITTING A MURDER. IT
IS FIRST DEGREE MURDER BECAUSE IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE
COURSE OF A ROBBERY. AS I TOLD THE JURORS ON MONDAY, COMMITTED
IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY HAS A SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE BECAUSE
THE LEGISLATURE SAID IN CERTAIN TYPES OF MURDERS WHERE THERE
ARE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES ATTACHED TO THOSE MURDERS, THAT
THOSE PARTICULAR MURDERS ARE QUALIFIED FOR A POSSIBLE DEATH
PENALTY.

NOW FOR EXAMPLE, I GAVE YOU INSTANCES OF MURDER

IN THE FIRST DEGREE COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY,

IS ONE. A BURGLARY, KIDNAPPING, A RAPE, MULTIPLE MURDERS

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

OR WHERE A CHILD IS MOLESTED AND DIES AS A RESULT, MULTIPLE MURDERS AS I SAID AND ALL OF THOSE QUALIFY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

SO THAT THE JURY IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE WOULD FIRST, HAVE TO DECIDE THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT, WAS HE GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE. AND IF THEY SAY NO, THAT IS THE END OF THE CASE.

IF THEY SAY YES, THEN THEY HAVE A FURTHER QUESTION TO ANSWER, WAS THAT MURDER COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. IS IT TRUE OR FALSE IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. THAT IS KNOWN AS THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

IF THEY SAY YES, THEN WE START THE SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL, WHICH IS KNOWN AS THE PENALTY PHASE. AND IN THE PENALTY PHASE, YOU HEAR NEW EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY BOTH SIDES. THE PURPOSE OF THAT EVIDENCE IS SO THAT YOU CAN CONSIDER FACTORS, LIKE BOTH SIDES WILL INTRODUCE EVIDENCE -- FACTORS SUCH AS THE AGE OF THE DEFENDANT, THE LACK OF OR PRESENCE OF ANY CRIMINAL ACTIVITY IN HIS PAST, HIS CHARACTER, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS PHYSICAL AND MENTAL CONDITION, ANYTHING THAT HAS TO DO WITH HIS PERSONNA.

EVERYTHING THAT MAY BE FAVORABLE TO HIM, HE WILL INTRODUCE TESTIMONY ABOUT IT. IN OTHER WORDS, THAT IS TO GET THE JURY TO GIVE HIM THE LESSER OF THE TWO PENALTIES.

ON THE OTHER HAND -- WELL, THAT IS CALLED EXTENUATING OR MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES. ON THE OTHER HAND, THE PEOPLE WILL ATTEMPT TO SHOW UNFAVORABLE ASPECTS OF HIM, THINGS BAD ABOUT HIM IN ORDER TO MAXIMIZE HIS GUILT, SO TO SPEAK, TO GET THE MAXIMUM PENALTY PERMITTED.

g

0

3

AS I TOLD YOU, THE PENALTY IS ONE OF TWO: LIFE

IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THAT MEANS

EXACTLY THAT. NO POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND HE STAYS IN PRISON

FOR THE REST OF HIS LIFE.

OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

THAT IS SOMETHING WHICH IS ENTIRELY WITHIN THE PROVINCE OF THE JURY TO DETERMINE BECAUSE, AS YOU KNOW, AS THE DEFENDANT. SITS THERE NOW HE IS PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT. HE IS PRESUMED TO HAVE DONE NOTHING AND HE IS INNOCENT OF ANY CRIME UNTIL THE CONTRARY IS PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND THAT IS THE OBLIGATION OF THE PEOPLE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KEENAN: I DO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, NOW WHAT WE ARE HERE FOR PRINCIPALLY
IS TO -- NOT ENTIRELY -- TO EXPLORE YOUR MIND TO DETERMINE
WHAT YOUR ATTITUDES AND FEELINGS ARE ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY,
TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT YOU CAN QUALIFY AS A JUROR ON A DEATH
PENALTY CASE.

I WILL ASK YOU FIVE QUESTIONS. THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS ARE REALLY ON THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL.

NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION REGARDING THE DEATH PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHICH WILL PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. KEENAN: NO.

THE COURT: AND THE NEXT ONE IS, IF HE IS FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THE JURY IS TO DETERMINE IS IT TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

NOW THE SAME THING: HAVE YOU ANY OPINION REGARDING
THE DEATH PENALTY WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN
IMPARTIAL DECISION CONCERNING THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE
SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE?

MS. KEENAN: NO.

THE COURT: NOW, THE NEXT HAVE TO DO WITH THE PENALTY.

WE ASSUME THAT HE HAS BEEN FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST

DEGREE AND IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY AND NOW WE ARE

ON THE PENALTY PHASE: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE

DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO AUTOMATICALLY VOTE TO

IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF THE EVIDENCE THAT MAY

BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. KEENAN: NO.

THE COURT: I EXPLAINED TO YOU WHAT THE PENALTY PHASE

IS, BOTH SIDES INTRODUCE EVIDENCE, BOTH ON THE GOOD SIDE AND

ON THE BAD SIDE.

AND ALONG THE SAME LINES, THE QUESTION IS: DO
YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT
YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT
THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT
MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. KEENAN: NO.

THE COURT: YOU UNDERSTAND, OF COURSE, THAT THE ISSUE

OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE

AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT

THAT YOU REACH THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

THE COURT: VERY GOOD.

9 10 11

- →

5

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 1 2 GOOD AFTERNOON, MISS KEENAN. 3 MS. KEENAN: HI. MR. BARENS: I AM ARTHUR BARENS AND I REPRESENT THE 4 DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT AND, AS WITH HIS HONOR, IT IS MY 5 OPPORTUNITY AT THIS STAGE TO ASK YOU QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DEATH 6 PENALTY OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. 7 THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO ANY OF OUR QUESTIONS 8 g BECAUSE NO ONE IS JUDGING YOUR ANSWERS, BECAUSE YOU CAN NEVER 10 BE WRONG ABOUT YOUR OWN OPINION. HOWEVER, BEFORE I GET TO THOSE QUESTIONS, I WANTED 11 TO JUST GO BACK FOR A BRIEF MOMENT ABOUT THE ARTICLE THAT 12 13 YOU READ. 14 LET ME ASK YOU, I BELIEVE THE ARTICLE YOU REFER 15 TO APPEARED IN THE LOS ANGELES TIMES? 16 MS. KEENAN: PROBABLY. MR. BARENS: DID YOU EVER READ ANY OTHER ARTICLE, OTHER 17 THAN THE ONE YOU REFERRED TO, IF IT BE ONLY ONE? 18 MS. KEENAN: IT PROBABLY WAS MORE THAN ONE. I READ THE 19 PAPER EVERY DAY PRETTY MUCH FRONT TO BACK. 20 MR. BARENS: IS IT THE LOS ANGELES TIMES YOU READ? 21 22 MS. KEENAN: YES. MR. BARENS: DO YOU EVER READ THE NEWSPAPER HERE IN 23 24 SANTA MONICA, THE EVENING OUTLOOK? 25 MS. KEENAN: THE EL SEGUNDO HERALD. IT DOESN'T HAVE ANYTHING. 26 MR. BARENS: HOW ABOUT LOS ANGELES MAGAZINE? 27 28

MS. KEENAN: NO.

MS. KEENAN: I DON'T THINK SO BUT THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: 1 WAS AROUND FOR THAT BUT I DON'T THINK
YOU WERE.

OKAY, DID YOU HAVE AN OPINION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT MY CLIENT HAD COMMITTED A MURDER AFTER YOU READ THE L.A. TIMES ARTICLE?

MS. KEENAN: NO.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, DO YOU FEEL THAT IF DURING THE
TRIAL THAT OCCURS HERE, A LOT OF THE STUFF THAT WAS IN THAT
ARTICLE DOESN'T COME INTO EVIDENCE, FOR INSTANCE, SUPPOSING
THROUGH THE TRIAL HERE YOU DON'T HEAR ANYTHING ABOUT A MURDER
UP NORTH AND YOU DON'T HEAR ANYTHING ABOUT AN IRANIAN MAN AND
HIS BODY AND YOU DON'T HEAR ANYTHING ABOUT HIS SON, WOULD YOU
BE CURIOUS AS TO WHY YOU WOULDN'T HEAR ABOUT THAT?

MS. KEENAN: CURIOUS, PROBABLY.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, WOULD IT IN ANY WAY MAKE YOU FEEL SOMETHING WAS BEING COVERED UP OR HELD AWAY FROM YOU OR THAT THERE WAS SOME LAWYER GAMES GOING ON HERE?

MS. KEENAN: NO.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, DO YOU THINK THAT YOU COULD PUT OUT OF YOUR MIND IN TRUTH EVERYTHING YOU HEARD OR READ IN THAT ARTICLE AND MAKE A JUDGMENT AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE SOLELY ON THE TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE THAT WOULD BE DEMONSTRATED IN THIS COURTROOM?

MS. KEENAN: I THINK SO, YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD HAVE A TENDENCY TO COMPARE WHAT YOU HEARD IN THIS COURTROOM AGAINST WHAT YOU HAD READ IN THE ARTICLE?

MS. KEENAN: PROBABLY NOT.

15A

MR. BARENS: OKAY, WE WOULD ASK YOU TO GO WAY BEYOND "PROBABLY."

MS. KEENAN: YES, I KNOW.

MR. BARENS: AND I WILL TELL YOU WHY.

MANNER, ADVISED YOU WHAT IS TRUE, THAT A PERSON THAT WRITES
A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE DOES NOT HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY OR THE
OBJECTIVES THAT WE AS LAWYERS AND JUDGES AND JURORS DO IN THIS
COURTROOM IN THE SEARCH FOR TRUTH AND JUSTICE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT I MEAN?

MS. KEENAN: I UNDERSTAND.

I MEAN I HAVE NEVER HAD TO DO THIS SO I DON'T KNOW WHAT I CAN PUT OUT OF MY MIND.

MR. BARENS: OKAY.

MS. KEENAN: I UNDERSTAND IN PRINCIPAL THAT THE ONLY EVIDENCE IS WHAT I WOULD HEAR HERE.

MR. BARENS: PRECISELY. AGAIN, IF THE NEWSPAPER ARTICLE HAD NOT MADE IT INTERESTING AND PROVOCATIVE, YOU WOULDN'T HAVE READ IT AND YOU CERTAINLY WOULDN'T HAVE THE GOOD MEMORY FOR IT THAT YOU DO TODAY.

MS. KEENAN: PROBABLY NOT.

MR. BARENS: PERHAPS WHAT YOU HEAR IN THIS COURTROOM WOULD BE A LOT DULLER THAN THAT, TOO. BUT THE MAIN THING IS, WE WOULD ALL ASK YOU TO ASSURE US THAT YOU WOULD JUDGE MY CLIENT AND THE PEOPLE'S CASE, SOLELY ON WHAT YOU HEARD IN THIS COURTROOM AND NOT BASED ON WHAT A GUY WRITES IN A COMMERCIAL PUBLICATION.

MS. KEENAN: YES. I WOULD MAKE EVERY ATTEMPT TO DO THAT.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. BUT YOU HAVE AGAIN, TOLD ME THAT
YOU REALLY HAD NOT COME TO ANY CONCLUSIONS ONE WAY OR ANOTHER
ABOUT THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE, MURDER, NO MURDER, JUST FROM
HAVING READ THAT ARTICLE?

MS. KEENAN: THAT'S RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. YOU DON'T HAVE TO BELIEVE -- OR

DO YOU HAVE A BELIEF THAT THINGS YOU READ IN THE LOS ANGELES

TIMES ARE NECESSARILY ACCURATE ON ALL COUNTS?

MS. KEENAN: I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THEY ARE.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. I THANK YOU FOR THAT. NOW WE ARE GOING TO THE DEATH PENALTY. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY?

MS. KEENAN: IN THEORY, I THINK THAT IT IS OKAY. IN PRACTICE, I DON'T KNOW THAT IT WORKS.

THE COURT: IN PRACTICE WHAT?

MS. KEENAN: THAT IT WORKS.

THE COURT: YOU MEAN IT REALLY ISN'T A DETERRENT TO

õ

## MURDER?

MS. KEENAN: I DON'T REALLY CARE ABOUT DETERRENT.

I DON'T THINK ANYBODY SHOULD BE PUNISHED, OTHER PEOPLE LESS

THAN -- I DON'T KNOW WHETHER EVERYBODY THAT SHOULD GET IT,

GETS IT OR EVERYBODY WHO GETS IT SHOULD HAVE IT.

IT IS A HUMAN INSTITUTION. I AM CONVINCED MISTAKES ARE FREQUENTLY MADE.

MR. BARENS: THERE IS NO QUESTION THAT THIS IS NOT THE MOST SCIENTIFICALLY PERFECT ACTIVITY THAT HUMANS ENGAGE IN.
BUT NONETHELESS, IT IS IN EXISTENCE AS AN ELEMENT OF OUR JUDICIAL PROCESS.

WOULD YOU BE CAPABLE, GIVEN TWO CHOICES DURING
A PENALTY PHASE, OF VOTING EITHER FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY
OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER, IF IT CAME DOWN TO
YOUR HAVING TO BE CAPABLE OF MAKING ONE OF THOSE TWO CHOICES?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, DO YOU UNDERSTAND, AS HIS HONOR POINTED OUT, THAT THERE ARE TWO DISTINCT AND SEPARATE PHASES OF THIS PROCEEDINGS? THERE IS THE GUILT TRIAL, DURING WHICH YOU ARE ASKED AS A JUROR TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT YOU BELIEVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT A FIRST DEGREE, INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED MURDER TOOK PLACE DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

MS. KEENAN: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: ONLY IF YOU BELIEVE THAT, WITH 11 OTHER JURORS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, DOES THIS LIFE AND DEATH PENALTY PHASE QUESTION EVER ARISE.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

٠,

MR. BARENS: IS IT BELIEVABLE TO YOU, THAT YOU COULD VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE DURING A PENALTY PHASE FOR A DEFENDANT THAT YOU HAD EARLIER FOUND GUILTY OF A FIRST DEGREE, PREMEDITATED MURDER?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO CONSIDER ALL OF
THE EVIDENCE HIS HONOR MADE REFERENCE TO, THAT WOULD BE
ELICITED DURING THE PENALTY PHASE?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

MR. BARENS: ABOUT HIS BACKGROUND, AGE, WHETHER OR NOT THERE IS PRIOR CRIMINAL CONDUCT?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, I ASKED YOU, AFTER READING THE LOS ANGELES TIMES ARTICLE, NOW BEING IN THIS COURTROOM AND THE JUDGE AND MYSELF AND MR. WAPNER IN A MOMENT, IS GOING TO BE TALKING TO YOU ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY.

WE HAVE GOT JOE HUNT SITTING DOWN THERE AT THE
END OF THE COUNSEL TABLE. DO YOU HAVE REASON IN YOUR MIND,
TO BELIEVE -- DO YOU BELIEVE JOE HUNT MUST HAVE DONE SOMETHING
WRONG OR HE WOULDN'T BE HERE?

MS. KEENAN: NO I DON'T. I DON'T THINK THAT MR. MEESE IS RIGHT.

I SHOULDN'T SAY THAT. I DON'T AGREE THAT ANYBODY WHO IS ARRESTED IS PROBABLY GUILTY OR IS GUILTY.

MR. BARENS: AND I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT HIS HONOR WOULD ENDORSE YOUR POINT OF VIEW, THAT HIS HONOR DOES NOT SUBSCRIBE TO WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN A SOMEWHAT CAVALIER COMMENT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

THAT IS PRECISELY BECAUSE THE CONSTITUTION GIVES ALL OF US THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, YOU, ME, ANYBODY ELSE THAT IS SITTING THERE IN THAT DEFENSE SEAT, UNTIL THERE HAS ACTUALLY BEEN A TRIAL. WE PASS FOR CAUSE. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU. MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I DID NOT MEAN ANY DISRESPECT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL. THE COURT: I KNOW THAT YOU DON'T. MR. BARENS: I AM SURE THAT IT WAS IN FACT, A CAVALIER COMMENT ON HIS PART. THANK YOU. 

28 MR. WAPNER: THAT IS A GOOD STARTING POINT. YOU CAN

AT ALL.

APPRECIATE, I TAKE IT FROM THAT ANSWER, THAT DURING THE TIME 1 2 THAT YOU ARE DECIDING WHAT CRIME WAS COMMITTED, WHAT THE DEGREE OF THE CRIME WAS AND WHO DID IT, THAT YOU CAN'T BE THINKING 3 4 ABOUT WHAT THE PUNISHMENT IS? MS. KEENAN: RIGHT. 5 MR. WAPNER: OR MIGHT BE? 6 7 MS. KEENAN: RIGHT. MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND IF THE JURY CONCLUDES THERE 8 WAS A FIRST DEGREE MURDER DURING A ROBBERY, THEN IT GOES ON 9 10 TO DECIDE THE QUESTION OF PENALTY. HOW DO YOU THINK THAT YOUR VIEWS ON THE DEATH 11 PENALTY WILL AFFECT YOU WHEN YOU GET TO THAT STAGE OF THE 12 13 CASE? MS. KEENAN: I THINK THAT I WOULD BE -- HOW DO YOU BE 14 MORE CAREFUL ABOUT SOMETHING LIKE THAT? SINCE IT SEEMS TO 15 ME THAT IT IS EASY -- NOT EASY, BUT THAT IT IS POSSIBLE TO 16 MAKE ERRORS, THAT YOU WOULD HAVE TO BE -- THE OTHER PENALTY 17 IS PRETTY BAD, TOO. SO I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY HOW TO ANSWER 18 19 THE QUESTION. 20 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. MS. KEENAN: I MEAN, I COULD VOTE FOR EITHER. 21 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONGLY-HELD RELIGIOUS 22 BELIEFS OR MORAL BELIEFS THAT WOULD AFFECT YOUR ABILITY TO 23 FAIRLY AND IMPARTIALLY DECIDE THE QUESTION OF EITHER DEATH 24 OR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? 25 MS. KEENAN: I DON'T THINK SO. I BELIEVE IN HUMAN 26 INSTITUTIONS TO THE EXTENT THAT I THINK PUNISHMENT IS MORALLY 27 NECESSARY, IF THAT IS WHAT YOU ARE ASKING ME. 28

MR. WAPNER: WELL, I AM JUST ASKING YOU FOR EXAMPLE,

ARE YOU OF THE OPINION THAT IT IS IMPROPER TO TAKE A HUMAN

LIFE AND THEREFORE, YOU COULD NEVER VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY

OR VIEWS ON THAT ORDER?

MS. KEENAN: NO. I THINK THERE ARE TIMES WHEN IT IS MORALLY ACCEPTABLE TO TAKE A HUMAN LIFE.

MR. WAPNER: AND IF YOU ARE CHOSEN AS A JUROR IN THIS

CASE, YOU WOULD BE ONE OF TWELVE PEOPLE MAKING THAT DECISION,

WHETHER THAT HUMAN LIFE SHOULD BE TAKEN. DO YOU UNDERSTAND

THAT?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

MR. WAPNER: I TAKE IT FROM YOUR PREVIOUS ANSWERS THAT IT IS A DECISION YOU ARE CAPABLE OF MAKING?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DURING THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THE PROSECUTION IS REQUIRED TO PROVE THE DEFENDANT'S GUILT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. WOULD YOU SOMEHOW, ELEVATE THAT STANDARD IN YOUR MIND BECAUSE YOU KNOW THAT THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY MIGHT BE INVOLVED AT SOME LATER POINT?

MS. KEENAN: NO.

THE COURT: YOU MEAN WOULD YOU ELEVATE IT TO A POINT WHERE YOU WOULD SAY BEYOND ALL DOUBT, NOT REASONABLE DOUBT?

MS. KEENAN: NO. I DON'T THINK SO.

MR. WAPNER: IF THE JUDGE TELLS YOU THAT THAT IS THE STANDARD AND IT IS THE SAME FOR ALL CASES, CAN YOU ACCEPT THAT AND FOLLOW THAT?

