SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 2 3 DEPARTMENT NO. 106 HON. RAYMOND CHOATE, JUDGE 4 Š THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Plaintiff. 6 7 vs. 8 BRUCE McGREGOR DAVIS, 9 Defendant. 10 11 12 REPORTERS DAILY TRANSCRIPT 13 Friday, December 10, 1071 14 15 VOLUME 10 16 17 18 **APPEARANCES:** 19 JOSEPH P. BUSCH, JR., District Attorney BY: ANTHONY MANZELLA For the People: 20 and STEPHEN R. KAY. 21 Deputies District Attorney 22 For Defendant Davis: GEORGE V. DENNY, III 23 24 25 26 27 MARY LOU BRIANDI, C.S.R. ROGER K. WILLIAMS, C.S.R. Official Court Reporters 28

2

3

5

6.

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14. 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1971, 10:04 A. M.

The record will show the defendant to be THE COURT: Both counsel are present.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, before we choose another juror, I would like on the record to apprise the Court of the fact that apparently the People do not intend to call Mr. Spahn, from conversations I've had with Mr. Manzella and Mr. Kay, and do not intend to bring him down at the time they bring Ruby Pearl down.

Their feeling is that from the standpoint of putting on their case and the way they want to put it on, that they do not want Mr. Spahn's testimony coming in during the course of their case in chief. They want me to call him during my defense that's put on. And this is a tactical move on their part which I can't argue with. They have a right to put on their case any way they want.

But I did want to let the Court know that apparently it would be necessary, then, to get Mr. Spahn down separate from or at a different time than Ruby Pearl comes down to testify for the People, which would mean having two tickets, one for him and one for Ruby Pearl, which would be the expense of putting them up --

THE COURT: What would be the problem, if any, of allowing Mr. Spahn's testimony introduced out of order?

MR. KAY: Well, I think, your Honor, it would destroy the continuity of the People's case. I mean, he would be a defense witness.

 Mr. Spahn is kind of confused, to say the least, and there's no telling what he would testify to on the stand.

I mean, he says one thing one day and another thing the next day, and I just don't want him to destroy the continuity of the People's case.

THE COURT: He's blind and virtually helpless without somebody accompanying him?

MR. KAY: That ts true.

THE COURT: And since he and Miss Pearl are coming from the same place, it would seem to me as though something might be worked out.

MR. KAY: Well, I'm not convinced that he would want

Pearl to come down with him, because Pearl is his foreman and
he might want one of them to be there at all times, at least
to supervise the ranch. He might want somebody else to come
down with him. I don't know that.

THE COURT: Is he running the ranch up there?

MR. KAY: I think he is.

MR. DENNY: Yes, your Honor. When I spoke with him on the phone, at which time, by the way, he did not seem confused at all, he said they do have a ranch up there, running about 30 head of horses.

THE COURT: Maybe he's only confused when he gets to Southern California.

MR. DENNY: Maybe he's only confused when he doesn't say what the District Attorney wants him to say.

MR. KAY: Or when he's around one of the particular girls in the Manson Family.

THE DEFENDANT DAVIS: Ha, ha.

THE COURT: You can't possibly know what date you want him here?

MR. DENNY: At this point we have no way of knowing, your Honor.

MR. KAY: And we have no idea of knowing what date we want Ruby Pearl here.

THE COURT: All right, let's work it out when the time comes.

MR. KAY: That is agreeable.

MR. DENNY: Fine.

THE COURT: The case of People vs. Davis.

I suppose we are at the point where we had excused, by acclamation from both sides, Mrs. Acosta.

MR. KAY: That's right.

THE COURT: So therefore, we need another juror, prospective juror.

THE CLERK: William F. Hall; H-a-1-1.

THE COURT: How many names does that leave in the box?

(Whereupon a discussion off the record ensued at the bench between the Court and the Clerk.)

MR. DENNY: Judge, I assume you will be calling a new panel down before the end of the day, will you not?

THE COURT: That appears to be so, yes.

MR. DENNY: Because I think it would be beneficial, in view of the fact that Mr. Manson is going to be sentenced on Monday, if -- if a new panel is down, and they can be advised not to read anything about it -- which I think may come out -- and not to watch TV during the time that there may be --

MR. KAY: George -- just a minute.

THE COURT: Mr. Hall?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes, sir.

Good morning.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF WILLIAM F. HALL

BY THE COURT:

28

26

27

	·
1	Q Good morning, Mr. Hall.
2	Were you present when the Court explained the
3	nature of this case, and read the indictment to your group
4	of jurors?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And you heard the Court's questions of the
7	prospective jurors from your group?
8	A (Indicating affirmatively.)
9	Q Yes? Did you say "Yes"?
10	A I heard the questions.
11	Q Yes.
12	Would your answers be any different than the
13	majority of jurors have responded to the Court's questions
14	of a general nature?
15	A Perhaps.
16	Q In what way can you think of, particularly, that
17	your answers might be different?
18	A (No response.)
19	Q You remember that series of questions that I
20	asked, that included, "Had any member of your family or close
21	friend been the victim of a crime of violence," for example?
22	A My fiancee's father was murdered.
23 24	Q How long ago was that?
25	A About three years ago.
25 26	Q Was that in Los Angeles County?
-	A Yes, sir.
27 28	Q Was there a prosecution that came about as a
28	result of that?

1	۶.	Yes.
2	ą	Dia you participate at all
3	. Δ	No.
4	Ç	In the prosecution
5	Λ	No.
6	9	or did you testify as a witness?
7		No.
8	3	Did you know him?
9	٨	No.
10	G.	Do you think that would affect your judgment at
11	all in this	case?
12	Α	No.
13	Q	In any other respects you remember these
14	questions -	- would your answers be any different?
15	•	I would rather be questioned, you know, just to
16 `	because :	I can't recall.
17	Q	Offhand, nothing comes to your mind?
18	Λ	(Indicating affirmatively.)
19	Q	What type of work do you do, Mr. Hall?
20	A	I am a civil engineer for the Metropolitan Water
21	District.	
`22	Q	And have you served on jury duty before?
23	٨	Never.
24	O,	Is there a lirs. Hall?
25	Α	Ro. Divorced.
26	Q,	Are you related to or a friend of any law
27	enforcement	officer?
28	Λ	A friend of well, law enforcement?

	8°	1	Q Yes. A police officer, a Highway Patrolman,
	\$ 	2	a Deputy District Attorney, an Attorney General a Deputy
	•	3	Attorney General? Any sort of a prosecuting officer. Deputy
		4	City Attorney?
		5	A Yes. I believe Donald Boags is a Public
		6	Defender, Deputy Public Defender.
		7	Q You are a friend of a Deputy Public Defender?
		8	A And Martin Weeks. I believe he's
		9	MR. DENNY: Could you hold that microphone up, Mr. Hall?
		10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes. Sorry.
		11	MR. DENNY: A little closer to your mouth?
		12	Thank you, sir.
		13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Martin Weeks. I believe he's
Á		14	with the District Attorney's Office.
U	j jes	15	Q BY THE COURT: Do you think that those relation-
		16	ships would affect your judgment
		17	A No.
		18	Q whatever? Are they close personal friends
		19 .	or
		20	A Socially, I see them.
		21	Q You see them socially?
2a	fls.	22	A Yes.
		23	
		24	
		25	
	<b>5</b> 2.	26	
		27	
	<u> </u>	28	·

3

4. 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

Q Have you or anyone close to you ever been accused of a crime, other than a traffic violation?

A No.

Q Do you think that as a result of this relationship with people whom you associate in law enforcement that you would be more inclined to believe a police officer simply because of his status, rather than somebody who is not?

Simply because of his status as a police officer, would you be inclined to give more credibility to a man, --

- A No.
- Q -- or less, because of some -- any reason?
- A Not any less.
- Q In what general area do you reside?
- A Highland Park. Northeast.

Q I take it it would not be a hardship to you to serve in this case for reasons of salary? Are there any other reasons?

A Well, I have a job that can be described as an administrative job within the civil engineering section. No one else can perform that job.

Well, I suppose sincethe company hasn't written a letter yet, perhaps they think that it can be by-passed for a while.

- Q Your company is what company?
- A The Metropolitan Water District.
- Q The Court has not yet received a letter. But,
  I think, even if I received a letter, I probably would not
  count it a personal type of hardship, for which I would excuse

10.

you -- unless you want to elaborate on it in some way.

A Well, I am responsible for scheduling and analyzing various design projects for water distribution facilities.

And I have to write computer programs, indicating the monthly progress reports on them; and using man-hours as a bench mark to determine how much money is to be allocated for various projects.

Usually twice a month this type of report is made, usually around the middle of the month, the end of the month.

Q Do you have any one at all who can do that?

A No. Can I answer your question more direct?

There's no personal hardship on me, necessarily, --

Q I see.

A -- but I am under the impression that it may be for the company, as far as the job is concerned.

But since they haven't sent in a letter, perhaps it isn't.

Q I think I'll have them undergo that. They have gotten a rate increase anyhow, so -- so, if somebody makes a small mistake in computing man-hours, perhaps it can be absorbed in that.

A You are referring to the Department of Water and Power?

Q Yes.

A That's altogether different.

Q It's different?

A Yes. I'm with the Metropolitan Water District.

1	
1	Q Oh, I see.
2	A Yes.
.3	Q You are correct. That is different. That hadn't
4	occurred to me.
5	A We have had a reduction in rates.
6	MR. KAY: Oh, oh.
7	Q BY THE COURT: A considerable difference in
8	organizations.
9.	Well, the Court does feel that that would not
10	constitute a personal hardship for which you should be
11	excused.
12	Now, I want to ask you about penalty. Do you have
13.	such views concerning the death penalty that you would, by
14	reason of those views, be unable to be impartial in determining
15	the first phase of the case, that of guilt or innocence?
16	A Yes.
17	Q In other words, knowing that you were sitting
18	knowing that you were sitting on a case which, if you found
19	a man guilty of murder in the first degree, would go into a
20	penalty phase, wherein you might have to determine guilt, or
21	rather, death or life imprisonment your judgment might be
22	affected in that first phase?
23	A Yes, it would be:
24	Q Is that what you are saying?
25	A Yes.
26	Q You would be less inclined to you would be
27	less inclined to find a man guilty of murder in the first
28	degree knowing you'd have to go on with that second phase; is

that what you mean?

A Oh, I may find him guilty of murder in the first degree, but I'd be -- I wouldn't want to --

Q Perhaps you misunderstood my question. You would have no prejudice in your mind which would keep you from being fair and impartial in determining the question of guilt or innocence, --

A No.

Q -- by reason of your views concerning the death penalty; is that correct?

A There would be no prejudice, no.

2b-1

2

1

3

**4** 5

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

21

23

24 25

26

27 28 Q So that you could be objective in determining whether or not the defendant is guilty of murder of the first degree?

A Yes.

Q But getting to the penalty phase, you do have some reservations about the application of the death penalty?

A Yes.

Q Now, are your views about the death penalty such that you would automatically refuse to impose it in any case?

A Yes.

Q Can you conceive of yourself ever considering the death penalty in any case?

A No case.

Q So your reaction would be an automatic one, then, of -- to vote against the death penalty in any case, regardless of the facts of the evidence that's produced?

A Yes.

MR. KAY: Your Honor, the prosecution would respectfully challenge Mr. Hall under Section 1073, Subdivision 2 of the California Penal Code.

THE COURT: It appears to be a good challenge. The Court grants it.

MR. KAY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hall, thank you very much. The Court does excuse you.

How much time do you have left?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: I just started Friday.

