COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,

VS.

SUPERIOR COURT NO. A-090435

JOE HUNT, AKA JOSEPH HUNT, AKA JOSEPH HENRY GAMSKY,

DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.

Q(T()?;

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

APPEARANCES:

R PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT: JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP

STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL 3580 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD

ROOM 800

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90010

FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT: IN PROPRIA PERSONA

VOLUME 47 OF 101 (PAGES 6/39 TO 63/2, 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 FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1987 VOLUME 42

PAGES 6189 TO 6312, 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	FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1987 VOLUM	F 4:2	PACES 6180 TO	6712
2		- ' -	17020 0105 10	6189
3				6264
4	4			
5	PROCEEDING	<u>35</u>		
6	MOTIONS			6189
7	,			
8	CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX	OF WITNE	SSES	
9	DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES:		EXAMINAT	ION
10	ROBERTS, LYNNE			
11	(b) Tik: DAKLING)		6189	
12	(BY MR. WAPNER) (BY MR. BARENS)		6192 6212	
13	PEOPLE'S WITNESSES:			
14	FOGG, CLARK W.			
15	CDI MK: WAFNER)		6214	
16	(BY MR. BARENS) (BY MR. WAPNER)		6217 6227	
17	ROBERTS, BROOKE			
18	(BY MR. WAPNER)		6232	
19	DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES:			
20	HUNT, JOSEPH			
21	(BY MR. BARENS) (BY MR. WAPNER)		6 2 4 4 6 2 4 7	
22	(B) THE WALKEY		6251 6257	
23			02)/	
24				
25				
26				
27				
28			•	

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1987; 10:15 A.M. 1 DEPARTMENT WEST C 2 HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE 3 (APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.) 4 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I WILL GET THE WITNESS, 5 6 YOUR HONOR. 7 (PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.) 8 9 LYNNE ROBERTS, CALLED AS A WITNESS BY THE DEFENDANT, HAVING BEEN PREVIOUSLY 10 SWORN, RESUMED THE WITNESS STAND AND TESTIFIED FURTHER AS 11 FOLLOWS: 12 THE CLERK: YOU HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN SWORN. YOU ARE 13 STILL UNDER OATH SO JUST HAVE A SEAT. 14 15 THE WITNESS: OKAY. THE CLERK: AND STATE YOUR NAME AGAIN FOR THE RECORD. 16 PLEASE. 17 THE WITNESS: LYNNE ROBERTS. 18 MR. BARENS: JUST ONE MOMENT, IF YOU WOULD, YOUR HONOR. 19 20 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 21 22 EXAMINATION (RESUMED) 23 BY MR. BARENS: 24 Q MRS. ROBERTS, I BELIEVE WE LEFT OFF YESTERDAY WHERE YOU HAD DESCRIBED A THIRD OCCASION WHEN YOU WERE UPSTAIRS 25 IN YOUR BEDROOM AND YOU OVERHEARD A CONVERSATION, DO YOU RECALL? 26 27 Α YES. 28 Q AND THAT CONVERSATION HAVING TAKEN PLACE BETWEEN

1 OFFICERS ZOELLER AND BREILING.

AFTER THAT, DID YOU COME OUT OF YOUR BEDROOM?

A NO.

I STAYED IN THE BEDROOM FOR A FEW MINUTES, BECAUSE MR. ZOELLER ASKED THE PHOTOGRAPHER, THE TALL MAN, TO COME AND HE BROUGHT HIM THERE AND THEY STOOD, LIKE, IN THE SAME LOCATION AND HE SAID TO HIM THAT IF -- THAT HE JUST SAID TO THIS MAN -- I DON'T KNOW HIS NAME -- HE JUST TO HIM "LISTEN, IF YOU ARE ASKED, WE WEREN'T SUPPOSED TO TAKE PHOTOGRAPHS AND WE WEREN'T SUPPOSED TO READ THOSE PAPERS IN THE COMPUTER ROOM," AND HE SAID, "IF YOU ARE ASKED, YOU TELL THEM THAT YOU STOPPED TAKING PICTURES AS SOON AS I TOLD YOU THAT YOU WEREN'T SUPPOSED TO TAKE ANY PICTURES."

NOW, WHO WAS THE SPEAKING PARTY IN THAT 1 Q CONVERSATION? 2 A MR. ZOELLER SAID THIS TO THE TALL MAN WHO HAD 3 THE CAMERA, THE PHOTOGRAPHER. 4 ALL RIGHT. NOW, AFTER THAT, WHAT DID YOU DO? 5 WELL, I WAITED UNTIL THEY WALKED DOWN THE HALL. 6 THEN I WENT INTO THE ROOM AND I ASKED MR. CHIER TO PLEASE COME OUT OF THE ROOM. HE WAS IN THE COMPUTER ROOM. 8 AND HE DID AND WE WALKED DOWNSTAIRS TO THE TAP 9 ROOM. I TOLD HIM THE CONVERSATIONS THAT I HEARD. 10 11 ALL RIGHT. NOW AFTER THAT, WHAT DID YOU DO DURING THE REST OF THE TIME THAT THE SEARCH ACTIVITY WAS GOING ON? 12 WELL, I WENT DOWNSTAIRS IN THE LAUNDRY ROOM AND 13 CHECKED WITH THE LADY THAT WAS WORKING THAT DAY. BECAUSE 14 SHE HAS HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE AND SHE WAS VERY UPSET. 15 I SPENT TIME WITH HER, CONSOLING HER. THEN I 16 17 TOOK HER UPSTAIRS IN MY BEDROOM AND TOLD HER TO YOU KNOW, SIT UP THERE AND WATCH TV OR SOMETHING. 18 BUT SHE WAS TOO NERVOUS TO WATCH TV. SO SHE JUST 19 SAT IN THE CHAIR: I SAID, "JUST STAY HERE UNTIL ALL OF THE 20 MEN LEAVE," BECAUSE SHE GETS VERY NERVOUS. 21 22 ARE YOU TELLING ME THAT YOU SPENT THE REST OF THE TIME THE SEARCH WAS PROCEEDING DOWNSTAIRS? 23 24 WELL, I WENT DOWN, YOU KNOW, TO SEE ABOUT HATTIE. 25 THEN I WALKED BACK UPSTAIRS AND -- NO. 26 THEN, WELL, I DIDN'T STAY THE WHOLE TIME DOWNSTAIRS. I WAS UPSTAIRS AND DOWNSTAIRS. 27

28

Q

ALL RIGHT.

A I KNOW I WAS ON THE STAIRS WHEN -- I WAS

DOWNSTAIRS AT ONE TIME WHEN I TOLD MY HUSBAND ABOUT HATTIE

BEING SO UPSET.

THEN AT THAT TIME, HE WENT UPSTAIRS AND TOLD THE MEN THAT IF THEY HAVE NOT FOUND WHAT THEY CAME FOR, IT WAS TIME TO LEAVE, YOU KNOW. THE LADY WAS VERY UPSET AND THEY SHOULD LEAVE.

MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT. I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER OF THE WITNESS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. WAPNER:

Q MRS. ROBERTS, DO YOU HAVE ANY WAY OF ESTIMATING THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF TIME IN MINUTES OR HOURS THAT YOU ACTUALLY WERE IN THE COMPUTER ROOM WATCHING WHAT THE PEOPLE WERE DOING?

A WELL, EACH TIME I WENT IN, IT WAS ONLY MINUTES.

THE ONE TIME I STAYED THERE THE LONGEST, MR. BREILING WALKED

IN AND ASKED MY HUSBAND AND I TO LEAVE.

BECAUSE HE SAID, "THIS ROOM IS TOO SMALL. IF YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE CONVERSATIONS, YOU HAVE TO GO OUT IN THE HALL."

THE COURT: HE WANTS AN ESTIMATE FROM YOU OF ALL OF
THE TIME THAT YOU WERE IN THERE TOTAL. ADD THEM ALL UP AND
TELL HIM HOW LONG YOU WERE THERE.

THE WITNESS: I SEE.

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 1 THE WITNESS: WELL, I WOULD SAY PROBABLY BETWEEN, YOU 2 KNOW, 15 TO 20 MINUTES. 3 BECAUSE EACH TIME I WOULD GO IN IT WOULD BE LIKE 4 THREE OR FOUR MINUTES. I WOULD GO IN THERE YOU KNOW. I WENT 5 IN THERE QUITE A FEW TIMES. 6 BY MR. WAPNER: FIFTEEN OR TWENTY MINUTES TOTAL? Q 7 OUT OF THE THREE HOURS, I WOULD SAY PROBABLY SO. 8 ALL RIGHT. AND THAT WAS BROKEN UP INTO SEVERAL 9 TIMES OF GOING IN FOR A FEW MINUTES AND THEN GOING OUT, RIGHT? 10 А YES. 11 NOW, ONE TIME DETECTIVE BREILING ASKED YOU TO 12 LEAVE BECAUSE HE SAID THE ROOM IS TOO SMALL IF YOU WERE JUST 13 GOING TO BE TALKING, TO GO SOMEPLACE ELSE, RIGHT? 14 HE SAID, "I AM GOING TO HAVE TO ASK YOU AND 15 MR. ROBERTS TO LEAVE THE ROOM -- " SOMETHING ABOUT HAVING THE 16 CONVERSATION OUTSIDE OF THE ROOM. 17 AND AS I WAS LEAVING, I SAID, "I WAS NOT TALKING." 18 AND THEN HE SAID SOMETHING ABOUT THE ROOM BEING 19 TOO SMALL AND I AM GOING TO HAVE TO ASK YOU TO WAIT OUTSIDE. 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

F

1 Q AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME WHEN YOU WERE IN THE ROOM, 2 WHAT WERE YOU DOING? 3 STANDING THERE WATCHING THEM. 4 WHO WERE YOU WATCHING? 5 THAT DETECTIVE ROZZI AND THE DETECTIVE THAT HAD 6 A MUSTACHE THAT IS STANDING OUTSIDE IN THE HALL. 7 THAT IS CLARK FOGG FROM THE BEVERLY HILLS POLICE 8 DEPARTMENT? 9 I DON'T KNOW HIS NAME. 10 IF I TOLD YOU THAT THE PERSON OUT IN THE HALL 11 WAS CLARK FOGG FROM THE BEVERLY HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT, WOULD 12 YOU ACCEPT THAT? 13 Α YES. 14 Q OKAY. AND WAS MR. FOGG SEARCHING THROUGH THINGS? 15 UH-HUH. 16 Q IS THAT YES? 17 Α YES. 18 Q WHAT DID YOU SEE HIM DOING? 19 WELL, HE WAS LIKE ON THE FLOOR, GOING THROUGH 20 SOME PAPERS AND THEN I SAW HIM -- THERE IS SHELVES THERE IN 21 THAT COMPUTER ROOM AND HE WAS, YOU KNOW, LOOKING THROUGH THINGS 22 ON THOSE SHELVES. 23 DID YOU SEE A MAN THERE WHO, FOR LACK OF A BETTER Q 24 TERM, APPEARED TO BE DOING SECRETARIAL TYPE TASKS OF WRITING 25 DOWN, FOR EXAMPLE, THE PICTURES THAT WERE TAKEN, MAKING NOTES? 26 Α NO. 27 Q DURING THE TIME THAT YOU SAW MR. FOGG IN THE 28 ROOM, WAS THERE SOMEONE ELSE IN THERE TAKING PICTURES, THE

1 TALL MAN, PERHAPS. 2 THE TALL MAN, I SAW TAKE PICTURES, ALL OF --3 YES, HE IS THE ONE I SAW TAKING PICTURES. 4 DID YOU EVER SEE MR. FOGG ASSISTING THE TALL 5 MAN WHO WAS TAKING PICTURES? 6 Α NO. 7 Q AND THE PERSON THAT YOU --8 WHEN MR. FOGG WAS GOING THROUGH THE BOOKCASE. 9 WHERE WAS MR. ROZZI? 10 HE WAS OVER BY THE -- THAT ARMOIRE I TOLD YOU 11 ABOUT YESTERDAY AND THERE WERE BOXES AND PAPERS AND THINGS 12 IN BACK OF IT AND ON THE SIDE OF IT, AND WORKING ALONG THE 13 DESK -- YOU SEE THE ARMOIRE AND THE DESK ARE LIKE SIDE BY 14 SIDE. 15 WHAT WAS MR. FOGG DOING AT THE BOOKCASE? Q 16 HE WAS JUST LOOKING THROUGH SOME THINGS THAT 17 WERE ON THE SHELVES. 18 Q WHAT THINGS? 19 WELL, THERE IS BOOKS AND LOTS OF PAPERS AND THINGS 20 LIKE THAT, BOOKS. 21 Q WHAT WAS HE DOING? 22 HE WAS JUST GOING THROUGH THEM. 23 WELL, CAN YOU EXPLAIN TO ME EXACTLY HOW HE WAS 24 DOING THAT? 25 А WELL, HE WAS, YOU KNOW, LIKE IF HE WAS LOOKING 26 AT THE PAPERS, HE WAS GOING THROUGH LIKE THIS AND LOOKING 27 THROUGH THEM, HOLDING SOME IN HIS HAND AND GOING LIKE THIS

28

(INDICATING).

```
1
            Q
                 DO YOU KNOW WHAT KIND OF PAPERS WERE ON THAT
 2
     BOOK SHELF?
 3
            Α
                 NO.
 4
                AND THIS IS THE TIME WHEN YOU WERE IN THERE WITH
 5
     YOUR HUSBAND, RIGHT?
 6
            Α
                  YES.
 7
            Q DID YOUR HUSBAND SAY TO MR. FOGG, "THOSE ARE
 8
     MY PAPERS"?
9
                 I THINK HE SAID THAT TO MR. ROZZI. AT ONE POINT
10
     HE SAID, "THOSE PAPERS ARE MINE."
11
                  AND I SAID, "WELL, I DON'T KNOW IF THOSE ARE
12
     YOURS, BOBBY, BECAUSE THE KIDS, YOU KNOW, HAVE A LOT OF STUFF
13
     IN HERE."
14
            Q
                 THAT IS WHEN DETECTIVE ROZZI WAS THERE?
15
            Α
                 UH-HUH.
16
            THE COURT REPORTER: IS THAT ANSWER YES?
17
           THE WITNESS: YES.
18
            Q
                BY MR. WAPNER: THERE WAS A DISPUTE -- MAYBE
19
    THAT IS NOT A GOOD WORD -- YOU AND YOUR HUSBAND HAD A DIFFERENCE
20
    OF OPINION AS TO WHETHER THOSE PAPERS WERE YOUR HUSBAND'S
21
    OR COULD HAVE BEEN SOMEONE ELSE'S, RIGHT?
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

1 Α WELL, THERE WASN'T A DISPUTE. 2 IT WAS JUST THAT WHEN MY HUSBAND SAID THAT TO 3 MR. ROZZI, IT WAS ABOUT THOSE PAPERS THAT WERE IN THAT BOX BEHIND THE ARMOIRE, THE PAPERS ON THE SHELF, I DIDN'T HEAR 4 MY -- YOU KNOW, I DIDN'T HEAR OR SEE MY HUSBAND SAY THAT ABOUT 5 THE ONES ON THE SHELF THAT HE WAS GOING THROUGH, BUT WHAT 6 7 HE SAID WAS ABOUT THAT BIG BOX THAT HAD ALL OF THE PAPERS 8 BY THE ARMOIRE. 9 NOW, WERE YOU IN THE ROOM WHEN DETECTIVE ROZZI 10 WAS GOING THROUGH SOME PAPERS THAT WERE ON THE SHELF? 11 А NO. 12 IT WAS THAT OTHER GENTLEMAN THAT I SAW GOING 13 THROUGH, MR. FOGG, ON THE SHELF. 14 Q WAS YOUR HUSBAND THERE AT THAT TIME? 15 Α IN THE ROOM? 16 Q YES. 17 Α WHEN I SAW THIS? 18 WHEN YOU SAW MR. FOGG GOING THROUGH THE PAPERS Q 19 ON THE SHELF, WAS YOUR HUSBAND THERE? 20 YES, I THINK HE WAS, YES. 21 AND YOUR HUSBAND DIDN'T SAY ANYTHING TO MR. FOGG 22 ABOUT "THOSE ARE MY PAPERS"? 23 I DON'T REMEMBER THAT. 24 THE OTHER TIMES THAT YOU SPENT IN THE COMPUTER 25 ROOM, WHAT DID YOU SEE? 26 WELL, I JUST SAW THE MEN OUT THERE, THE ONE, 27 YOU KNOW, AS I SAID YESTERDAY, I THINK IT WAS THE SECOND TIME 28 THAT I WENT IN THERE THAT I SAW MR. BREILING, MR. ZOELLER

```
AND THE PHOTOGRAPHER GOING THROUGH ALL OF THE COMPUTER PAPERS
 1
 2
     AND ALL OF THE STUFF ON THE END OF THE BED, WHICH WAS THE
     COMPUTER FILES AND THINGS, AND THE PHOTOGRAPHER, HE WAS TAKING
 3
 4
     PHOTOGRAPHS OF IT.
 5
                  NOW, THE SECOND TIME YOU WERE IN THERE, WAS HOW
 6
     LONG AFTER THE POLICE FIRST GOT TO THE HOUSE?
 7
                  WELL, I THINK IT WAS AT LEAST A HALF HOUR OR
     SO. I CAN'T REMEMBER JUST EXACTLY. I JUST --
 8
 9
                COULD IT HAVE BEEN OVER AN HOUR AFTER THEY HAD
10
     GOTTEN THERE?
11
              COULD IT HAVE BEEN OVER AN HOUR?
12
            Q
                 YES.
13
            A I DON'T -- I DON'T KNOW. IT COULD HAVE BEEN.
14
     IT COULD HAVE BEEN.
15
                  I DON'T REMEMBER THE TIME BECAUSE I WAS -- I
16
     WAS VERY UPSET AND I DIDN'T EVEN, YOU KNOW, THINK ABOUT, YOU
17
     KNOW, LOOKING AT THE TIME TO SEE WHAT TIME IT WAS AND ALL
18
    OF THAT.
19
                 THE FIRST TIME THAT YOU WERE UP THERE, HOW LONG
     WAS IT AFTER THE POLICE HAD GOTTEN THERE, THE FIRST TIME THAT
20
21
     YOU STOPPED IN THE COMPUTER ROOM?
22
                  WELL, THAT WAS, YOU KNOW, AFTER I HAD GONE DOWN-
23
     STAIRS AND SEEN -- I DON'T KNOW -- I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY.
24
                  I JUST KNOW WHAT I DID AND WHAT, YOU KNOW, WHAT
25
    I WENT --
26
                  YOU KNOW, DIFFERENT THINGS THAT I DID AND WHEN
27
     I WENT UP THERE THE FIRST TIME AFTER --
```

ACTUALLY, THE FIRST TIME THAT I SAW THEM WAS

ON MY WAY DOWNSTAIRS BECAUSE MY BEDROOM IS HERE AND THE HALL COMES HERE AND THEN RIGHT THERE IS THE COMPUTER ROOM, SO AS I -- THEY, YOU KNOW, WHEN I WENT DOWNSTAIRS THE VERY FIRST TIME, I LOOKED IN THE COMPUTER ROOM AND THAT IS WHEN I SAW THEM.

```
. Q
                 WHO WAS THERE, THEN?
 1
                  THAT WAS MR. ZOELLER, THE PHOTOGRAPHER AND THE
 2
     OTHER TWO MEN. AT THE TIME, I DIDN'T KNOW THEIR NAMES.
 3
                  WHAT DOES MR. ZOELLER LOOK LIKE?
 4
                  I KNOW WHAT MR. ZOELLER LOOKS LIKE. I HAVE SEEN
 5
     HIM MANY TIMES.
 6
                  JUST DESCRIBE HIM FOR ME, WOULD YOU PLEASE?
 7
           Q
                 YES. HE IS ABOUT I WOULD SAY, SIX FEET OR SIX-FEET-
           Α
 8
     ONE, MEDIUM BROWN HAIR, MUSTACHE.
 9
           Q
                 AND --
10
                 I HAVE SEEN HIM MANY TIMES.
           Α
11
                 WOULD YOU SAY HE IS SLENDER, HEAVY?
           Q
12
           Α
                 MEDIUM BUILD.
13
           Q
                 AND HE WAS THERE THE FIRST TIME THAT YOU WALKED
14
     BY?
15
                 YEAH. WELL, YES. I THINK HE WAS, YEAH.
           Α
16
           0
                 DOES THAT MEAN THAT YOU ARE NOT SURE?
17
                 WELL, THAT WAS JUST ABOUT -- IT WAS PROBABLY 15
18
19
     OR 20 MINUTES AFTER THEY GOT THERE. I WENT DOWNSTAIRS. I
     AM NOT SURE ON THAT TIME.
20
21
                 BUT YOU ARE MORE SURE THAT WHEN YOU WENT THROUGH
     THE SECOND TIME, THAT DETECTIVE ZOELLER WAS THERE?
22
                 YES.
23
24
                 AND THAT COULD HAVE BEEN AS MUCH AS AN HOUR AFTER
     THE POLICE GOT THERE?
25
26
           Α
                 YES.
27
                 AND THE SECOND TIME WHEN YOU WENT UPSTAIRS AND
     MR. ZOELLER WAS THERE, WAS MR. CHIER THERE ALSO?
28
```