MS. KEENAN: I THINK THAT IS THE WAY IT SHOULD BE FOR A TRAFFIC VIOLATION AND MURDER.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I PASS FOR CAUSE. 1 THE COURT: THAT IS EXACTLY RIGHT. BOTH SIDES HAVE 2 PASSED FOR CAUSE. THAT MEANS THAT YOU ARE EMINENTLY QUALIFIED 3 TO BE A JUROR IN THIS CASE. AND IF YOU ARE SELECTED, YOU 4 COULD BE FAIR IN DECIDING THE ISSUES IN THE CASE. 5 WE HAVE GOT SOME MORE PROSPECTIVE JURORS TO GO 6 THROUGH. 7 8 MS. KEENAN: YES, I KNOW. THE COURT: YOU HAVE BEEN WAITING AROUND FOR A WHILE. 9 I APOLOGIZE FOR IT. THE WHEELS OF JUSTICE GRIND EXCEEDINGLY 10 SLOWLY BUT EXCEEDINGLY FINE, AS YOU HAVE HEARD. 11 WE'LL ASK YOU TO COME BACK WITH THE OTHER JURORS 12 MONDAY MORNING. WE'LL GET STARTED WITH THE TRIAL. WILL YOU 13 DO THAT? 14 COME BACK TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AT 10:30 15 MONDAY MORNING. WE WILL BE READY TO GO. THANK YOU. MEANTIME, 16 TRY NOT TO READ ANYTHING ABOUT THE CASE OR TALK TO ANYONE 17 18 ABOUT IT. 19 MS. KEENAN: OKAY. (PROSPECTIVE JUROR KEENAN EXITED THE 20 21 COURTROOM.) (PROSPECTIVE JUROR KORVIN ENTERED THE 22 COURTROOM.) 23 24 THE COURT: IS IT MRS. KORVIN? 25 MS. KORVIN: YES. 26 THE COURT: WHERE DO YOU LIVE? 27 MS. KORVIN: MANHATTAN BEACH. THE COURT: YOU HEARD ON MONDAY GENERALLY WHAT THIS 28

CASE IS ALL ABOUT? 1 MS. KORVIN: YES. 2 THE COURT: BEFORE WE GO INTO DISCUSSION OF IT, I JUST 3 WANT TO KNOW IF YOU HAVE READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS CASE. 4 MS. KORVIN: WELL, I READ SOMETHING IN THE LOS ANGELES 5 TIMES. I DON'T KNOW WHEN IT WAS, BUT WITHIN THE LAST TWO 6 7 MONTHS. THE COURT: WEEKS AGO? 8 MS. KORVIN: YES. BUT I DON'T REMEMBER ANY DETAILS 9 10 OR --THE COURT: TRY TO REMEMBER ANYTHING THAT YOU CAN, IF 11 12 YOU CAN. MS. KORVIN: I DON'T KNOW IF IT WAS THE SAME ONE ABOUT 13 14 A CLUB? 15 THE COURT: THAT'S IT. THE BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB? MS. KORVIN: ABOUT A LOT OF MONEY. THAT IS ABOUT IT. 16 17 AND THERE WAS SOME KIND OF INVESTMENT. THAT IS ABOUT IT. 18 THAT IS ALL I REMEMBER. THE COURT: WHATEVER YOU MIGHT HAVE READ, DO YOU THINK 19 THAT IT IN ANY WAY, WILL AFFECT YOU IF YOU ARE SELECTED AS 20 A JUROR IN THIS CASE, IN GIVING BOTH SIDES A FAIR TRIAL? 21 22 MS. KORVIN: NO. I DON'T BELIEVE EVERYTHING I READ. THE COURT: WELL THEN, YOU ARE LEARNING ONE OF THE 23 CARDINAL LESSONS IN LIFE, DON'T BELIEVE EVERYTHING THAT YOU 24 25 READ. AT ANY RATE, WHATEVER YOU DID READ, PUT IT OUT 26 OF YOUR MIND, EVEN IF IT COMES BACK TO YOU. FORGET ABOUT 27 IT AND BE GUIDED BY THE EVIDENCE IN THE CASE. 28

29

MS. KORVIN: OKAY.

6

THE COURT: AND IN THE FUTURE, IF WHILE YOU ARE ON THE CASE OR EVEN BEFORE THAT, IF YOU SEE ANYTHING IN THE PAPERS, DON'T READ IT, OR WHATEVER YOU HEAR ON THE RADIO OR SEE ON TELEVISION, FORGET ABOUT IT.

MS. KORVIN: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: NOW BRIEFLY, AGAIN, TO REFRESH YOUR

RECOLLECTION, THE CHARGE IN THIS CASE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT -
AND YOU UNDERSTAND, OF COURSE, THAT IT IS JUST A CHARGE.

MERELY BECAUSE HE IS CHARGED WITH AN OFFENSE DOESN'T MEAN HE

IS GUILTY OF THE OFFENSE CHARGED; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

(WHEREUPON, MS. KORVIN NODS HER HEAD UP

AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: I JUST WANT TO BE SURE OF THAT BECAUSE SOME

OF THE JURORS THOUGHT MAYBE THAT WHERE THERE IS SMOKE THERE

IS FIRE AND THAT DOESN'T NECESSARILY APPLY.

THE CHARGE AGAINST HIM IS THAT HE COMMITTED A MURDER
IN THE FIRST DEGREE DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

AND I INDICATED TO YOU AND THE OTHER JURORS THAT
IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY HAS SOME SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE
BECAUSE EVEN IF A MURDER IS DELIBERATE, PREMEDITATED,
CALCULATED AND PLANNED, THAT DOESN'T QUALIFY IT FOR THE DEATH
PENALTY NECESSARILY. IT IS ONLY WHERE IT IS ACCOMPANIED BY
WHAT WE CALL SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THAT IT WAS COMMITTED
DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, AS IN THIS CASE AS IT IS
ALLEGED, OR IN THE COURSE OF A BURGLARY OR IN THE COURSE OF
A KIDNAPPING OR RAPE, OR IN A CHILD MOLESTATION WHERE THE
CHILD DIES, OR TORTURE OR MULTIPLE MURDERS, WHERE THE
LEGISLATURE HAS SAID IN 19 INSTANCES OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES,

1 2 3

THAT THAT PARTICULAR CASE WILL QUALIFY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY;
DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KORVIN: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: AND SO THIS IS ONE OF THEM WHERE ALLEGEDLY
A MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF ROBBERY, WHICH IS WHAT
WE ARE DEALING WITH HERE.

NOW, THE JURY WHICH WILL BE SELECTED IN THIS CASE
WILL FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE
DEFENDANT: DID HE OR DIDN'T HE COMMIT THE MURDER AND WAS OR
WASN'T IT IN THE FIRST DEGREE, AS WILL BE DEFINED TO YOU.

AND IF THE JURORS DECIDE THAT IT IS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THEY HAVE ANOTHER QUESTION TO ANSWER: IS

IT TRUE OR IS IT FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

BECAUSE THAT SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE QUALIFIES IT

FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE DEATH PENALTY, DO YOU UNDERSTAND,

AS I TOLD YOU?

(WHEREUPON, MS. KORVIN NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, NOW IF THEY ANSWER YES -- THAT

IS ON THE GUILT PHASE -- IF THEY ANSWER YES, THEN WE START

ANOTHER PHASE OF THE TRIAL AND THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL IS

CALLED THE PENALTY PHASE.

ON THE PENALTY PHASE, THE JURY WILL CONSIDER A NUMBER OF OTHER FACTORS IN DETERMINING WHAT PENALTY SHOULD BE IMPOSED.

THE DEATH PENALTY HAS TWO ASPECTS: ONE IS LIFE

IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THAT MEANS

- 5

EXACTLY THAT. NO POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. HE STAYS THERE FOR THE REST OF HIS LIFE.

AND THE OTHER IS DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KORVIN: UH-HUH. I DIDN'T KNOW THAT BUT, YEAH, 1 DO KNOW, OKAY.

THE COURT: THAT IS ONE OF THE TWO ON THE DEATH PENALTY PHASE.

NOW, THE JURORS THEN HEAR ON THE PENALTY PHASE ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY THEY HAVEN'T HEARD BEFORE AND THAT ALL GOES TO THE QUESTION OF PERSUADING THE JURY FOR OR AGAINST ONE OF THOSE TWO PENALTIES.

THE DEFENDANT WILL INTRODUCE THE TESTIMONY TO SHOW, AND YOU MUST CONSIDER, TESTIMONY OF HIS AGE, LACK OF ANY PRIOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITY, HIS CHARACTER, HIS BACKGROUND AND EDUCATION, HIS PHYSICAL AND/OR MENTAL CONDITION, ANYTHING WHICH HE MAY PRODUCE, EVIDENCE TO SHOW FAVORABLE ASPECTS ABOUT HIMSELF IN THE HOPE THAT THE JURY WOULD GIVE HIM THE LESSER OF THE TWO PENALTIES, AND THOSE ARE CALLED MITIGATING OR EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE PROSECUTION, ON THE OTHER HAND, WOULD SHOW
AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, THINGS WHICH ARE BAD AND
UNFAVORABLE ABOUT THE DEFENDANT SO THAT THE ULTIMATE PENALTY
WILL BE RECOMMENDED BY THE JURY, FOUND BY THE JURY.

NOW WHAT WE ARE INTERESTED IN AT THIS PARTICULAR STAGE, AND THAT IS WHY YOU ARE HERE, IS TO FIND OUT WHAT YOUR ATTITUDE IS, YOUR MIND SET IS WITH RESPECT TO THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY AND WE ARE GOING TO PROBE YOUR MIND TO

FIND OUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT IT.

NOW I WILL ASK YOU FIVE QUESTIONS AND COUNSEL WILL ASK YOU ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS IN ORDER TO EXPLORE YOUR ATTITUDES AND YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY.

THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS I ASK WILL RELATE TO THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION AS TO THE DEATH PENALTY, WHATEVER THAT OPINION MAY BE, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. KORVIN: NO.

6

A ROBBERY, COMES UP.

NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH

PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING A FINDING ON THE

QUESTION OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE IN THIS CASE, WHETHER IT WAS

HE IS FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THE

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, IF IT OCCURRED DURING THE COURSE OF

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YOU REMEMBER I TOLD YOU THAT IF

MS. KORVIN: NO.

COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

THE COURT: NOW, THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS PRESUPPOSE THAT
THE JURY HAS REACHED A GUILTY VERDICT OF MURDER IN THE FIRST
DEGREE AND THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE WAS FOUND TO BE TRUE,
NAMELY, IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

NOW THIS IS ON THE PENALTY PHASE: DO YOU HAVE

ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU

AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF

ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF

THE TRIAL?

MS. KORVIN: NO.

THE COURT: NOW THE SAME THING APPLIES TO LIFE
IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE: DO YOU HAVE
SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD
AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY
OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED
AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. KORVIN: NO.

THE COURT: YOU REALIZE, OF COURSE, THAT THE ISSUE OF
THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE AND

17A

1 THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT 2 YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL? 3 MS. KORVIN: YES, SIR, YES. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 5 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 6 GOOD AFTERNOON, MS. KORWIN (SIC). 7 I AM ARTHUR BARENS AND I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, 8 JOE HUNT, AND AS WITH HIS HONOR, IT IS MY OBLIGATION AT THIS 9 POINT OF THESE PROCEEDINGS TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT 10 YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY. 11 MS. KORVIN: UH-HUH. 12 MR. BARENS: PLEASE UNDERSTAND THAT NONE OF US ARE GOING 13 TO BE JUDGING ANY OF YOUR ANSWERS AND THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR 14 WRONG ANSWERS TO ANY QUESTIONS. YOU CAN NEVER BE WRONG ABOUT 15 YOUR OWN OPINION. 16 MS. KORVIN: ALL RIGHT. 17 MR. BARENS: MRS. KORWIN --18 MS. KORVIN: KORVIN. 19 MR. BARENS: KORVIN. THERE IS A FELLOW NAMED KORWIN 20 WHO HAPPENS TO BE A VERY CLOSE FRIEND OF MINE. 21 MS. KORVIN: OH, I AM SORRY. 22 MR. BARENS: I AM GETTING YOU OVERLAPPED HERE. 23 BEFORE WE GET TO THAT, I JUST WANT TO REFLECT BACK 24 FOR A MOMENT TO THE LOS ANGELES TIMES ARTICLE YOU MADE 25 REFERENCE TO. WAS THAT THE ONLY SOURCE DOCUMENT YOU EVER READ 26 ANYTHING ABOUT THAT MIGHT INVOLVE THIS CASE? 27 MS. KORVIN: YES.

MR. BARENS: JUST THAT SINGLE ARTICLE?

MS. KORVIN: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: YOU ADVISED THE COURT THAT YOU RECALLED READING ABOUT A CLUB OF FELLOWS FROM A PREP SCHOOL AND THAT THERE HAD BEEN SOME BUSINESS DEALS AND ABOUT THIS AND THAT.

YOU DIDN'T MENTION ANYTHING ABOUT THE ARTICLE MAKING REFERENCE TO A MURDER; DO YOU RECALL THAT ARTICLE SAYING THAT?

MS. KORVIN: YEAH, I DO REMEMBER THERE WAS SOMETHING

ABOUT A MURDER BUT I DIDN'T -- I DIDN'T REMEMBER READING ANY
THING ABOUT A ROBBERY DURING THE MURDER.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, DO YOU REMEMBER AT THIS POINT, WHEN YOU MENTIONED THAT THE ARTICLE MADE REFERENCE TO A MURDER, DO YOU REMEMBER ANYTHING MORE ABOUT THE ARTICLE THAN WHAT YOU MENTIONED EARLIER TO THE JUDGE?

MS. KORVIN: NO, I DON'T.

MR. BARENS: AFTER READING THAT ARTICLE, DID YOU COME AWAY WITH AN IMPRESSION THAT THE MURDER HAD IN FACT TAKEN PLACE?

MS. KORVIN: THE ONE THING I REMEMBER IS THAT SOMEBODY
WAS MISSING, SO NO, I DIDN'T GET THE IMPRESSION THERE WAS A
MURDER BUT SOMEBODY WAS MISSING AND HADN'T BEEN FOUND OR
HADN'T BEEN LOCATED OR NOT HEARD OF IN A WHILE SO, NO, I DON'T.

MR. BARENS: BUT DO YOU FEEL CONFIDENT THAT YOU COULD PUT ALL OF THAT SORT OF NEWSPAPER ARTICLE OUT OF YOUR MIND ENTIRELY --

MS. KORVIN: YES.

MR. BARENS: -- AND IF YOU WERE SELECTED AS A JUROR,
YOU WOULD JUDGE THIS MATTER SOLELY ON WHAT YOU HEAR IN THIS
COURTROOM, PERIOD?

MS. KORVIN: YES.

\_

23 -

MR. BARENS: OKAY, THANK YOU.

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY?

MS. KORVIN: I AM VERY AMBIVALENT ON THE WHOLE SUBJECT AND I DON'T HAVE -- I DON'T HAVE A STAUNCH OPINION ON IT.

MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T HAVE TO.

AS YOU KNOW, BEFORE YOU WOULD EVER HAVE TO COME
TO EVER MAKING A DECISION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, YOU WOULD
FIRST, ALONG WITH THE OTHER JURORS, HAVE TO GET THROUGH THAT
GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL.

THAT YOU AND THE OTHER JURORS HAD COME TO A BELIEF BEYOND A
REASONABLE DOUBT THAT A MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE HAD
OCCURRED, THAT IS, A PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL MURDER AND THAT
IT WAS DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, SO NOW WE ARE THROUGH
WITH THAT GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL AND WE ARE ON TO THE PENALTY
PHASE; COULD YOU ON THAT PENALTY PHASE VOTE FOR LIFE
IMPRISONMENT, ARE YOU CAPABLE OF VOTING FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT
WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE FOR A DEFENDANT, WHO YOU
BELIEVED HAD COMMITTED A FIRST DEGREE MURDER?

MS. KORVIN: YES, I COULD.

MR. BARENS: AND WOULD YOU ALSO BE CAPABLE OF VOTING FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IF YOU FOUND THAT TO BE WHAT WAS APPROPRIATE FOR THAT SAME DEFENDANT?

MS. KORVIN: THAT IS A TOUGH ONE. I DON'T KNOW.

MR. BARENS: BEING A TOUGH ONE IS TOTALLY ACCEPTABLE.

AND I SHARE IT WITH YOU. IT COULD BE EXTREMELY HARD TO DO.

WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW IS, THAT YOU WOULD BE CAPABLE OF CONSIDERING THAT AS AN ALTERNATIVE, AS WELL AS CAPABLE FAIR-MINDEDLY OF CONSIDERING LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AS A POSSIBLE SENTENCE OR PUNISHMENT. COULD YOU CONSIDER BOTH?

MR. KOVIN: I COULD CONSIDER BOTH.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. AND YOU WOULD BE CAPABLE OF CONSIDERING BOTH?

MS. KORVIN: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, YOU REALIZE THAT THE LAW, ALTHOUGH
HIS HONOR ARTICULATES THAT THERE ARE 19 CATEGORIES OF CONDUCT,
THAT IF ONE IS CONVICTED OF THAT, IT MAKES ONE QUALIFIED -OR A DEFENDANT, QUALIFIED FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

MANDATORY, BUT RATHER, IT IS A DECISION FOR JURORS TO MAKE.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KORVIN: YES.

MR. BARENS: THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE A DECISION YOU WOULD INDIVIDUALLY HAVE TO MAKE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: ANSWER AUDIBLY, BECASUE SHE CANNOT GET A NOD OF THE HEAD.

MS. KORVIN: OKAY. I WILL. SORRY.

MR. BARENS: NOW, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IN CALIFORNIA,
ALL THAT THE PEOPLE, THE GOVERNMENT EVER HAS TO PROVE IN ANY
CRIMINAL CASE, BE IT A TRAFFIC TICKET OR A FIRST DEGREE MURDER
CASE, IS PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT?

1 MS. KORVIN: YES. 2 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? MS. KORVIN: YES. MR. BARENS: AND DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THAT IS ALL THAT 5 NEED BE ESTABLISHED? AND I DON'T MEAN TO MAKE THAT SOUND LIKE 6 A SMALL THING BY SAYING THAT THAT IS ALL THEY NEED TO DO. BUT 7 THAT IS A STANDARD. IRRESPECTIVE OF THE TYPE OF CASE. 8 MS. KORVIN: YES. 9 MR. BARENS: AND THAT EVEN THOUGH THERE MIGHT BE A DEATH 10 PENALTY SENTENCE AVAILABLE AS A PUNISHMENT, THAT NO GREATER 11 THRESHOLD OF PROOF NEED BE CROSSED? 12 MS. KORVIN: THAT'S CORRECT. 13 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU HAVE ANY BELIEF SYSTEMS 14 ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY OR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE 15 THAT YOU THINK YOU SHOULD TELL ME ABOUT THAT I HAVE NOT ASKED 16 YOU ABOUT? 17 MS. KORVIN: NO. 18 MR. BARENS: OKAY. HAVE YOU ALWAYS FELT PRETTY MUCH 19 THE SAME WAY IN YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AND 20 WHETHER IT IS APPROPRIATE OR NOT? 21 MS. KORVIN: YES. I HAVE. 22 MR. BARENS: NOW, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH YOU 23 MIGHT HAVE READ AN ARTICLE IN THE LOS ANGELES TIMES THAT IN 24 A WAY REFERENCED THIS CASE AND BECAUSE THE JUDGE HAS TALKED 25 TO YOU ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AND I HAVE TALKED TO YOU ABOUT 26 THE DEATH PENALTY AND MR. WAPNER WILL MOMENTARILY, THAT THERE 27 IS NO REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE AS A RESULT OF THAT, THAT JOE 28 HUNT HAS DONE ANYTHING WRONG, JUST BECAUSE WE ARE HERE TALKING

ABOUT THAT? MS. KORVIN: THAT'S CORRECT. MR. BARENS: HE HAS WHAT IS CALLED A PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, THE SAME WAY YOU WOULD OR ANYBODY ELSE WOULD IN THIS COUNTRY, IF THEY WERE ON TRIAL. MS. KORVIN: OF COURSE. MR. BARENS: THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. THE DEFENSE WOULD PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. WAPNER: GOOD AFTERNOON, MS. KORVIN. I AM FRED WAPNER, THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY WHO IS PROSECUTING THIS CASE. TELL ME WHAT YOU MEANT WHEN YOU SAID YOU COULD CONSIDER BOTH PUNISHMENTS. MS. KORVIN: WELL, THOSE ARE THE ONLY TWO CHOICES, RIGHT? 

MR. WAPNER: IF YOU GET TO THAT POINT IN THE CASE, IF MS. KORVIN: THAT'S CORRECT. I COULD CONSIDER IT ONLY BECAUSE I AM A RATIONAL HUMAN BEING AND I ALWAYS CONSIDER MR. WAPNER: OKAY. LISTENING TO BOTH SIDES AND THINKING ABOUT IT IS ONE THING. ACTING ON IT IS SOMETHING ELSE. MS. KORVIN: THAT'S CORRECT. MR. WAPNER: OKAY. NOW, WHEN WE GET DOWN AND OUT OF THE CEREBRAL AND INTO THE PRACTICAL, EVERY-DAY WORLD, IF RATIONALLY YOU FELT THAT THE DEATH PENALTY WAS THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT, COULD YOU THEN ACT ON THAT DECISION? MR. BARENS: I WOULD OBJECT TO THAT, YOUR HONOR. HE IS ASKING HER TO PRE-COMMIT HERSELF TO A JUDGMENT THAT SHE THE COURT: NO. I THINK THAT THE QUESTION IS A PROPER MR. BARENS: IF THE QUESTION INVOLVES THE WORD "CAPABLE" IT IS AN APPROPRIATE QUESTION. MR. WAPNER: I THINK IT IS "CAN". MR. BARENS: "CAPABLE" IS MORE ACCURATE, MORE ARTICULATED THE COURT: "CAN" MEANS IS ABLE TO. MR. BARENS: LIKE THE WORD "CAPABLE". THANK YOU, YOUR

MR. WAPNER: THE QUESTION IS, IF YOU HAVE MADE A DECISION

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

RATIONALLY OR IF YOU BELIEVE RATIONALLY THAT THE DEATH PENALTY IS THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT, CAN YOU ACT ON THAT?

MS. KORVIN: I CAN.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. NOW, BEFORE, I BELIEVE YOUR WORDS WERE "I DON'T KNOW IF I COULD VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY." WHAT DID YOU MEAN BY THAT?

