SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 2 DEPARTMENT NO. 106 HON. RAYMOND CHOATE, JUDGE 3 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 5 Plaintiff, 6 No. A-267861 7 VS. BRUCE McGREGOR DAVIS. 8. Defendant. 9 10 11 12 REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT 13 Friday, February 25, 1972 14 VOLUME 51 15 16 17 **APPEARANCES:** 18 For the People: JOSEPH P. BUSCH, District Attorney 19 ANTHONY MANZELLA and STEPHEN R. KAY, Deputies District Attorney 21 For Defendant Davis: GEORGE V. DENNY, III 22 24 25 26 27 MARY LOU BRIANDI, C.S.R. ROGER K. WILLIAMS, C.S.R. Official Court Reporters 28

		. 1
1	INDEX	·
2		PAGE
3	DEFENDANT'S ARGUMENT (Continued)	7906
4.	PEOPLE'S CLOSING ARGUMENT	8017
5		
6		
7 .		
8		
9	WITNESSES IN PEOPLE'S MOTION TO RE-OPEN:	
10	GLEASON, William	8113 M 8123 8140 M
11		
12		
13		
14		,
15		, ,
Ĭę		
17		,
18	EXHIBITS	, ,
19	COURT'S SPECIAL EXHIBITS:	For Identification
20	4 - teletypes	8119
21 22		
23		,; ,;
24		
25	•	<i>:</i> .
26		
27		•
28		
•		

3

4

5

6

7

28

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1972 9:41 A.M.

THE COURT: All right. In the case of People vs. Bruce Davis, get the jury in.

THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.

(Proceedings had on unrelated matters.)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

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

THE COURT: We are all glad to see all of you, apparently in good health, and looking forward to the weekend, probably.

The defendant is present now. Both counsel, Mr. Kay and Mr. Denny, are present.

You may proceed, Mr. Denny.

MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, good morning.

I did want to go over a couple of instructions -- actually, more than a couple of instructions -- with you.

You'll hear them from the Judge, but sometimes they sound sort of mechanical. The Judge has to read a lot of instructions. You will get the instructions in the jury room to go over.

But I think it's important for a lawyer -- on either side -- to try to interpret those instructions some, if they need interpretation, or perhaps stress what he feels is an important part of them.

A-2

The instructions are supposed to be pretty bland statements of the law, but when you apply them to the facts, sometimes, they're not quite so bland.

And quite frankly, you people, in the course of about an hour, Monday, are going to be instructed on some of the most esoteric points of law that have come down and been developed over the centuries, that our judicial processes have been in the process of developing.

And it's almost impossible, really, for a lay jury -- much less people who supposedly have been schooled in the law -- to absorb all of that at one time.

So I feel it's proper, and our function as attorneys, to attempt to relate how the law, as given to you by the Court, fits some of the facts that you have heard -- and although there may be a different opinion as to what those facts are; each of may look at them differently; some of you jurors may look at them differently -- but at least see how they may apply to a state of facts, if you find that to be the state of facts.

Now, first, you'll hear:

"All persons concerned in the commission of a crime who either directly and actively commit the acts constituting the offense or who knowingly and with criminal intent aid and abet in its commission or, whether present or not, who advise and encourage its commission, are regarded by the law as principals in the crime thus committed and are equally guilty thereof."

Now, a principal is simply a person who could be charged as a co-defendant -- the same as an accomplice.

And we'll talk about that a little bit.

Now, the People have sought to have this instruction given, obviously, because they say that Bruce Davis was a principal in both of these -- or all three of these, as there are three counts alleged, three crimes charged.

It's just as applicable, however, in your determination -- which you must determine -- as to whether or not Ella Jo Bailey was a principal.

And in that context, you look at the words
"who either directly and actively commit the act constituting
the offense --" well, she didn't really do that -- "or who
knowingly and with criminal intent aid and abet in its
commission," -- and we'll get a little further here some
instruction on what the phrase -- or the words "aid and abet"
mean legally -- "or, whether present or not, who advise and
encourage its commission."

Now, think about that, when you are thinking about Ella Jo Bailey.

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

The People would like you to think of that in relationship to Bruce Davis. I would like you to think of that in -- and you should think of that, and the Court will so advise you -- in relationship to Ella Jo Bailey, whether

whe is an accomplice, a principal, an aider and an abettor. And if she is, other things follow, of course. Aa fls.

aa-1

 prosecuted for the identical offense charged against the defendant on trial.

"To be an accomplice, the person must have

"An accomplice is one who is liable to be

"To be an accomplice, the person must have knowingly --"

Let me just go back here. "An accomplice is one who is liable to be prosecuted for the identical offense charged against the defendant on trial."

That means: Is that person guilty of the offense for which the defendant is on trial?

It doesn't mean -- and it doesn't imply -- that the defendant necessarily was involved in anything. It's not Bruce Davis's accomplice.

The phrase -- or the word "accomplice," is very particular, very discrete in its meaning.

It simply means: Can that person be charged with the same offense that the defendant is charged with?

All right.

"To be an accomplice, the person must have knowingly and with criminal intent aided, promoted, encouraged,
or instigated by act or advice, or by act and advice, the
commission of such offense."

Think about that in connection with Ella Jo Bailey? Who aided, promoted, advised, encouraged the commission of the robbery and the murder of Gary Hinman?

Now, this is an interesting instruction, particularly in regard to Ella Jo Bailey.

"One who has knowingly and with criminal intent

aa-2

,28.

aided and abetted the commission of a crime may terminate his or her liability and end his or her responsibility for the crime -- "How? -- "by notifying the other party or parties of whom he has knowledge of his or her intention to withdraw from the commission of the crime and by doing everything in his power to prevent its commission."

That's why my line of questioning to Ella Jo
Bailey. After she had instigated, promoted and encouraged
the robbery of Gary Hinman, she kind of bugged out on the
caper, to use the common phraseology, and sent Susan Atkins
in her stead — knowing that Gary Hinman would probably be
killed.

Did she do anything to -- did she do everything in her power to prevent the commission of this offense? I asked her, you know, "You knew he was going to be killed, didn't you?

"A No. I didn't know."

And finally, as I read to you yesterday, "Well, I had an idea that if he put up a struggle, he might get hurt.

"And you did nothing to advise him? You did nothing? You didn't go to the police? You didn't even give him a call?

"A Oh, well, I was afraid of Charlie.

I was afraid of Charlie."

This female who, for one year, ten months -- as it was pointed out, not two years -- one year, ten months had been one of the first Manson girls, had stuck with the group -- "But I was afraid of Charlie."

1 fol

She wasn't so afraid that she didn't just take right off after the commission of this offense, with Bill Vance, her boyfriend.

Bill Vance, whom she testified to, had a mind of his own, and didn't take orders from Charlie. She wasn't all that afraid.

If she had wanted to remove herself from the conspiracy of which she was one of the prime movers, she could have done so two days before she did, instead of at the time she did, after the offense had been committed.

And then, it goes on:

"If notice to the other party or parties is impossible or impractical, he may end his responsibility -- " or her responsibility -- "by doing everything in his or her power to prevent the commission of the contemplated crime."

She did nothing. And indeed, as the People almost concede here -- have to concede -- she did those acts which aided, helped, after the brought home the bootie, the loot, the spoils, leaving the dead body to rot at 964 Old Topanga Canyon Drive.

б

n

Ġ4

0E

I know I sound like a prosecutor here when I'm talking to you. I don't like pictures of stinking bodies with skin slipping off them, flashed before a jury. But it is a fact. It happened. And I can't deny that. So you'll have it and you can see it. And it is a ghastly, grisley, gruesome picture that you wouldn't hang out on the wall of your home or anything, certainly, but it is life. A body decomposes. A body stinks after it is decomposed for a while.

All right, going on.

"A conviction cannot be had upon the testimony of an accomplice unless it is corroborated by other evidence as shall tend to connect the defendant with the commission of the offense."

We talked about that yesterday at some length. We don't need to go over it. And we talked about how you determine whether the testimony of the accomplice has been corroborated.

What is corroborative evidence? You have to remove all of the testimony of this accomplice. Again, an accomplice simply being one who could be charged with the same offense, not one who necessarily has any relationship with the defendant. Remove all of that from the case, wipe it out of your mind. You must perform this psychological feat, which is most difficult. And then see if there's anything left that connects the defendant with the offense. Not which connects something that the defendant may have purchased some weeks earlier and which other people have access to, but which connects the defendant specifically with

the offense. There is no such evidence in this case.

Now, again, you'll hear:

"Merely assenting to or aiding or assisting in the commission of a crime without guilty knowledge or intent is not criminal, and the person so assenting to, or aiding, or assisting in, the commission of a crime without guilty knowledge or intent in respect thereto, is not an accomplice in the commission of such crime."

Now, this is essentially an instruction which the defense would normally put in if you give some credence to the testimony of Ella Bailey, because all she has testified to in connection with Bruce Davis is that he was there and there's some question as to whether he was there in this Devil's Canyon campground meeting. She possibly being under the influence of pot, not remembering who was at such dinner meetings within any of the period of time, the week before or the week after.

She remember the people who were there on that one particular night, quite a feat of memory. But assuming you believe her and you didn't find that she's an accomplice, which I hardly think you cannot find, all she's testified to is, what? That she saw Bruce Davis talking with Manson and Beausoleil and she has testified to this admission. It is not a confession. It is an admission supposedly made, and I say "supposedly made," because that's the only damaging thing in all of her testimony.

We'll go over in the Shea case about three pieces

la fla.

of testimony given by three separate witnesses which are the smallest, most unreliable type of admission that you could possibly get against a defendant, and that's all they've got against Bruce Davis in this case.

But, anyway, if somebody does and acts without the guilty knowledge necessary -- and you must show that -then, they cannot be held as an accomplice in the commission of the offense.

Again, evidence that a person was in the company of or associated with one or more other persons alleged or proved to have been members of the conspiracy is not in and of itself sufficient to prove that such a person was a member of the alleged conspiracy.

And this is the hideous aspect of this type of conspiracy.

The conspiracy, the charge of conspiracy is known as the prosecutor's darling.

Clarence Darrow made that phrase famous in a number of cases that he tried which were conspiracy cases; conspiracy to bomb, conspiracy in connection with workers struggles during the period when the strike was evolving, the lockout and the boycott and all of that. And the prosecutor always used to charge the workers with conspiracy. Because, you see, conspiracy permits the prosecutor to get in all sorts of statements of other people -- not the defendant -- but other alleged conspirators. This is just one of the crazy parts of the law that has evolved and developed and has been under great, great criticism of recent years.

2

3

1

5

6 7

8

10

11

12

13.

5

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

44

24

25

27

28

But it is the prosecutor's darling, because this way they can get in the statements of three. four, five people, and introduce them in evidence against the sixth person, or the seventh or eighth, who have said nothing, because they are associated with, suspected or even admitted conspirators, the aura of criminality, the aura of guilt somehow is supposed to and frequently does, unfortunately brush off onto them. And that's why you are told, and there is a specific instruction and it is an important instruction that mere association in and of itself is not sufficient. And this is why, and we'll get into a particular exhibit here and I'll talk about that a little bit further, why I argued so strongly yesterday about this guilt by association. I don't think that merely because Bruce Davis was a member of the Manson Family, admittedly, was associated with Charles Manson, is going to permit you to be railroaded by the prosecution into conviction him on that basis.

Because there were lots of members of the Manson Family.

And merely because they were members of the Manson Family, that doesn't make them guilty of everything that Charles Manson did or Ella Jo Bailey did or Bill Vance or Danny DeCarlo did.

Then, again, evidence of the commission of an act which furthers the purpose of an alleged conspiracy is not in and of itself sufficient to prove that the member committing the act was a member of such conspiracy.

Now, if you feel that, again, Ella Jo Bailey's

8,

 testimony is entitled to any credence at all, in view of the fact that she perjured herself time and time again, and in view of the fact that you will be instructed that where you find that a witness willfully and with a design to deceive gave you false testimony, you can toss out all of that person's testimony, which I submit you should do as far as Ella Jo Bailey is concerned.

You may, some of you in your deliberations, attempt to look at it to give some credence to her testimony that Bruce Davis went with Charles Manson as she relates he told her. And let me just jump in here a minute and interrupt myself.

You know an extraordinary thing again.

Mr. Manzella argued to you briefly yesterday about the kind of guy Bruce Davis is who would make the statements because of one snippet of conversation that you got through Sergeant Whiteley, one tiny bit of conversation that Sergeant Whiteley related out of a good deal more, you must say, that he took from the context of some TV cameraman and reporters questioning Bruce Davis when he gave himself up. And the conversation that was related there, and this is supposed to explain the whole character of Bruce Davis.

What do you know about Bruce Davis? You know precious little, actually. But does that little snippet of conversation give you such insight into his character as to assume that he is such a blabbermouth that he is going to bare his soul to Ella Jo Bailey, the person that certainly Charlie Manson didn't trust by her own statement and probably

•

ļ2

25.

the rest of the Family didn't trust? And just pour out his part in a rather hideous murder? Well, you think about that.

Getting back to this, if you give it any credence, the fact that he did an act, the fact that he went with Charles Manson, assuming you believe anything that Ella Jo Bailey says, you've got to determine, again, whether he knew what was going on at the time.

Now, you may say that everybody -- everybody knew. But he's got to have some guilty knowledge. And I don't think you've been given any evidence to that effect. Other than such innuendoes that may have been involved in Ella Bailey's testimony.

Now, finally, we get to flight.

People like to give such an instruction, and they're going to argue and have argued indeed, Mr. Manzella did, that the departure of Mr. Manson, Bruce Davis, other members of the Family at the end of August was flight, flight from the crime of killing Shorty Shea.

Well, you know, that's sort of interesting because it is acknowledged that they were involved, Davis was not involved, when I say "they", but Manson, Ella Bailey, Sadie Atkins, Mary Brunner, Bob Beausoleil. But Bob Beausoleil did drive the truck, drive a Fiat up north -- for what purpose it is not known -- but he was stopped by Officer Humphrey.

But all the rest of these people, they stayed right there. Manson stayed there. Manson was arrested twice during this period of time. He still stayed right there at the ranch, after the killing of Gary Hinman. They

1a-4	1	left when they were ready to leave, when they had planned to	
	2	leave and when they did leave. There was no flight.	
*	. 3	But who, who fled after the commission of the	
	4	Hinman murder? Two people. Bill Vance and Ella Jo Bailey.	
*	5	Now, consider this instruction in connection with	
1b fls.	6	Ella Jo Bailey, if you will.	
	7		
	8		
	9		
	10		
	11		
	12	•	
3	13		
	14	•	
	15		
	16		
	17 18		
	19		
	20		
	21		
	22		
	23		
'n	24		
	25		
*	26		
	27		
	28		

"The flight of a person immediately after the commission of a crime, whereafter he is accused of a crime that has been committed, is not sufficient in itself to establish his guilt, but is a fact which, if proved, may be considered by you in the light of all other proved facts in deciding the question of his guilt or innocence. The weight to which that circumstance is entitled is a matter for the jury to determine."

All right, who fled? Who had a sense of guilt? Who was guilty? Who was guilty as hell of conspiracy to rob and murder Gary Hinman? Well, she admitted, finally, on the last day of cross-examination that she was responsible and, indeed, she was.

All right. Now, back to Shea.

Delma Baker we've talked about.

Richard Barber, we've talked about.

Paul Ewart. Interesting, again, the unasked question. The unasked question.

Paul Ewart was asked on direct examination very little.

"Did you get the car?

"Was the car, Shorty Shea's car towed into your garage?

Do you still have the car?

"Did you get it at some sort of foreclosure sale or something like that?"

The unasked question; questions.

1 2

Let's get the whole truth out, Mr. Prosecutor.
"What was the condition of the car when you got it?

"The brakes were bad. It needed brakes and the steering was in such condition that it was so unsafe that I wouldn't let somebody use it as a loan car, so I had to fix something in the steering and I had to put new brakes on."

Oh, is that so?

"Well, why didn't the prosecution bring that out? Why?"

Because it explains why Shorty Shea would not take that car on a long trip. Because, as you remember,

Lance Victor testified that the year before, when they had gone up to the salt mines -- that's just the test for the air raid. Wait just a minute.

(Pause.)

I think I can talk over it.

You recall Lance Victor said they took his car the year before, in 1968, to go up to the salt mines because that year, with the car Shorty Shea had, an old '59 Cadillac, that the brakes were bad and Shorty wouldn't drive it that distance. Remember. This year, both the brakes and the steering are bad. So bad to make it an unsafe car to drive. But the prosecution didn't ask those questions.

All right, Karen Nelson, simply here to show you that by the Leslie Salt Company records there's no record of his having gone up in the year '69 to work.

Now, I questioned her, about the fact of whether he might have worked briefly, because you see, he did work only briefly the year before, only a couple of weeks, and then left. And I'm not sure whether he would have worked under an assumed name or not, if he ever got up there. I'm not sure he ever got up there. I'm not sure that he left. We don't know.

Do any of you sitting there right now really think you know the whereabouts or what has happened to Shorty Shea?

His mother -- I'll put her name up here in just a minute. But his mother testified, and the dear lady, she said when I asked her -- I said, "You've been told that your son is dead, is that right?" And she said, "Yes."

And I said, "But do you know that?" And she said, "No, it is just I haven't heard from him for so long."

She doesn't know.

All right. Sam Launer. Again, the pawnshop owners come through very well as a group here. The man who pawned Shorty's guns.

Now, think about it -- in just a minute I'll get those exhibits, those pawn slips -- these guns that were so important. This is the thing that Mr. Manzella has made so much of in his statement as to a way of life. Mr. Kay may. The prosecution has. They must have called ten witnesses just to establish the fact that Shorty loved his guns.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, if I had a pair of

1b-4 matched guns like that, whether I am a cowboy or not, I'd be pretty proud of them. I'd love to have a pair of matched lc fls. guns like that. I'd be happy about it, too.

1c-1

no

And I'm sure Shorty Shea was -- I'm sure they probably meant more to him than they do to me. It is funny about Shorty Shea, those pawn slips show that he pawned the guns in February, one of them he redeemed in March, one of them he didn't redeem until May. These guns he loved so much. He sure didn't have them very much out of the year. He got them in '68, the testimony goes.

Now, we don't know whether he pawned them in '68 or not. They didn't bring any pawnbrokers in on that. But is is possible to assume that this was, again, his way of life, to use Mr. Manzella's phrase. That whenever he needed money, he hocked these guns. And although he was proud of them and he liked them and all, he didn't have them in his possession very much.

And Sam Launer says "Yeah, I hocked these guns for him back in February and in July, both of them."

Interesting.

Now, let's take the next group of witnesses.

All right, "All those essentially disinterested witnesses-officers."

Well, Officer James Pursell testified to the arrest of some of the people and the names they used and the fact that practically all the Manson people used false names. Deputy John Sheehan testified to the arrest on August 16th that the big raid of, who? I should say of whom.

Danny DeCarlo, under the name of Richard Alan
Smith. And that booking slip is in evidence. And the booking
slip is the one that the handwriting expert compared with the

1c-2

1 2

writing on the redemption slips, "Richard Alan Smith," Danny DeCarlo. Very interesting.

Richard Wachsmuth, his testimony has been gone into by Mr. Manzella.

And Sergeant Paul Whiteley, called by the prosecution in this case for certain evidence, specifically concerning the terrain of the Goler Wash-Ballarat area, the discussion of the maps that are in evidence here, the topo maps.

Discussion of something else interesting, the fact that you and I and everyone in here who pays taxes paid for some 5,000 man-hours of work digging up Spahn Ranch and Devil's Canyon and Ybarra Canyon and Box Canyon looking for Shorty Shea.

Now, that's kind of interesting. There must have been an awful lot of rumors going around as to different places where Shorty Shea is supposed to have been disposed of.

That map we have -- excuse me just a minute.

Let's get that.

(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings while Mr. Denny left the courtroom, returning shortly, and the following proceedings were had:)

MR. DENNY: We've got Devil's Canyon here (indicating)
-- golly, I don't think we've even gone into Ybarra Canyon,
Box Canyon. They're way even off this map, Exhibit 68 -no, that's not 68, 92.

They were digging up places all over the place,

1c-3

diverting the channel of the stream down here (indicating).

Does that remind you of another search for a body connected with the Manson case? Ronald Hughes. And that's sufficiently of common knowledge, so I think I can discuss that.

Ronald Hughes, one of the attorneys in the Tate-La Bianca case.

And remember when he disappeared? And there was all sorts of talk going around, ah hah, the Manson Family has dispatched Ronald Hughes. They've done him in, the poor slob. He wasn't much of an attorney. This was the first case he had handled. He was a bungler, stumbler, according to some, and they done him in. And the headlines blazed it for weeks. And there was rumor going all around about the murder of Ronald Hughes, that he had disappeared. And some three months or so later, a couple of hikers -- and this was after a great search by helicopter units, by ranger patrols, by search and rescue squads, they hadn't found him.

Had he been murdered? Had he been done in by the infamous Manson Family?

A few months later a couple of hikers found a body wedged between some rocks by a stream that obviously during the rain season overflowed its banks and caught him somehow or other.

You see how easy it is, how easy it is for rumors to fly; you attach the name Manson to them.

All of the searching and no Shorty Shea. Searching Helter-Skelter, here and there, no Shorty Shea.

2б.

Well, the search of all these people in connection with the Sheriffs and the search and rescue squads and the helicopters didn't turn up the body of Ronald Hughes either.

All right. The next witnesses:

And again, so-called "expert" witnesses. Although here, in connection with this aspect of the case, there were some expert witnesses -- Sergeant Herbert Campbell is an expert witness, a good handwriting man, with good qualifications; a man who takes some pride in his work, who does maintain a library, who reads, who reads more than one book on the subject.

And I have no quarrel whatsoever with either Sergeant Campbell's qualifications or his findings. And his findings, among others, were that Jack Paul McMillian and Bruce Davis are the same. That's no big problem there.

We certainly acknowledge that. He compared some other handwriting -- all of which, there's no quarrel with.

Let's leave Deputy Chamousis for a moment, and go to Dr. William Kaufmann. Dr. Kaufmann obviously is a very well qualified man in his field, who testified to the moon, and on our little trip to the moon that we took -- for whatever benefit it had, to establish the People's case -- we have no quarrel with either his qualifications or his testimony.

Interesting to see, though, that the People made so much of it, so much of this moon time of the month, that they brought in such an expert to establish it.

Because it indicates one thing, and that is that they're stuck with the theory that they're trying to sell you.

And in that regard, don't let them weasel, after

I get through talking with you, and say, "Well, it could be this, and it could be that, now that Mr. Denny has shown you that perhaps it didn't happen the way we have been trying to sell you the bill of goods that we have been trying to sell you."

The bill of goods that they have been trying to sell you is that Shorty Shea was done in on the night of either the 27th or the 28th of August, 1969, because that was about the night of the full moon; and, tied in with testimony as to when the Family left, it would have been right about there.

And you are going to receive an instruction, and it's an important instruction. It's an extremely important instruction, that is as follows:

"The prosecution has elected to rely on the acts testified to have occurred between August 16, 1969, and September 1, 1969, as constituting the offense charged against the defendant in Count III of the indictment."

That's the Hinman (sic) count. They have relied on the period of time between those specific dates, not "on or about," as they did in Count I, or Count II, but specific dates between August 16 and September 1, 1969.

You must not find the defendant guilty of the offense so charged against him unless you find that he committed such offense within that particular time, regardless of your belief as to the commission of the offense by the defendant or some other person or persons at some other

.

time."

Now, we'll talk about that in just a moment.

Also, as to the commission of the offense by some other

person or persons at some other time.

Deputy Chamousis. Now, I have no quarrel with Deputy Chamousis' findings, as far as the palm prints of Bruce Davis being on that footlocker. They're his palm prints. There's testimony, you see -- though it doesn't hurt my feelings too badly -- that many peoplewould have had access to those footlockers.

And again, this didn't come out by way of any examination from the prosecution. It was brought out by the defense on cross-examination of a prosecution witness, Johnny Swartz -- and also Barbara Hoyt.

And Johnny Swartz said, "Yeah, Shorty was living out of his car, but he was throwing his trunks in the storeroom there, along the boardwalk. And I have been in there with Shorty."

And, as Barbara Hoyt testified, she had been in there -- not with Shorty, but she had just been in there.

Anybody could go in there. No reason why not.

Plenty of opportunity for Manson, Davis,
Barbara Hoyt, anyone to put their palm print, fingerprint,
whatever, on anything in that storeroom.

And consider again the testimony that you've heard from Ella Bailey, Barbara Hoyt, Ruby Pearl. What was Bruce Davis doing, most of the time? What evidence do you have of the kind of guy we have here? Limited as it

He was working on the dune buggles. Remember Barbara Hoyt saying that -- or rather, Ella Bailey saying that during the period of time, during the period of June, July, particularly July, they were working on dune buggles, putting on roll-bars, extra roll-bars, extra supports, braces.

10-

 And who was doing that work? Bruce Davis. And that they had strung up lights, even so they could work at night, strung up lights from the outlet in the saloon, dragging the wires through there; and that they would work at nights on it.

Who was working at nights? Bruce Davis, working on the dune buggies.

Now, it's quite reasonable under the circumstances that he'd get grease on his hands. He didn't go around with clean hands, washing them all the time, in that kind of setup. You don't, when you are working with mechanical things.

And therefore -- and this is one of the reasons why we went into it so much, as far as Chamousis was concerned, and as far as Mr. Clements, when we called him -- because you can't tell, after a period of time, whether a print has been laid down from the oil of the skin, as we've pointed out, or from going through the hair, or if you get oil or grease on your hand, it will lay down a print and stay there.

And again, you see, a print is circumstantial evidence. And where you have circumstantial evidence, and the People are relying in this case totally, wholly and completely on circumstantial evidence, and where there is -- where there are two reasonable interpretations -- or at least, two reasonable interpretations of that evidence, one pointing to the defendant's guilt -- the People say the only way those palm prints could have gotten on there was Bruce Davis being involved somehow in the murder of Shorty Shea and taking his car and stashing it and opening those trunks or closing those trunks and

Ì5

doing something with the trunks after Shorty Shea was dead;

And therefore, there's a guilty inference to be drawn from those palm prints.

But the other reasonable inference is that those prints had been on there for some period of time; that they were on there — we don't know when they were laid down. You see, it's important; and the reason that I was upset by the testimony of Chamousis — and more upset by the testimony of Flois White, because Flois White just either did not know what he was talking about — and let's be charitable; let's just say that, which is bad enough, when a man's life hangs in the balance — or he was lying — which I think is the more reasonable interpretation of his evidence.

But Peter Chamousis just didn't know. He just didn't know. Peter Chamousis, in 15 years as a so-called expert, had read one book on the subject. And when I asked him, "have you read this book, this book, or this book?"

He says, "Well, if there was anything in there that I thought would help me, I'd read them. But you know, I know it all."

Well, he didn't know it all. He doesn't know it all. And that's why we brought Mr. Clements in, Wendell Clements, who has read more than one book on the subject, who has kept up with the field, who does read something more — you know, anybody with a little practice can move those eyepieces around and make comparisons and find it. That's a mechanical job. You can train anybody to do that.

But it's the knowledge of the field that's

important, that makes an expert. We don't question what he found in moving those things around. That s not important.

The important thing, and the reason you bring an expert to court, is so that he can do something more than just simply say, "Yeah, this point and this point match." What is the meaning of it?

"What is the meaning of it, Deputy? Here you find fingerprints -- or palm prints on a trunk that has been -- or, a footlocker that has been in the trunk of a car for some period of time, and you find no other prints in the whole car. Does that have some significance?"

Not to Chamousis. He doesn't know enough to attach significance to it.

Well, what is the significance? Were those prints put on just within ten days? Well, that would be kind of funny. The car was found on December 8th. That would mean that Mr. — or, ten days or two weeks; that would mean that Mr. Davis would have had to put the prints on sometime within that period of time.

Well, that doesn't sound reasonable, from what Sergeant Whiteley said and what Chamousis said. But particularly Whiteley said it looked as if that car had been there for quite a period of time, sitting there.

And it doesn't fit in with the People's theory, either, because apparently the People would contend that when Shorty Shea was murdered -- as they say he was -- on the night of August 27th or 28th, somehow his car was taken and driven

down there and stashed; and that was it.

So that would mean three months time. September, October, November -- plus a few days.

Well, if that's so, then -- and they say Bruce
Davis obviously, put his prints on during that period of
time -- well, then, how come they're still there?

Well, their expert didn't know. He wasn't sure.

He couldn't say. He didn't have the learning. He didn't have
the expertise.

And this is why we brought in Mr. Clements. Because I think again you should have the truth, to help you determine.

And Clements said, "Heck, yeah. Those prints could have been on that trunk three months."

Now, you see, that could be bad for the defendant, to prove, for the People, that -- yes, he could have put his prints on, if the car was stashed by the killers, and he was one of the killers, and the car was stashed on the night of the 27th or 28th of August.

But I'm not going to try to fool you -- or leave something up in the air -- if I can help it.

Because it's important to get the truth, to determine what the facts are, insofar as we can bring them to you.

And Clements went further. He said, "There's just no way of telling when they were laid down there. They could have been laid down three months, four months, five months, six months. There's no way of telling. But prints will last for a number of months.

