88D A0269

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,	OCT () 3 1989
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

STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL 3580 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD

ROOM 800

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90010

FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT: IN PROPRIA PERSONA

VOLUME 36 OF 101 (PAGES 5477 TO 5594 , 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 TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1987

VOLUME 36

PAGES 5477 TO 5594, 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	TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1987	VOLUME 36	PAGES 5477 TO	5594
2		A.M.		5477
3		P.M.		5546
4				
5	PRO	CEEDINGS		
6	110	, CLED 11405		
7	VOIR DIRE OF ALTERNATE JUROR	s (CONTINUED)		5477
8	MOTIONS			5546
9				
10				
11				
12				i
13				
14				
15	•			
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

I

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1987; 10:50 A.M. 1 HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE DEPARTMENT WEST C 2 (APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.) 3 THE COURT: STIPULATED THE DEFENDANT IS PRESENT, COUNSEL 5 ARE PRESENT AND THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS ARE PRESENT. 6 GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. 7 YOUR PEREMPTORY, IS IT? 8 MR. WAPNER: I WAS ABOUT TO EXAMINE MRS. BONE, YOUR 9 HONOR. 10 THE COURT: OH, GO AHEAD, YOU DO THAT. 11 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. 12 GOOD MORNING, MRS. BONE. HOW ARE YOU? 13 MS. BONE: FINE. THANK YOU. 14 MR. WAPNER: YOU SAID THAT YOU KNOW WHY ROSEMARIE WOULD 15 REMEMBER YOU. 16 MS. BONE: YES. 17 MR. WAPNER: WHY? 18 MS. BONE: I WAS AFRAID YOU WOULD ASK AND I REALIZED, 19 TOO, THINKING ABOUT IT OVER THE WEEKEND, I DO BELIEVE 20 JUDGE RITTENBAND WAS THE JUDGE. 21 I WAS FOREMAN OF THE JURY AT THE TIME AND WHEN 22 WE DID REACH A VERDICT AND WE CAME BACK INTO THE COURTROOM, 23 THE JUDGE ASKED WHAT THE VERDICT OF THE JURY WAS AND I 24 REMEMBER LEAPING TO MY FEET AND SAYING, "THE JURY FINDS THE 25 DEFENDANT" AND JUDGE RITTENBAND SAYING, "WAIT A MINUTE. YOU 26 WATCH TOO MUCH TV." 27

I SAID, "I NEVER WATCH TV."

2F

SIDE YOU FELT WASN'T WELL PRESENTED? 1 MS. BONE: I REALLY DON'T, SORRY. IN FACT, I DON'T 2 REMEMBER WHETHER THOSE LAWYERS WERE WITH THE CIVIL CASE OR 3 WITH THE CRIMINAL CASE. I JUST REMEMBER THINKING ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE 5 OF THAT LAWYER. BUT I DON'T REALLY RECALL WHETHER IT WAS 6 THE CIVIL OR CRIMINAL CASE. 7 MR. WAPNER: IN THE CIVIL CASE, YOU NEVER ACTUALLY GOT 8 TO THE POINT OF DELIBERATING? 9 MS. BONE: NO. 10 MR. WAPNER: SO DO YOU RECALL WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS 11 DISCUSSED IN THE JURY ROOM ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE OF THE 12 LAWYERS? 13 MS. BONE: THEN IT HAD TO BE THE CRIMINAL CASE. 14 MR. WAPNER: EITHER THAT OR IT WAS DISCUSSED AMONG THE 15 JURORS IN THE HALLWAY, PERHAPS? 16 MS. BONE: NO. I THINK IT HAD TO BE THE CRIMINAL --17 WELL, I DON'T WANT TO MAKE A DEFINITE STATEMENT BECAUSE I 18 AM NOT CERTAIN. I WOULD HAVE TO REALLY THINK BACK. IT HAS 19 BEEN ABOUT FOUR OR FIVE YEARS AGO. 20 MR. WAPNER: THE CASE THAT YOU WERE THE FOREMAN ON, 21 DID YOU TELL US IT TOOK ABOUT A WEEK TO GET A VERDICT IN THAT 22 CASE? 23 MS. BONE: NO. IT TOOK ABOUT SIX HOURS. 24 MR. WAPNER: DID EVERYBODY MAKE A PRETTY 25 CONSCIENTIOUS EFFORT TO REACH A VERDICT IN THAT CASE? 26 MS. BONE: VERY MUCH SO. IT WAS NOT A UNANIMOUS VERDICT 27 AT FIRST. 28

3 FO

THE COURT: ANYTHING FURTHER? 1 MR. WAPNER: YOU SAID THAT ON THE CASE YOU SAT ON BEFORE 2 YOU WERE SURPRISED BY WHAT THE DEFENDANT SAID. WHAT WAS IT 3 ABOUT WHAT HE SAID THAT SURPRISED YOU? 4 MS. BONE: I DON'T THINK IT IS WHAT HE SAID. 5 I THINK IT WAS THE BODY LANGUAGE, HIS VOICE, THE 6 TIMBER OF HIS VOICE, I WAS JUST SURPRISED. 7 HE SEEMED -- THE PERSON SEEMED VERY SHY TO ME. 8 HE CAME ACROSS AS VERY SHY AND I WAS A LITTLE BIT SURPRISED 9 BECAUSE OF THAT. 10 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I WILL PASS FOR CAUSE. 11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. PEOPLE'S PEREMPTORY. 12 MR. WAPNER: YES, WE DO THANK AND ASK THE COURT TO 13 EXCUSE MRS. BONE. THANK YOU, MA'AM. 14 THE COURT: THANK YOU, MRS. BONE. YOU WILL BE EXCUSED. 15 MR. BARENS: COULD WE APPROACH JUST FOR A QUICK MOMENT, 16 YOUR HONOR? 17 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 18 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD 19 AT THE BENCH:) 20 THE COURT: I THINK YOU HAD TWO THAT YOU HAD EXERCISED. 21 MR. WAPNER: THAT IS THE SECOND ONE. 22 THE CLERK: NO. THREE. 23 MR. BARENS: I JUST WANTED TO TAKE A MOMENT --24 THE COURT: NO. LET'S SEE HOW MANY HE HAS. HOW MANY 25 HAVE YOU EXERCISED, TWO, DIDN'T YOU? 26 THE CLERK: TWO. 27 MR. WAPNER: THAT IS THE SECOND ONE.

THE CLERK: AND MR. BARENS HAD THREE.

THE COURT: THAT IS RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: I JUST WANTED TO TAKE A QUICK MINUTE TO RECONFIRM WHERE WE ARE PROCEDURALLY NOW, JUDGE. WE HAVE NOW FINISHED THREE OF THE FIRST -- WELL, MR. RUTHERFORD WOULD MAKE IT FOUR ALTERNATES, ALTHOUGH HE IS NOW IN THE BOX, SO WE FINISHED THE NEXT THREE AND I AM WONDERING WHEN I CAN BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR THE EXERCISE OF A PEREMPTORY.

THE COURT: IF WE HAVE A FOURTH.

MR. BARENS: OKAY. SO THEN FRED WOULD BE THE ONLY ONE,
MR. WAPNER WOULD BE THE ONLY ONE ELIGIBLE AT THIS POINT IN
TIME?

THE COURT: THAT'S CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: AND THEN YOUR HONOR WILL MAKE A DECISION ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS AT THAT POINT?

THE COURT: I WILL SEE HOW MANY WE HAVE GOT.

AND I HAVE GOT TO GET A STIPULATION THAT WE DON'T HAVE TO HAVE TWO LEFT OVER.

MR. BARENS: I SEE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: YOU GET THE IDEA? SO WE CAN EXHAUST ALL OF THEM.

MR. BARENS: I SEE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: FOR EXAMPLE, SUPPOSE WE TAKE ONE OF THE FIVE LEFT, SO THAT WILL BE FOUR. HE HAS ONE PEREMPTORY, ALL RIGHT? SO ASSUME HE DOES NOT EXERCISE THE PEREMPTORY AND PASSES, THAT MEANS WE HAVE THREE IN THE JURY BOX AND WE HAVE FOUR OUT THERE. NOW WE CAN TAKE ONE MORE, WHICH IS PERFECTLY FINE, BECAUSE IF WE TAKE ONE MORE THERE WILL BE

YEARS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WHERE DO YOU LIVE? MS. CAMPBELL: PARDON ME? THE COURT: WHERE DO YOU LIVE? MS. CAMPBELL: RIGHT NOW AGOURA. I JUST MOVED TO AGOURA. THE COURT: AGOURA? HE HAS JUST BOUGHT A HOUSE OUT THERE, OUR BAILIFF, YOU KNOW. MS. CAMPBELL: SO I HEAR. THE COURT: YOU WILL HAVE HIM AS A NEIGHBOR.

IN THAT MATTER?

THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER SERVED AS A JUROR IN A 1 2 CRIMINAL CASE BEFORE? 3 MS. CAMPBELL: NEVER. THE COURT: AND HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY KIND OF THEFT OR CRIME OF ANY KIND? 5 6 MS. CAMPBELL: NEVER. THE COURT: YOU ARE VERY FORTUNATE. ALL RIGHT. YOU 7 8 MAY INQUIRE. MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. GOOD MORNING, 9 10 MS. CAMPBELL. MS. CAMPBELL: CAMBELL OR CABLE. I DON'T CARE. 11 MR. BARENS: OKAY. I WON'T CALL YOU JOHNSON, THOUGH. 12 13 YOU HAVE NEVER SERVED ON A JURY BEFORE. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN CALLED FOR JURY SERVICE BEFORE, WHERE YOU WERE 14 15 A PART OF THE PROCESS BEFORE? MS. CAMPBELL: THIS IS THE VERY FIRST TIME. 16 MR. BARENS: AND IS THIS EQUALLY, YOUR FIRST EXPERIENCE 17 IN THE COURTROOM AT ANY TIME THAT YOU HAVE EVER BEEN -- YOU 18 19 HAVE NEVER BEEN A WITNESS IN A TRIAL? MS. CAMPBELL: I WAS SUBPOENAED AS A CHARACTER WITNESS 20 21 AT ONE TIME FOR SOMEONE. I DON'T REMEMBER TOO MANY OF THE 22 DETAILS. I JUST WENT IN. THEY ASKED ME ABOUT A COUPLE OF DAYS THAT I WAS 23 AT WORK THAT THIS OTHER PERSON WAS SUPPOSED TO BE THERE. I 24 25 TESTIFIED THAT YES, THIS PERSON WAS AT WORK AND SO WAS I. 26 THAT WAS THE END OF THAT. MR. BARENS: YOU DIDN'T LISTEN TO ANY OF THE PROCEEDINGS 27

MS. CAMPBELL: NO. THEY CALLED US IN INDIVIDUALLY. 1 MR. BARENS: I SEE. WAS THAT A CRIMINAL TRIAL? 2 MS. CAMPBELL: I DON'T RECALL BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW WHAT 3 IT WAS ABOUT. I WAS JUST CALLED IN TO VERIFY SOMEONE WAS WHERE THEY SAID THEY WERE. MR. BARENS: WAS THAT YOUR ONLY EXPERIENCE IN THE 6 7 COURTROOM? 8 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. MR. BARENS: YOU NEVER HAD OCCASION TO WATCH A CRIMINAL 9 TRIAL IN ANY KIND OF SETTING? 10 MS. CAMPBELL: NO. 11 MR. BARENS: OKAY. YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE STARTING ON 12 A NEW JOB AT THE TELEPHONE COMPANY IN SPECIAL SERVICES. 13 MS. CAMPBELL: RIGHT. THAT'S CORRECT. 14 MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU BEEN WORKING FOR THE PHONE COMPANY 15 16 A WHILE? MS. CAMPBELL: SIX YEARS. 17 MR. BARENS: WHAT HAVE YOU GENERALLY DONE? 18 MS. CAMPBELL: I WAS A RESIDENTIAL REPRESENTATIVE. 19 I TOOK ORDERS TO HAVE RESIDENTIAL SERVICES INSTALLED. 20 MR. BARENS: PRIOR TO THAT SIX-YEAR STINT, WHAT DID 21 22 YOU DO? MS. CAMPBELL: WELL, LET'S SEE. I WORKED AS A SIGN 23 MAKER FOR THE HARRIS COMPANY FOR ABOUT THREE YEARS. THAT 24 IS A DEPARTMENT STORE IN THE SAN BERNARDINO AREA. 25 AND I WORKED UP AT SNOW SUMMIT DURING THE WINTER 26 SEASON FOR A WHILE. THAT IS A SKI RESORT THERE. 27 I HAVE DONE SOME COCKTAIL WAITRESSING. I HAVE

DONE SOME FOOD WAITRESSING. THAT IS ABOUT IT. 1 2 MR. BARENS: YOU HAVE TWO YEARS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE EXPERIENCE. WAS THAT HERE IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA? 3 4 MS. CAMPBELL: YES, IT WAS. 5 MR. BARENS: WHERE DID YOU GO TO SCHOOL? MS. CAMPBELL: SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE AND BIG 6 7 BEAR HIGH SCHOOL AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. 8 MR. BARENS: DID YOU HAVE A MAJOR AT THE J.C.? MS. CAMPBELL: I TENDED TO TAKE A LOT OF ART COURSES 9 AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY FOR MY MAIN INTERESTS. 10 11 MR. BARENS: WAS THAT PREPATORY TO A CERTAIN 12 PROFESSIONAL PURSUIT? MS. CAMPBELL: I HAD THOUGHT IT WOULD BE AT THE TIME. 13 BUT IT DID NOT END UP SO. THE ART WAS FOR COMMERCIAL 14 15 PURPOSES. 16 MR. BARENS: WHAT DID YOU INTEND TO DO, HAD YOU ACTUALLY PURSUED WHATEVER PROFESSIONAL INTEREST YOU HAD AT 17 18 THAT TIME? 19 MS. CAMPBELL: WELL, I HAD HOPED TO GO INTO BUSINESS ADVERTISING. BUT I JUST DIDN'T HAVE THE STAMINA AND 20 21 IMAGINATION FOR IT. 22 MR. BARENS: WAS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR WHERE YOU HAD A FIELD OF EMPHASIS IN CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY? 23 24 MS. CAMPBELL: NOT PARTICULARLY. IT WAS JUST A SUBJECT 25 THAT I WAS INTERESTED IN. MR. BARENS: COULD YOU TELL US WHAT INTERESTED YOU 26 27 ABOUT THAT? MS. CAMPBELL: JUST HOW PEOPLE HAVE DEVELOPED THEIR

DIFFERENT CULTURES OVER THE AGES. MR. BARENS: EVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL REPRESENTATION? MS. CAMPBELL: YES. MR. BARENS: WITHIN THAT, WAS THERE A PARTICULAR CULTURE YOU WERE INTERESTED IN? MS. CAMPBELL: NOT ESPECIALLY. I WOULD SAY MAYBE THE AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURES. MR. BARENS: FROM THAT EXPERIENCE, YOU BECAME AWARE OF THAT FACT THAT BASED ON CULTURAL EXPERIENCE, ONE'S PERCEPTIONS ARE GREATLY DEFINED. WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT STATEMENT? MS. CAMPBELL: THAT'S CORRECT. MR. BARENS: AND THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS, IN A SEARCH FOR TRUTH, SOMEWHAT LIKE THE SEARCH FOR BEAUTY, IT LIES IN THE EYES OF THE BEHOLDER, ISN'T THAT SO? MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. BARENS: CONDUCT THAT IS ACCEPTABLE IN VARIOUS 1 SOCIETIES AND CULTURES, IS UNACCEPTABLE IN OTHER CULTURES? 2 MS. CAMPBELL: THAT IS TRUE. 3 MR. BARENS: AND WHAT WE BELIEVE TWO DIFFERENT CULTURES WOULD LOOK AT -- THEY WOULD LOOK AT AN EVENT THAT WE WOULD 5 CALL A FACTUAL EVENT AND COME TO MARKEDLY DIFFERENT CONCLUSIONS 6 ABOUT THE GENESIS ABOUT THAT EVENT? 7 MS. CAMPBELL: DEFINITELY. 8 MR. BARENS: BASED ON THEIR BELIEF SYSTEMS? 9 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. 10 MR. BARENS: AND WHAT THEY PERCEIVE THINGS TO BE? 11 MS. CAMPBELL: THAT'S CORRECT. 12 MR. BARENS: COULD YOU UNDERSTAND FROM THAT, THAT TRUTH 13 PER SE OR THE EXISTENCE OR NON-EXISTENCE OF A FACT PER SE, 14 IS GREATLY SUBJECT TO A LOT OF SUBJECTIVE FACTORS? 15 MS. CAMPBELL: DEFINITELY. 16 MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU, BASED ON THAT EXPERIENCE, TAKE 17 A LOOK AT THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE VARIOUS WITNESSES WHEN THEY 18 TESTIFY, TO SEE WHAT VANTAGE POINT THEY ARE EXAMINING EVIDENCE 19 20 FROM? 21 MS. CAMPBELL: ABSOLUTELY. MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT BASED ON OUR 22 EXPERIENCES AS PARTICIPANTS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY, WE ARE ALL 23 REPRESENTATIVE OF SUBCULTURES SIMILAR TO WHAT YOU STUDIED, 24 THAT GREATLY BEAR ON OUR PRESUMPTIONS ABOUT REALITY? 25 26 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. MR. BARENS: SO IF WE HAVE A QUESTION THAT CALLS FOR 27

INTERPRETATION ABOUT WHETHER FACTS SUGGEST THAT SOMEONE IS

DEAD VERSUS WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE MISSING VERSUS WHETHER 1 OR NOT THEY ARE VOLUNTARILY OR INVOLUNTARILY MISSING, A LOT 2 OF THE CONCLUSIONS THAT A JUROR MIGHT -- SORRY, THAT A WITNESS 3 MIGHT DRAW, WOULD BE BASED ON THEIR EXPERIENCE LEVEL AND THEIR 4 PERCEPTION OF THINGS? 5 6 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. 7 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? MS. CAMPBELL: YES. I UNDERSTAND THAT. 8 9 MR. BARENS: TRUTH IS RELATIVE, ISN'T IT? 10 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. MR. BARENS: WHEN WE START TALKING ABOUT -- AND IF 11 YOU HEAR SOMEONE TELLING YOU IN THIS COURTROOM THAT SOMETHING 12 IS ABSOLUTELY TRUE, I DARE SAY FROM YOUR EDUCATION, I WILL 13 BET THAT THERE AREN'T MORE THAN ONE OR TWO THINGS ABOUT THE 14 UNIVERSE YOU COULD TELL ME THAT EXIST AS ABSOLUTE TRUTH. 15 16 MS. CAMPBELL: THAT'S CORRECT. MR. BARENS: IT BEHOOVES US THEN, TO CAREFULLY LISTEN 17 TO ALL OF THE WITNESSES BEFORE WE DRAW ANY CONCLUSIONS ABOUT 18 19 WHAT CONSTITUTES TRUTH? 20 MS. CAMPBELL: DEFINITELY. MR. BARENS: PARTICULARLY IF WE CANNOT IN A DIRECT 21 22 SENSE, EXAMINE EVIDENCE, LIKE A BODY? 23 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. 24 MR. BARENS: WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT? 25 MS. CAMPBELL: I AGREE. MR. BARENS: YOU KNOW ALL OF THIS BUSINESS ABOUT PIES 26 AND WHATNOT AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, THERE IS A TIME WHEN 27 YOU ARE GIVEN CERTAIN FACTS AND THEN ASKED TO DRAW A CONCLUSION 28

MR. BARENS: WHAT ANYBODY ELSE THINKS IS REASONABLE 1 IS THEIR OPINION. IT IS NO BETTER NOR WORSE THAN YOURS. 2 MS. CAMPBELL: I UNDERSTAND. 3 MR. BARENS: IT IS JUST INTERESTING -- NOW 4 MRS. BONES WHO SPECULATED IN RESPONSE TO ONE OF COUNSEL'S 5 OUESTIONS AND WANTED TO KNOW ABOUT THE SHAPE OF THE PIE. 6 MS. CAMPBELL: THAT HAD CROSSED MY MIND. 7 MR. BARENS: HAD IT INDEED? 8 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. 9 MR. BARENS: IT DIDN'T SEEM UNREASONABLE TO YOU, DID 10 IT? 11 MS. CAMPBELL: NO, BECAUSE I HAVE A CAT WHO WILL EAT 12 ANYTHING SO IT DIDN'T SEEM UNREASONABLE AT ALL. 13 MR. BARENS: I NOTICED MRS. BONES RESPONSE EVOKED A 14 BIT OF LAUGHTER ABOUT THE COURTROOM, WHICH I CAN UNDERSTAND. 15 BUT NONETHELESS, ALTHOUGH WE MIGHT HAVE LAUGHED 16 AT WHAT SEEMED TO BE A FARFETCHED OR SOMEWHAT REMOTE CONCERN. 17 NONETHELESS, IT TURNS OUT REASONABLE BASED UPON YOUR 18 CULTURAL EXPERIENCE, DOESN'T IT? 19 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. 20 MR. BARENS: SO WE COULDN'T EXACTLY DISMISS THAT OUT 21 OF HAND AS BEING UNREASONABLE, COULD WE? 22 MS. CAMPBELL: NO. 23 MR. BARENS: IT TURNS OUT THE FACT IS, OF COURSE, IT 24 COULD BE THE TRUTH, IT COULD BE THE ANSWER? 25 MS. CAMPBELL: VERY WELL COULD BE. 26 MR. BARENS: LITTLE JOHNNY MAY HAVE HAD SOME CONTACT 27 WITH A DOG THAT PUTS PIE ALL OVER HIM. 28

BUT WHAT DO WE SEE THERE? WE SEE, DO WE NOT,

THAT LITTLE JOHNNY HAS A TERRIBLY GUILTY APPEARANCE, HE LOOKED

GUILTY, DIDN'T HE?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. BARENS: HE LOOKED READILY CONVICTABLE, DIDN'T HE?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND THEN HE LOOKED REASONABLY CONVICTABLE BASED ON ALL OF THE EVIDENCE, DIDN'T HE?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES, HE DID.

MR. BARENS: BUT IF THE TRUTH BE THAT THE DOG IS THE EXPLANATION, WE BEST NOT HAVE CONVICTED HIM TOO QUICKLY INDEED.

MS. CAMPBELL: THAT'S TRUE.

MR. BARENS: THAT IS WHY WE HAVE TO LISTEN CAREFULLY

TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE, PARTICULARLY THAT EVIDENCE THAT

DOESN'T SEEM SO PROBABLE TO BEGIN WITH BECAUSE, I ASSURE YOU,

WE ARE IN AN UNUSUAL SETTING WITH UNUSUAL ANSWERS.

YOU WON'T JUST BE LOOKING FOR THE TYPICAL OR USUAL ANSWERS TO RESOLVE ALL OF THE QUESTIONS WE MAY DEAL WITH IN THIS COURTROOM?

MS. CAMPBELL: NO. I WOULD HAVE TO HEAR ALL OF THE TESTIMONY.

MR. BARENS: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE THAT ACCOMPANIES THE DEFENDANT?

