SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT NO. 106

HON. RAYMOND CHOATE, JUDGE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

224

Plaintiff,

No. A 267861

¥

BRUCE McGREGOR DAVIS,

Defendant.

REPORTERS DAILY TRANSCRIPT

Monday, January 17, 1972

VOLUME 24

APPEARANCES:

For the People:

JOSEPH P. BUSCH, JR., District Attorney

BY: ANTHONY MANZELLA

and STEPHEN R. KAY,

For Defendant Davis: GEORGE V. DENNY, III

BANEY (CROSS : EDIRECT)

COPY

MARY LOU BRIANDI, C.S.R. ROGER K. WILLIAMS, C.S.R. Official Court Reporters

1		IND	E X		
2	PEOPLE'S WITNESSES:		CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
3	BAILEY, Ella Jo (Continued)		3470 3637 eopened	3560 M	•
5	1	•••		•	
6		··			
. 8	,				
9 10		V.			
11		·			
12		EXHIB	<u>ITS</u>		
13	PEOPLE'S:	For I	<u>dentiți</u>	cation	In Evidence
14	51 - Photograph		3479		,
15	52 - Photograph		3479		
16	70 - Photograph		3479		
17	73 - Photograph		3479		
18	77-A through 77-AA - 1	Photographs	3479		3647
. 20					
21					
22					
23		•			
24					
25					
26	•				
27					
28					

	INDEX		
			In
	DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS: For Identify	cation	Evidence
	E - Photostatic copy of a three- page document entitled "Agreement"	3517	3520
	·		
1			

å

:		
1	A	Yes.
2.	Q	You didn't remember it last Thursday and Friday,
3	did you?	
4	A	No.
.5	Ą	How do you remember it now?
6	A	Just by your asking about it.
7	ହ	Well, you have gone over the notes from that
8	conversatio	n, over the weekend, haven't you?
9	A	No.
10	Q	You haven't gone over any notes over the weekend?
11	A	No.
12	Q	Or since Thursday or Friday?
13	A	No.
14	Q	Or any transcripts?
15	\mathbf{A}_{\cdot}	No.
16	4 0	Or Sergeant Whiteley's notes?
17	A	No.
18	Q	All right. Well, let's see if I can refresh
, 19	your recoll	ection from these notes, then.
20	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Going to page 3, did you state to them, in sub-
21	stance or e	effect, the following?
22		"Ella states that Vance, Mary, Sadie
23	and h	erself decided that Mary and Ella would drive
24	the 1	us to Santa Barbara, where it would be
25	aband	loned.
26		"Vance told Sadie to burn everything
27	that	had blood on it. Sadie said the gloves and
28	a whi	te three-cornered scarf had blood on it. These
	1	•

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

items were in the bus.

Wance told Sadie to burn everything that had blood on it."

Do you remember telling them that?

No. Sadie's the one that told Bill about the clothes that were in the back of the bus.

Assuming she told him that, since he couldn't know it, since he wasn't there in the bus, after she told him, isn't it a fact that he told her to burn the clothes?

> A No.

And you didn't tell the officer and Deputy District Attorney Burton Katz that?

I don't believe so.

Now, do you know so? You've testified under Now, you say you don't believe. Which is true?

> Ä No.

All right. I think at about the close of Friday's session, we were talking about the fact that you'd spent an awful lot of time talking with Deputy District Attorney Katz; isn't that right? Or a number of conversations with him, interviews?

Not with -- not with Katz; not very many.

•	-	,	
AA-1	1	Q	How many?
	2	A	Maybe three, three or four.
	3	Q	And Mr. Manzella, how many?
5	4	A	I don't know.
*	5	Q	Can you guess?
AB .	6	A	No.
	7	, Q	Can you state for a fact?
	8	A	No.
	9	Q	Can you state when any of them were?
	10	A	No.
	11	Q	You have no recollection of that?
	12	A	Of any of them?
	13	Q	Yes,
ig also	14	A	Yes, I can recollect some.
) k	15	Q	How many?
*	16	A	I don't know.
	17	Q	Well, is there anything like notes that would help
	18	you refresh	your recollection as to dates, times, number?
	19	A	No.
	20	Q	Well, they have been quite recently, haven't they,
	21	some of then	a?
3	22	A	I've talked to him a few times before I've come
	23	into court,	yes.
A Angles	24	Q	Yes. When was the most recent?
-w*	25	A	Last week. Friday, I believe.
8	26	Q	After the close of Friday's session?
	27	A	No.
_	28	Q	Do you mean the Friday before that?
	i		1

3

\$

5

6

7

8

9

10

26

27

28

	A	No.	Before	the	session.
--	---	-----	--------	-----	----------

Oh, before the session. I see. When was the time before that?

I don't know.

You have no recollection of things that recent? MR. MANZELLA: Objection. It's not relevant, and --THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. MANZELLA: -- it's argumentative.

BY MR. DENNY: You've talked to investigators from the Sheriff's department on a number of times, haven't you?

Yes.

MR. MANZELLA: The question's been asked and answered, your Honor,

THE COURT: Yes, it has.

BY MR. DENNY: And Miss Bailey --

THE COURT: The answer may remain in the record, however. The answer may remain. It has been asked, of course, previously.

Go ahead.

Q BY MR. DENNY: When an appointment was set up to discuss this case with me and with Mr. Kanarek, Mr. Manson's attorney, up on the 10th floor of the Old Hall of Records, in the Sheriff's Homicide Department, you refused to talk to us, didn't you?

I was given a choice. Α

Q And you chose not to?

And I chose not to. Α

1 AA-3 Q And you were given a choice by whom? 2 MR. MANZELLA: Objection, your Honor. That --3 THE COURT: Sustained. 4 MR. MANZELLA: -- assumes that the law does not give 5 her a choice. б MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, she is --7 THE COURT: The objection is sustained. 8 ' MR. DENNY: All right. 91 Now, you indicated, I think, in response to some 10 of Mr. Manzella's questions, that your sight is just as good 11 now as it was back on your days -- back in your days on the 12 ranch? 13 I don't remember saying that, but yes, it is. 14 All right. Although you were not wearing your 15 glasses at the time you were one of the Manson girls; is that 16 right? 17 Yes, that's right. A 18 All right. And again, showing you the exhibit 19 that's heretofore been marked as a People's exhibit, No. 37. 20 People's exhibit, will you start from the left here, 21 (indicating) A, B, C, along the top row, who is A? 22 Ä Susan Atkins. 23 Q And B? 24 Charles Manson. A 25 Q And C? 26 A Mary Brunner. 27 And D? Q 28

Robert Beausoleil.

A

1A-4	1	Q And B?
	2	A Bruce Davis.
	. 3	Q All right. By the way, would you take off your
*	4	glasses?
ë:	5	MR. DENNY: May I approach the witness a moment, your
	6	Honor?
	7	THE COURT: Yes, you may,
	8	MR. DENNY: May I see those glasses a moment?
	9	You don't mind if we put these on the clerk's
	10	desk just a moment, do you?
	11	MR. MANZELLA: The People would ask that the witness be
	12	allowed to keep her glasses and do what she wishes to do with
	13	her glasses, your Honor.
3 4	14 .	THE COURT: Yes, You should put them back.
giês g	15	
ŕ	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
3	22	
	23	
3 ₀ ,	24	
.· '	25	
ŝ	26	
	27	
	28	

MR. DENNY: Well, may I ask, your Honor, that she not 1-1 1 place them back on for a moment? 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 BY MR. DENNY: Now, Miss Bailey, you were fairly 4 * familiar with most of the people at the ranch among the 5 Family, is that right? б 7 MR. MANZELLA: Objection, the question is vague and 8 ambiguous. 9 THE COURT: Sustained. 10 BY MR. DENNY: Well, you knew people by sight, Q 11 didn't you? 12 MR. MANZELIA: Objection, vague and ambiguous. 13 THE COURT: Sustained. 14 BY MR. DENNY: Did you know the members of the 15 Manson Family by sight during the time that you lived with 16 them? 17 À Yes. 18 And you could recognize them if you saw them 19 again? 20 Yes. 21 And you could recognize pictures of them just 22, as you have recognized the pictures in People's 37, is that 23 correct? 24 I'm not sure if I would recollect everyone. 25 Well, let's try. 26 ŝ Your Honor, I have a series of photographs here 27 previously marked in evidence under People's symbols. I 28 wonder if they may be similarly marked at this time, if the

1-2	1
•	2
	3
3,	4
rê 3	5
** * *	6
	7
51,52,70,7 77Åthrough 77ÅÅ	3 8
77AA 77AA	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
4	14
	15
<i>\$</i>	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
5	23
j.	24
***	25
, }	26
	27
	28

People have no objection?

MR. MANZELLA: People have no objection, your Honor.

I'm looking for the exhibit number.

MR. DENNY: Well.I --

MR. MANZELLA: I believe it was Exhibit 77, People's 77, your Honor.

MR. DENNY: Well, there are a number: People's 51, People's 52, People's 70, People's 73, People's 77-A through Z, and 77-AA. May they be so marked for identification at this time?

THE COURT: So ordered.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Now, ma'am, I'm standing right at the same place where I was standing, back at the railing here, when you identified the pictures of Mr. Manson and Mr. Davis and the rest; is that correct?

THE COURT: The record will show that should be about 20 feet away.

Q BY MR. DENNY: I'm showing you People's 51. Who is that?

A I can't see.

MR. MANZELLA: Objection, your Honor. The People would object to what Mr. Denny is doing on the grounds it has no probative value. It is not relevant.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, may we approach the bench?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the

2

3

5

б 7

8

10

11 12

13

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

*

24

25

26

27 28 hearing of the jury:)

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, certainly it has probative value and it's relevant --

MR. KAY: Keep your voice down, George.

MR. DENNY: She's testified she could see certain things, particularly in regard to a gun and a knife and she identified Mr. Davis as having a gun and a knife when she was about 20 to 30 feet away from him shortly before the people are supposed to have left to go to the Himman home. She's testified that she did not have glasses at the time. She's testified that her eyesight now is as good as it was then. She has been able to identify at that distance, with her glasses, other photographs. And whether she's able to identify them with her glasses or not, she certainly should be able to identify at 20 feet the faces and pictures which are the same size and shape as the pictures that she has previously identified. If she cannot do so, it is probative as to the fact she could not see what she said she saw at the time she said she saw it in the portion of her direct testimony.

MR. MANZELLA: My objection, your Honor, is that it has no probative value and its prejudicial effect outweighs its probative value and it is not relevant.

No. 1, it is an attempt to conduct a test under the conditions which Mr. Denny has not established were the same as those during the events to which Miss Bailey has testified.

Miss Bailey identified people at a distance of

1.

2

4

5 6

.7

, 8,

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

la fla.

1

20 feet, not from photographs, and I think it is obvious there is a substantial difference between identifying a photograph and a person at 20 feet.

All of uswould much rather or could more clearly identify someone we know from a distance of 20 feet in person than we would a photograph of that person.

And there's been no showing that the photographs of these people, the people that are shown in the photographs, are the same as they were when Miss Bailey saw them during the events to which she's testified. So it has no probative value at all.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor ---

THE COURT: That sounds correct to me.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, it is no -- it is not correct at all.

If the Court please, she has identified at this distance with her glasses people whom the People are certainly happy to have her identify whether they were the same when she saw them or not. She's identified those pictures of Atkins, Brunner, Beausoleil, Manson and Davis.

Now, it is certainly relevant and probative as to her ability to see, merely her ability to see. I can hold up fingers and ask her if she can see. There would be no difference in holding up fingers and asking her to see, if she can see now, and determine her ability to see and --

MR. KAY: People --

MR. MANZELLA: People --

THE COURT: You may do that.

Ý.

MR. DENNY: I submit we should be able to do more than that. It is extremely probative to say she lived with these people, she knew these people and day in and day out for a year and ten months whether she can identify these people.

MR. KAY: But she didn't identify them as pictures out at Spahn Ranch. That's the difference.

MR. DENNY: Just a moment, you bring a picture right up to her face and say, "Can you identify this person?" I could say that's not probative, that's not relevant. I'm asking her to do the same thing --

MR. MANZELLA: Though we didn't ask her to identify pictures just to see if she can see. We asked her to identify pictures to determine who they were.

MR. KAY: We have no objection to their bringing the pictures --

MR. DENNY: Sure, you don't. Then, she can see.

MR. KAY: See, you're giving her a test and, then, it is improper.

MR. DENNY: I'm just standing back a few more feet than you,

THE COURT: I think a test under certain circumstances is proper to determine whether her eyesight without glasses is good or bad at this moment. I don't recall that she said that her eyesight was the same.

MR. DENNY: Yes, she did, your Honor. I just laid that foundation before I started this.

THE COURT: I don't know that she said it was the same.

MR. DENNY: She did, your Honor.

g.

· 25

THE COURT: She may have had some doubts in respect to that.

MR. DENNY: No.

THE COURT: Or she assumed that it was.

MR. DENNY: She said, "I don't think Mr. Manzella asked me that, but it is just as good how as it was then."

THE COURT: All right, assuming that that's true, I think you do have a right to make a test, but I don't think that this is a proper test.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, I'm not solely testing her on whether she can recognize people walking, moving people, solely on the issue of her ability to see my client with a gun at the time testified to. She's testified to a lot of things that she has been able to see. A car driving ten feet and fifteen feet away from her, going out, and identifying the people in there.

THE COURT: That's true.

MR. DENNY: She's testified to a good deal about what she could see, and certainly we have a right to determine if she can see at any given distance things.

Now, the difference in holding up my fingers and holding up a picture is pure --

MR. KAY: Pure or great.

MR. DENNY: -- pure circumstance. It isn't very great.

THE COURT: The Court believes it is. I think the comment that has been made by Mr. Manzella to the effect it can't be determined whether these people look the same as when she saw them.

*

28

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, the People have used these things, they've used these things to have — to have Juan Flynn identify them. They've used these things to have Ruby Pearl identify them. And there's been, certainly, no big squawk from the Beople about using these very pictures.

THE COURT: The Court will sustain the objection.

However, I will not sustain an objection to a test, other tests of her ability to see. So if you wish to proceed in that line --

MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- while she's on cross, you may.

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

- Q BY MR. DENNY: What am I holding in my hand?
- A Pardon?
- Q What am I holding in my hand?
- A I don't know.
- Q Can't you determine at all what I am holding?
- A I believe you are holding a felt marking pen.
- Q How many?
- A Two.

MR. DENNY: May the record --

- Q Oh, by the way, what color are they?
- A Green and red.

MR. DENNY: May the record reflect, your Honor, I am holding one felt marking pen with a green top and a white body and one red grease pencil with a red body and red grease lead.

THE COURT: So ordered. Yes, the record may so show.

1b fol

MR. DENNY: May the record further show I am standing at the same place where she identified the pictures of Mr. Manson, et cetera, from 20 feet distance from the witness stand.

THE COURT: Yes, the record may so show.

Q BY MR. DENNY: And you can certainly tell how many fingers I'm holding up at this point, can't you?

A Yes, four.

Q Fine.

By the way, you can recognize your old friends in these photographs, can't you, if they are brought close enough to you?

A Yes∗

1

4

5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

16

15

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

You've gone through it before, haven't you?

I don't know if I have seen those photographs.

Well, let me come up to you and see if you recall having seen these photographs?

THE COURT: You may put on your glasses.

THE WITNESS: Thank you,

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, I would appreciate if she can determine whether she can identify these people from the photographs without her glasses, first.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, the People would object to that procedure. There seems to be no reason for it.

On the grounds previously stated, we object to that procedure, your Honor. The Court has already ruled on that motion.

It appears to be well taken. Sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Showing you 51 for identification, who is that?

Gypsy, Catherine Share.

Q. You have no trouble recognizing her with your glasses on there, do you?

> A No.

Do you remember doing this at the grand -- I'm sorry, at another hearing?

A No.

Q All right. Who is that?

A Lynn Fromme.

It is 52. Q

Showing you 73, who is that?

1	A	Danny De Carlo.
2	Q	You have trouble recognizing him?
3	A	It is not a very clear photograph.
4	Ω.	Showing you People's 70 for identification, who is
5 .	that?	
6	Α .	I don't recognize it.
7.	Q	77-A, who is that?
8 •	, A	I only know her as Little Patty.
.9	Q,	All right. 77-B?
10	A	I don't know him.
11	Q	Are you sure that's a him and not a her?
12	A	I'm pretty sure.
13	Ω	All right. 77-C?
14	A	Susan Atkins.
15	Ω	77-B?
16	A	Robert Beausoleil.
17	Q.	77-E?
18	A	Bill Vance.
19	Q	77-F?
20	A	Juan.
21	Q	Juan?
22	A	Juan Flynn, I believe.
23	Ω	All right.
24		Now, all of these pictures that you have seen,
25	do they lo	ok substantially like the people portrayed in them
26	looked whe	n you were living with them?
27	MR.	MANZELLA: Objection, that's vague and ambiguous, your
28	Honor, cov	ering all the pictures she's seen.
	Į	

1 I'm asking all the pictures you have seen 2 thus far. All the pictures of the persons she's 3 THE COURT: recognized? 5 MR. DENNY: Yes. 6 THE COURT: Yes, you may answer that. 7 THE WITNESS: Would you repeat the question? 8 Q BY MR. DENNY: Do all of the pictures that you have 9 seen thus far that you have recognized appear to portray the 10 people shown in those pictures just about the way you remember 11 them when you were living with them? 12 Pretty well. 13 77-H? 14 I don't know her by name. 15. You recognize her by features? 16 I recollect seeing her a few times, not very 17 2 fol often. 18 19 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

2-1	1	Q 77-1?
	2	A Linda Kasabian.
	3	Q 77-J?
	4	A Sherry Cooper.
i.	5	Q 77-K?
4 33 6	6	A Brends McCann.
	7	Q. 77-L?
	8	A Steve Grogan.
	· 9	Q 77-M?
	10	A Ruth Morehouse.
	11	MR: MANZELLA: I'm sorry. Your Honor, I think we've
,	12	got the letters mixed up on those photographs.
	. 13	MR. DENNY: I think we have, too.
	14	THE COURT: The last one you called was 77-M.
Ŭ Ĵ	15	Ruth Morehouse.
¥	16	MR. MANZELLA: I think the mixup begins with 77-G,
	17	your Honor.
	18	THE COURT: That far back?
	19	MR.MANZELLA: Yes, I'm afraid so.
	20	MR. DENNY: Let me check. May I have just a moment,
	21	your Honor?
ž.	22	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
	23	(Pause in the proceedings while a discussion
	24	off the record ensued at the counsel table between
-	25	Mr. Denny and the defendant.)
Ÿ	26	THE COURT: What did you have in mind now?
	27	Q BY MR. DENNY: Let's go back to -E.
_	28	A Bill Vance.

```
-F?
             Q
1
             A
                   Juan Flynn.
2
                   -G?
             Q
3
                   The girl, I don't recognize.
             A
                    #H?
5
             Q
                   Linda Kasabian.
             A
6
7
             Q
                   -I?
8
             A.
                    Sherry Cooper.
· 9
                    -J?
             Q
10
             A
                   Brenda McCann,
11
                    -K?
             Q
12
             A
                    Steve Grogan.
13
                    -L?
             Q
14
             À
                   Ruth Morehouse.
15
                    -M?
             Q
16
                    Paul -- I'm not sure what his last name is.
             A
17
                    Watkins?
18
                    Yes.
19
                   -N?
20
                    I don't know her by name.
21
                Well, do you recognize her by her features?
22
                   I'm not real sure -- I -- I can't really recall
23
       if I've seen her.
24
                    -0?
             Q
25
                    He was a ranch hand. I just knew him by the
             A
26
       name Larry, Little Larry.
27
                    Little Larry. -P?
             Q
28
              Á
                    Bruce Davis.
```

1	Q	-Q?
2	A	I don't know him.
3	Q	You don't recognize him at all?
4	A	No.
5	Q	-R?
6	A	I recognize the picture. I can't remember the
7	name.	
8	Q.	You do recognize the face, though?
9	A	Yes, I do.
10	Q	Is that also a Larry?
11	A	Yes, I believe it is.
12	Q	Larry Jones?
13	A	That sounds right. I'm not sure what his last
14	name is.	•
15	Q	Was he one of the cowboys there?
16	A	Yes, he was pretty much a cowboy.
17	Q	-\$?
18	A	Patty Krenwinkel.
19	Q	-17 ?
20	A	Sandy Good.
21	Q	-u?
22	. ' A	Myself.
23 '	Q	-v?
24	A	Cathy Gillis.
25	~ &	-M3
26	_,A	Mary Brunner.
27	Q	X?
28	A	Leslie Van Houten.

