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 32 OF 101 (PAGES 4725 TO 4899 , 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

MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1987 VOLUME 32

PAGES 4725 TO 4899 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 | MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1987 | VOLUME 32 PAGES 4725 TO | 4899 |
|----|------------------------------|-------------------------|------|
| 2 | | A.M. | 4725 |
| 3 | | P.M. | 4784 |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | PRO | CEEDINGS | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | VOIR DIRE OF PROSPECTIVE JUR | ORS (CONTINUED) | 4725 |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |
| | | | |

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1987; 10:53 A.M.

DEPARTMENT WEST C HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE

(APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD

OUT OF THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE

JURORS:)

THE COURT: STIPULATED THE DEFENDANT IS PRESENT, COUNSEL ARE PRESENT.

MR. BARENS: GOOD MORNING.

MR. WAPNER: GOOD MORNING.

THE COURT: GOOD MORNING.

MR. WAPNER: TWO THINGS THAT I WANTED TO BRING UP WITH THE COURT BEFORE WE BROUGHT IN THE JURORS.

THE MOST IMPORTANT ONE BEING THAT OVER THE TWO
WEEK BREAK THAT WE HAD FOR THE CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR
HOLIDAY, I WAS ABLE TO HAVE SOMEONE MAKE A PHONE CALL REGARDING
JUROR NO. 11, MR. ERVIN WHITFIELD.

MR. WHITFIELD TOLD US THAT HE HAD WORKED AT THE SOUTHWEST DIVISION OF THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR SIX TO SEVEN MONTHS AND A CAPTAIN'S ADJUTANT AT THE LOS ANGELES POLICE STATION CALLED THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL AND THEY TOLD HIM THAT AN ERVIN A. WHITFIELD WITH THE DATE OF BIRTH OF DECEMBER 12, 1948, HAD IN FACT BEEN EMPLOYED BY THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT BUT ONLY FOR THREE WEEKS IN THE POLICE ACADEMY AND THEN HE HAD LEFT. THEY DIDN'T GIVE THE REASON.

THEY DID SAY, HOWEVER, HE WAS APPROVED FOR

2 FO

REHIRING, WHICH WOULD LEAD ME TO CONCLUDE THAT IT WASN'T ANY MALFEASANCE OR CAUSE FOR DISMISSAL. PROBABLY JUST SOMETHING HE DECIDED OR THEY DECIDED TO EXCUSE HIM BUT WITH THE UNDERSTANDING HE COULD COME BACK.

THE THING IS THAT HE HAS NOW -- IF THIS 15 THE SAME ERVIN WHITFIELD AND IF THAT STATEMENT FROM PERSONNEL IS CORRECT, APPARENTLY HE HAS LIED TO THE COURT ABOUT HIS SERVICE, SO I THINK THAT IN FAIRNESS TO HIM WHAT WE SHOULD DO BEFORE WE BRING THE OTHER PEOPLE IN IS TO HAVE MR. WHITFIELD COME IN AND, FIRST OF ALL, FIND OUT IF THIS IS THE SAME ONE.

I DO RECALL ASKING HIM HOW OLD HE WAS AND I BELIEVE HE SAID 38, WHICH WOULD MAKE THIS BIRTH DATE OF DECEMBER 12, 1948 CORRECT.

1112 00

MR. WAPNER: YES.

THE COURT: WHAT WAS HE ASKED?

THE COURT: HAVE WE GOT IT IN THE RECORD?

MR. WAPNER: ON THE DAILY TRANSCRIPT ON PAGE 3906 WHICH

THE COURT: HOW DID YOU HAPPEN TO CHECK ON HIM?

MR. WAPNER: HOW DID I HAPPEN TO CHECK ON HIM? BECAUSE WHEN HE SAID, IN MY RECOLLECTION, THAT IT WAS A YEAR AND A HALF THAT HE HAD BEEN WITH LAPD, NOTWITHSTANDING THAT HE SAID HE HAD BEEN IN THE SOUTHWEST DIVISION FOR SIX TO SEVEN MONTHS AND HAD NOT MADE ANY ARRESTS, I FOUND THAT VERY, VERY CURIOUS.

AND BECAUSE IT WAS THE LOS ANGELES POLICE

DEPARTMENT AND WE HAVE RESOURCES TO BE ABLE TO DO THAT KIND

OF CHECK VERY, VERY QUICKLY, THAT IS WHY WE CHECKED ON IT.

I WAS ABLE TO DO IT WITH ONE PHONE CALL.

THE COURT: SHALL WE HAVE HIM CALLED IN THEN AND HAVE HIM IN CHAMBERS AND HAVE A REPORTER THERE AND ASK HIM THOSE QUESTIONS?

MR. WAPNER: THAT'S FINE.

MR. BARENS: I SUPPOSE SO. THERE IS SUCH A BIG

OPPORTUNITY THAT THE PERSON THAT MR. WAPNER TALKED TO HIMSELF,

MIGHT HAVE BEEN MISTAKEN. OF COURSE, THE ONLY ONE UNDER OATH

WOULD BE WHITFIELD, NOT THE GUY MR. WAPNER TALKED TO. I DON'T

KNOW.

THE COURT: WELL, LET'S ASK WHITFIELD.

MR. BARENS: NOT TO MENTION, INSTEAD OF SAYING THAT THIS MAN LIED TO THE COURT, WE MAY HAVE MISUNDERSTOOD HIM OR HE MAYBE MISUNDERSTOOD THE QUESTION.

IS VOLUME 27, THE PROCEEDINGS OF TUESDAY, DECEMBER 23RD, 1986 1 AT LINE 9: 2 "MR. BARENS: WERE YOU ACTUALLY -- WERE 3 YOU ACTUALLY IN THE TRAINING CURRICULUM OR 4 WERE YOU OUT WORKING? WERE YOU POSTGRADUATE 5 AND ACTUALLY WORKING AS A POLICEMAN? 6 "MR. WHITFIELD: I HAD JUST FINISHED MY 7 TRAINING AND I HAD BEEN ON THE STREET FOR ABOUT 8 SIX OR SEVEN MONTHS." 9 THE COURT: THAT IS DEFINITE ENOUGH. 10 MR. BARENS: QUITE SO. 11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I WILL TELL YOU WHAT WE'LL DO. 12 WHY DON'T WE GET ALL THE JURORS IN AND PROCEED AS WE NORMALLY 13 DO, EXCEPT ABOUT FIVE MINUTES TO 12:00, I WILL ASK MR. 14 WHITFIELD TO WAIT A MINUTE. THEN WE'LL TAKE HIM INTO 15 16 CHAMBERS. MR. WAPNER: I PREFER TO DO MR. WHITFIELD FIRST BECAUSE 17 IF IN FACT, THIS INFORMATION THAT I HAVE IS CORRECT, I THINK 18 IT FORMS THE BASIS OF A CHALLENGE FOR CAUSE. 19 THE COURT: I DON'T SAY THAT IT DOESN'T. ALL I AM 20 SAYING IS THE QUESTION OF TIMING. THERE IS NO HARM. 21 WE ARE NOT GOING TO PICK A JURY TODAY, OBVIOUSLY, 22 23 THIS MORNING. MR. BARENS: I JUST THOUGHT INSTEAD OF HIM SITTING 24 25 THERE, YOUR HONOR, IF HE IS OUT, HE IS OUT. WE COULD GO ON TO SOMEBODY ELSE STRAIGHT AWAY. BUT IT IS UP TO YOUR HONOR. 26 YOU SEE, THE CHANGE IN THE COMPOSITION BEFORE 27

LUNCHTIME TODAY, MIGHT MAKE US WILLING TO ACCEPT A JURY.

1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IF THAT IS WHAT YOU WANT ME TO 2 DO, I WILL DO IT. SURE, GET HIM IN. 3 MR. BARENS: THE OTHER QUESTION -- DO YOU HAVE ANOTHER POINT FIRST? I THOUGHT YOU SAID YOU HAD TWO. 5 MR. WAPNER: THE ONLY OTHER MATTER THAT I HAVE IS A PROCEDURAL ONE IN TERMS OF SCHEDULING, SO THAT I CAN SCHEDULE 6 7 THE WITNESSES, TRY TO HAVE MAYBE A DAY, EITHER IF IT IS THE 8 DAY FOR THE OPENING STATEMENT OR ONE DAY IN BETWEEN THE END 9 OF THE JURY SELECTION --10 THE COURT: WELL, LET'S SEE WHAT HAPPENS. WE ARE IN THE DARK AT THIS MOMENT AS TO WHEN WE ARE GOING TO START THIS 11 12 TRIAL. 13 UNTIL WE ACTUALLY PICK A JURY, THERE IS NOTHING 14 WE CAN SCHEDULE. 15 MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. 16 MR. BARENS: I HAVE ONE PROCEDURAL QUESTION THAT 1 THOUGHT 17 MAY HAVE REFERENCED TO YOUR HONOR BEFORE. 18 THAT IS, THAT I PRESUME OR I REQUEST WE PROCEED 19 WITH THE 11 REMAINING PEOPLE BEFORE WE GO INTO THE GENERAL, 20 NEW PANEL, SINCE THOSE 11 HAVE BEEN HERE FOREVER. 21 THE COURT: WE ARE GOING TO DO THAT. 22 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 23 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WILL YOU GET WHITFIELD IN? 24 I THINK WE'LL DO IT IN CHAMBERS. 25 MR. BARENS: AGREED. 26

3

27

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD 1 IN CHAMBERS, THE DEFENDANT AND COUNSEL 2 BEING PRESENT:) (PROSPECTIVE JUROR WHITFIELD ENTERED 4 CHAMBERS.) 5 THE COURT: WE JUST WANT TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS, 6 MR. WHITFIELD. THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN SOME CONFUSION AS TO 7 WHAT YOUR BACKGROUND WAS. 8 HOW LONG HAD YOU BEEN WITH THE POLICE DEPARTMENT? 9 MR. WHITFIELD: OH, POSSIBLY A YEAR. POSSIBLY A YEAR. 10 THE COURT: POSSIBLY A YEAR? 11 MR. WHITFIELD: YES. 12 THE COURT: YOU HAD GONE TO THE ACADEMY FIRST, HADN'T 13 YOU? 14 MR. WHITFIELD: YES. 15 THE COURT: THEN YOU GRADUATED FROM THERE? 16 MR. WHITFIELD: YES. 17 THE COURT: AND THEN WHERE WERE YOU ASSIGNED AFTER THAT? 18 MR. WHITFIELD: SOUTHWEST DIVISION. 19 THE COURT: WHAT ARE YOU, ABOUT 38? HOW OLD ARE YOU? 20 MR. WHITFIELD: YES, I WAS --21 THE COURT: WHAT IS YOUR BIRTHDATE? 22 MR. WHITFIELD: DECEMBER 12, 1948. 23 THE COURT: THERE SEEMS TO BE SOME CONFUSION. APPARENTLY 24 25 THE RECORDS AT THE POLICE ACADEMY INDICATE THAT YOU WERE THERE, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, ABOUT THREE WEEKS AND THEN LEFT. 26 27 MR. WHITFIELD: REALLY?

OH, IT HAS BEEN A LONG TIME.

THE COURT: THAT YOU WERE IN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AS I WAS PROBABLY MISTAKEN. IT HAS BEEN A LONG TIME. THE COURT: WELL, DON'T YOU KNOW IF YOU WERE ON THERE MR. WHITFIELD: I HAVE NOTHING TO SAY, YOUR HONOR, BUT THE COURT: WELL, I THINK THAT UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, THE COURT: I THINK MAYBE IT IS BEST UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, SINCE THE RECORD INDICATES THAT THERE IS SOME CONFUSION AND THERE MIGHT BE SOME MISTAKE ON YOUR PART, I THINK MAYBE WE WILL EXCUSE YOU FROM JURY DUTY. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THE COURT: YOU GO TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM AND TELL THEM THAT YOU HAVE BEEN EXCUSED FROM JURY DUTY. (PROSPECTIVE JUROR WHITFIELD EXITED

THIS BRIEFLY BEFORE WE CAME IN HERE AND AGREED TO STIPULATE
THAT IF IT APPEARED THAT THE POLICE DEPARTMENT RECORDS WERE
CORRECT, THAT WE WOULD STIPULATE THAT HE COULD BE EXCUSED.

AND IT IS QUITE OBVIOUS FROM HIS ANSWERS THAT HE WAS NOT BEING TRUTHFUL WITH THE COURT.

MR. BARENS: WAS THAT STRANGE? I MUST SAY, EVEN FOR THE RECORD.

THE COURT: NOW HE CAN'T REMEMBER THAT FOR A YEAR HE HADN'T BEEN ON THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

MR. WAPNER: I THINK FOR THE RECORD, I AM JUST LOOKING

AT THE FACE OF ALL OF THE PEOPLE INVOLVED, I THINK IT IS FAIR

TO CONCLUDE OR FAIR TO STATE FOR THE RECORD THAT EVERYONE

CONCLUDED THAT MR. WHITFIELD WAS LESS THAN TRUTHFUL WITH THE

COURT.

THE COURT: THAT IS OBVIOUS TO THE COURT.

MR. BARENS: WHICH I WILL SAY FOR THE RECORD WAS TOTALLY CONTRARY TO MY PREVIOUS OPINION WHILE I WAS EXAMINING HIM AS A PROSPECTIVE JUROR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. HAVE THE CLERK AND EVERYBODY IN AND WE WILL START.

WHAT I AM GOING TO DO AT THIS PARTICULAR POINT

AS TO THE NEW JURORS, I AM GOING TO VOIR DIRE THEM AND FIND

OUT WHETHER THEY HAVE HAD ANY PRIOR JURY EXPERIENCE, HAD ANY

BRUSHES WITH THE LAW AND READ OFF THE LIST OF THOSE WITNESSES

THAT YOU GAVE ME. NOW THE LATTER PART OF IT, THE OTHER PEOPLE,

I AM MERELY ASKING WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE HEARD THOSE NAMES

BEFORE.

MR. WAPNER: IF YOU WANT TO, YOU CAN JUST READ THE LIST

OF WITNESSES WHICH I DID THE LAST TIME. THE COURT: AND NOT THE OTHER STUFF? THE COURT: YOU SEE, ONE OF THE JURORS WHO HADN'T YET BEEN SUMMONED IN THE BOX, ONE OF THE OLD JURORS HAD SENT A NOTE IN IN WHICH SHE INDICATED THAT SHE OR SOME MEMBER OF THE FAMILY KNEW LEVIN AND THAT IS WHY I THOUGHT IT MIGHT NOT BE A BAD IDEA FOR ME TO READ THOSE OTHER NAMES AND FIND OUT WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE HEARD OF ANY OF THESE OTHER PEOPLE. THE COURT: I WILL JUST READ THE NAMES OF THESE PEOPLE WHO ARE GOING TO BE POTENTIAL WITNESSES AND THE REST OF THEM AND ASK WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE EVER HEARD OF THEM. MR. BARENS: MR. WAPNER, ARE YOU AWARE OF WHAT JUROR THE COURT: I HAVE IT OUT THERE ON THE BENCH. MR. BARENS: I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR'S THE COURT: WHEN THE JUROR IS CALLED IN THE BOX, I WILL ASK HER, SHE SENT A NOTE. I DON'T INTEND TO MAKE A SECRET MR. BARENS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. MR. WAPNER: ONE OTHER THING, PROCEDURALLY, WE HAVE TO SEAT SOMEONE IN SEAT NUMBER 2 --MR. WAPNER: WHICH WAS MRS. FARKAS AND SEAT NUMBER 11 --

MR. WAPNER: -- WHICH WAS MR. WHITFIELD'S OLD SEAT,

4 FO

WHICH I THINK COUNSEL SHOULD THEN EXAMINE BOTH OF THOSE PEOPLE AT THE SAME TIME.

THE COURT: YES.

HOWEVER, WHAT I AM GOING TO DO IS FIRST TELL THE OTHER JURORS WHAT THE CASE IS ALL ABOUT AND THEN YOU CAN START WITH THE INTERROGATION OF THE JURORS. WE ARE GETTING THE TWO NEW JURORS IN THE BOX.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: OUT OF AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION, DO YOU

THINK -- AND I AM ASKING RATHER THAN SUGGESTING, SHOULD YOU

COMMENT ON WHITFIELD'S ABSENCE AT THIS POINT?

MR. WAPNER: NO.

THE COURT: NO.

MR. BARENS: JUST IN ORDER TO AVOID ANY SPECULATION.

THE COURT: HE IS NOT GOING TO TELL ANYBODY. IT MAY VERY WELL BE HE MIGHT HAVE ASKED TO BE EXCUSED, JUST LIKE THE OTHER JUROR WAS.

MR. BARENS: THAT IS TRUE.

OKAY, I AGREE WITH YOU, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: HAVE THEM BRING IN ALL OF THE JURORS.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS:)

THE COURT: THE DEFENDANT IS PRESENT AND COUNSEL ARE PRESENT. THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS ARE PRESENT.

GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. AT LONG LAST, I THINK WE MIGHT BE GETTING STARTED. IF THE OLD JURORS WILL BEAR WITH ME, WHAT I HAVE TO DO IS TO GO THROUGH THE SAME PROCEDURE I DID WITH THOSE OF YOU, THE OLD JURORS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE VOIR DIRE.

SO WHAT I WILL DO IS, ASK THE SAME QUESTIONS OF THE NEW JURORS THAT I ASKED THE OLD JURORS. IF YOU BEAR WITH ME. I DON'T THINK IT WILL TAKE VERY LONG.

NOW, I AM ADDRESSING MYSELF ONLY TO THOSE JURORS WHO ARE CHARACTERIZED AS BEING THE NEW JURORS. ONLY YOU ARE THE ONES INVOLVED.

NOW, WHAT I WANT TO DO, IS TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS. I WILL MAKE A NOTE OF ALL OF THE NAMES, DEPENDING UPON WHAT YOUR ANSWERS ARE GOING TO BE.

NOW, YOU HAVE KNOWN WHAT THIS CASE IS ALL ABOUT.

NOW WHAT I WANT TO DO IS, ASK YOU THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

HAVE YOU OR MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY OR CLOSE PERSONAL FRIENDS

EVER BEEN IDENTIFIED WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT, ANY MEMBERS OF THE

POLICE DEPARTMENT, SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, F.B.I., C.I.A. OR

ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY, YOU OR MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY?

RAISE YOUR HANDS AND TELL ME YOUR NAME. IF YOU TAKE THE PLACE

OF ANY JUROR SEATED IN THE BOX, I WILL HAVE YOUR NAMES AND

I WILL ASK YOU PERTINENT QUESTIONS ALONG THOSE LINES.

1 YES, SIR? WHAT IS YOUR NAME? 2 MR. YOUNG: CECIL YOUNG. 3 THE COURT: JUST LET ME HAVE YOUR NAME. 4 MR. YOUNG: YOUNG. 5 THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. YOUNG. LET ME GO THROUGH THE FIRST ROW, SECOND ROW AND THIRD ROW. 6 7 MS. FELTS: KAREN FELTS, F-E-L-T-S. 8 THE COURT: YES. THANK YOU. 9 MS. KUBECK: MY NAME IS KUBECK, K-U-B-E-C-K. 10 THE COURT: THANK YOU. YES? 11 MS. GALL: BRENDA GALL, G-A-L-L. 12 THE COURT: THANK YOU. 13 MS. ELIE: JULIE ELIE. 14 THE COURT: ELIE? THANK YOU. 15 MR. NAISTAT: NAISTAT, N-A-I-S-T-A-T. 16 THE COURT: YES? HAVE I GOT EVERYBODY NOW? ALL RIGHT. 17 WHICH OF YOU OR MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY HAVE EVER 18 BEEN THE VICTIM OF SOME SERIOUS CRIME, A ROBBERY, A BURGLARY 19 OR AN ASSAULT OR A RAPE OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT? JUST GIVE ME 20 YOUR NAMES AGAIN, IF YOU WILL PLEASE. 21 (THERE WAS A SHOW OF HANDS.) 22 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. NAISTAT? 23 ANYBODY EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY KIND OF 24 SERIOUS OFFENSE? WHAT IS YOUR NAME BACK THERE? 25 MS. ELIE: JULIE ELIE AGAIN. 26 THE COURT: THANK YOU. ANYBODY ELSE? 27 (NO HANDS WERE RAISED.)

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, THE NEXT QUESTION I HAVE

TO ASK IS, ARE THERE ANY OF YOU OR MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY WHO HAVE EVER BEEN ACCUSED OR ARRESTED FOR SOME SERIOUS OFFENSE?

I DON'T MEAN RUNNING A RED LIGHT, BUT ANY KIND OF SERIOUS OFFENSE, ARRESTED, ACCUSED OR CHARGED WITH ANY KIND OF A SERIOUS OFFENSE.

YOUR NAME?

MR. SPEARMAN: SPEARMAN.

THE COURT: YES. THANK YOU.

ALL RIGHT. DURING THE COURSE OF THE QUESTIONING, WHAT WE CALL THE HOVEY, ABOUT YOUR ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DEATH PENALTY AND SO ON AND SO FORTH, THERE HAVE BEEN SOME SUGGESTIONS MADE TO YOU ABOUT THE BURDEN OF PROOF, THE SAFEGUARDS WITH WHICH A DEFENDANT IS, ANY DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL ACTION, IS SURROUNDED.

AND THE COURT, DURING THE END OF THE TRIAL, THE COURT WILL GIVE YOU INSTRUCTIONS AS TO THE LAW APPLICABLE.

WHAT I WANT TO DO IS FIRST, GIVE YOU A FULL
INSTRUCTION AS TO THE QUESTION OF THE PRESUMPTION OF
INNOCENCE AND THE BURDEN OF PROOF IN A CRIMINAL CASE. THIS
IS IT.

"A DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL ACTION IS
PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT UNTIL THE CONTRARY IS
PROVED AND IN CASE OF A REASONABLE DOUBT WHETHER
HIS GUILT IS SATISFACOTRILY SHOWN, HE IS ENTITLED
TO A VERDICT OF NOT GUILTY.

"THE EFFECT OF THIS PRESUMPTION IS
TO PLACE UPON THE STATE, THE BURDEN OF PROVING
HIM GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT."

AND A REASONABLE DOUBT IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

"IT IS NOT A MERE POSSIBLE DOUBT

BECAUSE EVERYTHING RELATING TO HUMAN AFFAIRS AND

DEPENDING UPON MORAL EVIDENCE IS OPEN TO SOME

POSSIBLE OR IMAGINARY DOUBT. IT IS THAT STATE OF

THE CASE WHICH, AFTER THE ENTIRE COMPARISON AND

CONSIDERATION OF ALL OF THE EVIDENCE, LEAVES THE

MINDS OF THE JURORS IN THAT CONDITION THAT THEY

CANNOT SAY THEY FEEL AN ABIDING CONVICTION TO A

MORAL CERTAINTY OF THE TRUTH OF THE CHARGE."

NOW, THAT PRESUMPTION I SPOKE ABOUT, STAYS WITH THE DEFENDANT ALL THROUGHOUT THE TRIAL AND ALSO AT THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE JURY IN THE JURY ROOM.

THAT SAME INSTRUCTION OF COURSE, WILL BE GIVEN

TOGETHER WITH A NUMBER OF OTHER INSTRUCTIONS AT THE CONCLUSION

OF THE CASE. I THOUGHT I WOULD GIVE IT TO YOU NOW.

THE COURT: VERY WELL. I THINK WE ARE ABOUT READY NOW

TO PROCEED WITH THE VOIR DIRE OF THE JURY BUT FIRST WE HAVE

TWO VACANCIES, WE ARE GOING TO FILL THOSE TWO.

WHAT I AM GOING TO DO FIRST IS TO SELECT THE JURORS.

NOT FROM THE ENTIRE PANEL BUT WE HAD ABOUT 11 OR SOMETHING

LIKE THAT, LEFT OVER FROM THE LAST TIME AND WE WILL EXHAUST

THAT PANEL FIRST BEFORE WE COME TO THE OTHERS.

MR. BARENS: WAS YOUR HONOR GOING TO READ THE WITNESS

THE COURT: OH, YES, SURE. I AM SORRY ABOUT THAT.

NOW THIS IS DIRECTED TO THE NEW JURORS. THE LIST

OF WITNESSES, POSSIBLE WITNESSES FROM THE PROSECUTION STANDPOINT

HAVE BEEN READ TO THE OTHER JURORS SO YOU WANT ME TO DO IT

OR DO YOU WANT TO DO IT?

MR. WAPNER: I AM NOT SURE IF I HAVE IT.

THE COURT: I AM GOING TO READ YOU A LIST OF THE

POSSIBLE PROSECUTION WITNESSES AND THE PURPOSE OF THAT IS

TO ASK YOU WHETHER OR NOT YOU KNOW ANY OF THEM OR HAVE HEARD

ABOUT ANY OF THEM.

NOW THESE ARE THE NAMES:

NABIL ABIFADEL, N-A-B-I-L A-B-I-F-A-D-E-L.

JON ALLEN.

NEIL ANTIN.

PHYLLIS BALDUZZI.

MICHAEL BRODER.

GENE BROWNING.

LEWIS BURATTI.

DR. CHOI, C-H-O-I.

| 1 | SIMMIE COOPER. |
|----|--|
| 2 | ASHER DANN. |
| 3 | EVAN DICKER. |
| 4 | JERRY EISENBERG. |
| 5 | DEAN FACTOR. |
| 6 | MICHAEL FELDMAN. |
| 7 | ROBERT FERRARO. |
| 8 | JIM FOULK, F-O-U-L-K. |
| 9 | JACK FRIEDMAN. |
| 10 | SCOTT FURSTMAN, F-U-R-S-T-M-A-N. |
| 11 | LAURA GELLER. |
| 12 | MARK GELLER. |
| 13 | LINDA GWINN. |
| 14 | OLIVER HOLMES. |
| 15 | DIANE JAMES. |
| 16 | ROBERT JORDAN. |
| 17 | DEAN KARNY, K-A-R-N-Y. |
| 18 | LEONARD KAUFMAN. |
| 19 | STELLA KEENER, K-E-E-N-E-R. |
| 20 | HANNELORE LEIS, H-A-N-N-E-L-O-R-E L-E-I-S. |
| 21 | CAROL LEVIN. |
| 22 | MARTIN LEVIN. |
| 23 | RICHARD LIEBOWITZ. |
| 24 | STEVE LOPEZ. |
| 25 | LARRY MAIZE, M-A-I-Z-E. |
| 26 | LEN MARMOR. |
| 27 | DAVID MAY. |
| 28 | TOM MAY. |

```
JERRIANNE NEWMAN.
1
                   DAVID OSTROVE.
2
                   JAMES O'SULLIVAN.
 3
                   DR. JULIUS PASKAN, P-A-S-K-A-N.
 4
                   JEFFREY RAYMOND.
5
6
                   JOHN REEVES.
                  MARY REINHART.
7
                   DAVID REIS, R-E-I-S.
8
                   BROOKE ROBERTS.
9
                   JOHN ROBERTS.
10
                  DOLORES ROBINSON.
11
                  BART ROE, R-O-E.
12
                  DON SCHLEGEL.
13
                  MARVIN SPECTOR.
14
15
                  JERRY STONE.
                  BLANCHE STURKEY.
16
                  CHRIS STURKEY.
17
                  STEVEN TAGLIANETTI, T-A-G-L-I-A-N-E-T-T-I,
18
     TAGLIANETTI.
19
                  BOB TAYLOR.
20
                  TERRY TEREBA, T-E-R-E-B-A.
21
                  PAUL TOBIN.
22
                  GARY TOLFA, T-O-L-F-A.
23
24
                  PAT TOWERS.
25
                  GENE VACTOR.
                  HAROLD VALVIK.
26
27
                  EMIL VARMA.
                  JOE VEGA.
28
```

STEVEN WEISS. 1 THOSE ARE THE PROSPECTIVE OR POTENTIAL WITNESSES 2 TO BE CALLED BY THE PEOPLE. 3 NOW I WILL ASK YOU FROM THE FOLLOWING LIST WHETHER 4 OR NOT YOU HAVE EVER HEARD . THE FOLLOWING NAMES: 5 RONALD LEVIN. 6 JAMES PITTMAN. 7 BOBBY ROBERTS. 8 BROOKE ROBERTS. 9 REZA ESLAMINIA, R-E-Z-A E-S-L-A-M-I-N-I-A. 10 BEN DOSTI, D-O-S-T-I. 11 JOHN JENSEN. 12 MARTY JENSEN. 13 BILL KILPATRICK. 14 TERRY PHILLIPS. 15 FRANK MINGARELLA. 16 RYAN HUNT. 17 18 RYAN GAMSKY. TERRY PHYLLIPS. 19 KEITH ROHMAN, R-O-H-M-A-N. 20 AND L. M. SOBEL, S-O-B-E-L. 21 NOW HAVE ANY OF YOU LADIES AND GENTLEMEN HEARD 22 OR KNOW ANY OF THE NAMES WHO HAVE BEEN READ OUT, THOSE WHO 23 ARE GOING TO BE PROSPECTIVE WITNESSES OR THOSE GENERALLY WHO 24 I ASKED YOU WHETHER YOU KNOW ANY OF THEM? 25 YES, MA'AM. 26 MS. KAPES: I AM NOT SURE IF I HEARD BART ROE. 27

THE COURT: YES.

1 THE COURT REPORTER: WHAT IS YOUR NAME, PLEASE? 2 MS. KAPES: KAPES. 3 THE COURT: YES, HE IS ONE OF THE PROSPECTIVE WITNESSES? 4 MR. WAPNER: PROSPECTIVE WITNESS, YES. 5 THE COURT: WHO IS THIS BART ROE THAT YOU KNOW? 6 MS. KAPES: HE IS A DIRECTOR, MOVIE DIRECTOR AND I KNOW 7 HIM. 8 THE COURT: IS THAT THE ONE? 9 MR. WAPNER: I DON'T THINK HE IS A DIRECTOR. 10 MS. KAPES: OR ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PERHAPS. 11 MR. WPANER: HE HAS SOME CONNECTION WITH THE MOVIE 12 BUSINESS, I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IT IS. 13 THE COURT: HE IS A DIRECTOR OF WHICH COMPANY? 14 MS. KAPES: HE IS A DIRECTOR OR ASSISTANT DIRECTOR. 15 THE COURT: WITH WHICH STUDIO IS THAT? 16 MS. KAPES: I DON'T KNOW, SIR. 17 THE COURT: HOW DO YOU KNOW HIM? 18 MS. KAPES: SOCIALLY. I KNOW HIM AND HIS SISTER. 19 THE COURT: YOU KNOW HIM AND HIS SISTER? 20 MS. KAPES: YES, THAT IS ALL. 21 THE COURT: WELL, ASSUMING THAT HE IS THE SAME ONE, 22 WOULD THAT IN ANY WAY INFLUENCE YOU IN YOUR PERFORMANCE OF 23 YOUR DUTIES AS A JUROR? 24 MS. KAPES: I DON'T THINK SO. 25 THE COURT: OR WOULD YOU FAVOR HIS TESTIMONY OR 26 DISFAVOR HIS TESTIMONY IN ANY WAY? 27 MS. KAPES: I DON'T THINK SO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I THOUGHT I SAW ANOTHER HAND,

DID 1? ANYBODY ELSE?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

WE WILL PROCEED WITH THE DRAWING OF TWO MORE NAMES

OFF THE OLD LIST.

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

THE CLERK: JAY FARBER, F-A-R-B-E-R, JUROR NUMBER 2.

AND JUROR NUMBER 11, MARJORIE JOHNSON,
J-O-H-N-S-O-N.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MR. FARBER, YOU, TOO, HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WHICH WERE ASKED AND GIVEN, BOTH THOSE WHICH I ASKED AND THOSE WHICH COUNSEL HAVE ASKED, WHICH WAS BACK SOME TIME AGO, BUT AT ANY RATE, YOU RECALL ALL OF THAT?

