SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 2 HON. JOSEPH L. CALL, JUDGE DEPARTMENT NO. 52 3 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, .5 Plaintiff. No. A 267861 7 STEVEN GROGAN, Defendant. 9 10 **11** 12 REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT 13 Wednesday, July 14, 1971 14 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: 15 (See Volume I) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23. 24

Reported by:

VERNON W. KISSEE, C.S.R. HAROLD E. COOK, C.S.R.

Official Reporters

28.

25

26

27

VOLUME XIV:

Pages 1795 to 1839

disrupt you.

MR. WEEDMAN: Excuse me, your Honor, (Short pause,)

THE COURT: Excuse me. I won't bother you again.

O BY MR. WEEDMAN: So if you are selected to deliberate with the members of the jury who are already in the box, do you feel that you would be able to hold this middle position? Do you think that you will be able to go through the entire trial and not be a partisan for one side or for the other?

TREE CONTRACTOR

A I could.

Tke 2

·

i

.

.

2Ì

.22

And in that connection do you feel, Mr. Sweden, that you will be able to withstand the various onslaughts, of course, that may really bombard you during the course of this trial; for example, statements by counsel, arguments by counsel, opening statement by counsel, none of those things, of course, being evidence in the case, will you be able to view all of those things in their proper context and not suddenly say, "Oh, so that's what this case is all about," and in some capricious way suddenly abandon your middle position and make up your mind in that fashion.

Will you avoid doing all of that?

- A Yes, I would.
- And particularly will you wait until you hear all of the evidence in this case, bearing in mind that the prosecution puts his case on first and that this case may last that is, the prosecution's case may last for several weeks and you are really not going to hear from the defendant at all during that time.

Will you obviously wait until you hear our side of the case?

- A Yes, I would.
- Q And with respect to evidence that comes from witnesses, will you not be -- will you not be the kind of juror that believes everything that he is told without any critical examination of it?
 - A No.
 - Q All right.

Ϋ́ 8

.9

10 11

12

13

14

. 16.

17.

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26 27

28

You understand that during the course of the trial it is not only the duty and the obligation of counsel but often it is the pleasure of counsel to cross-examine witnesses, and will you particularly not begin to accept testimony until you have heard cross-examination?

Correct.

And will you particularly bear both with me and Mr.Katz when we are cross-examining a witness; for example, I am sure that you will not expect some kind of Perry Mason kind of technique where the witness suddenly breaks down and says, "Oh, you have got me, I have been lying all this time"?

A No. I wouldn't.

In other words you, I am sure, appreciate that cross-examination, for the benefit of the jury, really, cross-examination, if it is going to have any effect upon the direct testimony is going to be a much more subtle matter than that and it is going to call for some subtle appraisal by the jury; and I am sure you appreciate that, Mr. Sweden.

A Yes.

And again, during cross-examination will you maintain this sort of middle position, this kind of neutral position that the jury is really obligated to maintain?

A Yes, I would.

Q Okay.

Very often counsel feel the jury is just waiting for cross-examination but that if cross-examination is not somehow spectacular or dramatic, as I have suggested, then we suspect that some was jurys just blindly accept

everything that is said on direct examination. I take it you wouldn't do that? other words, I take it, Mr. Sweden, that you, in maintaining your middle ground are always going to be critical --Έ Yes, I would. -- of testimony in this case, irrespective of Q from where it comes or from whom it comes, whether they be prosecution witnesses or defense witnesses. Correct. 15. Ĭ9 5

3.

3-1

.3

19.

20:

23.

Q I believe we touched on this point, but if not I would like to. If we have, I would like to mention it again.

That is with respect to the volume of evidence here. I am sure you appreciate that this being a circumstantial evidence case, that where direct evidence, for example, a person says, "Yes, I saw Mr. A cross the street" -- after all one witness can prove that up. But if we are going to prove that up circumstantially it may take 25 witnesses.

have a great many more witnesses than the defendant in this case and particularly will you not abandon your middle ground and say — and by the way, Mr. Sweden, some of these questions may strike you as a little silly, but I feel compelled to put them in the form of a question so at least we can explore these areas with you.

Will you not in such a case, obviously, say, "Well, the People produced 10 times as many witnesses or 20 times as many witnesses as the defendant, and therefore the People certainly have by a preponderance of witnesses proven the case."

I am sure you are not going to do that.

A No.

As a matter of fact, to test that out, Mr. Sweden, let's suppose that the People produce a 104 witnesses in this case and the defendant doesn't produce any. As a matter of fact, let's suppose the defendant doesn't even testify, but after a careful consideration of all of the evidence and maintaining your center position, your objective position, your third party position, if after all that you are not satisfied