THE COURT: All right. Then, report to the 15th floor

1 assembly room there. 3 defense objection to the --THE COURT: Yes, the record may --5 MR. DENNY: -- challenge? 6 THE COURT: -- show your objection. 7 8 MR. KAY: THE CLERK: D-e-h-e-l-e-a-n. 10 MR. DENNY: Small "d" on the -- . 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 LOUISE DEHELEAN 18 BY THE COURT: 19 microphone is, please. 21 proceedings since last Friday? 23 A Yes, your Honor, 24 25 when the Court called you in, also? 26 A Yes, sir.

27

28

of the New Hall of Records, if you would, please, in the jury MR. DENNY: Your Honor, again, may the record reflect a THE CLERK: Mrs. Louise Dehelean; D-e-h-e-1-e-a-n. Could you spell that again, Joyce? THE CLERK: No, one word. D-e-h-e-1-e-a-n. THE COURT: Come forward, Mrs. Dehelean, please. PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Good morning, your Honor. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF Good morning. You may take the seat where that Mrs. Dehelean, have you been present during all the You have been here all week, from time to time. And would your answers be any different than the Q.

answers of the prospective jurors from your group were to the

questions of a general nature that I put to them? 1 Yes, sir. A Ź Q Would they be? 3 A Yes. 4 In what way? Q 5 Well, I -- I -- of course, I reason for myself A whether it is the right thing or not, but you know, I like 7 to go according to the law. Would your answers be any different, Mrs. Dehelean, 9 than the answers of the other prospective jurors -- the 10 majority of the jurors -- to the questions of a general 11 nature that I put to them? 12 No. Whatever the law -- as I see it, is -- I 13 think that's what I want to agree. 14 Have you been a juror before, Mrs. Dehelean? 15 Q A No, sir. But I have been called about -- this is 16 my third time. 17 I see. Have you ever served on a --18 Q 19 A Never, no. 20 -- on a jury? Q 21 You mean you served two prior terms of jury service? 22 A Never, no. No, this is the first time. 23 Q. I see. 24 A I've just been called. 25 You have been called, but you've never had the --. Q 26 No, no experience. A 27 -- had the opportunity to serve as a juror? Q 28 A No.

ಕಟ್ <sup>ಲ್</sup> ಕ	1
<b>)</b> , ,	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	15
. 7	15 16
. ~ 2c fls.	
. ? 2c fls.	16
2c fls.	16 17
2c fls.	16 17 18
. ? 2c fls.	16 17 18 19
2c fls.	16 17 18 19 20
. ? 2c fls.	16 17 18 19 20 21
2c fls.	16 17 18 19 20 21
2c fls.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
2c fls.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
2c fls.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25
2c fls.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

MR. DENNY: May we approach the bench, your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.

Q Would it be any hardship to you to serve in this case?

A No.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the prospective juror:)

MR. DENNY: I think Mr. Kay and I have exchanged knowing glances, and would agree to stipulate that, right away, to save the Court's time -- and everybody else's -- that we could excuse this juror.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KAY: So stipulate.

THE COURT: Thank you, gentlemen. She does seem to have some problem of comprehension.

MR. KAY: Yeah.

2c-1

1 2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court, within the presence and hearing of the jury:)

THE COURT: Mrs. Dehelean, these gentlemen have stipulated that you may be excused, and the Court does excuse you. Thank you very much.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Thank you.

THE COURT: Report to the 15th floor of the new Hall of Records, if you would, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: Will you pick another name?

THE CLERK: Joe A. Restovich; J-o-e; middle initial A; R-e-s-t-o-v-i-c-h.

## VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF

#### JOE A. RESTOVICH

### BY THE COURT:

- Q Mr. Restovich?
- A Yes, your Honor.
- Q Is that how you pronounce your name?
- A Restovich.
- Q Yes. Mr. Restoyich, were you present when the Court explained the nature of this case and read the indictment last Friday?
  - A Yes, your Honor.
- Q And would your answers be any different than the majority of the jurors responses to the questions of a general nature, that the Court put to the prospective jurors from your group?

1	Q Well, would it be any hardship to you to serve
2	as a juror in this case?
3	A No, your Honor. Financially, you mean, your
4	Honor?
5	Q In any way.
6	A No. No, not in that respect.
7	Q Well, have you served on a jury at all? Before?
8	A No, your Honor. This is my first tour.
9	Q The first time, your first case; is that right?
. 10.	A Yes.
11	Q And what type of
12	A I've never served on a case prior to this.
13	Q What kind of work do you do, Mr. Restovich?
14	A I am a warehouseman. I work for the Alfred Hart
15	Company; they're wholesale distributors of distilled spirits
16	and wine.
17	MR. DENNY: What is the company again?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Alfred Hart Company.
19	MR. DENNY: Alfred Hart?
20.	PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 1: Yes. Capital H-a-r-t.
21	Q BY THE COURT: Is there a Mrs. Restovich?
22	A No, your Honor, there isn't. I'm single.
<b>23</b>	Q Are you related to or a friend of any law
24	enforcement officer?
25	A Yes, your Honor. My brother is a sergeant with
26	the Los Angeles City Police Department.
27	Q How long has he been so employed?
28	A It is he has almost put in 30 years now. In:

ي و

1 As far as determining guilt or innocence? No. À You would have no problem there? Q 3 But I -- I could never vote for the death Ą No. 4 penalty --5 Q Would your --6 -- at any time. Α 7 Would your reaction be, should you be called Q 8 upon to make that decision, between life imprisonment and death, to automatically refuse to impose the death penalty? 10 Yes, your Honor. I could never do that and live 11 with myself, no. 12. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20. 21 22 23 24 .25 26. 27

27

28

# VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF HAROLD CIOCHON

#### BY THE COURT:

- Q Is your name Ciochon?
- A Yes, your Honor.
- Q I am pronouncing it correctly?
- A Ciochon. Ciochon.
- Q Mr. Ciochon, have you been present during all of the proceedings during this week?
  - A Yes, your Honor.
- Q Including the reading of the indictment last Friday?
  - A Yes, your Honor.
- Q Would your answers be any different than the majority of jurors have responded to the Court's questions of a general nature?
  - A No, your Honor.
- Q For example, you remember that series of questions wherein I asked whether -- whether -- asked the prospective jurors whether they had ever been convicted or had a close friend of relative convicted of a crime of any type?
  - A Yes, your Honor.
- Q Your answers would be the same to that series of questions?
  - A Well --
  - Q That the majority of the jurors have responded to?
- A Well, I was, I guess you'd say, convicted of a hit and run.

3-4	1	A I am a surveyor.
, `	2	Q For what?
.,	3	A Flood Control District.
	4	Q Flood Control, I see.
	5	And is there a Mrs. Giochon?
	G	A Yes, your Honor.
	7	Q Are you related to or a friend of any law
	:.	enforcement officer?
	· ý	A Uh, friends.
	10	Q Tell us about that. Who are they, policemen?
	11	A Yes, your Honor.
	12	Q Deputy Sheriff for
	13	A No, an LAPD, Burbank PD, Glendale PD. I used to
E 200 %	14	belong to the Burbank Auxiliary Police for eight years.
نیخ ۵	15	MR. DENNY: I'm sorry, the Burbank what?
	16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR CIOCHON: Auxiliary Police.
	17	Q BY THE COURT: The Burbank Auxiliary Police.
	18	You've heard of them.
	19	When did you leave the Auxiliary Police force?
•	20	A Oh, about six years ago.
	21	Q Do you think that as a result of these relation-
	22	ships with various police officers that you could be that
	23	you'd be able to judge a police officer's in spite of those
	24	relationships be able to judge a police officer's credibility
	25	on the same basis as anyone else?
	26	A Hmm, yes, your Honor.
	27	Q You understand the question?
	28	A Yes.

				*. · ·
3-5°°	1	, Q	You wouldn't give any greater co	
	2	credence to	the testimony of a person simply	
Ģ	3	she was a p	olice officer?	
•	4	A	No.	
	5	Q.	In what area do you reside?	
3a fls.	6	A	Highland Park.	
	7			**, * *
	8			,
	9			
	10			
	11			
	12			
	13		•	
# E C C C	14			
n Å	15	•	,	
A :	16			
	17	:		
	18			
	19			·
	20			
	21			
	22			
	23			
	24		•	
	25			
	26			
ેંટ સં	27			
94 0 m	28			

Q	Havė	you	ever	studied	law	or have	any	legal
experience	0 than	4h = r	. ~~	the molify		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		n
evher rende	Oriter	citai	1 011	cus borre	:e	horrce	rorc	er

A Well, yes, I did. I did take some courses at the Glendale Junior College, Police Science 101, report writing.

I was inspired to be a policeman, but it didn't work out that way.

Q Did you ever study criminal law?

A No.

Q In connection with the death penalty, do you have such views about it that you would be unable to be impartial in determining the question of guilt or innocence in the first phase of the case?

A No.

Q Are your views about the penalty such that you would automatically refuse to impose it regardless of the evidence?

A No.

Q Or do you have such views about the penalty that you would never vote to impose it?

A No.

Q Or would you automatically impose it upon a conviction of murder in the first degree, regardless of the evidence?

A No.

Concerning the publicity that you might have heard, seen or read in the last two years or so; had you ever heard of this case?

A Yes, your Honor.

1	Q Had you heard of Mr. Davis?
2	A Yes, your Honor.
3	Q Now, what how did this case come to your
4	attention?
5	A Well, it so happens that I did know the LaBiancas.
Ģ	Q You knew the LaBiancas?
7	A Yes. He gave me my he gave me a job when I was
8	going to high school and I was part-time box boy for the
9	Gateway Food Markets.
10	Q LaBianca was connected with Gateway Food Markets?
11	A Yes, he owned them. And plus I only live about
12	four blocks from where his parents live at, on the corner of
13	Cypress and Granada.
14	Q You know, of course, that Charles Manson was
15	convicted, amongst others?
<b>16</b> ,	A Yes, your Honor.
17	Q Of the LaBianca deaths?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Now, if the evidence should disclose that this
20	defendant, Mr. Davis, is associated with Mr. Manson, do you
21	think that you could be fair to Mr. Davis in determining any
22	issue that you might be called upon to determine in this case?
23	A Yes, your Honor.
24	Q You could put that that thought of that
25	relationship aside for the purpose of making whatever judgment
26	that you might be able to make, might be called upon to make
27	in this case? You would not allow it to prejudice you in any
28	wav?

1	A	Hmmm, I don't believe so, your Honor.
2	Q	Had you ever heard of Mr. Davis?
3	A	Not other than just it was mentioned in the papers.
4	Q	Had you ever heard of Shorty Shea?
5	A	Just what was mentioned in the papers.
.6	Ω	What did you hear about Mr. Davis and Shorty Shea?
7	A	Hmmm, just what I read. I mean,
8	Q	That's what we want to know.
9	•	What did you hear, see or read?
10	, <b>А</b>	That he was connected with the might have been
11	connected w	ith the death of the person.
12	· Q	What did you what have you read previously
13	about he	ard, seen or mead about Gary Hinman?
14	<b>A</b> .	Hmmm, about the same thing, your Honor, you know.
15	Just readin	g through the paper and that s it.
16	· Q	Well, do you know the name Gary Hinman? Had you
17	heard it be	fore
18	A	Yes, I've heard it before.
19	Q	Friday when you walked in here and I read the
20	indictment?	
21	A	Well, I heard it vaguely.
22	Q	What do you know about it?
23	A	Not too much about it, no.
24	Q	I mean, do you know who he is?
25	A	No.
26	Q	Well, what had you heard about Shorty Shea before
27	Friday, whe	en I read the indictment?
28	A	That he was a ranch hand out at the ranch.
		1

1	Q .	Spahn Ranch?
2	A	Yes.
3	. Ω	What else?
4	A	That's about it.
5	Q	Well, had you heard that either of these persons
6	was killed	before Hinman or Shea or both? Had you ever read
7	their names	in that connection?
8	A	Hmmm, I can't be for sure, your Honor.
9	Q	Did you follow the Tate-LaBianca trial rather
10	closely?	
11	A	Not rather closely, I mean, after the event first
12	happened, a	nd then towards the end, you know, just
13	Õ	You read a newspaper regularly?
14	A	Uh, yes.
15	Q	Daily?
16	A,	Yes.
17	Q	Yes. Times?
18	A	Times?
19	°Q	And do you look at radio and television news
20	reports occ	așionally?
21	À	I listen to the late news in the evening and that.
22	Q	Has that been your habit in the last two years or
23	so?	
24 .	Д	Off and on, yes, your Honor. And that always,
25	you know, 1	isten to the weather report and stuff like that.
26	Q	What do you know about the Manson Family? What's
27	that phrase	mean to you?
28	A	Well, his following that he has.

