SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES .2 DEPARTMENT NO. 106 HON. RAYMOND CHOATE, JUDGE 3 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 5 Plaintiff, 6 No. A-267861 7 8 BRUCE McGREGOR DAVIS, Defendant. 10 11 12 REPORTERS DAILY TRANSCRIPT 13 Monday, January 3, 1972 14 VOLUME 15 15 16 17 **APPEARANCES:** 18 JOSEPH P. BUSCH, JR., District Attorney BY: ANTHONY MANZELIA For the People: 19 and 20 STEPHEN R. KAY, Deputies District Attorney 21 For Defendant Davis: GEORGE V. DENNY, III 22 24 25 26 27 MARY LOU BRIANDI, C.S.R. ROGER K. WILLIAMS, C.S.R. Official Court Reporters

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 1972 10:56 A.M.

THE COURT: Good morning, everybody.

(Whereupon, murmurs of "Good morning, Judge," were heard from members of the jury.)

THE COURT: Nice to see you again. I hope you had some happy holidays, and that you have a fine 1972.

In the case of People vs. Davis, the record will show that the defendant is present with his counsel; that Mr. Manzella and Mr. Kay are present for the People, and that there are prospective jurors beyond the railing.

Would you all please rise and face the Clerk?

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 COURT: Will counsel approach the bench?

Do we have three seats there? Beyond Mrs.

Obradovich, there are two seats; and one the other side of

Mr. Cano.

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

THE COURT: We will take three prospective jurors?

MR. MANZELIA: I think that would be enough.

THE COURT: And then -- do you think it will take the 1 balance of the day to get these three? 2 MR. DENNY: Oh, I am sure it will. 3 MR. MANZELLA: I do, too. 4 THE COURT: Should we release those jurors who are in 5 the box? 6 MR. MANZELLA: I think that would be a good idea, to 7 release them until tomorrow morning, 8 MR. DENNY: Judge, the only thing I was wondering was whether or not they had heard anything over the holiday. 10 It's sort of an awkward situation, having impaneled them 11 at this point, but I do think it's important to determine, 12 13 since Manson was sentenced -- not Manson, but Grogan was up on a motion for new trial, and the new trial motion was 14 15 granted. 16 It did make the news, and it made some headlines 17 in connection with the Shea murder. And it certainly seemed 18 relevant, if they -- if any of them had been made aware of 19 that fact. 20 THE COURT: All right. The Court will inquire about 21 it. 22 Other than that, you would agree that the jury 23 may be released --24 MR. DENNY: Yes. if --25 THE COURT: -- while we select the alternates? 26 If any of them have heard, I would request MR. DENNY: 27 that the Court inquire of them out of the presence of the 28 other jurors and the prospective jurors, as to what they have

. ¹²

heard.

MR. KAY: I would just like to make one correction in the record. I think Mr. Denny misspoke when he said that the motion for new trial was granted as to Grogan.

MR. DENNY: Well --

MR. KAY: It wasn't granted. But the penalty was reduced from death to life.

MR: DENNY: Yes.

THE COURT: Yes. So I read in the newspaper.

MR. DENNY: Judge, I do have another motion to make at this point, and it revolves around that reduction of penalty.

Again, in view of the fact that all of the participants in the Hinman and Shea killings, other than Bobby Beausoleil -- who, according to all the evidence, did in fact stab Gary Hinman to death -- have received life; and in view of the reduction in the death penalty which was granted by Judge Kolts to Defendant Grogan, I feel that it would very definitely constitute, under the California Constitution, unusual punishment, if the death penalty were to be either voted by the jury or any attempt were made to carry it out.

It seems inconceivable --

THE COURT: So your motion is what?

MR. DENNY: My motion is that the alternates at this point not be queried as to their feelings on the death penalty; and that the People notproceed on the basis that they are going to seek the death penalty in this case, because I think if they did so, that this Court, under all of the circumstances that this Court is aware of, pertaining to the Defendant Manson,

to the Defendant Atkins, both of whom this court has sentenced, and the Defendant Grogan, all of whom have received life sentences in connection with all of these cases -- both Himman and Shea -- that this Court would be required to set aside any death penalty verdict, and --

THE COURT: How can you say that until you know that the Court -- when you know that the Court has not heard the evidence in this case?

MR. DENNY: Well, this Court has heard the evidence in this case.

MR. KAY: No.

MR. MANZELLA: It hasn't heard the evidence with regard to Mr. Davis.

MR. DENNY: Well, this Court has heard --

AA-1

1 2

Z

9,

THE COURT: Well, what do you have to say, the People?

MR. KAY: Well, we --

MR. MANZELLA: We want to proceed in the same manner in which we have been proceeding, and — because nothing has occurred in this court so far which would bring into play the Eighth Amendment regarding cruel and unusual punishment.

And at this point -- at this point, not having heard the evidence, it would be difficult for the Court to say whether or not a death sentence as to Mr. Davis would be cruel and unusual punishment, or whether or not it should be lowered -- or whether it should be reduced upon a motion for new trial.

Now, in the Grogan case, the only murder for which Grogan was tried was the Shea murder. And in this case, Mr. Davis is being tried for the Hinman murder as well.

And this Court has not heard the evidence with regard to Mr. Dayis on the Hinman murder.

And furthermore, Judge Kolts, it seems to me his -part of his reasoning -- again, I only know about it from the
newspapers -- but it seems to me that part of his reasoning
was also the background of the defendant Grogan; not merely
the facts of the case.

MR. KAY: Having talked to Burton Katz, who was the prosecutor on this case, he said that Judge Kolts weighed very strongly the fact that Grogan was 16 when he joined --

MR. DENNY: Eighteen.

MR. KAY: No, 16.

MR. DENNY: I'm sorry.

MR. KAY: (Continuing) -- when he joined the Family;

б

18.

.

and just a couple of weeks over 18 at the time of the murder, so that -- and that he is of very low intelligence.

Now, I don't think we have that in this case, because it's my understanding --

MA. DENNY: Hold it down, please.

MR. KAY: -- that Mr. Davis has had three years at the University of Tennessee, and that he's something like 27 or 28 right now.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor --

THE COURT: The motion is --

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I would ask for an other of proof at this cime as to what additional the People would intend to show by way of evidence of Bruca Davis that they have not already shown in the Manson case, or in the Grogon case, or that has not already appeared before this Court in the transcript of the Grand Jury, which this Court has to coad in connection with the 995 motion;

And in addition, what the Feople would intend to show at the penalty trial, so as to determine whether or not, in good faith, there is again; to be a real attempt made to get the death penalty on this defendant, and why this defendant — who, by all of the evidence that I am aware of thus far, through all of the discovery that I have made — and I am sure through all of the evidence that this Court has heard and has become aware of, not only through the evidence in the Manson case, but at the Grand Jury hearing and through the Grand Jury transcript — was no more than, at most, an accomplice who drove the three parties, seausoleil, Atkine and Brunner, to the — to the Himman

home, and then drove Manson to the Hinman home; did not in any other way --

THE COURT: The Court is not going to require that offer of proof.

The Court denies the motion.

I will, however, inquire of the jury that's in the box as to whether or not they have heard, seen or read anything concerning the case of People versus Grogan.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, may I just again, to complete the record -- it would not only be unusual punishment under the California Constitution, but cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendment, and violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States, and a violation of due process under the Fourteenth Amendment.

THE COURT: All right. Let's proceed.

fol

¥ 22

1-1

Š

18 -

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

THE COURT: I am directing this question, ladies and gentlemen, to each of you in the box.

I'll ask you now whether any of you, during the course of the recess, has heard, seen or read anything concerning Mr. Manson, this case or the case of People vs. Grogan?

(No affirmative response.)

THE COURT: I see no affirmative response.

And I see negative responses from several jurors.

Is there anyone now who has heard, seen or read anything concerning this case, Charles Manson or a Steven Grogan?

(No affirmative response.)

THE COURT: I see a negative response from all jurors.

Very well, it is the agreement of all the attorneys here and the Court that you may be excused now during the time that we are selecting the alternate jurors. We'll be selecting three alternate jurors and you may be excused tomorrow if we do not have them selected. If we do have them selected tomorrow, then we'll probably begin the case tomorrow. If not, then, I'll probably be excusing you again at about this time.

But in any event, I'll excuse you now until -not 10:00 o'clock, but 9:30 tomorrow morning. I'll assume
we'll be able to start at 9:30.

1-2

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15.

16

17

18-19

· 20

21

23

22

24

25 26

27

28

I'll see you then tomorrow at 9:30, with this admonishment, remember you are obliged during the course of this recess and any subsequent recess not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with this matter, nor are you to form or express an opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you.

Likewise, remember the admonishment regarding publicity. You are not to see, hear or read anything concerning Charles Manson or this case.

Miss Frazier, you indicated to the bailiff that you wanted to be excused.

Could you be here by 10:00 o'clock?

JUROR FRAZIER: I don't know. I'll call and see if I can get a later appointment.

THE COURT: Pardon?

JUROR FRAZIER: I'll call and see if I can get a later appointment. I doubt it, though.

THE COURT: In deference to you, then, in your situation. I will, instead of 9:30, make it 10:00 o'clock that we assemble. I'll change the order. You are to be here by 10:00 o'clock and if you can change that appointment, -- I'm sure that the doctor would accommodate you if he knew what your situation is.

Perhaps you can let him know that.

All right, thank you, and good to see you all back, and see you tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock.

(Whereupon, the jury retired from the courtroom,

5

.20

la fls.

ZZ

. 25 '

and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Joyce, will you take three alternate jurors.

THE CLERK: Mrs. Mary M. DeKuh; M-a-r-y, middle initial "M", last name D-e-K-u-h.

Cecil H. Chavers, C-e-c-i-l, last name, C-h-a-v-e-r-s.

Miss Manuela Alvarez; first name M-a-n-u-e-l-a,

last name A-l-v-a-r-e-z.

THE COURT: I'm speaking to all of you ladies and gentlemen beyond the rail and in the box now, the three of you who are in the box and those who have been sworn, this is the case of the People of the State of California vs.

Bruce McGregor Davis. Mr. Davis is, by this indictment before the court, charged with three violations of law, three counts. The indictment is in three counts.

And the first count charges that Mr. Davis, who is the gentlemen seated at the far end of the counsel table from the jury box, -- charges that Mr. Davis on or about the 27th day of July, in the County of Los Angeles, with -- and Defendants Charles Manson and Susan Denise Atkins, did willfully, unlawfully and feloniously, and with malice aforethought, murder Gary Alan Hinman, a human being.

la-1

1 2

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 of California, in that on or about the 25th through the 28th day of July, 1969, in the County of Los Angeles, those defendants did willfully, unlawfully and feloniously and knowingly conspire, combine, confederate and agree together and with other persons who true identity is unknown to commit the crime of murder, a violation of Section 187, Penal Code of California, a felony, and of robbery, a violation of Section 211, Penal Code of California, a felony.

That pursuant to and for the purpose of carrying out the objects and purposes of the aforesaid combination, agreement and conspiracy, the following overt acts were committed.

And three overt acts are alleged in Count II.

That on or about the 25th of July, 1969, the said defendants, Bruce McGregor Davis and Susan Denise Atkins, and Robert Beausoleil did travel to the vicinity of 964 Old Topanga Road, Malibu, in the County of Los Angeles, is overt act number one.

Overt act number two alleges that on July 26th, 1969, the defendants, Charles Manson, Susan Denise Atkins, and Bruce McGregor Davis did enter the residence at 964 Old Topanga Road, Malibu, in the County of Los Angeles.

And overt act number three charges that on or about July 26th, 1969, the 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 charges Mr. Davis with murder in violation of Section 187 of the Penal Code, in that it is alleged that between the 16th day of August, 1969, and the first day of September, 1969, that he, Charles Manson, Bruce McGregor Davis and Steve Grogan did willfully, unlawfully and feloniously, and with malice aforethought, murder one Donald Jerome Shorty Shea, a human being.

ment, Mr. Davis has entered pleas of not guilty and this is the time set for trial.

Mr. Davis is represented by Mr. George Denny, III, who is now standing.

And the People are represented by Mr. Manzella, Mr. Anthony Manzella and Mr. Stephen Kay, who are Deputies District Attorney.

Is there any one of you who knows anything whatever about this case?

(No response.)

THE COURT: Is there any one of you who knows any of the attorneys or has ever been represented by any of the attorneys in any way?

(No response.)

THE COURT: Is there any one of you at this time who feels that he has any information other than what he might have heard, seen or read which would disqualify him from being fair and impartial as a juror in this case?

(No response.)

lb fol

months. In other words, until about the end of February. The Court realizes that it might be a considerable hardship to you to serve as a juror for that period of time, particularly if — if you would suffer a financial hardship. That is, your wages would not be paid or if there is some other good reason which would cause you hardship. And if such is the case, that is if there is some unusual hardship, rather than just inconvenience — the Court knows that everyone is inconvenienced who has to serve for two months as a juror, but if it is more than just inconvenience, if it is a financial hardship or if it is some considerable hardship, the Court will hear from you if you wish to be excused as a result of that hardship.

During the recess, the coming recesses and during the rest of the day, if you have a chance, you may call your employer to determine whether you will be paid beyond the usual time of service for jurors which is 20 or 30 days.

There are some firms that will pay and some will not, and if you have any doubt about that, the Court would like you to inquire.

Ţ9

The Court does not intend to sequester you, that is to keep you from your homes during the course of the trial. You will be released each evening during the course of the trial to go to your homes. You will be released on weekends except possibly during deliberations.

We are in the process, the Court and counsel, of selecting alternate jurors.

Now, an alternate juror may or may not participate depending upon whether someone who is in the box, sworn as a juror is unable to proceed.

is excused from service as a juror, then the alternate jurors are selected. It means that you must, if you are selected by a -- as an alternate juror, be just as attentive as someone who is in the box because you may be called upon to serve. And you must take careful notes and listen to all the evidence. And your duties are just the same as that of any juror up to the time of deliberation. And you may, indeed, be called upon during the time of deliberation to fill in should it become necessary by reason of the absence of one of the other jurors, one of the jurors who is sworn.

I'll direct my questions to the three of you who are in the box now.

First, I want to tell you, instruct you as to certain things, certain terms that you will be hearing during the course of this voir dire examination so that there won't be any doubt in your mind as to what is being talked about.

"A defendant in a criminal action is presumed to

ð

25.

.28

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. A reasonable doubt is defined as follows: It is 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 cannot say they feel an abiding conviction, to a moral 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 abet in its commission or, whether present or not, who advise and encourage its commission, are regarded by the law as principals in the crime thus committed and are equally guilty thereof.

"A person aids and abets the commission of a crime if he knowingly and with criminal intent aids, promotes, encourages or instigates by act or advice, or by act and advice, the commission of such crime.

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

"Direct evidence means evidence that directly

б

proves a fact, without an inference, and which in itself, if true, conclusively establishes that fact.

"Circumstantial evidence means evidence that proves a fact from which an inference of the existence of another fact may be drawn.

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

"It is not necessary that facts be proved by direct evidence. They may be proved also by circumstantial evidence or by a combination of direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Both direct evidence and circumstantial evidence are acceptable as a means of proof. Neither is entitled to any greater weight than the other.

"You are not permitted to find the defendant guilty 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 proved 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 the defendant's 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.

2-1

1 2

б

17,

. 23<u>.</u>

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 of the first degree is murder perpetrated by willful, deliberate and premeditated killing, with malice aforethought, or a murder committed by torture, or a murder committed -- strike that.

(Continuing) -- or a killing committed by -- strike that.

(Continuing) -- or a killing committed in the course of a burglary or a robbery.

Now, the fact that the Court has given an instruction does not mean that it will be necessary for you to utilize that instruction, except for the construction concerning reasonable doubt, because as to whether or not an instruction will be utilized by a juror will depend upon the juror's determination of what the facts are. And a juror — the jury is the group, the body that decides what are the facts, what is the evidence in the case.

You are the sole judges of the evidence in the case, if you are chosen as a juror, and you determine what the facts are from the evidence that's presented here in court.

Now, I am going to ask several questions of the -just general questions, I'll term them, of the three who are
in the box. And will those of you who are beyond the rail
listen to the questions as I put them to the three who are in
the box? Because you will all be asked whether your answers

w

2

1

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

would be the same.

If your answers are not the same in any respect, remember how your answers would differ, so that when Court and counsel begin to question you, you can tell us in what respect your answers would differ.

All right. Speaking to Mrs. DeKuh, Mr. Chavers and Miss Alvarez -- is that it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALVAREZ: Yes.

THE COURT: Have any of you had any legal training or legal experience?

(No affirmative response.)

THE COURT: Has any of you been a victim of a crime of violence?

(No affirmative response.)

THE COURT: Or had a friend who has been the victim of a crime of violence?

(No affirmative response.)

THE COURT: Has any one of you been arrested for anything other than a misdemeanor charge, a misdemeanor traffic charge?

(No affirmative response.)

THE COURT: Has any of you been charged with a criminal offense other than a misdemeanor traffic offense?

(No affirmative response.)

THE COURT: Have any of you been -- has any of you been witness in a criminal case, or a civil case?

(No affirmative response.)

THE COURT: Will you all follow the Court's instructions

2-3

1 2

13.

18.

as I give them to you, regardless of what you believe the law should be, or what you believe the law is? Regardless of whatever beliefs you may hold concerning the law, will you follow the Court's instructions as I give them to you?

(No negative response.)

THE COURT: All right. I see affirmative responses there. All other responses have been negative.

All right. Can any of you think of any reason whatever why you couldn't be fair and impartial in this case?

(No affirmative response.)

charged the defendant with offenses which are punishable by death or by life imprisonment. And in a case in which the offense charged is punishable by death — or may be punishable by death — the Court is required to ascertain if any prospective juror entertains such conscientious opinions as would preclude the defendant — preclude a person from finding a defendant guilty if the evidence should justify such a finding; or if he would, under no circumstances, vote for the death penalty; or, having once found a defendant guilty of murder of the first degree, would always vote for the death penalty.

In other words, this is a case in which, if a defendant -- if the defendant is found guilty of murder in the first degree, the jury will be called upon to determine whether the defendant should suffer life imprisonment or death.

By saying this, the Court is not in any way inferring to you that it believes that it will be necessary for you to enter into a penalty phase, because I do not know

2-1

2a fol

at this time, nor do you -- because you have not heard the evidence -- whether the defendant will be found guilty of murder in the first degree, or guilty of any of the Counts of which he's charged, each of which is possibly punishable by death.

2a-1

7.

 But you should understand this: That in view of what I have said, and in connection with the penalty phase, that it may be possible that this jury -- that you, as members of this jury -- will be considering the question of life imprisonment or death for this defendant.

In arriving at a verdict in the case as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant -- and that will be determined in the first phase, the so-called first phase, the guilt or innocence phase of the trial -- the subject of penalty or punishment is not to be discussed or considered by you as a juror, as that is a matter which, under our law, must be considered in a separate proceeding, the so-called second phase or the penalty phase, if your finding in the first phase should require such a proceeding.

Do you all understand me thus far? If you do not, well, you may ask -- you may indicate to me by raising your hand that you do not.

Do you all understand me, those of you who are in the box?

(No negative response.)

THE COURT: All right. I see no hand, so I assume you understand.

In other words, if the defendant is acquitted, or if he's found guilty of a lesser crime than murder in the first degree, then there's nothing to submit to the jury on the issue of penalty. There's no second phase.

