## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES





DEPARTMENT NO. 52

STEVE GROGAN,

HON. JOSEPH L. CALL, JUDGE

,

4

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9. 10

11

. 12

13

14.

15

16<sup>-</sup>

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 .27

28

(A) (D)

PROPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

Defendant.

NO. A 267861

## REPORTER'S DAILY TRANSCRIPT

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 18, 1971

WATTELES

APPEARANCES:

(See Volume 1)

**VOLUME 35:** 

Pages 4589-4766, Incl.

Reported by:

VERNON W. KISSEE, C.S.R. -and-GEORGE WEBER, C.S.R. Official Reporters



CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES:

•	People v. Steve Grogan No. A267861	VOLUME Wed	35 Pag Inesđay,	es 4589 t August 1	o 4766, 8, 1971	Incl.
1						r
2 ·	IN	D E	X	,		<b>**</b> ***
3	PEOPLE'S WITNESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS	CHAMBERS
4 .	CROCKETT, Paul (Cont'd)	•	4593	4611	4621	
5	SAUNOOKE, Lee	4624	4636	4657 4670	4667	
6	•					
<b>7</b> .	WHITELEY, Paul J. (Resumed)	4673 4720				4681 (K) 4728 (K)
8.	#		4747			4730 (W)
9	· ·	* .				4740 (K)
10	GLEASON, William C. (Resume	đ) 4699	4703			
11 :						
12			• ·			ŀ
13	B X	HIBI	T S			,
14	PEOPLE'S		<del>10 to 14 (17 y 20 g) (</del>	FOR II	EN. IN	EVID.
15	9-A (Gun)		•			572
16	9-B (Gun)					572
17	67 -Aerial Photograph			4710		
18	68 -Aerial Photograph			4710		
19				#110		
20						
21						
						,
.55	•					
23				٠		
24					•	
25		,	*			
26.				•		
27						
28						
	•			•	•	

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 18, 1971 9:35 A.M.

> (The following proceedings were had at the bench outside the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, now, we are going to have trouble with the court which is trying Manson. They want all of our exhibits, and I won't give them to them at this time.

Judge Choate is a very fine man in every sense of the word. He is very courteous and kind.

Yesterday I gave him, only after talking with you two counsel, I issued the order to release certain exhibits because they can't move until they have these exhibits, some of them which we have here.

. 15

Now, they want all of our exhibits, and I said We are running this courtroom here. the answer is "No." I want to talk to you before I release anything.

I should talk to you gentlemen, and I will not arbitrarily throw these out because we will find ourselves

with the door locked and no exhibits to go by, you see.

I don't know what they want until they specify. Then I am going to talk to you because we have priority on all of this, and see if they release them. If they can't, fine, but they must work in unison with us which I think they will.

25

26

24

But I must tell you because I want Frank to tell them no more exhibits go out until we authorize it and get them back so we can proceed here.

27 28 MR. KATZ: Yes.

MR. WEEDMAN: I will just merely submit the matter to your Honor's sound judgment.

THE COURT: Well, I won't move, it is a joint matter, and of course I want to cooperate as much as possible, and you do to. But we should know where we stand before I start releasing anything because if I am not caution the first thing we know we can't move at all.

MR. WEEDMAN: That's right. It could happen.

THE COURT: So if they will specify what they want I will call you gentlemen to the bench, and if it is okay, out they go.

MR. WEEDMAN: I guess the record should reflect that I spoke with Judge Choate yesterday.

THE COURT: I told him to ring you.

MR. WEEDMAN: Yes. That's right. And then I called back and I spoke with your clerk, Mr. Hogan, indicating that we had no objection to releasing exhibits 1 through 20 at this time.

THE COURT: Fine.

MR. WEEDMAN: I just want to say that for the record.

THE COURT: I think you were called, too.

MR. KATZ: Yes. Well, I was present in chambers with Judge Choate at which time I indicated I would fully cooperate and indicated to him I did not object to the release of exhibits I through 20 at that time.

THE COURT: Well, all right.

Now, I won't release until I talk to you because I don't want to move unilaterally.

2 3

23° 

MR. KATZ: I would like to apprise the court that as soon as the People conclude their case in chief, which may be today or tomorrow I think at the latest, we are going to ask obviously before resting that all exhibits be received into evidence at that time. We are going to have all of our exhibits here.

I know that counsel in order to have an orderly record agrees with me. We will discuss as to each exhibit separately in their proper numerical sequence after which I will ask the exhibits be passed to the jury for their perusal before I rest.

THE COURT: The first step, we have got to have every exhibit here.

Mr. Hogan.

ļ

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 CLERK: Yes.

today or tomorrow, and we have to have every exhibit in this case here because there will be a formal offer that they be admitted in evidence as plaintiff's exhibits and they have to be right here on the counsel table at the time.

I'm telling you that so that you can start in to tell -- what department is that?

THE CLERK: 106.

THE COURT: -- that we will need them, Frank -- they have our exhibits 1 through 20-H?

THE CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: You might start to bug them on it right now, if you can.

Let's go ahead.

(The following proceedings were had in open court.)

THE COURT: People versus Grogan. We have the defendant, we have both counsel right here at the counsel table.

You can bring in the jury, Sheriff, if you will.

PAUL CROCKETT.

resumed the stand.

THE COURT: You have been sworn. State your name again.

THE WITNESS: My name is Paul Crockett.

(The following proceedings were had within the presence and hearing of the

jury.)