MS. KORVIN: I DON'T KNOW IF I COULD VOTE FOR IT. I HAVE NEVER BEEN ASKED TO BEFORE. IT IS YOU KNOW -- IT SOUNDS GOOD WHEN YOU READ ABOUT IT IN THE PAPER OR YOU HEAR ABOUT AN INSTANCE WHERE MAYBE SOMETHING BAD HAPPENED. MAYBE YOU THINK SOMEONE SHOULD DIE BECAUSE OF IT.

BUT I JUST DON'T KNOW IF I COULD VOTE FOR IT OR NOT. YOU KNOW, IF MY HUSBAND WAS MURDERED TOMORROW IN A ROBBERY AT 7-ELEVEN, I DON'T KNOW I WOULD FEEL. I WOULD PROBABLY, MORE THAN LIKELY, VOTE FOR IT.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. BUT YOU --

MS. KORVIN: BUT IF I DON'T BELIEVE IN IT, IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT YOU KNOW -- IT IS HARD FOR ME TO PIN IT DOWN. IT WOULD HAVE TO DEPEND UPON THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

MR. WAPKER: I UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS A VERY HARD DECISION TO ASK ANYBODY TO HAVE TO MAKE. BECAUSE OF THE WAY THE SYSTEM IS STRUCTURED, WE CAN'T ASK YOU THIS QUESTION LATER. ONCE YOU GET INTO THE JURY ROOM, IT IS TOO LATE.

SO, WE HAVE TO ASK YOU NOW. I DON'T KNOW IF THIS WILL HELP YOU, BUT TRY TO IMAGINE YOURSELF IN A SITUATION WHERE YOU HAVE FOUND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF AN INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING A ROBBERY.

AND YOU HAVE LISTENED TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ON

THE PENALTY PHASE AND NOW YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM DECIDING
THE QUESTION OF GUILT OR INNOCENCE. I HAVE BEEN HERE TOO LONG.

NOW, YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM DECIDING THE

QUESTION OF WHAT THE APPROPRIATE PENALTY SHOULD BE. AND YOUR

ONLY CHOICES ARE LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH

IN THE GAS CHAMBER. CAN YOU IMAGINE YOURSELF IN THAT

SITUATION?

MS. KORVIN: UH-HUH.

MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE TO SAY YES OR NO.

MS. KORVIN: YES.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. AND IF YOU HAVE DECIDED -- WELL, FIRST OF ALL, THE JUDGE WILL TELL YOU THAT EVEN THOUGH IT REQUIRES A UNANIMOUS JURY TO ARRIVE AT A VERDICT, EACH JUROR IS REQUIRED TO RENDER HIS OWN, INDIVIDUAL OPINION ON THE OUESTION. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KORVIN: YES.

MR. WAPNER: SO, YOU CAN'T BE DICTATED TO BY 11 PEOPLE OR ANY OF THE PEOPLE IN THE JURY ROOM. YOU HAVE TO MAKE UP YOUR OWN MIND.

IF YOU DECIDE IN YOUR OWN MIND THAT THE DEATH

PENALTY IS THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT, DO YOU THINK THAT YOU

ARE CAPABLE OF RENDERING A VERDICT FOR THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. BARENS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION. HE
IS ASKING HER IF SHE COULD VOTE FOR SOMETHING. AND I DON'T
BELIEVE THAT IS PERMISSIBLE. IT IS NOT PERMISSIBLE THAT EITHER
SIDE ASK IF THEY CAN VOTE THIS WAY OR THAT WAY.

THE COURT: THAT SHE WOULD BE CAPABLE OF DOING IT, THAT IS ALL. HOW ELSE CAN HE FIND OUT, IF SHE BECOMES A JUROR,

WHETHER OR NOT THE FACTS JUSTIFY IT, IF SHE WOULD VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, UNLESS HE ASKS HER THAT?

MR. BARENS: THE WAY THE QUESTION HAS NOW BEEN STRUCTURED,
YOUR HONOR, SHE HAS BEEN GIVEN A SITUATION WHERE HE IS SAYING
THAT SHE HAS ALREADY CONVICTED THE GUY, WILL SHE VOTE FOR THE
DEATH PENALTY. IT IS --

THE COURT: NO, HE WANTS TO KNOW WHETHER OR NOT SHE IS CAPABLE, IF THE CIRCUMSTANCES WARRANT IT, OF VOTING FOR THE DEATH PENALTY. IS THAT RIGHT?

MR. WAPNER: THAT'S CORRECT.

THE COURT: WOULD YOU BE CAPABLE OF VOTING FOR THE DEATH PENALTY?

MS. KORVIN: I WOULD BE CAPABLE OF IT. I AM NOT SAYING
I WOULD. I AM CAPABLE OF IT.

MR. WAPNER: I AM NOT ASKING YOU, BECAUSE YOU HAVE NOT HEARD THE FACTS OF THE CASE --

MS. KORVIN: RIGHT. I DON'T KNOW.

MR. WAPNER: ALL I AM TRYING TO FIND OUT IS, WHETHER OR NOT YOU ARE ABLE TO GIVE THE PROSECUTION A FAIR TRIAL.

MS. KORVIN: YES, OF COURSE.

MR. WAPNER: I REALIZE THAT WHEN WE PUT IT IN THAT CONTEXT, THAT EVERYONE SAYS, "OF COURSE," WE CAN BE FAIR.

WHAT IT REALLY COMES DOWN TO IS, IF YOU ARE A JUROR AND I AM ARGUING TO YOU ON THE PENALTY PHASE AND MY ARGUMENT IS THAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE DEATH, BUT YOU ARE REALLY LOOKING AT ME AND SAYING WELL, I DON'T CARE WHAT HE SAYS, WHEN IT COMES DOWN TO IT, DOWN TO THE NITTY-GRITTY, REGARDLESS OF THE EVIDENCE, I COULDN'T BRING MYSELF TO VOTE FOR THAT VERDICT.

MS. KORVIN: NO. I DON'T FEEL THAT WAY.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONGLY HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

OR MORAL BELIEFS THAT YOU THINK WOULD BEAR UPON YOUR ABILITY

TO BE A FAIR JUROR IN THIS CASE?

MS. KORVIN: NO.

MR. WAPNER: CAN YOU DECIDE THE QUESTION OF GUILT OR INNOCENCE WITHOUT THINKING ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO THE DEFENDANT IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY?

MS. KORVIN: YES.

MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU REQUIRE THE PROSECUTION TO HAVE MORE EVIDENCE OR REQUIRE THE PROSECUTION TO PROVE THIS CASE TO YOU BY A HIGHER STANDARD OF PROOF BECAUSE YOU KNOW THAT THE DEATH PENALTY MIGHT BE INVOLVED AT SOME POINT?

MR. BARENS: HIGHER STANDARD OF PROOF, MEANING BEYOND
A REASONABLE DOUBT?

MR. WAPNER: HIGHER THAN THAT.

THE COURT: DO YOU KNOW IN EVERY CRIMINAL CASE, THE SAME STANDARD APPLIES? A DEFENDANT IS PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT UNTIL THE CONTRARY IS PROVED.

IN THE CASE OF A REASONABLE DOUBT WHETHER HIS GUILT IS SATISFACTORILY SHOWN, HE IS ENTITLED TO A VERDICT OF NOT GUILTY.

WOULD YOU EXPECT A HIGHER STANDARD IN THIS CASE?

IN OTHER WORDS, BEYOND ANY DOUBT, BECAUSE IT HAPPENED TO BE

A MURDER CASE?

MS. KORVIN: NO, JUST REASONABLE DOUBT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.

MR. WAPNER: I PASS FOR CAUSE.

THE COURT: BOTH SIDES HAVE PASSED FOR CAUSE. WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT YOU ARE SELECTED AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE. YOU ARE QUALIFIED TO PASS UPON THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE AND ALSO THE PENALTY IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE.

WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO, IS, WE HAVE TO GO
THROUGH THE ENTIRE LIST BY MONDAY MORNING. I WILL ASK YOU
TO COME BACK ON MONDAY MORNING TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AT
10:30. WE WILL BE READY TO GO AHEAD. OKAY? DON'T READ

```
1
     ANYTHING ABOUT THE CASE.
 2
           MS. KORVIN: NO. I WON'T.
 3
                 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR KORVIN EXITS THE
 4
                 COURTROOM.)
 5
                 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR KUBECK ENTERS THE
 6
                 COURTROOM.)
 7
           THE COURT: IS IT MISS OR MRS.?
 8
           MS. KUBECK: MRS.
 9
           THE COURT: MRS. KUBECK, WHERE DO YOU LIVE?
10
           MS. KUBECK: TOPANGA.
11
           THE COURT: HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS
12
     CASE OR HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT IT?
13
          MS. KUBECK: NO.
14
          THE COURT: HAVE YOU TALKED TO ANYBODY ABOUT IT?
15
          MS. KUBECK: NO.
16
           THE COURT: DOES THE EXPRESSION "BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB"
17
     RING A BELL IN YOUR MIND?
18
          MS. KUBECK: NO. SOMEBODY MENTIONED THAT THAT IS WHAT
19
     IT WAS, BUT THAT IS ABOUT ALL. I DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ELSE.
20
          THE COURT: WHAT DID YOU HEAR FROM ANYBODY?
21
          MS. KUBECK: MY MOTHER-IN-LAW SAID IT WAS A VERY COMPLICATED
22
     CASE.
23
          THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WHAT DID SHE TELL YOU? ANY
24
    FACTS?
25
          MS. KUBECK: NO. SHE SAID SHE'S NOT SUPPOSED TO.
26
          THE COURT: I SEE. HOW LONG AGO WAS THAT?
27
          MS. KUBECK: IT WAS MONDAY NIGHT.
28
          THE COURT: THAT IS WHEN YOU KNEW AND SHE KNEW THAT YOU
```

18C

1 MIGHT BE A POSSIBLE JUROR IN THIS CASE. IS THAT RIGHT? 2 MS. KUBECK: NO, NO. 1 DID NOT KNOW I WOULD BE -- I 3 DIDN'T EVEN KNOW THE CASE. I DIDN'T HEAR THE NAME. 4 SHE SAID SHE HOPED IT WAS NOT THE SO AND SO CASE. 5 AND I ASKED WHAT THAT WAS. BECAUSE SHE SAID IT WAS A VERY 6 COMPLICATED CASE BUT SHE COULDN'T TELL ME ABOUT IT. I SAID 7 THAT MAYBE IT WAS IT. 8 THE COURT: SHE KNEW YOU WERE GOING TO BE A JUROR? 9 MS. KUBECK: SHE KNEW THAT I WAS GOING TO BE A JUROR. 10 THE COURT: I SEE. WELL, YOU UNDERSTAND OF COURSE, THAT 11 IF YOU ARE A JUROR ON THIS CASE, FROM NOW ON YOU ARE NOT TO 12 TALK TO ANYBODY ABOUT THIS? 13 MS. KUBECK: YES. I UNDERSTAND. YES. 14 THE COURT: YOU ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO READ ANYTHING ABOUT 15 IT? 16 MS. KUBECK: YES. I UNDERSTAND. 17 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU REMEMBER THAT ON MONDAY, 18 I GAVE YOU A GENERAL OUTLINE, AN IDEA WHAT THE CASE WAS ABOUT. 19 I TOLD YOU AT THAT TIME THAT THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED WITH 20 THE COMMISSION OF THE CRIME OF MURDER AND IT IS MURDER IN THE 21 FIRST DEGREE COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. 22 PARENTHETICALLY, MERELY BECAUSE SOMEBODY IS CHARGED 23 WITH A CRIME DOESN'T MEAN THAT HE IS GUILTY OF THAT CRIME. 24 25 26 27

19

28

IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT BECAUSE THERE IS SMOKE THERE
IS FIRE NECESSARILY, YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. KUBECK: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: SO YOU START ANEW WITH A PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, THAT THE DEFENDANT IS PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT UNTIL HE IS PROVED GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.

MS. KUBECK: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: AND THAT WILL ALL BE DEFINED FOR YOU IF YOU BECOME A JUROR IN THE CASE.

NOW, THE JURY SELECTED IN THIS CASE STARTS OFF
WITH THE GUILT PHASE OF THE CASE. THE GUILT PHASE IS: IS
THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE OR ISN'T
HE?

IF HE ISN'T, THAT IS THE END OF IT.

IF THE CURY FINDS HE IS GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THEY HAVE TO ANSWER ANOTHER QUESTION: IS IT TRUE OR IS IT FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

AND WHY IT IS IMPORTANT, AS I INDICATED, I THINK,
TO THE OTHER JURORS, IS THAT IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY MEANS
THAT THAT CASE QUALIFIES FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

ONLY THOSE MURDERS WHICH THE LEGISLATURE SAID, IF THOSE MURDERS WERE COMMITTED UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THEN THE DEATH PENALTY WILL BE APPLICABLE AND MURDER COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY IS ONE. MURDER COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A BURGLARY OR RAPE OR KIDNAPPING OR CHILD MOLESTATION AND THE CHILD DIES, OR TORTURE, OR MULTIPLE MURDERS, TOGETHER

WITH A NUMBER OF OTHERS THE LEGISLATURE SAID, THOSE CASES QUALIFY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

NOW, THE JURY THAT WILL BE IMPANELED IN THIS CASE

AND FINALLY SELECTED WILL HAVE TO DETERMINE FIRST, AS I TOLD

YOU, WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY

AND IF HE IS FOUND GUILTY, THEN WHETHER OR NOT THE SPECIAL

CIRCUMSTANCE HAS BEEN PROVEN TO BE TRUE. IF THEY SAY YES,

IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY IF HE IS FOUND

GUILTY --

AND BY THE WAY, DURING THE GUILT PHASE THE QUESTION

OF PENALTY DOESN'T COME UP AT ALL. IT IS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED

BY THE JURY UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES.

THEY SAY YES, THEN WE HAVE A SECOND TRIAL CALLED THE SECOND PHASE, WHICH IS THE PENALTY PHASE WHERE WE HAVE OTHER TESTIMONY THAT COMES IN WHICH YOU HAVEN'T HEARD BEFORE, AND THAT RELATES, FROM THE DEFENDANT'S STANDPOINT AS TO HIM, YOU MUST CONSIDER HIS AGE, ANY PREVIOUS CRIMINAL BACKGROUND, IF ANY, IF THERE IS NONE, THEN IT IS A FAVORABLE ASPECT, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS CHARACTER, HIS MENTAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITION AND ANY FAVORABLE ASPECTS ABOUT HIS LIFE OR HIS PERSON, THEY MAY BE CONSIDERED BY THE JURY.

AND THE REASON FOR THAT IS SO THAT IT CAN MITIGATE
THE OFFENSE. IN OTHER WORDS, INSTEAD OF HAVING THE ULTIMATE
PENALTY, THERE MAY BE SOME LESSER PENALTY THAT MIGHT BE
INFLICTED UPON HIM.

MS. KUBECK: EVEN THOUGH THE DEATH PENALTY IS SUPPOSED TO BE FOR THAT CRIME?

THE COURT: ONE OF THE TWO FOR THAT CRIME, YES.

1 AFTER HE IS FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST 2 DEGREE, IF YOU DO --

MS. KUBECK: OKAY.

THE COURT: -- THEN YOU CONSIDER ONE OF THOSE TWO
PENALTIES: LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE,
AND THAT MEANS EXACTLY THAT.

SOMETIMES PEOPLE HAVE A MISCONCEPTION, WHEN THEY

ARE CONVICTED AND SENT TO PRISON FOR LIFE WITHOUT THE

POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, THEY THINK THEY CAN GET OUT. HE WOULDN'T

GET OUT. HE CAN'T GET OUT. HE STAYS THERE FOR THE REST OF

HIS LIFE.

OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

THOSE ARE THE ALTERNATIVES.

ALL RIGHT, SO AFTER HEARING ALL OF THE EVIDENCE FAVORABLE TO THE DEFENDANT AND UNFAVORABLE TO THE DEFENDANT THAT THE PROSECUTION WILL ADDUCE, THE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, WE CALL THEM, THEN THE JURY MAKES UP ITS MIND AS TO WHAT IT WANTS TO IMPOSE, ONE OF THE TWO PENALTIES, IF THEY MAKE UP THEIR MINDS AT ALL.

NOW, SINCE THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY IS
INVOLVED, WE ARE HAVING THESE HEARINGS AND ASKING EACH
INDIVIDUAL JUROR WHAT THEIR MIND SET IS ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY,
EXPLORING YOUR FEELINGS AND YOUR THOUGHTS ON THE SUBJECT AND
YOUR ATTITUDES TOWARD IT.

I AM GOING TO ASK YOU FIVE QUESTIONS AND THERE WILL BE A NUMBER OF OTHERS WHICH WILL BE ASKED BY COUNSEL.

AND THESE FIVE QUESTIONS ARE -- THE FIRST TWO

HAVE TO DO WITH THE GUILT PHASE, NOT THE PENALTY BUT THE GUILT

19AE

6

PHASE OF IT, GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION

AS TO THE DEATH PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHICH WILL PREVENT

YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR

INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. KUBECK: NO, I DON'T THINK SO.

THE COURT: NOW, THE SECOND PART OF THAT, ALSO ON THE GUILT PHASE, HAS TO DO WITH THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, WHETHER ITWAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION WITH RESPECT TO THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, AS TO WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MS. KUBECK: NO, I DON'T.

THE COURT: THE NEXT PRESUPPOSES THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN CONVICTED OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

THE NEXT QUESTION I AM GOING TO ASK YOU IS: DO
YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD
CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY,
REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY
PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. KUBECK: NO, I DON'T THINK SO.

THE COURT: THE SAME THING HAS TO DO WITH LIFE

IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE: DO YOU HAVE

SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD

AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY

OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED

ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. KUBECK: NO. I DON'T.

THE COURT: NOW YOU UNDERSTAND, OF COURSE, THAT THE

ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS

CASE AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE

EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MS. KUBECK: YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT A VERY DEFINITE MIND SET ON THE DEATH PENALTY, RIGHT?

THE COURT: WELL, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHATEVER YOUR FEELINGS ARE.

MS. KUBECK: NO, OH, NO. I DON'T HAVE ANY.

THE COURT: WHATEVER YOUR FEELINGS MAY BE, THESE

QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ON THE ASSUMPTION -- YOU MAY OR

YOU MAY NOT HAVE AN OPINION ONE WAY OR THE OTHER AND YOU MAY

\_

•

0

HAVE VERY DEFINITE OPINIONS ONE WAY OR THE OTHER AND THAT IS WHAT I AM TRYING TO FIND AND THAT IS WHAT COUNSEL ARE GOING TO BE FINDING OUT.

MR. BARENS: GOOD AFTERNOON, MS. KUBECK.

MS. KUBECK: GOOD AFTERNOON.

MR. BARENS: I AM MR. ARTHUR BARENS AND I REPRESENT

JOE HUNT, AND AS HIS HONOR TOLD YOU, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, AS I AM OBLIGED TO

DO. THE WAY THESE PROCEEDINGS GO FORWARD.

PRELIMINARILY, LET ME INDICATE THAT THERE IS NO WRONG OR RIGHT ANSWER. NO ONE IS JUDGING YOUR OPINIONS AND WE ARE JUST SEEKING YOUR OPINION AND YOU CAN NEVER BE WRONG ABOUT YOUR OPINION.

MS. KUBECK: I UNDERSTAND.

MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY
AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY?

MS. KUBECK: UNDECIDED. I CAN'T SAY HOW I DO FEEL.

DO YOU WANT MY TOTAL OPINIONS?

MR. BARENS: YES.

MS. KUBECK: OH, WELL, INTELLECTUALLY, I AM AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY, VERY MUCH AGAINST IT.

PERHAPS IF THE CRIME WERE SO HORRIBLE, EMOTIONALLY,

I PROBABLY WOULD MAYBE FEEL, YOU KNOW, MORE TOWARD THE DEATH

PENALTY BUT INTELLECTUALLY, I AM AGAINST IT.

MR. BARENS: AND I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH THAT.

WHAT WE NEED TO FIND OUT IS WHETHER OR NOT DURING

THAT SECOND PENALTY PHASE -- AND YOU SEE WHAT THIS IS ALL

ABOUT IS FINDING OUT WHETHER OR NOT WHEN WE HAVE A JUROR SUCH

19A-3

AS YOURSELF --

MS. KUBECK: YES.

MR. BARENS: -- WHETHER YOU CAN GIVE A FAIR TRIAL TO BOTH SIDES.

MS. KUBECK: YES.

MR. BARENS: -- THE PROSECUTION'S SIDE AND THE DEFENSE

SIDE AND FOR THAT TO BE, WE NEED TO KNOW WHETHER YOU ARE

CAPABLE AND OPEN-MINDED OF CONSIDERING THE DEATH PENALTY AND

CAPABLE OF CONSIDERING LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY

OF PAROLE, IF WE EVER COME TO THAT IN A PENALTY PHASE.

MS. KUBECK: I THINK I AM CAPABLE OF EITHER DECISION, YES.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ONLY TIME
WE ARE EVER GOING TO DISCUSS THIS WITH YOU AGAIN WOULD BE
AT A JUNCTURE WHERE YOU AND ELEVEN OTHER LURORS, IF YOU WERE
SELECTED, WOULD HAVE ALREADY MADE A DETERMINATION THAT A FIRST
DEGREE, PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL MURDER HAD OCCURRED DURING
THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MS. KUBECK: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KUBECK: YES, I DO.