```
ALWAYS GO IN AND CHECK ON HIM AND TALK TO HIM BECAUSE HE STAYS
 1
     IN THERE FOR HOURS.
 2
                 HE PUTS THE LITTLE YELLOW, YOU KNOW, THOSE LITTLE
     TINY -- YOU KNOW, THE THINGS LIKE THAT (INDICATING). ONLY
     THE NEXT SIZE.
 5
                 HE PUTS THAT ON A THING, LIKE THOSE WERE HIS --
 6
     WHAT DO YOU CALL THEM?
 7
                 THEY WERE FOR THE DEFENSE AND THEY WERE NUMBERED.
 8
     I CAN'T THINK OF THE PROPER NAME.
 9
           Q
                EXHIBITS?
10
             YES. THAT'S IT.
           А
11
                MRS. ROBERTS, HAVE YOU EVER READ THE COMPUTER
12
     PAPERS?
13
           A I GLANCED THROUGH IT. YOU KNOW, I HAD NOT --
14
     I DIDN'T READ IT WORD FOR WORD ON EVERYTHING BUT I HAVE, YEAH.
15
                BY GLANCING AT IT, COULD YOU GET AN IDEA WHAT
16
     THE CONTENTS WERE?
17
           А
                YES.
18
                SO, IF I TOOK A QUICK GLANCE AT IT, YOU WOULD
19
     KNOW WHETHER IT WAS DEFENSE MATERIALS OR NOT, WOULDN'T YOU?
20
           A WELL, I WOULD THINK SO.
21
                 OKAY. YOU WOULDN'T HAVE TO SIT AND READ IT VERY
22
     EXTENSIVELY TO FIGURE OUT WHAT IT WAS, WOULD YOU?
23
                 NO. THAT IS WHY I WAS SURPRISED THAT THEY SPENT
24
25
     SO MUCH TIME READING IT.
26
                AND THE PEOPLE THAT YOU SAW READING THE COMPUTER
27
     PAPER WERE WHO?
```

A MR. BREILING, MR. ZOELLER AND THE PHOTOGRAPHER

AND THE OTHER ONE, MR. FOGG. 1 Q WHAT WAS THE PHOTOGRAPHER DOING WITH HIS CAMERA 2 WHILE HE WAS READING THE COMPUTER PAPERS? 3 HE WAS TAKING PICTURES OF IT. 4 CLOSEUP PICTURES OF THE COMPUTER PAPER? 5 YES. 6 Q AND HOW CLOSE WAS HIS CAMERA TO THE COMPUTER PAPER? 7 A WELL, THE COMPUTER PAPER WAS HERE (INDICATING) 8 AND HE WAS A TALL MAN. HE WAS GOING LIKE THIS WITH THE 9 CAMERA (INDICATING). 10 SO, IT WAS THAT FAR. I MEAN, HE WAS CLOSE. 11 DID HE TAKE A PICTURE OF ONLY ONE PAGE AND THEN 12 TURN THE PAGE AND THEN TAKE ANOTHER PICTURE? 13 A YES. THEY WERE TURNING THE PAPERS OVER LIKE THAT 14 (INDICATING), GOING THROUGH IT. AND HE WAS SNAPPING PICTURES. 15 Q SO, IT WAS LIKE THEY HAVE IN THE SPY MOVIES WHERE 16 THEY TAKE PICTURES OF PAPER? 17 MR. BARENS: OBJECTION, VAGUE AND AMBIGUOUS. 18 THE WITNESS: I DON'T KNOW ABOUT THE SPY MOVIES. I 19 HAVE NOT BEEN IN A SPY MOVIE. 20 THE COURT: YOU WOULD HAVE TO QUALIFY HER ABOUT SPY 21 PICTURES. 22 MR. BARENS: AND WHICH ONE. THEY ALL HAVE THOSE LITTLE 23 CAMERAS. 24 Q BY MR. WAPNER: HOW MANY PICTURES DID HE TAKE 25 OF THOSE PIECES OF PAPER? 26 A I DON'T KNOW. I WAS ONLY THERE FOR THREE OR FOUR 27

MINUTES AND THEN I WOULD WALK AWAY.

I ALSO HAVE A LOT OF CRYSTALS AND I HAVE PICTURES

- 1

1	OF MY FAMILY.	
2	Q WHAT WERE ALL OF THESE THINGS SITTING ON?	
3	A ON AN ANTIQUE DESK.	
4	Q WHAT IS THE TOP OF THE DESK MADE OUT OF?	
5	A I THINK THE WHOLE DESK IS LIKE MAHOGANY.	
6	Q DO THEY MAKE NOISE WHEN YOU PICK THEM UP AND	
7	PUT THEM DOWN?	
8	A THEY WOULDN'T HAVE TO.	
9	Q DID THEY THAT DAY?	
10	A I DON'T THINK SO.	
11	Q YOU ARE NOT SURE?	
12	A I DON'T REMEMBER SLAMMING THEM DOWN.	
13	I LIKE THEM A LOT. I WOULDN'T, YOU KNOW, I	
14	WOULDN'T SLAM THEM DOWN.	
15	Q WHEN IN RELATION TO WHEN YOU SAW EXCUSE ME.	
16	WHEN, IN RELATION TO WHEN YOU WERE IN THE UPSTAIRS	
17	COMPUTER ROOM THE SECOND TIME, DID YOUR DAUGHTER COME IN	
18	THE HOUSE?	
19	A I THINK THAT WAS WHEN THEY CAME IN THE HOUSE	
20	AND WENT INTO THE OTHER ROOM, THE BEDROOM, AND SHE SAT ON	
21	THE BED.	
22	MY SON, CURTIS, WAS STANDING IN THERE ALSO BUT	
23	HE WAS WALKING BACK AND FORTH, YOU KNOW, FROM ONE BEDROOM	
24	TO ANOTHER AND BROOKE WENT AND JUST SAT ON THE BED.	
25	Q WHAT WAS SHE WEARING?	
26	A I THINK SHE WAS WEARING LIKE THEY LOOK LIKE SUMMER	
27	PAJAMAS KIND OF BUT THEY ARE NOT TRULY PAJAMAS. SHE JUST	
28	SLEEPS IN THEM.	

1	Q DID SHE SIT ON THE BED, LIKE ON THE EDGE OF THE			
2	BED?			
. 3	A NO. SHE JUMPED, LIKE, IN THE MIDDLE OF THE BED.			
4	I WENT IN THERE, YOU KNOW. I SAW HER GO IN THERE			
5	AND I WENT IN AND SHE WAS JUST LIKE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE BED.			
6	IT WAS UNMADE AND SHE JUST JUMPED IN THE MIDDLE OF IT.			
7	Q WERE YOU THERE WHEN THE PHONE CALL CAME INTO			
8	THE HOUSE AND DETECTIVE ZOELLER AT SOME POINT GOT ON THE PHONE?			
9	A YES.			
10	ACTUALLY, I WAS ON THE PHONE AND I THINK IT WAS			
11	MR. BARENS SAID THAT OH, THAT YOU WANTED TO SPEAK TO HIM			
12	OR SOMETHING AND I GOT OFF THE PHONE.			
13	Q DID YOU SEE OR HEAR MR. ZOELLER TALK ON THE PHONE?			
14	A NO YES. I THINK HE WENT HE TOOK THE PHONE			
15	CALL, YOU KNOW, DOWN, I THINK IN MY HUSBAND'S OFFICE OR THE			
16	LIBRARY, WHICH IS RIGHT NEXT TO EACH OTHER.			
17	Q MR. BARENS CALLED THE HOUSE AND THERE WAS AN			
18	EMERGENCY INTERRUPT ON THE PHONE?			
19	A YES.			
20	Q AND YOU GOT OFF THE PHONE?			
21	A YES.			
22	Q WHEN, IN RELATION TO THAT, WAS IT THAT YOU HEARD			
23	THIS CONVERSATION IN THE HALLWAY YOU TOLD US ABOUT?			
24	A WELL, IT WASN'T LONG AFTER. I DON'T KNOW HOW			
	MANY MINUTES IT WAS BUT IT WAS JUST A FEW MINUTES.			
25	THE PRINCIPS IT WAS BOT IT WAS GOST A TEW MINOTES.			
25 26	Q AFTER THE PHONE CALL; IS THAT RIGHT?			

1 IT, THAT YOU SAW THE TALL MAN TAKING PICTURES OF THE COMPUTER 2 PAPERS? 3 OH, THAT -- HE DID THAT EARLY ON. 4 WERE THOSE PICTURES, DID THEY APPEAR TO BE IN 5 THE MIDDLE OF A ROLL THAT HE WAS TAKING PICTURES OF OTHER THINGS BEFORE AND OTHER THINGS AFTERWARDS? 6 7 WELL, HE HAD BEEN TAKING -- HE -- HE HAD BEEN 8 TAKING PICTURES, YOU SEE, BUT THAT WAS THE FIRST TIME I SAW 9 HIM TAKE PICTURES, BUT I KNEW THAT WHEN MR. BREILING SAID 10 TO MY HUSBAND, "DO YOU HAVE A SAFE?" AND HE SAID, "YES," AND 11 HE SAID, "MAY I SEE IT?" AND MY HUSBAND TOOK HIM DOWNSTAIRS 12 TO SEE IT AND THEN AFTER THAT, THEN -- HE -- MR. BREILING 13 WENT THROUGH ALL OF THE LUGGAGE THAT WE HAVE AND THEN THEY 14 WENT OVER AND I HAVE SHELVES, YOU KNOW, DOWN IN THE LAUNDRY 15 ROOM AND --16 0 MRS. ROBERTS, WAIT. I THINK WE HAVE GOTTEN A 17 LITTLE FAR AFIELD. 18 WELL, I WAS GOING TO TELL YOU THAT IS WHERE HE 19 TOOK SOME MORE PHOTOGRAPHS, I SAW HIM, BECAUSE I OPENED THE 20 DOOR AND HE WAS TAKING PICTURES, BECAUSE THEY TOOK -- I HAVE 21 AN OLD TYPEWRITER THAT IS ON THE SHELF DOWN IN THE LAUNDRY 22 ROOM AND HE TOOK PICTURES OF THAT. 23 DID YOU SEE HIM AFTER THAT TAKE THE SUPPOSED 24 PICTURES OF THE COMPUTER PAPER? 25 WELL, I -- YES, YES. THEN WHEN HE WAS UPSTAIRS, 26 HE WAS TAKING PICTURES BUT I HAD SAID TO HIM --27 YOU SEE, I KNEW HE WAS TAKING PICTURES BECAUSE 28

WHEN I CAME DOWNSTAIRS IN MY ROBE, I SAID, "OH, GOD, YOU ARE

NOT GOING TO TAKE MY PICTURE, ARE YOU?" HE SAID, "NO, NO, MRS. ROBERTS. I AM JUST TAKING PICTURES OF THE HOUSE AND THINGS IN THE HOUSE." AND I SAID, "OH, THANK GOODNESS." SO I KNEW HE HAD TO TAKE PICTURES. HE TOLD ME HE HAS TO TAKE PICTURES.

- 1

MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. NOTHING FURTHER.

MR. BARENS: NO REDIRECT, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: DO I UNDERSTAND YOU TO TESTIFY THAT

MR. ZOELLER AND SOME DETECTIVES FROM THE LOS ANGELES POLICE

DEPARTMENT, WERE GOING OVER EVERY, SINGLE PAPER THAT WAS IN

THAT ROOM WHERE THE COMPUTER WAS, TOGETHER WITH THE TRASH

BASKET?

THE WITNESS: YES THEY WERE.

THE COURT: HOW DO YOU KNOW IT WAS EVERY, SINGLE PAPER?

THE WITNESS: WELL, I DON'T KNOW EVERY, SINGLE PAPER.

I JUST KNOW ALL OF THE PAPERS THAT WERE ON THE END OF THE BED AND THE COMPUTER THING AROUND THE DESK AND IN THE TRASH CAN.

THE COURT: IN YOUR AFFIDAVIT, YOU SAID:

"I SPECIFICALLY RECALL SEEING DETECTIVE
ZOELLER AND TWO DETECTIVES FROM HOLLYWOOD DIVISION
OF THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT IN JOE'S
OFFICE GOING THROUGH EVERY, SINGLE PAPER IN THE
ROOM, INCLUDING THOSE IN THE TRASH CAN."

YOU SAW THAT?

THE WITNESS: I SAW THAT, YOUR HONOR. BUT I WAS NOT THERE EVERY MINUTE.

THE COURT: I JUST WANT TO KNOW WHETHER OR NOT YOU SAW THEM GOING THROUGH EVERY, SINGLE PAPER. IS THAT WHAT YOU SAID?

THE WITNESS: I DID SAY THAT.

THE COURT: YOU SAID ALSO YOU OVERHEARD THE CONVERSATION BETWEEN BREILING AND DETECTIVE ZOELLER?

THE WITNESS: YES.

THE COURT: WHO YOU SAY WERE NOT AWARE OF YOUR PRESENCE?
AND YOU SAY:

"THE CONTENTS OF THIS CONVERSATION
WILL BE REVEALED BY MYSELF ON EXAMINATION AT THE
TIME OF THE HEARING INVOLVED. HOWEVER, SUFFICE IT
TO SAY THAT THE CONVERSATION OVERHEARD BY MYSELF
WAS MOST DISTURBING TO ME BECAUSE OF ITS CYNICAL
NATURE."

WHAT WAS THE CYNICAL NATURE OF THE CONVERSATION?

THE WITNESS: WELL, THE FACT THAT HE SAID, "WHAT WE

MIGHT HAVE DONE IS ILLEGAL AND I HAVE GOT TO GET OUT OF HERE."

THE COURT: I JUST WANT TO BE SURE THAT YOU CHARACTERIZED

THAT AS BEING CYNICAL. IS THAT WHAT YOU SAY?

THE WITNESS: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

CALL YOUR NEXT WITNESS.

MR. BARENS: MAY I HAVE A MOMENT SO I CAN MAKE SURE -
(WITNESS LYNNE ROBERTS EXITS: THE

COURTROOM.)

(PAUSE.)

THE COURT: INCIDENTALLY, MR. WAPNER, AMONG THE PICTURES
TAKEN IN THIS ROLE NUMBER MH 4, IT SAYS "NINE ITEMS COLLECTED
BY S. A. BREILING FROM UPSTAIRS NORTHEAST AND SOUTHEAST
BEDROOM AND BASEMENT." DO YOU HAVE THOSE PHOTOGRAPHS?

MR. WAPNER: DON'T HAVE THE PHOTOGRAPHS.

THE COURT: WELL, WOULD YOU MAKE IT A POINT TO OBTAIN

THOSE SO WE CAN EXAMINE THEM?

MR. WAPNER: I WILL.

THE COURT: BECAUSE THERE HAS BEEN TESTIMONY HERE THAT
THE PHOTOGRAPHER ACTUALLY TOOK PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE COMPUTER
SPAWNED PAPERS WHICH HAVE BEEN REFERRED TO. I WANT TO SEE
WHETHER OR NOT ANY OF THOSE PHOTOGRAPHS ACTUALLY SHOW THAT.

MR. WAPNER: I WILL PROVIDE THOSE TO THE COURT,
YOUR HONOR. I CAN REPRESENT THAT I AT ONE TIME, SAW THE
BOOKS CONTAINING THE PHOTOGRAPHS THAT WERE TAKEN.

AND I ASKED OFFICER BREILING IF WE COULD KEEP THOSE AND USE THOSE AS EXHIBITS IN THIS HEARING.

AND HE SAID THAT THEY NEEDED THEM FOR THE

ANTICIPATED HEARING IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AND THAT IS WHEN

HE TOLD ME THAT THE OTHER PHOTOGRAPHS WOULD NOT BE READY FOR

TWO WEEKS.

THE COURT: WELL, SEE WHAT YOU CAN DO ABOUT GETTING THAT EXPEDITED.

MR. WAPNER: I CAN TELL YOU THAT THERE WERE NOT
PHOTOGRAPHS THAT WERE BLOWUPS OR CLOSEUPS OF DOCUMENTS, WHERE
YOU COULD SEE ANY WRITING OR READ ANY WRITING ON ANY
DOCUMENTS.

THE COURT: WELL, LET US BE THE JUDGE OF THAT.

MR. BARENS: HOW CAN THE PEOPLE SAY THAT WITHOUT THE PHOTOGRAPHS?

THE COURT: DID YOU HEAR WHAT I SAID? I SAID THAT --

MR. WAPNER: I AM NOT PURPORTING TO TESTIFY.

THE COURT: YOU GET THEM FOR ME. WOULD YOU?

MR. WAPNER: I WILL.

MR. BARENS: I WANT TO RECALL LYNNE ROBERTS FOR ONE 1 MINUTE, JUST ONE QUESTION. 2 THE CLERK: MRS. ROBERTS, YOU ARE STILL UNDER OATH. 3 THE COURT: DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 4 THE WITNESS: YES. 5 6 7 EXAMINATION BY MR. BARENS: 8 9 Q MRS. ROBERTS, UPON MR. HUNT'S RETURN TO THE RESIDENCE THAT LATE AFTERNOON OR EVENING, DID MR. HUNT START 10 SEALING UP THE DOCUMENTS THAT WERE REMAINING IN THE COMPUTER 11 ROOM? 12 YES. HE ASKED ME AND MY HUSBAND TO GO IN WITH 13 HIM. AND WE WENT INTO THE ROOM AND HE STARTED SEALING 14 15 EVERYTHING AND YOU KNOW, I SIGNED THE ENVELOPES AND 16 EVERYTHING. THEY WERE SEALED. IN OTHER WORDS, YOU SIGNED THE SEALED ENVELOPES 17 TO VERIFY THAT YOU HAD WITNESSED THE SEALING? 18 19 Α YES. AND DID YOU SEE WHAT MR. HUNT DID? WERE THERE 20 A LOT OF THOSE ENVELOPES? 21 А 22 YES. I THINK SO. 23 Q AND DID HE PUT THOSE ENVELOPES INTO A LARGE BOX? 24 А YES. 25 Q AND WAS THE BOX SEALED? A YES. 26 27 MR. BARENS: NOTHING FURTHER.

MR. WAPNER: I HAVE NO QUESTIONS.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. YOU MAY STEP DOWN.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU.

YOUR HONOR, WE WOULD STIPULATE THAT THE PEOPLE CAN CALL DETECTIVE FOGG, WHO WAS PRESENT AT THIS POINT, IN THE SAME FORMAT THAT WE DID PRIOR TO CALLING THE DEFENSE WITNESSES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. BARENS: THANK YOU.

THE COURT: DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER WITNESSES? 1 MR. BARENS: MR. WAPNER ASKED THAT I MAKE BROOKE ROBERTS 2 AVAILABLE AS HIS WITNESS. SHE HASN'T GOTTEN HERE YET. 3 FRANKLY I ASKED HER TO COME AT 11:00, YOUR HONOR. 4 THE COURT: WHAT? 5 MR. BARENS: WE ASKED HER TO COME AT 11:00, YOUR HONOR. 6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, VERY GOOD. 7 8 CLARK W. FOGG, 9 CALLED AS A WITNESS BY THE PEOPLE, WAS SWORN AND TESTIFIED 10 AS FOLLOWS: 11 THE CLERK: YOU DO SOLEMNLY SWEAR THAT THE TESTIMONY 12 YOU MAY GIVE IN THE CAUSE NOW PENDING BEFORE THIS COURT SHALL 13 BE THE TRUTH, THE WHOLE TRUTH AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH, SO 14 HELP YOU GOD? 15 THE WITNESS: YES, I DO. 16 THE CLERK: STATE AND SPELL YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD. 17 18 THE WITNESS: CLARK W. FOGG, C-L-A-R-K F-O-G-G. 19 20 EXAMINATION BY MR. WAPNER: 21 22 Q MR. FOGG, BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED? 23 Α BEVERLY HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT. 24 Q WHAT DO YOU DO FOR THEM? 25 Α I AM AN IDENTIFICATION TECHNICIAN. AND DID YOU GO TO A LOCATION AT 10984 BELLAGIO 26 Q 27 ROAD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ON JANUARY 8, 1987? 28 Α YES, I DID.

1	Q WHY DID YOU GO THERE?
2	A FOR A SEARCH WARRANT.
3	Q AND WHAT WAS YOUR FUNCTION DURING THE SERVICE
4	OF THAT SEARCH WARRANT?
5	A MY FUNCTION WAS TO PHOTOGRAPH THE SEARCH WARRANT
6	BEFORE AND AFTER ANY KIND OF A COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE THAT
7	WAS ORDERED BY OSCAR BREILING, AGENT OSCAR BREILING.
8	Q WHEN YOU WENT TO THE RESIDENCE, WHAT PORTION DID
9	YOU FIRST GO TO?
10	A MY ROLE WAS TO GO TO THE GUEST HOUSE.
11	Q AND WAS DETECTIVE ZOELLER WITH YOU, AMONG OTHER
12	PEOPLE?
13	A YES, HE WAS.
14	Q WHAT DID YOU DO IN THE GUEST HOUSE?
15	A I GOT THERE AT 10:40. I PHOTOGRAPHED THE GUEST
16	HOUSE BEFORE THE SEARCH AND PHOTOGRAPHED IT AFTER THE SEARCH
17	Q DID YOU PARTICIPATE IN THE SEARCH AT ALL OF THE
18	GUEST HOUSE?
19	A NO, I DID NOT.
20	Q AFTER YOU TOOK THE QUOTE "AFTER PHOTOGRAPHS"
21	UNQUOTE, OF THE GUEST HOUSE, WHAT DID YOU DO?
22	A I PROCEEDED TO GO TO THE MAIN HOUSE, UNDER
23	DIRECTION OF AGENT BREILING, TO HELP KURT KUHN KEEP A
24	PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG OF THE PICTURES THAT HE WAS TAKING.
25	Q AND WHERE IN THE MAIN HOUSE DID YOU GO?
26	A I WAS WITH KURT ON THE FIRST FLOOR AND SECOND
27	FLOOR THROUGHOUT THE HOUSE.
28	Q WHAT WERE YOU DOING?

1	A MY FUNCTION AND MY ONLY FUNCTION WAS TO KEEP A
2	PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG OF THE PICTURES THAT HE WAS TAKING. IT WAS
3	A WRITTEN DOWN DOCUMENTATION.
4	Q AND IS THAT A RECORD, WRITTEN RECORD OF THE
5	LOCATION THAT IS BEING PHOTOGRAPHED AND WAS BEING PHOTOGRAPHED?
6	A THAT'S RIGHT.
7	Q DID YOU AT ANY TIME WHILE YOU WERE IN THE MAIN
8	HOUSE PARTICIPATE IN THE SEARCH?
9	A NO, I DID NOT.
10	Q DID YOU GO UP INTO THE COMPUTER ROOM?
11	A YES, I DID.
12	Q DID YOU AT ANY TIME SEARCH ANY ITEMS IN THAT ROOM?
13	A NO, I DID NOT.
14	Q DID YOU LOOK AT ANY ITEMS, SEARCH ANY ITEMS THAT
15	WERE ON THE BOOK SHELF IN THAT ROOM?
16	A NO, I DID NOT.
17	Q DID YOU OPEN ANY NOTEBOOKS ON THE BOOK SHELF IN
18	THAT ROOM?
19	A NO.
20	Q DID YOU LOOK AT ANY PAPERS THAT WERE ON THE BOOK
21	SHELF IN THAT ROOM?
22	A NO.
23	Q WHEN YOU WERE IN THE COMPUTER ROOM, WAS YOUR JOB
24	STILL TO ASSIST MR. KURT KUHN IN KEEPING THE PHOTOGRAPHIC
25	LOG?
26	A THAT IS CORRECT.
1	I

EXAMINATION BY MR. BARENS: Q DETECTIVE FOGG, WERE YOU PREVIOUSLY FAMILIAR WITH THE INVESTIGATION SURROUNDING JOE HUNT AND THE DISAPPEARANCE OF RON LEVIN? A YES, I AM. Q AND IS IT NOT A FACT THAT PREVIOUSLY YOU HAD TAKEN PHOTOGRAPHS CONCERNING THE INVESTIGATION AND THE DISAPPEARANCE OF RON LEVIN? A THAT IS CORRECT. Q WHEN WAS THAT, SIR? A I BELIEVE IT WAS IN '84.