•	
3-1 , 1	that the People have proven their case to a moral certainty and
2	beyond a reasonable doubt, I take it you are going to acquit
3.	my client?
4	A Correct.
5	Q That will be true if the people produced a thousand
. 6	witnesses, isn't that so?
7	A Right.
. 8 :	HR. WEEDMAN: All right.
9	Mr. Sweden, thank you, sir, very much.
10	Pass for cause.
11	MR. SWEDEN: Your Honor, I spoke with my employer
12	THE COURT: Well now, wait just a minute, please. Let's
13	wait a minute.
. 14	Do you want to interrogate on this?
15	MR. WEEDMAN: Yes
16	THE COURT: All Eght.
17	Q BY MR. WEEDMAN: Mr. Sweden, tell us what you
18	learned about this business of a possible financial hardship
19]	to you?
20	A He told me that I could stay on the case for the
21	duration of the time without any hardship on his part, He
22	would continue paying my salary.
23	Q That is fine. In other words, this possible
24	personal hardship is not going to occur?
25	A No.
26	MR. WEEDMAN: Well, we are delighted.
27	Thank you, Mr. Sweden.
28	THE COURT: Thank you. I wasn't trying to be rude to you
	TP

but it is better that the interrogation come through the counsel than you and I carry on across the bench. Sometimes I do it, but there are special reasons for it. It is better to do it that way.

MR. SWEDEN: Thank you, your Bonor.

THE COURTS Thank you very much.

Go ahead.

MR. KATZ: Yes, thank your your Honor.

Q Mr. Sweden, let me assure you and the rest of the jurors at the outset I do not intend to call a thousand witnesses or indeed a hundred witnesses.

Mr. Weedman was bringing up -- and if your Honor will please excuse my back once more.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KATZ: Thank you.

Q Mr. Weedman was bringing up the fact that you are to accept everything without critical evaluation that unfolds from the witness stand.

In other words, if a witness gets up there and says that X is X, your job doesn't end with hearing that testimony. You have to evaluate that testimony in the light of the other objective evidence presented in this case and also evaluate the manner in which the witness testifies, his demeanor, his motive for testifying.

You will do that, won't you?

A Yes, I will.

1

4

5

٠6

:7 8:

g.

QF

11:

12 13

14

15

16

Ì7

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

and for example if the defendant takes the stand and says, "I didn't kill Shorty Shea" you realize your job goes much further than merely accepting that statement as fact. You must evaluate his testimony in the light of all of the evidence in this case; is that correct?

A Correct.

o If you believe, for example, that statement is false when you compare it with the other evidence in this case and the evidence in this case creates in your mind an abiding conviction to a moral certainty, I take it you would be willing to vote guilty: correct?

A Correct.

Now, Mr. Weedman, I am sure, wasn't attempting to be facetious when he was referring to the Perry Mason Show.

Did you ever watch that show?

A Occasionally.

O So did I. I noticed Hamilton Burger, who is the prosecutor, lost every case. Indeed I never saw him win any case.

In that connection you won't require me to conform to the high standards of Hamilton Burger in prosecuting this case; is that correct?

A No.

What we are saying is I don't mean that facetiously, we are not trying to entertain here. We hope you won't be bored, we hope you will give us your undivided attention in connection with the evaluation of the evidence in this case.

We are not here to entertain.

23 .

The other shows you have, The Defenders, a wonderful show, the Perry Mason Show, are designed to entertain, is that correct?

- A Correct.
- I take it in this case you won't require either Mr. Weedman or myself to entertain you but rather will require us to do the best job in representing our respective sides?
 - A That is right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

R

9

10

11`

12

13

14

15

16

17

18.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

	Q		Now,	Mr.	Swede	m,	Xón	have	heard	the	disc	cussion	WO
have	had	in	your	pre	son¢¢	COI	icer;	ning (circums	tant	ial	eviden	ce ,
have	Aon	not	:7									•	

- A Yes, I have:
- And did you have any quarrel with the law in this state which permits a man to be convicted of murder in the first degree based wholly on circumstantial evidence?
 - A No. I don't
- And did you hear his Honor state at the outset that the People will not present a body in this case; that is, any part of the body by way of photographic evidence, the body, itself, or any eyewitness to the killing or any eyewitness to having observed the body in death.

Do you understand that?

- A Yes, sir.
- Now, the law contemplates that the People may prove this case wholly upon circumstantial evidence; you understand that?
 - X Yes, I do.
- Is it fair to say that if you had a state of mind as you sit here now that, well, "I just don't like circumstantial evidence, I don't care what the law says about it, I am not going to follow the law of circumstantial evidence," you realize we couldn't get a fair trial; isn't that right?
 - A Yes.
- We hadn't given any example of circumstantial evidence since you were called in the last panel.

But let me briefly give an example of how we apply

6

7

8.

10

 \mathbf{n}

12

13

14

Ì5

16

171

18

it in our everyday lives. For example, you have a friend who is coming over to visit you and he drives a Mercury Cougar and you are inside the house and a car pulls up in the driveway and you hear the engine being turned off but you don't see the car and you don't see who is driving the car.

You open your door and at that precise moment your friend is getting out of the Mercury Cougar from the driver's side; there is no other person around; you conclude, without having seen your friend drive the car, that he drove the car over; isn't that right?

- A Correct.
- Now, the facts proven to you are that there is a Mercury Cougar, he is getting out of the car, you just heard it pull up and there is no one else around.

Isn't it reasonable to assume, then, or draw an inference that your friend just drove to your house?