MR. BARENS: AND NOW THE QUESTION BEING PUT TO YOU IS: WHAT SHOULD WE DO WITH THE DEFENDANT BY WAY OF PENALTY, DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

(MS. KUBECK NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

MR. BARENS: NOW, DURING THAT PART OF THE PROCESS,

COUNSEL WOULD BE GIVING YOU NEW EVIDENCE, AS HIS HONOR

REFERENCED, CONCERNING THE BACKGROUND OF THE DEFENDANT, HIS

AGE AT THE TIME OF THE ALLEGED COMMISSION OF THE CRIME, WHETHER HE HAD A CRIMINAL RECORD PRIOR THERETO, ET CETERA; WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO CONSIDER THAT EVIDENCE IN MAKING YOUR DECISION ON LIFE OR DEATH?

MS. KUBECK: YES. YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO, AREN'T YOU?

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO. SO, YOU WOULD BE INSTRUCTED TO DO THAT BY THE JUDGE.

MS. KUBECK: YES.

MR. BARENS: THAT IS ALL IT IS. I REALIZE THAT THE DEATH PENALTY IS AN ALTERNATIVE THAT IS HARSH AND A HARD DECISION TO EVER HAVE TO MAKE. WHAT I AM SEEKING TO RECONFIRM IS, THAT YOU WOULD BE CAPABLE OF CONSIDERING THAT ALTERNATIVE, AS WELL AS CAPABLE OF CONSIDERING THE ALTERNATIVE OF LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. IS THAT TRUE?

MS. KUBECK: I THINK SO.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. NOW. YOU WOULD BE INSTRUCTED AT A POINT IN TIME AND THE JUDGE MADE PASSING REFERENCE TO THE FACT THAT WHAT IS OBLIGATED FOR THE PEOPLE, THE GOVERNMENT IN THIS TYPE OF A CASE, IS THAT THEY PROVE THE CASE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. WHETHER IT BE A TICKET OR A MURDER CASE, IT IS THE SAME STANDARD OF PROOF. IT IS NOT TO AN ABSOLUTE DOUBT.

WE DON'T EVEN BELIEVE IN ABSOLUTE. BUT IT IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT BECAUSE IT IS A MURDER CASE, THAT THE PEOPLE ARE NOT HELD TO A HIGHER LEVEL OF PROOF THAN BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT?

MS. KUBECK: OKAY. YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? YOU WOULDN'T EXPECT ANY SORT OF ABSOLUTE PROOF OR YOU WOULDN'T EXPECT THEM TO DO MORE THAN THAT, JUST BECAUSE THERE IS A POSSIBILITY OF A DEATH PENALTY, AS WELL AS A POSSIBILITY OF LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MS. KUBECK: ARE YOU SAYING THAT THE EVIDENCE DOESN'T

HAVE TO BE AS ABSOLUTE IF A MURDER CASE IS -- AS 1T DOES IN 1 OTHER CASES? 2 3 MR. BARENS: YOU SEE, IN ALL CRIMINAL CASES, ALL CRIMINAL CASES, TRAFFIC TICKETS, MURDER, RAPE, BURGLARY, 5 FOREGERY, COUNTERFEITING, THE WHOLE GAMUT OF ALL THOSE CRIMES THAT WE GET INVOLVED IN AS LAWYERS, OF COURSE, THE ONLY 6 STANDARD OF PROOF THAT THE GOVERNMENT EVER HAS TO ESTABLISH 7 8 IS CALLED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. THAT IS ALL THEY HAVE 9 TO PROVE. 10 THE FACT THAT THERE COULD BE A PENALTY INVOLVING THE DEATH PENALTY OR A PENALTY INVOLVING THREE WEEKS IN THE 11 COUNTY JAIL, NONETHELESS, THE ONLY BURDEN OF PROOF THE 12 13 GOVERNMENT EVER HAS TO SHOW IS SOMETHING BEYOND A REASONABLE 14 DOUBT. 15 MS. KUBECK: OKAY. 16 MR. BARENS: CAN YOU ACCEPT THAT? 17 MS. KUBECK: YES. 18 MR. BARENS: AND WOULD YOU NOT HOLD THE PEOPLE TO A 19 HIGHER STANDARD OF CARE? 20 MS. KUBECK: I UNDERSTAND BECAUSE OF THE EXTREME --21 OKAY. I UNDERSTAND, YES. 22 MR. BARENS: OKAY? 23 MS. KUBECK: YES. 24 MR. BARENS: BUT YOU KNOW THEY HAVE TO AT LEAST, PROVE 25 THEIR CASE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT? 26 MS. KUBECK: I UNDERSTAND.

27 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH I SAY "AT 28 LEAST," THAT DOESN'T MEAN TO SAY THAT IT ISN'T A SIGNIFICANT

BURDEN THAT THOSE FOLKS HAVE? 1 MS. KUBECK: UH-HUH. 2 MR. BARENS: DO YOU ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT THE LAW NEVER 3 SAYS THAT THE DEATH PENALTY IS MANDATORY FOR ANY SORT OF 4 CIRCUMSTANCES. DO YOU KNOW THAT? 5 MS. KUBECK: NO. 6 MR. BARENS: OKAY. IN CALIFORNIA, YOU NEVER HAVE TO 7 GIVE ANYBODY THE DEATH PENALTY FOR ANYTHING. THAT IS SIMPLY, 8 A DECISION TO BE MADE BY JURORS. 9 ONLY YOU AS A JUROR AND IN CONCERT WITH THE OTHER 10 JURORS, CAN MAKE THAT DECISION. THE JUDGE CAN'T MAKE THAT. 11 12 WE CERTAINLY CAN'T. THE LEGISLATURE DOESN'T MAKE THAT. THAT IS YOUR 13 INDIVIDUAL DECISION. 14 MS. KUBECK: OKAY. 15 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 16 MS. KUBECK: YES. 17 MR. BARENS: NOW, DO YOU REALIZE THAT ALTHOUGH WE ARE 18 HERE TALKING ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY AND YOUR MOTHER-IN-LAW 19 MIGHT HAVE HEARD SOMETHING ABOUT THIS, THAT THERE IS NO 20 INDICATION THAT JOE HUNT HAS DONE ANYTHING WRONG, JUST BECAUSE 21 22 WE ARE HERE DISCUSSING IT? 23 MS. KUBECK: OF COURSE. MR. BARENS: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT HE HAS THE SAME 24 PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE THAT YOU WOULD OR ANYONE ELSE WOULD, 25

27

26

MS. KUBECK: I UNDERSTAND THAT.

IF THEY WERE CHARGED WITH THE CRIME?

28 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS VIRTUALLY

WITHOUT PRECEDENT THAT A JUDGE CAN SANCTION YOUR NOT SPEAKING TO YOUR MOTHER-IN-LAW ABOUT SOMETHING? THAT WAS A BIT OF A JOKE, MA'AM. MS. KUBECK: SHE SPOKE TO ME. I DIDN'T SPEAK TO HER. MR. BARENS: I WAS JUST TEASING. THE COURT: HE IS MAKING A JOKE. MR. BARENS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. ô THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MR. WAPNER? 2 

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. WAPNER: GOOD AFTERNOON, MRS. KUBECK. I DIDN'T QUITE UNDERSTAND. YOUR MOTHER-IN-LAW JUST REFRAINED FROM TALKING TO YOU ABOUT --MS. KUBECK: NO. DO YOU WANT ME TO TELL YOU THE WHOLE CONVERSATION? MR. WAPNER: YES, PLEASE. MS. KUBECK: SHE WAS ON JURY DUTY FOR FOUR MONTHS AT ONE TIME. AND SO SHE WAS INTERESTED. SHE KNEW THAT I WAS ON JURY DUTY. AND SHE SAID -- SHE ASKED IF I HAD GOT SELECTED FOR A PANEL YET. I SAID NO. AND SHE SAID THAT SHE HOPED IT WAS NOT -- I DIDN'T ABOUT THE CASE.

HEAR THE NAME. I REALLY DIDN'T BECAUSE I DIDN'T KNOW ANYTHING

I ASKED WHAT THAT WAS.

SHE SAID IT IS GOING TO BE A LONG TRIAL. AND I ASKED WHAT IT WAS ABOUT.

SHE SAID IT WAS ABOUT A MURDER AND SHE SAID THAT IT WAS A VERY COMPLICATED TRIAL AND IT WOULD BE A LONG ONE.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND THE CASE THAT SHE SAT ON DIDN'T HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THIS CASE?

MS. KUBECK: NO. NO, IT WAS 20 YEARS AGO.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THAT IS THE ONLY PART OF THAT, THAT I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND. I KEPT WRITING NOTES TO MYSELF ABOUT WHO THE MOTHER-IN-LAW WAS AND DID SHE SIT AS A JUROR.

MS. KUBECK: NO, NO. SORRY. SORRY, I AM JUST TRYING TO --

THE COURT: I AM GLAD THAT YOU TOLD US. IT IS PERFECTLY PROPER.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MS. KUBECK: YES. WHAT I WANTED TO EXPLAIN WAS THAT

I DIDN'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THE CASE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MS. KUBECK: AND SHE SAID THAT SHE COULDN'T UNDERSTAND. AND I SAID THAT I HAD BEEN OUT OF THE COUNTRY. SO I DIDN'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT IT.

THE COURT: THAT IS THE END OF THAT. NOW, LET'S GET ON TO SOMETHING ELSE.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. TELL ME HOW LONG YOU HAVE FELT THAT WAY ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, INTELLECTUALLY, VERY STRONGLY AGAINST IT.

MS. KUBECK: HOW LONG HAVE I FELT THAT WAY? WHEN I WAS VERY YOUNG, I WAS VERY LIBERAL.

THE COURT: WHAT?

MS. KUBECK: WHEN I WAS YOUNG I WAS VERY LIBERAL.

THE COURT: LIBERAL?

MS. KUBECK: AS I GET OLDER, I AM PROBABLY LESS LIBERAL.

MAYBE I KNOW MORE ABOUT LIFE. AND I HAVE -- I GUESS I HAVE SEEN GRAYS MORE THAN BLACKS AND WHITES. THAT IS ABOUT AS CLEAR AS I CAN GET TO IT.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. AND WHEN YOU SAY THAT YOU WERE INTELLECTUALLY VERY MUCH AGAINST IT, WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THAT?

MS. KUBECK: WELL, I MEAN THAT IF NOBODY IN THE WORLD INCLUDING A STATE COULD EVER PUT ANYBODY TO DEATH, WE WOULD NEVER HAVE WARS. WE WOULD NEVER HAVE YOU KNOW, STATES PUTTING PEOPLE TO DEATH FOR POLITICAL REASONS. THAT IS WHAT I MEAN.

MR. WAPNER: HOW DOES THAT TRANSLATE INTO YOUR ABILITY TO BE --

```
MS. KUBECK: IT IS JUST A THOUGHT. IT WOULD BE NICE
1
     IF SOCIETY WERE THAT WAY. THAT IS WHAT I MEAN.
2
          MR. WAPNER: OKAY. YOU HAVE TO DO ME ONE FAVOR --
3
          MS. KUBECK: OKAY.
          THE COURT: YOU MEAN ALL OF THIS IS JUST AN
5
     INTELLECTUAL EXERCISE? IS THAT WHAT YOU MEAN?
6
          MS. KUBECK: NO. I FEEL VERY DEEPLY ABOUT THE SUBJECT.
7
    AND I WOULD BE VERY SERIOUS ABOUT IT.
8
                 THAT IS WHAT I MEAN. THAT IS WHAT I AM TRYING
9
    TO IMPART. I DON'T HAVE LIGHT FEELINGS ABOUT TAKING A LIFE
10
    BY A STATE OR THE INDIVIDUAL.
11
          MR. WAPNER: OKAY.
12
13
          MS. KUBECK: THAT'S ALL.
          MR. WAPNER: I UNDERSTAND. THE FAVOR THAT I AM GOING
14
    TO ASK OF YOU IS, THIS NICE, YOUNG LADY SITTING BETWEEN US
15
    CAN ONLY WRITE DOWN ONE PERSON TALKING AT A TIME. SO --
16
          MS. KUBECK: DID I INTERRUPT YOU?
17
          MR. WAPNER: JUST WAIT UNTIL I AM FINISHED WITH --
18
19
          MS. KUBECK: OKAY.
          MR. WAPNER: NOW, CONSIDER THE STRENGTH OF YOUR FEELINGS
20
     ABOUT THE STATE TAKING SOMEONE'S LIFE, DO YOU THINK THAT WERE
21
    YOU TO BE A JUROR ON THIS CASE, YOU COULD RECONCILE YOUR
22
    OPINION WITH BEING A PARTICIPANT WITH ELEVEN OTHER JURORS
23
     IN A DECISION TO DO JUST THAT, TO TAKE SOMEONE ELSE'S LIFE?
24
25
          MS. KUBECK: IF THE CASE DEMANDS IT, YES. I AM SURE
26
    I COULD.
           MR. WAPNER: WHAT DO YOU MEAN WHEN YOU SAY, "IF THE
27
28
     CASE DEMANDS IT"?
```

MS. KUBECK: I DON'T THINK SO, NO. I DON'T THINK I 1 COULD SAY THAT. 2 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING IN MIND WHEN YOU SAY 3 "STRONG CIRCUMSTANCES"? I MEAN, ARE YOU JUST VISUALIZING 4 ANYTHING IN YOUR MIND WHEN YOU SAY THAT? 5 THE COURT: SHE SAID NO. SHE ANSWERED THAT. YOU ASKED 6 THAT TWICE. 7 MR. WAPNER: WELL, I AM NOT SURE. THE FIRST TIME I 8 ASKED IT UNFORTUNATELY, IT WAS A COMPOUND QUESTION. SO I 9 THOUGHT I WOULD SIMPLIFY IT. 10 THE COURT: GO AHEAD. 11 MS. KUBECK: I AM TRYING TO SAY THAT I AM NOT 100 PERCENT 12 FOR THE DEATH PENALTY OR 100 PERCENT AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY. 13 THAT IS ALL I AM TRYING TO SAY. 14 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. IN THIS CASE, THE ONLY WAY THAT 15 YOU WILL GET TO THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY, IS IF THE 16 JURY HAS DECIDED THAT THERE WAS A MURDER COMMITTED INTENTIONALLY 17 18 DURING A ROBBERY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? MS. KUBECK: YES. 19 MR. WAPNER: LET ME START OVER WITH THIS. I AM NOT 20 ASKING YOU ABOUT THE FACTS OF THIS PARTICULAR CASE. BUT IN 21 THE GENERAL CATEGORY OF MURDERS THAT OCCUR IN THE COURSE OF 22 23 A ROBBERY, DO YOU THINK THAT YOU ARE CAPABLE, IF THE FACTS 24 OF THAT PARTICULAR MURDER DURING A ROBBERY JUSTIFY IT, ARE 25 YOU CAPABLE OF VOTING FOR THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. BARENS: OBJECTION TO THAT. THAT IS MUCH TOO CENTERED AND TOO SPECIFIC A QUESTION.

26

27

28

THE JUDGE HAS SAID TO HER THAT WE ARE GOING TO

1 FO

TRY THE CASE THAT INVOLVES A MURDER ALLEGED COMMITTED DURING
THE COURSE OF AN ALLEGED ROBBERY. NOW HE IS ASKING IF A MURDER
IS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF AN ALLEGED ROBBERY, COULD
SHE VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY FOR THAT.

THAT IS THE QUESTION.

THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION. REPHRASE THE QUESTION.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

WHAT I AM TRYING TO GET AT IS, TAKING THIS CASE,

TRYING TO SEPARATE THEORY FROM REALITY, I AM NOT ASKING YOU

HOW YOU WOULD VOTE ON THIS CASE. ARE YOU CLEAR ON THAT?

MS. KUBECK: YES, OF COURSE. OF COURSE.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THIS CASE. STAND THAT? ASKED.

MR. WAPNER: AND I WON'T GIVE YOU ANY OF THE FACTS OF

MS. KUBECK: NO.

MR. WAPNER: BUT THERE IS ONLY ONE VEHICLE IN THIS CASE THAT WILL ALLOW YOU TO GET TO THE QUESTION OF THE DEATH PENALTY AND THAT VEHICLE IS THAT THE JURY WOULD HAVE TO DECIDE THAT THERE WAS AN INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING A ROBBERY; DO YOU UNDER-

MS. KUBECK: YES, OF COURSE.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT, SO NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT THE GENERIC CATEGORY OF MURDERS THAT OCCUR DURING ROBBERIES.

WITHOUT KNOWING THE PARTICULAR FACTS OF ANY GIVEN CASE. IS THAT A CATEGORY OF CRIME FOR WHICH YOU FEEL THAT IT IS APPROPRIATE TO HAVE THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. BARENS: OBJECTION. I DON'T BELIEVE THAT CAN BE

THE COURT: I WILL OVERRULE YOUR OBJECTION. I THINK IT IS A PROPER QUESTION.

YOU ARE ASKING HER, IN EFFECT, SUPPOSING THAT GENERALLY THERE IS A DELIBERATE MURDER WHICH HAS BEEN COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, WOULD SHE UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCE VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IN A CASE OF THAT KIND; IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE ASKING HER?

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. YES.

MS. KUBECK: A ROBBERY ISN'T ALWAYS PREMEDITATED, THE MURDER IN A ROBBERY IS NOT ALWAYS PREMEDITATED?

THE COURT: YOU MEAN THE MURDER, THE KILLING IS PREMEDITATED AND PLANNED AND EVERYTHING ELSE, ASSUMING IT IS

ALL PLANNED AND AN INTENTIONAL MURDER? 1 MS. KUBECK: PREMEDITATED, INTENTIONAL MURDER COMMITTED 2 3 DURING A ROBBERY. THE COURT: YES. 5 MR. WAPNER: CORRECT. MR. BARENS: THE DEFENSE SUBMITS YOU ARE ASKING THE JUROR 6 7 TO PREJUDGE THE EVIDENCE NOW. 8 THE COURT: NO, NO. HE WANTS --9 MS. KUBECK: OKAY. THE COURT: HE WANTS TO GET HER OPINION AS TO WHETHER 10 3.7 OR NOT IN ANY CASE WHERE THERE MIGHT BE THAT, NOT ON THIS PARTICULAR CASE, BUT WHETHER OR NOT HER MIND IS SUCH THAT --12 13 MS. KUBECK: CAN I STATE IT AGAIN? 14 THE COURT: YES. 3.5 MS. KUBECK: A ROBERY IN WHICH THERE WAS A PREMEDITATED, 16 INTENTIONAL MURDER COMMITTED INTENTIONALLY. 17 THE COURT: THAT'S RIGHT. MS. KUBECK: PREMEDITATED AND INTENTIONAL? 18 19 THE COURT: YES. MS. KUBECK: COULD I VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY IF A 20 21 PERSON WERE FOUND GUILTY OF AN INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED 22 MURDER DURING A ROBBERY? 23 THE COURT: YES. 24 MR. WAPNER: CORRECT, AND YOU HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE 25 ON THE PENALTY PHASE AND YOU FELT --26 MS. KUBECK: YES, I COULD. 27 IN OTHER WORDS, IF A MURDER DURING A ROBBERY IS 28 STRONG ENOUGH FOR ME TO BE ABLE TO DO THAT?

1 MR. WAPNER: THAT IS BASICALLY WHAT IT GETS DOWN TO. 2 THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU MEAN BY "STRONG 3 ENOUGH". MS. KUBECK: WELL --5 THE COURT: YOU MEAN IF IT WAS INTENTIONAL AND 6 PREMEDITATED --7 MS. KUBECK: WE ARE HITTING PREMEDITATED AND INTENTIONAL 8 HERE. AREN'T WE? 9 THE COURT: AND PLANNED. 10 MS. KUBECK: AND PLANNED, PREMEDITATED AND INTENTIONAL, 11 ARE THOSE THE KEY WORDS? 12 THE COURT: YES. 13 MS. KUBECK: YES. 14 MR. WAPNER: YES? 15 MS. KUBECK: YES. 16 MR. BARENS: BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. 17 MR. WAPNER: IN THAT KIND OF A CASE, DO YOU FEEL THAT 18 IF THE FACTS WARRANTED IT, YOU COULD VOTE FOR A VERDICT OF 19 DEATH? 20 MS. KUBECK: YES, I FEEL THAT I COULD. 21 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. PASS FOR CAUSE. 22 MS. KUBECK: I AM SORRY I BROUGHT UP THE DESIRE TO LIVE 23 IN A DEATH-FREE WORLD. 24 THE COURT: OH, THAT IS QUITE ALL RIGHT. WE LIKE TO 25 KNOW HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT IT, THAT IS WHY WE ARE ASKING YOU THESE 26 QUESTIONS, TO GET WHAT YOUR STATE OF MIND IS. 27 BOTH SIDES AGREE, AND THE COURT AGREES ALSO, THAT 28 YOU ARE EMINENTLY QUALIFIED TO BE A TRIAL JUROR IN THIS CASE.