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

Now we have all of our regular jurors, plus THE COURT: 1 the three alternates, in court. 2 You may proceed, Mr. Weedman. 3 MR. WEEDMAN: Thank you, your Honor. 4 5 CROSS EXAMINATION (Continued) 6 BY MR. WEEDMAN: 7 Does the expression, Mr. Crockett, "coming to now," · Q -8 have any particular meaning or significance to you? 9 To me? A 10 Yes, sir. 11 Yes, it does. A 12 What does "coming to now" mean, Mr. Crockett? 13 It means that you are not living in the past, you 14 don't have any mental pictures that you are looking at from the 15 past or the present -- I mean, or in the future. 16 words, you are existing at the moment, or living. 17 "Coming to now" means that you are existing at the 18 moment? 19 In other words, your thoughts of the past and your 20 thoughts of the future are out of the way, and you are existing 21 or you are in the present time. 22 Is this a state which, in terms of what we are .23 talking about, is an unusual state for a person to have? 24 A Well, if a person is prone to daydream and such as 25 that, they don't find it very easy. 26 And in terms again of explaining this phrase, 27 28 "coning to now," do people in that sense live in the future or

1	exist in the future in some way?
2.	A They can, yes, by daydreaming about what they are
3	going to do tomorrow.
4	Q So they don't literally live in the future, of
<b>5</b> ″	course, but their mind is on something other than the present,
6	is that the idea?
7	A That is what I think the understanding of it is.
8	Q Is this a technical phrase, if you will, found in
9	Scientology?
10.	A I think you find it in psychology, also.
n j	Q Well, is it found in Scientology as a technical
12	term, a term of art?
13-	A I would say that it is in Scientology, I know that.
14	Q Would it be fair to say that you first heard this
15	phrase as part of your studies or learning in the area of
16	Scientology?
17	A No.
18	Q When you tell us that this phrase is found in
19 ′	Scientology, can you tell us where it is found in Scientology?
20	MR. KATZ: Objection. Immaterial and irrelevant.
21	THE COURT: Read the question, please.
<b>22</b> .	(The record was read by the reporter
23	as follows:
24	"Q When you tell us that this phrase is
.05	
25	found in Scientology, can you tell us where it is
26	found in Scientology, can you tell us where it is found in Scientology?")
,	

22

23

24

25

26

27

28.

THE COURT: Read counsel's statement.

(The record was read by the reporter as follows:

"MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, may I approach the bench, then?")

THE COURT: Well, of course, you can if it is material.

Doesn't the ruling cover it, Mr. Weedman?

MR. WEEDMAN: I would like to make a record, your Honor. THE COURT: All right, better come in chambers.

(The following proceedings were had in chambers, outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Now we are in chambers, the defendant and counsel.

best method.

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, my question really seeks to attack the credibility, of course, of this witness' testimony that my client confessed, or at least he overheard a confession, whatever the case may be, as to killing Shorty Shea.

The term "coming to now" has been a term which we have heard in connection not only with my client's purported confessions, but also in connection with Charles Manson.

We take the position that it is very likely that this term, "coming to now," is a term that was well known to Mr. Crockett because of his background in Scientology before he ever met Charles Manson and long before he ever met my client.

We take the position that "coming to now" is an expression, and we will produce evidence, and we will produce

7. 

9.

· 12

2A

2Ì

3

evidence certainly on the defense, is an expression which is not known to my client, it is not an expression that my client has used or would use; that it is a term which is unique to Scientology, not to general psychology, and we suspect that this witness, if I am permitted to probe this matter, may well concede that he was well aware of this particular term, had used this term long before any meeting with Charles Manson or any meeting with my client.

MR. KATZ: Your Honor, may I respond to that?
THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

MR. KATZ: I have no objection once again if Mr. Weedman inquires of Mr. Crockett whether or not he was in the habit of using this phraseology, "coming to now," whether he was familiar with the concept of such. But to go into particular aspects of Scientology would be irrelevant and immaterial and would cause us to have a trial within a trial, i.e., a trial concerning collateral issues which would unduly protract and prolong the trial.

2a-1

4. 

.24

Now, the evidence is clear, at least according to our witnesses, that the phrase "coming to now" was used both by Mr. Grogan and Mr. Manson, and there is evidence to show that Mr. Manson was an eclectic person, that is, that he borrowed phrases from many philosophies and many sources and appropriated them to his own use in connection with the fulfillment of his philosophy and the articulation of it.

And in that connection, I can't see how it is material if Manson, for example, drew from Scientology and used the phraseology "coming to now" for his own purposes. We have shown that the family is a unit and acted in concert.

THE COURT: I have a serious question about the materiality of it. I think we are drifting from the basic issues here.

I would be inclined -- Is there an objection made?

MR. KATZ: Yes; that it would be irrelevant and immaterial with respect to the present question.

THE COURT: I am inclined to sustain your objection. Objection sustained.

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, you know I have very little to utilize in effective cross-examination of Mr. Crockett. Our position, of course, is that Mr. Crockett's testimony is highly suspect.

THE COURT: Well, I think it would be, too, if you were to offer it as to what -- what did Manson say respecting who killed Shorty Shea. I think it would be very material testimony, very much. But you haven't got to that point.

I caution again -- I'm not trying to cut in on you-

I caution the question of attempting to bring that in by way i of cross-examination. I have a question as to whether it is proper cross. As your own witness, I would say "Yes." And that is my point. 9: ited a 26. 

3-1

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

**15** 

16

17

18.

19

20

21

22<sub>3</sub> 23

24

25

26

27° 28° MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor remembers then, of course, the conference that we had --

THE COURT: Yes. A long conference.

MR. WEEDMAN: That we had Monday.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WEEDMAN: And I have not, frankly, arrived at a decision whether I amagoing to ask Mr. Crockett that question.