- A Correct.
- Q I take it then that you apply circumstantial evidence in your everyday life; isn't that correct?
 - A Yes, I do.
- And I take it you are not afraid to draw, then, inferences from facts that are proven to you, is that correct?
 - A Right.
- Q And if you believed, based on the circumstantial evidence in the case, that the People have proven the crime of first degree murder beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, would you, nevertheless, hesitate to vote for guilty solely because we had failed to produce a body or an eyewitness

24

25

26

27

	1	
	2	
•	á	
٠	4	
	5	
	6	ŀ
	7	
	.8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	•
	18	
,	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23,	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	

, .				 •
to	thank 111	in the	 . 3.	
	B COLOR	ing?		, h

I take it, then, you would not require the People to produce a body or an eyewithess to the killing or, indeed, an eyewitness to having observed the body in death so long as we met our burden of proof in law, which is proof beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty; is that correct?

· Correct.

MR. WEEDMAN: Excuse me, your Honor; I will object to the form of the question simply because Mr. Katz has constantly reiterated "the body," "the killing"; these are only alleged matters and I think to permit counsel to talk about "the body"-

MR. KATE: I don't mind saying "alleged."

MR. WEEDMAN: We'd appreciate that very much.

MR. KATE: Certainly; thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. KATZ: We realize at this point there is no evidence of any killing or, indeed, there is no evidence in this case at all; is that right?

Right.

So, certainly Mr. Weedman is correct, I should have prefaced by saying "the alleged body" and "the alleged killing" and, I believe, "the alleged witness who may have observed the alleged body in death."

In any event, you understand what I am talking about; is that right?

Yes, I do.

And I don't want to make the same mistake that

- O In other words, you would not automatically vote for life imprisonment upon the return of a first degree murder verdict without regard to the evidence; is that right?
 - A Correct.
- You would certainly want to know all of the evidence in this case, the moral culpability of the defendant, his involvement, how he felt during the alleged commission of the offense and his background and history, et cetera; is that right?
 - A Correct.
- Now, you distinguish between two situations, the situation A being, "I believe that capital punishment is appropriate under some circumstances"; and situation B being that, "I am called upon, myself, to personally participate in the death penalty verdict."

Do you recognize the distinction between those two situations?

- A Yes, I do.
- Q All right.

And in the latter situation you, yourself, are personally involved in making a decision as to whether or not another human being shall live or die; is that correct?

- A Correct:
- Q I assume you believe that that would be a very grave and serious responsibility; is that right?
 - A Yes, it would:
- Are you willing to accept that kind of responsibility if selected as a juror?

responsibility if selected as a juror in this case; is that right?

A Yes, I am.

Now, there is an area that I'd like to discuss with you at this point and it refers to one of sympathy.

With respect to the guilt or innocence phase, his
Honor will instruct you that your verdict is not to be
influenced in any way by any sympathy you may have for the
defendant or any passion or prejudice against the defendant.

If so instructed would you unesitatingly follow that instruction?

A Yes, I would.

2 You understand that whether or not Mr. Grogan is
19 years old or 25 or 40 or 50 or 70, he is to be treated
equally under the law; is that correct?

A Correct.

I take it you accept the proposition that if Mr. Grogan is shown by proper proof — that is, proof beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty — to have committed murder in the first degree, you will vote that verdict, despite his youthful appearance; is that correct?

A . Correct.

form, compromise your verdict in the guilt phase solely and in order to avoid the difficult position of having to determine whether or not another human should live or die, in the penalty phase; is that correct?

1 Right.

What I am saying is this, you would realize, for example, in the guilt phase of the trial that, "If I vote for first degree murder, my gosh, I am having to then go into the penalty phase and make a decision whether or not somebody is going to live or die."

Do you understand that?

- l Yes.
- Some jurors, we have found from past experience, try and allow this consideration to influence them in voting the proper verdict in the guilt phase.

Do you understand that?

- A Correct.
- So that it would be wrong for you to vote a lesser verdict, say, second degree murder or an acquittal, if the evidence in your mind created an abiding conviction to a moral certainty of murder in the first degree.

Do you understand that? ---

- A Right,
- What you are telling me. Mr. Sweden, is that you would not allow these kinds of extraneous factors to influence your fair and impartial determination of the evidence in the guilt or innocence phase; is that right?
 - à Correct.
- Q Is there any reason you can think of why you could not give both sides a fair trial?
 - A None whatsoever.
- Q If you were the prosecutor in this case would you be willing to have 12 jurors of your same frame of mind sit

1	in judgment on all of the issues in this case?
22	A Yes, I would.
3	Q And the same would hold true for the defendant; is
. 4	that right?
.	A Right.
6	MR. KATZ: Thank you, sir.
7	Pass for cause.
8	THE COURT: Very well.
	MR. KATZ: Accept the alternates.
10	THE COURT: Very well.
11	Shall we swear the jurors?
· 1 2	HR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor.
13	MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
1,4	THE COURT: Very well.
15	You will now swear the alternates.
16	(The three alternates were sworn by
17	the clerk.)
18	THE COURT: Now, let's see, first we can excuse the other
19	folks in the back of the room, let them go back, and we'll see
20	where we are.
21	Before we go further, I have some statements to
22	make, and I will talk to you gentlemen.
23	MR. KATE: Certainly, your Honor.
24	
25	
26	
27	
	

Tke 5

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

IJ

12

13

14 15

16

17.