1	Q ~Y?
2	A I just know her by the name Beau.
3	Q -Z?
4	A Dianne Lake.
5	Q -AA?
6	A I don't recognize that photograph.
7	Q All right, ma'am.
8	Now, other than the individuals that you say you
9	do not recognize at all, the photographs appear, again, to
10	show the people and you recall having seen them during the
11	time you lived with them?
12	A Yes, pretty much.
13	Q By the way, Manson was sort of the teacher of
14	the group, wasn't he?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And among the other things he taught was that it
17	was all right to lie to the authorities; is that right? To
18	the police?
19	A Yes.
20	Q You didn't lie to each other?
21	A No.
22	Q But it was perfectly permissible to lie to the
23	authorities, if it was worth while to your own purposes;
24	that's what he taught, isn't that right?
25	A In giving names and things like that, yes.
.26	- 1
27	1

2a fls.

2a-1	1	Q And in giving false information about yourself;
	2	is that right?
	3	A Yes.
* · ·	4,	Q And false information about others; is that right?
ŝ:	5	A I don't know what you mean by "others." No.
₹ •	6	Q If it fit your purposes, it was all right to give
	7	false information about others?
	8 .	MR. MANZELLA: Objection. It's vague and ambiguous.
	9	THE COURT: Sustained.
	10	Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, that's what he taught you,
	11	didn't he?
	12	A He taught that it was all right to give false
	13	information, that's true.
8 *	14	Q All right. By the way, what was the name that you
)	15	gave when you were arrested in Cleveland?
3	16	A I believe it was the name on the credit card,
	17	Martha Rees.
	18	Q Martha Rees?
	.19	A Yes.
	20	Q And that was a credit card that you
	21	MR. MANZELLA: Objection, your Honor. It doesn't appear
3	22	to be relevant.
-	23.	THE COURT: I'll let him finish his question.
) De	24	Q BY MR. DENNY: That's the credit card that you
	25	testified that you took when you took the Swartz Johnny
Ž.	26	Swartz's truck?
	27	A Yes.
_	28	Q And used it all the way across country with

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 1

25

26

27

28

Mr. Vance; is that right?

MR. MANZELLA: That doesn't appear to be relevant, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, is that the credit card through which the Tacoma police traced you and Mr. Vance?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. That doesn't appear to be relevant.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, she's --

THE COURT: It calls for a conclusion.

Q BY MR. DENNY: If you know.

MR. MANZELLA: Again, the same objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, you've testified that the Tacoma police traced you and your connection with the Manson Family through Mr. Vance: --

MR. MANZELLA: Objection.

Q -- you testified to that effect?

MR. MANZELLA: That calls for a conclusion, and does not appear to be relevant, your Honor.

MR. DENNY: She has so stated, your Honor.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained. Move on.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Now, the guns that you have mentioned, that were in the possession of Mr. De Carlo as the armorer, they were generally kept in one location; is that right?

A Uh -- when they were being stored, I'd say that's

1	true.
2	Q And where were they generally stored?
3	A In the bunkhouse.
4	Q In the bunkhouse or in the undertaking parlor?
5	A I don't know about the undertaking parlor. I
6	never I don't remember ever hearing that mentioned, really.
7	Q Well, that's where Danny set up his gun shop,
8	wasn't it?
9	A Well, if it was, I called it the bunkhouse.
10	Q Well, where was the bunkhouse, in relationship to
11	the rest of the buildings along the boardwalk?
12	A Right next to the office.
13	Q And where was the office?
14	A The last building on the boardwalk, nearest the
15	corrais.
16	Q So it was the office, and then the bunkhouse, and
17	then what?
18	A I'm not sure.
19	A room I didn't use, I don't believe.
20	Q And De Carlo was drunk a good deal of the time,
21	wasn't he?
22	A No, I don't really think you could say that.
23	Q Well, you did say that to Officer Whiteley and
24	Deputy Guenther and Deputy District Attorney Katz, on May
25	15th, didn't you?
26	A That Danny De Carlo was drunk a lot on the ranch?
27	Yes.
28	A No. I didn't say that.

•	1	Q Did you tell them that he didn't take orders	
	2	very much from Charlie?	
	3	A (Pause.) I'm not sure, but that would be kind of	
N. S. S.	4.	true.	
*	5	Q He didn't take orders very much from Charlie, did	
** *	6	he?	
	7	A No.	
	8	Q And neither did Bill Vance, did he?	
b fol	9	A No.	
	10		
	11		
	12	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
	13		
. 3 pr	14		
ي پز	15		
	16		
	17		
	18 .		
	19	·	
	20		
	21		
	22		
*	23		
4	24		
-3	25		
۵	26		
	27		
	28		
	I	1	

2

3

4

5

6

7

Я

9

24

25

26

27

28

Q	They	were	kind	of	loners,	weren	t	they?
---	------	------	------	----	---------	-------	---	-------

Yes. A

All right. Let me -- directing your attention to these now famous Whiteley notes of May 15, 1970, approximately 2:28 p.m., Tacoma City Jail, page 5, did you state to Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Guenther and Mr. Katz and your -- and in the presence of your attorney, Mr. Deutscher, "Danny DeCarlo came summer of '69. Biker. Never listened to Charlie. Drank all the time."

Do you recall telling them that?

- Ä No. I don't think that's -- that's accurate.
- Q Well, what's inaccurate about it, ma'am? Was he a biker?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Did he come in the summer of '69?
 - À Yes.
 - Q And you stated that he never listened to Charlie.
 - Pretty much, that's true. Å
 - Q So the only thing that's wrong is --
 - A Really.
 - -- "drunk all the time"?

Yeah. Drunk all the time. That -- that -- no. that's a lot of time. And I know Danny DeCarlo wasn't drunk all the time on the ranch.

KAY: Well, I'm going to object to that, because Mr. Whiteley's notes don't say that. The notes say that he drank all the time. It didn't say he was drunk, according to what Mr. Denny just read.

1

3

5

8

9

7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

÷

28

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. The answer is in the record.

MR. DENNY: Well, "drunk" is what I think I read, if I misread it the first time. My reading of it is "drunk all the time."

THE COURT: Let's move on. Ask your next question.

Q BY MR. DENNY: By the way, these promises that you say have been made to you by the prosecutor's office here and the prosecutor's office up there, you've indicated that you would receive immunity from prosecution regarding this case, and you would have the charge that was pending against you, that you --

MR. MANZELLA: I'm objecting to Mr. Denny's summarization of the testimony, your Honor. I believe the jury can determine what the testimony has been so far.

MR. DENNY: Well, I have to state that to state the last part of my question, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may go shead -- within reason.

MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor. I hope it will be within reason.

Q (Continuing) -- and the forgery charge would be dropped that you were charged with up in Tacoma.

Were you also promised that any other outstanding or pending charges against you would not be filed in Tacoma?

- A I don't know.
- Q What do you mean, you don't know?
- A Well, I saw that agreement in Tacoma, and I

2c fis.

2c-1	1	Q Well, let me read to you from your testimony back o
	2	August 12th, Page 5149.
	.3	*Q But at some time you spoke to the
, t	, 4, ,	police, right?
ŧ.	5 ,	*A Yes
3	` 6	"Q And the police when was the first
	7	time you spoke to the police?
	8	"A Concerning Mr. Hinman?
	9 .	Yes.
	10	"A Was in March of 1970.
	11	"Q That was in that was in Tacoma,
	12	Washington?
	13	"A Yes.
3 *	14	"Q Who arranged that meeting?
J	15	"A Who arranged the meeting?
4	16	"Q Yes.
	17	"A I believe the District Attorney up
	18	there.
	19	"Q The District Attorney up there arranged
	20	the meeting. This was after you were in trouble with
	21	forgery?
	22	"A Yes,"
* *	23	And then there was there were some objections.
8≨	24	
	25	And then:
ż	26	"Q BY MR. KANAREK: At some time the District
	27	Attorney in Tacoma, Washington the Pierce County
	28	District Attorney; right?
	,	"A Yes."

**

> 18 19

> > 21 22

20

23 24

25 26

27 28

2d fol

₹`

P.

A About --

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. It's vague and ambiguous. as to what officers Mr. Denny's referring to.

MR. DENNY: Any officers.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I'll also object on the grounds that in Miss Bailey's testimony read by Mr. Denny, she said that she spoke to the Tacoma authorities about the L. A. officers coming up two weeks after her arrest.

And here she has testified that she spoke to Sergeant Whiteley some time after that.

MR. DENNY: Well, let me withdraw that question.

THE COURT: Your objection is that it's not inconsistent?

MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor. Mr. Denny asks: Which is it? And the question assumes facts which are not in evidence in this case; she's saying -- she's not talking about the same thing.

THE COURT: Well, your objection is a little late.

MR. MANZELLA: She hasn't answered it yet, your Honor.

THE COURT: I thought you meant to the previous question.

MR. MANZELLA: The question that was just asked.

THE COURT: All right. The objection --

MR. DENNY: I'll withdraw the question.

THE COURT: -- is sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Let me direct your attention to the testimony you gave in this case, on just Wednesday, January 12th, 1972, starting at Page 3122, Line 12.

2d-1		1
		2
		3
3		4
200 m		5
*2 # *		6
		7
		8
		9
		10
		11
		12
	· .	13 14 15
Ž.	,	16
		17
		18
		19
		20
		21 .
***		22
~		23
д		24

25

26

27

28

	"Q	You	only	starte	i talk	ing about	t your	
relat	ionsi	nip wi	th the	ë Manson	r Famil	ly to the	e polic	e
after	you	Mete	under	arrest	for a	felony;	isn't	that
right	?							

ijΑ Yes, after I was questioned about it.

HQ. Well, were you questioned about it by the police up in Tacoma, Washington?

ħΑ I was questioned about my connection with Bill Vance first.

And did the police tell you how they knew #Q you had some connection with Bill Vance?

> #A Yes.

Did you have something on you at that ÌÌ Q time which indicated any connection with Bill Vance?

"A No.

iro Did they indicate to you there was a want out for you?

No. #

MR. MANZELIA: Your Honor, I hate to interrupt Mr. Denny's questioning. I like to wait until the question is over. But I don't see the purpose of reading all this testimony.

MR. DENNY: Well --

MR. MANZELLA: I really don't see the purpose of it. He has asked her about a day. This doesn't -- this testimony doesn't appear to have anything to do with the date.

> MR. DENNY: The second page --

THE COURT: It's a long question, Mr. Denny. Let's

28

get to it.

The objection, however, is overruled.

Q BY MR. DENNY: (Reading.)

"Q So, it was in your discussion with the police about your connection with Bill Vance that you unburdened yourself to the Tacoma police about your connection with the Manson Family?

"A No, it wasn't at that time.

"A -- oh, strike that.

"Q A good deal later?

"A Yes.

"Q After March 13, 1970, ma am, when did you start to feel that it might be beneficial to unburden yourself about your connection with the Manson Family?

"A When it was brought to my attention that they knew about my connection with the Manson Family.

"Q Oh. And when was that?

"A I believe it was sometime in May.

"Q And had you been in custody all that time?

"A Yes.

"Q You don't like it in custody, do you?

"A No.

"Q So --"

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, again, I have to object to this. This is ridiculous, to read all this testimony, which has nothing to do with the testimony --

MR. DENNY: I've got to read about five more lines,

2d-3

2 3

1

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

*

35

Ç,

24

26 27

28

your Honor, which is --

MR. MANZELLA: I object to it, no matter how many lines he has got left. It's silly to read all this testimony, your Honor.

MR. DENNY: Well. I have to --

THE COURT: It does appear to the Court to be unnecessary, Mr. Denny.

Will you get to the question, please, rather than simply reading the testimony which the jury has already heard?

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, this lady doesn't like to enswer things out of context, and I have to put it in context.

MR. KAY: We move that that be stricken, that statement of Mr. Denny's.

MR. DENNY: Well, she keeps saying they re out of context, your Honor, and that's why I --

MR. MANZELLA: She hasn't said that at all.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, if you have any remarks to make, I'll let you make them at the bench.

But the objection is well taken, Mr. Denny. seems to be no point in prefacing a question with three or four pages of testimony.

Now, the Court will ask you to conclude your question.

I will overrule the objection.

MR. DENNY: Thank you.

The last question, Miss Bailey -- and again, reading from your testimony --

So, from March 13 until sometime in May,

you stayed in custody; and only started to unburden yourself about your association with the Manson Family after the police knew about it anyway; is that right?

"A Yes, that's correct."

28

1

2

3

4

5

б

Is that correct?

MR. MANZELLA: Is what correct? The question is vague and ambiguous. He has read pages of testimony.

MR. DENNY: Just the question I last read.

THE COURT: Do you understand the question?

THE WITNESS: No.

BY MR. DENNY: Is it correct, ma'am, that the first time you ever spoke to the officers was sometime in late May -- or sometime in May? Strike that,

THE COURT: Concerning Mr. Vance?

MR. DENNY: Concerning Mr. Hinman.

MR. MANZELLA: The question is vague and ambiguous, and I object on that ground.

I have no idea what that question means now. THE COURT: Restate it, please.

'BY MR. DENNY: Miss Bailey, when was it that you first talked to the police officers of the department of the police in Tacoma, Washington, about Mr. Hinman? When?

I believe it was in May.

So that when you testified that it was a couple of weeks after you were arrested in March, when you so testified in the trial against Charles Manson, that was incorrect, --

That I spoke --

-- is that right?

-- about Mr. Vance at that time. Α

No, that you spoke about Mr. Hinman at that time.

MR. MANZELLA: No, that's argumentative, your Honor. I don't know --

THE COURT: Sustained. 1 Well, the answer may remain in the record. 2 objection's overruled. 3 BY MR. DENNY: Now, at this meeting, you were Q 4 represented by counsel, Mr. Deutscher; is that right? 5 MR. MANZELLA: Objection. Vague and ambiguous, as to 6 what meeting Mr. Denny's speaking of. 7 THE COURT: Sustained. 8 Q BY MR. DENNY: All right. 9 At the first meeting that you had with Sergeant 10. Whiteley, Deputy Guenther, Deputy District Attorney Burton 11 Katz, you were represented by Mr. Deutscher on May 15, 1970; 12 is that right? 13 Ą Yes. 14 And he explained to you, didn't he, that 15 arrangements had been made for you to talk with the authori-16 ties? 17 MR. MANZELLA: Objection. Calls for hearsay. 18 MR. DENNY: This goes to her state of mind. 19 MR. MANZELLA: We have already covered her state of mind, 20 your Honor. 21 MR. DENNY: I don't think we've covered her state of mind 22 23 on this. THE COURT: I will overrule the objection. 25 You may answer. 26 THE WITNESS: (No response.) 27 THE COURT: Do you understand the question? 28 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what the question is.

÷.

MR. DENNY: Could you reread it, Mr. Williams?

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

"Q And he explained to you, didn't he, that arrangements had been made for you to talk with the authorities?")
THE WITNESS: Yes.

Q BY MR. DENNY: And it was your state of mind, before you talked to them, that you would insist on some kind of guarantee of immunity from any prosecution in the Hinman case; is that correct?

A (Pause) Yes, I believe that's correct.

Q And you had your attorney there to make sure that that happened, that you got some kind of guarantee of immunity before you talked to them; isn't that correct?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. Argumentative.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, ma'am, was one of your purposes in having your attorney there to make sure that you would be granted immunity from any prosecution in the Hinman case before you talked to the officers?

MR. MANZELLA: Irrelevant and argumentative.

THE COURT: Overruled, You may answer.

THE WITNESS: I don't know. Mr. Deutscher was there mostly because he had been brought in about the forgery. Now, I -- I did talk to him about the Hinman, but I don't know that -- you know, we made any specific statements or -- you know, had any terms drawn up ahead of time.

I don't know that. 2f-1 Well, the subject of immunity was brought up soon after the officers were there, in that meeting of May 15, wasn't 2 it? 3 I don't know how soon after they got there it was 4 brought up. 5 Well, it was brought up close to the first thing, O. ĸ wasn't it? 7 Objection. The question's been asked MR. MANZELLA: 8 and answered, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Sustained. 10 Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, is it your -- all right. 11 Going to your testimony in the -- on the date 12 of August 12th, 1971, starting at line 25 on --13 MR. MANZELLA: I object to the testimony being read, 14 your Honor. There's no -- that calls for hearsay. 15 THE COURT: Would you show it to counsel? 16 17 MR. DENNY: Page 5151, starting at line 25, to 5152, 18 line 7. 19 (Pause in the proceedings while Mr. Denny 20 exhibited the transcript to Mr. Manzella.) 21 MR. MANZELLA: The People would object to it on the 22 grounds it is not relevant, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: All right. I suppose I have to look at it, 24 then. Bring it up here, would you? ÷. 25 (Whereupon, the following proceedings were had 26 at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the 27 hearing of the jury:) 28 THE COURT: What is it, Mr. Denny?

1

. .

⁴5

7 8

9

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24 25

÷.

3

26

27 28 MR. DENNY: It's a question by Mr. Kanarek as to when she first discussed anything having to do with getting off the criminal charge.

THE COURT: And is it contradictory of what she's stated?

MR. DENNY: Yes, it is.

MR. MANZELLA: No, it is not. She has said she doesn't know, and she has already enswered the question.

MR. DENNY: All right.

"Did you discuss with him anything concerning getting off of your criminal charge?

"Yes, they told me about an agreement that would be made if I agreed to testify.

"They told you that initially, first thing, right?

"I believe that came up soon after they were there. I don't know if it was the first thing mentioned.

"Close to the first thing mentioned?" (Nods head.)"

MR. KAY: That's not inconsistent.

MR. MANZELLA: That's exactly what she has been testifying to here, over and over again, and has already testified to in this trial.

THE COURT: She says, "I don't know if it was the first thing mentioned," but she does say that "It came up soon."

MR. MANZELLA: The fact that she nods her head is not admissible, your Honor. That's not an admissible response.