If the defendant is found guilty of murder of the first degree, an offense punishable by life imprisonment

2a-2

 or death, then there shall thereupon be the second proceedings, the second phase, on the issue of penalty; and it's the
jury's duty then to fix the penalty at death or life imprisonment.

Now, you should know that the law imposes neither death nor life imprisonment, but presents 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. It's entirely a juror's discretion as to whether or not life imprisonment or death should be imposed.

Therefore, I will be inquiring of jurors who are called -- or prospective jurors who are called to the box here -- whether you entertain such conscientious opinions concerning the death penalty as would preclude you from finding a defendant guilty, if the evidence should justify such a finding.

In other words, in the first phase of the trial, would you have such views concerning the death penalty as would preclude you from finding a defendant guilty?

I'll be asking you whether your opinions are such concerning the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it, without regard to any evidence that might be developed. Would you automatically refuse to impose it?

Or, on the other hand, if the defendant were found guilty of murder in the first degree, would you vote to impose the death penalty without regard to the evidence

2a-3

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

that might be developed during the trial? Would your reaction be an automatic one in connection with the imposition of the death penalty, without regard to the evidence, if there were a conviction of murder of the first degree?

Or are your views such concerning the death penalty that you could not be impartial in determining guilt or innocence? Or are your views such that you would never vote to impose the death penalty?

We'll begin with Mrs. DeKuh now, and I will ask her about her background, and including those questions, when we get to them.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF

MRS. MARY M. DE KUH

BY THE COURT:

- Q Have you had any jury experience, Mrs. DeKuh?
- A No.
- Q Neither civil nor criminal?
- A No.
- Q All right.

And what type of work do you do?

- A I work for the Los Angeles County Health Department, over at County General Hospital, secretarial.
 - Q Secretarial for --
 - A Public Health Nursing, Women's Division.
- Q Very well. And how long have you been so employed?
 - A A year and a half.

2a-4 I take it it would not be a hardship to you to serve in this case? No, it wouldn't. 3 All right. I'll ask you this, right at the outset, too. 5 Have you heard of Charles Manson? 6 Yes. 7 And have you heard of the Manson Family? 8 A Yes. 9 Do you have such yiews about Charles Manson or Q. 10 the Manson Family that a person -- a defendant shown to be 11 a member of the Manson Family could not receive a fair and 12 impartial trial from you, as a juror, because of what you've 13 heard, seen or read concerning Charles Manson or the Manson 14 Family? 15 Do you understand my question? 16 Yes -- no, I do. I think I could be fair, because A 17 what I've --18 In spite of what you may have heard, seen or 19 20 read concerning --21 Yeah, because --A -- concerning the Manson Family, you believe that 22 you could be fair and impartial --24 A Sure. 25 -- to somebody who might be a member -- the 26 evidence might show to be a member of that Family? 27 Because I don't believe that the public has 28 seen or heard everything. b fls.

		î	
2b-1	1	ନ୍	You think that the association alone with just
	2	considering	the association with Mr. Manson or the Manson
	3	Family woul	d not be sufficient, in your mind, to raise any
•	4	prejudice a	gainst an individual; is that correct?
	5	Α-	That's right.
*	6		That's right. Are you related to or a friend of any law enforce-
	7 .	ment office	r?
	8	'A	Yes.
	9	Q	Now, by law enforcement officer, I mean a police-
	10	man, a patr	olman, a deputy sheriff,
	11	A	Yes.
	. 12	Q	Let me finish this definition, too.
	13 .		(Continuing.) a deputy district attorney, a
	14	member of t	he Attorney General's staff, or the District
*	15	Attorney's	staff; anyone who could be a California Highway
ą.	16	Patrolman,	for example.
	17		Now, what is that relationship?
	18	Λ	I am married to a deputy sheriff.
	19	Q	Is that a close relationship?
	20.		(Laughter.)
	21	A	Yes, very extremely.
	22	Q.	And where a Los Angeles County Sheriff?
E) (2)	23	A	Los Angeles County.
	24	Q	What is his assignment?
*	25	A	He is out of Transportation Division.
	26	Q	In the Civic Center?
.	27	A	Yes. I think he he reports to the Jail
	28	Division.	

3

4 5

6 7

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

10 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

All right. Do you think that you could be fair Q and impartial?

I really do. (Laughing.) No. I do.

Q. Do you think it might cause some family argument? Are you afraid it might cause some family arguments, if you were to adhere to a position against the prosecution?

No, really. Because I think I am a pretty strong -- our marriage is based on a pretty strong-willed mind.

Would that even enter your mind?

My decision, on what his opinion would be? Oh, no. I mean, I would -- you know.

Do you think you could be completely independent of any -- any such thoughts?

Yes. Because he wasn't a cop when I married him A -- no -- yes.

Q. He was or was not?

A He was not.

All right. And you -- would you be able to -will everyone take note of this? That there will be an instruction read to you, ladies and gentlemen, concerning the criteria you use or may use as jurors to determine credibility of witnesses.

You are the sole judges of the credibility of a witness.

Now, let me ask Mrs. DeKuh:

Would you be able to judge a police officer's credibility on those standards which the Court spells out for 2b-3 you, and not give the police officer's testimony any greater 1 credence, simply because of his status? 2 A Definitely. 3 Where do you and Mr. DeKuh or Officer DeKuh 4 Q. reside? 5 Á In Highland Park, right on the Eagle Rock border. All right. Let's go to Mr. Chavers. Q 8. 9 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 10 MR. CÉCIL H. CHAVERS 11 BY THE COURT: Would it be any hardship to you to serve, Mr. 13 Chavers? 14 No, sir, it wouldn't. 15 Concerning the question I put to Mrs. DeKuh, 16 about the association with Manson and the Manson Family, 17 by reason of the publicity that you may have heard, seen or 18 read, do you think that you could be fair and impartial to 19 a person who is, according to the evidence, a member of the 20 Manson Family, or associated with Mr. Manson? 21 A Yes, I do. 22 What type of work do you do? 23 Ä I am a senior clerk for the Department of Water 24 and Power. 25 Have you had any jury experience whatever? Q. 26 No. I haven t. A 27 How long have you been employed with the Depart-28 ment of Water and Power?

1	A Three years.	
2	Q All right. Are you related to or a friend of	
3	any law enforcement officer?	
4	A No, I'm not.	
5	Q And is there a Mrs. Chavers?	
6.	A I'm sorry; I didn't hear.	
7	Q Are you married?	;
8	A Yes, I am.	
9	Q And what type of work does your spouse do?	
10	A She's a housewife.	
11	And you reside in what general area?	
12	A Southwest Los Angeles.	
13	Q Now, I didn't ask Mrs. DeKuh these questions,	
14	so I'll come back to her in a minute.	
15	But I'll ask you: Do you have such views	
16	concerning the death penalty that, by reason of those views,	
17	you could not be fair and impartial in determining guilt or	
18	innocence?	
is. ¹⁹	A No, I do not.	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q All right. Are you related to or a friend of any law enforcement officer? A No, I'm not. Q And is there a Mrs. Chavers? A I'm sorry; I didn't hear. Q Are you married? A Yes, I am. Q And what type of work does your spouse do? A She's a housewife. Q And you reside in what general area? A Southwest Los Angeles. Q Now, I didn't ask Mrs. DeKuh these questions, so I'll come back to her in a minute. But I'll ask you: Do you have such views concerning the death penalty that, by reason of those views, you could not be fair and impartial in determining guilt or immodence? A No, I do not.

	1					
2c-1	1	Q Or are your opinions concerning the death penalty				
	2	such that you would automatically refuse to impose it,				
	3	regardless of the evidence?				
3 .	4	A No, they are not.				
•	5	Q Or upon a conviction of murder of the first				
*	6	degree, would you automatically impose the death penalty,				
	7	regardless of the evidence?				
	8	A No.				
	9	Q All right. Would you pass the microphone, then,				
	10	to Mrs. Alvarez?				
	\mathbf{n}					
	. 12	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF				
	13	MRS: MANUELA ALVAREZ				
<u>.</u>	14	BY THE COURT:				
ę	15	Q Mrs. Alvarez,				
·	16	A Yes.				
	17	Q would it be any hardship to you to serve on				
	18	this jury?				
	19	A No.				
	20	Q What type of work do you do?				
	21	A I am a clerk for the County of Los Angeles.				
	22	Q In what department?				
€	23	A Purchasing and stores.				
*	24	Q I'm sorry?				
ş Ş	25	A Purchasing and stores.				
	26	Q And what would your answer be to the question that				
	27	I put to Mrs. DeKuh and Mr. Chavers regarding your views				
	28	about a person whom the evidence might show to be a member				

	[\cdot
2c-2	1	of the Manson Family, or associated with Mr. Manson?
	2	A I I'm unbiased. I don't
*	3	Q Pardon?
•	4	A I said: I'm unbiased, I would hope.
*	5	Q You would be unblased in making any judgment
* *	6	that you'd be called upon to make in this case?
	7.	A Yes.
	8	Q The things that you may have heard, seen or
	9	read concerning Mr. Manson or of the Manson Family would not
	10 ·	you would not allow to influence you in this case?
	11	A No, I would not.
	. 12	Q Have you served as a juror before?
	13	A No, I have not.
	14	Q Are you acquainted with or a friend of
•	15	any law enforcement officer, as I 've defined law enforcement
*	16	officer?
`',	17	A, * No.
	18	Q Is it Miss Alvarez?
	19	A Yes.
	<u>.</u> 20	Q In what general area of Los Angeles County do
	21	you reside?
	22	A Southwest L. A.
\$ \$	23	Q Concerning the penalty, now, the death penalty,
, P	24	do you have such views about it that you would automatically
Ą .≉	25	refuse to impose it, regardless of the evidence in the case?
	26	A Yes.
	27	Q Would your views about it be such that you could
	28	not be fair and impartial in determining guilt or innocence

in the first phase? 2c-31 A No. 2 Q. In other words, you could be fair and impartial 3 in determining the question of guilt or innocence of murder of the first degree; is that right? Yes. 6 Now, if you, however, were to enter into a second Q 7 phase, and had the duty to determine whether a person should 8 suffer life imprisonment or death, what would be your atti-9 tude about that? 10 I -- I don't believe in capital punishment. 11 Q. So that your reaction would be to automatically 12 refuse to impose it in any case? 13 A Yes. 14 Q Would you ever consider imposing the death 15 penalty? 16 Á No. 17 Your Honor, the prosecution would respect-18 fully challenge the juror under 1073, Subdivision 2 of the 19 Penal Code. 20 MR. DENNY: Well, may I inquire briefly, your Honor? 2ľ THE COURT: I think it's clear that -- you may if you 22 wish, however. Go ahead. 23 24 25 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION BY MR. DENNY: 26 Miss Alvarez, --27 Q 28 A Yes.

	ļ	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
2c-4	I	Q notwithstanding your feelings about being				
	2	against what they call capital punishment, nevertheless are				
5	3	there some cases, some horrendous cases that you can think				
	4	of a mass murder or something of that kind where you				
•	5	feel that the death penalty might be a proper penalty?				
\$ \$3	6	A No.				
	7	Q All right. You don't feel there are any cases				
	. 8	that you could possibly conceive of, where you feel the				
	9	death penalty would be proper, where it would be proper for				
	10	the State to kill someone; is that correct?				
	н	A No.				
	. 12	MR. DENNY: All right.				
	13	THE COURT: You are excused, then. Thank you, Miss				
	14	Alvarez.				
*	15	MR. DENNY: Thank you very much, Miss Alvarez.				
	16	MR. KAY: Thank you, Miss Alvarez.				
	17	THE COURT: The Court grants the challenge.				
	18	THE CLERK: Miss Molly Ackerman; M-o-1-1-y; last name,				
	19	A-c-k-e-r-m-a-n.				
	20					
	21	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF				
	22	MOLLY ACKERMAN				
Φ.	23	BY THE COURT:				
\$	24.	Q Mrs. Ackerman, is it?				
Ą	25	A Miss Ackerman.				
· •	26	Q. Miss Ackerman?				
Ď	27	A Yes.				
_	28	Q Miss Ackerman,				
		1				

1	A Yes.			
2	Q you've heard the proceedings thus far this			
3	morning?			
4	A Yes, sir.			
5	Q Would your answers be any different than the			
6	three have responded to the the first three prospective			
7	alternates have responded to the questions of a general			
8	nature?			
9	A Yes, sir. They would be in the affirmative.			
10	Q Your answers would be different or would not be?			
11	A (No response.)			
. 12	Q In what respects would your answers vary, if any?			
13	A I would be fair and unbiased, but well, the			
14	last question			
15	Q Concerning the death penalty?			
16	A Yes, sir.			
17	Q All right. Do you have such views about the death			
18	penalty, Miss Ackerman, that you could not be fair and impar-			
19	tial in determining the question of guilt or innocence in the			
20	first phase?			
21	A Yes. sir. I am opposed to capital punishment.			
22	Q So that in the first phase of the case, which			
23	involves the question of guilt or innocence, you could not be			
24	fair and impartial in determining whether or not the defendant			
25	was guilty of murder of the first degree; is that right?			
26	A Yes, sir.			
27				
28				

3 fls.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Q Why is that? Is that because you know -- knowing -- you might know what would face you in the second phase or what; would you explain that?

A Perhaps I didn't say that correctly. I think I would be fair in the first phase.

- Q First phase you could be?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q Could be fair and impartial?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q It is only when you get to the second phase involving punishment where you feel as though you have such views that you could not impose the death penalty?
 - A That is correct.
- Q Would your reaction be an automatic one that you would refuse to impose the death penalty automatically, regardless of the evidence in any case?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q Can you think -- strike that.

Are your views about the death penalty such that you would never vote to impose it in any case?

- A Never.
- Q Would you even consider imposing the death penalty in any kind of case?

A No. sir.

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

MR. DENNY: May the record reflect my objection to it and

27 28 1

3

2

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

based particularly on the objections I noted to the Court at the beginning of the proceedings this morning.

THE COURT: The record will so note.

MR. KAY: Thank you, Miss Ackerman.

MR. DENNY: That is as to the prior alternate juror also.

THE COURT: Yes, the record may so show.

THE COURT: Miss Ackerman, the Court would thank you and you are to follow the clerk's instructions.

THE CLERK: The 15th floor.

THE COURT: 15th floor. Yes, you are to go to the 15th floor of the New Hall of Records.

Let's take another juror for Miss Ackerman.

THE CLERK: Carroll M. Ailman, first name C-a-r-r-o-l-1, middle initial M, last name A-i-l-m-a-n.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF

CARROLL M. AILMAN

BY THE COURT:

- Q Mr. Ailman, you have been present thus far this morning?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q And heard all of the proceedings?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q Would your answers be any different than the majority of prospective jurors have responded to the Court's questions?
 - A No, not on the general questions.
 - Q . . . Can you think of any respect in which your answers

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

R

9

26

27

28

might vary other than the very personal ones involving your background?

> Α No.

Q All right. Would it be any hardship to you to serve as a juror in this case?

Yes, it would. Α

All right, what way? Q

À I am led to believe that my presence is important to my company and in one month's time I'm expected to go to work on a very important project. So, a long duration --

O What company is that?

McDonnell-Douglas Astronomical Corporation.

Will they pay you?

I'm not sure of that. I know they will for the first increment of time.

Is it involving some part of a space program? Q

Α Yes.

Q And that industry is not -- is not at its best at this moment?

Α That is correct.

Me to the state of the

Would you be concerned about -- if you were selected to serve for two months -- be concerned about your position with the company?

I am not in a position to say. I don't know. Α I have the impression that my job would be in jeopardy.

During the recess would you inquire, the coming . recess? We'll be in recess from noon until 2:00 o'clock. Would you or anyone else who has such questions in his mind about

İn a very gistant way.

29

3a-1 Tell us about that. 1 My mother in a second marriage married a man who 2 has two sons, one of whom is a policeman, who has become a 3 policeman. I have a very casual, very distant acquaintance-4 ship with them. 5 Q. Do you think that that would affect your judg-6 ment in this case? 7 A R In no way. And is there a Mrs. Ailman? 9 Q. A No, I am not married. 10 11 Q. And your place of residence generally in the 12 County is where? 13 A In the Hollywood Hills. 14 Regarding the death penalty, do you have such 15 views that you would automatically refuse to impose it in any 16 case regardless of the evidence? 17 Α No. I do not. 18 Or are your views about it such that you would Q. 19 automatically impose it upon a conviction of murder of the 20 first degree regardless of the evidence? 21 No, I would not. Α 22 Or would you, by reason of any views you might 23 entertain concerning the penalty, be unable to be fair and 24 impartial in determining guilt or innocence? 25 I believe I could be fair and impartial. A 26 What would be your answer to the question that I 27 put to Mrs. DeKuh and Mr. Chavers and the others regarding 28 publicity? Would your views by reason of publicity that

you may have heard, seen or read concerning the Manson Family 3a~2 be such that you could not be fair and impartial to someone 2 who the evidence might show would be a member of that Family? 3 Surprisingly chough I have read nothing about any of the previous cases. Have you ever heard the name Charles Manson? б Yes, I have, but only in the general context that 7 everyone's heard it. 8 I take it -- I judge from your answer that you 9 believe that you could be fair and impartial, even though the 10 evidence might show that somebody is associated with Mr. 11 Manson? 12 13 A That is correct. Now, can you think of any reason whatever why 14 15 you couldn't be fair and impartial in this case? 16 A No. I could not. Let's go back to Mrs. DeKuh. 17 Q 18 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 19 20 MRS. MARY M. DE KUH 21 BY THE COURT: Mrs. DeKuh, I did not ask you about the death 22 Q. 23 penalty. Are your views about that penalty such that you 24 25 could not be fair and impartial in determining guilt or 26 innocence? 27 No. Ά 28 Or are your views about the penalty such that Q

you would automatically refuse to impose it regardless of the 1 evidence? 3 Or would you automatically impose it upon a 4 conviction of murder of the first degree regardless of the 5 evidence? 6 A No. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Denny, do you wish to inquire? 8. MR. DENNY: Yes, thank you. 9 10 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 11 12 BY MR. DENNY: 13 I'll try to sight you through the two DA's here, Mrs. DeKuh. 14 15 As might be expected, I am somewhat curious about your deputy sheriff husband and the effect that it might 16 17 have on your deliberations. 18 You do seem to be a rather strong-willed woman 19 from your statements, but nevertheless it might have some 20 bearing, so I would like to inquire, if I may, how long have 21 you been married to Mr. DeKuh or Deputy DeKuh? 22 A Eleven years. 23 Q How long has he been a deputy sheriff? 24 Α Nine. 25 How long has he been in Transportation? Q. 26 Six or seven, I believe. Yeah, it was -- I A 27 believe it is about seven. 28 All right. And what was his duty assignment

3b f1s.

before that, do you recall?

A Uh, yes, he was in the Jail Division.

Q Was that downtown here in the Hall of Justice jail, right here?

A Yes. And then, I think they built a new one somewhere along the line. I think he's been in both divisions, the new jail and the old jail.

Q And at the present time is he in county-wide transportation?

A Yes. He drives the buses out of Transportation.

Q Now, does he come home at times and discuss his work with you?

A No, not really, because being a driver they don't -- at one time I think they used to be in court more. The Sheriff's Department. And then, it went to another division. And he said they were always on the go. Once in a while, if there was a particular case, but generally when he comes home he kind of likes to relax. And being in charge of the prisoners, that they don't -- so forth -- escape and stuff like that, he doesn't really get to know or hear the records about the prisoners.