·18

19

20,

21 · 22

23

24

25

26

27 28 THE COURT: Now, first of all I want to talk to you alternate jurors who have just been given the oath.

Mr. Clerk, you administered properly the same oath to the alternates that you did to the regular jurors, that is correct, isn't it?

THE CLERK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: That is what the code says.

THE CLERK: It is. Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, first of all, so that you three alternates will know just where your position or standing is in this case, I am going to read to you the code section on the powers and the duties and the obligations of alternates. It is covered by section — basically Section 1089 of our Penal Code.

And the clerk has sworn you now to act in the capacity, you are alternate jurors.

The code says -- I am going to read it word for word, so much as applies to our case and to you:

"Such alternate jurors" -- that is you three -"must be drawn from the same source and in
the same manner and have the same qualifications as the jurors already sworn."

That's the 12 jurors here.

"And be subject to the same examination and challenges."

Now, I cut out only what is not pertinent.

"Such alternate jurors shall be seated so as to have equal power and facilities for

11[.]`

14 7

19̀

seeing and hearing the proceedings in the case.

So that is, so far we have got you right where you are there. That would remain your seats. If any of you can't hear all the proceedings, see everything that goes on, just tell me.

Please just say, "Listen, I can't see what's happening. I want to get a better view of the proceedings."

If there is anything that comes up that prevents any one of you from seeing everything that takes place -I think you can, but if there is any question don't hesitate to tell, me.

Now, I will proceed. Check right back with the code on you have.

"They shall take the same oath as the jurors already selected."

"That has been given to you.

"They must attend at all times upon the trial of the cause in company with the other jurors. For failure to do so they are liable to be punished for contempt."

Now, what I am trying to get over is the point that you must see and hear everything that is said in the trial of this action. And the court -- this court cannot start to proceed, we cannot operate court and take testimony I am spelling it out -- until every one of you folks are seated there. Just like we can't proceed until the lawyers are there, until the defendant is here. And until every one

5-3

3.

4,

.6

7.

9.

of the 12 jurors are here,

So you must be right here ready to proceed.

I will proceed further:

of and be bound by the orders of the court.

Upon each adjournment of the court if the regular jurors are ordered to be kept in the custody of the sheriff during the trial of the cause the alternate jurors shall also be kept in confinement with the other jurors."

Now, right at this point I want to say to all of you I do not anticipate during the trial of this case putting anyone under the control or the custody of the sheriff. In other words, keeping you, to spell it out, keeping you here and not letting you go home to your home at night. I don't anticipate that at all.

The power is there, but I don't want you to worry about anything you don't have to worry about. And unless something unusual happened — and I know of no reason for it — you will go back and forth from your homes just as you always have been under the orders of the court not to discuss the case with anybody or come to any conclusion or opinion.

Now, we will proceed:

"Upon the final submission of the case to the jury such alternate jurors shall be kept in the custody of the sheriff and shall not be discharged until the original jurors are discharged."

Tke 5A.

б

Q

. 16

of jurors under the custody of the sheriff while the jury is making a decision quilty or not guilty, as an illustration, is up to me. And I won't keep -- I am leaving my mind open, but I won't keep anybody under the lock and key of the sheriff unless I am convinced it would absolutely have to be done. I know of no reason for it.

Now, we come a little more to the alternates again.

"If at any time, whether before" -- that means
generally during the trial of the case --

"or after the final submission of the case to the jury" -- that means generally the jury is sent to the jury room by the judge, by the court and told, "Now, here are your instructions. I have given them to you. You decide the case."

Now, "If at any such time or during the trial a juror dies or becomes ill or upon other good cause" -- that the judge, the court passes on as being most substantial cause, real cause then -- "and the juror is unable to function

as a juror" -- then the judge may excuse that juror and one of the alternates -- the code uses "the court may order the juror to be discharged" -- or excused.

And then the court instructs the clerk to draw the name of an alternate, one of you three, who shall then take the place in the jury box of the regular juror discharged. That is all clear to you? In other words, "Mrs. Smith," or "Mrs. Jones, you go over there." Your name is drawn from the

5a-2

,2

1

3

5

6

7

8

ġ

10

IJ

12

13

14, 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23 ;

24,

25 °

27

28

box as one of the three alternates, and then if that same unfortunate situation occurs, another alternate would be placed in by drawing from the box.

And if such is the case then an alternate takes the place of a regular juror, the alternate then is subject also to the same rules and regulations as though he had been selected as one of the original jurors. In other words, you step right in there and take over just as though you had started from scratch as an original juror.

Is that all clear to you? And you vote on the questions, all the questions that come to the jury, you vote upon.

Now, basically, that pretty well brings you up to date or covers, is a betterway, your duties and responsibilities in the trial of this case.

You have very serious responsibilities. And the regular jurors have very serious responsibilities in the acting as a juror in this case.

And they, as I have said many times -- you folks, all of you, you simply take over a great deal of the powers or the duties or the rights that I would have as a judge.

I move right over to you, just like I would say, "Here they are, you take them." They are your duties and rights basically, the finding on the facts in the case.