2£-3

9:

17.

3 fls.

THE COURT: That was probably my fault in not ascertaining whether --

MR. MANZELLA: That's not an affirmative answer. The court reporter's observations are not --

THE COURT: Well, the Court will permit you to read down through line 5 of page 5152, beginning with line 24 on the previous page.

MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: But there has been a great deal of time spent concerning that conversation. And this is pretty old stuff.

I think that it's time that we --

MR. MANZELLA: Sustaining the objection, your Honor, would cut off the consumption of time on this repetitious and irrelevant material.

THE COURT: I realize that. And I do realize that it is repetitious. But it is cross-examination, and the Court will permit it.

MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor.

3

1

4

6 7

8.

9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 : 19

20

22

21

23

25

36

j.

26

28

27

During the recess you are obliged not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with the matter, nor form or express any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you.

(Morning recess.)

THE COURT: Case of People vs. Davis.

The record will show that all the jurors are present. The defendant is present. All counsel are present.

State your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Ella Jo Bailey.

Q BY MR. DENNY: All right, going back to your testimony of January 13th, in the morning, Thursday.

Do you recall the following questions and snavers:

"Q Well, let's see if we can refresh your recollection a little bit.

"All right, going to page 3137 of this transcript:

"Q And they didn't tell you they'd drop the charges until the 16th, is that right, or was it on the afternoon or late in the conversation on the 15th?

I don't remember what day it was.

"'Q It was at least after the initial conversation with them where you spilled the story to them; is that right?

"A Yes.

"'Q Was there a discussion about immunity at the same time?

1
2
3
4
5
.6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
: 25

27

28

"A Yes.

"Q Now, did they tell you that there's a court procedure, a proper court procedure, where you apply to the Superior Court to be granted immunity under statutory provisions for that?"

And there were some objections in there as reported here.

"All right.

"'Q Were you advised about getting immunity through a statutory procedure to do so?'

"The Court overrules that objection."
Still quoting here from 3250.

"THE WITNESS: I don't recollect their wording about, you know, any procedures that they would have to go through to grant me immunity. I don't recall.

"'Q Well, now, what do you recall about the conversation of immunity? Tell us the conversation, what you said and what anybody else said.

"A Okay.

"I asked them, you know, if I testified at the trial, you know, what would happen to me. And they told me if I testified completely and truthfully at Charles Manson's, at Bruce Davis' trial, and Susan Atkins' trial, and at Mary Brunner's trial that they would grant me immunity from any charge that was outstanding against me in the case or in connection with any of this.

1	"Q In connection with the Himmen case?
2	" A Yes, in
3	And going on reading:
4 .	"Do you remember that?
5	"A Yes.
6	"Q So was the conversation on May 16, 1970?
7	"A Yes. It was after the first conversation
8.	with them.
9	"Q All right. But it was, then, on the 16th
10	of May, then, is that right?
11	"A Yea."
12	Which day was it?
13	MR. MANZELLA: I'm sorry, your Honor, I object on the
14	grounds it is vague and ambiguous. I don't know what "it" is
15	MR. MENNY: Well, let me rephrase it.
16	THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
17	Q BY MR. DENNY: Which day was it that the officers
18	spoke to you about immunity, early first thing in the
19	conversation on the 15th or late on the 16th?
20	A I believe we discussed it on both days.
21	Q When did you discuss it on the 15th?
22	A I don't recollect it. It is a long time ago,
23	Q It is, isn't it?
24	A Yes.
25	
26	
27	
28	

34 file.

3a-1	1	Q Any events that happened in July of 1969, are
	2	even longer ago, aren't they?
	3	A Yes.
**	4	But you remember them very well, don't you?
9	5	A Yes, I do.
* e	, , å	And you remember that the officers promised you
·	7	immunity if you testified at Mary Brunner's trial, is that
	8	right?
	9	A Yes, I thought that was part of the agreement.
	10	Q You swore under oath that that's what they told
Deft E ID	11	you before this jury, isn't that right?
	12	MR. MANZELLA: The question has been asked and answered.
	13	THE COURT: Sustained.
•	14	MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I have a photostatic copy that's
	15	been presented to me by the prosecutors of a three-page
4°	16	document entitled "Agreement." May this be marked Defendant's
	17	next in order?
	18	THE COURT: It would be
	19	MR. DENNY: I think
	20	THE COURT: Defendant's what, E?
	21	Let me check here.
ą ś.	22	Defendant's E.
**	23	MR. DENNY: May I mark "E" up in the right-hand corner
) 3.0	24	of the blue back?
3,6	25	THE COURT: You may mark it E for identification.
*	26	MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor.
	27	And will counsel stipulate that this is a photo-
	28	static copy of the original which they possess at this time?

÷*

٠,

1

26

27

28

MR. MANZELLA: So stipulated.

MR. DENNY: May I approach the witness, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes, you may.

BY MR. DENNY: Now, Miss Bailey, since we talked about this back on Wednesday or Thursday, you've had a chance to go over this agreement, isn't that right?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection, your Honor. The agreement between the District Attorney's Office and Miss Bailey has been covered. The question has been asked and answered.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, let me show you the agreement.

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. I don't think it is necessary. your Honor. The agreement's been covered.

MR. DENNY: The agreement has not been covered, your Honor. MR. MANZELLA: Miss Bailey has testified to what her knowledge of what the agreement is between the District Attorney's Office and herself.

It has been stipulated that the agreement may THE COURT: be introduced?

MR. MANZELLA: No. your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, the objection is overruled.

BY MR. DENNY: Would you look at that agreement, please, if you haven't seen it since you testified about it and look at it carefully.

(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings while the witnessederused the document.)

THE COURT: May I see that?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

28

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Denny.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Is that your signature that appears on the third page?

A Yes.

Q Were you present when the other parties signed that document?

A Yes.

Q And they signed several copies of it in your presence, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And you signed several copies, is that correct?

A Yes.

And did you retain a copy?

A No.

Q And did your lawyer, to your knowledge?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection, not relevant. Calls for hearsay.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Now, ma'am, Paragraph No. 1 says you agree to testify truthfully --

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. Object to the reading of the document, your Honor. It is not relevant. The agreement has been covered.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. DENNY: Well, I'd ask that it be received into evidence at this time.

MR. MANZELLA: The People object. It is cumulative.

The agreement has been covered. It is her state of mind of

3a-4

Ω

Rec'd

3b fol

į,

the agreement that's important.

MR. DENNY: It is the agreement that's important, too.
It contradicts her testimony.

MR. MANZELLA: I object to that and ask that the jury be advised to disregard it.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Denny's remark is stricken, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DENNY: Well, I ask it be received in evidence.

THE COURT: And may I request of both counsel, tell both counsel, again, once more, that if you wish to argue, argue in the presence of the Court only. Not in front of the jury. You can argue your case at the end of the case, at the end of the evidence you can argue whether or not it contradicts her testimony, Mr. Denny, and your remark in that respect is stricken.

However, the Court will permit it to be received into evidence as People's -- as Defendant's E.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Now, Miss Bailey, having looked at that document, does that refresh your recollection that nothing was said about testifying in the case of People versus Mary Brunner?

MR. KAY: Well, your Honor, I'll object on the parol evidence rule. The document speaks for itself.

27

28

THE COURT: On that ground, the objection is overruled.

Q BY MR, DENNY: Does that refresh your recollection, ma am?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection, there's been no testimony that her recollection needs refreshing, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Did you just testify about five minutes ago that somehow your recollection had been refreshed? You thought that Mary Brunner had been mentioned but now you're sure she hadn't?

A I don't recollect testifying to that.

Q All right. Now, going back to that May 15th or May 16th --

By the way, on seeing that particular document, does that refresh your recollection at all as to the date on which it was signed?

It doesn't bear a date, ma'am, so that's not going to help you.

A No.

Q So you can't remember again whether it was on the 15th or 16th, is that right?

A This agreement wasn't signed on the 15th or 16th.

Q When was that agreement signed?

A The day I was released.

Q And that was June 2nd, is that correct?

A On or around that date, yeah.

Q You testified, too, that you don't recall how much

3b-2 ►	1	the bail was, is that right
	2	A That's right.
ŧ	. 3	Q on that charge, that forgery charge?
3	4	MR. MANZELLA: Objection, the question has been asked
5. 7	5	and answered.
	6	THE COURT: Sustained, it has
	7	Q BY MR. DENNY: By the way
	8	THE COURT: it's been asked and answered.
	9	Q BY MR. DENNY: would it refresh your recollec-
	10	tion if I told you a thousand dollars?
	11	A No, it wouldn't.
	12	Q And that on June 2nd you were then released on
	13	your personal recognizance; does that refresh your recollec-
, î	14	tion?
)	15	A No.
•	16	Q And you were arrested under the name of Susan
	17	Ann Jackson?
	18	A Yes.
	19	MR. MANZELLA: Objection, the question has been asked
	20	and answered.
	21	THE COURT: The answer is stricken. The question has
	22	been asked and answered.
***	23	Q BY MR. DENNY: Who is Charles Jackson?
. a*	24	MR. MANZELLA: Objection, it is not relevant.
建 公 5条	25	THE COURT: Well, sustained.
,) *	26	Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, Charles Willis Jackson, do
<u>`</u>	27	you recall?
	28	MR MANZETTA: Objection

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

26

27

28

THE COURT: Let me rule.

Do you withdraw the question?

MR. DENNY: I'm sorry, I'll rephrase it.

Do you recall Willis Charles Jackson was charged with you on that forgery, was he not?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. DENNY: Was there a deal made, an additional deal not written out there that when you agreed to testify they would not only agree to drop the charges against you, after you testified, but they would drop all of the charges then pending against your co-defendants?

I don't know if, uh, it was discussed with me. I don't recollect.

> Now, are you sure of that, ma am? Q

MR. MANZELLA: Objection, the question has been asked and answered.

> THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. DENNY: Well, you do know that the charges were dropped on June 2nd against all of your co-defendants, don't you know that?

MR. MANZELLA: The question has been asked and answered.

MR. DENNY: The question has not been asked and answered.

MR. MANZELIA: Yes, she has answered it last week.

THE COURT: You may answer it.

I was under the impression that some of THE WITNESS: those charges were dropped before I ever made or before I

.

Ê

I can't recollect the exact conversations. There was talk about stocks and bonds. Well, is your memory hazy on whether there was conversation about a factory in the East? MR. MANZELLA: Objection, it is argumentative. THE COURT: Sustained, . 19

3c-1 Well, does it --Q 1 THE COURT: I'll strike that, strike that ruling. You 2 may answer. 3 Is your memory hazy in respect to that point? THE WITNESS: At this time, yes. 5 BY MR. DENNY: Well, would it help to refresh your 6 recollection from the testimony of the Mary Brunner trial which 7 is as follows: 8 "Q " -- " Page 71, Line 18 --9 MR. MANZELLA: Excuse me, I believe you misspoke your-10 self, Mr. Denny. 11 The testimony of Mary Brunner at MR. DENNY: I did. 12 13 the Grand Jury hearing. "Has there been some --" 14 15 MR. MANZELLA: I would object to the reading of it. If 16 he wants to refresh the witness's recollection, he can show it 17 to her. 18 MR. DENNY: May I do so, your Honor? 19 THE COURT: You may. BY MR. DENNY: Would you read Page 71, starting at 20 Q 21Line 18, down through Line 25. 22 A (Reading.) عن 23 Have you read it, read that? Q 24 A Yes. • 25 All right. Ø 26 ŤΟ Had there been some mention of the 27 first conversation that you told us about in 28 Devil's Canyon about stocks and bonds?"

ma am?

, '-	, (,	M	R. MA	YZEJ	ĮĀ.	· (O)	ojection	, your	Honor,	that	's noi	proper	•
Ther	e'	8	been	no		the	witness	hasn't	testi	F ie d	about	whether	to
not	iŧ	5	refre	she	a he	er r	ecollect	ion.					

BY MR. DENNY: I'll -Well, does that refresh your recollection?
I'll withdraw the reading.

Does that refresh your recollection, having read it,

A I don't know if it does or not.

The state of the state of

Q Well, did you testify in September before the Grand
Jury as follows: --

MR. MANZELLA: Calls for hearsay, your Honor. She's testified here.

MR. DENNY: This is an inconsistent statement.

THE COURT: All right, you may read it.

BY MR, DENNY: "Had there been some mention at the first conversation that you told us about in Devil's Canyon about stocks and bonds and deeds?

"A Yes. There was a little bit of discussion on it and an estimate of how much money everyone felt Mr. Hinman might have. And it was brought up that his family owned a factory in the East and he probably had — that perhaps he had money invested in stocks."

Do you remember so testifying?

A Yes.

Q Was that the truth?

A Yes.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

28.

	,
1	Q At that time?
2	A Yes, I believe so.
3	Q Was it the truth on July, 1969?
4	A What do you mean?
. 5	Q I'll withdraw the question,
6	Well, you knew that his family owned a business
7	back East, didn't you?
8	A Yes.
9	Q You're the one that brought up that his family
10	owned a factory back East at that meeting?
11	A No, I don't recollect that I made mention of the
12	factory.
13	Q Well, who made mention of it?
14	A I don't know.
15	Q Well, did Charlie first mention stocks?
16	A I recollect, uh, that stocks and bonds were
17	mentioned. But, uh, who said it, I don't recall.
18	Q Well, did you make the following statement to
19	Sergeant Whiteley, Mr. Guenther, Mr. Katz, on May 15, 1970:
20	"Don't know, maybe me. How about Gary
21	Hinman? Charlie: Yeah, he's single, owns that
22	house. Has stocks and bonds. Maybe we can
23	talk him out of it."
24	Did you make that statement to him?
25 26	A Those are Grogan's statements. Those aren't
20 27	completed sentences. I don't recollect, Mr. Denny.
28	Q Well, in sum and substance did you tell them
4 0	that as soon as you mentioned Gary Hinman, Charlie said, yeah

Who was it that suggested that Gary пQ might be talked into joining the Family vol-untarily and turning over his assets?") THE WITNESS: I don't recall who said it.

3d -1	1	Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, you said it, didn't you?
	2	A I don't remember.
	3	Q Directing your attention to your testimony on
*	4	August 12th, 1971, page 5143, question by Mr. Kanarek,
***	5	starting at line 18.
	6	"Well, was there a discussion as to how
3	7	the money would be obtained, Miss Bailey?
	8	"A No.
	9	"Q All right. Now, you
	10	"A I take that back. Yes, there was. It
	11	was suggested that perhaps Gary would come with our
	12	Family.
•	13	"Q And you suggested that Gary might come
	14	with the Family?
*	15	"A Yes,
**	16	"Q And you suggested that he might come with
	17	the Family and then how would this bring money to
	18	the Family?
	19	"A Anyone that came with the Family gave
	20	everything that they had to the Family.
	21	"Q And, so, it was your thought that he
•	22	would then sell his house and give it to the Family,
	23	is that the idea?
	24	A Yes.
.	25	Do you remember so testifying?
3	26	A Yes.
	27	Q So it was you who suggested that he might come
	28	with the Family?

I don't know. There was further discussion after I mentioned the name but I don't -- but I can't recall at this time. There was quite a bit of talk after the name was mentioned. And I can't recollect all that was said. Well, wasn't it Charlie who suggested he come MR. MANZELLA: The question has been asked and answered. BY MR. DENNY: Well, let me direct your attention to your testimony at the Grand Jury hearing in September in Was there any discussion of the manner of obtaining money from Gary Himman? Was that discussed in these two conversations that you mentioned?" The two conversations. I don't want to have to go all the way back to pages -- but talking about the conversation, now, in Devil's Canyon -- well, we'll get to "Was that discussed in these two conversa-Yes. First of all, it was suggested that perhaps he just be approached and he might willingly give his money to the Family and perhaps MR.MANZELLA: Objection, your Honor, this calls for

hearsay. The witness stated she doesn't recall.

1-3 i

3

4

5

6 7

8

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

3

*

24

25

26

27

28

MR. DENNY: - I think she testified that she was the one who suggested it.

THE COURT; All right, the Court overrules the objection.

Q BY MR. DENNY: All right.

"He might willingly give his money to the Family and perhaps come with us.

"Q Who was it, if you know, who made that particular suggestion?

"A Well, I know Charles Manson mentioned it.

"Q Was that at the first conversation?

"A Yes.

"Q And was that in Devil's Canyon, is that right?

"A Yes."

Do you recall so testifying?

A Yes.

Q Well, did you suggest it first or did Charlie suggest it first?

A That he might come willingly? What are you asking? I'm not sure.

Q Yes, that he might come with the Family and give his money and worldly possessions over to the Family. Who suggested that first in that conversation?

A Well, if I recollect, it was a discussion between several people. And it was probably mentioned right around the same time by both of us.

Q I see. Well, it is true, in any event, that as

<u>.</u> .		1
		.2
		3
***************************************		. 4
Market Ma		* 5 6
1 to 1	ť	
		7
		ĝ
		9
		10
		11
		12
		13
~ .'		14
•		15
*		16
		17
		18
3e fls.		19
		20
		21
		22
₄ .5		23
å k 4°		24
***		25
3		26
		27
		28

far bi	tek	8.8	1968,	Ci	urlie	e hac	i sent	yòu.	and	Mary	to	Gary	3
house	to	get	him	to	join	the	Family	, is	m ^f t	that	rie	tht?	

A. Yes.

dates in July and August. I believe it was July-August of '69, one, the day when you left the ranch; when was that?

A The 28th.

Q Of July?

A Yes.

Q And you said the other was the date when you were arrested in Ohio; when was that?

A I didn't give the exact date. I said I remembered it was in August now. At the time I probably remembered the date.

Q I know you didn't give the date. I'm asking you what was the date. You said you remembered it.

A I said I remembered at the time I was arrested.

I was sure that I was aware of the date that I was arrested on. Not that I can say the date now.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

26

27

28

Q All right, going to Page 3255 of your testimony on Thursday, January 13, morning session. Starting at Line 3. "Q That's the only particular date that

you were particularly aware of in that two-month period of July and August, 1969, is that right?"

And that was referring to the date you left again, the date of July 28.

No. I wouldn't say that's really true. "A It is two and a half years later now. I don't recall the dates I remembered at the time, but I definitely was aware of the date I was arrested in Ohio at the time. I was aware of that date. "

- At the time.
- But you're not now?
- No, I don't recall the date I was arrested on right now.

Now, you've testified, I think, previously, that except for the girls that were taking care of the babies and watching George Spahn, Charlie emphasized that everyone else be present at the campfire at D_vil's Canyon for meals.

- ΑĖ That's true.
- Q For meals, for dinner.
- For meals?
- Q For dinner.
- There wasn't much dinner in Devil's Canyon, no. I don't think that's correct.
 - Well, did you -- well, just a moment. Q Oh, at the campfire.

4-1

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22 23

24

25 26

, <u>ě</u>

27

28

Q And which were the babies that were there at that time?

MR.MANZELLA: I don't see the relevance of that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. DENNY: Well, may we approach the bench for one moment on that, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

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

MR. DENNY: I'm almost through.

THE COURT: Oh, I am not chiding you about that.

MR. DENNY: All right. Fine. The relevance of this is that Mary Brunner had a baby at that time, and the question is whether she would be staying with the baby and not be at the campfire site, as testified to by this witness.