3b-1

ī

2

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Q All right., ...,

Now, do you have a number of friends, however, in the Sheriff's department?

A Actually, no. Most of our friends aren't on the department at all.

Q Well, do you see friends socially who are members of the Sheriff's department?

A No, we don't.

Q You don't engage in any activities with the Sheriff's wives?

A No.

Q Of any kind?

Well, now, the Court asked you concerning whether there would be any adverse effect or pressure brought on you. I'm sure there would be no pressure brought on you during the course of your deliberations by your husband, and I'm sure you wouldn't feel any effects afterwards, but my feeling is just knowing his viewpoint about law enforcement and being on the side of enforcement of the law, as Deputy Sheriffs are, do you feel that this would, in some way, affect your own point of view in judging evidence? That is, would you be somewhat -well, I hate to use the word "bias," because nobody wants to admit they're biased. No one wants to admit they're prejudiced. That's kind of a leading -- but some people, because of their relationships do, and can honestly say, "Yeah, I sort of lean toward the prosecution, " or because of other things maybe they don't like police officers or something, they would say, "I lean toward the defense."

3b-2

Now, do you, as you sit there, considering your own feelings based on your eleven years of marriage and your own upbringing and background, feel that you have some sort of leanings toward the prosecution?

A I think I am more conservative than my husband. He is more liberal, really, when it comes down to it. And the fact he doesn't believe in the death penalty at all. So that's a little bit of his background. Where I don't have that feeling about the death penalty.

Q Uh-huh.

A So, I tend to be much more conservative than he does, which is unusual, really. And that's why I think most of our friends aren't with the department, I mean, the friends, personal friends -- we are not closely associated with the department socially.

- Q Well, again, going back to the original question.
- A Yeah (laughing).
- Q Assuming that you have a liberal husband, as a police officer he is still a police officer or Deputy Sheriff. If you are more conservative, it might make you more prosecution prone than he; is that what you are saying?

A I think I might have a tendency, really, truthfully.

Q That's what we are trying to get at. And we want you to be truthful.

A I am a conservative. My ideas are more conservative, really.

Q Well, do you feel because of that particular bent

1

2

3

Q,

7

8

9

26

27

28

or that feeling or just your own point of view that you would, in a criminal case, tend, perhaps, to side with the prosecution?

I hope I wouldn't, but I have a feeling that I I hope I would sit and judge very equally. might.

- Well, of course everybody hopes they can. But --Q
- But human' nature --
- That's right, and you know your human nature better than we. That's what we are trying to get at.

A I think I would lean conservatively towards the defense.

In other words, you feel maybe it would be a little easier for the prosecution to bring in a conviction with you as a juror than somebody who didn't have that predisposition; is that right?

Α I believe so, yes.

Q And perhaps the doctrine of reasonable doubt would be a little more easily overcome with your point of view, is that right?

Α Definitely.

Q And in spite of the judge's reading to you about that doctrine, it would be perhaps difficult for you to apply it in a criminal case; is that right?

Á That's right.

And do you feel, then, that really perhaps you could Q not be totally fair and impartial?

- A I -- I hope I could, but I do lean.
- Q Toward the prosecution?

Į

3

•5 6.

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

4 fol

24

25

26

27

28

Toward the prosecution.

Well, again, we're kind of at a --

Yes, I know, (laughing). I've never sat on a jury before, so I --

We're at a point of no return here, because of the way you've answered certain questions.

Certain questions, yes, because myself, I really don't know ---

See, I don't either, and I don't know you half as well as you know you. And all we're trying to do, both the prosecution and the defense, is to get fair-minded, down the road jurors who are not leaning one way or the other, you see.

Α Yeah.

But if you are, and you do have this predilection or bent for the prosecution, and you would not impose on them the burden that the Court read you of proving the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, that you would perhaps impose less of a burden than that, then you really shouldn't sit on a criminal jury, you see. particularly one where a man's life is in jeopardy, as it is here.

Α Yes. 4-1 Now, I have to ask you; Do you feel, under those Q. 1 circumstances, that it would be better that you not sit on 2 this jury? 3 A Yes. MR. DENNY: Well, I would, under the circumstances, 5 your Honor, challenge the juror under 1073, Subdivision 2 -б and with great thanks for her candor. 7 THE COURT: In view of her answers, the Court will 8 grant the challenge. 9 MR. DENNY: Thank you very much. Mrs. DeKuh. 10 THE COURT: Mrs. DeKuh, thank you very much. 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DE KUH: You're welcome. 12 MR. KAY: Thank you. 13 You're welcome. PROSPECTIVE JUROR DE KUH: 14 THE COURT: Let's see. That's the 15th floor, Mrs. 15 DeKuh, the 15th floor of the New Hall of Records, if you 16 17 would, the assembly room there. 18 Now, as to the rest of you -- let's take another 19 name first, in place of Mrs. DeKuh. 20 THE CLERK: Mrs. Beverly A. Ford; B-e-v-e-r-1-y; last name, F-o-r-d. 21 22 23 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 24 MRS. BEVERLY A. FORD 25 BY THE COURT: 26 Mrs., is it? Q 27 A Yes. 28 THE CLERK: Yes.

4-2

ģ

. ¹²

Q BY THE COURT: Mrs. Ford, would it be any hard-ship to you to serve in this case?

A No, it wouldn't.

THE COURT: All right. We'll get to the rest of the questions after -- to you, after 2:00 o'clock.

During the recess, ladies and gentlemen, you are obliged not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with this matter, nor are you to form or express any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you, should you be chosen as a juror in the case.

All right. We are in recess now until 2:00 o'clock. We'll see you all then.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, could the Court also request that the jurors check during the lunch time as to the hard-ship matter, and --

THE COURT: Yes. The Court has asked them previously to do that. You'll remember that.

(Whereupon, at 12:01 o'clock p.m., an adjournment was taken in this matter until 2:00 o'clock p.m. of the same day.)

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 1972 2:05 P.M. 1 2 3 THE COURT: The record will show Mr. Davis to be present 4 with his counsel, and Mr. Denny. And Mr. Kay for the People. 5 And in the box we have the prospective alternate jurors. 6 Mrs. Ford, Mr. Chavers, and Mr. Ailman. 7 8 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 9 MRS. BEVERLY A. FORD 10 BY THE COURT: 11 12 Were we about to talk to you, Mrs. Ford, is that 13 it? 14 Α ... Yes. 15 I think we had just called your name. 16 I think you indicated it would be no hardship 17 if you were to serve as a juror; is that true? Yes, I did call my employer on our lunch break 18 19 and as far as there was a limit as to how long, no one knew. 20 What is your business or occupation? Q. 21 A I work for Kaiser Permanente Optical Lab. 22 Q I'm sorry? 23 Α Kaiser on Sunset, the Optical Lab. 24 Q As nearly as I can recall, we've had people from Kaiser on the jury before. It is my recollection that they 26 were paid for the service beyond the 30 days period. Uh-huh. 28 Q. You couldn't get an answer over the lunch hour,

is that correct? 1 A No, they are either out to lunch or on vacation. 2 those that knew. But as far as the contract was concerned, 3 my supervisor said there was no limit. All right. So you are not concerned about being 6 paid during the time that you are serving as a juror? 7 Α No. 8 Are your views about the death penalty such that 9 you would automatically refuse to impose the penalty regard-10 less of the evidence? 11 No. 12 Or are your view about the death penalty such 13 that you would automatically impose it, that is vote for 14 the death penalty upon a conviction of murder of the first 15 degree regardless of the evidence? 16 No. 17 Or would your views be such that you could not 18 be fair and impartial in determining the question of guilt 19 or innocence in the first phase of the case because of your 20 views about the death penalty? 21 No. 22 Q. You've told us what your work is. 23 How long have you been so employed? 24 A Approximately three years. 25 Q. And is there a Mr. Ford? 26 No, we're divorced. Α 27 What type of work did he do? Q. 28 Α Uh, he worked for Bethlehem Steel.

	1	· ·
	1	Q Are you related to or a friend of any law enforce-
	2	ment officer?
	3	A No, I am not.
,	4	Q And in what general area do you reside?
.	5	A Southeast.
j P	6	Q Would you have such views about the Manson Family
*	7.	and Charles Manson as a result of what you have heard, seen
	8	or read that you could not be fair and impartial to somebody
	9	whom the evidence would show is a member of the Manson Family
	10	or associated with Mr. Manson?
a fls.	11	A No.
	. 12	
	13	
	14	,
a	15	
*	16	
	17 ,	
•	18	
	19	
-	20-	
	21	
	22	
∰r 3 () 45	23	
	24.	
**	25	
	26	
D .	27	
_	28	

5a-1

2 1

JUROR AILMAN: Thank you.

Q You could be fair and impartial in spite of anything you may have heard, seen or read, is that correct?

' ' VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF

CARROLL M. AILMAN

BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Ailman, what did you find out about your economic situation in the event you serve?

A To paraphrase my boss's boss, branch chief, named Gerald Carey, the company does not guarantee remuneration beyond the four-week period of time. And if my presence is not available for beginning work on a proposal as of the beginning of February, there is a risk that someone else will be assigned and the job situation might be --

Q Precarious for you?

A -- precarious, yes. Thank you for the word.

MR. DENNY: I would --

A On the basis of those two statements, I would respectfully submit that I not be considered as an alternate juror.

MR. KAY: We would stipulate that he may be excused for hardship.

MR. DENNY: I would so stipulate, your Honor.

THE COURT: Both Mr. Denny and Mr. Kay having stipulated, the Court would agree it is a hardship and you are excused. Thank you Mr. Ailman.

THE CLERK: Francis L. Munsch; F-r-a-n-c-i-s, last name 1 M-u-n-s-c-h. 3 4 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF ..5. FRANCIS MUNSCH BY THE COURT: 6 Mr. Munsch, you have been present during all of 7 8 the proceedings thus far today? A Yes, I have. 9 10 Would your answers be any different than the 11 majority have responded to the questions of a general nature? 12 And if so, in what respect would your answers vary? 13 The only difference so far would be that my 14 employer will only pay 25 days. 15 Q I see. After that, you'd be on your own? 16 That's right. Α 17 Q Would that constitute a hardship to you? 18 Α Family of eight to support, yes. 19 Q What type of work do you do? 20 Electronic engineer. Α 21 For whom? Q 22 North American Rockwell. Α 23 And you ascertained since I talked to you this Q 24 morning that this would be the case, they only pay for 25 days? 25 I spent a half-hour on the phone. А 26 MR. KAY: We'd stipulate that he could be excused for 27 hardship, your Honor. 28 MR. DENNY: So stipulate, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: All right, you are excused, then. 2 you, Mr. Munsch. THE CLERK: Jose A. Macias; J-o-s-e, last name M-a-c-i-a-s. 5 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 16 JOSE MACIAS 7 BY THE COURT: 8 Mr. Macias, have you been present during all the 9 proceedings thus far? 10 Yes, sir. 11 Would your answers be any different than the 12 majority have responded to the Court's questions? 13 Α Well --14 If so, in what respect? Q 15 Uh, I mean, can I answer it -- any of the answers A 16 you asked? 17 Q Surely. 18 Well, I -- I don't believe in capital punishment. A 19 Are your views about the death penalty such that 20 you would automatically refuse to consider the -- voting for 21 the death penalty regardless of the evidence? 22 Α Well, I ---23 Would you ever vote for the death penalty in any Q 24 dase? 25 This is my first case that I have been in the A No. 26 jury. 27 Q Yes. 28 And I -- I haven't been -- uh, before, in a place Α

1	like this.
2	Q You have never been before in a situation like
3	this?
4	A No, sir.
5	Q Well, you have given some thought to the subject?
6	A Yes, I have.
7	Q All right. Would there be any crime for which,
8	assuming that a man is guilty, that you would vote the death
9	penalty?
10	A Well, I I would have to say this, sir, I I
11	have to I never I don't know the case, this case at all.
12	Q That's correct.
13.	A Because I never read the papers.
14.	Q None of us know it.
15	A No.
16	A No. Well, I don't know I it is difficult for me
17	to say it.
18	Q Would you ever consider imposing the death penalty
19	in any case?
20	A No, sir.
21 .	Q You would not?
22	A No, sir.
23	Q Now, talking about the first phase of the case, the
24	phase wherein you are not to consider penalty or punishment,
25	but are concerned, really, with the question of guilt or
26	innocence.
27	Would your views about the penalty be such that
28	you could not be fair and impartial, I'm asking you, in the

first phase of the case? A Well -- yes, yes. Q I see. Now, getting to the second phase of the case which involves punishment, the question of life imprisonment or death, Faced with that choice, would you automatically refuse to impose the death penalty in every case regardless of the evidence? You mean death? Α Yes. Would you automatically -- am I confusing you? 🏄 Would you vote against the death penalty automatically?

6 fol

6-1 Q. You would never vote to impose the death penalty, 1 I take it, from what you've said, in any case, regardless of 2 the evidence? That's right. MR. KAY: Your Honor, the prosecution would respect-6 fully challenge this juror under Section 1073.2 of the Penal 7 Code. 8 MR. DENNY: And we object, your Honor, on the grounds 9 stated this morning. 10 THE COURT: All right. The Court grants the challenge, 33 and you are excused, Mr. Macias. Thank you very much. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MACIAS: Okay. 13 MR. KAY: Thank you, Mr. Macies. 14 THE CLERK; Miss Judith D. Gonzales; J-u-d-i-t-h; 15 last name. G-o-n-z-a-l-e-s. 16 17 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 18 MISS JUDITH D. GONZALES 19 BY THE COURT: 20 Miss Gonzales, you have been present during all 21 the proceedings thus far? 22 Yes, I have. 23 Would your answers be any different than the 24 majority have responded to the questions put to the group 25 as a whole? 26 No. 27 It would constitute no hardship to you to serve 28 as a juror, then?

6-2 Ą No. 1 And would you have such views about the death Q. 2 penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it? 3 A Yes. Q. You would? 5 A Yes. 6 In other words, you would never vote to impose Q, 7 the death penalty? 8 A Yes. 9 10 Q Are there any -- strike that. 11 Would you ever consider imposing the death penalty? 12 A No. 13 Given the choice between life imprisonment and 14 death, as you would be if you were a juror, and if you were 15 called upon to decide the question that would be presented 16 in the second phase of the case, the penalty phase, you would 17 automatically, in every case, vote for life imprisonment 18 against death? 19 20 Regardless of what evidence -- whatever evidence 21 might be produced? Yes. 23 Your Honor, the prosecution would respectfully .24 i challenge Miss Gonzales under Section 1073, Subdivision 2 of 25 the Penal Code. 26 MR. DENNY: Your Honor, did the Court inquire as to 27 the first phase of the case? I'm sorry. I was writing.

THE COURT: No, I haven't yet.

28

6-3	1	ବ	BY THE COURT: Would you ever consider imposing
	2	the death po	enalty in any case?
	3	Λ	No.
	4	ବ	Would your views be such concerning the death
*	5	penalty that	t you could not be fair and impartial in the first
ž Ž	6	phase involv	ing guilt or innocence?
•	7 ÷	'A	I don't understand that.
	8 '	Q Q	You understand what I have said concerning the
	ġ	possibility	that there will be two phases in this case?
	10	Λ	Yes.
	11	Q .	The first phase concerns what?
	12	A	(No response.)
	13	Q	What are you concerned with in the first phase of
	14	the case?	
,	15	Α	Do you mean
	16	Q	Yes.
3	17		What do you what are you concerned with? I'm
	18	testing you	to find out if you understand.
	19	A	Oh.
	20	Q	What are you concerned with in the first phase
	21	of the case	, then, according to what I have explained to you?
	22		I want to find out whether you understand it.
,	23	A	Do you mean if they're innocent or not?
ا الاستار الاستار	24	Q.	That's correct. You are concerned with guilt
₹ 2	25	or innocenc	e in the first phase, aren't you?
	26	A	Yes.
	27	Q ·	All right. Now, would your views about the
	28	death penal	ty be such that you would be unable to be fair and

6-4 impartial in that first phase, or could you look at the 1 evidence in the first phase and decide whether somebody is --2 Oh, in the first phase, I could. 3 -- is guilty or innocent, without regard to any Q 4 feelings you might have about the death penalty? 5 In the first phase, I could, yes. 6 All right. So it's only when you get to the second phase that you have the problem wherein you would never vote to impose the death penalty; is that correct? 9. . A Yes. 10 I would object to the challenge again, your MR. DENNY: 11 Honor, on the grounds previously stated. 12 13 THE COURT: The Court grants the challenge. Thank you, Miss Gonzales. The Court does excuse 14 15 VOU. 16 Herbert H. Edmondson; H-e-r-b-e-r-t; last THE CLERK: 17 name, E-d-m-o-n-d-s-o-n. 18 10 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 20 HERBERT H. EDMONDSON 21 BY THE COURT: 22 Mr. Edmondson, you have been present during all 23 the proceedings thus far, have you not? 24 ٨ Yes, I have. 25 Would your answers be any different than the 26 majority have responded to the Court's questions of a general 27 nature? 28 No, they wouldn't. A 6a fls.