MS. CAMPBELL: WELL, LIKE ONE OTHER LADY SAID BEFORE, I FEEL FORTUNATE TO LIVE IN A COUNTRY THAT THAT IS THE WAY THINGS ARE. I THINK IT IS GREAT. IT IS THE WAY IT SHOULD BE.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU UNDERSTAND THAT ALTHOUGH

MR. WAPNER MIGHT SAY THAT HERE, ALL DEFENDANTS GET THAT AND

A LOT OF THOSE DEFENDANTS ULTIMATELY ARE CONVICTED; DOES THAT

DETRACT IN YOUR MIND IN ANY WAY FROM THE FACT THAT HE HAS

THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AS HE SITS THERE?

MS. CAMPBELL: NO.

MR. BARENS: DOES IT MAKE IT ANY LESS IMPORTANT?

MS. CAMPBELL: NO.

MR. BARENS: DOES IT MAKE IT LESS IMPORTANT IF YOU WERE A DEFENDANT IN A CASE THAT OTHER DEFENDANTS OVER THE YEARS HAD BEEN CONVICTED?

MS. CAMPBELL: NO.

MR. BARENS: YOU DIDN'T REALLY THINK AS YOU SAT THERE
THAT NO DEFENDANT WHO HAD THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE HAD
NEVER BEEN CONVICTED IN THIS COUNTRY, DID YOU?

MS. CAMPBELL: NO.

MR. BARENS: BY THAT, IT IS NOT SOME PROCEDURAL NICETY THAT IS GIVEN THAT REALLY DOESN'T MEAN MUCH.

MS. CAMPBELL: NO.

MR. BARENS: COULD YOU BE WILLING TO LISTEN TO THE DEFENDANT TESTIFY OPEN-MINDEDLY?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK HE WOULD NECESSARILY BE LESS THAN TRUTHFUL?

MS. CAMPBELL: NO.

MR. BARENS: WHAT SORT OF HOBBIES DO YOU HAVE?

MS. CAMPBELL: I READ A LOT. I COOK. I SING.

I USED TO SKI. I DON'T DO THAT VERY OFTEN ANY

28 MORE.

26

THAT IS ABOUT IT. MR. BARENS: IS THERE ANY PARTICULAR SUBJECT MATTER YOU PREFER TO READ? MS. CAMPBELL: I LIKE HISTORICAL NOVELS. MR. BARENS: HISTORICAL? MS. CAMPBELL: NOVELS BASED ON QUITE A BIT OF FACT WITH ENOUGH FROU-FROU IN IT TO MAKE IT INTERESTING. MR. BARENS: ROMANCE? MS. CAMPBELL: NOT ROMANCE BUT --MR. BARENS: EDITORIAL? THAT MAKES IT INTERESTING: WHAT WAS THE LAST BOOK YOU READ? MS. CAMPBELL: "LONG KNIVES."

MR. BARENS: WAS THAT ABOUT CUSTER? 1 MS. CAMPBELL: IT WAS ABOUT GEORGE ROGERS CLARK. 2 MR. BARENS: THE EXPEDITION COMING TO THE WEST AND ALL 3 OF THAT? MS. CAMPBELL: THAT WAS WILLIAM CLARK. 5 MR. BARENS: WHO IS GEORGE WILLIAM CLARK? 6 MS. CAMPBELL: GEORGE ROGERS CLARK WAS WILLIAM CLARK'S 7 OLDER BROTHER. HE HELPED SETTLE THE KENTUCKY FRONTIER. 8 MR. BARENS: WELL, I LEARN SOMETHING EVERY DAY. 9 I DIDN'T KNOW HE HAD A BROTHER. I JUST THOUGHT HE WAS HANGING 10 OUT WITH SOME OTHERS -- HANGING OUT WITH ANOTHER FELLOW. 11 WHAT ABOUT THE LAST MOVIE YOU SAW? 12 MS. CAMPBELL: "STAR TREK IV." 13 MR. BARENS: DO YOU HAVE A STEADY BOYFRIEND? 14 MS. CAMPBELL: YES, I DO. 15 MR. BARENS: WHAT DOES HE DO? 16 MS. CAMPBELL: HE AND HIS FATHER OWN A GARAGE DOOR AND 17 GATE INSTALLATION BUSINESS. 18 MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN MARRIED? 19 MS. CAMPBELL: NO, NO, I HAVEN'T. 20 MR. BARENS: THAT IS FINE WITH ME. 21 HOW WOULD YOU FEEL -- AND I HAVE ASKED THIS OF 22 SEVERAL RECENT JURORS, PROSPECTIVE JURORS -- HOW WOULD YOU 23 FEEL, BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCE AND YOUR POINT OF VIEW AND 24 YOUR ATTITUDES, IF YOU WERE MY CLIENT HERE AND WERE CHARGED 25 WITH A SERIOUS CRIME, HOW WOULD YOU FEEL IF THE 12 JURORS 26 ALL HELD YOUR POINT OF VIEW? 27

MS. CAMPBELL: I WOULD BE FAIRLY CONFIDENT THAT I WOULD

HAVE A FAIR JURY, A FAIR HEARING. 1 MR. BARENS: AN OPEN-MINDED JURY? 2 MS. CAMPBELL: YES, SIR. 3 MR. BARENS: AND THAT IS ALL WE ARE LOOKING FOR. 4 THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. 5 MS. CAMPBELL: YOU ARE WELCOME. 6 MR. BARENS: PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. 7 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, MR. WAPNER. 8 MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 9 GOOD MORNING, MISS CAMPBELL. 10 MS. CAMPBELL: GOOD MORNING. 11 MR. WAPNER: WHEN DID YOU THINK ABOUT THE SHAPE OF THE 12 PIECE OF PIE, BEFORE OR AFTER MRS. BONE --13 MS. CAMPBELL: OH, BEFORE. I HAD BEEN THINKING ABOUT 14 THAT ALL ALONG. 15 MR. WAPNER: WHAT DIFFERENCE DID IT MAKE TO YOU? 16 MS. CAMPBELL: WELL, AS I SAID, I HAVE A CAT WHO WILL 17 EAT ANYTHING AT ALL AND IT IS VERY POSSIBLE THAT AN ANIMAL 18 COULD GET INTO THE HOUSE AND, YOU KNOW, GET INTO THE PIE. 19 MAYBE HE GRABBED THE ANIMAL AND HAD PIE ALL OVER HIM. I MEAN 20 IT IS A POSSIBILITY. 21 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU MAKE ANY DISTINCTION BETWEEN THINGS 22 THAT ARE POSSIBLE AND THINGS THAT YOU THINK ARE REASONABLE? 23 (PAUSE.) 24 MS. CAMPBELL: I THINK ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE. IT MAY 25 NOT ALWAYS BE REASONABLE BUT THINGS ARE ALWAYS POSSIBLE. 26 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND IN ANY GIVEN SITUATION, 27

REGARDLESS OF THE FACTS, DO YOU THINK YOU COULD ALWAYS COME

UP WITH ANOTHER QUESTION OR ANOTHER STATEMENT THAT THIS IS 1 POSSIBLE OR THAT IS POSSIBLE REGARDLESS OF THE FACTS? 2 (PAUSE.) 3 MS. CAMPBELL: IF --4 MR. WAPNER: LET ME SUGGEST SOMETHING TO YOU. 5 MS. CAMPBELL: THANK YOU. 6 MR. WAPNER: LET'S TAKE IT FIRST OF ALL OUT OF THE REALM 7 OF THE CAT AND SAY, WELL, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT A HORDE OF 8 RUNAWAY STUDENTS CAME INTO THE HOUSE AND THEY GRABBED THE 9 KID AND THEY HELD HIM DOWN AND THEY TOOK SOME PIE AND THEY 10 SMEARED IT ALL OVER HIS FACE, RIGHT? 11 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. 12 MR. WAPNER: IT IS POSSIBLE, RIGHT? 13 MS. CAMPBELL: IT IS POSSIBLE. 14 MR. WAPNER: IS IT LIKELY? 15 MS. CAMPBELL: NOT LIKELY. 16 MR. WAPNER: NOT REASONABLE? 17 MS. CAMPBELL: NOT TOO REASONABLE, NO. 18 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. NOW WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT THE 19 HYGIENE HABITS OF YOUR CAT AFTER IT EATS SOMETHING? 20 MS. CAMPBELL: SHE USUALLY WASHES. 21 MR. WAPNER: CATS WASH THEMSELVES? 22 MS.CAMPBELL: YES. 23 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. WHY DID IT OCCUR TO YOU TO PUT THE 24 CAT IN THE HYPOTHETICAL WHEN IT WASN'T THERE BEFORE? 25 MS. CAMPBELL: JUST BECAUSE OF BEING A CAT OWNER, I 26 KNOW WHAT THEY ARE CAPABLE OF. 27

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. HOW SOON AFTER THE CAT EATS SOMETHING

DOES THE CAT WASH ITSELF? 1 MS. CAMPBELL: USUALLY WITHIN ABOUT FIVE, TEN MINUTES. 2 MR. WAPNER: AND IS THE CAT PRETTY GOOD ABOUT WASHING 3 ITSELF? 4 MS. CAMPBELL: YEAH. YES, I MEAN. 5 MR. WAPNER: SO IN YOUR SITUATION, THE CAT WOULD HAVE 6 TO EAT THE PIE AND THEN IMMEDIATELY THE CHILD WOULD HAVE TO 7 COME UPON THE CAT? 8 MS. CAMPBELL: THE CAT WOULD HAVE TO BE CAUGHT IN THE 9 ACT. 10 MR. WAPNER: AND WOULD YOU EXPECT THAT YOU MIGHT SEE 11 SOMETHING DIFFERENT ON THE CHILD? 12 MS. CAMPBELL: PROBABLY SEE CAT FUR. 13 MR. WAPNER: DID YOU HEAR ANYTHING IN THE EXAMPLE ABOUT 14 CAT FUR? 15 MS. CAMPBELL: NO. 16 MR. WAPNER: IF YOU LOOKED AT THE CHILD AND YOU SAW 17 CAT FUR MIXED IN WITH THE PIE, THAT MIGHT MEAN ONE THING TO 18 YOU, RIGHT? 19 MS. CAMPBELL: THAT'S CORRECT. 20 MR. WAPNER: AND IF YOU DIDN'T SEE ANY CAT FUR, THAT 21 MEAN SOMETHING ELSE TO YOU, RIGHT? 22 MS. CAMPBELL: TRUE. 23 MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU ASK THOSE QUESTIONS AS WELL? 24 MS. CAMPBELL: PROBABLY. 25 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. YOU KNOW IT IS POSSIBLE THAT THE 26 NEIGHBORS HAD A LION WHO CAME IN AND ATE THE PIE, TOO, RIGHT? 27 MS. CAMPBELL: YES, THAT IS POSSIBLE. 28

MR. WAPNER: THE THING THAT I AM TRYING TO GET AT IS
THAT REGARDLESS OF THE CASE, REGARDLESS OF THE FACT SITUATION,
IF YOU GO INTO A JURY ROOM TO DELIBERATE A CASE WITH 11 OTHER
PEOPLE, YOU CAN ALWAYS AD NAUSEAM COME UP WITH ANOTHER
POSSIBLE QUESTION; DO YOU THINK THAT IS TRUE?

MS. CAMPBELL: OH, DEFINITELY.

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. AND DO YOU THINK THAT JUST
BECAUSE IT IS ALWAYS POSSIBLE TO ASK THE NEXT, IT IS POSSIBLE
THIS OR IT IS POSSIBLE THAT QUESTION, DO YOU THINK THAT JUST
BECAUSE OF THAT, THAT CASES CANNOT BE PROVED BEYOND A
REASONABLE DOUBT?

MS. CAMPBELL: NO, BECAUSE IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING WHEN YOU GO IN TO DELIBERATE, YOU HAVE ALL OF THE EVIDENCE THERE THAT YOU CAN WORK WITH.

MR. WAPNER: RIGHT. BUT --

MS. CAMPBELL: THERE IS NO WHAT-IFFING ONCE YOU ARE IN THERE, YOU HAVE TO GO WITH WHAT EVIDENCE YOU HAVE.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, BUT REGARDLESS OF WHAT EVIDENCE YOU HAVE, THE WHAT-IFFING DOESN'T COME FROM THE EVIDENCE. THE WHAT-IFFING COMES FROM PEOPLE ASKING THE QUESTIONS.

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: RIGHT.

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. AND ARE YOU THE KIND OF A PERSON WHO IS NOT GOING TO BE SATISFIED, NO MATTER WHAT KIND OF EVIDENCE YOU HAVE, IT IS ALWAYS GOING TO BE WHAT IF THIS OR WHAT IF THAT?

MS. CAMPBELL: NO.

1	MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN ON A JURY BEFORE?		
2	MS. CAMPBELL: NO, I HAVE NOT.		
3	MR. WAPNER: ARE YOUR PARENTS STILL LIVING?		
4	MS. CAMPBELL: MY MOTHER IS.		
5	MR. WAPNER: DOES SHE LIVE IN THE LOS ANGELES ARE?		
6	MS. CAMPBELL: NO. SHE LIVES IN BIG BEAR.		
7	MR. WAPNER: HOW OFTEN DO YOU SEE OR TALK TO HER?		
8	MS. CAMPBELL: I TALK TO HER ABOUT ONCE A WEEK. AND		
9	I USUALLY SEE HER IN THE SUMMER ABOUT EVERY OTHER WEEK. I		
10	VERY SELDOM GO UP IN THE WINTER.		
11	MR. WAPNER: TOO COLD?		
12	MS. CAMPBELL: I DON'T LIKE DRIVING IN THE SNOW AND		
13	ICE.		
14	MR. WAPNER: AND WERE YOU RAISED IN THE BIG BEAR AREA?		
15	MS. CAMPBELL: YES, I WAS.		
16	MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY BROTHERS OR SISTERS?		
17	MS. CAMPBELL: NO, I DO NOT.		
18	MR. WAPNER: WOULD YOU SAY YOU ARE FAIRLY CLOSE TO		
19	YOUR MOTHER?		
20	MS. CAMPBELL: YES. WE ARE GOOD FRIENDS.		
21	MR. WAPNER: HAD YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF A THEFT		
22	OR ANY KIND OF A CRIME SCHEME?		
23	MS. CAMPBELL: NEVER.		
24	MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA WHATSOEVER, WHAT		
25	THE CASE WAS ABOUT BEFORE YOU WERE CALLED AS A CHARACTER		
26	6 WITNESS?		
27	MS. CAMPBELL: NOT REALLY, NO.		

MR. WAPNER: DO YOU KNOW?

1 MS. CAMPBELL: I WAS JUST THERE TO VERIFY SOMEONE --2 LIKE I SAID, WAS WHERE THEY SAID THEY WERE ON A GIVEN DAY. 3 MR. WAPNER: YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER IT WAS A CIVIL 4 OR CRIMINAL CASE? 5 MS. CAMPBELL: I DON'T. 6 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU KNOW WHICH SIDE IT WAS THAT ASKED 7 YOU TO COME INTO THE COURTROOM? WAS IT THE PERSON WHO WAS 8 SUPPOSED TO BE AT WORK OR NOT OR WAS IT THE EMPLOYEE OR SOMEONE 9 ELSE? 10 MS. CAMPBELL: IT WAS THE PERSON WHO WAS SUPPOSED TO 11 BE THERE. 12 MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN IN A SITUATION WHERE 13 YOU WERE IN A SERIOUS DISCUSSION WITH A FRIEND OR RELATIVE 14 AND YOU TOOK A POSITION AND THEN CHANGED YOUR MIND? 15 MS. CAMPBELL: DEFINITELY. 16 MR. WAPNER: DO YOU THINK THAT IF YOU ARE IN THE JURY 17 ROOM AND YOU LISTEN TO ALL OF THE EVIDENCE AND YOU DISCUSS 18 IT WITH THE OTHER JURORS AND YOU HAVE ORIGINALLY TAKEN ONE 19 POSITION THAT YOU COULD CHANGE THAT POSITION IF THEY CONVINCE 20 YOU THAT YOU ARE WRONG? 21 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. 22 MR. WAPNER: AND THE OTHER SIDE OF THAT COIN, OF COURSE, 23 IS COULD YOU HOLD FAST TO THAT POSITION IF YOU WERE CONVINCED 24 THAT YOU WERE CORRECT? 25 MS. CAMPBELL: DEFINITELY. 26 MR. WAPNER: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE IDEA OF 27 CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE? 28

MS. CAMPBELL: IT IS FINE. I CAN'T SEE ANY REASON

WHY NOT TO USE IT, IF YOU HAVE IT.

MR. WAPNER: DID YOU HAVE AN IDEA IN YOUR HEAD BEFORE
YOU CAME INTO THIS COURTROOM THAT IT WAS DIFFERENT THAN OTHER
KINDS OF EVIDENCE OR NOT AS GOOD AS OTHER KINDS OF EVIDENCE?

MS. CAMPBELL: I HAD NOT REALLY THOUGHT ABOUT IT.

MR. WAPNER: IF THE JUDGE TELLS YOU THAT IT IS JUST AS GOOD AS ANY OTHER KIND OF EVIDENCE, CAN YOU FOLLOW THAT INSTRUCTION?

MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: IF THE JUDGE TELLS YOU THAT IT IS JUST 1 2 AS GOOD AS ANY OTHER KIND OF EVIDENCE, CAN YOU FOLLOW THAT 3 INSTRUCTION? MS. CAMPBELL: YES. 4 MR. WAPNER: IF YOU ARE CHOSEN AS A JUROR IN THIS CASE 5 AND YOU ACTUALLY GET INTO THE JURY ROOM TO DELIBERATE, CAN 6 YOU DECIDE THE CASE ON THE FACTS THAT ARE PRESENTED TO YOU 7 AND THE LAW THAT THE JUDGE GIVES YOU, WITHOUT SPECULATING 8 ON WHAT MIGHT BE POSSIBILITIES AND THINGS LIKE THAT? 9 10 MS. CAMPBELL: YES, I CAN. MR. WAPNER: AND FIGURATIVELY SPEAKING, WILL YOU ONLY 11 12 SEE THE CAT IF WE HAVE GOT CAT HAIR AND NOT IF WE DON'T? 13 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. MR. WAPNER: ASSUMING THAT THERE WAS NO CAT IN THAT 14 HOUSE, DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION AS TO WHAT HAPPENED TO THE 15 16 PIECE OF PIE? 17 MS. CAMPBELL: I WOULD HAVE TO SAY MORE THAN LIKELY, 18 THE CHILD ATE THE PIE, IF THERE WAS NO CAT IN THE HOUSE AND 19 JUST ME AND THE CHILD AND I KNOW I DIDN'T EAT IT. 20 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THE OTHER THING IS, THAT IS IMPORTANT, AS YOU POINTED OUT, WHEN YOU GO INTO THE JURY ROOM, 21 22 YOU WILL HAVE ALL OF THE FACTS. CAN YOU REFRAIN FROM 23 INJECTING OTHER FACTS INTO IT THAT WEREN'T THERE, FOR EXAMPLE? 24 MS. CAMPBELL: YES, I CAN. 25 MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THAT IS, REFRAIN FROM PUTTING A 26 CAT IN IF YOU DID NOT HEAR ANYTHING ABOUT IT? 27 MS. CAMPBELL: YES.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THE OTHER THING THAT IS IMPORTANT

AND WE HAVE TALKED ON THIS. I DON'T KNOW IF WE DID IT WHEN 1 ALL OF THE NEW GROUP WAS IN THE COURTROOM OR NOT. COULD YOU 2 REFRAIN FROM DOING ANY INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION IN THIS 3 CASE? 4 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. MR. WAPNER: CAN YOU? 6 7 MS. CAMPBELL: I HAVE SO FAR. MR. WAPNER: OKAY. WELL, IT IS IMPORTANT. THE REASON 8 FOR THAT IS, FIRST OF ALL, BECAUSE THE JUDGE WILL TELL YOU 9 THAT YOU CAN'T DO IT. THAT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT THING. IF 10 HE TELLS YOU SOMETHING, WILL YOU FOLLOW THAT? 11 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. LIKE I SAID, I HAVE SO FAR. 12 MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. AND THE SECOND REASON IS BECAUSE 13 ALL OF THE JURORS HAVE TO BE ON THE SAME FOOTING, DO YOU 14 15 UNDERSTAND THAT? 16 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. MR. WAPNER: SO IT WOULDN'T BE FAIR FOR ONE PERSON 17 TO GO OUT AND SEE SOMETHING AND EVERYBODY ELSE DIDN'T SEE 18 19 IT? 20 MS. CAMPBELL: YES. MR. WAPNER: AND THE THIRD AND MAIN REASON FOR THAT 21 AND ALL OF THE ABOVE, IS THAT THINGS MAY CHANGE BETWEEN THE 22 TIME THAT YOU SEE THEM AND THE WAY THEY WERE AT THE TIME THE 23 CRIME HAPPENED OR THE KILLING HAPPENED. DO YOU UNDERSTAND 24 25 THAT? MS. CAMPBELL: I UNDERSTAND THAT. 26 MR. WAPNER: IF YOU LISTEN TO ALL OF THE FACTS IN THE 27

CASE, YOU DECIDE THAT THE EVIDENCE PROVES BEYOND A REASONABLE

```
DOUBT THAT THE VICTIM WAS MURDERED AND THAT THE DEFENDANT
<u>,</u> 1
 2
     IN THIS CASE DID IT AND YOU FURTHER DECIDE THAT YOU JUST DON'T
     LIKE THE GUY WHO WAS MURDERED, COULD YOU NONETHELESS, RETURN
. 3
 4
     A VERDICT OF GUILTY?
 5
            MS. CAMPBELL: YES.
            MR. WAPNER: BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE WOULD PROVE BEYOND
 6
     A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE DEFENDANT IN FACT, COMMITTED THE
 7
 8
     CRIME?
            MS. CAMPBELL: IF THE EVIDENCE PROVES IT BEYOND A
 9
10
     REASONABLE DOUBT, YES.
            MR. WAPNER: THAT WOULD OF COURSE BE THE ONLY WAY THAT
11
     YOU WOULD RETURN A VERDICT OF GUILTY?
12
13
            MS. CAMPBELL: YES.
            MR. WAPNER: BUT THE POINT OF THAT QUESTION IS, THAT
14
     WHETHER OR NOT YOU LIKE THE PERSON WHO WAS KILLED, IF YOU
15
     BELIEVE THAT HE WAS KILLED AND THE DEFENDANT DID IT --
16
            MS. CAMPBELL: THAT WOULD HAVE NO BASIS IN THE DECISION.
17
18
            MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I WILL PASS
19
     FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.
20
            THE COURT: PEREMPTORY?
            MR. WAPNER: WE'LL ACCEPT THE ALTERNATES, YOUR HONOR.
21
            THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WILL YOU APPROACH THE BENCH,
22
23
     PLEASE?
24
                   (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD AT
25
                   THE BENCH:)
             THE COURT: IF YOU BOTH DESIRE A FOURTH JUROR, I AM
26
27
     WILLING TO GO ALONG WITH IT.
28
             MR. WAPNER: I THINK THAT WE SHOULD ABSOLUTELY HAVE
```

1 ONE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU FEEL THAT WAY? 2 3 MR. BARENS: I THINK OUT OF AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION, YES. 5 THE COURT: AND WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF WE HAVE TWO LEFT 6 OVER? 7 MR. BARENS: WE GO WITH THEM. WE EXHAUST THEM. 8 THE COURT: WE EXHAUST THEM? THAT IS AGREEABLE TO 9 YOU, ALSO? 10 MR. WAPNER: SO STIPULATED. MR. BARENS: LET ME ASK YOU SOMETHING. IT IS NOT THAT 11 I AM SUGGESTING WE FIX THE POT ENTIRELY BUT DO YOU WANT TO 12 13 AGREE THAT WE COULD WAIT FOR SPEARMAN LAST AND SEE HOW WE 14 DO WITH THE OTHER THREE? 15 MR. WAPNER: NO. 16 MR. BARENS: LET'S JUST GO WITH IT, THEN. 17 THE COURT: WHAT DID HE SAY? 18 MR. BARENS: NOTHING. I WITHDRAW THE COMMENT. IT 19 WAS NOT APPROPRIATE. 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. 2 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN 3 OPEN COURT:) THE COURT: I THINK IT WOULD BE A PITY WITH FOUR 4 REMAINING JURORS THAT HAVE BEEN HERE ALL OF THIS TIME, IF 5 THEY DIDN'T HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO COME IN AS A PROSPECTIVE 6 7 JUROR IN THE CASE. WHAT WE HAVE AGREED TO DO IS, WE WILL SIT THE 8 FOURTH ALTERNATE JUROR. PLEASE DRAW ONE. 9 10 THE CLERK: CATHERINE J. KEENAN, K-E-E-N-A-N. 11 THE COURT: MISS KEENAN, YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH THE WHOLE PROCEDURE NOW, AREN'T YOU? 12 13 MS. KEENAN: YES. 14 THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU DO? MS. KEENAN: I AM AN APPEALS OFFICER AT THE IRS. 15 16 THE COURT: TELL US WHAT YOU DO EXACTLY. MS. KEENAN: IF CASES COME TO ME FOR EXAMINATION, IF 17 18 THERE IS A DISAGREEMENT AFTER THE AUDIT IS FINISHED, I 19 SETTLE THEM SO THERE DOESN'T HAVE TO BE ANY LITIGATION. OR, THEY CAN APPEAL THE PENALTIES, THE CIVIL PENALTIES FOR 20 21 COLLECTION. 22 THE COURT: THAT IS EXTREMELY INTERESTING. TELL ME, WHAT WAS YOUR BACKGROUND AND TRAINING FOR THIS KIND OF A JOB 23 24 WHICH SEEMS TO BE VERY, VERY INTERESTING? MS. KEENAN: I HAVE A DEGREE IN HISTORY FROM UCLA. 25 26 I HAVE TAKEN A LOT OF ACCOUNTING AT NIGHT. 27 THE COURT: WHERE DO YOU LIVE?