THE COURT: Oh, you can ask her that, because you've already gotten into the question of where Mary Brunner was. And she's stated that she -- at one time, that she was incorrect in placing Mary Brunner where she had placed her in the course of her testimony.

But you can ask her, directly asking her about what babies were involved.

All right.

Now, the Court doesn't -- the Court doesn't mean to in any way cause you to limit your cross-examination, but --

1	MR. DENNY: Well, I should be able to get through,
2	if we can get rolling, hopefully, by just about 12:00 o'clock,
3	your Honor.
4	THE COURT: All right. Fine.
5	MR. DENNY: I'm going to try.
6	(Whereupon the following proceedings were had
7	in open court, within the presence and hearing of the
8	jury;)
9	Q BY MR. DENNY: Miss Bailey, Mary Brunner had a
10	haby at that time, didn't she?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And she sometimes cared for that baby, didn't
13	she?
. 14	A Yes, she sometimes did.
15:	Q And do you remember whether she cared for that
16	beby on July 21st?
17	A No, I don't remember.
18	Q Or July 22nd?
19	A No.
20	Q July 23rd?
21	A I don't remember.
21 22	
!	A I don't remember.
22	A I don't remember. Q 24th?
22 23	A I don't remember. Q 24th? A (No audible response.)
22 23 24	A I don't remember. Q 24th? A (No audible response.) Q 25th?
22 23 24 25	A I don't remember. Q 24th? A (No audible response.) Q 25th? A I don't remember.
22 23 24 25 •26	A I don't remember. Q 24th? A (No audible response.) Q 25th? A I don't remember. Q 26th?

1	either, do you?
2	A Not every minute of the day, no.
3	Q Around the evening time?
4	MR.MANZELIA: The question has been asked and enswered,
5	your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer that.
7	THE WITNESS: No, I don't remember.
8	Q And, again, what was the date of that campfire
9	discussion, when Gary Hinman's name was first brought up?
10	A Oh, it was the 25th.
11	Q And you were sure she was there on that day?
12	A Yes. I remember working with Mary over in the
13	woods.
14	Q You are sure she was at that campfire
15	A Yes.
16	Q discussion, when Hirman's name was brought up?
17	A Yes.
18	Q You are positive.
19	Now, you mentioned on direct that you had seen
20.	Shorty Shea around the ranch.
21	Do you remember when?
22	A No, I really don't.
23.	Q Well, did you see him in June; do you recall?
24	A I don't recall.
25	Q Well, do you recall the last time you saw him
26	around the ranch?
27	A No. The times that I remember were shortly
28	after we were first on the ranch. He used to come up and

1	talk to George Spahn.
2	Q He wasn't working there then?
3	A No.
4	Q Did you ever see him working on the ranch?
5	A No.
6	Q He'd just come and visit; is that right?
7	A Yesh.
8	Q You'd see him there on occasion?
9	A Yeah.
10	Q All right. By the way, Charlie tended to bully,
11	to threaten people, didn't he, a lot?
12	MR.MANZELLA: Objection. Calls for a conclusion.
13	Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, you know
14	THE COURT: Sustained.
15	MR. DENNY: I will withdraw that.
16	Q You know what it is to threaten somebody to
17	hurt them?
18	A Yes.
19	Q And Charlie used to do this; isn't that right?
20	A Yes.
21	Q And he did it to you; is that right?
22	A Yes.
23	And he also bragged a lot about the things that
. 24	he had done, hurting people; is that correct?
. 25	A He used to talk about it, yes.
26	
27	
28	

4a fls.

4a - 11 2 MR. MANZELLA: 3 4 5 THE COURT: б 7 You may answer. 8. 9 10 Q 11 Ă 12 Q. 13 A No. 14 Q 15 16 THE COURT: Sustained. 17 MR. MANZELLA: 18 Q 19 20 21 22 subject is irrelevant. 23 THE COURT: Sustained. 24 3. 25 26

He used to brag he'd killed a Black Panther -- a guy in a narcotic transaction; is that right?

That's objected to -- excuse me. That -objection; that calls for hearsay.

MR. DENNY: This goes to her state of mind, your Honor.

The objection is overruled.

THE WITNESS: He didn't say "Black Panther" and he didn't say "over any narcotic" things.

BY MR. DENNY: All right.

And he didn't say "kill."

He didn't say "killed"?

You're sure of that?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. It's not relevant.

I ask that the answer be stricken.

BY MR. DENNY: Well, did you tell Sergeant Whiteley, in sum and substance and effect --

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I object on the grounds that it's not relevant what she told Sergeant Whiteley. The whole

BY MR. DENNY: Well, you've mentioned that you spent some time sleeping up on the roofs of the Spahn Ranch buildings; is that correct?

Yes.

27

28

During part of that summer?

4a-2	1	A Yes.
	2	Q And that was because you were fearful of some
	3	Black Panthers coming into the camp; isn't that right?
3.	4	A I don't know about Black Panthers.
*	5	Q But it was fearful you were afraid of some
T.	6	Black Panthers coming; is that right?
*	7	A I don't recall, you know, the word "Panthers"
	8	being used.
	9	There was fear of black people coming to revenge,
	1Ò	yes.
	11	Q For this person that Charlie had stated that he ha
	12	killed; is that right?
	13	A Said that he had shot.
. \$	14	Q Said that he had killed; isn't that right?
*	15	A Said that he had shot.
Ġ	16	Q All right. Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley, on
	17	May 15th, 1970, in the presence of the other people we've
	18	already mentioned, "Charlie said, after killing Negro,
	19	'Everyone of you are going to have to kill; not me. ""
	20	A No, no. I didn't say that.
	21	Q You are misquoted again by Sergeant Whiteley; is
	22	that right?
•	23	MR. MANZELLA: Objection. It assumes that Sergeant
. € 	24	Whiteley was quoting her.
**************************************	25	THE COURT: Sustained.
¥'	26	Q BY MR. DENNY: You didn't tell him anything, in
	27	substance and effect, like that?
	28	A I hold him that Charlie came back, saving that

he had shot a black person; that he had -- that four bullets had gone off, and only one had struck the person.

But I didn't say that he said he killed him, because he didn't say that. He said that he shot someone.

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. It calls for conclusion and speculation.

THE COURT: Let him finish the question.

MR. DENNY: Mr. Manzella's correct, your Honor.

Indeed, you found out that Charlie hadn't killed the man, didn't you?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. It's irrelevant.
THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, now, at these Family conferences, whether they were dinners or campfire meetings or whatever, you've indicated Charlie did most of the talking; is that right?

A Yes.

Q And the girls didn't question him, and the men seldom did; isn't that right?

A Generally speaking, that's correct.

Q All right. In other words, he wasn't often challenged by anyone on what he was talking about; is that right?

A Yeah. Well, when you say "not often," that's correct.

Q All right. And the others were just sort of -- would just sort of indicate their agreement in some way, or

4a-4	1	8
	2	
	3	
ě <u>.</u>	4	
8	Ë	
*	6	
. •	7	ъ
	8	t
•	9 .	
	. 10	
*	11	,
	12	·
	13	1
3	14	
	Ì5	a
	16	t
	17	0
	18	£
	19	
•	20	
	2 1	
•	22	t
يغنج	23	
± *	24 -	
\$	25	
je Pr	26	
*	27	, ,

shut up and say nothing; is that right?

A Um-hum.

Q Your answer --

THE COURT: That means "yes," is that right? "Yes"?
THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. DENNY: All right. Your Honor, I am not going to be able to make it, unfortunately, by 12:00 o'clock, as I thought I would.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DENNY: Would this be a good time to stop?

THE COURT: All right. We can stop now.

:45? We'll take our recess until then.

During the recess, you are obliged not to converse amongst yourselves nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with the matter, or to form or express any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you.

We will see you at 1:45.

And you are excused until 1:45, Miss Bailey.

(Whereupon, at 11:59 A. M., an adjournment was taken in this matter until 1:45 P. M. of the same day.)

28

Ţ LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1972, 2:02 P. M. 2 3 THE COURT: In the case of People versus Davis. 4 Mr. Davis is present. All counsel are present and the jurors, 5 the jurors and alternates are likewise present, the record may 6 show. 7 Miss Bailey on the witness stand. R Go ahead, Mr. Denny. 9 10 ELLA JO BAILEY. 11 called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, having 12 been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further 13 as follows: 14 CROSS EXAMINATION (Continued) 15 BY MR. DENNY: 16 Miss Bailey, I believe you mentioned to us some 17 time back that you had been told that if you committed perjury 18 and Bruce Davis or Charles Manson or Susan Atkins was 19 convicted and went to the gas chamber because of your perjurious 20 testimony, you could be executed, too, you did tell us that, 21 right? 22 A Yes. .23 And that was suggested to you at this May 15-16 24 meeting up in Tacoma? Not at that time. Ä 26 When was that suggested to you? Q 27 I don't recall the exact date. It was quite A

\$

28

recently.

	1	I or just when I knew they were coming, was the first time
	2	gave it any thought, you know, after all that time. So, yes,
	3	I've remembered a lot since then.
4	4	Q And the officers had helped you to remember,
÷	5	haven't they?
	6	MR. MANZELLA: Objection, it is argumentative and it is
,	7	vague and ambiguous as to what the word "help" means.
	8	MR. DENNY: Withdraw the question.
	9	Q The Sheriff's deputies have assisted you in
	10	remembering things, haven't they?
	11	MR. MANZELLA: Same objection, your Honor.
	12	MR. DENNY: I'll stand by that.
6 f ol	13	THE COURT: Sustained,
¥	14	
); 2	15	ı
Ž	16	
	17	•
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
ž.	22	
P.	23	**
	24.	
** 4 ;	, 25	
	26	
	27	
	28	

1,

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25

27

26

28

as follows:

"Q Because you know, if you remember what they want you to, that will help you get off your charge ... up in Weshington, and this one down here; isn't that right?")

MR, MANZELIA: Objection. That's argumentative.

MR. DENNY: Goes to her state of mind.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: I don't know of any charge down here.

- Q BY MR. DENNY: Like conspiracy to commit robbery and murder of Gary Hinman?
 - A I wasn't charged with that.
- Q You made good and sure that you wouldn't be by getting that document signed, giving you immunity from that charge; isn't that true?

MR. MANZELIA: Objection. The question has been asked and answered.

MR. DENNY: I believe it was --

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Now, when you saw Mary and Sadie in what you call creepy-crawly clothes, as you've testified to this jury, you knew that they were dressed to go out and rob or steal something; isn't that true?

A Well, I wouldn't assume so just because of the clothes they had on, no.

Q Let me read your testimony before the Grand Jury in the Brunner case. Page 63, starting at line 15.

"Q How were these parties dressed?

*

	1
	2
	3
.	4
2 2 2 5	5
3.	6
6a Æ1s.	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
**************************************	12
	13
	14
	15
A.	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
*	23
*	24
*	25
.# **	26
` 	27
	28

friend Gary Hinman's name, hadn't you?

A Yes.

And that was the same Gary Hinman who thought so much of you that he had asked you to marry him; is that right?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE COURT: Sustained.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

28

BY MR. DENNY: And in your presence, Miss Bailey, · Q Charlie had said, "If he doesn't give you his property voluntarily, kill him. *

Isn't that right?

I don't recall Charlie saying that in my presence, no.

Q And you were happy enough to let Sadie Glutz take your place because you were just a little bit squeamish about bloodying up your own hands with Gary's blood; isn't that right?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. It's argumentative. THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. DENNY: Well, it was all right to let some-Q one else do your dirty work, that you felt would occur; isn't that right?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection --

THE WITNESS: I thought Gary would come with the Family.

- Q BY MR. DENNY: Freely and voluntarily?
- Ä Yes.
- You had gone up there several times before with Mary --
 - Not several times, no. A
- Well, when you told Sergeant Whiteley that, he was Q. in error, then?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection --

THE WITNESS: I said I had been there before.

Q BY MR. DENNY: And that Charlie had sent you and Mary up several times during 1969 to get him to join the Family;

· ign't that right? ປa-2 1 2 1968. I had been there a few times. 3 To get him to join the Family? Yes. 5 And he wouldn't do it? . 6 Not at the time. A 7 And you didn't have any reason to suspect that he 8 would, on July 25th or 26th, 1969, did you? 9 A I felt that he might. 10 At the point of a gun? Or a knife? Q 11 MR. MANZELLA: Objection. Argumentative. 12 THE COURT: Sustained. 13 MR. DENNY: It goes to her state of mind. 14 THE COURT: The objection is sustained. 15 BY MR. DENNY: Well, you did nothing to stop this Q 16 particular caper, did you? 17 I couldn't have stopped Charlie Manson, 18 You knew about it for several days, didn't you? Q 19 Not several days. A 20: Q Well, you've testified that several days elapsed 21 between the time that this was mentioned at the campground 22 site and the time that they left; isn't that right? å 23 The matter of talking over money and -- and that; Α 24 but not of killing him, no. * 25 And from the time you fingered him, if you will, 26 until the departure of Johnny Swartz's Ford car, you made no 27 effort to warn your old friend, Gary Hinman, --28 MR. MANZELLA: Objection as argumentative.

1,	Q BY MR. DENNY: about what was in store for him.
2	did you?
3	MR. MANZELLA: Objection. Argumentative.
4	THE COURT: Sustained.
5	Q BY MR. DENNY; Well, let me rephrase it.
. 6	You didn't do a blessed thing to warn Gary
67	Hinman,
8	MR. MANZELLA: Objection,
9	Q BY MR. DENNY: did you?
10	MR. MANZELLA: argumentative.
11	Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, let me leave out "blessed."
12	You didn't do a thing at any time from the time
13	you first put the finger on him as a person to get money
14	from, until the time that Ford left, did you?
15	A Charlie told me he'd kill me if I left the ranch.
16	No, I didn't do anything.
17	Q Charles told you that he'd kill you?
18	A If I left the ranch.
19	Q He told you that lots of times. He told all the
20	girls that; isn't that right?
21	And that's a compound question. Let me ask it just
22	one at a time,
23	He told you that personally lots of times, didn't
24	he?
25	A Not lots of times, no.
26	Q Many times?
27	A No.
28	Q More than once?
	į

	- [
	1	A More than once, yes.
ŀ	2	Q All right. And you left the ranch, didn't you?
	3	A Yes.
* }_	4	Q You left the ranch to go get gas with Bill Vance?
a.	5	A That was an errand that Charlie sent us on.
	6	Q You left the ranch to go get things down at the
4	7.	radio shop; right?
	8	A Yes, at Charlie's request.
	9	Q . And you had left the ranch before that? You and
	10	Bill Vance?
	'n	A At Charlie's request, yes.
	12	Q At Charlie's request. And you could have taken off
	13	any time, couldn't you?
**	14	A No, I wouldn't say that.
;	15	you did, didn't you, on July 28th? You took off?
fol	16	A Yes.
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	,
	21	
	22	
हैं	23	
i.	24	
	25	
ř	26	
	27	
	28	

6b

24

25

26

27

28

Ë

Q	, N	ow,	Miss	Beil	leу,	you	kept	yoursel	f right	up	ţo
date on	what '	wes	going	On	at	the	Himman	home,	through	the	<u> </u>
whole h	ekend,	địc	in i t	: you	.?						

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. That's vague and ambiguous. THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. DENNY: You kept yourself up to date, as best you could, be it information from the others -- phone calls, et cetera -- as to what was going on at Gary Himman's house: isn't that true?

A I heard several conversations over the weekend, yes.

Q All right. And you were right there, up and waiting with Bill Vance, when that bus came back, weren't you, --

MR. MANZELIA: Objection. Assumes --

Q BY MR. DENNY: -- from Gary Hinman's home?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection. Assumes she was waiting.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. DENNY: This is cross-examination.

THE COURT: , You may enswer that.

THE WITNESS: I wasn't waiting for that. I just happened to be awake at the time that the bus drove up.

Q BY MR. DENNY: With the killers inside; right?

A Susan Atkins and Mary Brunner were in the bus.

Q Well, that's right. You didn't see Bobby come in. You don't know how he arrived, do you, personally?

A No, I don't.

Q All right. You don't know whether he came in

1	that Fiat or not, do you,
2	A No, I don't.
3	Q personally? All right.
4	And you eagerly listened as Mary and Sadie
5	described the details of the robbery and murder of Gary
6	Hinman, didn't you?
7	MR. MANZELLA: Objection. The word "eagerly" makes it
8	argumentative.
9	THE COURT: Sustained.
10	MR. DENNY: I'll withdraw that "eagerly."
11	Q You listened closely
12	A Yes, I listened.
13	Q to all the details, as they described them to
14	you?
15	MR.MANZELIA: Objection. The word "closely" is
16	argumentative.
17	MR. DENNY: I will withdraw the word "closely".
18	THE WITNESS; I listened to what Mary and Sadie said,
19	yes.
20	Q BY MR. DENNY: All right. And you even discussed
21	with them your idea to drive Gary's microbus up to Santa
22	Barbara, to get rid of it?
23	A That wasn't my idea, to drive the bus to
24	Santa Barbara.
25	
26	
27	4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
28	

7 fls.

afraid of the police.

28

25

26

28

Q And you used phony names from then until you were finally caught and apprehended up in Tacoma, Washington, and identified as a Manson Family member; is that right?

A No.

MR. MANZELLA: Objection, asked and answered. I'11 withdraw the objection.

Q BY MR. DENNY: And now you're going to go scotfree in exchange for your honest and truthful testimony in this case, is that right?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection, assumes a fact not in evidence; that is, that she could be charged with the murder or the conspiracy to murder Gary Hinman.

THE COURT: It is argumentative, sustained.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I have no further questions of this witness.

THE COURT: Redirect.

MR. MANZELIA: Thank you, your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MANZELLA:

Q Miss Bailey, in the last few questions that Mr. Denny asked you this afternoon, you said that you could not have stopped Charlie. You could not have stopped Charlie. What did you mean by that?

A There was nothing I could do to, uh, stop Charlie from doing what he was going to do.

Q You had been with Charles Manson and other members of the Family since September of 1967, is that correct?

A	Yes.

Q. During the time that you were with Charles Manson and the other members of the Family, had anyone ever stopped Charlie from doing anything he wanted to do?

MR. DENNY: I'll object to that as calling for speculation and conclusion.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. MANZELLA: In your opinion had anybody Q. ever stopped Charlie from doing anything he wanted to do?

MR. DENNY: I'll object to that as vague and ambiguous, and also calling for speculation and conclusion.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. MANZELLA: Now, Miss Bailey, when the Family went to Devil's Canyon, did Charles Manson, in your presence, say anything to other members of the Family with regard to staying at Devil's Canyon?

This is in the latter part of July, 1969?

A Well, he -- he wanted everyone to be there because they had been spotted by the fire patrol.

MR. DENNY: I'll object to "because" -- everything after "because," as not responsive.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MR. MANZELLA: He wanted everybody to be there?

> A Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

26

27

28

ŕ

	Q	And	in	your	presend	ce	điđ	he	tell	other	members	Of
the	Family	that	he	wanțe	ed them	at	Dev	zil ⁱ	s Cal	nyon?		