MR. FARBER: YES, I DO.

THE COURT: DURING THE COURSE OF THAT QUESTIONING, DID

ANYTHING OCCUR TO YOU THAT YOU THOUGHT YOU MIGHT VOLUNTARILY

TELL US ABOUT OR WOULD YOUR ANSWERS BE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME?

MR. FARBER: THEY WOULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME.

THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU DO, PLEASE?

MR. FARBER: I AM A MECHANIC FOR WESTERN AIRLINES.

THE COURT: AND WHERE DO YOU LIVE?

MR. FARBER: REDONDO BEACH.

THE COURT: ARE YOU MARRIED?

MR. FARBER: SINGLE.

THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER SERVED AS A JUROR ON A CRIMINAL CASE BEFORE?

MR. FARBER: NO.

THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY KIND

OF A SERIOUS CRIME?

MR. FARBER: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU.

I AM JUST LOOKING DOWN HERE AT THE LIST,

MR. FARBER, TO SEE IF I HAVE YOUR NAME DOWN FOR ANYTHING.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

NO, THAT IS ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

ALL RIGHT, DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS -- OH, I

WILL FINISH UP, I THINK, WITH MRS. JOHNSON.

MRS. JOHNSON, I THINK THAT IS MARJORIE JOHNSON, ISN'T IT?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

THE COURT: YOU, TOO, HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WHICH WERE ASKED AND GIVEN, THOSE THAT YOU CAN RECALL, IF THE SAME GENERAL QUESTIONS WERE ASKED OF YOU, WOULD YOUR ANSWERS BE ANY DIFFERENT OR WOULD THEY BE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME?

MS. JOHNSON: SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WHAT DO YOU DO, PLEASE?

MS. JOHNSON: I AM RETIRED.

THE COURT: WHAT DID YOU RETIRE FROM?

MS. JOHNSON: ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL.

THE COURT: WHAT WAS YOUR JOB THERE?

MS. JOHNSON: BLUEPRINT CLERK.

THE COURT REPORTER: CLERK?

MS. JOHNSON: CLERK.

THE COURT: IS THERE A MR. JOHNSON?

MS. JOHNSON: NO.

THE COURT: YOU ARE A WIDOW, ARE YOU?

MS. JOHNSON: NO. I WAS DIVORCED.

THE COURT: WHAT DID HE DO DURING THE TIME YOU WERE MARRIED TO HIM? YOU DON'T KNOW?

MS. JOHNSON: THAT IS SO LONG AGO. IT HAS BEEN OVER 30 YEARS.

A JUROR ON MORE THAN ONE OCCASION? 1 MS. JOHNSON: OH, YEARS AGO, I WAS IN WEST L.A. COURT, 2 THAT HAS BEEN ALMOST 20 YEARS AGO NOW. 3 MR. BARENS: WAS THIS ALSO A CRIMINAL MATTER? MS. JOHNSON: WHAT? 5 MR. BARENS: WAS THAT ALSO A CRIMINAL MATTER, 6 MRS. JOHNSON? 7 MS. JOHNSON: NO. 8 MR. BARENS: IT WAS A CIVIL MATTER? 9 MS. JOHNSON: CIVIL CASE. 10 MR. BARENS: SO ON BOTH -- SO YOU HAVE BEEN A JUROR 11 ONLY TWICE? 12 MS. JOHNSON: RIGHT. 13 MR. BARENS: AND ASIDE FROM THE TWO TIMES YOU ACTUALLY 14 SERVED, HAVE YOU BEEN ON PANELS BEFORE WHERE YOU WERE CALLED 15 IN LIKE THIS AND POSSIBLY EXCUSED? 16 MS. JOHNSON: WELL, I WAS ON TWO OTHER CASES. I WAS 17 ON A JURY BUT ONE OF THOSE, THE JUDGE DISMISSED THE CASE AND 18 THEY WERE CIVIL CASES, AND THE OTHER ONE, THEY SETTLED OUT 19 OF COURT WHILE WE WERE AT LUNCH. 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

δ F

MR. BARENS: THAT WAS ALSO A CIVIL CASE?

MS. JOHNSON: YES, CIVIL.

MR. BARENS: RIGHT. OKAY. SO YOU JUST HAD PRIOR EXPERIENCE ON ONE CRIMINAL JURY WHERE YOU ACTUALLY WENT THROUGH THE TRIAL?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. HOW DID YOU FEEL AS A RESULT OF THAT EXPERIENCE ON THAT DRUNK DRIVING CASE? WERE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE WAY THE SYSTEM WORKED?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: DID YOU FEEL THE JURY WAS ABLE TO WORK WITHIN THE INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN BY THE COURT?

MS. JOHNSON: YES. THEY DISCUSSED THE MATTER, TOOK SEVERAL VOTES AND DISCUSSED IT AGAIN UNTIL THEY REACHED A FINAL VERDICT.

MR. BARENS: YOU FELT THE SYSTEM WORKED AT THAT TIME.

YOU RECALL THAT THE BURDEN OF PROOF THAT WE TALKED ABOUT

AND THE JUDGE HAS MADE REFERENCE TO ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS,

WAS THE SAME IN THAT CASE AS WHAT YOU WOULD BE DEALING WITH

IN THIS CASE, THAT BEING BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU RECALL THAT?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND DO YOU RECALL THAT THAT WAS MARKEDLY DIFFERENT THAN THE TYPE OF BURDEN OF PROOF YOU HAD EXISTENT IN THE CIVIL CASE YOU WORKED, WHICH IS REFERRED TO AS A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE, WHICH IS MORE LIKE, IF I CAN QUANTIFY IT, A 51/49 TYPE OF STANDARD?

l

MS. JOHNSON: OKAY.

2

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

3

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

4

MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THAT, MR. FARBER,

5

IN TERMS OF THE BURDEN OF PROOF? ARE YOU COMFORTABLE WITH

6

THAT STANDARD OF PROOF?

7

MR. FARBER: YES, I AM.

8

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN

9

SOMETHING THAT IS A MORE LIKELY STANDARD, LET'S CALL IT THE

10

PREPONDERANCE STANDARD, AS OPPOSED TO BEYOND A REASONABLE

11

DOUBT?

MR. FARBER: YES, I DO.

13

12

MR. BARENS: YOU HEARD HIS HONOR MAKE REFERENCE ALL

14

MORNING TO HOW ALL CONDUCT IS SUBJECT TO SOME SORT OF DOUBT,

15

WHICH I WOULD PROBABLY AGREE WITH. HOWEVER, IN THIS CASE,

THAT IN TERMS OF WELL. IF YOU HAVE 72 PERCENT OR YOU NEED

16

IT IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND WE CAN'T REALLY QUANTIFY

17 18

TO HAVE 98 PERCENT.

19

20 WOULD MAKE WHEN INVOLVED IN THE MOST SERIOUS OF YOUR AFFAIRS.

21

WE WOULD HESITATE, LET'S SAY, IN MAKING A DECISION IN SOME

OF OUR MORE SERIOUS CONSIDERATIONS. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

22 23

MR. FARBER: YES, I DO.

24

MR. BARENS: NOW, WE HAVE HAD A LOT OF DISCUSSION OVER

BUT RATHER, IT IS A TYPE OF DECISION THAT YOU

25

THE WEEKS OF THIS PROCESS IN TRYING TO DETERMINE WHAT IS

26

REASONABLE AND WHETHER ONE WOULD LOOK FOR WHAT IS THE MOST

27

LIKELY IN DETERMINING WHAT IS REASONABLE OR PERHAPS MRS.

28

JOHNSON, YOU COULD CONSIDER THAT SOMETHING NOT NECESSARILY

SITUATION?

3

MS. JOHNSON: YES. I GUESS IT COULD.

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

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IN HUMAN AFFAIRS AND THE WAY PEOPLE ACT, THAT ALTHOUGH SOMETIMES YOU COULD HAVE AN EXPLANATION FOR CONDUCT THAT WOULD BE RATHER HIGHLY UNUSUAL. IT WOULD NOT BE INCONSISTENT WITH THAT EXPLANATION BEING REASONABLE, NONETHELESS, IF THERE WAS EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF IT?

THE MOST LIKELY, WOULD STILL BE A REASONABLE ANSWER TO A

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE CONCEPT, IF YOU ARE TOLD THAT THIS IS A NO-BODY CASE AND I THINK EVERYONE PRETTY WELL UNDERSTOOD THAT, THAT THERE IS NO BODY, THAT THE DEFENSE DOES NOT HAVE A BURDEN OF PROOF TO EXPLAIN TO YOU WHAT HAPPENED TO THE BODY OR TO THE PERSON, IF THE PERSON BE DEAD? THE DEFENSE HAS NO BURDEN OF PROOF TO EXPLAIN WHERE THAT INDIVIDUAL IS AT THIS TIME. ARE YOU COMFORTABLE WITH THAT?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: HOW ABOUT YOU, MR. FARBER?

MR. FARBER: YES. I AM.

MR. BARENS: ARE YOU SATISFIED THAT THE SOLE RESPONSI-BILITY FOR PROVING SOMETHING IN THIS COURTROOM, RESTS WITH THE GOVERNMENT?

MR. FARBER: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, HOW ABOUT THE BUSINESS WE TALKED ABOUT

OF A DEFENDANT'S RIGHT NOT TO TESTIFY; MR. FARBER? DO YOU THINK IT IS A LEGITIMATE RIGHT AND EXPECTANCY?

MR. FARBER: SURE.

MR. BARENS: MISS JOHNSON?

MS. JOHNSON: I AGREE.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF THE
DEFENDANT DOES COME FORWARD AND TESTIFY, WOULD YOU THINK THAT
THE DEFENDANT IN HOPES OF SAVING HIS LIFE, WOULD BE MORE
LIKELY TO LIE OR MISLEAD THE COURT AS OPPOSED TO ANY OTHER
WITNESS?

MS. JOHNSON: NOT NECESSARILY.

6В

MR. BARENS: WHEN YOU SAY "NOT NECESSARILY", DO YOU
HONESTLY BELIEVE YOU COULD LISTEN TO A DEFENDANT AS A WITNESS
AS OPEN-MINDEDLY AS YOU COULD ANY OTHER WITNESS?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND IT IS BELIEVABLE TO YOU THAT THEY

COULD BE TELLING THE TRUTH, EVEN THOUGH THEY WOULD HAVE THE

MOST SIGNIFICANT STAKES IN THE COURTROOM, CONCERNING THEIR

FUTURE?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: MISS JOHNSON, ASIDE FROM THE JURIES THAT
YOU ACTUALLY HAD PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH, HAVE YOU EVER SAT
AND WATCHED A JURY TRIAL, ASIDE FROM THE ONES YOU WORKED ON?

MS. JOHNSON: NO.

MR. BARENS: AND HOW ABOUT YOU, MR. FARBER? YOU MENTIONED THAT YOU HAVE HAD NO PRIOR JURY EXPERIENCE?

MR. FARBER: THAT'S CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN A PART OF A GENERAL PANEL LIKE THIS PREVIOUSLY?

MR. FARBER: NO. THIS IS THE FIRST TIME.

MR. BARENS: I SEE. YOU HAVE HAD NO REAL CONTACT WITH LAWYERS OR PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM TO DATE?

MR. FARBER: NOT YOU KNOW, LIKE THIS, AS A JUROR. NO.

MR. BARENS: IN WHAT REFERENCE WOULD YOU HAVE HAD CONTACT WITH THE SYSTEM?

MR. FARBER: WELL, WE HAVE A FAMILY ATTORNEY. AND I HAVE HAD SOME LEGAL WORK DONE THROUGH THE ATTORNEY BEFORE.

MR. BARENS: I PRESUME IT WOULD ALL BE ON CIVIL TYPE MATTERS?

MR. FARBER: NO.

MR. FARBER: YES, A COUPLE OF LAWSUITS. 1 MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN A PART OF A TRIAL AS 2 3 A WITNESS? 4 MR. FARBER: NO. MR. BARENS: I SEE. YOU MENTIONED THAT YOU ARE A 5 MECHANIC AT WESTERN AIRLINES. WHAT SORT OF WORK DO YOU DO, 6 7 MORE SPECIFICALLY, MR. FARBER? MR. FARBER: I WORK IN THE ENGINE SHOP. I BLADE UP THE 8 9 DIFFERENT STAGES OF TURBINES. MR. BARENS: PRIOR TO THAT, DID YOU HAVE SOME OTHER 10 11 TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT? MR. FARBER: I WAS A MACHINIST FOR TWO YEARS. 12 MR. BARENS: WHERE WAS THAT? 13 MR. FARBER: QUICK CUTTING AND GRINDING IN GARDENA. 14 15 MR. BARENS: PRIOR TO THAT, DID YOU HAVE SOME EMPLOYMENT, 16 PRIOR TO THAT TWO YEARS? MR. FARBER: I WORKED FOR MY FATHER, WHO OWNS A 17 18 BURGLAR ALARM COMPANY. MR. BARENS: I SEE. DID YOU WORK IN THE BURGLAR ALARM 19 20 BUSINESS? MR. FARBER: OFF AND ON SINCE 1 WAS ABOUT 12 YEARS OLD. 21 22 MR. BARENS: SO, YOU SOMEWHAT GREW UP IN THAT AS A 23 FAMILY BUSINESS? 24 MR. FARBER: UH-HUH. 25 MR. BARENS: DO YOU AS A RESULT OF THAT, HAVE A LOT OF CONTACT WITH THE POLICE THAT COME TO INVESTIGATE CRIMES WHERE 26 27 YOUR DEVICES WOULD BE ACTIVATED?

MR. BARENS: WHY IS THAT? I DON'T KNOW WHY IT OCCURS 1 TO ME THAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN AN ESSENTIAL PART OF YOUR BUSINESS. 2 3 MR. FARBER: WELL, I JUST INSTALL THEM. MY FATHER 4 WOULD HANDLE ANYTHING ELSE. MR. BARENS: DO YOU FEEL THAT YOUR EXPOSURE IN THAT 5 6 BUSINESS OR GROWING UP IN A HOUSEHOLD WHERE THAT WAS THE 7 SUBJECT OF CONCERN, WOULD HAVE GIVEN YOU ANY BIAS TOWARD 8 LAW ENFORCEMENT IN OUR SOCIETY? 9 MR. FARBER: NO. MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T FEEL THAT ANYTHING ABOUT THAT 10 11 WOULD MAKE YOU MORE FAVORED TOWARD THE PROSECUTION THAN THE 12 DEFENSE OR THE CONVERSE OF THAT? 13 MR. FARBER: NO. 14 MR. BARENS: I SEE. WHAT SORT OF EDUCATION DID YOU 15 HAVE, MR. FARBER? MR. FARBER: CERTIFICATE FROM NORTHROP UNIVERSITY 16 17 INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY. 18 MR. BARENS: ANY AREA OF SPECIALIZATION THERE? 19 MR. FARBER: AIR FRAME AND POWER PLANT. 20 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU. AND ASIDE FROM THAT, ANY 21 FORMAL EDUCATION OTHER THAN HIGH SCHOOL? 22 MR. FARBER: NO. 23 MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU TAKEN ANY OTHER CLASSES, PERHAPS OUT OF JUST INTEREST IN TAKING CLASSES SINCE YOU GOT OUT OF 24 25 NORTHROP? 26 MR. FARBER: NO, I HAVE NOT. MR. BARENS: I SEE. DO YOU HAVE ANY PARTICULAR HOBBIES? 27

MR. FARBER: I DRAW FREEHAND AND A LITTLE WOODWORKING.

I GO TO A HEALTH SPA REGULARLY AND THAT IS ABOUT IT. 1 2 MR. BARENS: WHEN YOU DRAW, MR. FARBER, IS THERE A 3 PARTICULAR SUBJECT MATTER THAT YOU PREFER TO WORK WITH? MR. FARBER: NO. IT IS SUREALISM, YOU KNOW, THE TYPE 4 5 OF WORK I DO. 6 MR. BARENS: BUT NO PARTICULAR SUBJECT THAT YOU LIKE 7 TO DEPICT IN YOUR WORK? 8 MR. FARBER: NO. MR. BARENS: I PRESUME THE SAME WOULD BE YOUR ANSWER 9 10 AS TO YOUR WOODWORKING? MR. FARBER: YEAH. THAT IS SOMETHING I JUST PLAY AROUND 11 WITH. I BUILD TABLE TOPS OR WHATEVER. 12 13 MR. BARENS: I SEE. YOU HAVE NEVER BEEN MARRIED, MR. 14 FARBER? 15 MR. FARBER: NO. 16 MR. BARENS: MRS. JOHNSON, DO YOU HAVE ANY PARTICULAR 17 HOBBIES OR SOCIAL INTERESTS? 18 MS. JOHNSON: WELL, I LIKE TO GO TO TRAVEL FILMS AND 19 LECTURES AND DO A LITTLE KNITTING AND CROCHETING OFF AND ON. 20 THAT IS ABOUT IT. 21 MR. BARENS: DO YOU BELONG TO ANY SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS 22 OR CLUBS? 23 MR. FARBER: NO. 24 MR. BARENS: NOT TO APPEAR TOTALLY INSENSITIVE, I WAS 25 WONDERING IF THE UNFORTUNATE ACCIDENT YOUR CHILD WAS INVOLVED 26 IN. INVOLVED A DRUNK DRIVER? 27 MS. JOHNSON: NO.

MR. BARENS: I SEE. WHAT IS THE LAST BOOK YOU READ,

```
IF YOU RECALL?
1
           MS. JOHNSON: IT HAS BEEN YEARS SINCE I HAVE READ A BOOK.
2
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. WHAT IS THE LAST MOVIE YOU WENT
3
     TO?
           MS. JOHNSON: MOVIES? I DON'T GO. I MEAN, I HAVE NOT
5
6
     BEEN TO A MOVIE IN YEARS, EITHER.
           MR. BARENS: I SEE. I MIGHT ASK YOU, MR. FARBER, THE
7
     SAME. WHAT WAS THE LAST BOOK YOU READ?
8
           MR. FARBER: I AM CURRENTLY FINISHING A BOOK CALLED
9
10
     SITKA, BY LOUIS LAMOUR.
                 THE LAST BOOK WAS PROBABLY ALSO SOMETHING FROM
11
12
     LOUIS LAMOUR
           MR. BARENS: THOSE ARE GENERALLY DESCRIBED AS WESTERN
13
     ADVENTURE STORIES?
14
           MR. FARBER: YES.
15
           MR. BARENS: THE PRESIDENT READS THOSE, AS WELL?
16
           MR. FARBER: YES.
17
           MR. BARENS: HOW ABOUT THE LAST MOVIE YOU SAW?
18
           MR. FARBER: I DON'T RECALL. IT HAS BEEN QUITE SOMETIME
19
20
     SINCE I HAVE BEEN.
           MR. BARENS: DON'T GO TO MOVIES A LOT?
21
           MR. FARBER: NO. I HAVE SPENT A WHOLE YEAR WORKING
22
23
     NIGHTS, SO --
           MR. BARENS: ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THE UNION WHERE YOU
24
25
     WORK?
           MR. FARBER: YES, I AM. IT IS THE TEAMSTERS.
26
           MR. BARENS: AND ARE YOU ACTIVE IN THAT UNION?
27
28
           MR. FARBER: NO, I AM NOT.
```

MR. BARENS: YOU ARE NOT AN OFFICER OR STEWARD OF THAT UNION?

MR. FARBER: NO.

MR. BARENS: I SEE. NOW, MISS JOHNSON, IF WE WERE TO HAVE DURING THIS TRIAL, THE PARENTS OF THIS FELLOW WHO POSSIBLY DISAPPEARED, COME FORWARD AND TELL US ABOUT THE ALLEGED BEREAVEMENT THEY HAVE CONCERNING THE FACT THEY HAVE NOT HEARD FROM THEIR SON FOR A PERIOD OF TIME, I ASK YOU TRUE, DID YOU FEEL THAT THE UNFORTUNATE EXPERIENCE THAT YOU HAVE BEEN A PART OF, WOULD IN ANY WAY BIAS YOU TO PERHAPS GIVE MORE CREDIBILITY TO THEIR TESTIMONY THAN YOU MIGHT OTHERWISE?

MS. JOHNSON: NO.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU FEEL YOU COULD, NONETHELESS,
ALTHOUGH YOU HAVE HAD A HORRENDOUS TRAGEDY IN YOUR LIFE,
LISTEN TO THEIR TESTIMONY AND JUDGE THEIR TESTIMONY AS ANY
OTHER WITNESS?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW, AS WE ARE GOING ALONG HERE AND TALKING ABOUT WHETHER A MURDER OCCURRED, DO YOU RECALL THE DISCUSSIONS WE HAD WHERE THERE ARE REALLY TWO QUESTIONS, THAT BEING, OF COURSE, THE GOVERNMENT WANTS TO TALK ABOUT THAT JOE HUNT COMMITTED A MURDER AND THE DEFENSE WANTS TO TALK ABOUT WHETHER ANYBODY WAS MURDERED; DO YOU RECALL ALL OF THAT?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU BE LOOKING FOR EVIDENCE TO CONVINCE YOU IN THE FIRST INSTANCE THAT A MURDER HAD TAKEN PLACE?

MS. JOHNSON: I BELIEVE SO.

MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU WANT TO SEE SOME EVIDENCE THAT SOMEBODY WAS DEAD IN FACT BEFORE WE GET TO DECIDE IF AND WHO KILLED HIM?

MS. JOHNSON: I THINK SO. IT DEPENDS ON --

THE COURT: KEEP YOUR VOICE UP, WILL YOU, PLEASE?

MS. JOHNSON: IT DEPENDS ON THE TESTIMONY THAT WOULD COME IN PRETTY MUCH.

MR. BARENS: WE ARE TOLD ABOUT TWO TYPES OF TESTIMONY,

DO YOU RECALL, OR TWO TYPES OF EVIDENCE, WHAT WE CALL

DIRECT EVIDENCE AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU REMEMBER THAT?

7-2

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

MR. BARENS: DO YOU REMEMBER THEY ARE BOTH LOOKED AT,
YOU KNOW, PRETTY MUCH THE SAME BUT, RATHER, ONE DEMONSTRATES
EVIDENCE THROUGH INFERENCES AND YOU DRAW A CONCLUSION AND
THE OTHER IS A WITNESS WHO COMES FORTH AND SAYS THEY ACTUALLY
SAW SOMETHING.

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. JOHNSON: I GUESS I UNDERSTAND.

MR. BARENS: NOW, WHAT DO WE DO IF AFTER HEARING ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AND, OBVIOUSLY, YOU ARE GOING TO HEAR TWO SIDES TRYING TO EXPLAIN PROBABLY THE SAME FACTS, WHAT DO WE DO IF IT IS A CLOSE CALL?

MS. JOHNSON: CLOSE CALL, YOU WOULD HAVE TO GIVE THE BENEFIT TO THE DEFENDANT.

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO.

THE COURT WOULD INSTRUCT YOU THAT IF YOU WERE UNABLE TO REACH A CONCLUSION BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, WHAT HAS HAPPENED? WHAT HAS HAPPENED THEN IS THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS FAILED TO MEET THEIR BURDEN OF PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT; ARE YOU COMFORTABLE WITH THAT, MR. FARBER?

MR. FARBER: YES, I AM.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IN THIS FORUM THAT CLOSE CALLS GO TO THE DEFENDANT?

MR. FARBER: YES, I DO.

MR. BARENS: BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT DOESN'T HAVE THE BURDEN OF PROOF, THE PEOPLE DO BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.

MR. FARBER: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: PARDON?

MS. JOHNSON: NOT IN THE LEAST.

27

7-4

A F

MR. BARENS: DID YOU EVER TAKE ANY CLASSES OVER THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS, MRS. JOHNSON?

MS. JOHNSON: ANY CLASSES?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. BARENS: ANY SORT OF CLASSES, DID YOU ATTEND ANY 1 UNIVERSITY CLASSES OR EXTENSION CLASSES OR NIGHT SCHOOL? 2 MS. JOHNSON: A NUMBER OF YEARS AGO AT UCLA, IT PERTAINED 3 TO MY WORK AND I HAD SOME EXTENSION CLASSES THROUGH OUR 4 EMPLOYER, SPONSORED BY THE EMPLOYER. 5 MR. BARENS: AND THAT HAD TO DO WITH SOME TECHNICAL 6 ASPECTS OF YOUR EMPLOYMENT WITH ROCKWELL? 7 MS. JOHNSON: YES. 8 MR. BARENS: YOU HAVE BEEN A WIDOW FOR MANY YEARS? 9 MS. JOHNSON: 30 YEARS. 10 MR. BARENS: 30? 11 12

MS. JOHNSON: WELL, I WAS DIVORCED ABOUT 30 YEARS AGO.

I DIVORCED MY HUSBAND ABOUT 30 YEARS AGO.

MR. BARENS: YOU WERE DIVORCED ABOUT 30 YEARS AGO AND YOU NEVER MARRIED SUBSEQUENT TO THAT?

MS. JOHNSON: NO.

MR. BARENS: WHAT DO YOU DO DURING THE DAY TYPICALLY?

MS. JOHNSON: DURING THE DAY?

MR. BARENS: WHEN YOU ARE NOT HAVING TO BE HERE.

MS. JOHNSON: WELL, I HAVE A HOME, A YARD AND I HAVE
TWO CATS TO TAKE CARE OF AND I AM IN CONTACT WITH MY SISTER
AND HELP HER OUT WHEN SHE NEEDS IT SOMETIMES WHEN MY
BROTHER-IN-LAW IS IN THE HOSPITAL.

A JUROR: I CAN'T HEAR.

THE COURT: I ASKED YOU TO KEEP YOUR VOICE UP TO BE

SURE EVERYBODY HEARS YOU. FOR THE REASON, THAT IS, THAT A JUROR

WHO TAKES YOUR PLACE, IF SOMEBODY TAKES YOUR PLACE, I WILL

ASK THEM WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE QUESTIONS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

AND ANSWERS AND THEY CAN'T SAY THEY DID IF THEY DIDN'T HEAR. MS. JOHNSON: THAT KEEPS ME PRETTY BUSY, I MEAN. MR. BARENS: HOW WOULD YOU FEEL ABOUT BEING A JUROR IN THIS CASE, MRS. JOHNSON? MS. JOHNSON: WELL, ALL RIGHT. I HAVE QUITE A BIT TO TAKE CARE OF AT HOME. I MEAN BEING BY MYSELF, I MEAN I HAVE THE HOME TO TAKE CARE OF SO --MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK THAT YOU WOULD BE PREOCCUPIED WITH YOUR CONCERNS ABOUT THAT OR WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO PAY FULL ATTENTION TO ALL OF THE TESTIMONY AND THE ISSUES WE ARE GOING TO GET INTO HERE?

MS. JOHNSON: WELL, WHETHER OR NOT I MIGHT HAVE CONCERN IF SOMETHING WENT WRONG AND I HAD -- IF THE PLUMBING OR SOMETHING OF THAT KIND.

MR. BARENS: SURE, BUT OTHER THAN SOMETHING OUT OF THE ORDINARY, YOUR NORMAL AFFAIRS WOULDN'T BE TOO MUCH OF AN ISSUE?

MS. JOHNSON: THAT'S RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU FEEL, MR. FARBER. ABOUT POSSIBLY BEING A JUROR IN THIS CASE?

MR. FARBER: WELL, I AM NOT SO SURE I WOULD CARE PARTICULARLY TO BE A JUROR.

I MEAN IT WOULD BE NICE TO LISTEN TO IT BUT AS FAR AS ACTUALLY BEING A JUROR --

MR. BARENS: I PROBABLY HAVE THE SAME POINT OF VIEW YOU 1 DO ON THAT. HOWEVER, WE HAVE SOME RESPONSIBILITIES HERE. 2 WHEN YOU SAY YOU MIGHT RATHER JUST LISTEN TO THIS 3 THAN PARTICIPATE, WHY DO YOU FEEL THAT WAY, MR. FARBER? 4 MR. FARBER: WELL, I DON'T -- YOU KNOW, THINK I NEED 5 THE ADDED RESPONSIBILITY OF CASTING JUDGMENT UPON SOMEBODY'S 6 7 FUTURE. MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS INCUMBENT WITH 8 YOUR CITIZENSHIP IN THIS COUNTRY, OCCASIONALLY, TO BE PUT IN 9 10 THE POSITION WHERE YOU ARE TODAY? MR. FARBER: YES, I DO. 11 MR. BARENS: IF YOU WERE A JUROR IN THIS CASE, WOULD 12 YOU FEEL ANY RESENTMENT TOWARD EITHER THE PROSECUTION OR 13 14 DEFENSE COUNSEL AS A RESULT OF YOUR SOMEWHAT BEING PRESSED IN-15 TO THE SERVICE, HERE? 16 MR. FARBER: NO. MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. YOU UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS JUST 17 PART OF WHAT GOES ON HERE? 18 MR. FARBER: UH-HUH. 19 MR. WAPNER: IS THAT YES? 20 21 MR. FARBER: YES. MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE FACT THAT THE USUAL 22 23 OR SIMPLE ANSWER TO A QUESTION MAY NOT BE SATISFACTORY IN THIS 24 INSTANCE, BUT RATHER, WE WOULD HAVE TO POSSIBLY LOOK FOR AN 25 UNUSUAL ANSWER TO SOLVE IT? MR. FARBER: I DON'T KNOW. I AM INDIFFERENT ABOUT THE 26 27 WHOLE THING, REALLY.