All right. So, ladies and gentlemen, the point is: Those prints could have been just as easily put on by Mr. Davis when those trunks -- you see, there's only a period of about two weeks that we are talking about, the period between August 16 -- or August 17, when Shorty showed up at the ranch with those trunks, living out of his car, and -- at least, as far as the People are concerned -- a period of about August 27th, 28th or 29th; less than a period of two weeks. Actually, 11, 12 days.

There's no way of telling by looking at the print whether the print was laid down there on August 27th, 28th, or on August 20th, 21st, 22nd or 23rd,

The People want you to draw one inference,

2

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21 22

23

24:

25

3 fls.

28.

26 27 pointing towards guilt. And the evidence -- brought out again by Johnny Swartz on cross-examination and Barbara Hoyt on cross-examination -- showing that those trunks were available to be touched by anyone on the ranch, is just as susceptible of the reasonable interpretation, pointing to the fact that those were innocently placed.

And again, where you have those two reasonable inferences, it's your duty to adopt that pointing to innocence and reject that pointing to guilt.

All right. Next group of witnesses.

THE COURT: Let's take a recess, now, At 20 minutes to, be back, by that clock. And would you be back in the box, please, ladies and gentlemen?

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

(Proceedings had on unrelated matters.)

THE COURT: All right. In the case of Davis, get Mr. Davis in, will you?

THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: The defendant is present. All the jurors are present.

Mr. Denny, you may proceed.

MR. DENNY: Thank you.

Before I leave Deputy Chamousis, because you are going to receive in the jury room an exhibit which has been received into evidence, and there's only one purpose I submit for this having been submitted by the People in evidence, and that is to inflame your passions and prejudices against this defendant.

Deputy Chamousis -- again, I have some strong feelings about this, like all people who handle a volume of fingerprinting, taking handwriting exemplars, writing booking slips or whatever, said, "No, I can't recognize Bruce Davis now. The name I recognize, but I can't recognize Bruce Davis now."

So the People presented him with a picture, and said, "Well, you recognize that picture as the person whose prints you rolled on 12-11-1970?"

"Oh, yes, yes, certainly. Now, that's the picture of the man I recognized, absolutely, yes, indeed."

Well, they didn't have to go through all of that.

There are other ways of establishing who the

You know, in many, many cases it is done simply by the name, the same name.

party is whose prints were rolled.

I've been in cases where the Court had admitted into evidence the fact that the deputy doesn't know the print, he doesn't remember specifically the print, but it is the name of Bruce McGregor Davis taken on or about the date of

his arrest.

It says under a doctrine called in Latin, in effect, identity of name, there's sufficient to get that introduced into evidence.

Well, there's no quarrel with the fact that -the defense has never had any quarrel with the fact that
that's his fingerprint exemplar card. And there's a booking
number on it, which you'll see in People's 16-C. It can be
traced a dozen different ways.

But the People, for some strange reason, have to do it with a picture. And there's the picture, ladies and gentlemen. This is the first time you'll see it and I'll show it to you. A picture of Bruce Davis with an X cut in his forehead.

Now, some of you, in the course of the publicity that's been given to the various Manson cases, you're not supposed to consider that publicity for or against either the People or the defendant, may attach some significance to that. And that's what the prosecution wants you to do with this wholly unnecessary exhibit. And that's been the type of case that they've been presenting to you, and that's what this defense has been up against right from the beginning. And just consider the necessity for this when you consider the reception of evidence in this case and the type of case that's been put on to try to convict Bruce Davis of the crimes charged against him.

All right.

Now, let's go to these civilian witnesses. And

*

we don't have to spend a great deal of time with them, because Mr. Manzella ran down most of the testimony.

Jim Babcock and Sharon Babcock, friends of his, testified, among other things, he loved his guns and he wanted to be a stuntman.

Now, let's go into this.

When you were questioned on voir dire, many of you were asked, "Do you recognize the term 'stuntman Shorty Shea, stuntman Shorty Shea!?"

Well, you know, that's a little catch phrase that the newspapers and the other media for dissemination of news have used because it is kind of catchy. It is like the Black Dahlia. That's a catchy phrase.

There are many other phrases which you can think of which have been applied: "The Red Light Bandit, Caryl Chessman."

You see, it sells newspapers.

"Stuntman, Shorty Shea."

Well, when you get right down to it, and the evidence we've heard, this guy was a jack of all trades and a master of none, and a dreamer of great dreams, but a realizer of none of them.

Was he a stuntman? A purveyor of dirty books and adult curios? I won't use the term pornography because as Mr. Binder said, who knows what pornography is.

A builder of bookshelves or racks for the sale of these adult books in the Hollywood and Las Vegas stores? Was he a tree trimmer? Was he a shoveler of horse manure,

cleaning the barns, as George Spahn said he did? Was he a horse wrangler? Was he an occasional movie actor and an occasional stuntman, among all these other trades?

Was he a bartender? Was he most frequently an outof-work drifter? You see, none of those sell newspapers quite
as well.

"A bartender Shorty Shea." He was a bartender.

"Drifter Shorty Shea," he was a drifter.

Uh, "Tree trimmer Shorty Shea," doesn't sound quite as good as stuntman. But was he any more stuntman than any of these other things, really? Many people have dreams of getting into the movies.

Oh, minister, Reverend Shorty Shea, the attache case attests to. Was he a minister? He had a mail order certificate, apparently, establishing his ministerial qualifications.

Did that make him any more qualified to be a minister than the fact that he had a set of matched Colt .45's made him qualified to be a stuntman? I don't know. But I balk a little bit at the phrase that's been applied to him by the newspapers, because that phrase is no more applicable than many other phrases that could be applied to Shorty Shea.

All right, Bob Bickston. To hear the People examine him on examination, on direct, you would think that Bob Bickston was C. B. DeMille.

"Did Shorty appear in some of your TV documentaries?

"Oh, yes, I made three, four TV documentaries,

"Joaquin Murrietta, " et cetera, et cetera. Oh, that is the truth, but is it the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

Cross examination, Mr. Bickston.

"Whatever happened to those TV documentaries?

ĵ

2

3

4.

5

б

7

٠

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 .

23

24

25

26 27

28

Were they ever shown?

"A Well, no.

"Were they ever distributed?

"Well, no.

"Did they ever see the light of day anywhere as the production before any sort of audience?

"Well, no.

"And this outfit that you ran to make these films financed by one of Bing Crosby's sons, in fact, this was kind of a fly-by-night organization, really, in the trade you would call it that, wouldn't you?

"Well, yes."

There's the whole truth.

Now, why build it up? Why build it up? Why make
Bob Bickston seem what he isn't? Why make Shorty Shea seem
what he isn't? Why try to fool you, the jurors? Why? Because
this is part of the People's picture that they want to paint,
that Shorty Shea was interested in going into the movies. And
he had a movie deal all lined up here, and a movie deal all
lined up there.

Well, now, you know that's kind of interesting, too. Trying to figure out what the People's theory of this case is, I keep shaking my head in bewilderment. I have ever since I was appointed to represent Mr. Davis. And when I first read the Grand Jury transcript in this case, I shook my head and said, "Just a second now. Shorty's supposed to have a job with Frank Retz, so he's supposed to be there. But Shorty is supposed to have a job with Bob Bickston over in Arizona, so

3b fol

he's supposed to be there. But Shorty is supposed to have a job with Maurice Kosloff in Hollywood, so he's supposed to be over there. No, Shorty, according to Lance Victor, is supposed to have a job up in the salt mines up in Vallejo, so he's over there."

Where do the People contend Shorty's interests lay? Shorty's interests lay just exactly where they had always lain, and that is any place where he could pick up a buck.

All right. Jerry Binder, we don't need to go into his testimony overly, except for the fact that he did establish that these trunks were trunks -- I'm sorry, I think it was Magdalene Shea.

3b-1

It was either Jerry Binder or Magdalene Shea, to establish that the footlockers were the footlockers purchased by Shorty in Las Vegas. So he did not have them until July sometime. And this ties him in with the testimony of Johnny Swartz again.

Johnny Swartz, when he testified, said he had seen those footlockers up in the storage room and he wasn't sure whether it was before or after August 16, but you see, it couldn't really have been too much more. He only visited twice up there. He took his wife up there one time and he went up there another time with her and George Spahn wasn't there. He didn't have the footlockers there with him then. They wouldn't have been stored then. They were stored after he had come to stay for a while, after the August 16th raid.

Archibald Hall. Archibald Hall -- interesting, again, the unasked question of the prosecution. Why did they bring him in? Well, Archibald Hall sold Shorty the guns.

"Well, the price was, I think, about \$150."
"No further questions."

"Oh, did you ever get them --" I don't think they even asked him anything much more than that, as I recall.

Now, cross-examination.

"Mr. Hall, did he pay you that \$150?

"No, he paid me \$25 cash and gave me a couple of cameras."

I think the People may have brought out that he gave cameras for security, collateral, whatever.

"But he paid me the \$25.

"Oh, well, now, Mr. Hall --" and this is again purely by virtue of the fact that we have discovery, we get through discovery reports of these witnesses what they have stated previously, so we know. But the People know because we get them from the People. They have the same information, at least as much as the defense is able to get.

So reading the reports of his earlier statements, I said:

"Well, Mr. Hall, isn't it a fact that you had some conversation with Shorty about these guns in July?

"Oh, yeah, sure I did.

"What was that conversation, sir?
"Objection, hearsay.

"State of mind of Shorty Shea."

People got in all sorts of state of mind. So we get that in. And what is it?

Shorty called and said, "Gee, Arch, I don't want you to think that I'm --" I can't remember quite the phraseology now, but "-- cheating you here. I'll get that money in to you for the guns in the next couple of weeks. And if I don't, I'll bring the guns back."

Now, that's the People's witness, Arch Hall.
And he seemed to be an honest, credible witness.

Now, what does that do to the People's theory

1 2 6

3 5

> 7 8

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

3c fls.

28

27

espoused by Mr. Manzella so zealously, and perhaps Mr. Kay when he talks to you that Shorty Shea would never part with his guns. These were his babies, as Jerry Binder said, who is hardly a totally disinterested witness. And I have put down, "interested but not critical witnesses."

What does that do to their theory?

Mr. Manzella told you that this was a life style, that these guns had become part of Shorty.

Well, as I pointed out, not a very big part or else he's missing that part an awful lot of the time during the time he was supposed to have had them, because they were in hock most of the time.

But Arch Hall says, "He told me he was going to pay me or he'd bring the guns back."

"Deadbeating" is the word that Shorty used in that phone conversation.

"I don't want you to think I'm deadbeating you around, Arch."

Acknowledging the fact that he liked the guns, he wanted the guns, he would like to have kept the guns. Give Shorty credit enough for the fact that he, at least, told Arch Hall, "I'll either pay you or bring them back."

Well, the facts are that he couldn't pay him because Lance Victor said that he was trying to bum money off of him there in the last week of August sometime. So we'll go on with that subject a little bit further.

3c-1

Sandra Harmon, again, the first wife. All she established, as far as I could see, that Shorty was perhaps not the greatest husband in the world and certainly not the best father in the world, who had abandoned his children. And she, perhaps, not the most human-type of creature to, in effect, say, "Get out and don't bother the kids. Leave me with them," whatever it was. That's the way it wound up, and Shorty never saw his children again after 1965. Apparently, never contributed to them. And that bespeaks a little of the character of Shorty Shea. Perhaps the character of Sandra Harmon.

Muriel Quant, the only thing she testified to other than the fact, again, Shorty loved his guns and Shorty had been at the ranch a long time.

This incident was supposed to have such sinister overtones — you listened to the People's testimony on direct. Again, the truth, the whole truth, let it come out, let it all hang out on direct. Why not? Instead of having to wait and have it pulled out from the witnesses on cross examination. To hear it from the People's questioning. And the witness can only answer what the prosecution asks of her.

"Well, we walked down here and Manson threw a knife as Shorty Shea."

Oh, that sounds bad. That's motive, you see.

That's supposed to establish motive.

You'll get an instruction on motive. It is not necessary, but if you find one, it may tend to help to

ľ

incriminate the parties.

It is not Bruce Davis's motive, but supposedly since Davis was tied in with Charles Manson, he shares somehow this motive that you get in a conspiracy case. It rubs off on him somehow.

But this is motive? It shows that -- what,
Charlie had attempted to kill him then? Well, that's a lot of
rubbish. In front of Muriel Quant?

Well, then, let's bring it out. What happened?

The guys were standing around there in front of the door. They threw knives all the time.

There's testimony from Johnny Swartz on that.

There is testimony by some other person that they threw knives all the time.

Muriel Quant had better sense than to do what Shorty Shea did. She went around this group. She didn't walk along the boardwalk. She and Shorty had been walking together. She took the longer way. Shorty went right through, and Manson whipped a knife from about this space (indicating) to the wall, and it hit the door, about three feet in front of Shorty.

Well, that's not all that dangerous. I wouldn't like it. You wouldn't like it. It is sort of a dumb thing to do. But it certainly isn't an attempt to kill Shorty or anything like that.

"And, well, then, what happened, Mrs. Quant? What did Shorty do?

"Well, he just sort of grinned with a sheepish

Ŭ

11 ,

; (**13** %)

 grin and walked on." That's the truth of it.

Let it all hang out. Tell it. Tell it on direct, instead of having to have the defense bring out the whole truth on cross examination.

Elizabeth Shea, again, simply established, like all mothers, she heard infrequently from her son and, generally, by a collect phone call or whatever. And as I said, the dear lady, she doesn't know whether her son is dead or not.

Lance Victor, the guy who had gone up with Shorty to the salt beds, or as they call them, "salt mines" in Vallejo in "68, taking them up in his car because Shorty's car - his brakes were bad.

Dance Victor, who testified that sometime in this period after the raid, sometime perhaps within the last week of August, he did see Shorty. He came up on weekends, I think he said and talked to him.

Shorty said, "You know, things aren't right around here. Things are funny. I want to get out of here. And I need some money."

And Victor gave him a couple of bucks and said,
"I'll bring thirty bucks at the end of the week. Thirty dollars
at the end of the week."

And he went up at the end of the week, after he had gotten paid and Shorty was not there. But Shorty told him, "I am going up to Vallejo. I'm going to get out of here."

Right?

Okay. And then, we get to the category of "Very Much Interested and Involved Civilian Witnesses."

Now, we've mentioned John Swartz here just briefly. And what did Swartz testify to?

Well, we've gone over his testimony at some length except, again, the fact that Swartz's testimony for the People that he saw Danny DeCarlo and Bill Vance come into the gun room sometime in early September with Shorty's attache case and Shorty's two guns. Right? People stop there.

Well, I know that there's something more happened,

and the People know that something more happened. And so on

cross examination: "Mr. Swartz, there was some conversation that

went on there, wasn't there?

"Yés, there was.

"And what was that conversation?

"Well, DeCarlo said, 'Well, we finally got Shorty's

from the People. Now, isn't that interesting? Isn't that interesting?

And Mr. Manzella says, "Well, obviously that means they got Shorty's guns. They're talking about Shorty's guns and that's what Shorty's ego means."

Well, that's one interpretation. Another interpretation is: "We finally got Shorty. His ego, his being. Him."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I told you a little earlier today that I don't know what's happened to Shorty. I don't know where he went. I don't know where he's gone. And I asked if any of you know.

_

.

4 fol 17

18.

. 19

You see, the People have to convince you, and convince you beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, to a near certainty that Shorty Shea is dead. That he's dead by criminal means, and that this defendant had something to do with killing him.

Are you sure that Shorty is dead? His mother isn't. His own mother. Are you? Are you sure if he is dead — in your own mind, you feel, well, a person hasn't showed up for two and a half years or so, he must be dead. Are you sure he's dead by criminal means?

Remember Ronald Hughes?

But if you feel he was done in by criminal means, who did it? Where does the evidence most likely point to? Where is the bulk of the circumstantial evidence in this case? You think about that for a minute or two, and I'll tell you. I'll tell you what it appears to me, at any rate.

All right, Ruby Pearl, let's take Ruby Pearl.

Ŕ`

16·

Now, Ruby Pearl is -- well, before we take Ruby Pearl, let me go to Magdalene Shea.

Now, I gave Magdalene Shea kind of a rough time on cross examination. And I don't like parading a person's misdeeds before a jury, and I don't do it just -- just for amusement, just for sport, just for fun. I don't do it to degrade a person.

It is their life. They have created that. But I did it in this case because I didn't believe her.

Now, it's not particularly important whether she had an argument with Shorty and Shorty left her, or she left Shorty — except that the circumstances under which that parting did take place, those circumstances become relevant if she left — as Shorty told Marian — or Miriam — Binder she left: Not because of Shorty's drinking; not because Shorty was unhappy with her topless dancing; but because she was going back to her old boyfriend, because she was scared that something would happen to her or to Shorty at the hands of that boyfriend.

Now, that s what Shorty told Miriam Binder. And all this discussion, all this talk from Magdalene Shea, talking about the letter that disappeared -- funny about that -- all that just didn't ring true to me.

And so I began digging and digging and digging, and subpoenaing records, and going to the courts -- where things are a matter of record -- and I come up with what? Those arrest reports, those arrest reports on November 5th, the arrest report on August 22nd -- six days after they'd

11,

was.

split up, she s arrested down at the International Hotel at 2:00 o'clock in the morning.

And what name does she give as a person to notify? What name does she give herself? Not Shea. Fuery. Who to notify? Allan Fuery.

November 5th, arrested again, International Hotel. What name does she use? Fuery. Who to notify? Allan Fuery, husband.

Arrested again in May of 1970. The name? Fuery -- again, down at the International Hotel. The name she gives, Magdalene Fuery. Who to notify?

And interestingly enough, she said, when I questioned her, you remember, as far as the November 5th arrest, "Do you remember putting down Allan Fuery, husband?"

And she says, "No. No. brother."

And I said, "No, that was the one in May." And it

At that point, she puts down "Allan Fuery, brother, person to notify. Address, same as above."

In each instance, "Address, same as above."

Living with her. And where is it? Not the address she testified to on both direct and cross examination, where she was supposedly living with a friend -- girlfriends, second or third cousins -- but an entirely different address on Western Avenue. Not the address on South LaBrea that she gave us.

Now, is this a red herring? Is this something I am dragging across your path, to try to divert your attention

4a fol 25

from the obvious guilt of Bruce Davis, that the People have established by their flimsy circumstantial evidence?

Ladies and gentlemen. I don't know. I don't know what's happened to Shorty. All I know is what the facts are that have been developed thus far, and developed by virtue of an awful lot of hard work on the part of an awful lot of people not only Paul Whiteley. I've tried to develop a few facts, too, and I hope that I have been able to bring them to you.

I don't know. I don't know if he is alive or dead.

And if he's dead, I don't know whether he died accidentally or
by criminal means. And if he died by criminal means, I don't
know who killed him.

I don't know if Allan Fuery had anything to do with it or not. I only know that Shorty expressed this to Miriam Binder. And I don't see that there is any reason for Miriam Binder to lie on that.

One other thing that Magdalene Shea did testify to, and that's the luggage that he had — well, time is getting short, and I don't want to read all of this in. I was going to read it, but it's interesting to recall that he had a number of pieces of luggage, a regular suitcase, a brown suitcase, and a — an overnight case, a silver-blue overnight case, a weekender overnight case, along with these footlockers and the attache case.

4a - 1

And the blue-gray suitcase here is not that overnight case. He indicated that, that that does not belong to Shorty.

So, there are two pieces of luggage that are missing, that we don't know about, that Shorty may well have used to travel with.

Obviously, he is not going to travel with the steamer trunks.

And there's testimony from Ruby Pearl that he generally wore old work clothes, Levis, regular clothes that she'd wear working around the barn or on the ranch.

And in the main, those clothes are not in the trunks.

Those are the clothes he would have taken with him, as well as his cowboy boots, his hat -- if he wore one. So, the clothes that he would normally wear are missing, and the suitcases that he would use to carry those in are also missing.

Ruby Pearl, I said we'd get to.

Now, Ruby, I think, is -- if I can call her that-is essentially an honest woman. She was dishonest, I think,
specifically, in one area. And that's when I asked her if
she wore glasses.

And she says, "No, I've never worn glasses. No, I don't wear glasses."

I don't know whether you recall that or not. Here, starting at page 5189, on cross-examination by Mr. Denny.

"Q Oh, right away, Mrs. Pearl, you wear glasses at times; isn't that correct?

"A No, I never wear glasses.

"Q Well, ma'am, when you check your bills, make out your bills, you wear glasses to see the fine print, don't you?

"A No.

"Q Well, ma'am, going back to the weekend before this last weekend, when I was up there with you, remember -- talking to you and Mr. Spahn?

"A Well, just the last few months. Not when I was at the Spahn Ranch. I never owned a pair."

And then, she goes on, saying that she just picked up an old pair, and she had never been to an optometrist.

She had never been to an optometrist, so she doesn't know, really, what her eyesight is. But she was a little dishonest there.

Perhaps, as one who is getting a little bit older and doesn't like to acknowledge the results of advancing age, she was just simply a little too proud to acknowledge the fact that she does need glasses; that her eyesight is getting a little bit dimmer.

But essentially, I think, she's sort of the salt of the earth kind, who has done what so many of us so naturally do. She doesn't recall specifically the date on which she last saw Shorty. In fact, if you remember, I asked her, "Did you make a statement on December 14 --" I believe it was December 14 -- "1970, to Paul Whiteley, in the presence

4a - 3

of George Spahn and Randy Starr, that you last saw Shorty approximately either the 10th or the middle of September, somewhere?"

And she says, "I may have said that."

And I asked Paul Whiteley, when we brought him in on directly, and he said, "Yes, that's the statement she made.'

Again, that's interesting. Paul Whiteley -- that's a statement very much against the prosecution theory here, but Paul Whiteley was honest, and he said, "Yes, she did make that statement to me."

But she saw something, one time, there on the ranch.

She saw a car. She saw some men pile out of the car, and she had been talking to Shorty, and as she drove away, she saw the men walk toward where Shorty was walking.

Now, I believe that. I believe that that happened. She's dim and hazy, however, as to really all of the circumstances.

Now, these pictures, and the series 80 pictures, are particularly relevant. You see --

(Pause in the proceedings while Mr. Denny pinned a series of photographs on the board.)

You see, she was required to testify from a new picture, this picture (indicating), People's 80-I, instead of from a picture from which she had -- or, as to which she had previously testified in prior proceedings, 80-C.

And I had a purpose in insisting on this. And the purpose became very clear, in the course of her crossexamination. She testified she had certain conversations,

4b fls.

and she saw, as she started to drive out, a car pull in fast, and four people -- four people get out of that car and move then in the direction toward Shorty.

So the prosecutor -- I can't recall whether it was Mr. Kay or Mr. Manzella at the time -- said, "Would you mark with an X where Shorty was? And mark with zeroes where those four people were?"

4b-1

So she dutifully did so, and she marked with an X and a circle where her car was, at about this time -- supposed to be a load of manure there on a trailer of some sort, in this picture 80-I.

And she said, "That is the scene that I recall.

And there was a shadow sitting in the car there, but the shadow never got out -- " if indeed it was a person.

Interesting? Now, if this had been in front of the Grand Jury, where there's no right of cross examination and you were on that Grand Jury of ours, that's all you'd have.

But this is a trial, where a defendant has an opportunity to cross examine.

And so I said, "Mrs. Pearl, let's look at this picture which is the same picture, essentially, 80-C, that you marked up in a prior proceedings. There are five people there, five X's about Shorty Shea; isn't that correct?

"A Well, yes. Yes, it is.

"Q And also *R. P. 1' where you were supposed to be is a good deal closer than you've put it now; right?

"A Yeah."

But five X's? Five people?

"You've testified previously that Bill Vance was there, and that he got out of the car, and he moved over. Five people; isn't that right?

"A Well, yes. But I'm just not sure," et cetera, et cetera."

Well, again, this is sort of an interesting

4b-2

16.

thing. The instruction you'll get is: You may disbelieve the testimony of one who has willfully and with a design to deceive testified falsely, and toss out all of that person's testimony.

I'm not sure that I could say Ruby Pearl really willfully and with a design to deceive has testified. She just is not sure. She just doesn't remember. She doesn't recall.

And the fact that she testified one way one time and one way the other time only attests to that confusion.

Again, we went into it very specifically, because she marked on direct examination the route that this car took. And the car that she said drove in came right in that driveway, the driveway that is shown here on the lower left-hand portion of People's 29, zoomed in right by the grass — the grass that's shown in both photograph 80-A and People's 29 — and parked over by the grass, facing in a westerly direction, marked in green with a green arrow here on People's 29, with the "R. P." and the line drawn under it.

That's where the car parked. Now, this Exhibit 29 was a particularly important exhibit, and it was secured for one reason, one particular reason, to show the distances that are involved here.

Because these pictures in the 80 series don't really show the distances. You have to get up above it and look down, as this photograph does, to see how much distance is involved. And you people with some engineering background can look at the size of the trucks and the cars and make some estimate, a truck being about 20 feet, a car about 18 to 20

я

б

•

4c fol 29

feet, and you can make some estimate as to the distances involved, where -- even assuming Pearl was where she said she was, over here where the "R. P." and the line drawn to the green mark, over by the corral, which is supposed to indicate her car when she first started out, and this is to the car that she says these people got out of.

Now, see how many car lengths it is from there over to there. And then recall her testimony, her testimony at the Grand Jury -- which I used to, frankly, impeach her.

She testified she was almost squeezed out by this car as it came in. And where is the only place that you can really get squeezed out, particularly if a car makes that right-hand turn as fast as it did? The only point is right at the entranceway. And this (indicating) is where Pearl was when she saw this car.

Now, whether it was a dark night or whether it was a moonlight light -- and this is sort of interesting. Pearl had not previously testified anything about moonlight night. She established that. But then on cross examination, Page 5229, starting at Line 26:

"Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, ma'am, isn't it a fact that you didn't mention anything about a moonlight night until you heard from someone in the prosecution that Barbara Hoyt said, 'Oh, I heard someone scream on a moonlight night,' and this is when you said, for the first time, in September of 1971, 'The last time I saw Shorty was a full moon.'

"A No."

4c-1 And then she goes on: 1 "I didn't even hear that Barbara Hoyt 2 said anything like that. 3 uQ. BY MR. DENNY: Someone in the prosecution told you that another witness was going to say that 5 she heard Shorty screaming on a full moonlight night --6 on a full moon night; isn't that true, --7 ΉÀ 8 No. -- before you testified for the second Grogan trial? 10 11 No. I never --12 And before that, you had never mentioned, 13 at any trial, any proceeding, any Grand Jury hearing, 14 or to any police officer that there was a full moon 15 out, the last time you saw Shorty; isn't that a fact? 16 11 A I never mentioned it until it was stressed 17 'It must have been light. Was it moonlight?' 18 "And I said, 'Well, it was light. 19 sky was light. 20 "It was pumped into me -- 'How -- how 21 much was it?' 22 "'Well, it was light." 23 ¹¹Q It was pumped into you, wasn't it? 24 ΑB Well, I --25 "MR. KAY: Your Honor, I am going to object 26 to Mr. Denny yelling at the witness." 27 And you may remember, I did yell. I was amazed. 28 I was delighted, finally, that the truth came out.

4c-2	1
	2
:	3
î	4
A É	5
	6
,	7
	8
	9
	10
ž	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
\$ *	19
•	20
*	21
	22
	23
•	24
) ar	25
•	26
_	27

28

"MR. DENNY: I'm sorry.

"THE COURT: That was several decibels above --"

And then:

"Q BY MR. DENNY: I'm terribly sorry, Mrs. Pearl. It was pumped into you?

"A It was questioned to me, 'How light? How light? How light? There must have been moon. There was moon.'

"Q And when it was pumped --

"A ' 'And how much.'

"Q -- pumped into you?

A Like now. I never mentioned --

"Q Some lawyer telling you, --

"A No.

"Q -- 'There must have been light. There must have been light.' There must have been light.'
"Isn't that right?

"A No, I don't remember anybody mentioning light. I saw what I saw, and there was light enough to see, and this is all I was interested in."

Well, she goes on for a couple of more pages, which I don't have time to read.

"It was pumped into me and pumped into me and pumped into me, 'It must have been light.'"

Again, that doesn't happen too often on crossexamination. And when a lawyer has an opening, a little break like that, where the light -- be it moonlight or sunlight -- shines through, it is an extremely delightful 4c-3

1 2

 experience. But that was the truth shining through.

Someone in the prosecution had pumped her and pumped her into that.

All right. The dear lady -- this was possible to do with her. She had a background in show business. The photographs that are in evidence show that, with her dog act, I think, or some horses and things. And she has this sort of theatrical background, this theatrical point of view.

She would tend to build up something -- in retrospect -- because, you see, it's interesting; we go to George Spahn's testimony.

George Spahn said, "We didn't miss Shorty for six weeks after we hadn't seen him around."

"We."

And Pearl and George are like that (indicating).

"We didn't miss him for six weeks," and
then there was some incident that brought it to his mind.

And but for that incident, they wouldn't have missed him
at all, probably, because he comes and goes, comes and goes.