- A Yes, and not to leave either.
- Did anybody disobey Charles Manson? Q

Α Well, the first few days that we were there, the fellows pretty much --

MR. DENNY: I'll object to that as not responsive to the It is a yes or no answer. Move that be stricken.

THE COURT: Sustained. It is stricken.

Do you wish to have it reread?

Ø BY MR. MANZELLA: After Charles -- I'll rephrase it. After Charles Manson told every -- the members of the Family that he wanted them at Devil's Canyon, did anybody disobey him?

No.

During the time that you were living with the Q Family on Spahn Ranch, did the Family, the entire Family, including Charles Manson, get together almost every day in a group?

Well, not really every day, but it was common.

I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. Q٠

Not every day, but it was very common to meet in a A group.

Q. Can you tell us about how often?

Well, there was a time when they were working on the dune buggies that, uh, not everyone did meet all the time because they were doing other things, but it was pretty much every day.

1 7a-2 Q And on those occasions when the Family got 2 together as a group, did anyone speak to the Family as a group? 3 A Charles Manson. 4 And when Mr. Manson spoke to the Family as a group, Q 5 did any one interrupt him when he was speaking? 6 A People usually listened. 7 Q When the members of the Family began sleeping on 8 the roofs of the buildings at Spahn Ranch, did you ever hear 9 anyone in your presence tell the members of the Family to sleep 10 on the roofs? 11 Α Yes. 12 Q Who told the members of the Family to do that? 13 Charles Manson. Α 14 And when the members of the Family were sleeping on Q 15 the roofs of the buildings at Spahn Ranch, did they have any 16 weapons with them? 17 Yes, there was a guard kept every night. 18 And where was the guard kept? 19 There were several fellows, usually at least two or 20 three on the roofs with guns. 21 And is that on the roofs of --22 Of the boardwalk buildings. 23. Those are the buildings in the photographs you've 24 already identified for us? ÷ Yes. 26 That's the Longhorn Saloon, the Rock City Cafe, 27 the office and the bunkhouse and the other buildings? 28 A Yes.

7a-5 . What was being done in that regard? Uh, bullets were being made. Who was participating in that? Danny De Carlo and Ruth Morehouse and Sherry 7b.fol Cooper and I was also there,

7b-1	1	Q When did this activity begin at Spahn Ranch?
A CAN CAN CAN CAN CAN CAN CAN CAN CAN CA	2	A Well, it would have either been June or July.
	3	Q 1969?
	4	A Yes.
	5	Q Now, Mr. Denny asked you a question about whether
	6	or not Charles Manson trusted you,
	7	Did Charles Manson ever say anything to you about
	8	his attitude towards you?
	9	A Yes, he felt that it, uh
	10	MR. DENNY: Just a moment, I'll object to that. It is
	11	just a yes or no question. That's been enswered already.
	12	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: What did he say in that regard?
	13	A He felt that I, uh he thought that I would
& P	14	leave.
); ;	15	Q He thought you would leave the Family?
*	16 '	A Yes. He told me that about a year shead.
	17	Q What did he say about that?
	18	A He told me that I'd leave the Family three times.
	19	MR. DENNY: Just a moment, I'll object to hearsay and
	20	move the answer be stricken.
	21	MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I believe it is necessary to
6 .	22	go into this because that question was raised on cross-examina-
, \$	23	tion.
<u>.</u>	24	MR. DENNY: I'll withdraw my objection, your Honor, for
Ğ.	25	the purpose of her state of mind, if that's
Ê	26	THE COURT: Are you withdrawing
	27	MR. DENNY: Yes, I am.
	28	THE COURT: I was about to strike the answer.

1	MR. DENNY: May I have the question and answer reread,
2	your Honor?
3	The prior two or three questions and answers.
4	(Whereupon, the record was read by the reporter
5	as follows:
6	"Q What did he say in that regard?
7	"A He felt that I, uh, he thought that
8	I would leave.
9	"Q He thought you would leave the Family?
10	"A Yes. He told me that about a year ahead.
11	"Q What did he say about that?
12	"A He told me that I'd leave the Family
13	three times.")
14	THE COURT: The objection is withdrawn?
15	MR. DENNY: Yes, it is, your Honor.
16	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Well, what was the amount
17	involved in the credit card forgery in Tacoma, Washington?
18	A \$155.
19	Q Now, when the police officers came up to see you,
20	Sergeant Whiteley, and the other officers came up to see you
21	in Tacoma, Washington, in May, 1970, did they talk to you about
22	Bill Vance?
23	A Yes.
24	Q And did they tell you that they were trying to
25	locate Bill Vance through you?
26 .	A Yes. Yes.
27	Q And that they were trying to do that through you?
28	A Yes.

interviewed by Sergeant Whiteley and the other officers in Tacoma, did you make an attempt to keep fresh in your mind the events of that July, 1969?

A No, I did my best to forget everything that happened.

Q Why was that?

A I didn't ever went to associate with any of the people in the Family again.

Q Why was that?

A It wasn't how I wanted to lead my life after that point.

Q Now, Miss Bailey, did you at any time tell anyone to kill Gary Himman?

A No.

1

2

3

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

		3571
	Ω	Did you agree with anyone that Gary Hinman should
be ki	lled?	
	A	No.
	·Q	Did you advise anyone to kill Gary Hinman?
4	A .	No.
. • • 1	Q	Did you encourage anyone to kill Gary Hinman?
<i>*</i>	A	No.
	Q i	Did you plan with anyone to kill or how to kill
Gary	Hinman	
	A.	No.
	$\dot{\mathbf{Q}}^{f}$	Now, you testified on cross examination that in
June	o# 196	9, you began to live separately on the ranch with
Bill	Vance.	
	À	Yes.
	Q	And why did you begin to live separately on the
		•

aly on the ranch?

Because there was too much violence and talk about violence on the ranch. All -- all the guys except Bill Vance, pretty much, were carrying knives and there were a lot of guns around.

And I didn't choose to be with these people.

Well, prior to the time that Sergeant Whiteley Q and the other officers spoke to you in Tacoma, Washington, in May of 1970, did Sergeant Whiteley or anyone else tell you the -- what I might refer to as "the facts" of this case, the Hinman killing?

I'll object to that as calling for hearsay. MR. DENNY: THE COURT: Sustained,

2	
3	

4 5

6 7

9

8

11

10

13

-**12** ,

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28 Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Did anyone tell you -- Sergeant Whiteley or anyone else -- tell you what the officers believed they knew as a result of their investigation? Did anyone tell you the facts of this case?

A I really don't recollect.

Q Now, on that weekend -- Friday, Saturday and Sunday, July 25th, 26th and 27th -- was there any one thing which was a topic of conversation on the ranch?

MR. DENNY: I will object --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. DENNY: -- to that as calling for hearsay.

THE COURT: Overruled. The answer may remain.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, by -- all right. If it's a yes or no.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And did that conversation concern Gary Hinman?

A Yes.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor -- just a moment, please.

Again, I am going to ask that that answer be stricken. Of whom are we speaking? Co-conspirators? Anybody?

MR. MANZELLA: I believe Mr. Denny's right.

THE COURT: The objection will be sustained.

MR. MANZELLA: I'll reframe that.

MR. DENNY: May the answer be stricken?

THE COURT: Yes, the Court will strike the last answer, "Yes."

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: I'm sorry, Miss Bailey. I am

I

÷

referring to members of the Manson Family on the Spahn Ranch on the -- on that weekend.

MR. DENNY: And I'll object to that as also calling for hearsay.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I would like to approach the bench and argue it. It does deal with a few questions I intend to ask.

THE COURT: All right. You may.

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

THE COURT: Why are you offering this? For her state of mind?

MR. MANZELLA: I believe it is for her state of mind; but here's specifically why I am offering it:

Mr. Denny has brought out in the statements that Miss Bailey made to Sergeant Whiteley in May and September of 1970 certain things which were in his notes.

Now, many of the things which were in the notes of Sergeant Whiteley — things which Ella Bailey told him that she knew about what had happened at the Himman house, and things that she knew had happened on Spahn Ranch with regard to the killing of Gary Himman — now, these — a lot of these things were not things that she saw or heard.

THE COURT: Were what?

MR. MANZELLA: Some of these things were not things that she saw or heard. For example -- I'm trying to think of an example offhand -- oh, that Gary -- in Sergeant Whiteley's

8-4

, 22

 notes, for example, it says that Bobby was hit over the head with the gun.

MR. KAY: That Gary was hit?

MR. MANZELLA: That Gary was hit over the head with the gun.

Now, we know that Ella Bailey was not there and did not see that. But that's contained in her notes -- in Sergeant Whiteley's notes.

My point is this: That although -- what I am trying to show is that the Hinman -- the events surrounding the killing of Gary Hinman were a topic of conversation on the ranch that weekend; and that many of the things which Miss Bailey said to the officers were the result of her information which she had received from many other members of the Manson Family.

8a - 1

Š.

MR. DENNY: Which is clearly hearsay.

THE COURT: And of things which she claimed --

MR.MANZELIA: Well, I am not going into any of the specific things; but they were not things that she claimed to have seen or heard; and that -- for example, it says in the notes that Bruce and Bobby -- Bruce and Charlie left the ranch, and she -- and she admits that she never saw Bruce and Charlie leave the ranch.

But she was told that Bruce and Charlie -- and Charlie got a phone call, and that Squeaky, I believe it was, answered the phone, and it was Bobby, and that Bobby was having trouble, and that he said Gary wasn't cooperating.

You know, this was stuff that was a topic of conversation. What I am trying to show is her state of mind at the time the officers interviewed her, which was that they were not calling for testimony from her; that she was relating to them everything she knew about the case and not merely things which she saw or heard, but everything she knew about the case.

Now, what I intended to bring out was that the Manson -- among the members of the Manson Family that weekend, at Spalm Ranch, the events at Gary Hinman's home and the events concerning Gary Hinman were a topic of conversation -- were being spoken about -- during that weekend.

MR. DENNY: Well --

MR. MANZELLA: And that at the time that she was interviewed by Sergeant Whiteley, that she recalled --

1

4

3

5

7 8

9

11

13

12

14 15

17

16

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

THE COURT: How do you think that such conversation is admissible?

MR. MANZELLA: I'm not asking for the conversation. I'm asking her --

MR. DENNY: For the topic of conversation.

MR. MANZELLA: -- for the topic of conversation.

MR. DENNY: Which is just the same thing.

MR. MANZELLA: No, it isn't, because it doesn't say anything. It doesn't say that anybody did anything. It's not hearsay.

It's just -- all I am asking her --

MR. DENNY: It is not even an admission, so it's just something that's said --

MR.MANZELLA: It's to her state of mind. That's why I say it's not even hearsay, really, because we are not saying that anybody did anything.

We are just saying, "You know, what was the name that was mentioned?

"Gary Hinman."

That's not being offered for the truth of what was said, because it doesn't say anything.

MR. DENNY: Then it's irrelevant.

THE COURT: Well, her credibility --

MR. MANZELLA: And it's relevant on her credibility, her state of mind, because at the time she was interviewed by the officers, she had in her mind all of this information that was -- that she knew about from these conversations.

THE COURT: Her credibility has been attacked by means

26

27

28

of these notes.

MR. MANZELLA: Right.

THE COURT: Do you intend to put Sergeant Whiteley on?

MR. DENNY: I certainly do.

MR. MANZELLA: We intend to put Sergeant Whiteley on right after --

THE COURT: Well, your testimony might properly fall in place after -- by your theory, after Sergeant Whiteley's come on.

MR.MANZELIA: Well, we intend to use Sergeant Whiteley to corroborate a lot of the things that she's testified to. but ---

THE COURT: I think she is able to explain -- that she would be able to explain why there were these discrepancies, apparent discrepancies.

MR. DENNY: Well, instead of asking --

THE COURT: Because you have --

MR. DENNY: Well, she --

Your Honor, she's --

THE COURT: You have elicited from her --

MR. DENNY: She is not able to explain Sergeant Whiteley's Sergeant Whiteley can testify as to what he took down and why he took it down. And I expect Sergeant Whiteley will do so.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DENNY: And Sergeant Whiteley can testify as to whether, when he put quotes around various things, he was quoting directly from what she said she had seen and heard.

8 a- 4	1	
	2	
	3	
*	4	
8b fls.	5	
8b Îls.	6	
ŧ	7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
gri	14	
*	15	
34. 24.	16	,
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	-
	21	
	22	
*	23	
,	24	
*	25	
<u>.</u>	26	
•	27	
	28	

And when he put down, "I heard that," or when he wrote, "I was advised that -- " why he did that.

But we are talking about now the notes. And the only testimony that's relevant there are the notes themselves and Sergeant Whiteley's testimony pertaining to them.

8b-1

2

1

3

5 6

7

9

11

10

12 13

14. 15

پان

**

ė

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

26

27 28 MR. MANZELLA: No, that's wrong. The notes are not relevant, because she has no knowledge of the notes.

What's relevant is what she says she said to Sergeant Whiteley in May.

MR. KAY: That's right.

MR. DENNY: That's exactly right.

MR. MANZELLA: That's what relevant, not the notes.

MR. DENNY: That's exactly right. And what she says, she has said time and time again. She has said she didn't know that.

When I quoted the notes to her, she said time and again, "No, I didn't say that. I was misquoted. He misconstrued what I said,"

Now, that's as far as she can go. She can't then try to bolster herself up by saying, "I said certain things this way and certain things that way, because I had heard certain things from certain people."

MR. KAY: Why can't she say that?

MR. MANZELLA: There's no reason she can't say that.

MR. DENNY: Well, she has obviously said that already.

MR. KAY: No, she hasn't. You haven't let her.

MR. MANZELLA: She hasn't. If she says it on cross-examination, then I am entitled to go into it on direct -- on redirect, because it's the subject of cross-examination.

If she hasn't said it, I am entitled to go into it because we are entitled to rehabilitate her on redirect.

THE COURT: Well, she has responded largely in -- in answer to questions about that conversation with Sergeant

چ

ź

28

Whiteley, that -- well, she just didn't say it that way. That's about the way she answered.

MR. MANZELLA: That's right. That's right.

Well, there was one other thing. On cross-examination this afternoon, I believe Mr. Denny brought out that the Himman -- the events at the Himman home were a topic of conversation at the ranch. And in fact, asked, "Were you kept up to date --"

MR. KAY: That's right.

MR.MANZELLA: -- "during the weekend?"

MR. DENNY: And you objected and --

MR. MANZELLA: No. I objected to the words "closely" and -- and something else. And then you asked the question, asked it again, and the answer was -- the answer remained.

MR. DENNY: All right. But that's still --

MR. MANZELLA: And I am entitled to go into that, just as a matter of covering on redirect what was covered on cross.

THE COURT: I will let you ask that one question, without any details -- without going into any details of conversations.

MR. DENNY: During the period of alleged conspiracy.

But not afterwards, because that's what my question specifically related to, that weekend.

MR. MANZELLA: Well, that's what my question related to.
I said: "Friday, Saturday and Sunday, July 25th, 26th and
27th."

THE COURT: All right. I will permit you to go that far.

Ÿ

ż

MR. MANZELLA: Thank you.

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

THE COURT: You may ask your question again, Mr. Manzella.

BY MR. MANZELLA:

Q Miss Bailey, among members of the Family at Spahn Ranch that weekend, in July, 1969, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, was there one thing which might be called a topic of conversation among the members of the Family?

A Yes.

Q And were you present among the persons during this conversation, these conversations?

A Yes, a lot of them.

Q And what was the topic of conversation that weekend at the Spahn Ranch, among the members of the Family?

A What was happening at Gary Himman's.

Q Now, when you were interviewed by Sergeant Whiteley in May and September of 1970 -- strike that. Strike that.

Some of the things that you heard during conversations with regard to Gary Himman at the ranch that weekend, were they things that you had not seen and heard yourself?

A Yes.

Now, when you were interviewed by Sergeant Whiteley in May and September of 1970 -- and as you remembered more of what had occurred that weekend and what you had observed

that weekend and during the month of July -- did you tell Sergeant Whiteley -- did you give Sergeant Whiteley some of the information which you heard from others?

MR. DENNY: Just a moment. I'll object as leading and suggestive, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

1

5

6

7

8

9

0 BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley in May and September of 1970 only those things which you had seen and heard yourself, or did you include things which had been the subject of the conversations that weekend?

MR. DENNY: That's leading and suggestive, also, your Honor.

And I would object on that ground. THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

BY MR. MANZELLA: Miss Bailey, in May and September of 1970, when you were interviewed by Sergeant Whiteley, did he ask you to tell him only those things you had seen or heard?

MR. DENNY: That calls for hearsay.

MR. MANZELLA: It goes to her state of mind, your Honor. And that's what I am inquiring about.

MR. DENNY: I don't think --

THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: No. I told him a lot that had happened on that Saturday, a lot of things that I had heard about then and at other times.

BY MR. MANZELLA: And when you say things that you Q had heard about, are you referring to things that you had heard from members of the Manson Family; is that correct?

A Yes.

26

2

4

5 б

7

8

9

11

10

12 13

15.

14

16 17

18

19

. 20

21 22

23

24

25

27

26

ř

28

THE COURT: Sustained, same ruling.

MR. MANZELLA: On both grounds, your Honor, hearsay and best evidence?

THE COURT: Yes.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Now, Miss Bailey, at the Grand Jury proceeding on September 13, 1971, you were asked the question with regard to the Volkswagen microbus, and you were asked if you drove the bus, and you answered yes.

Did you mean that you personally drove the bus from the back house to the eucalyptus trees?

A No. I meant that I was -- if the question was asked, it was put: "Were you driving in the bus?" and I meant, "Yes, I was riding along." I didn't drive the bus.

And in August of 1971, when you testified in the case of People versus Manson, did you not testify that Mary drove the bus?

A Yes, I did, I believe.

Attorney Burton Katz that Mary drove the bus?

A Yes, I did.

Now, at the Devil's Canyon camp site, Mr. Denny asked you whether or not -- or asked you who was present at the Devil's Canyon camp site during the conversation which you brought up the name of Gary Hinman. And you named several people and did not name Bruce Davis.

Can you tell us why? This is on cross examination. Tell us why?

A Oh, it is often easy to forget someone's name when

you're listing a whole bunch of peoples. And I had named him as someone who had been there on all previous occasions that I had been asked and, so, it was just a slip of my mind at the time Mr. Denny asked.

- Q Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley in May of 1970 that Mr. Davis was there?
 - A Yes, I did.
- Q And on September 23, 1970, did you tell Sergeant Whiteley that Bruce Davis had been at the camp site?
 - A Yes.
- Q And at the Manson trial in August of 1971, did you tell the jury in that case that Mr. Davis was there?
 - A Yes, I did.
- Q Now, Miss Bailey, on direct examination in answer to my question with regard to People's 30, which is the 9-millimeter Radom pistol --

I've examined the gun, your Honor, it is not loaded.

-- you testified that, in answer to my question,
"It appears to be the gun that Bruce Davis was carrying that
night."

What did you mean by that?

- A That it appears to be a gun, you know, that he was carrying. It looks like the gun he had.
- Now, have you ever denied the fact that you were the one that brought up the name of Gary Hinman at the Davil's Canyon camp site?
 - A No.