THE COURT: I would go so far as this. I would have no objection -- in fact I believe I have the authority to do it as a court, to take him in and myself -- well. I don't want to appear partisan one way or the other, but the question could be asked out of the presence of the jury and plaintiff making his objection:

"Did you have a conversation with Charles Manson such and such a date?

"Yes.

"Respecting the" --- just briefing it over as to who, what was said about the death of Shorty Shea.

"Yes.

"What was said?"

Take it down in that transcript.

Now, the reason I am saying that is because in fairness to you, or in fairness to the People, you call this witness back, you don't want -- I mean as a matter of right you don't want to have him come on and say something entirely contrary to what all your indications are or the grand jury indicates.

In other words, if it is down here it would be

~~26..

. 27

28 -

followed up if you wanted in open court at a proper time as part of your defense. That is your decision. I am not trying to decide that for you.

MR. WEEDMAN: I appreciate that opportunity very much.

However, we have Mr. Crockett's statement to California

Highway Patrolman Steuber. I a very clear tape, and in which

he unequivocally states that Charles Manson did not name any

names in connection with Charles Manson's purported confession.

So I am not really terribly worried that he would change that under the circumstances.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. WEEDMAN: We also have his testimony before the grand jury basically to that effect. So I don't think that he would change it.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. WEEDMAN: But I appreciate that opportunity.

Your Honor, in that connection -- I am glad you raised it because I propose now to leave that question open as long as I can. I intend to have Mr. Crockett on the stand as a defense witness.

THE COURT: This is as your witness?

MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WEEDMAN: If I eventually decide to ask him this, then of course I will utilize him.

The reason I am not going to go into it now is because I am afraid that in the event that there is a conviction in this matter, I am afraid that the appellate courts

1 would then say that I had thereby waived all of my former 2 objections to lack of corpus delicti for homicide; lack of 3 corpus delicti for the conspiracy; and any objection, proper or 4 not, to the receipt in evidence of Charles Manson's statement to Barbara Hoyt. 6 So I am not quite ready to do -- not quite ready to 7 give up those points, possibly at least for a possible appeal. 8 THE COURT: Yes, I understand. 9 Well, not arguing this case one way or the other, 10 but from your standpoint, as a separate situation, would it not 11 from your standpoint be a more forceful presentation to put him 12. on as your witness? 13 MR. WEEDMAN: Yes. 14 THE COURT: And ask what was said? .15 MR. WEEDMAN: Yes. 16 THE COURT: These are factual matters. I am not advocating 17 one fellow against the other. These are facts. If he said it, 18it is entitled to go before the jury. 19 MR. WEEDMAN: It would have more force at that time. 20 THE COURT: I would still stand by my ruling on the last 21 question. 22 MR. WEEDMAN: Very well, your Honor. 23 I know you will understand, and I will try and 24 approach it from a different direction and hope that it is not 25 objectionable. But if counsel objects then --26. THE COURT: There is an objection as I understand. 27 MR. WEEDMAN: And if your Honor rules then perhaps my 28 statement of a moment ago will stand sufficiently for the

1 2

3.

4

5,

6

7 8

ġ.

10

11 12

13

14

15 -16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25· 26·

27

28.

record in this area so we won't have to come back into chambers again.

THE COURT: All right.

Let me make one more point. I may be jumping ahead.

But whatever can be ironed out ahead -- back to Crockett, the witness, respecting compliance with Spriggs, the Spriggs case.

Theoretically, Manson would have to be -- or actually Manson would have to be called here, asked questions so as to demonstrate inaccessibility as a witness on the stand, unavailability.

And then probably the technical procedure would have to take place if Manson would refuse to testify, which undoubtedly he would and maybe very properly so, or his counsel advise him not to answer, and he would not answer -- these are matters of policy, these are matters of decision for both counsel more than for me as a judge.

So you mustn't take it I am trying to tell anybody how to run a case, because you are just as capable as I am.

I am posing what I am thinking about.

For me as a judge to hear, it won't make any difference if Manson is out there or Kanarek is out there or 20 other lawyers, that wouldn't affect the legal point. What does Crockett say. But what the effect of Manson in the courtroom, the objection is made by Kanarek, objection sustained and then it is demonstrated his inaccessibility.

Then call Crockett, whether it would help the People

to have him there just by inference or not or the defendant,
I pose a serious question that maybe a stipulation respecting—
so that no points would be waived — a stipulation to the
effect that it may be deemed that Manson was called, that
objections were made, the objection sustained.

Stipulating to the propriety of the background, merely the procedural steps took place. I will make my ruling, then in that way. Any objections can be overruled, the People could object. They are not bound by stipulating to the ultimate fact. Merely to the procedural steps that have taken place.

Mow, that is something you may want to think about.

MR. WREDMAN: Of course it is agreeable with me, but it

may not be agreeable with Mr. Katz.

THE COURT: That is another thing there. Those are things for you to decide about.

I say that whether these are your decisions, what whether it would help you or not as a matter of policy, what the jury might think or they might not think I don't know.

Those are your decisions.

## 

3A

3

1

2

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16 -

17 18

19

20

21

22

23° 24

**2**5

26

27 28 MR. KATZ: Yes.

MR. WEEDMAN: All right.

THE COURT:

question.

THE COURT: All right. Let's go ahead.

MR. KATE: Well, I don't see any problem, your Honor, simply because Mr. Manson cannot be called in front of the jury presumably until it was determined that he was going to testify freely and voluntarily. Therefore, the proper procedure is to call Hr. Manson, if at all, out of the presence of the jury and in the presence of Mr. Kanarek he asserts his privilege in self-incrimination.