MS. KEENAN: EL SEGUNDO.

```
THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER SAT AS A JUROR IN A CRIMINAL
1
2
    CASE BEFORE?
3
           MS. KEENAN: NO.
4
           THE COURT: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF ANY KIND
5
    OF A SERIOUS CRIME?
6
           MS. KEENAN: PETTY ASSAULT.
7
           THE COURT: PETTY ASSAULT?
           MS. KEENAN: I THINK THAT IS WHAT IT WAS. I WAS LIVING
8
9
    IN TOKYO.
10
                 THERE WAS A STREET BRAWL AND FLYING BOTTLES.
    MY LEGS WERE ALL CUT UP. I NEVER WENT TO THE TRIAL. BUT
11
12
    I HAD TO MAKE A DEPOSITION.
13
           THE COURT: I SEE. YOU HAVE FULLY RECOVERED FROM THAT,
14
    DID YOU?
15
           MS. KEENAN: YES.
16
           THE COURT: THAT'S GOOD. ALL RIGHT. QUESTIONS?
17
           MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. GOOD MORNING,
18
    MISS KEENAN.
19
           MS. KEENAN: GOOD MORNING.
20
           MR. BARENS: MISS KEENAN, OBVIOUSLY, YOUR EMPLOYMENT
     IS OF SOME CONCERN TO THE DEFENSE. IN THE IRS SETTING, I
21
22
    BELIEVE THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE IS IN TERMS OF THE
23
    TAXPAYER WHO HAS THE OBLIGATION OR THE DUTY OF PROOF. IS
    THAT CORRECT?
24
25
           MS. KEENAN: THE BURDEN OF PROOF ON DEDUCTIONS AND
26
    MOST CIVIL PENALTIES IS ON THE TAXPAYER. ADDITIONAL INCOME,
27
     IT IS ON THE GOVERNMENT AND ON FRAUD, IT IS ON THE GOVERNMENT.
28
     BUT, THERE IS NO INNOCENCE. THEY ARE ALL CIVIL CASES. I
```

HAVE NEVER DEALT WITH A CRIMINAL CASE.

SOMETIMES I FIND THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS COMPLETELY WRONG, THERE IS NO CASE AND THAT THEIR HAZARDS ARE 100 PERCENT. OKAY?

THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN VERY OFTEN BECAUSE,

FORTUNATELY, OUR EMPLOYEES AREN'T THAT INCOMPETENT TO BE

100 PERCENT WRONG FREQUENTLY.

SOMETIMES I FIND THAT THE TAXPAYER IS 100 PERCENT WRONG.

THEY DON'T LIKE THE LAW. A LOT OF TIMES I GET "IT IS NOT FAIR," WHICH IS TOTALLY IRRELEVANT TO MY CONSIDERATIONS.

MOST OF IT IS UNFAIR.

(LAUGHTER IN COURTROOM.)

MR. BARENS: YOU WILL GET NO ARGUMENT FROM ME. I WILL ENDORSE THAT ALL THE WAY.

MS. KEENAN: I ALWAYS TELL THE TAXPAYERS "CONGRESS IN

ITS WISDOM THOUGHT THIS WAS FAIR WHEN THEY PASSED IT," OKAY?

ALL I LOOK AT IS WHETHER IT IS LEGAL OR NOT AND

IT IS NOT THAT BLACK AND WHITE A LOT OF TIMES.

ONE OF OUR MOST FREQUENT QUESTIONS IS: "WHAT IS
THE DIFFERENCE?" AND IT IS NOT THAT EASY AS SOMETIMES THERE
IS NO RIGHT ANSWER SO I SAY "WELL, IF A GUY HAS A 60/40
PERCENT CHANCE OF PROVING IT, SINCE THE BURDEN IS ON HIM,
SO WE WILL SETTLE IT FOR 40 PERCENT."

MR. BARENS: SO YOU KIND OF PRORATE THE STATISTICAL PROBABILITIES OF SUCCESS FOR THE GOVERNMENT AND MAKE A SETTLEMENT RECOMMENDATION BASED ON THAT?

MS. KEENAN: RIGHT.

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. BARENS: YOU REALLY DON'T GET INTO BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT AS A CONCEPT, DO YOU, AT ALL? MS. KEENAN: NEVER, NEVER. MR. BARENS: REALLY, IT IS MORE BASED ON IT IS A MORE LIKELY TEST? MS. KEENAN: IT IS MORE PROBABLE THAN NOT AND IN A TIE, IN DEDUCTION CASES, CREDIT CASES, THE TIES GO TO THE GOVERNMENT. MR. BARENS: ISN'T ALSO WHEN THAT HAPPENS, THEY TAKE EVERYTHING BESIDE THE TIES? MS. KEENAN: THE TAXPAYER IS IN CONTROL OF ALL OF THE RECORDS SO I THINK THAT IS WHY CONGRESS PASSED THAT. MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND IN THIS FORUM, ALL OF THAT IS TOTALLY DIFFERENT, IF NOT TOTALLY CONTRARY? MS. KEENAN: I WOULD SAY IT IS TOTALLY CONTRARY. MR. BARENS: WHAT HAPPENS IF YOU ARE A JUROR, AS A JUROR, WHAT DO YOU DO IF IT IS A CLOSE CALL ON WHETHER IT IS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT OR NOT?

MS. KEENAN: IT GOES TO THE DEFENDANT.

MR. BARENS: MS. CAMPBELL-CABLE, THE JUROR SEATED TO YOUR LEFT, JUST NOW IN DISCUSSION WITH MR. WAPNER, SAID IN RESPONSE TO "WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PIECE OF PIE IF THE CAT WASN'T PRESENT IN THE HYPOTHETICAL," AND SHE RESPONDED "I BELIEVE MORE THAN LIKELY THE CHILD ATE THE PIE."

NOW, WHAT DO WE DO IF YOU RETIRE AND DELIBERATE

AND THE BEST YOU CAN SAY ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT'S CASE HERE

IS THAT MORE THAN LIKELY JOE HUNT KILLED SOMEBODY?

MS. KEENAN: IT IS NOT ENOUGH TO CONVICT.

MR. BARENS: NOT AT ALL.

WE HAVE HAD EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION, HAVE WE NOT,
ABOUT THE APPEARANCE OF GUILT OR SUSPICIOUS CONDUCT OR
SUSPICIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES, IS THAT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT?

MS. KEENAN: NO.

MR. BARENS: APPEARANCES, EVEN IN YOUR BUSINESS, I WOULD PRESUME, CAN BE DECEIVING AT TIMES.

MS. KEENAN: YES.

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO.

AND OFTEN, DON'T YOU GET TAXPAYERS' RECORDS THAT

HAVE THE APPEARANCE OF CONSTITUTING A DEDUCTION BUT ON FURTHER

EXAMINATION, ARE UNSUPPORTED?

MS. KEENAN: I DON'T WANT TO SAY THAT I GET THEM OFTEN BUT, YES, I DO GET DOCUMENTS THAT CAN'T BE RELIED UPON.

28

MR. BARENS: I'LL BET YOU IN FACT GET A LOT OF DOCUMENTS 1 2 THAT ARE JUST DOWNRIGHT FABRICATION. 3 MS. KEENAN: NOT A LOT BUT I HAVE SEEN QUITE A FEW. MR. BARENS: SO IF WE WENT ON THE APPEARANCE OF THINGS, 4 5 WITHOUT LOOKING AT THE UNDERLYING MOTIVES OF THE WRITERS, 6 THE PREPARERS OF THOSE DOCUMENTS, WE REALLY WOULDN'T GET TO 7 THE RIGHT ANSWER, WOULD WE? 8 MS. KEENAN: RIGHT. 9 MR. BARENS: COULD YOU ACCEPT THAT IN THIS SETTING, IN THIS FORUM, THE DEFENDANT HAS NO BURDEN OF PROOF WHATSOEVER? 10 11 MS. KEENAN: ABSOLUTELY. 12 MR. BARENS: IF THE DEFENDANT TESTIFIES AND SAYS "WELL, I DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENED TO RON LEVIN, I DIDN'T KILL HIM 13 14 BUT I DON'T KNOW WHAT HAPPENED TO HIM," DO YOU THINK THAT 15 HE HAS SOME AFFIRMATIVE DUTY BEYOND THAT TO EXPLAIN TO YOU 16 WHERE THIS PERSON IS? 17 MS. KEENAN: ABSOLUTELY NOT. 18 MR. BARENS: COULD YOU ACCEPT THAT? 19 MS. KEENAN: YES. 20 MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK THERE IS ANYTHING UNFAIR THAT 21 THE GOVERNMENT HAS THE SOLE BURDEN TO PROVE WHAT DID OR DID 22 NOT HAPPEN TO MR. LEVIN? 23 MS. KEENAN: NOT AT ALL. 24 MR. BARENS: HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT THE PIE BUSINESS 25 AND THE REASONS GIVEN IN THE COURTROOM? 26

MS. KEENAN: GIVEN THE LIMITS OF THE EXAMPLES, IF THOSE WERE ALL OF THE FACTS, I WOULD SAY THAT THE CHILD ATE THE PIE.

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

HAD.

MR. BARENS: AS A RATIONAL PERSON, IF I CREATE A HYPOTHETICAL WHERE I HAVE TOTALLY ISOLATED THE FACTS AND I HAVE TOLD YOU THERE IS NO ONE ELSE PRESENT IN THE HOUSE, A TOTALLY SANITARY SITUATION, MUCH MORE SANITARY THAN YOU HAVE EVER HAD IN REAL LIFE, BUT I TELL YOU THAT NO ONE IS THERE BUT THE MOTHER AND THE CHILD AND WE ARE OUT IN THE MIDDLE OF NOWHERE, EVEN WITHOUT ACCESS TO HUMANITY, PETS OR OTHER KNOWN FACTORS, AM I REALLY ASKING YOU A QUESTION WHEN I ASK YOU WHO ATE THE PIE? MS. KEENAN: NO. MR. BARENS: NOT A QUESTION AT ALL, IS IT? I AM SIMPLY ASKING YOU TO TELL ME I AM RIGHT;

IS THAT CORRECT?

MS. KEENAN: I WOULD SAY THE LIMITATIONS ARE SUCH THAT IT IS THE ONLY CONCLUSION THAT YOU CAN GIVE.

MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND IF THAT IS WHAT WE HAD IN THIS COURTROOM, WE WOULDN'T HAVE ALL OF THIS GOING ON? MS. KEENAN: I WOULDN'T HAVE A JOB IF THAT IS WHAT WE

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO.

YOU ARE NOT GOING TO GET THAT SANITARY PACKAGE IN ANY KIND OF A CASE WHERE A DEFENDANT PLEADS NOT GUILTY BECAUSE, OTHERWISE, WE WOULD BE HERE TALKING ABOUT SENTENCE INSTEAD OF ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT ANYBODY IS GUILTY OF ANYTHING; DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. YOU ARE COMFORTABLE WITH THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE?

MS. KEENAN: YES. 1 MR. BARENS: WHEN YOU LOOK AT -- YOU TOLD ME EARLIER 2 THAT YOU LOOK AT A FILE OR WHATEVER, HOW DO YOU LOOK AT THAT? 3 DO YOU JUST GET WRITTEN REPORTS OR DO LAWYERS MAKE A 4 PRESENTATION TO YOU? 5 MS. KEENAN: NO. 6 THEY ARE FROM AGENTS, ACCOUNTANTS AND THEY ARE 7 ACCOUNTING WORKING PAPERS. 8 MR. BARENS: WHAT DO YOU SEE FROM THE TAXPAYER'S POINT 9 OF VIEW? 10 MS. KEENAN: THE WORKING PAPERS, OKAY? THEY ARE 11 THEORETICALLY INCLUDING THE LOG WHICH APPLIES, THE FACTS IN 12 THE CASE, THE TAXPAYER'S POSITION AND THE ACCOUNTANT'S 13 POSITION. 14 MR. BARENS: DOES THE AGENT EXPRESS HIS PERCEPTION OF 15 THE TAXPAYER'S POSITION? 16 MS. KEENAN: YES. 17 MR. BARENS: SO ACTUALLY, THERE IS NOTHING THERE ON 18 A FIRSTHAND ARGUMENT-TYPE BASIS? 19 MS. KEENAN: YES. 20 THEY MAKE A WRITTEN FORMAL PROCESS. SOME OF THEM 21 ARE FROM ATTORNEYS, SOME FROM CPA'S AND SOME FROM THE 22 TAXPAYERS THEMSELVES. 23 THEY VARY WIDELY FROM "THIS IS NOT FAIR" TO VERY 24 LENGTHY LEGAL DISSERTATIONS. 25 MR. BARENS: PRIOR TO YOUR DETERMINATION, HAVE YOU 26 RECEIVED COMMENTS FROM THE CASE AGENT CONCERNING THE 27 DEFENDANT'S PROTEST OR THE TAXPAYER'S PROTEST POSITION, HAVE

SAID BUT I DON'T THINK OF MYSELF AS LAW ENFORCEMENT. MR. BARENS: WHAT CONCERNS ME IS YOUR PERCEPTION OF YOURSELF, NOT THE PUBLIC'S PERCEPTION OF YOU. MS. KEENAN: THAT IS RIGHT, I DON'T THINK OF MYSELF OR NEVER DID. MR. BARENS: YOU DID NOT? MS. KEENAN: NO.

8 F

MR. BARENS: YOU FELT THAT -- DID YOU BELIEVE YOU HEARD 1 THE STORY THAT THIS TAXPAYER IS GOING TO COME IN HERE AND 2 GIVE ME A SONG AND DANCE AND THEY ALL DON'T TELL THE TRUTH 3 AND YOU KNOW, HAVE A BIAS LIKE THAT? 4 MS. KEENAN: NO, BECAUSE MOST OF THE AUDITS, MOST OF 5 THE EVIDENCE THAT YOU GET IS THE TAXPAYER SAYING THAT IT IS 6 7 SO. 8 MOST PEOPLE DON'T HAVE RECORDS AT ALL, NO DOCU-9 MENTS AT ALL. SO MOST OF WHAT YOU LOOK AT IS THINGS THAT THE 10 11 TAXPAYER SAYS. MR. BARENS: DO YOU THINK THERE IS ANYTHING, BASED 12 ON YOUR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OR TRAINING AT ALL, THAT WOULD 13 14 BIAS YOU AS A WITNESS IN FAVOR OF THE PROSECUTION? 15 MS. KEENAN: NO. 16 MR. BARENS: YOU DO NOT? 17 MS. KEENAN: NO. MR. BARENS: THE FACT THAT YOU WORK FOR THE UNITED 18 19 STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE PROSECUTION REPRESENTS A BRANCH 20 OF THE STATE OR COUNTY GOVERNMENT, AS THE CASE MAY BE 21 PERCEIVED. THAT WOULD NOT IN ANY WAY INFLUENCE YOU IN FAVOR 22 OF THE PROSECUTION? 23 MS. KEENAN: NO. MR. BARENS: YOU MENTIONED THAT YOU HAVE A DEGREE IN 24 25 HISTORY?

28 WITHIN THAT DEGREE?

MS. KEENAN: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND DID YOU HAVE AN EMPHASIS OF STUDY

26

```
MS. KEENAN: YES, THE 16TH CENTURY, MOSTLY THE
1
2
    REFORMATION.
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. WHERE DID YOU OBTAIN THAT
3
    DEGREE?
4
           MS. KEENAN: AT UCLA.
5
           MR. BARENS: AND YOU HAVE A GRADUATE DEGREE OR POST-
6
    GRADUATE DEGREE?
7
           MS. KEENAN: JUST A BACHELOR OF ARTS.
8
           MR. BARENS: AND DID YOU HAVE A MINOR ACCOMPANYING
9
10
    THAT?
           MS. KEENAN: ENGLISH.
11
           MR. BARENS: ANY PARTICULAR EMPHASIS IN ENGLISH?
12
           MS. KEENAN: NO. I READ A LOT. I LIKE THE CLASSES.
13
           MR. BARENS: IS THERE A PARTICULAR TYPE OF READING
14
15
    THAT YOU PREFER?
           MS. KEENAN: HISTORY.
16
           MR. BARENS: IT SEEMS CONSISTENT TO ME. DID YOU HAVE
17
     A PROFESSOR NAMED LEEHAN AT UCLA IN ENGLISH?
18
            MS. KEENAN: NO. I DON'T THINK SO.
19
            MR. BARENS: DID YOU READ ANY PHILOSOPHY?
20
            MS. KEENAN: YES, HOBBES, MARX -- I WAS JUST TRYING
21
     TO THINK OF THEM, LOCKE, ROUSSEAU, LES PHILSOPHES IN FRANCE
22
23
     AND A LOT OF RELIGION.
            MR. BARENS: DID YOU GET INTO ANY EXISTENTIAL PHILOSOPHY?
24
            MS. KENNAN: NO. I THINK I MAY HAVE READ NO EXIT.
25
     I HAVE A COPY WHICH I HAVE RESISTED LOOKING AT. I DON'T KNOW
26
27
     THAT I EVER GOT THROUGH IT. BUT I HAVE IT.
            MR. BARENS: DID YOU GET INTO READING CAMUS OR SARTRE
```

MS. KEENAN: YES.

```
1
    OR ANY OF THOSE PEOPLE?
2
           MS. KEENAN: NO.
3
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH WHAT
4 -
    I MEAN BY EXISTENTIAL PHILOSOPHY?
5
           MS. KEENEN: ACTUALLY, I HAVE HEARD THE TERM, OKAY?
6
    BUT I DON'T REALLY KNOW WHAT IT -- I HAVE READ STUFF BY
7
    SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR, THE FEMINIST STUFF.
8
           MR. BARENS: DID YOU EVER HEAR THE EXPRESSION "PARADOX
9
    PHILOSOPHY" IN ANY OF THE MATERIALS YOU EITHER READ OR WERE
10
    LECTURED UPON AT UCLA?
11
           MS. KEENAN: NOT THAT I RECALL.
12
           MR. BARENS: THIS DOESN'T RING ANY BELLS FOR YOU?
13
           MS. KEENAN: NO.
14
           MR. BARENS: WOULD A YOUNG MAN WHO WAS A MEMBER OF
15
     SOMETHING CALLED THE BILLIONAIRE BOYS CLUB CAUSE YOU ANY
16
    CONCERN?
17
           MS. KEENAN: NO.
18
            MR. BARENS: IT DOESN'T MAKE YOU THINK THAT HE IS SOME
19
     SORT OF A BAD GUY AS A RESULT OF THAT?
20
           MS. KEENAN: NO.
21
           MR. BARENS: YOU WOULDN'T THINK THAT HE OWED TAXES,
22
     WOULD YOU?
23
           MS. KEENAN: NO.
24
            MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. YOU HAVE NEVER WATCHED A
25
     CRIMINAL TRIAL BEFORE?
26
            MS. KEENAN: NO.
27
            MR. BARENS: HAVE YOU EVER WATCHED ANY TAX TRIALS?
```

8B

1	MR. BARENS: AND HAVE YOU WATCHED TAX EVASION TRIALS?
2	MS. KEENAN: NO, ONLY TAX COURT TRIALS. THOSE ARE
3	CIVIL CASES.
4 -	MR. BARENS: CIVIL? OVER IN THE FEDERAL BUILDING,
5	HERE?
6	MS. KEENAN: YES, JUST A JUDGE.
7	MR. BARENS: WHY DO YOU DO THAT?
8	MS. KEENAN: ON CALENDAR, WE MAKE A LAST DITCH EFFORT
9	TO SETTLE THE CASES.
10	MR. BARENS: SO YOU ARE PRESENT IN THE COURTROOM TO
11	PARTICIPATE IN A HOPEFUL NEGOTIATION PROCESS?
12	MS. KEENAN: YES.
13	MR. BARENS: WHAT USUALLY HAPPENS AT THE LAST MINUTE,
14	THERE? I MEAN, IN THE GREATER PERCENTAGE OF CASES, IS THERE
15	A DISPOSITION?
16	MS. KEENAN: ALMOST ALL OF THE CASES ARE SETTLED.
17	MR. BARENS: IT IS BASED ON WHAT I WOULD GENERALLY
18	REFER TO AS A COST-EFFECTIVE BASIS, BOTH FOR THE GOVERNMENT
19	AND THE TAXPAYER?
20	MS. KEENAN: THAT IS WHY IT IS DONE. WE CAN'T CONSIDER
21	THAT WHEN YOU WRITE UP THE REPORT.
22	YOU HAVE TO COME UP WITH SOME LEGAL AND FACTUAL
23	WAY TO SETTLE THE CASE.
24	
25	
26	
27	