As a judge, with the jury in operation, the trial by jury, the judge -- and I know I have said this and I am sorry I have to repeat it -- but as we go along repetition is necessary. The jury decides all of the facts in the case.

5a-3

ŀ.

2

ż

4

5.

б

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

i5

16

17

18

19-

2Ö

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

I do not pass on the facts. And you are the judges. You are the judges of the facts in this case.

I am out, if I can put it bluntly. I am out. I am not in the fact-finding side of the trial of this lawsuit at all. The jury is the judge of all of the facts. The credibility, the honesty, the integrity, the lack of honesty, the lack of integrity of any witness. Any witness. Any factual matter. Any matter of fact. Matter of truth. Matter of lack of truth.

All of those matters are for the jurors and the jury to decide in this case. It is your responsibility and your duty, And I have no rights nor do I possibly claim any in the question of facts. It isn't mine. It is yours.

Now, a great deal of this I have covered. Before I forget it, may I again have a stipulation, or do you want me to reread the charges of the indictment that I have read to the jurors a number of times? I am glad to reread them to the alternates and also the regular jurors, although I think we had a stipulation on them.

Do you want to reread that?

MR.WEEDMAN: Your Ronor, I would appreciate your reading the charge.

THE COURT: The charge?

MR. WEEDMAN: The charge, yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I will do it.

Now, again I am going to reread the charge that has been filed --

MR. WEEDMAN: Excuse me, your Honor. I wonder if we might

fin -4

2

. 1

3

4 5

6

7

8

10·

11[°]

13.

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22° 23

24

25

.26 27

2ŝ

approach the bench in that connection for just one moment.

THE COURT: Surely.

MR. WEEDMAN: I would appreciate the opportunity.

THE COURT: Do you want the reporter?

MR. WEEDMAN: Not necessary, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Better come in here.

(Conference in chambers with both counsel and the defendant present, not reported.)

(The following proceedings were had in open court:)

THE COURT: Now, I am going to read to you the -- I will call it the word complaint, but it is technically called the indictment in which this crime is charged against the defendant. It reads as follows:

"is accused by the Grand Jury of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, by this indictment of the crime of murder in violation of Section 187 Penal Code of California, a felony, committed prior to the finding" -- that means the rendering of the indictment -- "and as follows:

That between the 16th day of August, 1969 and the lat day of September, 1969, at and in the County of Los Angeles, State of California,

the said defendant Steve Grogan did wilfully,

unlawfully and feloniously and with malice

aforethought murder Donald Jerome (Shorty)

5a-5

1 2

Ź

ĝ

Shea," S-h-e-a, "a human being."

Now, that is the charge and upon that charge as I said many times and I just have to repeat as I go along, the jury must make a finding, ultimately, when the case is all tried, you go to the jury room -- of guilty or not guilty and then I have many, many times laid out the subsequent procedure.

The jury finds the defendant in the jury room after the entire case is tried, the jury says not guilty, that concludes everything at that point. No further proceedings of any case. The case is concluded.

Tke 6

· -T

Ģ

Ś,

Q.

2Ì

The jury makes the finding of guilty as charged; then they set the degree. The degree is second degree, the case is concluded as far as further jury proceedings are concerned.

The jury makes a finding of first degree, the penalty hearing is held, and at the conclusion of the penalty hearing the jury sets the hearing, as I have heretofore indicated so many times.

Now, procedurally, that brings us up, again to that status of the case.

Now, as I have indicated, there is lots of, I guess, work to do, lots of testimony to take, procedure to be had, and I would ask all of you folks again -- and I have no complaints in the matter, simply repeating it -- make every effort to be here at 9:30, if you will, so we may proceed sharp at 9:30 because, as you see, we can't move until everybody is here. It is just kind of dead time until you are all here and counsel and defendant, everybody must be here.

Now, as has been indicated, there will be a number of witnesses called. I do not know who is going to be called, it isn't my business, I don't decide on the facts; I don't know who is going to be called, I honestly don't know. I could go so far as to say that I don't have the slightest idea who they are going to call, the People or the defendant. It wouldn't make any difference, anyway, because you are the judge of the facts.

But, it is obvious there will be some time

elements involved with a number of witnesses that will be called. You can't call all witnesses in one day, it takes time, so you must expect that there will be a number of witnesses that will be called and it will take time; and one thing that supersedes or is the foundation to all of that statement is this: that as you hear the various witnesses testify you must still -- and regardless of how many witnesses you hear talk or testify for one side or the other -- you must keep your mind open. That is so important.

It may be a hard order or injunction from the court to say that, to listen to witnesses testify and don't make up your mind. I am not saying all of that.

I am saying, don't make up your mind; that's very important, because you make up your mind, you hear some witnesses testify and you make up your mind, you are, in effect, prejudging the case. You must keep your mind open.

You must wait until all of the witnesses testify and you mustn't make up your mind. You can make a mental note of the testimony, but don't freeze your mind.

must not take issue, you mustn't take sides. As counsel have said to you, and I believe I did once or twice during the picking of the jury, you put it on both sides; if you were the People or the defendant, either way, you want to put it. You wouldn't want to have somebody in the jury box listen to one or two witnesses and make up his mind.