So, something brings it to mind. The police come out. They start digging up the ranch.

And then, in retrospect, she says, "Now, I remember everything. You know, I remember. I remember there was a time when I saw these guys get out and walk towards Shorty."

MR. KAY: Well, your Honor, I'm going to object to that. There's no evidence that that's why she remembered.

4c-4

1

2 3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

MR. DENNY: Now, I am not stating her testimony. stating my interpretation of what went on in this good lady's mind.

There was no testimony as to that, certainly. But extrapolating from, and looking at the reasonable interpretations which I think you may draw from the evidence, I think you put a little common sense and a determination of human nature and how it operates into the hopper -- which certainly you are permitted to do; you don't park your brains outside the jury room when you go in there to deliberate; as you listen to the evidence, you don't park your brains outside and just receive what is spoken here.

You interpret it. That's your function.

So, this good lady, I submit, some weeks later, says, "You know, I'll bet that's when Manson and the Family did Shorty in."

And then, at a time even later than that, someone pumps her and pumps her and pumps her to say it was on a moonlight night, when she had never said so before. And that's how that happened.

Now, I've spent a good deal of time going into her eyesight, her vision, et cetera. Her eyesight is not that good. She does wear glasses. The distances here, the night -- certainly, not under the most ideal circumstances. How could you tell who these people were?

> "How did you know them? Well, how did you know Bruce Davis? How did he walk?

"A I never saw him walk. I generally just saw him standing around."

The People would argue to you that she can tell by their movement; that you can tell a person you've seen before by the way he moves, by the way he walks; you're used to seeing it.

But she said these people were moving faster than she had ever seen any of them move before, and she had never even seen Bruce Davis move before.

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24 ,

. 25

26

27 28 Now, there were other men on the ranch, too. But she jumped to the conclusion.

And, again, I say the good lady, I don't think she's lying with an intent to deceive you. I think she has deceived herself. I think she has talked herself into this. And I don't castigate her for that, like some of the other witnesses who have perjured themselves willfully, knowingly, intentionally, with a design to deceive you. But I think this woman has simply talked herself into having seen something that she's just not sure she saw at a time when she's just not sure she saw it. She did see something like this, one night, and it may have been a night when Shorty told her, you know, "I would like to get out of here, funny things are going on." A time when Shorty was tipsy. But was it the last time that she saw Shorty? Because she told Sergeant Whiteley the last time she saw him was in mid-September. And none of the Manson Family members were there on the ranch, at least not any of these male members that got out of the car at the ranch at that time. They were all up in Olancha except maybe Steve Grogan, but -- not Olancha, but the Barker-Meyers Ranch.

So, again, look at the way it's evolved. Look at the way the testimony occurred. Look at the credibility of the witnesses,

Here is a witness that I don't think is all that credible as to what she saw, but I don't think she is willfully trying to deceive you. And that's an important distinction for you to make, certainly, in this case.

•

24.

. **25**'

All right, let's talk about Frank Retz.

Now, Frank Retz -- it is sort of interesting to see Frank Retz on cross-examination, because at one point I think we were at dagger's points, he and I, as I was questioning him, and questioning him quite hard. At the end it was almost a love set.

But interesting what his testimony was on direct. Trying to develop as I did at the discussion about Shorty Shea with George Spahn and getting Shorty to be hired as a watchman with something which, through some devicus process of Squeaky listening stealthily behind George Spahn's blind eyes to the conversation, on and through Squeaky as a conduit of this information, got to Charlie Manson. And having that information, they figured they had to dispatch Shorty Shea to keep him from queering the works. What works? They were going to be gone. But that's the People's theory of the case.

And so they set this all up. Squeaky there. Did Squeaky hear these conversations? Well, heck yeah, she may have heard them, although George Spahn, when we called him down, said generally we try to get away from any people when we discussed business.

But, then -- all right, let's get some of the rest of the conversation.

Now, again, I don't have any more information than the People have. They may have more than I do, but I don't have any more than they do as to what Frank Retz had previously said. But they don't bring out what Frank Retz

J

÷

. 25 ı

. . previously said, what Frank Retz previously testified to at the Grand Jury hearing. The Grand Jury through which this indictment was gotten, but at which there was no lawyer to represent Bruce Davis and cross-examine these witnesses as I have done here before you.

And what did Frank Retz say? He said, "We had a conversation about Shorty's coming over and Shorty was to come over Monday. And I got a phone call from Shorty on Monday about 9:00 o'clock Monday morning, and I told Shorty, 'Come right down. You be right down here.' And Shorty said, 'Yes, I will come Monday morning, 9:00 o'clock.'"

Now, he said, "It was either Monday or Tuesday.

I do my banking Monday or Tuesday, so it was either Monday or Tuesday.

"I didn't do my banking, but I waited for him until the afternoon and he didn't show up and he never showed up." Monday or Tuesday morning. People didn't bring that all out because, you see, that doesn't fit in very nicely with their theory. Their theory is somewhere in here (indicating) he disappeared.

But, now, look. If it is a Monday or Tuesday, if it is the 25th or 26th of August, Charlie Manson was in jail there. And you have the evidence here in People's 101 and People's 102 as to the periods of time that he was in jail.

People's 102, I believe it is, shows that he was in jail following the March 6th -- or the August 16th arrest, from August 16 to August 20. There's no Monday or Tuesday that

he could have dispatched poor old Shorty then, because he was in jail.

And lo and behold, the following Monday and Tuesday, he's in jail. He's in jail the 25th and 26th, and he isn't released, according to the People's 102, until 11:42 at night.

5a fls.

9 .

·

. 25

·5

7 ·

But this period of time, when Pearl says she saw him, was between 11:00 o'clock and midnight. And Sergeant Whiteley testified it takes a good 45, 50 minutes, to get from the jail out to Spahn Ranch. So it couldn't have been that Monday or Tuesday, the 25th or 26th of August.

And low and behold, the next Monday or Tuesday, the 1st and 2nd of September, all the evidence shows that Bruce Davis, Tex Watson and Charlie Manson were up at the Barker-Meyers Ranch.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, why is it that the People didn't call George Spahn? I told you. I told you right at the beginning of this case that they were not going to call George Spahn, didn't I? In my opening statement I said, "We'll prove to you that they've got witnesses available, witnesses they called at the Grand Jury hearing that they will not call. Witnesses like George Spahn."

And why? Why did they not call George Spahn?

Because they knew what testimony the honest George Spahn would give.

Starting at Page 7070.

"Q All right. Now, the last occasion when you talked to Don about this, do you remember about what day of the week that was?

"A No, I'm not 'sartain.

"Q What did you tell him, the last occasion that you spoke to him?

"A Well, I told him now to be sure and go see Frank, because Frank wants to see you."

27

28

1

"And I understood it to be a -- he said -- it was on a Monday that Shorty should go down there, between 8:00 and 9:00.

"And I told him just, 'to be sure and do it, Shorty, because he wants to see you, and he won't fool around."

"Q Do you recall what Shorty replied, if anything?

"A Well -- no. I took it for granted that he went.

"Q Well, no. Wait a second. You are getting ahead of the story a little bit.

"This conversation that you had, was this conversation on the day that he was supposed to go, which was a Monday?"

Well, there's an objection at that point. New question by Mr. Denny.

"Well, sir, he had just told us about a conversation about Shorty going to meet Mr. Retz on Monday.

"A Yes,

"Q Between 8:00 and 9:00 o'clock, is that right?

."Α Yes."

And a further question by me.

"Now, this conversation that you had with Don, was that had on the day that Don was supposed to go meet Mr. Retz?

1 "You can answer that. 2 ľА May I answer? 3 OIL Yes. ľΑ No, that wasn't the day. 5 O How many days before the day that 6 Don was supposed to meet Mr. Retz did you have 7 that conversation with him, do you recall? 8. "A Well, it was just a mighty few days 9 before he was supposed to go I reminded him again 10 to be sure and be there. 11 D" All right. 12 And he said he sure would. 13 "O All right, sir. And to your recollec-14 tion, is that the last conversation that you had with 15 Don? 16 ľΑ I think it was -- I think that it was. 17 O¹¹ All right. 18 "Now, was there a period of time thereafter, 19 Mr. Spahn, at which you began to be concerned about 20 the fact that Don was missing? 21 ďΑ Yes. 22 "Q And about how long thereafter was 23 that that you became concerned about the fact that 24 Don wasn't around any more? 25 'Well, it was, uh -- I would say six 26 weeks." 27 People didn't want that information to get before you for some strange reason. But the defense brought it in.

It corroborates Frank Retz. It corroborates what Frank Retz said at the Grand Jury hearing. It corroborates what Frank Retz acknowledged was his testimony at the Grand Jury hearing and was the truth.

The testimony of Mr. Retz.

"Now, Mr. Retz, do you recall, though, that Shorty did call you about 9:00 o'clock in the morning?

"A It was after 9:00, yes, shortly
after 9:00 that I remember, because I got my
appointments every day. The secretary said,
"Will you accept a call from Shorty Shea collect?"
"Collect?"

"Yes.

"You remember collect?

"I say yes.

"You remember.

"And this is at your office where, sir?

"5767 Lankershim Boulevard or 5769, which
you call that, too.

"Q All right. And you've related that conversation to us that Shorty said he'd be happy to take the job?

"A That's correct.

27

28

"Q And asked about the money?

"A That was the first thing.

"Q The first thing, 70 bucks a week and all you can eat?

"A That's right.

"Q All the good delicatessen food you can eat, and then Shorty said he'd be there in about a half an hour, is that right?

"A That's what he said.

"Q All right. And you waited for him to come, is that right?

"A That's right.

"Q And you waited until even the afternoon, later into the afternoon for him to come and he didn't show up?

"A He didn't show up.

"Q All right.

"And you specifically recall waiting for him and being a little upset because that was your banking day that you took stuff to the bank, that particular day, isn't that right?

"A Well --

"Q The day that he called?

Monday, Tuesday, is my banking day.

Sometimes also Wednesday, because I go three or
four times a week to the bank. But I know when
I go to the bank and if I take off to the bank
and I say to my secretary, if somebody waits for

5b-2	1	"me, he can wait, and it takes ten minutes and
, F	· 2	I'm back.
•	3	Well, let me direct your attention to
÷	4	the Grand Jury hearing.
7. 1	5	"A Uh-huh.
	6	"Q When you testified on December 14,
	7	1970, before the Grand Jury.
	8	"A Yes.
	9	"Q Of this County.
	10	"Do you remember that?
	11	"A Yeah.
	12	"Probably if you refresh my memory, I
<u>6</u>	13	can remember, probably."
<u>.</u>	14	All right, then, we'll stipulate down to the
<u>;</u>	15	point where I do refresh his memory and he says:
	16	"Yes, it does."
	17	And so I read:
	18	"'Q'" from me reading from the
ï	19	Grand Jury testimony that he had given.
	20	"And do you know whether or not it
F	21	was a weekday or a weekend that Shorty called
∰ W W W	22	ýou?
	23	"A It was probably on a Monday. It
	24	was beginning I was Sunday out and I discussed
	. 25	the thing with George. It was on a Monday, so
	26	far as I remember.
	27	"In other words, you discussed it
	. 28	with George on a Sunday, and then on Monday

.,7

•

. 25.

"'you received a call from Shorty Shea?
"'A That is correct.

" 'Q And do you recall whether or not it was in the morning or the afternoon?

"'A It was in the morning because
I was to get some place, somewhere, usually
Monday. That's my day where I go to the bank
and things like that. And I know I delayed
that for afternoon because I was waiting for
Shorty. And after I called up approximately
1:00 o'clock, Spahn, he said, "He left."'

I'm asking him now, "Do you remember that?"
His answer:

"Do you remember that?"

"That's -- that's -- I guess, now, it comes clear. Yes, I was waiting for him at the time and after I went to the bank and I returned, called Spahn up. It could be on a Monday or Tuesday because on Monday if I don't have time to go to the bank on Monday, go on Tuesday."

So he talked to Shorty Shea on either a Monday or Tuesday. If it is the 25th or 26th, Manson is in jail. And if it is the first or second Monday, Davis, Watson, are all up at the Barker-Meyers Ranch. No wonder the People didn't want to call George Spahn. No wonder People didn't want to get into that aspect of Mr. Retz' testimony. All right, Barbara Hoyt. Let's take Barbara Hoyt quickly. And I had a quotation here for Barbara Hoyt, something about "Butter not

ĩ

20 ·

melting in her mouth," or, again, the one "Milk masquerading as cream."

An attractive looking girl, an intelligent girl, a smart girl, a smart-aleck girl. You know, that's one of the things that you can take into account when you look at the credibility of the witness. Their demeanor on the stand. Their interest in the case. Their demeanor.

Well, after a day or so of cross-examination some of that veneer was stripped away and you saw that smark-alecky demeanor of this delinquent, Barbara Hoyt, who is not such a sweet, demure young thing as that outfit she first wore, that long pink gingham dress or whatever that she paraded in before you with.

Now, Barbara Hoyt is another one whose testimony is perjury.

THE COURT: I'm going to interrupt you at this time. We'll reassemble at 1:00 o'clock, and I'll let -- can you close in a half hour, Mr. Denny?

MR. DENNY: I think I can, your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: We'll give you a half hour to close, and then at 1:30 we'll hear from Mr. Kay, beginning his close.

So, ladies and gentlemen, during the recess -- now, I'll see you at 1:00 o'clock.

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 it until it is finally submitted to you.

(Whereupon at 11:55 o'clock a.m. the noon recess

ma tam?

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1972, 1:07 P. M.

THE COURT: The record may show that the defendant is present with counsel. All the jurors are present. Mr. Kay and Mr. Denny are present, and also Mr. Manzella.

Mr. Denny, you may proceed.

MR. DENNY: Thank you, your Honor.

Mr. Kay, ladies and gentlemen of the jury:

and I've only got a half hour left, allotted by the Court, so that's why I'm talking a little bit faster than I was before.

Now, Barbara Hoyt, the young lady, in whose mouth butter would not melt, as I've said, testified to just a few points that were really critical material. But we took her on cross examination for quite a period of time to discuss -- or, to probe her credibility.

And what were the points? One, that she heard screams, shorty Shea's screams, on a particular night. Well, I won't review it, because we've reviewed it and reviewed it and reviewed it and reviewed it to some degree, except to point out the fact that assuming, for the sake of argument, you believe this young lady, that she heard screams — let's say that that is so — that's an area, an out-of-the-way area, where many sounds in the nighttime could be heard, at any time.

Did she hear Shorty Shea's screams? Well, again, taking her own testimony, Page 5572, Line 4.

"Q Well, are you good at recognizing screams,

ê

20⁻

 "A I don't know. This is my only opportunity --

"Q. / The only time in your whole life when you've ever heard anyone scream?

"A Like that.

"Q And recognize it?

"A Oh, no. No, I mean screaming like that."

But she told about recognizing her brother's scream, or whatever. Well, if she couldn't recognize Shorty's speaking voice, how does she recognize his screaming voice?

And this is interesting, again, too. You see, she wasn't really quite well enough prepared in this particular area of examination. Ruby Pearl said, "Shorty Shea was a guy from "Bahston," and his mother, Mrs. Shea, had lived in "Bahston," and had brought him up in "Bahston," and spoke with a "Bahston" accent, and this is what Pearl said. Do you remember?

And I asked Barbara Hoyt fifteen different ways if she could tell anything about Shorty's speaking voice. And you may remember -- and the judge commented that I was talking with a western drawl at the time. I said, "Did he talk lak a cowboy, lak this?"

And she didn't say. "I don't know. I don't know. I don't know."

I gave her every opportunity in the world to say he spoke with a Boston accent, and she couldn't, because she didn't know.

17 '

 And if she didn't know that much about his speaking voice, how in heaven's name does she know what his screaming voice sounds like?

Now, again, about these screams, Mr. Manzella argued that -- "Well, if it were different than one of these Manson Family members had testified, we could bring in some more Manson Family members to testify contrary to her -- " or them, or any of the Manson people, or ex-Manson people, or Manson-associated people, who are the chief witnesses for the prosecution.

"Who was there on the night you say you heard this?"

Well, Johnny Swartz was there. Well, George Spahn was there. Well, Larry Jones was there. A number of the cowboys were there. A number of different people were there.

Only Barbara Hoyt heard these screams.

Now, I am talking loud now. But no way to match that when I screamed the other day, in cross examining her.

I know I scared some of you, I'm sure, out of your seat almost.

But that was done for a purpose, too.

I don't find it particularly promotive of the image of the staid lawyer, to be screaming around the courtroom.

But it was done for this reason:

This gal kept saying -- when I was screaming, just about as loud as I could scream, screaming to the point where I was hoarse -- I had to use a microphone that afternoon -- "No. It was louder, louder, louder."

Now, you heard me screaming just about a

human being could scream. And if it was louder than that, everybody in Chatsworth could have heard that scream. 6a fol

22 -

.

Somebody besides Barbara Hoyt would be brought in by the prosecution to say, "Yes, I heard the screams. I corroborate Barbara Hoyt. I heard those screams that night, and I wondered what was going on, because I heard screams of pain and fear also.

"I heard screams that sounded like a woman screaming in a horror movie. I heard those screams."

But no, nobody is brought in other than Barbara Hoyt.

Barbara Hoyt, the prosecutor's darling.

Barbara Hoyt, who says she's spoken to millions of policemen and thousands of attorneys -- District Attorneys.

Now, she was exaggerating then, just as she was exaggerating on everything else she testified to. Obviously, she didn't talk to millions of officers. But she talked to plenty of officers.

And, interestingly enough, those officers didn't believe her. Lieutenant Nielsen, one of the chief investigators in the Tate-La Bianca case, questioned her on December 29th. He questioned her, and when she said it was Shorty's screams, he disbelieved it so that he didn't put down it was Shorty screaming; he couldn't give credence to that.

And you are supposed to believe that, beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, when that officer, who's trained, didn't believe it?

Now, the People want you to. And the People

1 2

× 3

sgain figure they -- "Those officers are incompetent officers."
Well, I don't think they're incompetent officers.

All right. She's testified to the screams. She testified to them being under the moonlight. All right, ladies and gentlemen. If you want to believe that, fine. The People are struck with it. They have made their case.

They took some -- a bit of testimony that came out -- you see, she hadn't -- and this has been brought out by testimony. She hadn't testified to that before the Grand Jury. She hadn't told any investigating officer; she hadn't told any district attorney; when she testified at the first Grogan case, she didn't testify to that.

It was only at the time of the Manson case that it just happened to come out, in the course of cross-examination by Mr. Kanarek. And I've read that examination to you, disclosing that this sprang into her mind.

"Oh, it was a moonlight night." And boom!
The prosecution jumped on that.

They thought, "Ah hah! This will be good. It was a moonlight night. All right. Let's set it right in this area (indicating), and we'll bring in a moon man from the Griffith Observatory, and we will get it right down to the fine point."

Okay. They have done this. Now, they're stuck with it. If you believe it, fine. But it's strange that, in two years, she hadn't told anybody who questioned her very thoroughly about that, before; but they're stuck with that date now, that they've figured out.

a

'

.6 '

î

 Now, this is important. You are going to receive an extraordinarily complex instruction, that has never before been given, I imagine, in California -- and may never again -- but it's an instruction that was worked over, with some diligence, to try to make it as simple as possible; but it is a complex idea.

You see, the People are contending, now, finally, -- they still haven't put it in writing; they've still never charged the defendant with such a conspiracy -- but they're contending now that this was not simply a conspiracy to murder Shorty Shea, but because it's necessary to get in this evidence of supposed statements Charles Manson made, and the only way they can do that is by prolonging the conspiracy beyond the point when they say -- they alleged that Shorty was killed, they -- they sort of fabricate this new theory, this new concept, that in order to get this evidence in, "Well, we will say that there was a continuing conspiracy; not just to murder Shorty, but to murder and to hide the body and to conceal the murder."

And you see, there's a body of law that says if, in fact, a conspiracy does start out -- or, in the course of the conspiracy, it evolves -- that one of the objectives is not just to commit the crime, but to conceal the crime -- and in case of a murder, conceal the body, conceal the fact of the crime -- then statements made all during the course of that conspiracy are admissible against the co-conspirators, even if they didn't say it; they weren't there.

6b fls.

Now, this again, is part of the testimony of the prosecutor's darling. All right. So, this is what the People have said, in order to get in the statement of -supposedly made by Manson to DeCarlo, down by the stream, that their -- that, "Does lye or lime get rid of a body?" Which is supposed to show that they've killed Shorty, and now they're trying to dispose of his body by lye or lime.

è

Interestingly enough, it's supposed to have been said to DeCarlo. Interesting, again. Where did she flee to when she fled the desert, from Charlie, from Barker Ranch. To DeCarlo: to Danny DeCarlo.

And who's Danny DeCarlo's big buddy? Bill Vance.

And who's Bill Vance's sweetheart? Ella Jo Bailey.

There they are again, all together (indicating).

Did these people -- the two girlfriends -- have reason to

fabricate, to hide, maybe to try to put the blame on others?

When all the evidence in this case, really, points to Bill

Vance and Danny DeCarlo, if anyone killed Shorty Shea -- and

we'll get into that in just about five minutes.

All right. But again, this instruction says, in effect, "If you believe that there was this sort of continuing conspiracy, this conspiracy to not only murder Shorty Shea, but to hide the body, and to hide the crime, then -- and if you think that Bruce Davis was part of this conspiracy, if you believe that there was the conspiracy to murder, et cetera, and the other factors that are involved, then and only then may you consider any statements made by Manson -- and there are two particular statements, one made by Manson, and one supposedly made by Clem Grogan, to Juan Flynn. And again --

MR. KAY: Well, your Honor, I am going to object. That wasn't one of the statements covered by that instruction. That was Manson and Swartz.

THE COURT: Oh, Swartz, yes.

MR. DENNY: Swartz, that's right.

THE COURT: John Swartz.

/. *

 MR. DENNY: Right. Thank you, your Honor.

The one supposedly made to John Swartz, that
Shorty had to go to San Francisco, that Manson had gotten him a
job with somebody and had sent him on up there to San
Francisco.

And this, the People are introducing by way of attempting to show that, supposedly, they're trying to throw people off the track as to where Shorty really is -- presuming that Shorty was dead.

All right. Now, this statement of Barbara Hoyt, this interesting statement that -- this lye or lime bit, that's not admissible against Bruce Davis, but it's hard for a jury to -- to make that cut-off of testimony. But the People have gotten it in; that was their main -- main object. It's paraded before you. As they say, can you unring a bell?

Well, according to law, according to the theory of law, you are supposed to be able to. If the Judge tells you to, you're supposed to be able to. Hopefully, you can.

If you find that, as I said to you, that there was a conspiracy to murder Shorty Shea, and as a part of that conspiracy there was a conspiracy to hide the fact of the murder, well, it was the most bumbled and fumbled conspiracy ever.

Because apparently, according to these witnesses, the chief architect of that conspiracy and the others did nothing but blab it away, talk about it, talk about it.

Or, was this part of the same routine that Charlie had followed for a long time? Now, assume this -- and I'm

1 2

3

5

6 7

8

9:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

jumping ahead a little bit because I must; I'm in a hurry.

The evidence shows, according to Frank Retz -the People's witness; part of his testimony that they didn't put on -- and George Spahn, the People's witness at the Grand Jury hearing, but the evidence that we had put on in this case that Shorty was supposed to meet with Frank Retz on a Monday or Tuesday.

Well, assuming it wasn't the Monday or Tuesday, the 25th or 26th of August, let's go over to the Monday or Tuesday, the 1st and 2nd of September. It's marked in red here, because -- and I think the Court has already taken judicial notice -- or I believe so -- that Monday was Labor Day, September of 1969.

So, it could have been that Monday, Labor Day, that Frank Retz was at work, until Shorty appeared, or Tuesday, the next banking day. Frank Retz said it was either Monday or Tuesday.

Low and behold, the first gun that is redeemed by Richard A. Smith -- Danny DeCarlo -- is redeemed on the Suppose, in fact, Shorty was killed -- was killed on his way to see Frank Retz. Never got there. Was killed by -who? Who is remaining down here?

Barbara Hoyt says Danny DeCarlo came up, but he went back down, and then came up again later for that supper that she and Juan Flynn were at on a weekend.

And there's no question that he was down here on the 2nd because his signature is on that redemption slip.

On the 3rd, the second gun and the gun case were

redeemed from San Launer's pawnshop; and presumably, on either that day or the next day was the day that John Swartz saw who?

Danny DeCarlo and Bill Vance, with Shorty's guns.

"Well, we finally got Shorty's ego."

Then, Shorty's attache case, the attache case that's in evidence — and what does it contain? It contains checks and things in the name of who? Mr. Vance, under his various pseudonyms, of Dwayne Schwarm or — who's the other one here? Yes, William Rex Cole — and the blue suitcase, again, with numbers of checks made out in the same name.

But when that blue suitcase was found, not the shirts of Danny DeCarlo in it, I submit.

2

ŀ

3

5

Ģ

•

•

10

11

, 12

ĵ.

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

All right. Trunks, footlockers. Now, again, the inventory of those footlockers that Sergeant Whiteley made out and put with them has disappeared, once it got to the prosecutor's office. So we don't really know what was in those trunks.

Were those shirts, with Danny DeCarlo's laundry mark on them, in those trunks? Well, the pictures show you that everything was taken out of those trunks to photograph. Some things remained in; you can't see everything that was there.

There was just a hodgepodge of stuff that was taken out and photographed, the series 65 pictures.

Were Danny DeCarlo's shirts in those footlockers?

And if so, who's covering up for Danny DeCarlo?

Is Barbara Hoyt? The woman who fled from Charles Manson to

Danny DeCarlo's? Along with Sherry Cooper?

Who's trying to cover up for William Rex Cole, the person in whose custody those guns were, along with Danny DeCarlo, according to John Swartz? Who's trying to cover up for him? Ella Jo Bailey, his girl friend? Is she?

All right. I'll leave that to you.

Now, let's go to this statement that Barbara Hoyt made concerning the dinner up here.

And this is interesting, too, the dinner that she and Juan Flynn were at. Here's a diagram on the board that we drew of the Meyers ranch house, and Juan Flynn placing various people and placing the girls where they were sitting.

And this dinner apparently occurring about the

. 12

ï

5th or 6th, of September -- or, that weekend -- up at the Meyers Ranch.

Present: Danny DeCarlo, Charles Manson, Charles Watson, Bruce Davis and Juan Flynn and some girls -- Barbara Hoyt among them. And it's the same dinner, because I got the tapioca bit in . Both Juan and Barbara said, "Yes, it was tapioca for dessert."

So, we've established it was the same dinner. But their versions of it differ markedly.

Barbara Hoyt says, "Oh, yes, the girls got cigarettes for the men after dinner, and they smoked cigarettes. But it was not marijuana cigarettes." She says there was no gun passed around the table.

But she did see Juan Flynn go out.

Now, if Juan Flynn went out, it was after the dinner, after the gun was passed around, because she testified he went out after this gun was passed around. He went out to relieve himself.

So, their versions don't quite jive, in some particulars, because Juan Flynn says, "Yes, at that dinner, marijuana was put in the pipe and passed around, and there wasn't enough for the girls, so we passed around a pipe.

"And also, this gun was passed around."

Now, if the conversation was related as Barbara Hoyt relates it to you, well, sure as heck, Juan Flynn should have remembered that conversation, and any "Yeahs" or nods of the head, with smiles thrown in, of Bruce Davis, because he was --

12_,

8.

6d fls.

MR. KAY: Your Honor?

MR. DENNY: -- a lot closer than Barbara Hoyt, who is blind as a bat, was to --

MR. KAY: Your Honor, I'm going to object to that, since Mr. Denny was the one who objected to Mr. Flynn relating that conversation. I think that's improper.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

MR. DENNY: Now, ladies and gentlemen, you see, the conversation is admissible -- and the reason I objected to it -- and Mr. Kay may be proper in jumping up here, but the only way that conversation is admissible is under a very interesting formula of the law, which says: You can't admit a statement by another person, unless it's admitted against the defendant in this case, in the guise of an adoptive admission.

An adoptive admission is an admission that is, in effect, incriminating in some way, whereby -- for instance, if I would say, "The reporter and I, we went out last night and we killed somebody," and the reporter nodded his head (indicating), now, that's an adoptive admission on his part. He hasn't said anything, but he nods his head.

It's a kind of assent. Or, if he just says,
"Yeah, yeah," that's an adoptive admission; you see? That's
all it takes, just to get someone to say, "Yeah."

6d-1

The reporter said, "Yeah, yeah," when Danny was relating that the two of them went out and killed somebody. But unless there's this "Yeah, yeah," or some form of assent to adopt the admission, it's not admissible.

And who remembers? Who remembers? Who has that fine, distinct memory of that adoptive admission? Why, Barbara Hoyt. Barbara Hoyt, who remembers it when?

On May 20th, 1971, when questioned by one of the prosecutors in this case. And never before. Never before?

Never before because it's needed now, some sort of adoptive admission is needed against Bruce Davis, because they don't have any case without it, so on May 20th, they get it.

And what is it?

"Uh, Charlie said that, uh -- let's see how he put it.

"That 'we told Shorty that we wanted to show him something and we took him for a ride in a dune buggy."