```
Q
                 AND WHAT PHOTOGRAPHS -- STRIKE THAT.
 1
                 WHAT PLACES DID YOU TAKE PHOTOGRAPHS IN IN 1984?
 2
                 IT WAS THE RESIDENCE OF RON LEVIN AND IT WAS
 3
     CONCERNING A MISSING REPORT.
 4
 5
                MISSING PERSON'S REPORT?
                YES, THAT IS CORRECT.
 6
             AND BETWEEN 1984 AND 1987, DID YOU BECOME FAMILIAR
 7
     WITH THE FACTS CONCERNING THE INVESTIGATION OF THE
 8
     DISAPPEARANCE OF RON LEVIN AND THE ALLEGED HOMICIDE OF RON
 9
     LEVIN THEREAFTER?
10
11
           A YES, I DID.
                AND SO YOU HAD A PRETTY WELL UNDERSTANDING OF
12
     WHAT THAT CASE WAS ABOUT?
13
           A ONLY A BRIEF KNOWLEDGE.
14
                SURE. DID YOU UNDERSTAND THAT JOSEPH HUNT WAS
15
     THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE?
16
17
             YES, I DID.
                DID YOU UNDERSTAND, AS YOU WENT TO THE ROBERTS
18
     RESIDENCE ON JANUARY 8, 1987, THAT JOE HUNT WAS PRESENTLY
19
     THEN IN TRIAL FOR THAT HOMICIDE?
20
           А
                YES.
21
           Q
22
                 WHO TOLD YOU THAT?
                 THAT WAS UNDER DIRECTION OF OSCAR BREILING, LES
23
     ZOELLER.
24
25
           Q
                 THEY TOLD YOU THAT?
                 YES.
26
           Α
27
           Q
                 WHAT DID THEY TELL YOU IN THAT REGARD?
28
           Α
                 THAT HE WAS UNDER THE SUSPICION OF MURDER AND
```

```
THAT WE ARE THERE TO SEARCH HIS HOUSE AND MY ROLE WAS TO TAKE
 1
      PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE SEARCH.
 2
                  DID THEY TELL YOU THAT MR. HUNT WAS PRESENTLY
 3
      IN TRIAL IN THE COURTROOM IN TRIAL?
                  I BELIEVE SOMETHING WAS MENTIONED TO THAT EFFECT.
 5
                  WHO MENTIONED THAT, SIR?
            Q
 6
                  I BELIEVE IT WAS AGENT BREILING.
            Α
 7
                  WHEN DID HE MENTION THAT TO YOU, SIR?
            Q
 8
                  DURING A BRIEFING BEFORE THE SEARCH.
            А
 9
            Q
                  WHAT DID HE SAY IN THAT REGARD DURING THAT BRIEFING?
10
                  THAT A TRIAL WAS NOW IN PROGRESS AND THAT WE WERE
11
     TO SEARCH THE RESIDENCE AND, BASICALLY, MY ROLE IN THE SEARCH.
12
           Q
                  DID HE TELL YOU WHAT TO PHOTOGRAPH?
13
                 YES, HE DID.
           Α
14
                 WHAT DID HE TELL YOU TO PHOTOGRAPH, SIR?
15
                 BASICALLY, HE WANTED ME TO PHOTOGRAPH THE GUEST
16
     HOUSE BEFORE THE SEARCH, OVERALL PHOTOGRAPHS AFTER THE SEARCH
17
     AND ANY KIND OF EVIDENCE HE WANTED POLAROIDS OF, JUST AN
18
     OVERALL OF THE EVIDENCE BEING COLLECTED.
19
                 HOW MANY POLAROID PICTURES DID YOU TAKE?
20
           Α
                 EIGHT.
21
                 CAN YOU EXPLAIN TO ME WHY THERE IS NO REFERENCE
22
     TO POLAROID PHOTOGRAPHS AT ALL IN THE SUMMARY WE RECEIVED
23
     ON THE RETURN ON THE WARRANT, THERE IS NO REFERENCE TO
24
     POLAROID PHOTOGRAPHS ON THERE.
25
           Α
                THERE SHOULD BE.
26
                 THE REPORT THAT I GAVE OSCAR BREILING, THERE WERE
27
     MENTIONS OF POLAROIDS BEING TAKEN.
28
```

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR MIGHT TAKE NOTE OF THE FACT THAT ALTHOUGH THIS WITNESS TALKS ABOUT EIGHT PHOTOGRAPHS OF A POLAROID NATURE, AS BEST AS I CAN IN THIS LISTING CALLED "PHOTOGRAPH LOG," WHICH, AS YOUR HONOR IS AWARE CONTAINS SEVERAL PAGES, THERE IS NO MENTION OF POLAROID PHOTOGRAPHS. THE COURT: THERE IS NO MENTION OF ANY OTHER KIND OF PHOTOGRAPHS, IS THERE? MR. BARENS: WELL. YOUR HONOR --THE COURT: IT JUST SAYS -- ALL IT SAYS IS "PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG," THE PHOTOGRAPHER --MR. BARENS: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. THEY SPEAK ABOUT FRAME NUMBERS OF WHAT APPEAR TO BE 35 MILLIMETER, PHOTOGRAPHIC MATERIALS. THE COURT: WHERE DOES THAT APPEAR? MR. BARENS: WELL, YOUR HONOR, THE WAY THEY HAVE IT, CIRCUMSTANTIALLY IT APPEARS THAT --

1 THE COURT: WHERE DOES IT SAY 35 MILLIMETERS? 2 MR. BARENS: IT DOES NOT SPECIFICALLY SAY THAT. 3 THE COURT: WELL, YOU SAID THAT IT SAYS 35 MILLIMETERS. 4 MR. BARENS: IT APPEARS TO BE. 5 THE COURT: WHAT MAKES YOU THINK IT APPEARS TO BE? 6 MR. BARENS: WELL, THERE IS A REFERENCE FRAME NUMBER AND FOR INSTANCE, THERE IS LIKE, A 35 BELOW THAT. 7 8 THE COURT: 35? 9 MR. BARENS: NO, 35 NUMBERS. THAT SUGGESTS THAT IT 10 WAS A ROLL OF 36. 11 THE COURT: 35? 12 MR. BARENS: WELL, LOOK AT THE VERY FIRST ONE YOU COME 13 TO SEQUENTIALLY, YOUR HONOR. 14 THE COURT: WELL, THAT MEANS THE NUMBER OF FRAMES WHICH 15 ARE ON THE ROLL? DOES THAT MEAN 35 MILLIMETER? 16 MR. BARENS: NO. I AM ASSUMING THAT YOU MIGHT TAKE NOTICE THAT IF I AM TAKING A 35 MILLIMETER, IT WOULD TYPICALLY 17 18 BE A ROLL OF 36 FRAMES. 19 THE COURT: I CAN'T TAKE NOTICE OF THAT. 20 MR. BARENS: I WOULD SAY BASED ON MY EXPERIENCE, IT 21 WAS SUGGESTED TO ME THAT THAT IS WHAT WE HAD HERE. 22 WHEREAS WITH POLAROIDS --23 THE COURT: ASK HIM IF HE KNOWS MORE ABOUT IT. 24 MR. BARENS: OKAY. 25 IF YOU WERE DESCRIBING A PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG --26 THE COURT: TAKE A LOOK AT THE PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG, WILL 27 WILL YOU TELL US WHAT KIND OF A CAMERA WAS USED FOR YOU? 28 THAT?

ASSUMING THAT HE BASICALLY WANTED TO START A NEW ROLL OF FILM

2

AT THAT TIME. Q ANY PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU WOULD IF YOU HAD TEN LEFT IN THE CAMERA? Α NO. ALL RIGHT. DO YOU NORMALLY USE ALL 36 FRAMES, Q DO YOU NOT, SIR? A YES. Q I NOTICE FOR INSTANCE THAT IF YOU GO TO THE ROLL "G.H.I" WHICH I GUESS IS THE LAST ONE OF THESE, IT JUST HAS NUMBERS THROUGH 16. SO, WE HAVE OVER HALF THE ROLL LEFT, I PRESUME, ON THAT ROLL OF FILM? A THAT'S CORRECT.

```
1
            Q WELL, ALL RIGHT. IN THE EVENT --
 2
            THE COURT: WHY DIDN'T YOU ASK THE OTHER PHOTOGRAPHER
 3
    ALL OF THAT WHEN HE WAS HERE?
 4
            MR. BARENS: IT QUITE WELL DIDN'T OCCUR TO ME.
 5
           THE WITNESS: BECAUSE THE GUEST HOUSE WAS SUCH A SMALL
 6
     PLACE, ONLY 16 FRAMES WERE NEEDED TO PHOTOGRAPH THE WHOLE,
 7
    ENTIRE SCENE.
 8
            Q BY MR. BARENS: AND THEN, I AM NOT ASKING YOU
 9
    WHAT HE DID, BUT WHAT YOU MIGHT DO UNDER THE SAME OR SIMILAR
10
    CIRCUMSTANCES. BECAUSE YOU WENT TO A DIFFERENT PLACE, YOU
11
    WOULD THEN START A NEW ROLL JUST AS A RESULT OF THAT?
12
           A THAT'S CORRECT. WHAT HE DOES IS, WE FILE ALL
13
    THE NEGATIVES TOGETHER.
14
           MR. BARENS: THAT MAKES SENSE TO ME.
15
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IT MAKES SENSE TO ME, TOO.
16
    PARDON ME, YOU SAY THOSE EIGHT POLAROIDS ARE IN THE POSSESSION
17
    OF ARTHUR BREILING?
18
           THE WITNESS: YES.
19
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
20
           Q BY MR. BARENS: DID YOU SHOW THOSE EIGHT TO
21
    ANYBODY ELSE?
22
                NO. THEY WERE SHOWN TO KURT KUHN.
23
           Q DID YOU SEE ANYONE SHOWING THE PHOTOGRAPHS TO
24
    ANYONE ELSE?
25
           A NO, SIR. I DID NOT.
26
           THE COURT: AND DID HE SHOW IT TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
27
    TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE?
```

THE WITNESS: I AM NOT AWARE ABOUT THAT, NO.

1	Q BY MR. BARENS: NOW, WHERE ARE THOSE EIGHT				
2	POLAROIDS NOW?				
3	A IN THE POSSESSION OF ARTHUR BREILING.				
4	Q HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT, SIR?				
5	A BECAUSE WHEN I CAME TO TESTIFY THE FIRST TIME,				
6	HE HAD THEM IN A NOTEBOOK, A BLACK NOTEBOOK.				
7	Q HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT, SIR?				
8	A I DID SEE THOSE.				
9	Q AND HOW DID YOU HAPPEN TO LOOK AT MR. BREILING'S				
10	NOTEBOOK WHEN HE CAME TO COURT, HERE?				
11	A THOSE WERE THE PHOTOGRAPHS THAT I TOOK, I WAS				
12	TAKING AT THE TIME OF THE SEARCH.				
13	Q RIGHT. WHY DID YOU HAPPEN TO BE LOOKING AT MR.				
14	BREILING'S NOTEBOOK WHEN YOU CAME TO COURT, HERE?				
15	A HE GAVE ME THE NOTEBOOK WITH ONLY THE PICTURES				
16	THAT I TOOK.				
17	Q WHY DID HE DO THAT?				
18	A TO ASK ME QUESTIONS ABOUT THOSE PHOTOGRAPHS,				
19	HOW HE SET THEM UP.				
20	Q DID YOU FELLOWS KIND OF CONFER GENERALLY ABOUT				
21	WHAT HAPPENED THAT DAY DURING THE SEARCH?				
22	A NO, SIR.				
23	Q YOU DIDN'T DISCUSS THAT AT ALL?				
24	A NO. HE THOUGHT I MIGHT NEED THE PHOTOGRAPHS				
25	WHEN I TESTIFIED HERE.				
26	Q DID YOU PHOTOGRAPH DOCUMENTS?				
27	A NO, SIR, NO PARTICULAR DOCUMENTS. THERE WERE				
28	A NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS TOGETHER WHICH I TOOK AN OVERALL				

```
1
     PHOTOGRAPH OF, POLAROID ONLY.
 2
                 ASIDE FROM THE EIGHT POLAROID PHOTOGRAPHS THAT
 3
     YOU SAY YOU TOOK, DID YOU TAKE ANY MORE PICTURES?
 4
                  NOT IN THE MAIN HOUSE.
 5
                  ALL RIGHT. THEREFORE, YOU ARE SAYING THAT THEY
            Q
 6
     WOULD HAVE BEEN TAKEN IN THE GUEST HOUSE?
 7
            Α
                  THAT'S CORRECT.
 8
            Q
                  YOU TOOK POLAROID PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE GUEST HOUSE?
 9
            Α
                  NO, SIR. I DID NOT.
10
            Q
                  YOU TOOK 35 MILLIMETER IN THE GUEST HOUSE?
11
            Α
                  THAT'S CORRECT.
12
                  YOU WERE IN A ROOM UPSTAIRS WITH A COMPUTER IN
            Q
13
     IT?
14
            Α
                  YES, SIR. I WAS.
15
                  DID YOU HAPPEN TO SEE MRS. ROBERTS IN THAT ROOM?
            Q
16
            Α
                  YES.
17
                  AND WAS SHE THERE ON ONE OR MORE THAN ONE OCCASION
18
     WHILE YOU WERE IN THAT ROOM?
19
            Α
              MORE THAN ONE OCCASION.
20
                 AND HOW LONG IN POINT OF TIME, CAN YOU ESTIMATE
21
    YOU WERE IN THAT ROOM?
22
                  I WAS IN THERE, IN AND OUT I GUESS, A TOTAL
23
    OF -- IF YOU WOULD TOTAL ALL OF THE MINUTES TOGETHER, PROBABLY
24
    AN HOUR.
25
                 THAT YOU SPENT IN THERE? DID YOU HAVE YOUR
26
    CAMERA WITH YOU DURING THAT HOUR?
27
                A POLAROID CAMERA, YES, SIR.
28
            Q
                 YES, SIR?
```

TO HAVE THEM AT THAT TIME, JUST TO SEE IF THEY DID COME OUT.

1	Q ALL RIGHT. IS IT ALSO A PRECAUTION IN THE EVENT
2	UNLIKELY AS IT MAY BE THAT THE OTHER PICTURES THAT YOU
3	TOOK WOULD NOT COME OUT?
4	A THAT'S CORRECT. IT IS A BACK-UP.
5	Q AND HAVE YOU HAD ANY CHANCE TO REVIEW THE PHOTO-
6	GRAPHS THE PHOTOGRAPHIC LOGS TODAY?
7	A YES, I HAVE.
8	Q DO THEY REFER TO THE POLAROID PICTURES ON THEM?
9	A NO, THEY DO NOT.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 ·	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

j.

```
DID YOU WRITE YOUR OWN RECORD OF WHAT HAPPENED
            Q
 1
      AT THE HOUSE?
 2
                  YES, I DID, AS PER THE SHOTS TAKEN.
 3
                  OKAY. THAT IS THE PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG?
 4
                  YES, IT IS.
 5
                  THAT SHOULD BE THE LAST SHEET.
 6
                  BUT AS FAR AS THE POLICE REPORT, ACTUALLY OTHER
            Q
 7
     THAN THE PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG, DID YOU MAKE ANY POLICE REPORT
 8
     OF YOUR ACTIVITIES THERE?
 9
           Α
                  NO, SIR.
10
           Q
                  DID MR. KUHN?
11
           Α
                  YES, HE DID.
12
           Q
                  DID YOU HAVE A CHANCE TO REVIEW MR. KUHN'S REPORT?
13
           Α
                 YES, I DID.
14
           Q
                  DID MR. KUHN CONFER WITH YOU BEFORE WRITING HIS
15
     REPORT?
16
           Α
                 WE BASICALLY TALKED ABOUT WHAT HE WAS GOING TO
17
     WRITE AND AFTER HE WROTE IT, I CONFERRED AND OKAYED THE REPORT.
18
                 AND INDICATED TO HIM YOU THOUGHT IT WAS ACCURATE?
19
           Q
                 YES, I THOUGHT IT WAS ACCURATE.
20
                 DID YOU PUT IN THE REPORT THAT THERE WERE IN FACT
21
           0
     SOME POLAROID PHOTOGRAPHS TAKEN BY YOU?
22
                 I DON'T BELIEVE THERE WAS A MENTION OF THAT.
23
           THE COURT: YES, IT SAYS "POLAROID PHOTOGRAPHS OF THOSE
24
     SPECIFIC ITEMS COLLECTED TO BE TAKEN BY I.D. TECHNICIAN FOGG."
25
           THE WITNESS: YES.
26
                 BY MR. WAPNER: IF YOU PUT THAT IN THE REPORT
27
     AND YOU READ IT, WAS IT ACCURATE AT THE TIME?
28
```

```
YES, YES, IT WAS ACCURATE.
           Α
 1
           Q
                 AND WHEN YOU SAW THOSE PHOTOGRAPHS THAT AGENT
 2
     BREILING HAD WHEN HE WAS HERE, DID THOSE APPEAR TO BE THE
 3
     PHOTOGRAPHS YOU HAD TAKEN THAT DAY?
 4
 5
               YES, THEY DID.
           MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER.
 6
          THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
 7
 8
 9
                              EXAMINATION
     BY MR. BARENS:
10
               WHEN YOU WERE TAKING POLAROID PHOTOGRAPHS, WAS
11
     DETECTIVE ZOELLER PRESENT IN THE ROOM?
12
13
           Α
             NOT AT ALL TIMES.
           Q
             WAS HE PRESENT AT SOME TIMES?
14
           Α
                YES, HE WAS.
15
                 DID OFFICER ZOELLER EVER SEE ANY OF THOSE
16
17
     POLAROID PHOTOGRAPHS?
           A I PRESUME HE DID.
18
19
           MR. BARENS: NOTHING FURTHER.
20
         THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
21
           THE WITNESS: THANK YOU.
22
           THE COURT: YOU ARE EXCUSED.
23
           MR. BARENS: CAN I JUST SEE IF THE WITNESS HAS ARRIVED?
24
           MR. WAPNER: THIS WITNESS IS EXCUSED?
25
           THE COURT: YES, SURELY.
26
           MR. BARENS: NO OBJECTION.
27
           MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
28
           MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T SEE THE WITNESS AT
```

THIS MOMENT. THE COURT: YES. MR. BARENS: COULD WE PERHAPS HAVE A TEN-MINUTE RECESS, PLEASE? THE COURT: SURE. MR. BARENS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: VERY WELL. (RECESS.)

1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. CALL YOUR NEXT WITNESS. 2 MR. WAPNER: BROOKE ROBERTS. 3 4 BROOKE ROBERTS. 5 CALLED AS A WITNESS BY THE PEOPLE, WAS SWORN AND TESTIFIED 6 AS FOLLOWS: 7 THE CLERK: YOU DO SOLEMNLY SWEAR THAT THE TESTIMONY 8 YOU MAY GIVE IN THE CAUSE NOW PENDING BEFORE THIS COURT SHALL BE THE TRUTH, THE WHOLE TRUTH, AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH, 9 10 SO HELP YOU GOD. 11 THE WITNESS: I DO. 12 THE CLERK: PLEASE TAKE THE WITNESS STAND. STATE YOUR 13 NAME. 14 THE WITNESS: BROOKE ROBERTS. 15 THE CLERK: DOES YOUR FIRST NAME END WITH AN "E"? 16 THE WITNESS: YES. 17 18 EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. WAPNER: 20 MISS ROBERTS, ARE YOU THE DAUGHTER OF BOBBY AND 21 LYNNE ROBERTS? 22 YES, I AM. 23 DO YOU LIVE AT 10984 BELLAGIO ROAD, CITY AND 24 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES? 25 YES, I DO. А 26 Q WHERE AT THAT LOCATION, DO YOU LIVE? 27 Α I LIVE IN THE GUEST HOUSE. 28 Q WERE YOU HOME ON JANUARY THE 8TH, 1987?

1	А	YES, I WAS.	
2	Q	DID SOMEONE COME AND KNOCK ON YOUR DOOR?	
3	A	THEY BANGED ON MY DOOR.	
4	Q	AND DID YOU OPEN THE DOOR RIGHT AWAY?	
5	A	NO, I DIDN'T.	
6	Q	WHAT DID YOU DO?	
7	А	WELL, I WAS SLEEPING AT THE TIME. AND ALL THEY	
8	SAID WAS THAT	T THEY WERE GOING TO BREAK DOWN MY DOOR.	
9		I WAS NOT SURE EXACTLY WHO THESE PEOPLE WERE.	
10	Q	HOW LONG WERE. THE PEOPLE THERE BEFORE THEY SAID	
11	THEY WERE GOING TO BREAK DOWN YOUR DOOR?		
12	А	ONE MINUTE. THEY CAME TO MY BEDROOM IMMEDIATELY.	
13	Q	AND WHEN THEY FIRST KNOCKED ON THE DOOR, WHAT	
14	DID THEY SAY?		
15	А	THEY SAID, "OPEN THE DOOR OR WE ARE GOING TO	
16	BREAK DOWN TH	HE DOOR."	
17	Q	DID THEY SAY, "WE ARE POLICE OFFICERS. WE ARE	
18	HERE TO SERVE	E A SEARCH WARRANT"?	
19	А	NO, THEY DIDN'T.	
20	Q	YOU MEAN YOU JUST HEARD BANGING ON YOUR DOOR	
21	AND SOMEBODY	SAID, "OPEN THE DOOR OR WE ARE GOING TO BREAK	
22	IT DOWN"?		
23	А	THAT'S RIGHT.	
24	Q	YOU HAD NO IDEA WHO IT WAS?	
25	А	NO. I CALLED MY FATHER IMMEDIATELY.	
26	Q	AND IT WAS ONLY BECAUSE YOUR FATHER TOLD YOU	
27	THAT THEY WER	E POLICE OFFICERS THAT YOU UNDERSTAND THEY WERE?	
28	A	NO. HE NEVER COULD TAKE THE PHONE CALL BECAUSE	

```
1
     THEY WERE IN THE HOUSE ALSO.
 2
                 SO WHAT HAPPENED AFTER THAT?
 3
                 WELL, I HEARD LESS ZOELLER'S VOICE AND THEY WERE
 4
     GETTING READY TO BREAK DOWN MY DOOR.
 5
                  THEY SENT A POLICE OFFICER AROUND IN MY BEDROOM,
     TO THE BATHROOM WINDOW. AND THEY WERE OPENING UP THE WINDOW
 6
 7
     AND THEY WERE BANGING ON THE DOOR.
 8
                  I SAID YOU KNOW, "WAIT A MINUTE. I JUST GOT
9
     UP, HERE."
10
                  AND I IMMEDIATELY OPENED THE DOOR. AND THEY
     SAID THAT I HAD TO GET OUT AND THEY ALL CAME IN.
11
12
            Q HOW LONG WERE THEY THERE BEFORE THEY ACTUALLY
    OPENED THE DOOR?
13
14
            Α
                 A MINUTE.
15
            Q
                 AND AFTER THEY CAME IN, WHAT DID THEY DO?
16
                  THEY TOLD ME THAT I HAD TO LEAVE THE ROOM AND
    THEY TOOK PHOTOGRAPHS.
17
18
            Q
                 AND AFTER THEY TOOK THE PHOTOGRAPHS, WHAT DID
19
    THEY DO?
20
            А
                  THEY TOLD ME THEY WERE GOING TO SEARCH THE ROOM.
21
            Q
                  DID THEY?
22
            Α
                  YES.
23
            Q
                  HOW LONG WERE THEY THERE?
24
            Α
                  APPROXIMATELY AN HOUR AND A HALF.
25
            0
                  DETECTIVE ZOELLER WAS THERE THE WHOLE TIME?
26
            Α
                  NO, HE WAS NOT.
27
                  HOW LONG DID HE STAY THERE?
            Q
28
                  I DON'T KNOW.
```

1	Q WELL, HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT THEY WERE IN THAT
2	ROOM AN HOUR AND A HALF?
3	A BECAUSE I LOOKED AT THE CLOCK AND IT WAS A QUARTER
4	TO 12:00.
5	Q WHEN THEY LEFT YOUR ROOM?
6	A THERE WERE A COUPLE OF POLICE OFFICERS IN MY
7	ROOM. ZOELLER WAS NOT IN MY ROOM ANYMORE.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

```
Q WHEN THEY FIRST CAME IN, DETECTIVE ZOELLER WAS
 1
     THERE DOING THE SEARCH, CORRECT?
 2
                PARDON ME?
          Α
 3
              WHEN THEY FIRST CAME IN YOUR ROOM, DETECTIVE
 4
     ZOELLER WAS THERE DOING THE SEARCH, WASN'T HE?
 5
           Α
                 YES.
 6
           Q
              WHERE WERE YOU?
7
           А
                I WAS ON MY BED.
8
                 AND DID YOU STAY ON THE BED THE WHOLE TIME?
           Q
9
           Α
                 YES.
10
                AND HOW MUCH OF THAT TIME DID YOU SEE DETECTIVE
11
     ZOELLER THERE?
12
           Α
             AN HOUR.
13
           Q HE WAS IN YOUR ROOM FOR, UNINTERRUPTED FOR AN
14
     HOUR?
15
                NO, HE -- DETECTIVE BREILING CAME IN AND WANTED
16
     TO TALK TO HIM A COUPLE OF TIMES AND WANTED HIM TO GO OUTSIDE
17
     WITH HIM.
18
                 DID HE LEAVE FOR A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME?
           Q
19
           Α
                YES.
20
           Q
                 A FEW MINUTES?
21
           А
                 FIVE, TEN MINUTES.
22
                 TALKING TO OFFICER BREILING?
           Q
23
24
           Α
                 UH-HUH.
25
           Q
                WAS HE STANDING OUTSIDE TALKING TO OSCAR BREILING?
           Α
                I DON'T KNOW.
26
27
           Q
                AND BUT FOR THE BETTER PART OF AN HOUR, HE WAS
     IN YOUR ROOM?
28
```

27

28

SO YOU LEFT AND LEFT THE POLICE OFFICERS THERE I WENT UP TO JOE'S OFFICE AND I WENT INTO HIS WHAT WERE YOU DOING WHILE YOU WERE THERE? Α I WAS WATCHING. Q WHAT DID YOU SEE? Α I FOLLOWED DETECTIVE ZOELLER UPSTAIRS. THE COURT: YOU SAW DETECTIVE ZOELLER WHAT?