3b fol

Q	Manson "s	following?
---	-----------	------------

A Yes.

Q Now, if -- if it should be disclosed by the evidence that Mr. Davis was a member of the Manson Family or associated with the Manson Family in some way or other, do you think because of what you know, from having heard, seen or read the various publicity media about the Family, that you could be fair and impartial?

Would Mr. Davis be at any disadvantage in having you on the jury, in view of what you have read about the Manson Family?

A No, your Honor, No, I'd have to base it upon the evidence and that, that was presented.

3b+1 ∘<sup>≒</sup>

Q

 aside -- not forget, but set aside anything that you may have heard, seen or read concerning the Manson Family, Charles Manson, anything that you may remember that you do not now remember about Himman, Shea, Mr. Davis; could you do that? Could you set it aside for the purpose of making a judgment in this case based upon the evidence?

A I believe so, your Honor, yes.

Q When you say, "I believe so," are you expressing any doubt your ability to do that?

If I were to instruct you that you were to set

A Well, it is kind of hard to blank it out that you know it in the back of your mind and that just by saying so --

Q That's what we are driving at. We want to know whether you can, as you put it, very well blank it out for the purpose of being a juror in this case and deciding the case, basing your judgment on the evidence?

What do you -- what is your assessment?

What is your opinion of your ability to do that?

Are you too immersed in the news reports that you've read concerning Himman-Shea, this case, Mr. Manson, that you could not effectively putthose things aside?

A Well, I might have -- tend to be a little bias and that, yes, I mean, if you put it all together like that.

Q That's what I mean.

A Yes,

Q We want your candid expression as to whether or not you could be fair and impartial in spite of what you have heard, seen or read and apparently you're fairly well

1	read on the subject, so that Mr. Davis would start out in		
2	your mind, because of your associations with would have		
3	somewhat of a disadvantage?		
4	A Yes.		
5	MR. DENNY: I would offer a challenge under 1073,		
6	Subdivision 2.		
7	THE COURT: It appears to be well taken.		
8	MR. DENNY: Thank you very much for your candor.		
9	THE COURT: Thank you. The Court appreciates, Mr.		
10	Ciochon, your honesty and appraising your ability.		
11	Floor 15 of the New Hall of Records, if you would,		
12	please. There is a jury assembly room that you are to report		
13	to there.		
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR CLOCHON: Thank you.		
15	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ciochon.		
16	THE CLERK: Miss Phyllis Cortez, P-h-y-1-1-i-s, last		
17	name, C-o-r-t-e-z.		
18	THE COURT: How many names do we have left on this		
19	panel, two?		
20	THE CLERK: Two.		
21			
22	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF		
23	PHYLLIS CORTEZ		
24	BY THE COURT:		
25	Q Is your name Cortez?		
26	A Uh-huh.		
27	Q Mrs. Cortez?		
28	A Yes.		

- 1		·	
1		Miss.	
2	ଦ	Miss Cortez.	
3	•	Miss Cortez, have you been present since last	
4	Friday when	you from time to time when you've been called !	
5	into this co		
6	A	Yes.	
7	Q,	And you've heard all the proceedings?	
8	A	Yes.	
9	ą	Can you think of any respect in which your answers	
10	might be dif	ferent than the answers of the other prospective	
11	the major	ity of the other prospective jurors than the	
12	questions I	put to them?	
13	A	No.	
14	ବ	Do you remember that series of questions that I	
15	put to prosp	ective jurors from your group that I overheard?	
16	A	Yes.	
17	ę,	You can't think of any way that your answers	
18	might vary?		
19	A	No.	
20	ବ	Would it be a hardship to you to serve in this	
21	case?		
22	A	Yes, because they won't pay me.	
23	Q	Get that microphone up.	
24	A	They won't pay me for more than 20 days.	
25	Q	Who won't?	
26	<b>A</b> .	Sears.	
27	Q.	Who?	
28	A	Sears.	

1	Q Sears.			
2	You work for Sears, in what capacity?			
3	A Uh, mail order department.			
4	Q And you've checked with them since I asked you			
5	to inquire?			
6	A Yes.			
7	Q And you found that you will not be paid?			
8	A Yes.			
9	MR. KAY: We'd be willing to stipulate that this juror			
10	may be excused for hardship.			
11	MR. DENNY: So stipulate, your Honor.			
12	THE COURT: You are excused, and the Court thanks you.			
13	Do you have time left?			
14	PROSPECTIVE JUROR CORTEZ: Yes.			
15	THE COURT: All right, report to Room strike that			
16	to Floor 15, New Hall of Records.			
17	THE CLERK: Alex W. Rudometkin. A-1-e-x, middle initial			
18	"W", last name R-u-d-o-m-e-t-k-i-n.			
19				
<b>20</b>	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF			
21	ALEX W. RUDOMETKIN			
22	BY THE COURT:			
23	Q Mr. Rudometkin, take that seat with the microphone,			
24	if you would, please.			
25	Have you been present all week and heard all the			
26	proceedings?			
27	A Yes, your Honor.			
28	Q Would your answers be any different than the			

majority of the jurors have responded to the questions of a general nature that I put to them? 3c fls. 3 A No. 

1	Q Would it be any hardship for you to sit in this
2	case?
3	A Yes, it would, your Honor.
4	Q Tell us about it, and get that microphone up a
5	little closer.
6	A Uh, I've got ten days left out of the tour and my
7	company only allowed me 20 days pay and the rest would be
8	a hardship.
9	Q What is your company?
10	A Arrow-Hart, Incorporated.
11	Q You've checked with them since I've asked you to
12	inquire?
13	A Yes, your Honor.
14	Q And you found that you will not be paid beyond
15	your regular tour of duty?
16	A Yes.
17	MR. KAY: We'd be willing to stipulate that this juror
18	can be excused for hardship.
19	MR. DENNY: Yes, so stipulate.
20	The company again was, sir, Arrow-Hart, Incorpor-
21	ated?
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR RUDOMETKIN: Arrow-Hart, Incorporated.
23	MR. DENNY: Arrow-Hart?
24	PROSPECTIVE JUROR RUDOMETKIN: Yes.
25	MR. DENNY: Thank you, sir.
26	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Rudometkin. These gentlemen
27	have agreed that you may be excused, then. Room 415 of the
28	new Hall of Records.

3c-2 0 3 We have one left? We need another panel. They're on their way. THE CLERK: Yes. THE COURT: We 11 be in recess, then, until they arrive. (Short recess.) 4 fols 17. 

1

3

5 6

8

10 11

12

16

18

19

20 21

22

23

26

27 28

THE COURT: The record will show that all counsel are present in this case; that there is a panel of prospective jurors in the courtroom, who have not yet been sworn. And the defendant is present.

Will you all please rise, those of you who are prospective jurors, and raise your right hands?

THE CLERK: You and each of you do solemnly swear that you will well and truly answer such questions as may be asked of you touching upon your qualifications to act as trial jurors in the cause now pending before this Court, so help you God?

> THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS: I do.

THE CLERK: Please be seated.

THE COURT: Would you put the names of the new prospective jurors in the box, and select another juror, in place of the last one excused?

THE CLERK: Lawrence Campbell; L-a-w-r-e-n-c-e; last name, C-a-m-p-b-e-1-1.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Campbell? You may take your place in the box.

And I'll be talking to you, and to the jurors beyond the rail. I intend to move rather fast on this. Would you listen very carefully?

I will be asking Mr. Campbell some questions; and then later on. I will be asking you whether your answers would be the same as Mr. Campbell replied to the questions that I put to him.

(Pause in the proceedings while a discussion

**ź**7

off the record ensued at the bench between the Court and the Clerk.)

THE COURT: I'm going to tell you what this case is all about. I'll read -- or paraphrase -- the indictment to you; read some instructions to you concerning the law, and ask Mr. Campbell some questions of a more or less general and then personal nature.

I will be asking you those same questions. So, if you have any -- if you note any answers which would be different, if your answers would be different, then when you were called to the box here, be prepared to tell us how your answers would vary from Mr. Campbell's.

This is the case of the People of the State of California vs. Charles Manson, Susan Denise Atkins, Bruce McGregor Davis, and Steve Grogan.

Mr. Bruce McGregor Davis is the defendant before this court. He is charged by this indictment with having, on the 27th day of July -- in the first count of the indictment, he is charged with a violation of Section 187 of the Penal Code, in that on the 27th day of July, 1969, in the County of Los Angeles, he, in the company of Charles Manson -- strike that -- Charles Manson, Susan Denise Atkins and Bruce McGregor Davis did willfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with malice aforethought murder Gary Alan Hinman, a human being.

In other words, there is a count of murder in the indictment, as to the first count.

The second count alleges that Charles Manson,

Susan Denise Atkins and Bruce McGregor Davis did commit the crime of conspiracy to commit murder and robbery, in violation of Section 182.1 of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about the 25th through the 28th day of July, 1969, in the County of Los Angeles, those defendants did knowingly conspire to commit the crime of murder, in violation of Section 187, and robbery, in violation of Section 211 of the Penal Code, and committed certain overt acts.

Certain overt acts were committed in the course of that conspiracy. And the overt act first alleged here is that on the 25th day of July, Bruce McGregor Davis, Susan Denise Atkins and Robert Beausoleil did travel to the vicinity of 964 Old Topanga Road, Malibu, in the County of Los Angeles;

Overt act No. 2 alleges that on July 26th, Charles Manson, Susan Denise Atkins and Bruce McGregor Davis did enter the residence at 964 Old Topanga Canyon Road, Malibu, in the County of Los Angeles;

Overt act No. 3 alleges that on or about July 26th, Defendants Charles Manson and Bruce McGregor Davis did drive away from 964 Old Topanga Road in a Fiat automobile owned by Gary Hinman.

Count III alleges that Charles Manson, Bruce McGregor Davis and Steve Grogan committed a violation of Section 187 of the Penal Code, between the 16th day of August, 1969, and the first day of September, 1969, in that they did willfully, unlawfully and feloniously, and with malice aforethought, murder Donald Jerome "Shorty" Shea, a human being.

fls.

So, we have a count of murder in the first count, a count of conspiracy in the second count, and a count of murder in the third count.

To those counts, to that indictment, Mr. Davis has entered pleas of not guilty. And this is the time set for trial. We are in the course of selecting a jury to try this case.

The Court will instruct you that this indictment I read is not evidence, and should not be taken as evidence by you. It's simply a means of bringing this case to this court and to the jury, so that the issues in the case can be tried.

I want to know from you whether it will constitute a hardship to you to serve in this case, because it will take approximately two months to try the case.

You will not be sequestered during the course of the two months, the Court will tell you. The Court will not require you to be in a hotel during all that time, and kept away from your families. You will be able to go home each night during the course of the trial.