6a-1 Q It would be no hardship to you to serve in this 1 case? 2 No, it wouldn't. Α 3 Q What type of work do you do? Sheet metal worker. A 5 And do you have views concerning the death 6 penalty that are such as would keep you from being fair and 7 impartial in determining guilt or innocence? R Α No. 9 Q Or are your views about the penalty such that you 10 would automatically refuse to impose it? 11 No, I would not. Ą 12 Or would your views be such that you would auto-13 matically impose it upon a conviction of murder of the first 14 degree, regardless of the evidence? 15 Say that again? A 16 Would you automatically vote for the death 17 penalty, upon a conviction of murder of the first degree, 18 without regard to the evidence? 19 Yes, I would. 20 In other words, if somebody were convicted of 21 murder of the first degree, you would automatically impose it 22 23 without regard to the evidence? 24 No, not necessarily. Α Then I might have confused you in putting it the 25 Q 26 way I did. 27 Would you -- in either case, would you, if you were 28 called upon to decide the question of life imprisonment or

death, would you examine the evidence and consider and weigh 1 the evidence, before you voted either way? 2 Yes, I would. 3 Α Q And would you in any way vote automatically for 4 5 either penalty, life imprisonment or death, automatically? Without regard to the evidence? 6 7 Α (No response.) Я Q Do you want me to restate that? 9 Α Yes. 10 O Would you automatically vote for either punish-11 ment -- penalty or penalty, life imprisonment or death, --12 without regard to the evidence? 13 A Yeş. 14 MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, I think that's a compound 15 question. I think he has -- it has to be put -- the two 16 questions, the alternatives, should be put in two separate 17 questions. 18 'THE COURT: Well, the Court has received answers from 19 him indicating that he would not -- indicating separate : 20 responses that he would not, And, in order to save time, I 21 put them in that way. Apparently it is confusing, however. 22 Let's start over. 23 Mr. Edmondson, would you, if you were called upon 24 to determine the issue of penalty, automatically refuse to 25 impose the death penalty, regardless of the evidence? 26 I would not. Α 27 Or upon a conviction of murder of the first Q 28 degree, would you automatically impose the death penalty,

1	regardless of the evidence?
2 `	A No.
3	Q What type of work do you do? You say sheet metal?
4	A Yes, sir.
5	Q For whom do you work?
6	A Well, I am under Amtrak now. I have a five-year
.7	contract, but I don't work.
8	Q I see. You are under a five-year contract?
9	A It's five and a half now, yes.
10	Q Wherein you do not work?
11	A That's right.
12	Q Explain that to me. That sounds like a fairly
13	good contract.
14	(Laughter.)
15	A Well, I worked I worked for the Union Pacific;
16	and when they
17	Q Keep that microphone close, please.
18	A I worked for the Union Pacific up until May,
19	and they done away with their passenger trains, and all those
20	that was laid off as a result of it, if you had over five
21	years service, you got six years' pay yearly.
22	Q I see. All right. Is that the type of work that
23	you have done most of your life, sheet metal work,
24	A Yes.
25	Q for the railroad?
26	A Forty-four years.
27	Q And are you related to or a friend of any law
28.	enforcement a law enforcement officer as I've explained

*

	1	that term?	
	2	A	No.
	3	Q	Is there a Mrs. Edmondson?
	4	A	No, there isn't.
*	5	Q	In what area do you reside, generally?
, e de	6	A	The west part.
	7	MR. D	ENNY: I'm sorry?
•	8	Q	BY THE COURT: I didn't hear that.
-	9	A	The west part of L. A.
	10	Q	Can you think of any reason why you couldn't be
	11	fair and im	partial in this case?
	12	A	No, I can't.
	13,	Q	Do you have such views about the Manson Family or
	14	Charles Man	son, as a result of what you've heard, seen or
*	15	read in the	news media, that you couldn't be fair and impartial
*	16	to somebody	whom the evidence would show to be a member of the
•	17	Manson Fami	1y?
	18	. A	No. I haven't taken any sides one way or the
b fol.	19	other.	
	20		
	21		
	22		
*	23	. 4	
<u>.</u>	24	7	
\$ \$ } •	25		,
1	26	·	
D , - !	27 28		

1	Q Would a member of the Manson Family be at any
2	disadvantage
3	A No, they would not.
4	Q in other words, in having you as a juror?
5	A No, they would not.
6	THE COURT: All right. You may examine.
7	MR. DENNY: I wonder if you could pass that microphone
8	down to Mrs. Ford? And I will question her first.
9	
10	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF
11	BEVERLY A. FORD
12	BY MR. DENNY:
13	Q Mrs. Ford, I don't believe I'm sorry. We seem
14	to be dodging heads here you were asked, "Have you had any
15	prior jury experience?" ma'am?
16	A No, I haven't.
17	Q You hesitated. I'm wondering what the reason for
18	your hesitation was?
19.	A Well, I was a witness in I have been a
20	witness.
21	Q Do you want to hold that right up to your mouth?
22	A Okay.
23	Q That's the way. Then we can hear.
24	A I said: I have been a witness. And that was the
25	reason for the hesitation.
26	Q All right. And in what kind of case?
27	A Narcotics.
28	Q And was this recently?

1	A No. It's been about oh, nine years.
2	Q And was this were you called by the defense or
3	by the prosecution?
4	
5	Q And was this someone related to you or a friend of
6	yours?
7	A Yes, it was my uncle.
8	Q All right. And was he convicted or acquitted?
9	A Acquitted.
10	Q Now, have you been a witness in any other case at
н	any other time?
12	A No, I haven't.
13	Q All right. In that particular case, I assume that
14	since he was acquitted, you felt that he had been wrongfully
15	charged, perhaps? Is that right?
16	A Yes.
17	Q All right. Now, as a result of that, is there,
18	would you say, any lingering feelings of hostility toward the
19	prosecution, or toward the police forces, for having wrong-
20	fully charged him
21	A No.
22	Q of the narcotics offense?
23	A No.
24	Q Do you feel that anything in connection with that
25	particular past event would make you kind of tend to be a
26	little bit as the lady before you, sitting in that very
27	seat, says, "Edging toward the prosecution" do you feel that
28	it would make you tend to edge towards the defense, or against
	i was the many total tales are the second at the control of the co

1	the prosecution
2	A No.
3	Q because of that?
4	And did police officers testify in that particular
5	case?
6	A Yes, they did.
7	Q All right. And was your testimony in conflict
8	with theirs?
9	A Hmmm no, not really. No.
10	Q All right. Well, I'm not sure that the question
11	was specifically asked of you, as it was again of Mrs. DeKuh
12	but looking at it from the other side, since she was married to
13	an officer because of the experience that you have pre-
14	viously had, do you feel that you would give less weight to the
15	testimony of any police officer than you would to a civilian
16	witness, because of the fact that he was a police officer?
17	A No.
18	Q You would judge his credibility by the same
19	standards that you would judge the credibility of any other
20	witness?
21	A Yes, I would.
22	Q Based on the criteria that the judge will give you
23	in an instruction; is that right?
24	A Yes.
25	Q All right. Now, other than this case against your
26	uncle, have any other friends or relatives of yours been
27	charged with an offense, as far as you know?
28	A No.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

1	Q Now, what is the optical job that you have, ma'am?
2	A I order the frames and lenses.
. '3	Q All-right. And what sort of work did your husband
4	do at Bethlehem Steel?
5	A - He was a it's been some time ago a floorman.
6	That was one of the titles.
7	Q All right. Now, I'm going to ask you a number of
8	questions concerning the death penalty. As the Court has
9	stated to you, the mere fact that we ask these questions does
10	not in any way indicate that we think we will necessarily get to
n .	that issue. But this is the only chance we have to talk to
12	you jurors.
13	And you understand that?
14	A Yes.
15	Q My questioning of you doesn't by any means indicate
16	to you that I think we'll ever get there; do you understand
17	that?
18	A Yes.
19	Q All right. Now, these questions that I will ask
20	you. I will probably repeat them to most of the jurors who are
21	sitting out there, so they can all listen, and I'll try and
22	speak loudly enough through this microphone so that they can
23	hear, too, and think of the questions that they or, the
24,	answers they might give to those questions.
25	First of all, have you read anything at all con-
26	cerning the death penalty, the pros or cons or anything of
27	that kind? At any time
28	A Yes.

1	Q during your life?
2	A Yes, I have.
3	Q Have you made any sort of study of the issue of the
4	death penalty? Have you done any
, 5	A No, no studying, no.
6	Q any directed reading in that?
7	A No.
8	Q Your reading was just sort of by chance, just
9	reading it as you were coming across something?
10	A Yes, reading it in the newspaper.
11	Thèse type of cases where perhaps the paper
12	carries an article about someone who has been executed by the
13	State, or on the contrary, issues raised pro and con about the
14	death penalty? Or both?
15	A Issues pro and con about the death penalty.
16	Q All right. And have you ever attended any sort of
17	meetings or anything where that was the topic of conversation?
18	A No.
19	Q Now, you are going to be asked in this case by the
20	prosecution to bring in a guilty verdict, obviously. That's
21	what they want. And they say that they then want to ask you to
22	vote to execute this defendant.
23	Now, I take it you've never had a situation
24	involved where your word, your single, sole, solitary word,
25	meant whether somebody lived or died; is that correct?
26	A Yes.
27	
28	

7 fol

7-1

Q Now, generally the prosecutor will ask you in the case, and I'll ask you the same thing now, whether, assuming you felt that this was a case where you felt in your sole discretion, because nobody tells you how to vote, not even the Judge, not even the laws of the State -- assuming you felt that this was a case where, for whatever reason, you felt the defendant should be executed by lethal gas in the gas chamber up in San Quentin.

Would you have the courage of your convictions, as that phrase is sometimes used, to come in from your deliberations, to look him in the eye, to look me in the eye, and say to Mr. Davis, "By my vote I sentence you to die?"

Could you do that?

A Yes, I would.

And by the same token, ma'am, if you did not feel that this was a case where the death penalty was warranted, if you did not feel that this was a defendant against whom the State should exact such a toll, would you feel that you were doing your duty as a juror to come in and face the Judge and the prosecutor and your friends and everyone else and say, "No, I vote life and not death for this man."

Would you be able to do that?

- A Yes, I would.
- Q Would you feel that you were doing your duty as a juror by doing that?
 - A Yes, I would. If I felt this, I would do it.
 - Q All right.

7-2

2

1

3

5

б

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

. 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

04

25

26 27

28

Now, ma'am, the Court has asked you, and sometimes we get down to sort of neat phraseology here, whether you would refuse to invoke the death penalty or vote the death penalty on a first degree murder verdict regardless of the evidence. And you stated no.

The Court has also asked you if you would automatically vote for the death penalty on a finding of first degree murder. And to that you have also answered no.

Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q In other words, it would depend on a whole lot of factors, is that right?

A Right, right.

Q All right. So, that at this point, you are not predisposed one way or the other, is that right?

A No, I am not.

Q Just as you are not predisposed toward the guilt of the defendant; is that right?

A Right.

Q You are predisposed toward the innocence of the defendant, right?

A Right.

Q Because you understand under our law he is presumed innocent; you understand that?

A Yes, uh-huh.

Q And until you go into that jury room, you will carry that presumption with you; is that right?

A That's right.

7-3

1

3

5

4

6 7

8

9

11

10

12

13 14

15

16

18,

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27 28 Q All right, ma am.

Now, I've asked you about whether any friend has been charged with a crime or any relative other than your uncle. I'm not sure whether the Court asked you whether any friend or relative had ever been a victim of a crime or if you, yourself, had ever been a victim of any kind of crime; have you?

A No.

Q Or has any friend or relative?

A No.

Q Now, I believe you heard the Court read to you certain instructions which generally come at the end of the case.

But in order to give you some idea what this case is about, the Court read some instructions concerning evidence, concerning accomplice, concerning conspiracy, things of that kind. And one of those instructions concerns circumstantial evidence.

Now, do you understand that circumstantial evidence is accepted just as direct evidence is; do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q. Now, the definition of circumstantial evidence that the Court gave is one which even lawyers, I think, have a hard time understanding.

But circumstantial evidence is, in effect, something where you have to draw an inference that something else occurred, you see. 7-4

2

1

3

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 5

22

7a fls.

24

25 26

27

28

For instance, if I can give you just a brief illustration, and this will, I hope, do for the other jurors, too.

A mother sees her little son going into a cookie jar in the kitchen after she has told him not to. She says, "Don't do that. That's against the law in this house."

And she sees him go and take cookies from the cookie jar.

What she sees is direct evidence of the household crime, you see.

You understand?

A Yes.

On the other hand, the mother having told the son not to go into the cookie jar, that's a no-no, she goes out of the room and when she comes back in the kitchen, the top is off the cookie jar, and there are cookies missing off the top of the cookie jar because it was full when she left. And her son has crumbs on his mouth. But she did not see him go into the cookie jar. Her observations, what she saw at that time, although they are observations of what she has seen, is circumstantial evidence of that household crime.

Do you understand that?

Yes.

7a-1	1
	2
	3
*	4
<u>\$</u>	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
,	12
	13
_	14
);	15
	16
#	17
•	18
	19
٠	20
	21
	22
	. 23
李 華 李	24 - 25
2	_
¥.	26
_	27

Q All right.

Now, the law in this state says either one could convict him of that crime. And it says also that either kind of evidence can convict a person of murder.

Now, do you find anything so abhorrent in that, that a person could be convicted of murder only on circumstantial evidence that you would not vote for guilty if you felt the circumstantial evidence showed that the defendant had committed the crime?

A I think I'd have to have time to weigh it in my mind.

Q Well, you'd be given all the time you need. That's one thing that the Court will do.

A And I think, uh, there would have to be more evidence than just crumbs on his mouth.

Q Just what?

A Crumbs on his mouth. There would have to be more evidence.

(Laughter.)

Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, assuming, though, there were more evidence than just crumbs on his mouth. That there was sufficient evidence so that you felt beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty that that crime had been proven.

Could you then conscientiously vote a verdict of guilty?

A Yes, I could.

Q All right. Now, let me go one step further. I

7a-2

б²

 may sound like a prosecutor here. I'm trying to ask some of these questions just to speed the thing up. These are questions that he would normally ask.

In this case there are two charges of murder. There is one charge of conspiracy, too.

On one of the charges of murder, the People are attempting to prove that Donald Jerome Shorty Shea died.

That he died by criminal means.

In other words, that he was murdered. And that this defendant is in some way responsible for this death.

However, there is no body. The death, if in fact any death occurred is going to be attempted to be proved by the People by circumstantial evidence.

Now, interestingly enough in California, although some people think you have to have a body to prove murder, it is not so. You can prove a murder without a body. And you prove it by circumstantial evidence.

Now, the People, then, as to Count III are going to attempt to show a death and a death by criminal means by circumstantial evidence.

If they can produce sufficient evidence, and I say if they can, to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty that Shorty Shea is dead, that he died by criminal means, and that this defendant was criminally responsible for it, do you feel that you could vote guilty?

Q All right.

Yes.

Now, the Judge read you, as part of an instruction,

7a-3

an instruction that is a very important instruction in a circumstantial evidence case, where the case of the People rests wholly or substantially on circumstantial evidence, and there are two reasonable interpretations of the evidence, one pointing to the defendant's guilt and one to his imnocence, and the instruction goes: You are required, where they are both reasonable interpretations of the evidence, you are required to adopt that view of the evidence pointing to the defendant's innocence and reject that pointing to his guilt.

Now, do you have any quarrel at all with that instruction?

- A No, I don't.
- Q Do you think that is fair?
- A Yes.
- Q And would you follow that instruction to the letter?
 - A Yes, I would.
- Q If you find that the evidence in this case falls within the ambit of that instruction?
 - A Right.
- Q All right. Now, there will be some experts testifying in this case or people who will attempt to qualify themselves and may qualify themselves as experts.

I'm not sure that the Court read an instruction concerning expert testimony.

But do you feel just because a man may qualify as an expert that anything he says is gospel and you must accept ever thing that he says from the witness stand?

7a-4

1 2

7b fis.

THE COURT: Well, the Court will instruct you with respect to expert testimony.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, let --

THE COURT: The Court's instruction generally will state to you that you are not bound to accept expert testimony. You may reject the testimony if you find it to be unreasonable.

Will you follow that instruction as well as all the other instructions the Court gives you concerning the law?

THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I would.

Q BY MR. DENNY: All right, thank you.

Now, ma'am, let's go back to a situation where you are in the guilt or innocence phase of the trial and you have now retired to the jury room for your deliberations and you are in a minority. Perhaps a minority of one. All of your other fellow jurors, 12 good citizens who are conscientiously attempting to do their job just as you are, are of a different opinion than you are.

And let's just, for the sake of an example, say that they are all voting for guilt and you are voting for innocence, acquittal, because you do not feel that the People have proven their case and proven it beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, which is their burden.

Would you, simply in order to bring in a unanimous verdict change your view from theirs if you are not convinced their view is right?

A No, I don't think so, because his life would be at stake.

б

R

Q That's correct.

Now, by the same token, would you, nevertheless, listen to what they had to say to see if they could convince you of the correctness of their position?

A Yes, I would.

Q And on the other hand, would you explain to them your position, why you felt as you felt and why you felt they were wrong?

A Yes.

Q You wouldn't just clam up and say I know what I know and I'm not going to change no matter what?

A No.

Q Because you understand -- well, some people do that. You smile and I smile as I say it, but it has happened and it is in the interest of both the People and the defendant in a case which is going to be a long case to attempt to reach a verdict if you can conscientiously do so. But if you can not, you would not change your vote to bring in a unanimous verdict or merely because 11 other people are against you, is that right?

A Yes.

Q Now, the Court has read to you three charges, three counts.

Count I charging the murder of Gary Hinman;
Count II charging the conspiracy to commit robbery and
murder of Gary Hinman -- did I say Count II or Count III?
That was Count II; and, Count III, the alleged murder of
Shorty Shea.

Now, each of these is a separate count. And again, I'm not sure that the Court read this instruction, but there is an instruction that you must consider the evidence or consider the guilt or innocence of the defendant separately as to each count.

Now, do you think that you could do this?

A. Yes

One occurring in late July and one supposedly occurring in late August. And sometimes it is said that a defendant is greatly prejudiced by having two separate charges put together that way for the same jury to hear. And sometimes it is felt that a jury has an almost insuperable job in trying to keep the two counts separate, because they may say, "Well, he's guilty of one and, therefore, he must be guilty of the other."

Or, "Well, where there's all that smoke, there must be fire. And let's say he is guilty of one and acquit him of the other."

Or, "Where there's smoke there's fire. He must be guilty of both, although there doesn't seem that strong of evidence on either."

Now, this sometimes happens.

Now, do you think you can segregate those three charges and determine separately as to each whether the People have produced enough evidence as to each separate count to sustain their burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty; can you do that?

A I would certainly try to. I --

Q All right, well, that's all we can ask. Fine.

Now, a question has been asked by the prosecutor earlier when we were questioning other jurors as to whether or not you would vote for second degree murder instead of first degree murder or some lesser charge simply in order to avoid the responsibility of determining the issue of life or death, assuming you reached a first degree murder verdict.

You wouldn't do that, would you?

In other words, you wouldn't vote something less than the evidence showed if the evidence showed beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty that the defendant was guilty of one of the crimes that he was charged with simply to avoid your responsibility of voting in the penalty phase of the trial, would you?

A No, I wouldn't.

Q If, on the other hand, the evidence showed something less than first degree murder and you were instructed that you might find something less, and you were convinced only that the defendant were guilty to that degree or to that extent, you'd have no reluctance in voting for that lesser offense, would you?

A No, I wouldn't.

Q If the People did not sustain their verdict as to any charge, would you feel you were doing your duty in voting to acquit the defendant?

A Yes, I would.

8 fls.²⁷

3

5

6

7 8

. Q

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

Q Now, the Court has read you certain instructions concerning conspiracy, and conspiracy is where two or more people combine to commit a criminal offense.

Now, there's something known as kind of a concept of -- "Birds of a feather flock together," or, "Guilt by association."

You've heard that expression?

- 'A Yes, I have.
 - Q Or those expressions?
 - A Yes.
- Q All right. Now, it's also part of our law that mere association if the prosecution in any case, where they're charging conspiracy, shows only association of the defendant with some acknowledged conspirators, and that's all, that that in and of itself is insufficient to convict.

Now, does that seem fair to you?

- A Would you rephrase that, please?
- Q Yes. If the prosecution shows only that the defendant associated with some acknowledged conspirators but that's all; only mere association and nothing more; no criminal design or intent on his part then you must acquit him, and that's the law.

Now, does that seem fair to you?

- A Yes.
- Q All right. And would you follow that instruction, assuming the Court gives it to you?
 - A Yes, I would.
 - Q All right. Now, indeed, the law goes even further

8-2

, i1

than that and says even if someone doesn't act -- and it is shown by the prosecution that someone doesn't act which may further the ends of the conspiracy, but he does it without guilty knowledge or guilty intent or criminal intent, that the mere doing of an act, without the showing of criminal intent, if that's all the prosecution can show, then the jury must acquit.

For instance, I'll give you an example. We'll go back to the days of the horses, and three men on horseback come up to a bank. And they're going to rob the bank. They have conspired to rob the bank.

And they leave their horses with a fellow standing on the corner, by the old cigar store, and say, "Here,
fellow, hold these horses just a few minutes, would you?"

And he said, "Sure."

They go in, and they rob the bank. They run out, they jump on their horses, and they go away. The guy's left standing there, dumfounded, and the Sheriff comes and grabs him.

Well, he was not part of the conspiracy, and he had no criminal intent. He didn't know what they were going to do, but he did an act which furthered the object of the conspiracy, holding the horses, to enable them to go in and rob the bank.