```
THE WITNESS: I FOLLOWED DETECTIVE ZOELLER UPSTAIRS.
 1
            Q
                  BY MR. WAPNER: WAS MR. CHIER THERE AT THAT POINT?
 2
                 YES, HE WAS.
 3
                  SO WHEN YOU WENT UPSTAIRS WITH MR. ZOELLER,
 4
 5
     MR. CHIER WAS ALREADY THERE?
           А
                HE WAS IN THE HALLWAY.
 6
                AND DID YOU FOLLOW MR. ZOELLER FROM YOUR ROOM
 8
     TO THE MAIN HOUSE?
           А
                 YES.
 9
                 AND SO WHEN MR. ZOELLER GOT THERE, MR. CHIER WAS
10
11
     ALREADY THERE?
           Α
                 YES.
12
                AND WHEN YOU WENT INTO JOE'S, MR. HUNT'S OFFICE,
13
     DID DETECTIVE ZOELLER GO IN THERE ALSO?
14
           Α
15
                 YES, HE DID.
                 WHAT DID YOU SEE HIM DO?
16
                 I SAW HIM GET DOWN ON HIS KNEES, AND BREILING
17
     WAS RIGHT ACROSS FROM HIM ON HIS KNEES ALSO, AND THEY STARTED
18
     GOING THROUGH FILES AND PAPER.
19
20
           Q
                 WHERE IN THE ROOM?
21
                 RIGHT IN FRONT OF ME.
22
                 I KNOW BUT THAT DOESN'T HELP THE JUDGE, BECAUSE
23
     HE DOESN'T KNOW WHERE YOU WERE.
                 IN THE CENTER OF THE ROOM. THERE IS BOXES AND
24
     THEN THERE IS JOE'S DESK AND THEN THERE IS A BED RIGHT NEXT
25
26
     TO THAT.
27
                 AND IT WOULD BE NEAR THE BED AND THE DESK?
           Q
```

Α

28

YES.

Q WERE THE ITEMS IN THAT BOX CONTAINED IN MANILA 1 FOLDERS? 2 YES, THEY WERE. А 3 Q WAS DETECTIVE ZOELLER LOOKING THROUGH THEM, 4 PULLING THEM BACK TOWARD HIM AS HE WOULD GO? 5 A HE WAS READING THEM AND THEY WERE DISCARDING 6 THINGS AND THEN BREILING WAS ALSO READING AND GOING THROUGH 7 THE FILES. 8 Q WOULD OSCAR BREILING READ THE THINGS THAT 9 DETECTIVE ZOELLER HAD SET ASIDE FOR HIM? 10 A NO. 11 OSCAR BREILING HAD -- WHAT I NOTICED WAS BREILING 12 WOULD SAY, "READ THIS" AND ZOELLER WOULD READ IT AND THEN 13 ZOELLER -- ZOELLER STARTED GOING THROUGH THE WHOLE ENTIRE 14 ROOM WITH OTHER POLICE OFFICERS. 15 Q WHAT ELSE DID YOU SEE HIM DO, BESIDES READING 16 THOSE FILES? 17 A I SAW HIM LOOK ALL THROUGH JOE'S DESK. I SAW 18 19 HIM GO THROUGH THE TRASH CAN. I SAW HIM GO THROUGH THE BOOK SHELVES. 20 . Q THE BOOK SHELVES THAT HAD THE BLACK BINDERS ON 21 THEM? 22 23 А YES. 24 Q AND WHAT DID YOU SEE HIM DO IN THOSE BOOK SHELVES? I SAW HIM GO THROUGH EVERY LEAFLET OF PAPER. 25 А EACH BINDER? 26 Q 27 Α YES. 28 Q AND EACH PIECE OF PAPER IN EACH BINDER?

-5	1	А	YES.
	2	Q	ONE BY ONE BY ONE?
	3	А	THAT IS WHAT THEY DO.
	4	Q	HOW MANY BINDERS WERE ON THAT BOOK SHELF?
	5	А	I DON'T KNOW.
2 F	6		
	7		
	8		
	9		
1	0		
1	1		
1	2		
1	3		
1	4		
1	5		
1	6		
1	7		
1	8		
1	9		
2	0		
2	1		
2	2		
2	3		
2	4		
2	5		
2	6		
2	7		
2	8		

1 Q TAKE A GUESS. 2 MR. BARENS: OBJECTION. 3 THE COURT: GIVE US YOUR BEST ESTIMATE. MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 5 THE WITNESS: APPROXIMATELY 15. 6 Q BY MR. WAPNER: AND DO YOU HAVE AN ESTIMATE OF 7 APPROXIMATELY -- THE APPROXIMATE THICKNESS OF THE PAPERS IN 8 EACH OF THOSE BINDERS? 9 A ABOUT THREE INCHES, TWO AND A HALF INCHES 10 (INDICATING). 11 AND HOW LONG WERE YOU IN THAT ROOM ALTOGETHER? Q 12 A I WAS IN JOE'S ROOM FOR -- I WAS WALKING IN AND 13 OUT OF JOE'S ROOM AND THE GUEST BEDROOM -- BECAUSE THEY WERE 14 ALSO GOING THROUGH EVERYTHING IN THE BEDROOM AND TAKING 15 PICTURES. AND I WANTED TO SEE WHAT WAS GOING ON, YOU KNOW, 16 EXACTLY WHAT THEY WERE DOING IN BOTH ROOMS. 17 DID YOU CONTINUE TO WALK BACK AND FORTH? Q 18 A AFTER I LEFT THE OFFICE, THERE WERE A LOT OF 19 POLICE OFFICERS IN HIS BEDROOM. AND SO I WENT AND SAT ON 20 HIS BED AND JUST WATCHED WHAT THEY WERE DOING. 21 · Q DID YOU GO BACK INTO THE COMPUTER ROOM AFTER 22 THAT? 23 YES, I DID. I WALKED IN. AND THEN I WALKED 24 BACK OUT. 25 HOW MANY TIMES DID YOU DO THIS PROCEDURE, GOING Q 26 BACK AND FORTH? 27 A APPROXIMATELY THREE TIMES. 28 Q AND THE TOTALITY OF THE TIME THAT YOU SPENT IN

```
1
     THE COMPUTER ROOM WAS WHAT?
 2
                  ALTOGETHER BACK AND FORTH?
 3
            Q
               ALTOGETHER.
 4
                  TWENTY-FIVE OR TWENTY MINUTES.
 5
                 AND IN THAT 20 MINUTES, DETECTIVE ZOELLER WAS
 6
     GOING THROUGH THE FILES ON THE FLOOR, RIGHT?
 7
            А
                 YES.
 8
                  GOING THROUGH EVERY PAGE OF THE THREE INCHES
            Q
 9
     OF THE 15 BINDERS, RIGHT?
10
            Α
                  YES.
11
            Q
                  AND WHAT ELSE WAS HE DOING?
12
            Α
                  HE WAS ALSO LOOKING THROUGH THE DESK, JOE'S DESK.
13
            Q
                  EVERY DRAWER?
14
                  YES.
15
            Q
                  EVERY PIECE OF PAPER?
16
            Α
                  YES.
17
            Q
                  EVERY PENCIL?
18
            Α
                  YES.
19
            Q
                  EVERY PIECE OF COMPUTER PAPER?
20
            Α
                  YES.
21
                  WHAT ELSE WAS HE LOOKING AT?
            Q
22
            Α
                  UNDER THE BED.
23
                  ALL RIGHT. HOW LONG DID HE SPEND UNDER THERE?
            Q
24
            Α
                  I DON'T KNOW.
25
                  WHAT ELSE DID HE LOOK AT?
            Q
26
            Α
                  HE LOOKED EVERYWHERE IN THE ROOM.
27
                  WHERE ELSE?
            Q
28
            Α
                  HE LOOKED IN THE TRASH CAN.
```

1	Q AT EVERY PIECE OF PAPER?
2	A I PRESUME SO.
3	Q WELL, WAIT A MINUTE. DID YOU SEE HIM DO IT OR
4	NOT?
5	A YES, I DID.
6	Q SO YOU KNOW THEN THAT IT WAS EVERY PIECE OF PAPER,
7	RIGHT?
8	A YES.
9	Q AND WHAT ELSE DID HE TOOK AT?
10	A THAT IS ALL I CAN REMEMBER.
11	Q ALL RIGHT. DID YOU SEE HIM APPARENTLY READING
12	IT? IS THAT WHAT YOU SAW HIM DO?
13	A YES.
14	Q THIS ALL HAPPENED IN THE 15 OR 20 MINUTES THAT
15	YOU WERE IN THERE?
16	A YES. IT WAS STILL HAPPENING WHEN I LEFT.
17	MR. BARENS: I BELIEVE THE WITNESS STATED
18	THE COURT: TWENTY OR TWENTY-FIVE MINUTES.
19	MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU. NOTHING FURTHER.
20	MR. BARENS: I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER.
21	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. YOU MAY STEP DOWN.
22	DO YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER WITNESSES?
22	DO YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER WITNESSES? MR. BARENS: FROM THE DEFENSE, WAIT JUST A MOMENT.
1	
23	MR. BARENS: FROM THE DEFENSE, WAIT JUST A MOMENT.

1 JOSEPH HUNT. CALLED AS A WITNESS ON HIS OWN BEHALF, HAVING BEEN PREVIOUSLY 2 3 SWORN, EXAMINED FURTHER AS FOLLOWS: 4 THE CLERK: YOU HAVE BEEN SWORN AND YOU ARE STILL UNDER 5 OATH. HAVE A SEAT THERE AND STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD. 6 THE WITNESS: JOE HUNT. 7 8 EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. BARENS: 10 Q MR. HUNT, YOU TESTIFIED THAT SUBSEQUENT TO YOUR 11 RETURN TO THE HOME ON JANUARY 8, 1987, THAT YOU CAUSED 12 THE REMAINING MATERIALS IN THE OFFICE TO BE SEALED. IS THAT 13 CORRECT? 14 Α YES. 15 WHAT DID YOU DO WITH THE THEN SEALED MATERIALS? 16 WELL, THEY STAYED AT MY HOUSE FOR A COUPLE OF 17 DAYS. THEN I THOUGHT IT WOULD BE SAFER IF I TURNED THEM OVER 18 TO YOU, MR. BARENS. 19 Q AND DID YOU IN FACT, TURN THE ENTIRE ASSEMBLAGE 20 OF SEALED MATERIALS OVER TO ME? 21 Α YES. 22 Q AND WERE THEY CONTAINED --23 THE COURT: WERE THEY WHAT? 24 MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I PREFER NOT TO HAVE THAT. 25 THE COURT: WELL, HE IS ALREADY DONE. 26 MR. BARENS: I MEAN PROSPECTIVELY, YOUR HONOR. 27 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD. 28

MR. BARENS: YOU ARE SAYING TO ME TO GO AHEAD?

1 THE COURT: YES. 2 BY MR. BARENS: MR. HUNT, YOU TURNED THOSE OVER 3 TO ME IN A SINGLE BOX? 4 YES, WITH A COVER ON IT. 5 ALL RIGHT. AND YOU GAVE THAT TO ME APPROXIMATELY 6 A WEEK AGO AT MY OFFICE? 7 Α APPROXIMATELY FIVE OR SEVEN DAYS, SOMETHING LIKE 8 THAT. 9 Q LAST WEEK? 10 Α YEAH. 11 Q THANK YOU, MR. HUNT. 12 MR. HUNT, DID YOU HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK 13 AT THE CONTENTS OF A CERTAIN BOX THAT THE COURT PROVIDED ME 14 WITH YESTERDAY IN THIS COURTROOM? 15 Α YES. 16 AND OSTENSIBLY, IT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE COPIES 17 OF THE MATERIALS THE POLICE PEOPLE TOOK FROM THE ROBERTS! 18 RESIDENCE ON JANUARY 8, 1987? 19 A THAT IS WHAT I WAS TOLD. 20 DID YOU SEE ANYTHING MISSING FROM THAT, COPIES 21 THAT YOU UNDERSTOOD THAT THEY HAD TAKEN? 22 THE COURT: WHAT DO YOU MEAN, DID HE SEE ANYTHING 23 MISSING? MISSING FROM WHAT? 24 MR. BARENS: MATERIALS THAT WE RECEIVED SUPPOSEDLY 25 ARE REPRESENTED BY A SUMMARY IN THE INVESTIGATION REPORT. 26 WE HAVE HEARD TESTIMONY ABOUT WHAT WAS ALLEGEDLY TAKEN. 27 THE COURT: YES.

MR. BARENS: AND THERE WAS SOME IDENTIFICATION --

THE COURT: WELL, DOES HE KNOW FIRST WHAT WAS TAKEN? HOW DOES HE KNOW WHAT WAS MISSING FROM THE BOX? MR. BARENS: LET ME BE MORE SPECIFIC WITH HIM, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GO AHEAD. Q BY MR. BARENS: MR. HUNT, AMONG THE MATERIAL THAT YOU SAW YESTERDAY, WAS THERE AN EXHIBIT NUMBER XEROXED THAT YOU SAW? A COULD YOU ASK THAT QUESTION AGAIN? I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND IT.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

37?

Q YES, AMONG THE MATERIALS THAT YOU LOOKED AT IN
THE BOX YESTERDAY, WAS THERE AN EXHIBIT NO. 37?
A WELL, THERE WAS WHAT APPEARED TO ME TO BE A
XEROX OF THE POST-IT STICKER WHICH HAD MY WRITING ON IT,
37, AND IT WAS NEXT TO A PIECE OF PAPER.
Q ALL RIGHT. DID YOU IN FACT ARE YOU FAMILIAR
WITH WHAT WAS THE CONTENTS OF THE EXHIBIT YOU HAD NUMBERED

A YES, I AM.

Q ALL RIGHT. IS EXHIBIT NO. 37 SOMETHING YOU HAD DISCUSSED WITH ME?

A YES, I HAD DISCUSSED IT WITH YOU.

Q AND YOU HAD DISCUSSED IT WITH MR. CHIER?

A YES.

Q DID YOU SEE EXHIBIT NO. 37, THE SUBSTANCE OF EXHIBIT NO. 37 AMONGST THE MATERIALS THAT WERE IN THE BOX?

A NO, I DIDN'T.

THE POST-IT STICKER WAS NEXT TO SOMETHING ENTIRELY DIFFERENT.

Q NEXT TO ANOTHER MATERIAL?

A YES.

MR. BARENS: NOTHING FURTHER.

THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE.

24

25

27

28

21

22

23

26 BY MR. WAPNER

BY MR. WAPNER:

Q DID YOU SEE THIS POTENTIAL EXHIBIT NO. 37 IN ANY OF THE MATERIALS THAT YOU SEALED UP AND GAVE TO MR. BARENS?

EXAMINATION

A NO.

AT THAT POINT, MR. WAPNER, I LOOKED VERY CAREFULLY AND VERY THOROUGHLY THROUGH ALL OF THE XEROX MATERIALS IN AN EFFORT TO TRY AND FIND WHAT I RECOLLECT, RECALL TO BE NO. 37 AND THEN I LOOKED AT MY COMPUTER TO VERIFY WHAT ITS RECORD OF NO. 37 WAS.

Q AND DID YOU LOOK IN THE HOUSE, IN THE ROOMS TO FIND OUT IF YOU HAD THAT PIECE OF PAPER?

A YEAH. I LITERALLY TORE THE PLACE APART LOOKING FOR IT.

Q AND WHAT ABOUT IN THE REST OF THE BOX?

A THE REST?

Q OF THE BOX THAT YOU WERE PROVIDED.

A I LOOKED VERY CAREFULLY THROUGH THE BOX THAT I WAS PROVIDED, THREE OR FOUR TIMES.

Q AND YOU DIDN'T FIND WHAT YOU BELIEVED TO BE THE SUBSTANCE OF THAT DOCUMENT?

A NO, I COULDN'T FIND IT ANYWHERE, MR. WAPNER.

MR. WAPNER: I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER.

THE COURT: WHAT WAS 37?

MR. BARENS: I WOULD OBJECT AND INSTRUCT HIM NOT TO ANSWER.

THE COURT: OVERRULED. I WANT TO KNOW WHAT IT SUPPOSEDLY REPRESENTS. I DON'T WANT TO HAVE THE EXACT CONTENTS.

MR. BARENS: DID YOU UNDERSTAND, MR. HUNT?

IF I MIGHT CAUTION MR. HUNT, PLEASE DO COOPERATE WITH THE JUDGE AND TELL HIM WHAT 37 CONSISTED OF.

THE WITNESS: YES.

MR. BARENS: HOWEVER, I AM ASKING YOU NOT TO IDENTIFY
THE PERSONS WHO ARE INVOLVED IN NO. 37.

THE WITNESS: YOU WANT -- CAN I ASK HIM A QUESTION?

THE COURT: WHAT IS 37?

THE WITNESS: COULD I ASK HIM TO CLARIFY?

THE COURT: YES.

THE WITNESS: YOU WANT ME TO TELL HIS HONOR WHAT 37 WAS, WITHOUT SAYING WHO IT REFERRED TO, IS THAT CORRECT?

LET ME GIVE HIS HONOR AN ANSWER AND SEE IF IT SATISFIES HIM.

MR. BARENS: GO AHEAD AND SEE IF HE IS SATISFIED WITH THE ANSWER.

THE WITNESS: NO. 37 WAS AN EXTREMELY IMPORTANT PIECE

OF INFORMATION THAT WAS MEANT FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF A WITNESS

IN BOTH THIS CASE AND IN MY SAN FRANCISCO CASE.

THE COURT: IS THAT A COMMUNICATION YOU RECEIVED FROM YOUR LAWYER?

THE WITNESS: NO.

IT WAS IN HIS OWN HANDWRITING.

THE COURT: WHOSE HANDWRITING?

THE WITNESS: THE WITNESS IN QUESTION.

THE COURT: IT WAS A DOCUMENT OR AN EXHIBIT THAT IS

GOING TO BE USED FOR THE PURPOSE OF CROSS-EXAMINING A WITNESS

IN THIS CASE AND THE CASE IN SAN MATEO COUNTY, IS THAT IT?

THE WITNESS: YES.

IT WAS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT ONES I HAVE, IF NOT THE MOST IMPORTANT.

THE COURT: YOU MEAN, WAS IT IN THE FORM OF A LETTER

OR MEMORANDA, WAS IT?

THE WITNESS: IT WAS FOLIOGRAPHIC, IT WAS A NOTE, AND IT WAS A DATED NOTE AND BOTH THE DATE AND THE CONTENTS OF THE NOTE WERE OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE TO THE DEFENSE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. YOU HAVEN'T GOT A COPY OF IT, HAVE YOU?

THE WITNESS: NO.

ALL OF THE EXHIBITS, WITH A FEW EXCEPTIONS, WERE THE SOLE COPIES OF THE MATERIALS.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

THE WITNESS: IF I MIGHT ADD --1 THE COURT: DID YOU FIND ANY COMPUTER PAPERS LIKE THAT 2 IN THE BOX THAT YOU GOT? 3 THE WITNESS: NO, I DIDN'T, YOUR HONOR. 4 YOUR HONOR, I DIDN'T FIND ANY OF THE RECENTLY 5 GENERATED COMPUTER PAPER FROM MY APPLE COMPUTER, WHICH I GOT 6 7 IN 1986. THE COURT: THERE WERE NO COMPUTER PAPERS IN THERE AT 8 ALL, WERE THERE? 9 THE WITNESS: I THINK THERE WERE SOME THINGS THAT WERE 10 GENERATED BY COMPUTERS BUT CERTAINLY NOT BY MY COMPUTER AND 11 WHAT WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT. 12 THE COURT: THEY DIDN'T LOOK LIKE COMPUTER PAPERS, DID 13 THEY? 14 15 THE WITNESS: NOT FROM THAT COMPUTER. NO. SIR. THE COURT: BECAUSE I LOOKED INTO IT, TOO, AND I DIDN'T 16 FIND ANY COMPUTER PAPERS IN THERE AT ALL. 17 ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU. 18 19 ANYTHING FURTHER? MR. WAPNER: JUST BRIEFLY, YOUR HONOR. 20 22 EXAMINATION

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

BY MR. WAPNER:

Q WAS THAT DOCUMENT THAT WAS ANTICIPATED TO BE DEFENSE EXHIBIT 37 WRITTEN IN THE PERIOD OF 1983-1984?

YES, IT WAS, MR. WAPNER.

WAS IT WRITTEN PURPORTEDLY BY SOMEBODY WHO WAS Q A MEMBER OF THE BBC OR SOMEONE RELATED TO THE BBC?

1	A SOMEONE RELATED TO THE BBC.
2	Q THANK YOU.
3	LET ME ASK YOU, THESE EXHIBIT STICKERS, THEY WERE
4	AFFIXED TO THE PIECES OF PAPER WITH LITTLE PIECES OF ADHESIVE
5	THAT COME ON THE PAPER, RIGHT?
6	A YES.
7	Q AND THIS STICKER IN THE XEROX OR ON THE XEROX
8	OF THE STICKER THAT HAD THE WRITING "37" ON IT, WAS THAT
9	ATTACHED TO AN EXHIBIT THAT WAS ASSIGNED AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT
10	NUMBER BY YOU, OR WAS IT ATTACHED TO SOMETHING THAT WASN'T
11	SUPPOSED TO BE AN EXHIBIT?
12	A IT WAS ATTACHED TO SOMETHING WHICH WAS NOT AN
13	EXHIBIT.
14	WHAT IT WAS ATTACHED TO WAS SOMETHING THAT I
15	RECOLLECT BEING IN MY BEDROOM AND IT WAS ALSO SOMETHING THAT
16	BROOKE ROBERTS HAD WRITTEN DOWN ON THE LIST WHICH, YOU KNOW,
17	I HAVE HEARD TESTIMONY TO THE EFFECT SHE MADE WITH RICHARD
18	CHIER, YOU KNOW, IN RICHARD CHIER'S PRESENCE.
19	Q SO YOU DON'T KNOW HOW THAT 37 POST-IT STICKER
20	CAME TO BE IN THE BOX OR WHETHER IN FACT THAT DOCUMENT WAS
21	IN FACT TAKEN?
22	A I KNOW HOW THE POST-IT STICKER CAME TO BE IN THE
23	BOX.
24	Q HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT?
25	A REFERRING TO THE CARDBOARD BOX THAT WAS ON THE
26	BED, BECAUSE I PLACED ALL OF THE EXHIBITS WITH THE POST-IT
27	STICKERS IN THE BOX THAT WAS ON THE BED THE NIGHT BEFORE OR
28	THE MORNING OF JANUARY 8 WHEN I LEFT FOR COURT.

Q RIGHT, BUT YOU DON'T KNOW HOW IT CAME TO BE IN THE BOX THAT THE DETECTIVES TOOK, DO YOU?

A I DON'T KNOW HOW -- WHAT THE CHAIN OF CUSTODY
WAS FROM THE TIME THAT THE DETECTIVES TOOK THOSE THINGS OR
TOOK THAT STICKER NO. 37 AND THE TIME THAT I RECEIVED IT IN
COURT, NO, I DON'T.

Q AND YOU DON'T EVEN KNOW IF THE DETECTIVES EVEN TOOK THAT ITEM THAT IS 37, DO YOU?

ALL I KNOW IS THEY TOOK NUMBER 37 LABEL.

Q IF SOMEHOW THAT FELL OFF OF SOMETHING WHILE THEY WERE SEARCHING AND GOT INCLUDED IN THE BOX, YOU WOULDN'T KNOW THAT.

MR. BARENS: OBJECTION, CALLS FOR SPECULATION ON THE WITNESS' PART.

THE COURT: OVERRULED.

THE WITNESS: ALL OF THE EXHIBITS 1 THROUGH SIXTY-SOME ODD WERE IN A CARDBOARD TRAY. NUMBER 37 -- AND THEY WERE IN SEQUENTIAL ORDER.

NUMBER 37 WOULD HAVE BEEN IN THE MIDDLE OF THOSE EXHIBITS. I HAD GONE THROUGH THE EXHIBITS A FEW DAYS EARLIER BECAUSE I WAS COMPARING THEM AGAINST THE -- A FEW DAYS EARLIER BEFORE JANUARY 8, BECAUSE I WAS COMPARING THEM AGAINST THE COMPUTER LIST. AND ALL OF THEM -- YOU KNOW, IT WAS A SEQUENTIAL PROGRESSION FROM 1 THROUGH 66.

Q BY MR. WAPNER: I DON'T THINK THAT ANSWERED THE QUESTION. BUT IT IS ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. NOTHING FURTHER.

THE COURT: WELL, IF THEY WERE WANTING TO TAKE YOUR

EXHIBIT, YOU MEAN THEY JUST TORE OFF THAT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

37 AND THEY KEPT THE OTHER EXHIBIT? IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE

TELLING US?

THE WITNESS: I DON'T KNOW. BUT THESE POST-IT

STICKERS, YOU CAN TAKE THEM OFF. IT IS NOT LIKE SCOTCH TAPE.

YOU CAN TAKE THEM OFF WITHOUT RIPPING. THE MUCILAGE OR

WHATEVER, DOESN'T ADHERE THAT STRONGLY.

THE COURT: WELL, SINCE THIS WAS THE ONLY THING THAT WAS FOUND OF EXHIBIT 37 --

MR. BARENS: I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND THAT.

THE COURT: THE STICKER 37 WAS THE ONLY ONE OF THE 60 EXHIBITS THAT YOU HAD MARKED WITH NUMBERS, IS THAT RIGHT?

THE WITNESS: ALL OF THE 60 EXHIBITS, IF I UNDERSTAND

YOUR HONOR'S QUESTION PROPERLY, WERE NUMBERED AND HAD POST-IT STICKERS ON THEM, 1 THROUGH SIXTY-SOME ODD.

THE COURT: THEN YOU CLAIM THAT WHEN YOU GOT BACK ALL 60 EXHIBITS WERE MISSING. IS THAT IT?

THE WITNESS: WHEN I GOT BACK HOME JANUARY THE 8TH,

I WENT UPSTAIRS. ALL EXCEPT TWO -- AND I PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED

ABOUT THOSE TWO WITH THE POST-IT STICKERS AFFIXED ARE IN THE

BOX WHICH IS IN MR. BARENS' POSSESSION.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ALL OF THE 58 HAVE BEEN TAKEN,
AT LEAST THEY WERE MISSING, IS THAT CORRECT?

THE WITNESS: YEAH, SIXTY-SOME ODD.

THE COURT: YOU DIDN'T FIND THEM IN THE BOX, DID YOU?

THE WITNESS: NOT THE BOX MR. WAPNER TURNED OVER TO US YESTERDAY. I FOUND ALL OF THEM TO BE IN GOOD ORDER, SAVE FOR THIS NUMBER 37, THE POST-IT STICKER OF WHICH WAS XEROXED ON A LEGAL SIZED -- XEROXED ON A LETTER SIZED PIECE OF PAPER.

THAT PIECE OF PAPER DID NOT RELATE TO THAT EXHIBIT NUMBER.

THE COURT: MY QUESTION IS, THE 60 THINGS THAT YOU HAD MARKED WHEN YOU DESIGNATED THEM EXHIBITS, WERE THEY FOUND IN THE BOX, ALL EXCEPT 37?

THE WITNESS: YES, YOUR HONOR. IN THE BOX THAT THE DISTRICT
ATTORNEY TURNED OVER TO US, I FOUND ALL OF THE OTHER EXHIBITS
IN ORDER.

THE COURT: ALL OF THE EXHIBITS, CORRECT?

THE WITNESS: YES.

THE COURT: AND WHICH OF THOSE 60 DO YOU CLAIM ARE

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED FROM THE LAWYER, CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS?

THE WITNESS: IF MY MEMORY SERVES ME CORRECTLY --

THE COURT: YES?

THE WITNESS: NONE OF THOSE EXHIBITS ARE CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN MY LAWYER, EXCEPT SINCE I HAVE SHOWN HIM THOSE DOCUMENTS, THEY WERE DOCUMENTS THAT HE UNDERSTOOD TO BE A PART OF --

THE COURT: NO COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR LAWYER? IS THAT RIGHT?

THE WITNESS: NO. THE EXHIBITS WERE FOR SUBMISSION TO THE COURT.

1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. BUT THEY WEREN'T CONFIDENTIAL, 2 WERE THEY? 3 MR. BARENS: OBJECTION, WORK PRODUCT. 4 THE COURT: OVERRULED. WERE THEY CONFIDENTIAL 5 COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR LAWYER? 6 THE WITNESS: I FELT THAT THE EXHIBITS WE WERE GOING 7 TO USE IN THE TRIAL, THAT WE AGREED UPON BE SUBMITTED AS 8 EVIDENCE, WERE CONFIDENTIAL. THAT IS MY OWN STATE OF MIND. 9 IT IS NOT REALLY --10 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. ANYTHING FURTHER? 11 MR. BARENS: NOTHING FURTHER. 12 MR. WAPNER: YES, JUST BRIEFLY. 13 14 EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. WAPNER: 16 OTHER THAN THOSE 60 OR SO EXHIBITS OR WHAT YOU 17 HAVE LABELED AS EXHIBITS, WERE THERE OTHER THINGS IN THE BOX 18 THAT THE DETECTIVES TOOK? 19 THERE WERE SOME OTHER THINGS MISSING WHEN I CAME 20 HOME. AS TO WHAT WAS IN THE BOX THAT THE DETECTIVES TOOK, 21 I WAS IN COURT AT THE TIME THEY TOOK THE BOX. 22 WELL, YOU REVIEWED THE BOX, YESTERDAY, DIDN'T 23 YOU? 24 YES. Α 25 0 ALL RIGHT. 26 Α THAT BOX --27 Q AND THAT PURPORTED TO CONTAIN A COPY OF EVERYTHING 28 THAT WAS TAKEN, RIGHT?