THE COURT: That takes stipulation.

MR. KATZ: It doesn't take a stipulation at that point.

It is factually supported in the record at which time Mr. Manson would never appear in front of the jury. So I don't see the problem.

THE COURT: Well, I would disagree with you. I would say that the procedure — the jury is entitled to pass on the credibility of anybody. They are to judge, and when you are speaking of any of those people who are witnesses that the matter is a matter that — in a jury trial their presence is entitled to be before the jury unless you stipulate to the contrary.

MR. KATZ: Well, we haven't reached that point yet.

I am here to try the case. But I simply pose the

Well, you don't have to fight that one out now.

Well, I know. It doesn't make any difference

(The following proceedings were had in 1 \* open court in the presence of the jury.) 2 :THE COURT: We are back in the courtroom. All parties 3 are here. Sustained. Ask you next question, Hr. Weedman. 6 BY MR. WEEDMAN: Are you telling us, Mr. Crockett, 7 that prior to meeting Charles Manson and prior to meeting 8 members of the Manson family, you had never heard the phrase "coming to now"? 10 Ä I did not say that. 11 Well, had you heard the phrase, "coming to now" --12 Q and I am just seeking to clarify, of course --13 You mean "coming to now," that particular phrase? Α 14 0 Yes. 15 In that particular order? Not the context of A 16 17 what you were saying? Well, my question apparently is not clear to you. 18 Q And there is some confusion. 19 20 Let's see if we can straight it out, Mr. Crockett. I will withdraw the pending question. .21 22 We were speaking a moment ago of the phrase "coming to now," And you explained what this means. 23 24 A Yes. 25 And I believe you indicated to us that this was an expression or a phrase that had some particular meaning in 26 27 Scientology, and you went beyond that and said that you felt 28 or believed that it also had some meaning from general

psychology. Ì Am I correct so far? 2 (Nodding head affirmatively.) 3 THE COURT: Don't nod your head. 4 THE WITNESS: Yes. 5 Thank you. THE COURT: 6 BY MR. WEEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. 7 Now, do you now tell us -- yes or no -- that you 8 had never heard this phrase prior to meeting the Manson 9 family? 10 MR. KATZ: Excuse me. There is an objection on the 11 grounds of the latent ambiguity, that is, is he talking about 12 the concept of coming to now, or the specific words in their 13 14 sequence, "coming to now"? THE COURT: First of all, I will take an answer yes or 15 16. Then whither I rule is another situation. 17 You can answer yes or no. 18 THE WITNESS: Which question? 1<u>9</u> THE COURT: All right. 20 Read the question. Then you can answer yes or no. 21 MR. WEEDMAN: Let me withdraw the question, your Honor, if I may. 23 THE COURT: All right. 24 BY MR. WEEDMAN: When did you first hear the phrase Q 25 "coming to now"? 26 That's better. A 27 The first time I heard it in that particular 28 phrase was with Charlie Manson.

- 4	
1	Q Had you heard a phrase similar to this phrase from
2	Scientology?
.3	A Not exactly that way, no,
4	Q Well, what would the phrase have been that you
5,	heard from Scientology?
6	A "Present time."
7	Q "Present time"?
8 .	A Mas.
9	Q Now, did you conclude or strike that.
10	Does "present time" have the same meaning for you
11 .	as *coming to now*?
12.	A Essentially the same, yes.
13	Q Who explained what "coming to now" means, if anyone,
14	tó you?
15	A Charlie.
16	Q When was that?
17	A I had a lot of conversations with Charlie.
18	Q Well, I am asking you when Charles Manson explained
19	the phrase "coming to now" to you.
<b>20</b>	A Sometime in that time period when not just one
21	time, but many, many times.
22	He was continually using the phrase.
23	Q Had you ever heard my client use this phrase prior
24	to this purported confession that you overheard?
25	A Had never had but one conversation with Clem out-
26	side of this one that was when he and I were in this cabin
27	that I was speaking of.
28 <sup>.</sup>	Q Well, did he use that phrase "coming to now" during

r	that previous conversation that you had with him, meaning the
2	defendant?
8	A Not that I that I recall at this moment.
4	Q All right.
5	So this was a phrase, then, that was used by
6	Charles Manson and used repeatedly, is that correct?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And this was used by Charles Manson and used
9	repeatedly, was it not, prior to your overhearing this pur-
10	ported confession?
11	A Yes.
12	Q From my client?
13	Let me go back to that, go back to that conversa-
<b>14</b>	tion, if you will, wherein my client allegedly admitted killing
15.	Shorty Shea.
16	I had gathered from your direct testimony this
17	is by way of a question I gathered from your direct
18	testimony that this was a conversation that my client had had
19:	with you. Is that a mistaken impression?
20	A I believe that the whole situation was that I
21	overheard this conversation.
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

<b>∉</b> -1	1	Q And in the
	.2	A And that he did state to me parts of it.
	<b>3</b> .	Q In the intervening time since you were last in
	4	court and testifying have you perhaps recalled any of the
	5 -	persons who were present at this conversation?
•	6	A The only part that I recall is what Clem said to
	7	me and that I was there and that he was there. There were
	8.	other persons there, but I don't know who they were.
	9	Q Did he just seem to turn in your direction and
	10	make these statements about Shorty Shea?
1	11	A Yes.
	12	Q I take it that he didn't preface these remarks
	13	with any other that is, he didn't preface this confession
	14	with any other remarks to you?
	15	A No.
	16	Q In terms of describing what happened, did he just
	17	without any apparent provocation or reason merely look in your
	18	direction and say in substance that he had killed Shorty Shea?
	19	A Yes.
•	20	Q And was that all he said to you?
	21	A That's all.
	22	Q What did you do thereafter, immediately thereafter?
•	23	A Felt kind of dumb.
	24	Q What did you do? Did you walk away?
	25	à Yes,
	<b>2</b> 6	Or did you do anything? You didn't say anything
	.27	back to my client at this point?
	28	A No.