4a-1, 5

.3

6.

10.

However, during the course of deliberations, for whatever time it takes to deliberate upon the case, you will probably be sequestered.

The Court intends to be on vacation from December 20th, through the end of the year. You should know that.

If you don't have information as to whether or not your employer will pay you during the entire term as your service as a juror, then I would ask you to contact your employer, via telephone, during the noon hour or during the next recess, and be prepared to let us know whether or not you will in fact suffer any financial hardship, or any other type of hardship, as a result of serving on this jury, should you be chosen.

You will hear the phrase "reasonable doubt" in the course of this case, and you've probably heard it before.

A defendant in a criminal action is presumed to be innocent until the contrary is proved, and in case of a reasonable doubt whether his guilt is satisfactorily shown, he is entitled to an acquittal. This presumption places upon the state the burden of proving him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Reasonable doubt is defined as follows: It's not a mere possible doubt; because everything relating to human affairs and depending on moral evidence is open to some possible or imaginary doubt.

It is that state of the case which, after the entire comparison and consideration of all the evidence, leaves the minds of the jurors in that condition that they

\_

19· 

cannot say they well an abiding conviction, to a noval certainty, of the truth of the charge.

who either directly and actively commit the act constituting the offense, or who knowingly and with criminal intent aid and about in it's commission or, whether present or not, who advise and encourage its commission, are regarded by the law up principals in the crime thus sommitted and are equally quilty thereof.

If he knowingly and with criminal intent side, promotes, encourages or instigates by set or advice, or by set and advice, the cosmission of such a crime.

The testimony of a withter, a writing, a material object, or anything presented to the senses offered to prove the existence or non-existence of a fact is either direct or circumstantial evidence.

Direct evidence merns evidence that directly proves a fuet, without any interence, and which in itself, if true, conclusively establishes that fact.

Circumstantial evidence means evidence that proves a fact from which an inference of the emistence on another fact may be grawn.

An inference is a deduction of fact that may logically and reasonably be drawn from another fact or group of facts of tablished by the evidence.

It's not necessary that facts be proved by direct evidence. They way be proved also by directantial

1a-3

1 2

evidence or by a combination of direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Both direct evidence and circumstantial evidence are acceptable as a means or proof. Neither is entitled to any greater weight than the other.

You are not permitted to find the defendant quilty of any crime charged against him based on circumstantial evidence, unless the proved circumstances are not only consistent with the theory that the defendant is guilty of the crime, but cannot be reconciled with any other rational conclusion, and each fact which is essential to complete a set of circumstances necessary to establish a defendant's guilt has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

Also, if the evidence as to any particular Count is susceptible of two reasonable interpretations, one of which points to the defendant's guilt and the other to his innocence, it is your duty to adopt that interpretation which points to his innocence and reject the other which points to his guilt.

A conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to commit a public offense, and with the specific intent to commit such offense, followed by an overt act committed in this state by one or more of the parties for the purpose of accomplishing the object of the agreement. Conspiracy is a crime.

In order to find a defendant guilty of conspiracy, in addition to proof of the unlawful agreement, there must be proof of the commission of at least one of the overt acts alleged in the indictment.

Murder is the unlawful killing of a human being,

1

3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

a killing perpetrated by willful, deliberate, premeditated -by a willful, deliberate --

All murder which is perpetrated by any kind of willful, deliberate and premeditated killing, with malice aforethought, is murder of the first degree -- or, a murder committed by torture, or a murder committed -- or a killing committed in the course of a burglary or a robbery is murder of the first degree.

We will be talking during the course of this voir dire examination about murder of the first degree, and thus the Court has explained this to you.

The fact that I have given these instructions does not necessarily mean that you will be called upon, should you be chosen as a juror, to utilize these instructions; because whether an instruction applies depends on what you determine the facts to be in the case. And the jury is the sole judge of the facts in a criminal case.

# VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF LAWRENCE CAMPBELL

## BY THE COURT:

- Q I'll ask you now, Mr. Campbell, whether it would constitute any hardship to you to serve in this case?
  - A Not that I know of.
- Q You would be -- oh, incidentally, when you utilize that microphone, you have to hold it right close to your lips, right up to your mouth, if you would, please, Otherwise, it will not pick up.

1a-5				
	1			Your enswer was?
•	2		A	Not that I know of.
	3		Q	What type of work do you do?
	4		A	I am an architect.
	5		Q.	And for whom are you employed?
	6		À	Bechtel Corporation.
	7		Q	Have you ever served as a juror before?
	8		A	I was selected, but the case was dismissed yester-
	9	day.	•	
	10		Q	I see. What type of case was that?
5 fol	11		A	A burglary.
	12			
4.	13			
	14			
نبر ۹	15			
	16			
	17			
	18			
	19			
	20 21			
	22			
	23			
•	24			,
	25			
_	26			
* * ù	27	}		
	28			·
*				·

م * • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ļ										
5-1	1	Q.	A criminal case?								
. *	2	A	Yos.								
	3	Q	A burglary case.								
	4		And you never got to the point where you								
	5	deliberated?									
	6	Α	No, sir.								
	7	Q	All right. Are you related to or a friend of any								
	8	lew enforcement officer?									
	9	By law enforcement officer, I mean a police officer									
	10	a Highway Patrolman, Deputy Sheriff, member of the District									
	11	Attorney's Office?									
	12	A	No.								
	13	Q.	Prosecutor of any type?								
* <u>}</u> .	14	Å	No, air, no.								
2 %	15	Q.	You don't have a relative or friend who is in								
	16	law enforce	ment, then?								
	17	A	No.								
	18	Q	All right.								
	19	ı	All right. In what general area do you reside? Escle Rock.								
	20	A	Eagle Rock.								
	21	Q	And is there a Mrs. Campbell?								
	22	A	Yes, there is.								
	23	Q	Is she employed outside the home?								
	24	A	No, she isn't.								
	25	Q	Will you follow the Court's instructions regardless								
*	26	of what you	believe the law to be or what you believe the law								
	27	should be?									
. ते के के	28	A	Yes.								

 Q You may have had some instructions given to you as a juror concerning the burden of proof that's required in a civil case.

In a civil case you may recall that the burden of proof in that type of case is simply a preponderance of the evidence.

In other words, the plaintiff must establish its case by a proponderance of the evidence in order to win a claim for money, whatever it may be in a civil case; you understand that?

A Yes.

Q Do you understand the distinction between this and the burden of proof that I have read to you and instructed you about; that is, that the People have the obligation of proving the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

A Yes.

Q Now, in this case, ladies and gentlemen, the offenses charged are punishable by death or life imprisonment.

The Court is required to ascertain if any prospective juror entertains such conscientious opinions as would preclude a defendant, -- the juror, finding a defendant guilty, if the evidence should justify such a finding, or if the juror would under no circumstances vote for the penalty, for the death penalty; if the juror would automatically vote against the death penalty or whether the juror would, by reason of his feelings concerning the death penalty, would automatically vote for the death penalty upon a conviction of murder of the first degree.

 Now, the Court, in talking about penalty, wishes to state that at the outset I have no way of knowing whether or not you will be called upon to determine the question of penalty, as that will be dependent upon what your finding is as to guilt.

In other words, this case is possibly divided into two phases.

One, the first phase of the case involving the question of guilt or innocence of the charges that I have read to you, and if there is a finding of guilt of murder of the first degree, then, the case enters into a second phase involving penalty.

So in arriving at a verdict in this case, as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant in the first phase, the subject of penalty or punishment is not to be discussed or considered by you, as that is a matter which, under our law, must be considered and determined in a separate proceeding, if your findings in the first phase require such a proceeding.

If the defendant is acquitted or found guilty of a lesser crime than murder of the first degree, then there's nothing to submit to the jury on the issue of penalty.

Do you understand thus far, Mr. Campbell?

A Yes, sir.

Q So the Court wishes to inform you that the law imposes neither death nor life imprisonment. The law does not impose either punishment for murder of the first degree, but presents the two alternatives, the two alternatives to

the absolute discretion of the jury.

The Legislature has formulated no rules to control the exercise of the jury's discretion.

and I'll make this inquiry of you now, Mr. Campbell, and will others of you beyond the rail be thinking about what your answers would be to these other questions when I put them to you, because you may be quite -- probably will be called upon to be in this box, too.

Are your opinions concerning the death penalty such that by reason of them you could not be fair and impartial in determining guilt or impocence?

A No.

Sa Fla,

\$

---

Or are your views concerning the death penalty such that you would automatically refuse to impose the death penalty regardless of the evidence that might be produced? Or are your opinions concerning the death penalty such that if the defendant were convicted of murder in the first degree that you would vote to impose the death penalty without regard to the evidence that might be developed during the case? Would you repeat that, please? Would you automatically vote to impose the death penalty upon a conviction of murder in the first degree without regard to the evidence that might be produced in the case? Or are your views concerning the death penalty such Now, I'll be asking all of you about this: Whether you heard of this case before; Whether you heard of Charles Manson or the Manson What your thoughts are about Manson or Manson Whether you can set aside anything that you -whether you are capable of setting aside anything that you may have heard, seen or read about this case, Charles Manson, or Whether, if you are capable, you will set aside

such matters to make a judgment on any issue that you might be

8 . 

from the news media or conversations that you had with your friends or relatives concerning those subjects; and whether you can be fair and impartial.

Now, for the purpose of examining Mr. Campbell and

now, for the purpose of examining Mr. Campbell and each of you about publicity and your knowledge of publicity, it is necessary for us to conduct that examination separately and apart from the balance of the panel. So, that's what we'll do in Mr. Campbell's case when we get to that point.

called upon to make in this case independently of such reports

However, the Court would permit counsel at this time to inquire generally on voir dire of Mr. Campbell.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I wonder if the Court wants to introduce the attorneys, at least, to the jurors?

THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. DENNY: To see if anybody knows us.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I did not do this.

The defendant is Bruce McGregor Davis.

And would you stand -- well, you needn't stand.

Mr. Davis is the man that's at the far end of counsel table from Mr. Compbell.

He's represented by Mr. George Denny, attorney for the defendant.

The People are represented by Mr. Stephen Kay,
Deputy District Attorney, and Anthony Manzella, Deputy District
Attorney.

Is there any one of you who knows Mr. Davis, who has ever heard anything from any close friend or relative concerning Mr. Davis?

1	Ω	Mr. Campbell, you say that your wife is presently.
2	a housewife	
3		Has she previously been employed in any capacity,
4	sir?	
5	A	Yes, she has.
6	Q	In what capacity, sir?
7	A	Secretary.
8	Q	And what sort of secretary? To what sort of firm
9	or individu	ual?
10	A	Board of Education, State of California, Kaiser
11	Aerospace.	
12	Ω	In Kaiser Aerospace, you say?
13	A	Yès.
14	Q	Again, that microphone is not as good as it might
15	be, so you	do have to speak pretty closely to it.
16		In your course in business law, I take it, you had
17		ncerning evidence, did you?
~'	nothing con	and grant grant grant grant
18	nothing cor	No.
	-	
18	A	No.
18 19 20 21	A Q	No. Or anything relating to criminal law?
18 19 20 21 22	A Q A Q	No. Or anything relating to criminal law? No, sir.
18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A Q	No. Or anything relating to criminal law? No, sir. You don't feel in any sense that you are the
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A Q A Q trained lay	No. Or anything relating to criminal law? No, sir. You don't feel in any sense that you are the wyer, in any way, I take it?
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A Q A Q trained lay	No.  Or anything relating to criminal law?  No, sir.  You don't feel in any sense that you are the wyer, in any way, I take it?  No.
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	A Q A Q trained law A Q	No.  Or anything relating to criminal law?  No, sir.  You don't feel in any sense that you are the wyer, in any way, I take it?  No.  An engineer, yes, a lawyer, no?
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A Q A Q trained law A Q A	No.  Or anything relating to criminal law?  No, sir.  You don't feel in any sense that you are the wyer, in any way, I take it?  No.  An engineer, yes, a lawyer, no?  An architect.

military Service? No. Α And I'm sorry, you didn't even get to the point of hearing evidence or testimony in this burglary case; is that what I understood? That it was dismissed just after you were impaneled? 5b fol A Yes. ÌB 

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

Q Or wa

Or was some evidence taken?