```
1
                  WELL, I AM NOT TRYING TO BE TECHNICAL WITH YOU.
     MR. WAPNER. BUT I DIDN'T SEE A PIECE OF PAPER IN THERE THAT
 2
 3
     SAID THAT I PURPORTED THIS TO BE EVERYTHING THAT WAS TAKEN.
     SO I DON'T KNOW. PERHAPS MR. BREILING HAS EXHIBITS, YOU KNOW.
 4
 5
            0
                  OKAY. I WON'T ARGUE WITH YOU ON THAT POINT.
 6
                  OF THE THINGS THAT YOU SAW IN THE BOX, WERE THEY
 7
     ALL MATERIALS THAT WERE GENERATED DURING THE PERIOD OF 1983
 8
     AND 184?
 9
               NO. I DON'T BELIEVE THAT TO BE TRUE.
10
            0
                  OKAY.
11
                  NO. I AM NOT RECOLLECTING ANYTHING OTHER THAN
12
     SOME LETTERS FROM JEFFREY MELCZER, WHICH MAY HAVE BEEN 1985
13
     OR '86.
14
            THE COURT: FROM WHOM?
15
            THE WITNESS: JEFFREY MELCZER. HE IS MY ATTORNEY IN
16
     THE CIVIL MATTER.
17
            Q
                 BY MR. WAPNER: I WON'T GET INTO WHETHER ANYBODY
18
     ELSE VIOLATED YOUR PRIVILEGES IN ANY OTHER CASE.
19
                  BUT, THE LETTERS BETWEEN YOU AND MR. MELCZER,
20
     WERE NOT -- ARE YOU CLAIMING THAT THOSE WERE SOMEHOW
21
    PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN YOU AND MR. BARENS AND MR.
22
     CHIER?
23
                 NO, I AM NOT, MR. WAPNER.
24
                 OTHER THAN THE LETTERS FROM MR. MELCZER, CAN
25
     YOU RECALL ANYTHING ELSE THAT WAS TAKEN, THAT WAS NOT GENERATED
26
    DURING THE PERIOD OF 1983 AND '84?
27
                WELL, THE LABELS THEMSELVES. ONCE AGAIN, I AM
```

NOT TRYING TO BE TECHNICAL.

1 Q THAT'S ALL RIGHT. I AM LISTENING. 2 A I WANT TO GIVE YOU A PRECISE ANSWER. I DIDN'T 3 STUDY THE DOCUMENTS. A LOT OF THE DOCUMENTS, I DIDN'T STUDY 4 REALLY CAREFULLY. 5 I WENT THROUGH THE EXHIBITS LAST NIGHT, SO I 6 AM NOT PREPARED TO GIVE YOU A FULL ANSWER ON THAT AT THIS 7 TIME, MR. WAPNER. 8 WAIT A SECOND. YOU DIDN'T GO THROUGH THOSE 9 CAREFULLY, BUT YOU WENT THROUGH THEM CAREFULLY ENOUGH TO KNOW 10 THAT THIS ONE THING THAT YOU ARE CLAIMING IS THE MOST IMPORTANT 11 THING, WAS MISSING? 12 IT WAS HIGHLY DISTINCTIVE. I COULD TELL YOU 13 THAT IT WAS NOT FOR INSTANCE, A CHECK. I DON'T HAVE TO LOOK 14 AT THE CHECKS AND THERE IS QUITE A LARGE QUANTITY OF THAT 15 MATERIAL, THAT WAS XEROXED CHECKS. I DON'T HAVE TO LOOK AT 16 THOSE VERY CAREFULLY TO KNOW THAT THEY WEREN'T AN EIGHT AND 17 A HALF BY ELEVEN PIECE OF PAPER, MR. WAPNER. 18 ALL RIGHT. AND THAT IS THE ONLY -- THAT ONE Q 19 PIECE OF PAPER IS THE ONLY THING THAT WAS MISSING, THAT YOU 20 THINK WAS MISSING? 21 WELL, FROM THE EXHIBITS, YES. THERE WAS IN MY 22 BEDROOM I RECOLLECT, A QUANTITY OF STATIONERY THAT RELATES 23 TO A PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL IN THIS CASE. I DIDN'T SEE COPIES 24 OF EACH SHEET OF THAT. 25 AND IT SEEMS LIKE THEY WERE COPYING EVERY SHEET 26 OF EVERYTHING ELSE. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THEY JUST COPIED

ONE SHEET OF THAT AND SAID IT WAS ENOUGH.

OKAY. OTHER THAN THE LETTER FROM MR. MELCZER,

28

Q

27

THE POST-IT STICKERS, WAS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THAT WAS GENERATED IN A PERIOD OTHER THAN 1983 OR '84?

A THERE WAS A PLEADING PAPER BY PARKER KELLY AND JOHN COST, WHO ARE MY LAWYERS IN SAN FRANCISCO REPRESENTING ME IN THAT CRIMINAL CASE.

- 1

Q WHAT ELSE?

A THERE WERE QUITE A FEW OTHER THINGS, I BELIEVE,
THAT RELATED TO 1985-'86 THAT I CAN'T RECOLLECT THEM IN
DETAIL.

Q WERE THEY COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR LAWYER?

A I CAN'T -- I CANNOT RECOLLECT AT THIS TIME WHAT EXACTLY SOME OF THOSE OTHER THINGS WERE THAT WERE IN THE BOX.

THE COURT: YOU SAY THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN LETTERS,

COMMUNICATIONS IN THAT BOX THAT YOU SAW, BETWEEN YOUR LAWYER

AND YOU?

BECAUSE I DIDN'T SEE ANY OF THOSE THINGS IN THERE,
MAYBE THEY WERE HIDDEN SOMEWHERE.

THE WITNESS: NO, YOUR HONOR, I DON'T RECOLLECT AT THIS

TIME BUT, AS I SAID LAST NIGHT, I WASN'T -- I WAS LOOKING

AT THE EXHIBITS AND THEN I STARTED --

AFTER I SAW THIS THING WITH NUMBER 37, I BECAME INVOLVED WITH THIS WHOLE ISSUE OF 37.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AT ANY RATE, YOUR BEST

RECOLLECTION IS YOU DIDN'T SEE ANY COMMUNICATION BETWEEN YOU

AND YOUR LAWYER, IS THAT RIGHT, BY THAT, I MEAN THE LAWYERS

THAT REPRESENT YOU HERE?

THE WITNESS: NO, NOTHING ADDRESSED TO ARTHUR.

THE COURT: PARDON ME?

THE WITNESS: NO, NOTHING ADDRESSED TO ARTHUR OR ON HIS STATIONERY.

THE COURT: WELL, FROM YOU TO HIM OR FROM HIM TO YOU.

THE WITNESS: NO, MY BEST RECOLLECTION IS THERE WAS

WITH IT?