	Q		And	on	Septer	ober	23	or	rat	her	in S	Septo	ember	o£
1970,	in	Tac	coma,	đị	đ you	tell	Serg	sant	Wh	itel	ley t	hat	you	
though	it j	you	were	th.	e one	tḥat	brou	ght	up	the	name	of	Gary	
Hinmar	12						•							

A Yes.

Q And in the Manson trial in August of 1971, did you testify that you were the one that brought up the name of Gary Hinman?

A Yes.

Has anyone among law enforcement agencies or the prosecutor's office ever told you that you were not to say that you were the one that brought up the name of Gary Hinman?

A No.

Q Was that the first time that the name of Gary
Hinman had been brought up among the members of the Family?

A No.

Q You've already testified with regard to 1968, when Charles Manson sent you to the Hinman home.

Had Gary Himman been out to the ranch that summer of 1969?

A Yes.

9a-1	1	Q And did you see him when he came out to the ranch?
A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	2	A Yes.
	3	Q Was this on one occasion or more than one occasion,
	4	if you recall?
	5	A I really I can't recall how many times he was
	б	there. He came to visit, but it was infrequently,
	7	Q Do you ever recall what he did when he came to the
	8	ranch?
	9	A No, other than just talk to the people there.
	10	Q And had you heard Mr. Manson on prior occasions
	11	mention the name of Gary Hinman as somebody who had money?
	12	A Yes,
	13	Q Now, again, still referring to the Devil's Canyon
,i	14	campfire, the week of Gary Hinman's death.
, .	15	You said that kidnaping was mentioned and later so
\$	16	was killing or murder at the Grand Jury hearing in the Brunner
	17	case in September of 1971.
	18	Were any names other than Gary Hinman's name
	19	mentioned at that Devil's Canyon camp site that evening?
	.20	A Yes.
, e	21	What other names were mentioned?
	22	A I only can recall Terry Melcher.
4	23 .	Q Terry Melcher's name?
A K	24	A Yes.
5	25	Q What was said about Terry Melcher?
ŧ	26	A That he was uh, that he was young. That he was
	27	Doris Day's son. And that he had a lot of money and that it
-	28	was felt that he'd be harder to convince to come into the

28

Family and so kidnaping might be necessary.

Q The conversation at the Devil's Canyon camp site, did that conversation -- strike that.

And did you tell Sergeant Whiteley about that on September 23, 1970?

A Yes.

Now, in answer to one of Mr. Denny's questions, you said that you thought -- it was thought by the members of the Family that were present that Gary Hinman would not be a problem.

Why was that?

MR. DENNY: Just a moment, may I have that question repeated?

THE COURT: You may read it,

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

Now, in answer to one of Mr. Denny's questions you said that you thought -- it was thought by the members of the Family that were present that Gary Hinman would not be a problem.

"Why was that?")

MR. DENNY: Well, I'll object to what she thought, "Why was that," why other people thought something is certainly calling for speculation.

MR. MANZELLA: I'll withdraw the question. It wasn't clear.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Miss Bailey, during the conversa-

9a - 3

A.

 tion at Devil's Canyon campfire or camp site, I'm sorry, you said in answer to one of Mr. Denny's questions that it was said by the members of the Family there that Gary Hinman would not be a problem, Terry Melcher might be a problem.

MR. DENNY: I'll object.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: What was said in that regard?

MR. DENNY: I'll object to that as assuming facts not in evidence. She didn't answer that to me.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: What was said about Gary Hinman?

MR. DENNY: Well, again, by whom? I'll object to that
as calling for hearsay.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: You were asked by Mr. Denny whether you thought that Gary Hinman would come with the Family. Why did you think that Gary Hinman would come with the Family?

A Because he was a rather effeminate man. I didn't think he'd pose any opposition to any of the men in our Family.

Q Did the other members of the Family at the Devil's Canyon camp site that evening agree with that?

A Yes.

MR. DENNY: Just a moment, I'll object and move the answer be stricken as again calling for hearsay.

THE COURT: Yes, the answer is stricken. The objection is sustained:

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And did you -- strike that.

During the recess you are admonished that you are 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 nor express any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you.

About 10 or 15 minutes.

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

THE COURT: All right, the record will show the jurors are out of the courtroom.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, Mr. Denny questioned Miss Bailey on a prior -- what he alleged was a prior inconsistent statement.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MANZELLA: Something about she heard somebody left the ranch.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MANZELLA: What I am doing is asking her to attempt to explain, if there is any apparent inconsistency between what she testified to here at this trial and what she said to Sergeant Whiteley on -- in May of 1970.

THE COURT: I assumed it was that, but -- and she has a right to explain the apparent inconsistency.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, she would have the right to explain that particular one that I pointed out to her, which

THE COURT: And I think -- I was going to say, I think it should be pointed out what you are talking about.

MR. MANZELLA: I did. I said, "Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley in May of 1970 that you heard somebody left the ranch?"

Now, I'll have to make it more clear when, but I'm referring to that weekend in late July, 1969, did you tell Sergeant Whiteley in May, 1970, that during that weekend you had heard somebody left the ranch.

THE COURT: Well, I think if you firm up that type of

r 8

· 14

question so that it is pointed out what you're discussing, an inconsistency, in asking her to explain it, it would be --

MR. MANZELLA: I don't see why I should point it out, your Honor. I don't think it is an inconsistency.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, the question that I asked her previously was referring to the note, and I read the whole note.

"Charlie wanted me to go to Gary's house and get money. They were going to take a gun. I was picked to go and Bill V. told Charlie I wasn't going. Charlie said Bobby.

Mary and Sadie were going to go. They took a German gun. It belonged to Bruce. Gary was to sign over his house and car titles. I heard they left."

MR. MANZELLA: You see --

MR. DENNY: Now, that's what I read. And that's what she can explain if she wants to, but not that she heard some other thing that they left.

MR. MANZELLA: Well, yes, she can, because that's the problem with this, because these notes were not written by Ella Jo Bailey, they are written by Sergeant Whiteley. They're not her statements. They were notes of Sergeant Whiteley. That is what I have been objecting to. Therefore, there is nothing in any of the evidence so far that says she would say this — there is no evidence she would say these things. I'm asking her if she said something like this. There's nothing magical about this until we get to Sergeant Whiteley's testimony, because they are not Ella Bailey's notes. They're Sergeant Whiteley's. I'm asking her if she told Sergeant Whiteley that during that weekend she heard somebody left the ranch. That's

how she can -- she will, if she can, explain any apparent inconsistency.

THE COURT: All right, I see your point.

Well, with the correction that we've spoken about, the Court will permit that kind of question.

MR. DEMNY: Well, does the Court mean by referring to this specific portion of the conversation that I quoted?

THE COURT: The Court believes that -- so there would be no misunderstanding in the jury's mind, it would be better to do it that way.

MR. MANZELLA: Well, the problem is, your Honor,
Mr. Denny created whatever impression that may have been
created in the Court's mind that these notes were taken in any
kind of order or that they were quotes of Ella Bailey.

MR. DENNY: I didn't create it. Sergeant Whiteley did.

MR. KAY: Wait until he testifies.

MR. MANZELLA: That's just it, they're not. They're not at all.

In fact, there are three pages or four pages of notes for the May interviews. And --

THE COURT: Well, this is --

MR. MANZELLA: I can't pinpoint it --

MR. DENNY: I've got 22 pages.

THE COURT: Well --

б

7

8

9

27

28

THE COURT: Well, unless you pinpoint it --

MR. MANZELIA: -- except to pinpoint it to May of 1970. THE COURT: It would certainly be hearsay to go into that conversation, wouldn't it?

MR. MANZELLA: I don't understand why, if Mr. Denny has been allowed to bring out that she -- to ask her --

THE COURT: He has been able to go into it by may of a prior inconsistent statement.

MR. MANZELLA: Right. And I am going into the same statement.

THE COURT: Well, I sustained the objection to it -or would have sustained the objection to it, because I felt that it was not an explanation of a prior inconsistency which had been brought out.

Now --

MR. MANZELLA: She said that she did not tell Sergeant Whiteley the --

MR. DENNY: "I heard they left."

MR. MANZELLA: -- what's written down in the notes. And what I am asking her is:

What did you tell Sergeant Whiteley with regard to that?

And the way I pinpoint it is, "Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley that you had heard that weekend that somebody left the ranch?"

> Presumably, the answer will be: "Yes." And then I will ask her --

MR. DENNY: Well --

4

5.

6 :

7 8

9

11

13

15

14

17

16

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

MR. MANZELLA: -- "to what were you referring?"
THE COURT: How do you --

MR. MANZELIA: See, Mr. Denny is trying to show that she was referring to Bruce Davis, to Robert Beausoleil, Mary Brunner and Susan Atkins.

What I'm trying to show is that she was referring to Charles Manson and Bruce Davis, later on that weekend, when they went to the house, and Manson cut Hinman and Davis held the gun on him.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor --

THE COURT: It seems to me that the May conversation and the September conversation have been gone into extensively; that any inconsistencies should be explainable.

But, in the Gourt's opinion, it has to be somewhat pinpointed, or the --

MR. MANZELLA: Right. I agree.

THE COURT: -- or neither the Court nor anyone will know what you are talking about.

MR. MANZELLA: Well, I think that's pinpointed. That's how I pimpointed it, by asking her if she said these things.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, may I suggest that if he wants to have her explain what appears to be a prior inconsistent statement, that the prior inconsistent statement, which is now in evidence -- that I just read to the Court -- be read to her? And she be given the opportunity to explain it?

Secondly, I would --

MR. MANZELIA: That prior inconsistent statement is not in evidence, your Honor. She denied making it.

10-3

6.

÷

ř

says:

MR.DENNY: But it is in evidence, at any rate, whether she denied it or not.

MR. MANZELLA: No, it isn't. No, it isn't, because a prior inconsistent statement is not in evidence until, one, the witness admits making the statement; or, two, you have independent proof that the statement was made by the witness.

And you don't have either up to this point.

MR. DENNY: All right. Secondly, your Honor --

THE COURT: Again, gentlemen, you are rather out of order in view of the fact that you haven't put Sergeant Whiteley on to --

MR. MANZELIA: Well, see, that's not my problem, your Honor. That's Mr. Denny's problem. He's the one that says that it's in evidence.

THE COURT: And Sergeant Whiteley has not yet testified.

MR. MANZELLA: So that means that none of that's in

evidence yet.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, again, if I may make one further point on this? And then I will be very quiet and let the Court take a well-deserved recess.

I believe the People are in bad faith in having her at this point attempt to explain away that particular conversation by saying, "No, I meant I later heard somebody say that Charlie and Bruce left," because of what appears right after that in these notes, a copy of which Mr. Manzella has.

And I would like to read it to the Court. It

"I heard they left. Then a phone 10-4 I heard Gary had grabbed the gun and wasn't cooperating. Charlie asked Bruce if he would go to Gary's house and Bruce said okay." And then it goes: "Mary drove with Sadie in the van to the back house. Both told us how it happened. Then Mary and I wiped the van down." Right in chronological order. 10a fls. 16 : .28

10a-1

4 5

 THE COURT: Well, you have been reading from the notes, Sergeant Whiteley's notes.

MR. DENNY: The notes of May 16th, 1970.

MR. MANZELLA: They're the notes of May 15th.

MR. DENNY: No, they're the notes of May 16th, --

MR. MANZELLA: You're wrong.

1 1

MR. DENNY: -- 1970, at 12:46 P. M.

Well, that's the order I got them in.

MR. MANZELLA: Well, that's -- that's a shame, because they're the notes of May 15th of 1970.

MR. DENNY: Well, I have three pages of notes which are the last three pages of notes, that Sergeant Whiteley gave me, in that order, which I have numbered Pages 21, 22 and 23, starting with "\$27, Sadie had money. Charlie said \$27, and we got his cars, before said Gary had stocks." And then — and the next entry is 5-16-70, 12:46 P. M. "Ella Jo Bailey. Charlie, Bruce, Sadie, Mary, Bobby — and then it goes on to the next page: "Last '68, went to Hinman's house, sent by Manson to get Gary to join Family." And goes on over again into that matter I've previously read.

THE COURT: All right. The Court will permit the question if -- with the change that you've indicated that you will make --

MR. MANZELLA: What change was that, --

THE COURT: -- in the question.

MR. MANZELLA: -- your Honor?

THE COURT: That you were more specifically pinpointed, point out what she -- what you mean by the question.

MR. MANZELLA: All right. Fine.

(Mid-afternoon recess.)

THE COURT: All jurors and alternates are present.

All counsel and the defendant are present.

Please continue.

BY MR: MANZELLA: Miss Bailey, in May of 1970, when you were interviewed by Sergeant Whiteley and the other officers, did you tell them that, over that weekend in July, Friday, Saturday and Sunday of 1969, that you had heard that somebody left the ranch?

MR. DENNY: I'll object again as calling for hearsay, as indicated to the Court earlier in our discussion -- unless it's properly prefaced.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Miss Bailey, during that weekend, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, the 26th -- the 25th, 26th and 27th of July, 1969, had you heard that somebody left the ranch?

MR. DENNY: I will object to that as calling for hearsay.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Miss Bailey --

THE COURT: Strike that -- well, sustained. The objection is sustained, yes.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. During the May interview with Sergeant Whiteley -- that is, May of 1970 -- I'll withdraw that. I'm sorry.

Mr. Denny asked you a question on cross examination

with regard to whether or not you had told Sergeant Whiteley 1 that you had heard that somebody left the ranch. 2 Do you recall that? On cross examination? 3 I don't recall the question. A All right. Now, did you tell Sergeant Whiteley, 5 in May of 1970, that you had gone to Gary Hinman's house in 6 1968? `7 A Yes. : 8 And did you tell Sergeant Whiteley in May of 1970 9 that you had been sent there by Charles Manson? 10 Α. Yes. 11 And did you tell Sergeant Whiteley in September of 12 1970, in Tacoma, that you did not see Bruce leave with the 13 14 gun? MR. DENNY: Object to that, and move the answer -- I'm 15 sorry; there's no answer in. 16 Object to that as calling for hearsay. 17 18 MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I believe we offer it as a 19 prior consistent statement. 20 MR. DEMNY: Well, I have seen no --21 THE COURT: Will you approach the bench? 22 MR. DENNY: I would like to, your Honor. 10b fol 23 24 25 26 27 28

10b-1

ì 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11 .

13

15

14

16 17

18

19

20

22

23 24

ř

. 25

26

27 28 (Whereupon the following proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the jury:)

MR. MANZELLA: Mr. Denny pointed out --

THE COURT: You think it's admissible under Section 791 as a prior consistent statement?

MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor. Mr. Denny pointed out -- or asked Miss Bailey whether or not -- I think he referred to Mr. Katz notes, February of 1971, the statement that Miss Bailey had made to him with regard to Beausoleil having the gum, and --

MR. DENNY: And the knife.

MR. MANZELLA: And I intend to offer the statement that Miss Bailey told Sergeant Whiteley that Bobby, Mary and Sadie took the German automatic belonging to Bruce, and that the gun had been kept in the gun room; that she didn't see him leave with it, but that she knows — but that she — but that she knows that they took the gun, and — meaning that she didn't see Bruce leave, and she has never said that she saw Bruce leave.

In other words, she has not identified Bruce as the driver of that vehicle, but that she did see Bruce with the gun, before they left; but that she did not see Bruce leave with the gun.

THE COURT: How is that a prior consistent statement, with anything that's inconsistent in her testimony now?

MR.MANZELLA: Well, Mr. Denny --

THE COURT: Is it or is it not?

10b-2

1 2

3

5

6

.7

9

11

12

10

13

15

14

17

16

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25,

26 27

ř

28

MR. DENNY: No.

MR. MANZELLA: Well, because she testified -- because Mr. Denny has brought out a statement of -- taken by Mr. Katz, in which he claims that she said that Beausoleil had the gun.

THE COURT: I recall that. I recall that now, that there was some statement to that effect: Beausoleil's having it in his possession -- or, at least, you asked her, did you not, Mr. Denny?

MR. DENNY: Well, I asked her on cross-examination from this very note, the same thing. I can point to my notes for cross-examination.

And I asked her, "Did you state to Sergeant Whiteley in May, 19 -- May 15th, 1970, 'Took German auto belonging to Bruce; kept in gun room. Didn't see him leave with it, but know he took the gun.'"

MR. MANZELLA: I don't remember that question being asked, though.

MR. DENNY: Well, I asked it, specifically, and I'll show you right here in my cross-examination where I did ask it.

THE COURT: When did you ask it? On Friday?

MR. DENNY: No, today. I'm almost sure it was today.

It may have been -- it may have been Friday.

THE COURT: Well, but you don't agree that it is a prior inconsistent statement? Or --

MR. DENNY: No, it's inconsistent with her present testimony. Her present testimony was that she saw Bruce

105-3

í2 ⁴

*

Ė

with the gun, and she saw Bobby Beausoleil with a sheath knife, and they were standing, talking together in front of the saloon.

And then she saw Bobby and Mary and Sadie. And this is certainly inconsistent with that.

"Took German auto belonging to Bruce, kept in gun room. Didn't see him leave with it, but know he took the gun."

MR. MANZELLA: And my position is that that's consistent with her testimony here, because she never claimed to have seen Bruce Davis leave.

In other words, she identifies Beausoleil, Atkins and Brunner in the car. In other words, she saw Davis with the gun before they left, and she never saw Davis leave; she knows he took the gun, because she saw it with him earlier, and then he made the statement the following day -- or rather, that following Monday -- that he had held the gun on Gary while Manson slashed him with the sword.

My position is that that is consistent with her testimony at this trial, and is prior to the statement that Mr. Denny brought out, from February of 1971, because this was taken in September.

MR. DENNY: I don't see that this is in any way a prior consistent statement. That is, consistent with her present testimony.

MR. KAY: Well, if you --

MR. DENNY: It's closer to an inconsistent statement than a consistent statement, when she says, "Didn't see him

25 '

locatis.

leave with it, but know he took the gum."

MR. MANZELLA: She has never claimed at this trial or any trial -- any proceeding that she saw Bruce leave with the gum. She is not claiming that. She never has.

THE COURT: I think that's true, as I recall the evidence.

10c-1

Ź

1

3

5

6

7

9

11

10

12

13 .

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25 26

27 28 MR. KAY: Mr. Denny, if you claim that you asked her the question, why do you object if we ask her the question? The same question?

MR. DENNY: Because it's in the context that you are putting it as a prior consistent statement.

I asked her as a prior inconsistent statement, and think the Court properly let me do it, and I don't --

MR. MANZELLA: Well, the Court's not ruling on that.

MR. DENNY: Well, I am asking the Court to rule on it.

MR. MANZELLA: The Court's not ruling on -- the Court's ruling only preliminarily whether it's inconsistent or consistent. He is not making a final determination.

That's for the jury.

MR. DENNY: It's a question of law for the Court initially.

MR. MANZELLA: Well, initially, yeah. But that doesn't preclude the People from arguing it's a consistent statement.

MR. DENNY: Yes, if it's not admissible under 791 as a prior consistent statement.

THE COURT: "Prior consistent statement of a witness.