Did anyone else say anything to him in apparent response to his saying that he had killed Shorty Shea? 3. MR. KATZ: Excuse me, your Honor. I will object on the ground that it assumes facts not in evidence. Those weren't Š. the words of the defendant. 6 THE COURT: Let me have the wording of the question. (The question was read by the reporter 8: as follows: 9 Did anyone else say anything to 10 him in apparent response to his saying that he 11 had killed Shorty Shea?") . 12 MR. KATZ: If your Honor please, maybe it is a play on 13words, but it does assume facts not in evidence, because those 14 weren't the words, as such, and there was reference to sticking people with knives and cutting the head off of Shorty. 15 16 Those were the words. Now, obviously the conclusion can be 17 drawn that he therefore killed Shorty Shea. 18 Maybe it is a technical point, but I want to leave 19 the record clear on that. So my objection is that it is \_20° assuming facts not in evidence. 21 THE COURT: Read it again, Mr. Reporter. 22. (The question was reread by the reporter 23 as follows: 24 Did anyone else say anything to 25 him in apparent response to his saying that he 26 had killed Shorty Shea?") 27 THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer the question. 28 It calls for a yes or no answer. Is the question clear now?

1	THE WITNESS: Well
2	THE COURT: Do you want him to read it again?
3	THE WITNESS: Read it again.
4	(The question was reread by the reporter
5	as follows:
6.	"Q Did anyone else say anything to
7	him in apparent response to his saying that he
<b>'</b> 8	had killed Shorty Shea?*)
9	THE WITNESS: No
10	MR. WEEDMAN: That is all I have. Thank you, Mr. Crocket
11	
12	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
13	BY MR. KATZ:
14	Q Mr. Crockett, just so the record is clear, what
15	were the words that Clem said during this conversation
16	concerning the killing of Shorty Shea?
17:	THE COURT: I think that has been asked and answered.
18	MR. KATZ: The problem is that counsel in his questioning
19	has used the phrase "killing Shorty Shea," and I want to know
20:	what the exact words were, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: That has been asked and answered. I think it
22	has been covered, unless you want the answer in I think it
23	has been covered.
24	What do you want to do, Mr. Weedman?
25	MR. WEEDMAN: Pardon me?
26	THE COURT: Is there an objection? I think it has been
27	asked and answered and has been covered in direct examination.
28	
٠.	MR. KATZ: There is an ambiguity there, your Honor. I'm

INDEX

just trying to clear it up. 2 THE COURT: Well, it would bring out the conversation 3. twice. That is the effect of it. 4 MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, I have no objection to it. 5. has been asked and answered, your Honor is correct, but I have 6 no objection to counsel going through it again if he wants to. THE COURT: Well, I may step in -- let's see where we go. 8 Read the question, and you listen to the question, 9 please. 10° (The question was read by the reporter 11. as follows: 12 Mr. Crockett, just so the record \*0 13. is clear, what were the words that Clem said 14 during this conversation concerning the killing 15 of Shorty Shea?") 16 THE COURT: It has been asked and answered, clearly. 17 MR. KATZ: Counsel is not objecting, your Honor. I'm -18 asking permission or leave of the court --.19 THE COURT: It has been covered clearly on direct. 20<sup>°</sup> made notes on it. Now, it gives the People two direct 21 examinations. I don't say that intentionally, but it does, 22 and the defendant may want to recross, which he has a right to 23 do. But it has been asked and answered. 24 I think I will make my own objection and sustain .25 it. Sustained. 26 BY MR. KATZ: Then I would like to direct your 27 attention, Mr. Crockett, to a specific answer which you 28 apparently gave on Monday, August 16, 1971.

1 .	Counsel, I direct your attention to page 4495.
2:	THE COURT: You can read it. Has it been read to the
3	jury?
4	MR. KATZ: There is an error here, your Honor. I want to
5	clarify it, if I may. I know what I am doing, if you will give
6	me some leeway,
7	THE COURT: Go ahead.
. 8	Q BY MR. KATZ: There was a question by me at the top
9	of page 4495:
10	"Did Clem continue to talk?
11	"A Yes."
12	And then the question was:
13	"What else did he say?"
14	And then you said,
15	"He wouldn't die, so we had to chop
16	his head off."
17	Now, I want to ask you one question with reference
18.	to the answer I just read: Did Clem say the words "so we had
19	to chop his head off?" or what did he say? Is your answer
20	there correct or is there an error?
21 .	A He said "I had to."
22	Q All right. Now, I want to once again read the
23	answer that you gave on Monday, apparently. This is on page
24	4495.
25	"He said he wouldn't die, so we had to
26	chop his head off."
27	Did you just misspeak yourself at that time? Did
28	you mean to say "I," or did he say "we," or what?
	A He waid, "I."

4A

2 3

\_\_\_

**8** 

Q So that is a mistake, "so we had to chop his head off," is that correct?

A Yes. That is what I said.

Q That is correct?

A Yes.

Now, Mr. Crockett, between the recess, that is, the time we concluded the proceedings on Monday, August 16, 1971, and until this morning, have you had an opportunity to listen to some of the tapes that Paul Steuber made of you on 12/19/69?