```
NOTHING THERE TO THAT EFFECT.
 1
           THE COURT: MR. WAPNER.
 2
           MR. WAPNER: I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER.
 3
           THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. YOU MAY STEP DOWN.
 4
 5
           THE WITNESS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
           MR. BARENS: WE REST, IF THAT IS APPROPRIATE, YOUR HONOR.
 6
           THE COURT: WELL, YOU MEAN ON THE MOTION?
 7
 8
           MR. BARENS: WELL, WE WILL ARGUE.
           THE COURT: OF COURSE. I MEAN YOU REST ON THE MOTION.
 9
                 HOW ABOUT YOU?
10
           MR. WAPNER: I HAVE NO FURTHER WITNESSES, YOUR HONOR.
11
           THE COURT: AND NO REBUTTAL?
12
           MR. WAPNER: I HAVE NO REBUTTAL.
13
                 IT OCCURS TO ME, NOT THAT I IN ANY SENSE AM TAKING
14
     WHAT MR. HUNT SAID TO BE THE GOSPEL, BUT I --
15
16
           MR. BARENS: WHY NOT?
           MR. WAPNER: I JUST WONDER IF A PHONE CALL TO
17
     MR. BREILING, IN THE EVENT -- I DON'T KNOW WHETHER WHAT HE
18
     SAYS IS TRUE OR NOT.
19
           THE COURT: WHY DON'T YOU GIVE HIM A PHONE CALL AND
20
21
     SEE WHETHER OR NOT --
22
                 DO YOU WANT TO RESERVE YOUR RIGHT TO CALL
23
     MR. BREILING?
24
          MR. WAPNER: THANK YOU.
          THE COURT: YOU CALL HIM NOW AND WE WILL ADJOURN UNTIL
25
    1:30.
26
27
           MR. BARENS: YOU WOULDN'T LIKE TO ARGUE NOW AND BE DONE
```

THE COURT: NOW, IN 12 MINUTES OR 15 MINUTES? MR. CHIER: FIVE MINUTES. MR. BARENS: HOW LONG DO YOU WANT TO TAKE? MR. CHIER: FIVE, SIX MINUTES. MR. BARENS: LET ME CONFER WITH THE PEOPLE, BECAUSE IF WE CAN FINISH THIS THIS MORNING WE WON'T HAVE TO COME BACK. THE COURT: IF THE MOTION IS DENIED, WE HAVE SOME OTHER UNFINISHED BUSINESS WE CAN FINISH THIS AFTERNOON AND WE WILL BE READY FOR THE JURY TRIAL ON MONDAY IF IT IS DENIED. MR. BARENS: YES, INDEED. WHY DON'T WE DO IT AT 1:30, SINCE WE HAVE TO COME BACK AT 1:30 ANYHOW? THE COURT: YOU DO THAT. WHY DON'T YOU FIND OUT FROM BREILING, SINCE THERE HAS BEEN SOME TESTIMONY ABOUT THE MISSING PAPERS, YOU HAD BETTER ASK HIM ABOUT THAT. (AT 11:45 A.M. A RECESS WAS TAKEN UNTIL 1:30 P.M. OF THE SAME DAY.)

1 SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA; FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1987; 1:35 P.M. 2 DEPARTMENT WEST C HON. LAURENCE J. RITTENBAND, JUDGE 3 (APPEARANCES AS NOTED ON TITLE PAGE.) 4 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I WILL HEAR ARGUMENTS, NOW. 6 MR. BARENS: WELL, AS I ADVISED THE COURT, I WAS GOING 7 TO HAVE MR. CHIER ARGUE THIS MOTION. 8 MR. CHIER: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. IF IT PLEASE THE 9 COURT, COUNSEL, I ASSUME YOUR HONOR, THAT FROM THE PROGRESS 10 OF THINGS IN THIS COURT, THAT YOUR HONOR IS DENYING THE 11 DEFENSE LEAVE TO LITIGATE THE BONA FIDES OF THE SEARCH WARRANT 12 IN SAN MATEO COUNTY? 13 THE COURT: I AM NOT DOING ANYTHING. YOU CAN DO WHAT-14 EVER YOU WANT IN SAN MATEO COUNTY. 15 MR. CHIER: I AM ASSUMING THAT THERE IS NO CONTINUANCE 16 BEING GRANTED HERE? 17 THE COURT: THERE WON'T BE ANY CONTINUANCE GRANTED 18 FOR THAT PURPOSE HERE. 19 MR. CHIER: SO IT IS SOMEWHAT AWKWARD AT THIS MOMENT 20 IN TIME, TO BE ARGUING IN THIS CASE, THAT A DISMISSAL SHOULD 21 BE GRANTED BY REASON OF THE DELIBERATE AND CALCULATED 22 ENCROACHMENT BY THE PROSECUTION IN THE PRIVILAGED MATTERS 23 BECAUSE --24 THE COURT: WHICH PRIVILEGED MATTERS ARE YOU TALKING 25 ABOUT? 26 MR. CHIER: I AM TALKING ABOUT WORK PRODUCT AND --27 THE COURT: WHOSE WORK PRODUCT ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? 28

MR. CHIER: I AM TALKING ABOUT THE COMPUTER PRINTOUT

THAT --THE COURT: THERE WAS NOT ANYTHING AMONG THE PAPERS THAT I SAW WHICH SHOWED ME A COMPUTER PRINTOUT. MR. CHIER: WELL, I AM DISTINGUISHING -- COULD I JUST ARGUE? THE COURT: JUST GO AHEAD. GO AHEAD.

1

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

13

12

14 15

> 16 17

18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25 26

27

28

MR. CHIER: IN ORDER TO PROPERLY ADDRESS THIS ISSUE, WE HAVE TO GO TO THE GENESIS, WHICH IS THE PROCUREMENT BY OSCAR BREILING OF A SEARCH WARRANT FOR THE RESIDENCE OF, AS WE HAVE SEEN AND AS THEY ANTICIPATED, THE OFFICE OF THE DEFENDANT, JOE HUNT.

THE PROCUREMENT OF THE WARRANT IS NOTABLE IN SEVERAL RESPECTS: FIRST, THAT IT WAS PROCURED ON THE BASIS OF STALE INFORMATION.

THE COURT: STALE WHAT?

MR. CHIER: STALE INFORMATION, YOUR HONOR.

SECOND, THAT THE WARRANT OMITTED TO ADVISE THE ISSUING MAGISTRATE OF THAT CRITICAL INFORMATION, WHICH AGENT BREILING MADE SUCH AN ISSUE OF IN BRIEFING THE OFFICERS WHO WERE GOING TO SERVE THE WARRANT ON THE BELLAGIO LOCATION.

THE OMISSION FROM THE AFFIDAVIT OF THE FACT THAT THERE WERE LIKELY TO BE SENSITIVE MATERIALS OF A PRIVILEGED NATURE ON THE PREMISES, I THINK, WAS NOT AN ACCIDENT. IT WAS A DELIBERATE OMISSION, AS WAS THE FAILURE TO NOTIFY MR. WAPNER OR THIS TRIAL COURT CONCERNING THE INTENTIONS DURING A TIME WHEN MR. HUNT WAS IN TRIAL AND, OBVIOUSLY DISABLED FROM BEING PRESENT AT HIS HOME IN A TOTALLY DEFENSELESS POSITION VIS-A-VIS THE SERVICE OF THIS WARRANT.

THE WARRANT, ON ITS FACE, IS OVERLY BROAD. IT AUTHORIZES BY ITS TERMS THE SEIZURE OF NEARLY EVERYTHING, LEAVING TO THE SEIZING OFFICERS THE DISCRETION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT ANY PARTICULAR PIECE OF EVIDENCE IS WITHIN THE BROAD PARAMETERS OF THE WARRANT.

IN ORDER TO DETERMINE THE SEIZABILITY, EVERYTHING

THAT IS POTENTIALLY SEIZABLE MUST BE LOOKED AT BY THE OFFICERS AND EVALUATED.

NOW WE HAVE HEARD TESTIMONY DURING THESE PROCEEDINGS CONCERNING A KIND OF POLICE NEW SPEAK, THAT IS, "GLANCING"
IS NOT READING. BUT WE HAVE HEARD TESTIMONY FROM THE
DEFENDANT, WHICH IS UNCONTRADICTED AND PERHAPS CORROBORATED
BY THE TESTIMONY OF AGENT TULLENERS, THAT CERTAIN OF THESE
COMPUTER PRINTOUTS WHICH WERE THERE IN PLAIN VIEW BY THE
COMPUTER AND ON THE FLOOR, ON THE BED, HAD CONSPICUOUS
HEADNOTES ON. AGENT TULLENERS WAS ABLE TO GLEAN FROM HIS
GLANCING THAT ONE OF THE COMPUTER PRINTOUT STACKS HAD MATTERS
ON IT RELATIVE TO THE JURY SELECTION, SO HE THOUGHT AND SO
HE INFERRED.

NOW, I WOULD SUBMIT TO THE COURT, THAT IN AND OF ITSELF, THE DEFENSE NOTES AND NOTATIONS CONCERNING PARTICULAR PROSPECTIVE JURORS ARE IN ITSELF, A TYPE OF PRIVILEGED MATERIAL THAT IS DEFENSE MATTER AND THAT THE VOIR DIRE IN A CRIMINAL CASE IS NO LESS A PART OF THE TRIAL PROCESS THAN IS OPENING STATEMENT OR CLOSING ARGUMENT.

SO, THE THINGS THAT WE KNOW AND HAVE BEEN
DISCLOSED IN THIS COURTROOM, THAT WERE THERE ON THE PREMISES
TO BE VIEWED, WERE INEVITABLY VIEWED BY THE OFFICERS, WERE
MATTERS OF WORK PRODUCT AND DEFENSE-ORIENTED MATERIALS.

THE FACT THAT SOME OF THESE MATERIALS WERE LEFT BEHIND AND NOT SEIZED DOES NOT GAINSAY THAT THEY -- THERE HAVE BEEN MULTIPLE VIOLATIONS OF THE DEFENDANT'S RIGHTS IN THIS CASE.

IT IS SIGNIFICANT THAT THE OFFICERS ASSEMBLED AT THE BEVERLY HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT AND THAT EVERYBODY EXCEPT OFFICER KUHN OR WHATEVER HIS TITLE IS, MR. KUHN -- EVERYBODY EXCEPT MR. KUHN RECALLS IN VARYING DETAIL, THE BRIEFING GIVEN BY MR. BREILING.

THE SUBSTANCE OF THE TESTIMONY OF PERSONS WHO APPEARED HERE CONCERNING THE BRIEFING, WAS THAT THERE WERE LIKELY TO BE DEFENSE TYPES OF MATERIALS THERE, PRIVILEGED MATERIALS, WORK PRODUCT MATERIALS AND THAT THEY SHOULD BE CAREFUL IN THEIR SIFTING AND RUMMAGING THROUGH THESE PAPERS.

AND IT WAS AFTER ALL, ACCORDING TO THE SEARCH WARRANT, PAPERS THAT THEY WERE LOOKING FOR, NEVER MIND THAT THEY TOOK PAPERS FROM 1984, BY THE WAY. NEVER MIND THAT THEY TOOK TYPEWRITER RIBBONS, TYPEWRITER BALLS AND OTHER THINGS

WHICH ARE CLEARLY NOT WITHIN THE PARAMETERS OR DESCRIPTION CONTAINED IN THE WARRANT.

IN ANY EVENT, AT THIS BRIEFING, WE NOW HAVE

KNOWLEDGE, SCIENTER ON THE PART OF THE OFFICERS, SEARCHING

OFFICERS AND PARTICULARLY, OFFICER ZOELLER, WHO WAS THE -
HE HAD THE BIGGEST AX TO GRIND VIS-A-VIS MR. HUNT, YOUR HONOR.

I THINK IT WAS NOT AN ACCIDENT THAT MR. BREILING ASSEMBLED PERSONS WITH INTIMATE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROSECUTIONS OF MR. HUNT. IT WAS NOT AN ACCIDENT THAT MR. ZOELLER WAS INVITED. MR. BREILING CONCEDED ON THE STAND THAT HE WAS WELL AWARE THAT MR. ZOELLER MIGHT IN THE COURSE OF SEARCHING ON THE SAN MATEO WARRANT, HIT PAY DIRT OR HAVE A COLLATERAL BENEFIT BY THE SEIZURE OR VIEWING OF SOMETHING THAT WOULD AID THE PROSECUTION.

THE CASE OF <u>UNITED STATES V. GIGLIO</u> ESTABLISHES
THE RATHER IRREFUTABLE PRINCIPLE OF LAW THAT THERE IS ONE
GOVERNMENT, ONE PROSECUTION.

THE FACT THAT IT IS CLAIMED THAT MR. WAPNER HAS
NO KNOWLEDGE OF ANY OF THE MATTERS THAT WERE IN MR. HUNT'S
HOUSE, DOES NOT AID THE PROSECUTION IN THIS SITUATION ONE
IOTA. THE EVIDENCE AND INFORMATION DEEMED OR KNOWN TO
MR. ZOELLER AND SEEN BY MR. ZOELLER IS DEEMED TO BE KNOWLEDGE
OF THE ENTIRE PROSECUTION, JUST NOT THE BEVERLY HILLS POLICE
DEPARTMENT.

THERE IS VICARIOUS LIABILITY. THERE IS VICARIOUS RESPONSIBILITY. THERE IS THE KNOWLEDGE OF ALL OF THEM.

MR. ZOELLER IS A PERSON WHO INTERFACES WITH THE WITNESSES.

MR. ZOELLER IS A PERSON WHO INTERFACES WITH THE

DISTRICT ATTORNEY. MR. ZOELLER IS YOUR HONOR, A KEY PERSON IN THIS DRAMA AND THE INFORMATION SEEN BY HIM, ALTHOUGH IT WAS NOT TAKEN AND WE CONCEDE THAT THE COMPUTER THINGS DO NOT APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN ACTUALLY TAKEN AND PARENTHETICALLY, WHETHER THEY WERE PHOTOGRAPHED OR NOT REMAINS TO BE SEEN -- AND THERE ARE CERTAIN IRREGULARITIES WITH RESPECT TO THE PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG IN THAT THEY GO UP THERE WITH ROLLS OF 36 EXPOSURE FILM, SOME OF WHICH ARE COMPLETELY EXPOSED AND OTHERS, ODDLY ENOUGH, ARE LOPPED OFF AT EXPOSURE 10 OR 12.

BUT, BE THAT AS IT MAY, MR. ZOELLER'S VIEWING -AND IT IS VIRTUALLY INCONTESTABLE THAT HE DID VIEW THESE
THINGS, PUTS THE DEFENDANT IN THIS DILEMMA.

MR. ZOELLER, WHO IS THE LAST PERSON IN THE WORLD WHO SHOULD HAVE BEEN BROUGHT ALONG ON A SEARCH OF A DEFENDANT'S PREMISES IN THE MIDST OF A TRIAL, HAS BEEN EXPOSED TO MATERIALS WHICH THE DEFENSE WAS INTENDING TO USE IN THEIR DEFENSE OF THIS PERSON, MR. HUNT.

HE HAS BEEN AND THEY HAVE BEEN EXPOSED TO

MATERIALS ANALYZING AND CROSS-REFERENCING CERTAIN ASPECTS

OF THIS PROSECUTION AND THIS IS STATE ACTION, UNDER THE GUISE

OF THE FOURTH AMENDMENT, AND IT IS NOT JUSTIFICATION IN

CONTEMPLATION OF LAW FOR AN ENCROACHMENT OF A DEFENDANT'S

FIFTH AND SIXTH AMENDMENT PRIVILEGES TO SAY IT WAS DONE IN

THE NAME OF THE FOURTH AMENDMENT.

THE CASE OF TOWLER ESTABLISHES THAT THE GOOD INTENTIONS OF THE POLICE OR THE PROSECUTION IN MAKING THE ENCROACHMENT DO NOT MATTER.

IN TOWLER, YOUR HONOR, YOU WILL RECALL THAT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY WENT INTO THE JAIL CELL WITH A COURT ORDER TO GET A HANDWRITING EXEMPLAR AND IN THE PROCESS, HE VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY-CLIENT MATERIALS.

THE COURT FOUND IN TOWLER, YOUR HONOR, THAT
ALTHOUGH THERE WAS A LOFTY MOTIVE, THE DETERRENCE OF FUTURE
CRIME INVOLVED IN TOWLER, THAT THE INFRINGEMENT WAS DEPLORABLE
BUT SINCE THIS WAS BEING RAISED POST-TRIAL, IT WAS NOT
REVERSIBLE ERROR BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE
PREJUDICE.

NOW IN THIS CASE, THE CONUNDRUM THE DEFENDANT
IS IN IS THIS: HE CLAIMS, AND THERE IS CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE
TO COOROBORATE HIS CLAIM, THAT THERE WERE DEFENSE MATERIALS
IN THE ROOM THAT WAS SEARCHED FOR APPROXIMATELY THREE HOURS
BY NOT LESS THAN FOUR OFFICERS AT ANY GIVEN TIME.

NOW, IT IS INESCAPABLE -- IT IS INESCAPABLE THAT

IN SEARCHING A SMALL AREA SUCH AS THE ROOM THAT WE ARE TALKING

ABOUT FOR THREE HOURS BY MEN THAT HAVE BEEN TRAINED, A, OR

FIRST, TO SEARCH AND SECOND, WHO HAVE SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE ABOUT SPECIFIC MATTERS IN THIS CASE, IT IS INESCAPABLE THAT THEY MAY HAVE SEEN IN THE COURSE OF DIFFERENTIATING FROM SEIZABLE AND UNSEIZABLE ITEMS, MATTERS WHICH ARE PRIVILEGED.

NOW, THE DILEMMA OF THE DEFENDANT IS THAT SINCE IT IS CLAIMED THAT MR. WAPNER DOES NOT KNOW ABOUT THIS NOW AND, THEREFORE, HE IS NOT TAINTED, THAT IN ORDER FOR THE COURT TO PROPERLY RULE ON SUCH A CLAIM BY THE DEFENDANT, IT SHOULD PROPERLY HAVE A PREVIEW OR HAVE A DISCLOSURE BY THE DEFENDANT OF WHAT IT WAS THAT WAS THERE AND THEN AND ONLY THEN CAN THE COURT SAY WITH DEFINITION THAT WHAT WAS SEEN WAS INDEED PRIVILEGED OR WORK PRODUCT AND, THEREFORE, SANCTIONS ARE IN ORDER.

BUT THE DILEMMA THAT WE ARE IN, YOUR HONOR, AS SO INCISIVELY RECOGNIZED IN <u>BARBER</u> IS THAT WE ARE IN THE POSITION AS A RESULT OF STATE ACTION, OF HAVING TO REVEAL THE VERY THING WE ARE HERE TO PROTECT AND BECAUSE, YOUR HONOR, OF THE FACT THAT THIS WAS A CALCULATED RISK, THIS WAS A RISK ASSUMED BY MR. ZOELLER, AN AGENT OF THE PROSECUTION WHEN HE CHOSE NOT TO ADVISE YOUR HONOR, WHEN HE CHOSE NOT TO ADVISE YOUR HONOR, WHEN HE CHOSE NOT TO ADVISE ANYBODY CONCERNING HIS INTENTIONS, AND I THINK THAT WE CAN SHOW, WE CAN POINT TO A CONSCIOUSNESS OF IMPROPRIETY, TO SAY THE LEAST, ON THE PART OF MR. ZOELLER IN MAINTAINING HIS SILENCE.

HIS ALLEGED REASON FOR NOT CONTACTING MR. WAPNER
IS THAT MR. WAPNER IS AN ETHICAL AND HONEST PERSON AND HE
WAS AFRAID THAT MR. WAPNER MIGHT FEEL ETHICALLY OR LEGALLY
BOUND TO TAKE STEPS TO PREVENT THIS, WHICH HAS PUT US IN THE

VERY POSITION WE ARE HERE TODAY ARGUING THAT THIS CASE SHOULD BE DISMISSED.

AND IT IS BECAUSE, YOUR HONOR, OF THE DIFFICULTY
FOR THE DEFENDANT TO PROVE HIS PREJUDICE, IT IS THE UNSURENESS
OF WHAT MR. ZOELLER WILL DO WHEN HE INTERFACES WITH WITNESSES,
WHEN HE TALKS TO MR. WAPNER, WHEN HE ANSWERS QUESTIONS FROM
THE STAND. IT IS BECAUSE OF THE VERY DIFFICULTY IN PROVING
THE EXACT NATURE OF THE USE OR EXPLOITATION OF THE MATTERS
THAT WERE UNCONTESTABLY THERE AND SEEN BY THESE OFFICERS,
AND PARTICULARLY MR. ZOELLER, THAT THE ONLY APPROPRIATE
REMEDY IS DISMISSAL.

IT IS VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO PROVIDE ANY LESSER SANCTION.

AND THAT THE COURT'S ORDERING OF MR. ZOELLER
AND MR. BREILING AND THESE PEOPLE, THE COURT'S ORDERING THESE
PEOPLE NOT TO DISCUSS THIS IN ANY WAY, IS A MERE GENUFLECTION
IN THE DIRECTION OF SOME SORT OF REMEDY AND IS REALLY NO
REMEDY AT ALL, YOUR HONOR, BECAUSE THEY CAN'T -- THEY HAVE
TO TALK TO ONE ANOTHER. THEY HAVE TO INTERFACE BECAUSE OF
OTHER INTERRELATED MATTERS AND IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO ERASE FROM
THEIR MINDS THINGS THEY HAVE SEEN AND THAT WILL EITHER
CONSCIOUSLY OR UNCONSCIOUSLY AFFECT THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE

EVEN IF THE COURT MAKES SOME RULING ON THIS
ISSUE OF TAINT, REQUIRING THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY TO PROVE
BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT EVIDENCE OR TESTIMONY DERIVES
FROM AN INDEPENDENT SOURCE, THIS IS INADEQUATE BECAUSE IN
ORDER FOR THE COURT TO MAKE AND ENFORCE SUCH A SANCTION, THE

DEFENDANT HAS TO REVEAL HIS SECRETS TO THE COURT AND COUNSEL

TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE PERSON OR THE THING BEING

USED AGAINST HIM DERIVES FROM SOME INDEPENDENT SOURCE OR

DERIVES FROM THE DEFENDANT'S PAPERS.

AND IT IS FOR THIS REASON THAT THE PEOPLE ACTING THROUGH MR. ZOELLER HAVE ASSUMED THE RISK OF CONTINUANCE AND I SUBMIT, YOUR HONOR, THAT THERE IS NO LESSER REMEDY.

MR. CHIER: MAY I HAVE JUST A MOMENT?

THE COURT: YOU MEAN THE SAFEGUARDS WHICH I HAVE INDICATED TO THE PROSECUTION TEAM THAT HAS TESTIFIED HERE -- FIRST, I HAVE GOT TO ASSUME THAT THEY READ SOMETHING THAT THEY WOULD REMEMBER, WHICH THEY TESTIFIED THAT THEY DIDN'T.

YOU HAVE GOT TO ASSUME THAT THESE PEOPLE WILL
DISOBEY MY INJUNCTION NOT TO DISCUSS IT WITH THE DISTRICT
ATTORNEY OR WITH ANY WITNESSES, ANYTHING THAT THEY MIGHT HAVE
HEARD AND THAT THAT INFORMATION IF THEY HEARD IT, WILL LIE
BURIED WITH THEM, IF IT TOUCHES UPON THE CONFIDENTIAL
COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN THE ATTORNEY AND CLIENT OR ANY SOCALLED WORK PRODUCT.

YOU HAVE TO ASSUME THAT THEY WON'T LISTEN TO ME, WON'T FOLLOW MY INJUNCTIONS AND COMMUNICATE IT NONETHELESS, TO THE PEOPLE OR TO THE WITNESSES WHO WILL TESTIFY IN THIS CASE. IS THAT RIGHT? YOU DON'T BELIEVE THAT IT IS POSSIBLE TO BE SANITIZED?

MR. CHIER: WELL, I HAVE TO ASSUME A CERTAIN AMOUNT

OF THAT, YES, YOUR HONOR, WHETHER INTENTIONAL OR NOT -
THE COURT: YOU SAY THAT IT CANNOT BE IN ANY WAY

SANITIZED, AS SOME OF THE CASES STATE?

WE SHOULD KEEP IT FROM GOING INTO EVIDENCE BEFORE THIS JURY AND THERE IS NO HARM DONE?

MR. CHIER: WELL, COULD MR. ZOELLER BE PROHIBITED FROM SPEAKING TO THE WITNESSES?

THE COURT: HE HAS BEEN TOLD NOT TO, ABOUT ANY MATTER WHICH HE READ WHICH IS WITHIN THE SO-CALLED PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION WHICH HE SAID HE DIDN'T READ ANY.

BUT ASSUMING THAT HE DID, HE HAS BEEN FIRMLY ENJOINED NOT TO COMMUNICATE IT, ANY OF THAT INFORMATION TO ANYBODY.

MR. CHIER: BUT HE HAS NOT BEEN PROHIBITED FROM FLAT
OUT, SPEAKING TO THESE PEOPLE. HE HAS MERELY BEEN PROHIBITED
FROM SPEAKING --

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT ME TO MAKE IT MORE POSITIVE?

I WILL SEE THAT COUNSEL COMMUNICATES TO HIM.

I WILL MAKE IT MORE POSITIVE THAT HE IS NOT EVEN TO SPEAK TO ANY PEOPLE ABOUT ANY MATTER WHICH TOUCHES UPON THE FORBIDDEN FRUIT THAT SUPPOSEDLY, HE HAS TAKEN.

MR. CHIER: WELL, COULD I READ FROM <u>BARBER</u>? IT IS EXPRESSED BETTER THAN I CAN. ON THE FACTS OF <u>BARBER</u> --

THE COURT: WAS THAT A FOUR TO THREE DECISION?

MR. CHIER: THIS IS THE GLOVER COURT.

THE COURT: ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT BARBER OR GLOVER?

MR. CHIER: I AM TALKING ABOUT THE <u>GLOVER</u> COURT QUOTING <u>TOWLER</u>, SORRY, YOUR HONOR.

"ON THE FACTS OF BARBER, WE CONCLUDE

THAT AN EXCLUSIONARY SANCTION WOULD NOT ADEQUATELY

PROTECT THE DEFENDANT'S RIGHTS IN PART, BECAUSE IN

ORDER TO ENFORCE THAT SANCTION, NAMELY, THE SANCTION

OF FORCING THE PROSECUTION TO PROVE THE SOURCE OF

THEIR EVIDENCE, THE DEFENDANT WOULD HAVE BEEN

FORCED TO DIVULGE THE FULL CONTENTS OF CONVERSATIONS

TO WHICH THE POLICE INFORMANT ..."

THIS IS ANALOGOUS IN THIS CASE, TO MR. ZOELLER -THE COURT: WELL, THAT IS NOT TRUE. NOBODY IS FORCING

HIM TO DIVULGE ANYTHING TO ANYBODY.

MR. CHIER: BUT HERE IS THE THING, YOUR HONOR. IF SOMETHING SHOULD COME UP IN THE COURSE OF TRIAL WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT WAS NEVER PROVIDED TO THE DEFENDANT BY WAY OF DISCOVERY, BUT YET, WAS SOMETHING THAT COULD HAVE BEEN KNOWN TO THE PERSON TESTIFYING UNKNOWN TO THE PROSECUTION THROUGH ANY OF ITS AGENTS --

THE COURT: WELL, YOU WILL RECOGNIZE THAT WHEN IT COMES UP. YOU CAN COME UP TO THE BENCH AND ASK ME TO EXCLUDE THAT TESTIMONY AND I WILL SEE THAT IT IS DONE.

MR. CHIER: BUT YOU SEE, THERE IS NO WAY TO DO THIS
IN CASES WHERE LET'S SAY, THERE IS A SECONDARY USE OF IT.
IT IS EXPLOITED AND NOT USED DIRECTLY, JUDGE. THAT IS THE
DIFFICULTY WE ARE IN AND --

THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU MEAN BY "SECONDARY USE". HOW --

MR. CHIER: IF THEY GET A LEAD FROM SOMETHING. LET'S SAY THAT SOMETHING THEY SAW, THEY DON'T GO OUT AND USE IT DIRECTLY, BUT IT GIVES THEM A LEAD. SO, THERE IS AN ATTENUATED NEXUS.

THE COURT: THAT IS ASSUMING THAT THEY SAW SOMETHING WHICH THEY CAN USE. UNTIL IT IS PROVEN TO ME AS TO WHAT HE ACTUALLY SAW, THAT THEY WERE GOING TO USE, I CAN'T SPECULATE THAT MAYBE THERE IS SOMETHING THAT MAYBE THEY WILL USE.

I CAN'T MAKE A DECISION IN DISMISSING A MURDER TRIAL, A MURDER CASE IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITH A DEATH PENALTY, BASED UPON SOMETHING THAT YOU ARE SPECULATING ABOUT.

WHAT PARTICULARLY DO YOU WANT ME TO EXORCISE?

MR. CHIER: HERE IS WHAT BARBER SAYS ABOUT THIS VERY ISSUE:

"EVEN THE BLATANT USE OF ILLEGALLY
OBTAINED INFORMATION WILL BE DIFFICULT TO PROVE.
AS JUSTICE MARSHALL POINTS OUT, PROVING THAT AN
INFORMER REPORTED TO THE PROSECUTION ON DEFENSE
STRATEGY ..."

0B-1

I AM NOT CALLING MR. ZOELLER AN INFORMER. BUT .

FOR PURPOSES OF THIS ARGUMENT, HE IS IN THE ROLE OF AN INFORMER.

IT SAYS:

"PROVING THAT AN INFORMER REPORTED TO
THE PROSECUTION ON DEFENSE STRATEGY WILL SELDOM
BE POSSIBLE NOT ONLY BECAUSE SUCH PROOF REQUIRES
AN INFORMER OR PROSECUTOR TO ADMIT HIS OWN
WRONGDOING AND OPEN THE DOOR TO DAMAGE SUITS
AND AN ATTACK ON CONVICTIONS BUT ALSO BECAUSE
AN INFORMANT'S FAILURE TO MAKE A REPORT AFTER
OVERHEARING A LAWYER/CLIENT SESSION OFTENTIMES
CAN BE AN EFFECTIVE MEANS OF COMMUNICATING TO
THE PROSECUTOR THAT NOTHING SURPRISING WAS
UNCOVERED."

THE COURT: REFRESH MY RECOLLECTION. WHAT WAS THE NATURE OF THE CHARGE IN THE <u>BARBER</u> CASE?

MR. CHIER: I DON'T THINK THAT THE NATURE OF THE CHARGE
HAS ANY --

THE COURT: LET ME DECIDE THAT. WHAT WAS THE NATURE OF THE CHARGE THERE?

MR. CHIER: I BELIEVE THAT IT WAS A TRESPASSING. THERE WAS A --

THE COURT: DO YOU THINK THE SUPREME COURT, THAT

SUPREME COURT EVEN, NOT ANY LONGER OUR SUPREME COURT -- BUT

YOU SAY THAT THE SUPREME COURT IN THE MURDER CASE WHERE THE

DEATH PENALTY IS SOUGHT EQUATES BOTH CASES AND THE REASONING

IN THAT CASE WOULD ALSO APPLY TO THIS? IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE

TELLING ME? 1 MR. CHIER: I THINK THAT JUSTICE IS BLIND TO THE NATURE 2 OF THE CHARGES WHEN --3 THE COURT: NO. IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. IT IS THE 4 TYPE OF CHARGE, CRIME THAT YOU ARE GOING TO DISMISS. 5 MR. CHIER: YOU MEAN THERE IS A BALANCING PROCESS THAT 6 TAKES PLACE HERE? 7 THE COURT: YOU KNOW DAMN WELL. IT IS A MUCH MORE 8 SERIOUS CHARGE. THIS REQUIRES MUCH MORE SERIOUS CONSIDERATION. 9 MR. CHIER: RESPECTFULLY, I DISAGREE WITH THE COURT'S --10 THE COURT: YOU MEAN THAT A SPITTING ON THE SIDEWALK 11 CASE, INSOFAR AS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ARE CONCERNED, IS THE 12 SAME AS A MURDER CASE WHERE THE DEATH PENALTY IS SOUGHT? 13 MR. CHIER: WELL, INSOFAR AS THE PANOPLY OF RIGHTS 14 AVAILABLE TO THE DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL CASE, IT IS THE SAME. 15 YES. HE HAS A RIGHT TO COUNSEL EVEN IF IT IS A MISDEMEANOR. 16 HE HAS A RIGHT OF CROSS-EXAMINATION. 17 HE HAS THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION. 18 HE HAS THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE. HE HAS THE SAME --19 THE COURT: I JUST WANTED TO GET THAT EXPRESSION FROM 20 YOU AS TO WHETHER YOU THINK THAT THE SUPREME COURT, AS THEY 21 DID IN THAT CASE ON THE NATURE OF THE CHARGE IN THAT CASE --22 IT WOULD BE THE SAME AS IT WOULD IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE WHICH 23 IS A CAPITAL CASE, IF IT COMES UP BEFORE THEM. 24 25 MR. CHIER: I THINK THAT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ARE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, NO MATTER WHAT LEVEL --26 THE COURT: TO THE EXTENT OF DISMISSING A MURDER TRIAL? 27

MR. CHIER: YES, YOUR HONOR.

28

THE COURT: WELL, I JUST WANTED TO GET YOUR VIEW ON IT.

MR. CHIER: MAY I JUST SAY IN CONCLUSION YOUR HONOR,
THAT IN THIS CASE YOUR HONOR, WE HAVE SEEN THE PIECE OF PAPER
DATED 1987 WHICH MR. TULLENERS CHARACTERIZED AS EVIDENCE OF
I GUESS, AN INTENDED INFORMANT ASSASSINATION, PLANTING IN
THE GROUND LIKE A TREE OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

THE MORE LOGICAL, REASONABLE INTERPRETATION OF
THIS PIECE OF PAPER AND THE SCRIPTIC NOTATIONS IS THAT FIRST,
MR. HUNT IS APPARENTLY, IN COMMUNICATION WITH MR. PITTMAN.

THE COURT: THAT IS WHAT I SUSPECTED MYSELF.

MR. CHIER: ALL RIGHT.

THE COURT: I SUSPECTED IT WAS A CALL FROM PITTMAN

TO THE DEFENDANT AND HE MADE NOTES OF THE CALL HE HAD GOTTEN.

MR. CHIER: LOOK WHERE WE ARE AS A RESULT OF THIS,

JUDGE. THE VERY THING THAT YOU SUSPECTED AND WE SUSPECTED

IS PROBABLY SUSPECTED BY THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY SO WHAT DOES

HE KNOW FROM THIS? HE COULD KNOW FROM THIS THAT MR. HUNT'S

DEFENSE IS PROBABLY NOT CONFLICTING WITH MR. PITTMAN'S. THAT

IS VALUABLE INFORMATION TO A PROSECUTOR.

THE COURT: WHAT IS THERE TO INDICATE ANY NATURE OF THE DEFENSE?

MR. CHIER: THE FACT THAT --

THE COURT: TELL ME WHAT IS IN THAT DOCUMENT FROM WHICH
YOU CAN DRAW A CONCLUSION THAT PITTMAN WAS TELLING HIM ABOUT
A DEFENSE WHICH WAS GOING TO BE EXERCISED?

MR. CHIER: ITS EXISTENCE SUGGESTS THAT THESE PEOPLE ARE IN CONTACT AND IT WOULD, THEREFORE, BELIE THE FACT THAT THERE IS GOING TO BE CONFLICTING DEFENSES OFFERED BETWEEN MR. HUNT AND MR. PITTMAN.

IT IS NOT OBVIOUSLY INEXORABLE BUT THAT IS CERTAINLY A LEGITIMATE INFERENCE ONE COULD DRAW FROM THE CONTENTS OF THIS PIECE OF PAPER.

SOME THINGS EVEN BY OMISSION, THINGS DON'T HAVE
TO ACTUALLY COME RIGHT OUT AND HIT YOU RIGHT IN THE HEAD AND
SAY "THIS IS OUR DEFENSE," AND D-E-F-E-N-S-E, YOUR HONOR,
BUT THERE ARE MORE SUBTLE FORMS OF PREJUDICE JUST BY EXISTENCE
OR NONEXISTENCE OF THINGS.

THE COURT: YOU ARE GOING TO ASSUME THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS GOING TO BE ADMISSIBLE IN SUM IN THE ACTION UP NORTH OR WHETHER IT WOULD BE ADMISSIBLE IN THE ACTION HERE?

MR. CHIER: WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT ADMISSIBILITY.

THE COURT: THERE ISN'T ANYTHING IN THERE THAT CAN BE USED BY ANYBODY.

MR. CHIER: IT CAN BE USED BY WHAT IT SUGGESTS OR WHAT IT INFERS.

THE COURT: TELL ME WHAT IT CAN BE USED FOR.

MR. CHIER: WELL, YOUR HONOR, THAT IS THE PROBLEM I

AM IN. IF I WERE TO TELL YOU ALL OF THE EXHIBITS IN THAT

BOX, THERE WERE SOME SIXTY SOME, YOU KNOW, EXHIBITS, YOUR

HONOR, IF I WERE TO STAND HERE NOW AND HAVE TO TELL YOU EXACTLY