"And then, he said, they took him for a ride, they hit him in the head with a pipe, I think he said. I think he said lead, but I'm not sure if he said lead.

"And then, they started stabbing him, and stabbing him, and stabbing him, and then he said he was real hard to kill until they brought him to now."

Barbara, talking to the prosecutor now:

"Do you want me to put in the things that Bruce said in the statement?

"Q Yes, if you would."
Has she been rehearsed?

19:

	I .	
5 d−2	1	"A All right. Well, he said that at the
	2	end, about the now part, uh
•	3	"Q So far you've related what Manson said; is
2	4	that right?
* *	5	"A Yes,
	6	"Q All right. Now, put in also what you heard
	7	Mr. Davis say.
	8	"A Well, he said when he said, "he was
	9	pretty hard to kill until we brought him to now, he said, yeah
	10	when we brought him to now, Clem cut his head off.
	n	"And Bruce said, 'That was far out."
*	12	"And a couple of other times he said, "Yeah,"
*	13	and things like that, and agreed."
3	14	And let's see, what else he said?
.	15	"Oh, Shorty said, after they started stabbing him,
	16	Charlie said Shorty asked, 'Why, Charlie, why?' and Charlie
	17	said, 'Why? This is why, and I stabbed him again."
	18	"That's what he said.
š	19	"Q That's what Charlie said?
۵	20	"A Yes.
ê	21	"Q And did Bruce say anything to that?
	22	"A I believe he did.
	23	"Q Do you remember what he said at that
, 6	24	point?
8	25	"A I remember a couple of times, though, he
F	26	said 'yeah.'"
_ .	27	Going on, "Q BY MR. KAY: Miss Hoyt, you've told
	28	us that when Manson said that when Shorty got to now, Clem cut

6d - 3

2

1

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

his head off, but that Mr. Davis said, 'Yeah, that was far out'?

> "A *Yeah, that was pretty far out. *

"0 Other than that statement, would you tell us what Mr. Davis said during the conversation at which points he said something, as far as you remember?

"A Uh, well, he said -- uh, when he said we were stabbing him and stabbing him and things like that, Bruce said, 'Yeah.'

"Q And did you see Bruce's demeanor when he said that?

"À Yeah, he smiled and said 'Yeah,' and nodded his head.

"Well, I don't remember that he smiled. I remember that he nodded his head and said 'Yeah.'

> "Uh, let's see, what else did he say? "That's all I can think of."

Ladies and gentlemen, are you able to believe that? Are you really going to believe that, from that blind bat up there, that he smiled and nodded his head and said "Yeah," in the candlelight? When the People are telling you the candlelight cast such funny shadows that a black gun barrel (indicating) looked gold?

That is fabricated, lying, perjured testimony! And I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen -- and I've said it before, and I'll say it again -- that is fabricated and manufactured with the full knowledge, consent and connivance of the prosecution in this case. And I'm not going to mince any words

words about it.

And this is hideous, if you people are going to be a party to convicting a man on testimony like that. I shudder! I shudder! I shudder for the sons and daughters of every one you, who may be tried under circumstances like this.

Paul Watkins. Let's take him just briefly here, because all he testified to was just one small thing.

Amazing! Out of all this conversation that supposedly was going on between Bill Vance and Bruce Davis, as they're walking down this wash together, what -- what is heard?

"That's why we killed Shorty."

Isn't that amazing? That's all he remembers.

Do you believe that?

Paul Watkins, that's all he really testified to, and yet I took him on cross examination for as long as I did, to show him -- and to show you, the jury -- the background of this fellow, the hophead, the marijuana-smoking, pill-dropping person that he is.

2

1

3

5

6

7

8

·9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

All right, we must go on.

Juan Flynn, what did he testify to? Not much. He testified about the gun, though. That gun which he described how? As a gold barrel with scrolls. With scrolls. Does that sound familiar?

MR. KAY: I'll object to that. That was Mr. Crockett that testified to that.

THE COURT: The objection will be overruled.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, I'm sure that neither counsel will willfully misstate the evidence. You are the ultimate judges of the facts of the evidence in the case.

Go ahead, Mr. Denny.

MR. DENNY: If I am mistaken, I apologize. But the point I wanted to make was -- Paul Crockett did also testify that this was a gun with scrolls. And that's why I was saying. did it sound familiar? A gold-barreled gun.

On my examination, on my examination I questioned him about earlier testimony, as far as it being a gold-barreled gun, as he had so testified previously. Gold with scrolls.

I said, "Does that look gold?

"Well, no, it doesn't now.

"Where are the scrolls?

"I don't see them.

"Neither do I."

Here, 5980.

"Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Would you describe the revolver for us?

"Well, it looked like the type of gun that one

-2 1 2 would have in a collection. It was a .45 caliber six-shooter revolver with a long barrel and it had fancy little, oh, scrolls on it. It was a nice piece. It was strictly a collector's item."

Then, my cross examination.

"It is different than the gun you saw Mr. Manson with, is that correct?"

Talking about the gun in evidence here, one of Shorty's guns.

"Now, in what respect are you referring to?

"I'm referring to the respect that you described it previously to a number of different people as a gold-plated gun; isn't that correct?

"A Well, I don't know whether that's goldplated or not, but it has the appearance of being gold.

"Q How about the barrel?

"The barrel is very similar to the gun that I looked at.

"Q A gold-plated barrel?

"A Well, it has been changed considerably.

"Q Then, it is different than the gun you saw, is that correct?

"A I would say that if I had to look down the barrel of it again, I would say it is the same gun. But I don't have any specific marks that I can put on it that I can say positively that that's the gun.

"Where are the fancy scrolled designs? Where is the gun with the fancy scrolled designs that Mr. Manson put in your

. . . .

<u>*</u>

8

5

6

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

4

15.

16 . 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

_

,

.

--

"face?

"Would you like to point those out to the jury or the judge or anyone?

"I don't see them.

"Q Neither do I.

"No further questions."

Do you remember that? Does that sound familiar? Where did Juan Flynn get "gold-barreled gun"? From Paul Crockett, that's where. The three musketeers up there: Big Paul, Little Paul and Brooks, Brooks Posten, joined by the fourth.

Who are they? Arthos, Porthos, Aramis and D'Artagnon? Living upthere now in Shoshone together. The three joined by the fourth musketeer. All getting together, all talking about their stories, what they are going to say, what they are going to testify to. And all getting their stories the same way, mixed up, that this gun was a gold-plated gun with fancy scrolls.

Now, that's just one of the small pieces that we could get, that we could put together for you to show you what these people have done. All right, that's Paul Watkins and Paul Crockett. Big Paul and Little Paul and Juan.

John Swartz, we've talked about.

Al Springer. Let's get to Alan Springer.

You know, before we do, I've got to read you just briefly one little thing that I felt was so apropros of the testimony of these girls, Barbara Hoyt and Ella Jo Bailey. It is from Arthur Miller's Crucible. The story is about the

7-4 $\overline{X}\Omega A$

6.

8 *

Salem witch trials that were brought about by the young girls who, a couple of them, had been caught dancing nude by the uncle of one and it was sinful then. And in order to take the heat off themselves, they got the idea to start calling some of the women in the community witches. And they began to have a trial, and they began to issue warrants based on the statements of these young girls.

.12

.

Abigail is one of them. Parris is her uncle. The Minister through whom this process began. Proctor is the husband and one of the women who has just received a warrant for his wife's arrest. And he ripped it up. And the bailiff says:

"You've ripped the Deputy Governor's warrant, man!

"Damn the Deputy Governor!

"Out of my house!"

And the other Minister who has been brought up:

"Now, Proctor, Proctor!

"Proctor: Get y'gone with them! You are a broken Minister.

"Hale: Proctor, if she is innocent, the court --

"Proctor: If she is innocent! Why
do you never wonder if Parris be innocent --" that's
the uncle of Abigail "-- or Abigail? Is the accuser
always holy now? Were they born this morning as
clean as God's fingers? I'll tell you what's
walking Salem -- vengeance is walking Salem. We
are what we always were in Salem, but now the
little crazy children are jangling the keys of
the kingdom, and common vengeance rights the law!
This warrants vengeance! I'll not give my wife
to vengeance!"

And I'll not give my client to vengeance, not out of the mouths of these witnesses, I won't.

2

1

3

6

7

8

10

13

12

13

14,

15

16

17,

18

19

-6

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Alan Springer.

You know, my daughter, my older daughter was playing a record for my younger daughter from Peter Pan. and I heard this song, a light, delightful song sung by the fellow that's appeared so often on Broadway. I can't remember his name right now. He played Captain Hook. Green is the -- his last name. And he sings this song. "Who is the swimest swine in the world, Captain Hook, Captain Hook. Who is the swiniest swine in the world." And he goes on to tell what a nasty, evil, reprehensible, indispensable man is he. And I thought how fitting. Alan Springer. Alan Springer who testified to only one thing, really, against this defendant, and that's this alleged conversation of November 26th, when, having gone to the police on behalf of whom? Danny DeCarlo, his buddy. Danny DeCarlo, who he was worried about, so worried that although he, Springer only had four counts against him at the time. he was worried because Danny was involved in what, murder. Murder. And so he wanted to help his buddy get off any involvement in murder. And so he went to the police.

And he said, "I'll cooperate with you if you help Danny and help me." And the police said, "Sure, we'll help you. We'll take care of you for as long as you can testify for us," which they've done. And we don't need to recount that any more.

"And we'll take care of Danny. You tell him just to come in."

All right. And Alan Springer, who then goes out

7s-3

,18

7b fls.₂₃

and gets the sword and brings it in, "Am I being helpful?

Am I being helpful? Do you need more?" And so he brings in more.

"Hey, I've got a statement for you. How's that?
How's that? A statement. I got a statement from
Bruce Davis."

And he relates the statement. And the People say, "Oh, well, now, you've impeached him up one side and down the other with all the immunity he's got and all the breaks he's got, but just remember he's stuck with that same statement ever since it was made. He's stuck with that statement."

Well, sure as hell he has. That's his ticket to freedom. That's his ticket to get off. And he's gotten off again, again, and again.

And you know, Mr. Bugliosi made a statement,

I believe in the course of his argument in the Tate-La

Bianca case, when they relied on the same type of creeps

and villians and cut-throats and receivers of stolen property,

to support the People's case. Except in that case they

weren't impeached time and time again by police officers,

as they have been in this case, which I'm still waiting for

the prosecution to explain.

7.

11 '

I3,

2ĺ

 thing about — in trying to say that the jury should give credence to the testimony of these witnesses, "Well, when you descend into hell, you can't expect to find angels." And if the prosecution gives you some of that garbage, that they take their witnesses where they find them, and they have to get these witnesses, and if they have to go to hell to get them, you can't expect to find angels. I say you are damn right, you don't find angels. And just because they're testifying for the prosecution now instead of sitting as defendants, where most of them ought to be, doesn't mean that all of a sudden, as in the Crucible here, they speak the truth.

as the chief witnesses for the prosecution all of a sudden turn to truth sayers? Well, if you all feel that you would want to be convicted on the testimony of such people, and you feel that they are credible, and then find Bruce Davis guilty based on that type of testimony, especially when that type of testimony is contradicted in every major respect by good police officers and good Deputy Sheriffs.

Ladies and gentlemen, I submit to you that we have done for the defense exactly what I told you we would do in our opening statement. I submit to you we have proven everything that we set out to show, that I knew we could show, that I knew we would show, and that I submit we have shown. And I submit to you that we have shown that the People's witnesses have contradicted themselves, have contradicted one other and themselves. That they have lied. That they have perjured

14,

... 16

themselves. That in some instances they have done so with the connivance and the behest of the prosecution.

If the evidence in this case has been fooled with and tampered with, not only by the experts, but by representatives of the prosecution. That the case stinks to high heaven.

And I submit that you, as jurors, would want no part in the conviction of anybody based on a case of this kind, no matter how long it's been, no matter how long it's taken.

I do want to thank you for taking that period of time out of your lives. You have seen something here which, I say, you will not see the likes of again. I hope you will not see the likes of again. And I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that in a very short period of time, giving due regard to your duty and responsibility to deliberate this case, that you will return with a proper verdict. And a proper verdict in this case, based on what you have seen and what you've heard in this courtroom, is a verdict of acquittal as to all Counts. Thank you very much.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, if Mr. Denny is through with his argument, could I be heard on something out of the presence of the jury? In other words, could you declare a recess now?

MR. KAY: It is going to take me about ten or fifteen minutes to set up anyway. Ten minutes.

THE COURT: All right, we'll declare a recess until 2:00 o'clock.

Ladies and gentlemen, during the recess you are admonished not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject

. 16'

5

 connected with this matter, nor form or express any opinion on it until it is finally submitted to you.

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

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Manzella.

The record will show that all the jurors have left.

MR. DENNY: Do you want to close the door out there?
THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, the People have located Bill Vance. And the People are -- on Monday, would move to re-open their case. I would like to be heard on that, on that, now. Because it involves bringing Bill Vance back from Missouri.

Sergeant Whiteley advised me this morning that he had located the whereabouts of Bill Vance. That he was living on a farm in Missouri and that he had contact with Vance, and established contact with Vance through the Sheriff in that county in which Vance was living in Missouri.

Now, the People are asking leave of Court to reopen their case for the purpose of presenting Bill Vance, Bill
Vance's testimony, and I would like to make argument to the
Court now on behalf of our motion.

THE COURT: I'll say, you start out at a disadvantage.

MR. MANZELLA: I understand. That's the first time I've

ever argued ---

THE COURT: Because here, Mr. Manson has been tried on these same charges and, presumably, there were many months

during which the People might have pursued this --7b-4MR. MANZELLA: We have pursued --THE COURT: -- this witness. MR. MANZELLA: Wes, your Honor. THE COURT: And the Court would like to have some explanation as to why Mr. Vance has not been located previously. MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: I'll hear from you. 7c fol 2ľ

2

1

4

3

5

7

8.

9 10

11

12 13

ž

14

Ţ5

16

17

18

19

20

21.

¹.22

23° 24

25

26

28

27 *

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, the People would offer the testimony of Sergeant Whiteley on the -- what, in effect, would be the diligence of the investigators in attempting to contact, subpoena or arrest and subpoena Bill Vance for the purpose of securing his testimony here at this trial.

Sergeant Whiteley isn't here right now to testify to that because of the fact that he's busy arranging to go to Missouri to bring Vance back here.

THE COURT: Well, what would you anticipate that Vance might say, in the first instance?

MR. MANZELLA: Well, those are the two points.

In the first place, the People believe we have exercised diligence in attempting to locate Vance; and, in the second, his testimony would be material, which are the two requirements required before reopening can be allowed. And the materiality of Vance's testimony will be that he can establish the statements of the parties, Charles Manson, Bruce Davis and other members of the Family with regard to the conspiracy and agreement to rob and murder Gary Hinman. And that he can, as the Court knows from the evidence that's been offered at the case, that he was involved in securing, along with Danny DeCarlo, Shea's guns within a few days after Shea was killed. And that the case found in the desert had his papers in it, showing his connection with that.

on both the Hinman murder and on the Shea murder.

Now, he may have more knowledge than that. I can't say whether he does or not. I just don't know yet at

18[.]

this point. That's why I say the People are going to ask to reopen on Monday. He's still in Missouri as of this date, and he will be brought back over the weekend.

THE COURT: From where do you arrive at your conclusions that he will make such statements; from Sergeant Whiteley?

MR. MANZELLA: From -- yes, Sergeant Whiteley. But from statements that Vance has made to him since this morning, but rather from evidence which we have which is in the homicide manual and in all the statements and reports that form part of the investigation in this case --

THE COURT: Well, do you have --

MR. MANZELLA: -- that Vance was present.

And from the testimony of Ella Bailey -- we are not allowed to go into it completely, but from her testimony Vance was present at the conversation with Manson just prior to the time that Manson asked Ella Bailey to go to Hinman's home.

And in that conversation, I don't believe it all-the conversation itself or what Vance told her that Manson
said was not brought out here, because it is hearsay. But
the testimony is that she -- that Vance -- that at that
meeting Manson told Vance and the other members of the -the male members of the Family that "Everyone was going to
have to kill for me or for the Family."

And, again, as I say, Sergeant Whiteley has not interviewed Bill Vance, so we don't know what -- exactly what information he has. But the combination of that and the fact that he was in possession of Shea's guns and made the

7c-3

statement, "We finally got Shorty's ego," established that he had knowledge of Shea's death and knowledge of the guns, the fact that DeCarlo had gotten them. In fact, he may have been with DeCarlo. We just don't know at this point.

But the testimony would clearly be relevant, since both sides have argued Bill Vance -- and Mr. Denny has just finished spending a lot of time arguing Bill Vance. If he could get up on the witness stand, his testimony would be relevant. Mr. Denny has accused him, along with Danny DeCarlo, of killing Shorty Shea. So he's certainly a figure in this case. So I believe --

THE COURT: Oh, he was a figure in the other case -- MR. MANZELLA: I certainly think it is material.

THE COURT: -- months ago, and it should have been plain to the People --

MR. MANZELLA: It was, your Honor. It has been plain to the People. For two years we wanted Bill Vance. That's why the original contact was made with Ella Bailey, the record shows the original contact was made with Ella Bailey. We've been trying to get him for two years now and we haven't been able to find him. We've finally gotten him. And I believe his testimony would be most material, would be material. And I think we can show -- I can show actually under oath through the testimony of Sergeant Whiteley the efforts that he's made to locate Bill Vance and that those efforts have continued since October of 1969, his attempt to locate and get Bill Vance.

THE COURT: Well, what was this, a sudden surge of energy

on Sergeant Whiteley's part or some fortuitous event or what?

MR. MANZELLA: No, it wasn't. As with all homicide investigations, it was probably a combination of a number of things. But more than anything, luck. That all of his investigation finally paid off, and he's located Bill Vance. That's probably what it is.

THE COURT: There's probably no doubt that Bill Vance would be a very important witness to one side or the other.

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

THE COURT: And the Court can see that right from the start that Mr. Vance -- Vance's testimony could be important.

1

2

3

5

б

7

8.

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

24

.23 . . . 24

25

26

27

28

MR. MANZELLA: Now, I am prepared to argue the case --

THE COURT: I have some reservations about the question of diligence and notice. I -- at this time I'm going to deny your motion with the idea in mind you may at the end of the day if you wish, present Sergeant Whiteley to put on some evidence in connection with it. We'll go ahead at this time with the argument --

MR. MANZELLA: All right.

THE COURT: -- of the People, the closing argument.

MR. MANZELLA: All right.

MR. KAY: I need about five more minutes.

THE COURT: All right, we're in recess on the Davis case.

MR. DENNY: Oh, your Honor, excuse me, if I can bring up one point on the record.

I have been informed that -- apparently in the course of my preparation for my argument, I have not heard some of the remarks that have been made by the Court to the jury, that the Court did not intend to sequester this jury during their deliberations.

THE COURT: True.

MR. DENNY: Is that -- well, I would strongly, strongly object, your Honor, to a jury, in what has just been declared a non-capital case, but what has heretofore been a capital case, where a man is accused of the crimes that Mr. Davis is accused of, of not being sequestered.

THE COURT: What's the basis of your objection?

1 2

2Š,

MR. DENNY: Well, the basis of my objection, your Honor, is the fact it is hard enough in a case of this kind for jurors not to form or express any opinions with anybody until the matter has been submitted to them, but once the matter has been submitted to them, once they begin to give and take, then, they should not have the chance of being exposed to those in their family or friends or whatever who will interject something into the discussion that is supposed to remain just among those twelve people. And I think there's too much likelihood in a case of this kind, your Honor, of that happening.

The People have studiously --

The jurors have studiously, I assume, avoided forming or expressing an opinion. But now you send them out to do just exactly that and to start thinking about how they are going to vote in this case.

MR. MANZELLA: Just a moment, the jury commenced entering the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Would you wait out in the hallway, just a moment, ladies and gentlemen?

(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings while members of the jury exited the courtroom, and then the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DENNY: And, your Honor, where you have a traffic case or something like that, or a case that's maybe taken one or two days to try, even a felony case, I think there's some reason to say, for inconvenience sake or whatever -- and the

1 matter is relatively simple for the jury to arrive at a verdict 2 and they may or may not even take a full day in deliberation, 3 that's fine. But here we can assume that the jury, if it is a conscientious jury, is going to spend some time in delibera-5 tion. And they should be kept together during that period of ń time and not exposed to any outside influences when they are 7 in a diligent attempt -- we assume a diligent attempt, and I 8 do, looking at these jurors when I say that, to come to a consensus of those twelve people responsible for arriving at 10 that verdict. And I think where a case has gone as long as 11 this has, where the evidence has taken some two months to 12 present, that it would be -- not necessarily foolhardy, but 13 asking for trouble that we do not need to ask for, to permit 14 the jurors to go out among their family and friends during 15 the process of deliberation. There is too much opportunity, 16 your Honor, for error to creep in in that respect. And I think 17 the Court doesn't need to take that chance. This has been a 18 hard fought case and the Court has had a lot of rulings to make and whether they go one way or the other, I think at this point, at least, we we got a decent record that s not going to be muddied up by something that could happen in this phase of the case that need not happen. I strongly urge your Honor that 23 they be sequestered.

> I'll consider it. THE COURT:

(Whereupon, unrelated matters were called and heard before the Court.)

THE COURT: Are you ready, Mr. Kay? MR. KAY: Yes, your Honor.

19

20

22

24

25

26

27

```
THE COURT:
                                      I'm not.
                             (Laughter.)
8, fol
                               (Short recess.)
           5
           6
           7
           8
           9
          10
          11
          12
          13
          14
          15
          16
          17
          18
          19
          20
          21
          22
          23
          24
          25
          26
          27
```

3

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

1

THE COURT: The record will show the defendant is present with his counsel, Mr. Kay for the People. jurors are all present.

You may proceed.

Thank you, your Honor. MR. KAY:

Ladies and gentlemen: A lot of slanderous and completely false remarks have been made by Mr. Denny here during his two-day harangue; and I have just been waiting for the opportunity to respond.

You know, I can't say much when I'm sitting here, and the other counsel is arguing, but -- but I have got a lot to say (indicating). I have got a lot to say.

And I will be finished Monday afternoon, because that's when you are going to be -- that's when you are going to be instructed. And I think -- I think that you are going to have a little different slant on this case when I finish my argument than you have now that Mr. Denny has finished his argument.

Mr. Denny, at least 20 times during his argument, has been looking over his shoulder and saying, "Now, you " know that Mr. Kay is going to stand up and -- and, gee, I'm not going to have a chance to respond to him. And I --I want you to go to the jury room, and I want you to respond to him."

Why is he worried about Mr. Kay standing up and arguing? And you people trying to respond to him? Why?

Because he knows that I wouldn't let him get away with the argument, the argument quote, unquote, that

13

15 16

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

18 •

21 .

24.

he made in front of you ladies and gentlemen during the last two days in this courtroom, a court of law.

Now, I'll admit that Mr. Denny is an eloquent and skilled defense attorney, and that what he says sounds good. But sounds are not evidence. In this case, they are not evidence.

Ladies and gentlemen, the People of the State of California have not only proven in this case beyond any reasonable doubt that Bruce Davis is guilty of two of the most vicious, brutal murders in the annals of California crime, we've also proven that Mr. Davis is guilty of those murders, and they are murders of the first degree.

Now, when you ladies and gentlemen go into the jury room, to commence your deliberations, there are two courses of action that you can follow. The first course of action is to walk into the jury room in a state of utter confusion about what the evidence is in this case, because your interpretation of the evidence has been clouded and blurred by the tactics of Mr. Denny.

The second course of action is to walk into the jury room in a clear-thinking manner, and make your decisions based on the substantial, truthful evidence that the People have presented in this case.

ofaction. I wonder if any of you have read the great

Victor Hugo's account of the octopus. Mr. Hugo says that

"No man can appreciate such a fish unless he has seen it."

He says, "It has the aspect of scurvy and gangrene." He

3.

.

24, ¯

. . . describes it as "diseased, embodied in monstrosity. It doesn't have a beak to defend itself like a bird; it doesn't have claws to defend itself like a cat; it doesn't have teeth to defend itself like an alligator.

"But it does have what one would call an ink bag. And when it is attacked, it lets out a dark fluid from that ink bag, making all the surrounding water dark and murky, so that it can escape into the darkness."

Now, I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, is there any similarity between the ink bag of the octopus and the defense in this case? Has the defense argued any real, valid, legitimate defense, reasonably based on the evidence?

Or has Mr. Denny sought to employ the ink bag of the octopus by making everything dark and murky, and attempting to escape into the darkness?

There is an easy enswer to this, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Denny has sought to employ the ink bag of the octopus-+ for the only reason, that this is the only defense that Mr. Davis has to these charges.

The only problem for Mr. Davis is that the ink bag is not a legally recognized defense to murder in the State of California.

There are defenses to murder. There are self defense, alibi, prevention of a felony, defense of others.

But the ink bag hasn't yet reached the statutes of this great state -- and I might add that it never will.

Let me ask you this: Has Mr. Denny stated, even once, that based on the evidence in this case, that Mr.

б

12·

<u>.</u> 14

8a f1s.

Davis is innocent of these charges? Of course not.

Mr. Denny has tried by innuendo, suspicion, character assassination, to attack our witnesses, to attack the Sheriff's Office, and to attack Mr. Manzella and myself.

Their only hope is, ladies and gentlemen, that you are going to be unable to see through the dark fluid put out by the ink bag of Mr. Denny and come back, because you have not been able to see the true state of facts in this case, with verdicts of not guilty.

Now, Mr. Denny has told you that he's the one that has brought out the truth in this case. I say that that man doesn't know the meaning of the word. What he has brought out is double talk and confusion.

ŝ

ŝ

28.

Mr. Denny let us all know right from the very beginning, what the word "truth" meant to him. He said that "cross-examination is the great engine for truth. Thank God we have it."

But then, in a typical double talk fashion,
Mr. Denny says -- in trying to wiggle out of the fact that
he didn't put on a defense of any merit in this case -that he didn't call any members of the Manson Family,
because some of them were liars and the truth, quote,
unquote, would have been lost by hours of cross-examination
of them by the prosecution.

So in other words, if he brings something out on cross-examination, it's the truth. If we bring something out, it's a lie. The truth is going to get lost.

Mr. Denny had the audacity to say to you that if he called other members of the Manson Family, that there would just be a conflict in testimony with our witnesses. So, what would that prove?

Don't you believe him. I suggest that there's no conflict. If there was any conflict, you know that Mr. Denny would have just been so happy to put some witness up there, to show that one of our witnesses was lying about a material point.

Mr. Denny even spelled out an instruction to you, on one of his little charts -- which I suggest, again, is a half truth on Mr. Denny's part. His chart said: "In deciding whether or not to testify, the defendant may choose to rely on the state of evidence and upon the failure of the

1-2

ĸ

People to prove every essential element of that charge against him."

I That was basically what his chart said. He left out something. The instruction that you are going to be read says:

"In deciding whether or not to testify, the defendant may choose to rely on the state of evidence and upon the failure, if any, of the People to prove every essential element."

"If any."

Mr. Denny says that the People's case is Alice in Wonderland. I say that the People's case is one of unbelievable horror and savagery and inhumanity, unparalleled, outside of wartimes, in the 20th Century.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I intend to clear up the water which Mr. Denny has sought to make murky. I intend to do this so that you folks can clearly see the evidence, the facts and the issues in this case, so that you are going to be able to behold the form of the retreating octopus and bring Mr. Davis to justice.

I want you ladies and gentlemen to follow the second course of action, and this is to walk into the jury room and commence your deliberations with the substantial evidence in this case clearly in mind.

I am confident that if you do this, and you are reasonable -- as you all promised Mr. Manzella and I on voir dire, when we were selecting you, that you would be -- you will come to the inescapable conclusion that Bruce Davis is

18.

.20

.27 28. guilty of two counts of first degree murder and one count of conspiracy to commit murder.

Let's talk for a minute about reasonable doubt.

Now, you all stated on response to my questions on voir dire that you realize that, in a criminal case, the People -- the prosecution -- has the legal burden of proving a defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and that we had this same burden in criminal case, from a traffic ticket up to a murder case.

We do not -- I repeat: We do not have the burden of proving a defendant guilty beyond all doubt, beyond a shadow of a doubt, to an absolute certainty.

We do not have the burden of proving Mr. Davis guilty to the point that you are absolutely positive, absolutely certain, absolutely sure that he is guilty, and no doubt whatsoever in your mind of his guilt.

Such degree of proof is rarely if ever possible. His Honor will instruct you that the prosecution does not have the burden of offering that degree of proof which excludes all possibility of error and produces absolute certainty. Only moral certainty is required.

Moral certainty is simply that degree of proof which produces conviction in an unprejudiced mind.

Now, obviously, ladies and gentlemen, the doctrine of reasonable doubt certainly does not place an insurmountable burden on the prosecution, because if it did, we would never be able to get a conviction in any case.

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based on sound

.5

8b fls.

28:

reason and logic, and has a firm foundation in the evidence, and is not based on speculation or conjecture.

With this in mind, I submit to you that there is no reasonable doubt as to Mr. Davis' guilt on the three counts with which he is charged.