Let's say you were the defendant, as an illustration make up his mind when he hears one or two witnesses without

listening to all the testimony -- put yourself as defendant or put yourself as the plaintiff, either way you want to do it, I am not trying to pick out the defendant or the plaintiff either way, somebody suffers, somebody doesn't get a fair trial, that's a better way of putting it; somebody doesn't get a trial, either the People or the defendant is not going to have a trial here, a jury trial, if you make up your mind before you listen to all of the testimony and all of the proceedings in the case. You must keep your minds open.

6a

11 12

ነ

2

3

5

6

Ź

8

9.

10

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 4

.23

24

25

\$1.66\$\$\$\$\$\$\$

朝中等 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)

26

27

6a-1

6.

1,8

23· ,

24.

 may carry great weight. Well, fine, put it down in the back of your head, write it down on a piece of paper, but don't crystallize on it. Put it in the back there, get all the testimony in the case before you make up your mind in the matter.

Now, it is highly important, again I admonish you

Now, I said many times, it is true some testimony

Now, it is highly important, again I admonish you, you must not, folks -- this is very important -- you mustn't discuss this case with anybody, you just must remember that.

That is the reason, one of the basic reasons why in the past, in many cases, the court is given the power to take the jury in and lock them up.

I am not going to scare you; I am not going to do
it: I have no intention of doing it. I'd rather put it that
way -- lock them up and keep them during trial and they can't
talk to other people, they can't get information from outside
sources and they can't look at a radio and get information, or
a neighbor ringing up and, "Hello, what happened today?" None
of those sources.

Remember, you have a very serious position. You are a judge, you are a superior court judge, a judicious officer, in effect, certainly, so far as the facts are concerned.

You are a judge and you have very serious responsibilities, and you mustn't talk about the case; go home and say, "Well, today we had so and so on the stand," and talk about it. You mustn't do that.

You are going to find a moment -- just as an illustration -- you talk about witnesses who testified and what

6a-2 1

9.

19;

20.

·23.

25.

the facts are, and it may be done very innocuously, very innocently; before you know it you are freezing your mind; before you know it you are taking sides.

You say, "I wonder, this is proven, that is proven, or the other," instead of keeping your mind open, you crystallize your mind; you get in an argument with somebody and you are taking issues, you are taking sides.

You might as well be for the lawyer out there, for the People, or the lawyer for the defendant, either way; so that's just one of the many reasons you mustn't get into discussions. You mustn't talk about the case. Keep your minds open. Don't allow people to talk to you.

That is another problem, they come up, say, "What happened?" Something like that. I just tell them, say, "Listen, I can't talk about the case. I have taken an oath to try this case. I am a judge in the case. I decide the guilty or not guilty aspects, I can't talk to you about this case, don't talk to me about it, please."

And I would ask you, too, that if there is anything that arises by way of notoriety -- I don't know what it may be-accounts in the newspaper or anything on the television or radio or not, I would ask you, as an injunction or order, please abstain, keep away from the matter, because it leads to discussions, hearing somebody on the radio or somebody comments, "This happened, that happened." You are the juror in the matter and if you listen to these side comments, these discussions, before you know it you are freezing your mind one way or the other.

6a-3

. .

6b

15.

That is one of the problems you have when I let you go home at night and come back and forth. You must, on the other hand, obey the orders of the court and you mustn't discuss these matters, pick up items and read it and say, "By golly, I guess that's right."

You are the judge and what is right or not is from the evidence from the witness stand and not from the radio or television stand or not somebody you meet in the hallway or on the street car or bus, I should say.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

6b-1

2

1

3,

5

6

7

_

1Ò

ù

12

13.

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23.

24 25

26

27

28

You must keep your minds open and refrain from picking up any comments from any matter other than that established in court, because you remember this courtroom is where the trial is.

This isn't a curbstone, this is a serious situation and your opinions must not be influenced by what is called commonly curbstone discussions or what somebody else tells you in the grocery store or church or anyplace else. That's why you mustn't talk about it.

Once you get pulled into a conversation you're in trouble; the moment you get into a conversation you are in trouble, you can't miss getting in trouble. The moment you say, "Yes, two or three witnesses" --

"Who were they?"

"I don't know, a young man, old man, this man, that man."

"What did they say?"

There you are; now you are a partisan, you are getting partisan, you are talking, your mind is getting frozen automatically. You have got to keep it open, so you must not discuss the case with anybody.

So, please refrain from any discussion you may hear or comments over the air or in writing in the papers, abstain from them entirely.

Now, I have indicated a number of times the hours of court are from 9:30 to 12, 2 o'clock to 4. I would like to operate on the hours 2 to 4. There are problems, however, on that. I will stay with our schedule if I can.

2

3

5

6

7

8,

10

11

12

13.

14 15

·16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

We have difficulty -- some courts, many courts operate on the schedule of 1:30 to 4 o'clock, which is very commendable, so what I say is not in criticism.

We have some difficulty with -- undoubtedly we will have difficulty operating on the schedule of 1:30 to 4 rather than 2 o'clock to 4 for this reason: this big building here is a county courthouse, it is not what you might call the criminal courts, although this is a full-fledged criminal court and is used to try many, many criminal cases over here.