MR. BARENS: I TEND OVER THE YEARS TO PERCEIVE THE 1 WHOLE CIVIL JUSTICE SYSTEM AS SOMETHING THAT COULD BE CALLED 2 A SYMPHONY OF ACCOMMODATION, WHICH HAS BEEN SET UP OVER SIX . 3 OR 800 YEARS. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THERE IS NO 4 . ACCOMMODATION BETWEEN MR. WAPNER AND MYSELF POSSIBLE IN THIS 5 6 SETTING? 7 MS. KEENAN: YES. MR. BARENS: WE JUST CAN'T WORK IT OUT. WE HAVE TOTALLY 8 DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW, HERE. THIS IS NOT SOMETHING WHERE 9 WE, YOU UNDERSTAND, TRY TO MARK EACH OTHER UP, SO TO SPEAK 10 AND THEN SEE IF WE CAN WORK SOMETHING OUT, JUST BEFORE YOU 11 12 RETIRE? 13 MS. KEENAN: YES. 14 MR. BARENS: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 15 MS. KEENAN: YES. MR. BARENS: AND THIS IS NOT A BARGAINING CONTEST THAT 16 17 WE ENGAGE IN, HERE? 18 MS. KEENAN: YES. MR. BARENS: BUT RATHER, WE HAVE A TOTALLY BLACK AND 19 WHITE VARIANCE ON WHAT THE TRUTH IS. 20 21 MS. KEENAN: YES. MR. BARENS: AND DO YOU THINK YOU COULD LISTEN TO ALL 22 THE EVIDENCE BEFORE YOU CAME TO A CONCLUSION? 23 24 MS. KEENAN: YES. MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD NOT BE OVERWHELMED BY WEEKS 25 OF THE GOVERNMENT PUTTING ON THEIR CASE, SAYING THIS IS TRUE 26 27 AND THIS IS TRUE AND THIS IS TRUE AND THEN, EVEN BEFORE I

PUT ON A DEFENSE, HAVE REACHED SOME DECISION ABOUT THE DEFENDANT

```
GUILT OR INNOCENCE? YOU COULD RESIST THAT, COULDN'T YOU?
1
2
           MS. KEENAN: YES.
           MR. BARENS: YOU WOULD WANT TO HEAR BOTH SIDES?
. 3
4
            MS. KEENAN: YES.
            MR. BARENS: DO YOU HAVE ANY HOBBIES?
5
            MS. KEENAN: YES. I PLAY THE PIANO AND THE VIOLIN.
6
7
            THE COURT: I CAN'T HEAR YOU.
            MS. KEENAN: I PLAY THE PIANO AND THE VIOLIN AND I
8
9
     PLAY TENNIS.
            MR. BARENS: DO YOU HAVE A STEADY BOYFRIEND?
10
11
            MS. KEENAN: YES.
12
            MR. BARENS: WHAT DOES HE DO?
            MS. KEENAN: HE SELLS INSURANCE.
13
14
            MR. BARENS: NEVER BEEN MARRIED?
15
                         NO.
            MS. KEENAN:
16
            MR. BARENS: AS I HAVE ASKED RECENT PROSPECTIVE JURORS,
     HOW WOULD YOU FEEL IF YOU WERE MY CLIENT HERE ON THE DEFENSE
17
     AND THE JURY WAS COMPOSED OF PEOPLE WITH YOUR BACKGROUND?
18
     HOW WOULD YOU FEEL ABOUT GOING TO TRIAL? WHAT WOULD YOU SAY
19
     TO ME AS YOUR LAWYER AND I WOULD SAY TO YOU HOW WAS THE JURY
20
21
     LOOKING TO YOU, MISS KEENAN?
            MS. KEENAN: I THINK THAT I WOULD BE QUITE SATISFIED
22
23
     THAT I COULD GET A FAIR HEARING AND A FAIR TRIAL.
24
            MR. BARENS: YOU CAN ASSURE ME, BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY AS
25
     A DEFENSE LAWYER DEALING WITH SOMEONE WHO IS A PART OF THE
26
     GOVERNMENT AND RIGHTLY OR WRONGLY, I THINK MOST TAXPAYERS
     LOOK AT THAT WHOLE IRS SITUATION AS PROSECUTION ORIENTED.
27
```

YOU DON'T FEEL ANY WAY, THAT THAT WOULD CAUSE

```
YOU -- SHOULD CAUSE ME PROPERLY ANY CONCERN ABOUT YOU AS AN
1
2
    INDIVIDUAL?
           MS. KEENAN: ABSOLUTELY NOT.
3
           MR. BARENS: OBVIOUSLY, I APPRECIATE THAT EVERY ONE
4
    OF YOU WHO WORKS IN THE IRS, IS DIFFERENT IN YOUR
5
    PHILOSOPHY AND VALUE SYSTEMS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE PASS
6
    FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.
7
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
8
           MR. WAPNER: GOOD MORNING, MS. KEENAN. HOW COMFORTABLE
9
    DO YOU FEEL NOW THAT MR. BARENS HAS TOLD YOU TWO OR THREE
10
    TIMES THAT HE THINKS YOU ARE PROSECUTION ORIENTED? IS THAT
11
    SEAT GETTING A LITTLE BIT WARMER TO YOU?
12
           MS. KEENAN: I HEAR IT ALL OF THE TIME.
13
           MR. WAPNER: AND THE TAX COURT CASES, IF THEY GET TO
14
    COURT, WHO ARE THEY PROSECUTED BY?
15
           MS. KEENAN: THE DISTRICT COUNSEL.
16
           MR. WAPNER: FOR THE IRS?
17
           MS. KEENAN: (NODS HEAD UP AND DOWN.)
18
19
           MR. WAPNER: IS THAT YES?
20
           MS. KEENAN: YES.
           MR. WAPNER: HOW MUCH CONTACT DO YOU HAVE WITH THEM
21
22
    ON A DAILY BASIS?
           MS. KEENAN: WELL, I SEE THEM. WE SHARE THE LIBRARY.
23
24
    WE DON'T WORK TOGETHER.
                  THEY ARE PROSECUTORS. I MEAN, THAT IS THE WAY
25
     IT IS SET UP. THE GOVERNMENT IS THE DEFENDANT.
26
           MR. WAPNER: OKAY. YOU DON'T SEE YOURSELF AS JUST
27
```

A BRANCH OF THE DISTRICT COUNSEL?

MS. KEENAN: NOT AT ALL. MR. WAPNER: YOU DON'T WORK WITH ANY ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS? MS. KEENAN: NO, NEVER. THEY DO CRIMINAL CASES. MR. WAPNER: AND NONE OF YOUR CASES EVER BECOME CRIMINAL CASES? MS. KEENAN: NO. MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU HAD ANY EXPERIENCES WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT, LIKE TRAFFIC TICKETS OR THINGS LIKE THAT, THAT LEFT SUCH A BAD TASTE IN YOUR MOUTH THAT YOU WOULD HOLD IT AGAINST A POLICE OFFICER IF HE TESTIFIED? MS. KEENAN: NO.

1	MR. WAPNER: DO YOUR PARENTS LIVE IN THE LOS ANGELES
2	AREA?
3	MS. KEENAN: YES, THEY LIVE IN EL SEGUNDO.
4	MR. WAPNER: HOW OFTEN DO YOU SEE OR TALK TO THEM?
5	MS. KEENAN: ABOUT ONCE A WEEK.
6	MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY BROTHERS OR SISTERS?
7	MS. KEENAN: ONE OF EACH.
8	MR. WAPNER: DO THEY LIVE LOCALLY?
9	MS. KEENAN: MY BROTHER LIVES IN MANHATTAN AND MY SISTER
10	LIVES IN MAR VISTA.
11	MR. WAPNER: MANHATTAN IN NEW YORK?
12	MS. KEENAN: MANHATTAN BEACH.
13	MR. WAPNER: HOW OFTEN DO YOU SEE OR TALK TO THEM?
14	MS. KEENAN: ABOUT ONCE A WEEK.
15	MR. WAPNER: DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA ABOUT CIRCUMSTANTIAL
16	EVIDENCE OR DID YOU BEFORE YOU CAME INTO THE COURTROOM HERE?
17	MS. KEENAN: YES.
18	MR. WAPNER: AND WHAT WAS YOUR FEELING BEFORE YOU CAME
19	INTO COURT?
20	MS. KEENAN: THAT ALL EVIDENCE IS EVIDENCE. I HAD
21	A FOUR-HOUR CLASS ON EVIDENCE WHEN I BECAME AN APPEALS OFFICER.
22	MR. WAPNER: OKAY. THAT DOESN'T QUALIFY YOU TO KNOW
23	MORE ABOUT IT THAN THE JUDGE?
24	MS. KEENAN: I KNOW THAT.
25	MR. WAPNER: OKAY. SO YOU HEARD THE EXAMPLE THAT I
26	USED WITH THE OTHER JURORS ABOUT OCCASIONALLY GETTING JURORS
27	IN THE JURY BOX WHO SAY THAT THEY HAVE BEEN TO LAW SCHOOL
28	OR THEY KNOW THIS OR THEY KNOW THAT AND THEY DON'T FOLLOW
	1

```
1
    THE JUDGE'S INSTRUCTIONS.
2
                  THAT IS NOT GOING TO BE A PROBLEM FOR YOU?
3
           MS. KEENAN: NO.
4
           MR. WAPNER: HAVE YOU EVER BEEN THE VICTIM OF A FRAUD
5
    OR ANY KIND OF A CON SCHEME?
6
           MS. KENNAN: NOT THAT I EVER DETECTED.
7
           MR. WAPNER: OKAY. HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN WORKING
8
    FOR THE IRS TOTALLY?
9
           MS. KEENAN: FIFTEEN YEARS.
10
            MR. WAPNER: DID YOU HEAR THE NAMES OF ALL THE WITNESSES
11
    THAT THE JUDGE READ?
12
           MS. KEENAN: YES.
13
           MR. WAPNER: AND DID YOU HEAR THE NAME OF THE VICTIM
14
     IN THIS CASE, MR. LEVIN, RONALD LEVIN?
15
            MS. KEENAN: I HEARD ALL OF THE NAMES.
16
            MR. WAPNER: DIDN'T MEAN ANYTHING TO YOU?
17
           MS. KEENAN: (NODS HEAD FROM SIDE TO SIDE.)
18
            MR. WAPNER: IS THAT NO?
19
            MS. KEENAN: NO, SORRY.
20
            MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR.
21
            THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
22
            MR. BARENS: COULD WE APPROACH THE BENCH?
23
            THE COURT: YES.
24
                  (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD AT
25
                  THE BENCH:)
26
            MR. BARENS: I AM NOT SURE WHAT TO DO NOW.
27
            THE COURT: WELL --
28
            MR. BARENS: I AM NOT PREPARED -- WELL, I HEAR THAT
```

```
I HAVE ONLY ONE, AS I UNDERSTAND IT? HE HAS ONE, TOO?
1
2
           THE COURT: YES.
3
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. COULDN'T WE HEAR BOTH OF THEM
4
    BEFORE I HAVE TO EXERCISE MY CHOICE?
5
           THE COURT: NO.
6
           MR. BARENS: BECAUSE I DON'T HAVE A CHOICE.
7
           THE COURT: NO. YOU HAVE GOT A CHOICE NOW TO TAKE
8
    HER OR NOT TAKE HER.
9
           MR. BARENS: BUT THEN YOU SEE, IF I DON'T TAKE HER,
10
    IF I DON'T --
           THE COURT: IF YOU DON'T TAKE HER, YOU MIGHT GET
11
12
    SPEARMAN.
13
           MR. CHIER: HE LIKES ARTHUR'S SUIT, ANYWAY.
14
           MR. BARENS: I STILL HAVE A PEREMPTORY, IF I DON'T --
15
           THE COURT: IF HE TAKES HER, THEN YOU HAVE NOT GOT
16
    A PEREMPTORY.
17
           MR. BARENS: CAN WE TALK?
18
           MR. WAPNER: ABOUT WHAT?
19
           MR. BARENS: I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT YOUR THOUGHTS
20
    ARE.
21
           MR. WAPNER: NO. THE GAME DOESN'T WORK THAT WAY.
22
           THE COURT: THAT'S RIGHT.
23
           MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. COULD WE CONFER FOR A MOMENT,
24
    THEN? SO I AM CLEAR IF I PASS HER, THEN I AM AT FRED'S
25
    MERCY?
           THE COURT: NO. I DON'T THINK THAT YOU ARE AT ANYBODY'S
26
27
    MERCY. IF YOU ARE OF THE OPINION SHE WOULD MAKE A GOOD
28
    ALTERNATE OR POSSIBLE REGULAR JUROR, YOU ACCEPT HER. IF YOU
```

DON'T THINK SO, YOU CAN LOOK AT WHAT YOU HAVE LEFT. MR. BARENS: I KNOW. ALL RIGHT. HE IS OUT THERE LIKE THAT SHARK IN THE MOVIE JAWS. HE IS OUT THERE. OKAY. JUDGE, LET US HAVE A MOMENT IF YOU WOULD, PLEASE. THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD 1 IN OPEN COURT:) 2 (UNREPORTED COLLOQUY BETWEEN MR. BARENS, 3 MR. CHIER AND THE DEFENDANT.) MR. BARENS: WE WILL PASS FOR CAUSE, YOUR HONOR. 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YES, I KNOW YOU PASSED FOR CAUSE 6 BEFORE. IT IS YOUR PEREMPTORY. 7 (PAUSE.) 8 MR. BARENS: I WILL ACCEPT THE ALTERNATE. 9 THE COURT: VERY GOOD. 10 MR. WAPNER: THE PEOPLE WILL ACCEPT THIS ALTERNATE ALSO. 11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 12 WHAT I AM GOING TO DO IS NOW -- WE DON'T WANT 13 TO SWEAR THEM YET, IS THAT IT? 14 MR. WAPNER: CORRECT. 15 THE COURT: WHAT I AM GOING TO DO NOW IS TO ASK YOU 16 ALL TO COME BACK TOMORROW MORNING. 17 THE REASON FOR THAT IS WE HAVE GOT SOME MOTIONS 18 THAT WE HAVE TO DISPOSE OF THIS AFTERNOON AND THERE IS NO 19 SENSE YOUR WAITING AROUND JUST TWIDDLING YOUR THUMBS UNTIL 20 YOU ARE READY TO BE CALLED BACK IN, SO WHAT I WILL ASK YOU 21 TO DO IS TO COME BACK. 22 MR. WAPNER: MAY WE APPROACH THE BENCH? 23 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, APPROACH THE BENCH. 24 IT MIGHT BE TOMORROW MORNING, LADIES AND 25 GENTLEMEN. 26 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD 27

AT THE BENCH:)

THE COURT: I AM SORRY. I THOUGHT WE WERE GOING TO ARGUE THOSE MOTIONS THAT YOU HAVE, THE ORAL MOTIONS THAT YOU HAVE PENDING AND DEPENDING UPON WHAT THE DISPOSITION IS GOING TO BE OF THOSE MOTIONS -- IN OTHER WORDS, SUPPOSE WE ARGUE THE MOTION TO DISMISS AND I DENY IT, JUST ASSUMING THAT I DO, WHAT IS THERE LEFT FOR US TO DO BUT TO TRY THE CASE?

MR. BARENS: I BEG YOUR PARDON, YOUR HONOR, BUT I BELIEVE THAT WE HAD DETERMINED LAST THURSDAY --

THE COURT: THAT WE WILL TAKE A WEEK, YOU MEAN?

MR. BARENS: YES.

THE COURT: WE WILL TAKE THE REST OF THE WEEK.

MR. BARENS: WELL, I HAD MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE, WHICH YOUR HONOR WAS CONSIDERING AND YOUR HONOR HAD SOMEWHAT INDICATED THAT WE WOULD HAVE TEN DAYS IN WHICH TO GO TO SAN FRANCISCO. I HAVE PREPARED THE MOTION.

THE COURT: YOU HAVE HAD MORE THAN TWO WEEKS TO GO TO SAN FRANCISCO AND TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT.

MR. BARENS: IF YOU WILL RECALL, WE DIDN'T PRESENT THE MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE UNTIL LAST WEDNESDAY, WHICH WAS HEARD LAST THURSDAY, YOUR HONOR, AT WHICH TIME YOUR HONOR INDICATED THAT WE WOULD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO GO UP THERE AND GET ON THE CALENDAR AND BE HEARD ON OUR MOTION TO RETURN OUR EXHIBITS.

THE COURT: I TOLD YOU TWO WEEKS AGO TO SEND YOUR ASSOCIATE UP THERE TO MAKE ANY MOTIONS THAT NEED TO BE MADE. YOU WEREN'T NEEDED, SINCE YOU ARE TRYING THIS CASE HERE.

MR. BARENS: THE DEFENDANT IS ENTITLED TO BE THERE TO LOOK AT THE DOCUMENTS AND TO TESTIFY AT THE EVIDENTIARY

HEARING, WHICH I NEED HIM PRESENT FOR.

THE COURT: HASN'T THAT MOTION BEEN MADE?

MR. BARENS: I HAVE A MOTION I DID NOT FILE.

THE COURT: WHY NOT?

MR. BARENS: I HAVE BEEN HERE ENGAGED.

THE COURT: YOU HAVE AN ASSOCIATE WHO HAS BEEN MAKING ANY NUMBER OF MOTIONS WHILE YOU ARE HERE.

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO.

YOUR HONOR, I REPRESENT TO THE COURT, I HAVE
DILIGENTLY AND EXPEDITIOUSLY PROCEEDED IN RESPONSE TO THIS
HORRENDOUS THING THAT HAS HAPPENED HERE. IT HAS NOT BEEN
TWO WEEKS NOW BUT, RATHER, IT HAS BEEN TEN DAYS NOW AND NOT
COURT DAYS AT THAT.

YOUR HONOR, WE WERE UNABLE TO FILE THE MOTION
YESTERDAY BECAUSE THERE WAS NO ONE IN SESSION YESTERDAY.
WE ARE PREPARED TO FILE THE MOTION.

I WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS ANOTHER PROBLEM THAT I
WOULD LIKE TO STATE, YOUR HONOR, WHICH I AM SURE YOUR HONOR
WOULD BE AWARE OF IF YOU THINK ABOUT IT. I AM NEITHER FISH
NOR FOWL IN THAT COURT RIGHT NOW. THIS CASE NUMBER OF THIS
COURT DOWN HERE DOESN'T HELP ME UP THERE. I HAVE TO SOMEHOW
PIGGYBACK MY WAY, SO TO SPEAK, INTO THAT COURT.

THE COURT: WHY DIDN'T YOU GIVE INSTRUCTIONS TO THE LAWYER UP THERE WHO IS REPRESENTING THE DEFENDANT THERE?

MR. BARENS: I TALKED TO HIM YESTERDAY.

THE COURT: WHY DIDN'T YOU HAVE HIM GO THERE AND TALK
TO HIM AND GIVE HIM ALL OF THE PAPERS?

MR. BARENS: I TALKED TO HIM YESTERDAY.

THE COURT: TEN DAYS HAVE GONE BY AND NOT A THING HAS BEEN DONE.

MR. BARENS: THAT IS JUST NOT TRUE, YOUR HONOR. I HAVE RESPONDED AS VIGOROUSLY AS COUNSEL CAN.

YOUR HONOR, I DID NOT CREATE THIS PROBLEM. I
NOTICE YOU ARE NOT ASKING MR. WAPNER WHAT HE HAS DONE.

THE COURT: I WANT YOU TO GET FINISHED TELLING ME NOW WHAT YOUR POSITION IS AND THEN I WILL ASK MR. WAPNER.

MR. BARENS: I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT THE PROSECUTION HAS DONE TO ASSIST IN THE RECOVERY OF THOSE DOCUMENTS FOR US.

THE COURT: WHAT DOCUMENTS?

MR. BARENS: THE MATERIALS THAT WERE REMOVED.

THE COURT: WHAT HAS BEEN REMOVED?

MR. BARENS: WE DON'T KNOW.

THE COURT: I HAVEN'T THE REMOTEST IDEA WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT EVEN. WHAT DOCUMENTS DO YOU HAVE REFERENCE TO?

MR. BARENS: THEY HAVE NOT PROVIDED US WITH AN INVENTORY, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT IT, MR. WAPNER?

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, AS THE COURT KNOWS, I HAVE INTENTIONALLY ATTEMPTED TO DISTANCE MYSELF FROM WHAT WAS TAKEN BECAUSE I DON'T WANT THE PROSECUTION IN THIS CASE TO BE TAINTED BY ANY MATERIALS THAT WERE SEIZED AND THEN HAVE MR. BARENS SAY WELL, THANK YOU, MR. WAPNER, FOR LOOKING AT IT AND NOW YOU ARE TAINTED BY THIS AND YOU CAN'T PROSECUTE THIS CASE. SO I DON'T INTEND TO LOOK AT THE DOCUMENTS.

THE COURT: I DIDN'T ASK YOU TO LOOK AT THEM. I WANT TO KNOW WHAT THE DOCUMENTS ARE SPECIFICALLY TO SEE WHAT RELATIONSHIP THOSE DOCUMENTS HAVE TO THIS CASE. SO FAR AS I KNOW, ALL OF THE NOTES THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN TAKING -- AND HE HAS BEEN DOING A LOT OF THAT, A MASS OF THAT, THOSE ARE A LOT OF THINGS THAT HAVE BEEN TAKEN. I AM NOT INTERESTED IN WHAT THEY TOOK OF HIS. I AM ONLY INTERESTED IN WHAT THEY TOOK OF COUNSEL. MR. WAPNER: WELL, I CAN GET A LIST FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE. I CAN GET A COPY OF THE RETURN ON THE WARRANT. I HAVE NO IDEA HOW SPECIFIC IT IS. IN OTHER WORDS --

9-5

THE COURT: WELL, AT LEAST SEE WHAT IT IS THAT THEY
TOOK. IS THERE A DESCRIPTION OF THE DOCUMENTS WHICH WERE
TAKEN?

MR. WAPNER: I WILL OBTAIN A RETURN OF THE WARRANT.

I ASKED THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ABOUT THAT LAST WEEK AND IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY WERE GOING TO HAVE THE RETURN PREPARED AS OF LAST WEDNESDAY. I DON'T HAVE A COPY OF IT. I AM SURE I CAN GET ONE.

THE COURT: WHY DIDN'T YOU GET IT BEFORE NOW?

MR. WAPNER: IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING HE WAS GOING TO

SEND IT TO ME.

THE COURT: THIS IS TUESDAY. THAT WAS LAST WEDNESDAY.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, I WILL CALL HIM AND SEE.

THE COURT: DID YOU SEE A COPY OF THE RETURN?

MR. BARENS: NO.

I TRIED TO CONTACT MR. VANCE AND PARKER KELLY.

MR. JOHN VANCE IS THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND I TRIED TO REACH

HIM WITHOUT SUCCESS.

SINCE FRIDAY, I HAVE TRIED TO REACH PARKER KELLY,
MR. HUNT'S LAWYER UP THERE, WITHOUT SUCCESS.

I AM ASKING THOSE GENTLEMEN -- MY PURPOSE WAS TO ASK THEM IF THERE WAS SOMEHOW A WAY TO WORK OUT A STIPULATION THAT I COULD APPEAR AND BE ON CALENDAR FOR MY MOTION UP THERE.