MR. WEEDMAN: I'm going to object to that, your Honor. That is not a proper question to ask this witness. If counsel feels there is some rehabilitating necessary, let him introduce it. I'm not going to let the witness rehabilitate himself.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. Read the question, please.

(The record was read by the reporter as follows:

"Q Now, Mr. Crockett, between the recess, that is, the time we concluded the proceedings on Monday, August 16, 1971, and until this morning, have you had an opportunity to listen to some of the tapes that Paul Steuber made of you on 12/19/69?")

THE COURT: It would be immaterial, I think.

MR. KATZ: All right. I will withdraw the question and ask it another way.

You told Mr. Weedman, as best you recall, that

Í

.3

5.

22,

.28 when Dave Steuber -- and I erroneously referred to him as

Paul Steuber -- had some taped interviews with you, you
thought that Watkins, that is, Paul Watkins, and Brooks

Poston, were not present during the taping. Is that correct?

Is that what you told Mr. Weedman?

A Yes.

Q Since then have you had an opportunity to refresh your memory to determine whether or not this is a correct statement? You can answer that yes or no. Have you had an opportunity?

A Yes.

And now, as you think back independently on the witness stand at this time, can you tell us whether or not Mr. Watkins and Mr. Poston and Mr. Juan Flynn were present during your interview with Dave Steuber in December 169?

MR. WEEDMAN: I object to this line of questioning, your Honor, unless counsel is offering it to impeach his own witness. He has a right to do that. But he has to take that position.

THE COURT: It would go to a legal question of impeachment, if these questions go in, and I will so advise the jury.

MR. KATZ: It doesn't go to impeachment.

THE COURT: On all these questions, it is for them to pass on the credibility of the truthfulness of the statements of Monday or at this time. I would advise them at this time now, that it is up to them. I'm not passing on it. Whether they are or aren't, I don't know. Under the new Code, of

course, a party may outright impeach his own witness if he wants to. But it may have a materiality for impeachment if the jury wants to accept it and question the credibility of the witness. That is what the law says.

MR. KATZ: Your Honor, I object. I'm sorry; I respectfully object to your use of the word "impeachment." I'm not attempting to impeach the witness.

THE COURT: I'm telling them it is impeachment as a matter of law. I don't care what you say. I'm saying it amounts to impeachment for them. They can accept the Monday version or they can accept the version now that he is about to give:

MR. KATZ: That is a correct statement, and I have no objection to that

THE COURT: That is what I am saying. It is impeachment whether it is intended so or not, because one of the statements is correct and one is wrong; or else there is no need to talk about it. Just stand on the one. You have a conflict there for the jury, not for me -- for the jury.

MR. KATZ: May the witness answer the question?

THE COURT: If you want the question answered, ask the question.

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, counsel again, though, is insisting that this is not impeachment, and --

THE COURT: I'm saying it is impeachment.

MR. WEEDMAN: I'm suggesting that I agree.

THE COURT: It goes to the credibility of the witness. I so state.

1	by that?
2	A What did I mean by that?
3	Q Yes.
4	A Well, when I first got to Shoshone I didn't have
5	any money at all. We walked out of Death Valley, or whatever
6	you want to call the place, me and Brooks had walked from
7	Barker Ranch
8	Q Can you answer my question?
9 '	A Go ahead.
10	Q My question is, what did you mean by you didn't
11	need the money when you told that to Mr. Weedman?
12	A Well, I wasn't going anywhere. I didn't have
13	anything to do.
14	Q Did you thereafter get a job in Shoshone?
15 '	A I sure did.
16	Q Have you been working there ever since?
17	A Yes.
18	Q Is Shoshone a big town?
19 20	A I think the sign on the highway says about 185
21:	people live there.
22	Q Now, Mr. Crockett, can you just tell us a little
23	bit about what you did in connection with mining gold with
24	Watkins and Poston?
25	A Well, we ran up and down the mountain and we had
26	little bags that we made out of pants, trousers, and such as
27	that, and we would fill them full of this ore and then we
28.	would tie it together and throw it across our shoulders and
	haul it down.

Q Let's stop. You say you ran up and down a mountain. What kind of a mountain are we talking about?

A The foot of the trail at the canyon at this particular place was about a mile and a half, and I would say about 1500 feet higher than the floor, and so when I say running up and down the mountain, it was pretty good, hard work.

All right. 4b-1 1 Now, did you carry something on your backs? 2 We had back packs that we strapped these little 3, bags of ore on and carried them down by hand. 4 Who is "we"? 5 Brooks Poston and Paul Watkins and myself. 6 When you got some of the ore down to the bottom, 7 did you do something with it in trying to refine it? 8. We took mortars and pestles, which are nothing 9 more than steel encased, you know, like a pot that you would 10 sit on the floor and would take another piece of metal and 11 break the rock up until it was powder, and then we would take 12 regular gold pans and pan it out. 13 Did you in fact distill some gold from the ore? 14 We did. 15 How much gold did you get in this time period, 16 say, between the end of May 1969, and say September, the end 17 of September 1969? 18 Well, I didn't have any scales to weigh it with, 19 but I would say approximately about 6 ounces of gold, which at 20 this particular time I still have about half of it and the 21 partner that I had carried off approximately the other half, 22 and I don't know what he did with it. 23 The partner? What partner do you have reference ~24 to? 25 Stanley Berry. 26

Berry, is that correct?