A The District Attorney presented his case and we recessed, and then the next day it was called off.

Q I see.

All right. Now, sir, I'm going to ask you some questions as the Judge has about the death penalty. And you understand that by my questions, just as the Judge has stated to you, I am in no way implying that I think you are even going to reach that point here.

You understand that?

A Yes.

Q That the questions I ask are asked at this time simply because this is the only opportunity that either side has to question jurors as to their attitude. And that attitude may be completely immaterial if the defendant is found not guilty; you understand that?

A Yes.

Q All right.

Now, sir, have you done any reading at all in -in the field of or concerning the death penalty?

A Yes.

Q What sort of reading would you say you've done?

A Just in the newspapers or current magazines.

Q Well, are these articles concerning when a person has been executed by the State or are these articles pertaining to efforts by some groups or persons to eliminate or abolish the use of the death penalty or both?

A More in the area of the abolition of the death

27 28

.24

25

26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

	Q.	From	what	you	told	the J	udge,	that	Aon	are	able
in	certain	n cases	or yo	id we	ould l	oe, to	vote	for	the	impo	sition
of	the de	ath pena	alty,	the	exect	ition	of a	defen	dant	by :	lethal
gas	s up in	the gas	s chan	ber	you	could	vote	for	that	?	

A Yes.

Q All right. So from that answer I take it that you are not unalterably opposed to the imposition of capital punishment as they euphemistically term it?

A I am not opposed,

Q And I take it that you feel, then, that there are certain cases in which, at least as far as you are concerned, that is the appropriate penalty, correct?

A Yes.

Q And do you feel that any time a person has been convicted of willful, premeditated, deliberate, first degree murder, that that is an appropriate case for the infliction of the death penalty?

MR. KAY: To which I'll object on the grounds previously stated, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that question.

MR. DENNY: Could the question before it be reread, also, and the answer?

THE COURT: Yes, it may.

(Whereupon, the record was read by the reporter as follows:

"Q And I take it that you feel, then, that there are certain cases in which, at least as far as you are concerned, that is the appropriate

2

3

5

б

7

8

9

21

22

23.

25

26

27

28

would term it a shootout.

Just happened? Q

A Between the law officers and the people holding the person hostage.

Q I see.

Other than that, you've not personally witnessed a ---

No. I haven't. Α

Q Now, sir, I take it you have never been in a situation, then, where you, in effect, had a person's life in your hands; is that right?

No, I don't think so.

Other than when you get into your car daily. O

But in a very serious sense, you have never been faced with the choice that you, and you alone would make of whether another individual based on something that you did, would live or would be executed by the state by lethal gas being administered to him; is that correct?

I've not had that experience.

Well, assuming that you are seated as a juror and the People establish their case beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, et cetera, you could be in that situation? Not that I am saying that you will be, by any sense, but as we sit here, the People at least think you may be in that situation.

And assuming you are in that situation, sir, do you feel that -- I'm asking the People's question here, because they often ask this, but let me ask it of you anyway.

Do you feel you have whatever moral fiber, courage

∻ 1	L

1.

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

of your convictions, strength of your convictions, whatever, that if you felt it was the right case, you could come in and look at Mr. Davis here and say, "Mr. Davis, I sentence you to die by the administration of lethal gas in the execution chamber"; could you say that?

A Yes, I could.

Q Let's turn it around, now, sir.

If you felt that, even assuming that you had found the defendant guilty of murder, such as he's charged with, but taking cases which you say, depending on the facts that the case or cases or charges were not such that it warranted the imposition of the death penalty, from your own personal point of view, do you think that there would be anything inconsistent with your duty as a juror in coming back into this courtroom and returning a life verdict rather than death?

A I could.

Q I'm sure you could.

Do you think that it would be upholding your duty as a juror to do so?

A Of course.

Q And by the same token, could you look at the judge, could you look at the prosecutors and say, "Life not death"?

A Yes.

Q All right.

THE COURT: Have you covered that subject, that particular subject?

MR. DENNY: Inasfar as that particular subject, yes.

THE COURT: Let's recess now.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

5c+3

R

Ladies and gentlemen, I'll instruct you in this recess that you are not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, on any subject connected with this matter --

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I think they're having a little difficulty hearing you.

THE COURT: Incidentally, if you cannot hear the Court or counsel in that back row there, would you raise your right -- just raise your hand and we'll get closer to the microphone.

The Court instructs you that you are not to converse about this case amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else during the time that you are a prospective juror or a juror, if you should be chosen, and you are not to form or express any opinion on the matter until the matter is finally submitted to you, should you be chosen as a juror.

We'll be in recess now until 2:00 o'clock. When we recess now --

Can you hear me?

A VOICE: I can hear you, your Honor. I had a question.

THE COURT: I see. What is your question?

A VOICE: What about — you said something about calling our boss at lunch.

THE COURT: Yes. Over the noon hour find out whether or not you are going to be paid in the event you should serve on this jury.

A VOICE: May we mention the case?

MR. KAY: She is saying, your Honor "May we mention the case?"

THE COURT: Oh, thank you.

5c-4

5d fol

Yes, of course, you may mention the case. You don't need to discuss any facts in connection with it, you may just mention to your employer -- well, you don't know any facts, of course. But the Court would say that you can name the case and tell your employer that it will last approximately two months. It will take you probably to the end of February. And ask whether or not you'll be paid during that period of time. So ascertain that.

Yes, the first lady that raised her hand.

A VOICE: Your Honor, if you feel that you just couldn't possibly render a fair decision, can you state so right now?

THE COURT: We might arrange that.

5d-1

1

2

à

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I wonder if we could simply have those jurors submit their names to the bailiff and perhaps we could work out something under those circumstances.

THE COURT: Will you approach the bench.

Yes, sir.

A VOICE: I have a question.

About the time limit, is that considered -- I mean, my employer says to put in the regular -- I think one calendar month, is that right?

THE COURT: Ordinarily a juror serves a calendar month or 20 days, and is generally paid for it by an employer.

A VOICE: And that's -- that's --

THE COURT: And if you go beyond that time, which of course you will, if you are chosen as a juror in this case, the Court wants to know whether or not it would constitute any hardship to you of a personal nature or if you -- or of a financial nature.

A VOICE: Well, it would in my case.

THE COURT: Pardon?

A VOICE: It would, because I am allowed just the regular month.

THE COURT: Well, I may talk to you later in the event your name is drawn out of the box.

A VOICE: Okay.

THE COURT: But at this point, I want all of you to inquire about that unless you know, as this gentleman does know.

A VOICE: I know.

27 28 5d-2

14. 

23.

THE COURT: All right. Any more questions?

MR. DENNY: Did you want to see us at the bench?

THE COURT: Yes, may I see counsel at the bench?

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the prospective jury:)

THE COURT: Did you have some suggestion in connection with that?

MR. DENNY: Well, I thought if we can get a gal like this lady in the beginning who said if we can tell you right now that we'd be so prejudiced that we couldn't sit on the jury, can we tell you now instead of sitting around, I think it would make some sense perhaps to have them give their names to the bailiff and --

MR. KAY: We could maybe question them right off the bat, right after lunch.

MR. DENNY: I think it is possible to do that, if they are so certain that they can't be fair under the circumstances, whatever those circumstances are, although she seems to have some very definite opinion that it is going to save a lot of time that you'd ask, take asking the general questions and all the rest of them, if we can just exclude them from the voir dire.

THE COURT: Somebody who is that strong in his or her opinion generally gets it out in the first few minutes that they are in the box.

MR. KAY: That's true. That's true.

THE COURT: I don't know how we can arrange the

mechanics in saving time.

Š

MR. DENNY: All right.

THE COURT: We'd probably still have to question them individually, and her name may never come up.

So let's just leave it alone.

MR. DENNY: Well, I assume at least you've got that gal pinpointed?

THE COURT: I assume you have.

MR. KAY: We both have, you know. We don't know what her problem is.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court within the presence and hearing of the prospective jurors:)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll see you at 2:00 o'clock.

When you reassemble, you can assemble -- you can reassemble in Department 100, which is the courtroom immediately adjacent to this.

MR. DENNY: Except for Mr. Campbell.

MR. KAY: I just wanted to remind you there are a couple of jurors who are sitting on the jury now who we haven't generally voir dired. I think jurors No. 8 and 9.

THE COURT: Yes, I remember that. And we can get around to that and voir dire them and have all of them -- voir dire them in the presence of this panel, to orient this panel. And then, after we're finished with that voir dire, this gentleman on publicity.

All right, let's do that when we reassemble.

MR. KAY: Okay. 1, (Whereupon, at 12:00 o'clock noon an adjournment was taken until 2:00 o'clock p.m. of the same day.) 

5**–** 1

Y , \*

ļ

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

คร

24

25

26 27

28

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1971, 2:39 P. M.

THE COURT: Let's proceed in the Davis matter.

MR. DENNY: May we approach the bench for just a moment?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DENNY: Without the reporter?

(Whereupon, proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, which was not reported; followed by a discussion off the record at the bench between the Court and the bailiff.)

THE COURT: Tell her she's going to have to wait.

The bailiff, gentlemen, is telling me about those two jurors who raised their hands and indicated they had fixed states of mind which they thought would preclude them from serving on this jury.

And one of them has indicated that -- well, each of them has indicated an attitude toward capital punishment, which they believe would exclude them.

I think, however, that we probably should just permit them to -- or, require them to remain, in the event their names are called, and then examine them.

MR. MANZELLA: Right. I agree.

THE COURT: Rather than take them out of order.

Will you tell them that, Mr. Kuczera?

THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I wonder if we might proceed by just having Mr. Campbell in, first, so that we can --

THE COURT: All right.

3

4

5

6

7

8

MR. DENNY: -- examine him on publicity, and then bring in the rest of the panel, and Mr. Kay can take over from there.

THE COURT: All right. Let's do that, then.

(Pause in the proceedings while prospective juror No. 1 entered the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Mr. Campbell -- the record should show that all counsel are present and the defendant is present.

9

#### FURTHER VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF

#### LAWRENCE CAMPRELL

### BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Cumpbell, the Court wishes to inquire of you whether you have previously heard of this case at all, before I read the indictment to you this afternoon -- or this morning, rather? Had you previously heard of this case at all?

- I -- not this particular case. I heard of the case +-
- I mean this indictment.
- A No.
- Have you had -- you started to tell me you heard of a case.

That was selecting a jury. That's the extent A Yes. of it, was that they were selecting a jury, and ic was taking some time.