HOW EACH ONE OF THOSE DOCUMENTS IS GOING TO BE USED, I MEAN,

YOU KNOW, WE HAVE GIVEN AWAY THE STORE.

THE PROBLEM IS THAT TO CUNNING AND WILY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS THAT ARE FAMILIAR WITH THE CASE, THEY CAN FIGURE OUT FROM A MERE LOOKING AT THESE THINGS WHAT THEIR FUNCTION IS OR WHAT THEIR PURPOSE IS AND THAT IS WHERE YOU ARE PREJUDICED IN A SITUATION LIKE THIS.

IT IS NOT ANYTHING THAT NECESSARILY HAS TO BE THERE IN NEON LIGHTS. IT IS THE VERY EXISTENCE OF CERTAIN THINGS OR THE VERY SEGREGATION OF CERTAIN THINGS FROM OTHER THINGS, THE VERY ORDER OF THINGS, IN WHICH THE ITEMS ARE ORDERED, GIVES YOU INFORMATION THAT YOU SHOULDN'T OTHERWISE HAVE.

AND HOW ELSE ARE YOU GOING TO DETER THIS TYPE OF CONDUCT BY THE POLICE, WHEN THERE IS AN ONGOING TRIAL,

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

WHEN THERE IS EVIDENCE THAT THESE PEOPLE HAVE NOW, THEY KNOW FULL WELL THAT THIS IS A FAIRLY UNUSUAL SITUATION WHERE MR. HUNT IS MORE ACTIVELY PARTICIPATING IN HIS OWN DEFENSE.

THERE IS NO QUESTION THEY KNEW THERE WOULD BE THE POSSIBILITY OF THIS STUFF BEING THERE AND IT WAS THERE. IT WAS THERE. AND FOR MR. ZOELLER TO BE THERE IS JUST INEXCUSABLE, INCOMPREHENSIBLE AND I THINK UNCONSCIONABLE. IT IS SO EGREGIOUS IN MY MIND, SO I DON'T KNOW ANY LESSER SANCTION IS ADEQUATE AND I THANK YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: FIRST OF ALL, LET ME TRY AND STRUCTURE THIS SOMEWHAT. I THINK THAT THERE ARE SEVERAL SEPARATE ISSUES HERE.

FIRST OF ALL, THERE IS A QUESTION OF WHAT WAS ACTUALLY TAKEN AND THE COURT HAS HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW ALL OF THE ITEMS THAT WERE TAKEN, AND I WOULD ASK THE COURT AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE ARGUMENTS TO MAKE SOME FACTUAL FINDING AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE ITEMS THAT WERE TAKEN IN ANY WAY ENCOMPASSED THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE AND IF THEY DID. THEN WHAT THE APPROPRIATE REMEDY IS IN TERMS OF THAT.

AND FROM THE TESTIMONY THAT WE HAVE HAD FROM, AMONG OTHER PEOPLE, MR. HUNT THIS MORNING ON THE WITNESS STAND BY HIS OWN ADMISSION, MOST OF THOSE ITEMS WERE DOCUMENTS THAT WERE PREPARED IN 1983 AND 1984, BEFORE ANY ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE EXISTED OR RELATIONSHIP EXISTED THAT WOULD GIVE RISE TO A PRIVILEGE, SO THE COURT HAS TO MAKE OBVIOUSLY A FACTUAL DETERMINATION ON THE ITEMS THAT IT HAS BEFORE IT.

THEN THE NEXT QUESTION IS OF THE ITEMS THAT WERE

NOT TAKEN BUT WERE OBSERVED BY THE LAW ENFORCEMENT PEOPLE,
HAS THERE BEEN A SHOWING BY THE DEFENSE, WHO HAS THE BURDEN
IN THIS HEARING, THAT THEY SAW THINGS THAT ENCOMPASSED
ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED MATERIAL?

MR. CHIER ASSUMED IN HIS ARGUMENT THAT IT WAS UNCONTROVERTED THAT THEY SAW THESE THINGS. I DON'T ASSUME THAT AT ALL. IN FACT, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF AGENT TULLENERS, EVERY PERSON WHO TESTIFIED SAID THAT THEY DID NOT SEE THINGS THAT ENCOMPASSED LAWYER-CLIENT PRIVILEGE OR WORK PRODUCT MATERIALS.

AS THE COURT IS AWARE, DURING THE HEARING ON
THIS MOTION, I CONTINUED TO ATTEMPT TO OBJECT TO THE PHRASE
"DEFENSE MATERIALS" BECAUSE THAT IS TOO BROAD. WE ARE NOT
TALKING ABOUT DEFENSE MATERIALS BECAUSE DOCUMENTS THAT WERE
PREPARED IN 1983 AND 1984, DURING THE TIME THAT THE BBC WAS
IN OPERATION AND THE CRIMES IN THIS CASE OCCURRED, ARE NOT
WORK PRODUCT AND THEY ARE NOT PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS.
THE FACT THAT THEY MAY LATER GO ON TO BE USED BY THE DEFENSE
IN THE PREPARATION OF THE CASE DOESN'T SOMEHOW THEN ELEVATE
THESE DOCUMENTS TO THE STATUS OF EITHER PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS
OR WORK PRODUCT.

THE DEFENSE IN THIS CASE THAT THE PEOPLE SAW THINGS THAT WERE WORK PRODUCT, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE ITEM THAT AGENT TULLENERS SAID THAT HE SAW THAT HAD TO DO WITH SOMEBODY'S IMPRESSION OF ONE OF THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS IN THE CASE.

WELL, IN THAT INSTANCE, LET'S ASSUME THAT THAT IS EITHER WORK PRODUCT OR ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED MATERIAL. AGENT TULLENERS TESTIFIED THAT HE HAD NEVER TALKED TO OR MET ME UNTIL THE MORNING OF THAT HEARING AFTER THE JURY IN THIS CASE ALREADY HAD BEEN SELECTED AND THAT THAT INFORMATION WAS NOT COMMUNICATED TO ME OR TO ANYONE ELSE.

AND LET'S ASSUME THAT HE TOLD OTHER PEOPLE, WHICH HE SAID HE DIDN'T DO. SO WHAT? THERE IS NO PREJUDICE IN ANY WAY DEMONSTRATED BY THE USE OF THAT MATERIAL, EVEN THOUGH HE COULDN'T EVEN REMEMBER THE NAME OF THE PERSON WHO WAS ON THERE OR THE SPECIFIC INFORMATION THAT THE DOCUMENT CONTAINED.

AS FAR AS THE NOTE THAT WAS SEIZED THAT HAD TO DO SOMEHOW WITH PLANTING SNITCHES, AS FAR AS THAT PARTICULAR PIECE OF PAPER IS CONCERNED, I THINK THAT WITHOUT CONCEDING THAT IT IS PRIVILEGED OR WORK PRODUCT OR ANYTHING ELSE, THAT IF THE COURT TAKES THE STEP OF SAYING, "OKAY, THE SANCTION AS FAR AS THAT PIECE OF PAPER IS CONCERNED IS THAT THE PROSECUTION DOESN'T USE THAT PIECE OF PAPER OR ANY INFORMATION DERIVED FROM IT," SEEMS TO ME THAT IT IS SUFFICIENT.

MR. CHIER SAYS THAT IT IS INCONCEIVABLE THAT THE OFFICERS SAW THESE THINGS. I ASSUME THAT THAT IS BASED ON THE TESTIMONY OF THE OTHER PEOPLE THAT WERE IN THAT HOUSE.
BUT I SUBMIT TO YOU, THAT THOSE PEOPLE DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY SAW.

THEY DON'T KNOW WHO THEY SAW DOING WHAT. THEY WERE IN AND OUT OF THOSE ROOMS. AND THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT WAS ON THE PIECES OF PAPER THAT THE PEOPLE WERE LOOKING AT.

ONE EXAMPLE OF COURSE, IS MR. HUNT, WHO SAYS THAT I WENT THROUGH ALL OF THE ITEMS WHEN I GOT BACK AND OF ALL OF THE PIECES OF COMPUTER PAPER THAT WERE THERE AND THAT WERE IN THE TRASH CAN, I REMEMBER WHAT WAS IN MY TRASH THAT I PUT THERE APPROXIMATELY A WEEK OR SO BEFORE.

THERE WERE THREE OR FOUR PIECES MISSING THAT I

CAN'T FIND LATER. AND THEREFORE, THE OFFICERS MUST HAVE TAKEN

THEM.

WELL, THE COURT HAS GONE THROUGH THE BOX AND BASICALLY HAS GOTTEN MR. HUNT TO AGREE WITH THE COURT ON THE STAND, THERE WEREN'T ANY PAPERS IN THAT BOX THAT WERE GENERATED BY THAT COMPUTER.

SO, I THINK IT CALLS MR. HUNT'S CREDIBILITY AS
TO THAT PARTICULAR POINT INTO SERIOUS QUESTION.

THE COURT: BEFORE THE BOXES WERE TAKEN AWAY, DID

MR. TULLENERS TESTIFY THAT MR. CHIER WAS GIVEN EVERY

OPPORTUNITY TO EXAMINE EVERY PIECE OF PAPER, EVERY DOCUMENT

THAT WAS PLACED IN THE BOXES BEFORE THEY WERE TAKEN AWAY?

MR. WAPNER: YES AND COULD HAVE AS MUCH TIME AS HE
WANTED TO, TO DO IT. HE WAS IN NO RUSH. AND AGENT TULLENERS

HAD GONE THERE EXPECTING TO SPEND THE WHOLE DAY THERE.

ALSO, THE POINT THAT THE COURT MAKES ABOUT THE
DISTINCTION BETWEEN THIS CASE AND <u>BARBER</u> I THINK, IS APT WHEN
YOU TAKE A LOOK AT THE OTHER CASES THAT --

THE COURT: WILL FOLLOW BARBER?

MR. WAPNER: AND SOME WHICH PRECEDE IT. BUT THERE ARE MURDER CASES, THE <u>GLOVER</u> CASE IN PARTICULAR THAT I CITED, THAT WERE MUCH MORE EGREGIOUS VIOLATIONS THAN WE HAVE HERE.

IN THE GLOVER CASE, ALTHOUGH IT WAS A SEARCH OF
THE DEFENDANT'S JAIL CELL WITH A SEARCH WARRANT, FIRST, THEY
WENT IN WITH THE USE OF TELLING HIM THAT HIS LAWYER WAS THERE,
SO THAT HE WOULD GATHER UP ALL OF HIS LEGAL PAPERS AND THEN
THEY STOPPED HIM.

THEY TOOK THE PAPERS AWAY FROM HIM. THEY LOOKED

AT HIS LEGAL PAPERS AND ALTHOUGH THEY WERE SEALED, THE

DISTRICT ATTORNEY THEN GOT AN ORDER THAT THEY BE TURNED OVER

TO HIM BY WAY OF DISCOVERY AND THEY WERE.

IT WAS UNDISPUTED IN THAT CASE THAT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND THE POLICE DEPARTMENT HAD READ CERTAIN ITEMS THAT WERE CONTAINED IN THERE.

THE <u>GLOVER</u> COURT DIDN'T HAVE ANY TROUBLE IN FASHIONING A REMEMDY SHORT OF DISMISSAL IN THAT CASE.

THE COURT: AND THAT CASE, TO BE SURE, NONE OF THAT EVIDENCE GOT INTO THE TRIAL. IS THAT RIGHT?

MR. WAPNER: THAT'S RIGHT. AND <u>TOWLER</u>, IN A SIMILAR FASHION, WAS A SEARCH OF THE JAIL CELL WHERE THE PROSECUTOR HIMSELF, THE PERSON ACTUALLY PROSECUTING THE CASE, READ A SYNOPSIS OF THE DEFENSE IN THAT CASE.

AND ALTHOUGH THE CASE WAS DECIDED BASED ON THE FACT THAT THE DEFENDANT HAD FAILED TO ASK FOR A DISMISSAL IN THE LOWER COURT AND THEREFORE, WAS BARRED FROM URGING THAT ON APPEAL, THEY DID SAY IN DICTA, THAT REMEDIES SHORT OF DISMISSAL COULD BE FASHIONED IN THAT CASE.

AND ALSO, THERE IS A CASE THAT PRECEDED <u>BARBER</u>,
AN APPELLATE CASE, THE <u>WILSON</u> CASE, WHERE A LAWYER CAME WITH
A CLIENT TO SURRENDER HIM TO THE POLICE STATION. THEY FIRST
OF ALL, SEPARATED THE LAWYER AND THE CLIENT AND WOULDN'T LET
HER BE PRESENT WHEN SHE WAS OBJECTING TO THE CLIENT BEING
QUESTIONED.

THEN WHEN THEY PUT THE LAWYER AND THE CLIENT IN

A ROOM TO SPEAK WITH EACH OTHER, THE POLICE TAPED THE

CONVERSATION BETWEEN THE LAWYER AND THE CLIENT AND THEN LATER

PLAYED THAT TAPE FOR SEVERAL PEOPLE.

IT WAS UNCLEAR FROM THE RECORD, EXACTLY HOW MANY
PEOPLE OR WHO THEY WERE. BUT IT WAS TAPED. THERE WERE
PERSONNEL FROM THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE WHO HEARD THAT.

THERE WERE AS MANY AS EIGHT TO TWENTY PEOPLE WHO HAD HEARD THE RECORDING. THE COURT IN THAT CASE HAD NO TROUBLE COMING TO A REMEDY SHORT OF DISMISSING THE CASE.

THE PROBLEM IN <u>BARBER</u> WAS THAT EVERYTHING WAS ORAL AND IT WAS AN INFORMANT WHO HAD INTENTIONALLY BEEN PLANTED BY THE POLICE DEPARTMENT TO LISTEN IN ON THESE ATTORNEY/CLIENT CONVERSATIONS.

THERE IS NO PROOF IN THIS CASE THAT THERE WERE

ANY ATTORNEY/CLIENT COMMUNICATIONS THAT WERE OVERHEARD.

I THINK THE RECORD IN THIS HEARING, FALLS FAR SHORT OF

PROOF THAT ANYTHING THAT WAS READ BY THE PEOPLE WHO WERE

THERE ENCOMPASSED AN ATTORNEY/CLIENT CONVERSATION OR ANY KIND

OF PRIVILEGED MATERIAL.

AND I THINK FURTHER, THAT THE OFFICERS WERE EXCEEDINGLY CAREFUL IN NOT READING THAT MATERIAL AND IN FACT, AGENT BREILING BRIEFED ALL OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO WERE DOING THE SEARCH ON THAT MATTER.

I AM PERFECTLY COMFORTABLE WITH THE SANCTION FROM THE COURT, THAT NONE OF THE MATERIAL THAT WAS TAKEN -- LET'S EVEN ASSUME THAT IT WAS LAWFULLY SEIZED BY THE POLICE DEPARTMENT. I WAS PREPARED TO GO TO TRIAL WITHOUT THAT

I AM STILL PREPARED TO GO TO TRIAL WITHOUT THAT MATERIAL, EVEN THOUGH MUCH OF IT I SUBMIT TO THE COURT, WAS LAWFULLY SEIZED UNDER THAT WARRANT AND PROBABLY COULD BE TURNED OVER TO THE PROSECUTION AFTER PROPER LITIGATION IN SAN MATEO COUNTY.

BUT IF THE COURT MAKES AN ORDER IN THIS CASE THAT

NONE OF THE CONTENTS OF THE ITEMS THAT WERE SEIZED SHOULD

BE DIVULGED TO THE PROSECUTION IN THIS CASE, THEN I THINK

THAT IS A SUFFICIENT --

THE COURT: WELL, SUPPOSE THERE IS NO CONFIDENTIAL

COMMUNICATIONS OR ATTORNEY/CLIENT CORRESPONDENCE OF ANY KIND

OR WORK-RELATED OR PRODUCT-RELATED, IS THERE ANYTHING TO

PREVENT THE DISCLOSURE OF ANYTHING AMONG THE PAPERS WHICH

WERE SEIZED, TO THE PROSECUTION IN THIS CASE?

MR. WAPNER: LEGALLY, PROBABLY NOT.

THE COURT: WHY NOT? YOU MEAN, DOCUMENTS THAT HAVE
BEEN PROPERLY SEIZED AND THEY DON'T FALL WITHIN THE PRIVILEGE,
IT CAN'T BE USED BY YOU?

MR. WAPNER: YOU SAID, "IS THERE ANYTHING TO PREVENT

THE COURT: THAT IS WHAT I SAID, YES.

MR. WAPNER: I SAID THAT THERE PROBABLY IS NOTHING TO PREVENT IT.

THE COURT: SO, ANYTHING SEIZED ISN'T TAINTED BY ANY CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION OR ATTORNEY/CLIENT PRIVILEGE AND MAY BE USED BY YOU. IS THAT TRUE?

NOW, IS IT YOUR POSITION THAT YOU WOULD HAVE A

MR. WAPNER: I THINK THAT PROBABLY THAT IS TRUE.

OUT OF AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION --

THE COURT: THAT IS WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN DOING ALL
THROUGHOUT HAS BEEN OUT OF AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION ON EVERYTHING
YOU HAVE DONE ON THIS CASE TO MAKE SURE THERE IS NO ERROR
WHICH OCCURS.

MR. WAPNER: LET ME JUST SAY ONE THING TO THE COURT IN THAT VEIN.

I AM NOT SURE WHAT THE COURT IS SAYING, BUT IN

ANY EVENT, THIS WAS NOT SUGGESTED BY COUNSEL, BUT I THINK

THAT THE ARGUMENT COULD BE MADE THAT A PORTION OF THOSE

DOCUMENTS THAT NOW HAS BECOME AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION

WOULD BE THAT NOTATION -- NOT THE DOCUMENT ITSELF -- I AM

NOT TALKING ABOUT THE DOCUMENT ITSELF, BUT THE NOTATION ON

THE DOCUMENT OF A STICKER WITH A NUMBER ON IT, WHICH IS

TANTAMOUNT TO A STATEMENT BY SOMEONE, PRESUMABLY A WITNESS,

BASED ON THE TESTIMONY AT THIS HEARING, WHICH "WE INTEND TO

USE TO IMPEACH A WITNESS WITH" AND SO ON AND SO FORTH, ALL

I AM SUGGESTING IS IF THE COURT DECIDES THAT IT IS GOING TO

TURN THE MATTERS OVER TO THE PROSECUTION OR IF THE COURT IS

MAKING A RULING THAT THERE WAS NO PRIVILEGE OR ANYTHING, THAT

ANY NOTATION ON THE DOCUMENTS THAT THEY ARE --

THE COURT: YOU MEAN MERELY A STICKER WITH A "37" ON THAT, IT IS COMPLETELY MEANINGLESS. NOBODY WOULD WANT TO INTRODUCE THAT INTO EVIDENCE. FOR WHAT PURPOSE?

MR. WAPNER: I AM NOT SUGGESTING I WOULD INTRODUCE
THE STICKER. THAT IS NOT WHAT I AM SAYING, THAT THE STICKER
IS TANTAMOUNT TO A STATEMENT, WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT WAS

SUGGESTED, "WE INTENDED TO USE THAT TO IMPEACH A WITNESS."

THE COURT: WHAT ABOUT THE IMPLICATION IN MR. BARENS'
CROSS-EXAMINATION OF SOME OF YOUR WITNESSES THAT THIS WASN'T
A BONA FIDE SEARCH WARRANT WHICH WAS SOUGHT?

THAT WHAT THE REASON FOR SEEKING IT WAS, AND
THE REASON FOR HAVING ZOELLER AND THE L.A. POLICE OFFICERS
PRESENT AT THAT TIME WAS TO TRY TO GET EVIDENCE, NOT IN THIS
CASE OR IN THE CASE UP THERE, BUT SOME OTHER MATTER, AND THAT
IT WAS JUST A SUBTERFUGE AND TO BE USED FOR THAT PARTICULAR
PURPOSE AND, THEREFORE, THAT TAINTS THE ENTIRE SEARCH?

MR. WAPNER: WELL, I DON'T THINK THAT THERE IS ANY EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THAT.

THE COURT: LOOK, HE SAYS THERE IS AN INFERENCE: WHY
DO THEY SELECT ZOELLER, WHO IS THE PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR IN
THIS PARTICULAR CASE? AND WHY DID THEY SEEK THESE OTHER
OFFICERS, ITO AND ROZZI AND SOME OF THE OTHERS, WHO WERE
INTERESTED IN THIS MURDER IN HOLLYWOOD, BUT FOR THE PURPOSE
OF TRYING TO GET EVIDENCE THAT THERE MIGHT POSSIBLY BE THERE,
IMPLICATING HIM EITHER IN THIS CASE OR ON THOSE CASES IN
HOLLYWOOD?

MR. WAPNER: WELL, FIRST OF ALL, LET ME ADDRESS THAT IN TWO WAYS: FIRST OF ALL, I THINK THE FACT THAT DETECTIVE BREILING, AGENT BREILING WENT TO TWO OR THREE DIFFERENT PEOPLE IN THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE AND THEN TO A JUDGE IN SAN MATEO COUNTY AND HAD A JUDICIALLY AUTHORIZED SEARCH, IS EVIDENCE OF THEIR GOOD FAITH AND THAT THEY GOT THE WARRANT FOR PRECISELY THE REASONS THAT WERE STATED IN THE WARRANT.

AND I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANY EVIDENCE --

THE COURT: PARENTHETICALLY, YOU BELIEVE THE SEARCH WARRANT WAS VALIDLY ISSUED AND BASED UPON AN AFFIDAVIT OF GOOD CAUSE?

MR. WAPNER: YES, I DO.

THAT WHETHER THE SEARCH WARRANT WAS VALID AND/OR WHETHER IT

WAS A SUBTERFUGE IS BASICALLY NOT GERMANE TO THE ISSUE BEFORE

THIS COURT BECAUSE THE QUESTION IS: WHAT DID THE PEOPLE WHO

WERE THERE SEE? DID THEY SEE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED

COMMUNICATIONS? AND DID THEY SEE WORK PRODUCT?

IT IS GERMANE TO THE ISSUE BEFORE THIS COURT

ONLY TO ONE EXTENT, WHICH IS IF THE SEARCH WARRANT WAS NOT

VALID AND THE ITEMS THAT THEY TOOK, THEREFORE, ARE NOT PROPERLY

SEIZABLE, THEN THEY CAN'T BE TURNED OVER -- THEY CAN'T BE

USED BY THE PROSECUTION IN THAT CASE OR IN THIS CASE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: BUT IF --

THE COURT: AND IF THERE WAS ANYTHING SEEN, IT CANNOT BE USED IN THIS CASE AND NO COMMUNICATION OF THAT MATERIAL SHOULD BE MADE TO EITHER YOU OR ANY PROSPECTIVE WITNESS IN THE CASE, INCLUDING THE POLICE OFFICERS.

MR. WAPNER: RIGHT.

THE COURT: IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE SAYING?

MR. WAPNER: WELL, THE QUESTION REALLY IS: DID THEY VIOLATE ANY PRIVILEGE.

WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IS, IF IT IS NOT A LAWFUL WARRANT, THEY CAN'T USE THE INFORMATION IN ANY EVENT?

THE COURT: THAT IS CORRECT.

WELL, MY PRESENT THINKING IS THAT IT WAS ON ITS

FACE, IT LOOKS LIKE A PERFECTLY VALID SEARCH WARRANT AND ON

ITS FACE WITH THE SUPPORTING AFFIDAVIT OF GOOD CAUSE THAT

SUPPORTS THE ISSUANCE OF A SEARCH WARRANT, SO IF I WERE TO

DETERMINE IT AB INITIO, I WOULD SAY IT IS A VALID WARRANT

AND A VALID AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF THE WARRANT. I HAVE READ

IT AND I HAVE STUDIED IT CAREFULLY AND I HAVE REACHED THE

CONCLUSION THAT THE WARRANT WAS A VALID WARRANT VALIDLY ISSUED

AND VALIDLY SERVED AND VALIDLY SUPPORTED BY THE AFFIDAVIT

OF GOOD CAUSE.

NOW WE REACH ANOTHER POINT. THE THRESHOLD POINT IS, ASSUMING THAT TO BE DONE AT THE TIME OF THE SEARCH, WHAT THEY SEIZED WAS THAT IN ANY WAY IN VIOLATION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE DEFENDANT?

NOW, THERE IS EVIDENCE ON BOTH SIDES, ISN'T THERE?

YOU HAVE HEARD FROM THE WITNESSES, THE FAMILY WHO WERE THERE,

1 WHO SAY THEY SAW THEM EXAMINE EVERY SINGLE DOCUMENT AND READ 2 IT CAREFULLY, APPARENTLY EVERY SINGLE PIECE OF PAPER THAT 3 WAS THERE, THEY READ -- AND I DON'T KNOW THAT THEY ACTUALLY 4 SAID THEY SEIZED ALL OF IT, THOUGH, I DON'T REMEMBER THEIR HAVING SAID THAT. BUT WE KNOW ONE THING, HOWEVER, AND I THINK 5 6 I CAN MAKE A FINDING TO THAT EFFECT: THAT THERE WAS NOTHING 7 IN ANY WAY CONFIDENTIAL, IN ANY WAY WAS THERE ATTORNEY-CLIENT 8 PRIVILEGED OR WORK PRODUCT WHICH WAS ACTUALLY SEIZED. [F WE BELIEVE MR. TULLENERS THAT EVERYTHING IN THAT BOX THAT 10 WAS ACTUALLY TAKEN AWAY HAD BEEN EXAMINED BY MR. CHIER AND 11 NO OBJECTION MADE TO ANY ONE OF THEM, HE HAD SUFFICIENT TIME 12 13 14

IN WHICH TO DO IT. IF I HAD TO DECIDE THAT ISSUE, I WOULD DECIDE THAT HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXAMINE THOSE DOCUMENTS AND I HAVE TO REACH THE CONCLUSION THERE WAS NOTHING AMONGST THOSE DOCUMENTS WHICH WAS IN ANY WAY CONFIDENTIAL WHICH WAS SACROSANCT AND I AM MAKING THAT FINDING NOW.

MR. WAPNER: OKAY, WHICH LEAVES THE SECOND ISSUE, WHICH IS THE ISSUE OF WHAT WAS SEEN BUT NOT TAKEN.

THE COURT: THAT IS CORRECT. AS TO THAT, WE HAVE GOT A CONFLICT OF TESTIMONY, HAVEN'T WE? WE HAVE THE TESTIMONY OF ALL OF THE POLICE OFFICERS THAT, FIRST, THEY WERE ENJOINED CLEARLY AND DIRECTED NOT IN ANY WAY TO READ OR TO SEIZE ANYTHING WHICH MIGHT LOOK LIKE AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION AND EACH ONE OF THEM TESTIFIED CATEGORICALLY THAT THEY DIDN'T DO THAT, EXCEPT FOR THE POSSIBLE EXCEPTION OF MR. TULLENERS, WHO TESTIFIED ONLY WITH RESPECT TO WHAT APPEARED TO BE NOTES AND COMMENTS ON A VOIR DIRE OF A PROSPECTIVE JUROR. AND I

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

CAN'T CHARACTERIZE THAT, AS APPARENTLY IT WAS DONE BY THE DEFENDANT, WHO IS VERY CONSCIENTIOUS ABOUT EVERYTHING THAT HAPPENED IN THIS CASE AND TOOK NOTES VOLUNIMOUSLY, BUT I CAN'T CHARACTERIZE THAT AS BEING A VIOLATION OF ANY PRIVILEGE. IT IS SOMETHING THAT HE HIMSELF TOOK AND DID WITHOUT ANY COMMUNICATIONS TO ANYBODY. SO EVEN THAT, I DISCOUNT. I DON'T THINK THAT IS A CAUSE FOR DISMISSING A MURDER CHARGE MERELY BECAUSE SOMEBODY LOOKED AT A COMMENT ON VOIR DIRE OF A PARTICULAR JUROR.

THAT IS WHY I ASKED THE QUESTION BEFORE, DOES

IT MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE WHAT TYPE OF CASE IT IS, BEFORE WE

REACH THE CONCLUSION TO DISMISS IT. AND WITHOUT MORE SERIOUSLY

CONSIDERING DISMISSING A MURDER CHARGE, RATHER THAN ONE

INVOLVED IN THE BARBER CASE AND IT IS MY OPINION AND I WILL

STATE IT ON THE RECORD, THAT I THINK IF THE SUPREME COURT

HAD TO CONSIDER DISMISSING A MURDER CHARGE WHERE THE DEATH

PENALTY IS SOUGHT FOR THE KIND OF CONDUCT THAT TOOK PLACE,

THAT THEIR CONCLUSION MIGHT BE DIFFERENT.

EVEN IF THAT CASE WAS A FOUR TO THREE DECISION

IF I REMEMBER CORRECTLY, AND THREE OF THE MEMBERS OF THAT -
OR MOST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE MAJORITY OPINION ARE FROM

JUSTICES WHO ARE NO LONGER ON THE COURT AND CONCEIVABLY,

ANOTHER SUPREME COURT MIGHT ACT DIFFERENTLY.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, I ALSO THINK THE CASES THAT HAVE BEEN DECIDED SINCE THEN, SUPPORT THE COURT'S POSITION.

THE COURT: WHEN THAT CASE HAS BEEN DISTINGUISHED, ANY NUMBER OF TIMES, I DON'T KNOW OF ANY, SINGLE CASE IN WHICH IT HAS FOLLOWED ON THE FACTS OF THAT CASE.

IN ANY EVENT, YOU HAVE GOT AN INDICATION FROM ME. I FIND FIRST THAT ON ITS FACE, THAT THE SEARCH WARRANT WAS VALID.

TWO, IT WAS ADEQUATELY SUPPORTED BY THE AFFIDAVIT.

I BELIEVE THAT ALL OF THE PEOPLE WHO ENGAGED IN THE PARTICULAR

SEARCH AND SEIZURE WERE ADEQUATELY AND FIRMLY AND

CATEGORICALLY ADVISED UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES, TO SEIZE OR

TAKE OR READ OR DO ANYTHING WITH RESPECT TO ANY MATTER WHICH

INVOLVED THE ATTORNEY/CLIENT RELATIONSHIP OR OTHERWISE

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PRIVILEGED.

AND WHATEVER THEIR PURPOSE MAY HAVE BEEN, I DON'T THINK IT IS EVEN MATERIAL THAT THEY WENT IN THERE ASSUMING THAT THEY MIGHT BE ABLE TO FIND SOMETHING. THAT HAPPENS IN EVERY CASE, ANY KIND OF A SEARCH WARRANT, THAT THEY MIGHT BE LOOKING FOR THINGS, HOPING THERE MIGHT BE SOMETHING ELSE UNCOVERED.

BUT I DON'T THINK THAT THIS IS INVALIDATING THE SEARCH.

SO, I WILL DENY THE MOTION. ALL RIGHT.

NOW, WE HAVE ANOTHER MOTION PENDING, HAVE WE NOT?

HAVE YOU READ THE O'HARE CASE?

MR. BARENS: I BELIEVE MR. CHIER DID.

HOWEVER, I THINK RELATIVE TO THE ARCE MATTER, WE CAN MAKE THIS RATHER SIMPLE, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ARCE?

MR. BARENS: YOU ARE REFERENCING THE ARCE MOTION?

THE COURT: YES.

MR. BARENS: DOESN'T <u>O'HARE</u> HAVE TO DO WITH THE ARCE

20 MATTER?

THE COURT: YES.

MR. BARENS: THE MATTER IS SUBMITTED.

THE COURT: LET ME HEAR FROM YOU. I DON'T WANT TO MAKE
A JUDGMENT UNLESS I FEEL I AM DOING THE RIGHT THING.

DO YOU FEEL THAT <u>O'HARE</u> IS NOT CONCLUSIVE, BUT VERY PERSUASIVE ON THE MOTION?

MR. BARENS: MR. CHIER READ O'HARE. I DID NOT.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THEN I WILL GET MR. CHIER'S

VERSION OF IT. I WILL HEAR FROM YOU.

MR. CHIER: FROM A CURSORY EXAMINATION, IT WOULD APPEAR
THAT AT LEAST AS TO A PORTION OF THE POINTS BEING URGED IN
OUR MOTION THAT THE O'HARE CASE COULD BE SEEN AS DISPOSITIVE.

I HATE TO ENGAGE IN THIS AMBIGUOUS LAWYER TALK.

BUT THERE WERE OTHER ASPECTS OF THE MOTION WHICH I DO NOT

THINK ARE ADDRESSED BY O'HARE, SUCH AS THE QUESTION OF WHETHER

OR NOT PERSONS ARE TOO EASILY EXCUSED FOR HARDSHIP, THE

COMPOSITION OF THE NUMBER OF YOUNG PEOPLE AND THE NUMBER OF

POOR PEOPLE AND THAT TYPE OF STUFF.

I WOULD BE WILLING TO JUST SUBMIT IT ON THE BASIS

OF THE MOTIONS --

THE COURT: YOU MEAN THAT YOU CANNOT INQUIRE OF PEOPLE WHETHER OR NOT IT WOULD BE AN ECONOMIC HARDSHIP FOR THEM?

YOU MUST TAKE THEM AND INSIST UPON THEIR STAYING, EVEN THOUGH

THEY ARE POOR AND COULDN'T AFFORD TO DO IT?

MR. CHIER: WELL, AS I SEE IT, JUDGE, THE FACT THAT

THE JURORS GET TEN OR TWELVE DOLLARS A DAY, WHICH IS NOT EVEN

A LIVING WAGE --

THE COURT: OF COURSE NOT.

MR. CHIER: YOU WOULD TEND TO GET EITHER A PROFESSIONAL JUROR, A RETIRED PERSON. YOU DON'T GET A TRUE CROSS-SECTION.

THE COURT: YES. YOU DO GET A LOT OF EMPLOYED PEOPLE WHOSE EMPLOYERS ARE WILLING TO PAY THEM.

MR. CHIER: WELL, YOU DON'T -- YOU TEND TO GET PEOPLE FROM THE LARGE CORPORATIONS WHO ARE MORE MIDDLE CLASS. THEY HAVE MORE MIDDLE CLASS VALUES. IT IS A SEGMENT OF THE POPULATION, JUDGE, THAT IS DIFFERENT FROM PEOPLE THAT WORK FOR SMALLER COMPANIES, THAT DON'T HAVE THE SAME TYPE OF CORPORATE MENTALITY.

THE COURT: YOU MEAN WE SHOULD GO DOWN TO SKID ROW AND PICK OUT PEOPLE THERE?

MR. CHIER: WELL, I THINK THAT THERE IS SOMETHING SHORT OF THAT, THAT IS MISSING FROM THE JURY PANEL, YOUR HONOR.

OBVIOUSLY, THE SKID ROW PEOPLE WOULD NOT QUALIFY.

THE COURT: WHAT HAVE YOU TO SAY ABOUT THAT, MR. WAPNER? COUNSEL CONCEDES THAT THE LARGE PART OF THE OPINION IN O'HARE, SEEMS TO BE ALMOST DETERMINATIVE EXCEPT FOR THE OTHER POINTS THAT HE MADE ABOUT POOR PEOPLE NOT BEING ON A JURY BECAUSE THEY CAN'T AFFORD IT, SO THEY ARE NOT CHOSEN.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, IT IS A NOVEL THEORY. IT IS INTERESTING.

THE COURT: OF COURSE, I HAVE NOT EVER SEEN ANY CASE WHICH SO DECIDED.

MR. WAPNER: WELL, THAT IS WHAT I WAS GETTING TO.

THE COURT: HE WANTS ME TO --

MR. WAPNER: CREATE LAW?

THE COURT: YEAH, GO INTO NEW PASTURES, SO TO SPEAK,
TASTE THE ALFALFA THERE.

MR. WAPNER: WE KNOW MR. CHIER HAS A VERY CREATIVE LEGAL MIND BECAUSE FROM HIS CAR, HE COULD TRY TO FIGURE OUT THAT HE SHOULD CONVERT MR. HUNT'S HOUSE INTO A LAW OFFICE AND THAT HE COULD DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE SEARCH.

I WILL GRANT THE FACT THAT HE HAS A VERY CREATIVE LEGAL MIND. BUT I DON'T THINK THAT THAT IS THE LAW IN THIS STATE.

I ALSO DON'T NECESSARILY AGREE WITH THE CONCLUSION
THAT IT KEEPS POOR PEOPLE OFF THE JURY UNLESS HE IS TALKING
ABOUT -- WELL, I DON'T KNOW WHO HE IS TALKING ABOUT BECAUSE
IF HE IS TALKING ABOUT PEOPLE WHO HAVE JOBS THAT PAY THEM
A LOW WAGE, WE DON'T HAVE ANY TESTIMONY THAT THESE PEOPLE
WON'T BE COMPENSATED, EVEN AT THE LOW WAGE, FROM THIS JOB,
WHILE THEY ARE ON JURY DUTY BECAUSE WE KNOW THAT MOST OF THE
PEOPLE WHO ARE ON JURY DUTY, WHETHER THEY ARE RICH OR POOR,
IF THEY ARE NOT COMPENSATED BY THEIR EMPLOYER, THEY ARE
EXCUSED.

THAT INCLUDES RICH PEOPLE AND POOR PEOPLE AND MIDDLE INCOME PEOPLE. SO, LIKEWISE, WHAT IF HE IS TALKING