MR. BARENS: WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO WITH MR. HUNT

HERE, IF YOU GET TO THE END OF THE CASE AND YOU ARE NOT SURE THE COURT: ARE YOU ASKING HIM TO PREJUDGE IT? I DON'T MR. BARENS: I AM ASKING HIM, HOW DOES A JUROR HAVE TO VOTE, YOUR HONOR, IF HE IS UNSURE OF WHAT HAPPENED TO THE ALLEGED VICTIM AT THE END OF THE CASE. IF HE IS NOT SURE --THE COURT: WELL, THE QUESTION YOU ASKED BEFORE ASKED MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. SUPPOSING YOU HAVE HEARD ONE SIDE TELL YOU A BUNCH OF STUFF, YOU KNOW, EVIDENCE OR TEST!-MONY ABOUT WHAT THEY CONTEND HAPPENED TO THE ALLEGED VICTIM. AND THEN YOU HEAR DEFENSE WITNESSES WHICH I ASSURE YOU, WILL TELL YOU WHAT THEY CONTEND HAPPENED OR THEY MIGHT JUST END UP SAYING THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENED. AND YOU GET TO THE END OF THAT PROCESS AND IN YOUR OWN MIND. YOU HAVE HEARD TWO SIDES TESTIFYING BUT YOU ARE NOT MR. FARBER: WELL, WHAT WAS SAID EARLIER. THE TIE GOES MR. BARENS: RIGHT. IF WE ARE NOT SURE WHAT HAPPENED AT THAT POINT, THE BENEFIT OF THE DOUBT SPECIFICALLY RESOLVES IN FAVOR OF THE DEFENDANT IN EACH AND EVERY INSTANCE. NOW, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT GOES TO ALL OF THE ELEMENTS MR. BARENS: SORRY. WE'LL GET TO THAT STUFF LATER. ΙT

8B

MR. FARBER: YES. MR. BARENS: COULD YOU ACCEPT THAT? MR. FARBER: YES. MR. BARENS: THAT WHEN WE ARE DETERMINING WHAT IS REASONABLE AND WE KEEP USING THIS WORD, "REASONABLE" BECAUSE THE WHOLE STANDARD OF PROOF GOES TO WHAT IS REASONABLE, THAT TWO DIFFERENT PEOPLE COULD REASONABLY HAVE DIFFERENT VIEWS ABOUT THE SAME FACTS? MR. FARBER: YES. MR. BARENS: AND THEN AS A JUROR, YOU HAVE A DECISION TO TRY TO SORT THAT OUT AND COME TO A CONCLUSION, IF YOU CAN? DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? MR. FARBER: CORRECT. MR. BARENS: YOU ARE COMFORTABLE WITH THAT, MRS. JOHNSON? MS. JOHNSON: YES. MR. BARENS: THANK YOU. THANK YOU BOTH FOR YOUR TIME. I PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 1 2 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. GOOD MORNING, MR. FARBER AND MISS JOHNSON. IT HAS BEEN A WHILE SINCE WE HAD 3 4 THIS PART OF THE CASE. 5 MR. FARBER, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE IDEA THAT THE STATE CAN PROVE OR IS ALLOWED TO ATTEMPT TO PROVE THAT 6 7 THERE WAS A MURDER, BY CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE WITHOUT 8 PRODUCING A BODY? MR. FARBER: WELL, I THINK IT HAS BEEN DONE BEFORE, 9 10 RIGHT? MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND IS THAT ANOTHER WAY OF SAYING 11 THEREFORE, IT COULD BE DONE AGAIN IF THE EVIDENCE PROVES IT 12 13 TO YOU? 14 MR. FARBER: YEAH. 1 WOULD SAY SO, YES. MR. WAPNER: OKAY. YOU SAID THAT YOU DIDN'T WANT TO 15 16 SIT IN JUDGMENT ON SOMEONE. COULD YOU DO IT? 17 MR. FARBER: WELL, YEAH. I BELIEVE SO. MR. WAPNER: WHEN YOU GET INTO THE JURY ROOM, THE JUDGE 18 19 IS GOING TO TELL YOU THAT YOU HAVE TO VOTE YOUR OWN, INDIVIDUAL CONSCIENCE, BUT YOU ARE REQUIRED TO DISCUSS THE 20 21 CASE WITH 11 OTHER PEOPLE. DO YOU THINK YOU COULD DO THAT? 22 MR. FARBER: YES. MR. WAPNER: IF IT CAME DOWN TO A VOTE, IS IT GOING TO 23 24 BE SOMETHING LIKE FOR EXAMPLE, EIGHT AND THREE AND ONE 25 ABSTENTION, YOU BEING THE PERSON WHO ABSTAINS? 26 MR. FARBER: NOT NECESSARILY. 27 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. IF THE JUDGE AT THE END -- MAYBE

I AM TOO BUSY THINKING OF THE NEXT QUESTION. EXPLAIN THAT

TO ME. WHEN YOU SAY, "NOT NECESSARILY" WHAT --1 MR. FARBER: WELL, YOU KNOW, I CAN STICK TO MY GUNS IF 2 3 I BELIEVE IN SOMETHING. BUT YOU KNOW, I AM ALSO ABLE TO CHANGE MY MIND. I WOULDN'T ABSTAIN BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO JUDGE THE DEFENDANT. 5 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. CAN YOU APPRECIATE THAT YOU ARE NOT 6 7 JUDGING THE DEFENDANT, AS YOU ARE MAKING A DECISION AS TO 8 FACTS, THE EVIDENCE IN THE CASE AND THE LAW THAT IS PROVIDED 9 TO YOU? MR. FARBER: YEAH. I CAN SEE THAT IS THE WAY IT IS 10 11 SUPPOSED TO BE DONE. MR. WAPNER: THE OTHER PART OF THAT IS, THE JUDGE WILL 12 TELL YOU THAT YOU CAN'T CONSIDER WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO THE 13 DEFENDANT IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY. 14 15 MR. FARBER: UH-HUH. MR. WAPNER: ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT YOU CAN'T FOLLOW THAT 16 INSTRUCTION IF HE GIVES IT TO YOU? 17 MR. FARBER: NO. I AM NOT. THAT IS NOT WHAT I AM SAYING. 18 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. I AM NOT TRYING TO PUT WORDS INTO 19 YOUR MOUTH. HOW WILL IT AFFECT YOU IF YOU ARE SITTING ON THE 20 JURY AND YOU ARE TRYING TO THINK ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO 21 22 THE DEFENDANT? ARE YOU GOING TO THINK ABOUT THAT? 23 MR. FARBER: WELL, I AM SURE IT WOULD ENTER INTO MY MIND. 24 I WOULD TRY TO PUT IT OUT, BUT --MR. WAPNER: CAN YOU MAKE THE DECISION WHEN IT COMES 25 26 DOWN TO MAKING A DECISION, AS TO WHAT THE FACTS PROVE, WHEN YOU APPLY THEM TO THE LAW? CAN YOU PUT OUT OF YOUR MIND WHAT 27

MIGHT HAPPEN TO THE DEFENDANT IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY?

1 MR. FARBER: I BELIEVE I COULD. 2 MR. WAPNER: THE JUDGE IS GOING TO TELL YOU THAT YOU 3 HAVE TO. CAN YOU FOLLOW THAT INSTRUCTION? 4 MR. FARBER: SURE. 5 MR. WAPNER: MISS JOHNSON, DO YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEMS WITH 6 THAT? 7 MS. JOHNSON: NO. 8 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT WHEN YOU ARE DECIDING 9 WHETHER OR NOT A CRIME WAS COMMITTED AND WHO DID IT, YOU CAN'T 10 THINK ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO THE PERSON, IF YOU FIND HIM 11 GUILTY? 12 MS. JOHNSON: I UNDERSTAND IT, YES. 13 MR. WAPNER: AS A JUROR, YOU SIT AS A JUDGE OF FACTS 14 IN THE CASE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 15 MS. JOHNSON: YES. 16 MR. WAPNER: SO, PUT YOURSELF IN THAT IMAGINARY BLACK 17 ROBE. IF YOU WERE TO ACTUALLY BE ONE OF 12 JUDGES IN THE 18 CASE, DO YOU UNDERSTAND --19 MS. JOHNSON: YES. 20 MR. WAPNER: AND TRY TO THINK ABOUT IT THIS WAY. IF 21 YOU WERE COMING TO THE COURTROOM AND SITTING AS AN OBSERVER 22 AND THERE WAS A TRIAL WHERE ONLY THE JUDGE WAS MAKING THE 23 DECISION, WE CALL THAT A COURT TRIAL. 24 AND THE JUDGE WOULD LISTEN TO ALL OF THE FACTS 25 AND MAKE A DECISION. AS A CITIZEN SITTING BACK THERE, WOULD 26 YOU WANT YOUR JUDGE MAKING A DECISION BASED ON THE FACTS AND 27 THE LAW, OR WOULD YOU WANT HIM MAKING HIS DECISION BASED ON

WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO THE PERSON, IF HE FINDS ONE WAY OR THE

OTHER?

MS. JOHNSON: BASED ON THE LAW.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. AND THEN, ONCE HE MAKES A
DECISION AS TO WHETHER THERE WAS A CRIME AND WHETHER THE
PERSON ON TRIAL COMMITTED THAT CRIME, THEN AND ONLY THEN
SHOULD HE THINK ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO THE PERSON, THAT
IS ONCE HE IS CONVICTED, IF HE IS?

MS. JOHNSON: SORRY?

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THE IDEA OF PENALTY OR PUNISHMENT DOESN'T COME UNLESS AND UNTIL THERE IS A CONVICTION?

MS. JOHNSON: RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE CONCEPT OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, DID YOU HAVE ANY OPINIONS ABOUT IT BEFORE YOU CAME INTO COURT?

MS. JOHNSON: OH, NO, NOT REALLY.

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU HEAR THE EXAMPLE I GAVE THE JURORS
ABOUT THE CHERRY PIE?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU REMEMBER IT OR DO YOU WANT ME TO GO OVER IT AGAIN?

MS. JOHNSON: WELL, THE BOY HAD A PIECE OF PIE WHICH WAS MISSING AND --

MR. WAPNER: RIGHT, AND THE LITTLE BOY HAD PIE ALL OVER HIS FACE.

MS. JOHNSON: FACE.

MR. WAPNER: WHO DO YOU THINK ATE THE PIE?

MS. JOHNSON: WELL, I WOULD ASSUME THE BOY BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT HE DID.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. WHAT DO YOU THINK -- WHAT ELSE DO YOU THINK MIGHT HAVE HAPPENED?

MS. JOHNSON: OH, A NUMBER OF THINGS COULD HAVE HAPPENED, I GUESS.

MR. WAPNER: IF YOU WERE ASKED TO DECIDE THAT QUESTION BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, IF SOMEBODY GAVE YOU THE FACTS THAT I GAVE IN THE EXAMPLE AND SAID, "DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AS TO WHAT HAPPENED," WHAT WOULD YOU SAY?

MR. BARENS: I AM GOING TO OBJECT. THERE WERE A

VARIETY OF FACTS GIVEN AND I AM NOT SURE WHICH HYPOTHETICAL

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

MR. WAPNER: AND THEN YOU TRY NOT TO REPEAT THE SAME MISTAKE AGAIN?

MS. JOHNSON: RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: AND YOU TRY AND FIGURE OUT WHAT REASONABLY HAPPENED TO THAT PLANT, WHY DID IT DIE?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. WAPNER: AS OPPOSED -- ALL KINDS OF THINGS ARE POSSIBLE, RIGHT?

IT IS POSSIBLE, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT THERE WAS A FROST IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT AND IT KILLED THE PLANT, RIGHT?

MS. JOHNSON: RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: BUT SINCE IT IS SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, THAT IS NOT TOO LIKELY, RIGHT?

MS. JOHNSON: RIGHT. IT HAS HAPPENED BUT --

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. IF IT IS ONE PLANT THAT DIED, FOR EXAMPLE. AND THE PLANTS ON EITHER SIDE OF IT ARE ALL RIGHT, YOU WOULD PROBABLY CONCLUDE IT WASN'T A FROST OR IT WOULD HAVE AFFECTED ALL OF THE PLANTS?

MS. JOHNSON: RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU UNDERSTAND THE DISTINCTION I WAS TRYING TO MAKE BETWEEN DRAWING REASONABLE INFERENCES FROM THE FACTS AND KIND OF SPECULATING OR GUESSING ABOUT WHAT MIGHT HAVE HAPPENED?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. WAPNER: WERE YOU ABLE TO MAKE THAT DISTINCTION ON THE DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE CASE THAT YOU SAT ON? MS. JOHNSON: YES.

28

26

9-4

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEM SEPARATING THE WHEAT FROM THE CHAFF, SO TO SPEAK, IN THAT CASE?

MS. JOHNSON: NO.

MR. WAPNER: YOU ARE KIND OF SOFT-SPOKEN.

MS. JOHNSON: OH.

MR. WAPNER: WHEN YOU WERE IN THE JURY ROOM ON THE DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE CASE, WERE YOU ABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN DELIBERATIONS WITH THE OTHER 11 PEOPLE?

MS. JOHNSON: OH, YES. GOT VERY -- GOT VERY EXCITED AT TIMES IN THE DISCUSSION.

MR. WAPNER: AND WERE YOU ABLE TO EXPRESS YOUR VIEWS
TO THE OTHER 11 PEOPLE?

MS. JOHNSON: YES.

MR. WAPNER: AND LIKEWISE, TO LISTEN TO THE VIEWS OF THE OTHER 11 PEOPLE?

MS. JOHNSON: RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: AND AS MR. FARBER INDICATED, ARE YOU ABLE TO STICK TO YOUR GUNS IF YOU ARE CONVINCED YOU ARE RIGHT?

MS. JOHNSON: OH, YES.

MR. WAPNER: CAN YOU CHANGE YOUR MIND IF YOU ARE CONVINCED THAT YOU ARE WRONG?

MS. JOHNSON: IF I AM CONVINCED THAT I AM WRONG, YES.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, DID YOU HAVE OCCASION ON THAT CASE, THE DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE CASE, TO TAKE ONE POSITION AND THEN CHANGE YOUR MIND?

MS. JOHNSON: ON THAT PARTICULAR CASE, I DIDN'T HAVE TO CHANGE MY MIND.

MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU HAD OCCASION ON ANY OF THE OTHER

CASES YOU HAVE SAT ON ON JURY DUTY TO TAKE A POSITION AND THEN CHANGE YOUR MIND? MS. JOHNSON: ON THE OTHERS, WHEN WE GOT INTO THE JURY, ONE WAS DISMISSED AND THE OTHER WAS SETTLED OUT OF COURT. MR. WAPNER: THOSE ARE THE ONLY TWO? MS. JOHNSON: YES. MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU HAD ANY SERIOUS DISCUSSIONS WITH FRIENDS OR RELATIVES WHERE YOU TOOK A POSITION AND THEN ENDED UP CHANGING YOUR MIND? MS. JOHNSON: OH, YES.

LOOKING AT THESE ENGINES AND SAY, "WELL, THIS IS POSSIBLE

BUT NOT LIKELY," THINGS LIKE THAT? 1 MR. FARBER: UH-HUH, YES. 2 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU WORK ON CARS AT ALL? 3 MR. FARBER: YEAH, I DO. MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU HAD THE EXPERIENCE OF TRYING TO 5 FIND OUT WHAT IS WRONG WITH SOMETHING IN YOUR CAR ENGINE? 6 7 MR. FARBER: YES, I HAVE. MR. WAPNER: DID YOU GO AROUND AND TRY TO FIGURE OUT, 8 9 ELIMINATING THINGS AS POSSIBILITIES? 10 MR. FARBER: YES. MR. WAPNER: AND FINALLY COME UP WITH WHAT YOU THINK 11 IS THE REASONABLE THING WRONG WITH IT AND TRY AND WORK 12 13 ON THAT? MR. FARBER: THAT'S RIGHT. 14 THE COURT: WILL YOU BE MUCH LONGER? 15 16 MR. WAPNER: PROBABLY. THE COURT: PROBABLY? HOW MUCH LONGER, MORE THAN HALF 17 18 AN HOUR? 19 MR. WAPNER: NOT MORE THAN HALF AN HOUR. 20 THE COURT: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, WE WILL TAKE OUR NOON 21 RECESS AT THIS TIME. I WILL ASK ALL OF YOU TO COME BACK HERE AT 1:45 THIS AFTERNOON. THE JURORS WILL TAKE THE PLACE THEY 22 23 NOW OCCUPY AND AS TO THE OTHER JURORS, THE OTHER JURORS CAN SIT ANY PLACE YOU LIKE BUT BE HERE. WE WILL SEE YOU HERE 24 25 AT 1:45 THIS AFTERNOON. MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE A QUESTION FOR YOUR 26 27 HONOR.

(THE JURORS LEFT THE COURTROOM.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS:)

(UNREPORTED COLLOQUY BETWEEN MR. BARENS

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

AND MR. WAPNER.)

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I ASK THIS QUESTION AT THIS TIME SO AS NOT TO ANNOY YOUR HONOR AT A LATER TIME.

YOUR HONOR, THE NEW JURORS THAT HAVE COME IN EXTRANEOUS OF THE FIRST 11 THAT WE ARE DEALING WITH DID NOT HEAR ANY OF THE HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLES OF EITHER COUNSEL.

THE COURT: I DON'T THINK WE HAVE TO DO THAT WITH THEM,
DO WE?

MR. BARENS: WELL, I ASK YOU THIS, YOUR HONOR. IT IS

DIFFICULT AT TIMES TO RELATE TO DIRECT AND INDIRECT AND

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, ET CETERA, WITHOUT PROVIDING SOME

HYPOTHETICAL ILLUSTRATION IN ORDER TO PROBE THEIR ORIENTATION.

THE COURT: HASN'T IT BEEN OUR EXPERIENCE THAT THERE ARE SO MANY VARIATIONS AND SO MANY OTHER FACTS THAT ON THE HYPOTHETICAL GIVEN, THAT THEN THERE IS ANOTHER HYPOTHETICAL ON TOP OF ANOTHER HYPOTHETICAL, SO I WANT TO GET AWAY FROM THAT ALTOGETHER. IT IS NOT NECESSARY.

MR. BARENS: AGAIN, I WAS JUST ASKING YOUR HONOR'S ORIENTATION SO I WOULD KNOW HOW TO GOVERN MY QUESTIONING, AND I PRESUME THE SAME FOR MR. WAPNER.

THE COURT: YOU SEE, THE DIFFICULTY WITH THESE

HYPOTHETICALS, YOU BUILD UPON HIS AND HE BUILDS UPON YOURS

AND HE BUILDS UPON YOURS AND BACK AGAIN AND IT GOES ON

10 F

MR. WAPNER: WELL, IF THE COURT IS RESTRICTING IT, THEN I WILL USE THE EXAMPLE ABOUT THE CHERRY PIE, YOUR HONOR. I THINK THAT IT IS VERY HELPFUL FOR THE JURORS AND VERY HELPFUL FOR ME IN UNDERSTANDING THEIR STATE OF MIND, TO BE ABLE TO USE THOSE EXAMPLES BECAUSE THERE IS NO OTHER WAY TO GET INTO THEIR THOUGHT PROCESSES.

YOU NEVER FIND OUT WHO ARE THE ONES WHO SAY THAT
THE HELICOPTER IS GOING TO COME INTO THE MIDDLE OF THE OCEAN,
UNTIL YOU ASK THE QUESTIONS.

THE COURT: WELL, CERTAINLY AS TO THE OLD JURORS, THEY HAVE HEARD ALL OF THAT. I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYTHING, ANY NECESSITY WITH THEM.

BUT, WHEN YOU GET INTO THE NEW JURORS, THEN YOU CAN ASK YOUR HYPOTHETICALS.

MR. BARENS: THAT'S ALL YOU MEANT TO INQUIRE?

MR. WAPNER: THE ONLY THING THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK
THE COURT PERMISSION TO DO IS, THAT WITHOUT REPEATING THEM,
I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW THEY FEEL FOR EXAMPLE, ABOUT THE
PERSON ON THE BOAT OR THE PERSON WITH THE CHERRY PIE.

THE COURT: I THINK WE HAVE HEARD ENOUGH ABOUT THE BOAT

BECAUSE THERE ARE SO MANY POSSIBILITIES WHICH ARE NOT ENVISIONED

BY THAT HYPOTHETICAL. THERE ARE TOO MANY THINGS.

THEN HE COMES UP WITH SOME OTHER SUPPOSITITIOUS FACTS AND YOU GO ON AND YOU ANSWER MORE.

I THINK THAT THESE JURORS ARE SUFFICIENTLY

INTELLIGENT AND KNOW IN THE ABSTRACT, WHAT CIRCUMSTANTIAL

EVIDENCE IS AND WHAT CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE ISN'T.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, IF THE COURT WILL RECALL, ONE OF

THE MOST INTELLIGENT PEOPLE WAS THE FIRST PERSON THAT SAID --1 SHE WAS SEATED IN SEAT NUMBER 1. NOTWITHSTANDING HER 2 INTELLIGENCE, SHE WAS THE ONE WHO WAS SPECULATING WILDLY ON 3 DIFFERENT THINGS THAT MIGHT HAVE HAPPENED. 4 THE COURT: WELL, THAT IS EXACTLY MY POINT. WHAT IS 5 THE USE? WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THOSE HYPOTHETICALS? 6 THEY SPECULATE UPON OTHER POSSIBILITIES THAT MIGHT 7 HAPPEN. 8 MR. BARENS: WE WOULD VIGOROUSLY DISAGREE WITH WHAT 9 COUNSEL DEFINES AS WILD SPECULATION IN TERMS OF THE ATTITUDE. 10 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AT ANY RATE, WHAT DO YOU WANT 11 TO USE, THE CAKE? IS THAT WHAT YOU WANT TO USE? 12 13 MR. WAPNER: YES, PLEASE. THE COURT: THAT WILL BE WITH THE NEW JURORS? WELL, 14 DO YOU WANT TO ASK THE OLD JURORS? 15 16 MR. WAPNER: I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE OLD ONES, AS WELL. THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW. YOU HAVE CREATED A TREMENDOUS 17 PASSION AND LIKING FOR THAT PARTICULAR EXAMPLE OF YOURS. I 18 DON'T THINK IT HAS ANY PURPOSE. 19 BUT IF YOU WANT TO ASK IT, GO AHEAD. 20 MR. BARENS: THEN YOUR HONOR IS LETTING MR. WAPNER HAVE 21 22 HIS CAKE? THE COURT: HE CAN HAVE HIS CAKE AND YOU CAN HAVE IT 23 24 T00. 25 (AT 12:08 P.M. AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN 26 UNTIL 1:45 P.M. OF THE SAME DAY.) 27

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1987; 1:50 P.M.

DEPARTMENT WEST C HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE

(APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD

OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE AND HEARING OF THE

JURY:)

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE MR. WAPNER WANTED
TO SPEAK TO YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: YES?

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, AT THE LUNCH ONE OF THE JURORS
RAN INTO ME IN THE MALL AND JUST SAID HELLO AND I JUST SAID
HELLO AND THAT WAS THE END. BUT I WOULD LIKE THE COURT TO
TELL THE JURORS THAT IF WE DON'T SAY HELLO TO THEM IT IS
BECAUSE WE DON'T WANT TO HAVE ANY --

THE COURT: I WILL TELL THE JURY WHEN THEY ARE SELECTED,

I ALWAYS TELL THEM THAT.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I HAD ONE THING I WANTED TO

BRINGTO THE COURT'S ATTENTION SO THAT THE COURT COULD CONSIDER

A RESPONSE TO THIS PROBLEM.

THE COURT: WHICH PROBLEM ARE WE TALKING ABOUT?

MR. BARENS: WELL, YOUR HONOR, AS A RESULT OF THE

ACTIVITIES OF LAST THURSDAY ON THAT SEARCH WARRANT,

APPROXIMATELY 78 DEFENSE EXHIBITS WERE REMOVED -- EXHIBITS

WERE REMOVED FROM THE RESIDENCE, MANY OF WHICH WERE ORIGINALS.

MR. HUNT IS PREPARING AN INVENTORY FOR ME OF WHAT
THEY WERE. WE WOULD OBVIOUSLY LIKE THEM BACK IN AN UNCOPIED

FORM BECAUSE I DON'T THINK THAT THE PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE COPIES

OF DEFENSE EXHIBITS UNTIL WE ARE PREPARED TO INTRODUCE THEM

IN THE DEFENSE PORTION OF THE CASE.

NOW YOUR HONOR, WE OBVIOUSLY --

THE COURT: YOU ARE NOT GETTING ANY EXHIBITS. YOU ARE NOT GETTING ANY OF THESE PAPERS THAT WERE SEIZED, ARE YOU?

MR. WAPNER: NO, YOUR HONOR.

MR. BARENS: LET ME TELL YOUR HONOR THE MORE SPECIFIC

PROBLEM WE HAVE GOT: IT NOW TURNS OUT THAT LES ZOELLER,

MR. WAPNER'S INVESTIGATING OFFICER, WITH AT LEAST THREE OTHER

MEMBERS OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, WERE PRESENT DURING THIS

ACTIVITY. WHY, I COULDN'T TELL YOUR HONOR, SINCE THEY WERE

SEARCHING AND ASSISTING THE PEOPLE FROM NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

IN THIS ENTERPRISE, AGAIN WITHOUT HAVING THE BRAINS TO TELL

MR. WAPNER THEY WERE GOING TO GO OVER AND DO ALL OF THIS

STUFF. THEY HAVE ALL NOW BEEN EXPOSED TO ALL OF THESE DEFENSE

EXHIBITS, WE HAVE SOME EVIDENCE WHICH WILL BE A MOTION

SUBMITTED TO THE COURT THAT THESE PEOPLE WERE IN FACT IN

ACTIVE POSSESSION -- THESE BEVERLY HILLS PEOPLE WERE IN ACTIVE

POSSESSION OF OUR DEFENSE EXHIBITS.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT HIS HONOR FEELS HIS JURISDICTION
IS IN TERMS OF ORDERING A RETURN OF THE DEFENSE EXHIBITS.
BUT THE PROBLEM I HAVE NOW, IS NOT BEING ABLE TO PREPARE THESE
EXHIBITS. I DON'T HAVE THEM.

MR. WAPNER: TWO THINGS OR THREE THINGS. FIRST OF ALL, WE DON'T KNOW YET BECAUSE WE HAVE NOT HAD ANY TESTIMONY, WHAT THE POLICE OFFICERS SAW AND WHAT THEY HAVE DONE. I WON'T ACCEPT A BALD ASSERTION, COUNSEL'S STATEMENT THAT THE POLICE OFFICERS SAW THESE EXHIBITS.

I AM SURE THAT THAT WOULD BE THE SUBJECT OF LITIGATION. I ANTICIPATE THE MOTION PROBABLY WILL BE FILED THIS WEEK. I THOUGHT IT WOULD HAVE BEEN FILED TODAY.

BUT I EXPECT THAT WE'LL HAVE TO HAVE TESTIMONY ON THAT.

SECOND OF ALL, MY UNDERSTANDING IS FROM TALKING
TO THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL, JOHN VANCE, THAT THE ITEMS
THAT WERE SEIZED WERE PLACED IN BOXES AND SHIPPED FROM LOS
ANGELES TO SAN FRANCISCO, WHERE THEY ARRIVED I BELIEVE, THIS
MORNING. THEY WILL BE SEALED, AND KEPT IN THE OFFICE OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL UNTIL AN INDEPENDENT DETERMINATION CAN BE
MADE AS TO WHAT SHOULD BE DONE WITH THESE EXHIBITS. THERE ARE
ALL KINDS OF POSSIBILITIES.

NONE OF US HAVE SEEN THE WARRANT. IT IS POSSIBLE THAT NOTWITHSTANDING THE FACT THAT THEY ARE DEFENSE EXHIBITS, THAT SOME OF THEM ARE PROPERLY SEIZABLE UNDER THE WARRANT.

THAT DOESN'T MEAN I AM ENTITLED TO SEE THEM, BUT

IT MAY MEAN THAT THE PROSECUTION IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA,

WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE THAT THEY WERE GOING TO BE USED AS

DEFENSE EXHIBITS, IS ENTITLED TO HAVE THE DOCUMENTS. I HAVE

NOT SEEN THE WARRANT. I DON'T KNOW. THAT WILL ALSO BE

THE SUBJECT OF LITIGATION.

THAT BRINGS ME TO THE THIRD POINT, WHICH IS THAT
THE PROCEDURES IN THE PENAL CODE FOR APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL
MASTER, I THINK, CAN BE UTILIZED TO A CERTAIN EXTENT TO SORT
OUT THIS PROBLEM.

THE PENAL CODE OBVIOUSLY, PROVIDES IN SPECIAL

MASTER SITUATIONS, THAT THE MASTER DO THE SEARCH AND BE PRESENT

DURING THE SEARCH. WELL, WE CAN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT THAT AT

THIS TIME.

WHAT I AM SUGGESTING, IS THAT THAT BE USED AS A BASIS FOR AN EXAMINATION OF THE RECORDS BY SOME INDEPENDENT THIRD PARTY. HOWEVER, THE CODE SUGGESTS THAT THE MOTION WHICH IS IN THE NATURE OF A 1538.5 MOTION TO GET RETURN OF THE DOCUMENTS OR PREVENT THEIR USE, BE MADE WITHIN THREE DAYS OF THEIR SEIZURE.

I AM NOT SUGGESTING THAT THAT NECESSARILY HAS TO BE DONE OR FOLLOWED IN THIS CASE. BUT I THINK THE MOTION HAS TO BE PROPERLY MADE IN FRONT OF THE JUDGE IN SAN MATEO COUNTY.

IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THAT IS GOING TO NECESSITATE

MR. HUNT, THROUGH HIS COUNSEL -- EITHER HIS COUNSEL IN THIS

CASE OR HIS COUNSEL IN THE SAN MATEO COUNTY CASE OR BOTH,

MAKING A MOTION AND HAVING THE SPECIAL MASTER OR THE EQUIVALENT

OF THE SPECIAL MASTER OR SOME INDEPENDENT PARTY APPOINTED BY

THE COURT IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, EXAMINE THOSE RECORDS AND

DETERMINE WHAT HAPPENS TO THEM.

I AM NOT SUGGESTING IN ANY SENSE THAT THE PROSECUTION

IN THIS CASE, SHOULD BE ENTITLED TO THEM. BUT THIS IS A
WHOLE, SEPARATE ISSUE ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS TO THOSE RECORDS UP
THERE AND THAT HAS TO BE DETERMINED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.
AND I THINK THE PROPER FORUM FOR THAT IS IN SAN MATEO COUNTY.

SO MY SUGGESTION IS THAT WE CAN GO AS FAR AS
WE CAN IN PICKING THE JURY AND IF WE GET THIS JURY, NOT
IMPANEL THE JURY, NOT SWEAR THE JURY AND NOT HAVE JEOPARDY
ATTACH UNTIL THAT LITIGATION OCCURS.

WE CAN EVEN GET 12, AGREE THAT THOSE WILL BE THE

12 AND NOT SWEAR THEM AND GET OUR ALTERNATES AND AGREE TO

THOSE PEOPLE AND NOT SWEAR THEM AND THEN HAVE THE LITIGATION

ON THE ISSUE OF THE SEARCH WARRANT. THEN WE SHOULD BE PREPARED

I THINK, TO START THIS CASE.

THE COURT: WHAT ACTION IS BEING TAKEN BY COUNSEL UP
IN SAN MATEO COUNTY?

MR. BARENS: I HAVE NOT TALKED TO PARKER KELLY, OTHER
THAN THROUGH MR. HUNT ADVISING ME THAT HE, HIMSELF, HAS NOT
SEEN THE WARRANT OR AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT THEREOF, AS OF TODAY.
ALTHOUGH DURING THE LUNCH HOUR --

THE COURT: WELL, I THOUGHT THE RETURN WAS -
MR. BARENS: HE HAD NOT SEEN ANYTHING ON IT AS YET. HE

IS ENDEAVORING NOW TO DISCOVER THOSE MATERIALS AND FIND OUT

WHAT HE CAN. AT LEAST, THIS IS WHAT I AM ADVISED BY THE

DEFENDANT.

THE COURT: I MEAN, HAVE YOU EXAMINED THOSE --

MR. BARENS: WE ARE RECEIVING LATER TODAY, AN INVENTORY

OF THE REMAINING RECORDS. I HAVE NOT PERSONALLY GONE UP THERE

AND EXAMINED THOSE, NO, SIR.

THE COURT: WELL, ARE YOU GOING TO MAKE A RECORD OF WHAT YOU CLAIM IS MISSING FROM THAT?

MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THEN YOU MAKE A RECORD AND TELL
ME WHAT THEY ARE. DON'T DESCRIBE THE DOCUMENTS OR THE
CONTENTS. BUT TELL ME WHAT IS MISSING.

I WILL DO WHATEVER I CAN IN GETTING THE COURT IN SAN MATEO COUNTY TO RELEASE ANY OF THESE DOCUMENTS WHICH ARE PRIVILEGED IN YOUR PARTICULAR CASE THAT MAY BE USED IN THIS PARTICULAR TRIAL.

MR. BARENS: I AM YOU KNOW -- TWO POINTS. I AM SURE
YOUR HONOR IS AWARE THAT MERELY RELEASING DOCUMENTS BACK TO
THE DEFENSE, IN THE DEFENSE OPINION WILL NOT BE A SUFFICIENT --

THE COURT: WELL, I WON'T PERMIT THEM TO USE ANY OF THAT INFORMATION.

MR. BARENS: IT IS GOING TO INVOLVE YOUR HONOR,

CONSIDERING THE ROLE TO BE PLAYED BY THE BEVERLY HILLS POLICE

OFFICERS WHO HAVE BEEN ARGUABLY POLLUTED BY THAT MATERIAL.