27

28

I take it you are no longer partners with Stanley CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

	Ψ
1	A Yes, I'm not partners with him any more.
.2	O Did you ever send Paul Watkins to Las Vegas with
3	some gold?
4	A Well, he took some with him, he took this gold
<b>5</b> .	with him, and he lived at a friend's house, and then he forgot
, 6	about it, and lo and behold about three months later this
7	guy brought it back.
·8	Q Do you still have the gold?
9	A I still have it.
10	Q Was this a money-making venture?
11 -	A No. It was supposed to be, but it never turned ou
12	that way.
13	Q Now, you said, in describing Brooks Poston's
14	physical condition to Mr. Weedman, that he just didn't do
15	anything. Would you more specifically detail his physical
16	condition, if you can?
17	A He wasn't capable of it. He was in pretty sad
18	shape.
19	THE COURT: When you say "he," who do you mean?
20	THE WITNESS: Brooks Poston.
<b>21</b>	Q BY MR. KATZ: Did that physical condition change
22	after he began to work for you?
23;	A It sure did.
24	Q In what manner did it change?
25	Well, he got so that he could go up and down the
26	mountain instead of just walking a hundred yards and having
27	to sit down and rest.
Ż8 ,	MR. KATZ: Thank you. I have no further questions.

4b-3	1	THE COURT: Is that all, gentlemen?
	Ž	MR. WEEDMAN: I have a few questions, if I may.
	3	
INDEX	4	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
	5	BY MR. WEEDMAN:
٠	.6	Q Are you telling us, Mr. Crockett, that after doing
•	ל	this apparently hard work for some six months that you really
	-8	had no need for that \$1100 that you received?
,	<u>9</u>	A Well, it was nice to have.
-	10	Q With respect to these conversations that Mr. Katz
	11	has now touched upon, that is conversations with police
	12	officers, is it then true, Mr. Crockett, that there were times
	13	when you heard Poston tell his story to the police, you heard
	14	Watkins tell his story to the police, and at about that same
<b>)</b>	15	time you also told your story to the police?
	16	A Yes.
	17	Q And all three of you were listening to one another
	18	during this time then, is that correct?
	19	A You mean at this one instant?
-	20	Q Well, I don't know what one instant you are talking
	21	about. Maybe you can tell us.
	22	When we were supposed to be telling this all at
•	23	the same time?
	24	Q Yes. You were all together and you were all
-	25	overhearing each other, isn't that so?
	· 26.	A Yes.
<b>\$</b>	27	Q Tell your respective stories about my client?
	28	A Yes.

MR. WEEDMAN: That's all I have.

MR. KATZ: Nothing further. Thank you.

THE COURT: That's all, gentlemen?

MR. KATZ: Yes.

THE COURT: That is all.

MR. WEEDMAN: I want Mr. Crockett, your Honor, to be on call.

THE COURT: Yes.

Now, Mr. Crockett, it is entirely possible or probable defendant may want to call you for testimony when he puts on his side of the case.

And therefore I am advising you, please, you must consider you are on call. I am putting you on call.

That means, in spelling it out, it means you don't have to sit here and wait your time. I want you to go about your business, whatever you have to do.

But keep in readiness in case a call is put in to bring you back to the courtroom.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: That is it. I will put you on call.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. KATZ: Lee Sauncoke.

28

## LEE SAUNOOKE,

called on behalf of the People, being first sworn, testified as follows:

THE COURT: Raise your right hand and be sworn, please.

THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear the testimony you will 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: Thank you, ma am.

Will you take the stand and be seated, please.

THE COURT: Be seated and state your name, please.

THE WITNESS: Lee Saunooke.

THE COURT: Now, ma'am, when you talk -- pull up your chair, will you, a little more there. A little more still. That's it.

And pull this right around, just like you are talking in the telephone. Keep your voice up so the jury and counsel can all hear you.

THE CLERK: Ma'am, will you be kind enough to spell your first name and last name, please.

THE WITNESS: Lee, L-e-e. And Saunooke, S-a-u-n-o-o-k-e.

THE CLERK: S-a-u-n-o --

THE WITNESS: -o-k-e.

THE CLERK: Oh, I see.

24252627

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 .

13.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1		DIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. KATE	· •
3	Q	Ise, where were you living in March of 1970?
4	A	At 21005 Parthenia Street.
5	Q	You tend to talk very fast. Would you slow down
6	for us.	
7	A	21005 Parthenia Street, Canoga Park.
8 .	Q	In Canoga Park?
9	A	%s.
10	۵	Is this a house?
<b>ļ1</b> · '	<b>A</b>	Yes, it is.
12	Ω	And you were working at that time in March of 1970
13	A	Yes, I was.
14	Q	Where were you working?
15	A	At Denny's Restaurant in Agoura.
16	Ω	And do you have a child?
17	A	Yes, I do.
18	<u>Q</u>	All right.
19		And as a result of working and having a child,
<b>20</b>	was it neces	ssary to hire some help?
<b>21</b> , .	<b>A</b> .	Yes, it was.
<b>22</b>	Ω	In that connection, in March of 1970, did you hire
23	some help?	Yes
24	A	Yes,
25	Ω	Who did you hire to help you with your child?
26	. <b>A</b>	A girl called Liz. Elizabeth Moreland.
27	Q	Moreland is spelled M-o-r-e-l-a-n-d, if you know?
<b>28</b>	A	I believe so.