- I see. Are you talking about the Tate-LaBianca case?
  - A No, I am talking about this case.
  - You are talking about this case. You are talking Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

about the -- you've just heard that they were selecting : ŀ for this case; is that what you --I heard a couple of jurous caying, that they were in 3 the process of being rejected -- or, I've been rejected from a 4 case that was taking a long time --5 6 Q I Acc. 7 -- in soluction a jury. Had you ever heard the name Bruce Davis balars? 8 Ļ. No. Ă va Col 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 24 25 27 28

~	1		
6a-1.	ı	Q	Or had you ever heard the name Himman before
,	2	Gary Hinman	before I read it?
	3	A	Yes.
	4	ବ	In what way? In what connection?
	5	A	With the publicity on the Manson case.
	6	Q	About the same time as that Tate-La Bianca
	7	homicide car	se?
	8	<b>A</b> .	Between then and now.
	9		I don't know exactly what time
	10	Q	When was the last time you read anything about
	11	Mr. Manson?	
	12	A	I I don't believe I read anything, but I did
•	13	hear someth	ing on the radio in passing, and I don't it was
^ *# 	14	just a news	east, and I didn't pay too much attention to it.
	15	Q	How long ago was that? A matter of days, weeks,
	16	months?	
	17	A	Weeks a week or something like that. I
	18	Q	Have you ever heard of anyone being prosecuted
	<b>19</b>	for these m	urders, or alleged murders of Shea and Hinman?
	20	A	Prosecuted?
	21	Q	Yes.
n com	22	A	Anyone other than Davis? Hmmm I can't recall.
	23	Q	Do you know in what connection you heard Mr.
	24	Manson's na	me?
	25	A	I believe that he was suspected. That's what I
	26	heard. I d	on t know if he had come to trial.
	27	Q	Well, what have you heard about the name Shea?
É	28	Board com	or read shout it?

1	A That he was missing.						
2	Q And do you recall that he was looked for in some						
3	particular place?						
4	A Yes, on the Spahn Ranch, I believe.						
5	Q And the Spahn Ranch is what?						
6	A I believe that is where the Manson Family lived.						
7.	Q And the Manson Family is what group?						
8	A It's a group that surrounds Charles Manson.						
9	Q Now, could a member of the Manson Family receive a						
10	fair trial from you?						
11	A Yes.						
12	Q You wouldn't be so prejudiced from what you've						
13	heard, seen or read concerning that Manson Family that you						
14	would not be able to be fair and impartial?						
15	A I don't think so.						
16 .	Q Well, what have you heard about Hinman?						
17	A Other than today?						
18	Q Gary Hinman?						
19	A I I heard that he was killed.						
20	Q Do you did you read any of the details, or						
21	hear						
22	A No.						
23	Q or see any of the details?						
24	A No.						
25	Q You don't know where it's alleged to have						
26	happened or anything about it?						
27	A No. I knew that it was connected at some time						
28	with the Tate-La Bianca or, there was a connection assumed						

12<sup>.</sup>

or something.

I'm not too sure about that.

Q Let me ask you this. Is it possible for you, in your state of mind now, knowing what you have heard, seen and read about the Manson Family, and the Tate-La Bianca, and the Hinman-Shea and so forth, is it possible for you to set aside any such information that you have previously learned, and make a decision on any issue that you are called upon to decide in this case, basing your decision solely on the evidence and the Court's instructions of law in this case?

A Yes.

Q Can you do that?

A Yes.

1	Q What you have to do, in effect, is blank out what									
2	you have learned over a period of months, now, from the press,									
3	radio or television, and decide the case solely on what you hear									
4	and see in the court as evidence.									
5	A Right.									
.6	Q Can you do that?									
7	A Yes.									
8	Q And will you do that?									
9	A Yes.									
10	Q And will you be fair and impartial?									
11	A Yes.									
12	THE COURT: Mr. Denny?									
13	MR. DENNY: Thank you.									
14										
<b>15</b>	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION									
16	BY MR. DENNY:									
17	Q Mr. Campbell, do you regularly subscribe to one of									
18	the daily papers here in Los Angeles?									
19.	A No, I dőn't.									
20	Q Do you see one on a regular basis?									
21	A Not no, not necessarily.									
22	Q And what would you say is your major source of									
23	news?									
24	A Television.									
25	Q Do you regularly watch television news broadcasts,									
26	morning or evening, or any particular time?									
27	A When I have control of the television, I do.									
28	Q You have some children, I take it?									

1

3

A Yes.

All right. Well, would you say, on a fairly Q regular basis, however, --

4

A Yes.

5 6

-- either morning or evening, you do get news Q via the television?

7

Yes, I do. A

8

9

All right. And how about radio? Do you get news Q broadcasts over a particular news station or a music station that plays -- that has news every so often?

10

The station I listen to has a short broadcast every

12

11

hour.

13.

All right. And do you make something of an effort Q to attempt to keep up with the day's happenings? At least in the world and locally?

14 15

> I try to. But sometimes I just don't have the time. Α

16

Q Like us all. All right.

17 18

Now, sir, as far as the latest thing that you say you heard about Mr. Manson you say, "I believe Manson was suspected."

19 20

Of what?

22

21

Α In connection with the Hinman case.

23 24

In other words, you heard something or saw some-Q thing over TV or radio that Manson was suspected of complicity

25 26

in the death of Mr. Hinman?

27

28

Something of that nature. I think -- I think, A since the publicity of the trial -- the first trial, the Tate-LaBianca trial -- that I haven't paid too much attention.

ケルアデ

I didn't -- I did, you know, pay a certain amount of attention; but since then, things pass through your mind, either -- you know, through the news media, that doesn't necessarily register.

And I think this was one of the cases.

Q Um-hmmm.

Well, it does register, at least to the extent that you do make a connection between Gary Hinman and Charlie Manson; and the fact that Charlie Manson was at least suspected of -- of something to do with Mr. Hinman's death; is that right?

A Yes. There was something -- I'm not exactly sure what it was -- but the two names went together.

I'm sure there was some connection.

<u>7-1</u>

Q Well, do you recall whether there was also, in connection with that, the fact that he was being tried or had been tried for the killing of Gary Hinman?

A I -- I think that might be.

Q Or had been convicted?

A I have a feeling that I even know more than I suggested. I think that I heard that he had been sentenced on this case, and I believe he had gotten a life sentence. This is what I think.

Q All right.

A Over a death penalty that he had received before.

Q Over and above the Tate-La Bianca death penalties that he had received?

A This is why it had stuck in my mind, as I recall now.

Q Right.

And do you recall in that connection hearing whether he was also charged with the alleged murder of Shorty Shea? Whether he had been tried on that charge or charged on that with the Himman killing?

A Well, I think that since the original publicity, the connection of the two names have been put together in the press so often, that I would think that they're probably related. And I would think that they're together. That's --

Q Well, again, this is perhaps a logical assumption on your part. Perhaps not.

But the thing that I am mainly interested in, is not only the fact that you make this, as I say, possibly a

7-2

22<sup>.</sup>

logical assumption, but do you recall, now that we've talked about it, a little about it, having specifically seen, heard or read recently within the last several weeks of Mr. Manson having been tried or found guilty or convicted or sentenced on these two charges together?

A I don't know if they were together. I only recall the name "Hindman" in relation with Mr. Manson, or in relation to, at the time I heard it.

Q I see.

A I don't even recall the time at which I heard it.

It was just -- I'm just recalling as I'm sitting here.

Q Right. That's what we are trying to help you do, refresh your recollection to determine just how much you are able to recall and how far back or how far forward in your memory these recollections are.

Do you recall hearing about Shorty Shea or stuntman Shorty Shea some couple of years ago when the news of the Tate-La Bianca cases and the arrest of Mr. Manson and some others occurred?

A Yes, I do, in that they were looking for the man or that they had reported him missing. I think they -- this sheriff or whoever it was was looking for them and they had certain leads. And they looked there, and they looked here, and as far as I know they've never found him. That's my recollection of Shorty Shea.

Q All right. And thinking about that, is that the last you heard about him or have you heard anything more recently about Shorty Shea, to your knowledge? Seen, heard

3

4

5

б

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

27

or read, I should say.

A I couldn't honestly answer I recall that. I may have and I may have not. I just -- I'm not sure.

Q Uh-huh.

A I mean, they could have been together for the way it was before -- you know, at the time there was much publicity on the case. Because I think all three or four cases were suspected of being tied together at the time.

Q Well, when you say they could have been together, I'm not exactly sure of what you mean.

A Well, I think at the time much publicity was given to the Manson case, that he was suspected of being connected with the Tate-La Bianca, the Hinman case and the missing of Mr. Shea.

Q All right.

Well, you do have knowledge of the finding of guilt of Mr. Manson in the Tate-La Bianca cases, is that right?

A Yes.

Q And the sentences that he received there, the death sentences?

A Yes.

Q All right.

And, now, in addition to that, you have some information, though somewhat fuzzy, about more recent proceedings with Mr. Manson involving the Hinman case?

A Yes.

Q And, again, is it your feeling that because of

the connection that there had been previously, that you read about, that there is then this same connection now in the newscast that Mr. Manson apparently was tried on, of Mr. Hinman and possibly Mr. Shea, also?

MR. KAY: Well, I'm going to object. I think that's an ambiguous question. I don't understand it anyway.

THE COURT: You --

MR. DENNY: Well, let me rephrase it, then.

THE COURT: You may rephrase it.

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

15

14

16 17

18

19

24

27

28

25 26

Q. Knowing about the outcome of the Tate-La Bianca cases and that those are now, at least separate, and knowing or having read something about Manson's trial in connection with the Hirmon case, is it your feeling that that case and the Shen case was tied together in this latest prosecution?

Could have been. I -- I don't know. The only thing that I say that I recall the late -- the only publicity or the only news that I had heard was that he was given a life sentence. And the reason that it struck me was that he had already been sentenced to die. And they had given him a life after that.

All right.

Does the name Steve Grogen ring a bell at all to you?

A No.

Now, sir, if you were to recall any more about this, either IV newscasts or radio newscasts, however it was that you got this information, this latest information about Mr. Manson, and if before the jury were to be impaneled you read anything more about it, would you be able to tell us, tell us that?

- À You mean volunteer?
- Yes, just raise your hand to the Judge. Ď.
- A Sure.
- And say I have thought --Q
- A I do understand, yes.
- -- of one additional thing or any other factors; could you do that?

1	A Yes, sure.
2	Q And you would think about that for us? Think
3	think about it, give some thought to that newscast?
4	A (Nods head.)
5	Q So that you can determine in your own mind
6	whether it is way, way back in your mind and not easily
7	brought to the fore or whether it is just waiting to pop
8	out?
9	Λ Yes.
10	Q Or just waiting to pop out.
11	All right.
12	Now, did you follow, would you say, not avidly,
13	but at least casually, the course of the Tate and La Blanca
14	trial?
15	A Not the trial itself, other than what occasionally
16	came on the television news. I read in the newspaper
17	accounts the story that as they had published it.
18	Q That was
19	A Not of the trial so much, of the
20	Q The Susan Atkins
21	A The ***
22	Q The Susan Atkins account that appeared?
23 24	A Yes, that's right.
25	Q Now, do you have any feeling, sir, as you sit
26	there, that anyone connected with this Manson Family, with
20 27	Charles Manson, anyone who, for an extended period of time,
28	perhaps, was associated with Mr. Manson, perhaps is more
40	likely to be sort of criminally oriented than someone not

connected with Mr. Manson or the Manson Family? 1 A Not necessarily. So that the mere fact of association itself does 3 not in your mind sort of ter the person associated with the same brush as Mr. Manson or -No. I don't --6 -- or the people who were found guilty with him 7 in the Tate and La Bienca killings; is that right? Á No. All right, sir. Q 10 Do you have any feeling at all as you sit there, 11 for any reason --Well, let me ask you one more thing, as far as 13 dope or drugs, Have you read some things in connection with this 15 Tate-La Bianca thing and the Manson Family, et cetera, about 16 these drugs? 17 Yes. I believe I had heard that they were on 18 drugs at the time. 19 Well, do you have any feelings yourself about 20 drugs so that because of those feelings perhaps you might 21 feel some sort of antipathy toward any person who might 92 admit on the stand having used drugs? 23 A No. 24 Or anyone, if there's evidence that he did use 25 drugs, that this would influence you against him in any way? 26 Á No. 27 Except, of course, insofar as his sbility to Q 28

( Table )

ئ م

remember, if he's a witness? You'd consider that, I take it, his drug use in connection with all of the other things that the Judge will tell you that you may consider in determining a witness' credibility?