ANOTHER FACT, YOUR HONOR, THAT ADDS ALMOST A
HUMOROUS TWIST TO THIS IS THAT I WOULD AGREE WITH MY COLLEAGUE
THAT THE NORMAL RESPONSE THAT WE AS LAWYERS DO FOR THIS KIND
OF CONDUCT -- I AM SURE YOUR HONOR WOULD HAVE DONE IT -- IS
TO BRING A 1538.5 MOTION TO SUPPRESS THE EVIDENCE, EXCEPT THAT
I CAN'T SUPPRESS THOSE EXHIBITS. I WANT THE STUFF. I DON'T
WANT IT SUPPRESSED. IT IS THE OPPOSITE, HERE.

THE COURT: WELL, I THINK THE FIRST THING TO DO IS TO FIND OUT WHAT THE STUFF IS, THE RECORDS THAT ARE MISSING.

MR. BARENS: WELL, WE IN ALL LIKELIHOOD WILL BE FILING

THAT AS A PART OF A LARGER MOTION TO YOUR HONOR'S ATTENTION THIS WEEK, ADDRESSING THIS IN SOME COMPREHENSIVE FORMAT.

I ONLY BROUGHT THIS UP AT THIS JUNCTURE TO MAKE

YOUR HONOR AWARE OF THE ONGOING NATURE OF THE PROBLEM WE HAVE

GOT AND TO GIVE YOUR HONOR AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONTEMPLATE THIS

KIND OF UNUSUAL SITUATION.

MR. WAPNER IS VERY ACCURATE IN SUGGESTING THAT

AN INDEPENDENT MASTER SHOULD BE THE APPROPRIATE REMEDY.

THE COURT: I DON'T CARE WHAT THE PROCEDURE IS THAT IS FOLLOWED. I WANT IT ACCOMPLISHED. I WANT TO ACCOMPLISH FINDING OUT WHAT IS MISSING AND SECONDLY, HAVE WE GOT THOSE RECORDS AND THIRD, TO GET THEM BACK TO YOU.

MR. BARENS: ONE OTHER DIMENSION I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE
A RECORD ON. WHEN MR. WAPNER SUMMARILY INDICATES SOME
INDEPENDENT MECHANISMS WILL BE SET UP TO SEE WHAT IS AVAILABLE
FOR THE DEFENSE OR WHAT IS A PART OF THE DEFENSE CASE UP THERE
OR WHATEVER, I THINK YOUR HONOR SHOULD BE A PARTICIPANT IN
THAT ACTIVITY BECAUSE YOUR HONOR IS THE ONLY ONE THAT WILL
SERVE AS A JUDGE IN THE LOS ANGELES CASE.

I WON'T.

SO I DON'T KNOW HOW THESE FELLOWS COULD PROCEED.

THE COURT: I HAVE TO KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IS MISSING.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, YOUR HONOR. WELL WE WILL MAKE SURE THE COURT IS APPRISED.

MR. WAPNER: ONE OTHER THING, YOUR HONOR, THE COURT
ON THURSDAY INQUIRED OF COUNSEL WHETHER IT HAD COPIES OF THE
EXHIBIT TO WHICH HE REPLIED, YES.

THE COURT: HE SAID HE HAD THE ORIGINALS OF THE COPIES WHICH WERE SEIZED.

MR. WAPNER: WELL --

MR. BARENS: IT TURNS OUT --

MR. WAPNER: THE POINT BEING WHETHER THE ORIGINALS WERE TAKEN OR THE COPIES WERE TAKEN, IF COUNSEL HAS ANOTHER COPY, BE IT THE ORIGINAL OR A COPY AND THE ONLY OBJECTION TO THE USE OF THAT WOULD BE A BEST EVIDENCE OBJECTION, I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH SAYING THAT HE IS ALLOWED TO USE A COPY.

THE COURT: HE WANTS TO BE SURE THAT YOU DON'T GET THEM.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, I HAVE -- I HAVE TRIED TO MAKE EVERY

ASSURANCE TO COUNSEL AND TO THE COURT THAT I DON'T AND THAT

THAT IS AN INDEPENDENT QUESTION.

BUT WHAT I AM SAYING IS, IF ALL HE IS SAYING IS
"WE WANT THEM BACK SO WE CAN USE THEM," AND THE ONLY WAY I
WOULD BE ABLE TO PROHIBIT HIM WOULD BE BY A BEST EVIDENCE
OBJECTION, I AM TELLING THE COURT IF HE IS REPRESENTING THAT
IS ONE OF THE ONES THAT WERE TAKEN --

THE COURT: HE SAID HE HASN'T THE ORIGINALS. HE IS

SAYING HE HAS COPIES OF THE ORIGINALS THAT WERE TAKEN.

MR. BARENS: IT NOW TURNS OUT THAT THERE WERE 70 TO 80 DEFENSE EXHIBITS THAT MR. HUNT HAD NOT SUBMITTED TO ME AS YET, THAT WERE IMPEACHMENT MATERIALS FOR PROSECUTION WITNESSES THAT I HAVE NOT COPIES OF AT ALL. THEY WERE DOCUMENTS THAT HAD BEEN HELD, IN THE GREATEST OF CONFIDENCE, BY MR. HUNT.

THE COURT: HADN'T YOUR COLLEAGUE SEEN THEM?

MR. BARENS: NO, AS IT TURNS OUT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY HE SHOULD KEEP DOCUMENTS FROM YOU WHICH ARE IMPORTANT.

MR. BARENS: THEY WEREN'T KEPT FROM US.

WE HAD ACTUALLY ASKED HIM, AS THEY WERE REFERENCED FROM TIME TO TIME, TO KEEP THEM IN A SAFE PLACE AND I HAD NOT -- I JUST HAD NOT EXAMINED THEM.

THE COURT: BUT YOU HAVE A LIST OF WHAT THESE DOCUMENTS ARE, HAVEN'T YOU?

MR. BARENS: MR. HUNT IS IN THE PROCESS OF PREPARING THEM.

IF I COULD JUST HAVE A SECOND, YOUR HONOR, WITH THE DEFENDANT.

(UNREPORTED COLLOQUY BETWEEN MR. BARENS.

AND THE DEFENDANT.)

MR. BARENS: I CANNOT AT THIS ABSOLUTE MOMENT IN TIME ARTICULATE WHAT THEY ARE TO YOU.

THESE ARE THINGS THAT I WOULD REPRESENT TO THE COURT -- AND I WILL MAKE ALL OF THIS KNOWN IN MY MOTION -- THAT I HAD FROM TIME TO TIME SEEN. I HAD NOT COPIED THEM

ALL, FOR ONE REASON OR ANOTHER. HOWEVER, THEY ARE THINGS

THAT WE HAD DISCUSSED AND THAT I HAD SEEN BUT I DO NOT -
JUST TO MAKE THE RECORD CLEAR ON MR. WAPNER'S POINT -- BUT

I DO NOT HAVE COPIES OF IN MY OFFICE, THAT I JUST DO NOT HAVE

COPIES OF.

AS YOUR HONOR IS WELL AWARE, AS A TECHNICAL MATTER, THE FILE AND ALL OF ITS MATERIALS, ARE THE PROPERTY OF THE CLIENT IN THESE MATTERS. I AM MERELY, YOU KNOW, AS ANY CRIMINAL LAWYER, I AM A CUSTODIAN OF FILES FOR A CLIENT. I CANNOT WITHHOLD A FILE FROM A CLIENT, ET CETERA.

IN THIS INSTANCE, THE CLIENT HAD POSSESSION OF THESE MATERIALS THAT I HAD ACCESSED BUT NOT COPIED.

THE COURT: LET'S FIND OUT WHAT THE FACTS ARE BEFORE
WE --

MR. BARENS: I WAS JUST ADVISING THE COURT --

THE COURT: BEFORE WE BEGIN TO MAKE ANY KIND OF AN ADJUDICATION OR SUGGESTION.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, LET'S GET THE JURORS IN.

HOW MANY PEREMPTORIES HAVE YOU EXERCISED?

MR. BARENS: 17.

THE COURT: THERE SEEMS TO BE A QUESTION. YOURS IS THE NEXT PEREMPTORY, ISN'T IT?

MR. WAPNER: CORRECT.

(WHEREUPON, THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS:)

THE COURT: DID ONE OF YOU GENTLEMEN IN THE BACK RAISE YOUR HAND WHEN I ASKED WHETHER OR NOT YOU KNEW ANY OF THE WITNESSES WHOSE NAMES HAD BEEN CALLED OR ANYTHING? (UNREPORTED COLLOQUY BETWEEN THE COURT AND THE CLERK.)

THE COURT: DID ANYBODY SAY THEY KNEW ONE OF THE PROSPECTIVE WITNESSES WHOSE NAME IS OSTROVE? (NO AUDIBLE REPLY.)

THE COURT: THE CLERK MUST BE MISTAKEN.

ALL RIGHT, MISS ELIE, YOU HAVE THAT HARDSHIP NOTE,

HAVE YOU?

MS. ELIE: YES, SIR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YOUR EMPLOYER WON'T PERMIT YOU TO STAY AND TO BE PAID?

MS. ELIE: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU. YOU WILL BE EXCUSED. EVERYBODY IS HERE?

THE CLERK: YES, EVERYBODY IS HERE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THE DEFENDANT IS PRESENT, COUNSEL ARE PRESENT AND THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS ARE PRESENT.

YOU MAY CONCLUDE YOUR VOIR DIRE.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. FARBER AND MRS. JOHNSON.

MRS. JOHNSON, DID YOU READ ANY ARTICLES RECENTLY ABOUT PEOPLE BEING GRANTED IMMUNITY TO TESTIFY AGAINST OTHER

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

MS. JOHNSON: I HAVE SEEN IT IN THE PAPER OCCASIONALLY. 1 MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU ANY FEELINGS ABOUT THAT --2 MS. JOHNSON: NO. 3 MR. WAPNER: -- THAT IT IS WRONG TO GIVE SOMEONE A 4 BREAK, WHO IS POSSIBLY GUILTY OF A CRIME, IN ORDER TO 5 PROSECUTE SOMEONE ELSE? 6 MS. JOHNSON: NO. 7 MR. WAPNER: IT DOESN'T BOTHER YOU? 8 MS. JOHNSON: IT DOESN'T BOTHER ME. 9 MR. WAPNER: HOW ABOUT YOU, MR. FARBER? 10 MR. FARBER: NO. 11 MR. WAPNER: MR. FARBER, YOU HEARD THE EXAMPLE I GAVE 12 ABOUT THE TWO PEOPLE BEING ROBBED? 13 MR. FARBER: YES, I DID. 14 MR. WAPNER: IS THE BACKGROUND OF THE VICTIMS, IS THAT 15 GOING TO MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE TO YOU, IS THAT GOING TO MAKE 16 ANY DIFFERENCE TO YOU AS TO WHETHER YOU FIND THE PERSON GUILTY 17 OR NOT? 18 MR. FARBER: NO. 19 MR. WAPNER: IT DOESN'T MATTER WHETHER YOU LIKE HIM 20 OR DISLIKE HIM? 21 MR. FARBER: NO, IT DOESN'T. 22 MR. WAPNER: MRS. JOHNSON, HOW ABOUT YOU? 23 MS. JOHNSON: IT WOULDN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE. 24 MR. WAPNER: MRS. JOHNSON, HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM 25 OF A CON SCHEME OR A THEFT OF ANY KIND? 26 MS. JOHNSON: NO. 27

MR. WAPNER: MR. FARBER?

NO.

MR. FARBER:

27

28

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU BOTH. 1 THE COURT: PASS FOR CAUSE? 2 MR. WAPNER: YES, YOUR HONOR. 3 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, IT IS THE DEFENDANT'S PEREMPTORY. 4 MR. WAPNER: I BELIEVE IT IS THE PEOPLE'S PEREMPTORY. 5 THE COURT: NO, THE DEFENDANT'S. 6 MR. BARENS: NO. WE HAVE THE PEOPLE'S. 7 THE COURT: OH, THE PEOPLE. I AM SORRY. I SAW THE 8 ODD NUMBER AND I FORGOT ABOUT THE FACT YOU PASSED ONCE. 9 MR. BARENS: WE HAD PASSED. 10 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THE PEOPLE. 11 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. WE WOULD THANK 12 AND ASK THE COURT TO THANK AND EXCUSE MRS. SHAW, JUROR NUMBER 13 12. 14 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU, MRS. SHAW. 15 THE CLERK: STEVEN C. WIENS, W-I-E-N-S, AND THAT IS 16 STEVEN WITH A V. 17 THE COURT: I THINK YOU HAD INDICATED THAT A LONG TIME 18 AGO, MR. WIENS, THAT YOU OR SOME MEMBER OF YOUR FAMILY HAVE 19 BEEN IDENTIFIED WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT WORK. 20 MR. WIENS: YES. MY FATHER ISARETIRED PAROLE OFFICER 21 FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. 22 I ALSO HAVE AN ACQUAINTANCE WHO IS A PROSECUTING 23 ATTORNEY FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES. 24 25

THE COURT: WHICH COUNTY?

MR. WIENS: L.A. COUNTY.

THE COURT: WHAT IS HIS NAME?

MR. WIENS: HER NAME IS SARAH LAZARUS.

THE COURT: WHERE IS SHE? LONG BEACH. MR. WIENS: IN THE D.A.'S OFFICE IN LONG BEACH? THE COURT: MR. WIENS: YES, THE D.A.'S OFFICE. 4 F0

MR. WIENS: NO, SIR.

1 THE COURT: WELL, THE FACT THAT YOU WERE, WOULD THAT IN 2 ANY WAY PREDISPOSE YOU TO FAVOR THE PROSECUTION AGAINST THE 3 DEFENSE? 4 MR. WIENS: NO. 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE 6 QUESITONS AND ANSWERS WHICH WERE ASKED AND GIVEN, DID YOU 7 NOT? 8 MR. WIENS: YES. 9 THE COURT: IF THE SAME GENERAL QUESTIONS WERE ASKED 10 OF YOU, WOULD YOUR ANSWERS BE ANY DIFFERENT OR WOULD IT BE 11 SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME? 12 MR. WIENS: THE SAME. 13 THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU DO? 14 MR. WIENS: I AM A COMPUTER PROGRAMMER FOR XEROX 15 CORPORATION. 16 THE COURT: ARE YOU MARRIED? 17 MR. WIENS: YES. I AM GOING THROUGH A DIVORCE RIGHT 18 NOW. 19 THE COURT: WELL, WHAT DOES YOUR WIFE DO? MR. WIENS: SHE IS AN ARTIST. 20 21 THE COURT: AND WHAT FORMAL EDUCATION DID YOU RECEIVE? 22 MR. WIENS: I HAVE A BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE FROM 23 CAL STATE, DOMINGUEZ HILLS. 24 THE COURT: YOU HAVE NO CHILDREN? 25 MR. WIENS: NO. 26 THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER SERVED AS A JUROR IN A 27 CRIMINAL CASE BEFORE?

THE COURT: AND HAVE YOU EVER BEEN A VICTIM OF ANY KIND 1 OF CRIME? 2 MR. WIENS: NOTHING SERIOUS, JUST BURGLARY. 3 THE COURT: BURGLARY? 4 MR. WIENS: A BURGLARY ONCE AND ANOTHER TIME A MOTORCYCLE 5 I HAD WAS STOLEN. 6 THE COURT: WAS THAT INVESTIGATED BY THE POLICE? 7 MR. WIENS: YES, IT WAS. 8 THE COURT: WERE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE WAY THE INVESTI-9 GATION WENT DOWN? 10 MR. WIENS: YES. I WAS. 11 THE COURT: IT WON'T PREVENT YOU IN ANY WAY FROM -- THAT 12 YOU WON'T BE PREJUDICED AGAINST THE DEFENDANT BECAUSE HE HAS 13 BEEN CHARGED WITH AN OFFENSE? 14 15 MR. WIENS: NO, SIR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 16 MR. BARENS: GOOD AFTERNOON, SIR. WOULD YOU SAY YOUR 17 18 LAST NAME? MR. WIENS: WIENS. 19 MR. BARENS: MR. WIENS, I APPRECIATE YOUR ADIVISING US 20 THAT YOUR FATHER HAD BEEN A PAROLE OFFICER. HOW OLD WERE YOU 21 WHEN YOU MOVED OUT OF THE HOUSE? 22 23 MR. WIENS: I WAS 21. MR. BARENS: AND YOUR FATHER WAS STILL ALIVE AT THE TIME? 24 25 MR. WIENS: YES. MR. BARENS: YOUR FATHER WORKED FOR THE LOS ANGELES 26 27 COUNTY PAROLE OFFICE? 28 MR. WIENS: YEAH.

27

28

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL US WHICH AREA OF THE COUNTY 1 2 HE WAS IN? MR. WIENS: I BELIEVE ALL THE WAY FROM LONG BEACH UP 3 INTO SANTA MONICA. I THINK HE CHANGED AROUND SEVERAL TIMES. 4 MR. BARENS: DID HE HAVE THAT PARTICULAR EMPLOYMENT THE 5 6 WHOLE TIME YOU WERE LIVING AT HOME? MR. WIENS: NO. GROWING UP, HE WORKED FOR -- HE STARTED 7 8 OUT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS BACK I THINK IN THE '50'S WORKING AS A GUARD AT SOLEDAD PRISON. AND HE WORKED HIS WAY 10 UP THROUGH THE CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT. 11 MR. BARENS: DID HE EVER SHARE ANY STORIES WITH YOU ABOUT 12 HIS EXPERIENCES EITHER IN THE PENAL SYSTEM OR AS A PAROLE 13 OFFICER? MR. WIENS: A FEW. NOT TOO MANY. A FEW EXPERIENCES, 14 15 YEAH. 16 MR. BARENS: DID HE TELL YOU ABOUT SOME OF THE BAD OR ROWDY CONDUCT SOME OF THE PRISONERS USED TO GET INVOLVED 17 18 IN. IN THE PRISON? MR. WIENS: NO, NOT AS FAR AS THE PRISON. HE DIDN'T 19 20 TELL ME TOO MANY BAD STORIES ABOUT HIS PAROLEES. MR. BARENS: DID HE SHARE WITH YOU ANY OF HIS 21 22 FRUSTRATIONS ABOUT PAROLED PEOPLE THAT HE WOULD WORK WITH THAT 23 WOULD GET BACK INTO TROUBLE AGAIN? 24 25

MR. WIENS: YEAH. I THINK HE WAS MORE FRUSTRATED WITH
THE SYSTEM, RATHER THAN THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES.

HE FELT THE SYSTEM WAS A LITTLE BIT UNFAIR TOWARD
HELPING THE PERSON GET OUT OF A LIFE OF CRIME.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU BE ANY MORE SPECIFIC IN THAT,

SIR?

MR. WIENS: HE WAS VERY LIBERAL-MINDED AND FELT MORE
THAT A PERSON WHO HAD BEEN -- WAS COMING OUT OF PRISON, SHOULD
BE GIVEN SOME SORT OF TRAINING OR HELP TO REMOVE HIMSELF FROM
THAT TYPE OF ENVIRONMENT. HE FELT IT DIDN'T DO ANY GOOD TO
PUT A PERSON IN PRISON WHERE THEY ARE IN THE SAME ENVIRONMENT
AND PUT THEM BACK OUT ON THE STREETS IN THE SAME ENVIRONMENT
BECAUSE THAT WAS TOO MUCH AGAINST THEM.

MR. BARENS: DID HE EVER TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, HAVE ANY PROBATIONERS THAT HAD BEEN CONVICTED OF ANY MURDER CASES?

MR. WIENS: I COULDN'T ANSWER THAT.

1 MR. BARENS: YOU WOULDN'T KNOW? 2 MR. WIENS: NO. MR. BARENS: DID YOU EVER GO TO YOUR FATHER'S JOB WITH 3 4 HIM OR PARTICIPATE WITH HIM AT ALL? MR. WIENS: NO, NOT REALLY. WELL, I MET A FEW OF HIS 5 6 PAROLEES. MR. BARENS: THEY WOULD COME BY OCCASIONALLY TO TALK 7 8 TO YOUR DAD? 9 MR. WIENS: OCCASIONALLY. MR. BARENS: DID YOU DEVELOP PERSONALLY IN YOUR OWN 10 MIND, ANY KIND OF ATTITUDE TOWARDS PAROLEES? 11 HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT THESE GUYS THAT WOULD COME 12 TO SEE YOUR DAD? DID YOU THINK THEY WERE BAD GUYS? 13 MR. WIENS: NOT REALLY. I CAN ONLY REMEMBER REALLY ONE 14 OR TWO OF THEM. THEY WERE PEOPLE MY FATHER WAS TRYING ERNESTLY 15 16 TO HELP. THEY SEEMED LIKE VERY SINCERE PEOPLE THAT REALLY 17 DDN'T -- THEY WANTED TO CHANGE THEIR LIFESTYLE. 18 19 MR. BARENS: DID YOU AS A RESULT OF GROWING UP WITH YOUR DAD, DEVELOP ANY KIND OF PHILOSOPHY ABOUT THE CRIMINAL 20 21 JUSTICE SYSTEM? MR. WIENS: YEAH. A LOT OF HIS VIEWS HAVE RUBBED OFF 22 23 ON ME. 24 AS FAR AS TO ME, IT REALLY DOESN'T HELP OUR 25 SOCIETY TOO MUCH TO PUT A PERSON IN PRISON AND THEN PUT HIM 26 BACK IN THE SAME ENVIRONMENT. WHEN THEY ARE IN PRISON, THEY 27 JUST LEARN MORE ABOUT CRIME AND THEY ARE WITH CRIMINALS AND THEN YOU PUT THEM BACK ON THE STREETS WHERE THEY ARE JUST GOING 28

TO DO IT AGAIN, GIVEN NOTHING BETTER TO DO, NO OTHER MEANS 1 TO SUPPORT THEMSELVES. 2 MR. BARENS: IN OTHER WORDS, YOUR PHILOSOPHY IS THAT 3 REHABILITATION SHOULD BE A MORE ACTIVE SCIENCE AND THAT IT 4 SHOULD TRANSCEND THE PRISON EXPERIENCE, BUT RATHER WORK 5 IN TEH COMMUNITY UPON RELEASE FOR REHABILITATION TO BE 6 7 EFFECTIVE? MR. WIENS: YES. MR. BARENS: DID YOUR DAD EVER TALK TO YOU ABOUT WHETHER 9 OR NOT HE EVER HAD A PAROLEE SAY TO HIM OR A PROBATIONER SAY 10 TO HIM THAT THEY WERE FALSELY ACCUSED OR I SHOULD NOT HAVE 11 BEEN CONVICTED TO BEGIN WITH? 12 13 MR. WIENS: NO. MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T RECALL ANYTHING LIKE THAT? 14 15 MR. WIENS: NO. MR. BARENS: DO YOU HAVE ANY BIASES FOR THE PROSECUTION 16 AS A RESULT OF GROWING UP WITH YOUR FATHER, THAT WOULD IN ANY 17 WAY, MAKE YOU THINK A FELLOW ACCUSED OF A CRIME WAS MORE LIKELY 18 19 TO HAVE COMMITTED IT THAN NOT? 20 MR. WIENS: NO. MR. BARENS: YOU HAVE HEARD ME OVER THE WEEKS, TALK ABOUT 21 THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE ASSOCIATED WITH MR. HUNT, YOURSELF 22 OR ANY OTHER DEFENDANT THAT WOULD BE IN THIS COURTROOM. 23 AS HE SITS THERE NOW, DO YOU SEE HIM WRAPPED IN 24 THAT COCOON, THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE? 25 MR. WIENS: YES, SIR. 26 MR. BARENS: ARE YOU COMFORTABLE WITH THAT? 27

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT AN ACCUSATION IS 1 2 NOT EVIDENCE IN AND OF ITSELF? 3 MR. WIENS: YES. MR. BARENS: NOW, YOU REFERENCED, FOR WHICH I AGAIN 4 APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT YOU HAVE A DEPUTY D.A. THAT YOU ARE 5 FRIENDS WITH, A LADY NAMED LAZARUS? 6 7 MR. WIENS: YES. MR. BARENS: AND NOT MEANING TO PRY, BUT I NEED TO, WHAT 8 IS THE NATURE OF THAT RELATIONSHIP? 9 MR. WIENS: SHE IS THE WIFE OF SOMEONE I WORK WITH. AND 10 I HAVE SEEN HER -- I MET HER ABOUT A YEAR AGO AT A PARTY. I 11 HAVE SEEN HER MAYBE FIVE TIMES SINCE, JUST AT PARTIES. 12 MR. BARENS: SHE IS THE WIFE OF SOMEONE YOU CURRENTLY 13 14 WORK WITH? 15 MR. WIENS: YES. MR. BARENS: DID YOU EVER DISCUSS HER WORK WITH HER? 16 MR. WIENS: OCCASIONALLY. SINCE I HAVE BEEN HERE, I 17 HAVE BEEN TRYING TO THINK OF SOME SPECIFIC INSTANCE WHERE WE 18 HAD DISCUSSED A CASE OR ANYTHING ABOUT HER WORK. AND I KNOW 19 WE DISCUSSED THINGS VERY GENERALLY, BUT NOTHING SPECIFIC. 20 MR. BARENS: WHAT DID SHE TELL YOU? SHE IS OUT THERE 21 CRUSHING CRIME ALL DAY LONG? WHAT DID SHE TELL YOU ABOUT HER 22 JOB? SHE IS OUT THERE GETTING THE BAD GUYS OFF THE STREETS 23 24 AND WE ARE ALL SAFE? MR. WIENS: NO. I DON'T RECALL. IT IS MORE JUST HER 25 26 JOB. WHAT SHE DOES FOR A LIVING. MR. BARENS: DID SHE EVER SHARE WITH YOU ANY FRUSTRATIONS, 27

SAYING SO MANY BAD GUYS ARE GETTING OFF OR THE SYSTEM IS THIS

14B

WAY OR THAT WAY OR ANY KIND OF COMPLAINT? MR. WIENS: NO. MR. BARENS: DID SHE EVER TALK TO YOU ABOUT ANY PARTICULAR PROSECUTION SHE WAS INVOLVED IN? MR. WIENS: NO. MR. BARENS: DOES HER HUSBAND, YOUR FRIEND, EVER DISCUSS WITH YOU HIS WIFE'S WORK? MR. WIENS: NOT REALLY, NO.

MR. BARENS: NOT REALLY? 1 2 MR. WIENS: NO. MR. BARENS: DID YOU AS A RESULT OF CONTACT WITH THAT 3 PROSECUTOR, DEVELOP ANY BIAS TOWARD THE PROSECUTOR? 4 5 MR. WIENS: NO. MR. BARENS: DO YOU, HAVING BEEN FRIENDS IN YOUR PERSONAL 6 LIFE WITH A PROSECUTOR -- I DON'T KNOW WHY IT NEVER HAPPENED 7 TO ME -- HAVE A FEELING THAT A PROSECUTOR IS NECESSARILY A 8 GOOD PERSON THAT WOULD ONLY PROSECUTE A CASE IF A PERSON WAS 9 10 IN FACT, GUILTY? MR. WIENS: COULD YOU SAY THAT AGAIN? 11 MR. BARENS: SURE. WOULD YOU HAVE A FEELING IN YOUR 12 MIND, HAVING BEEN IN YOUR PERSONAL SETTING, FRIENDS WITH A 13 PROSECUTOR, AN ATTITUDE THAT A PROSECUTOR, A DISTRICT ATTORNEY, 14 WOULD ONLY PROSECUTE SOMEONE WHO IS IN FACT, GUILTY OF A CRIME? 15 MR. WIENS: NO. I WOULD ONLY FEEL THAT THEY ARE DOING 16 IT BECAUSE THEY FEEL THEY HAVE THE EVIDENCE TO DO IT, NOT THAT 17 18 THEY ARE ALWAYS RIGHT. NO. MR. BARENS: DO YOU BELIEVE THEY DO IT BECAUSE IT IS 19 20 THEIR JOB? 21 MR. WIENS: SURE. MR. BARENS: OKAY. AND THAT THEY ARE LIKE THE REST OF 22 THE HUMANS WHO COULD MAKE A MISTAKE, EVEN IN GOOD FAITH, NOT 23 SUGGESTING THAT IT WOULDN'T BE IN GOOD FAITH BUT RATHER, THEY 24 COULD MAKE A GOOD FAITH MISTAKE AND THAT YOUR FRIEND PERHAPS 25 IN HER PROSECUTORIAL ACTIVITIES, COULD IN GOOD FAITH, 26 PROSECUTE SOMEONE WHO WASN'T IN FACT, GUILTY? 27

MR. WIENS: YES. IT COULD HAPPEN.

```
1
           MR. BARENS: IT COULD HAPPEN?
2
           MR. WIENS: YES.
3
           MR. BARENS: NOW. YOU ARE GOING THROUGH A DIVORCE AT
     THIS JUNCTURE?
4
5
           MR. WIENS: YES.
6
           MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU BEEN TO COURT YET ON THAT?
7
           MR. WIENS: NO.
8
           MR. BARENS: IS THIS YOUR FIRST REAL CONTACT WITH THE
9
     SYSTEM. ASIDE FROM YOUR PARTICIPATION. IN THIS SETTING?
10
          MR. WIENS: I WAS A WITNESS TO SOME PEOPLE BREAKING INTO
     CARS IN A PARKING LOT AT WORK ONCE. AND I WAS CALLED IN TO
11
12
     TESTIFY AT A PRELIMINARY HEARING.
13
           MR. BARENS: YOU ACTUALLY TOOK THE STAND?
14
          MR. WIENS: YES.
15
          MR. BARENS: AND TESTIFIED. YOU WERE A PROSECUTION
16
    WITNESS?
17
          MR. WIENS: YES.
18
          MR. BARENS: WERE YOU CROSS-EXAMINED BY A DEFENSE COUNSEL?
19
          MR. WIENS: YES, I WAS.
20
          MR. BARENS: AS A RESULT OF THAT EXPERIENCE, HOW DID
21
    YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEFENSE LAWYER?
22
          MR. WIENS: WELL, SHE WAS VERY SMART.
23
          MR. BARENS: AND DID YOU FEEL ANY HOSTILITY OR RESENTMENT
24
    TOWARDS THE DEFENSE LAWYER?
25
          MR. WIENS: NO.
26
          MR. BARENS: DID THE DEFENSE LAWYER TRY TO IN SOME WAY,
27
    MODIFY OR IMPEACH YOUR OBSERVATIONS?
```

MR. WIENS: NO. SHE MADE AN ATTEMPT TO -- SHE CAUSED

1 ME TO REALLY THINK ABOUT WHAT I ACTUALLY SAW. 2 MR. BARENS: RIGHT, TO BE REAL SURE THAT YOUR PERCEPTION 3 OF FACTS WAS IN FACT, ACCURATE? 4 MR. WIENS: YES. 5 MR. BARENS: CAN YOU BELIEVE AS WE HAVE DISCUSSED HERE. 6 THAT SOMETIMES IT IS POSSIBLE THAT YOU AND I COULD LOOK AT 7 THE EXACT SAME CIRCUMSTANCES AND COME TO ERRATICALLY DIFFERENT 8 OR EVEN OPPOSING CONCLUSIONS? 9 MR. WIENS: YES. IT COULD HAPPEN. 10 MR. BARENS: THAT WE COULD HAVE VARIED EXPLANATIONS 11 FOR THE SAME FACT? 12 MR. WIENS: YES. 13 MR. BARENS: A LOT OF THAT WOULD GO TO OUR EXPERIENCES? 14 MR. WIENS: YES. 15 MR. BARENS: AND SO WOULD OUR PERCEPTION OF REALITY? 16 MR. WIENS: YES. MR. BARENS: IT GETS BACK TO THAT WORD "REASONABLE." 17 18 IS IT BELIEVABLE TO YOU THAT YOU AND I COULD BOTH 19 COME TO DIFFERENT CONCLUSIONS ON THE SAME FACTS AND YET, BOTH 20 OF US BE REASONABLE? 21 MR. WIENS: YES. 22 MR. BARENS: NOT NECESSARILY FOR ME TO SAY THAT IF YOU 23 DISAGREE WITH ME YOU ARE RIGHT AWAY, UNREASONABLE. WE COULD 24 BOTH BE REASONABLE, WOULDN'T YOU SAY? 25 MR. WIENS: YES. 26 MR. BARENS: WE HEARD MR. WAPNER TALKING ABOUT SEPARATING 27 THE WHEAT FROM THE CHAFF. WHO DOES THAT IN THIS COURTROOM? 28

MR. WIENS: THE JURY.