Basically all oriminal cases are tried in the Hall of Justice at Temple and Broadway; and you say, "Why did the case come over here?" It is only a matter of mechanics.

Well, simply, the problems are so many and so creat and there are so much, let's put it, volume of business, that only so many cases can be handled by so many judges in so many courtrooms; and when the pressure gets so great that there is no place to put a criminal case for trial -- you have got to be tried in 60 days after filing of the indictment -- the case has to come out and has to go to some courtroom. So, therefore, there are always -- there are one, two or three, four of the civil courts that do civil work, generally, that are more or less open to the overflow. Now, it isn't the word "overflow" is right -- to the "pressure of business" so as to get the cases out they come over here to these civil courts -- and I might say, incidentally, that only the pressure of business, litigation of trial, has been so much that I probably in the last year or two have been trying for two civil cases I'd try then I'd have a third, at least a third of the cases, maybe 40 percent

6c

of the cases that have been tried here in the last two or three years -- at least two years -- have been all criminal cases; and that's no different than any of these other cases that are going on. They come over here because they have to and they are entitled to a courtroom for immediate trial.

So, that's why they sometimes flow into what ordinarily goes in as a civil case. That's why we are trying it right here.

The 6c

К

• 17

18.

 $\hat{2}2$

I have drifted again. My point is this, that to start at 1:30 instead of 2 the district attorney's offices are over in the Hall of Justice, defense counsel has, obviously, has his office and there are some matters that do need attention.

of his own of certain cases, although he is dedicated, regimented to this case until it is tried. There is, nevertheless, a certain amount of business that must be tried, and so when he comes — or, defense counsel comes from his office to here or the district attorney from his office to here, it isn't like going down the elevator for one flight of stairs in the criminal court building at the Hall of Justice, right in the courthouse. It isn't a question of taking three minutes or five minutes in walking to an office in the courthouse. He has got to walk clear over here to this courtroom.

So I think it is better that I allow that latitude of 30 minutes instead of making the hours 1:30 to 4, that I allow the latitude in there of 2 o'clock to 4, although the time is needed, I am aware of it, for trial. The time is needed, but I think I will try to stand by the schedule of 2 to 4 rather than by 1:30 to 4, at least until we see how the practical aspects of it work out.

Therefore, after that long talk I have given you, the hours of court will be from 2 to 4 instead of 1:30 to 4 until I advise you to the contrary.

Now, one or two matters that I think I covered

6c-2

8..

13-

19.

25.

previously -- oh, yes, the People's counsel, the deputy district attorney and the defense counsel, each of them have a right to make, before they open their case, what is called an opening statement.

Now, I may be a little ahead of the picture, but I want to at least clear it in your mind -- I may repeat it later on -- an opening statement, let's say, by the People, Mr. Katz were to get up, or if I tell him, "Go ahead and put on your case, Mr. Katz," I say that now, he may say "Your Honor, I want to make an opening statement to the jury."

Now, an opening statement is a statement -- we'll take the People to start with -- by Mr. Katz, in which he'll say to you something like this, "We expect to prove the defendant guilty of this crime, and in doing so we expect" -- notice. I am using "expect" -- "we expect to prove to you that such and such and that this and this took place; and we expect to show this; and we expect to show this; and we expect to show this; and we expect to show this to prove the defendant guilty to a moral certainty and beyond a reasonable doubt."

In other words, it is an outline. It is just like the preface to an article or a book where the author makes a little preface to you, "Well, in this book the subjects I am covering are such and such."

It is a guide; it is used as a guide, probably, basically a guide, to advise the jury as to what he is about to do, what testimony he expects to produce to establish his side of the case.

He is talking about his side of the case and what he expects to show to you either by pictures or what is called physical evidence, or by testimony that flows from the witness stand; so that as he puts on his case you will have some idea of what he is trying to do.

Otherwise, you are in the dark and if he doesn't tell you what he expects to do you won't have much of an idea as to what he is trying to prove; so it is an outline.

T

11,

15-

.

.

8 ·

10,

Now, what he tells you is not evidence. This is the big thing, his statement is not evidence at all. It is just an advisory guide.

expect to do this."

Whether the testimony that is produced is true or false or good or bad or convincing or not is for you to decide. He is simply — and his statement to you is not an argument. He is not arguing this case. Get that clear.

The argument of a lawyer comes later when the case is tried. He will argue his case. He will say, "John Smith said so and so. Mrs. Jones said so and so. We have established so and so."

That is his argument. That comes at a later time,
But in what is called his opening statement it is
a statement of expectancy. Some courts have called it a
statement of expectancy.

It is a statement of what he says, it is a statement of what he expects to do to prove his case. So remember,
he is not testifying, he is not stipulating, he is not arguing,
he is simply — it is simply an inference or a guide of what
he expects to do to prove his case.

Now, so far do you think you have got that clear what he -- the strength or the effect of his statement, when he makes an opening statement to you?

Now, without going through the same statement in detail, just like I have, the same situation would apply basically to Mr. Weedman, if, as and when he makes an opening

¹ 2

3

5

6

Ź

8

٠ġ٠

ÍO.

11

12

13

14

. 15

16

17

18

ĮÌ

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

statement to you.