MS. KUBECK: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: SO WHAT WE WILL ASK YOU TO DO IS TO COME BACK. WE WILL FINISH WITH THE REST OF THE LIST AND WE WILL BE READY ON MONDAY MORNING TO PROCEED WITH THE TRIAL IN THIS CASE.

MS. KUBECK: SO I AM EXCUSED UNTIL MONDAY MORNING?

THE COURT: SO YOU ARE EXCUSED UNTIL MONDAY MORNING AT 10:30, AND YOU WILL GO TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AND BE THERE WITH THE OTHER JURORS AND THEN YOU ALL COME BACK IN HERE.

MS. KUBECK: ALL RIGHT, MONDAY.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, COULD WE --

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, A TEN-MINUTE RECESS.

(RECESS.)

(PROSPECTIVE JOROR MC EWAN ENTERS THE 1 COURTROOM.) 2 THE COURT: MS. MC EWAN, WHERE DO YOU LIVE? 3 MS. MC EWAN: SANTA MONICA CANYON. THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER READ ABOUT THE CASE OR HEARD 5 6 ANYTING ABOUT THE CASE AT ALL? MS. MC EWAN: YES. I READ A GREAT DEAL ABOUT IT. 7 THE COURT: WHERE DID YOU READ IT? 8 MS. MC EWAN: I HAVE READ IT IN THE LOS ANGELES TIMES 9 AND ABOUT A MONTH OR TWO AGO I READ IT IN TIME AND NEWSWEEK. 10 THEY HAD A LONG ARTICLE ABOUT IT, THE WHOLE THING. 11 THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU REMEMBER ABOUT THE FACTS 12 SUPPOSEDLY OF THE CASE? 13 MS. MC EWAN: WHAT DO I REMEMBER? I REMEMBER THAT THERE 14 WAS STOCK DEALS AND A GROUP OF YOUNG PEOPLE WHO CALLED THEM-3.5 SELVES THE YOUNG MILLIONAIRES OR SOMETHING. 16 THE COURT: THE BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB? 17 MS. MC EWAN: UH-HUH. AND THEN A MAN NAMED MR. LEVIN 18 19 OR LEVIN. PUT UP A DEAL TO -- GAVE -- WAIT. LET ME SEE. HE GAVE -- I GUESS THAT IS WHAT IT IS -- THAT HE 20 WOULD GIVE HIM A MILLION DOLLARS, LET'S SAY, TO INVEST. 21 THEN THE DEFENDANT BUILT UP THAT MILLION DOLLARS. 22 THEN THERE WASN'T ANY MONEY AT ALL. IT WAS A PHONY DEAL. 23 24 SO THEN THEY SAID THAT MR. LEVIN WAS KILLED. AND THEN THEY GOT INTO THE NEXT ONE. DO YOU WANT ME TO GO INTO 25 26 THE NEXT ONE? 27 THE COURT: YES. MR. MC EWAN: THEN, ONE OF THE YOUNG MEN SOUNDED LIKE 28

A SAUDI ARABIAN OR AN IRANIAN. HIS FATHER, THEY TRIED TO GET 1 2 MONEY FROM HIS FATHER. AND THEN THEY KILLED HIS FATHER. 3 THE COURT: WELL, ASSUMING THAT WHAT YOU READ ARE THE 4 FACTS AND ASSUMING WHAT YOU READ IS TRUE -- SORRY. 5 ASSUMING WHAT YOU READ IS -- WHAT YOU THINK THE 6 FACTS ARE IN THE CASE, WOULD YOU LISTEN TO THE TESTIMONY IN 7 THIS CASE IF YOU ARE SELECTED AS A JUROR AND FORGET ABOUT ANY-8 THING THAT YOU READ? 9 MS. MC EWAN: I COULDN'T LISTEN WITH AN OPEN MIND. 10 WOULD BE BIASED. 11 THE COURT: HOW DO YOU MEAN YOU WOULD BE BIASED? 12 MS. MC EWAN: I HAVE MADE UP MY MIND. 13 THE COURT: MOST OF THE FACTS YOU TOLD ME ABOUT WERE 14 NOT THE FACTS IN THE CASE. 15 MS. MC EWAN: THEY ARE NOT? 16 THE COURT: THEY ARE NOT. 17 MS. MC EWAN: WELL, THE FACTS THAT I READ --18 THE COURT: THAT IS THE REPORTER THAT REPORTED THEM. 19 MS. MC EWAN: WELL, TO ME, THOSE ARE THE FACTS. THAT 20 IS WHAT I THINK I READ. AS FAR AS THAT, I THINK THE DEFENDANT 21 IS GUILTY. 22 THE COURT: DO YOU THINK SO? 23 MS. MC EWAN: YES, POSITIVE. 24 THE COURT: WITHOUT EVER HEARING ANYTHING OF THE 25 TESTIMONY?

MS. MC EWAN: I MIGHT SAY THAT I AM PRETTY BIASED.

26

27

26

27

28

RATHER THAN SECONDHAND. MS. MC EWAN: THANK YOU. MS. MC EWAN: NO, HUH-UH.

THE COURT: YOU THINK YOUR MIND IS SUCH THAT, NO MATTER WHAT YOU HEAR YOU HAVE MADE UP YOUR MIND AS TO WHETHER THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OR NOT?

MS. MC EWAN: I AM AFRAID SO.

MR. BARENS: I HAVE A MOTION -- STIPULATION, I BELIEVE.

MR. WAPNER: I STIPULATE SHE CAN BE EXCUSED, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HONESTY AND FRANKNESS, I APPRECIATE IT VERY MUCH.

MS. MC EWAN: OKAY. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: IT IS TOO BAD YOU ARE SOLD ON WHAT YOU READ IN THE NEWSPAPERS AND BELIEVE ALL OF THE FACTS YOU READ ARE CORRECT WITHOUT WAITING TO HEAR WHAT THE TESTIMONY IS UNDER OATH AND GIVING YOU AN OPPORTUNITY OF HEARING IT FIRSTHAND

HOWEVER, IF YOU HAVE MADE UP YOUR MIND ABOUT THE FACTS IN THIS CASE AND NOTHING WOULD EVER CHANGE YOU, YOU WILL NOT MAKE A GOOD JUROR IN THE CASE.

THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, COULD YOUR HONOR PLEASE INSTRUCT THE JUROR NOT TO SPEAK TO OUR OTHER JURORS?

MS. MC EWAN: NO, I WOULDN'T.

THE COURT: DON'T TALK TO ANY OF THE OTHER JURORS.

THE COURT: BECAUSE THE FACTS YOU HAVE ARE WRONG.

MS. MC EWAN: NO, I DIDN'T TALK TO THEM BEFORE EITHER.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR MC EWAN EXITED THE COURTROOM.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

(PROSPECTIVE JUROR MC GLONE ENTERED THE COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: MR. MC GLONE? THAT IS MR. MC GLONE?

MR. MC GLONE: YES

THE COURT: MC GLONE?

MR. MC GLONE: MC GLONE, M-C-G-L-O-N-E.

THE COURT: MR. MC GLONE, WHERE DO YOU LIVE?

MR. MC GLONE: IN LOS ANGELES.

THE COURT: IN WHAT PART OF IT?

MR. MC GLONE: LAUREL CANYON AREA.

THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS CASE?

MR. MC GLONE: NO, SIR.

THE COURT: DO YOU KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT IT EXCEPT WHAT

I TOLD YOU HERE ON MONDAY?

MR. MC GLONE: NO, SIR.

THE COURT: YOU KNOW NOTHING?

MR. MC GLONE: NO.

THE COURT: THE EXPRESSION BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB, DOES THAT RING A BELL IN YOUR MIND?

MR. MC GLONE: NO, IT DOES NOT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, WHAT I AM GOING TO DO IS BRIEFLY AGAIN TELL YOU WHAT THE CASE IS ABOUT AND THEN ASK YOU CERTAIN QUESTIONS. THOSE QUESTIONS WHICH COUNSEL AND I WILL ASK, THOSE QUESTIONS ARE INTENDED TO EXPLORE YOUR MIND AS TO WHAT YOUR FEELINGS ARE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY; DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MR. MC GLONE: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: NOW TO BEGIN WITH, I DID TELL YOU THAT THE CHARGE IN THIS CASE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IS THAT HE COMMITTED A MURDER IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

YOU MUST UNDERSTAND, OF COURSE, THAT THAT IS THE CHARGE. IT DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT A CHARGE HAS BEEN MADE THAT IT IS TRUE OR UNTRUE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. MC GLONE: YES.

THE COURT: IF YOU ARE A JUROR, YOU WILL HEAR ALL OF
THE EVIDENCE AND MAKE UP YOUR MIND AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THERE
IS A BASIS FOR ANY OF THE CHARGES.

AT ANY RATE, THE CHARGE AGAINST HIM IS THAT HE COMMITTED A MURDER AND IT WAS A DELIBERATE, INTENTIONAL MURDER IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

NOW, IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY AS I POINTED OUT TO YOU, HAS A SIGNIFICANCE. NOT EVERY MURDER, EVEN IF IT IS DELIBERATE AND PLANNED AND PREMEDITATED, CALLS FOR THE IMPOSITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY.

IT IS ONLY THOSE MURDERS WHICH THE LEGISLATURE

HAS SINGLED OUT UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT THOSE

MURDERS THEN QUALIFY FOR A DEATH PENALTY; DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

(MR. MC GLONE NODS HIS HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: ONE OF THOSE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES IS A DELIBERATE MURDER COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, LIKE THIS ONE IS ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN, THAT QUALIFIES IT FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

SIMILARLY, MURDERS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A BURGLARY, FOR EXAMPLE, OR A RAPE OR A KIDNAPPING OR

C

• •

٠.

÷ĉ

5

7

MULTIPLE MURDERS OR TORTURE MURDERS AND SO FORTH, THOSE ALSO OUALIFY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

SO IT IS ONLY WHERE IT IS COMMITTED UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT THE LEGISLATURE SAID THESE CASES QUALIFY FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

NOW, BY DEATH PENALTY, WE MEAN ONE OF TWO THINGS:

EITHER LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE -
AND IT MEANS EXACTLY THAT: LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE

POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. YOU ARE IN PRISON FOR THE REST OF

YOUR LIFE WITHOUT ANY POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, YOU NEVER GET

OUT.

OR IT IS DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

NOW, THE JURY WHICH WILL BE IMPANELED IN THIS

CASE TO TRY THE CASE WILL FIRST DETERMINE ON WHAT WE CALL

THE GUILT PHASE, THEY WILL FIRST DETERMINE THE GUILT OR

INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT.

IF THEY FIND HIM INNOCENT OF THE CRIME OF MURDER, THEN THAT IS THE END OF IT.

IF THEY FIND HIM GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST

DEGREE, THEN THEY HAVE TO DECIDE THIS SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE

I TOLD YOU, WHETHER IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

IF THEY SAY TRUE, IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THEN THAT SAME JURY HEARS MORE EVIDENCE BOTH FROM THE DEFENSE AND FROM THE PROSECUTION. THAT EVIDENCE WILL BE FOR THE PURPOSE OF INFLUENCING THE JURY AS TO WHICH OF THE PENALTIES SHALL BE IMPOSED.

THE DEFENDANT, OF COURSE, WILL INTRODUCE EVIDENCE, WE EXPECT, OF THINGS THAT ARE FAVORABLE ABOUT HIM. AND YOU

5

MUST CONSIDER THE FACT OF HIS AGE, HIS BACKGROUND, HIS LACK
OF ANY PREVIOUS CRIMINAL ACTIVITY, HIS CHARACTER, HIS MENTAL
AND PHYSICAL CONDITION AND ANYTHING THAT HAS TO DO WITH A
PERSON WHICH MIGHT BE FAVORABLE TO HIM.

THE PROSECUTION, ON THE OTHER HAND --

THAT IS CALLED MITIGATING AND EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES TO LESSEN THE OFFENSE WHICH HAS BEEN COMMITTED.

AND THE PEOPLE, ON THE OTHER HAND, WILL SHOW
AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH WILL SHOW FACTS ABOUT THE
DEFENDANT WHICH ARE UNFAVORABLE SO THAT THE ULTIMATE PENALTY
CAN BE IMPOSED UPON HIM.

CHAMBER OR LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THE JURY HEARS ALL OF THAT ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL AND THEN THEY MAKE UP THEIR MINDS WHEN THEY GO IN THE JURY ROOM TO DELIBERATE AND MAKE UP THEIR MINDS WHICH IT SHOULD BE, LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

NOW, THE QUESTION OF PENALTY NEVER COMES UP ON THE FIRST PHASE, ON THE GUILT PHASE. ALL YOU HAVE TO DETERMINE IS GUILT OR INVOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT ON THE GUILT PHASE, THAT IS ALL. NO QUESTION OF PENALTY IS INVOLVED IN ANY WAY.

THAT COMES LATER; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. MC GLONE: YES, I DO.

THE COURT: NOW, THE QUESTIONS I AM GOING TO ASK YOU,
AND COUNSEL ARE GOING TO ASK YOU, HAVE TO DO WITH YOUR STATE
OF MIND, YOUR MIND SET, TO EXPLORE YOUR MIND ABOUT HOW YOU
FEEL, WHAT YOUR ATTITUDE IS TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY.

I AM GOING TO ASK YOU FIVE QUESTIONS. THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS INVOLVE THE FIRST PART OF THE TRIAL, THE GUILT PHASE.

AND NOW IT IS THIS: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION, WHATEVER THAT OPINION MAY BE, WHICH WILL PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MR. MC GLONE: NO, I DO NOT.

THE COURT: THEN YOU REMEMBER I TOLD YOU THAT IF HE IS FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THE QUESTION € OF WAS IT COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY WILL BE DETERMINED, THE JURY WILL BE ASKED TO SAY TRUE OR FALSE AS TO THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

I WILL ASK YOU THE SAME QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO THAT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION ON THE DEATH PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE?

MR. MC GLONE: NO, I DON'T.

5

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS PRESUPPOSE
THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST
DEGREE AND THAT IT WAS INTENTIONAL AND DELIBERATE AND THAT
IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

THIS HAS GOT TO DO WITH THE PENALTY PHASE. NOW,

THE FIRST OF THOSE TWO QUESTIONS I WILL ASK YOU ON THE PENALTY

PHASE IS AS FOLLOWS: DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION CONCERNING THE

DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE FOR

THE IMPOSITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF EVIDENCE

THAT MAY BE PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY PHASE IN THE TRIAL?

MR. MC GLONE: NO, I DON'T.

THE COURT: THE SAME QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO LIFE
WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION
CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE
FOR LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY
EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE
TRIAL?

MR. MC GLONE: YES, I DO.

THE COURT: WHAT IS THAT?

MS. MC GLONE: I DISAGREE WITH THE DEATH PENALTY. I
WOULD VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.

THE COURT: LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

MR. MC GLONE: LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.

THE COURT: THAT IS ONLY IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, DELIBERATE, INTENTIONAL AND IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, WOULD YOU UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES, VOTE FOR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER BUT YOU MIGHT VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE? IS THAT WHAT

YOU ARE TELLING US?

MR. MC GLONE: THAT'S RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: FOR JUST A MOMENT, YOUR HONOR?

MR. MC GLONE, I AM ARTHUR BARENS. I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT.

AND ALTHOUGH I MIGHT PERSONALLY SHARE YOUR VIEW

ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, WHAT WE ARE LOOKING FOR HERE, IS TO

SEE IF WE CAN FIND JURORS THAT WOULD BE OPEN-MINDED ENOUGH

TO AT LEAST CONSIDER BOTH ALTERNATIVES, THOSE BEING LIFE WITH
OUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND THE DEATH PENALTY.

SO, THESE PEOPLE WOULD QUALIFY AS JURORS BECAUSE
A PERSON THAT COULDN'T, COULD NOT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. MC GLONE: YES, I DO.

MR. BARENS: NOW, A MOMENT AGO, YOU SAID THAT YOU BELIEVED

1 THINK, UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD YOU EVER VOTE FOR THE

DEATH PENALTY?

(MR. CHIER ENTERS THE COURTROOM.)

MR. MC GLONE: THAT'S RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: AS YOU CONSIDER DIFFERENT CONDUCT THAT COULD BE POSSIBLE, LET'S START, LET'S SAY WITH RICHARD RAMIREZ, THE NIGHT STALKER FELLOW. DO YOU THINK IF YOU BELIEVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUST AFTER A TRIAL, AFTER LISTENING TO A TRIAL, THAT YOU COULD NEVER VOTE IN FAVOR OF THE DEATH PENALTY FOR HIM?

MR. MC GLONE: YES. I COULD NEVER VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY.

MR. BARENS: I AM CONVINCED. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND YOUR CANDOR, SIR.

THE MATTER IS SUBMITTED. 1 MR. WAPNER: NO OUESTIONS. 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR 3 CANDOR AND YOUR FRANKNESS. WE APPRECIATE IT VERY MUCH. 4 THAT IS, WE APPRECIATE IT RATHER THAN YOUR WAITING 5 UNTIL YOU ARE A JUROR AND THEN MAKING IT KNOWN IN THE JURY 6 ROOM THAT YOU DO THINK THAT WAY. 7 WE ARE GLAD YOU TELL US NOW. HOWEVER, WE THINK 8 YOU WOULD MAKE AN EXCELLENT JUROR IN SOME OTHER TYPE OF CASE. 9 SO, YOU TELL THE CLERK IN THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM THAT YOU ARE 10 WILLING TO SERVE IN SOME OTHER CASE WHERE THE DEATH PENALTY 11 12 IS NOT REQUIRED. THANK YOU. (PROSPECTIVE JUROR MC. GLONE EXITS THE 13 14 COURTROOM.) (PROSPECTIVE JUROR MC GREAL ENTERS THE - 5 16 ccurtroom.) 17 THE COURT: MR. MC GREAL, IS THAT IT? 18 MR. MC GREAL: YES, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND THAT YOU WANT TO CLAIM HARDSHIP, 19 20 DO YOU? MR. MC GREAL: YES, ON ACCOUNT OF MY WIFE'S HEALTH. SHE 21 HAS A CHRONIC HEART CONDITION. SHE ALSO HAS HYPERTENSION AND 22 23 ARTHRITIS. 24 SHE IS DUE TO GO AND SEE THE DOCTOR. THERE ARE 25 ONLY TWO OF US AT HOME. 26 THE COURT: HOW LONG HAS SHE HAD IT? MR. MC GREAL: SHE HAD A BY-PASS ABOUT NINE YEARS AGO. 27

THE REASON THAT I DIDN'T TELL YOU BEFORE, I THOUGHT YOU COULD

GET A DAY OFF IF YOU WERE ON THE JURY PANEL. BUT NOW I 1 2 REALIZE THAT YOU CAN'T. 3 THE COURT: YOU CAN HAVE A DAY OFF, ON FRIDAYS. 4 MR. MC GREAL: NO, NO. SHE HAS GOT TO GO AND SEE A 5 SPECIALIST. THEN THERE WILL BE TESTS AFTER THAT. I WILL HAVE 6 TO TAKE HER IN FOR IT. 7 I DON'T KNOW WHEN THAT IS GOING TO BE. IT WILL 8 BE IN TWO WEEKS' TIME. ã MR. BARENS: I BELIEVE IT WILL BE STIPULATED. 10 MR. WAPNER: YES. I STIPULATE THAT HE BE EXCUSED. 11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. YOU WILL BE EXCUSED. YOU TELL THE JURY ASSEMBLY CLERK THAT YOU SHOULD 12 13 BE EXCUSED FROM JURY DUTY ALTOGETHER. 14 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR MC GREAL EXITS THE 15 COURTROOM.) 16 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR LORETTA BROOKS 17 ENTERS THE COURTROOM.) 18 THE COURT: I HAVE MOORE AND BROOKS. WHICH IS IT? 19 MS. BROOKS: IT IS BROOKS NOW. 20 THE COURT: MOORE WAS YOUR MAIDEN NAME? 21 MS. BROOKS: YES. 22 THE COURT: WHERE DO YOU LIVE? 23 MS. BROOKS: SHERMAN OAKS. 24 THE COURT: HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS 25 CASE OR DO YOU KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT IT EXCEPT WHAT I TOLD YOU 26 WHEN YOU WEREHERE ON MONDAY? 27 MS. BROOKS: NO.

THE COURT: DOES THE PHRASE "BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB" RING

ANY BELL WITH YOU?

MS. BROOKS: NO.

THE COURT: DO YOU REMEMBER ON MONDAY I GAVE YOU AN IDEA ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE CASE WE ARE ABOUT TO TRY? I TOLD YOU THAT IT WAS A CHARGE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT, THAT HE COMMITTED A DELIBERATE, PREMEDITATED MURDER IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

NOW, IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY HAS, AS I TOLD YOU, SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE IN THIS CASE.

DO YOU KNOW THAT NOT EVERY MURDER, IF IT IS

DELIBERATE, INTENTIONAL, PREMEDITATED AND PLANNED AND EXECUTED

MEANS IT QUALIFIES FOR THE DEATH PENALTY? IT IS ONLY WHEN

THAT MURDER HAS BEEN COMMITTED IN THAT WAY UNDER SPECIAL

CIRCUMSTANCES.

•

24B

IN OTHER WORDS, IT IS A MURDER WHICH IS COMMITTED

IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY AS THIS ONE IS ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN,

A MURDER WHICH IS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A BURGLARY OR

A KIDNAPPING OR A RAPE OR MULTIPLE MURDERS OR MURDERS AFFECTED

BY TORTURE AND ANY NUMBER OF OTHERS.