A I'm sure.

Q But merely because he used drugs, you wouldn't turn him off and say, "I wouldn't believe him"?

A No.

Q All right.

I have no further questions on this issue, your Honor.

### VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. KAY:

Q Mr. Campbell, let me just ask you in one area that Mr. Denny brought up.

You said that you became aware through the news media that Mr. Manson got death on the Tate-La Bianca case, but got life on the Hinman case.

Do you think if you gat as a juror in this case that you could put that knowledge out of your mind, erase it in your mind; do you think you can do that?

A As far as I know there is no connection. I don't --

Q Well, what I am saying is that in this case you can only consider the evidence that comes from that witness stand.

A Yes.

2 • 35	1	Q Do you understand that?
	2	Λ Yes.
•	3	a And the witnesses that testify in the courtroom.
	4	So unless somebody testified to the fact that
	5	Mr. Manson or Susan Atkins or somebody got the death penalty
	6	in the Tate-La Bianca case or Mr. Manson got the death penalty
	7	on the Himmon case, you couldn't even consider that, you
	8	couldn't even talk about that in the jury room with the
	ð	other jurors; do you understand that?
75 fls.	. 10	Á Yes.
•	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
- <del>(*</del> 6)	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25.	
*	26,	
<i>\$</i>	27	
**	28	

3

MR. DENNY: I think ,Mr. Kay, you made a misstatement of the facts. You said Mr. Manson got the death penalty in the Hinman

MR. KAY: Oh, yes, life imprisonment in the Hinman case.

5

б

7

10

11

12

13.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27 28

MR. KAY: Your Honor, I think Mr. Denny and I have resolved it, I'll question Mr. Campbell on the death penalty and

case.

You understand whatever your outside knowledge is as far as the Manson Family or Mr. Manson himself or Mr. Davis or other members of the Family, unless you hear evidence on this from the witness stand, you can't even consider that in making your determination as to either the guilt or innocence of Mr. Davis or as to what penalty he gets in this case; do you understand that?

A Yes.

And will you do that? Will you not consider your outside information?

Yes. Α

MR. KAY: I have no further questions on publicity, but I haven't had the chance to question Mr. Campbell on the death penalty in front of the entire panel, which I'd want.

THE COURT: All right, let's bring the panel back with the jurors who are in the box.

THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.

MR. KAY: Mr. Campbell, I believe you are going to be in seat No. 1. That's the last seat down there.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kay.

(Whereupon, Mr. Dunny and Mr. Kay conferred at counsel table.)

7b-2

Ġ

I'll sit down, and Mr. Denny will question the other jurors generally, and then I'll question them generally.

THE COURT: All right. We've covered penalty and publicity with the other jurors?

MR. DENNY: Yes.

MR. KAY: That's right.

THE COURT: I wonder if you have given any thought to doing this, all the voir dire, including that of publicity, with all of the panel present --

MR. DENNY: I don't see how we can do that issue, your Honor, the publicity issue.

THE COURT: It would certainly save time.

MR. DENNY: Well --

THE COURT: Well, that's not the principal consideration
The thing is I don't believe it would have any appreciable
affect on the panel if you would do it that way, if any at all

MR. DENNY: Well, I couldn't disagree more strongly.

If certain information is made known to them from either side.

THE COURT: It may be true, there are some prospective jurors who have more information than others, and in answering questions they may very well educate the other prospective jurors.

(Whereupon, the prospective jurors were brought into the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Mrs. Figueroa, you are No. 5.

Mr. Ciochon is No. 6.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DUNKINS: What number am 12 MR. KAY: Mrs. Dunkins, I think you are in seat No. 9.

THE COURT: Yes, Mrs. Dunkins is No. 8. Mrs. Muldrow, you are -- Mr. Burtiss is No. 8, I'm sorry, and Mrs. Dunkins is No. 9. Mr. Burtiss is No. 8 and Mrs. Dunkins is No. 9. 8 fol Now, we have it. 13. 

8-1"

13. 

. 19

 Mr. Kay, you may begin.

The record may show that all the prospective jurors, beyond the rail and in the box, are present.

MR. KAY: Mr. Campbell, before I question you very briefly on the subject of capital punishment, I would like to direct a few general questions to you, and to you ladies and gentlemen that are sitting out there.

Does anybody have any trouble hearing me up here?

If you do, just raise your hand, and I'll -- I'll get a

microphone, and then we'll all be deaf.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, at the outset, let me encourage Mr. Campbell -- and the rest of you -- when Mr. Manzella and I ask you questions, to please be as candid as you can possibly be.

I understand that, for a lot of you, that it's going to be hard, because you are not used to public speaking, and you probably don't know maybe more than one other person in this whole courtroom. It might be hard to speak up now.

But, as I have told some of the jurors that have suffered with us here for a week or more, I imagine it would be much harder to speak up in the jury room, when your co-jurors know that you were asked a question during this voir dire phase of the trial, while we were selecting a jury, when you were asked a question about the death penalty or some other subject, and you failed to speak up at that time.

Also, it would be a violation of your oath not to speak up now. And believe me, hobody here is going to bite

8-2

1 2

you or do anything bad to you. We just want to find out what your views are.

This is the last chance that either Mr. Manzella or I or Mr. Denny will get to find out what your thoughts are. And we want to get twelve fair and impartial jurors. That's the main thing we're interested in.

Now, to make our position absolutely clear, just as we want you to be candid with us, we want to be candid with you.

If the jury which is impaneled to try this case convicts Mr. Davis of either first degree murder or conspiracy to commit murder — or both — during the penalty phase of the trial. Mr. Manzella and I will vigorously urge the jury to return a verdict condemning Mr. Davis to death in this case, for the crimes that he has committed.

Let me encourage you again, if I ask you a question and you don't understand it, don't answer it. Just tell me that you don't understand it. Could I repeat it? Could I rephrase?

You don't have to answer one of our questions yes or no. If you want to explain your answer, feel perfectly free to do so.

And chiefly, let me encourage you, if you give an answer -- say, on the death penalty, if today you tell me that, "Well, Mr. Kay, I think I could vote for the death penalty," and then over the weekend, you think about it, and you think about it -- and I'm sure you are all going to think about it; you should think about it -- and you think about it,

8-3 4

-

-

.9

8a fol

and you change your mind, well, if you come back here Monday, and you are seated on the jury, don't hesitate to raise your hand and say, "Mr. Kay, I thought about it, and I told you or Mr. Manzella or the judge that I could vote for the death penalty, but I -- I just -- I just couldn't now. And I realized that over the weekend, when I did a lot of more thinking about it."

Don't hesitate to do that, if you change your mind on that question or any other question.

8a - 1

Now, Mr. -- and also, I would ask you -- the last question I'm going to direct generally to you, is that while I'm questioning Mr. Campbell, and I am just going to briefly question him on capital punishment, then I'm going to sit down, and then Mr. Denny is going to question a couple of jurors, generally, and then either Mr. Manzella or I will

question the jurors generally, after Mr. Denny.

But mentally ask yourself the same questions that I am going to ask the jurors. And also, that Mr. Denny's going to ask the jurors. Because at least where I am concerned -- and where Mr. Manzella is concerned, we won't have to go through all the same questions again, when you get up on the -- in the jury box.

We can ask you, "Did you hear such and such a question? Did you understand what we were talking about? Would your answer be any different?"

Because I am going to give some examples when I question the jurors generally, and I -- I don't want to have to repeat them -- except that I will, if you didn't understand; and I will ask you if you understood my example.

# VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF LAWRENCE CAMPBELL

BY IR. KAY:

Q Now, Mr. Campbell, you were questioned by Mr. Denny on the death penalty, and I think you made your answers pretty clear, so I am not going to ask you specifically too many questions.

8a-2

T do believe that it's your position that you have resolved in your own mind that, if you felt the evidence warranted it in this case, that you could vote for a verdict of death, --

A Yes.

Q -- is that true?

And you understand that in that death penalty case, a capital case, a crime for which the punishment could be life imprisonment or death, in order to reach a verdict of death, all 12 jurors must be unanimous; they must all agree.

So that means that each individual juror participates in that verdict, because unless each juror votes for death, you don't get a death verdict.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q And understanding that, are you willing to participate in such a case, where you might have to decide whether or not Mr. Davis will get life imprisonment or death in the gas chamber?

A Yes.

Now, knowing that if you found the defendant,
Mr. Davis, guilty of first degree murder, that you would have
to face this issue of deciding whether or not to give him
life imprisonment or death, would you even consider finding
him guilty of second degree murder, for instance, or some
charge less than first degree murder, to avoid the responsibility
of making this decision as to whether he gets life or death?

A I would ask you to repeat that, please.

Q All right. Knowing that if you convicted Mr.

Davis of first degree murder -- and let me explain this first:

That only if Mr. Davis is convicted of first degree murder and/or conspiracy to commit murder do you face the issue of whether or not he gets life or death?

8b-1 -

20° 

25.

In other words, if he's convicted of, say, second degree murder on both the Hinman and Shea murders, and found, say, not guilty on the conspiracy to commit murder, then you wouldn't face the issue of the death penalty.

But if he's convicted of first degree murder on either or both the Hinman and Shea murders, or if he's convicted of conspiracy to commit murder, then you would have to face the issue of determining whether or not he got life imprisonment or suffered the death penalty.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Now, realizing this, that if you found him guilty of first degree murder or conspiracy to commit murder — or both — that you would have to make a determination as to whether or not he got life imprisonment or suffered the death penalty, would you even consider finding him guilty of anything less than first degree murder, and conspiracy to commit murder, for the sole reason that you'd want to avoid the responsibility of moving into the penalty phase of the trial, and having to make the determination of whether he got life or death?

A No.

Q And do you feel that any moral or religious belief that you presently hold would prevent you from voting for the death penalty in this case?

A No.

Q Do you have any close friend or relative who opposes the death penalty, who you feel might attempt to exert

**,** 

1

. 3

4

5

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

pressure on you to vote for life imprisonment, if you were selected as a juror in this case?

A No.

Q And I take it that you are willing to assume the serious responsibility that goes along with being a juror in this case?

A Yes.

MR. KAY: Thank you. I'll pass on the death penalty issue with this juror, your Honor.

Thank you very much, Mr. Campbell.

THE COURT: Mr. Denny? You may begin the general voir dire of those jurors who have not been questioned.

MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor.

14 15:

16

17

18

#### VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. DENNY:

Q Mr. Campbell, you are the last one, but you are number one in the box so I'll direct a few questions to you, if I may, sir.

19 20

21

22

23

24

Sir, the judge read you some questions, instructed you on evidence, direct evidence and circumstantial evidence, that in effect, where the People's case rests chiefly or solely on circumstantial evidence, you are not permitted to find the defendant guilty, unless the proved circumstances are not only consistent with guilt, but are irreconcilable with any other rational decision.

25 26

Now, part of circumstantial evidence sometimes, in a juror's mind, consists of association. And one of the

2000年までは

instructions that the judge didn't give you — but that is part of that — is that you cannot find a person guilty of any crime, if the only thing that is shown by the People is association with other people who may be criminals, who may have committed the crime that you are talking about.

But if the People established only association, that in and of itself is not sufficient to find a person guilty.

Now, do you understand that?

A Yes, I do.

8c-1

2

1

Q And would you, in this case, be able in good conscience to return a verdict of acquittal, if the only thing that the People demonstrated by their evidence -- even if there was an awful lot of it -- was simply association, and nothing more, with people who may have committed some crime?