Now, let's talk for a while about circumstantial evidence. You've all heard a lot of talk about circumstantial evidence during the jury selection process and during Mr.

Denny's argument. But I think it's a very important concept, and I want to spend a little time on it.

Both direct and circumstantial evidence are entitled to equal weight under the laws of our state. Every one of you jurors promised Mr. Manzella and myself that you would follow this law, and that you would have no quarrel with it.

8b - 1

.

 Now, let me say this about circumstantial evidence. There is absolutely nothing in the world wrong with circumstantial evidence. It's obviously the type of evidence that's most used in criminal trials.

Let me ask you this: Where would you expect to get direct evidence to the Hinman and Shea murders? Ladies and gentlemen, in order to get an eyewitness to those murders and get direct evidence, you would have to descend to the depths of hell and interview the likes of Charles Manson, Bruce Davis, Steve Grogan, Susan Atkins, Tex Watson, Robert Beausoleil.

After all, you didn't expect these people to come down from -- from wherever they are and testify for the prosecution in this case, did you? But don't we really have the equivalent of direct evidence in this case?

We do. We have Bruce Davis's confessions to both of these murders, and to the fact that he was a very willing participant.

He has told us, through these confessions, what took place -- at least to the extent that we know he is guilty of these murders.

You also stated to Mr. Manzella and myself that you had no quarrel with finding Bruce Davis guilty of first degree murder, based on circumstantial evidence, if that circumstantial evidence convinced you that he was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

And I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that there does not exist a sound, rational, reasonable doubt, with a firm foundation in the evidence, as to Mr. Davis's guilt.

8ъ--2

3.

6.

.21

26·

I want to read an instruction to you, and then I want to examine this instruction with you at some length. This is a circumstantial evidence instruction.

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

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

Now, Mr. Denny says that the prosecutors don't like this instruction. Well, let's see. Let's examine this instruction and the wording.

Let me ask you this: Other than the rational conclusion that the evidence in this case points to Mr. Davis's guilt, on the three Counts with which he is charged, would another rational conclusion be that the evidence points to his innocence?

I submit to you that it would be unreasonable to conclude, from the totality of all the evidence presented in this courtroom, that Mr. Davis is innocent of any or all of these

8b - 3

3_.

ų,

charges.

Now, this instruction talks about a set of circumstances. You jurors are going to have to decide, among yourselves, back in the jury room, what set of circumstances you are going to require to prove to you that Mr. Davis is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of each and every one of these charges.

His Honor, Judge Choate, is not going to instruct you that if you find that facts A, B, C and D exist, that you have to convict him; or if you find that the facts W, X, Y and Z exist, you have to acquit him.

You are going to have to decide what evidence you are going to base your conviction or acquittal on.

Now, the trap that you must not fall into, when you are analyzing the circumstantial evidence in this case, is to look at each piece of evidence separately. You don't analyze a piece of evidence -- a confession, a piece of physical evidence or something separately. You have to look at that piece of evidence in relation to the total picture, all the other evidence. Because the other evidence gives meaning to each individual piece of evidence.

Now, an example of this would be like if you came into this courtroom -- say I was standing right here, and I had to prove that I was in a room. Well, now, if I cup my hands together (indicating) and just looked at a door, now, just by looking at the door -- the door's open now, but pretend it was shut now -- if I cupped my hands together and just looked at the door through a tiny hole, I couldn't see that I was in a room.

85--4

3_.

9.

8c fol

I mean, that door might be standing up by itself, out in a lumber yard. Just by seeing a door, I cannot see that I am in a room. And if I just look at a window (indicating), well, I can't see that I'm in a room. That window might be on a new construction project and there's nothing else around except for the window.

See, in order for me to prove that I'm in a room, I have to look around, and I see the door and I see the window, and I see the chairs and I see the floor, and I see the walls and I see the ceiling. Taking all these things all together I know that I'm in a room.

If I look at anything separately, I can't see that I'm in a room. So remember this, when you analyze the evidence back in the jury room. Look at it all together. Don't try and just take one little piece of it and say, "Well, gee, does this little piece of evidence prove that Bruce Davis is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?"

No. Take the whole picture. Say, "Does this evidence, taken together with everything else, all the other evidence that's produced, does all that evidence together prove that Bruce Davis is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?"

Mr. Denny has said that circumstantial evidence is like a chain, and if one link breaks, the whole thing falls apart. Well, circumstantial evidence isn't like a chain.

8c-1

1 2

5

It's like a rope. And each fact is a strand of that rope. And as the prosecution piles one fact upon another, one circumstance upon another, we add strands and add strength to that rope, until that rope is strong enough to bind the defendant Bruce Davis to the just verdict of guilty.

Now, if one strand breaks -- and I'm not for a moment suggesting that any important evidence in this case has been disproved by the defense -- but if any strand breaks, that does not mean that that rope is broken like a chain, because that rope can be so strong -- because there are so many other strands -- that the loss of one or two strands is not going to break that rope. It's still going to be strong enough.

And remember, again, that you and you alone are the ones who decide what facts are essential in your own mind, to convince you that Bruce Davis is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, the last part of the instruction I read to you states that, "If the evidence as to any particular count is susceptible of two reasonable interpretations, one pointing to the defendant's guilt and one pointing to innocence, that you must take that interpretation which points to innocence."

However, you'll note that we have that word
"reasonable" again. So in other words, that if one interpretation of the evidence is reasonable, and one is unreasonable, you have to reject the interpretation of the evidence

8c=2

, 3

5

6

7 8

9

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

*

23

24

25

27

26

28

that's unreasonable.

And once again I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, if there is a reasonable interpretation of the evidence pertaining to the defendant's innocence, where is it? Don't you think that if it existed, we would have seen it by way of defense in this case? Of course we would have.

Ladies and gentlemen, it would be unreasonable on your part to interpret the overwhelming evidence in this case as reasonably pointing to this defendant's innocence.

Now, let me at this point clear up one of the clouds of ink left behind by the defense. The defense has attempted in this trial, from the moment Mr. Denny made his opening statement, to get you off the track of Bruce Davis, and instead get you thinking about those terrible people in law enforcement, that made all those agreements with certain witnesses to get their testimony, their truthful testimony, before juries in this county, in the numerous murder cases in which members of the Manson Family have been charged.

Mr. Denny wants to get you so mad at us that you will let a vicious murderer walk out of this courtroom.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, there is nothing in the world wrong with law enforcement making an agreement to grant immunity or to dismiss a lesser charge, in return for valuable, truthful testimony in a major criminal prosecution.

If there was, the law would prohibit it.

Now, there have only been three agreements made by the prosecution in this case: Alan Springer -- and we'll talk about it when I talk about the Shea case in a couple 8c-3

2

1

3

4

6

7

8.

9 .

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

of minutes -- Ella Jo Bailey; and Bruce Davis himself.

Mr. Denny stated that -- on his chart, he had Mark Arneson there the other day.

Well, Mark Arneson never got any deal out of the prosecution. His case was dismissed, because he was turned over to the Army and prosecuted for -- he was put in the stockade for AWOL.

I'm not saying he wasn't guilty of the charge, the -- getting Gary Hinman's VW microbus, because I think he knew it was probably hot when he got it.

But I am just saying that there was no deal made for his testimony.

Now, Ella Jo Bailey. Ella Jo Bailey? Mr. Denny would just have loved to see us not make any deal with Ella Jo Bailey, because one Ella Jo Bailey's gone, his client's gone on the Himman case.

Well, Ella Jo Bailey, if we hadn't made a deal, she could have refused to testify in this case, on the grounds that she might incriminate herself -- because, as we all know -- and as I'll explain when we get into the law later -- that Ella Jo Bailey is an accessory of the Hinman murder. She's guilty of being an accessory to a murder.

So, what did we do to get her testimony in front of juries in this county? Well, we gave up the prosecution of a stingray -- Ella Jo Bailey -- to get four man-eating sharks -- Manson, Davis, Atkins and Brunner.

I would say that's a pretty good trade, a\$155 credit forger and an accessory for four vicious murders.

8c-4

.

> 6.

Mr. Denny alleged in his opening statement that there's a conspiracy among members of law enforcement to convict Bruce Davis and other members of the Manson Family, by any means possible.

Mr. Denny says that he was an ex-prosecutor and that when he was a prosecutor, he was interested in seeing that justice was done -- indicating, obviously, that Mr. Manzella and myself are only interested in a conviction and not interested in seeing that justice is done.

ડે

Well, ladies and gentlemen, having spent the last two years of my life with only two weeks off --

MR. DENNY: Well, I object to this, your Honor. I don't believe that that's either in the evidence or permissible argument.

THE COURT: Very well. That is not within the evidence.

MR. KAY: Well, ladies and gentlemen, having been involved in the prosecution of the Tate-LaBianca murders, and now the Hinman and Shea murders, I --

MR. DENNY: I don't think that's in the evidence either.

MR. KAY: I think it is. Barbara Hoyt gave testimony on that.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. You may continue.

MR. KAY: Having prosecuted the Tate-LaBianca murders and

now the Hinman and Shea murders, bringing six vicious murderers

to justice, justly and fairly prosecuting them, I take great

offense at that man and the remarks that he has made in this

courtroom, the false utterances of a man that has only one

thing in mind: Walk that client out the door; get a gold star

by your name.

We are seeking justice, ladies and gentlemen. But Mr. Denny certainly doesn't want to have anything to do with justice, because justice in this case means that Bruce Davis is guilty.

Mr. Denny said that you will not see the likes of this case again. All I can say, ladies and gentlemen, is that juries never before -- and I hope to heaven never again will have to sit on cases involving the viciousness and the

3.

24°

 wantonness, the wanton disregard for human life that has been exhibited in this case, that has been exhibited by Mr. Davis and by other members of the Manson Family.

Now, I agree with Mr. Denny. If Mr. Davis is convicted, you won't see the likes of this case again. Mr. Denny would obviously rather see us prosecute Ella Jo Bailey, Mark Arneson, Alan Springer, and Niki Shea, Fireman Mel Walker, Sergeant Robert Chirstansen, Deputy Flois White, Barbara Hoyt, Juan Flynn, Deputy Chamousis, Paul Watkins, rather than Bruce Davis, Charles Manson, Susan Atkins, Mary Brunner, Robert Beausoleil, Tex Watson, Steve Grogan.

All of those Manson Family members are just innocent little flower children. Mr. Denny would have you believe that there were all these dead bodies around Los Angeles, and just because we have nothing else better to do, we went out and charged members of the Manson Family with murder.

All I am going to say to you is this: We don't like to make deals or grant witnesses immunity. When I see a crime committed, I want to see that crime prosecuted. But sometimes the realities of the situation dictate that such agreements be made for the protection of our society — let me repeat that: For the protection of our society.

Just because we enter into such an agreement does not mean that the witness is going to get up on the witness stand and lie. If we thought that would occur, we obviously wouldn't call that witness.

And as far as the Manson Family is concerned, you'd better all thank God -- thank God that we have brought those

.

 that I have previously mentioned to justice, just as you are going to bring that man, Bruce Davis, to justice in this case.

When you are weighing the credibility of some of the former associates of Bruce Davis --

THE COURT: Excuse me just a minute. I think the references to the Manson Family, and bringing them to justice, as you put it, Mr. Kay, are out of place. And the Court strikes Mr. Kay's remarks about that.

What occurred in previous cases involving any members of the Manson Family has no bearing on -- that is, what the ultimate result was in other cases has no bearing whatever in this case.

MR. KAY: When you are weighing the credibility of some of the former associates of Bruce Davis and Charlie Manson, that have been called as witnesses by the prosecution in this case, such as Ella Jo Bailey, just remember this:

When murders are committed by Bruce Davis and Charles Manson and other members of this indescribable organization of vicious murderers, you don't have Shirley Temple as a witness.

Now, Mr. Manzella and I would have loved to have called some all-American boy or all-American girl, have them get up on the stand and give you the Doris Day-type smile and just have a perfect, immaculate record, no involvement with the law or anything.

But Mr. Davis wouldn't have associated with that type of person. Who did he associate with? He associated with Ella Jo Bailey, Charles Manson, Steve Grogan. That's why.

1 2

That's why he confessed to Ella Jo Bailey, and confessed to these other members of the Manson Family; because they were -- they were close. They were all together. They were members of a single organization, a close-knit group.

They confided in one another. As Mr. Denny brought out in the testimony of Ella Jo Bailey, they never lied to each other; never lied to each other; always confided in one another.

Now, Mr. Denny didn't spend too much time on the Shea case, so I am going to start out talking about the Shea case, because I think that a lot of time is required on this case, because there was an awful lot of substantial evidence pointing to Mr. Davis's guilt on this case.

Now, there are three questions, I think, that you should ask yourself, back in the jury room, on the Shea case.

The first question: Is Shorty dead?

The second question is: Did Bruce Davis participate in his murder?

And the third question is: Is Mr. Davis guilty of first degree murder?

Now, in talking about whether or not Shorty's dead, I have a lot of subcategories here, and the first category that I'm going to start with is his friends and his relatives.

Now, Shorty was a very open-minded and likeable fellow, and I think his friends liked him very much, and he liked his friends very much. I think you saw on the witness stand, when his friends testified, that their love for this man came through -- from the tears of his mother to Jerry

Binder calling him a "Macho," that he was a man's man; that it was fun to be with him.

Lance Victor said, "Oh, I had a special nickname for my good friend. I called him 'Pirate.'" You know, And he had that warm expression on his face when he was talking about Shorty.

Dawn Quant, when asked about her relationship with Shorty, said, "Real close."

And then, there's Bob Bickston and Jim Babcock.

You can just sense their love for Shorty when they are talking about him. I can't -- I can't put into words the feelings that they expressed while they were on the stand, but you all got to observe them and I think it probably came across to you.

Now, with his friends and relatives, you saw over a 12-year period, the people that were closest to Don. When Don was in trouble, he always went to his friends. If he needed to borrow money, he went to Jerry Binder, went to Ruby, went to Lance Victor, went to his mother, wired her for money. When he needed help, did he run away from his friends? No, to Lance Victor.

"Lance, I think they're trying to kill

To Ruby;

me."

"Ruby, they're out to get me, Pearl."

When he needed work, Jerry Binder -- he followed Jerry Binder around. He worked for him for the last four years of his life. I'm not saying he worked 365 days of the year for him, but every one of those years he worked for him.

Bob Bickston, Arch Hall. He was always contacting Bickston and Hall about jobs in the movies.

Now, Mr. Denny belittled Shorty for the fact that he never was successful in the movies. But, for heaven's sakes, the man tried. That was his dream. That was his life. Why belittle him. That was all he talked about. That was all he thought about.

 .2

 ,′ ′_,

--

 For friendship, he went to the Bickston -- or he went with Bickston. He and Bickston were close friends. He was always talking to him and with him.

Jerry, Jerry Binder was like a brother to him. Jerry was the best man at his wedding.

Lance, he and Lance, especially in that last year, were close. They saw each other a couple of times a month, when Lance got back from the salt mine.

And for love, Ruby and George, they were like a mother and father to him. When he was in town, if he wasn't working at Spahn Ranch, he'd always go there on the weekend to visit Ruby and George, always.

And his mother; sweet; sweet lady.

Niki. Niki. He was head over heels in love with Niki. Just head over heels in love with her.

One of the things that you can -- you might think from the evidence, "Well, what if Shorty was just scared? He was obviously afraid of the Manson Family. What if he was just scared and ran away? Maybe he's living somewhere to get away from these people. What if he was just scared and ran away?"

Well, ladies and gentlemen, it is unreasonable to believe that he ran away because he was afraid, because he certainly wasn't afraid of his mother. He wasn't afraid of his close friends. He wouldn't have stayed away for two and a half years without contacting them. He just wouldn't have done that. Those weren't the people that he was afraid of. So if he went somewhere, he would have contacted them.

9# fls.

He would have contacted them.

And that's the same reason why he didn't leave voluntarily, because if he left voluntarily or if he left because he was afraid, he would have contacted his friends. He had no arguments with his friends. He had nothing against them. These are close friends. These are over a 12-year period. These were this man's friends. He would have contacted them, some of them. Let's see what some of them have to say. And remember, that Shorty never told anyone that he was going to permanently leave the Los Angeles area.

He told Lance, when he talked to him about going up to the salt mines, he said, "Well, Bickston's picture isn't as fast as I want it. I'm thinking of going up to the salt mines to earn a little money in the meantime until it gets started."

But let's see what some of the friends and relatives say.

Shorty's mother, between 1957 and 1969, she said that she would hear from Donald at least two or three times every year. Now, during that period of time she said she would always -- this is very important -- always hear from him on Christmas and Mother's Day. Always. Not some of the Christmases and some of the Mother's Days, but always, every one of those years she would hear from him.

1Š

on the last Christmas she said she got a tapestry from him.

And on Mother's Day he would send her a telegram or call her.

The last time she heard from him at Christmas was 1968.

Now, remember, we're alleging that he was murdered probably the 27th or 28th of August, around that time, of '69. So the last Christmas that she heard from him was in '68. He never lived to Christmas of '69.

The last time she heard from him on Mother's Day was May of '69, before August of '69. Never heard from him since. That's the last time that his mother ever heard from him, May of '69.

Now, from 1957 to 1968 she said that Don came back to Boston to visit her at least eight times. But she hadn't seen him. She hadn't heard from him since Mother's Day in May, 1969. And she said she'd made inquiries and she still can't find any trace of him.

Now, I've talked about Don visiting Spahn Ranch. That was certainly his favorite hangout. They haven't seen him since August of '69.

Now, Mr. Denny brought something up which we'll get into about Pearl saying, "Oh, well, probably saw him in the last of September or the middle of September, the 10th."

But you know when Pearl was on the stand, she said, well, she never paid too much attention to dates. But the way she remembered the last time she saw him was by the event when she had the conversation with him, and then saw all the four defendants fan out afterhim on the boardwalk. That was the last

. 7· 8·

^

time she saw him. And moonlight or no moonlight on her part, the most important part of her testimony is the fact that both she and Barbara have always been consistent on saying that the Manson Family left the next day.

Barbara said that the Manson Family left the day after the screams, after she heard the screams. And Ruby said the Manson Family left the day after she saw the men get out of the car and rapidly approach Shorty on the boardwalk. That's why we know they're both talking about the same thing. So we'll get into that later, when we talk about how Shorty met his death and when it was.

Now, Jim and Sharon Babcock. They were very good friends of Shorty. Jim knew Shorty since 1959. He last saw Shorty on August 17, 1969, and at that time Shorty was driving the Mercury Comet. Drove it over to his house to show him wedding pictures. How proud he was of the marriage. And he brought him some corn. You remember that Jim remembered that Shorty brought him, he and his wife, some ears of fresh corn.

Bob Bickston. Well, Don worked three pictures for Bob in 1965, *66 and *68.

Now, Mr. Denny brings up the fact, "Well, gee, these weren't successful pictures," you know, "Shorty was a bum. He never was a success."

What difference does it make whether the pictures were successful or not? It is not important. It is Shorty's state of mind that was important. This was his life. I mean, the guy could have gone on for 30 years like this Ben Johnson, who was in the last picture show and never been a success and

ب

6 **1 2**6

 all of a sudden been in a picture and he's a big star. But it is his way of life, whether he made any money at it or not, whether his pictures sold or not.

Bob Bickston testified that Shorty last worked for him in March of '69, when they were dubbing sound for the picture they made in '68, Hangfire, which Don was in.

Now, the important part here is that Bob was going to make a film in the summer of '69, which would have fulfilled Shorty's dream. It was an integrated western in which Don was going to have a good part throughout the picture. And it was a Union budget picture which would have meant at long last Don would have been able to get his Union card. God, Don was ecstatic. He couldn't believe that after all these years he was going to get his Union card. Now, this is what Bickston said about it, "God, Don was ecstatic. He couldn't believe that after all these years he was going to get his Union card."

Shorty wouldn't have left. Not with this opportunity.

Remember, the last phone call that we know that Shorty had, in the end of August, when he was talking to Dawn Quant over the phone, all he talked about to her was how excited he was about Bickston's upcoming picture. Sure, it had been postponed a couple of times, and eventually it wasn't made, but Shorty didn't know that. He was still looking forward to it. He was going to be a Union actor, a member of the Screen Actors Guild. He was going to have his Union card.

3. 4.

24.

•

 Now, Bob Bickston kept in touch with Shorty all the time. They were close friends. He said when one of them was out of state, one or the other of them, either Bob or Shorty, that they would be in contact at least six times a year. And when they were both here, they would be in contact every three to six weeks. Bob Bickston hasn't heard anything from Shorty since the summer of '69.

And it was brought out, the innumerable phone calls and conversations that Shorty had with Bob about, "Hey, do you know anybody that's got any movie work, any job?" And he had the same type of conversations with Arch Hall. Shorty wouldn't have gone and left these people without contacting them.

friends. Especially the last year when Lance got back from the salt mines, they went to the salt mines together. Shorty came back, and then Lance came back, and then they saw each other quite often during that period.

And, again, Shorty confided in Lance out at Spahn Ranch when he -- when Shorty was in trouble and in fear.

Dawn Quant. Shorty asked her to make Christmas candy for him again on the coming Christmas, the Christmas of '69. That shows some intention that he wasn't planning on leaving permanently.

"Hey, Dawn, are you going to make me some of that Christmas candy again next Christmas? I really liked it. I'm looking forward to it."

9b - 2

l

_

 Ruby Pearl has known Shorty for about 15 years. She said that Shorty was considered a part of the family and was always welcome there at Spahn Ranch. She said that from 1956 through 1969, six or seven months was the longest period of time that Shorty was ever out of contact with her. The longest period of time, over that whole period of time, '56 to '69. She hasn't heard from him since that night that he told her, "Pearl, they're out to get me."

Remember that Pearl gave Shorty the negatives because Shorty wanted to get some publicity shots of the pictures that they'd been in together. Well, where were -- and he said he'd give them back to Pearl as soon as he had the pictures made from the negatives.

Well, where were the negatives found? In Don's abandoned car in December of '69. They were in a white envelope by the car in the footlockers.

Niki Shea. Don was so much in love with her.

This woman meant everything to him. He took her around -when they got back to L. A., he took her around and he
introduced her to his friends. He introduced her to George
and Ruby, and the Babcocks, and Lance, he took the wedding
photographs over for them to see. Look at how proud this
man is in these wedding photographs (indicating).

And you know from the letter that was passed around to you that this woman meant everything to him. He wouldn't have -- he wouldn't have gone off and left her. Not for all this period of time. He wanted to get back with her. He said in the letter, and we know it is confirmed, that he

9b-3

.

 did leave the letter.

Remember that Niki testified that he left the letter saying that, "If you want to get in contact with me, get in contact with me through the Babcocks."

And remember Niki testified, and Sharon Babcock confirmed it, that that's who Niki called to try and find Don.

Now, if Don had voluntarily gone anywhere, he would have let the Babcocks know where he was going so that Niki could be in contact with him. He wouldn't have just left without leaving a forwarding address, so to speak.

Over his chest, over his heart, he had the tattoo, "I'll always love Niki," and he had a little heart, a tattoo, "I'll always love Niki," on the heart. She last saw him on August 16, 1969.

Jerry Binder -- I think it is clear from his testimony how close he and Don were, that they were like brothers. That he always tried to employ Shorty. And when he couldn't afford to employ Shorty, he got Shorty a job with Herb Bromberg who was the owner of the Cab Inn, the place where he met Niki Shea.

employee and that between '65 and '67 Jerry would see him every day at work. And that if Don ever left town, he would always let Jerry know where he was. And that in '67 and '68, he would see Don every day when Don was working for him, and once a week for dinner if he wasn't working for him.

Now, remember that Jerry testified to something

9.

.

-20 '

26,

9c: fls.

pretty important. The fact that on many occasions he had loaned Shorty money. He said that he had loaned him up to \$500 and that Shorty always paid him back except for the fact in July of '69 he lent him \$100 and he's never been paid back. Why? Well, a dead man can't repay a debt.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

10.

, 9

13,

Jerry said that the last time he heard from Don was in August of '69. And he said that even when Don would go out of town and they weren't at the same location together, and Don would go out of town, that he would call Jerry collect, and that Jerry encouraged him to do this, go call me collect when you're out of town." "Sure." He did. They always kept in contact, from '65 to August of '69. August of '69 being the last time that Jerry heard from Don.

Remember, he talked to him over the phone when Don was at his house here in Hollywood and Jerry was in Las Vegas. He said from '65 to '69, the most that they were out of contact, was three months, at the most. He said, "We were in constant communication."

Now, Jerry lived in Las Vegas for one and a half years after Don left to come back to L. A. in July of '69. He had the same phone number as when Don was there, and the business where he and Don were together. His partner owns the business now and knows how to contact Jerry, and that business has the same phone number now as it did when Don worked there. Haven't heard from Shorty since August of '69.

And Miriam Binder, Jerry's wife, said August 19, of '69, was the last time she heard from him. That's when he took her to the doctor's.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you don't just all of a sudden forsake your mother, your wife and the close friends that you have accumulated over a 12-year period unless you are a victim of foul play. Based on the evidence in this case, there is no reasonable explanation for Shorty not contacting

.

ŝ

E.

TO STOT

;

,

2ŀ

:

any of his close friends and relatives for over two and a half years, other than the reasonable explanation that he was murdered.

Would this be a good time for a recess, your Honor?
THE COURT: If you wish.

MR. KAY: Yes.

THE COURT: During the recess you are admonished, ladies and gentlemen, 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 expresss any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you.

About ten minutes, if you will, please.

(Afternoon recess.)

9.

ì

THE COURT: All right. The record will show that all the jurors are present. The defendant is present with his counsel. The clerk is here.

We are ready to proceed.

MR, KAY: Thank you, your Honor.

I know that it's almost asking the impossible to ask you to stay awake on a Friday afternoon, especially at 20 minutes after 3:00; but you know, all of counsel involved in this case -- as I'm sure you are well aware of -- have been working long and hard on it.

And everything I've written down, I've tried to put as much thought as I know how into it, and -- you know, I hope that as much as you are physically able to, that you can pay attention to what I have to say, because I think it's important, and I hope that you'll think it's important, too.

Okay. Under Shorty's -- is Shorty dead? The second category, I've titled: Shorty's love for the movies. We've talked somewhat about this, and the other remarks I've made already.

Sandra Harmon, her testimony, I thought was very, very relevant to this point, and it showed exactly how much the man really did love the movies.

Sandra said that Don talked about the movies all the time. That's the thing he really wanted. That's the thing he wanted most, was to be in the movies.

Now, the important thing she testified to is: That's the reason they separated. She said that she was

: 15

*

 opposed to his movie work, and that's why they separated. She didn't want to have anything to do with it.

So Shorty, even back in '65, when he separated, wanted to be in the movies so badly, so much, that he lost his wife and his children because of it.

This man was possessed with a desire to become a movie actor. This -- he lived it; he breathed it.

We have already talked about Bob Bickston, and you'll remember his many contacts with Bickston, about being in the movies, and how excited he was about Bickston's upcoming film.

Lance Victor said, "The movies were the main thing Shorty talked about."

Arch Hall, he said that Don would come by his studio in Burbank about every two months, after 1963, and talk about the movies and how much he wanted to be an actor and a stuntman, and he would ask if Mr. Hall knew if there was any work available for him.

Well, Mr. Hall is a substantial and successful producer; no question about that. And Shorty knew that. And he kept in contact with Mr. Hall, all the time, about jobs.

And Mr. Hall did employ him in at least one picture, now, that he filmed -- I think it was in '65 -- that's still being shown over in Europe. And Don had a small part in it.

Dawn Quant said she talked to Shorty over the phone in the latter part of August, and he told her about a

Đ

·18

0

movie job that was coming up -- Bob Bickston's -- and about how excited he was about it. This was the main topic of their conversation. Don said Dawn Quant said that Shorty said he wanted the job badly. This is in the end of August, 1969.

Niki testified that on August 11th, that they went to Maurice -- not Morris; Mr. Denny called him Morris. I don't. His name's Maurice Kosloff. And Don and Niki went to Maurice Kosloff's studio, to audition for a part in a movie that was going to be made.

Don got a speaking part. Niki got an extra part. They were both measured for costumes. And Niki said that Don was just extremely excited. Here, he got a speaking part in this.

And on top of that, she said that Don was extremely excited about the Bickston movie. Here, there are two movies, not just one. There are two movies that he's very excited about. Niki said that mostly all Don would talk about was going back into the movies; that's all he talked about, the movies, the movies.

Jerry Binder said, "The movie industry came first and foremost in his mind. All he wanted to do was work in the movies. We talked about that constantly."

So, almost everything that Don did and thought about was directed towards a career in the movies.

Jerry Binder, you remember, testified that when Don was working for him, he always -- at least, in Shorty's state of mind -- said that that was just temporary; that he

1 2

8.

ļļ

10a fls.

was just going to work for Jerry until he got a job in the movies; that that was his state of mind.

And remember, that's the important thing, what Shorty's state of mind was, not what the actual reality of the situation was.

We are not saying that Shorty's Clark Gable or Burt Lancaster or someone like that. He wasn't. But his state of mind is important.