Do you see? Now, if the People were only able to show that much, that person would have to be acquitted of the charge of robbery -- or, conspiracy to commit robbery.

Do you understand?

8-3	1	A Yes.
	2	Q All right. Now, does that seem fair to you?
	3	A Yes, it does.
	4	Q And if you are given an instruction to the effect
íą.	5	that a defendant must be acquitted, where the only showing is
3	6	that he did an act which furthered the ends of the conspiracy,
•	7	but that's all, would you follow that instruction?
	. 8	A Yes, I would.
	9	MR. DENNY: All right, ma'am. Perhaps let's pass the
	· 10	microphone over to Mr
	11	
	12	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF
	. 13	CECIL H. CHAVERS
	14 ·	BY MR. DENNY:
₩,	15	Q (Continuing) is it Chavers or Chaivers?
<u>.</u>	16	A Chavers.
₹	17	Q Chavers?
	18	A Yes.
	19	Q All right. Mr. Chavers, prior to your work with
	20	the Department of Water and Power, which you say you ve
•	21	worked at for three years, for whom did you work?
	22	A I worked for the Department of Traffic, City of
-it	23	Los Angeles.
**************************************	24	Q Doing what sort of work?
	25	A I was a clerk-typist over there.
	26	Q For how long?
	27	A For four years and seven months.
	28	Q And that's right down to the minute almost. And

in that particular department did you come in contact with 8-4 police officers? No. No personal contact, no. All right. Now, do you have any friends at all Q in the field of law enforcement? 3a fol No. A . 16

28

Q Now, you say that your wife is presently a housewife. Had she previously been employed in any capacity?

Λ Yes. Approximately two years ago, she worked for a road manufacturing firm for approximately three months. I don't recall the name of it, but it was in the city of Vernon somewhere, I believe.

Q All right.

Now, sir, I'll askyou this question. And this applies to all of the other jurors, too.

When you are asked about your work, or your business or occupation, that includes any part-time work that you do, too. Sometimes people will answer what their main job is, but they have a part-time job which is very significant, too -- or may be.

Do you have any part-time employment?

A No, I don't.

Q All right.

Have you been in the Service at all?

A No, sir.

Q Now, again, because this is the opportunity that we -- the one opportunity that we get to talk to you, I'm going to ask you certain questions about the death penalty. And starting off, have you done any reading on the subject?

A I have noticed articles -- one, I believe, I read in the Los Angeles Times approximately seven or eight months ago.

Q Was this on the question of abolition or retention

of the death penalty?

A Yes, it was.

Q All right. And have you on occasion discussed this with friends, relatives or classmates in school, something of that kind? Or a school assignment, maybe?

A No, no school assignment.

Q Have you done any studying on it, other than just this casual reading that you've mentioned?

A No, I haven't.

Q All right. So, you, too, are in a position where, for the first time in your life, if you are chosen as a juror, and are seated with the regular jury for some reason, you would be in a position of your single, sole, solitary vote determining whether a man lives or dies. And you have never been in that position before, I take it?

A That's correct.

And again, would you have the courage of your convictions, if that's what it is presumed to take, to come in and look Mr. Davis in the eye, if you felt that it was the kind of case where you felt the death penalty was appropriate, and the kind of defendant where you felt it was appropriate, and say, "Mr. Davis, because of my vote, you will die"?

A Yes. I would --

Q Do you think you could do that?

A Yes.

Q And, sir, by the same token, if you did not feel that he was the kind of defendant or that this was the kind of case or these were the kind of cases -- assuming

we again ever get to that point -- where the death penalty was appropriate, would you feel you were doing your duty in saying to the Court, to counsel over there, and everyone else, "No, I properly vote for the death penalty -- for life imprisonment in this case, against the death penalty"?

A Yes, sir.

And as you sit there now, you have no predilection one way or the other as to what type of case you feel the death penalty would be the case -- would be the penalty that you would vote; is that right?

A No, I have no idea at the present time, no.

Q All right, sir. Well, again, so that we are communicating, not only you and me but the rest of the jurors, too, the prospective jurors, you understand that if a person is found guilty of first degree murder, that does not mean that he should automatically suffer the death penalty; do you understand that?

A Yes, sir.

Q There are some people who feel that first degree murder means automatically he should get death. You are not of that mind?

A No, sir, I'm not.

Q Now, again, as we discussed with Mrs. Ford, I take it as of this moment, your state of mind -- or frame of mind -- is that the defendant is innocent; is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q Because that is the presumption of law which follows him right through to the point where you exit to

```
the jury room to begin your deliberations.
                                Do you understand that?
8b fls.
                                Yes.
                         A
           6
           7
           8
          10
          11
          12
          13
          14
          15
          16
          17 ·
          18
          19
          20
          21
          22
          23
          24
          25
          26
          27
          28
```

Q Now, do you also understand that in a case -- in a criminal case, the defense is not required to put forward any evidence whatsoever? Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q The defense has no burden whatsoever; do you understand that?

A Yes, sir.

And it is the prerogative of the defense attorney if he feels that the People have not established their case, by the necessary burden of proof — if they haven't proven their case beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, as far as the defendant's guilt is concerned — then he doesn't even have to call the defendant to the witness stand, or he doesn't even have to put on any evidence.'

Do you understand that?

A Yes, I do.

Now, do you have any feelings as you sit there that a defendant, if he does not take the witness stand, must have something to hide? And therefore, is probably guilty?

A No, I do not.

Q Do you understand that, by the constitution of the United States, that presumption is not only inappropriate, it's unconstitutional?

That you can't presume that? You can't properly presume that?

Some people feel this, you know. But the law is to the contrary. The defendant doesn't have to take the stand, may not be compelled to take the stand; and indeed, if his

 attorney feels that the case is so weak that they don't need to put on evidence, he shouldn't take the stand.

Now, do you feel that there would be anything wrong with -- in the defendant following that course in this case?

A No. I do not.

And if in fact I did not choose to call him to the stand, or I only put on a couple of witnesses, say, to rebut a couple of points perhaps that the People have brought out, and then rested, you would not make up any deficiency in the People's case by the fact that the defendant did not take the stand, would you?

A No, sir, I wouldn't.

Q All right. Fine.

Now, sir, did you hear the questions that I asked of Mrs. Ford previously?

A Yes, I did.

Q And would your answers to her questions -- to those questions be the same as her answers?

Yes, they would.

you had had no prior jury experience; is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q I see. Yes. "

could not be fair both to the People and to the defendant, in the trial of this case?

A No. sir, I do not.

4 5

MR. DENNY: All right. Could you pass the microphone, then, back up to Mr. Edmondson?

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF

HERBERT H. EDMONDSON

BY MR. DENNY:

Q Mr. Edmondson, we have been over the questions about the death penalty, but these are questions again that I have to ask each individual juror.

And sir, I did make note of your initial answer to the Court's question, and I was not sure whether it was based on perhaps a misinterpretation of the Court's question, or of a conviction on your part.

But I put down, when you answered the question, whether you would automatically vote to impose the death penalty upon a verdict of murder in the first degree, that you said: Yes, you would.

Now, was that your frame of mind, sir?

A No, not necessarily.

Q Do you have the feeling that one who is found guilty of murder of the first degree should therefore be given the death penalty?

No, I do not.

Part Call Carry

You understand that murder in the first degree may be found in a number of different ways. If a person actually kills, then he may be found guilty of murder in the first degree, on the basis of premeditation, deliberation, cold-plooded murder.

8c fol 18

On the other hand, he may be an accomplice; he may never strike a blow himself, and yet be found guilty as an accomplice.

And the Court read you certain accomplice instructions: One who aids and abets with guilty knowledge is an accomplice, or he may be guilty as a conspirator, although being miles away at the time.

There may be all sorts of ways that a person can be found guilty of murder of the first degree; do you understand that?

A Yes.

And therefore, there would be degrees of culpability that might affect the judgment of one determining the issue of penalty, assuming there had been a finding of murder of the first degree.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

B c-1	1	Q	All right. And you'd take all of those factors
	2	into accour	t before you would vote one way or the other, I
	3	take it; is	that correct?
	4	A	That's correct. That's right.
8	5	Q	All right. Have you done any time in any of the
#(#E *	6	Armed Force	s, sir?
a '	7	A	Yes, I have. World War II.
	8	Q	And what branch of the Service were you in?
	9	A	Navy.
	10	Q	And did you see active duty, sir?
	11	A	Yes, I điđ.
,	12	Q	In what kind of work?
	13	A	Uh Shipfitter in the Navy, on on the Alabama
_	14	Q	I take it, however, that you were not firing at
)	15	people your	self is that right?
	16	A	No, I wasn't. I wasn't.
₹	17	Q	And were you fired upon?
	18	A	Yes. A number of times.
	19	Q	All right. Have you seen men killed about you?
	20	A	No, huh-uh. No, I haven't.
	21	Q	Now, sir, I take it, then, that this would be a
	22	first for y	ou, as far as the situation where you had to make
	23	a decision	which, because of your own cold, calculated,
â	24	reflected o	hoice, involved the life or death of a man; is that
<u>.</u>	25	correct?	
•	26	A ,	That is correct.
	27	•	And do you feel any reluctance or hesitancy in
	28	undertaking	that responsibility?

8c-2

9 fls.

26[₹] ≠

A No, I do not.

And again, the questions that I have asked of the other jurors here, assuming that you did not feel that the death penalty were an appropriate penalty in this particular case -- assuming, again, in the hypothetical situation, if we ever get there -- which I'm not conceding by a long shot -- but for the sake of this questioning session that we are going through, assuming that you felt that it were not, would you have the courage of your convictions to look the Judge in the eye, and the prosecutors, the reporters -- anybody else -- and say, "No, I vote for life and not death."

A That is right.

And would you feel, sir, that you were doing --9-1 Q. 1 Yes. Α 2 -- your duty as a juror in returning a verdict 3 of that kind? 4 Yes, I would. 5 All right, sir. Q 6 Now, you say there is no Mrs. Edmondson. 7 Has there been a Mrs. Edmondson in the past? 8 A No. 9 A bachelor all these years? 10 Q. That's right. A 11 Son of a gun. 12 Q. And I'm not sure whether you were asked by the 13 14 Court whether you or any friend or relative have ever been 15 the victim of any crime. 16 Had you, sir? 17 No. I haven t. A 18 Q. Now, the Court read you the instruction on 19 reasonable doubt and defined reasonable doubt to you. 20 We talked about the burden of proof on the 21 People being to prove the charge beyond a reasonable doubt and 22 to a moral certainty. 23 Now, this is a heavy burden. It is not an 24 insuperable burden, because obviously people are found 25 guilty of crimes every day. It is not a burden of proving 26 a person guilty beyond all possible or imaginary doubt, any 27 doubt that can be cooked up out of the blue. 28 But it is proof beyond a reasonable doubt and to

a moral certainty. 1 Now, do you feel, sir, that there is anything 2 wrong in a criminal case, as distinguished from a civil 3 case, where a man's life and liberty are at stake in imposing that heavy burden on the People? 5. No. 6 You feel that it is proper that they be 7 required to bring in evidence to that degree of proof before 8 a man is found guilty by a court or by a jury? 9 10 A Yes. And in this case, would you have any hesitancy, 11 whatsoever, in voting to acquit the defendant, voting not 12 guilty, if the People did not bring in sufficient evidence 13 to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral 14 15 certainty that the crimes have been committed and that he was 16 in any way responsible for those crimes if committed by 17 anyone? 18 No, I'd have to be convinced. A 1ġ And you'd have to be convinced? Q 20 A Yes. 21 By that degree of proof? 22 A Yes. 23 Beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral Q. 24 certainty? 25 That's right. A 26 And if you were not convinced, you feel that you Q. 27 would vote to acquit? 28 A Right.

1	And you would feel you were doing your duty as
2	a juror?
3	A Yes, I would.
4	Q In upholding the laws of this state, is that
5	right?
6	A That's wight.
7	Q All right, sir.
8	Now, going back again, just briefly, to the
ģ	death penalty issue.
10	Have you done any reading on the subject your-
11	self?
12	A No, I haven't read anything up on it, only what
13	I just happened to see in the paper and glance at it. That's
14	all.
15	Q All right. You've made no study of it yourself,
16	is that right?
17	A No.
18	Q All right, sir.
19	Your Honor, I'll pass at this point pending the
20	examination on the publicity.
21	MR. KAY: Your Honor, I wonder if we can take our
22	afternoon recess at this time?
23	THE COURT: Yes, we will take a short recess.
24	You are admonished that you are obliged not to
25	converse amongst yourselves, nor permit anyone to converse
26	with you on any subject connected with this matter. It will
27	be about ten minutes.
28	MR. KAY: Thank you.

•

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20-

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28 (Afternoon recess.)

THE COURT: The record may show the defendant is present with his counsel. Mr. Kay for the People. All the prospective jurors are present.

You may proceed, Mr. Kay.

MR. KAY: Thank you.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. KAY:

Q Mrs. Ford, do you have it firmly resolved in your mind that if you felt that if the evidence in this case warranted it, that you could come back and vote for the death penalty against Mr. Davis?

A Yes, I could.

Q And is there any doubt about that at all in your mind?

A No.

Q Mr. Chavers, do you have it firmly resolved in your mind that -- if you felt that the evidence in this case warranted it, that you could come back and tell Mr. Davis that he had to die for the crimes he's committed?

A I do.

Q And is there any doubt at all in your mind?

A No, there isn't.

Q Mr. Edmondson, do you have it firmly resolved in your mind that you could vote for the death penalty in this case if you felt that the evidence warranted it?

A I can.

<u>ځ</u>

Q And is there any doubt at all about that in your mind?

A None.

Now, as much as possible, I'm going to try to ask the three of you questions as -- collectively, instead of individually. But in order to effectively do this, I'll need each of you to answer out loud when I ask you the questions. Most of the questions can be answered with a yes or no, but if you don't want to answer the question yes or no, don't feel that you have to. If you want to explain your answer, please feel free to do so.

And if, at any time, you give an answer to either Mr. Denny or to myself and you thought a little bit more about it and you want to change your answer, don't hesitate to do so.

Now, this is a question that I ask of all jurors that allows them to bring up any personal reason that they have that they might not want to sit on the case that hasn't been touched upon.

And the question is, can any of you think of any reason why you could not or should not sit on this jury or don't want to sit on the jury?

ALTERNATE JUROR NO. 1: No.

ALTERNATE JUROR NO. 2: No.

ALTERNATE JUROR NO. 3: I cannot.

Q Now, is it the firm position of all three of you that the prosecution is entitled to an equal fair trial to the defense in this case?

1	A (All three prospective alternate jurors answered
2	in the affirmative.)
3	Q And do any of you have any sympathy for Mr. Davis
4	the defendant, because he is a defendant in this case?
5	Λ (All three prospective alternate jurors answered
6	negatively.)
7	Q Now, in the guilt phase of the trial, as you've
8	heard from Judge Choate already, the prosecution has the
9,	legal burden of proving the defendant guilty beyond a
10 ;	reasonable doubt.
11	Now, this, and this alone, is our legal burden
12	at the guilt phase of the trial.
13	And in the penalty phase there is no burden on
14	either side. The defense has no burden and the prosecution
15 ·	has no burden. It is entirely up to the sole discretion of
16	the jury as to whether or not Mr. Davis gets life imprison-
17	ment or the death penalty.
18	But getting back to the guilt phase, do you
19	understand this, and this alone, proving the defendant guilty
20	beyond a reasonable doubt, is our legal burden?
21	In other words, we don't have the burden of
22	proving the defendant guilty to an absolute certainty, beyond
23	a shadow of a doubt or beyond all doubt. It is beyond a
24	reasonable doubt.
25	Will all of you follow the law in this regard?
26	A (All three prospective alternate jurors answered
27	in the affirmative.)
28	Q And realizing this is thestandard, the burden of

proof that the prosecution has, would any of you hold the prosecution to any higher standard, any higher burden of proof? (All three prospective alternate jurors answered 10 fls. in the negative.) 14. 15.

10-1

 Now, in every criminal case, be it a misdemeanor or a felony — in other words, if the defendant's charged with running a red light, the prosecution still has to prove that he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The same is true of any felony case: A burglary, a robbery, a narcotics case, or a murder.

Now, just because this is a murder case, would any of you hold us to any higher burden of proof, realizing that the burden of proof is the same in every criminal case, no matter what the charge?

(The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the negative.)

Now, other than Mrs. Ford, who has already answered this question, do either of you two gentlemen have any close friend or relatives that have been charged with a crime other than misdemeanor traffic offenses?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR EDMONDSON: No, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHAVERS: Yes. I had an uncle who -MR. DENNY: Excuse me. Could we have him use the
microphone?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHAVERS: Yes. I had an uncle that was convicted on narcotics. He was an addict, and he did serve some time for that.

Q BY MR. KAY: Okay,

Were you a witness in that case?

A (Prospective Juror Chavers) No, sir.

Q And did anything take place in that case that would prejudice you against police officers, or prosecutors?

3	
	The first the second section of the
Í	A (Prospective Jur
2	Q Did you feel tha
3	his case?
4	A (Prospective Jur
5	Q And Mrs. Ford, I
.6	uncle was not fairly treated
7.	That's what I understood fro
8	A (Prospective Jur
9	folt that he was fairly acqu
10	MR. DEMNY: Would you
п	Q BY MR. KAY: In
12	fairly treated by the jury,
13	authorities, by charging him
14	A (Prospective Jun
15.	Q Oh. It was a co
16	A (Prospective Jur
17	Q In front of the
18	A (Prospective Jun
19	Q And did you witr
20	what you testified to? Or d
21	uncle's character?
22	ስ (Prospective Ju

24

25

26

27

28

*

A	(Prospective	Juror	Chavers)	no.
---	--------------	-------	----------	-----

Q . Did you feel that your uncle was fairly treated in his case? 📐

(Prospective Juror Chavers) Yes, I did.

And Mrs. Ford, I take it that you felt that your uncle was not fairly treated in his case; is that correct? That's what I understood from what you told Mr. Denny.

(Prospective Juror Ford) He was acquitted. felt that he was fairly acquitted.

MR. DENNY: Would you take the microphone?

BY MR. KAY: In other words, you felt he was O fairly treated by the jury, but not by the prosecutorial authorities, by charging him with the crime?

> (Prospective Juror Ford) There was no jury. Α

Q Oh. It was a court trial?

(Prospective Juror Ford) Yes. A

In front of the judge alone? Q

(Prospective Juror Ford) Ä

And did you witness the alleged crime? Is that Q what you testified to? Or did you just testify as to your uncle's character?

(Prospective Juror Ford) No, his character. there was a discrepancy as to whether he was home or not on the day that the police officers -- well, that was the difference.

I see. Okay. So, that's basically what you testified to, --

> (Prospective Juror Ford) Á

10-3	1	Q as to whether or not he was home or not home
• .	2	A (Prospective Juror Ford) Yes.
	3	Q on that particular day?
•	4	Now, would any of you any of the three of you
.₹	5	give any less weight, to the testimony of a witness, because
\$	6	that witness is a police officer?
	7	A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered
	8	in the negative.)
	9	Q Do any of you to any degree whatsoever any
	10	degree whatsoever feel any bias or prejudice against police
	H.	officers?
	12	A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered
	13	in the negative.)
<u> </u>	14	Q Mrs. Ford, did you I didn't hear an audible
•	15.	answer.
10a fol	16	A (Prospective Juror Ford) I said: No.
3 .	17	
	18	·
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
*	23	
•	24	
7 5	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	

3

4

6 7

8.