MR. BARENS: RIGHT. IT IS NOT WHAT THE LAWYERS TELL
YOU IS CHAFF AND WHAT IS WHEAT. IT IS WHAT YOU FOLKS DECIDE
AS JURORS WITH YOUR OWN JUDGMENT, ISN'T IT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOU HAVE GOT TO LOOK AT THE EVIDENCE FOR THAT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

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

MR. BARENS: MR. WIENS, NOW WE GET INTO THIS WHOLE DEBATE LOOKING FOR REASONABLE. THE GOVERNMENT TELLS YOU WHAT IS LIKELY, LOOK FOR WHAT IS MORE LIKELY HERE, MORE LIKELY.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT WHAT IS MORE LIKELY MIGHT NOT NECESSARILY BE THE ANSWER TO THIS CASE?

MR. WIENS: I COULD SEE THAT BEING A POSSIBILITY, YES.

MR. BARENS: AND IF THE EVIDENCE SHOWED YOU THAT WHAT IS MORE LIKELY, THE CASE TURNS OUT TO BE WHAT IS MORE BELIEVABLE IN THIS INSTANCE, COULD YOU VOTE IN FAVOR OF THEM?

MR. WIENS: SAY THAT AGAIN.

MR. BARENS: WELL, IF IT TURNS OUT THAT ONE THING LOOKS LIKELY IN THIS TESTIMONY, IN THIS DEAL, IN THIS TESTIMONY, BUT THE EVIDENCE SHOWS YOU THAT WHAT LOOKS REALLY LIKELY IS JUST NOT SUPPORTED BY THE EVIDENCE, WHAT DO YOU DO WITH THAT INSTANCE IN TERMS OF MR. HUNT HERE?

MR. WIENS: WELL, YOU HAVE TO FIND HIM NOT GUILTY.

MR. BARENS: NOT GUILTY, BECAUSE WHAT IS MORE LIKELY MAY SIMPLY NOT BE SUPPORTED BY THE EVIDENCE; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: NOW. THE DEFENDANT IS SITTING THERE SAYING "WELL, WAIT A MINUTE, I DON'T HAVE TO PROVE ANYTHING HERE. I CAN'T PROVE WHAT HAPPENED TO THIS ALLEGED VICTIM BUT THE GOVERNMENT CAN'T EITHER; " WHAT DO WE DO THEN?

MR. WIENS: IF THEY CAN'T PROVE THERE IS A VICTIM, THERE IS NO CRIME.

MR. BARENS: PRECISELY. PRECISELY, THERE IS NO CRIME. YOU MENTIONED YOU ARE A PROGRAMMER FOR IBM?

27

MR. WIENS: XEROX.

MR. BARENS: I AM SORRY.

XEROX. TAKE NO OFFENSE BY THAT, SIR.

(LAUGHTER IN COURTROOM.)

MR. BARENS: WHAT PRECISELY DO YOU DO IN THAT ACTIVITY?

MR. WIENS: PRECISELY?

MR. BARENS: NO, I WOULDN'T UNDERSTAND THE ANSWER.

TELL ME, IS THERE A PARTICULAR TYPE OF PROGRAMMING ACTIVITY YOU ARE INVOLVED IN FOR A CERTAIN SYSTEM?

MR. WIENS: YES.

I WORK ON A PRINTING SYSTEM. I WRITE SOFTWARE THAT INTERPRETS DATA COMING OVER A COMMUNICATIONS LINK AND INTERPRET. THAT DATA ON HOW TO IMAGE THE PAPER, WHAT SORT OF IMAGE COMES OUT ON THE PAPER.

THE COURT: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT NOW, DON'T YOU?

(LAUGHTER IN COURTROOM.)

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO. I FEEL SO MUCH MORE COMFORTABLE.
WE COULD TALK FOR HOURS ON THIS SUBJECT.

I AM COMPUTER-ILLITERATE WHEN IT COMES TO THIS.

LET ME ASK YOU THIS: IF THERE WERE A DIFFERENT PROGRAMMER TO DO YOUR ACTIVITY, COULD THE IMAGING VARY SIGNIFICANTLY?

MR. WIENS: IT HAD BETTER NOT.

MR. BARENS: BUT IF SOMEONE ELSE WAS ORIGINATING YOUR WORK PRODUCT TO SOLVE THE SAME TYPE OF PROBLEM, WOULD THERE BE MUCH OF A VARIANCE?

MR. WIENS: THERE COULD BE A FAIRLY SIGNIFICANT

DIFFERENCE IN THE WAY THEY SOLVE THE PROBLEM. HOWEVER, THE

MR. BARENS: THE ULTIMATE IMAGERY THAT WE SEE --

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: -- WOULD BE IDENTICAL?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: QUITE A DIFFERENT THING THAT WE HAVE GOING ON HERE, ISN'T IT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WIENS: OKAY.

MR. BARENS: NO NECESSITY, THAT BECAUSE YOU HAVE COMPETING WITNESSES ABOUT THE SAME FACTS, THAT WE GET TO AN IDENTICAL RESULT, IS THERE?

MR. WIENS: I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE CONNECTION.

MR. BARENS: WELL, IF YOU HAVE ONE WITNESS TESTIFYING
TO A FACT AND SAY, "WELL, TO ME THIS MEANS SO AND SO," AND
THEN WE HAVE ANOTHER PROGRAMMER HERE -- BECAUSE NOW WHAT ARE
THESE WITNESSES UP HERE? THESE ARE WITNESSES, PEOPLE THAT
ARE TRYING TO PROGRAM YOU JURORS WITH EVIDENCE, PROGRAMMING
YOU WITH DATA, SO WHEN YOUR BIG COMPUTER HERE DOES ITS
ANALYSIS WE GET A RESULT; ISN'T THAT ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS HERE?

MR. BARENS: OKAY. NOW IF WE HAVE DIFFERENT WITNESSES
PROGRAMMING YOU FOLKS UP THERE, STEALING YOUR JOB, CAN YOU
UNDERSTAND WHY WE WON'T NECESSARILY COME TO THE SAME RESULT
WITH DIFFERENT PROGRAMMERS IN THIS INSTANCE?

MR. WIENS: YES, I THINK I SEE WHAT YOU MEAN.

MR. BARENS: I WILL TELL YOU WHY THAT HAPPENS: HERE,
YOU GET THE MURDER PROGRAMMER AND YOU ALSO GET THE PROGRAMMER
THAT SAYS "NOTHING HAPPENED AT ALL," BUT THEY ARE BOTH GOING

27

28

TO BE TALKING ABOUT THE SAME ALLEGED FACTS.

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: THEY ARE NOT GOING TO ANYWHERE COME TO

THE SAME RESULT AFTER THEY PROGRAM THIS VEHICLE; ARE YOU WITH

ME ON THAT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: WHERE DID YOU GO TO SCHOOL?

MR. WIENS: CAL STATE DOMINGUEZ HILLS.

MR. BARENS: WHAT DID YOU MAJOR IN THERE?

MR. WIENS: BUSINESS DATA SYSTEMS.

MR. BARENS: AND YOU WERE THERE FOR FOUR YEARS?

MR. WIENS: ABOUT THAT. I WORKED FULL TIME WHILE I
WAS GOING THROUGH SCHOOL SO IT TOOK ME ABOUT SIX YEARS, SIX
TO SEVEN YEARS.

MR. BARENS: WHERE DID YOU WORK DURING THAT PERIOD OF TIME?

MR. WIENS: I WORKED AS A TRUCK DRIVER FOR A HEALTH FOOD COMPANY AND I ALSO WORKED IN A GAS STATION.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, SIR, DID YOU MINOR IN ANYTHING WHILE YOU WERE TAKING THAT CURRICULUM?

MR. WIENS: NO, SIR.

MR. BARENS: DID YOU TAKE ANY PHILOSOPHY COURSES?

MR. WIENS: I TOOK ONE PHILOSOPHY COURSE.

MR. BARENS: WHICH ONE WAS THAT?

MR. WIENS: I DON'T REMEMBER WHAT THE TITLE WAS.

IT IS TWO YEARS AGO.

MR. BARENS: DID ANY OF THE PHILOSOPHY YOU READ IN THAT CLASS STAND OUT IN YOUR MIND OR GET REAL IMPORTANT TO YOU?

MR. WIENS: NO. OF THIS PHILOSOPHY? MR. WIENS: NO. MEAN ANYTHING TO YOU? MR. WIENS: NO. PHILOSOPHY?

MR. BARENS: DID YOU DO ANY SECONDARY READING ON ANY

MR. BARENS: DOES THE EXPRESSION PARADOX PHILOSOPHY

MR. BARENS: YOU DIDN'T HEAR ANYTHING ABOUT THAT IN

MR. WIENS: NO, NOT THAT I RECALL.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU GET INTO ANY PARADOXES IN 1 COMPUTER PROGRAMMING? 2 MR. WIENS: WELL, NONE I AM AWARE OF. 3 MR. BARENS: A PARADOX IS A GIVEN SET OF FACTS THAT 4 APPEAR ONE WAY AND TEND TO HAVE AN OPPOSITE CONCLUSION. 5 MR. WIENS: YES. 6 MR. BARENS: DID YOU GET INTO THAT? 7 MR. WIENS: YES, THAT CAN HAPPEN. 8 MR. BARENS: WHAT DO YOU DO WHEN THAT HAPPENS? 9 HOW DO YOU ANALYZE OR COME TO SOME CONCLUSION 10 ABOUT WHAT IS TRUE? 11 MR. WIENS: YOU HAVE TO LOOK FOR MORE DATA. YOU CAN'T 12 MAKE A DECISION. 13 MR. BARENS: RIGHT. 14 SO IF WE HAD COMPETING IMPLICATIONS AND COMPETING 15 INPUT INTO A SITUATION THAT LED TO A PARADOXICAL CONCLUSION, 16 WE HAVE TO LOOK FOR DATA. 17 MR. WIENS: YES. 18 MR. BARENS: AND WHAT HAPPENS IF WE DON'T GET MORE DATA, 19 SIR? 20 MR. WIENS: IN THIS INSTANCE? 21 MR. BARENS: YES. 22 MR. WIENS: NOT GUILTY. 23 MR. BARENS: NOT PROVEN, NOT GUILTY, SAME THING. 24 MR. WIENS: YES. 25 MR. BARENS: DO YOU HAVE ANY HOBBIES?

MR. WIENS: I WINDSURF. I PLAY RACQUETBALL AND I GO 27 TO A LOT OF HOCKEY GAMES. I LIKE TO PLAY POKER, GO DANCING. 28

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. WELL, YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE
A LITTLE -- YOU KNOW, THAT POKER BUSINESS, YOU DON'T REALLY
KNOW WHERE YOU STAND UNTIL THAT LAST CARD IS TURNED.

MR. WIENS: NOT USUALLY.

MR. BARENS: NOW, IN THE POKER GAME, IF YOU ARE PLAYING.

MR. BARENS: NOW, IN THE POKER GAME, IF YOU ARE PLAYING -AND I AM NOT A CARD PLAYER -- BUT YOU KNOW THE GAME WHERE
YOU TURN THE CARDS OVER ONE AT A TIME SO EVERYBODY SEES WHAT
YOU HAVE GOT, IT IS GOING TO BE A LITTLE LIKE THAT GAME.
WHAT DO YOU CALL THAT GAME, SIR --

DRAW POKER OR SOMETHING, MR. CHIER?

(LAUGHTER IN COURTROOM.)

MR. BARENS: WELL, IT IS A GAME WHERE YOU TURN THE CARDS

A VOICE: STUD.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOU WASTED YOUTH PEOPLE.

YOU TURN IT OVER ONE AT A TIME AND YOU BET EACH
TIME YOU TURN THE CARD OVER, RIGHT?

MR. WIENS: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, SIR, YOU DO NOT DO THAT IN THIS CASE.

CAN YOU UNDERSTAND THAT YOU DON'T BET A DIME ON
A WITNESS UNTIL YOU HEAR THEM ALL?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T STAKE YOUR HAND AND YOU DON'T STAKE THE DEFENDANT'S LIFE UNTIL YOU TURN EVERY CARD?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: THAT PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE STAYS IN PLACE, THAT MANTLE OF INNOCENCE STAYS IN PLACE ON THE DEFENDANT RIGHT INTO THAT JURY ROOM.

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

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE GOVERNMENT, THE

PEOPLE PUT THEIR CASE ON FIRST AND THEY ARE GOING TO TRY -
YOU KNOW, OBVIOUSLY, FOLKS, WE WOULDN'T BE HERE IF THEY WEREN'T

GOING TO TRY TO BIAS YOU ON THAT FIRST GO-AROUND.

YOU ARE NOT GOING TO DECIDE GUILT OR INNOCENCE BASED ON WHAT YOU HEAR IN THE FIRST HALF OF THIS CASE, ARE YOU?

MR. WIENS: NO.

MR. BARENS: OKAY, YOU WILL LISTEN TO THE SECOND HALF --

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: -- AS OPEN-MINDEDLY AS THE FIRST HALF?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: WHAT IS THE LAST BOOK YOU READ?

MR. WIENS: I THINK IT WAS "GORKY PARK."

I DON'T READ VERY OFTEN.

MR. BARENS: A WHOLE DIFFERENT SYSTEM THAN THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE.

MR. WIENS: OH, YES.

MR. BARENS: ABSOLUTELY.

A WHOLE DIFFERENT SYSTEM, BEATING GUYS UP AND GETTING THEM TO TESTIFY.

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: THE GUYS HERE VOLUNTARILY TAKE THE STAND
IN THEIR OWN DEFENSE; IS THAT CORRECT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. BARENS: WHAT WAS THE LAST MOVIE YOU SAW/

MR. WIENS: STAR TREK 4.

MR. BARENS: WE WON'T GIVE YOU ANY OF THAT. 1 (LAUGHTER IN COURTROOM.) 2 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, SIR, FOR YOUR TIME. 3 WE PASS FOR CAUSE. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 5 MR. WAPNER: GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. WIENS. 6 YOU HAVE NOT SERVED ON A JURY BEFORE? 7 MR. WIENS: NO. 8 MR. WAPNER: YOU HEARD ALL OF THE QUESTIONS I ASKED 9 ABOUT PEOPLE WHO ARE CAPABLE OF CHANGING THEIR MINDS? 10 MR. WIENS: YES. 11 MR. WAPNER: WHERE DO YOU FIT INTO THAT SPECTRUM, DO 12 YOU THINK? 13 MR. WIENS: I THINK IN THE MIDDLE. 14 MR. WAPNER: SO IF YOU TAKE A POSITION AND YOU ARE SHOWN 15 THAT IT IS WRONG, YOU COULD CHANGE YOUR MIND? 16 MR. WIENS: YES. 17 MR. WAPNER: AND ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOU TAKE A 18 POSITION AND YOU ARE CONVINCED THAT YOU ARE RIGHT, YOU COULD 19 HOLD FIRM TO YOUR CONVICTION? 20 MR. WIENS: YES, I COULD. 21 16 FO 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

3

4

5

6

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. WAPNER: THE INCIDENT THAT YOU HAD WHERE YOU 1 TESTIFIED AT THE PRELIMINARY HEARING, WERE YOU CALLED UPON TO MAKE AN IDENTIFICATION OF ONE OR MORE PEOPLE? MR. WIENS: THEY ASKED ME TO, BUT I COULDN'T IDENTIFY THE PEOPLE. ALL I IDENTIFIED WAS THE CAR BEING DRIVEN. MR. WAPNER: WERE YOU IN A POSITION TO BE ABLE TO SEE THE PEOPLE? 7 MR. WIENS: NOT REALLY. I WAS DRIVING ALONG. I JUST 8 SAW TWO PEOPLE IN THE CAR. 9 I DIDN'T ACTUALLY -- I COULDN'T RECOGNIZE THE 10 TWO PEOPLE. 11 12 13 14

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. WAS IT A SITUATION WHERE YOU NEVER ACTUALLY SAW THE PEOPLE OR YOU SAW THEM FOR A PERIOD OF TIME WHICH WAS NOT SUFFICIENT?

MR. WIENS: RIGHT. IT WAS JUST TOO SHORT OF A PERIOD OF TIME TO SEE THE ACTUAL PEOPLE. I SAW THEM DOING WHAT THEY DID. I CALLED THE POLICE AND THE POLICE CAPTURED THEM LATER.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND DID YOU EVER HAVE TO TESTIFY AFTER THE PRELIMINARY HEARING?

MR. WIENS: NO. I BELIEVE THEY PLEADED GUILTY.

MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU EVER HAD A SITUATION WHERE YOU WERE WALKING DOWN THE STREET AND SAW SOMEONE YOU THOUGHT YOU KNEW AND IT TURNED OUT IT WAS NOT THAT PERSON?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: YOU ARE FAMILIAR THAT PEOPLE MAKE MISTAKES ALL OF THE TIME IN MAKING EYEWITNESS IDENTIFICATION?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IN THAT CASE THAT YOU WITNESSED, IF IT

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

WAS DEPENDENT SOLELY UPON YOUR ABILITY TO RECOGNIZE THAT

PERSON OR THOSE PEOPLE, YOU PROBABLY WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN ABLE

TO DO THAT; IS THAT CORRECT?

MR. WIENS: NO.

MR. WAPNER: WHAT DID YOU THINK OF THE PERSON WHO PROSECUTED THAT PRELIMINARY HEARING?

MR. WIENS: I DIDN'T FEEL TOO MUCH ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.

I WOULD HAVE APPRECIATED THEM GIVING ME A LITTLE MORE

INFORMATION BEFORE I WENT IN.

MR. WAPNER: IN TERMS OF TALKING TO YOU AND PREPARING YOU FOR WHAT YOU WERE GOING TO TESTIFY ABOUT?

MR. WIENS: FOR WHAT I COULD EXPECT.

MR. WAPNER: WAS IT ONE OF THOSE SITUATIONS WHERE THEY
HAD TEN OR TWELVE PRELIMINARY HEARINGS ON CALENDAR AND
WITNESSES ALL OVER THE HALLWAYS?

MR. WIENS: I DON'T KNOW.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY FEELINGS ABOUT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, AS A RESULT OF THAT EXPERIENCE THAT WOULD AFFECT YOU IN THIS CASE?

MR. WIENS: NO.

MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE HEARD THE EXAMPLES THAT I HAVE USED ABOUT NOT MAKING A DECISION IN THE CASE BASED ON WHETHER YOU LIKE THE VICTIM OR NOT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: THE EXAMPLE I USED ABOUT THE BASKETBALL GAME? WELL, LET'S FORGET ABOUT THAT ONE FOR THE TIME BEING. IN HOCKEY -- YOU ARE A HOCKEY FAN, RIGHT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IN HOCKEY -- AND I DON'T KNOW MUCH ABOUT IT -- BUT IF A REFEREE WAS GOING TO MAKE AN OFFSIDES CALL AND THE DETERMINATION WAS WHETHER THE PUCK OR THE MAN GOT PAST THE BLUE LINE FIRST, HE SHOULD MAKE THAT BASED ON WHAT HE SEES OF WHERE THE PUCK IS AND WHERE THE PLAYER IS?

MR. WIENS: THAT'S RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: NOT BASED ON WHETHER HE LIKES ONE TEAM OR THE OTHER?

MR. WIENS: THAT'S THE WAY IT IS SUPPOSED TO BE.

MR. WAPNER: IN HOCKEY GAMES OF COURSE, YOU CAN BOO THE OFFICIALS?

MR. WIENS: RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: IN THIS CASE, IF YOU BOO THE JUDGE, YOU ARE IN BIG TROUBLE. BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY IN THIS CASE,

ALTHOUGH JUDGE RITTENBAND IS THE JUDGE WHO GIVES US THE LAW,
YOU ARE GOING TO BE THE JUDGE OF THE FACTS. DO YOU UNDERSTAND
THAT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU FEEL COMFORTABLE IN THAT ROLE?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU FORM ANY OPINION OF PROSECUTORS

OR THEIR ROLE IN THE PENAL SYSTEM, GROWING UP WITH YOUR FATHER

AS A PAROLE OFFICER?

MR. WIENS: NO, NOT AT ALL.

MR. WAPNER: DID HE TALK TO YOU MUCH ABOUT HIS WORK?

MR. WIENS: OCCASIONALLY WE TALKED ABOUT IT. I THINK
HE TALKED ABOUT IT MORE SINCE HE RETIRED THAN WHILE I WAS
GROWING UP.

MR. WAPNER: HOW OFTEN DO YOU SEE OR TALK TO HIM? MR. WIENS: I USUALLY SEE HIM ABOUT TWICE A YEAR. MR. WAPNER: DOES HE LIVE IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA? MR. WIENS: NO. HE TRAVELS AROUND QUITE A BIT. HE IS IN TEXAS RIGHT NOW. MR. WAPNER: OKAY. DO YOU TALK TO HIM MORE OFTEN THAN TWICE A YEAR? MR. WIENS: YES. WE USUALLY COMMUNICATE AT LEAST THROUGH LETTERS ONCE A MONTH OR SO. MR. WAPNER: OKAY. IN THIS CASE IF YOU SIT ON THIS JURY, YOU HAVE TO MAKE THE DETERMINATION OF GUILT OR INNOCENCE WITHOUT CONSIDERING WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO THE DEFENDANT IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? MR. WIENS: YES.

1 MR. WAPNER: CAN YOU DO THAT? 2 MR. WIENS: YES. 3 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. YOU KNOW BECAUSE YOU HAVE BEEN IN 4 THIS COURTROOM FOR A LONG TIME, WHAT MIGHT BE COMING SOMEWHERE 5 DOWN THE ROAD? 6 MR. WIENS: YES. 7 MR. WAPNER: THE JUDGE WILL TELL YOU WHEN YOU ARE 8 DECIDING THIS PART OF THE CASE, YOU HAVE TO PUT THAT OUT OF 9 YOUR MIND. CAN YOU DO THAT? 10 MR. WIENS: YEAH. I BELIEVE SO. 11 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. IN OTHER WORDS, IT IS NOT LIKE YOU CAN PRETEND YOU DIDN'T HEAR IT. CAN YOU MAKE THE DECISION 12 WITHOUT BEING SWAYED BY THAT ONE WAY OR THE OTHER? 13 14 MR. WIENS: WELL, I THINK JUST THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE 15 CHARGE MAKES IT -- WHEN YOU ACTUALLY GO TO DELIBERATE, WOULD 16 MAKE ME THINK A LOT HARDER BEFORE I WOULD MAKE THE DECISION. 17 MR. WAPNER: REGARDLESS OF THE PENALTY, IS WHAT YOU ARE SAYING? 18 19 MR. WIENS: YES. MR. WAPNER: WOULD IT MAKE YOU WANT PROOF GREATER THAN 20 21 THAT OF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT? 22 MR. WIENS: NO. BUT I THINK IN THIS CASE REASONABLE 23 DOUBT BECOMES SOMETHING I WOULD BE VERY PICKY ABOUT, SINCE 24 IT IS GOING TO HAVE SUCH AN AFFECT ON THIS PERSON'S LIFE. 25 MR. WAPNER: THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT I WAS TRYING TO GET 26 AT BEFORE. WHICH IS, YOU HAVE TO DECIDE THE QUESTION OF WHAT 27 IS REASONABLE DOUBT OR NOT WITHOUT THINKING ABOUT THE EFFECT

IT IS GOING TO HAVE ON SOMEBODY'S LIFE.

IN OTHER WORDS, THE STANDARD OF PROOF, BEYOND

A REASONABLE DOUBT, DOESN'T CHANGE DEPENDING UPON THE EFFECT

IT HAS ON SOMEONE. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MR. WIENS: YES. I UNDERSTAND THAT.

MR. WAPNER: SO THAT THE PERSON CHARGED WITH DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE, IS ENTITLED TO HAVE HIS -- THE STATE PROVE THE CASE AGAINST HIM BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, EVEN THOUGH THE CONSEQUENCES OF WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO HIM AREN'T THE SAME AS THE CONSEQUENCES OF WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO SOMEONE WHO COMMITTED A MURDER.

MR. WIENS: I UNDERSTAND.

MR. WAPNER: BY THE SAME TOKEN, AS A PROSECUTOR, I AM ENTITLED TO HAVE YOU HOLD ME TO THE SAME STANDARD BUT NOTHING MORE IN THIS CASE, EVEN THOUGH IT IS A MURDER AND THE CONSEQUENCES MAY BE GREATER.

CAN YOU DO THAT?

MR. WIENS: I BELIEVE SO, YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU ARE SAYING,
THAT IT IS A MURDER CASE AND IT SHOULD BE TREATED VERY
SERIOUSLY. I AGREE WITH YOU.

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: BUT WHAT I AM CONCERNED ABOUT IS, YOUR ABILITY TO GIVE THE PROSECUTION A FAIR TRIAL.

MR. WIENS: I BELIEVE I CAN DO THAT.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. IF YOU HAVE A DOUBT IN YOUR MIND WHEN YOU ARE IN THE JURY ROOM DELIBERATING, WILL YOU ASK YOURSELF IF THAT DOUBT IS BASED ON REASON?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: AND WILL YOU TRY TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN POSSIBLE OR IMAGINARY DOUBTS AS THE JUDGE HAS SUGGESTED IN READING THE INSTRUCTION ON REASONABLE DOUBT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DOUBTS THAT ARE REASONABLE?

MR. WIENS: YES. I BELIEVE I COULD FOLLOW THE JUDGE'S INSTRUCTIONS AS TO THAT.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. IN ANY SITUATION, YOU COULD PROBABLY SAY THAT ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: SO THAT FOR WHATEVER THE SITUATION 1S,
YOU COULD COME UP WITH SOME POSSIBLE EXPLANATION, RIGHT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: JUST BECAUSE SOMETHING IS POSSIBLE, DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THAT IT IS REASONABLE?

MR. WIENS: THAT'S RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. WOULD YOU EXAMINE IN YOUR OWN MIND, WHETHER YOU THOUGHT IT WAS REASONABLE OR NOT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: AND HAVING DONE THAT, IF YOU DETERMINE
YOUR DOUBT IS REASONABLE, THAT IS ONE THING. BUT IF YOU
DETERMINE IT IS NOT REASONABLE, THAT IS SOMETHING ELSE, RIGHT?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: I DON'T KNOW WHAT I JUST SAID. MAYBE YOU DO. I THINK I WAS GOING SOMEWHERE AND NEVER GOT THERE.

DOES YOUR POKER PLAYING MOSTLY ENCOMPASS PLAYING

WITH FRIENDS?

MR. WIENS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU EVER GO TO LAS VEGAS AND PLAY POKER? MR. WIENS: NO. MR. WAPNER: WHEN YOU PLAY WITH FRIENDS, DO YOU LIMIT THE STAKES? MR. WIENS: YES. MR. WAPNER: DO YOU PUT A LIMIT ON YOURSELF IN TERMS OF HOW MUCH YOU ARE WILLING TO LOSE IN ANY GIVEN NIGHT? MR. WIENS: I USUALLY DON'T TAKE MORE THAN \$10 WITH ME. 1 AM NOT SO CONFIDENT. MR. WAPNER: HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT THE IDEA THAT THE STATE IS ALLOWED TO PRESENT A MURDER CASE WITHOUT A BODY? MR. WIENS: I FEEL OKAY ABOUT IT. IT JUST MEANS THEIR JOB BECOMES HARDER.

MR. WIENS:

NO.

CASES WERE HANDLED BY THE POLICE? 1 MR. WIENS: NO. WELL, I THOUGHT AS FAR AS MY MOTORCYCLE, 2 I WAS IMPRESSED WITH HOW MUCH THEY LOOKED INTO IT. 3 MR. WAPNER: WHAT POLICE DEPARTMENT WAS THAT? 4 MR. WIENS: GARDENA POLICE DEPARTMENT. 5 MR. WAPNER: YOU DON'T REMEMBER THE NAME OF THE OFFERS? 6 MR. WIENS: NO I DON'T. 7 MR. WAPNER: WHAT EFFECT HAVE YOUR VIEWS ON THE PENAL 8 SYSTEM -- WHAT EFFECT ARE THEY GOING TO HAVE ON YOUR ABILITY 9 TO MAKE A DECISION IN THIS CASE FAIRLY? 10 MR. WIENS: I DON'T THINK THAT THEY WILL. 11 MR. WAPNER: YOUR FATHER DEALT WITH PEOPLE AFTER THEY 12 WERE ALREADY CONVICTED? 13 MR. WIENS: YES. 14 MR. WAPNER: ARE YOU GOING TO TAKE IT UPON YOURSELF TO 15 TRY TO MAKE SOME EVALUATION OF THE DEFENDANT AND WHAT MIGHT 16 HAPPEN TO HIM AND THEREFORE, KIND OF ADJUST YOUR VERDICT OR 17 YOUR DELIBERATIONS ONE WAY OR ANOTHER? 18 MR. WIENS: NO. 19 17F 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

THE COURT: I SEE.

MR. WAPNER: AS WITH NOT CONSIDERING THE PENALTY, THE 1 GUILT OR INNOCENCE SHOULD BE DETERMINED ON WHETHER OR NOT THERE 2 3 WAS A CRIME AND WHO DID IT? 4 MR. WIENS: YES. MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I WILL PASS FOR CAUSE. 5 6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE DEFENSE WILL RESPECTFULLY 7 ACCEPT THE PANEL AS PRESENTLY CONSTITUTED. 8 9 THE COURT: THE PEOPLE? MR. WAPNER: WE WOULD THANK AND ASK THE COURT TO EXCUSE 10 11 MR. FARBER. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU, MR. FARBER. 12 THE CLERK: LINDA KING, L-I-N-D-A. 13 14 THE COURT: IS THAT MISS OR MRS.? 15 THE CLERK: IS THAT MRS., MA'AM? 16 MS. KING: YES. THE COURT: MRS. KING, YOU TOO, HEARD ALL OF THE 17 QUESTIONS WHICH WERE ASKED AND ANSWERED? 18 19 MS. KING: YES. THE COURT: IF THE SAME GENERAL QUESTIONS WERE ASKED 20 OF YOU, YOUR ANSWERS WOULD BE ABOUT THE SAME, WOULD THEY? 21 22 MS. KING: YES, THEY WOULD. 23 THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU DO, PLEASE? MS. KING: I AM A CUSTOMER SERVICE REPRESENTATIVE FOR 24 EASTMAN KODAK AT THE MOTION PICTURE DIVISION. 25 THE COURT: THE MOTION PICTURE DIVISION OF WHAT? 26 MS. KING: IN HOLLYWOOD FOR EASTMAN KODAK. 27

AND THERE IS A MR. KING, IS THERE? 1 MS. KING: YES. 2 3 THE COURT: WHAT DOES HE DO? MS. KING: HE SELLS REAL ESTATE. THE COURT: TELL US ABOUT YOUR FORMAL EDUCATION. 5 MS. KING: I AM A HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE AND I ATTENDED 6 THE SAVINGS AND LOAN INSTITUTE AND TOOK A COST ACCOUNTING 7 8 COURSE THERE. THE COURT: AND YOUR HUSBAND? 9 MS. KING: HE GRADUATED FROM TEXAS UNIVERSITY IN 10 BUSINESS. 11 THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN? 12 MS. KING: YES. I HAVE TWO BOYS. 13 THE COURT: AND HOW OLD ARE THEY? 14 MS. KING: SIXTEEN AND A HALF AND FIVE AND A HALF. 15 THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY KIND 16 OF A CRIME? 17 18 MS. KING: NO. THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER SAT AS A JUROR ON ANY CASE 19 20 BEFORE? 21 MS. KING: NO. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ANY QUESTIONS? 22 MR. BARENS: OH, THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 23 24 GOOD AFTERNOON, MRS. KING. 25 MS. KING: GOOD AFTERNOON. MR. BARENS: MRS. KING, WHAT PRECISELY DO YOU DO AS A 26 CUSTOMER SERVICE REPRESENTATIVE? DO YOU GET BEAT UP ALL DAY? 27 28 MS. KING: NO, NOT QUITE.