THERE ARE 19 IN WHICH THE LEGISLATURE HAS SAID

THOSE MURDERS COMMITTED UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES QUALIFY FOR

A POSSIBLE DEATH PENALTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. BROOKS: RIGHT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, THE FACT THAT THE CHARGES
HAVE BEEN BROUGHT AGAINST THE DEFENDANT DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING.
IT DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING IN THE SENSE THAT WHERE THERE IS
SMOKE THERE IS FIRE.

YOU HAVE GOT TO FORGET ABOUT THAT. THERE IS MERELY
A CHARGE AND AN ACCUSATION. IT DOESN'T MEAN HE COMMITTED
ANYTHING. HE IS PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT UNTIL THE CONTRARY
IS PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.

NOW, THE JURY WHO WILL BE SELECTED IN THIS CASE,
WILL FIRST HAVE TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT
COMMITTED THE MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND WHETHER OR NOT
THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. IF THEY
FIND THAT HE DIDN'T COMMIT ANY MURDER, THAT IS THE END OF THE
CASE. IF THEY FIND HE COMMITTED THE MURDER AND IT WAS
DELIBERATE, THEY HAVE TO THEN FIND WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS IN
THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

AND IF THEY DO THAT, THEN THE JURY HEARS ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY WHICH IS UNRELATED AS SUCH, TO THE MURDER EXCEPT THAT YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO CONSIDER THE ACT OF MURDER, TOO.

5

THE DEFENDANT WILL PRODUCE EVIDENCE WHICH IS
FAVORABLE TO HIM. YOU MUST CONSIDER HIS AGE, HIS PREVIOUS
LACK OF ANY CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF ANY KIND, HIS CHARACTER,
HIS BACKGROUND AND ANYTHING WHICH IS FAVORABLE TO HIM.

AND THE PURPOSE OF THAT OF COURSE, IS TO HAVE YOU GIVE THE LESSER OF THE TWO ALTERNATIVES.

THE PROSECUTION ON THE OTHER HAND, WILL SHOW

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES. THE CIRCUMSTANCES WILL SHOW THAT

HE IS NOT A GOOD PERSON. HE IS A BAD PERSON. THE PROSECUTION

WILL SHOW THINGS UNFAVORABLE ABOUT HIM.

THE PURPOSE OF THAT OF COURSE, WOULD BE TO HAVE

THE JURY GIVE HIM THE MAXIMUM PENALTY, WHICH IS DEATH IN THE

GAS CHAMBER. DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

SO, THE JURY HEARS ALL OF THAT. AND THEN THEY
DELIBERATE AND DECIDE ONE OF TWO THINGS, SHOULD IT SE LIFE
WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE -- AND THAT MEANS EXACTLY
THAT, LIFE WITH NO PAROLE. IT IS STATE PRISON FOR THE REST
OF HIS LIFE.

OR, IT COULD BE DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER. DO YOU UNDERSTAND? NOW, ON THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, THEY DETERMINE WHETHER HE IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY. YOU CANNOT -- YOU MUST NOT CONSIDER THE QUESTION AS TO THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL.

YOU ARE TO CONSIDER THE MERITS ONLY AS TO WHETHER OR NOT A CRIME WAS COMMITTED AND THE DEFENDANT COMMITTED IT AND WHETHER IT WAS MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MS. BROOKS: OKAY.

5-1

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, NOW WITH THAT PRELIMINARY BACK-GROUND, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS. THE PURPOSE OF THESE QUESTIONS WILL BE TO EXPLORE THE STATE OF YOUR MIND WITH RESPECT TO YOUR FEELINGS AND YOUR ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT IS WHAT THE JURY IN THIS CASE WILL HAVE TO CONSIDER SO WE HAVE TO FIND OUT WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE SO PREJUDICED AGAINST THE DEATH PENALTY OR SO PREJUDICED FOR THE DEATH PENALTY THAT THEY CANNOT BE A FAIR JUROR; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

(MS. BROOKS NODS HER HEAD UP AND DOWN.)

THE COURT: NOW I AM GOING TO ASK YOU FIVE QUESTIONS.

COUNSEL WILL ASK YOU A NUMBER OF OTHERS. ALL OF THE QUESTIONS

ARE DESIGNED FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXPLORING YOUR MIND ON THE

SUBJECT.

NOW THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS I AM GOING TO ASK

YOU HAVE TO DO WITH THE FIRST PHASE OF THE TRIAL, NAMELY,

THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT: DO YOU HAVE ANY

OPINION AS TO THE DEATH PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHICH

WILL PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE

GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT?

MS. BROOKS: NO.

THE COURT: OKAY, AND ALSO ON THE GUILT PHASE OF IT,

I TOLD YOU THAT THE NEXT QUESTION THAT THE JURY DETERMINES,

IF THEY FIND HIM GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, WAS

THAT MURDER COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY? THAT IS

A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE, WE CALL IT. AND THEY SAY TRUE OR

FALSE.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION WITH RESPECT TO THE DEATH

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHICH WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE TRUTH OR FALSITY OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE?

MS. BROOKS: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE PENALTY PHASE. WE PRESUPPOSE THAT THE JURY HAS FOUND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

THE FIRST OF THOSE QUESTIONS IS: DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU AUTOMATICALLY TO VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

WHAT I AM ASKING YOU IS: AUTOMATICALLY, ARE YOU GOING TO VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, NO MATTER WHAT YOU HEAR ON THE PENALTY PHASE?

MS. BROOKS: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, AND THE SAME THING IS: DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION?

MS. BROOKS: NO --

WELL, I THINK YOU ARE SAYING THAT, WHATEVER I HEAR, WILL I CONSIDER WHAT I HAVE HEARD? I AM --

THE COURT: NO. I AM SAYING, WILL YOU AUTOMATICALLY,

1 WITHOUT EVEN CONSIDERING WHAT YOU HEAR ON THE PENALTY PHASE, WOULD YOU AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT? 2 MS. BROOKS: NO, NO, NO. 3 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THAT IS GOOD. YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY 5 MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN THIS CASE AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS 6 7 HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN THE EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE 8 OF THE TRIAL? 9 MS. BROOKS: YES. 10 THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? MS. BROOKS: RIGHT. 11 12 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 13 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 14 GOOD AFTERNOON, MRS. BROOKS. 15 MS. BROOKS: HI. 16 MR. BARENS: I AM ARTHUR BARENS AND I REPRESENT THE 17 DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT. 18 AND AS WAS THE CASE WITH HIS HONOR, IT IS MY 19 OBLIGATION NOW TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR POINT 20 OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY. 21 PARENTHETICALLY, LET ME INDICATE THAT THERE ARE 22 NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS AND NO GOOD AND 23 BAD ANSWERS. NO ONE HERE IS EVEN JUDGING ANY OF YOUR 24 ANSWERS, BECAUSE YOU CAN NEVER BE WRONG ABOUT YOUR OWN OPINION. 25 WITH THAT IN MIND, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH 26 PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY? MS. BROOKS: I DON'T AGREE WITH IT. 27

THE COURT: YOU SAY YOU DON'T AGREE WITH IT?

MS. BROOKS: I DON'T AGREE WITH THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT
WE SHOULD SOLVE OUR PROBLEMS WITH THE DEATH PENALTY AS IT
IS INSTITUTED NOW.

MR. BARENS: RIGHT, AND I DON'T EVEN THINK THAT IS THE ISSUE THAT WE ARE CONFRONTED WITH HERE.

BUT, RATHER, WHAT IT COMES DOWN TO IN THIS PROCESS,

TO QUALIFY AS A JUROR, WE NEED TO KNOW WHETHER YOU WOULD BE

WILLING DURING A PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL, SO THAT BOTH

THE PROSECUTION AND THE DEFENSE ARE AFFORDED A FAIR TRIAL,

WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO CONSIDER THE DEATH PENALTY AS ONE

ALTERNATIVE TO DEALING WITH A CONVICTED DEFENDANT, AS WELL

AS BEING WILLING TO CONSIDER LIFE IN PRISON WITHOUT THE

POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE?

THE COURT: I THINK YOU HAD BETTER DIVIDE IT UP.

MS. BROOKS: UH-HUH.

THE COURT: YOU HAD BETTER DIVIDE IT UP. ASK HER WHETHER 1 2 SHE WOULD CONSIDER THE DEATH PENALTY FIRST AND LIFE IMPRISONMENT 3 WILL COME LATER. MR. BARENS: WELL, SHE WOULD PROBABLY HAVE TO CONSIDER 4 5 THEM BOTH CONJUNCTIVELY. 6 THE COURT: NO, NO. 7 MR. BARENS: THERE ARE TWO ALTERNATIVES PRESENT. 8 THE COURT: NO. NO. 9 MR. BARENS: WELL, I WILL ASK YOU SEPARATELY. 10 WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO CONSIDER THE DEATH PENALTY 11 AS AN ALTERNATIVE? 12 THE COURT: YOU MEAN DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER? 13 MR. BARENS: IT IS THE ONLY WAY IT CAN BE DONE, TO MY 14 KNOWLEDGE. 15 MS. BROOKS: DEATH, NO. 16 MR. BARENS: OKAY --17 THE COURT: THE DEATH PENALTY INVOLVES, AS I TOLD HER, 18 TWO ASPECTS: ONE, LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY 19 OF PAROLE AND THE OTHER, DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER, SO THE 20 DEATH PENALTY COVERS TWO THINGS INSTEAD OF ONE. 21 MR. BARENS: WELL, GETTING BACK TO WHERE WE ARE HERE, 22 YOU HAVE INDICATED TO ME THAT YOU WOULD NOT CONSIDER THE DEATH 23 PENALTY UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES? 24 MS. BROOKS: OKAY, BY DEATH PENALTY, IF WE ARE TALKING 25 ABOUT PUTTING SOMEONE TO DEATH --26 MR. BARENS: THAT IS THE ONE. 27 MS. BROOKS: WE HAVE GONE THROUGH EVERYTHING ELSE AND

WE HAVE DECIDED THAT THIS IS NOW OUR ALTERNATIVE, WHAT HAPPENS

```
TO THIS PERSON.
1
           MR. BARENS: YES.
2
           MS. BROOKS: I WOULD NOT WANT TO.
3
           THE COURT: YOU WOULD NOT WANT TO WHAT?
           MS. BROOKS: PUT THEM TO DEATH.
5
           MR. BARENS: OKAY, AND I CAN UNDERSTAND THAT YOU WOULDN'T
6
     WANT TO.
7
                BUT WHAT I AM ASKING YOU, LET'S TRY TO CREATE
8
     THE SETTING AS TO WHERE THAT WOULD EVER COME UP.
g
                 YOU AND THE OTHER JURORS WOULD FIRST HAVE TO HAVE
10
     BELIEVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT A PREMEDITATED,
11
     INTENTIONAL, COLD-BLOODED MURDER OCCURRED.
12
          MS. BROOKS: UH-HUH.
13
          MR. BARENS: AND THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING A ROBBERY.
14
                I AM NOT TALKING ABOUT SOMETHING ACCIDENTAL.
16
    1 AM NOT TALKING ABOUT SOMETHING IN SELF-DEFENSE.
                I AM TALKING ABOUT A PREMEDITATED, FIRST DEGREE
17
    MURDER.
18
19
          MS. BROOKS: UH-HUH.
20
          MR. BARENS: ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT YOU COULD NEVER
    UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES CONSIDER THAT THE DEATH PENALTY WOULD
21
    BE AN APPROPRIATE REMEDY FOR A FIRST DEGREE MURDERER?
22
          MS. BROOKS: YES.
23
24
          MR. BARENS: IRRESPECTIVE OF THE FACT THAT THE CRIME
25
    MIGHT HAVE BEEN COMMITTED SOLELY FOR GREED WITH A WANTON
26
    HEART?
27
          MS. BROOKS: YES.
```

MR. BARENS: THE MATTER IS SUBMITTED, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WE ARE GRATEFUL TO YOU FOR BEING AS FRANK 1 2 AS YOU ARE AND THAT IS THE ONLY WAY WE WANT JURORS TO BE. MS. BROOKS: THAT IS THE ONLY WAY IT CAN BE. 3 THE COURT: OF COURSE, IT SHOULD BE AND THAT IS SO. 4 BUT UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, YOU SEE, YOU CAN'T QUALIFY AS 5 A JUROR ON THIS CASE, ON A DEATH PENALTY CASE, ALL RIGHT? 6 MS. BROOKS: OKAY. 7 THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 8 MS. BROOKS: OKAY. THE COURT: YOU CAN REPORT TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM 10 AND TELL THEM YOU ARE EMINENTLY QUALIFIED TO BE A JUROR ON 11 SOME OTHER CASE. 12 MS. BROOKS: FINE. OKAY. 13 THE COURT: I AM SORRY I CUT YOU OFF, MR. WAPNER. DID 14 YOU WANT TO ASK ANY QUESTIONS? 15 MR. WAPNER: NO. 16 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROOKS EXITED THE 17 COURTROOM.) 18 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR VENICE MURRAYENTERED 19 THE COURTROOM.) 20 THE COURT: YOUR FIRST NAME IS VENICE? 21 MR. MURRAY: RIGHT. 22 THE COURT: THAT IS AN UNUSUAL FIRST NAME. 23 24 MR. MURRAY, HAVE YOU READ OR HEARD ANYTHING AT 25 ALL ABOUT THIS CASE, EXCEPT WHAT I TOLD YOU ABOUT IT ON MONDAY? 26 MR. MURRAY: NO, I HAVEN'T. 27 THE COURT: THE NAME BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB, DOES THAT

MEAN ANYTHING TO YOU, REGISTER IN ANY WAY?

-- MR. MURRAY: NO, IT DOESN'T.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, WHAT I AM GOING TO DO IS BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE WHAT I TOLD YOU ON MONDAY ABOUT THE FACTS OF THE CASE AND THEN ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS.

THE QUESTIONS WILL BE ASKED BOTH BY MYSELF AND
BY OPPOSING COUNSEL AND THEY WILL BE TO DETERMINE YOUR ATTITUDE
TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY. THAT IS WHY YOU ARE SITTING HERE
NOW, ALL RIGHT?

MR. MURRAY: YES.

THE COURT: FIRST, YOU WILL REMEMBER I TOLD YOU THAT
THIS IS A CASE WHERE THE PEOPLE HAVE CHARGED THE DEFENDANT
WITH THE CRIME OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE AND IT WAS
COMMITTED DURING A ROBBERY; DO YOU REMEMBER THAT?

MR. MURRAY: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, COMMITTED DURING A ROBBERY HAS SOME SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE.

YOU KNOW, IT IS NOT EVERY MURDER THAT IS PUNISHABLE BY DEATH OR BY LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE.

WE MIGHT HAVE A DELIBERATE, INTENTIONAL, PLANNED MURDER COMMITTED INTENTIONALLY AND STILL NOT BE SUBJECT TO THE DEATH PENALTY.

IT IS ONLY WHERE THAT MURDER IS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY UNDER SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY OR A BURGLARY OR A RAPE OR A KIDNAPPING OR WHERE A CHILD IS MOLESTED AND DIES OR WHERE SOMEBODY IS TORTURED OR WHERE THERE IS A MULTIPLE MURDER. THERE ARE 19 IN ALL OF THESE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT QUALIFY THE CASE FOR IT.

MR. MURRAY: I BEG YOUR PARDON. YOU SAID THERE WERE 19?

0

5

6

THE COURT: THERE ARE 19 ALTOGETHER OF THOSE DIFFERENT KINDS OF CRIMES. I DON'T HAVE TO ENUMERATE THEM. BUT IN THOSE INSTANCES, THE DEATH PENALTY MAY BE SOUGHT BY THE PEOPLE. ALL RIGHT?

NOW, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT MERELY BECAUSE IT IS A DELIBERATE, INTENTIONAL MURDER BY ITSELF, DOES NOT SUFFICE.

IT HAS GOT TO BE UNDER CERTAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, LIKE I TOLD YOU, ROBBERY, BURGLARY AND SO FORTH.

AND IT IS ALLEGED IN THIS CASE THAT IT WAS

COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. NOW, THE JURY WILL

FIRST, HAVE TO DETERMINE IRRESPECTIVE OF ANY KIND OF PENALTY,

WHAT WE CALL THE GUILT PHASE.

THAT IS, IS THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE? IF HE IS NOT GUILTY, THAT IS THE END OF IT.

1F HE IS GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, THEN THE JURY HAS ANOTHER QUESTION TO DECIDE, WAS THAT COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, TRUE OR FALSE.

DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, THAT IS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE.

THEN, THAT SAME JURY LISTENS TO ADDITIONAL
TESTIMONY BOTH FROM THE DEFENDANT AND FROM THE PROSECUTION.
THE PURPOSE OF THAT TESTIMONY WILL BE ON BEHALF OF THE
DEFENDANT, TO TRY TO SHOW THINGS WHICH ARE FAVORABLE TO HIM.

YOU MUST CONSIDER HIS AGE AND YOU MUST CONSIDER
HIS LACK OF ANY PRIOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES, HIS CHARACTER, HIS
REPUTATION, HIS MENTAL AND PHYSICAL CONDITION AND ANYTHING
THAT DEALS WITH THE PERSON AS SUCH, WHICH IS FAVORABLE TO HIM.

IT COULD BE THAT HE HAS BEEN A GOOD MAN ALL OF

5

HIS LIFE, EXCEPT FOR THIS ONE THING. THE PURPOSE OF THAT OBVIOUSLY, IS TO PERSUADE THE JURY NOT TO GIVE HIM THE ULTIMATE PENALTY OF DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

AND THE PROSECUTION ON THE OTHER HAND, WILL SHOW
AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES, WILL SHOW THINGS ABOUT HIM WHICH
ARE BAD, UNFAVORABLE, TO PERSUADE THE JURY TO GIVE HIM THE
ULTIMATE PENALTY.

NOW, THE JURORS HEAR ALL OF THAT AND THEY GO INTO A SECOND DELIBERATION. THEY DELIBERATE THE FIRST TIME ON THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE. THEN THEY DELIBERATE AS TO WHETHER IT SHOULD BE ONE OR THE OTHER, LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE OR DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER.

THAT. IT IS LIFE WITH NO POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. HE STAYS
THERE THE REST OF HIS LIFE.

OR, IT COULD BE DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER. THAT,
THE JURY HAS TO DETERMINE. NOW, THE QUESTIONS I AM GOING TO
ASK YOU AND COUNSEL WILL ASK, RELATE TO YOUR STATE OF MIND
AND YOUR FEELINGS AND ATTITUDES ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY TO
SEE WHETHER OR NOT YOU CAN QUALIFY AS A JUROR IN THIS TYPE
OF CASE.

MR. MURRAY: OKAY.

THE COURT: NOW, THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE GUILT PHASE. I TOLD YOU THAT IT IS GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY AND SO FORTH.

NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH

PENALTY, WHATEVER IT MAY BE, WHICH WILL PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING

AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE OF THE

DEFENDANT?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. MURRAY: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, THE SAME QUESTION HAS TO DO WITH THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES. YOU HAVE TO MAKE A FINDING WHETHER IT IS TRUE OR FALSE THAT IT WAS COMMITTED DURING THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY. THAT IS A SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE.

DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY THAT WOULD PREVENT YOU FROM MAKING AN IMPARTIAL DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THAT MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY?

MR. MURRAY: NO.

THE COURT: OKAY. NOW, THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS PRESUPPOSE THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE, DELIBERATE, PREMEDITATED AND THAT IT WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY.

NOW WE ARE ON THE PENALTY PHASE, AS I EXPLAINED TO YOU. RIGHT?

NOW, DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION AS TO THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY, TO IMPOSE THE DEATH PENALTY, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE THAT WAS PRESENTED ON THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MR. MURRAY: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE SAME THING AS LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. DO YOU HAVE SUCH AN OPINION CONCERNING THE DEATH PENALTY, THAT YOU WOULD AUTOMATICALLY VOTE FOR LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, REGARDLESS OF ANY EVIDENCE

23 24

25

26

27

THAT MAY BE PRESENTED AT THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL?

MR. MURRAY: NO.

THE COURT: GOOD. NOW, YOU UNDERSTAND OF COURSE, THAT
THE ISSUE OF THE DEATH PENALTY MAY OR MAY NOT TAKE PLACE IN
THIS CASE AND THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ASKED ONLY IN
THE EVENT THAT YOU REACH THAT PHASE OF THE CASE? RIGHT?

MR. MURRAY: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: COULD YOU INQUIRE WHAT --

THE COURT: YES?

MR. WAPNER: YOU ASKED HIM ABOUT PUBLICITY. BUT, COULD YOU ASK WHAT PART OF TOWN HE RESIDES IN?

THE COURT: YES. WHERE DO YOU LIVE?

MR. MURRAY: I LIVE IN WOODLAND HILLS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. MURRAY. I AM ARTHUR BARENS. I REPRESENT THE DEFENDANT, GOE HUNT.