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

3

28

Q Okay. Thank you.

And Mrs. Ford, do you feel to any degree whatsoever that you lean towards the defense in this case, from your past experiences?

- A (Prospective Juror Ford) No.
- Q Have any of the three of you ever studied law?
- A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the negative.)
- Q And do any of you know any criminal defense attorneys, or private investigators?
- A (Prospective Juror Ford) I know an attorney. I don't know if he is a criminal --
 - Q What's his name?
- A (Prospective Juror Ford) English. Herman A. English.
 - Q He is both.

Now, Mr. Denny described to you how you must consider the guilt or innocence of Mr. Davis in this case, on each of the three Counts; separately on each of the three Counts.

But you understand that you might consider some of the same evidence as to two or more of the Counts. In other words, say you have fact A. Well, fact A might bear on Count No. 1 and Count No. 2; so you can consider fact A on both Counts — although you have to decide and determine Mr. Davis's guilt or innocence separately on each Count.

Do you all understand that?

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered

: 7

14.

16.

in the affirmative.)

Q And as far as circumstantial evidence, Mr. Denny gave the example that in the circumstantial evidence case, that where there are two reasonable interpretations of the evidence, one pointing to guilt and one pointing to innocence, that you must take the interpretation which points to the defendant's innocence.

However, you all understand that the key word in this instruction is "reasonable." Now, if you find that there's only one reasonable interpretation, and that interpretation points to the guilt of the defendant, I take it that none of you would even hesitate in finding the defendant guilty; is that correct?

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the affirmative.)

Q And Mr. Denny also said that it's the prerogative of the defense attorney to decide if the People's case is weak, and then he can determine not to put on a defense.

Well, you understand that -- that that may be his decision, or that his decision may be that he just doesn't have a defense to put on.

Do you understand that?

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the affirmative.)

Q So, would you follow the Court's instructions on that?

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the affirmative.)

10a - 3

. 1

ŗ.

:

år

10b Fol 25

Q Now, Mr. Denny gave you the example of the cookie jar, that example; and I am going to give you a real short example which might be even simpler than that -- hopefully.

Say, for example, that in a case -- you were trying to prove -- or, the prosecutor was trying to prove that I wrote this yellow legal piece of paper that I have here (indicating); trying to prove that I wrote this.

Now, if you saw me write this (indicating) with your own eyes, that's direct evidence. You saw me do it.

But say that you didn't see me do it. Now, how are you going to do this? Well, assume that a handwriting expert came in, and he — his job was to determine whether or not I wrote this. And say that he got some other papers that he knew that I wrote — maybe he saw me write some other papers — and then he compared my handwriting on the papers that he saw me write with this, and he said that, in his expert opinion, that I also wrote this paper.

Well, that's circumstantial evidence. Also, it -if I confessed, if I said to you, "I wrote this page; this is
my handwriting," that's a confession, and a confession is
circumstantial evidence.

There are probably a lot of things that are circumstantial evidence that you don't -- you don't think of, like fingerprints, confessions, expert testimony, ballistics, things like that are circumstantial evidence.

10b-1

 Now, do any of you have a quarrel with the Court's instruction that in the -- in the State of California -- as in every other state -- circumstantial and direct evidence are entitled to equal weight?

In other words, one type of evidence is not favored over the other, under our law. Do any of you quarrel with that?

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the negative.)

Q And do any of you quarrel with the fact that, under our law, a person can be convicted of first degree murder, based on circumstantial evidence? Standing alone?

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the negative.)

Q Now, I believe that the evidence will show in this case that, as to Count No. I and Count No. II, that the body of Gary Hinman was recovered.

But in Count No. III, the authorities have been unable to locate the body of Donald Jerome Shea, whom the papers have sometimes referred to by his nickname of "Shorty," Shorty Shea.

Now, do any of you feel that it is unfair to try a defendant for murder, where the authorities have been unable to locate the body of the victim of that murder?

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, excuse me. I think this assumes facts not based on evidence, --

THE COURT: Mr. Williams, would you read the question, please?

MR. DENNY: -- and is asking them to judge, prejudge 1 the evidence. 2 THE COURT: Would you read it to me, please, Mr. 3 Williams? (Whereupon, the record was read by the 5 reporter as follows: 6 "Now, do any of you feel that it is 7 unfair to try a defendant for murder, where the 8 authorities have been unable to locate the body 9 of the victim of that murder?") 10 MR. DENNY: This assumes that there is a body. 11 THE COURT: Sustained. 12 Or that he is dead. MR. DENNY: 13 MR. KAY: Well, I am going to object to Mr. Denny's 14 statements. As usual, he is just --15 16 THE COURT: Yes. The Court has sustained the objection. 17 Thank you. MR. DENNY: 18 There's no need to comment any further. THE COURT: 19 MR. KAY: May Mr. Denny's statements be stricken? 20 21 THE COURT: Yes. And your remarks in argument are 22 stricken likewise. Ladies and gentlemen, when the Court strikes 23 24 anything, you are to treat it as though it had never been 25 uttered, never been heard. 26 The Court does strike the statements of counsel. .27 BY MR. KAY: In this regard -- and in Count 28 No. III, you've already been told that no body will -- has

4*

been found.

In this regard, under the law of the State of California, the prosecution does not have to produce the body.

I believe Mr. Denny already explained that to you in his voir dire.

In this regard, we have to prove only that the victim died, and that his death was caused by criminal means for example, that he was murdered.

And will you all follow the law in this regard?

A ... (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the affirmative.)

- And do any of you have any quarrel with this law?

 A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the negative.)
- Q Do any of you quarrel with the law that permits a death of a victim to be proven by circumstantial evidence?

 PROSPECTIVE JUROR FORD: Would you restate that?
- Q BY MR. KAY: Do any of you quarrel with the law that permits the death of a victim to be proven by circumstantial evidence?

In other words, if you don't have the body, you have to prove the death by circumstantial evidence.

If you have the body, the death is proven by direct evidence. If you don't have the body, it's proven by circumstantial evidence.

Now, do any of you quarrel with the law in California that permits the prosecution to prove the death of a victim by circumstantial evidence?

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the negative.)

Q And I take it that on Count III, in the -- well, let me ask you this:

After hearing that the prosecution will be unable to produce a body of Donald Jerome Shea in Gount No. III -the Count No. III that Mr. Davis is charged with -- do any of you just automatically shut your mind to the case? Or would you be willing to listen to the evidence in this case and, if the evidence can do it, if the evidence can convince you beyond a reasonable doubt, are you willing to be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of Mr. Davis' guilt in the death of Donald Jerome Shea?

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the affirmative.)

20、各种科学技能

11-1

Q Now, in California, under the law of aiding and abetting, a person who, with criminal intent, aids another in the commission of a crime is just as guilty as the one who actually commits the crime.

Do any of you quarrel with that law?

A (The three prospective jurors answered in the negative.)

So, you understand in aiding and abetting a person can be guilty of first degree murder, even though he did not personally strike the blow? Do any of you quarrel with this law?

(The three prospective jurors answered in the negative.)

Q Under the law of conspiracy in California, each member of a criminal conspiracy is liable for each act and bound by each declaration of every other member of the conspiracy if that act or that declaration is made in furtherance of the object of the conspiracy.

Do any of you quarrel with that law?

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the negative.)

Q Can any of you think of any reason at all why you should not sit on this jury?

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the negative.)

Q And do all of you feel that you can give the prosecution, the People of the State of California, whom Mr. Manzella and I represent, a fair trial in this case?

11-2

A (The three prospective alternate jurors answered in the affirmative.)

And will all three of you promise me that if you are selected in this case, and I know sometimes it is hard for an alternate juror, although in many cases an alternate juror does have to replace a regular juror, especially in a case of long duration, and this is estimated to last for probably a month and a half, to two months, but it will probably be a month and a half, that you have a very good chance of taking the place of a regular juror.

But will all of you promise me if you do become regular jurors and you do deliberate in the jury room that you will all be reasonable?

in the affirmative.)

MR. KAY: I have no further questions. I'll pass for cause, your Honor.

THE COURT: Both sides pass for cause?

MR. DENNY: As of this point, yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask both of you beyond the rail and both you gentlemen who are in the box, likewise, to go out in the hall. We*re going to question each one who is in the box individually, beginning with Mrs. Ford, concerning publicity that they may have heard, seen or read concerning this case or about this case, about Charles Manson.

We are 'interested in knowing, ladies and gentlemen -- one moment.

11-3

Z

4 5

18 ,

We're interested in knowing what you have heard.

You might be thinking about what you have heard, seen or read in any of the news media concerning this case, Charles Manson, or the Manson Family.

We're interested in knowing whether you can put such matters, as you may have learned, out of your mind and act independently on any issue that you may be called upon to decide as a juror. Whether, in spite of what you heard, you can be fair and impartial. If you cannot be, right at the outset, let us know that. If you can be fair and impartial, and whether you can or whether you will be fair and impartial and will disregard such matter that you may have heard, seen or read.

Very well. Don't discuss the case during the time that you are outside with anyone. Don't allow anyone to discuss it with you.

You may wait outside in the corridor until your name is called.

(Whereupon, the prospective panel retired from the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had:)

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF

BEVERLY A. FORD

BY THE COURT:

Q Mrs. Ford, you previously have heard the name Charles Manson, have you not?

A Yes, I have.

Q And Manson Family, that phrase, have you not?

			·
11-4	. 1	A	Yes.
	2	Q	Do you know the name Bruce Davis? Have you ever
	3	heard, seen	or read it before?
	4.	Ä	No.
•	. 5	Q	Do you know the name Grogan, Steven Grogan?
9: **:	б ;	A	No.
•	7	Q	Or do you know the name Atkins, Susan Atkins?
	8	A .	Yes, I've read it.
	. 9	Ç.	What do you know about that name?
	10	À	That she was supposed to have been in on the
	11	mass murder	5.
	12	Q	Now, you're talking about the Tate-LaBianca
	13	case?	
<u> </u>	14	A	Yes.
•	15	Q	The Sharon Tate killing?
	16	A	Yes.
\$	17	Q	Did you follow that in the press or in the
	18	newspapers?	
	19	- , A	Uh, I didn't read too much of it. I got most of my
lla	fol (20)	information	from the television news.
	, 21	,	
	22		
•	23	, , , ,	
	24		
ŧ	25		
	26	SEPA .	
	27	<i>:</i>	
•	28		

11a-1	1	Q	I see. Do you read the newspaper daily?
.	2	A	I glance through it, yes.
	3	Q	Do you subscribe to the Times or a paper?
	4 .	A	A pay paper, Herald.
ř	5	Q	I see. You buy that on the stands?
), E	6	A	Yes.
E.	7	Q	Have you heard anything whatever about the name
	8	Shea, Shorty	7 Shea?
	9	A	The name sounds familiar, but I couldn't
	10	Q	Have you heard the name Hinman?
	11	A	No.
	12	Q	All right. What do you know about the Manson
	13	Family? Wha	it do you think they are?
<u></u>	14	A	Personally?
●,	15	Q	Yes.
	16	. A	Well, when it first happened, I thought it was,
3 3	.17	uh, savage,	a savage act.
•	18	Q	The killings, of course, were savage?
	19	A	Yes.
	20	, ,	And over a period of time, I guess I lost interest
	21	in it. Eye	ry so often I would hear the Manson name, but I
	22	never did ke	eep with it daily.
	23	Q	When was the last time you heard the name Manson?
ë	24	A	I guess about three weeks ago.
3	25	Q	In connection with what?
ă.	26	A	When he was sentenced. Uh
^ .	27	Q	Do you know what he was sentenced for?
	28	A	He was, uh, I believe it was they found him

1	guilty for the Sharon Tate murders.
2	Q That's your best recollection?
3	A Yes.
4	And your best recollection of what the sentence
5	was is what, life imprisonment or death?
6	A Death.
7	Q Did you ever hear anything of an anti-Negro
.8	nature concerning the Manson Family?
9	A No.
10	Q Did you ever hear anything which you believe
11	would prejudice you to such an extent that you couldn't be
12	fair to somebody who might be shown to be a member of the
13	Manson Family?
14	A No.
15	Q Now, are you capable of setting aside whatever
16	you may have heard, seen or read concerning Charles Manson,
17	the Manson Family, concerning Shorty Shea or Hinman, if you
18	should remember any such matters?
19	A I could set it aside.
20	Q Are you capable of setting those things aside
21	in deciding any issue that you might be called upon to
22	decide solely from the evidence that's received hereinforth
23	and only upon that evidence and not upon any of that material
24	that you may have heard, seen or read outside the courtroom?
25	A Yes.
26	Q And will you do that?
27	A Yes, I will.
28	Q Are you sure about your capability of setting

÷

4

1	aside of any such thing that you may have heard, seen or
2	read?
3	A Yes, because I haven't read that much of it,
4	so I couldn't be prejudiced.
5	Q And can you, in spite of what you heard, seen
6	or read, or in spite of what you may remember, set such
7	matter aside and be fair and impartial?
8	A Yes.
9	Q. Will you do that?
10	A Yes, I would.
n	MR. DENNY: Pass for cause, your Honor.
12	MR. KAY: No questions on publicity.
13	THE COURT: All right, bring another person in, then.
14	And perhaps you could go outside, if you would,
15	Mrs. Ford.
16	
17	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF
18	CECIL H. CHAVERS
19	BY THE COURT:
20	BY THE COURT: Q Mr. Chavers, would you come forward just a
20	Q Mr. Chavers, would you come forward just a
20 ´ 21	Q Mr. Chavers, would you come forward just a moment and be seated there where the microphone is.
20 21 22 23 24	Q Mr. Chavers, would you come forward just a moment and be seated there where the microphone is. Have you ever heard of this case before?
20 21 22 23 24 25	Q Mr. Chavers, would you come forward just a moment and be seated there where the microphone is. Have you ever heard of this case before? A This particular case?
20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Q Mr. Chavers, would you come forward just a moment and be seated there where the microphone is. Have you ever heard of this case before? A This particular case? Q You may pull that loose, if you would. I see
20 21 22 23 24 25	Q Mr. Chavers, would you come forward just a moment and be seated there where the microphone is. Have you ever heard of this case before? A This particular case? Q You may pull that loose, if you would. I see that it is tangled.

	1	A No, sir, I haven't.
	2	Q You have heard of Manson and the Manson Family?
	3	A Yes.
•	4	Q Have you heard of Shorty Shea before?
i i	5	A Yes, I've heard reference of that in the Manson
į ž		case that I have read in the paper.
*	7	Q What do you know about Shorty Shea?
	8	A Nothing other than the fact that they accused
	9	the Family of disposing of him.
	10	Q Of disposing of his body?
	11	A Well, of the individual. I don't I'm not cer-
	12	tain whether or not that body was ever found or not, but I
	13	noticed that they were on trial for that one, also.
	14	Q What do you know about Mr. Hinman except that
• .	15.	which I've read in the indictment?
	16	A Uh, only that the Manson Family was tried for his
\$	17	murder, also. The disposition of his body, whether it was
	18	found or not, I really don't recall.
	19	Q Do you know whether or not anyone has been found
	20	guilty of his murder?
	` 21	A Uh, yes. I believe this was a couple of weeks
	22	ago I saw on television that they had convicted, I believe it
4. *	23	was, Manson and I think it was Mr. Watson. And that they
æ.	9/	mentioned he had life imprisonment on it or something. That's-
*	25	Q Do you know of what Mr. Manson was convicted? Was
	26	that the murder of Hinman; is that your best recollection?
	27	A Gee, I believe so. I'm not certain. I'm not
11b	fls. 28	certain of that.

11b-1

\$

 Q Had you ever heard anything of an anti-Negro nature concerning the Manson Family during the time of that Tate-La Bianca trial?

A I believe during the first couple of weeks there was some inference to that. After that, I -- I cannot say I heard any other information in regards to it.

Q Having that in mind now, do you think that you could be fair to somebody whom the evidence shows might be a member of that Manson Family?

A Yes, sir.

Q You can set that out of your mind?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you think that you could be as fair, for example, as a juror who had never heard of the incident involving the search for Shea's body or who had never heard of the Hinman murder conviction?

In other words, are you capable of setting such matters completely out of your mind for the purpose of making any judgment that you might be called upon to make in this case?

Yes, I'm sure I could.

Q You understand that any -- as you've heard here, this morning, this afternoon, that one of the elements that the People must prove in proving a count of murder, is death by an illegal means, by criminal means; you understand that?

A Yes.

Q And do you think that what you have heard, seen or read in the news media would at all sway you in making a

1 decision as to whether or not that element had been proved? 2 No, sir, I don't. A 3 Q. All right. Are you certain of your capability 4 of setting aside such matters and deciding this case solely 5 on the evidence that you hear solely in the courtroom, hear 6 and see here? 7 Α Yes. 8 Q. And will you do that? 9 A Yes, sir, I will. 10 11 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. DENNY: 13 Mr. Chavers, going back to the most recent thing 14 that you have heard concerning the Manson or Manson Family 15 members in court. 16 What is the most recent thing that you have 17 heard and through what media did you hear it? 18 A The most recent thing that I have heard was the 19 conviction of Manson in regards to one of the deaths. I 20 don't know exactly which one it was. I know I was watching it on Channel 7 News, the evening news and they indicated 22 that he had been convicted of a murder and that he received 23 a life sentence for this particular one. The individual, 24 I honestly do not recall which one of the individuals it was. 25 All right. Q. 26 Have you heard of anyone else being tried for the 27 Hinman or Shea murders? 28 A No, sir.

```
murders, is that correct?
            1
                                   That's correct.
                           A
            2
12 fls.
            5
            6
            7
            8
            9
            10
            11
            12
            13
            14
           15
           16
    Į
           17
           18
           19
           20
           21
           22
           23
           24
            25
           26
           27
           28
```

12-1 All right. Now, there are a number of people 1 in this county who are not aware of that. They haven't seen, heard or read it. 3 By the way, you say that this was over Channel 7 where you got this information? 5 Yes, it is. 6 Is that the main source of your daily news? Q. 7 Yes. Normally I look at the early news, around 8 5:00 o'clock, when I get in from work. 9 Q How about newspapers? Do you read a newspaper 10 also? 11 A I have very little time to read newspapers. 12 Mostly, sports are my main interest, because of limited time 13 that I have during the working hours. 14 So therefore, I rely a great deal on -- you know, 15 the evening news, to let me know what's happening. 16 17 Q. All right. Now, having been made aware that a jury here in Los Angeles County has found Mr. Manson guilty 18 19 of one of the two alleged murders, do you feel that, with that knowledge in mind, you would perhaps tend to feel that --20 "Well, the murders were in fact committed"? 21 Would you feel that way? 22 That the murders were in fact committed? A 23 24 Yes. Q. 25 Α Yes. 26 Q Both murders? Shea and Hinman? Is that your 27 feeling, as you think about it now?

28

A. Well, I -- I believe that -- whatever one that he

Ţ

was convicted from -- excuse me. See, because I do not know the individuals, -- let me say this again; excuse me -- exactly which one it was. But there was some reference to it.

And they did convict him of one. I don't know exactly which. But I would have to say this:

That I would have to see evidence that indicated that such a murder did take place, if it did.

That's all I can say.

Q Well, let me put it to you this way:

Do you think that if you sat there -- let's just presume, for the sake of argument, that something in your head said, "Oh, now I am sure that it was the Shea case that he was found guilty of."