Now, the law says he can, but he has the right after Mr. Katz makes an opening statement, Mr. Weedman can get right up and say "I want to make my opening statement."

And he has a right to follow it right up. Or he may say to himself "I don't want to make my opening statement now. I just don't want to do that."

He is talking to himself: "I don't want to do it.

I will hold up my opening statement until the People put on
their case."

And then Mr. Weedman can say, "When I put on my case I will make my opening statement then. I don't want to put it on now."

He has that absolute right. That is up to him, I haven't anything to do with it. That is his right.

So I simply want to advise you that if he says, for instance, "Well, I would like to withhold my opening statement at this time," to the court, that is his business. It is his right. He may have good reasons for wanting not to make an opening statement at this time. So he has a perfect right to hold up an opening statement.

And maybe he doesn't want to give any opening statement. He has an absolute right. He can simply say, "I don't want to make an opening statement at all. I want to put on my testimony" or whatever he wants to do. He doesn't have to make an opening statement, and neither do the People.

The People don't have to make an opening statement, either. Generally they do, not invariably, but generally they

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

do. Not invariably, but generally they do. Generally defense counsel does, but it is entirely up to the lawyer whether that is the best procedure or not, whether he wants to make an opening statement or not.

He may have very good reasons he doesn't want to make an opening statement. That is his business. I just want to try to give you the whole panorama of the situation.

Now, let's see where we are. There are a number of things I had in mind to mention to you and some of them have slipped. Some of them I have covered. Nost of them I have covered, I believe.

I believe I have covered most of the matters.

Now, I tell you, I am going to talk to counsel for two or three minutes. I will take a short recess. Do not discuss the case. We will proceed in just a few minutes. We are at recess. Thank you.

Do you want to step in, gentlemen.

MR. KATZ: Yes.

MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Conference in chambers with both counsel and the defendant present, not reported.)

(Recess.)

数据 50% 计扩展

7a

28.

1

3

4

5

7:

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

.22

THE COURT: Now, gentlemen, we have all jurors in court. We have here the defendant Steve Grogan. We have both counsel.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we have been in chambers with counsel and defendant discussing some procedural matters, matters of trial, matters of possible testimony. That is as to the time, the place, the taking of the testimony, manners of testimony. All procedural.

And there are a great deal, a great number of matters and problems, serious problems of procedure and getting the witnesses here and some questions of study of statements of various witnesses that both counsel want to study.

They all have to do with the trial of this lawsuit. And it has been suggested, and I think very properly so, that now we have got our jury, we have been some time getting our jury here so again you can see some idea as to the magnitude, extent of the trial — that both counsel for the People and defendant are entitled to some time, to some aid and get ready to move. It takes time, rather than start in with one witness and cast around like somebody falling off a boat, as to who comes on next.

The case should be regimented so they can move. I think it is very important for both sides.

It has been suggested, and I think it is proper, that we go over because of the unusual length, number, volume of witnesses and other problems that I just can't start to enumerate to you, we go over till Tuesday morning at 9:30 to actually start the trial of this case.

I am convinced that it is important and necessary

7a-2

1,7

Ž3

for counsel to have that time to get ready.

And that doesn't mean that either counsel for plaintiff or defendant have been careless at all. That is not so. They are both very diligent counsel, and they are very learned counsel, both of them. And they are diligent in their application of their time.

So don't let me get you on the wrong street by suggesting that. To formulate the procedural matters, some witnesses have to come from out of State. Now, just to give you an idea, times have to be arranged, schedules have to be arranged.

So there are serious problems that both counsel have before them. Both of them have serious problems to formulate our procedures.

I think it is justified that we go over till Tuesday morning. We will be all ready.

I have advised counsel that I will give this time.

I will advise the jury to this effect. And they have advised

me they will be ready to go at 9:30 Tuesday morning.

So you can figure we will go and start in trial then. Now, again, this business about talking to anybody.

Keep in mind now you will have no jury work of any kind at all.

You can go home or about your business in a few minutes, until next Tuesday.

In other words today, Wednesday, when I let you go, you are through. Tomorrow Thursday you are through. There is no jury work. Friday there is no jury work. Saturday and Sunday obviously there is no jury work.

2

3

5

6

'

9

10 . 11

12

13.

14

15 16

> . 17

18.

. 4

19 20

2i

22

23

24

25

26

27 22

28

Monday there is no jury work. But Tuesday we start taking testimony. Tuesday morning at 9:30.

So keep in mind obviously you are in this case. You know you are sworn. Don't go back to the jury assembly room. I am saying that because some of you are laymen. You don't know about that time element.

You are in this case. You are sworn in here and as far as we are concerned we are in trial right now, actually. We are starting. No witnesses have been sworn but you have been sworn and we are in operation right now, in the trial of this matter.

So do not go back to the jury assembly room at all.

You can do anything you want to, but don't go back. And be
here promptly on Tuesday morning and we will proceed.

Do not discuss the case or come to any opinion or conclusion. I will recess you until 9:30 Tuesday morning. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

9:30 a.m.on Tuesday, July 20, 1971.)

展标点的原作程序

新建筑技术

化海线 建铁铁铁矿