AND AS WITH HIS HONOR, I AM OBLIGED AT THIS PART OF THESE PROCEEDINGS, TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR POINT OF VIEW ON THE DEATH PENALTY. PLEASE UNDERSTAND THAT THERE AREND RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS. NO ONE IN THE ROOM IS JUDGING YOU ON YOUR ANSWERS.

BUT RATHER, WE ARE JUST SEEKING YOUR OPINION. YOU CAN NEVER BE WRONG ABOUT YOUR OWN OPINION.

WITH THAT IN MIND, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEATH
PENALTY AS A GENERAL PROPOSITION IN OUR SOCIETY?

MR. MURRAY: I FEEL THAT IT IS -- I WOULD HATE TO USE

IT UNLESS IT IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY. THERE ARE CASES I FEEL,

THAT ARE NECESSARY.

MR. BARENS: NOW, BY THAT, I BELIEVE -- ARE YOU TELLING

ME THAT IF YOU EVER GOT TO THAT SECOND PHASE OF THE TRIAL,

AS HIS HONOR WAS REFERRING TO THE PENALTY PHASE, THAT YOU WOULD

BE ABLE TO AT LEAST CONSIDER THE DEATH PENALTY AS A PUNISHMENT,

THAT YOU WOULD BE ABLE TO AT LEAST CONSIDER THE DEATH PENALTY

26B

4 5

1

2

3

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

AS A PUNISHMENT IF THE FACTS WARRANTED IT?

MR. MURRAY: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND ON THE OTHER HAND, YOU WOULD BE AS EASILY OPEN-MINDED IN CONSIDERING LIFE WITHOUT POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AS A PUNISHMENT IF THAT IS WHAT THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES MADE YOU BELIEVE WAS APPROPRIATE?

MR. MURRAY: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, EARLIER ON WHEN YOU FIRST RESPONDED TO ME THAT YOU WOULD BELIEVE THE DEATH PENALTY WOULD BE APPROPRIATE UNDER CERTAIN SITUATIONS, DID YOU HAVE ANY SITUATIONS THAT YOU WERE THINKING ABOUT OR THAT CAME TO MIND IN YOUR OPINION WHEN YOU THOUGHT THAT WE SHOULD USE THE DEATH PENALTY?

MR. MURRAY: YES, REPEAT MURDER OFFENSES AND MASS MURDERS. MR. BARENS: ASSUMING THAT YOU HAD A SITUATION WHERE THERE WAS ONLY ONE PERSON DEAD -- AND AGAIN, LET ME PREFACE IT BY SAYING I AM NOT AT ALL REFERRING TO ANYTHING YOU ARE LIKELY TO HEAR ABOUT THIS CASE. I AM JUST INDICATING A HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION FOR YOU, OUT OF THE BLUE.

ASSUMING THAT YOU ONLY HAD A DEAD PERSON AND THAT THAT PERSON WAS KILLED BY A DEFENDANT DURING THE COMMISSION OF A ROBBERY AND LET'S SAY -- LET'S ASSUME THAT IT WAS PREMEDITATED AND IT WAS INTENTIONAL AND THIS PERSON GETS KILLED BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT IS SEEKING TO ROB HIM AND JUST GOES UP TO HIM AND SHOOTS HIM AND KILLS HIM AND STEALS ALL THE MONEY, THAT IS WHAT WE HAVE GOT.

YOU BELIEVE THAT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. COULD YOU IN THAT SITUATION, AT LEAST CONSIDER THE DEATH PENALTY

AS A POSSIBLE SENTENCE FOR THAT DEFENDANT?

MR. MURRAY: WELL, I WOULD HAVE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT HIS CHARACTER. I WOULD HAVE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT IT.

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO. THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT HIS HONOR WAS SUGGESTING TO YOU WHEN HE SAID YOU WOULD BE INSTRUCTED BY THE COURT TO CONSIDER THE DEFENDANT'S BACKGROUND, HIS CHARACTER, WHETHER OR NOT HE HAD ANY CRIMINAL RECORD, WHEN IT WAS TIME TO DO THE PENALTY PHASE, IF YOU EVER GOT TO THAT.

MR. MURRAY: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, YOU UNDERSTAND ALTHOUGH HIS HONOR
DESCRIBED 19 VARIOUS TYPES OF CRIMES FOR WHICH THE DEATH
PENALTY IS AVAILABLE, THAT NOWHERE DOES THE LEGISLATURE SAY
YOU HAVE GOT TO GIVE SOMEBODY THE DEATH PENALTY.

THEY HAVE GOT TO DIE 15 THEY DID THIS, BUT RATHER,
THAT IS REALLY SOMETHING YOU AS A JUROR WOULD HAVE TO DECIDE.
DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. MURRAY: YES, I DO.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. NOW, WHEN WE WERE IN THAT FIRST PART OF THE TRIAL, THE GUILT PHASE, A POINT IN TIME WOULD COME WHEN THE JUDGE WOULD SAY TO YOU IF YOU WERE A JUROR AND THE REST OF THE JURORS, THE PEOPLE, THE GOVERNMENT, THE PROSECUTION HAS A BURDEN OF PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT FOR YOU TO FIND GUILT. YOU HAVE HEARD THAT EXPRESSION BEFORE, HAVE YOU NOT?

MR. MURRAY: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT WHETHER IT IS A TRAFFIC TICKET, A RAPE, A BURGLARY, A MURDER, THE STANDARD

OF PROOF IS ALWAYS THE SAME, THAT BEING BEYOND A REASONABLE 1 2 DOUBT? 3 MR. MURRAY: YES. MR. BARENS: AND DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE PEOPLE ARE 4 5 HELD TO THE SAME BURDEN OF PROOF, WHETHER THE PENALTY IS DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER OR A WEEK IN THE COUNTY JAIL? DO YOU KNOW 6 7 THAT THAT IS THE LAW? 8 MR. BURRAY: WELL, IF I AM TOLD SO. I MEAN, THAT I --9 WELL. DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER AND BEING TRIED FOR A TRAFFIC 10 TICKET ARE TOTALLY SOMETHING DIFFERENT TO ME. MR. BARENS: TRUST ME WHEN I TELL YOU THAT THE STANDARD 11 12 OF PROOF IS THE SAME, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE PENALTY. THE JUDGE 13 WILL TELL YOU THAT STRAIGHT UP. OKAY? 14 MR. MURRAY: YES. MR. BARENS: NOW, KNOWING THAT THAT IS THE ABSOLUTE 15 LEGAL INSTRUCTION THAT YOU WILL RECEIVE AS A JUROR, ARE YOU 16 WILLING TO ACCEPT THAT ALL THAT HAS TO BE PROVED IS GUILT 17 18 BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT? 19 MR. MURRAY: YES. 20 MR. BARENS: YOU WILL ACCEPT THAT, SIR? 21 MR. MURRAY: YES. MR. BARENS: YOU WILL FOLLOW THAT? 22 23 MR. MURRAY: YES, I WILL. 24 MR. BARENS: NOW, UNDERSTAND SO THAT YOU DON'T CONFUSE ME WITH THE OTHER SIDE, THAT ALTHOUGH I MIGHT SAY TO YOU THAT 25 26 ALL THEY HAVE TO PROVE IS GUILT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, I DON'T MEAN TO MAKE THAT SOUND LIKE IT IS SOMETHING SMALL. 27 28 DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT I AM SAYING?

MR. MURRAY: YES. 1 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. NOW, YOU WOULD ALSO BE TOLD THAT 2 DURING THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL, IN OTHER WORDS WHETHER 3 YOU BELIEVE THE DEFENDANT OR INNOCENT, YOU ARE NOT AT ALL TO 4 CONSIDER THIS PENALTY OF EITHER DEATH OR LIFE WITHOUT 5 POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 6 MR. MURRAY: YES. 7 MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK THAT YOU COULD MAKE A DECISION 8 AS TO WHETHER THE DEFENDANT WAS GUILTY OR INNOCENT, WITHOUT 9 CONSIDERING AT ALL WHAT THE POTENTIAL PENALTY MIGHT BE, WERE 10 YOU TO FIND GUILT OR INNOCENCE? 11 12 MR. MURRAY: YES, I COULD. MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH 13 I AM HERE TALKING TO YOU ABOUT QUESTIONS INVOLVING YOUR 14 ATTITUDES ON THE DEATH PENALTY AND HIS HONOR DID SO PREVIOUSLY 15 AND MR. WAPNER, THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY WILL DO SO, THAT THERE 16 IS NO REASON FOR YOU TO BELIEVE THAT MR. HUNT HAS DONE ANY-17 THING WRONG, JUST BECAUSE WE ARE HERE TALKING ABOUT THAT? 18 MR. MURRAY: I UNDERSTAND. 19 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE FACT THAT HE 20 IS ACCUSED OF A CRIME, DOESN'T MEAN HE COMMITTED A CRIME? 21 MR. MURRAY: I UNDERSTAND THAT. 22 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT I MEAN BY PRESUMPTION 23 24 OF INNOCENCE? 25 MR. MURRAY: YES. MR. BARENS: BUT IF YOU WERE A DEFENDANT IN THIS COURT-26 ROOM OR ANYBODY ELSE WAS, THAT EVERYONE COMES IN HERE WITH 27

A PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE? WE HAVE TO HAVE A TRIAL.

MR. MURRAY: INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY, YES. MR. BARENS: QUITE SO. THE DEFENSE PASSES FOR CAUSE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME, SIR. 

MR. WAPNER: GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. MURRAY. I AM FRED
WAPNER. I AM THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY WHO IS PROSECUTING
THIS CASE.

MR. MURRAY: GOOD AFTERNOON.

MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU EXPLAIN TO ME WHAT YOU MEANT
WHEN YOU SAID THAT YOU HATE TO USE THE DEATH PENALTY UNLESS
IT IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY?

MR. MURRAY: WELL, I WOULDN'T, JUST BECAUSE -- NOT TO MAKE IT SEEM LIKE ANY SMALL MATTER -- BUT I THINK PEOPLE ARE ABLE TO BE -- WELL, PEOPLE ARE ABLE TO BE REINSTITUTED INTO SOCIETY, YOU KNOW, REHABILITATED, SO TO SPEAK, YOU KNOW, IF THEY COMMITTED A MURDER OR I DON'T -- THAT DOESN'T MAKE THEM NECESSARILY -- IT DOESN'T NECESSARILY MAKE THEM A HAZARD TO SOCIETY.

OR I MEAN I THINK THAT SOME PEOPLE ARE ABLE TO LIVE IN A SOCIETY, TO GO TO PRISON AND BE REHABILITATED, SO TO SPEAK, AND BE ABLE TO COPE IN SOCIETY.

MR. WAPNER: SO THE "ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY" HAS TO DO WITH PEOPLE THAT YOU THINK, AFTER HEARING THE EVIDENCE, THAT THERE IS NO CHANCE THAT THEY WOULD BE REHABILITATED, IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT?

(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.)

MR. WAPNER: I DON'T MEAN TO BE PUTTING WORDS IN YOUR MOUTH.

WAS THAT A FAIR STATEMENT?

MR. MURRAY: WELL, I WOULDN'T WANT ANYONE ON THE STREET
WHEN I AM PRETTY SURE THEY ARE GOING TO GO OUT AND COMMIT
ANOTHER MURDER. IF I FEEL THEY ARE GOING TO GO OUT AND

g

COMMIT ANOTHER MURDER -- IF I FEEL THEY ARE GOING TO GO OUT

AND COMMIT ANOTHER MURDER, I WOULDN'T WANT THEM OUT ON THE

STREET. I DON'T THINK THEY ARE ABLE TO LIVE IN THE SOCIETY.

WE DON'T WANT THOSE PEOPLE OUT.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. HOW DOES YOUR OPINION ON THIS CHANGE

IF I TELL YOU THAT IF YOU ARE A JUROR ON THIS CASE YOU ONLY

HAVE TWO CHOICES AND ONE IS DEATH IN THE GAS CHAMBER BUT THE

OTHER ONE IS LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF

PAROLE?

THE COURT: HE NEVER GETS OUT AND HE IS NEVER REHABILITATED.

MR. WAPNER: WHETHER HE IS REHABILITATED OR NOT, HE
IS NEVER GOING TO BE ABLE TO GET OUT INTO SOCIETY TO PROVE
IT TO ANYONE.

MR. MURRAY: WELL, HE IS ALIVE. I IMAGINE PEOPLE CAN
BE PRODUCTIVE IF THEY ARE GIVEN THE CHANCE TO BE PRODUCTIVE
IN PRISON.

I WOULD RATHER -- I WOULDN'T -- THAT IS A BAD CHOICE TO SAY, "RATHER."

THE COURT: YOU WOULD RATHER WHAT?

MR. MURRAY: I WAS GOING TO SAY, YOU KNOW, WELL, IF HIS CHARACTER DOESN'T WARRANT HIM BEING PUT TO DEATH, IF THE CRIME WASN'T SO MALICIOUS, I THINK THE CHOICE OF LIFE IMPRISONMENT WOULD BE, YOU KNOW, FINE, A GOOD CHOICE, YOU KNOW, IF HIS CHARACTER AND THE CRIME HE SUPPOSEDLY COMMITTED WASN'T MALICIOUS, YOU KNOW, MALICIOUS.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONG PERSONAL RELIGIOUS

OR MORAL CONVICTIONS THAT WOULD AFFECT YOUR ABILITY TO DECIDE

THIS CASE FAIRLY?

MR. MURRAY: I DON'T THINK SO, NO.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY HESITATION ABOUT THAT --

MR. MURRAY: NO, I DON'T.

MR. WAPNER: -- DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONG BELIEFS?

IF YOU ARE A JUROR ON THIS CASE AND YOU SIT THROUGH THE GUILT PHASE AND YOU AND 11 OTHER PEOPLE DECIDE THAT THERE WAS AN INTENTIONAL MURDER DURING A ROBBERY AND THEN YOU SIT THROUGH THE PENALTY PHASE AND YOU HEAR ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AND THEN YOU GO INTO THE JURY ROOM AND YOU DELIBERATE ON THE CASE AND YOU DECIDE IN YOUR OW. MIND THAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT IS DEATH, ARE YOU CAPABLE OF RENDERING THAT VERDICT?

MR. MURRAY: YES, YES, I AM.

•

\_

2

3

MR. WAPNER: ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOU DECIDE THAT THE APPROPRIATE PUNISHMENT IS LIFE IMPRISONMENT WITHOUT PAROLE, ARE YOU CAPABLE OF RENDERING THAT VERDICT?

MR. MURRAY: YES, I AM.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT NOBODY IS GOING TO TELL YOU HOW TO VOTE, THAT YOU HAVE TO MAKE UP YOUR OWN MIND?

MR. MURRAY: YES.

MR. WAPNER: KNOWING THAT YOU MIGHT BE CALLED ON TO MAKE A DECISION OF THAT CALIBER, DOES THAT --

WELL, MAYBE YOU HAVE ANSWERED THIS QUESTION: YOU FEEL LIKE YOU CAN MAKE THAT KIND OF A DECISION?

MR. MURRAY: YES, I DO.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I WILL PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR -->NOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, BOTH SIDES HAVE PASSED FOR CAUSE.

WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT YOU CAN QUALIFY AS A TRIAL JUROR ON

THIS CASE AND SIT AS A TRIAL JUROR AND DECIDE THE GUILT PHASE

AND THE PENALTY PHASE.

WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO IS -- WE WILL FINISH

IT UP TOMORROW, I THINK, SO I WILL ASK YOU TO COME BACK ON

MONDAY MORNING AND YOU WILL GO TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AT

10:30 AND THEN WE WILL BRING YOU ALL HERE AND WE WILL START

THE TRIAL, FINISH UP THE IMPANELMENT OF THE JURY, ALL RIGHT?

MR. MURRAY: ALL RIGHT.

THE COURT: WILL THAT BE ALL RIGHT WITH YOU?

MR. MURRAY: THAT IS FINE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MONDAY MORNING AT 10:30, THE

27

28

JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM. 1 MR. MURRAY: OKAY, FINE. 2 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, FINE. SEE YOU THEN. 3 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR MURRAY EXITED THE COURTROOM.) 5 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, BEFORE PROCEEDING NOW, PERHAPS 6 AT THIS TIME IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR US TO -- IT APPEARS 7 THERE MAY BE TWO THINGS WE NEED TO QUERY THE COURT ABOUT, 8 RATHER THAN STARTING WITH ANOTHER JUROR. 9 THE BAILIFF: THERE ARE NO MORE JURORS. 10 THE COURT: THERE ARE NO MORE JURORS UNTIL TOMORROW. 11 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. THAT MAKES IT EASY THEN. 12 AND OBVIOUSLY, WITH ONLY EIGHT NAMES LEFT WE ARE 13 IN GOOD SHAPE AS IT IS. 14 THE COURT: WE WILL FINISH TOMORROW. 15 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR WILL RECALL THERE WAS THIS 16 CONSERVATOR FELLOW OSTROVE ON THE LEVIN ESTATE THAT WE HAVE 17 BEEN TRYING TO SCHEDULE IN TO GO AND SEE AND MR. WAPNER HAS 18 19 BEEN --THE COURT: WHAT IS HIS NAME? 20 21 MR. BARENS: OSTROVE. 22 MR. WAPNER: OSTROVE. THE COURT: WHO IS HE NOW? 23 MR. BARENS: HE IS THE CONSERVATOR FOR THE LEVIN ESTATE. 24 25 THE COURT: YES, YES.

MR. BARENS: AND MR. WAPNER HAS BEEN MOST HELPFUL IN

AFFORDING US COOPERATION IN ARRANGING FOR THAT APPOINTMENT.

IT OCCURS TO THE DEFENSE THAT SUCH AN EXAMINATION

OF HIS RECORDS WILL NOT BE MEANINGFUL TO THE DEFENSE WITHOUT
THE PARTICIPATION OF MR. HUNT. THE DEFENSE NOT BEING FAMILIAR
WITH ALL OF THE POSSIBLE TRANSACTIONS THAT MIGHT HAVE GONE
ON INVOLVING MR. LEVIN, AND LET'S ASSUME, HIS COMPLEX
MACHINATIONS THAT SIMPLY MYSELF NOR MR. CHIER WOULD BE AWARE
OF OR ADVISED ABOUT, AND WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE PERMISSION
TO HAVE MR. HUNT PRESENT DURING THE EXAMINATION OF THOSE
RECORDS.

FOR REASONS KNOWN TO HIMSELF, MR. WAPNER OBJECTS
TO MR. HUNT BEING PRESENT DURING THE REVIEW OF THOSE RECORDS.

NOW, WE FEEL THAT OBVIOUSLY SAFEGUARDS COULD EASILY BE INSTALLED TO SANITIZE THE SETTING WHEREIN THOSE RECORDS WOULD BE REVIEWED.

IT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE FOR US TO GO TO THE EXPENSE,

AS WE JUST DON'T HAVE THE ABILITY TO DO SO, TO GO AND COPY

ALL OF THAT STUFF AND SOMEHOW TRANSPORT IT BACK TO MY OFFICE.

THE TIME AND THE EFFORT WOULD BE INCREDIBLE, NOT TO MENTION

THAT WE WOULD PROBABLY END UP COPYING A LOT OF STUFF WE DON'T

WANT.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE AN INVESTIGATOR THAT YOU CAN SEND ALONG AND BE PRESENT AT THE TIME?

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO COULD BE THERE.

BUT I WAS ONLY YESTERDAY, TOLD BY MR. CHIER THAT
THEY WANTED THE PRESENCE OF MR. HUNT THERE. I DIDN'T KNOW
THAT UNTIL YESTERDAY AND AFTER GIVING IT SOME THOUGHT, TO
ME, IT IS TANTAMOUNT TO ALLOWING MR. HUNT TO GO INTO
MR. LEVIN'S APARTMENT BECAUSE, IN ESSENCE, MR. OSTROVE HAS

28F

POSSESSION OF A LOT OF DOCUMENTS THAT WERE TAKEN OUT OF MR. LEVIN'S PLACE.

IT IS INCREDIBLE TO ME THAT AFTER COUNSEL HAS

HAD THIS CASE FOR TWO AND A HALF YEARS THAT COUNSEL IS NOT

FAMILIAR ENOUGH WITH THE FACTS OF THE CASE TO LOOK AT THAT

OR HAVE AN INVESTIGATOR LOOK AT THOSE RECORDS AND DETERMINE

WHAT IS SIGNIFICANT AND WHAT IS NOT SIGNIFICANT. AND I JUST--

THERE ARE OTHER WAYS THAT WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO

ACCOMMODATE THIS OR ACCOMPLISH THIS -- I AM SORRY -- BUT I

JUST THINK THAT IT IS HIGHLY IMPROPER. I DON'T KNOW OF ANY

CASE WHERE THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN ALLOWED TO GO RIFLE THROUGH

ORIGINAL EXHIBITS.

IT IS ALMOST, TO USE AN EXAMPLE, TANTAMOUNT TO SAYING THAT "YOU CAN GO TO THE EXHIBIT ROOM AT THE BEVERLY HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT AND JUST LOOK AT ALL OF THE RECORDS THAT WE HAVE GOT" AND I DON'T THINK THAT IS PROPER EITHER.

## FOR THOSE REASONS --

HAD? HE NEVER SAW THEM.

MR. WAPNER: I DON'T THINK THAT --

THE COURT: IS YOUR ASSOCIATE HERE FAMILIAR WITH ALL

OF THE RECORDS? HE IS THOROUGHLY AWARE OF IT. CAN HE BE THERE

AT THE TIME?