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

WELL, I HAVE BASICALLY TWO FUNCTIONS: ONE HAS REALLY NOTHING TO DO WITH CUSTOMER SERVICE. I PAY ALL OF THE BILLS FOR EASTMAN KODAK IN THE PACIFIC SOUTHERN REGION, WRITE ALL OF THE CHECKS FOR GAS, ELECTRIC AND THE PHONE. THAT PART OF IT IS NOT CUSTOMER RELATIONS.

THE OTHER PART, WHICH IS CUSTOMER RELATIONS, IS I TAKE MOTION PICTURE ORDERS OVER THE PHONE FOR MAJOR STUDIOS AND FREE-LANCE PEOPLE ALSO AND ENTER THEM INTO A COMPUTER FOR BILLING PURPOSES.

MR. BARENS: SO YOU ARE NOT INVOLVED IN CUSTOMER DISPUTE EVALUATIONS THEN?

MS. KING: NO, NOT UNLESS THERE IS A PROBLEM AND THEN I HAVE -- YOU KNOW. I HAVE TO MORE OR LESS USE MY JUDGMENT AS TO WHAT THE RIGHT DECISION IS IF, YOU KNOW, IF THEY ARE HAVING A PROBLEM WITH THE FILM OR WHATEVER.

MR. BARENS: AND WHAT DO THEY DO, THEY CALL YOU UP AND SAY THE PRINT IS NO GOOD?

MS. KING: WELL, BASICALLY, THEY WILL CALL ME AND --NOT SO MUCH WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE FILM, BUT IF THEY ORDERED THE WRONG FILM OR WE GAVE THEM THE WRONG FILM, WHICH HAPPENS AT TIMES. AND THEY WILL CALL AND SAY "WELL, I ORDERED THIS KIND OF FILM AND 1 DIDN'T GET THE RIGHT KIND".

MR. BARENS: SO AT THAT POINT YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO CONSIDER SOMEBODY'S STATEMENT TO MAKE AN ADJUSTMENT FOR BILLING PURPOSES?

MS. KING: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: DOES THAT USUALLY JUST INVOLVE AN ACTIVITY YOU DO OVER THE PHONE OR DO YOU DO SOMETHING ELSE TO VERIFY

THE POSITION OF THE CALLER?

MS. KING: MOSTLY, IT IS DONE OVER THE PHONE AND THEN IF THEY COME IN, THEY WILL BRING THE FILM BACK AND THEN IT IS OUT OF MY HANDS AT THAT POINT.

I JUST, MORE OR LESS, TAKE THEIR WORD FOR IT ON
THE PHONE AND TELL THEM TO, YOU KNOW -- WE CHECK THE ORDER
OUT AND SEE IF IT WAS IN FACT -- IN FACT, IF THEY DID GET THE
WRONG FILM. IF THEY DID JUST BRING IT BACK, THEN WE HANDLE
1T FROM THERE.

MR. BARENS: YOU ARE TYPICALLY SPEAKING OF SOMEONE YOU HAD NEVER MET ON THAT OCCASION; IS THAT RIGHT?

MS. KING: RIGHT.

15

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

17A

28

MR. BARENS: HOW EVER DO YOU MAKE THOSE DECISIONS?

MR. KING: WELL, I GIVE THEM THE BENEFIT OF THE DOUBT WHICH, YOU KNOW, I DON'T -- OF COURSE, WE HAVE THE ORDER THAT WE CAN CHECK AND THERE ARE TIMES WHEN THEY ARE WRONG AND THERE ARE TIMES WHEN WE ARE WRONG, BUT IT IS BASICALLY --

MR. BARENS: WHEN IN DOUBT --

MS. KING: WHEN INDOUBT, THE CUSTOMER IS ALWAYS RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: WELL, THE CUSTOMER IN OUR SYSTEM HERE IS THE DEFENDANT HERE, A GUY THAT IS ON TRIAL; HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THAT? ARE YOU STILL COMFORTABLE WITH THAT, IF WE TAKE IT OUT OF THE EASTMAN KODAK SETTING AND PUT IT INTO A CRIMINAL COURTROOM, DO YOU FEEL COMFORTABLE WITH THAT PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE?

MS. KING: YES.

MR. BARENS: EVEN BETTER THAN GIVING HIM THE BENEFIT OF THE DOUBT, WE WILL PRESUME INNOCENCE FROM THE START; IS THAT CORRECT?

MS. KING: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOU ARE COMFORTABLE WITH THAT?

MS. KING: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOU MENTIONED YOU HAVE NEVER HAD ANY PRIOR JURY EXPERIENCE AT ALL.

MS. KING: NO.

MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU EVER WATCHED A TRIAL?

MS. KING: NO.

MR. BARENS: NEVER BEEN A WITNESS?

MS. KING: NO.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. IS THIS YOUR FIRST EXPERIENCE WITH

THE LEGAL SYSTEM? 1 MS. KING: YES. 2 MR. BARENS: HOW ABOUT YOUR HUSBAND, HAS HE EVER BEEN 3 ON A JURY? 4 MS. KING: I THINK HE HAS. I DON'T KNOW HOW LONG AGO, 5 BUT WE HAVE DISCUSSED, YOU KNOW, JURY DUTY AND HE SAID THAT 6 HE HAD BEEN ON A TRIAL ONE TIME BUT WE NEVER WENT INTO IT. 7 THIS WAS YEARS AGO. 8 MR. BARENS: IN ANY DISCUSSION OF JURY DUTY, THERE WAS 9 NOTHING SIGNIFICANT DISCUSSED THAT I DON'T KNOW ABOUT? 10 11 MS. KING: NO. I DIDN'T EVEN GO INTO IT WITH HIM. IT WASN'T 12 REALLY THAT IMPORTANT. 13 MR. BARENS: IS THIS YOUR FIRST CONTACT, AS WELL, IN 14 ANY SIGNIFICANT SENSE WITH LAWYERS? 15 MS. KING: THE ONLY CONTACT WITH A LAWYER THAT MY 16 HUSBAND AND I BOTH ARE HAVING RIGHT NOW IS IN TEXAS AND THAT 17 IS FOR SETTLEMENT OF A ESTATE AND THAT IS JUST --18 MR. BARENS: THERE IS NOTHING FROM YOUR INVOLVEMENT WITH 19 COUNSEL THERE THAT WOULD HAVE ANY BEARING WITH WHAT WE ARE 20 DOING HERE, WOULD 1T? 21 22 MS. KING: NO. MR. BARENS: IN THAT ESTATE QUESTION YOU ARE HANDLING, 23 YOU ARE PROBABLY POSITIVE THAT SOMEONE PASSED AWAY, I 24 25 PRESUME? 26 MS. KING: YES.

27 MR. BARENS: THERE WILL BE A DIFFERENT QUESTION FOR YOU 28 HERE, MRS. KING.

26

27

28

DO YOU HAVE ANY HOBBIES?

MS. KING: I LIKE TO COOK AND PLAY TENNIS AND PLAY CHESS AND LOOK AFTER MY KIDS.

MR. BARENS: YOU KNOW IN PLAYING CHESS, YOU DO A BIT OF ANTICIPATING, DON'T YOU, WHAT THE OTHER FELLOW IS DOING?

MS. KING: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: AND YOU HAVE TO FIGURE OUT RESPONSIVE MOVES,
YOU THINK IF YOU DO THIS, THEY WILL DO THAT AND THE REVERSE
OF THAT AS WELL?

MS. KING: YES.

MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU ASSURE ME THAT AS A JUROR, YOU WOUDLN'T DO THAT IN HERE?

MS. KING: NO.

MR. BARENS: WE WON'T ANTICIPATE ANYTHING.

MS. KING: NO.

MR. BARENS: WE WON'T ASSUME ANYTHING, WILL WE?

MS. KING: NO.

MR. BARENS: WE GET INTO THIS BUSINESS ABOUT

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE AND THAT MAKES YOU HAVE TO ASSUME

SOMETHING IS TRUE; DO YOU THINK IT IS ALL THAT SIMPLE?

MS. KING: NO, I DON'T THINK IT IS AT ALL.

MR. BARENS: WELL, THERE HAS TO BE SOME EVIDENCE UPON WHICH TO BASE AN ASSUMPTION, ISN'T THERE?

MS. KING: IT HELPS.

MR. BARENS: IT HAD BETTER.

IN THIS INSTANCE, IF BECAUSE THERE IS NO BASIS UPON WHICH TO BASE AN ASSUMPTION, WHAT HAPPENS?

MS. KING: THE DEFENDANT IS INNOCENT.

MR. BARENS: WELL, IT IS NOT PROVEN, TOO, IS IT? 1 IF WE CAN'T BASE AN ASSUMPTION ON SOMETHING, IF 2 IT IS JUST TANGLING OUT THERE IN MID-AIR, IT IS NOT AN 3 ASSUMPTION, IT IS A GUESS THEN? 4 5 MS. KING: RIGHT. MR. BARENS: WE HEARD, YOU KNOW -- I INTEND TO TALK 6 ABOUT REASONABLE AND WE GET INTO THE WORD POSSIBLE HERE. 7 YOU KNOW, ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE. OF COURSE, IF A DEFENSE LAWYER SAYS 8 TOO, ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE, YOU AREN'T SUPPOSED TO LISTEN TO 9 THAT BECAUSE WE ARE GOING TO GIVE YOU SPECULATION. 10 YOU SEE, YOU ARE TOLD THAT WHEN DEFENSE LAWYERS 11 TALK ABOUT POSSIBLE, WE MEAN SPECULATE. 12 I SUBMIT TO YOU, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT 13 POSSIBLE DOESN'T NECESSARILY EQUATE TO USUAL? 14 MS. KING: RIGHT. 15 MR. BARENS: COULD YOU RELATE TO THAT? 16 MS. KING: UH-HUH. 17 MR. BARENS: AND JUST BECAUSE SOMETHING IS OUT OF THE 18 ORDINARY DOESN'T MEAN IT IS IMPOSSIBLE? 19 MS. KING: RIGHT. 20 MR. BARENS: IT DOESN'T MEAN IT IS UNREASONABLE JUST 21 BECAUSE IT IS UNUSUAL; IS THAT TRUE? 22 23 MS. KING: YES. MR. BARENS: IT IS KIND OF UNUSUAL, WOULDN'T YOU SAY 24 TO YOURSELF, YOU WALK IN HERE AND THE JUDGE TELLS YOU WE ARE 25 HERE TO TRY A FIRST DEGREE MURDER CASE AND THE NEXT THING YOU 26 HEAR THE LAWYERS TELLING YOU NO BODY; THAT IS UNUSUAL, ISN'T 27

28

IT?

MS. KING: YES. 1 MR. BARENS: BUT IT IS REALLY HAPPENING. 2 MS. KING: IT IS POSSIBLE. 3 MR. BARENS: QUITE SO. 4 AND THAT IS WHAT WE ARE HERE ABOUT. 5 SO WHAT IS NOT THE USUAL COULD BE TRUE. 6 7 MS. KING: UH-HUH. MR. BARENS: NOW YOUR CHILDREN ARE BOTH IN SCHOOL? 8 MS. KING: YES. 9 MR. BARENS: AND YOUR 16-YEAR-OLD IS IN HIGH SCHOOL? 10 MS. KING: YES, HE IS A JUNIOR. 11 MR. BARENS: WHERE DOES HE GO TO SCHOOL? 12 MS. KING: HE GOES TO GRANT HIGH SCHOOL IN VAN NUYS. 13 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINION ABOUT 14 STUDENTS THAT GO TO THESE PRIVATE SCHOOLS AS OPPOSED TO 15 PUBLIC SCHOOLS LIKE GRANT? 16 17 MS. KING: NO. HE HAS BEEN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL SINCE HE WAS IN THIRD 18 GRADE AND NOW HE IS IN HIGH SCHOOL AND HE DIDN'T GO TO PRIVATE 19 20 SCHOOL, BUT HE HAS BEEN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL. MR. BARENS: WAS THERE SOME FEELING OR ATTITUDE YOU 21 DEVELOPED ABOUT PRIVATE SCHOOLS THAT HELPED YOUR FAMILY MAKE 22 A DECISION TO PUT HIM INTO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL? 23 24 MS. KING: NO. 25 THAT WAS MORE OR LESS LEFT UP TO HIM. I WANTED HIM TO GET THE BASIC EDUCATION AND WHEN 26 IT CAME TO HIGH SCHOOL, WE ALL SAT DOWN AND DISCUSSED IT AND 27 28 HE WANTED TO GO INTO A PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL.

ΙÖ

MR. BARENS: YOU DIDN'T HAVE ANY MISGIVING ABOUT MR. BARENS: YOUR HUSBAND SELLS SOME PARTICULAR TYPE MS. KING: RESIDENTIAL. AND HE IS JUST GETTING INTO MR. BARENS: THAT HAS BEEN HIS ONLY OCCUPATION MS. KING: HE WAS WORKING FOR -- HE WAS A SUPERVISOR IN A SAVINGS AND LOAN ABOUT FOUR YEARS PRIOR TO THAT. MR. BARENS: WAS THERE ANY REASON HE LEFT THE SAVINGS MS. KING: NO. HE JUST WANTED TO DO SOMETHING MR. BARENS: WHAT DID YOU ADVISE THE COURT YOUR MS. KING: I TOOK A COURSE AT THE SAVINGS AND LOAN INSTITUTE IN ACCOUNTING, FOR COST ACCOUNTING. IT WAS BASICALLY MS. KING: I WORKED FOR -- IN BEVERLY HILLS FOR GIBRALTAR SAVINGS AND LOAN IN BEVERLY HILLS. I WAS IN MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. THEREFORE, I PRESUME IF I 27 PRESENTED FOR YOU A CASHIER'S CHECK DRAWN ON A SWISS BANK, 28

28

YOU WOULD PROBABLY ASSUME THAT THERE WAS MONEY IN BACK OF MR. BARENS: THERE WAS REAL MONEY IN BACK OF THAT CHECK? MS. KING: FOR A CASHIER'S CHECK? YES. MR. BARENS: DID YOU HAVE ANY INSTANCES WHERE CASHIER'S MS. KING: NO, NOT IN MY EXPERIENCE. NO. MR. BARENS: THAT WOULDN'T BE REASONABLE, WOULD IT? MR. BARENS: NOT BASED ON ANY EXPERIENCE WE COULD BRING MR. BARENS: WHEN DID YOU WORK -- DID YOU EVER WORK MR. BARENS: WERE YOU ALWAYS DOING WHAT AT THE SAVINGS MS. KING: I WORKED IN ACCOUNTING, JUST BASIC AND THEN I WENT INTO PAYROLL. THIS WAS 13 YEARS AGO. I WAS JUST CALCULATING THE PAYROLL FOR EVERYBODY. MR. BARENS: WHAT WAS THE LAST BOOK YOU READ? MS. KING: "I ONLY WANT WHAT IS BEST FOR YOU." I DON'T KNOW WHO WROTE IT. IT IS A BOOK ABOUT PARENTS AND KIDS AND

YOU KNOW, WHAT PARENTS WANT OUT OF THEIR CHILDREN AND WHAT

THEIR CHILDREN WANT OUT OF THEIR PARENTS.

MR. BARENS: WELL, IT SOUNDS LIKE A FAMILIAR LINE TO ME. HOW ABOUT THE LAST MOVIE YOU SAW?

MS. KING: "INDIANA JONES."

MR. BARENS: WELL, WE WILL GIVE YOU BETTER, MS. KING.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, WE'LL TAKE A 15-MINUTE RECESS NOW.

(RECESS.)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

14

15

16

17

19

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: THE DEFENDANT IS PRESENT AND THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS ARE PRESENT.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

GOOD AFTERNOON, MRS. KING.

DID YOU MEET YOUR HUSBAND AT THE SAVINGS AND LOAN?

MS. KING: NO.

MR. WAPNER: THAT WAS JUST A COINCIDENCE THAT YOU HAPPENED TO BE IN THE SAME BUSINESS AT DIFFERENT TIMES?

MS. KING: YEAH.

IT WAS TWO DIFFERENT SAVINGS AND LOANS.

MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU HEARD THE QUESTIONS I ASKED OF THE OTHER JURORS?

MS. KING: YES.

MR. WAPNER: WHAT WAS YOUR VIEW OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE BEFORE YOU CAME INTO THE COURTROOM?

MS. KING: WELL, I WASN'T AS CLEAR ON IT AS I AM NOW. I WASN'T, YOU KNOW, THAT SURE OF IT AT THE TIME.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEM WITH THE IDEA THAT IT IS JUST AS ACCEPTABLE AS A MEANS OF PROOF AS ANY OTHER KIND OF EVIDENCE?

MS. KING: NO.

MR. WAPNER: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE IDEA THAT YOU MIGHT BE CALLED ON TO MAKE A DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT A MURDER OCCURRED AND THE VICTIM IS SOMEONE THAT YOU DON'T LIKE?

MS. KING: THAT DOESN'T BOTHER ME.

MR. WAPNER: SHOULD THE PERSON'S LIFESTYLE OR BACKGROUND OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO YOU IN DECIDING

WHETHER OR NOT A MURDER WAS COMMITTED --

MS. KING: NO.

MR. WAPNER: -- AND WHO DID IT?

MS. KING: NOT AT ALL.

MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF A CON SCHEME OF ANY KIND?

MS. KING: NO.

MR. WAPNER: WHAT DID YOU DO AT THE SAVINGS AND LOAN?

MS. KING: I WORKED IN THE ACCOUNTING DEPARTMENT AND IN PAYROLL.

MR. WAPNER: WHAT DID YOU DO IN THE ACCOUNTING DEPARTMENT?

MS. KING: BASICALLY JUST -- GOD, IT WAS SO LONG AGO -- WORKING WITH LEDGERS AND BALANCING LEDGERS, MOSTLY.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT WITNESSES WHO TESTIFY UNDER GRANTS OF IMMUNITY?

MS. KING: IT IS FINE WITH ME.

MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING IN THE PAPERS RECENTLY ABOUT THAT HAPPENING IN OTHER CASES?

MS. KING: NO. 1 HEARD IT IN GENERAL, YOU KNOW, JUST PEOPLE SPEAKING BUT 1 DIDN'T READ ANYTHING ABOUT IT.

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU LISTEN TO THE ANSWERS OF MOST OF THE OTHER JURORS ABOUT THE HYPOTHETICALS WE HAVE GIVEN TO VARIOUS PEOPLE?

MS. KING: YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND AS YOU LISTENED TO THE OTHER
PEOPLE ANSWER, WERE THERE ANY THINGS THAT YOU HEARD THAT YOU
FELT WERE KIND OF WILD GUESSING OR SPECULATING, AS OPPOSED
TO PEOPLE GIVING WHAT YOU THOUGHT IN YOUR MIND, WERE REASONABLE
ANSWERS?

MS. KING: NO. I THINK YOU KNOW, THE BOAT INCIDENT,
EVERYBODY HAD THEIR OPINION. AND I HAD MINE. EVERYBODY JUST
MORE OR LESS SPECULATED.

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU THINK THAT -- DID YOU HEAR ANY 1 2 ANSWERS THAT YOU FELT WERE FAR-FETCHED? 3 MS. KING: NO, NOT REALLY. MR. WAPNER: WERE YOU ABLE TO HEAR ALL OF THE ANSWERS 4 5 EVERYBODY GAVE? 6 MS. KING: YES. 7 MR. WAPNER: AND THEY ALL SEEMED REASONABLE TO YOU? MS. KING: ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE, EVEN THE BOAT. 8 9 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. BUT THAT IS WHAT WE HAVE BEEN TALKING 10 ABOUT FOR A LOT OF WEEKS NOW ABOUT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ANY-11 THING IS POSSIBLE AND WHAT IS REASONABLE. 12 I AM NOT TRYING TO TELL YOU WHAT IS REASONABLE. I AM JUST ASKING YOU IF YOU HEARD ANYTHING -- I GUESS WHAT 13 14 I AM SAYING IS. WHAT IS REASONABLE TO YOU? DO YOU MAKE A 15 DISTINCTION BETWEEN THAT PHRASE, ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE AND WHAT 16 IS REASONABLE? 17 MS. KING: WELL, I THINK ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE. BUT WHAT 18 IS REASONABLE, I THINK IN MY OPINION, IS MY OPINION. AND I 19 WOULD HAVE TO GO WITH WHAT I FEEL IS REASONABLE. 20 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. BUT IN LISTENING TO THESE OTHER 21 PEOPLE IN YOUR OPINION, DID ALL THE THINGS THAT EVERY ONE OF 22 THEM SAID, SEEM REASONABLE TO YOU? 23 MS. KING: NOT NECESSARILY WHAT THEY SAID, NO. NO, I 24 WOULD HAVE TO SAY NO. 25 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. 26 MS. KING: NOT EVERYTHING. 27 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. DID YOU HEAR ANSWERS FROM SOME OF

THE PEOPLE YOU THOUGHT IN YOUR OWN MIND AS YOU WERE HEARING

THEM, THEY WERE KIND OF FAR-FETCHED OR IT WAS KIND OF SPECULATING?

MS. KING: YES.

MR. WAPNER: I WOULD ASK YOU WHAT YOUR OPINION IS, BUT THAT WOULD GET ME IN TROUBLE WITH THE JUDGE, I THINK.

HAVE YOU EVER SAT ON A CRIMINAL JURY BEFORE?

MS. KING: NO.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. WHEN YOU ARE DECIDING WHETHER
YOU HAVE A REASONABLE DOUBT OR NOT, WILL YOU MAKE THE
DISTINCTION IN YOUR MIND BETWEEN ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE AND WHAT
IS REASONABLE TO YOU?

MS. KING: MORE WHAT IS REASONABLE TO ME.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND DO YOU THINK IT IS TRUE THAT IN ANY SITUATION, REGARDLESS OF THE FACTS, IT IS ALWAYS -- YOU CAN ALWAYS SAY WELL, THIS IS POSSIBLE AND THAT IS POSSIBLE?

MS. KING: WELL, WE COULD SAY THAT, YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. SO, WHATEVER THE FACTUAL SITUATION IS, IT IS ALWAYS POSSIBLE TO COME UP WITH ANOTHER POSSIBLE EXPLANATION, RIGHT?

MS. KING: RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. WE HAD A GUY IN LAW SCHOOL AND HIS NAME WAS WAGNER. THEY USED TO CALL HIM WHAT-IF WAGNER. HE WOULD RAISE HIS HANDS AND SAY WHAT IF THIS AND WHAT IF THAT AND THEN THE PROFESSOR WOULD ANSWER. THEN HE WOULD RAISE HIS HAND TO SAY WHAT IF THIS AND WHAT IF THAT.

AFTER THE FIRST SEMESTER, THEY CALLED HIM WHAT-IF WAGNER. IT STAYED WITH HIM FOR THE WHOLE TIME.

HALF-YEAR-OLD IS, IS ON AND OFF AND GONE AND HERE AND THERE.

1 BUT I JUST LIKE TO SPEND AS MUCH TIME AS I CAN 2 WITH HIM. 3 MR. WAPNER: ARE YOUR PARENTS STILL LIVING? 4 MS. KING: YES. MR. WAPNER: DO THEY LIVE IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA? 5 6 MS. KING: NO, BACK EAST. 7 MR. WAPNER: HOW OFTEN DO YOU TALK TO THEM? MS. KING: ABOUT ONCE A WEEK ON AN 800 NUMBER AT WORK. 8 9 MR. WAPNER: THAT MUST COME IN AWFULLY HANDY, I GUESS, 10 HUH? 11 MS. KING: DON'T TELL MY BOSS. MR. WAPNER: DON'T WORRY. KODAK DOESN'T HAVE THE ROOM 12 13 BUGGED. 14 IS THERE ANYTHING ABOUT YOUR BACKGROUND THAT YOU THINK WE SHOULD KNOW THAT YOU THINK WOULD AFFECT YOUR ABILITY 15 16 TO BE A FAIR JUROR IN THIS CASE? 17 MS. KING: NO. MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK THAT YOU CAN DECIDE THIS CASE 18 ON THE FACTS AND THE LAW WITHOUT LETTING THE POSSIBLE PENALTY 19 ENTER INTO YOUR MIND AND AFFECT YOU AT THE TIME YOU ARE MAKING 20 21 THE DELIBERATION? 22 MS. KING: YES. I THINK I CAN. 23 24 25 26 27

21

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

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE DEFENSE WOULD RESPECTFULLY ACCEPT THE PANEL AS PRESENTLY CONSTITUTED.

THE COURT: THE PEOPLE?

MR. WAPNER: WE WOULD THANK AND EXCUSE MRS. HALICK, JUROR NUMBER 9.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. YOU WILL MAKE YOUR WEDDING IN TIME, WON'T YOU, IN APRIL?

MS. HALICK: YEAH.

THE COURT: LOTS OF LUCK TO YOU.

THE CLERK: RONALD CLEWS, C-L-E-W-S.

THE COURT: MR. CLEWS, IT SEEMS YEARS AGO WHEN YOU INDICATED THAT YOU OR SOME MEMBER OF YOUR FAMILY HAVE BEEN THE VICTIM OF SOME KIND OF A CRIME.

MR. CLEWS: YES. OUR HOUSE HAS BEEN BURGLED -- WELL, TWO DIFFERENT HOUSES THREE TIMES AND THE CAR, TOO.

THE COURT: WAS THAT INVESTIGATED BY THE POLICE?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

THE COURT: WERE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE WAY THE INVESTIGATION WENT DOWN?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

THE COURT: THE FACT THAT YOU HAVE BEEN THE VICTIM ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS, WOULD THAT IN ANY WAY INCLINE YOU TO BE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE BECAUSE HE HAS BEEN ACCUSED OF SOME CRIME?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

THE COURT: I THINK YOU TOLD US THAT YOU OR SOME MEMBER

OF YOUR FAMILY HAVE BEEN, UNFORTUNATELY, ACCUSED OF SOME

OFFENSE OR ARRESTED. WHO WAS THAT?

MR. CLEWS: ME. I WAS ARRESTED FOR FAILING TO IDENTIFY

MYSELF, SECTION 467(E) OF THE PENAL CODE. THAT WAS ABOUT

20 YEARS AGO.

THE COURT: WELL, THAT WAS JUST A MISDEMEANOR, WASN'T

IT?

MR. CLEWS: I FORGET NOW WHAT IT WAS.

THE COURT: OH, SURE.

YOU THINK YOU HAVE BEEN UNJUSTLY ACCUSED, WERE YOU?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

AS A MATTER OF FACT, IT IS PROVEN NOW THAT I WAS, YES.

THE COURT: I DON'T UNDERSTAND.

MR. CLEWS: WELL, THAT IS DECLARED UNCONSTITUTIONAL, THAT LAW NOW.

THE COURT: WHAT HAPPENED IN YOUR CASE?

MR. CLEWS: I WAS FINED \$25.

THE COURT: WHAT WERE THE FACTS THAT CAUSED YOU TO BE FINED \$25?

MR. CLEWS: WELL, I WAS WALKING DOWN THE STREET AT 2 O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING AND A POLICEMAN IN HIS CAR CAME AND WANTED TO QUESTION ME.

THE COURT: AND?

MR. CLEWS: I TOLD HIM THAT HE HAD NO RIGHT TO DO THAT.

THE COURT: NONETHELESS, HE ARRESTED YOU?

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

MR. CLEWS: THEY TOOK ME TO JAIL, UH-HUH.

THE COURT: YOU WERE SOBER AT THE TIME, WEREN'T YOU?

MR. CLEWS: OH, YES.

(LAUGHTER IN COURTROOM.)

THE COURT: DID THAT CAUSE YOU TO HAVE ANY DEEP

RESENTMENT AGAINST POLICE OFFICERS?

MR. CLEWS: NO, NO.

THE COURT: YOU WON'T IN ANY WAY PERMIT THAT TO INTERFERE IN ANY WAY WITH YOUR BEING A JUROR FOR EITHER THE PROSECUTION NOR THE DEFENSE?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

THE COURT: FINE.

OTHER THAN THAT, IF I WERE TO ASK YOU THE SAME

GENERAL QUESTIONS WHICH WERE ASKED OF THE OTHER JURORS, WOULD

YOUR ANSWERS BE ANY DIFFERENT OR WOULD THEY BE SUBSTANTIALLY

THE SAME?

MR. CLEWS: SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME.

THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU DO, MR. CLEWS?

MR. CLEWS: I AM A RETIRED CARPENTER.

THE COURT: DID YOU HAVE ANY EMPLOYMENT WITH SOME COMPANY OR WERE YOU ON YOUR OWN?

MR. CLEWS: WELL, THE LAST SIX YEARS I WAS IN BUSINESS WITH ANOTHER FELLOW, IN BUSINESS FOR OURSELVES.

THE COURT: ARE YOU MARRIED?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

THE COURT: PRESENTLY?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN?

MR. CLEWS: YES. THE COURT: HOW MANY? MR. CLEWS: TWO CHILDREN. THE COURT: HOW OLD ARE THEY? MR. CLEWS: 33 AND 37. THE COURT: WHAT EDUCATION DO YOU HAVE, FORMAL EDUCATION? MR. CLEWS: I WENT TO SCHOOL UNTIL I WAS 14. THE COURT: AND WHAT DO YOUR CHILDREN DO? MR. CLEWS: THEY ARE SCHOOLTEACHERS. THE COURT: DOES MRS. CLEWS HAVE ANY KIND OF EMPLOYMENT OR ANY KIND OF OCCUPATION? MR. CLEWS: YES. SHE IS AN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST.

27

28

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM

MR. CLEWS: WELL, JUST THOSE BURGLARIES.

THE COURT: JUST THE OTHERS.

HAVE YOU EVER SERVED ON A JURY?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. CLEWS.

MR. CLEWS: GOOD AFTERNOON.

MR. BARENS: MR. CLEWS, I DO RECALL THAT YOU HAD

READ SOMETHING ABOUT THIS CASE.

MR. CLEWS: THAT'S RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: IT WAS JUST ONE ARTICLE IN THE LOS ANGELES

MR. CLEWS: THAT'S RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: JUST THAT ARTICLE?

MR. CLEWS: YES, THAT'S ALL.

MR. BARENS: NOW, MR. CLEWS WE ARE HERE, YOU ARE IN THE JURY BOX, MR. HUNT IS SITTING DOWN THERE, DO YOU HAVE ANY RESERVATION AT ALL IN ASSURING ME THAT NOTHING YOU READ ONE WAY OR THE OTHER IN THAT ARTICLE WOULD INFLUENCE YOU AS

MR. CLEWS: IT WOULD NOT INFLUENCE ME.

MR. BARENS: AND YOU FEEL CONFIDENT THAT I AM NOT FIGHTING ANY SORT OF AN UPHILL BATTLE BECAUSE OF THAT?

MR. CLEWS: NO, YOU ARE NOT.

MR. BARENS: AND BELIEVE YOU ME, IT IS A SACRED

PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS, IS THAT STILL WELL IN PLACE IN YOUR PERCEPTION?