IF MR. VANCE, WHO HAS ALWAYS BEEN A GENTLEMAN

IN THE PAST, WOULD PERMIT ME STANDING TO GO THERE AND MOTION

THE RETURN OF MY DOCUMENTS --

THE COURT: YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT "MY DOCUMENTS."

Α

```
I DON'T KNOW WHAT DOCUMENTS YOU ARE REFERRING TO.
1
           MR. BARENS: MY CLIENT'S DOCUMENTS, YOUR HONOR.
2
           THE COURT: THAT IS BETTER.
3
           MR. BARENS: THE DEFENSE'S DOCUMENTS.
4
                 I AM SORRY, YOUR HONOR.
5
           THE COURT: YES.
6
           MR. BARENS: BUT HOWEVER, I SUBMIT, SOME OF MY
7
     DOCUMENTS, I BELIEVE, THE DOCUMENTS BEING ONES I GENERATED.
8
           THE COURT: YOU KNOW WHAT THEY ARE, DON'T YOU?
9
           MR. BARENS: I HAVE NO IDEA, YOUR HONOR.
10
           THE COURT: YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT YOUR DOCUMENTS ARE
11
     EITHER?
12
           MR. BARENS: YES, I KNOW WHAT DOCUMENTS ORIGINATED IN
13
     MY OFFICE THAT WOULD BE A PART OF WHAT WAS THERE.
14
                 THERE WERE CERTAIN MEMORANDA I ADDRESSED TO THE
15
     DEFENDANT WHEREIN I DISCUSSED ANTICIPATED TESTIMONY.
16
           MR. WAPNER: MAY I SUGGEST SOMETHING?
17
           THE COURT: YES.
18
           MR. WAPNER: THAT WE TELL THE JURY TO COME BACK AT
19
     1:45 AND THAT I WILL CALL MR. VANCE IN THE MEANTIME BUT --
20
           THE COURT: WHY DON'T I TELL THEM TO COME BACK TOMORROW?
21
           MR. BARENS: WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO WITH THEM
22
     TOMORROW?
23
           THE COURT: WELL, WE MIGHT RESOLVE SOME THINGS TODAY,
24
     THIS AFTERNOON.
25
           MR. BARENS: I CAN ASSURE YOUR HONOR THAT I FACTUALLY
26
     BELIEVE THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS A LEGAL BASIS TO PROCEED TO
27
```

AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING UP THERE TO OBTAIN DOCUMENTS.

I BELIEVE YOUR HONOR INDICATED YOU WOULD NOT RULE ON THE MOTION TO DISMISS UNTIL AFTER YOU HEARD ABOUT THE DISCOVERY MOTION.

THE COURT: THAT IS WHY I TOLD YOU LAST WEEK THAT I
WANTED TO KNOW PRECISELY WHAT IT IS THAT WAS SEIZED. IT MIGHT
HAVE ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS CASE AT ALL.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THEY HAVE TEN DAYS IN WHICH
TO RETURN -- IN WHICH TO FILE A RETURN ON THE WRIT.

THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND IT HAS BEEN RETURNED.

MR. BARENS: AGAIN, YOUR HONOR, THEY HAVEN'T MADE IT AVAILABLE TO THE DEFENSE.

MR. WAPNER: I WILL FIND OUT WHETHER THEY FILED THE RETURN OR NOT. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THEY HAVE.

I THOUGHT THEY WERE GOING TO DO IT AS OF LAST WEEK.

MR. BARENS: ACTUALLY, YOUR HONOR, TO BE CANDID, I DON'T BELIEVE THEIR TEN DAYS EXPIRED BY LAST WEDNESDAY. I THINK THEY HAD UNTIL FRIDAY ON THE TEN DAYS.

THE COURT: WHEN ARE YOU GOING TO FIND ALL OF THAT OUT?

MR. WAPNER: I WILL CALL RIGHT NOW.

BUT IN ANY EVENT, YOUR HONOR, THERE HAS TO BE SOME LITIGATION ON THIS IN THE COURT IN SAN MATEO COUNTY AND THEN WE HAVE TO HAVE A HEARING IN THIS COURT IN ADDITION TO THAT TO DETERMINE NOT ONLY WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN TAKEN BUT THE EFFECT OF WHAT WAS TAKEN ON THIS CASE AND THE EFFECT OF WHAT WAS SEIZED BY THE OFFICERS.

THE COURT: SO FAR, ALL I KNOW IS WHAT HAS BEEN TAKEN

IS THE AFFIDAVIT OF WHAT'S HIS NAME, THAT ALL OF THE DOCUMENTS

HE HAD PREPARED BUT NOTHING -- NO RELATIONSHIP SHOWN AT ALL TO THE ALLEGED QUOTE 80 EXHIBITS. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE 80 EXHIBITS ARE AND WHAT HE HAS TO DO WITH THE EXHIBITS.

THEY SHOULD BE IN YOUR POSSESSION AND NOT IN HIS.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE FACT THAT THE DEFENDANT
PREPARED CERTAIN DOCUMENTS FOR ME, YOUR HONOR, IF WE ARE
TALKING ABOUT DOCUMENTS WHERE THE DEFENDANT IS TALKING ABOUT
HIS TESTIMONY AND HIS WORK PRODUCT AND FOR THEM TO HAVE
POSSESSION OF THAT ANTICIPATED TESTIMONY TO ENABLE THEM TO
ANTICIPATE HIS TESTIMONY AND MY CROSS-EXAMINATION OF
WITNESSES --

YOUR HONOR, I WILL ADMIT TO THE COURT HE HAS

WRITTEN ME EXTENSIVE MEMORANDA TELLING ME HOW I -- SUGGESTED

CROSS-EXAMINATION FOR WITNESSES AND THEY SHOULDN'T HAVE THAT.

THE COURT: A LOT OF STUFF WAS LEFT. HOW DO WE KNOW IT WASN'T STUFF THAT WAS LEFT BY THE PEOPLE WHO HAD THE SEARCH WARRANT?

YOUR STUFF IS NOT INCLUDED IN THAT.

MR. BARENS: I WILL SUBMIT TO YOUR HONOR THAT THE 80 DEFENSE EXHIBITS THAT WOULD SUPPORT CROSS-EXAMINATION AND IMPEACHMENT OF THESE WITNESSES WAS SEIZED.

THE COURT: AS EXHIBITS 1 THROUGH 80?

MR. BARENS: I WOULD NOT -- WHY WOULD WE DO THAT AT THIS TIME?

THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW. YOU MENTIONED SPECIFICALLY 80 EXHIBITS.

MR. BARENS: THAT IS CORRECT.

THE COURT: ARE THERE 80 EXHIBITS?

HAVE A BEARING ON THIS PARTICULAR CASE AND ASK TO HAVE ALL

10 F

OF THESE RECORDS SENT DOWN HERE AND EXAMINED BY ME. WOULD THAT BE A SUGGESTION?

MR. WAPNER: AS I TOLD THE COURT LAST WEEK, I THINK
WHAT HAS TO BE DONE, THERE HAS TO BE AN INDEPENDENT PARTY
IN THE NATURE OF A SPECIAL MASTER APPOINTED TO EXAMINE THE
EXHIBITS.

THE COURT: WELL, I DON'T PROPOSE TO CONTINUE THIS TRIAL INDEFINITELY. I WANT TO GO TO TRIAL ON THIS CASE.

MR. WAPNER: I AGREE, YOUR HONOR. I WANT TO GO TO TRIAL ALSO. BUT THIS IS A VERY IMPORTANT ISSUE THAT I THINK ABSOLUTELY HAS TO BE RESOLVED BEFORE WE PROCEED BECAUSE IF IT IS NOT PRESOLVED AND RESOLVED PROPERLY AND WE PROCEED TO TRIAL IN THIS CASE FOR TWO OR THREE MONTHS, IT IS FOR NAUGHT. I DON'T WANT TO DO THAT.

THE COURT: BUT, YOU SUGGEST THAT WE CONTINUE IT FOR THREE OR FOUR MONTHS? IS THAT WHAT YOU WANT TO DO, UNTIL WE RESOLVE THE MATTER UP THERE?

MR. WAPNER: NO, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: FIRST I WANT TO FIND OUT WHAT HAS BEEN SEIZED. THEN I CAN MAKE MY OWN MIND UP AS TO WHETHER OR NOT WE CAN PROCEED IN THIS CASE AND WHETHER OR NOT WE CAN GET THE STUFF BACK.

MR. BARENS: EXCUSE ME. I NEED A MOMENT.

(BRIEF PAUSE.)

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, AGAIN, FIRST OF ALL, WE GET BACK TO THE ISSUE OF, DOES THE DEFENSE HAVE TO REVEAL TO THE COURT AND TO THE PROSECUTOR, THE NATURE OF OUR EVIDENCE IN ORDER TO PROTECT THIS EVIDENCE?

THE COURT: I HAVE TO KNOW WHAT IT IS. I HAVE TO KNOW WHAT IT IS IN ORDER TO PASS UPON THIS MOTION. IS IT MATERIAL OR ISN'T IT MATERIAL? IS IT ALL MAKE-BELIEVE? IS IT A LOT OF STUFF THAT HE WROTE UP, WHICH DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING IN THIS CASE?

MR. BARENS: I CAN ASSURE YOUR HONOR, THAT I BELIEVE

THE QUESTIONS HE PROPOSED TO ME FOR CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES --

THE COURT: WELL, HE CAN STILL DO THAT DURING THE COURSE OF THE TRIAL.

MR. BARENS: BUT YOUR HONOR, IF THEY HAVE GOT IT, IF
THE PROSECUTION HAS GOT IT, THEN --

THE COURT: WELL, WHAT WE CAN DO IS GET IT BACK.

MR. BARENS: RIGHT, YOU ARE STILL GOING TO HEAR THE MOTION FOR DISMISSAL THAT YOU ARE GOING TO LISTEN TO OPENLY, YOUR HONOR?

MR. WAPNER: WELL, THE QUESTION BEFORE THE COURT IS WHAT DO WE DO WITH THIS JURY? WE HAVE BEEN AT THE BENCH NOW FOR ABOUT TEN MINUTES. I THINK THAT AT THE VERY LEAST, WE SHOULD MAYBE TELL THEM TO COME BACK AT 2:00 O'CLOCK AND BETWEEN 1:45 AND 2:00 O'CLOCK, WE CAN RESOLVE THIS.

BUT IT DOESN'T APPEAR THAT WE ARE GOING TO RESOLVE THIS.

THE COURT: WELL, THEN, I WILL HAVE THEM COME BACK TOMORROW MORNING. IT GIVES US ALL AFTERNOON TO EXPLORE IT AND FIND OUT. THANK YOU.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT:)

THE COURT: SORRY TO KEEP YOU WAITING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. MATTERS HAVE COME UP WHICH MAY ENTAIL A LITTLE DELAY. SO, WHAT I WILL ASK YOU TO DO IS, COME BACK TOMORROW MORNING AT 10:30 IF YOU WILL, PLEASE. GO TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM.

WHEN WE ARE READY FOR YOU HERE, WE WILL ASK YOU

TO COME IN. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

AS TO THE REMAINING JURORS IN THE PANEL, THE

COURT WISHES TO THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ATTENDANCE HERE

ALL THROUGHOUT. YOU SEE, WE HAVE A FULL COMPLIMENT OF JURORS

PLUS OUR ALTERNATES.

YOU ALL GO BACK TO THE JURY ASSEMBLY ROOM IF YOU WILL, PLEASE. TELL THEM THAT SO FAR AS THIS CASE IS CONCERNED, YOU ARE NOT REQUIRED ANYMORE. THANK YOU.

I WILL SEE YOU ALL BACK TOMORROW MORNING.

(AT 12:07 P.M. AN ADJOURNEMENT WAS TAKEN

UNTIL 1:35 P.M. OF THE SAME DAY.)

1 SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1987; 2:00 P.M. 2 HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE DEPARTMENT WEST C 3 (APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.) 4 5 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD 6 OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE AND HEARING OF THE 7 JURY:) 8 THE COURT: I THINK WE HAVE SOME UNFINISHED BUSINESS 9 FIRST. HAVEN'T WE, A MOTION WHICH HAS BEEN FILED? 10 MR. BARENS: THE ONLY MOTION I BELIEVE THAT WAS 11 RELEVANT AT THIS TIME FRAME, YOUR HONOR, THERE HAD BEEN A MOTION, 12 THAT I WILL CALL IT A TENTATIVE RULING YOUR HONOR HAD MADE 13 LAST THURSDAY CONCERNING COUNSEL'S DEFENSE MOTION TO CONTINUE IN LIGHT OF ALL OF THIS BUSINESS ABOUT THE DOCUMENTS IN SAN 14 15 MATEO. THAT WAS THE ONLY MOTION WE HAD REQUESTED BEFORE THE 16 COURT. 17 THE COURT: DIDN'T WE HAVE A PROPORTIONALITY THING? 18 MR. BARENS: YOU MEAN THE ARCE MOTION, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YES, THE ARCE MOTION, DIDN'T WE HAVE THAT? 19 20 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR MIGHT RECALL WE HAD RESERVED 21 ARGUMENT ON THAT. 22 THE COURT: THAT IS WHAT I SAID. WHY DON'T WE DISPOSE 23 OF THOSE PRELIMINARY MOTIONS FIRST? 24 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I AM NOT PREPARED. 25 AT AN EARLIER TIME, YOUR HONOR MIGHT RECALL MR. 26 CHIER HAD EXCLUSIVELY HANDLED THE WHOLE ARCE BUSINESS AND 27 I HAD ADVISED THE COURT THROUGHOUT THAT I HAD NO FAMILIARITY 28 AT ALL ON THAT WHOLE ARCE MATTER.

. 2

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE OTHER MOTION -- YOUR HONOR,
JUST TO KIND OF SUMMARIZE ALL OF THE MOTIONS PENDING IN THE
ETHER THAT I CAN THINK OF NOW, WE HAD WITHDRAWN THE KARNY
DISCOVERY MOTION, AS YOU WILL RECALL, LAST WEEK.

ANOTHER MOTION THAT I STILL AM A LITTLE UNDEFINED ON, WAS THE FINAL RESOLUTION ON THE STATE BAR PROCEEDINGS ON THE SUBPOENAED MATERIAL FROM THE STATE BAR THAT YOUR HONOR HAD CONSIDERED. I AM NOT SURE THAT WE ACTUALLY HAD SOME DEFINITIVE RESOLUTION ON THAT.

THE COURT: I THOUGHT YOU SAW THE VARIOUS EXHIBITS WHICH WERE IN THE -- THAT I MADE AVAILABLE TO YOU. THOSE ARE THE ONLY RECORDS I MADE AVAILABLE TO YOU. YOU GET WHATEVER YOU CAN FROM THAT. THAT IS THE END OF THAT.

MR. BARENS: AND THEN YOUR HONOR HAS RULED THAT THE REST OF THE MATERIAL WAS SUBJECT TO VARIOUS PRIVILEGES?

THE COURT: THAT'S CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, LET ME JUST THINK IF THERE WAS ANYTHING ELSE BEFORE THE COURT. THE WAY I UNDERSTOOD YOUR HONOR LAST THURSDAY, YOUR HONOR INDICATED THAT HE COULD NOT RULE IN A VACUUM ON THE MOTION TO DISMISS THAT HAD BEEN CALENDARED.

THEREFORE, WE WERE GOING TO HAVE -- WHICH BRINGS
US PERHAPS TO THE BUSINESS AT HAND, WE WERE GOING TO HAVE
A BRIEF OPPORTUNITY TO PROCEED AS REQUIRED IN NORTHERN
CALIFORNIA, COME BACK HERE WITH THE RESULTS OF THAT AND
INCORPORATE IT INTO --

THE COURT: I WON'T WAIT FOR A DISPOSITION OF THAT MATTER.

IT TAKES TOO LONG. I DON'T WANT TO HAVE THIS JURY ON HOLD

UNTIL THEN.

I WANT TO FIND OUT FIRST WHAT THE PAPERS ARE THAT
YOU SAY WERE SEIZED WHICH YOU NEED TO PROCEED HERE. ARE THOSE
VITAL DOCUMENTS? THE MOST VITAL DOCUMENT WHICH WAS NOT
SEIZED, IS YOUR HEAD. YOU HAVE GOT IT ALL IN YOUR HEAD. YOU
CAN PROCEED WITH THAT.

MR. BARENS: YES, ALTHOUGH I MIGHT HAVE IT IN MY HEAD,
MY HEAD WILL NOT PRODUCE AN EXHIBIT. AND AGAIN YOUR HONOR,
PLEASE OBLIGE ME IN MAKING A RECORD HERE YOUR HONOR, IN
PERSPECTIVE, THE DEFENSE DID NOT BRING THIS TRAVESTY UPON
ITSELF.

THE FACT IS, THAT THESE PEOPLE HAVE COME IN AND
TAKEN DEFENSE EXHIBITS AND A VARIETY OF OTHER MATERIALS. THEY
HAVE NOT RETURNED -- HAVE NOT FILED THEIR RETURN ON THE
WARRANT YET, WITH THE COURT. WE HAVE NOT ACCESSED THAT
MATERIAL.

THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND IT WAS.

MR. WAPNER: THE RETURN HAS BEEN FILED. I WILL HAVE A COPY OF IT. IT IS BEING EXPRESS MAILED TO ME. I SHOULD HAVE IT BY TOMORROW.

MR. BARENS: WELL, OBVIOUSLY, I HAVE NOT SEEN IT,

YOUR HONOR, TO THE EXTENT THAT THAT DOCUMENT -AND I WOULD PRESUME YOUR HONOR, THAT THAT DOCUMENT WILL MAKE
SOME GENERALIZED REFERENCE TO FOR INSTANCE, "BOX OF
MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS," WE --

MR. WAPNER: I THINK MR. BARENS IS CORRECT BECAUSE I
REQUESTED MR. VANCE AND MR. BREILING, WHO WERE RESPONSIBLE

13F.

FOR THE SEARCH, TO SEAL THE ITEMS THAT THEY GOT, SO THAT AN INDEPENDENT DETERMINATION COULD BE MADE AS TO WHETHER THE ITEMS WERE PRIVILEGED OR WERE THEY NOT PRIVILEGED AND WHETHER THEY SHOULD BE KEPT OR WHETHER THEY SHOULD BE TURNED OVER TO MR. BARENS.

AND WHEN I SPOKE TO MR. VANCE THIS AFTERNOON,
HE TOLD ME THAT THE RETURN IS GOING TO SAY IN VERY GENERAL
TERMS WHAT THEY GOT. SO I DON'T THINK WE ARE GOING TO BE
ABLE TO TELL BY LOOKING AT THAT.

THE COURT: WELL, WE HAVE GOT TO LOOK AT THE DOCUMENTS, DON'T WE? NOT WE, ME.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO SEE THEM AT SOME POINT. BUT THE WARRANT WAS ISSUED AND RETURNABLE IN SAN MATEO COUNTY AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I THINK THAT WE ARE OVERLOOKING IN ALL OF THIS IS, THAT SEPARATE FROM ANY DETERMINATION THAT IS MADE BY THIS COURT, IS A DETERMINATION TO BE MADE IN THE SAN MATEO COUNTY COURT AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE WARRANT WAS VALID, AND IF IT WAS VALID, WERE THE ITEMS SEIZED, PROPERLY SEIZED UNDER THE WARRANT AND IF THEY WERE PROPERLY SEIZED UNDER THE WARRANT, WAS ANY PRIVILEGE VIOLATED AND IF THERE WAS, WHAT IS THE REMEDY.

THERE ARE PARTIES IN THAT PROCEEDING THAT HAVE
AN INTEREST IN THOSE DOCUMENTS INDEPENDENT OF ANYTHING THAT
GOES ON IN THIS COURT, SO THERE IS GOING TO HAVE TO BE
LITIGATION THERE BEFORE THERE IS ANY LITIGATION HERE.

THE COURT: I AM ONLY INTERESTED IN FINDING OUT

SPECIFICALLY WHAT IT WAS THAT WAS SEIZED THERE TO SEE WHETHER

OR NOT THAT HAS ANY RELEVANCY TO ANYTHING IN THIS PARTICULAR

CASE.

THEY MIGHT HAVE SEIZED EVERYTHING THAT MIGHT

BE RELEVANT TO THE CASE UP NORTH AND LEFT ANYTHING THAT WAS

NOT RELEVANT TO THAT CASE UP THERE, WITH THE DEFENDANT AT

HIS HOME.

MR. WAPNER: HOW DOES THE COURT PROPOSE TO DO THAT?

THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW HOW I AM SUPPOSED TO DO THAT.

WHAT I INTEND TO DO IS SO WE CAN PROCEED

AS EXPEDITIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE IN THIS CASE, I AM GOING TO CALL

THE JUDGE UP THERE AND ASK TO HAVE ALL OF THOSE RECORDS AND

DOCUMENTS BROUGHT DOWN HERE AND I WILL HAVE AN IN CAMERA

INSPECTION TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT ANYTHING POSSIBLY UP THERE

IS PRESENT HERE THAT COULD BE USED BY DEFENSE COUNSEL IN THE

TRIAL OF THIS CASE.

IF THERE IS NOTHING IN THERE THEN, OF COURSE,
THERE IS NOTHING I AM INTERESTED IN.

AND IF THERE IS, THEN I WILL HAVE COPIES MADE

OF THAT AND TURN IT BACK TO THE DEFENDANT.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE DEFENSE WOULD CONTEND
THAT IT WOULD BE HIGHLY INAPPROPRIATE, AND I SAY THIS
RESPECTFULLY, FOR YOUR HONOR, WHO IS ABOUT TO TRY THIS CASE,

IF HE VIEWSDEFENSE MATERIAL.

2

I BELIEVE THE PROCEDURE, YOUR HONOR, IS FOR AN

3

INDEPENDENT MASTER.

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE INDEPENDENT MASTER GOING TO DO? DOES HE KNOW WHAT THE ISSUES ARE IN THIS CASE?

5 6

YOU CAN'T HAVE AN INDEPENDENT MASTER EVALUATE

7

WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE RELEVANT HERE.

8

MR. BARENS: I BELIEVE WE COULD IDENTIFY TO AN

9

INDEPENDENT MASTER THE NATURE OF THE MATERIALS THAT THE DEFENSE

10

PLANS TO PRESENT TO THE COURT DURING THE TRIAL.

11

I BELIEVE THAT YOUR HONOR SHOULD NOT EXAMINE

12 THE DEFENSE MATERIALS.

13

THE COURT: I CAN HAVE THESE RECORDS HERE, NOT IN THE

14

PRESENCE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY, BUT IN YOUR PRESENCE AND

15

WE CAN GO OVER EVERYTHING AND SEE WHAT THEY ARE AND IF THERE

IS ANYTHING IN THERE THAT BELONGS TO YOU, WE CAN HAVE THEM

16 17

COPIED AND LEAVE A COPY FOR WHOEVER WANTS IT UP THERE. THAT

18

IS THE WAY I THINK IT SHOULD BE DONE.