Evidence of a statement -- according to 791 -- "of a statement previously made by a witness that is consistent with his testimony at the hearing is inadmissible to support his credibility unless it is offered after:

"(a) Evidence of a statement made by him that is inconsistent with any part of his testimony at the hearing has been admitted for the purpose of attacking his credibility, and the statement was made before the alleged inconsistent state-

ment --* 1 MR. MANZELLA: Right. 2 MR. KAY: Right. 3 MR. MANZELLA: That's exactly what I'm arguing. MR. DENNY: There's no question that this thing was made 5 before, since according to my notes, as they were given to 6 me, they were made -- or, it was made in May. 7 I am a -- I was a little surprised in --8 MR. MANZELLA: It was made in September. 10 MR. DENNY: I'm surprised that it was made in September, 11 now. instead of May. 12 MR. MANZELLA: All right. 13 MR. DENNY: But even so, it is not a prior consistent 14 It is not consistent with her present testimony. statement. 15 *MR. MANZELLA: Where can you point out that it's 16 inconsistent? 17 MR. DENNY: Where she says she didn't see him leave 18 , with it. 19 MR. KAY: That's what she says now. She never said she 20 saw him leave with it. 21 THE COURT: Yes, I think it is consistent. 22 MR. MANZELLA: By the way. I don't believe I objected to 23 any questions about this sort of thing, so the Court never did 24 ł rule on whether it was consistent or inconsistent. 2 THE COURT: The Court will permit it. 26 Thank you, your Honor. MR, KAY: 11 pfol 27 28

11-1		1
		2
		3
₹ _à		4
B. C. S.		5
#n.		6
•		7
		8
		9
		10
		11
		12
		13
*		14
**		15
A PACTO		16
		17
		18
		19
		20
æ.		21 [,]
,	•	, 22.
ই		23
3		24
₹		25
è		26
		27

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

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Miss Bailey, in September, 1970, did you tell Sergeant Whiteley that in substance that with regard to that Friday evening, July 25, 1969, that they took a German automatic belonging to Bruce which had been kept in the gun room? That you didn't see him leave with it, but you know that Bruce took the gun?

A Yes.

Q Now, Miss Bailey, at any of the proceedings at which you've testified, have you ever claimed that you saw Bruce Davis as the driver of Johnny Swartz' Ford that evening?

A No.

Q Prior to the time you saw the four people leaving in Johnny Swartz Ford, prior to that time, did you see Bruce Davis with that gun?

A Yes.

Q Did you see him leave with the gum?

A No.

Q Have you ever claimed that you did see Bruce Davis
leave with the gum?

A No.

Q Have you ever told anyone at any trial proceeding or interview that you could identify Bruce Davis as the driver of Johnny Swartz' Ford?

A No.

Q Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley in September of

11-2		1
		2
		3
		4
		5
		6
•		7
		8
		9
		10
		11
		12
		13
žj.		14
		15
		16
		17
		18
		19
_	,	20
		21
		22
*		23
<u>#</u>		24
ž 3		25
ş .	,	26
	•	27
		28

3

5

б

7

8

11

26

27

28

1970 that Bobby had a fancy knife?

Å Yes.

Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley in September of 1970 that later that weekend Sadie and Mary drove up in Gary's bus?

A Yes.

MR. MANZELLA: May I have a moment, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings.)

BY MR. MANZELLA: Now, MissBuiley, prior to the Q time that you had spoken to Sergeant Whiteley or any officer with regard to this case, had Sergeant Whiteley or anyone else told you -- strike that.

Had Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officer told you about -- or told you that chanting beads or Buddhist prayer beads had been found near the body of Gary Himman?

MR. DENNY: Object to that as calling for hearsay.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I would like to be heard on that. We're asking her if any law enforcement officer told her about that.

THE COURT: All right, I'll hear you at the bench.

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

THE COURT: All right, let's get the question.

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

11-3

*t**

ï

÷

 "Q Now, Miss Bailey, prior to the time that you had spoken to Sergeant Whiteley or any officer with regard to this case, had Sergeant Whiteley or anyone else told you -- strike that.

"Had Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officer told you about -- or told you that chanting beads or Buddhist prayer beads had been found near the body of Gary Himmen?")

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, what I am trying to do is show corroboration for her statement -- testimony with regard to Bruce Dayis' statement with regard to the Hinman killing by showing that through her testimony and testimony of Sergeant Whiteley and perhaps other officers that no one told her of the results of their investigation was about, the chanting beads and so on and so forth, to show --

THE COURT: You're not offering this statement for the truth of the matter it might contain?

MR. MANZELIA: Of course not, to show that she could not --

THE COURT: Just as to whether or not it had been said?
MR. KAY: Uh-huh.

MR. MANZELLA: To show that she could not have fabricated Bruce Davis' confession.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor --

MR. MANZELIA: -- from what the law enforcement officers told her.

Let me just point this one final thing out before Mr. Denny argues and that is this:

lla fls.

Has Mr. Denny asked -- or say she was given a report or something to show she was told about this case, he would certainly be entitled to bring that out that she had fabricated the confession of Bruce Davis, because she knew about the beads and knew about him, oh, being struck over the head and so on. He would be entitled to bring that out, not for the truth of it, but to show her state of mind as to whether or not she knew about these things before she told the officers about Bruce Davis' confession.

THE COURT: Why do you believe it is hearsay in the light in which it is offered?

MR. DENNY: Can't help but think of the old saying, "People speak with forked tongue." They've just spent a good deal of time, over my strenuous objections, of what she had heard from all the members of the Manson Family during the weekend of July 25, 26, 27 as to the fact that this was common rumor, common knowledge, common talk with all the members of the Manson Family, and she certainly could have picked it up at that time. And to say simply she didn't hear it from the officers is not to say that she couldn't have fabricated it.

MR.MANZELLA: Fine, if you want to bring that out, fine, bring it out. The Gourt limited me with regard to what I could ask with members of the Manson Family --

MR. DENNY: And properly so, and the Court should limit you here.

MR. MANZELLA: Yes, but I'm not offering it for the 11a-1 truth of the matter asserted. 2 MR. DENNY: You're offering it -- it's bearsay, to 3 show whether or not the officers said something to her so that she could have that information when she said it back. MR. KAY: It is not hearsay. It is not offered for the truth of the matter asserted. MR. MANZELLA: And I expect her answer to be no, of 9 course. 10 MR. DENNY: No, of course. 11 MR. MANZELLA: Which is not hearsay. MR. DENNY: It's not relevant. 13 MR. MANZELLA: It is not relevant? I've established the 14 relevance, since the answer is no, there is no hearsay. 15 THE COURT: Since there is the inference her story is 16 fabricated and this is the effort on the part of the People 17 to rehabilitate her in that respect and I can see why it's 18 offered, all right, I'll overrule the objection. 19 (Whereupon, the following proceedings were had 20 in open court within the presence and hearing of the 21 jury:) 22 THE COURT: Would you read the question, Miss Briandi? (Whereupon, the question was read by the reporter 24 as follows: 25 "Q Now, Miss Bailey, prior to the time that 26 you had spoken to Sergeant Whiteley or any officer 27 with regard to this case, had Sergeant Whiteley or 28 anyone else told you -- strike that.

11a-2

2

1

1

4 5

6 7

8

10

11 . 12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

``

24

26

27

28

"Had Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officer told you about -- or told you that chanting beads or Buddhist prayer beads had been found near the body of Gary Himman?")

THE WITNESS: No.

Q Had Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officers told you that Gary Himman had received a wound to his face?

A No.

Q Had Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officer told you that a bullet or bullets had been found at Gary Hinman's home?

A No.

Q Had Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officer told you that a -- when the body was discovered, a blanket was covering the body up to the neck?

A No.

Q Had Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officer told you that when it was recovered, the 9 millimeter Radom had no grips on it?

A No.

Q Had Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officer told you that when Gary Himman's body was yound it had two wounds to the top -- strike that. It had a wound to the top of the head and a wound behind the ear?

A No.

Q Or that it had any wounds to the head?

A No.

11a-3

2

I

3

7

8

46.

9 10

11 . 12

14

15

16

* (4)

3

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

Q Has Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officer told you that the --

MR. DENNY: Mr. Manzella, I'm going to object to the question before you get it out, as far as "has." If you talk about had they, before her statement of May, 1970, I have no objection.

MR. MANZELLA: All right, fine.

Q Prior to the May, '70, 1970 interview with Sergeant Whiteley, had he or any other law enforcement officer told you that when they discovered the body that they discovered the kitchen table had been broken and a chair had been knocked over in the kitchen?

A No.

Q All right, had Sergeant Whiteley or any -- strike that.

Had Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officer told you those things before the September, 1970, interview?

A No.

Q Had they -- had Sergeant Whiteley or any other law enforcement officer or prosecutor, and I'm including prosecutor in these questions as law enforcement officers -- would that change your answer knowing that I am including prosecutors?

A No.

Q Has Sergeant Whiteley or any law enforcement officer or prosecutor told you any or all of these seven things that I have enumerated prior to the time you spoke to

-- were interviewed by Mr. Katz in February of 1971?

A No.

All right. And prior to the time that you testified in the trial of People vs. Charles Manson in August of 1971, had Sergeant Whiteley, any law enforcement officer, any prosecutor, told you any or all of those seven things? That is, about the chanting beads, the wound to Gary Hinman's face, a bullet found at the house, a blanket over the body, a Davis -- strike that -- that the 9 millimeter Radom pistol had no grips on it when it was recovered, that Gary Hinman's body had wounds to the top of his head, and that a kitchen table had been broken and a chair had been knocked over at the location?

'- A No.

Q And prior to your testimony at this trial --

A No. sir.

Q Had anybody told you, Sergeant Whiteley, any law enforcement officer or prosecutor told you those facts?

A No.

11b-2

ð

.21

THE COURT: All right, I'll hear from you.

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

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, Mr. Kay --

THE COURT: Let me get the question straight, now, what was the last question?

MR. MANZELLA: I was asking her if she told Sergeant Whiteley about statements that Bruce Davis had made to her on Monday, July 28th, and I was about to ask her what she had told Sergeant Whiteley. I believe Mr. Kay has pointed out to me — I didn't realize that Mr. Denny had examined her on the confession. And Mr. Kay pointed out to me that Mr. Denny did examine her about the confession and — implying that her testimony with regard to the confession was false.

And I have statements from the May, 1970, interview, view and the statements from the September, 1970, interview, and they are consistent with her testimony here. And for that reason I think they would come in under Section 791 of the Evidence Code because they are consistent with the testimony here.

I had forgotten that Mr. Denny did question her with regard to Bruce Davis's confession.

MR. KAY: 791'(b), too...

THE COURT: Under 791 (b), it would come in in view of the fact there is an intimation that it's influenced her -- the statement is influenced by bias or motive to have herself exculpated here.

26

27

28

	Ω	Now,	when	you we	ere i	nter	viev	ved in	May	of 19	70,
at	that	time did	you r	ecall	some	òf	the	things	to	which	you' ve
ter	stifie	ad here?									•

Α Yes.

MR. DENNY: Asked and answered, and move the answer be stricken.

THE COURT: Overruled. And the answer may remain.

BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you recall all of the things Q to which you've testified here?

MR. DENNY: Asked and answered, objection.

BY MR. MANZELLA: At that time, in May of 1970.

MR. DENNY: Asked and answered.

THE COURT: Overruled, you may answer.

No, I didn't remember all the things at that time A that I remembered now.

BY MR. MANZELLA: And did you, in May of 1970, Q tell Sergeant Whiteley about those statements that Bruce Davis had made to you on Monday, July 28?

Yes.

Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley at that time that Bruce Dayis had told you that he had gone to --

MR. DENNY: Just a moment, I'll object that this is not a prior consistent statement.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. MANZELLA: May I have a moment, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I would like to be heard briefly on the last objection, if I may.

11b-3

2

1

3

5

б

7

9

10

1I 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

26

•

į

125 fol

27

28

At 791(b) requires that the statement be made before the bias, motive for fabrication or other improper motive is alleged to have arisen.

Now, what would you say about that?

And, of course, 791(a) requires that the consistent statement be made before the alleged inconsistent statement.

MR. MANZELLA: Yes.

Well, Mr. Denny has questioned her about the confession itself. Now, you see, the problem is --

THE COURT: In what respect is it --

MR. MANZELLA: Consistent?

THE COURT: -- consistent?

MR. MANZELLA: Or prior?

THE COURT: And prior.

MR. MANZELLA: Okay, it is consistent in that there's nothing in it that she has not testified to in either statement, in either May or September of 1970. There's nothing in either statement that's inconsistent with what she testified to eith either confession.

And, secondly, it is prior to, because I don't remember what statement Mr. Denny was talking about when he questioned her about the confession, but if he was talking about the September statement, the May statement is prior to that. If he's talking about the May statement, I can bring out everything that she told Sergeant Whiteley with regard to the confession.

12-1

5.

f 6

 MR. DENNY: Well, you still haven't gotten over the problem of whether there's no motive to fabricate. The whole—the whole thing is, she's now a person who is implicated in the crime herself, and she's purporting to relate, in May, at the earliest, a confession of Bruce Davis.

MR. MANZELLA: Um-homm.

MR. DENNY: And if you are trying to show that is a prior inconsistent statement, there is certainly a motive to fabricate there, if you are trying to show that it's consistent with her present testimony now.

MR. MANZELLA: Um-hmmm.

MR. DENNY: And the same in September. So, I don't think, under the Evidence Code, it can come in.

MR. MANZELLA: Well, to show a prior -- 791, I believe, is broken down into two separate and distinct sections. One is a motive to fabricate, the other is a prior consistent statement.

MR. DENNY: But in any case, you must show, as a sine qua non to both of them, that the prior consistent statement was made at a time when there was not motive to fabricate.

MR. MANZELLA: No, that's not true.

MR. KAY: No.

MR. MANZELLA: All you have to show, under 791, was that the -- any prior consistent statement, was that the consistent statement was made before the inconsistent statement.

MR. kAY: Section 791, Subdivision A, does not say anything about the fact that it has to be made before the reason for bias --

MR. DENNY: But I haven't introduced any statement; I

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

ر10

 \mathbf{n}^{i}

28

haven't introduced any --

MR. MANZELLA: Well, you questioned her about --

MR. DENNY: Certainly, I questioned her, but I haven't introduced another statement.

THE COURT: What inconsistency did he bring out?

MR. DENNY: I didn't bring out any inconsistency.

MR. MANZELLA: I don't think he has brought out any inconsistencies. But I still have the right --

MR. DENNY: Then you are stuck with it.

* MR. MANZELLA: -- to introduce statements made before statements that he says that she made.

MR. DENNY: That would only be under (b), then. under (b), you have to show that --

MR. MANZELLA: No, wait a minute.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. You still have a right to do what?

MR. MANZELLA: In other words, I don't have to agree that he has brought out an inconsistent statement. All I have to show is that there's an apparent inconsistency -- or that he's attempted to show that she has made an inconsistent statement.

And if I can show that prior to that time, she made a statement consistent to her testimony at trial, I can bring that out.

THE COURT: Doesn't 791 refer to --

MR. DENNY: 791 ---

THE COURT: -- to a statement that's inconsistent?

MR. DENNY: Inconsistent. Under 791 (a), I would have had to have introduced a prior inconsistent statement --

12-3 THE COURT: That's true. 1 2 MR. DEMMY: -- before the People would be able to 3 introduce a consistent statement. I have not done so. Therefore, the only way to 5 get it in would be under 791 (b). THE COURT: I don't recollect any inconsistency --6 7 MR. DEMNY: The only thing I questioned --8 THE COURT: -- on cross concerning that point. 9 MR. DENNY: The only thing I questioned her on, your 10 Honor, was concerning the slash on the ear, as to whether it was 11 the left ear. 12 THE COURT: Yes, I remember that. 13 That's all. MR. DENNY: 14 MR. KAY: And also, the chanting beads you questioned her 15 about. 16 . MR. MANZELLA: Yes. Mr. Denny asked her if she told 17 Sergeant Whiteley that she had been -- that -- whether Davis had 18 told her that Manson had slashed him on the left side of the 19 face. 20 THE COURT! Yes, 21 MR. MANZELLA: And I would be entitled to go into the 22 entire conversation, at that point, with regard to that point. 23 MR. DENNY: She said: "No." Her answer was: 24 "Yes." I'm sorry. She said: "Yes." Her answer was: 25 THE COURT: Now, I don't recall --26 MR. MANZELLA: I don't, either. I remember something \$2a fol 27 about that, but I don't remember how you asked the question.

28

"No" --

MR. DENNY: Well, I asked her, "Do you mean to say you 12b-1 1 2 3 but slashed him on the left side?" 4 And she says: "Yes." 5 THE COURT: What side was it, actually? 6 MR. KAY: The left. 7 Я MR. MANZELLA: Um-hmm. Q 10 (indicating), and --11 THE COURT: That's not inconsistent. 13 14 < 15₂ 16 under 790. 17 18 bring out an inconsistent statement. 10 20 statement. 21 22 should be sustained. \mathbb{R}_{i} 23 MR. MANZELLA: Okay. 24 4 MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor. 25 26 27 jury:) . 28

remember specifically he said the slashing was on the left side, not the right? Or just not slashed him on the face, MR. DENNY: It was the left side, your Honor. MR. DENNY: You back a guy with a sword, right-handed MR. DENNY: They're not introducing any consistent --THE COURT: I think you have to show the inconsistency which you are trying to combat with the consistent statement MR. MANZELLA: I thought Mr. Denny had attempted to MR. DENNY: I did not. I don't have an inconsistent THE COURT: I think that's true. I think the objection (Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court, within the presence and hearing of the THE COURT: Go on with your next question.

2Ś.

26

27

28

MR. MANZELLA: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.

Q Now, Miss Bailey, I don't know if I -- I don't recall if I asked you this question or not.

But prior to your testimony here at this trial, had Sergeant Whiteley, any law enforcement officer or any prosecutor told you about the chanting beads?

A No.

MR. DENNY: That has been asked and answered. The same answer.

MR. MANZELLA: Has it?

MR. KAY: Yes.

MR. MANZELLA: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: That's all right. The objection is overruled. It may remain in.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Had Sergeant Whiteley, prior to your testimony at this trial -- well, strike that.

Miss Bailey, you -- you testified that money was being discussed. On cross-examination you testified that money was being discussed frequently at the ranch by members of the Family.

Now, when did that begin?

A Well, it began as early as -- when we were living down on Gresham. But it became more important all the time, as the summer went on.

Q And specifically, was there anything said by Charles Manson with regard to what was to be done with the money?

A It was for preparations to go to the desert,

12a - 3Now, you've mentioned -- you've told us that 1 Q Terry Melcher's name was brought up at the Devil's Canyon 2 campsité. 3 Were there any other names brought up, of people 4 5 who might have money? That's been asked and answered twice. б MR. DENNY: 7 THE COURT: Sustained. 8 BY MR. MANZELLA: When the other names were 9 brought up, was there a discussion about those other people? 10 MR. DENNY: It assumes a fact not in evidence. 11 THE COURT: Overruled. 12 THE WITNESS: Yes, there was a discussion. 13 BY MR. MANZELLA: Do you recall what that dis-Ò. 14 cussion was now? 15 Å (Pause.) Uh -- well --3 16 Q. Well, let me withdraw that. 17 Do you recall the names of these other people. 18 other than Gary Himman and Terry Melcher? 19 I only --MR. DENNY: That's been asked and answered, your Honor. 21 She said: No. 22 THE COURT: Sustained. It has been asked and answered. 3<u>3:</u> 23 MR. MANZELIA: All right. È Now, during that conversation at the Devil's Canyon campaits, did -- when Terry Melcher's name was 26 mentioned, did Charles Manson say where Terry Melcher lived? è 27 A Yes. 28 And where did Terry Melcher live?