MR. CLEWS: THAT'S RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: ASIDE FROM THAT ARTICLE THAT YOU HAD READ,
HAD YOU HEARD ANYTHING INDEPENDENT OF THAT ARTICLE ABOUT THIS
CASE?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

MR. BARENS: HAD YOU EVER DISCUSSED THAT ARTICLE WITH ANYONE PRIOR TO OUR ASKING YOU A QUESTION ABOUT IT IN COURT HERE?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

MR. BARENS: HAD YOU EVER BEEN A PARTY TO A DISCUSSION

THAT SOMEONE ELSE WAS HAVING ABOUT THAT ARTICLE ON THIS CASE?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

MR. BARENS: SO YOU ARE TOTALLY UNTAINTED AS YOU COME HERE BUT FOR THAT, EH?

MR. CLEWS: I THINK SO.

MR. BARENS: I APPRECIATE THAT.

MR. CLEWS, YOU WORKED AS A CARPENTER MOST OF YOUR ADULT LIFE?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND WAS THERE A PARTICULAR TYPE OF

CARPENTRY YOU DID?

MR. CLEWS: NO. I WORKED IN ALL KINDS OF THINGS, ALL KINDS OF BUILDINGS AND ROAD BUILDING AND THINGS.

MR. BARENS: DID YOU DO INTERIOR CARPENTRY OR DID YOU DO EXTERIOR, FRAME-UP WORK?

MR. CLEWS: BOTH.

MR. BARENS: BOTH? 1 AND ARE YOU FROM THE LOS ANGELES AREA? 2 MR. CLEWS: NO. 3 MR. BARENS: WHERE WOULD YOU BE FROM, SIR? 4 MR. CLEWS: WHERE WAS I BORN? 5 MR. BARENS: YES. 6 MR. CLEWS: LONDON. 7 MR. BARENS: AND YOU GREW UP OVER THERE? 8 MR. CLEWS: YES. 9 MR. BARENS: DID YOU HAVE YOUR EDUCATION OVER THERE? 10 MR. CLEWS: YES. 11 MR. BARENS: YOU TOOK THE ELEVEN PLUS TEST? 12 MR. CLEWS: THEY DIDN'T HAVE -- WELL, I TOOK -- I TOOK 13 THE TEST WHEN I WAS -- JUST BEFORE I WAS 11, YES. 14 MR. BARENS: AND WAS IT AS A RESULT OF THAT TEST THAT 15 YOU WERE KIND OF GUIDED INTO THE CARPENTRY ACTIVITY? 16 MR. CLEWS: NO, NO. 17 I BECAME A CARPENTER AFTER I CAME OVER HERE. 18 MR. BARENS: WERE YOU DIRECTED SOMEWHERE IN PARTICULAR 19 AFTER THE ELEVEN PLUS? 20 MR. CLEWS: YES, UH-HUH. 21 MR. BARENS: WHERE DID THEY REFER YOU AFTER THAT? 22 MR. CLEWS: WELL, I WENT TO WHAT THEY CALL A SECONDARY 23 SCHOOL. 24 MR. BARENS: RIGHT. 25 AND DID YOU FOCUS ON ANY PARTICULAR AREA OF STUDY 26 DURING THAT TIME? 27 MR. CLEWS: NO. 28

1 - 7

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

```
MR. BARENS: THE ANATOMY OF LONLINESS? DID THAT COURSE
SUGGEST A CERTAIN PROFILE TO YOU OF A LONELY PERSON AND THE
WAY THOSE PEOPLE ACTED?
     MR. CLEWS: I REALLY CAN'T RECALL WHAT IT WAS ABOUT NOW,
I JUST REMEMBER THE NAME.
     MR. BARENS: WAS THERE ANYTHING IN THAT CLASS THAT
SUGGESTED CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR OR ATTRIBUTED CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR
TO APPARENTLY ISOLATED INDIVIDUALS?
     MR. CLEWS: I DON'T RECALL THAT AT ALL.
     MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T RECALL THAT AS A PART OF THE
CURRICULUM?
    MR. CLEWS: NO.
     MR. BARENS: WHAT ARE YOU READING THERE?
     MR. CLEWS: LAKE WOEBEGONE DAYS.
     MR. BARENS: WELL, THAT IS REAL AMERICAN STUFF FOR YOU
THERE.
     MR. CLEWS: YES.
     MR. BARENS: WHAT HAD YOU READ JUST PRIOR TO THAT?
     MR. CLEWS: I HAVE NOT READ A BOOK FOR A LONG TIME.
      MR. BARENS: HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN YOU CAME TO THE UNITED
STATES?
     MR. CLEWS: ABOUT 18.
     MR. BARENS: ANY PARTICULAR REASON YOU CAME OVER HERE?
      MR. CLEWS: A HIGHER STANDARD OF LIVING.
      MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. HAD YOU DONE MILITARY SERVICE
IN GREAT BRITAIN?
      MR. CLEWS: NO. WELL, I WAS ACTUALLY IN THE MERCHANT
```

NAVY AT THE TIME. IT WAS THE MERCHANT MARINES. IT WAS THE

```
EARLY PART OF THE WAR.
1
           MR. BARENS: DID YOU COME STRAIGHT TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA?
2
3
           MR. CLEWS: NO.
          MR. BARENS: YOU STARTED IN THE EAST COAST AND MOVED
4
5
     WEST?
           MR. CLEWS: I LIVED IN CLEVELAND FOR 15 YEARS.
6
          MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T EVEN NEED TO EXPLAIN TO ME WHY
7
8
     YOU LEFT CLEVELAND, MR. CLEWS. ALTHOUGH I MUST SAY, I SAW
     ON TELEVISION YESTERDAY A BIG SIGN THAT SAID "NO MORE
9
10
    CLEVELAND JOKES."
                 SO. WE HAVE HAD OUR CLEVELAND JOKES FOR THE YEAR.
11
    MR. CLEWS. DO YOU GO TO THE MOVIES AT ALL?
12
13
           MR. CLEWS: ONCE IN A WHILE.
14
           MR. BARENS: WHAT WAS THE LAST MOVIE YOU SAW?
15
          MR. CLEWS: DOWN BY LAW.
          MR. BARENS: WHAT WAS THAT ABOUT? I MISSED THAT.
16
          MR. CLEWS: IT WAS ABOUT THREE PEOPLE IN PRISON IN
17
    LOUISIANA AND THEIR INTERRELATIONSHIPS.
18
19
          MR. BARENS: THEY WERE PEOPLE IN THE MOVIE WHO WERE ALL
     CONVICTED OF SOMETHING OR OTHER?
20
          MR. CLEWS: NO. I DON'T THINK SO. IT WAS ACTUALLY A
21
     JAIL, A CITY JAIL. I THINK IT WAS A COUNTY JAIL. THEY WERE
22
23
     BEING HELD BUT THEN THEY ALL ESCAPED.
24
          MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. MR. CLEWS, WHAT PART OF LONDON
25
     DID YOU GROW UP IN?
26
          MR. CLEWS: SOUTHEAST, WOOLEDGE.
          MR. BARENS: WHAT DOES YOUR FATHER DO?
27
```

MR. CLEWS: HE WAS A POLICEMAN.

```
1
           MR. BARENS: INDEED. THEY ARE ALL POLICEMEN DOWN
2
     THERE, AREN'T THEY? AND DID IT HAVE ANY BEARING ON YOU, AS
3
     FAR AS WHAT I DO FOR A LIVING? I DEFEND CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS.
4
     DOES THAT MAKE YOU SUSPICIOUS OF CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS IF YOUR
5
     FATHER WAS A CONSTABLE?
6
           MR. CLEWS: NO.
7
           MR. BARENS: DID HE TALK TO YOU MUCH ABOUT HIS JOB?
8
           MR. CLEWS: NOT TOO MUCH. THE JOB WAS -- NOT MUCH
9
     HAPPENED ON THAT JOB.
10
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. NOW, DO YOU HAVE ANY HOBBIES?
11
           MR. CLEWS: NO. I DON'T THINK SO. NOT REALLY, NO.
12
           MR. BARENS: YOU DID MENTION THAT YOU WERE RETIRED FROM
13
     CARPENTRY?
14
           MR. CLEWS: YES.
15
           MR. BARENS: AND DID YOU SAY SIX YEARS AGO YOU RETIRED?
16
           MR. CLEWS: NO. NO, ABOUT TWO YEARS AGO.
           MR. BARENS: AND HOW DO YOU FILL YOUR TIME SINCE THEN?
17
18
           MR. CLEWS: WELL, MOST OF THE LAST TWO YEARS, I HAVE
19
     SPENT BUILDING A HOUSE.
20
           MR. BARENS: FOR YOURSELF?
21
           MR. CLEWS: FOR ONE OF MY DAUGHTERS.
22
           MR. BARENS: AND THAT IS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA?
23
           MR. CLEWS: YES, IN VENICE.
24
           MR. BARENS: BOTH OF YOUR CHILDREN YOU MENTIONED, ARE
25
     SCHOOL TEACHERS?
26
           MR. CLEWS: YES.
27
           MR. BARENS: WHAT LEVEL DID THEY TEACH ON?
```

MR. CLEWS: ONE TEACHES JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AND ONE

TEACHES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. MR. BARENS: BOTH GIRLS, SIR? MR. CLEWS: EXCUSE ME? MR. BARENS: THEY ARE GIRLS? MR. CLEWS: BOTH GIRLS, YES. MR. BARENS: ARE THEY MARRIED? MR. CLEWS: NO. NEITHER ONE OF THEM ARE MARRIED. MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. DID YOU EVER GO BACK TO ENGLAND AFTER YOU CAME TO THE UNITED STATES? MR. CLEWS: YES.

```
MR. BARENS: WHAT, VISITING FAMILY?
1
2
           MR. CLEWS: YES.
           MR. BARENS: AND THEY ALL LIVE IN SOUTHERN ENGLAND?
3
           MR. CLEWS: NO. SOME LIVE IN BIRMINGHAM.
           MR. BARENS: WELL, I BET YOU NEVER LIKED GOING THERE,
5
6
     DID YOU?
7
           MR. CLEWS: I LIKE IT, YES.
8
           MR. BARENS: MANCHESTER?
9
           MR. CLEWS: NO.
10
           MR. BARENS: LIKE LIVING IN CLEVELAND, BIRMINGHAM?
11
           MR. CLEWS: THEY ARE TOGETHER.
           MR. BARENS: I GUESS WE BETTER NOT HAVE ANY BIRMINGHAM
12
13
     JOKES EITHER. ALL RIGHT.
14
                DO YOU GO TO THE MOVIES AT ALL?
15
           MR. CLEWS: YES. YOU JUST ASKED ME THAT.
16
           MR. BARENS: I ASKED YOU THAT BUT ASIDE FROM THAT MOVIE
17
     THAT I DIDN'T RECOGNIZE, HAVE YOU SEEN ANYTHING ELSE OF
18
     RECENT DATE?
           MR. CLEWS: WELL, I HAVE A VCR. I AM USING THAT MUCH
19
20
     MORE NOW.
           MR. BARENS: YOU RENT MOVIES TO WATCH?
21
22
           MR. CLEWS: YES.
           MR. BARENS: WHAT WAS THE LAST TIME YOU RENTED A MOVIE?
23
24
     WHAT DID YOU RENT?
25
           MR. CLEWS: THE GREAT GATSBY. THE REASON I RENTED THAT
26
     IS BECAUSE IT WAS MENTIONED HERE.
27
           MR. BARENS: I RECALL I MENTIONED IT.
28
           MR. CLEWS: YES.
```

```
MR. BARENS: SPEAKING TO A JUROR THAT WAS IN THE NUMBER
1
2
     12 BOX ABOUT HIS EXPERIENCE WITH DR. LEEHAN AT UCLA.
                 THINGS WEREN'T QUITE WHAT THEY SEEMED TO BE IN
3
4
     GATSBY, WERE THEY? GATSBY'S PERCEPTION OF DAISY?
           MR. CLEWS: WELL, RIGHT. RIGHT, YES.
5
          MR. BARENS: AND GATSBY WAS SORT OF POSTURER, WASN'T
6
     HE? WOULD YOU CLASSIFY HIM AS A PERSON WHO POSTURED A BIT?
7
           MR. CLEWS: YEAH. HE WAS -- HE WANTED THINGS THAT WERE
8
9
     NOT HONEST, I WOULD SAY.
           MR. BARENS: HE WANTED THINGS THAT SIMPLY WEREN'T
10
11
     AVAILABLE TO HIM, IN YOUR OPINION?
          MR. CLEWS: PERHAPS. I AM NOT SURE ABOUT THE ANSWER
12
13
     TO THAT.
           MR. BARENS: DID HE SEEM EVER TO TAKE CREDIT FOR THINGS
14
15
     THAT WEREN'T TRUE?
           MR. CLEWS: I DON'T KNOW ABOUT THAT, EITHER.
16
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. HE ULTIMATELY THOUGH, HAD SOME
17
18
     MORALITY TO HIM, DIDN'T HE?
           MR. CLEWS: YEAH. WELL, HE HAD PRINCIPLE. YES, IN THE
19
20
     END.
           MR. BARENS: HE HAD SOME PRINCIPLE, EVEN THOUGH HE WAS
21
     A BIT OF A POSTURER AND A BIT OF A CON MAN HIMSELF?
22
23
           MR. CLEWS: YES.
           MR. BARENS: RESENTED THE WAY WHICH PEOPLE TREATED LIFE
24
25
     AND DEATH, DIDN'T HE?
           MR. CLEWS: I DON'T KNOW ABOUT THAT, EITHER.
26
           MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK HE THOUGHT THAT THEY HAD A
27
28
     BIT OF A CAVALIER ATTITUDE IN THE WAY THEY TREATED THOSE
```

```
1
     VICTIMS OF THE ACCIDENT?
2
           MR. CLEWS: I REALLY DON'T KNOW.
3
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. HAVE YOU EVER WATCHED A TRIAL
4
     BEFORE?
5
           MR. CLEWS: NO.
6
           MR. BARENS: AND YOU HAVE NEVER PARTICIPATED AS A JUROR
7
     IN ANY OTHER ASPECT OF THIS SYSTEM, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THAT
8
     ARREST THAT YOU WERE SUBJECT TO?
9
           MR. CLEWS: NO. I HAVE NEVER BEEN A JUROR OR WATCHED
10
     A TRIAL.
11
           MR. BARENS: RIGHT. WHEN YOU HAD THAT EXPERIENCE OF
12
     BEING ARRESTED, ALBEIT ILLEGALLY, DID YOU ACTUALLY APPEAR IN
13
     COURT ON THAT?
14
           MR. CLEWS: YES.
15
           MR. BARENS: DID YOU HAVE DEFENSE COUNSEL?
16
           MR. CLEWS: NO.
17
           MR. BARENS: OR A PUBLIC DEFENDER?
18
           MR. CLEWS: NO.
19
           MR. BARENS: YOU REPRESENTED YOURSELF?
20
           MR. CLEWS: YES.
21
           MR. BARENS: DID YOU TRY THE CASE YOURSELF?
22
           MR. CLEWS: 1 DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT MEANS.
23
           MR. BARENS: WELL, DID YOU TAKE THE STAND AND TESTIFY
24
     AND THEN WERE YOU CROSS-EXAMINED BY PROSECUTORS?
25
           MR. CLEWS: YES.
26
           MR. BARENS: AND NONETHELESS, YOU WERE -- WERE YOU
27
     FOUND GUILTY?
28
```

MR. CLEWS: YES.

MR. BARENS: BECAUSE YOU WE WOULD SAY IN A FAIRLY TECHNICAL STATE, WERE GUILTY OF A TECHNICAL MATTER?

MR. CLEWS: YES. THEY SAID I WAS GUILTY. I MEAN, YES.

I WAS TECHNICALLY GUILTY.

MR. BARENS: THEY HAD THIS ILLEGAL LAW, WHAT TURNED OUT TO BE AN ILLEGAL LAW AND YOU HAD TECHNICALLY, VIOLATED THE LAW. I PRESUME THAT IS WHAT WAS SAID?

MR. CLEWS: THAT'S RIGHT, YES.

MR. BARENS: AND NOW YOU HAVE HEARD DISCUSSION HERE WHERE WE TALKED -- EVEN TODAY MR. WAPNER MADE REFERENCE TO YOU NOT DISPUTING WHETHER OR NOT SOMEONE HAD BEEN KILLED JUST BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T LIKE THE VICTIM. DID YOU HEAR THAT TYPE OF DISCUSSION?

MR. CLEWS: UH-HUH.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU REMEMBER THAT THAT GOES BACK TO THAT BUSINESS ABOUT A COKE DEALER BEING ROBBED VERSUS A PRIEST BEING ROBBED AND WE TREAT THEM BOTH ON AN EQUAL LEVEL. DO YOU REMEMBER THAT?

MR. CLEWS: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: WELL NOW, IF I TOLD YOU THAT THERE WAS A BIT OF AN ISSUE MR. CLEWS, ABOUT WHETHER A ROBBERY TOOK PLACE AT ALL, IF THAT WERE THE INQUIRY, WOULD YOU WANT TO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE VICTIM?

MR. CLEWS: I DON'T KNOW.

MR. BARENS: WELL MR. CLEWS, HERE WE HAVE THIS FELLOW.

WE ARE NOT REALLY DEBATING WHETHER HE IS A PRIEST OR A

COKE DEALER. BUT THE ISSUE IS WHETHER HE WAS ROBBED AT ALL.

WOULDN'T WE HAVE TO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT HIS NATURE

AND HIS CHARACTER AND BACKGROUND AS AN ALLEGED VICTIM TO SEE 1 2 WHETHER HE WAS TELLING THE TRUTH IN THE FIRST INSTANCE ABOUT 3 WHETHER HE HAD EVEN ROBBED BEFORE WE START WORRYING ABOUT 4 WHETHER WE ARE GOING TO CONVICT THE GUY WHO ALLEGEDLY ROBBED 5 HIM? CAN YOU FOLLOW ME WITH THAT? 6 MR. CLEWS: I AM NOT FOLLOWING YOU. 7 MR. BARENS: WELL, THE GOVERNMENT BRINGS IN A GUY AND 8 PUTS HIM IN THE BOX AND SAYS THAT WE ARE GOING TO TRY HIM FOR 9 COMMITTING A ROBBERY. AND THE GUY DOESN'T SAY THAT HE IS JUST NOT GUILTY. 10 HE COMES IN AND HE SAYS IT TO YOU, LISTEN, THE GUY WAS NEVER 11 EVEN ROBBED. HE IS MAKING IT UP. HE IS JUST SAYING THAT 12 13 BECAUSE OF SOME AGENDA OR MOTIVATION THAT HE HAS, HIMSELF. 14 NOW, WERE THAT THE ISSUE BEFORE YOU, WOULD YOU 15 BE CONCERNED ABOUT WANTING TO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT HIS BACK-16 GROUND, THEN? 17 MR. CLEWS: YES. 18 MR. BARENS: INDEED. WELL, THAT IS THE TYPE OF THING 19 WE WANT YOU TO PAY ATTENTION TO, IF YOU ARE A JUROR. YOU 20 WOULD LISTEN TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE, MR. CLEWS? 21 MR. CLEWS: YES. 22 MR. BARENS: ON BOTH SIDES? 23 MR. CLEWS: YES. 24 MR. BARENS: THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND YOUR HONESTY, 25 SIR. I PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. 26 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. CLEWS.

MR. CLEWS: GOOD AFTERNOON.

27

MR. WAPNER: IT IS SOMETIMES IMPOSSIBLE AFTER ALL OF THIS TIME AND ALL OF THE TIME YOU HAVE BEEN HERE -- WELL, I DON'T THINK THAT HAS -- AT LEAST I DON'T HAVE IT IN MY NOTES, WHAT PART OF THE COUNTY YOU LIVE IN.

MR. CLEWS: VENICE.

3-1

MR. CLEWS: YES.

28

MR. CLEWS: AH, I FELT THAT THEY WERE OVERSTEPPING THEIR MR. WAPNER: AND DID YOU SEE THE SAME POLICE OFFICERS MR. CLEWS: I AM NOT SURE. I DON'T THINK SO. MR. WAPNER: WERE THERE SOME POLICE OFFICERS IN COURT WHO CLAIMED TO BE THE SAME ONES OR WERE THERE JUST NO POLICE THEY MUST HAVE BEEN THE SAME POLICE OFFICER, YES. SINCE THEN, HAVE YOU HAD ANY VISCERAL REACTION MR. WAPNER: IF YOU SEE OR HEAR A POLICE OFFICER TESTIFY IN THIS CASE, ARE YOU GOING TO HAVE ANY VISCERAL REACTION JUST TO THE FACT HE IS A POLICE OFFICER? MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK POLICEMEN ARE MORE OR LESS MR. WAPNER: IN THAT CASE, DID YOU HAVE A JURY TRIAL MR. WAPNER: AND DID YOU FEEL THAT THE JUDGE WAS DOING HIS JOB PROPERLY? 27

IT WAS A WOMAN, BY THE WAY. 1 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. 2 AND IN THIS CASE YOU WILL BE A JUDGE OF THE FACTS; 3 DO YOU FEEL COMFORTABLE WITH THAT ROLE? 4 MR. CLEWS: YES. 5 MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE TO JUDGE THE FACTS AND THEN APPLY 6 THE LAW THAT THE JUDGE GIVES YOU TO THE FACTS, CAN YOU DO 7 THAT? 8 MR. CLEWS: YES. 9 MR. WAPNER: CAN YOU DO THAT EVEN IF YOU DON'T AGREE 10 WITH THE LAW THAT HE GIVES YOU? 11 MR. CLEWS: YES. 12 MR. WAPNER: AND IF PART OF THAT LAW IS THAT A MURDER 13 CAN BE PROVED WITHOUT A BODY, BY CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, 14 CAN YOU FOLLOW THAT? 15 MR. CLEWS: YES. 16 MR. WAPNER: THE POINT IS, IN YOUR CASE THAT YOU HAD, 17 IT WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN RIGHT FOR THAT JUDGE TO SAY "WELL, I 18 DON'T AGREE WITH THIS LAW AND, THEREFORE, I AM GOING TO ACQUIT 19 THIS PERSON"; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 20 MR. CLEWS: YES. 21 MR. BARENS: I OBJECT TO THAT AS MISREPRESENTATIVE OF 22 THE LAW OF DISCRETION. 23 THE COURT: I WILL SUSTAIN THE OBJECTION. 24 MR. WAPNER: YOUR JOB AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE IS NOT 25 TO AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE LAW; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 26 MR. CLEWS: I UNDERSTAND THAT. 27 MR. WAPNER: IF THE JUDGE GIVES YOU THE LAW, EVEN IF

YOU DON'T AGREE WITH THAT, WILL YOU FOLLOW IT?

MR. CLEWS: YES, I WILL.

MR. WAPNER: WERE YOU LOOKING FOR ANY PARTICULAR THING IN "THE GREAT GATSBY" WHEN YOU READ IT?

MR. CLEWS: NO.

MR. BARENS SEEMED TO THINK IT WAS SIGNIFICANT AND I THOUGHT MAYBE THERE WAS SOMETHING I COULD LEARN FROM SEEING IT SO THAT IS WHY I RENTED IT.

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU THINK YOU LEARNED SOMETHING FROM RENTING IT?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: WHAT DID YOU LEARN?

MR. CLEWS: WELL, I LEARNED, I THINK, WHAT F. SCOTT FITZGERALD'S, HIS MORAL MESSAGE THAT HE WAS TRYING -- HIS MORAL MESSAGE.

MR. CLEWS: HARDLY AT ALL, NO, NOTHING.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 MR. WAPNER: IS IT THE KIND OF A THING -- WAS IT THE 2 KIND OF A COURSE THAT IF YOU HEAR SOMETHING IN THIS COURTROOM 3 ABOUT SOMEBODY BEING LONELY, THAT IT IS GOING TO COME BACK 4 TO YOU, DO YOU THINK? 5 MR. CLEWS: NO. 6 MR. WAPNER: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT CIRCUMSTANTIAL 7 EVIDENCE GENERALLY? 8 MR. CLEWS: I THINK IT IS EVIDENCE. 9 MR. WAPNER: AND IF THE JUDGE TELLS YOU THAT BOTH DIRECT 10 AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE ARE ACCEPTABLE AS A MEANS OF 11 PROOF AND NEITHER ONE IS ENTITLED TO ANY GREATER WEIGHT THAN 12 THE OTHER, CAN YOU FOLLOW THAT INSTRUCTION? 13 MR. CLEWS: YES. 14 MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY KIND 15 OF A CON SCHEME? 16 MR. CLEWS: NO. 17

MR. WAPNER: TELL ME ABOUT ~- CAN YOU ELABORATE ON YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT HOW THE POLICE HANDLED THE BURGLARIES AND THE CAR THEFTS.

MR. CLEWS: I THINK THEY DID WHAT THEY COULD, GIVEN THEIR RESOURCES AND THAT WAS IT.

MR. WAPNER: WERE YOU AT THE HOUSE WHENTHEY CAME TO TAKE THE REPORT ON THE BURGLARIES?

MR. CLEWS: YES.

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU REMEMBER FEELING ANY ANIMOSITY
TOWARDS THOSE POLICE OFFICERS?

MR. CLEWS: NO, NO, NO.

MR. WAPNER: CAN YOU DECIDE THIS CASE, THE GUILT OR

INNOCENCE OF THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE WITHOUT REFERENCE 1 TO WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN TO HIM IF YOU FIND HIM GUILTY? 2 MR. CLEWS: RIGHT. 3 MR. WAPNER: THAT WON'T BE A PROBLEM FOR YOU? 4 MR. CLEWS: NO. 5 MR. WAPNER: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT PEOPLE WHO TESTIFY 6 UNDER A GRANT OF IMMUNITY? 7 MR. CLEWS: I WOULD THINK ABOUT IT. 8 MR. WAPNER: WHAT WOULD YOU THINK? 9 MR. CLEWS: THAT IT IS A LITTLE -- I WOULD WATCH IT 10 VERY CLOSELY, WATCH WHAT THEY SAID VERY CLOSELY. 11 MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU WANT TO KNOW, FOR EXAMPLE, WHY 12 THEY WERE GIVEN IMMUNITY? 13 MR. CLEWS: YES. 14 MR. WAPNER: RIGHT. AND DO YOU HAVE ANY OPINIONS ON 15 THE SUBJECT GENERALLY? 16 MR. CLEWS: WELL, I WISH 1T DIDN'T HAVE TO BE. 17 MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU READ ANYTHING IN THE PAPERS 18 RECENTLY ABOUT IT OR ABOUT PEOPLE BEING --19 MR. CLEWS: WELL, ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON IN WASHINGTON. 20 MR. WAPNER: RIGHT. 21 AND THERE WAS SOMETHING IN THE PAPER MORE RECENTLY 22 ABOUT THE MURDER THAT HAPPENED HERE A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO 23 OF THE BASKETBALL PLAYER WHO GOT KILLED. 24 MR. CLEWS: OH, YEAH. 25

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU HAPPEN TO CATCH THAT?

MR. CLEWS: YES I DID, AS A MATTER OF FACT, YEAH.

MR. WAPNER: AND DO YOU THINK THAT THERE ARE TIMES WHEN

28

26

IT IS NECESSARY? MR. CLEWS: WELL, THAT WAS A GOOD CASE RIGHT THERE, YEAH. MR. WAPNER: IN EXAMINING THE TESTIMONY OF SOMEONE WHO TESTIFIED UNDER A GRANT OF IMMUNITY, WOULD YOU USE THE SAME STANDARD, THE SAME SCALE IN EVALUATING HIS TESTIMONY AS THE TESTIMONY OF OTHER WITNESSES? MR. CLEWS: YES. MR. WAPNER: IN OTHER WORDS, I AM NOT SAYING HOW MUCH VALUE YOU WOULD GIVE TO THE TESTIMONY, BUT WOULD YOU USE THE SAME STANDARD TO MEASURE HIS TESTIMONY? MR. CLEWS: OH, YES, YES, YES. MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU DO THAT FOR ALL OF THE WITNESSES WHO TESTIFIED IN THE CASE? MR. CLEWS: YES. MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY DIFFICULTY WITH THAT IDEA? MR. CLEWS: NO. MR. WAPNER: PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THE DEFENDANT'S PEREMPTORY. (UNREPORTED COLLOQUY BETWEEN MR. BARENS, MR. CHIER AND THE DEFENDANT.)

MR. BARENS: ONE MOMENT, YOUR HONOR. 1 THE COURT: IT IS ALL RIGHT. 2 (PAUSE.) 3 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE DEFENSE WOULD THANK AND 4 EXCUSE NUMBER 11, MS. JOHNSON. 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, MS. JOHNSON. 6 (PROSPECTIVE JUROR JOHNSON EXITED THE 7 COURTROOM.) 8 THE CLERK: MARJORIE GOOLEY, G-O-O-L-E-Y. THE COURT: MISS GOOLEY, I WILL ASK YOU THE QUESTION 10 I ASK EVERY WITNESS WHO TAKES THE PLACE OF ANOTHER WHO HAS 11 BEEN EXCUSED. YOU TOO, HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE QUESTIONS ASKED 12 AND ANSWERS GIVEN? 13 MS. GOOLEY: RIGHT. 14 THE COURT: IF THE SAME GENERAL QUESTIONS WERE ASKED 15 OF YOU, YOUR ANSWERS WOULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME? 16 MS. GOOLEY: YES. 17 THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU DO, PLEASE? 18 MS. GOOLEY: I AM AN EXECUTIVE SECRETARY. 19 THE COURT: BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED? 20 MS. GOOLEY: BOEING COMPANY. 21 THE COURT: BOEING UP IN SEATTLE? 22 MS. GOOLEY: THEY ARE. 23 THE COURT: THEY HAVE GOT OFFICES DOWN HERE, TOO? 24 MS. GOOLEY: YES. 25 THE COURT: AND YOU ARE AN EXECUTIVE SECRETARY TO WHOM,

THE RESIDENT MANAGER? IS THAT RIGHT? 27

MS. GOOLEY: YES. 28

28

MS. GOOLEY: THE YOUNGEST IS A FRESHMAN AT LOYOLA THE COURT: AND WHAT WAS YOUR FORMAL EDUCATION? MS. GOOLEY: I HAVE A BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT LACROSSE. THE COURT: AND YOUR HUSBAND?

THE COURT: AND THE JURY REACHED A VERDICT IN THAT CASE?

MS. GOOLEY: YES.

THE COURT: UH-HUH. HOW LONG AGO WAS THAT?

MS. GOOLEY: I THINK IT WAS '82.

THE COURT: AND HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY

KIND OF A SERIOUS CRIME?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MS. GOOLEY: NO.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

GOOD AFTERNOON, MS. GOOLEY.

MS. GOOLEY: GOOD AFTERNOON.

MR. BARENS: YOU KNOW MS. GOOLEY, I WILL GO RIGHT INTO

YOUR JURY EXPERIENCE.

MS. GOOLEY: YES.

MR. BARENS: IT NEVER WOULD HAVE OCCURRED TO YOU THAT

MR. BARENS: HOW LONG FROM THE TIME YOU WERE FIRST ON THE JURY PANEL BEING SELECTED UNTIL THE VERDICT WAS REACHED? HOW LONG DID THAT TAKE?

MS. GOOLEY: IT WAS A VERY SHORT CASE. IT ONLY LASTED FIVE DAYS, I BELIEVE. IT WAS FIVE OR SIX DAYS.

MR. BARENS: FROM THIS PART OF THE PROCESS TO THE VERDICT?

MS. GOOLEY: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: AND WAS IT A JURY THAT CAME TO A DECISION SOMEWHAT ON THE FIRST GO-AROUND, THAT EVERYONE SEEMED TO HAVE THEIR MINDS PRETTY WELL MADE UP WHEN THEY RETIRED?

MS. GOOLEY: NO. I THINK WE DELIBERATED A WHOLE DAY.