Do you see?

And -- "Ah-ha!" while you are sitting there
listening to the evidence, you say, "By golly, now something
tells me it was the Shea case he was found guilty of."
Something has rung a bell here or done something. "And I
know that a jury found that Shea had been murdered, and that
someone in the Manson Family at least was responsible -namely, Charlie Manson."

Do you feel that you would be able, if the evidence was put on here, to say, "Well, I don't know how that jury found that Shorty Shea was dead -- or Shorty Shea was killed, because there just isn't proof of it here, sufficient to convince me beyond a reasonable doubt."

Do you think you could do that?

A Yes, I could.

MR. KAY: Well, your Honor, I was -- all right.

Q BY MR. DENNY: If you felt that some jury in Los Angeles County had found that Shorty Shea was dead, but there was evidence here, and it wasn't sufficient, you'd have no reluctance in finding not guilty; is that right?

A That's correct.

Q Even if you supposed that some other jury had found that he was dead; is that right?

A Yes. Well, I can only go by this: That -- I would have to hear the evidence here, and be convinced, thoroughly convinced, that this actually did take place, based upon the evidence.

And then I would have to make a decision.

Q All right. And you understand, I am just -- when I was discussing it, I was positing a hypothetical situation; because, as you said, you weren't sure which one Manson was found guilty of, whether Himman or Shea, both or either; is that right?

A That's correct.

Q All right. Now, as far as this anti-black evidence, what was it that you heard about that?

A Well, it's very difficult to recall, because this was during the -- gee, I imagine the first week or two of this trial. I recall hearing some reference to Manson's -- uh -- oh, his plan to do these killings and blame it on black people or something of this nature.

This was very early. Other than that, I don't recall ever hearing any other information in regards to it.

12a-1

*

Q And did you ever hear anything concerning a -Manson's philosophy concerning a black-white confrontation
of any kind?

A I believe this was the information that I did hear, in the early parts of the trial. I believe this was where I did hear the information.

Q Um-hmm. And is it your state of mind that this -- at this point, that you -- that you feel kindly disposed toward Mr. Mangon because of those philosophies?

A Oh, no, sir. I feel that -- well, he has a right to express his own opinions. I don't necessarily -- you know, share his views.

But nevertheless, I feel that -- I don't feel one way or the other about it. I hear a lot of things, and I try not to let them affect the way I think, and try to make judgments on the things that I feel that are important, that count.

of guilt by association, assuming the evidence shows -- and the evidence will show, in fact -- that Mr. Davis was associated with Mr. Manson, and the so-called Manson Family, do you have any feelings at all, based on what you have seen, heard and read -- and feel -- about Mr. Manson and the Manson Family, or his philosophy or his crimes or anything else, that that would affect your judgment against Mr. Davis, in determining his guilt or innocence of the charges?

A No, sir. I would be going only on the facts.

MR. DENNY: Okay. Pass for cause, your Honor.

1	MR. KAY: No questions on publicity, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Would you retire
3	to the hallway, then, Mr. Chavers, and ask Mr. Edmondson to
4	come in?
5	
6	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF
7	MR. EDMONDSON
8	BY THE COURT:
9	Q Mr. Edmondson, have you ever heard of this case
10	before you ever walked into this courtroom?
11	A Not of this case, no, sir.
12	Q Have you ever heard, seen or read anything
13	whatever concerning Mr. Bruce Davis?
14	A (Pause.) I think I did, at the time of arrest.
15	Q Tell me what you remember.
16	A We11
17	Q And hold the microphone up, if you would, please.
18	A The only thing I can remember was the crime he
19	was charged with, is all.
20	Q What was that?
21	A Uh murder of Shorty Shea.
22	Q Had you heard heard anything whatever about
23	Mr. Shea?
24	A No, I don't know nothing about him.
25	Q Or read anything?
26	A No.
27	Q Had you ever seen a news report on television,
28	for example, concerning Mr. Shea?

\$

		· ·
1	A	Yes, possibly I have.
2	Q	What do you remember of that?
3	A	Being in the movies, I believe.
4	ę.	He was supposed to have been in the movies?
5	A	I think that's what I had seen.
6	ବ	What else do you know about Mr. Shea?
7	A	Nothing.
8	ର	Did you ever hear that he worked at a certain
9	ranch?	
10	A.	No.
11	•	Did you ever hear, for example see or read
12	that he was	looked for by the police agencies?
13	A	Yes, I had read that.
14	ବ	Does that recall to your mind anything now more
15	of what you	ve read, heard or seen?
16	A	No. Only that I knew that they hadn't located
17	the body, is	all.
18	ବ	Now, do you have any idea in your mind at this
19	time that M	r. Shea is dead or alive?
20	A	No, I have no idea.
21	Q	How about the name Hinman? Had you heard, seen
22	or read the	name Hinman?
23	A	Yes. I had heard where he was a musician;
24	that's all	I knew about it him; that's all I had read.
25	Q	Had you heard, seen or read, likewise, that he
26	was killed?	
27	A	No, I don't remember about him being killed.
28	Q	You just recall that he was a musician?

ŧ

	1	A Yes.
	2	Q Associated in some way with Mr. Manson or the
3		Manson Family?
*	4	A (No response.)
Ŧ	5	Q What I'm interested in is how you happen to
^	6	recall this, that he was described as a musician.
•	7	A Well, I had read I think I read that in the
	8	paper, where he was a musician.
	9	Q In what context did you read that? That you
	10	remember?
	11	A I I don't remember, other than just reading
	12	it.
	13	Q You just recall the phrase
	14	A Yes, yes.
,	15	Q "musician Gary Hinman"?
	16	A Yes.
3	17	Q What do you know about the Manson Family?
	18	A Nothing, only what I had read from time to
	19	time. I didn't follow the trial.
	20	Q What trial are you talking about now?
12b	fls. ²¹	A The Manson trial.
	22	·
	23	
\$	24	
₹ 3	25	
•	26	
	27	
	28	

1	2	h-	1
	Z		_

1	Q	The Tate killing of the Tate and LaBianca
2	killing tria	1?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	Do you know the results in that case?
5	A	Of that case, in that trial?
6	,	I think all those who got convicted got the death
7	penalty, but	I'm not positive.
8	Q	When was the last time that you heard, saw or read
9	the name Man	son?
10	A .	When he arrived at San Quentin.
'n	Q	That was two or three weeks ago?
12 4	A	Yes, sir.
13	19/4	Have you ever heard or seen or read the name
14	Grogan? Ste	1
15	A .	No. I haven't.
16	Q	Do you know of anyone having been prosecuted
17	previously f	or the murders of Shea or Hinman?
18	A	Do I know of anyone who had previously been
19	Ω	Prosecuted.
20	A	prosecuted
21	Ω	For the murders of Shea or Hinman?
22	A	No.
23	Q	Now, you may remember more as time goes on, that
24	you do not r	ecall now; do you understand?
25		Something may cause you to remember something that
26	you had hear	d, seen or read concerning Mr. Manson, the Manson
27	Family, or M	fr. Shea or Mr. Hinman or Mr. Davis or one
00	thing on and	when consorning this open

27

28

Q

A

Yes, I will.

And will you be fair and impartial in this case?

12b - 3THE COURT: Mr. Denny? 1 Thank you, your Honor. MR. DENNY: 2 3 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. DENNY: 5 Mr. Edmondson, you are in effect retired at this 6 point; is that correct? 7 Well, no. I'm not retired, no. Я A What are you doing, sir? 9 But I am on the payroll, if this is what A 10 you mean. 11 12 All right. You are doing what you want to do with 0 13 the time you ve got? 14 That's right. Α All right. And does that include keeping up with 15 Q 16 the news as best you can? 17 No. not too much anymore, because I am -- I'm running around too much. I don't do too much reading. 18 All right. How do you attempt to keep up with the 19 20 news of the day? 21 Mostly television, if I'm around. 22 All right. Now, sir, when you say that the last 23 you heard about Manson was two or three weeks ago, when he got 24 to San Quentin, do you recall what was the medium by which you 25 learned that information? Television, newspaper, or what? 26 I believe it was television. Ά 27 And do you recall what was said in that particular 28

television broadcast?

12b-41 No. I just think it was about the arrival, is all. Α 2 Did it say why he was now arriving there? Q 3 I don't know whether it said why he was arriving Α 4 there or not. 5 Did it say for what he was arriving there? For 6 what crime or crimes? 7 Or do you recall? 8 Yes. The -- the LaBianca and Tate case. I think 9 that was it. 10 All right. You paused a good while before you said, 11 "I think that was it." 12 Were you trying to figure out whether there were 13 any other charges that were pending in that connection? 14 No, that's -- that's all I could think of, that I 15 had seen on television. 16 All right. Now, as far as Shorty Shea, you said you Q 17 had possibly seen something about him on television, that he had 18 been looked for by police agencies. 19 That's right. A 20 Do you recall when it was that you last heard any-21 thing about Shorty Shea? 22 Oh, no, I don't. Sometime -- quite some time 23 ago. I remember that. 24 Q All right. And about Gary Hinman? When's the 25 last time you heard anything about him? 26 Around the same time, I think. A 27 Would this be over a year ago, would you say? 28 A year and a half, or two? Or within the last month or so?

12b-5Oh, I would say less than a year, anyway. Α 1 Well, would you say within the last couple of 2 Q months? 3. No, I would say it was longer than that. 4 A Have you heard of Charles Manson being charged Q 5 with any crimes other than the Tate-LaBianca killings? Heard, 6 seem or read of them? 7 No, I haven't. 8 A All right. Now, sir, do you have such feelings --9 Q well, let me go back a minute. 10 You were, I assume, with most of the County of 11 Los Angeles, aware of the Tate and LaBianca killings when they 1 12 Į3 occurred: is that correct? A That's correct. 13 fol 14 15 16 3 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

	,	
13-1	1	Q And like most of us, did you at least follow the
	2	headlines and the news flashes on radio and TV for the couple
	3	of months that followed that, up to the capture of Mr.
	4	Manson and imprisonment?
٠	5	A I don't believe I followed it that long.
êş R	6	Q Well, did you make
R,	7	A I didn't make any effort to read about it.
	8	Q Didyou do so afterwards, during any portion of
	9	the trial?
	10	A After the trial was over, yes, I knew the
	11	result.
	12	Q All right. Now, did you form any opinion at
	13	that time as to Mr. Manson and those who followed him as
	14	to whether they were a pack of criminals running together or
,	15	what?
	. 16	A No, I don't think I formed any opinion of them.
\$	17	Q Do you have any opinion now?
	18	A No.
	19	Q As to any person who might have been associated
	20	in any way with Mr. Manson for any period of time?
	21	A No.
	22	Q Do you feel, sir, as you sit there now, that
	23	one who was a member of this so-called Manson Family, Manson
? •	24	group, one who associated with him for a period of time,
.e.	25	somehow shares some of the criminality of Charlie Manson
-	26	just by virtue of that association?
	27	A No, I don't.
	28	O All right, sir, fine.

13 - 2I'11 pass for cause, your Honor. 1 MR. KAY: No questions on publicity, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Kuczera, would you call the 3 two who are in the hallway, Mrs. Ford and Edmondson back --4 I mean, Mr. Chavers back here? 5 THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir. б . The first peremptory is -- all right, the THE COURT: 7 first peremptory challenge is with the People. 8 The People will thank and excuse Mrs. Ford. 9 MR. KAY: Thank you, Mrs. Ford. 10 THE COURT: Mrs. Ford, thank you, you are excused, then, 11 12 and you should report to Room 253 tomorrow morning at 9:00 13 Thank you for being here. 14 MRS. FORD: 253, is that the courthouse? 15 THE COURT: Yes, that's the main courthouse, 111 North 16 H111. THE CLERK: Mrs. Margaret O'Neil, M-a-r-g-a-r-e-t, 17 18 0-'-N-e-i-1. 19 20 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 21 MARGARET O'NEIL 22 BY THE COURT: 23 Mrs. O'Neil, you have been present during all 24 of the proceedings thus far except during the time you have 25 just been excluded, is that correct? mosed? 26 Yes, your Honor. A 27 Would it be any hardship to you to serve in this 28 case?

Q All right. Do you have such feelings concerning the death penalty that you could not be fair and impartial in determining the first phase of the case involving guilt or innocence?

A No.

A

Q Do you have such views about it that you would automatically refuse to impose the death penalty regardless of the evidence?

A Well, I would have to listen carefully to the evidence, and then if I felt that the death penalty was what was to be voted on, I would.

Q In other words, you would look at the evidence to determine whether or not the death penalty should be imposed?

Your reaction would not be an automatic one?

No, I feel like I would consider it carefully and

vote on it, if that's the way I felt it should be.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Q All right.

On the other hand, supposing there were a conviction of murder in the first degree, would you automatically impose the death penalty and vote for it, upon a conviction of murder in the first degree, regardless of the evidence?

A Well, I would certainly vote on it, if the evidence showed that it was -- that the person was guilty of committing it.

Q If a person were guilty of murder of the first degree, then your reaction would be to vote for the death penalty regardless of the evidence?

A Well, I don't understand quite what you mean regardless of the evidence. If -- the evidence would have to point that he was guilty, and then I would vote for the death penalty.

All right. Let's assume that you are past that first hurdle, that the prosecution has convinced you beyond a reasonable doubt.

A That he is guilty.

Q That he is guilty.

Now, we're not talking about guilt or innocence at this point, then, are we?

A No.

Q We're talking about penalty, then, are we not?

A Yes.

Q Now, simply upon that conviction of murder in the first degree, without looking back at that evidence or looking

13a-2	1	at any evide	ence, if any, which is submitted to you, would you
	2		ly go in at the time of deliberation and state that
	_		r the death penalty in any case?
	3		
£	4	A	No.
	5	Q	Without looking at the evidence?
÷ A	6	A	No.
	7	Q	What type of work are you employed outside the
•	8	home?	·
	9	A	No, I am a widow. And I was a teacher many years
	10	ago.	
	11	Q	In what school system?
	12	A	Grammer school in Minnesota.
	13	Q	In Minnesota, I see.
<u></u>	14		And what type of work was your spouse involved in?
•	15	, A	Well, he was district manager of an oil tool
	16	manufacturi	ng company.
3	. 17	Ω	Are you related to or a friend of any law
	18	enforcement	officer?
	[‡] 19		No.
ž.	20		My father was a lawyer, but that was many, many
	21	years ago.	
	22	Q	Was he ever a prosecutor, District Attorney?
	23	Α	No, he was never District Attorney. He was just
ie.	24	a little to	wn lawyer.
)	25	Q	Was he involved in the defense of criminal
à	26	cases?	
	27	Ą	Well, I suppose he must have had some. Very few
D	28	in our litt	le town, if any.
	-		

1	Q	Where was that town?
2	A	Western Minnesota.
3	Q	What was the name of the town?
4	A	Breckenridge.
5	, Q	Breckenridge?
6	A	Uh-huh.
7	Q	Do you, yourself, have any legal experience?
8	A	No, I've never had any.
9	Ω	You live in what part of the county now?
10	A	I live in about well, the Wilshire District, I
11	guess you w	ould call it, about two blocks from the Ambassador.
12	Q	Can you think of any reason why you couldn't be
13	fair and impartial in the case?	
14	A	No, I can't think of any reason why I wouldn't
15	be fair and	impartial,
16	Q	Have you ever heard of the name of Bruce Davis
17	previously?	
18	A .	No.
19	o T	Heard, seen or read it in any of the news media?
20-	A	No, I don't read newspapers very much.
21	THE COURT: Perhaps you two gentlemen, Mr. Chavers and	
22	Mr. Edmondson would retire now, if you would.	
23		Just a moment.
24	MR. K	AY: No, stay here, we need you.
25	JUROR	O'NEIL: Oh, gad.
26	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	(Whereupon, the other prospective alternate
27	jurors reti	red from the courtroom, and the following pro-
28	ceedings we	ere had:)
ı		i i

ŀ	Q BY THE COURT: Now, you had never heard, seen or
2	read the name Bruce Davis, Mrs. O'Neil?
3	A No, I I can
4	Q Hold that up.
5	A I can truthfully say that I have never.
.6	Q You had heard the name Charles Manson?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And Manson Family?
9	A Yes.
10	Q What do those words mean to you? What's Manson
n	Family mean?
12	A Well, a group of people who seemed to get off on the
13	wrong foot.
14	Q Did you follow the Tate-LaBianca trial involving
15	the killing of Sharon Tate?
16	A Not too no, I didn't read very much about it.
17	Q You didn*t follow that murder case?
18	A No, I didn't, because I I I don't have too
19	much time to read or I don't like to read too much. But when I
20	do read, I'd rather read more uplifting things than
21	Q All right.
22	Have you heard the name Grogan before, Steve
23 ²²	Grogan?
25	Q Shorty Shea?
26	A I think I've heard that name, Shorty Shea.
27	Q What do you remember about what you have heard,
28	seen or read about Shea?
	4

*

		1	A Well, I it seems to me like, uh, he was
		2	involved in the some kind of a place they had together, this
		3	family, in either in the Valley or Griffith Park or some
		4	place. That's I remember the name, Shea.
13b	Ŷ	5	Q Do you remember anything more about him?
		6	A Well, he was I think he belonged to the Manson
		7	Family.
	•	8	·
		9	·
		10	
		11	·
		12	
		13	
		14	
	7	15	
		16	
	V	17	
		18	
		19	
		20 21	
		22	
		23	
	ė	24	
	•	25	
	. * . ***	26	A Company of the Comp
		27	
),	28	

13b-1

ı.

4 5

 Q Anything further that you can recall?

You say "belonged," you put it in the past tense.

A Well, I mean, was in the group.

Q Had you ever heard that anybody was looking for his body or he was looked for by law enforcement authorities?

A No.

Q Never heard that.

How about the name Hinman? Had you ever heard his name, Gary Hinman, before I read the indictment today?

A Well, I suppose I have heard it, but I don't remember where.

Q Musician Gary Hinman; does that help you to recall anything about him that you may have heard, seen or read?

A I can't put my finger on anything.

Q Now, you stated that this Manson Family appeared to be a group that got off on the wrong foot, meaning that they acted illegally in many cases or generally, as a matter of fact?

A No, all I can get from all of this, hearing people talk about it and seeing pictures that were on the front page of the paper, whether you wanted to read it or not, you saw them, and they, uh, they were influenced by some person who seemed to have, uh, uh, a kind of a control over them. I don't think any of them meant to be -- meant to do wrong. And if they did, why, that's -- they weren't good people, that's all. They --

13b-2

*

Ź

Q Would somebody who is a member of the Manson
Family be at any disadvantage in having you as a juror as a
result of what you have heard, seen or read and as a result
of the feeling that you have just described to us?

A Well, I would just certainly have to find out a lot more about why these things were done and -- or, and if they were done and by whom.

Q If they were done at all and by whom?

A Yeah.

Q In other words, the fact that a person may have been associated with Charles Manson would not, as a result of what you have heard, seen or read, cause you to have any prejudice against him, is that right?

A No, I don't think -- uh, I can't make it clear. But I think people can get off on the wrong foot by being influenced by certain people. And -- but I think that that wouldn't -- if I thought this person who was certainly old enough to know better, knew he was doing wrong, I wouldn't have any sympathy for him.