		• •
12a-4	1	A It was said that he lived across the street from
	2	Malibu Beach.
	3	Q And had you personally ever been to Terry
€,	4	Melcher's home?
	5	A Not that one.
- 	6	Q Had you been to another home of Terry Melcher?
*	7	A Yes.
	8- `	Q Where was that?
	9	A Somewhere in Beverly Hills, I believe, that area.
	10	Q And had you gone there alone or with someone else?
	11	MR, DENNY: I'll object to that as irrelevant and
	12	immaterial.
	13	THE COURT: Sustained.
* *	14	Q BY MR. MANZELIA: And had you gone there with
\$	15	other members of the Family?
43	16	MR. DENNY: Object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.
12b f1	5 • 17	THE COURT: Sustained.
	18	
•	19	-
	20	
	21	
4	22	•
ε	23	
*	24	
£.	25	
₽.	26	٠.
	27	
•	28	

28

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: When had you gone there?

MR. DENNY: Object to that as irrelevant and immaterial.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: It was much earlier.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Was it during 1969, or was it even earlier than that?

A I believe it was in '69, but it would have been the very early parts of '69.

Now, did you, during your interview in May or September of 1970, with Sergeant Whiteley, did you tell Sergeant Whiteley that Beausoleil, Brunner and Atkins and a fourth person left the ranch for Gary Hinman's house while you were at the ranch house?

A Not while I was at the ranch house, no.

Q Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley anything about that, during -- in May or September of 1970?

MR. DENNY: I'll object to that as calling for hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, the implication has been traised that --

MR. DENMY: May we have argument at the bench, if we are going to have argument?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. MANZELLA: All right. Thank you.

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

THE COURT: Ken, repeat the question to me, will you?

THE REPORTER: Yes. I'll read the preceding question,

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

Mow, did you, during your interview in May or September of 1970, with Sergeant Whiteley, did you tell Sergeant Whiteley that Beausoleil, Brunner and Atkins and a fourth person left the ranch for Gary Hinman's house while you were at the ranch house?

"A Not while I was at the ranch house, no.

"Q Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley anything about that, during -- in May or September of
1970?")

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, we are right back to the same thing that we were just discussing at the last break.

They want to get in this business, "I heard they left," in that conversation; and I am sure that's the conversation you are pointing to.

MR. MANZELLA: No. Actually, I have got the wrong one. I am talking about September. I think there were some words about the ranch house in September.

. MR. DENNY: That's right. That's right.

MR. MANZELLA: And I wanted to show that Mr. Denny raised the implications that she told Sergeant Whiteley that she wasn't present when they left, and I'm asking her what she did tell Sergeant Whiteley.

12b-3

è

THE COURT: Well, you asked her the question, and it was in -- it was a prior -- it was an inconsistency, a prior inconsistency, about whether she actually was standing at the place she said she was standing when the car left.

MR. KAY: That's right.

MR. DENNY: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you put the question to her --

MR. DENNY: Based on --

THE COURT: -- concerning what she had said to Sergeant Whiteley, in a previous conversation, regarding being at the ranch house.

MR. DENNY: That's right. And this is what we were discussing at the last break, at 3:00 o'clock, whether they could ask her just -- "Well, what did you tell Sergeant Whiteley about your hearing someone leave?"

Or whether they had to preface it by the prior inconsistent statement that I've put forward, on Page 22 of these notes, and then ask her to explain:

"Did you say that, or did you say something else?"
THE COURT: I think that that would be proper.

MR. DENNY: Well, that's the way the Court ruled then, and I think the Court should continue to rule now, rather than the way they're trying to do it.

MR. MANZELLA: Well, what I am asking her is whether she told Sergeant Whiteley that she was at the ranch house. I thought she said no.

MR. DENNY: That's right, That's what she did say. She said no.

THE COURT: That's right. She stated no.

MR. MANZELLA: Now, I am asking her what she did tell Sergeant Whiteley.

See, Mr. Denny's the one -- he kept asking her the question, "Well, if this is what Sergeant Whiteley wrote, did he make a mistake?"

12c-1

16·

18,

19 `

Ţ

THE COURT: Well, is this meant for the truth of the matter, that you are asking that? It would clearly be hearsay, if that is the case.

MR. MANZELLA: No, I am asking her this -- I am asking her this because I want to establish from -- from her testimony, as well as from Sergeant Whiteley's testimony, what she did tell Sergeant Whiteley.

Mr. Demy has raised the implication that it was -- has raised the implication that she made certain statements -- for example, that she was at the ranch house when they left.

And I am trying to bring out what she -- the actual statement that she made to Sergeant Whiteley.

THE COURT: Do you believe that you will be able to establish that this is what she did tell Whiteley? In other words, that you will be able to establish this by her inconsistent statement?

MR. DENNY: Well, I hope so, your Honor, if -MR. MANZELIA: I mean, Mr. Denny has raised the implication --

MR. DENNY: If he's going to testify consistently with his notes -- unless he's going to say, "I lied in my notes," or, "I take very sloppy notes," or, "I just made this up."

I would expect that Sergeant Whiteley would testify that, "This is what she told me, and the order in which she told me."

MR. MANZELLA: Well, Sergeant Whiteley -- I can tell you that Sergeant Whiteley, with regard to that specific

12c-2

2

1

3

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13⁻

15

16·

18

19

20 21

22

23· 24

25

ş.

26

27 28 point, will say -- will testify that he asked Miss Bailey a
few things about the typewritten report, and she corrected him
on several points, two points in particular. She -- the
typewritten report says that -- that she did not see Beausoleil,
Brunner and Atkins and Davis leave the ranch, and that she did
see Manson and Davis leave the ranch.

That's what Whiteley has in his typewritten report. And that when she -- when he asked her about it later -- and she testified to this already -- that she told him: No, that was a mistake; that she did not see Manson and Davis leave, but that she did see Beausoleil, Brunner and Atkins and a fourth person leave the ranch.

MR. DENNY: Well --

MR. MANZELLA: And I think it's proper to bring that out.

THE COURT: Well, is it a prior consistent statement that
you are asking for?

MR. MANZELLA: Yes.

MR. DENNY: No, because it's hearsay.

MR. MANZELLA: She's going to say that she told Whiteley

THE COURT: When?

MR. MANZELLA: In September, 19 --

THE COURT: In September or -- or in May?

MR. MANZELLA: In -- in -- wait a minute.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

MR. KAY: What she's going to be doing, she's going to be explaining what appears 'inconsistent statement, your Honor.

MR. MANZERLA: She's going to expla

· ·	
12c-3	, 1
	2
	3
8 ,	4
و من المناس المن	5
₹ ⟨ Ç	6
ů.	7
	8
	9
	10
•	11
	12
	13
_ 4	14
	15
*** ***	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
Š .	23
¥	24
ž,	25
	26

£

27

28

THE COURT: Well, it's admissible only for the purpose of --

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I have no objection, your Honor, if they put it the way they should put a prior inconsistent statement; namely:

"Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley on May 15-or May 16 -- 1970, that you did see Bruce and Charlie
leave?"

Now, if that's -- if that is the prior consistent statement or -- strike that.

"That you saw Hirman and Mary and Sadie and a fourth person leave?"

Now, that would be consistent with her present testimony, and that would contradict what appears to be in these notes.

But you can't just say, "What did you tell him?"

The only way to get in a prior consistent statement is the funny way that the law has of being able to
lead a witness on that particular question, and asking the
very conversation, so that you can say, "Is this what you said?"

Because that's the prior inconsistent statement.

MR. MANZELLA: I think that's objectionable as leading, your Honor. That's why I don't ask it.

MR. DENNY: That's the way you have to do it.

THE COURT: Well, the -- the question on crossexamination is -- is leading, as it nearly must be, but --

MR. DENNY: You can't just --

THE COURT: -- I think you should rephrase your question.

	1	It would be admissible
	2	MR. MANZELIA: All right.
	3	MR. DENNY: Your Honor, only one thing
8	4	THE COURT: It would be admissible, don't you think,
L2d Fla.	5	to show to assist the jury in determining credibility only?
	-6	
₽ ,	7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
*	14	
•	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
***	22	
	23	
` <u>`</u>	24	
Ļ	25	
Ž.	26	
	27 28	·
-	4 0	

2

3

4

5

6,

7:

8

9

MR. DENNY: No, your Honor. If you are going to get that prior consistent statement. --

THE COURT: That's true, --

MR. DENNY: -- the only thing --

THE COURT: -- under Green, it would be admissible substantively, too, wouldn't it?

MR. DENNY: That's right. And the only way you can get it in, if it is in fact consistent with her present testimony, MR. MANZELLA: Right.

MR. DENNY: -- namely, "Did you tell Sergeant Whiteley that you did see Bobby, Sadie and Mary leave in John's Swartz's Ford.

If she says, "Yes," that's fine. And I'm not going to object to that.

But if you say, "Well, what did you tell them about leaving?" That's an improper way to get in a prior consistent statement.

THE COURT: All right. I'll agree with you in that respect.

> MR. MANZELLA: Okav.

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

THE COURT: You may ask your question, Mr. Manzella.

MR. MANZELLA: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.

Miss Bailey, in September of 1970, when you were interviewed by Sergeant Whiteley at Tacoma, did you tell him that you -- that you were at the ranch house when Bobby, Mary and Sadie and a fourth person left the ranch?

1 I told him I was at --A No. 2 MR. DENNY: Just a moment. Just a moment. I'll object 3 to anything beyond "No," and move that it be stricken. 4 THE COURT: Nothing has been said. 5 Beyond "No," it will be stricken, ladies and 6 gentlemen. The answer "No." may remain in the record. 7 BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Did you tell him that 8 you were -- strike that. 9 Did you tell him that you saw Bobby, Mary, Sadie 10 and a fourth person leave the ranch? 11 A Yes. 12 (Pause in the proceedings while a discussion off 13 the record ensued at the counsel table between Mr. Manzella 14. and Mr. Kay.) 15 MR. MANZELLA: May I have just a moment, your Honor? 16 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 17 (Further pause in the proceedings.) 13 fol 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 Ì. 25 26 27 28

13-1	1	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Miss Bailey, did you
	2	(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings
	3	while Mr. Manzella conferred with Mr. Key at counsel
	4.	table.)
	5	MR. MANZELLA: I'll withdraw that, your Honor.
	6	Thank you, your Honor, I have no further questions
ā	7	Thank you, Miss Bailey.
	8	MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I wonder if before starting
	9	on cross I might reopen that is, before starting on
	10	recross I may reopen my cross for just a moment?
	11	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
	12	MR. DENNY: Thank you.
	13	
<u>*</u>	14	CROSS-EXAMINATION (Reopened)
)	15	BY MR. DENNY:
4. 0	16	Q Miss Bailey, would you remove your glasses again,
	17	please.
	18	Your Honor, I think well, strike that.
	19	Strike that.
	20	MR. KAY: May we approach the bench a moment on this,
	21	your Honor?
₹	22	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
<u>ئ</u> ق	23	(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had
Ž	24	at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the
ş	25	hearing of the jury:)
	26	MR. KAY: I still feel that
	27	THE COURT: What is it you purport to do?
	28	MR. DENNY: Two things, your Honor.

13-2

Ņ

First of all, I do want to, now, having laid the foundation that she can recognize these people and that they were -- they do appear as they did when she knew them during the time she was living at the ranch --

THE COURT: The people in the various pictures which you have shown.

MR. DENNY: That is correct.

-- would like to determine whether she can recognize them from a distance of 20 feet, at which she could recognize the other photographs of Manson, Beausoleil, Atkins, Brunner and Davis.

I want, in addition, your Honor, to have the jury, themselves, look through her glasses.

And I would not like to have those glasses received into evidence, but I do feel it is extremely relevant to her ability to see and to the jurors' determination of that ability to see, for the jury to do as I do, and that is to look through the Coke bottle lens type glasses that this girl wears.

MR. KAY: They're not Coke bottle lenses. I've looked through the glasses and they're not Coke bottle lenses.

THE COURT: No, they don't appear to be.

MR. DENNY: Well, I am speaking a little facetiously and perhaps a little more grandiloquently than I should, but nevertheless --

THE COURT: I can't think the jury, in looking through the glasses, would have any great probative value.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor --

There are about two, three, four, or five of them who wear glasses.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know whether the others have normal vision or not. It is difficult to say what effect it

MR. DENNY: Well, it is difficult to say, your Honor.

And, therefore, the Court would not permit that. I don't think it would have any probative value.

MR. DENNY: Well, may this --

THE COURT: Now, what else do you wish?

MR. DENNY: Well, just for the record make that as the offer of proof that I would make and the fact that I do feel it is probative as to the ability of this witness to see, and the Court is overruling that offer, I take it?

MR. DENNY: All right.

Well, the other thing --

THE COURT: You have the other fact that there's been a considerable time lapse --

MR. DENNY: Well, that she has indicated, your Honor, her eyes are the same now.

THE COURT: Even though she has --

MR. MENNY: And that's what she has testified to.

THE COURT: Yes. Even though she has indicated that --

THE COURT: -- and she states, however, that she has not been to -- for an examination since shortly after her

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11 12

13

14

15 16

Š

17

18 '19

20

22

21

23 24

25

26

27

28

13a fls.

مر کک

ن.

Š

Š

apprehension, as I remember.

MR. DENNY: So she states, but that again is a question of her credibility.

THE COURT: All right. And in the event the Court does not want to permit that experiment --

MR. DENNY: Well, the other thing is, I do want to proceed to attempt to have her identify the people who she says she knows and recognizes when I showed them to her close up here, and I have extracted from the group of photographs those people who she has indicated she did not know or could not readily recognize and want to show her only those whom she says she did know, could recognize, and whose pictures look like she remembered seeing them when she was living among them in 1969.

THE COURT: The Court thinks that the pictures do not in any way -- these pictures do not in any way approximate having the real person here in each instance.

MR. DENNY: No question about that.

THE COURT: So what this is, really, is an eye test rather than a test of her credibility as to whether or not --

MR. DENNY: That is correct.

THE COURT: -- as to whether or not she knows and does know and recognizes these people.

MR. DENNY: I would seek to have it --

THE COURT: So instead of an eye chart, you're going to use photographs?

MR. DENNY: That's correct, your Honor, for that limited purpose.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

28

MR. KAY: Except --

MR. DENNY: -- that it may be received.

MR. KAY: The vice is, your Honor, it is very misleading to the jury.

THE COURT: I don't think so if the Court instructs them.

MR. KAY: Well, your Honor asked me to draft an instruction.

(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings up at the bench while the Court perused the document.)

MR. DENNY: Assuming Mr. Kay's handwriting is better than Manzella's, may I read it?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KAY: Uh-huh.

(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings while Mr. Denny perused the documents.)

(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings up at the bench during which time Court and counsel perused several documents.)

MR. KAY: The problem is, that doesn't cover what the problem is with this test and it is very misleading. The problem is that Mr. Denny obviously wants the jury to assume that if she cannot identify these pictures that, therefore, she couldn't identify persons out on Spahn Ranch on July 25. 1969. Why else would he be doing it?

MR. DENNY: That a not my purpose. It is simply --MR. KAY: It is obvious that that s your purpose. MR. DENNY: No.

1

2

3

5 6

7 8

10

9

11 12

13

14 15.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

Ţ

3

25 26

⁵. 27

28

THE COURT: I'll permit it.

MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor.

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

THE COURT: So, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Denny is about to conduct a test of Miss Bailey's eyesight. And you are not to assume that the lighting or background conditions in this courtroom are in any way similar to the lighting or background conditions on Spahn Ranch on July 25, 1969, or that if the persons whose photographs are depicted here were here that she could or could not identify them. This is not a test to determine her credibility concerning her knowledge of recognition of the persons in the photographs, ladies and gentlemen, it is a test of her ability to see without glasses at this time, and that's the only thing it is offered for. These photographs could just as well, in other words, be an eye chart of some type.

MR. DENNY: Thank you.

Is there anything that either counsel wishes THE COURT: the Court to say further in connection with this?

MR. DENNY: No.

Q Now, I've mixed up the series here, so let me show you these photographs.

Who is that?

- You needn't hold them up because I can't see them.
 - Well, I'm showing you 77-V for identification.

You don't know who that is, is that correct?

A (No response.)

S.

Ţ

5

7.

11

		:	
13b-1	1	Q '	Is that a man or a woman?
Ô .	2	À	I don't know.
	3	Q	51?
*	4	A	No.
***	5	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
	6	A	I don't know.
Ť	7	Q	77-E?
	8	A.	No.
	9	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
	10	A	I don't know.
	11	Q	77-F?
	12	A	I don't know.
	13	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
b	14	A	I don't know.
• t	15	Q	77-I, can you recognize that person?
S	16	A	No.
\	17	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
	18	A	I don't know.
	19	Q	77-J, can you recognize that person?
	20	A	I don't know,
	21	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
<i>X</i> ^	22	A	I don't know.
	23	Q	77-W?
ż	24	A.	I don't know.
*	25	Q	Is that a men or a woman?
	26	A	I don't know.
~~	27	Q	77-K?
	28	A	I don't know.

13b-2	_	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
**************************************	1	A.	I don't know.
	2		
	3		77-L?
3 7:	4	,	I don't know.
1	5	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
	6	Á	I don't know.
•	7	Q	77-M?
	8	A	I don't know.
	9.	Ġ.	Is that a men or a woman?
	10	A	I don't know.
	11	Q,	77-P?
	12	A	I don't know.
	13	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
•	14	A	I don't know,
*	15	Q	77-G?
	16	A	I don't know.
) }	17	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
	18 .	A	I don't know.
	19	Q.	77-R?
	20	A	I don't know.
	21	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
	22	A	Don't know.
\$	23	Q	77-T?
, de la companya de l	24	A	Don't know.
Š .	25	Q	Is that a man or a woman?
2	26	A	I don't know.
	27	Q	77-X?
	28	A	Don't know.

13b-3	1
	2
	3
r	4
3 ₆ . I	5
	6
ŕ	7
	8
	9
E vi dence	10
	11
	12
	13
)r	14
	15
, \$	16
Ĵ	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
Ĵ.	23
i de la companya de l	24
	2 5
3	26
	27
	28

- Q Is that a man or a woman?
- A Don't know.
- Q 77-S?
- A Don't know.
- Q Is that a man or a woman?
- A I don't know.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I would like these photographs at this time received in evidence.

THE COURT: All right, they're received in evidence bearing the numbers that they've heretofore been marked for identification.

MR. DENNY: Is the Court going to take its afternoon recess at this time? I have a good deal of cross-examination, further cross, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, we'll recess, then.

We're recessed until tomorrow morning at 9:30, ladies and gentlemen. During the recess you are advised not to converse amongst yourselves nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to conver 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.

Good night. I'll see you tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, there were murmurs heard by the jury of "What time?")

THE COURT: 9:30. Didn't I say it? 9:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:30 o'clock p.m. the evening adjournment was taken, the matter herein to be recurred the following day, Tuesday, January 18,