19

20

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE IMPACT OF WHAT OCCURRED THAT DAY AT THE ROBERTS' IS, AS WE CONTENDED IN THE MOTION

21

TO DISMISS BEFORE YOUR HONOR --

22

BECAUSE THEY SEIZED CERTAIN MATERIALS THAT MIGHT BE APPLICABLE

THE COURT: YOU ARE MAKING A MOTION TO DISMISS JUST

23 24

TO THIS CASE HERE? I WILL DENY THAT RIGHT OUT OF HAND.

25

THAT IS NOT GROUNDS FOR A MOTION TO DISMISS IN THIS CASE.

26 .

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, A MAJOR PORTION OF THE MOTION

27

THAT IS BEFORE THE COURT GOES TO WHAT IS THE REMEDY FOR THE

28

FACT THAT THE BEVERLY HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT, THE INVESTIGATORS

IN THIS CASE, HAVE READ DEFENSE MATERIAL.

THE COURT: I HAVE TOLD YOU WHAT THE REMEDY IS. I
WILL ENJOIN AND DIRECT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY NOT TO TALK TO
ANY OFFICERS ABOUT WHAT THEY FOUND OUT UP THERE. I WILL ENJOIN
THEM TO A COMPLETE SILENCE AND TO A COMPLETE DIVORCE FROM
ANYTHING THEY MIGHT HAVE HEARD AND NEVER TO MENTION IT TO
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR --

THE COURT: AND I WILL ENJOIN HIM NOT EVEN TO LOOK AT

IT OR TALK ABOUT IT. THAT IS THE ONLY WAY OF SANITIZING IT.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE THE LAW ENTITLES

THE DEFENDANT TO --

THE COURT: I CAN HEAR YOUR MOTION NOW. I DON'T HAVE
TO WAIT UNTIL THAT IS DONE, BECAUSE YOU CLAIM AT THIS
PARTICULAR POINT YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO SEEK A DISMISSAL OF
THIS CASE, ISN'T THAT RIGHT, WITHOUT KNOWING WHAT THE DOCUMENTS
ARE THAT HAVE BEEN SEIZED; IS THAT CORRECT?

MR. BARENS: IF I MIGHT BE HEARD.

THE COURT: I AM ASKING YOU WHETHER THAT IS CORRECT.

MR. BARENS: YES, IT IS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: THEN I AM GOING TO DENY YOUR MOTION.

MERELY BECAUSE SOMEBODY ELSE WENT UP THERE,
WITHOUT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY HERE HAVING ANYTHING TO DO WITH

IT, AND THEY MIGHT HAVE FOUND OUT SOMETHING WHICH THEY CANNOT

USE AND WILL NOT USE AND I AM ENJOINING ITS USE, DOESN'T MEAN

YOU ARE ENTITLED TO A DISMISSAL OF THIS ACTION. IT HAS NOTHING

TO DO WITH WHAT THE D.A. DID.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE WE ARE ENTITLED

1 TO AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON THAT, YOUR HONOR. IT IS
2 INCUMBENT TO LISTEN TO TESTIMONY, HAVE THE SEARCHING OFFICERS
3 AND THE TESTIMONY OF THE DEFENDANT HIMSELF AS TO WHAT WAS
4 GOING ON THERE.

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT THE SEARCHING OFFICERS TO TESTIFY HERE AS TO WHAT THEY READ, WHAT THEY DIDN'T READ? THEN THAT WILL BE DISCLOSING EVERYTHING THAT THEY KNOW.

MR. BARENS: WE WANT IT IN FRONT OF A SPECIAL MASTER.

THE COURT: I AM NOT GOING TO CONTENANCE THAT.

MR. BARENS: ALL I CAN DO, YOUR HONOR -- YOUR HONOR MAKES RULING AND I MAKE MOTIONS.

THE COURT: YES. I AM MAKING A RULING HERE ON THE BASIS OF THE MOTION THAT YOU MADE, NAMELY, THAT YOU ARE ENTITLED TO A DISMISSAL OF THIS CASE MERELY BECAUSE A JUDGE UP IN SAN MATEO COUNTY ISSUED A SEARCH WARRANT TO SEARCH FOR PAPERS THAT MAY BE MATERIAL TO THE CASE UP THERE AND THAT THAT WAS DONE, AND WHATEVER PAPERS WERE UNEARTHED FROM THE PREMISES OF THE DEFENDANT WERE THEN MADE KNOWN TO SOME OF THE POLICE OFFICERS IN THIS CASE. ON THE BASIS OF THAT, I WILL NOT GRANT YOUR MOTION. I WILL DENY IT.

MR. BARENS: IF I MIGHT JUST GO ON JUST A BIT, YOUR HONOR.

YOUR HONOR, THE CONDUCT OF THE GOVERNMENT

OFFICIALS RESULTED IN, WE CONTEND, A VIOLATION OF MR. HUNT'S

FIFTH AND SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

WE HAVE A ONE-GOVERNMENT CONCEPT, AS YOU KNOW, WHICH IS A WELL ESTABLISHED LEGAL PRINCIPLE IN THIS STATE AND THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES.

THE FACT THAT MR. WAPNER WAS NOT PERSONALLY
INVOLVED IN THE CONDUCT, IN TERMS OF PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT,
DOES NOT EXCUSE IT.

THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS THIS IS AN AGENCY THAT IS ATTRIBUTED TO MR. WAPNER'S OFFICE, THEIR CONDUCT IS ATTRIBUTED TO MR. WAPNER'S OFFICE AND WE SUBMIT THAT THE CONDUCT WAS SO OUTRAGEOUS IN THIS INSTANCE, WHAT OCCURRED WAS SUCH A SUBSTANTIVE VIOLATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO COUNSEL, RIGHT TO PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS WITH HIS COUNSEL, AS TO AMOUNT TO ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE PROCEDURES.

THE COURT: AT THIS POINT, I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE SEARCH WARRANT SOUGHT.

MR. BARENS: I WOULD REQUEST ONCE AGAIN, YOUR HONOR -THE COURT: IN ORDER FOR YOU TO MAKE ANY KIND OF
A VALID POINT, IS TO TELL ME THAT THE SEARCH WARRANT SOUGHT
DOCUMENTS WHICH ARE REQUIRED IN THIS CASE AND USABLE BY YOU
IN THIS CASE.

MR. BARENS: WE SAID, YOUR HONOR --

THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW.

HAVE YOU SEEN THE SEARCH WARRANT?

MR. BARENS: THEY HAVE NOT GIVEN US THAT.

THE COURT: DID YOU SEE THE SEARCH WARRANT?

MR. BARENS: NO, I HAVE NOT.

THE COURT: THEN YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT AT THIS POINT, DO YOU?

MR. BARENS: I DO KNOW WHAT I AM TALKING ABOUT IN THE SENSE, YOUR HONOR, THAT I AM NOW MORE SPECIFICALLY ADVISED THAT 76 DEFENSE EXHIBITS WERE SEIZED.

AND LET ME EXPLAIN TO YOUR HONOR MORE SPECIFICALLY WHAT I MEAN: THE 76 DEFENSE EXHIBITS HAD WITH THEM AN INDEX CATALOG THAT IDENTIFIED BOTH THE EXHIBIT AND THE RELEVANCE, SIGNIFICANCE TO THE DEFENDANT, WHICH DOCUMENTS WERE PREPARED BY MR. HUNT.

14/-1

I HAD DISCUSSIONS WITH MR. HUNT OVER TIME ABOUT
THOSE SPECIFIC DOCUMENTS. I HAD FROM TIME TO TIME, SEEN SOME
OF THE DOCUMENTS THAT WERE SEIZED. I CANNOT PRESENT THE
CASE WITHOUT MY DOCUMENTS. THAT IS THE FIRST THING.

THE SECOND THING I MUST GET BACK TO YOUR HONOR,
IN ENJOINING -- AND I SUBMIT THAT THE SANCTION, THE REMEDY,
IS INSUFFICIENT IN THIS INSTANCE -- IN ENJOINING THOSE
OFFICERS FROM TELLING MR. WAPNER WHAT THEY SAW, IT DOES NOT
GO FAR ENOUGH, YOUR HONOR. THOSE OFFICERS HAVE EXTENSIVE,
ONGOING CONTACT WITH ALL OF THE WITNESSES. THE PEOPLE ARE
GOING TO CALL THOSE WITNESSES TO TESTIFY IN THIS CASE AND
THEY WILL BE INSTRUMENTAL IN PARTICIPATING WITH THEM.

I CAN'T UNRING THE BELL. THE KNOWLEDGE THAT THEY

HAVE -- HOW COULD YOUR HONOR EVER FEEL PROPERLY ASSURED THAT

THEY HAD NOT MADE USE DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY OF KNOWLEDGE

THEY HAD IN PREPARING WITNESSES TO TESTIFY?

THE COURT: HOW AM I TO KNOW AND RULE ON IT UNTIL I

SEE THE SO-CALLED EXHIBITS OF YOURS, TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT

THERE IS ANY RELEVANCY IN THIS CASE? IF THE WORLD KNEW ABOUT

IT, IT WOULDN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE OR THE JURORS, IF THEY

KNEW ABOUT IT, IT WOULDN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE OR THE

DISTRICT ATTORNEY KNEW ABOUT IT, IT WOULDN'T MAKE ANY

DIFFERENCE.

HOW DO I KNOW WHAT THEY ARE? TO GRANT A MOTION ON THE BASIS -- YOU TELL ME THERE ARE 76 EXHIBITS AND TO GRANT A MOTION TO DISMISS WITHOUT ANYTHING FURTHER. WELL, THAT IS RIDICULOUS.

MR. BARENS: THE CASE THAT WE CITE IN OUR MOTION TO

26.

DISMISS, BARBER, TALKS ABOUT THIS VERY ISSUE AND ADDRESSES WHAT YOUR HONOR JUST SAID.

IT SAID THAT YOUR HONOR CAN NEVER KNOW AND THAT
IS WHY DISMISSAL IS THE ONLY REMEDY IS BECAUSE NEITHER THE
COURT NOR COUNSEL COULD EVER BE TOTALLY ASSURED THAT THE
MATERIALS WEREN'T TAINTING THE DEFENSE'S INHERENT POSITION.

THE COURT: LET ME KNOW WHAT THEY ARE. I HAVE GOT TO KNOW WHAT THEY ARE BEFORE I CAN SAY ANYTHING.

MR. BARENS: WELL YOUR HONOR, I AM HAPPY IN CAMERA,

TO DISCUSS -- THE PROBLEM I GET INTO YOUR HONOR, THERE IS

NO PRECEDENT FOR MAKING COUNSEL TELL THE SECRET TO PROTECT

THE SECRET.

I AM TELLING YOUR HONOR IN GOOD FAITH AND AS AN OFFICER OF THIS COURT, THAT THERE WERE DEFENSE MATERIALS EXPOSED TO THE PROSECUTION'S AGENTS THAT WENT INTO A PRECISE CROSS-EXAMINATION, QUESTION-BY-QUESTION AND THAT IS WHAT WE PLANNED TO USE, PRECISE TACTICS THAT WE PLANNED TO UTILIZE, DOCUMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PROSECUTION WITNESSES AND MR. WAPNER IS WRITING ALL THIS DOWN AND I AM TRYING TO BE AS CIRCUMSPECT AS I CAN TO PROTECT MR. HUNT'S INTEREST IN THIS CASE.

THERE WAS CORRESPONDENCE THAT WAS AUTHORED BY
PROSECUTION WITNESSES THAT WILL FLY IN THE FACE OF TESTIMONY
IN THIS COURTROOM AND PREVIOUS TESTIMONY THEY HAVE EXPRESSED.

BEYOND THAT, I CAN'T GO, YOUR HONOR, AND STILL FULFILL MY DUTY HERE.

THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND THAT. I CAN UNDERSTAND YOUR CAUTION IN DISCLOSING ANYTHING THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL BETWEEN

YOU AND YOUR CLIENT AND ANYTHING THAT YOU PREPARED FOR HIM
IN THE NATURE OF A COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE ATTORNEY AND
A CLIENT.

I DON'T WANT YOU TO TELL ME SPECIFICALLY WHAT

IT IS. BUT I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT IT IS, SO WE CAN SEE

WHETHER OR NOT THERE IS ANY BASIS FOR WHAT YOU ARE TELLING

ME.

MR. BARENS: LET ME GIVE YOUR HONOR A FURTHER EXAMPLE.
WE HAD ALL THE PITTMAN TRANSCRIPTS AVAILABLE. MR. HUNT READ
THE PITTMAN TRANSCRIPTS. WE READ THE PITTMAN TRANSCRIPTS.

WE SAT DOWN AND WORKED ON QUESTIONS. I THEN GAVE

THE STUFF TO MR. HUNT AND ASKED HIM TO WORK ON QUESTIONS.

THOSE DOCUMENTS --

THE COURT: DID YOU MAKE A NOTE OF THE DOCUMENTS THAT YOU HAD?

MR. BARENS: YES.

THE COURT: YOU HAVE STILL GOT THEM. YOU CAN USE THEM AGAIN WITH ANY WITNESS THAT MAY TAKE THE STAND.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE AGENTS OF THE PROSECUTION ACCESSED THAT MATERIAL.

THE COURT: I AM TRYING TO SANITIZE ALL THAT. I AM TRYING TO SAY THAT HE WILL NOT USE THAT.

MR. BARENS: YOU CAN'T ASSURE US OF THAT OR YOURSELF OF THAT, JUDGE.

THE COURT: THE MOTION HAS TO BE GRANTED THEN? ISN'T
THAT WHAT YOU ARE TELLING ME?

MR. BARENS: THAT IS WHAT BARBER SAYS THAT WHEN THIS HAPPENS, THE JUDGE -- YOU READ WHAT BARBER SAYS.

THE COURT: WE HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH IT. THE PROSECUTION DOWN HERE HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH IT. IT WAS --

MR. BARENS: THE LAW SAYS THAT THE FACT THAT THE D.A.

ON THE CASE IN THE COURTROOM HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH IT, MEANS

NOTHING IN ITSELF.

THE COURT: THERE WAS A WARRANT ISSUED ON AN AFFIDAVIT
BY A JUDGE IN ANOTHER COUNTY.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, BARBER ADDRESSES THIS POINT.

BARBER SAYS THERE IS NO NECESSITY --

THE COURT: GIVE ME THAT CITATION AGAIN, WILL YOU?
TAKE IT DOWN, WILL YOU?

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, WE ARE ARGUING THIS CASE IN A VACUUM BECAUSE I DON'T ACCEPT MR. BARENS' CHARACTERIZATION OF WHAT THEY SAW OR WHAT THEY READ.

THE COURT: THAT IS WHAT I AM TRYING TO TELL HIM.

I WON'T ACCEPT IT UNTIL I SEE IT MYSELF.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.

MR. BARENS: IN ANY EVENT, WE HAVE BARBER VERSUS

MUNICIPAL COURT, A 1979 --

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE NAME?

MR. BARENS: BARBER, B-A-R-B-E-R.

THE COURT: VERSUS MUNI COURT?

MR. BARENS: YES, AT 24 CAL.3D, 742 AND 750. YOUR HONOR, MIGHT WE APPROACH BRIEFLY?

THE COURT: SURE.

ARGUE THIS MOTION.

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD

AT THE BENCH:)

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I AM NOT IN THE LEAST, TRYING
TO BE CONFRONTATIONAL IN ANY WAY. I HAVE AVOIDED THAT.

MR. CHIER PREPARED THIS MOTION AND IS MUCH MORE VERSED ON
THIS MOTION THAN I AM.

I WOULD MOST RESPECTFULLY SEEK LEAVE OF THE COURT TO HAVE MR. CHIER RESPOND TO THIS MOTION. HE PREPARED THE MOTION. HE RESEARCHED IT.

THE COURT: WELL, YOU HAVE READ IT, HAVEN'T YOU?

MR. BARENS: I DID NOT READ ALL THE SUPPORTING CASES.

I DID NOT FIND BARBER, NOR DID I READ ALL THE -- MR. CHIER DID. I ASK YOUR HONOR AS HUMBLY AS I CAN, TO ALLOW HIM TO

MR. WAPNER: BEFORE WE EVEN GET INTO THAT, I DON'T THINK
THAT WE ARE HERE TO ARGUE THE SUBSTANCE OF THIS MOTION BECAUSE
WE WILL BE GOING AROUND IN CIRCLES.

26 .

IT IS ALL GOING TO COME BACK TO THE FACT THAT

THE COURT HAS TO HAVE FACTS BEFORE IT CAN MAKE A DETERMINATION.

THE COURT: HE SAYS I DON'T NEED THOSE FACTS. HE SAYS

ALL I NEED IS HIS STATEMENT. HE SAYS ALL I NEED IS HIS

STATEMENT THAT THESE ARE CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN

ATTORNEY AND CLIENT, WHICH YOUR OFFICE -- BY "YOUR OFFICE"

I MEAN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT HERE IN BEVERLY HILLS OR

LOS ANGELES, HAS HAD ACCESS TO AND THEY HAVE READ.

SO THAT IMMEDIATELY, HE SAYS IT GIVES THEM A RIGHT TO MAKE THIS MOTION TO HAVE IT DISMISSED.

MR. WAPNER: BUT THE POINT IS, THAT JUST BECAUSE MR. BARENS SAYS THAT IS FACT, DOESN'T MAKE IT A FACT.

THE COURT: OF COURSE. OF COURSE NOT.

MR. BARENS: BUT YOUR HONOR, THE ONLY REASON THIS COMES
UP IS THAT YOUR HONOR IS NOW RULING AGAINST MY MOTION.

THE COURT: I -- YOU SAY THAT I MUST GRANT YOUR MOTION

BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S POLICE OR

THE POLICE DEPARTMENT -- WHAT IS HIS NAME AGAIN?

MR. BARENS: ZOELLER. BUT THERE WERE TWO OTHER OFFICERS
THAT ACCOMPANIED HIM.

THE COURT: AND TWO OTHERS MIGHT HAVE BEEN UP THERE.

FIRST, YOU SUPPOSE THAT HE READ IT. THEN YOU SUPPOSE THAT

HE COMMUNICATED IT. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE AT ALL.

MR. BARENS: I NEVER SAID THAT HE COMMUNICATED TO MR. WAPNER. I AM SAYING THAT THE LAW IS SUCH IN THIS STATE THAT THEY DON'T HAVE TO COMMUNICATE TO MR. WAPNER.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THAT IS SUFFICIENT. RIGHT AT THAT POINT THEN, YOU SAY THAT THE MOTION SHOULD BE GRANTED?

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE STILL THAT WE ARE ENTITLED TO A HEARING ON ALL THIS BUSINESS, AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING WHERE I HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO CROSS-EXAMINE THOSE FELLOWS.

THE COURT: HOW CAN WE HAVE AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING IF

I DON'T SEE WHAT THE RECORDS ARE AND THE RECORDS AREN'T

PRODUCED FOR ME?

MR. BARENS: BECAUSE I ASSUME YOUR HONOR, THAT MY MOTION FOR THE RETURN OF RECORDS IS GOING TO BE GRANTED AND I PLAN TO TURN TO -- TO USE THOSE DOCUMENTS IN AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING AND SAY TO THEM, LISTEN, YOU SAW THIS, DIDN'T YOU? OR DID YOU SEE IT? HOW COULD YOU TELL YOU DIDN'T SEE THIS WHEN IT WAS A PART OF SOME OTHER EXHIBITS THAT YOU DID IN FACT, SEE?

I MEAN, WE HAVE TO GET INTO THAT.

MR. WAPNER: TWO THINGS ARE HAPPENING. ONE -- THERE ARE TWO DIFFERENT CLAIMS THAT I SEE THAT ARE BEING MADE BY THIS MOTION. ONE IS THAT PEOPLE WHO WERE THERE DURING THE SEARCH SAW CERTAIN THINGS AND THEY TOOK THEM. AND IF WE GET THOSE THINGS BACK, THEN WE CAN MAKE A DETERMINATION AS TO WHAT THEY SAW.

I THINK THEY ARE MAKING A SECOND CLAIM, WHICH

IS THAT THEY SAW OTHER THINGS THAT THEY DIDN'T TAKE. AS TO

THAT SECOND PART --

THE COURT: HOW ARE WE GOING TO KNOW THAT?

MR. WAPNER: WELL, THE SECOND PART, YOU HAVE TO HAVE
A HEARING, ACCORDING TO THE DECLARATIONS THAT WERE FILED WITH
THE MOTION AND THEY WILL CALL WITNESS A, B AND C, WHO ARE
GOING TO SAY --

THE COURT: WELL, LET'S HAVE A HEARING. WE WILL CALL
THE POLICE OFFICERS FROM DOWN HERE, WHO SUPPOSEDLY WERE UP
THERE AND ASK THEM WHAT THEY FOUND OUT AND WHAT THEY SAW.

MR. WAPNER: I THINK HOWEVER, THAT THE HEARING IS

AFTER THE FIRST RESOLUTION. THE FIRST RESOLUTION IS, WHAT

WAS TAKEN AND ARE THEY ENTITLED TO IT BACK.

THE COURT: WELL, WHAT WAS TAKEN WILL BE COMING IN THE MAIL, WON'T IT, TO YOU, EXPRESS MAIL?

MR. WAPNER: ONLY A GENERAL LIST. WHAT IS GOING TO COME IS NOT GOING TO BE SATISFACTORY TO YOU.

WHAT IS GOING TO COME IS A GENERAL LIST THAT IS
GOING TO SAY, "WE TOOK BOXES OF EXHIBITS OR PAPERS OR
MISCELLANEOUS PAPERS."

THE COURT: WITHOUT DESCRIBING IT?

MR. WAPNER: IT WON'T DESCRIBE IT IN NEARLY THE DETAIL SUFFICIENT TO MAKE A RULING.

THE COURT: WELL, WHAT IS GOING TO BE THE RESOLUTION?

SUPPOSE YOU HAVE -- WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN? YOU ARE GOING

TO START MAKING THE MOTIONS AND MOTIONS UP THERE.

THEN YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE A SPECIAL MASTER

APPOINTED AND THEN IT WILL BE WEEKS OR MONTHS BEFORE WE EVER

GET TO TRIAL IN THIS CASE.

MR. WAPNER: I DON'T THINK SO.

THE COURT: OF COURSE IT WILL. I KNOW HOW THEY WORK.

THERE WILL BE DOZENS OF WITNESSES CALLED, HUNDREDS OF

DOCUMENTS TO LOOK OVER.

THAT DOESN'T MAKE IT OVERNIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: I DON'T THINK IT TAKES OVERNIGHT. BUT

14CF

I DON'T SHARE THE COURT'S CONCERN THAT IT IS GOING TO TAKE MONTHS. IT MAY TAKE A FEW WEEKS. MAYBE I AM BEING SOMEWHAT NAIVE BUT BETWEEN NAIVETE AND YOUR EXPERIENCE, I THINK THAT THERE IS SOMEWHAT OF A COMMON GROUND WHERE, IF WE PUT THIS CASE OVER FOR EXAMPLE, FOR -- AND I DID DISCUSS THIS WITH COUNSEL, LET'S SAY, TEN DAYS UNTIL A WEEK FROM MONDAY FOR A STATUS CHECK, IF THERE IS SOMETHING WE CAN DO IN THE MEANTIME BY WAY OF MOTIONS, WE'LL DO IT.