Q Well, aside from that idea about him or anybody, if you are speaking of a member of -- a nameless member of the Manson Family, aside from that aspect of your thinking, would the defendant in this case, if the evidence shows that he is a member of the Manson Family, or was a member of the Manson Family, suffer any prejudice in your mind to begin with?

A No. No. But if he -- if he actually is guilty and we can prove that he was guilty --

i	Q You understand that must be established beyond a
2	reasonable doubt?
3	A Yes, yes, indeed.
4	Q And you haven't any quarrel with that?
5	A No.
6	Q Well, can you set aside what you may have heard,
7	seen or read, even though it be sparse, and decide this
8	case only on the evidence that's submitted here?
9	A Well, that's really what I would have to just
10	the evidence, because I want I took a trip this summer
11	and I was gone about four months. And I haven't really
12	been you'd be surprised, the papers that in the big
13	cities where we were, they aren't filled with this Manson
14	thing. So we didn't get a chance to anyway.
15	Q When was the last time that you read the name
16	Manson? Days, months, weeks ago?
17	A That I read anything about the Mansons?
1 8	Q About Charles Manson?
19	A Oh, I think it would oh, heavens, I think it
20	was, if I read anything at all, it was shortly it was just
21	about the time the whole thing broke.
22.	Q You mean the Tate-La Bianca murders?
23	A Yeah, I suppose so.
24	Q Are you at all doubtful about your ability to
25	set aside anything you may have heard, seen or read or
2 6	anything that you may remember as the case goes along? Are
27	you at all doubtful about your ability to set that aside
28	and decide the case solely on the evidence?

in it

3

<u> </u>	1	A No, I'm not a bit doubtful about that, I know.
	2	Q Will you do that?
13c fls.	3	A Yes, I will.
	4	
£	5	
<u>k-</u> ≭	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14 15	
•	16	
3	17	
	18	r-
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
<u>-</u>	25	
,	26	
	27	
	28	

13c-1

1 2

Q And will you be fair and impartial in deciding any issue?

A Yes, of course.

THE COURT: Mr. Denny.

MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. DENNY:

Q Mrs. O'Neil, let me go back, if I may, to the Court's questions about the death penalty.

When the Court asked you, -- assuming, now, you have found the defendant guilty of first degree murder. However you've gotten there, by whatever road --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- you have found that he knew what he was doing, he got involved in this thing. Whether he struck the blow or was an accomplice or by virtue of a connection with some conspiracy to commit murder, robbery, or whatever, this fellow here, sitting next to me, Mr. Davis, was guilty of first degree murder, is it your state of mind that having made that determination, without more, without further regard for any other evidence, you would then vote to impose the death penalty on him?

MR. KAY: Well, I'm going to object to that question, your Honor, because in his question he is stating a lot of evidence and he's stating without regard to any further evidence.

THE COURT: Let me hear it.

23 .

MR. DENNY: Let me rephrase the question, then.
THE COURT: Very well.

BY MR. DENNY: Is it your state of mind, ma'am, having found the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of first degree murder, that without regard to any other evidence you would then vote to impose the death penalty?

A Well, now, let me say, if he has been found quilty, what other evidence could there be?

Q Well, this is just what I am trying to get. I'm talking about your state of mind.

Is it your state of mind now, that having found him guilty, having listened to all the evidence, having found him guilty, then, without regard to the evidence that you had gotten to find him guilty, without regard to any of that evidence, but merely considering the fact that now you are convinced that he was guilty of first degree murder, would you then vote to impose the death penalty?

A No. no.

MR. KAY: I --

A There would be other considerations. I'd certainly listen to evidence after that. There would be some talk, surely, before we came to a decision of whether to -- imprisonment or death. There would have to be.

Q Let's assume there was no other evidence. Do you understand that in the penalty phase neither the prosecution or the defense are required to put on any further evidence. They may rest.

A All right. Then, we'd have to go through those --

13c-3

1 .

3.

5

7

R

9

11

12

13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28 that fact business, issues of fact again, like it says in that eighteenth --

No, there would be no further issues of fact. You have made the determination of fact that he was guilty and you had found that and found that beyond a reasonable doubt.

THE COURT: Mrs. O'Neil, were you referring to the facts that existed in the first phase, then? The facts of those? Is that what you have stated?

JUROR O'NEIL: You mean we have cleared up all these facts in the first phase?

- Q BY MR. DENNY: That's right.
- A And we found him guilty?
- Q That's right, found him guilty of first degree murder.

Now, no further evidence is put on in the penalty phase of the trial by either the prosecution or the defense.

Is it your feeling that you would then automatically, without regard to the evidence, having found him guilty of first degree murder, vote to impose the death penalty?

- A I think that s an awful hard question to answer.
- Q Yes, it is, ma am, but I have to ask it of you.
- Q Well, I tell you why, because I am only one of twelve jurors. Now, maybe some of the other jurors, after discussion, have found things or discovered something that I missed. Maybe I missed something they missed. It is talking the thing over that makes us come to a decision.
 - Q Yes, but my --

3.

As serious as a death penalty or as lenient as maybe life imprisonment.

Well, let me just look to your state of mind, though, at the present time.

Is your state of mind such that you would be one to say, having found him guilty of first degree murder, then, I vote for the death penalty? 15 1 1 1

A I wouldn't be the first one to say that.

Q Well, would you be the second or third one to say that, ma'am?

MR. KAY: Well, your Honor, I'm going to object. This is very ambiguous.

THE COURT: Sustained. I think you might rephrase your question.

you might be the first to say it, is your state of mind such that you feel that a person having been found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of first degree murder, without regard to any other evidence, should be given the death penalty?

A No, because I think there might have been other -like you say, without any evidence. Maybe somebody has some
evidence after he's been given the death penalty or I mean been
found guilty that they might think life imprisonment would be
the thing.

Q Well, just assume that you get no other evidence.

THE COURT: You understand that that question is somewhat ambiguous in that you can consider the evidence which has been submitted to you previously in determining the question of life imprisonment or death; do you understand that?

JUROR O'NEIL: That's right.

So, then I -- if the evidence that has already been presented would make me feel that he deserved the death penalty. I would give it.

Q BY MR. DENNY: All right, ma'am.

Let me go, then, to the publicity.

14 fol

You say that these people, as far as you have seen, heard and read, appeared to have been influenced by Mr. Manson, is that correct? People associated with Mr. Manson?

A Well, I feel he must have had a great influence on so many young people that seemed to be fairly intelligent young people.

- Q Could you hold that microphone up?
- A Uh-huh, yes. I forget. My own voice frightens me.
- Q Well, I think you said if they did these acts on their own without being influenced by Mr. Manson, then they were bad people, is that correct?
- A If they continued to follow Mr. Manson's dictates, whatever they were, they -- then, I think they -- well, I just don't know what to say. But I just can't understand people doing that.
- Q Well, is it your feeling, based on what you have heard, seen or read, that Mr. Manson is something of an evil man?
- A Well, I surely think he's an evil man in what he's either done himself or -- or had other younger people do that certainly didn't --
- Q Well, is it your feeling, then, that those who have been associated with Mr. Manson for some considerable period of time, perhaps over a year, share somewhat this evil quality of Mr. Manson?
- A Well, some of it must rub off on them or they could see.

Q In other words, it's kind of this feeling again, of "birds of a feather do flock together," as far as you are concerned; is that right?

A Well, I -- I don't -- I -- I suppose so.

If birds of a feather flock together and stick
to it, then --

Q Well, if the evidence were to show that they had stuck together with Mr. Manson for quite some period of time -- several years, perhaps -- I take it you would start off under those circumstances feeling that Mr. Davis was perhaps criminally oriented; is that correct? Along with Mr. Manson?

A Well, either -- I don't think really criminally oriented, but I do think he was in a way almost hypnotized.

Q Well, is it your feeling that perhaps if -- if Mr. Davis were in fact associated with Mr. Manson for a period of time, that you would -- just as you sit there now, knowing that much, and then based on what you've seen, heard and read, and based on your feelings which have stemmed from your readings and your viewings -- do you feel that perhaps you'd be a little bit antagonistic towards Mr. Davis? Because of this association with Mr. Manson for that period of time?

A No, I don't think I'd really feel antagonistic.

Q Well, let me then use another word.

Do you feel that perhaps that Mr. Davis might have to show you that he was innocent of any criminal activity, because of that association with Mr. Manson?

A Yes, I'm afraid he'd have to show me.

Q And that in that case, in spite of the fact that

14-2 he has no burden of proof legally, as far as you are 1 concerned, he would have some burden of proof to convince 2 you that he was not guilty; is that correct, --3 Well --A 4 Q. -- based on --5 Well, there goes the issues of facts again. 6 ď. That's what I don't know. We have got to learn all those 7 8 things. 9 But as far as you are concerned, in judg-Q 10 ing those issues of fact, you would feel, then, that Mr. Davis 11 had to prove his innocence, in effect, of any criminal charges 12 because of his association with Mr. Manson; isn't that your --13 No, not entirely. A 14 But it is -- it is a fact, is it not, that he Q. 15 would have to show you, as you put it, that he was not guilty? 16 Well, you mean that -- that if all of the other A 17 members of the jury voted him not guilty, and I still had a 18 feeling that he was guilty -- is that what you mean? -- that--19 No, no, ma'am. I am talking about your feelings 20 about him right now. Don't think about the other members 21 of the jury. I am talking about just you. 22 Now, you've seen, heard and read some things 23 about Charlie Manson which perhaps turn your stomach; right? 24 A Oh, well, I just read the headlines. I didn't --25 Well --Q. Ť 26 I don't like to read that. A 27 I understand. It's nauseating stuff. Q 28 Would it be fair to say that, in some respects,

it does turn your stomach, or has turned your stomach? Would 14-3 1 that be fair to say? 2 Well, I suppose it would, if I read enough of it. 3 Well, based on what you have read, would it --Q. would that be a fair phrase to use, as far as your state of 7 5 mind, or how it affected you? 6 ÷ A I have got a pretty good stomach. 7 All right. Q 8 I don't turn very easily. À All right. Q. 10 But, at least, as far as that goes, you have got 11 certain feelings about Mr. Manson, based on what you've 12 heard, seen or read; correct? 13 A Yes. 14 And they're not good feelings; isn't that Q. 15 correct? 16 What I know mostly about that is what has been A 17 on television, the news. That's just about all that I 18 know. 19 And there has been an awful lot on the television 20 in the news? 21 Yes, there has been quite a lot. A 22 But, of course, I don't sit down from morning 23 24 to night and listen to the news. 25 All right. Getting back to the point, though, 26 you have some feelings against Mr. Manson because of what 27 you've heard, seen and read? 14a fls. 28 Yes, I have, definitely.

14a-1	1
	2
•	3
	4
À	5
á.	6
`\$	7
	8
	9
	10.
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
ð	17
	18
r	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
2	24
10 mg	25
<u> </u>	26 .

28

	Q	And	aga	iinst	those	peop.	le who	ha	ve a	SŞ	ociated
with	him	knowing	g l y	for	a peri	od of	time	:	for a	8	lengthy
peri	od of	time;	is	that	right	?					

- A Yes, against them, --
- Q All right.
- A -- but --
- Q Don't let me cut you off. Go ahead.
- A No.

Q All right. Now, with those feelings, and with the information here that Mr. Davis has been associated with him for a relatively long period of time, it then follows that you have certain feelings against Mr. Davis, as one of that group; isn't that correct?

A Yes, I guess that's right.

Q All right. And you've stated, I think, that because of those feelings that you have, Mr. Davis, then, as far as you are concerned -- not the other members of the jury, but as far as you are concerned -- would sort of have to prove to you that he was innocent of these charges; isn't that correct?

He would have to bring up some evidence to show you that he was innocent; is that correct?

A Well, let's say he'd have to bring up some evidence to show that he was really involved in making the jury vote guilty; that -- his part was that -- was that he really was guilty.

Q Well, I don't quite understand you.

The People are supposed to prove that.

A I know. But I mean, my -- the People would prove that by listening to what he'd have to say; and bringing up all the evidence and all the facts.

- Q Well, suppose he doesn't say anything, though?
- A Well, I mean, he would speak through you.
- Q 'Suppose I don't say anything?
 What I am trying to --

A Well, I guess what I would give him would be the benefit of the doubt, then,

Q Well, would you give him the benefit of the doubt? Mrs. O'Neil? Or is it your feeling that he comes in here, kind of clothed with Manson's own guilt, sharing in that guilt?

- A No. No, I don't feel that way.
- Q Or sharing in that tendency to commit crime?

 Do you feel that?

Again, going back to this "birds of a feather flock together" bit, do you feel that one who has associated with Mr. Manson for a period of time must share some sort of criminal tendencies?

- A Yes, I guess I do.
- Q And do you feel that Mr. Davis, assuming that he has associated with Mr. Manson, then, shares some criminal tendencies with Mr. Manson?
 - A Well, I hate to compare anybody to Mr. Manson.
- Q Well, you've just said, though, that people who have associated with him for a period of time, in your mind, do share those criminal tendencies; right? That's the

way you feel about it? 1 Did I say "share"? They can't help but -- but --2 I think I did say "rub off." 3 All right. So that they are probably more 5 likely to be guilty than innocent, because of that association, in your mind; is that right? б Yes, I guess that's right. 7 8 And that's so of Mr. Davis in this case; isn't Q. that right? 9 10 Yes. MR. DENNY: All right. I'd offer a challenge under 11 1073, Subdivision 2, your Honor. 13 MR. KAY: May I ask a few questions, your Honor? 14 THE COURT: You may. 15 16 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. KAY: 18 Mrs. O'Neil, I'm not sure you are clear about 19 this. But in a criminal case, a defendant is presumed 20 innocent until the contrary is proven. 21 So, at the start of a case, the defendant is 22 presumed innocent. 23 A Yes. 24 Do you understand that he doesn't have to put 25 forth any evidence at all? Do you understand that? 26 burden is on the prosecution to prove that -- as in this 27 case -- that Mr. Davis is guilty of these crimes beyond a 2**8** reasonable doubt; do you understand that?

Yes. 1 And do you feel that, as you are sitting there, 2 . that you are routral at this point? In other words, you 3 don't favor the prosecution, and you don't favor the 4 defense at this time? 煮 5 No. I don't favor either one right now. б ŝ And could you give Mr. Davis a fair trial in this 7 case? Even knowing what your feelings are about Mr. Manson? Ýes. 14b fls. 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 .21 22 23 24 25 * 26 27. 28

27

28

Ą

your Honor.

No.

MR. KAY:

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

We would oppose the challenge for cause,

```
14b-2
                              The Court will grant the challenge.
                  THE COURT:
        1
                        Thank you very much, Mrs. O'Neil.
        2
                  PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: You're welcome.
        3
                  MR. DENNY: Thank you, Mrs. O'Neil.
                            Thank you, Mrs. O'Neil.
 ۲.
                  MR. KAY:
        5
                  THE COURT:
                               The 15th floor of the Hall of Records --
        6
 Ç
            strike that.
        7
                        Go to Room 253, the assembly room, in the new
        8
            courthouse, tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock.
        9
                  PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: At 9:00 o'clock?
       10
                  THE COURT: At 9:00 o'clock.
       11
                 PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Okay. Thank you.
        12
        13
                THE COURT: Would you bring the balance of the panel in?
        14
                  THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.
                  THE COURT: Choose another name, please.
       16
                  THE CLERK: Jesse Lee Jeffery: J-e-s-s-e --
        17
                 THE COURT: You may remain standing, if you will.
       18
                  THE CLERK: -- middle name, L-e-e; last name --
              THE COURT: , You may remain standing. I'm going to let
       19
       20
            you go right away.
       21
                  THE CLERK: -- J-e-f-f-e-r-y.
       22
                  THE COURT: Jeffery?
       93
                  THE CLERK: Yes, sir.
       24
                  THE COURT:
                               Mr. Jeffery?
       .25
                  PROSPECTIVE JUROR JEFFERY: Yes, sir (indicating).
       26
                  THE COURT: Mr. Jeffery, you will be next in the box for
       27
            Mrs. O'Neil, who has just been excused, tomorrow morning.
       28
                  MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I don't think they can all hear
```

14b - 31 you. 2 THE COURT: Can you all hear me? 3 THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS: No. 4 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Jeffery, you heard me, . 5 did you not? PROSPECTIVE JUROR JEFFERY: 6 7 THE COURT: All right. Tomorrow morning, ladies and 8 gentlemen, at 9:30. -- is there still somebody missing? 9 (Pause in the proceedings.) 10 THE COURT: Is everyone here now? 11 THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes. 12 To your knowledge, are they all here now? THE COURT: 13 To my knowledge, yes, sir. THE BAILIFF: 14 Tomorrow morning, the Court will expect to THE COURT: 15 see you ladies and gentlemen, at 9:30. 16 And the Court admonishes you that you are not, 17 during the course of this recess, to discuss the case amongst 18 yourselves nor with anyone else, nor are you to permit anyone 19 to discuss with you any matter connected with the case; and 20 during the course of the recess, you are not to form or 21 express any opinions on the matter, until such time as it is 22 submitted to you, should you be chosen as a juror. 23 I'll see you at 9:30 tomorrow morning. 4 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Mr. Bailiff, where did he say 25 I was to go? è 26 THE BAILIFF: Room 253. 27 THE COURT: Room 253, new county courthouse, tomorrow 28 morning at 9:00 o'clock.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, before we take our recess -- do we have a juror present?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DENNY: I'll hold it just a minute.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had after all the members of the prospective jury had exited the courtroom:)

MR. DETINY: Your Honor, I have presented to the Court copies of the subpoenas which I have heretofore personally served on Mr. Manson and Mr. Grogan -- of which I have indicated on the back of each of the subpoenas the dates when they were served.

15-1

 I don't know whether Mr. Grogan has been transported to San Quentin or not, as of the present time. Of course, as indicated by one of our jurors, Mr. Manson has. And those subporns are for their presence in court today. Obviously, I don't expect to call them as witnesses today. I don't know when I may call them as witnesses.

I have had an opportunity to talk at some length with Mr. Manson on one occasion and Mr. Grogan on the 23rd of December, during which I received some very valuable and important information from both of them. And I do want to be able to discuss some further points with them. And that is one of the reasons that I have subpoenaed them down. Not simply to appear, but to be able to talk to them as important and necessary witnesses in this case.

THE COURT: What are you asking?

MR. DENNY: Well, I'm asking that the Court determine why they were not brought down or why they were -- we were not notified as to why they were not brought down and to insure that they will be brought down in sufficient time.

THE COURT: The Court had some discussion with the Sheriff concerning this question as to whether or not Mr. Manson should be brought down on this date and the Court told the Sheriff that it was not necessary to have Mr. Manson present in court at this time. I believed that it would not be at a point where Mr. Manson's testimony would be -- could be utilized at this time. So when we're farther along in the trial, the Court will order Mr. Manson and Mr. Grogan to be present at a time when you can -- will have time to discuss,

have a day or two to discuss testimony with them and so that they will be present at the time that you want to put them on the witness stand, should you wish to do that.

MR. DENNY: Well, that's fine, your Honor, if that can be left open so I can discuss it with the Court.

THE COURT: So I'll leave open the date and keep me apprised as to when you want them here.

MR. DENNY: That's fine.

THE COURT: And we'll work it that way.

MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. KAY: Good night, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good night, and I'll see you tomorrow morning at 9:30.

(Whereupon, at 4:45 o'clock p.m., the evening adjournment was taken, the matter to be resumed the following day, Tuesday, January 4, 1972, at 9:30 o'clock a.m.)