IT WAS NOT UNANIMOUS.

MR. BARENS: DID YOU BY THE TIME YOU CAST YOUR FINAL BALLOT, HAVE THE SAME ATTITUDE OR OPINION ABOUT THE GUILT OR INNOCENCE THAT YOU DID FROM THE TIME YOU CAME IN TO START DELIBERATING, AS YOU DID AT THE END?

MS. GOOLEY: I DID.

MR. BARENS: AND YOU FOLKS REACHED A UNANIMOUS VERDICT?

MS. GOOLEY: YES. I MUST SAY THAT I WAS ON ONE TOUR

OF JURY DUTY. BUT I DID SERVE ON TWO CASES. AND ON THE OTHER

CASE, IT WAS A DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE CASE. IT WAS IN

THE MUNICIPAL COURT, I BELIEVE.

MS. BARENS: RIGHT.

MS. GOOLEY: AND ON THAT CASE, WE DID NOT REACH A VERDICT.

MR. BARENS: I SEE. YOU HAD WHAT MIGHT BE CALLED A

HUNG JURY?

MS. GOOLEY: RIGHT.

FELT.

28

4 B

MR. BARENS: RIGHT. THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS, THAT YOUR ONLY OBLIGATION IS TO VOTE YOUR CONSCIENCE AS YOU SEE IT AS AN INDIVIDUAL. YOU DON'T HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO FACILITATE THINGS FOR OTHER JURORS.

MS. GOOLEY: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: NOW, YOU KNOW THAT YOU HAVE AN OBLIGATION MEANINGFULLY TO DIALOGUE WITH THE OTHER JURORS IN TRYING TO REACH A DECISION. BUT SHOULD YOU DISAGREE, YOU ARE ENTITLED TO HOLD TO YOUR VIEWS.

MS. GOOLEY: CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: ARE YOU COMFORTABLE WITH THAT?

MS. GOOLEY: YES.

MR. BARENS: ASIDE FROM THOSE TWO CASES, DID YOU HAVE ANY OTHER JURY EXPERIENCE?

MS. GOOLEY: NO I DID NOT.

MR. BARENS: THE ATTEMPTED MURDER CASE, HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT THE WAY THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND DEFENSE COUNSEL PERFORMED THEIR JOBS?

MS. GOOLEY: I WAS FAVORABLY IMPRESSED WITH BOTH SIDES.

I THOUGHT THEY BOTH PRESENTED THE CASE, THE EVIDENCE THAT

THEY HAD.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. IN THAT SECOND DRUNK DRIVING MATTER, WHAT WAS YOUR OPINION OF COUNSEL'S PERFORMANCE?

MS. GOOLEY: WELL, I THOUGHT IT WAS VERY GOOD.

MR. BARENS: YOU DID?

MS. GOOLEY: YES I DID.

MR. BARENS: YOU DIDN'T THINK PERHAPS IN THAT CASE,
THAT THE DEFENSE COUNSEL HAD NO POSITION AT ALL AND WAS

JUST BEATING A DEAD HORSE? MS. GOOLEY: NO. THEY BOTH HAD DIFFERENT POSITIONS. THEY BOTH DID THE BEST WITH WHAT EVIDENCE THEY HAD. MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THE STANDARD OF PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT IS WHAT WE WILL BE DOING WITHIN THIS CASE? MS. GOOLEY: YES. MR. BARENS: NOW, YOU NEED TO RESPOND AUDIBLY, MS. GOOLEY. MS. GOOLEY: YES.

MR. BARENS: YOUR ANSWER WAS YES? 1 2 MS. GOOLEY: YES. MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. IN THAT PRESUMPTION OF 3 INNOCENCE. DID YOU FEEL HONESTLY DURING THE ATTEMPTED MURDER 4 TRIAL, THAT THE DEFENDANT STILL IN YOUR MIND, THE PRESUMPTION 5 OF INNOCENCE PRIOR TO THE TIME THE DEFENDANT PUT ON A CASE? 6 7 MS. GOOLEY: YES. MR. BARENS: I AM HOPING WHEN I ASK YOU THAT QUESTION, 8 THE DEFENDANT DID PUT ON A CASE. 10 MS. GOOLEY: YES. MR. BARENS: DID THE DEFENDANT TESTIFY IN THAT CASE? 11 12 MS. GOOLEY: YES. MR. BARENS: AND DID YOU FIND THAT YOU HAD AT ALL, 13 PREJUDGED HIS TESTIMONY BEFORE HE GOT ON THE STAND? 14 15 MS. GOOLEY: NO. 16 MR. BARENS: HAD YOU ANTICIPATED HIS TESTIMONY OR DID 17 YOU JUST LISTEN TO IT, AS IT WAS ARTICULATED? 18 MS. GOOLEY: I LISTENED TO IT. MR. BARENS: AND YOU FOUND YOU WERE ABLE TO DO SO 19 20 OPEN-MINDED? 21 MS. GOOLEY: YES. 22 MR. BARENS: DID YOU FEEL YOU WERE CAPABLE OF BEING 23 AS OPEN-MINDED WITH THAT DEFENDANT TESTIFYING AS YOU WERE SAY, WHEN SOME WITNESS TO THE ALLEGED CRIME HAD TESTIFIED? 24 25 MS. GOOLEY: YES. 26 MR. BARENS: YOU REALLY DID? 27 MS. GOOLEY: YES I DID.

MR. BARENS: DID THE DEFENDANT IN THE DRUNK DRIVING

```
CASE TESTIFY?
1
           MS. GOOLEY: YES.
2
           MR. BARENS: WAS HE ABLE TO MAKE HIS WAY TO THE STAND?
3
           MS. GOOLEY: YES.
           MR. BARENS: AND DID YOU FEEL THAT HE STILL HAD A
5
     PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AFTER THEY PUT THAT BREATHALYZER
6
     IN?
7
           MS. GOOLEY: YES.
8
           MR. BARENS: YOU DID? YOU WANTED TO HEAR HIS SIDE OF
9
     THE STORY?
10
          MS. GOOLEY: I DID.
11
          MR. BARENS: OKAY. YOU KNOW FROM THAT EXPERIENCE THEN,
12
     THAT ONE OF THE REALLY FUNDAMENTAL THINGS WE LIKE TO DO OR
13
     ATTEMPT TO DO AS BEST WE CAN AS HUMANS IS LISTEN TO ALL OF
14
     THE EVIDENCE BEFORE WE START COMING TO A CONCLUSION. IS THAT
15
     CORRECT?
16
          MS. GOOLEY: YES.
17
           MR. BARENS: IS THAT BECAUSE THE TRIAL IS NOT OVER UNTIL
18
     THE LAST WORD IS SPOKEN?
19
           MS. GOOLEY: RIGHT.
20
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. NOW, PRIOR TO YOUR BECOMING
21
     AN EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, DID YOU HAVE A DIFFERENT FORM OF
22
     EMPLOYMENT?
23
           MS. GOOLEY: I TAUGHT SCHOOL EARLY IN MY CAREER. THEN
24
     I STAYED HOME FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS, RAISING MY CHILDREN.
25
     I HAVE BEEN WORKING NOW EIGHT YEARS.
26
           MR. BARENS: WHAT SORT OF SCHOOL DID YOU TEACH, GRAMMAR
27
```

SCHOOL?

```
MS. GOOLEY: YEAH, GRAMMAR SCHOOL.
1
           MR. BARENS: THAT WAS HERE IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA?
2
           MS. GOOLEY: YEAH.
3
           MR. BARENS: AND YOUR HUSBAND DOES WHAT AT HUGHES, MA'AM?
4
           MS. GOOLEY: HE MANAGES A DIVISION IN THE SPACE AND
5
     COMMUNICATIONS GROUP.
6
           MR. BARENS: IN SPACE COMMUNICATIONS GROUP?
7
           MS. GOOLEY: YES.
8
           MR. BARENS: AND DID HE HAVE A DIFFERENT TYPE OF
9
     EMPLOYMENT OR PROFESSION PRIOR TO THIS ACTIVITY?
10
           MS. GOOLEY: NO.
11
           MR. BARENS: HE HAS ALWAYS BEEN IN THE AEROSPACE
12
     INDUSTRY?
13
           MS. GOOLEY: YES, ALWAYS BEEN IN AEROSPACE.
14
           MR. BARENS: DO YOU HAVE ANY HOBBIES OR ACTIVITIES?
15
           MS. GOOLEY: I DO. I DON'T HAVE AS MANY THAT I PURSUE
16
     NOW AS I USED TO HAVE. I DON'T HAVE A LOT OF TIME.
17
                I ENJOY A LOT OF THINGS, A LOT OF THINGS AROUND
18
     THE HOME, ARTSY-CRAFTSY THINGS AND ENTERTAINING.
19
           MR. BARENS: DO YOU MEAN BY THAT THAT YOU SIMPLY DON'T
20
     HAVE THE TIME FOR ANY LONGER --
21
           MS. GOOLEY: WELL, I USED TO DO MORE ART-RELATED THINGS.
22
     I USED TO PARTICIPATE MORE IN SPORTS ACTIVITIES AND THOSE
23
     SORTS OF THINGS. I DON'T DO THAT NOW.
24
           MR. BARENS: ANY PARTICULAR SPORT?
25
           MS. GOOLEY: TENNIS.
26
           MR. BARENS: AND IN ARTS, WAS THERE A PARTICULAR
27
```

ARTISTIC ENDEAVOR?

MS. GOOLEY: JUST DRAWING AND PAINTING AND THOSE SORTS OF THINGS. MR. BARENS: ANY PARTICULAR TYPE? MS. GOOLEY: I HAVE VERY LITTLE TIME NOW. MR. BARENS: ANY PARTICULAR TYPE OF SUBJECT YOU LIKED TO PAINT? MS. GOOLEY: NO. MR. BARENS: DO I RECALL THAT YOU TOLD ME THAT YOU READ SOMETHING ABOUT THIS CASE? MS. GOOLEY: I DID. MR. BARENS: AND COULD YOU TELL US AS YOU SIT THERE TODAY, AS I ASKED MR. CLEWS A MOMENT AGO, THAT YOU TRUTHFULLY COULD GIVE THE DEFENDANT A FAIR TRIAL, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHAT YOU READ? MS. GOOLEY: I FEEL I COULD.

25 F

MR. BARENS: DO YOU HAVE ANY RESERVATION WHATSOEVER 1 THAT MIGHT MAKE YOU HESITATE IN THAT ANSWER? 2 MS. GOOLEY: NO, I HAVE NONE. 3 MR. BARENS: AND YOU DON'T FEEL I WOULD HAVE TO SORT OF HAVE AN UPHILL BATTLE WITH YOU IN TERMS OF HAVING TO OVER-COME SOME SUSPICION OR DOUBT YOU MIGHT HAVE AS A RESULT OF 6 7 WHAT YOU READ? 8 MS. GOOLEY: NO. MR. BARENS: DO YOU MEAN THAT SINCERELY? 9 MS. GOOLEY: I DO MEAN THAT SINCERELY. 10 MR. BARENS: DO YOU BELONG TO ANY ORGANIZATIONS OR CLUBS? 11 MS. GOOLEY: I DON'T NOW. 12 IN THE PAST, I HAVE. 13 MR. BARENS: AND WHAT WOULD THOSE HAVE BEEN? 14 MS. GOOLEY: OH, LIKE UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S CLUB, THE 15 16 AAUW. MR. BARENS: I AM SORRY. YOU MEAN THE AMATEUR ATHLETIC 17 18 WOMEN? 19 MS. GOOLEY: NO. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN. 20 I BELONGED TO PTA AND WAS A GIRL SCOUT LEADER AND 21 ALL OF THOSE SORTS OF THINGS THAT ARE ORGANIZATIONS. 22 MR. BARENS: WHAT IS THE LAST BOOK YOU READ? 23 MS. GOOLEY: THE LAST BOOK I READ WAS "THE OLD MAN IN 24 25 THE SEA," A SHORT ONE. (LAUGHTER IN THE COURTROOM.) 26 MR. BARENS: WE ARE GETTING TO THAT WITH THIS JURY 27

SELECTION. WE ARE GETTING ALONG.

25

26

27

28

AND WHAT ABOUT THE LAST MOVIE YOU SAW? 1 MS. GOOLEY: WELL, I SAW FOUR MOVIES THE WEEK BETWEEN 2 3 CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEARS AND THE LAST ONE WAS "CHILDREN OF A 4 LESSER GOD". MR. BARENS: OF THE FOUR MOVIES THAT YOU SAW, WHICH ONE 5 6 CAUGHT YOUR ATTENTION THE MOST? 7 MS. GOOLEY: WELL, I LIKED THEM ALL FOR DIFFERENT 8 REASONS. MR. BARENS: THERE WAS NONE OF THE FOUR THAT PARTICULARLY 9 10 STOOD OUT IN YOUR MIND? MS. GOOLEY: I LIKED THE LAST ONE VERY MUCH, "CHILDREN 11 12 OF A LESSER GOD". MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. THAT DOESN'T GIVE ME ANYTHING 13 14 TO WORK WITH. MS. GOOLEY: I REALLY ENJOYED THEM ALL FOR DIFFERENT 15 16 REASONS. MR. BARENS: MRS. GOOLEY, WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE 17 FACT THAT IF THERE ARE COMPETING INFERENCES, IF THE SAME FACT 18 19 SITUATION THAT YOU HEAR TESTIMONY ON LEAVES A CLOSE CALL, 20 WOULD YOU TRY TO GUESS ABOUT WHICH ONE WOULD BE RIGHT OR WOULD 21 YOU BE LEFT WITH A NOT-PROVEN? 22 MS. GOOLEY: I WOULD BE LEFT WITH NOT-PROVEN. 23

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. YOU KNOW WE HAVE HEARD TALK
TODAY, AS WE GLIBLY TALK ABOUT, YOU KNOW, ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE,
AND THE IMPLICATION OF ALL OF THAT IS, OF COURSE, YOU ARE NOT
SUPPOSED TO THINK ABOUT ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE. YOU ARE
SUPPOSED TO LOOK FOR SOME OBVIOUS ANSWER AND IF YOU DO THAT,
WE TELL YOU YOU ARE REASONABLE. I AM NOT TELLING YOU THAT.

I WILL TELL YOU WHY.

COULD YOU UNDERSTAND THAT TO LOOK AT, TO FAIRLY

CONSIDER ALL OF THE EVIDENCE THAT IS GIVEN TO YOU, YOU HAVE

TO LOOK AT EVERYTHING THAT IS POSSIBLE BASED ON THAT EVIDENCE?

MS. GOOLEY: YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. GOOLEY: RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: AND IF YOU DON'T LOOK AT EVERYTHING THAT

IS POSSIBLE BASED ON THE EVIDENCE YOU ARE GIVEN, THEN YOU

HAVEN'T FAIRLY CONSIDERED ALL OF THE EVIDENCE TO MAKE A

DECISION; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

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

MR. BARENS: I DON'T THINK ANYBODY IS SAYING TO YOU AS

A JUROR "WELL, WE WANT YOU TO THINK ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE."

YOU ARE CERTAINLY ENTITLED TO DO THAT BECAUSE YOU

COULD BELIEVE THAT PERHAPS NEITHER SIDE WOULD GIVE YOU ANY
EVIDENCE UPON WHICH YOU WOULD BE ABLE TO MAKE A DECISION; DO
YOU UNDERSTAND THAT POSSIBILITY?

MS. GOOLEY: YES.

MR. BARENS: IN OTHER WORDS, JUST BECAUSE THE GOVERNMENT PUTS ON WITNESSES THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO CONVICT THE DEFENDANT AND THE DEFENDANT PUTS ON WITNESSES THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO EXONERATE HIM OR AT LEAST EXPLAIN THE BEST THE DEFENSE KNOWS WHAT IS HAPPENING, DO YOU UNDERSTAND YOU MIGHT NOT BE SATISFIED WITH EITHER AS HAVING GIVEN YOU SOMETHING YOU COULD RELY UPON AS BEING AN EXPLANATION FOR WHAT ALLEGEDLY OCCURRED; COULD YOU ACCEPT THAT?

25A

MS. GOOLEY: I COULD.

MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU DO THAT IN TERMS OF MR. HUNT

DOWN THERE?

MS. GOOLEY: THE VERDICT HAS TO GO TO THE DEFENDANT.

MR. BARENS: NOT GUILTY, NOT PROVEN.

MS. GOOLEY: NOT PROVEN GUILTY.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, MRS. GOOLEY.

3

2

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MR. WAPNER.

4

MR. WAPNER: MRS. GOOLEY, DID YOU THINK WE WOULD EVER

PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.

5

GET TO YOU?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MS. GOOLEY: OKAY.

DO YOU ACCEPT THE FACT THAT YOU COULD DELIBERATE ON THE CASE, FAIRLY CONSIDER ALL OF THE EVIDENCE, DECIDE THAT IT MIGHT BE A CLOSE QUESTION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT IT IS PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT OR NOT AND STILL DECIDE THAT IT HAS BEEN PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT?

MS. GOOLEY: WELL, I DON'T THINK IT COULD BE CLOSE.

I THINK IT WOULD HAVE TO BE PROVEN.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. MAYBE THIS IS JUST LAWYER'S QUIBBLING ABOUT WORDS AND I SHOULDN'T WORRY ABOUT IT BUT I GUESS EVERYONE, EVERY JUROR IN THEIR OWN MIND WILL HAVE TO DECIDE WHAT IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AND EXACTLY WHAT EVIDENCE TIPS THE SCALES FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL PERSON, YOU NEVER REALLY KNOW.

MS. GOOLEY: RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: BUT CAN YOU FORESEE A SITUATION WHERE YOU ARE NOT SURE WHETHER IT IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT OR NOT AND YOU CONSIDER THE EVIDENCE AND YOU THINK ABOUT IT AND AFTER MORE CONSIDERATION YOU DECIDE THAT IT IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT?

MS. GOOLEY: REPHRASE THAT ONE. I AM NOT --

MR. WAPNER: I THINK I AM PROBABLY WORRYING ABOUT SOMETHING THAT MAYBE I SHOULDN'T WORRY ABOUT.

LET ME JUST GO ON TO SOMETHING ELSE.

1 MR. WAPNER: ON THE JURY THAT YOU SAT ON, THE DRIVING 2 UNDER THE INFLUENCE CASE THAT WAS HUNG --3 MS. GOOLEY: YES. 4 MR. WAPNER: -- DID YOU THINK THAT ALL 11 PEOPLE MADE 5 AN HONEST EFFORT TO TRY AND REACH A VERDICT? 6 MS. GOOLEY: I THOUGHT 11 DID. 7 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND THE OTHER PERSON, WAS HE 8 DISCUSSING THE EVIDENCE, DID YOU THINK? 9 MS. GOOLEY: NO. 10 I THOUGHT HE WAS COMING AT IT MORE FROM AN 11 EMOTIONAL VIEW, YOU KNOW. 12 I THINK HE REALLY FELT THAT HE COULDN'T IN JUST 13 CONSCIENCE FIND ANYBODY GUILTY OF ANYTHING; THAT IS REALLY 14 WHAT IT AMOUNTED TO IN THE FINAL. 15 HE DIDN'T REALLY HAVE VERY VALID REASONS FOR HIS 16 POSITION. 17 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK THAT THAT WAS THE POSITION 18 THAT HE -- OR A WAY THAT HE FELT BEFORE HE EVEN STARTED TO 19 HEAR THE CASE? 20 MS. GOOLEY: UH-HUH. 21 MR. WAPNER: SAY YES. 22 MS. GOOLEY: YES, 1 DO. 23 MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T HAVE TO SAY YES BECAUSE HE SAID 24 YOU SHOULD. 25 (LAUGHTER IN COURTROOM.) 26 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, MR. BARENS. 27

THE REASON WE KEEP DOING THAT IS SO THAT IT IS

EASIER FOR THE REPORTER TO WRITE IT DOWN.

1 MS. GOOLEY: YES, I UNDERSTAND. 2 I AM BAD ABOUT MUMBLING. 3 MR. WAPNER: YOU HAVE TOLD US THAT WHEN WE WERE ASKING 4 YOU QUESTIONS ON THE DEATH PENALTY THAT YOU IDENTIFIED WITH 5 HARVARD AND WITH THE MAYS; COULD YOU ELABORATE ON THAT A LITTLE 6 BIT? 7 MS. GOOLEY: ONLY BECAUSE THEY WERE THE TWO KNOWN TO 8 ME IN THE ARTICLE. I KNEW OF HARVARD SCHOOL AND 1 KNEW OF 9 THE MAY COMPANY AND THAT WAS THE ONLY ASSOCIATION THAT I HAVE 10 OTHER THAN THAT. 11 MR. WAPNER: DID ANY OF YOUR KIDS GO TO HARVARD SCHOOL? 12 MS. GOOLEY: NO, THEY DID NOT. 13 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU KNOW ANYBODY WHOSE CHILDREN --14 MS. GOOLEY: YES. 15 MR. WAPLER: -- WENT TO HARVARD SCHOOL? 16 MS. GOOLEY: YES, ONE FAMILY. 17 MR. WAPNER: HOW OLD ARE THEIR CHILDREN NOW, THE ONES 18 WHO WENT TO HARVARD SCHOOL? 19 MS. GOOLEY: TWENTY-ONE. 20 MR. WAPNER: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE IDEA THAT YOU 21 COULD HAVE A MURDER WITHOUT A BODY? 22 MS. GOOLEY: I CAN ACCEPT THAT. 23 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK THAT IF YOU ARE SATISFIED 24 BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT A MURDER WAS COMMITTED AND 25 THAT THE DEFENDANT DID IT, THAT HE SHOULD BE REWARDED FOR 26 BEING CLEVER ENOUGH TO SOMEHOW DISPOSE OF THE BODY? 27 MS. GOOLEY: DO I THINK HE SHOULD BE REWARDED? NO.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. HAVE YOU BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY KIND

```
1
     OF A CON SCHEME?
2
           MS. GOOLEY:
                       NO.
3
           MR. WAPNER:
                       ANY KIND OF A CRIME AT ALL?
4
           MS. GOOLEY: JUST, YOU KNOW, BREAKING INTO MY CAR FOR
5
     THE RADIO AND SOME MINOR THINGS LIKE THAT, STOLEN BICYCLES.
6
           MR. WAPNER:
                        ON THE OCCASION WHEN YOUR CAR WAS BROKEN
7
     INTO, DID YOU MAKE A REPORT TO THE POLICE?
8
           MS. GOOLEY:
                       YES, WE DID.
9
           MR. WAPNER: WERE YOU SATISFIED WITH HOW IT WAS HANDLED?
10
           MS. GOOLEY: YES, I THINK THEY DID ALL THEY COULD.
           MR. WAPNER: DID YOU LISTEN TO THE EXAMPLES THAT WERE
11
12
     GIVEN AND THE ANSWERS THAT WERE GIVEN TO THE VARIOUS EXAMPLES
     WE HAVE HAD ABOUT TYPES OF EVIDENCE?
13
14
           MS. GOOLEY: YES.
15
           MR. WAPNER: COULD YOU HEAR ALL OF THE ANSWERS?
16
           MS. GOOLEY: FOR THE MOST PART.
17
           MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK THAT ALL THOSE PEOPLE WHO GAVE
18
     THOSE ANSWERS WERE BEING REASONABLE OR DID SOME OF THOSE
19
     ANSWERS SEEM MORE REASONABLE TO YOU THAN OTHERS?
20
           MS. GOOLEY: SOME SEEMED MORE REASONABLE THAN OTHERS.
21
           MR. WAPNER: DID SOME SEEM FAR-FETCHED TO YOU?
22
           MS. GOOLEY: A LITTLE.
23
           MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.
24
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THE PEOPLE'S PEREMPTORY.
25
           MR. WAPNER: MAY I HAVE JUST A MOMENT, PLEASE?
26
           THE COURT:
                       SURELY.
27
          MR. WAPNER: WE WOULD THANK AND ASK THE COURT TO EXCUSE
28
     JUROR NUMBER 9, MR. CLEWS.
```

THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. CLEWS.

THE CLERK: LINDA MICKELL, M-I-C-K-E-L-L.

MR. WAPNER: MAY WE APPROACH THE BENCH, PLEASE?

THE COURT: YES.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD

AT THE BENCH:)

THE COURT: THAT IS THE ONE I TOLD YOU ABOUT?

MR. BARENS: YES. COULD I SEE THE NOTE NOW?

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, BECAUSE OF THIS NOTE AND
BECAUSE OF THE HOUR, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT WOULD BE
APPROPRIATE TO EXCUSE THE OTHER JURORS NOW AND INQUIRE OF
THIS WOMAN OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE OTHER JURORS ABOUT
THE SUBSTANCE OF THIS NOTE.

THE COURT: WHY DON'T WE -- DOESN'T THAT CALL ATTENTION
TO THE OTHER JURORS THE FACT THAT SHE HAS BEEN SINGLED OUT
FOR SOMETHING? WHY DON'T I ASK HER TO STAY AND ASK HER OTHER
QUESTIONS.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, EVEN WITHOUT INQUIRING, THE FACT THAT HER BROTHER IS FRIENDS WITH THE VICTIM, SHE IS IN A POSITION TO SAY THAT HER BROTHER SAID THAT HE HAS NOT HEARD FROM HIM IN A COUPLE OF YEARS. THAT WOULD MAKE HER BELIEVE THAT SOMETHING HAPPENED TO HIM. HER OWN BROTHER --

THE COURT: WELL, IT DOES NOT DISQUALIFY HER FROM BECOMING A JUROR.

MR. BARENS: WELL, --

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO EXCUSE HER?

MR. BARENS: I DO.

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT HER EXCUSED?

MR. WAPNER: I DON'T THINK IT IS ENOUGH TO, NO. I NEED

TO KNOW MORE FACTS. I WOULD LIKE TO INQUIRE ABOUT THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NOTE.

MR. BARENS: DOES YOUR HONOR HAVE AN OPINION?

THE COURT: I HAVE NO OPINION, NO.

MR. BARENS: YOU DON'T THINK THE NOTE IS DISQUALIFYING IN ITSELF?

THE COURT: NO, NOT AT ALL.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. WELL, LET'S DO THIS, YOUR HONOR.

IT IS 4:20.

WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE TO ASK HER, THE GENERAL

QUESTIONS? THEN YOU RELEASE THE JURY THEN OR DO YOU WANT

TO -- I WOULDN'T MIND PUTTING IT OVER UNTIL TOMORROW MORNING

AND INQUIRING OF HER THEN, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: INQUIRE OF HER, YOU MEAN?

MR. BARENS: YES.

THE COURT: WHY DON'T -- I TELL YOU WHAT I WILL DO.
WHY DON'T I ASK HER THE USUAL QUESTIONS AND THEN I WILL
DECLARE A RECESS.

MR. BARENS: IF YOU WOULD.

THE COURT: AND THEN WE CAN HAVE HER COME IN TOMORROW MORNING IN CHAMBERS.

MR. BARENS: I WOULD PREFER THAT.

MR. WAPNER: THAT'S ALL RIGHT.

THE COURT: WELL, WHAT IS IT THAT YOU WANT?

MR. WAPNER: NO. THE ONLY FEELING IS THAT IF WE HAD

THE INFORMATION TONIGHT, I MIGHT BE IN A BETTER POSITION TO --

THE COURT: WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE? WE CAN GET HER IN TOMORROW.

1 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. MR. BARENS: I WOULD LIKE TO CONTEMPLATE IT. 2 THE COURT: SURE. 3 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD 4 IN OPEN COURT:) 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MS. MICKELL, YOU TOO, HAVE HEARD 6 ALL OF THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WHICH WERE ASKED AND GIVEN? 7 MS. MICKELL: YES I HAVE. 8 THE COURT: IF THE SAME GENERAL QUESTIONS WERE ASKED 9 10 OF YOU, WOULD YOUR ANSWERS BE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME? MS. MICKELL: YES IT WOULD. 11 THE COURT: AND WHAT DO YOU DO, PLEASE? 12 MS. MICKELL: I AM RETIRED FROM A BUSINESS I OWNED. 13 THE COURT: WHAT KIND OF A BUSINESS WAS THAT? 14 MS. MICKELL: I WAS A FLORAL DESIGNER. I HAVE MY OWN 15 16 FLORAL DESIGN STUDIO. THE COURT: AND IS THERE A MR. MICKELL? 17 MS. MICKELL: YES THERE IS. 18 THE COURT: AND WHAT DOES HE DO? 19 MS. MICKELL: HE IS A BUSINESS EXECUTIVE WITH HIS OWN 20 21 COMPANY. 22 THE COURT: HIS OWN COMPANY? 23 MS. MICKELL: YES. 24 THE COURT: WHAT KIND OF A BUSINESS IS THAT? 25 MS. MICKELL: HE OWNS ORTHO MATTRESS COMPANY. THE COURT: OF COURSE, YOU KNOW ME, DON'T YOU? 26 27 MS. MICKELL: I HAVE MET YOU TEN YEARS AGO. BUT I DIDN'T KNOW IF YOU WOULD REMEMBER THAT. I AM IMPRESSED THAT YOU 28

```
REMEMBER.
1
           THE COURT: HE HAS TWO BROTHERS IN BUSINESS WITH HIM?
2
           MS. MICKELL: YES. HE IS IN BUSINESS WITH HIS BROTHERS.
3
           THE COURT: I THINK I MET YOU THROUGH MR. ARNIE COHN,
4
     DIDN'T 1?
5
           MS. MICKELL: YES, THAT'S CORRECT.
6
           THE COURT: WHAT IS YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND?
7
           MS. MICKELL: I HAVE A BACHELOR'S DEGREE FROM UCLA IN
8
     PSYCHOLOGY.
9
           THE COURT: PSYCHOLOGY?
10
           MS. MICKELL: YES.
11
           THE COURT: AND YOUR HUSBAND?
12
           MS. MICKELL: HE ALSO HAS A BACHELOR'S DEGREE FROM UCLA.
13
           THE COURT: HOW MANY CHILDREN DO YOU HAVE?
14
                         WE HAVE TWO AND WE LOST ONE CHILD.
           MS. MICKELL:
15
           THE COURT: AND YOU LOST ONE CHILD?
16
           MS. MICKELL: UH-HUH.
17
           THE COURT: HOW DID YOU LOSE IT?
18
           MS. MICKELL: BRAIN TUMOR.
19
           THE COURT: HOW OLD WAS HE?
20
           MS. MICKELL: SHE WAS 12.
21
           THE COURT: WHAT DO THE OTHER TWO CHILDREN DO?
22
                         THE OTHER TWO ARE BOTH GIRLS. ONE HAS
           MS. MICKELL:
23
     JUST GRADUATED FROM USC. THE OTHER ONE IS AT BOSTON
24
     UNIVERSITY.
25
           THE COURT: AND HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY
26
     SERIOUS CRIME?
27
```

MS. MICKELL:

28

NO.

THE COURT: AND HAVE YOU EVER SERVED AS A JUROR IN A CRIMINAL CASE?

MS. MICKELL: NO. THIS IS MY FIRST EXPERIENCE.

THE COURT: WELL, I THINK BEFORE YOU BEGIN, I WOULD RATHER HAVE A RECESS. WE WILL TAKE THE ADJOURNMENT AT THIS TIME.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, WE WILL TAKE OUR ADJOURNMENT AT THIS TIME UNTIL TOMORROW MORNING.

WHAT HAVE WE GOT TOMORROW?

THE CLERK: 10:30 IS GOOD, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I WILL ASK YOU TO RETURN

TOMORROW MORNING AT 10:30. ALL OF YOU GO INTO THE JURY

ASSEMBLY ROOM. WHEN WE ARE READY FOR YOU HERE, WE'LL ASK

YOU TO COME IN.

GOOD NIGHT.

(AT 4:25 P.M. AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1987, AT 10:30 A.M.)