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, IT WOULD BE VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE

FOR US TO BE ABLE TO TOTALLY APPRECIATE EVERYTHING THAT WE

MIGHT NEED TO APPRECIATE. THE LAWYERS SIMPLY ARE NOT THE CLIENT

THE COURT: HOW IS HE AWARE OF THE RECORDS THAT LEVIN

MR. BARENS: THE DEFENDANT HAD EXTENSIVE BUSINESS

RELATIONSHIPS ON A VARIETY OF LEVELS WITH MR. LEVIN, ALL OF WHICH

I SUBMIT I WOULDN'T BE AWARE OF BECAUSE I DIDN'T SPEND THE

YEARS IN CONTACT WITH MR. LEVIN THAT THE DEFENDANT DID.

THE DEFENDANT IS FAMILIAR WITH ALL OF THE VARIOUS
TOPICS THAT MR. LEVIN WAS INVOLVED WITH, AS WELL AS A VARIETY
OF OTHER THINGS. I JUST DON'T HAVE ANY KNOWLEDGE AT ALL ABOUT
IT. BUT YOUR HONOR, IF WE COULD ADDRESS WHAT THE CONCERN
APPEARS TO BE, OBVIOUSLY, LET'S BE HONEST, OKAY?

THE COURT: WELL, ABOUT THE INTEGRITY OF THE RECORDS.

THAT IS WHAT I AM CONCERNED ABOUT.

MR. BARENS: THAT IS WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS.

HONESTLY, WHAT THE PEOPLE ARE SAYING IS THAT THEY ARE AFRAID

MR. HUNT IS GOING TO GO THERE WITH HIS LAWYERS AND DESTROY

RECORDS OR REMOVE RECORDS OR TAMPER WITH RECORDS OR ALTER

RECORDS. LET'S CALL A SPADE A SPADE.

NOW, THAT IS EASILY ACCOMPLISHED OR OBVIATED THROUGH TWO WAYS.

NUMBER ONE, I DARE SAY THAT COUNSEL WOULD NEVER
PERMIT THAT. COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT WOULD NEVER PERMIT
THAT AND COUNSEL WOULD BE A WITNESS TO THAT ACTIVITY.

SECONDARILY, THE PEOPLE HAVE THE ENTIRE BEVERLY
HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT AT THEIR DISPOSAL. THEY HAVE THE
ENTIRE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND INVESTIGATOR'S STAFF
AVAILABLE. WE ASK THEM TO MAKE ONE OF THOSE BODIES AVAILABLE
TO GO OVER AND SAFEGUARD THE INTEGRITY.

THE COURT: HOW LONG IS IT INDICATED THAT THIS THING WILL LAST?

MR. BARENS: I WOULD SAY AS LONG AS ANYWHERE FROM THREE TO FOUR HOURS.

THE COURT: CAN'T YOU GET SOMEBODY FOR THREE OR FOUR
HOURS TO BE THERE AND SEE THAT NOTHING IS TAMPERED WITH?

MR. WAPNER: WELL, FIRST OF ALL, THE FILES OF MR. OSTROVE ARE QUITE EXTENSIVE.

AND TO SAY THAT WE ARE GOING TO GO THROUGH THE ENTIRE BEVERLY HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT AND MR. OSTROVE'S LIBRARY --

THE COURT: DON'T YOU THINK SINCE YOU ARE PRESENTING
THE CASE AND SO FORTH, THAT YOU SHOULD KNOW WHAT IS IN THOSE
RECORDS YOURSELF?

MR. WAPNER: I DO KNOW WHAT IS IN THOSE RECORDS.

THE COURT: WELL THEN, YOU HAVE SEEN THEM BEFORE?

MR. WAPNER: YES.

MR. BARENS: WE HAVE NOT.

MR. WAPNER: I TOLD MR. BARENS AND MR. CHIER FROM THE

VERY BEGINNING, THAT I WOULD BE HAPPY TO LET THEM LOOK AT THAT.

I DIDN'T HAVE ANY CLUE UNTIL YESTERDAY THAT THEY WERE INTENDING TO HAVE MR. HUNT THERE.

IF THEY WANTED TO LOOK AT THOSE, IF THE ATTORNEYS
WANT TO LOOK AT THOSE RECORDS OR COPY WHATEVER THEY WANT, THEN
THEY CAN BE MADE AVAILABLE. THEY CAN GO OVER THEM AT THEIR
LEISURE WITH THE DEFENDANT THEN.

BUT I DON'T WANT JOE HUNT RIFLING THROUGH RON LEVIN'S RECORDS.

THE COURT: WELL, MR. BARENS CLAIMS THAT HE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT TO LOOK FOR.

MR. WAPNER: HOW CAN THAT BE?

THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW. BUT THAT IS WHAT HE IS TELLING ME. THAT IS WHAT HE SAYS.

MR. BARENS: 1 AM STRAIGHT UP, TELLING YOU THAT I DON'T FEEL SECURE GOING THERE. 1 AM NOT SECURE IN SAYING I WOULD BE ABLE TO REPRESENT JOE HUNT, AS A DEFENDANT AND LISTEN, I FOUND EVERYTHING THAT WAS RELEVANT THERE. I DON'T FEEL COMPETENT TO DO THAT.

I AM A LAWYER, NOT AN ACCOUNTANT.

THE COURT: MR. CHIER COULD PROBABLY BE AVAILABLE FOR THAT PUBPOSE. HE KNOWS WHAT IT IS ABOUT.

MR. BARENS: MR. CHIER, THERE IS NO WAY THAT I WOULD EVER FEEL MR. CHIER EITHER IS COMPETENT TO SATISFY THE DUTY I FEEL TO JOE HUNT IN REGARD TO THE EXAMINATION OF THOSE RECORDS.

THAT LEAVES ME WITH TWO UNACCEPTABLE CHOICES.

I HAVE TO EITHER --

THE COURT: WHAT IS IT YOU ARE CONCERNED ABOUT? YOU

\_\_\_

ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THE INTEGRITY OF THE RECORDS, SO NOTHING IS CHANGED?

WHY DON'T YOU GET SOMEONE? THREE OR FOUR HOURS,

IF IT IS THAT LONG, I THINK YOU COULD TAKE AN INVESTIGATOR

OVER THERE AT THE TIME.

YOU HAVE GOT THE FACILITIES, HAVE YOU NOT?

MR. WAPNER: WELL, IF THAT IS WHAT --

THE COURT: I THINK THAT WOULD BE THE FAIR THING TO DO, WOULDN'T IT? THAT IS, PROVIDING THAT HE DOES NOT HANDLE ANY OF THOSE RECORDS.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, I THINK I TOLD YOU THAT THAT IS WHAT I DON'T WANT, IS TO HAVE MR. HUNT SITTING THERE, RIFLING THROUGH THE FILES. AND THEN --

THE COURT: HE IS NOT SUPPOSED TO HANDLE ANY OF THE FILES.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, THAT IS EXACTLY THE POINT I AM

GETTING TO. THAT IS WHY IF HE NEEDS TO BE THERE WHILE THE

ATTORNEY IS EXAMINING THE RECORDS AND THEN IF THE ATTORNEY

WANTS TO CONSULT WITH MR. HUNT AND SAY, IS THIS SIGNIFICANT

AND THEY SHOW IT TO HIM, THAT'S ALL RIGHT.

IF THAT IS THE PROCEDURE THAT WE HAVE TO GET, THAT IS OKAY.

MR. BARENS: JUDGE, I --

MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME. I AM NOT THROUGH.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MR. WAPNER: IF MR. CHIER OR MR. BARENS OR BOTH WANT TO EXAMINE THE FILE PAGE BY PAGE, THAT IS FINE WITH ME.

BUT I THINK THAT THAT SHOULD BE VERY CLEAR THAT

IT IS THE LAWYER WHO IS EXAMINING THE FILE, WITH THE DEFENDANT THERE ONLY FOR CONSULTATION.

THE COURT: WELL, THAT IS ALL IT WOULD BE FOR.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: THAT IS ALL I ASKED FOR, LET ME TELL YOU.

THE COURT: BE SURE THAT THAT IS FOLLOWED. YOU HAVE

AN INVESTIGATOR THERE.

28B

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: HAVE MR. OSTROVE KNOW WHAT IS GOING TO TAKE

PLACE. THE LAWYERS WILL EXAMINE THOSE FILES. THE DEFENDANT

WILL BE THERE FOR THE PURPOSE OF CORROBORATING OR CHECKING

OR IDENTIFYING AND THAT IS ALL, NOT HANDLING ANY OF THE PAPERS.

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, COULD WE GET A MINUTE ORDER TO THAT EFFECT?

THE COURT: CERTAINLY. IS THAT AGREEABLE TO YOU?

MR. BARENS: YES, QUITE SO. JUST ONE MOMENT.

(BRIEF PAUSE.)

MR. BARENS: WE WOULD LIKE AN EXAMINATION AT THE SAME TIME, TO VIEW BUT NOT TOUCH -- TO VIEW ALL OF LEVIN'S OFFICE EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS THAT MIGHT BE PRESENT IN MR. OSTROVE'S OFFICE AT THAT TIME, TO VIEW THEM.

THE COURT: WHAT DOES THAT MEAN?

MR. BARENS: WELL, WE BELIEVE THAT THERE MAY OR MAY NOT BE CERTAIN CHATTEL PROPERTIES, PROPERTY THAT COULD BE EXCULPATORY IN NATURE, THAT WOULD BE PRESENT IN OSTROVE'S OFFICE THAT OSTROVE WOULD IDENTIFY AS BEING THE PROPERTY PREVIOUSLY IN MR. LEVIN'S POSSESSION.

MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME FOR JUST ONE MOMENT.

(PAUSE.)

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, THERE ARE NO SUCH THINGS. I
HAD A CONVERSATION WITH MR. BARENS. HE IS TALKING ABOUT
PIECES OF OFFICE MACHINERY.

THEY DON'T HAVE ANYTHING LIKE THAT. AND WHEN MR.

BARENS GOES THROUGH THE FILES TO SEE IT, HE WILL SEE THAT THEY

HAD AN APPRAISER APPOINTED.

ALL OF THE PROPERTY WAS APPRAISED AND THEN IT WAS 1 AUCTIONED OFF. THERE IS NO PROPERTY, AS SUCH. 2 MR. BARENS: THEN HE DOESN'T HAVE THE PROPERTY. 3 THE COURT: WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO? 4 MR. BARENS: THEN I SHALL NOT VIEW SUCH PROPERTY. AND 5 THEN WE WOULD LIKE OBVIOUSLY, JUST --6 THE COURT: JUST THE RECORDS? 7 MR. BARENS: JUST LIKE THE RECORDS, OBVIOUSLY. I WOULD 8 LIKE TO COPY THE DOCUMENTATION SUBSTANTIATING WHERE THOSE 9 CHATTELS WENT, WHERE THEY ARE AND WHEN THEY WERE SOLD. 10 THE COURT: WHICH CHATTELS ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT NOW? 11 12 WHAT MATERIAL? MR. BARENS: WELL, YOUR HONOR, YOU WILL SEE DURING THE 13 TRIAL THAT THERE IS SOME CONTENTION ABOUT HOW THINGS WERE 14 15 MADE. THE COURT: WELL, YOU CAN ASK THE ADMINISTRATOR. 16 MR. BARENS: THE EXECUTOR, I BELIEVE? 17 THE COURT: THE EXECUTOR. WAS THERE A WILL? 18 MR. BARENS: WHAT IS HE NOW? I GUESS THE CONSERVATOR. 19 I BELIEVE IT IS THE CONSERVATOR OF THE ESTATE. 20 THE COURT: THAT'S RIGHT. WE HAVE THE FIVE-YEAR PERIOD. 21 MR. BARENS: YES. I WAS INTO P.I. NOT PROBATE. THAT 22 23 IS A BIT OF A JOKE. ALL RIGHT. NOW YOUR HONOR, THERE WAS A SECOND 24 ISSUE. YESTERDAY, THE DEFENDANT FILED A MOTION FOR A HEARING 25 ON THE ISSUE OF THE HOLLYWOOD INVESTIGATION MATERIALS ON 26 27 KARNY.

WE RECALENDARED THAT YESTERDAY FOR HEARING TODAY.

THE COURT: 1 DID SEE SOME PAPERS. 1 ALL IT SAYS IS THAT IT WAS A MOTION FOR DISCOVERY, 2 3 WITHOUT ANY ACCOMPANYING PAPERS. MR. BARENS: IT MADE REFERENCE IN THE BODY OF IT TO 4 5 RESTORING TO CALENDAR THE MOTION PREVIOUSLY FILED. I THINK THAT IT WAS ON DECEMBER 12TH OR WHATEVER 6 7 DATE IT WAS, BY REFERENCE. 8 THE COURT: WELL, "PLEASE TAKE NOTICE ON JANUARY 7TH AT 10:30 A.M. THE DEFENDANT WILL MOVE THE COURT FOR THE 9 10 RELEASE SPECIFIED IN DEFENDANT'S MOTION OF DECEMBER 3RD." 11 WHAT IS THAT MOTION? MR. BARENS: THAT MOTION YOUR HONOR, IS IN YOUR FILE. 12 IT WAS THE ORIGINAL, FILED MOTION OF THE DISCOVERY MATERIALS 13 14 FROM THE HOLLYWOOD POLICE DEPARTMENT AND EVERYONE ELSE 15 CONCERNING THAT KARNY ISSUE. WE HAVE NEVER --16 THE COURT: I DON'T REMEMBER THAT. MR. BARENS: IT IS QUITE WELL IN YOUR FILE, YOUR HONOR. 17 18 AND NOW I UNDERSTOOD WHEN WE FILED THE MOTION YESTERDAY, I 19 ADDRESSED IT TO MR. WAPNER, WHO ADVISED ME THAT HE WOULD NEED 20 A PERIOD OF TIME IN WHICH TO BE ABLE TO RESPOND, WHICH WE 21 CERTAINLY THINK IS APPROPRIATE. 22 WE ARE JUST INQUIRING AS TO WHAT DATE WE COULD 23 HAVE THIS MOTION HEARD. 24 THE COURT: ANY TIME THAT IS AGREEABLE WITH YOU IS OKAY 25 WITH ME. 26 MR. BARENS: DO YOU HAVE A DATE FOR THAT? 27 MR. WAPNER: I DON'T HAVE A DATE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: DID YOU FIND THE MOTION PAPERS?

THE CLERK: DID I FIND THEM? THE COURT: DID YOU FIND THEM? THE CLERK: NO. I HAVE NOT FOUND THEM YET. MR. BARENS: DECEMBER 3RD, I BELIEVE. WE HAVE A PHOTO-COPY HERE, BEARING THE COURT FILE STAMP, YOUR HONOR. 

```
I KNOW MR. WAPNER HAS A COPY.
 1
                 (PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)
 2
           THE COURT: WILL YOU FURNISH US WITH A COPY OF 1T?
 3
     SHE DOESN'T SEEM TO FIND IT.
 4
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. NOW THIS IS THE ONLY COPY I
5
     HAVE AT HAND, WHICH I WILL LEAVE WITH YOU FOR NOW.
 6
           THE COURT: YOU HAVE IT, THAT IS THE FILE COPY. YOU
7
     HAVE IT STAMPED THERE?
8
           MR. BARENS: QUITE SO, IT IS STAMPED DECEMBER 4TH, 1986.
9
           THE COURT: THAT IS LAST MONTH.
10
           MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR.
11
           THE COURT: IS IT IN ANOTHER FILE? IS THAT THE ONLY
12
     FILE YOU HAVE RIGHT HERE?
13
           THE CLERK: NO. I HAVE ANOTHER FILE BUT I HAVE GONE
14
     THROUGH ALL MY PAPERS.
15
16
          THE COURT: TAKE A LOOK AT THE OTHER FILE IF YOU DON'T
     FIND IT IN THIS ONE.
17
           THE CLERK: I WAS LOOKING FOR A DIFFERENT DATE.
18
           THE COURT: DECEMBER 4TH.
19
                 OFF THE RECORD.
20
                 (UNREPORTED COLLOQUY BETWEEN THE COURT,
21
22
                 COUNSEL AND THE CLERK.)
          MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, WHY DON'T WE SAY THAT WE WILL
23
    HAVE THIS HEARING NEXT WEDNESDAY, THE 14TH?
24
25
          THE COURT: AT 1:30?
          MR. BARENS: AT 1:30, ALL RIGHT.
26
          THE COURT: OR 9:30, ANY TIME YOU WANT IT.
27
```

MR. BARENS: 9:30, DID YOU SAY?

ō

THE COURT: OR 9 O'CLOCK, IS THAT BETTER?

MR. BARENS: NO. I WAS ACTUALLY THINKING OF 10:30.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, I DON'T WANT TO TAKE ANY TIME OFF FROM THE JURY TRIAL.

MR. WAPNER: I THINK WE SHOULD GET THE JURY FIRST AND THEN BEFORE WE SWEAR THE JURY, WHICH I GUESS IS BEFORE WE DO THE ALTERNATES BECAUSE YOU CAN'T DO THE ALTERNATES UNTIL YOU SWEAR -- I GUESS YOU COULD TECHNICALLY, HOWEVER NORMALLY YOU SWEAR THE FIRST 12 BEFORE YOU GET THE ALTERNATES. AND AFTER WE GET THE FIRST 12 AND BEFORE THEY ARE SWORN, I THINK WE CAN DO THIS MOTION.

AND WE ALSO HAVE TO RESOLVE THE ARCE MOTION, WHICH THE COURT SAID IT WOULD RULE ON.

THE COURT: I WILL RULE ON IT NOW.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT --

THE COURT: YOU MEAN YOU WANT TO ARGUE IT, DO YOU?

MR. WAPNER: WE PUT IT DOWN FOR ARGUMENT SO WE SHOULD AT LEAST ARGUE THAT BEFORE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, WHEN DO YOU WANT TO ARGUE THAT?

MR. WAPNER: BUT WE CAN PUT DOWN THESE MOTIONS
TENTATIVELY FOR NEXT WEDNESDAY AT 10:30, ASSUMING THAT WE
HAVE A JURY, AND IF NOT, WE WILL POSTPONE THEM UNTIL WE GET
THROUGH.

THE COURT: WHY NOT MAKE IT AT 10 O'CLOCK?

MR. WAPNER: THAT IS FINE.

THE COURT: NEXT WEDNESDAY.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT.

THE COURT: DO YOU THINK WE WILL HAVE A JURY BY THAT

TIME?

NINE CHALLENGES SO THAT IS SEVENTEEN.

MR. WAPNER: MAYBE. I DON'T KNOW IF WE WILL HAVE A JURY BY THAT TIME OR NOT.

MR. BARENS: WELL, LET ME JUST SAY, FOR THE RECORD,
THE DEFENSE'S ONLY CONCERN IS THAT WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY,
NUMBER ONE, TO BE HEARD ON THAT DISCOVERY MOTION.

THE COURT: SURE.

MR. BARENS: AND, NUMBER TWO, TO BE IN RECEIPT OF THE MATERIALS, SHOULD WE PREVAIL ON THE MOTION, PRIOR TO THE TIME OR TO SEEK AN ALTERNATIVE REMEDY IF WE ARE UNSUCCESSFUL IN THE TRIAL COURT PRIOR TO THE TIME WE MAKE AN OPENING STATEMENT.

THE COURT: THIS ARGUMENT IS IN A VACUUM, I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE MOTION IS ALL ABOUT. I HAVEN'T SEEN THE PAPERS.

SHE HASN'T BEEN ABLE TO FIND THEM.

MR. BARENS: FINE, YOUR HONOR. I WOULD HAVE SWORN THAT
YOUR HONOR HAD BEEN GIVEN THE MOTION BECAUSE AT ONE TIME WE
HAD A LITTLE DISCUSSION ABOUT THIS.

THE COURT: WHAT WAS THE MOTION FOR NOW?

MR. BARENS: THIS WAS THIS BUSINESS ABOUT, YOU REMEMBER, WE HAD THAT <u>DAVIS V. ALASKA</u> DISCUSSION, YOUR HONOR?

THE COURT: YES, YES.

MR. BARENS: AND THIS IS THAT BUSINESS ABOUT, YOU KNOW,
KARNY BEING ALLEGEDLY A SUSPECT IN A MURDER CASE IN HOLLYWOOD
AND THE PEOPLE WOULDN'T TURN OVER THEIR INVESTIGATION MATERIALS
TO SEE HOW KARNY FITS IN THAT HOMICIDE PICTURE.

THE COURT: OH, YES, I REMEMBER THAT.

MR. BARENS: SO WE HAD IT ON CALENDAR ONE TIME AND WE GOT BUSY WITH JURY SELECTION SO WE OFF-CALENDARED THE

DISCUSSION, WE HAD SOME DISCUSSION IN CHAMBERS, AND NOW WE

WOULD LIKE TO GO BACK ON THAT, YOUR HONOR, SINCE IT IS OBVIOUSLY VERY IMPORTANT TO THE DEFENSE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: BE THAT AS IT MAY, YOUR HONOR.

ô

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, WE WILL SCHEDULE IT, I WILL READ

YOUR COPY AND THEN GIVE IT BACK TO YOU.

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.

(AT 4:35 P.M. AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN

UNTIL THURSDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1987, AT

10:30 A.M.)