And again, I say that, based on the evidence in this case -- and I'm talking about all of the evidence; remember, always, we have got to keep all the evidence in mind -- based on the evidence in this case, the only reasonable explanation for why Don has disappeared from his lifetime dream, being in the movies, working in the movies as an actor and as a stuntman, is that he was murdered.

И

 That, ladies and gentlemen, is the only thing that could keep him away, the only thing that could keep him away.

Now, the third category is Shorty's revolvers.

I want to make one point, which was kind of in the middle of what I was going to say, but I want to say it to you at the outset, so you aren't confused by the misinformation that was given to you in Mr. Denny's argument.

Mr. Denny made a big production about the fact of -- "Well, Shorty said that he was going to take the guns back to Arch Hall, either he would pay him or he'd take the guns back to him."

Shorty Shea never said that. That's why counsel's closing remarks are not evidence. The evidence comes from the witness stand. The evidence doesn't come from Mr. Denny's mouth.

Let me read you what Mr. Hall did say -- if I can find the transcript here. I've got the page number, but not the volume.

Page 4476.

"Q All right. And either 'I will pay you what I owe you and make good on those bad checks' --"

And remember, Arch Hall testified that Shorty

had given him some bad checks as part of buying the gun.

"A I believe I told him --" "I" being Arch

"I believe I told him, you know, either return the guns or pay the balance."

ģ

Shorty never said that he's going to bring the guns back. Huh-uh! Not on your life! Arch Hall said, "Pay the balance or bring the guns back."

It's a little different, I think you'll agree.

It's a little different than you heard in Mr. Denny's argument.

And also, Mr. Denny said that it wasn't brought out on direct that Mr. Hall never received payment for these guns. Well, page 4467, Volume 30. And this is on direct.

"Okay. Now --"

"Q Now, between the time that he had purchased the guns from you in August of '68 until the time he called in late July or early August, '69, had you heard from him?

"A No. I had not.

"Q Okay. Now, in this conversation you had with him --

"Again, your Honor, this will be admitted for Mr. Shea's state of mind --

"-- what did he say to you?

"A You are speaking now with reference to the call in 1969?

"Q Right. Late July or early August.

"A Yes. He said that he was very sorry that he hadn't been back to take care of the payment; and that he had been out of the country. I think he said he had been married in the meantime, and that he would be by in a few days and settle up and pick up the

10-

.,

ķ

- 28 "cameras and pay me the balance on the guns.

"Q Now, do you remember when this was in late July or early August? Do you remember whether it was July or August?

"A It was in August. The -- the late July or early August was when he bought the guns."

And then, he goes on to say -- well, he said that he was out of the state, not out of the country, on direct examination.

You see, that's what was said, not what Mr. Denny in his argument said. Oh, that sounds good; that sounds good. But sounds are not evidence in this case.

The evidence comes from the witness stand, not from -- not from the attorneys; not even from what I say. It comes from the witness stand.

So you understand, Mr. Denny's sounds are not evidence in this case -- thank goodness.

Now, Shorty's revolvers.

These were his prized possessions, there's no question about that -- oh, and also, another thing that Mr. Denny said. These guns were never pawned in 1968. You never heard any evidence on that. That's an unreasonable inference to draw from the evidence.

Do you think if they were, that Mr. Denny wouldn't have brought some evidence in, saying, "See, look, he pawned them all the time."

That's baloney. They never were pawned in '68.
All right. Now, getting back to this. Shorty

10.

4 14

10b fls.15

Ż0

loved the guns. They were part of him, and he felt that they were essential to his movie work -- which, of course, was his dream.

What did some of the people who knew him best have to say about his love for the guns? Jim Babcock:
"Shorty told him how proud he was of the guns; that they were the first set of guns that he ever owned, and that he intended to use the guns in his stuntwork."

How did he treat the guns? "He treated them like most men would treat a favorite pet. And he said, as many of the other witnesses have said, that the guns are now, of course, in much worse condition now than they were then.

Why are they in worse condition? Because they were up in Death Valley, up at Barker and Meyers Ranch, and got a lot of rough treatment out there in the desert.

1 2

3

Bob Bickston. Bob made the inserts on this attache case -- which is helping me in my argument this afternoon (indicating) -- of Shorty's. So Shorty carried the guns around with him. He even had a special case for them, that he had the two guns in, and he had a knife that he kept in there, too.

But what did Bob Bickston say about how Shorty treated the guns? "Don treated the guns like newborn babies. He had a silicone cloth that he carried in the attache case, and each time someone handled one of the guns, he took this cloth and wiped the gun completely clean of anybody's fingerprints and put it back into the case by holding it by the wood, and not by the metal."

Remember that Shorty bought these guns before he went up to the Leslie salt mines in 1968. This is what Bickston has to say: That he last saw the guns in June of '69, and Don was still treating them the same way he always had; and that they were still in new condition. Don's feelings didn't change about these guns.

Lance Victor. What did Lance say about it? He said: "When Shorty had the guns, you could look at them with a magnifying glass and not see any dust on them." He said, "Don would talk about the guns all the time," and he said that they were the greatest things that he'd have.

Arch Hall, getting back to him for a minute, said that as far back as 1964, when they worked -- when Don worked on the film "Deadwood 76" -- which is -- I can remember the name, but this is the film that's being shown in Europe now

б

 Shorty worked in — that Arch Hall said that Don fell in love with the guns, way back in '64. So, look at the torch he held for these guns, until he could afford to get them in '68. Remember that Mr. Hall testified that when Don would come by to his studio, even before he bought them, that he would — you know, he would look at the guns and practice twirling them around and everything; but that Mr. Hall wouldn't let him take them off the property.

He kept them, you know; would keep them locked up, because he didn't want anybody to take them, because he didn't want them to turn up missing.

And of course, Arch Hall said that the last time he heard from Don was in August of '69, when Don called him over the phone, and he told -- he told Don, "Either --" you know, "bring the guns back, or make up the payment."

Dawn Quant. Dawn Quant said -- and this is very significant -- said that Shorty said that he wouldn't sell them, ever. Now, Dawn was a very close friend of Shorty's. They were friends for about 15 years.

Dawn said she wanted to buy them, and she asked

Shorty -- you know, if she could buy them. And he said: No that he wouldn't sell them, ever. Now, certainly, if he was going to sell them to anybody, he would have sold them to a friend, especially if a friend wanted to buy them. And Dawn Quant did.

Shorty said he wouldn't part with them; that they were his prize possession.

Ruby Pearl said that Shorty left the revolvers with

10c fol

her when he went to Las Vegas, and he said, "Take very good care of them. Don't let anyone have them." And she said that Shorty said — he was always saying how they fit him; they were a part of him; they were his personal possessions; he felt odd without them.

Now, Niki Shea. And this is -- Niki is really a good indication of how much Don thought of his guns. Here's the woman he marries -- just been married less than a month -- and he thinks so much of the guns that he even shows her how they're matching serial numbers on the guns.

Remember, she said, "Oh, yeah, he pointed out to me that they were matching serial numbers." And he also pointed out to her that one of the guns had a hair trigger. This is to his new bride he's so proud of these possessions.

"Honey, look, look. I have got -- they ve got matching serial numbers. And this one has a hair trigger. It's been balanced." Don told Niki that he would never, never sell the guns to anyone; that he would never get rid of them -- the same thing he told Dawn Quant, that he would never sell them to anybody.

Now, of course, this becomes significant in a little while, when we see how the guns ended up.

Now, it's true that Don did pawn the guns on a couple of occasions. But this is very relevant. Niki: I asked him why he didn't pawn the guns for more money."

1,1

5.,

.6

Now, remember when he took the guns in and pawned them? It was always like for \$20 apiece, for each gun.

Niki: "I asked him why he didn't pawn the guns for more money, and he told me the reason he didn't was because this way, he was sure that he would get them back."

He could have got more money for them. Everybody has testified that they were certainly worth more than
he pawned them for. But he pawned them for just a small
amount of money, so that he could afford to raise the funds
and get the guns back.

This was apparently the only collateral that this man owned, his beloved guns.

Jerry Binder, describing how Shorty treated the guns: "He polished them, he cleaned them, he rubbed them, he drooled on them."

He didn't mean that literally, but you know, that's how Shorty reacted to the guns.

Okay.

Now, what happens to the guns? What happens to the guns? Remember the first time he pawned them, February 3rd, 1969, for \$20 -- \$20 for each gun, and the brown attache case, and then he redeemed them, one gun for \$23, and the other gun for \$24?

Then, he pawned them on July 25th, 1969 -- these are both to Sam Launer -- for -- the first gun for \$20; on July 28th, 1969, the second gun for \$25, plus the attache case.

.8

x`

 He put in the gun and the attache case on the second time.

Okay. Now, when were these redeemed? They were redeemed September 2nd, 1969, and September 3rd, 1969. By whom? Who redeemed them? Danny DeCarlo, forging the name R. Smith or R. A. Smith or Richard Alan Smith -- I don't think he wrote out Alan, but there is no question that Danny DeCarlo, a member of the Manson Family, the man who -- who Manson and Danny were discussing how to get rid of Shorty's body, by 1ye or lime -- "Which will get rid of it? Lye or lime?

"Lime will preserve it. Lye will get rid of it."

And of course, it's only expected that Danny
would be the one to get the guns. Why? Because the testimony
in this trial has been that Danny was the keeper of the guns
for the Manson Family; he was the one that lived in the gun
room; he was the one that took care of the guns -- I think
somebody called him the armorer -- so it's only logical that
he would end up with Shorty's guns.

And we know, from the "Last Supper," that he brought the prize revolvers up to the Meyers Ranch area, so that they could all gloat over their accomplishment of getting Shorty's revolvers.

Remember that Barbara Hoyt testified that when they went up to -- up to the Barker-Meyers Ranch area, that Danny was in one of the two cars that went up; and that he came back the same night, and then he came back up again.

Well, obviously, when he came back, then he got

Ź

7 · ·

the guns out on September 2nd and September 3rd, and then came up in time to be at the -- at the Meyers Ranch dinner, which was at the end of the first week of August (sic).

And of course, the fact that even the Manson Family knew that -- how much thought, how much Shorty thought of the guns, that's why they were so happy getting them. DeCarlo and Vance saying, "Well, we finally got Shorty's ego."

Well, the guns were his ego. There's no question about it. I think that's proved beyond any doubt in this case.

Now, the Meyers Ranch dinner -- and I think that there's no doubt in anybody's mind that Juan Flynn -- that the guns -- or, at least the one gun that he saw -- was Shorty's gun. He has been consistent on it. Even before, he said that the gun said -- that it was an Italian gun. It said: "Made in Italy." And that it said ".45 Caliber Colt." All these things are on the gun, and when you get the guns in the jury room, you can look at all these things.

He also said that the gun had a wooden handle. He has been consistent on this. He did say that the gun looked golden or bronze.

Well, again, you remember Mr. Manzella's argument, how -- he showed you all the different gold parts, the gold parts of the gun (indicating). Maybe, in Juan's memory, that's what he remembered. Obviously, the gold isn't -- the gun is not gold or bronze (indicating) but maybe that's the thing that stuck in Juan's mind.

But all the circumstances -- the wooden handles, the "Made in Italy," ".45 Caliber Colt" -- and of course, Juan had good reason to remember the gun, because it was being pointed at him.

He was looking down the barrel most of the time until it was passed, until it was passed to him.

10d-1

1 2

ļ0

14.

What did Bruce do, when he had the gun there at that Meyers Ranch dinner? Well, according to Juan, "Well, he handled the gun. He pointed it at me. And then he looked at it. He looked at me. And he looked around to the people at the table."

They were all very proud. These are -- these are proud people. They re proud of their accomplishment, getting Shorty's ego -- "Shorty's ego" -- passing the gun around.

Now, Mr. Denny brings up the fact that Barbara Hoyt didn't testify about the gun incident. Well, number one, certainly Juan would have more of a reason to remember a gun being passed around the table than Barbara would, especially because the gun was pointed at Juan. And also, Barbara didn't say that she was there all the time.

She said that she got up and went into the kitchen a few times. And remember, because she was the one that was serving the dinner. And also, Juan testified that the gun incident happened after dinner.

And Barbara didn't say that she was there after dinner. And also, Barbara didn't say that the gun incident didn't happen. She just said that she didn't remember whether it happened or not.

And that's -- you know, not knowing that it's -what significance the gun has, that's not really too significant
an event, just having the gun passed around the table -especially not for people that have a lot of guns and that are
used to it. I mean, it's no big deal.

It's a big deal now, because we know it was

10d-2

4 5

 Shorty's gun; but one of the Manson Family, just around the table area at the time, it's -- it's not that big a thing.

Then, Elma Baker came in and testified that R. A. Smith -- who we know to be DeCarlo -- sold the guns to him on October 10th, 1969, for \$75; and that then the guns were in bad condition; the bluing was worn, and the handles were scratched. Obviously, they had been up in Death Valley.

Now, when a person leaves voluntarily, and nothing happens to him, he takes those things with him which are his prized personal possessions, the things that are treasured by him.

But Shorty's revolvers ended up in the hands of those he hated, the Manson Family. Do you think that he would have even let any of these people touch his guns? Even touch his guns?

Not to speak of redeeming them at the pawnshop and keeping them and selling them. Do you think that he would even have let these people -- knowing how he felt about them -- that he would have let them even touch, even touch those guns?

Hmm-mm! No, sir!

He was in love with these guns. He wouldn't have left without them. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, based on all the evidence, all the evidence, the only reasonable explanation for what happened to Shorty's guns is that they fell into the hands of the Manson Family, certain members, after they murdered him.

Now, the confessions and admissions on the Shea case, of Manson, Davis and Grogan, as to the murder of Shorty

Shea clearly establish, beyond any reasonable doubt, that Shorty was murdered.

And of course, you can consider these confessions and admissions to substantiate and strengthen the other proof that we have submitted to you on Shorty's death.

Now, we'll talk about these confessions and admissions somewhat later in my argument.

1

2

ŭ

5

6

7

8

9

10

11.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

ŝ

20

21

22

23

24

. ...

27

28

Let's talk about Paul Whiteley a minute,

Sergeant Whiteley and the investigation that he performed.

A very thorough, detailed investigation that certainly,

if Shorty was alive, would have turned him up.

Sergeant Whiteley testified that he commenced his investigation on October 13, 1969. And that he ended it November, 1971.

First thing, teletyped to the record section in California that keeps the criminal records. It is called He went to see if there was any arrest record. Checked the DMV, the division of hospitals in California and Arizona, the Coroner's Office throughout the nation. Licensing bureaus in California, Arizona and Massachusetts and Texas, and checked the Federal Bureau of Investigation, State Department Division of Passports, credit agencies in California, the Internal Revenue Service, Social Security, Workmen's Compensation. That he sent out nationwide teletypes describing Shea to missing persons details of local police departments. He contacted the U. S. Post Office at every known address that Shorty had ever had. He contacted the trade unions in Southern California, the Bureau of Social Services, which is welfare. Local utility companies. Veterans Administration. The U. S. military records in The registrar of voters. Every known friend that Kentucky. Shorty had ever had. He checked with each police department in every town that Shorty had ever lived in. What did he find? He found no record of Shorty's existence after August No record of Sheats existence after August of 169. of 169.

ľ

:

--

Now, the physical search.

He said that he began the physical search in December of 1969 for Shea's body and ended it in July of 1970. You've seen those photographs enough, the aerial photographs of Spahn Ranch and the surrounding area. Sergeant Whiteley performed a very thorough search. He went into every around there that the Manson Family hadbeen known to have frequented. Searched the canyons, the different canyons. Pumped the creek dry. Sent scuba divers down the well. 5,000 man-hours. A man-hour, if one man works eight hours, that's eight hours, you know, so on and so forth. Two men work eight hours, 16 man-hours. 5,000 man-hours. Of course, in this area -- and remember, he said that part of the search was done up in the Barker-Meyers Ranch, the Death Valley area, and you're going to get all those pictures in there to see how barren and desolate that area is.

Well, this is certainly looking for a needle in a haystack here. He could have walked right over the spot where Shorty was buried and can't find him. He can't dig up the whole area, but he tried. He looked around in caves and creeks.

Also, very, very important, Sergeant Whiteley testified that while this physical search was being performed that it was highly publicized. That there were the TV cameras out there and there were reporters. And you know from this trial that there have been other trials about Shea's murder, and still no Shorty Shea. Nobody to say, "Oh, hey, Shorty is over here. He's up in San Francisco. He's up in Las

3.

 Vegas, or something. All the publicity. Nobody, nobody has heard of Shorty's existence since August of '69.

Sergeant Whiteley described that, how when he was up there that there was no traffic on the road except for police officers. That he's been up there four times and the only traffic on that road between Ballarat and Goler Wash that he's seen have been police vehicles that have been patroling the area.

And it certainly -- at both Spahn Ranch and Death Valley and the surrounding area of Spahn Ranch -- it is just like looking for a needle in a haystack.

Ofcourse, this assumes -- this assumes that there even exists a body.

Remember -- remember that conversation between Manson and Danny DeCarlo, overheard by Barbara Hoyt? Lye and lime. Lime preserves it, lye destroys it. Manson said, "Where can I get some lye?" There may very well may not be a body in existence. We'll talk on that subject a little more.

Now, also a very important point about showing that Shorty is not alive, his unusual markings on his body and how easy, how easy it would be for him to be detected. This is a description of this man's body.

He had three horses tattooed on his chest. On his left arm he had a rose with the word "Rose" on it.

Over his heart, "I'll always love Niki," and a heart. He had a scar over his left eye that started up above the eyebrow and

came down through the eyelid and ended above the left cheekbone. Both of his legs had been broken. He had visible scars on both legs. He had a hole in his back whereit looked like a bone had been broken. Like it sunk in. His feet were both broken.

2

1

3

6

7.

8

9

10

11 12

13

14. 15

16

17

18

19%

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

Now, a man with these unusual features and markings on his body could not easily disappear. Police and hospitals could spot him right off. All those markings. Certainly, unusual markings.

Now, what are some other reasons why we know that Don is dead.

Well, his car. His car was found abandoned, dusty and dirty. Just a stone's throw away from the old Manson Family hangout on Gresham Street.

Well, why was it taken there? Obviously, because these people had lived there. They knew on this dirt road that the car would go unnoticed, on the dirt shoulder -- let me see if I can find that.

Well, I can't find the photographs right now, but there are some color photographs in evidence of the location where Don's car was found. And it shows that it is off on the side on a -- just a dirt shoulder, and I think that you can see the --

Oh.

MR. DENNY: Is that it, Steve?

MR. KAY: No, but thanks anyway.

Let's see. Well, anyway, you're going to get all the exhibits in the jury room, so you know you should look through each and every one of the exhibits to see what they are and you'll come across these pictures. And you'll see the area where the car was abandoned. Certainly, if they knew that the car was taken to this area it would be a long while before it was noticed or that anybody would call up. I mean, they lived

7.

, . 24

,

 in the area. They knew the type of people that lived in the area. They knew whether they'd bother or not calling up about an abandoned vehicle.

Now, in this car, the two footlockers, Shorty's two footlockers, were his clothes.

Now, Jerry Binder and Niki Shea both testified that Don had precious few clothes. And when you get in the jury room, you look through those clothes and you'll see that the clothes that were in those footlockers, were found in the footlockers, were good clothes. They're good shorts, pants and shirts and different things. They smell bad now, because goodness knows, they've been in those footlockers for a time and haven't been cleaned or anything. But they're good quality clothes. And Shorty just didn't have that much money to go around just throwing his good clothes away. And the car, also.

Paul Ewart testified that in March of 1970 that that car was still in usable condition. He didn't say it was in excellent condition, but he said it was in usable condition. He said that by his own standards that he wanted to fix the brakes and the steering wheel because he thought they would be dangerous, but that they were in usable condition.

And remember, Don, when he had that old Cadillac before, when they were going up to the salt mines, Don was driving the car around with bad brakes. That didn't bother him. Lance Victor said, "Oh, that scared me, so -- we took my car up."

Don had precious little money. He wasn't going to abandon this vehicle, this car. He just wasn't going to leave

.

7.

11b fol

26 ,

it there, if he left voluntarily.

And, also, look where the car is. Right by the old Manson Family hangout on Gresham Street, You've heard a lot of talk about Gresham Street and who lived there and the fact that Barbara Hoyt said that's when she first met the Family. She was taken there on April 1st, when she first met them.

And, also, the keys to this vehicle that operated the ignition were underneath the driver's seat. Of course, when they were turned, nothing happened because the battery was dead because the car had been sitting there for such a long time. But the keys were there.

Also, about how long the car had been there.

Again, circumstantial evidence. These magazines were found in the footlockers. I want you to look at these in the jury room.

These Shooting Times, August, of 1969. Guns and Hunting, July of '69. We know how crazy Don was about guns. Gun Facts, July, '69. Gun World, August of '69. Guns and Ammo, July of '69. Shooting Times, July of '69. Ebony, June of '69.

the end of August of '69. You don't see any September,
October, November magazines in here. They're not there.

Other reasons that we know that Don is dead, the
fact that his attache case was hidden under some bushes in
that road between Ballarat and Goler Wash, hiding the evidence
getting rid of it. Vance and DeCarlo probably did that. Their

Now, remember, we allege that Don was killed at

property was in -- Vance's was in the attache case. But

DeCarlo's shirts -- DeCarlo's shirts were in the blue suitcase.

Remember Whiteley, Sergeant Whiteley testified that when he went over to L.A.P.D. to get the suitcase that those shirts were in there. And, of course, they were, because Danny DeCarlo knew — because Danny DeCarlo knew Shorty was murdered. If he didn't participate in it, he certainly knew about it. And he certainly is not going to use Shorty's footlockers. And then, when the footlockers are dumped, he's not going to leave the shirts in the footlockers with his name on them. Huh-uh. He knew Shorty was murdered. He either participated or he knew it.

Also, Karen Nelson. The only place that Shorty indicated that he was going to go other than L.A. around the time that he was murdered was the Leslie salt mines. Karen Nelson said he never got there. He never worked for them after September of '68.

llc fol

7.

26,

14.

23.

Now, another reason we know he's dead is because of Charles Manson's incredible statement that he made to John Swartz. An incredible statement.

Now, remember Swartz testified that he had this conversation with Manson about ten days after the raid.

Listen to this.

"Swartz said that he asked Manson if he had seen Shorty. Shorty said, 'Yes, that a friend had a friend in San Francisco who needed someone to work for them, so he --' Charlie -- 'told Shorty about it, and then gave Shorty some money to go to San Francisco.'"

Can't you just imagine giving -- Charlie Manson, his old friend, his old buddy Shorty Shea, who they talked about at all those dinner conversations about what a snitch Shorty was and the fact that he caused the raid and he was going to work for Frank Retz, yeah, well, he gave his old buddy Shorty some information about a job up in San Francisco and on top of that gave him some money. Sure thing.

You know, this is very interesting. Mr. Denny gets up here and says, "Well, gee, if there was a conspiracy to conceal Shorty's body, it was sure the most ill kept secret. They blabbed it to everybody." Huh-uh. Huh-uh. Look at who different things are said to. John Swartz, not a member of the Manson Family, not -- well, he's a law abiding citizen. I think we can say that. He was a ranch hand. He was not involved with these people. What did they tell him to conceal, the fact that Shorty had been murdered? Oh, he went to San Francisco. Got a job up there and gave him

 some money. Doesn't that sound familiar?

Steve Grogan, Clem, telling Juan Flynn -- Juan was a Family member. They spoke freely with Juan. But they said, "Juan, if anyone asks you about Shorty, you tell them that he went to San Francisco."

Now, the only non-Family member, the only non-Family member that was told anything about this was Alan Springer. Alan Springer, a member of an outlaw motorcycle gang, the Straight Satans. Sure, they told him. They probably thought, "Well, if anybody -- if anybody should be anti-law enforcement, not a friend of law enforcement, it should be Alan Springer, a member of the motorcycle gang, an outlaw motorcycle gang," a friend of Danny DeCarlo. And remember, he and Davis, at the time they related this to him, how they could get Danny, of course Springer didn't mean that. He was just trying to find out what they were going to do with Danny about testifying.

"Well, what do you think about Danny testifying?"

Showed them the article and everything. I'm sure
that they didn't figure that Mr. Springer would be on the
side of law enforcement, as he is.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, there can be absolutely no doubt about why Shorty Shea was murdered. Shorty wasn't murdered for the reason that Mr. Denny said, because he was going to be a watchman at Frank Retz' place. That was just another fact added onto it.

Let's look at this for the motive. Let's go through this and see what was said.

Barbara Hoyt testified that in the dinners at the back house, when she was present, she said that after the Family members got out of jail, after the August 16th raid, Shorty's presence on the ranch became a common topic of conversation among the members of the Family.

11d-1

7.

And that the majority of these conversations,
Manson, Davis, Grogan and Watson was present. And to say that
Shorty was hated by the Family was an understatement.

Barbara told us that at some of the dinners at the back house, his royal highness, Charles Manson, made certain pronouncements about Shorty Shea. And remember Barbara describing a number of the conversations she said about Shorty's presence, "They were countless conversations because they were all the time." What did Manson say, "paranoia, paranoia." Manson said that "Shorty was an ex-policeman and an informant."

Well, Manson had a lot to worry about, goodness knows.

"And that he caused the raid and, also, that he was working with -- and, also, that he was working with Frank Retz to get the Family kicked off the ranch. And he was bad-mouthing the ranch, which Barbara took to mean that he was bad-mouthing the Family to the police."

Manson and the Family, but especially Manson, hated Frank Retz. So when he found out that Shorty was going to be an armed guard for Retz, this was just one more fact about why Shorty was hated.

Now, the Family wanted to go to the desert, but they wanted to go when they were good and ready.

You remember Barbara Hoyt testifying the reason that Manson gave to her about why they went up to the desert when they did? She said that Manson told her that the reason they were going up at that time because he, Manson, wanted to get the

girls under 18 away from the police. Baloney. It was too hot for them on the ranch, that's why they left at that time.

7.

Ranch on the day of the raid, but after the raid happened. He also visited the ranch on several occasions the week before the raid, and since it was known that Shorty hated the Family, in some way Manson must have felt that Shorty must have informed to the police and caused the raid. Another fact which placed Shorty's life in danger.

But make no mistake about it, Shorty was not murdered because he was going to be hired as an armed guard by Frank Retz. He was murdered because, God only knows, the Manson Family had a lot to hide from -- from the police, and in their minds Shorty was making it too hot for them. He was bad-mouthing the ranch to the police, according to Manson. He had caused the raid.

Look, this is what -- this is what Davis said to Al Springer during that conversation which again corroborates this point. Davis told Springer, he said, "The guy was a snitch," telling about the guy that they killed, how they took care of snitches, how they took care of snitches and you wonder why we have to give Al Springer deals to come in and testify after Davis told him how they took care of snitches, cutting off their head and arms. Oh, well, Springer can hardly wait to get in here and testify, wow.

This is what Davis said to Springer. Davis said, "The guy was a snitch and he drank too much." Well, we know Shorty drank too much.

7.

ļl

12 fol '

"That they were afraid that he was going to go to the police with information." That's why they murdered him. That's the truth.

What did Shorty find out? What did he find out? What information? What information were they afraid he was going to go to the police with? They felt that he had already caused the raid. Did Shorty know something else? That what Davis said.

Now, before -- before Mr. Davis and Mr. Manson and Mr. Grogan and Mr. Watson and maybe Mr. DeCarlo murdered him, there is no telling what they did to torment this poor man. We know that Shorty knew that he was a marked man. We know that. But, unfortunately, Lance Victor didn't have enough money to give him when he came out on the ranch on the 25th or the 26th of August, so that Shorty could go up to the salt mines and get away from them. Shorty never lived to that Friday when Lance came back with the \$30.

What was Shorty's state of mind about what the Family was trying to do to him? Manson threw a knife right in front of his face. Oh, Manson smiled about it, I'll grant what Mr. Denny said, that Manson smiled about it. But Dawn Quant and Shorty didn't. This went to his state of mind.

28

Obviously, Manson wasn't trying to kill him with this knife throwing incident. But he was conveying a little message.

How would you feel if Charles Manson threw a knife in your path, about three feet from your head?

Let's go to the conversation that he had with Lance Victor.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Again, I made the mistake of not putting down the volume number.

Volume 29, page 4313, questioning by me.

"Q Now, sometime after August 16, 1969, did you have occasion to go out to Spahn's Ranch?

"A Yes.

"Q And did you see Don there?

"A Yes, I seen him there.

"Q Did you also see his car there, the white Comet?

"A Yes, it was sitting up, when I saw it, by the ranch house.

"Q When you say 'the ranch house,' is that where George Spahn lived or --

"A Yes, he did.

"Q Now, in relation to the 16th of August, 1969, when was it that you went out to Spahn Ranch and saw Don there?

"A It seemed like to me it was about the middle of August.