Would you be able to return a verdict of acquittal, --

A Yes, sir.

Q -- of not guilty?

A Yes, sir.

Q And feel you were doing your duty in doing so; is that right?

A Of course.

Q And also, there's another area of law here, particularly in connection with conspiracy cases, where you may have a bunch of people conspiring to commit a crime, and the evidence shows that the defendant in a particular case — the case that you're interested in — the defendant did some act which helped further the object of the conspiracy, but he didn't have the requisite criminal intent; he didn't share the criminal intent with the other conspirators.

He did an act, but it wasn't done from the standpoint of joining in that conspiratorial intent that is necessary.

And if the People show that, and nothing more, that in and of itself is not sufficient to make that defendant

26

27

8c-2

4.5

б

guilty of the conspiracy.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q And if the People in this case show only that -only that the defendant may have done some act, but did it
without the requisite criminal intent -- or, there was no
evidence to show his requisite criminal intent -- and they
presented that and only that, would you have any reluctance
in acquitting him?

A No.

Q You would feel you were doing your duty in that respect; is that right?

A Yes.

Q Now, going once more to this idea of circumstantial evidence, the People obviously are interested somewhat in whether or not you feel it's fair that the State of California, under the rules of law that it operates by, permits a jury to find a person guilty of first degree murder, if there's no body?

Because in one of these counts, the -- Count III, pertaining to Shorty Shea, the body has never been found.

There's a question as to whether he's even dead or not.

But, say the People are going to try to show to you that, despite the fact that there's no body --

MR. KAY: Well, your Honor, I'm going to object.

There might be a question in Mr. Denny's mind, but he might stand alone on that.

I would ask that his gratuitous comment be 1 stricken. 2 THE COURT: Well --3 Well, I'm not sure --MR. DENNY: -- it is an observation by Mr. Denny; THE COURT: 5 but I am sure that what he meant was that it is the burden of the People to establish that Mr. Shea is dead. 7 MR. DENNY: If I misspoke myself, that's certainly what I intended to say, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Very well. 11 BY MR. DENNY: In other words --12 THE COURT: The objection is sustained, and his remark 13 is stricken. Thank you, your Honor. MR. KAY: 15 MR. DENNY: All right. 16 Now, do you understand that under the law, Q. 17 the People can prosecute a man for murder, without producing 18 a body? Do you understand that? 19 Only since you've told me. 20 Well --Q. 21 I didn't know that. 22 Well, that is a fact. Q. 23 Now, do you feel, sir, that there is anything 24 unfair about prosecuting a man for murder, without a body? 25 I don't know. A 26 Well, if the law says that you can do that, would 27 you follow that law? 28 Yes. A

Q All right.

Now, the law goes even further. And, as the Judge has told you, there is direct evidence, generally direct evidence -- although the instruction is a little confusing, direct evidence means generally what you can see, hear and touch, what somebody has observed, what somebody has heard directly in the commission of a crime.

Now, there's direct evidence and there's circumstantial evidence. Now, the circumstantial evidence -- for instance, the little kid in the cooky jar. The mother sees him in the cooky jar, and sees his hand in the cooky jar, and she has told him not to take cookies, and she sees him taking cookies out, that's direct evidence. She sees him.

If, on the other hand, she goes out of the room, she comes back in, and the cooky jar, which was full, now is half full, and her little son is there with cooky crumbs all over his mouth, and holding his tummy, that's circumstantial evidence that -- that he's been into the cooky jar.

Do you understand?

A Yes.

9 fls.

27 28

1

2

3.

5

6

7

10

11

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q But she didn't see him, nobody saw him.

evidence.

A

Yes.

Q All right.

′

7

Now, in a murder case, the People sometimes, if they don't have a body, they have to prove the death by circumstantial evidence. And the law of California permits the prosecution, and it is the only way they can do it without

Now, knowing that is the law, do you feel there is anything unfair about that?

a body, to establish, if they can, a murder by circumstantial

A No.

Q And assuming that is the law, would you follow that law as it is given to you by the Court in looking at the evidence in this case?

A Yes.

Q Understanding, of course, that there is this additional fact, as the Court read to you, when the People's case rests chiefly or primarily on circumstantial evidence, and then there are two views of the evidence, two interpretations, one of which points to the defendant's guilt and the other of which points to the defendant's innocence, when it is a circumstantial evidence case, and both of these interpretations are reasonable from the evidence, the jury must adopt that pointing to the defendant's innocence and reject that pointing to the defendant's guilt.

Do you understand that?

A Yes, I do.

б

13.

...

And in this case, if there are proved circumstances, and one reasonable interpretation might be that the defendant's guilt — that they point to the defendant's guilt, but another equally reasonable interpretation points to the defendant's innocence or is consistent with innocent conduct, would you have any reluctance, whatsoever, in adopting that view which points to his innocence and voting not guilty?

A No.

Q And you would feel that you were doing your duty as a juror in so voting?

A Yes.

Q Is that correct?

A Yes, I would.

Q All right, sir.

Now, you've answered a question of Mr. Kay as to whether or not you would even consider voting second degree murder or acquittal simply to avoid the harrowing experience of determining whether a man should live or die based on your vote. And you said no, that you wouldn't -- you would do that; is that correct?

A Yes.

evidence that the evidence did not disclose first degree murder, and if under the instructions of the Court it showed second degree or something less or it just didn't measure up to proof beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, that you would have no hesitancy or reluctance, whatsoever, in voting not guilty; is that correct?

3

A Yes.

Not to avoid the death penalty, but just simply Q because the People hadn't met their burden of proof; is that right?

That's right.

And you would feel that you were doing your duty as a juror in that case, is that right?

Yes, I would. Ã

Now, I'm not sure whether it was while you had been on the panel or not, but a number of jurors have been asked, and I think you may have been asked, although you've indicated, I think earlier in your answers that you did not have any friends in law enforcement; is that correct?

- That's correct. A
- And never been a subject of a criminal charge?
- No. Α
- Or anyone close to you? Q
- No. Α

Well, let me ask you, then, whether you would tend to give more weight to the testimony of a police officer than you would to a layman, a non-police officer, simply by virtue of the fact that the man was a police officer?

No, I wouldn't. Α

In other words, you understand they are human, Q they can error or they can err or they can lie just like any other humans?

- Absolutely. Α
- Under the right circumstances or the wrong Q

5

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

l

9a fol 21

circumstances.

And you would judge their credibility by the same standards that the judge gives you to vote, to determine the credibility of any witness; is that right?

- A Yes, that's right.
- Q All right.

Now, there is one, one type of witness, however, when the judge talked about an accomplice.

An accomplice is an aider and abettor. One who helps in the commission of a crime.

And if a person testifies from the stand, and you find that they are an accomplice, and the judge will instruct you as to what an accomplice is, — but if you find that they are an accomplice or he or she is an accomplice, then, there is a further instruction that you must view the testimony of an accomplice with caution. And you can imagine why. There are all sorts of reasons why. And if that occurs in this case, and you receive such an instruction, will you be able to look with the required caution that the judge is going to tell you about at the testimony of an accomplice?

A Yes.

27

28

1

2

Q	£	Ind	judge	that	in a	dditi	on to	all	the	oth	er
factors	that	the	Judge	vill	. tel	.1 you	you	must	use	in	,
determin	ning '	the	credib	ility	of	any o	ther	witne	eşs?		

A Yes, I could.

Now, you understand, sir, -- I take it that --I tell you -- let me, if I may, just have you pass the microphone up to Mrs. Dunkins, who is the No. 9 juror there.

# VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF NORMA L. DUNKINS

## BY MR. DENNY:

Q, Mrs. Dunkins.

A Yes.

You understand that it is one of the basic Q foundations of our law that a defendant in a criminal action does not have to prove anything; do you understand that?

> A Yes.

The entire burden of proof is on the State to prove any defendant, whether it is in a small misdemeanor case, in a traffic case or anything up to murder or treason, perjury, robbery, anything --

> Λ Yes.

-- to prove that defendant --Q.

Á Guilty.

-- guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, your moral certainty; do you understand that?

<u>ئ</u>ئ

A Yes.

Q And obviously it is not an impossible burden. It is not proof beyond all possible doubt, but it is a very heavy burden. And you appreciate that?

A Yes.

Q Now, you understand, of course, that in this state a defendant, as of this time, before any evidence is in, is presumed to be innocent?

A Yes.

Q And further, that a defendant is not required to produce any evidence, is not required to call any witnesses, is not required to take the stand himself and testify; do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q And that if the prosecution doesn't meet its burden or if the defense attorney feels it doesn't necessarily meet the burden or the defense attorney says, "Look, that's all they've got, I'm not going to put on any evidence. I'm not going to rebut anything. I'm not going to call the defendant."

You understand he doesn't have to?

A I understand.

Q He can say to the jury, "Hey, look, if this is all there is, you can just acquit the defendant, because it is not enough."

A Yes.

Q Now, do you have any feelings, as you sit there, that perhaps in any case where a person is charged with a

crime, he must be guilty or the probabilities are he's guilty if he doesn't take the stand in his own defense?

A No.

Q You understand that under our Constitution he doesn't have to and you cannot draw any adverse inference against him if he fails to or if his attorney doesn't call him to the stand; do you understand that?

A Yes, I do.

THE COURT: We'll come back to Mrs. Dunkins on Monday morning.

MR. KAY: Your Honor, I believe it was going to be Monday afternoon, because of your matter --

THE COURT: Oh, yes. We have matters to conduct in -during the course of Monday morning, by reason of which the
Court cannot get to this case.

And, accordingly, the Court will excuse you until 1:45 on Monday afternoon.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I think some of the jurors again are having a little trouble hearing you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

The Court then will excuse you until 1:45 on Monday afternoon.

Did everybody -- can everybody hear me now?

Remember the admonition that I have heretofore given this group. I believe I have given it to everyone before, and that is that you are not to discuss this case amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to discuss it with you, nor are you to form or express any

ବ ବ

opinion about the matter until it is finally submitted to you, should you be chosen as a juror.

Two or three of you indicated to Mr. Kuczera, the bailiff, that you would like to be excused in this matter for one reason or another. But the Court has conferred with all counsel, and until we can do it in orderly fashion — in other words, until your name is chosen from the box and you're put in the jury box and asked questions, the Court does not believe it would be proper to excuse you.

So, accordingly, those of you who have asked to be excused, the Court is not going to grant your request unless and until the Court excuses you, after you've been placed in that jury box and the Court sees sufficient reason for your excuse.

Will those of you who might have financial problems, remember -- in serving two months, remember to inquire of your employer so you'll have that information for me on Monday afternoon, should you be chosen.

Good night. I'll see you, and have pleasant weekends all of you.

I'11 see you on Monday.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, before the -- I've been cut off.

Could we approach the bench before the jurors are excused a moment?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DENNY: Without the reporter. That's all right.

THE COURT: Generally for your guidance, if you are selected as a juror in the case, we'll run from about 9:30

until 12:00, recess until 1:30 or 2:00 o'clock, and then we'll work until 4:30. But I'm going to let you get on the freeway earlier today.

(Whereupon, proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the prospective jurors, which were not reported.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the Court would order you that you are not to see, hear or read anything whatsoever concerning this case, concerning Charles Manson, the Manson Family. You are to take positive steps. You have the affirmative obligation under this order of the Court to take steps to avoid such matters, such publicity.

All right, then, I think that takes care of it. I'll see you at 1:45 on Monday afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 3:35 o'clock p.m. an adjournment was taken, these proceedings to be resumed at 1:45 o'clock p.m., Monday, December 13, 1971.)