1 BUT I DON'T WANT TO CONTINUE THE CASE FOR MONTHS, 2 EITHER. I AGREE WITH THE COURT. 3 MR. BARENS: I DON'T WANT TO EITHER. 4 MR. WAPNER: BUT I THINK IT CAN BE DONE MORE 5 EXPEDITIOUSLY. 6 THE COURT: THE MAIN POINT HE IS MAKING IS THAT AT THIS 7 PARTICULAR STAGE, THE HARM HAS ALL BEEN DONE. NO MATTER WHAT 8 HAPPENS, NO MATTER WHAT THE DOCUMENTS ARE, THE HARM IS 9 ALREADY DONE. 10 SO, HE WANTS THIS MOTION IN EFFECT, DECIDED NOW. 11 MR. WAPNER: I THINK THE COURT IS MISREADING COUNSEL. 12 I DON'T THINK HE WANTS THE MOTION NOW. I THINK HE IS 13 ASKING FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING. 14 THE COURT: DO YOU WANT AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING? 15 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I WANT TO --16 THE COURT: OR, DO YOU WANT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING 17 HERE OR THERE? 18 MR. WAPNER: HERE AND IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA. 19 MR. BARENS: THE LAW SAYS THAT I AM ENTITLED TO IT. 20 JUDGE, I WANT TO PROCEED IN SOME ORDERLY FASHION, HERE. 21 JUDGE, I BELIEVE THAT ANY JUDGE HEARING THIS IN 22 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, IS GOING TO ORDER THE RETURN OF MY 23 DOCUMENTS IN SOME SUMMARY FASHION. 24 ANY JUDGE WHO HEARS MY SITUATION DOWN HERE, WILL --25 THE COURT: WELL, I ASKED YOU TO MAKE THAT MOTION TWO 26 WEEKS AGO. WHY DIDN'T YOU MAKE IT? 27 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE BEEN IN YOUR COURT FOR 28 THE LAST TWO WEEKS.

THE COURT: WELL, MAKE THE MOTION AND HAVE IT 1 RETURNABLE SOMETIME, AND THEN YOU GO UP THERE AND --2 MR. BARENS: I HAVE THE MOTION HERE TODAY, YOUR HONOR. 3 WE ARE GOING TO FILE IT. BUT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE RETURN 4 ON THE SEARCH WARRANT BEFORE I FILE MY MOTION. 5 THE COURT: HE TELLS ME THE RETURN ON THE WARRANT IS 6 SOMETHING -- IT DOESN'T GIVE YOU ANYTHING. 7 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I DIDN'T GET THE AFFIDAVIT 8 UNTIL LAST FRIDAY. FOR YOUR HONOR TO EVEN OBLIQUELY 9 SUGGEST THAT I HAVE BEEN DERELICT IN PURSUING THIS MATTER, 10 IS INACCURATE. 11 THE COURT: DO YOU REMEMBER THAT I TOLD YOU LAST WEEK 12 THAT I WANTED IT DONE RIGHT AWAY? 13 MR. BARENS: I WANTED IT DONE, TOO. I AM OFFENDED 14 THAT --15 THE COURT: THEN YOU SHOULD HAVE DONE IT. 16 MR. BARENS: DONE WHAT? HOW COULD I PROCEED? 17 THE COURT: GET THE MOTION UP THERE. 18 MR. BARENS: WELL, HOW COULD I MAKE AN INTELLIGENT 19 MOTION WITHOUT HAVING THE DOCUMENTS? 20 THE COURT: YOU DON'T NEED THE RETURN. IF YOUR 21 POSITION IS THAT THEY CAME DOWN AND --22 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T KNOW --23 THE COURT: THAT THEY CAME DOWN AND UNLAWFULLY MADE 24 A SEARCH AND SEIZURE AND YOU DON'T NEED ANYTHING FURTHER THAN 25 THAT. 26 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE JUDGE IS GOING TO ASK ME 27 TO TALK TO THEM ABOUT WHAT THEY TOOK. 28

THE COURT: YOU SAY THEY KNEW WHAT THEY TOOK.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE DEFENDANT HAS AN INHERENT RIGHT TO BE THERE WITH ME WHEN THIS GOES DOWN. HOW CAN HE BE THERE WITH ME WHEN HE HAS AN OBLIGATION TO BE HERE WITH US? I CAN'T BE TWO PLACES AT ONE TIME AND HE CAN'T BE TWO PLACES AT ONE TIME, YOUR HONOR.

WHY AM I SUDDENLY THE VICTIM OF ALL OF THIS?

THE COURT: I WANT IT DONE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

MR. BARENS: I KNOW, BUT YOUR HONOR IS SUGGESTING THE DEFENSE DOESN'T WANT THIS DONE.

THOSE ARE DEFENSE EXHIBITS UP THERE.

MR. WAPNER: MAY I SAY SOMETHING?

I UNDERSTAND, I THINK, THE COURT'S DESIRE TO PROCEED AS EXPEDITIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE.

AS I SAID BEFORE LUNCH, I BELIEVE TO PROCEED

TOO EXPEDITIOUSLY HERE IN THIS CASE IS FALSE ECONOMY BECAUSE

IF WE DO NOT GET A PROPER RESOLUTION OF THIS MATTER NOW, THEN

THAT MEANS NOTHING BECAUSE WE WILL HAVE TO TRY THE CASE AGAIN

TWO YEARS FROM NOW.

THE COURT: I DON'T THINK SO.

MR. WAPNER: AND SO I THINK THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO TRY AND GET IT RESOLVED.

I AM NOT SAYING THAT WE DRAG OUR FEET.

THE COURT: I WANT SOME OUTSIDE LIMIT AS TO HOW LONG
THIS THING IS GOING TO TAKE. I WANT AN OUTSIDE LIMIT SO THAT
I CAN TELL THE JURORS THAT THEY CAN COME BACK AND WE WILL
START THE TRIAL.

MR. BARENS: COULD WE DO THIS? I HAVE A SUGGESTION.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, IF WE COULD HAVE -- WHAT WE HAD TALKED ABOUT JUST BEFORE WE CONVENED, WAS TO GO OVER TO A WEEK FROM MONDAY, THAT IS A WEEK FROM MONDAY TO GIVE YOUR HONOR A STATUS REPORT ON WHAT HAPPENED IN SAN FRANCISCO AND WHAT KIND OF RESPONSE WE GOT UP THERE AND AT THAT TIME, I BELIEVE WE COULD MAKE A DEFINITIVE STATEMENT TO YOUR HONOR BASED ON SOMETHING, RATHER THAN A GUESS.

THE COURT: SUPPOSE I GET AN ORDER FROM THE JUDGE UP
THERE TO HAVE THIS STUFF BROUGHT DOWN HERE FOR ME TO LOOK
AT IT?

MR. BARENS: AGAIN, YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE, AND I WOULD BE GLAD TO GIVE YOUR HONOR SOME LAW ON THIS, I BELIEVE WE WOULD BE IN SEVERE JEOPARDY BY EVER CONSENTING TO YOUR HONOR SEEING THIS MATERIAL.

THE COURT: WHY?

MR. BARENS: BECAUSE YOUR HONOR IS TRYING THE CASE.

THE COURT: DO YOU THINK I WOULD BE POISONED BY IT?

DO YOU THINK I AM TWO YEARS OLD SO I WOULD BE INFLUENCED BY

SOMETHING I MIGHT READ?

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, NO. I AM ONLY SAYING THAT PRECEDENCE WOULD SUGGEST THAT IT WOULD BE UNAPPROPRIATE FOR THE COURT TO DO SO.

THE COURT: WELL, THEY WOULD BE SEEING IT UP THERE, WON'T THEY? EVERYTHING YOU ARE TELLING ME NOW, THEY WOULD BE SEEING EVERYTHING, ALL OF THE DOCUMENTS AND EVERYTHING.

MR. BARENS: A SPECIAL MASTER.

THE COURT: A SPECIAL MASTER WILL BE SEEING IT HIMSELF,

WON'T HE?

2 MR. BARENS: YES.

THE COURT: WON'T ALL OF YOU BE SEEING IT, TOO?

MR. BARENS: NO, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WHY NOT?

MR. BARENS: WELL, YOUR HONOR, THE SPECIAL MASTER --

THE COURT: YOU MEAN YOU WILL HAVE A HEARING BEFORE

A SPECIAL MASTER WITHOUT ANYBODY BEING PRESENT?

MR. BARENS: NO, YOUR HONOR.

THE SPECIAL MASTER -- IT WOULD BE DESCRIBED TO
THE SPECIAL MASTER, THE DEFENSE'S POSITION ON WHAT WAS
ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION AND DEFENSE MATERIALS AND HE
WOULD HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION IN ISOLATION WITHOUT ANY IMPACT
ON THIS CASE OR HAVING ANY FURTHER RESPONSIBILITIES IN THIS
CASE.

YOUR HONOR, LISTEN, BEFORE YOU GET UPSET WITH

THE DEFENSE HERE, THE DEFENSE DIDN'T DO THIS. I DIDN'T BRING

THIS PROBLEM INTO YOUR LIFE OR MY LIFE.

MR. WAPNER: MR. BARENS, I THINK THE COURT, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, THE COURT IS NOT SO UPSET WITH ANYBODY AS WITH THE FACT THE TRIAL IS GOING TO BE DELAYED FOR A PERIOD OF TIME.

MR. BARENS: I WANT TO GET THINGS DONE AS SOON AS

POSSIBLE. I HAVE A CAREER TO PURSUE AND I DON'T WANT TO BE

HERE FOR THE REST OF MY LIFE BUT I DON'T WANT TO SEE A

MISTRIAL OR HAVE SOMETHING ON APPEAL THAT IS GOING TO BE

PUT BACK IN MY LAP TWO YEARS FROM NOW.

I AM TRYING TO SEE THAT HIS RIGHTS ARE PROTECTED.

THE COURT: FIRST OF ALL, YOU WANT THE JUDGE UP THERE TO ISSUE AN ORDER.

MR. BARENS: WITH THE MATERIALS RETURNED TO US WITH TO A SPECIAL MASTER.

THE COURT: SUPPOSE THE JUDGE UP THERE RULES THAT WITHOUT ANYTHING ELSE, THIS IS PROPERLY SEIZABLE, NOW WHAT?

MR. BARENS: THEN I WILL COME BACK HERE AND I WILL SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFY, AFTER MY DISCOVERY MOTION THERE, AND SAY, "LISTEN, JUDGE, THEY ARE NOT GIVING ME THE PROPER DOCUMENTS."

THE COURT: SUPPOSE THE JUDGE UP THERE SAYS THAT NOTHING THERE IS RELEVANT HERE AND THAT NOTHING SHOULD BE RETURNED.

MR. BARENS: THEN YOUR HONOR IS GOING TO HAVE TO HEAR THE MOTION FOR DISMISSAL OF THE JUDGMENT AT THAT POINT IN TIME AND I WILL HAVE TO COME BACK AND SAY THEY HAVE MY IMPEACHMENT MATERIALS AND THEY SAY I CAN'T USE THEM.

THE COURT: THAT IS WHY I WANT TO CUT THROUGH ALL OF THIS. IF IT COMES BACK TO ME, I WILL GIVE THE STUFF BACK IF IT BELONGS TO YOU.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, NO.

THE COURT: THEN I WILL GIVE IT TO YOU.

BUT YOU ARE NOT SATISFIED WITH THAT, YOU WANT A DISMISSAL BECAUSE MAYBE THE POLICE OFFICERS LOOKED AT IT. THEN WE ARE BACK TO SQUARE ONE.

WHAT IS THE USE OF GOING THROUGH ALL OF THAT

IF ALL FYOUR POINT WILL BE THAT THE POLICE OFFICERS LOOKED

AT IT?

MR. BARENS: I HAVE TO DO WHAT THE LAW SAYS MAKES INCUMBENT UPON ME IN THIS SETTING.

THE COURT: THEN THE MATTER CAN BE DECIDED NOW. YOU ARE ARGUING -- I HAVE TO REPEAT IT AGAIN -- YOU ARE ARGUING THAT THE CASE IS ALREADY OUT OF THE BAG AND YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS HAVE BEEN VIOLATED AND AT THIS POINT YOU ARE ENTITLED TO A DISMISSAL; AM I SAYING THAT CORRECTLY?

15A

MR. BARENS: YES. I UNDERSTAND YOUR HONOR. 1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 2 MR. BARENS: BUT I DON'T THINK I CAN CONVINCE YOU OF 3 THAT WITHOUT HAVING AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING UP THERE AND AN 4 EVIDENTIARY HEARING IN THIS COURTROOM WHERE I CAUSE THESE 5 PEOPLE TO TESTIFY ABOUT WHAT THEY SAW AND WHAT THEY DID. 6 I DON'T THINK I WILL EVER CONVINCE YOUR HONOR 7 WITHOUT PUTTING THESE LIVE BODIES ON IN HERE. 8 THE COURT: WHY DON'T WE HAVE A HEARING DOWN HERE? 9 WHY DO I HAVE TO WAIT FOR YOU TO DO IT UP THERE? 10 MR. BARENS: BECAUSE I WOULD LIKE TO GO UP THERE, AS 11 THE LAW REQUIRES ME TO DO, AND MAKE A MOTION TO FIRST RETURN 12 THE MATERIALS. 13 YOUR HONOR, ON THE CHANCE THAT I WILL HAVE TO 14 GO FORWARD IN TRIAL DOWN HERE EVENTUALLY, I HAVE GOT TO MAKE 15 A MOTION FOR THE RETURN OF MY DOCUMENTS. IF YOUR HONOR 16 DENIES MY MOTION IT IS STILL --17 THE COURT: I HAVEN'T GOT YOUR DOCUMENTS. 18 MR. BARENS: NO, NO. 19 BUT IF YOUR HONOR DENIES MY MOTION TO DISMISS, 20 I STILL NEED THE MATERIALS TO PROCEED WITH THE TRIAL AND I 21 CAN'T TELL YOUR HONOR WHETHER I HAVE GOT THOSE MATERIALS OR 22 23 NOT --LISTEN. DOES YOUR HONOR HAVE SOME FEELING I 24 AM HERE TRYING TO BE DILATORY? 25 THE COURT: NO. 26 MR. BARENS: OR TO DELAY THIS TRIAL? 27 THE COURT: NO, NO. 28

BUT I THINK -- I DON'T THINK WE NEED ALL OF THESE 1 2 STEPS THAT YOU WANT TO TAKE. MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, IF I DON'T HAVE THE MATERIALS, 3 I CAN'T PUT ON THE DEFENSE. IF I DON'T HAVE THE EXHIBITS, I CAN'T PUT THEM ON AS DEFENSE EXHIBITS. 5 I HAVE GOT TO MAKE A MOTION FOR THE RETURN OF 6 7 THE DOCUMENTS. THE COURT: CAN YOU TELL ME NOW WHAT THE EXHIBITS ARE 8 9 THAT YOU WANT? 10 MR. BARENS: I TOLD YOUR HONOR. 11 THE COURT: 76 EXHIBITS, IS THAT WHAT YOU WANT? MR. BARENS: I WANT THOSE AND I WANT ANY AND ALL --12 13 MR. CHIER: EVERYTHING THEY TOOK. 14 MR. BARENS: ANY AND ALL DOCUMENTS. 15 THE COURT: EVERYTHING THAT WAS TAKEN? 16 MR. BARENS: YES. 17 THE COURT: ON A VALID WARRANT? 18 MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR. 19 WHY ARE THEY MORE -- WHY IS IT VALID UP THERE? . IT ISN'T UNTIL I HAVE LITIGATED WHETHER IT IS VALID OR NOT. 20 21 I WANT TO BE ABLE TO TALK TO THE JUDGE AND SAY, 22 "LISTEN, JUDGE, YOU HAD NO RIGHT TO DO THIS". THE COURT: HAVE YOU GOT YOUR PAPERS ALL READY TO MAKE 23 24 YOUR MOTION UP THERE? 25 MR. BARENS: I HAVE THAT WITH ME. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ARE YOU GOING TO FILE IT 26 27 TOMORROW?

MR. BARENS: I CAN'T FILE IT TOMORROW. IT WILL BE

FILED AT THE LATEST DAY AFTER TOMORROW. I HAVE IT IN DRAFT FORM HERE. THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU WANT ME TO DO? MR. WAPNER: WHAT I WOULD LIKE IS FOR THE COURT TO GIVE US ENOUGH TIME SO THAT ONCE THAT MOTION IS FILED, THE PROSECUTING AGENCY HAS TIME TO RESPOND TO THAT UP THERE AND THEY HAVE A HEARING. THEN ONCE THEY HAVE A HEARING, HE EITHER GETS BACK CERTAIN DOCUMENTS OR HE DOESN'T. AFTER THEY HAVE THAT, THEN WE COME BACK HERE.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I AM NOT ADDRESSING THIS

28

15 B

I HAVE A LEGAL OBLIGATION TO SAY THIS. THE COURT: DON'T I KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT THIS CASE FROM THE PITTMAN CASE, I KNOW EVERYTHING ABOUT THAT CASE, EVERY-THING TO BE KNOWN; DOES THAT TAINT ME? MR. BARENS: I AM NOT SAYING AS A PERSONAL MATTER THAT YOUR HONOR WOULD BE TAINTED OR INFLUENCED IN ANY WAY. I AM SAYING THE LAW REQUIRES ME TO SAY THAT THE DEFENDANT'S RIGHTS COULD BE ABRIDGED BY YOUR HONOR READING THE COURT: I HAVE TO MAKE A DETERMINATION TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT'S RIGHTS ARE ABRIDGED AND I HAVE TO SEE THOSE DOCUMENTS TO MAKE THE RULING. MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR HAS --THE COURT: I HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY SHOULD BE RETURNED. TO DETERMINE IF THEY ARE RELEVANT IN THIS CASE, I HAVE TO SEE THEM, DON'T I? MR. WAPNER: SOMEBODY HAS TO SEE THEM. MR. WAPNER: THE QUESTION IS WHETHER OR NOT IT SHOULD BE THIS COURT OR WHETHER IT SHOULD BE A SPECIAL MASTER. LET'S SAY THAT THE SPECIAL MASTER LOOKS AT THEM. THE COURT: A SPECIAL MASTER KNOWS NOTHING ABOUT THE ISSUES IN THIS CASE WHATSOEVER TO KNOW WHETHER OR NOT

28 THE COURT: WHAT?

MR. BARENS: A SPECIAL MASTER CAN CERTAINLY DETERMINE 1 WHAT IS AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION. 2 MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I AM CONFIDENT THEY DIDN'T 3 SEIZE ANY ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATIONS. 4 MR. BARENS: I DON'T THINK YOUR HONOR CAN ACCEPT THAT. 5 THE COURT: NO, I CAN'T ACCEPT THAT. 6 MR. WAPNER: I AM NOT ASKING THE COURT TO MAKE A RULING 7 8 BASED ON THIS. THE COURT: NO, I AM NOT MAKING ANY RULING BASED ON 9 THAT OR ANY RULING BASED ON WHAT HE SAYS HAS BEEN SEIZED, 10 THE 76 SO-CALLED EXHIBITS. I CANNOT MAKE ANY DETERMINATION 11 AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE EXHIBITS OR JUST A LOT OF 12 13 HOGWASH. MR. BARENS: I HOPE YOUR HONOR IS NOT DETERMINING IN 14 YOUR HONOR'S MIND THAT WHEN I SAY THERE ARE 76 EXHIBITS, I 15 AM BEING ANYTHING LESS THAN CANDID ABOUT THAT OR FEEL THAT 16 17 THEY ARE NOT OF SIGNIFICANCE. THE COURT: NO, NEVER HAVE I EVER IMPUGNED YOUR 18 19 INTEGRITY IN THIS CASE, HAVE I? MR. BARENS: NO, YOU HAVE NOT, AND I APPRECIATE THAT. 20 I AM SUBMITTING TO YOU THAT THE TWO YEARS THAT 21 22 JOE HUNT HAS BEEN WORKING ON THIS WITH ME, WE DIDN'T INTEND TO COME DOWN HERE AND GO DOWN THE TUBES, SO TO SPEAK. WE 23 HAVEN'T GOT MR. YOUNG PUTTING THIS CASE ON. WE PLAN TO GO 24 FORWARD AGGRESSIVELY HERE AND PLAN TO PUT ON EVERY EXHIBIT 25 WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO LOCATE INTHE LAST TWO YEARS. 26 27 THE COURT: IS 30 DAYS ENOUGH TO DO ALL OF THAT?

MR. BARENS: I DON'T EVEN ASK FOR 30 DAYS.

28

THE COURT: HOW LONG DO YOU WANT?

MR. BARENS: HERE IS WHAT I ASKED YOUR HONOR TO DO,

IF HIS HONOR WOULD LET US COME BACK A WEEK FROM MONDAY WITH

A STATUS REPORT, I THINK WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN, TO BE

HONEST WITH YOU -- 'OUR MOTION WILL BE GRANTED.

THEY ARE GOING TO GRANT MY MOTION AND WE WILL COME BACK AND PUT ON AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON A MOTION FOR DISMISSAL, WHICH I WILL DO FORTHWITH.

THE COURT: PARDON ME. DID YOU TALK TO THE ATTORNEY 1 GENERAL WHO IS GOING TO PROSECUTE THIS CASE? 2 MR. WAPNER: YES. 3 THE COURT: HE KNOWS WHAT THE PAPERS ARE WHICH WERE 4 SEIZED, DOESN'T HE? 5 MR. WAPNER: THE INVESTIGATOR KIND OF KNOWS WHAT THEY 6 7 ARE. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL DOESN'T REALLY KNOW BECAUSE 8 HE WASN'T PRESENT DURING THE SEARCH. 9 THE COURT: CAN'T HE JUST TAKE THINGS WHICH ARE RELEVANT 10 11 TO THAT CASE UP THERE --MR. BARENS: OH, YOUR HONOR. 12 THE COURT: -- AND SEND EVERYTHING BACK HERE? 13 MR. BARENS: YOU COULD NOT RELY ON MR. VANCE, WHO I 14 LIKE PERSONALLY, TO BE ANYTHING ELSE THAN A PROSECUTOR. 15 THE COURT: HOW ABOUT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL? HE IS 16 THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, YOU DON'T TRUST HIM? 17 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, HE IS THE MOST PROSECUTION 18 ORIENTED MAN YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE. 19 MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, WHAT I AM TRYING TO DO IS 20 TO DOT ALL OF THE I'S, CROSS ALL OF THE T'S, AND MAKE SURE 21 THAT EVERYTHING IS DONE PROPERLY SO THAT SOMEBODY CAN'T COME 22 BACK AND SAY, "WELL, THE PROSECUTOR JUST CALLED UP AND THEY 23 KIND OF SHMOOZED EVERYBODY AND THEY GOT WHAT THEY WANTED." 24 25 I DON'T WANT IT TO LOOK LIKE THAT. MR. BARENS: I DON'T WANT IT TO LOOK LIKE THAT EITHER. 26 THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU WANT TO DO? DO YOU WANT TO 27 CONTINUE IT TO A WEEK FROM MONDAY, TEN DAYS? 28

MR. BARENS: TO A WEEK FROM MONDAY, WE WILL COME BACK 1 AND GIVE YOUR HONOR AN HONEST STATUS REPORT. 2 3 THE COURT: TEN DAYS? MR. BARENS: THAT ROUGHLY, YES, YOUR HONOR, AND I WILL 5 VIGOROUSLY PURSUE THIS MATTER. THE COURT: A STATUS REPORT ISN'T ENOUGH. THAT MEANS 6 7 ANOTHER FOUR WEEKS AFTER THAT. MR. BARENS: I DIDN'T SAY THAT, YOUR HONOR. 8 I SAID, YOUR HONOR, I HOPE TO BE UP IN THAT COURT 9 NEXT WEEK IN SAN MATEO, IF AT ALL POSSIBLE, AND GET SOMEBODY 10 11 TO LISTEN TO ME. MR. WAPNER: I THINK THAT IT IS REALISTIC TO THINK 12 THAT PROBABLY BY TWO AND A HALF WEEKS, WHICH WILL BE THE REST 13 OF THIS WEEK, NEXT WEEK AND THE FOLLOWING WEEK, I THINK IT 14 IS REALISTIC TO THINK WE COULD HAVE ALL OF THIS RESOLVED AND 15 16 BE PREPARED TO GO FORWARD. MR. BARENS: THAT IS RIGHT, I THINK THAT IS REALISTIC. 17 THE COURT: I WILL HAVE YOUR PROMISE AND YOUR PROMISE, 18 TOO, SO WE WILL CONTINUE IT TO A WEEK FROM NEXT MONDAY. 19 MR. BARENS: WELL, MR. WAPNER SAID IT MIGHT BE A 20 BETTER IDEA SO I DON'T HAVE TO WASTE ANYBODY'S TIME, MR. WAPNER 21 SAYS IN TWO AND A HALF WEEKS I CAN GET IT ON CALENDAR AND 22 BE DONE WITH IT INSTEAD OF HAVING ANOTHER CONTINUANCE. 23 24 THE COURT: THEN THAT WILL SHORTEN THE TIME. 25 26

16

27

28

MR. BARENS: COULD I HEAR MR. WAPNER AGAIN? SORRY.