"Q Well, in relation to the 16th, if you 12-2 can give us -- was it -- do you know how long after 2 that, or what do you remember? 3 II A Well, I went out -- I was out there to see him -- it was on a Monday or Tuesday. 5 Yeah. But do you remember how many days 6 it was after the 16th? 7 Α" No. I don't. It may have been -- it may R. have been about a week or so or something like that. 9 ^{II}Q. A week or so after the 16th? 10 A" Yeah. 11 ΩII 12 Now, where was Don when you saw him at 13 Spahn Ranch on that occasion? 14 A^{II} Well, he was down by the corrals. 15 "Q. Now, when you went out to Spahn Ranch on 16 that occasion, did you go with anybody? 17 ^{II}A Yes, I did. "Q 18 Who was that? 19 ΠA That was Bob Ferrin. 20 Now, did you have an occasion to talk to 21 Don when you were there at Spahn's Ranch? Did you 22 have any conversation with him? 23 "A Yes, I did. 24 . 25 demeanor while you were having the conversation with 26 him, how he acted? 27 Well, he was kind of edgy, you know. 28 Kind of a little nervous and he kind of -- you know,

Did you notice anything unusual about his

"looked around like this (indicating)" and he indicated on the stand -- "you know, when he was talking, you know.

"And he would move around a lot and stand on one foot and the other.

"Q Was this unusual for the way --

"A Yes, because usually he would lean against the post, just naturally, and just stand up and talk to you --" or, "just stand and talk to you." Not "stand up," but "stand and talk to you.

"Did he do anything unusual when someone other than the cowboys would come by?

"A Yeah, he would change the subject. If he was talking, he would stop or he would stop talking.

"Q And who were the people that would come by that would make him change the subject?

"A It was -- well, some of the cowboys would walk by, and some of the other people, but it was mostly the other people that was there.

mean? Old people, young people?

"A I believe it was -- I believe it was some of the Family members. They looked like some of the Family members, but I couldn't tell whether it was or not.

"Q Did they have long hair or short hair?

"A They all had long hair, just like the frontiersmen.

"Q On the many occasions that you talked to

"Shorty after you first met him in 1965, had you 12-4 ever seen him act that way? Ż $\mathbf{A}^{\mathbf{H}}$ No, I never did." 3 Going to page 4330, to the conversation: 4 [™]Q All right. Mr. Victor, what did he say, 5 and what did you say? 6 A^{n} Well, Don, he was very nervous, and he 7 said -- he says, uh, he says, 'I think there's something 8 wrong. He says, 'I think, you know, they're trying to 9 12a fls. 10 kill me." 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 .<u>2</u>2 23 24 25 27 28

12a-1

. 16.

6

"And I says, 'Oh, come on, Don, you're probably just feeling bad because of being out of a job and everything.' I said, 'That's impossible, because, you know, because the people didn't strike me as that way.'

"And he says, 'No, I'm not kidding you.'
He says, 'There's something wrong.' And so the conversation went on like that.

"And I says, 'No, that's impossible.'

I said, 'What you need is a little bit of money
under your belt and you'll feel a lot better.' I
said, 'You're stranded here like a -- last man and
everything, and you're kind of getting paranoid
about it.'"

And then this is when they talked about the money:
"Q And what else was said about the money?

"A Oh, then he says he wanted to go up north,

back up to Leslie, where we had been before." At Leslie Salt Mines. "And then he asks Lance for the money, and then Lance said that he couldn't have it until Friday-that's the day the eagle flies, according to Lance -- and then he said that he'd come back with the \$30," and he said, "Don said he would wait. He said, 'Good. I'll be here.'"

But of course, when Lance came that Friday, he was never there.

"And in the conversation --" this is page

"Q And in the conversation that you had with

12a-2

20° 21°

:

: 28

"Don -- we are talking about where he asked to borrow the money, and he said, 'I believe they're trying to kill me' -- what was his demeanor?

"A He was very nervous."

Now, is this corroborative? Yeah. Yeah. The conversation on what we contend was the last night of his life, the conversation with Ruby Pearl, what did he say to Ruby Pearl? He said, "It gives me the creeps to stay here. It's kind of weird here." He wanted to stay at Pearl's house that night, you remember.

Ruby said about Shorty, during this conversation, that he was very serious, and he kept looking around, and that she had never seen him act this way before. And then he said, "Pearl, they're out to get me."

Who do you think he was referring to? The Spahn Ranch Family? Well, he was a member of the Spahn Family.

Or the Manson Family?

Okay. When was Shorty murdered? Ruby Pearl remembers that the last time she ever saw Shorty was when she had the conversation with him in the parking lot. That's how she pinpoints the last time she ever saw him. Because it was the conversation in -- and the members of the Manson Family getting out of the car and rushing towards the direction where Shorty was and fanning out.

Now, Ruby is not sure that there was a full moon, but she said that she remembers that it was a bright night, and the sky was light.

(Pause in the proceedings while Mr. Kay examined some volumes of the transcript.)

MR. KAY: Volume 34, page 5239. Now, this is about the -- Mr. Denny says that it was pumped into her, that there was a -- that there was a full moon. Well, this is by Mr. Manzella:

"Now, Mrs. Pearl, you used the words 'pumped into you' in regard to some of the last few questions that Mr. Denny asked you.

"Were you referring to questions that occurred in the courtroom, during the course of trial?

"A Yes.

"Q And were you referring to the kind of questioning that Mr. Denny was doing --

"A Yes.

"Q -- of you here just a few moments ago?

"A Yes.

"Q Now, before you testified, nobody told you to say that there was a full moon that night, did they?

"A No."

What was Ruby Pearl referring to when she said "pumped," that she was "pumped"?

BY MR. DENNY: -- and this is on cross-examination.

"Q You indicated earlier that someone had pumped you about that, did you not?

"A Well, I was insinuating yourself.

You were insinuating --12a-4 1 "MR. MANZELLA: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that answer, your Honor. Could I have it read back?" 3,.. And then it was read back, the answer, "Well, I was insinuating yourself." 5 BY MR. DENNY: You were insinuating myself, 6 that somebody was pumping you earlier like I'm doing now; 7 isn't that right? "A Not someone. You." 12b fls. 10 Well, we've all seen Mr. Denny in this courtroom. \mathbf{n} 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

12d-1 13x

Now, you see, Mr. Denny is arguing to you, like -"Well, gee, the prosecution is so thorough that they just cover
everything, that obviously they got the full -- everything out
of the witness the first time they ever talked to that witness,
that was relevant.

"And if the witness didn't tell them -- give them certain information the first time they ever talked to the witness, well, it must be that the prosecution's telling them to come up with some information, or that the witness is lying."

Well, a clear example of the fact that that s not true is Barbara Hoyt and full moon. When did the full moon come out? Did it come out by Mr. Manzella or myself or Mr. Katz?

Huh-uhl

It came out on cross examination by Mr. Kanarek,
Mr. Manson's attorney during the Manson trial. Nobody had ever
thought to ask her about it before, except that Mr. Kanarek
was asking her about the conditions, and -- boom! "Hey, yeah.
I remember there was a full moon that night."

Now, the important thing, why we know, again, why Barbara Hoyt and Ruby Pearl are talking about the same night, is the fact that both of them agree -- and have been completely consistent on it -- that the Manson Family left the mext day for the desert.

So the night that Ruby Pearl had the conversation with Shorty and saw Manson, Davis, Grogan and Watson -- and she's not sure about Bill Vance, but I'll get to the other testimony, showing that Mr. Vance was probably not there --

25 *

12d-2

1 2

 when they fanned out towards Shorty on the boardwalk, that this was the same night that Barbara Hoyt heard the screams, because they both agreed that the Manson Family went up to the desert the next day.

And Ruby says that she remembers that this was approximately two weeks after the raid.

Now, Barbara Hoyt remembers that there was a full moon on that night. And she has been consistent about it, ever since somebody questioned her on it, ever since Mr. Kanarek brought it out.

She said that the moon was in the south -- and of course, that's corroborated by Dr. William Kaufmann. He testified that the full moon at that time would have been in the south -- which Barbara didn't describe it as being in the south; she described it as being in back of the -- in back of the buildings on the boardwalk. And of course, this would mean that when Davis and Manson and Grogan and Watson were going towards Shorty, that the light from the full moon would have been shining in their faces.

Now, Mr. Denny -- and I don't know how he can make this conclusion, based on the evidence -- said, "Oh, well, Ruby Pearl doesn't have good eyesight." Yet he was standing back here with those photographs that he had of Ella Jo Bailey and others, and he was pulling them (indicating), and Ruby Pearl was sitting up there identifying this, that, and the other thing. Her eyesight's great.

And she said that she -- she said, "I just took my driver's test, and I have never been to an optometrist before,

12d-3

13 fol 29

Mr. D nny brought out, she said that they were for her close work; but she didn't wear glasses at the time that she was at Spahn Ranch; she didn't have any trouble seeing these people.

She'd seen them hundreds of times that night. She testified to that, that she saw them at night all the time, even when there wasn't a full moon. But this night, there was a full moon -- which would have been shining into their faces, as they were walking towards Shorty Shea, on the boardwalk area.

And remember, Ruby Pearl has never been — never been inconsistent on the fact that Manson, Davis, Grogan and Watson were there. Never. Shets kind of hazy on Bill Vance. One time she said Vance was there, and now she is not sure. But shets sure of those other four, one of which is Bruce Davis. Okay.

THE COURT: Let's take a short break, and then we'll stop at five minutes to 5:00 or so -- shortly before 5:00.

Let's just take five minutes, so that you can stir around a bit.

And during the recess, don't converse amongst yourselves nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with this matter, nor are you to form or express any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you.

We are in recess.

I'm getting so I can state that pretty fast.

(Laughter.)

(Short recess.)

12c-1? 14-1

THE COURT: All the jury is present. The defendant is present with his counsel, the record should show, along with Mr. Kay:

MR. KAY: Okay. We only have about half an hour to go.

We were talking about when it was that Shorty was murdered. Now, very important in this regard, remember that Barbara Hoyt saw Deputy Wachsmuth take Manson and Stephanie Schram off the Spahn Ranch, after they had been arrested on the 24th. And we stipulated that Manson was arrested -- was released from jail on the 26th. Mr. Manzella has written it in at 11:42 p.m.

Now, importantly, Barbara said that it was within a few days after that -- after Manson came back -- that she heard the screams. And again, she testified that after she heard the screams, the next day, the Family left for the desert.

Dr. William Kaufmann, the director of Griffith
Park Observatory, testified that on August 27th, 1969, there
was a full moon out in the Chatsworth area. He also
testified that on August 26th, 1969, and on August 28th,
1969, there would have appeared to have been a full moon in
the sky in the Chatsworth area, to a lay observer -- even to
himself, he said, without sensitive electronic equipment,
he couldn't tell which was the actual night of the full moon.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, again, I didn't interrupt Mr. Manzella on this point, but I think since it's been reiterated, I have to interrupt. I made the objection at

٠ 6

the time. Dr. Kaufmann did not so testify. Dr. Kaufmann was not there, and didn't testify that the full moon was out.

He just said that there would have been, by the charts, and that point was very specifically made.

So I do want to emphasize that this is stating facts which are not in evidence.

THE COURT: Again, ladies and gentlemen, you are the sole judges of the evidence in this case. As I've stated before, it's ultimately up to you as to what the testimony was.

MR. KAY: Thank you, your Honor. Mr. Denny's right on that point, that he did object, and that Dr. Kaufmann didn't testify to that. He just testified that there would have been a full moon.

We know from Barbara Hoyt that there was a full moon, and that it was -- it was visible, and that there wasn't any clouds blocking it out. That's why we know that there wasn't a full moon there.

Well, I mean, there would have been a full moon anyway. But I mean, that's why we know that there weren't clouds blocking it out.

Now, very important is this little chart which you all have from Dr. Kaufmann. And important in it is the time -- the bottom part here (indicating), the time at which the moon sat at an altitude of 30 degrees above the horizon, because Dr. Kaufmann testified that once the moon gets to -- rises to 30 degrees above the horizon, then until it falls to 30 degrees above the horizon, that the illumination is the

.3

13.

same.

Okay. So, on the 26th, August 26th, the moon got to 30 degrees -- to an altitude of 30 degrees above the horizon at 10:00 p.m.; and it fell to 30 degrees below the horizon at 3:45 a.m. on August 27th.

Now, I'm not contending that Shorty was killed on August 26th, because -- I just don't think it happened that way, because Manson got out of jail so late at night.

On August 27th, the moon rose to 30 degrees at 10:30 p.m. and fell to 30 degrees at 4:16 a.m.

On August 28th, the moon rose to an altitude of 32 degrees at 11:00 p.m. and fell to 30 degrees above the horizon at 4:45 a.m. on the 29th.

Now, you remember that Ruby Pearl testified that when she saw the incident she described in the parking lot there, that it was after 11:00; so that means -- it's corroborated that on each one of those nights, the moon would have been, at that time -- at the time that Ruby Pearl saw what she said she saw -- would have been at full illumination.

Now, Lance Victor -- we've just gone over his testimony, but he remembers that it was on a Monday or Tuesday that he saw Shorty at Spahn Ranch, and it was a week after the Spahn Ranch raid.

Well, the raid was the 16th, and a week from that would be the 23rd. And the closest Monday or Tuesday would be the 25th or 26th. The 25th or 26th.

Now, Mr. Denny argues that -- "Well, Frank Retz'

9.

 testimony is in conflict with this." Well, Frank Retz' testimony isn't in conflict, because Frank Retz said that when he got the call to Shorty -- and of course, as I am going to get into, Shorty was scared to death, and he -- even though he was talking about -- "Yeah, Frank, I'll be there in 30 minutes." And, "Yeah, George, I'll go see him."

He wouldn't have -- he wouldn't have gone.

Remember, he told John Swartz, he said, "Well,

I am going to go up to Frank Retz this evening and see about
a job."

Well, he called Retz at 9:00 o'clock in the morning, and Retz was waiting for him at 9:00 that night. So, he was procrastinating, because he knew -- Shorty knew that if he took that job, armed guard against the Manson Family, it would be all over. It would be all over for him.

The reason it's not inconsistent is because Mr.
Retz testified, on direct examination, that he remembers,
specifically, that when Shorty called him, it was in August.

So that would eliminate -- because he called him on a Monday or Tuesday, and he said specifically it was in August. Well, the dates that Mr. Denny pointed out, saying, "Well, Danny DeCarlo was down here on the first or second, and that was Labor Day," that's eliminated, because he remembers them as in August.

Okay. So Lance remembers that he saw Shorty on a Monday or Tuesday, August 25th or 26th. And that he said he would be back on Friday, which would have been the 29th.

2.

7,

15 fls.

. 15

16.

...

. 25

And he did come back. He did come back with the \$30.

And remember, Shorty said that he was going to wait for him. He said, "That's fine. I'll wait for you."

So, when Lance got there, he said that Shorty was gone; that his car was gone; and that he, Lance, made inquiries and couldn't locate Shorty.

So, with the testimony of Barbara Hoyt -- excuse me -- that there was a full moon, Dr. Kaufmann stated that there was a full moon, that's (indicating) the date, the 28th.

1 1 ·

-18

Why the 28th? Because Ruby and Barbara both testified that the next -- Barbara said it was in the evening-the Manson Family left for the desert. Paul Watkins testified that he had a draft physical to take. He was up at the Barker-Meyers Ranch area and he said that he left on the 1st and that the Manson Family, Davis and Manson and the others that came up, got there two days before.

Well, if they left the evening of the 29th, they would have arrived there on the 30th, which, of course, the 30th, 31st, would be two days before Watkins left to go take his draft physical. So I submit to you that the 28th is the most reasonable date that Shorty Shea was murdered. It just fits in with all of the testimony from the different witnesses that the 28th was the date.

Now, Mr. Denny made a big point of the fact that he said on his opening statement that we wouldn't call George Spahn and, of course, we didn't call George Spahn.

Well, why should we call him? Why drag an 83-yearold blind man down from his resting place in Oregon to testify to nothing? What did George Spahn testify to that Frank Retz and Ruby Pearl hadn't already testified to?

I submit that the only reason that Mr. Denny called him was so that he could stand up to you and say, "Well, look, I told you in my opening statement that they weren't going to call him and they didn't call him. Hurrah for me, I called him."

What did he add? What did he add? He said he talked to Shorty and he wanted Shorty to get in touch with

 Frank Retz. But he didn't -- you know. And Shorty said,
"Oh, sure, okay." But he didn't remember what day it was that
he talked to Shorty.

Well, Frank Retz can pinpoint the fact, "Well, I talked to George about it on a Sunday, and then Shorty called me on a Monday." Why call George Spahn? I mean, what does he add, other than for some more ink for Mr. Denny to spread around.

How was Shorty murdered? How was he murdered? Well, let's follow the events at Spahn Ranch after Barbara Hoyt served him what we contend was the last meal that he was ever going to eat.

After dinner Barbara remembers overhearing a conversation in which either Brenda or Squeaky -- either Brenda or Squeaky -- and you've seen them in the courtroom during this trial, you've seen Brenda back there making eyes at her boy friend. You've seen her back there. Squeaky came in when George Spahn was here, but did the defense call either one to deny it? What would they have to deny?

Barbara said she overheard one of them -- she didn't remember which one -- say that Shorty would be taken care of. Shorty would be taken care of. Yeah, he would be taken care of. He was taken care of.

Okay, the dinner, the conversation, "Shorty would be taken care of," then Ruby Fearl's conversation with Shorty, which she says was about 11:00 p.m., at which time Shorty said, "They're out to get me." Mr. Denny says that we're relying mainly on Ruby Pearl for a conviction on the

,

ïí

13a f1s.

Shea case. That's hogwash. She is certainly an important piece of evidence. We're relying on all of our witnesses for a conviction in the Shea case. He's trying to boil it down to just one witness. That's just not so. We're relying on all of the witnesses.

Now, I think that from your own common experience that you ladies and gentlemen know what the vision -- what your vision is like on a clear full moon night. I think that you all know that you can read a newspaper by the light of the full moon and that you can recognize people that you know probably at distances of over 100 feet. Just think back on your own common experiences. I'm sure that sometime in your lives, at least when you were little, that you did experiments to see how you could see. I know I did, in the light of the full moon. Just think how well you can see.

MR. DENNY: Well, object to that. That's assuming facts way outside the evidence.

THE COURT: All right, sustained. That is stricken.

MR. KAY: What's that, your Honor?

THE COURT: You may resume your argument.

MR. KAY: All right. Well, forget the fact that I made a test. But think back to your own common experience, when you go into the jury room. We expect you to dwell on your good sense, the experience that all of you have when all of you put your heads together. You've got an awful lot of good experience, so use your good experience and your common sense when you get into the jury room and start deliberating on this case.

13a-1

3 .

_-

 Now, the point about Ruby saying that, uh, that -one time said that Bill Vance was among the four that got out
of the car and she's not clear on it any more.

Well, remember that Barbara Hoyt testified at Page 5647 that Vance wasn't back at Spahn Ranch when they left for the desert. She said that Vance got to the Spahn Ranch between the time Barbara -- between the time they left for the desert and the time that Sadie and Juan came up.

Well, we know he probably got there within the first week of September, because he was there with DeCarlo. He and DeCarlo had Shorty's guns there in the gun room.

Okay, what happened next? Barbara went to the parachute room and was just ready to go to sleep when she heard something that frightened her and that she will have to live with for the rest of her life, the screams of Shorty Shea being violently and brutally murdered. Let's see what she says.

Volume 36, at Page 5492. Question by me.

"Now, after you went to the parachute room that night, did something unusual happen?

"A Yes.

"Q And was anyone with you when this unusual event took place?

"A No.

"Q Would you please describe to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what the unusual event was?

"A I had just gotten into bed and I heard a

13a-2

.

,10.

1,4

 "scream. And I sat up. And for a minute there wasn't any sound, and so I thought, well, maybe I imagined it. And I laid back down again. And then, the acreaming started again. And it kept going and going and going for a long time.

"And do you know who it was that was screaming?

"A It was Shorty."

Barbara has always said it was Shorty. She has never been inconsistent on that as far back as December, 1969.

And Lieutenant Neilsen said he didn't believe her. He said he didn't want to tie her down because he didn't know what the basis — her basis was for knowing it was Shorty screaming.

He didn't say he didn't believe her.

"Q Now, could you tell the direction of where the screams were coming from?

"Well, let me ask you this: Did the screams sound like they were close to you or far away?

"They sounded pretty far away. Down the creek, toward the outlaw shacks. Just in that direction."

"Approximately how many screams did you hear, Barbara?

"A I don't know. Many.

"Approximately how long did the screams last?"

Now, remember, we're talking about the same night,

the same night that Ruby Pearl saw Manson, Grogan, Davis and

		1
		2
بدر		3
•		4
*		5
		6
		7
		8
		9
		10
	ź	11
1	ч	12
		13
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	<u>.</u>	13 , 14
بغ	``	15
	‡	16
		16 17 18
	4	ʻ 18
		19
		20
÷		21
		22
		23
, '		24
& -		25
* *		26
		27
		28

Watson fan out rapidly and approach Shorty on the boardwalk.
We're talking about the same night. But afterwards. Because, remember, Barbara said that it had been dark for a long time and was probably after midnight. And Ruby said that when she saw what she saw, that that was around 11:00.

"Q Approximately how long did the screams last?

"A Well, it seemed like a really long time, so I really couldn't accurately tell you. It probably wasn't a real long time, though, but it just seemed like it.

"Q It seemed to you like it was a long time?

'A Yes.

"Q How would you characterize those screams that you heard?

"A They were loud. And they were painful. And they were the same kind that -- you know, those horror movies when the lady is screaming, that kind of scream.

"Well, it was like that.

"Q Now, what did you do in the parachute room, when you heard these screams?

"A I looked out the window.

"Q Did you see anything?

"A Uh -- I could only see how light it was.

And I saw these leaves that was on the screen, but I couldn't see anything worth telling of.

1 "Now, did that -- did the event that you heard 2 the screams, did that upset you? 3 "A Yes. O Were you able to go back to sleep right 5 away? 6 "A No. 7. Ø" Did you go to sleep at all that night? 8 "A Yes. 9 "Q Where did you go to sleep in the 10 parachute room after you heard the scream? 11 "A On the floor. 12 uO. All right. And why did you do that? 13 "A I was scared." 14 Of course she was. If any of you had heard those 15 screams, you'd be pretty scared, too. 16 Where on the floor did you sleep? : 17 By the bed. **18** Now, is there any doubt at all in your 19 mind that it was Shorty that you heard screaming? 20 ľΑ No." 21 Well, why would there be any doubt? .22 Number one, she heard all those dinner time 23 conversations among the Manson Family about Shorty's presence on 24 the ranch and how they hated him and how he caused the raid and 25 how he was bad-mouthing the ranch to the police. 26 Number two, just after she served dinner to him 27 that night she heard either Brenda or Squeaky saying, "Well, 28 he'll be taken care of. Shorty will be taken care of."

The next day, when she goes down to the creek area, she hears Danny DeCarlo. And how in the world Mr. Denny can stand up here and say that Barbara Hoyt was Danny DeCarlo's girlfriend when he, himself, brought out on cross examination her boyfriend was Dave B.ker, otherwise known as Karate Dave. And she hitchhiked across the country to find him one time. That they were living down on the beach together. Manson gave him \$100 to go down there. Just ink. It sounds good, but it is not the truth.

13b

U

7.

lye or lime.

17.

19 , ´•

.* *23. *

Now, the next day she hears Danny DeCarlo and Manson having the conversation about getting rid of "the" body. Lime will preserve it, lye will get rid of it. Charlie asked, "Where can I get some lye?" I mean, whether she recognized Shorty's voice at the time he was actually screaming or not, it is obvious there can be no doubt in her mind — she would be stupid if there was a doubt in her mind. She has just talked to Shorty that night when she served him dinner and she heard the screams and heard all of this talk about Shorty will be taken care of and how are they going to get rid of the body,

And Mr. Denny made a big point about the Boston accent. But Barbara Hoyt said she didn't know what a Boston accent was. So she can't say whether Shorty had one or not. But I submit the main reason she recognizes it was Shorty's voice, because she'd be stupid not to, with all that was going on. I mean, it is so obvious that it was Shorty's voice. It is the only reasonable inference for an intelligent girl, as Barbara Hoyt is. And if there's any girl that's far from being a perjurer, it is Barbara Hoyt. Barbara Hoyt is the only shining light in the whole Manson Family. I mean, that that's a girl that's got her feet firmly on the ground and has got a future ahead of her. That girl --

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll recess at this time: During the recess you are admonished not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with the matter, nor are you to form nor express any opinion on it until it is

1

2

3

5

4

6

7.

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 £ 26

27

finally submitted to you.

I'll see you at 9:15 on Monday morning.

Our timetable appears to be this. Mr. Kay will conclude his argument sometime Monday. Possibly early Monday afternoon. And the Court will instruct you. And then, you will have the case.

All right.

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

THE COURT: Remember the admonition, you are not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with the matter.

Remember, too, the obligation you have to avoid any news media, any of the news media reports concerning Mr. Manson, the Manson Family, this case or --

MR. KAY: Your Honor, excuse me. Can I make just one point? I was just going to make one point, and then I'd be finished.

It is 5:00 o'clock, Mr. Kay. THE COURT:

MR. KAY: It will only take ten seconds.

Save it. You're going to have plenty of THE COURT: time.

So, I'll see you at 9:15. We are in recess now.

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, before the jury is discharged, could we approach the bench a moment?

> All right, you may just wait just a moment. THE COURT: You may approach the bench.

26

27

28

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

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, I did not interrupt Mr. Kay's argument on the matter of Frank Retz saying that he had spoken to Shorty within the month of August, because'I was just not totally sure that I was right. But I have checked the transcripts and I find the only place where a time is mentioned was a place where I objected to the Court.

MR. KAY: Huh-uh, no. I can show you. He's talking about the conversation with Shorty --

"Q -- " it is on Page 4394.

THE COURT: Here?

MR. KAY: Yeah.

THE COURT: "Do you remember it was still August?

"Yes."

Is that what -- go ahead and take a look at it.

MR. DENNY: All right.

MR. KAY: Yes, see, he says he recognizes his voice.
You're very thorough, George, but I think you just missed one.

THE COURT: Wasthat your cross?

MR. KAY: No, it was direct.

THE COURT: Redirect?

MR. KAY: No, on redirect --

MR. DENNY: Apparently it was on redirect -- on redirect it was gone into again and he said he did not know. And that's where I made the objection it was leading and suggestive and the Court sustained the objection. And then, he was asked

on Page 4451 when it was and he said he didn't know, but if it is in the report --2 THE COURT: It appears to be in the record on direct. 3 MR. KAY: Yeah. THE COURT: Although he did reverse himself on cross. 5 So -6 7. MR. DENNY: Well --THE COURT: That leaves it in the laps of the jury. MR. KAY: Was Tony going to bring whiteley back? THE COURT: I was going to hear evidence whether or not 10 11 to grant a motion to re-open. 12 (Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in 13 open court within the presence and hearing of the jury:) 14 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I'll excuse you now. 15 Mr. Kuczera will have charge of you on Monday, and he'll be -if you have any questions now, since we will be in recess, 16 17 you might put them to him. Good night. Have a good weekend. 18 (Whereupon, the jury retired from the courtroom, 19 and the following proceedings were had:) 20 THE COURT: We're in recess. Go get Tony. 21 MR. KAY: All right. 22 (Short recess.) 23 24 25 26 27

28

_

> .

26 .

MR. DENNY: Your Honor, before we get into that, your Honor, the Clerk has apprised me of the fact that if you do leave, that it may be that she would be called upon by the Clerk's Office to float, to take the place of clerks who are off sick or whatever and --

THE COURT: I don't think she could. She's been eating too many of those doughnuts.

(Laughter.)

MR. DENNY: Well, I'm not sure how she would float.

THE COURT: I would request the Clerk's Office that she remain in the courtroom because of the great number of exhibits.

MR. DENNY: That's precisely what I think should be done and that's what I wanted to bring up.

THE COURT: We've attempted that before and we've squared that away, so don't worry about that.

MR. DENNY: All right.

THE COURT: The People have indicated that they desire to present evidence on the motion to reopen to present the testimony of Bill Vance, and that -- I'd be interested in knowing whether there have been any conversations with Mr. Vance so that it could be known that he would testify.

In view of what the Court has heard about Mr. Vance, itseems quite likely that an immunity order would have to be made in order to cause him to testify if he were -- almost certainly he should have legal advice before he testifies.

So that may leave -- that may leave the certainty

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

9.

10 11

12

13

14

16.

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27. 28. of his testimony in the air, even should the Court grant that.

MR. MANZELLA: Well, by phone -- I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Even should the Court grant the order.

I'm interested in the question of diligence.
So you may proceed.

MR. MANZELLA: All right.

Your Honor, on the first point, as far as whether or not Mr. Vance will testify, no court time will have been lost and we'll know by Monday morning definitely whether or not he will testify. So no court time will have been lost, as far as that's concerned.

In other words, we'll know definitely Monday morning whether or not he will testify.

THE COURT: By that, you mean -- what do you mean exactly? You anticipate he would be here by Monday morning?

MR. MANZELLA: Well, Sergeant Whiteley and Deputy Gleason will have spoken to him personally by then.

THE COURT: In Missouri?

MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor, and will know whether or not he will testify.

In other words, the People aren't asking for a continuance, because we'll know Monday morning, when the court opens on Monday, by then we'll know whether or not he will testify.

THE COURT: And to what he will testify?

MR. MANZELLA: I believe so, yes.

THE COURT: Well, this is rather premature to explore

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27 . -28. it now, then.