```
ABOUT WELFARE RECIPIENTS? WELL, IF THEY GET THEIR FIVE OR
 1
      TEN DOLLARS A DAY, THAT IS ON TOP OF THEIR WELFARE BENEFITS.
 2
     THERE IS NO INDICATION THAT THEIR WELFARE BENEFITS WOULD
 3
      CEASE BECAUSE THEY ARE ON JURY DUTY.
 4
                  I DON'T KNOW WHAT EXACTLY -- WHO HE IS SUGGESTING
 5
     WOULD BE EXCLUDED, BUT I DON'T THINK WE HAD ANY TESTIMONY
 6
     AT THAT HEARING THAT WOULD SUPPORT THAT KIND OF A THEORY.
 7
     I THINK THAT IT IS --
 8
           MR. CHIER: MAY I JUST RESPOND?
 9
           THE COURT: YES.
10
           MR. CHIER: PART OF THE PROBLEM AS I SAW IT THEN AND
11
     I STILL SEE IT, IS THAT BY LIMITING THE JUROR SELECTION
12
     SOURCES TO D.M.V. LISTS AND VOTER REGISTRATION LISTS, YOU
13
     ARE MISSING A FAIRLY LARGE SEGMENT OF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE
14
     JURORS, PERSONS THAT ARE NONCONFORMING, PERHAPS PEOPLE THAT
15
     DON'T DRIVE CARS AND PEOPLE WHO ALTHOUGH THEY DON'T VOTE OR
16
     REGISTER TO VOTE, MIGHT PARTICIPATE IN GOVERNMENT BY --
17
           THE COURT: WELL, OF THOSE PEOPLE, HOW ARE WE GOING
18
     TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE CITIZENS?
19
           MR. CHIER: WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE CITIZENS?
20
21
           THE COURT: PARDON ME. DO WE PERMIT ALIENS TO SIT ON
     JURIES?
22
           MR. WAPNER: NO. THEY HAVE TO BE --
23
           THE COURT: CITIZENS?
24
           MR. WAPNER: CITIZENS, I BELIEVE. YES.
25
           THE COURT: AM I RIGHT ABOUT THAT?
26
           MR. BARENS: YES.
27
```

THE COURT: HOW ARE WE GOING TO DETERMINE IF WE PICK

THEM OFF THE STREET, WHETHER THEY ARE CITIZENS? MR. CHIER: WELL, THERE ARE PUBLIC UTILITY LISTS. THE COURT: THAT WOULDN'T SHOW US WHETHER THEY ARE CITIZENS. MR. CHIER: BUT, NEITHER DOES A DRIVER'S LICENSE.

F

THE COURT: WELL, THEY HAVE TO SAY IN THERE, DON'T 1 2 THEY HAVE TO, IF I REMEMBER, WHETHER THEY ARE A CITIZEN OF 3 THE UNITED STATES? MR. CHIER: NO, I DON'T THINK THAT IS A REQUIREMENT. 4 5 MR. BARENS: NOT ON THE DMV. THE COURT: AT ANY RATE, ON THE VOTER LISTS, YOU HAVE 6 7 TO BE ONE. 8 I THINK WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE WHOLE PROCESS 9 OF FINDING OUTT WHETHER THEY ARE CITIZENS --10 MR. CHIER: MAYBE WE WILL SOMEDAY HAVE --11 THE COURT: WELL, SOMEDAY. 12 AT ANY RATE, THE SYSTEM WE HAVE GOT HAS BEEN 13 WORKING PRETTY WELL. I DON'T THINK THAT THIS IS THE TIME 14 TO CHANGE IT. 15 MR. BARENS: WE ARE OBLIGATED --16 THE COURT: WELL, YOU HAVE BEEN DOING VERY WELL, BOTH 17 OF YOU AS LAWYERS HAVE BEEN DOING VERY WELL UNDER IT AND I 18 HOPE YOU CONTINUE TO DO SO. YOUR COLLEAGUE HAS BEEN DOING 19 VERY WELL AND HE HAS PRESENTED THE CASE IN ITS BEST POSSIBLE 20 LIGHT. 21 MR. BARENS: QUITE SO. I COULD NOT ADD ANYTHING TO 22 MR. CHIER'S PREPARATION, YOUR HONOR. 23 THE COURT: FINE. THEN WE HAVE CLEARED OUR DECKS, 24 HAVE WE? 25 MR. WAPNER: I THINK, ALTHOUGH I THINK IT IS PRETTY 26 OBVIOUS WHAT HAS BEEN GOING ON, HAS THE COURT MADE A RULING 27 ON THE ARCE MOTION?

THE COURT: YES, I AM DENYING IT.

MR. BARENS: I AM SHOCKED.

THE COURT: I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYTHING IN THE SELECTION OF OUR JURORS WHICH IS IN ANY WAY UNCONSTITUTIONAL OR A VIOLATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S RIGHTS.

MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT TO
EVERYBODY, I JUST WANTED TO TAKE UP SOME HOUSEKEEPING THINGS
SO WE DON'T HAVE TO DO IT NEXT WEEK.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. WAPNER: MAYBE THIS IS ONE OF MY PERSONAL QUIRKS,
BUT CAN WE HAVE SOME UNDERSTANDING THAT WHEN OBJECTIONS ARE
MADE DURING THE COURSE OF TRIAL THAT THEY ARE MADE BY STATING
THAT THERE IS AN OBJECTION AND STATING THE LEGAL GROUNDS,
RATHER THAN HAVING SPEAKING OBJECTIONS? AND IF THERE IS GOING
TO BE A SPEAKING OBJECTION, THAT IT BE DONE AT THE BENCH.

THE COURT: WELL, YOU DON'T HAVE TO DO THAT. MR.

BARENS KNOWS THAT AND HE WILL OBSERVE THAT, I AM SURE HE WILL

OBSERVE THAT.

MR. BARENS: QUITE SO, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: INCIDENTALLY, I WANT NO REFERENCE AT ALL ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED IN HOLLYWOOD IN ANY WAY THROUGHOUT THIS TRIAL.

MR. WAPNER: THAT WAS THE NEXT THING.

THE COURT: I DON'T WANT ANY SUGGESTION THAT THERE
WAS A HOLLYWOOD MURDER OR ANYBODY CONNECTED IN THIS CASE WAS
INVOLVED IN IT.

MR. WAPNER: CAN THAT RULING BE --

THE COURT: THERE WERE REFERENCES, YOU HAD ASKED ABOUT THAT HOLLYWOOD MURDER, MR. BARENS.

MR. BARENS: YOUR HONOR, I HAD UNDERSTOOD AND IN GOOD FAITH WITH YOUR HONOR FROM THE START, THAT IN FRONT OF THE JURY, I WOULD NEVER DO THAT.

THE COURT: WELL, FINE. I AM SURE YOU WILL OBSERVE THAT.

MR. BARENS: I WILL DO SO.

1 MR. WAPNER: THAT INCLUDES ANY INFERENCE THAT MIGHT 2 BE SUGGESTED BY A QUESTION THAT IS ASKED OF A WITNESS? 3 THE COURT: HE KNOWS THAT. HE KNOWS WHAT TO DO AND 4 HE KNOWS WHAT TO ASK AND WHAT NOT TO ASK. HE HAS NODDED HIS 5 HEAD, HE KNOWS I TOOK HIM TO TASK. HE KNOWS WHAT TO DO. HE IS AN EXPERIENCED, COMPETENT LAWYER AND AN ETHICAL ONE, 6 7 T00. 8 IS THERE ANY OTHER THING YOU CAN THINK OF? MR. WAPNER: NONE THAT I CAN THINK OF RIGHT NOW. I 9 10 AM SURE I CAN THINK OF SOME AND I WILL --11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, YOU TAKE IT UP AT THE BENCH 12 THEN. MR. BARENS: I AM SORRY. WHAT WAS THAT? 13 THE COURT: ANY OTHER CHORES YOU CAN THINK OF, IS THERE 14 15 ANYTHING ELSE YOU WANT TO HAVE, ANY WARNINGS? IF YOU HAVE 16 ANY, I WOULD LIKE TO LISTEN TO YOURS, TOO. 17 MR. BARENS: NO, YOUR HONOR. 18 I PRESUME WE ALL UNDERSTAND THE HOURS AND THE 19 DAYS TYPE OF THING SO THAT WE --20 THE COURT: FOUR DAYS A WEEK. 21 MR. BARENS: FOUR DAYS FROM 10:30 TO 4:30, TYPE OF 22 THING SO WE CAN ALL RELY ON OUR SCHEDULES, YOUR HONOR? 23 THE COURT: THAT'S RIGHT. AND EVERYBODY WILL BE 24 PROMPT AND ON TIME. 25 MR. BARENS: RIGHT. 26 YOUR HONOR, PERHAPS NOW ISN'T THE TIME TO INQUIRE 27 ABOUT IT, THERE HAD BEEN SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT EASTER.

THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW THAT. THERE HAS BEEN NO

28

1 DISCUSSION ABOUT EASTER. 2 MR. BARENS: I HAD A CONVERSATION WITH YOUR CLERK. 3 THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO GO SKIING, THAT IS JUST 4 WHAT YOU WANT TO GET OFF FOR. 5 MR. BARENS: YES, YOUR HONOR. 6 THE COURT: THAT INVOLVES EXPENDITURE OF TOO MUCH 7 MONEY WITH THE SALARIES FOR THE HELP AND EVERYBODY ELSE AND 8 IT COST \$4,000 A DAY TO RUN A COURT, DID YOU KNOW THAT? 9 MR. BARENS: NO, I DID NOT, YOUR HONOR. 10 THE COURT: THE STATISTICS SHOW THAT. 11 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT, YOUR HONOR. 12 THE COURT: ALL THE DECKS HAVE BEEN CLEARED, HAVE THEY? 13 MR. WAPNER: YOUR HONOR, I DO ANTICIPATE THE OPENING 14 STATEMENT ON BOTH SIDES ON MONDAY. 15 THE COURT: WELL, THEY MIGHT NOT WANT TO DO THAT. THEY 16 MIGHT RESERVE THEIR RIGHT TO MAKE AN OPENING STATEMENT. 17 MR. WAPNER: I ONLY SAY THAT BECAUSE I TALKED TO MR. 18 BARENS EARLIER, AND THE TESTIMONY WILL COMMENCE MONDAY 19 AFTERNOON. 20 THE COURT: WELL, WE WILL GO RIGHT THROUGH. 21 DID YOU HEAR WHAT HE SAID? 22 MR. BARENS: I DIDN'T ACTUALLY. 23 THE COURT: HE SAID YOU WILL HAVE OPENING STATEMENT 24 FIRST THING MONDAY MORNING AND I SAID YOU MAY RESERVE YOUR 25 RIGHT TO MAKE AN OPENING STATEMENT. 26 MR. BARENS: ALL RIGHT.

THE COURT: YOU DON'T HAVE TO MAKE IT ON MONDAY.

MR. BARENS: I UNDERSTAND THAT, YOUR HONOR. HOWEVER,

I HOPE THEY ARE STILL AWAKE AFTERWARDS. THE COURT: THEY ARE STILL WHAT? MR. BARENS: AWAKE AFTERWARD. MR. WAPNER: I JUST WILL TELL THE COURT I TALKED TO MR. BARENS ABOUT THAT IN SCHEDULING WITNESSES, I AM DOING THAT IN ANTICIPATION. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU WANT TO FIND OUT FROM HIM WHETHER HE INTENDS TO MAKE AN OPENING STATEMENT? MR. WAPNER: I KNOW HE IS NOT BOUND BY IT BUT I AM JUST TELLING THE COURT IF I GET SURPRISED AND RUN OUT OF WITNESSES. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, SEE YOU ON MONDAY. (AT 2:40 P.M. AN ADJOURNMENT WAS TAKEN UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1987 AT 10:30 A.M.) 21.