MR. WAPNER: WHEN I SAID THAT THE TWO AND A HALF WEEKS, I WAS HOPING THAT THAT MEANS EVERYTHING. THAT MEANS GOING UP TO NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, DOING WHATEVER THEY HAVE TO DO, COMING BACK DOWN HERE, HAVING OUR HEARING, HAVING OUR MOTIONS AND THEN BASICALLY TWO WEEKS FROM THIS COMING MONDAY, WE MAKE OPENING STATEMENTS AND WE GO TO TRIAL.

MR. BARENS: WELL, ASSUMING THE JUDGE STILL HAS -THE COURT: CAN'T YOU GET AN AGREEMENT FROM THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL THAT ALL OF THE STUFF THEY SEIZED SHOULD
BE BROUGHT DOWN HERE? LET THEM MAKE COPIES OF ANYTHING THERE
THAT THEY THINK THEY NEED FOR THEIR TRIAL. PRESERVE THE REST
OF THE RECORDS FOR THEIR USE UP THERE. THEY DON'T NEED IT
NOW.

THEY HAVE GOT TO WAIT UNTIL WE FINISH OUR TRIAL,
ANYWAY. CAN'T YOU GET THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO DO THAT?

THE COURT: AND NOT JEOPARDIZE THIS CASE?

MR. WAPNER: MAYBE.

MR. BARENS: COULD WE AT LEAST DO IT A WEEK FROM MONDAY,

TO GET STRAIGHT ON ALL OF THIS? I WANT AN OPPORTUNITY TO

GET --

THE COURT: NO. IF WE GET ALL OF THIS STUFF DOWN HERE, EVERYTHING IS BEING TRANSFERRED DOWN HERE --

MR. BARENS: I AM IN NO WAY -- LET ME MAKE THIS CLEAR.

I AM IN NO WAY, WAIVING MY RIGHT TO AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING

ON MY DISMISSAL MOTION, EVEN IF THOSE DOCUMENTS ARE --

THE COURT: WELL, WHAT IS THE BASIS OF YOUR MOTION?

MR. BARENS: WELL, ONCE THE DOCUMENTS ARE DOWN HERE,

JUDGE --1 THE COURT: YOU WANT TO PUT THE COPS ON THE STAND? 2 MR. BARENS: YES, SIR. I WANT TO PUT THE DEFENDANT 3 ON THE STAND. 4 THE COURT: THAT'S ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN DO THAT. I WILL 5 PERMIT YOU TO DO THAT. 6 MR. BARENS: I WANT EVERY OPPORTUNITY I CAN, TO CONVINCE 7 YOUR HONOR TO GRANT THE DISMISSAL MOTION. 8 THE COURT: WELL, LOOK, THIS IS A VERY, VERY SERIOUS 9 THING BEFORE I WILL EVER DISMISS. 10 YOU MEAN SO THAT THEY CAN REFILE IT? IS THAT 11 WHAT YOU MEAN? 12 MR. BARENS: I DON'T WANT THEM TO REFILE IT. I AM SAYING 13 THAT IT IS OBLIGATORY ON THIS COUNSEL TO SERIOUSLY PURSUE 14 THE DEFENSE MOTION TO DISMISS. 15 THE COURT: WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THE CASE -- SUPPOSE HE 16 DISMISSES IT? THERE IS NO JEOPARDY ATTACHED BECAUSE --17 MR. BARENS: I HAVE A GENTLEMAN'S AGREEMENT WITH 18 MR. WAPNER THAT I WOULD NOT REQUEST THE JURY TO BE SWORN. 19 THEIR OPTIONS ARE OPEN. I AM TRYING TO HAVE SOME SENSE OF 20 FAIR PLAY ABOUT THE WAY THE DEFENSE IS CONDUCTING THEMSELVES. 21 22 23

THE COURT: WELL, IF IT IS DISMISSED, WHAT HAPPENS?

MR. BARENS: WELL, THEY HAVE THEIR OPTIONS.

THE COURT: WHAT OPTIONS?

MR. BARENS: TO REFILE.

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, THIS PRESENTS A VERY

INTERESTING POINT.

24

25

26

27

28

MR. BARENS: THEY WILL NEVER SUCCESSFULLY GET IT

REFILED.

MR. WAPNER: FORGET ABOUT THE REFILING.

MR. BARENS: I AM BEING UP FRONT.

MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME.

THE COURT: IF IT IS -- WHAT I HAVE BEEN TELLING YOU

IS THAT IT IS A VERY SERIOUS MURDER CASE. IF IT IS GOING

TO BE DISMISSED BECAUSE OF SOME CONDUCT ON THE PART OF

SOMEBODY, SOME ATTORNEY GENERAL UP IN ANOTHER CASE THAT

AFFECTS THIS CASE --

MR. BARENS: IT INVOLVES THE INVESTIGATORS IN THIS CASE.
WAIT A MINUTE, YOUR HONOR --

THE COURT: WELL, THEY ARE NOT THE ONES -- THAT I DON'T KNOW. WE'LL FIND OUT IN AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING HOW INSTRUMENTAL THEY WERE IN GETTING THIS THING, THE WARRANT AND THE ATTACHMENT.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I --

MR. WAPNER: LET'S DO THIS. LET ME TALK TO THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL. IF HE SAYS TO ME THAT HE WILL MAKE COPIES
OF EVERYTHING AND GIVE IT TO THE DEFENSE, NOT TO ME BECAUSE
I DON'T WANT THE COPIES -- AND I DON'T WANT TO BE TAINTED
BY THIS. BUT IF HE SAYS THAT HE WILL MAKE COPIES OF ALL OF
THIS AND GIVE THEM BACK TO THE DEFENSE, COPIES OF EVERYTHING
THAT WAS TAKEN, THEN IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE SHOULD BE IN SOME
POSITION IN THIS COURT --

THE COURT: THEN WE CAN PROCEED, EXCEPT FOR THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING AND --

MR. WAPNER: WE HAVE TO HAVE AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING.

THE COURT: WE'LL HAVE AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING.

MR. BARENS: MIGHT I STATE THAT I AM SURE YOUR HONOR IS AWARE OF THE FACT THAT IN THIS STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS AND THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES, THERE IS AMPLE PRECEDENT TO SHOW THAT THE MOST SERIOUS OF CRIMES HAVE BEEN THE SUBJECTS OF DISMISSAL MOTIONS THAT WERE GRANTED, IN LIGHT OF PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT.

MR. WAPNER: LET'S NOT ARGUE THE DISMISSAL MOTION NOW.

THE COURT: THERE IS NO PROSECUTOR MISCONDUCT HERE.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE PROSECUTOR, AS THE BARBER CASE SHOWS, IS CONSIDERED THE VICTIM OF HIS OWN INVESTIGATORS.

MR. WAPNER: WE ARE NOT ARGUING THAT MOTION NOW. WHAT IS THE POINT OF GOING THROUGH IT?

THE COURT: WILL YOU SEE IF YOU CAN GET THE ATTORNEY

GENERAL TO DO IT? WE WILL GET A COURT ORDER TO SEND IT DOWN

HERE, SINCE WE ARE TRYING THE CASE FIRST AND ORDER HIM TO

MAKE COPIES OF EVERYTHING AND TURN IT OVER TO DEFENSE COUNSEL.

THAT WILL BE SO YOU DON'T LOOK AT IT OR ANYTHING ELSE. THEN TELL HIM ALSO THAT IT IS AN ORDER OF THIS COURT THAT NOTHING BE DIVULGED AS TO WHAT HE IS GOING TO MAKE COPIES OF.

MR. WAPNER: I WILL PURSUE IT. AS FAR AS THE JURORS ARE CONCERNED, WHEN THEY ARE COMING BACK TOMORROW, I THINK THAT CERTAINLY -- WE CAN'T DO ANYTHING WITH THEM THIS WEEK.

AND I DON'T THINK IT IS REASONABLE TO ASSUME WE ARE GOING TO GET THIS RESOLVED BEFORE NEXT WEEK.

SO, I THINK MAYBE --

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO CALL UP THE ATTORNEY GENERAL NOW? FIND OUT IF THEY WILL SEND THE STUFF DOWN.

bA-

MR. WAPNER: I WILL CALL. BUT, LET ME JUST TELL THE
COURT ALL OF THE THINGS THAT OCCUR TO ME, WHICH IS THAT THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL THERE, ALTHOUGH HE HAS A BIGGER PROBLEM IN
HIS CASE BECAUSE IT IS HIS INVESTIGATORS WHO ACTUALLY SEIZED
ALL THIS MATERIAL, MAY SAY WE HAVE BOXED IT UP AND IT IS SEALED
AND WE DON'T WANT TO MAKE COPIES BECAUSE WE ARE GOING TO HAVE
SOME INDEPENDENT AGENCY MAKE THAT DETERMINATION.

THE COURT: HAVE THEM SEND IT DOWN HERE AND WE'LL MAKE COPIES.

27

28

MR. BARENS: WHO WILL? 1 THE COURT: WE WILL HERE. 2 MR. WAPNER: HE IS TALKING ABOUT THE COURT. 3 THE COURT: THE COURT WILL. 4 MR. BARENS: WITHOUT READING THEM? COULD YOU ORDER 5 A CLERK TO MAKE COPIES? 6 THE COURT: WHAT AM I GOING TO TELL THEM TO MAKE COPIES 7 OF? 8 MR. BARENS: EVERYTHING IN THE BOX. 9 THE COURT: WHAT IS IT, ONE BOX? MR. BARENS: NO. THE COURT: HOW MUCH? 12 MR. BARENS: A LOT OF STUFF. 13 MR. WAPNER: THE MORE I THINK ABOUT IT, THE MORE I AM 14 CONVINCED THAT --15 THE COURT: I THINK ALL HIS NOTES AND THE VOLUMES AND 16 VOLUMES OF IT, LIKE ON THIS PADS THAT HE HAS GOTTEN. HE HAS 17 HAD DOZENS AND DOZENS OF THOSE, THAT I THINK WERE SEIZED. 18 HE SAID SO, HIMSELF. HE SAID SO IN HIS AFFIDAVIT. 19

I DON'T THINK ANY -- I DON'T BELIEVE THAT FROM WHAT I READ IN THE PAPERS THAT THERE WAS ANYTHING EXCEPT FOR REFERENCE TO 80 EXHIBITS, NOTHING THAT WAS SEIZED THAT LOOKS LIKE IT IS ANYTHING AT ALL SIMILAR TO THIS CASE.

MR. BARENS: WHAT ABOUT MY STUFF?

MR. WAPNER: WELL, WE DON'T KNOW.

THE COURT: HOW DO I KNOW UNTIL I READ IT?

MR. BARENS: I CAN ONLY GO ON WHAT THE ROBERTS,

MR. AND MRS. ROBERTS WERE WILLING TO TELL ME.

THE COURT: WELL, I WON'T PAY ANY ATTENTION TO WHAT 1 THEY SAY. 2 MR. BARENS: WELL, YOU MIGHT WANT TO LISTEN TO THEIR 3 TESTIMONY. THE COURT: ON WHAT THEY SAW SOMEBODY READING? 5 MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR. I --6 THE COURT: I AM TELLING YOU THAT I WILL TAKE IT WITH 7 A GRAIN OF SALT. 8 MR. BARENS: BUT IF A POLICE OFFICER TELLS YOU THAT 9 HE DIDN'T READ IT, YOU WOULD TAKE THAT WITH MORE THAN A GRAIN 10 OF SALT? 11 THE COURT: SURE I WOULD. 12 MR. BARENS: WHAT IS THAT? 13 THE COURT: YES. I WILL TAKE IT -- HOW DO THEY KNOW 14 WHAT THE POLICE OFFICER READ? 15 MR. BARENS: BECAUSE THEY HAD A REAL INTEREST IN WATCHING 16 THEM AND WHAT THEY WERE DOING AND WE ASKED THEM TO. 17 THE COURT: THEY SAW DOCUMENTS THEMSELVES, DID THEY? 18 MR. BARENS: YES. I ASKED THEM IN CHAMBERS, TO BE SURE 19 TO CATALOG -- WHEN YOUR HONOR PERMITTED ME TO USE YOUR PHONE, 20 I WENT IN THERE AND I TOLD MRS. ROBERTS TO BE SURE AND 21 CATALOG WHAT THEY WERE DOING. 22 THE COURT: I DON'T WANT TO PREJUDGE ANYTHING. 23 MR. BARENS: WHAT I AM ASKING IS --24 THE COURT: I WILL TAKE A LOOK. TRY TO GET IT. THEY 25 DON'T NEED IT NOW. THEY CAN WAIT UNTIL AFTER THEY START THEIR 26 TRIAL. 27

WE CAN FINISH OURS IN THE MEANTIME. LET THEM

SEND ALL OF THE BOXES DOWN HERE. MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, PLEASE --THE COURT: I DON'T NEED TO KNOW WHAT THEY ARE. I WON'T READ THEM. I PROMISE YOU THAT. I JUST WANT TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT IT IS RELEVANT. MR. BARENS: ALL I WILL SAY IS IF THEY WILL SEND ALL OF THE STUFF DOWN HERE AND RETURN IT TO US --THE COURT: RETURN IT TO YOU? MR. BARENS: RETURN IT TO THE DEFENSE --THE COURT: WELL, WHAT ABOUT THE STUFF THEY SEIZED WHICH MIGHT BE PROPERLY SEIZABLE? WHAT ABOUT THE --MR. BARENS: LET THEM COPY IT FOR THEMSELVES AND SEND ALL THE STUFF DOWN TO ME.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WE WILL SEE IF THEY CAN DO THAT.

MR. WAPNER: IF IT IS PROPERLY SEIZABLE UNDER A VALID

WARRANT, THEY ARE UNDER NO OBLIGATION TO RELEASE THE ORIGINALS.

THE COURT: OF COURSE NOT. HAVE THEM CHECK AND MAKE COPIES OF WHAT THEY HAVE GOT AND SEND IT DOWN HERE.

MR. WAPNER: I AM SUGGESTING THAT THERE IS LITIGATION ON WHETHER IT WAS A VALID WARRANT. BECAUSE IF IT IS NOT A VALID WARRANT, THEN THEY ARE NOT ENTITLED TO THE STUFF IN THE FIRST PLACE. RIGHT?

THE COURT: IF IT IS NOT A VALID WARRANT, THEY ARE NOT ENTITLED TO IT.

MR. WAPNER: TO TAKE IT, RIGHT.

THE COURT: IN OTHER WORDS, THEY HAVE TO RETURN IT?

MR. WAPNER: IF IT IS A VALID WARRANT, THEN THEY MAY
BE ENTITLED TO SEIZE IT BUT IT STILL MAY BE PRIVILEGED AND
A SPECIAL MASTER WOULD HAVE TO MAKE THAT DETERMINATION.

AND IF IT IS A VALID WARRANT AND IT IS NOT PRIVILEGED BUT THEY WERE GOING TO BE USED AS EXHIBITS DOWN HERE, THEN THEY ARE ENTITLED TO COPIES.

THE COURT: WELL, THAT WILL AVOID ALL THE SPECIAL MASTER STUFF, WHICH WILL TAKE AN INORDINATE AMOUNT OF TIME.

LET THEM COPY EVERYTHING THEY HAVE GOT UP THERE

AND MAIL IT ALL DOWN HERE AND RETURN IT TO HIM. YOU ARE

ENTITLED TO COPIES.

AREN'T THEY ENTITLED TO COPIES OF EVERYTHING THAT WAS SEIZED?

MR. WAPNER: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MAKE THE COPIES AND RETURN IT 1 ALL. 2 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, CAN I GET A RULING THAT IN 3 THE EVENT THE EXHIBITS AREN'T THE ORIGINALS, THAT YOUR HONOR 4 WILL LET ME ADMIT THEM INTO EVIDENCE? 5 THE COURT: THE COPIES THEY MAKE? YES. 6 MR. BARENS: THERE IS NOTHING ELSE I CAN DO. 7 THE COURT: THAT IS GOOD. SURE. I WILL PERMIT THAT. 8 MR. BARENS: YES. 9 THE COURT: ALSO A FIRM INJUNCTION AND AN ORDER TO THE 10 POLICE OFFICERS -- I WILL MAKE IT PERSONAL TO THEM AND I WILL 11 HAVE THEM BROUGHT IN HERE, THAT THEY ARE NOT TO DISCLOSE 12 ANYTHING THAT THEY HAVE READ TO ANYBODY OR INDICATE IT TO 13 ANY WITNESSES AND CERTAINLY NOT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY. 14 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, THE DEFENSE ABSOLUTELY INSISTS 15 ON A FULL EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON THIS MATTER, RATHER THAN 16 JUST A SUMMARY ORDER. 17 THE COURT: WE'LL HAVE AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING. WE WILL 18 HAVE THE POLICE OFFICERS COME IN AND WE WILL FIND OUT. 19 YOU CAN'T ASK THEM WHAT THEY READ BECAUSE THEY 20 WILL BE DISCLOSING THINGS FOR YOU. 21 MR. BARENS: I WOULD ASK YOUR HONOR TO --22 THE COURT: UNLESS YOU WANT TO HAVE THEM IN CAMERA, 23 HERE. 24 MR. BARENS: WELL, I WOULD --25 THE COURT: WE WILL FIND IT OUT FIRST. THEY CAN MAKE 26 COPIES AND SEND EVERYTHING DOWN TO HIM. 27

MR. WAPNER: WELL, I WILL FIND OUT ABOUT THAT, YOUR

HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: MEANTIME, WHAT DO WE TELL THE JURY TOMORROW MORNING? TO COME BACK A WEEK FROM MONDAY?

THE COURT: WE WILL TELL THEM TO COME BACK A WEEK FROM MONDAY, YES.

MR. WAPNER: UNLESS A WEEK FROM MONDAY AT THE MOMENT, IS GOING TO BE THE DAY FOR THE STATUS CHECK TO SEE WHERE WE ARE.

THE COURT: YES. BEFORE WE GO, WHAT AM I GOING TO TELL
THE JURORS TOMORROW AS TO WHY THERE IS SUCH A LONG DELAY?

MR. WAPNER: WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO TELL THE JURORS
TOMORROW IS THAT DURING THE COURSE OF SELECTING THE JURY,
SOMETHING UNEXPECTED TRANSPIRED THAT NO ONE HAD ANTICIPATED.
BECAUSE OF THAT, IT IS GOING TO TAKE AT LEAST THE BALANCE
OF NEXT WEEK TO RESOLVE IT.

MR. BARENS: AND IF I MIGHT INTERRUPT AND I DO SO RESPECTFULLY YOUR HONOR, SIMPLY SAY THAT THERE ARE PRETRIAL MOTIONS THAT HIS HONOR HAS TO CONSIDER.

THE COURT: THAT DOESN'T TAKE THAT LONG.

MR. BARENS: WELL, YOU COULD SAY THAT WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE FILING SOME MOTIONS AND YOUR HONOR HAS TO CONSIDER THEM AFTER THEY ARE FILED.

THE COURT: WELL, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF MOTIONS AND
HEARINGS OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. ALL RIGHT. WILL
THAT BE ALL RIGHT WITH YOU?

MR. WAPNER: ALL RIGHT. TELL THEM WE ARE GOING TO ASK
THEM TO COME BACK A WEEK FROM MONDAY, WHICH WOULD BE

17 F

FEBRUARY THE 2ND.

THE COURT: WHAT WAS THAT CITATION?

MR. BARENS: PEOPLE VERSUS BARBER -- SORRY. THAT IS
BARBER V. MUNICIPAL COURT, 24 CAL.3D 742.

THE COURT: I WILL READ THAT.

MR. BARENS: IT IS REALLY IMPORTANT, YOUR HONOR, OR I WOULDN'T BRING IT UP.

THE COURT: WELL, OF COURSE IT IS. ALL RIGHT.

742? IS THAT RIGHT?

MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: IF THERE IS ANYTHING THAT CAN BE DONE IN THIS COURT BY WAY OF HEARINGS IN THE MEANTIME, APPROPRIATE MOTIONS WILL BE MADE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: I THINK YOU SHOULD ALSO TELL THE JURORS
THAT ON FEBRUARY THE 2ND WHEN THEY COME BACK, WE MAY BE
PROCEEDING WITH THIS CASE OR IT MAY TAKE ANOTHER WEEK TO
RESOLVE IT.

THE COURT: ARE YOU GOING TO CALL THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

AND FIND OUT WHETHER THEY CAN RETURN EVERYTHING THAT THEY

SEIZED AND THEY WILL MAKE COPIES OF IT?

MR. WAPNER: I WILL TALK TO THEM ABOUT IT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THEN HE CAN PROCEED UP THERE WITH THE MOTIONS. YOU CAN HAVE THEM RETURN YOUR COPIES.

MR. WAPNER: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. DO WE STILL NEED TO BE AT THE BENCH? MR. BARENS: NO. I JUST FEEL LIKE I DON'T KNOW WHAT I AM DOING MORE PRIVATELY UP HERE. ALL RIGHT, I AM CONCLUDED FOR THE DAY, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, TOMORROW. MR. BARENS: AT 10:30, YOUR HONOR. (AT 2:50 P.M. AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN UNTIL WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1987 AT 10:30 A.M.)