MR. MANZELLA: The reason I asked Deputy Gleason to come over today, to show -- because I felt diligence on our part was a necessary showing. I think materiality is clearly shown by the way both sides have treated Mr. Vance in his connection with the case. But I wasn't sure exactly what had been done and Deputy Gleason was more or less involved in the attempting to locate Bill Vance during the --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MANZELLA: -- two years.

THE COURT: You can put Deputy Gleason on for that point.

MR. MANZELLA: All right, Deputy Gleason, will you take the stand, please.

THE COURT: Go shead and swear him.

THE WITNESS: I have been.

THE COURT: You were sworn previously in the trial, but let's swear him again.

THE CLERK: Raise your right hand, please.

You do solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give in the cause now pending before this court shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

THE WITNESS: I do.

THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: William C. Glesson, G-1-e-s-o-n.

WILLIAM C. GLEASON.

-3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MANZELLA:

Deputy Gleason, you are the William Gleason who is one of the investigating officers in this case, assigned along .with Sergeant Whiteley and Deputy Charles Guenther?

A Yes.

And you've been involved in the investigation of this case since when?

October of '69, 1969.

And from October of 1969 until this date, have Q, you made efforts to locate a person who has been referred to during the course of this trial as -- by various names: Bill Vance, William Rex Cole, Bill Van Sickle, Dwayne Schwarm; have you made efforts to locate that person?

A Yes.

15a fls.

19

18

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

	Q	And	lw E	nen	did	you	begin	Aonù	efforts to	locate	the
man	1:11	refer	to	as	Bill	l Var	ace?				

A My first effort would have been around December 1st, 1969.

Now, would you tell us what -- what you did from December 1st on, in an effort to locate Bill Vance?

A I've checked all of his known residence addresses, checked all of his known employers. I've contacted numerous friends of his. I've ran checks to determine driver's license issuance, driver's license record, any record of vehicles registered to him. Very lengthy letters to other police agencies asking them to check various addresses in other states.

I've spoken to various law enforcement officers in the State of California attempting to locate Vance.

Q All right. Have you contacted any agencies or persons in states other than in California?

A Yes.

Q What states and what agencies or persons?

A The Missouri -- I'm sorry, the Kansas City,
Missouri Police Department and the Chief of Police of
Sewickley, Pennsylvania. That's spelled S-e-w-i-c-k-e-l-y.

Now, during the course of your -- the efforts about which you have just testified, did you receive information from persons or agencies that Bill Vance had been seen at particular locations at particular times?

A In talking to his friends and employers, I determined that he had been seen -- the last he had been seen

lsa-2 1 that I could place him was in April of 1970 in the San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles County. 3 And who did you talk to that gave you that informa-4 tion? 5 I talked to a friend of his by the name of Betty Α 6 Feiken, F-e-i-k-e-n. 7 And --Q 8 She stated she had seen him in the Van Nuys area A 9 approximately the end of March or the first of -- first week 10 of April, 1970. 11 When was this that you talked to her and she gave 12 you this information? 13 Sometime in the summer of 1970. Probably June, 14 1970. 15 Now, have you received information recently with Q 16 regard to the whereabouts of Bill Vance? 17 . . . A Yes. 18 When did you receive that information? Q 19 On February 24th, 1972, yesterday. Α 20 Did you do anything after you received the informa-21 tion? If so, what did you do? 22 Contacted the Sheriff of Gentry County, Missouri. À 23 Asked him if he knew of a person living in his county by the 24 1 name of Bill Cole. He stated he did. He has known Mr. Cole 25 for -- since July of 1970, and has been a resident of that 26 county, to his knowledge, since July of 1970. 27 And this was the Sheriff of Gentry County that told 28 you this?

A Yes.

Q Now, have you since had further conversations with the Sheriff between yesterday and during today? Have you had further conversations with the Sheriff, either you or Sergeant Whiteley?

A Yes. I spoke to the Sheriff -- his name is
Rainey, R-a-i-n-e-y. I spoke to him approximately two hours
ago and he stated that he had again contacted a person known to
him as Bill Cole. And in our conversation we compared the
physical description that I had against the physical description
that he had, and that he determined it to be the same person.

Q And did you have any information with regard to persons with whom Bill Cole was living in Gentry, in Gentry County?

A Yes, he apparently now is living with a girl that I previously identified as Patricia Joan Baldwin.

Q Is she also referred to as Little Patty?

A Yes.

I -- in speaking to the Sheriff, the physical description that he had of her, matches the physical description I had of that person.

Q And Little Patty is one of the girls that's been identified at this trial, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q All right. During the course of your efforts to locate Bill Vance, you've told us about one interview in which you obtained information as to someone who had seen him, and this was out in San Fernando Valley.

Did you receive any other information like that?

A Yes. I spoke to an employer of his in the Chatsworth area. He stated that he had seen Vance, as he best could recall, sometime during the month of December, 1969, and that was in a restaurant in Chatsworth.

He knew this person, as Vance had been an employee of his at a Shell service station in Chatsworth.

Q And did you -- well, strike that.

For what purpose did you originally begin to look for Bill Vance?

A During my initial investigation in the case, I was assigned to the Auto Theft Detail and I wanted him for investigation of auto theft. That would have been in December of

Q And since then, have you -- have your efforts to contact him been motivated also by the fact that you now know that he is a witness to certain events relevant to the Hinman and Shea cases?

A Yes.

27

28

Q All right. Is there any information, if you
well, is there any information that you have received that
you have not investigated? Any information that you know
of that you have received with regard to the whereabouts
of Bill Vance that you have not investigated or that
someone in your office has not investigated?
A None that I can think of.
Q All right. Have you sent out teletypes or other
types of communication to agencies, various agencies?

Q Where are they? Do you have them?

A In my folder.

Yes, I have.

Yes.

Q All right. Perhaps you can take those out.

Are those teletypes covered generally in what
you have already testified to?

Have you brought any of those with you today?

A Yes.

A

Q

A

There are also other teletypes that I did not have time to prepare to bring to court.

Q Are those copies -- the ones that you have with you on the witness stand, are they copies of other teletypes that you have?

A Yes.

Q So could we mark those as an exhibit in this matter?

A Yes.

THE COURT: Yes, it will be received as People's

15b-2

2

1

3

4 5

6

7. 8

19, 10

11

12 13

14 15

16

18

19

Court's 4

17

20

21

22 23

24

25

28

26

Special Exhibit next in order, whatever that may be, Mrs. Holt.

MR. MANZELLA: Could I mark those collectively, your Honor, rather than individually?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MANZELLA: Mr. Denny, have you seen those?

MR. DENNY: No. I haven't.

MR. MANZELLA: All right.

THE COURT: Let's see, we don't have any category of People's Special Exhibits. I thought we did.

MR. DENNY: I think that's right. I think that the last thing that we marked was marked as a Court's Special Exhibit.

THE COURT: All right, the Court will simply call it -call these teletypes, mark them collectively as Court's Special Exhibit 4.

MR. DENNY: Could I see those.

MR. MANZELLA: Yes. I was just going to show them to the Judge, first.

Did you want to see them before I showed them to Mr. Denny?

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. MANZELLA: I haven't seen them either.

THE COURT: How did Sheriff Rainey happen to call you, do you know that? Just a friendly chat or --

THE WITNESS: No, sir, I called Sheriff Rainey.

THE COURT: How did you learn about Sheriff Rainey?

THE WITNESS: I was advised that Mr. Vance was in his

15b-3	1	County.
	2	THE COURT: Who advised you?
,	3	THE WITNESS: An informent of mine.
*	4 .	THE COURT: Somebody called you on the telephone?
á.	5	THE WITNESS: Yes.
	6	THE COURT: And when did that occur?
	7	THE WITNESS: Yesterday, February 24th.
	8 · ·	THE COURT: Was this an informant whom you knew from
	9 1	; 'before?
	10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
	n	THE COURT: And have been in contact with?
. *	12,	THE WITNESS: Yes.
<u>.</u>	13	THE COURT: Have you ever asked him or heard before
*	14	where enything at all about the whereabouts of Bill
•	15	Vance?
	16	THE WITNESS: Yes, I had.
	17	THE COURT: More than once?
	18	THE WITNESS: Yes.
s	19	THE COURT: When was the most recent time that you had
	20	asked?
á.	21	THE WITNESS: Well, I do not recall the exact time.
	22	We've talked on the phone several times, and it seems to me
	23	that probably every phone conversation we did talk about
, *	24	Vance?
¥ £	25	THE COURT: Well, have you since this trial began,
÷ ,	26	have you talked with that person?
	27	THE WITNESS: Yes.
_	28	THE COURT: Since the during the course of the

15b-4

1 2

3

4

5

7

8.

9

10

11

12

14

15;

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

Manson trial involving these same homicides? Had you talked with that person?

THE WITNESS: Not that I recall, sir.

THE COURT: When, in relation to -- well, when did you last talk to this person insofar as the month is concerned, this month or --

THE WITNESS: Prior to yesterday?

THE COURT: Yes, prior to yesterday.

THE WITNESS: Probably about ten days ago, as best as I recall.

THE COURT: In ten days ago, the person, so far as you know, did not know the whereabouts of Bill Vance?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's true.

THE COURT: Did you have any reason to believe before yesterday that the person could disclose the whereabouts of Bill Vance to you?

THE WITNESS: No.

I probably should explain something, if I could, sir.

THE COURT: What I think you should explain, is why this sudden spurt of interest at this point when there's been one homicide trial and this one is so far over, why wasn't this course pursued before? That's what I think you should explain?

THE WITNESS: From what I was told, this person that I talked to just found out within the last few days where Mr. Vance was and he relayed the information to me.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Deputy Gleason, have you talked

to other informants, including members of the Manson Family, 15b-5 ı. such as the girls, who have been attending the trials, and have been present in the courthouse, other informants, including them, with regard to the whereabouts of Bill Vance? 15c fls. 5 A Yes. · 20

1 15c-1 And has that been a continuous thing -- well, has Q 2 it been a continuous thing -- well, has it been a continuous 3 thing? Yes. 5 And have you received any information prior to 6 yesterday from any of these persons whom you've called 7 informants or I've called informants with regard to the where-8 abouts of Bill Vance? No, not to his positive location. 10 And these are persons that you knew to be -- to have 11 been known to Bill Vance and who knew Bill Vance, these persons 12 that you've talked to? 13 Yes, most of the People knew him personally. 14 MR. MANZELLA: That's all I have, your Honor. 15 16 **CROSS** CROSS EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. DENNY: 18 Is John L. Ries, R-i-e-s, another alias of Bill 19 Vance? 20 It is a name I tried. I'm not sure if he's ever 21 used it or not, but the name came up that he may have used or 22 that he may have used that name. 23 Well, so that these teletypes that you've got here Q 24 for John L. Ries are just sort of a shot in the dark, is that 25 right? 26 Yes. . A 27 And you started sending them around July 27, 1971, 28 is that correct?

m 15c-2 1 1 That's the date that appears to CII. Apparently. "CII fugitive 7 27 71 1340 PDT"? 3 Α On the name Ries? Q Right. 5 Yes, that's right. Α 6 Q Well, is this one you sent or one that came back to 7 you? 8 Α Those, I believe, would be replies. 9 O "No Rec Ries, John L., CII Wanted Persons Unit 10 GM JN." That's a reply? 11 That would be a reply from CII. 12 Well, are these yellow sheets that appear to be 13 teletypes replies or in the main copies of --14 Well, this one, for instance, dated 1-6-71, "Refer 15 Deputy Gleason Homicide Bureau Det Div, no record vehicle 16 registered to Dwayne Ernest Schwarm as given in files." That 17 would be -- MVS Sacramento DMV; that's a reply? 18 Yes. 19 All right. And that's in January of 1971; January 20 6th, 1971? 21 A Yes. 22 Again, from MSV Sacramento DMV, January 6th, 1971, Q 23 nothing currently registered to David Lee Hamic. 24 That's one of Bill Vance's aliases, is that right? 25 Yes. A 26 All right. But that, again, is over a year ago, Q 27 January of 1971; is that right? 28 A Yes.

15c-3 Again, May 18, 1971, "No record driver's license 1 William Rex Vance, " doesn't seem to indicate where this is 2 15c-3 from. DDL CAE. 3 It would be DMV Sacramento. DDL is the initials A 4. for the driver's license section of DMV. 5 All right. And we've talked about this July 6 27. 1971 on John L. Ries. 7 Another one in -- apparently police department in 8 9 Cleveland, and I can't make out the date on that. But it is for John L. Ries, too. 10 11 And that didn't pan out anything, is that right? 12 That's a reply, also, from Cleveland. Α 13 Q Right. But you determined that John L. Ries is 14 not the name used by Bill Vance or have you? 15 That was another -- that was the shot in the dark. Α 16 Yes, that's what I was saying. You've determined 17 that that was not Bill Vance? 18 Well, they had no positive way of identifying him. 19 I think the teletype said they had no information on that 20 name. 21 THE COURT: Perhaps we can hold this until Monday 22 morning. 23 MR. DENNY: Well, may I inquire some further? I think it 24 would be a good idea to hold this, your Honor, until we can 25 go over these. 26 THE COURT: Well, this has been sprung on you rather 27 suddenly, and you may want to look --28

MR. DENNY: I would like to look at the teletypes, but

I would also like to get a little bit of information from 15c-4Sergeant Gleason right now, if I could, just briefly. 2 3 THE COURT: All right, if you would. BY MR. DENNY: Is Bill Cole now presently in the 5 custody of the Sheriff? б A No. 7 Q There in Missouri? 8 Α Νo. Q And you don't have any hold placed on him? 15d fol Α No. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

15d-1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

77

12

13

14

15 16

17

. . . . 18

10

20

21

22

20

24

26

27

28

- You don't know, then, that he has been advised by any counsel concerning what is like to occur as far as his being taken into custody as far as you and Sergeant Whiteley?
 - A As far as I know he was not advised of that.
- And this particular informent that you've talked about, you said you didn't have any reason to suppose that the person could tell you Vance's whereabouts in response to the Court's question, is that right? That before this time you had no reason to suppose, reason to believe this person could tell you about Vance's whereabouts?
 - A Right.
- Q But you say every conversation that you had with the information you talked about the whereabouts of Vance, is that right?
- A Well, we talked about Vance to see if -- if he had heard anything about where Vance was. But they are always in the negative.
- Q But you did feel that that particular informent, of all the informants you've talked to, apparently, would have some information about the whereabouts of Vance? That was your key to get to Vance; is that right?
- A Well, he was one of the persons I was talking to. Uh, he is the first person that's given me a positive location.
- All right. And this is a person that you've known since the beginning of the investigation of this case or approximately around that time?

A Yes. I met him probably a year ago was the first time.

Well, other than these teletypes and the things Q that you've mentioned --

By the way, without going through them, do you know, without having looked at them yourself, when is the most recent official communication by way of teletype or letter that you sent out in connection with your attempts to locate Bill Vance; the date or the approximate date?

Probably July of '71. July or August of '71. A

Q All right. Since that time, your efforts have been solely by phone call to people like your informant or phone calls from your informant?

> Yes. Α

And as far as this informant goes, are you refusing to identify the informant on some grounds that you feel his or her life might be in danger if you did disclose the identity?

A Yes.

I assumed that.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor --

THE COURT: What do you think the problem is in connection with that point?

> MR. DENNY: Beg pardon.

By whom -- directing the question to THE COURT: Deputy Gleason:

Who might harm him?

THE WITNESS: Uh, other friends -- or other persons

19

23

24

25 -26

27

28

15d-3

23·

 that have been involved in this case and other related cases.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, might Bill Vance harm him?

A That's possible, I don't know.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, I have no more questions of Deputy Gleason at this time. I do feel, though, that the People have made not a particularly great showing of due diligence in this connection; and

Secondly, the People have in no way indicated at this point, at this juncture, what the testimony would be. They say the testimony of Mr. Vance would be material, but not necessarily material to the prosecution. The prosecution is the one who wants to open this case, reopen this case. They can't say it is going to be material from that standpoint.

THE COURT: That's true.

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

MR. DENNY: And the defendant isn't requesting that the case be reopened. I don't know what the materiality or relevancy of his testimony might or might not be. I certainly, at this point, don't vouch for his credibility by any means.

As the Court points out, he, of all people next to Danny DeCarlo, is probably the next key suspect in the case, by the People's own evidence, if we are to believe Ruby Pearl. And I don't see: One, that they have established due diligence;

Two, I don't see that they have established in

15d-4

8.

. 15 e fls²⁰.

.26

any way what testimony they expect to get from him; and

Three, if, in fact, they do expect to grant him immunity for his testimony, I think there's a case that I made some note of, People vs. Newton, which Mr. Manzella brought up, at 8 Cal. App. 3rd.

THE COURT: Wait a minute.

Is it fair to use the People's authorities?

MR. MANZELLA: With our compliments, your Honor.

THE COURT: Go shead.

MR. DENNY: All right, 8 Cal. App. 3rd, 359, at 383, and it sets forth the factors --

THE COURT: 8 Cal. App. --

MR. DENNY: 3rd, 359.

The factors to be considered in reviewing the exercise of such discretion, that is the discretion to reopen, at a particular state of the case, stage of the case, I should say, include the stage of the proceedings, the stage the proceedings had reached when the motion was made and they cite People vs. Carter, 48 Cal. 2d 737 at 757 for that.

15e-1

3

4 5

6

8

- 7

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

22 23

24

. 25

26

27

28

48 Cal. 2d --THE COURT:

48 Cal. 2d 737 at 757. MR. DENNY:

"-- the diligence shown by the moving party in discovering the new evidence, -- " and they cite Fernandez vs. United States, a Ninth Circuit decision 329 Fed. 2d 899, at 903, "-- the prospect that the jury would afford it undue emphasis -- " and they cite Eason vs. United States, another Ninth Circuit case 281 Fed. 2d 818, 821-822, "And the significance of the evidence." Referring again to People vs. Carter.

And then, they note "reopening -- and its conceivably attendant consequences in terms of further proof, argument and instructions -- would have been inconvenient because of the stage of the proceedings at which the defendant moved but it was neither impossible nor unreasonable."

In this particular case, it was just a very small thing in changing the wording that had appeared in a document that had been introduced into evidence. But by changing that wording it completely changed the meaning of it from did to didn't, and the Court in that case merely permitted the parties, the prosecutor and the defense, to write in on the exhibit "didn't," instead of "did," as appeared. And then, sent it into the jury without any explanation.

And in that case, -- in this case, the Appellate Court said that the lower court had abused its discretion in not permitting at least that little thing because it wasn't such a big thing. It wouldn't have required an

15e-2

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10-, *

'II '

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

กะ

26

27 28 additional instruction. It wouldn't have required additional argument. It wouldn't have required a new day or days of testimony and cross-examination. It was a simple thing that should have been done.

But certainly in this case, I think the Court can envision what is likely to occur if it is necessary to go through the procedure of bringing Bill Vance back here, and I assume they're going to bring him back anyway, in leg irons, because they want him for a number of things. Passing checks is the least of the offenses that he's committed here that I am aware of and I think the Court is aware of.

THE COURT: Is there -- excuse me just a moment.

Is there, so far as you know, a warrant outstanding for Mr. Vance?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. DENNY: He may not --

THE COURT: He may not choose to waive extradition.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, that's a problem we really don't have to get to at this point.

THE COURT: Well, as a practical matter --

MR. MANZELLA: I don't think so. We're not asking for a continuance. By Monday morning when the court is ready to proceed, we will be ready to proceed with Mr. Vance, as the Court allows us to or we'll say to the Court we don't have Mr. Vance, in which case Mr. Kay will finish his argument. In other words, we're not asking for a continuance.

What we're trying to show here is we have exercised diligence to find him and that, come Monday morning, if we

15e-3

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8. 9.

10

11

12

13 14

> 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

. 25 26

27

28

have Mr. Vance here and can put him on the stand, we will argue or we will -- maybe we'll argue now that the law permits us to do that.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Denny.

MR. DENNY: Well, may I inquire just one further question?

Q BY MR. DENNY: Where, specifically, is Mr. Vance now?

A He's in a residence near a town of McFall, Missouri, which is in Gentry County.

Q Where?

A McFall, M-c-F-a-1-1. I don't have his address.

Q Is there any reason why you have not teletyped the Sheriff to take him into custody since there is this outstanding warrant?

MR. MANZELLA: I think, your Honor, I think -- I don't want to get into it now, but picking him up assumes a fact -- Deputy Gleason and the Sheriff of Gentry County have been in contact. The Sheriff has been in contact with Mr. Vance.

THE COURT: Go ahead and explain it.

THE WITNESS: Well, my only contact with Sheriff
Rainey has been to positively identify Mr. Vance. We have
not spoken about taking him into custody or the fact that
there was a warrant outstanding for his arrest.

Q BY MR. DENNY: Well, that's what I want to know.

Is there any reason why, knowing now, through your conversation at least two hours ago with Sheriff Rainey, that the William -- whatever his name is that he is going

15e-4 under now --1 THE COURT: Cole. Q BY MR. DENNY: -- Cole or whatever -- is the 3 same person as the Bill Vance you've been looking for, and with the warrant outstanding, that has been outstanding for 5 sometime, why have you not teletyped Sheriff Rainey to take 6 him into custody --7 MR. KAY: I think that's irrelevant. 8 BY MR. DENNY: -- on an outstanding warrant. 15f f1s. THE COURT: It probably is. 11 12 13 14 15 . 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 . 25 26 28

15f-1

MR. DENNY: Well, I think there's some relevancy, your Honor, in the good faith of the People at this time in making the motion that they're making. If what they are doing — and as I see what they are doing, is they've got him set up there. Then, they're going to send Sergeant Gleason and — Deputy Gleason and Sergeant Whiteley back to talk to him before he has the advice of counsel, before he has the opportunity to talk to any lawyer, which he would have the opportunity to do if he were taken into custody.

Now, the normal procedure in a case of this kind is, if you know that there's a suspect and there's a warrant outstanding, you tell the Sheriff in the place where you've located him, you teletype the Sheriff a copy of that warrant and he goes out and, based on that warrant, makes an arrest.

And then, as the Court points out, a guy has an opportunity to get counsel to determine whether he's going to waive extradition or not.

What they're doing here, and it may be very good police work, it may be very good work from the prosecution, but what they're doing here is circumventing -- and I can't raise Bill Vance's constitutional rights, certainly, but I can put it on the record and point it out to the Court that's what's going to happen, is that these officers are going to go swoop down on Bill Vance and Little Patty and talk to them there and try to get them to come back here and waive extradition and all the rest of it that's required without the advice of counsel. And I submit that under all the circumstances of this case, it just doesn't look too good, when we've got it on the record here from

5

б

7

8

9

Deputy Gleason that he's made the identification and that a man is sitting there ready to be arrested, that he hasn't got the man arrested so that he has the opportunity to get the rights that are supposed to be accorded an arrestee, and that is the advice of counsel.

MR. KAY: That's why I objected, it is irrelevant.

MR. MANZELLA: Since he hasn't been arrested, he hasn't any rights of an arrestee. Mr. Denny's concern for Mr. Vance's rights are touching.

THE COURT: He's not concerned about Cole's constitutional rights.

I understand that. We all catch his MR. MANZELLA: I think we do. But still it is not relevant to our consideration here.

THE COURT: No. it isn't. I don't think it is, in any event.

MR. MANZELLA: Now, Mr. Denny talked about -- I'm prepared to talk about these cases, if the Court wants me to.

I think not. I think we'll close it for the THE COURT: night since it is five minutes to 6:00 and our reporter is about ready to drop. I'll hear from you on Monday. Can we assemble early on Monday, 8:30?

MR. MANZELLA: 8:30 is fine.

THE COURT: And may we have the Sergeant here, and I would like to have that informant here.

MR. MANZELLA: Can I talk to Deputy Gleason just a moment?

THE COURT: You're not a Sergeant, are you?

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

Ìľ

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

THE WITNESS: No. a Deputy.

THE COURT: May we have the Deputy here. Just so we have the right identification.

(Whereupon, Mr. Manzella conferred with the witness off the record.)

MR. MANZELLA: Deputy Gleason says he can reveal who the informant is, your Honor, now, if that's bothering the Court. If it isn't --

THE COURT: It is kind of bothering me.

MR. MANZELLA: Go ahead, Deputy Gleason.

THE WITNESS: The person I received the information from was a Larry Larson, L-a-r-s-o-n.

. THE COURT: I don't recall having heard his name, anyway. MR. MANZELLA: He's not connected with the Manson Family, your Honor. He's a private citizen.

THE COURT: Aliases.

Do you have any questions? I know you have some more, what you want to pursue at 8:30 on Monday morning --MR. DENNY: Yes, let's do that.

THE COURT: But this inquiry is really to determine the extent of or lack of diligence on the part of the People, part of the law enforcement in locating Vance. And I will let you, when you have further information, make your -- enlarge upon your motion by telling the Court and counsel what you would expect to prove by Vance, if anything.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, Deputy Gleason -- as far as what we have done to locate Mr. Vance, Deputy Gleason will not be needed Monday morning; is that correct?

3

4

5

6,

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

15h fol 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, I would like the Court to make an order that in view of the fact that there's been testimony that other documents, other teletypes, other letters have been sent out, I would like the Court to make an order that Deputy Gleason or the party who sent the teletypes on his behalf or sent letters on his behalf bring into court the complete file of all of the documents showing all the attempts that have been made since September of 1969 to locate William Vansickle or Bill Vance or whatever other name that he goes by, because there's precious little here in the special exhibit to confirm that much attempt has been made, at least as far as teletypes go. And all we've got now, the evidence that while I got together as much as I could in the time that I had -- that he's got the whole weekend. And I think that that's little enough -- if they can expect to get that documentary evidence in, as to what things actually have been sent out.

THE COURT: Well, it appears pretty sparse to me. I was looking at it just briefly, and it does appear sparse. And if you wish -- however, I don't see it is to your advantage if you oppose the motion --

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, I -- again, just get the facts before the Court.

MR. MANZELLA: Deputy Gleason tonight will go through the rest of the files and come up with the rest of the teletypes that he has.

THE COURT: All right. I would like to have this informant here.

Would you tell him that we can't -- he could be

б

8.

subpoenaed, I suppose, but would he come without a subpoena?

I don't want to put anybody to the trouble of subpoenaing him.

THE WITNESS: I think he would. He would rather not, naturally.

THE COURT: Well, it would be -- if the defendant agrees, we could have it in a closed session so he needn*t be -- his identity would not be exposed generally.

MR. DENNY: I'm sure that I could work that out, your Honor, if that were of concern to him. You might tell him that THE WITNESS: I know that would be of concern to him.

MR. DENNY: Well, your Honor, I've got a problem in this respect, and I appreciate Deputy Gleason's current concern, but I think as an attorney for the defendant, I have to run down what information I can about this gentleman. And it is going to require my making some inquiries about who he is and what connection he's had with the Manson Family. So whether the hearing is held in camera or not, his name having been disclosed by Deputy Gleason at the instance of Mr. Manzella here, I certainly don't think I should be bound not to make inquiry of those members of the Manson Family that I know to determine who he is and his reliability for anything of that kind.

THE COURT: I don't think that s too important, do you, at this point? And the question we're inquiring into, which would be important to the Court, would not be what the connection with the Manson Family might be, but what his connection with Bill Vance might be.

MR. DENNY: Well, Bill Vance was connected with the

already marked as an exhibit or were they through informal 1 channels? In other words, through the informants, such as this 2 investigator that you have told us about? 3 Most of it was checking his addresses and talking Α to people that he knew, people he worked with. 5 These records here are only to determine if he had 6 recently applied for a driver's license or recently received 7 a traffic citation. Some way to determine -- if he was driving 8 a vehicle, we could contact the owner of that vehicle. 9 All right. / 10 But most of it would be verbally. 11 12 All right. THE COURT: All right, fine. See you all at 8:30 13 14 Monday morning. THE WITNESS: Do you wish that person here? 15 THE COURT: Yes, let's have him here. 16 Do you want him here, Mr. Denny? 17 MR. DENNY: I think it would be beneficial, your Honor, 18 19 yes. THE COURT: All right, have him here. We needn't 20 subpoena him. Tell him we'll take it in camera. 21 MR. DENNY: Plus the other documentary stuff. 22 MR. MANZELLA: I'll bring that in, your Honor. 23 (Whereupon, there was an off-the-record discussion 24 between counsel and the Court, and the following proceedings 26 were had:) MR. DENNY: Let's just get back on the record for just 27 28 a minute.

. 1

Deputy Gleason has indicated this investigator is going to be real unhappy, et cetera, coming in. And I wasn't sure from the tenor of what you said at the close here whether you wanted him specifically, having asked earlier to get him in or whether you just want him in for my benefit or what.

THE COURT: In view of the Court's finding out what his position is, I'm less inclined to want him in. However --

MR. DENNY: Well, can we leave it this way, your Honor, if that is the case -- because I would want him in to question him if I can't get some information from him. Deputy Gleason says he's going to give him a call and I will call him, and then if I am satisfied with what I get, can we just leave it at my discretion to have him come in or not?

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DENNY: Fine.

THE COURT: That's all right with me.

DEPUTY GLEASON: Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 6:10 P. M. an adjournment was taken in this matter.)