		·
1	·Q	All right.
<b>Ż</b>		And prior to March of 1970 had you met the defend-
3	ant Mr.	Grogan?
4	A	Yes, I have.
5	Ω	And where had you seen him before March of 1970?
6	A.	Spahn's Ranch.
7	Q	And did you know Mr. Grogan by sight?
8 .	À	Yes,
9	Ω	And did you know his name?
10	, А	I knew him as Clem.
11	Ø	All right.
12		Now, were you familiar with the Spahn Ranch?
13;	λ	Yes, sir.
14	Q	And how long had you been frequenting the Spahn
15.	Ranch?	
16	A	Ten years.
17	Q	Incidentally, did you know Shorty Shea?
18	A	Wes, I did.
19	Q	How long did you know Shorty Shea?
20	Ä	Ten years.
21	Q	And can you tell us, characterize your relation-
22	ship wi	th Shorty, whether or not you were good friends or
23	whether	you were just acquaintances, or what.
24	A	We were very close friends.
25	Q	And would he visit you at the various places you
26	would 1	ive?
27	A	Always.
28	Q	Did you ever see him at Spain Ranch?
	1	

1	سيستقيم وبنديان بالقيو الوماء الاقتلام بالأكسان المائد
1	A Oh, many times. I would work with him many times.
2`	Q I'm sorry. I didn't hear your last statement.
3	A I have worked with him many times.
4	Q All right.
5	So directing your attention to March of 1970, did
6	something unusual happen between Liz Moreland and the
7	defendant?
<b>8</b> ·	A Yes.
9	Q And would you try and specify the date in March of
10	1970 when this incident occurred.
<b>11</b>	A I'm not really sure what date it was. It was
12	one of the nights that I worked.
13	THE COURT: Pardon me.
14	MR. KATZ: Let's stop there for a moment.
15	THE COURT: Would it be towards the first, or the
16	middle or the last part of March of 1970?
17	THE WITNESS: I just don't really know. I know it was
18	in during the rainy season in March. That is the only reason
19	I can pinpoint it, is because it was raining.
20	THE COURT: Who was present at this time? Who was
21	there?
22	THE WITNESS: Liz Beth Moreland. Clem, or Steve Grogan.
23	And Rocky,
,24	Q Is this Rocky Todd?
25	A Yes.
26	Q Is he also known as Randy Mourglea?
27	A. I don't know.
28	Q And approximately what time during the day or
;	

,	evening did	this incident occur?
	, <b>A</b>	It was about midnight.
	Ω	Where did it occur?
	A	Well, they were in my living room.
	Q	Now, tell us exactly who was in your living room.
	λ	Steve Grogan and Lizbeth Moreland and Rocky.
	Q	And yan you tell us what happened.
	A	Well, I had come home early. I wasn't expected at
	that hour.	. ·
	1	And I came in the back door to prevent waking
	anyone up in	the house and heard the house really smelled,
	and I though	t, "Gee, what is that?"
		And I went in toward the living room, and I
í		hem laughing.
	Q	You heard who laughing?
	A	Well, it turned out to be Clem and Lizbeth.
	ů.	All right.
	λ	I didn't know who it was when I was in the kitchen.
	Ω	All right.
	À	I got as far as the door that separates the dining
	room and the	kitchen. They were in front of the fireplace.
	Rocky was on	the couch and he appeared to be asleep.
	<del></del>	They were laughing and he says
	Q	Who says?
	A	Clem said to Lizbeth, "You just pull back their
_	hair.Pulled	back his head by his hair and cut his throat, and
_	blood came o	ut."
		He says, "And the whole time I was doing that,

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

5a-1	1	Q Why did you sheak out the back door and go around?
<b>)</b>	2	A I didn't want them to know I was there.
	3	MR. WEEDMAN: Objection. Not material, your Honor, as
٠	4	to why she did something.
	5 .	THE COURT: Sustained.
	6.	Q BY MR. KATE: You went out the back door and went
	Ż.	around someplace?
	8	A I went around the front of the house and slammed
•	9	the truck door and came in the front. And nobody was there.
*	10	They had went out the back door.
• .	- <b>11</b>	Q You didn't see them come out the front door, is
	12	that right?
	13	A No.
· Y	14	Q And you were facing the front door when you
<b>F</b>	15	slammed the truck?
	16	A Yes.
	17	Q Incidentally, did you ever see Shorty with a
	18	matched set of guns?
	19	A Yes, I did.
	20	Q And did you know in what container, if any, he
•	21	carried them?
٠	22	Yes. He had them in an attache case, and it had
	23	his name on it.
	24	Q What name, if you recall?
	25	A Rev. Donald Shea.
	26	Q All right.
<b>F</b>	27 -	And did he ever display or exhibit the guns in
	28	front of you?

he
ar
4
3
out
,
4
- 1

3.

defendant are here.

All right. Now, what do you intend to ask or prove from this witness respecting the last question?

MR. KATI: Well, your Honor, I am merely establishing that she --

THE COURT: Let's suppose she ways yes.

Read the question again.

MR. KATS: She said yes.

THE COURT: Read the question.

(The question was reread as follows by the reporter:)

"Q Now, Lee, at sometime in the latter part of 1968 were you living across the street from Bill Vance on Gresham Street?") THE COURT: Suppose the answer is yes.

Now, what do you expect to prove there?

MR. KATE: I am just establishing that she lived in that particular area in 1968. I think counsel is worried that I may attempt to show some prior acts of hostility between Mr. Manson and Shorty Shea at the address on Gresham Street when the Manson family was residing at Bill Vance's home in the latter part of 1968.

That is not my intention at all. Counsel is going and has already suggested to the court in argument that perhaps one of the explanations for the car — and I have reference to Shorty's car being abandoned near the Gresham Street home was that because Lee Saunooke lived across the street — and I merely am attempting to show sequentially that

she lived at Gresham Street in the latter part of 1968 and that in the first part of '69 she moved to another street. And show thereafter that Shorty had visited her at her new residence.

That is all I intend to do. I do not intend to go into any prior acts of hostility between Mr. Manson and Mr. Shea or to go into any hearsay conversations in that area.

THE COURT: What would be the materiality of it?

Let me put it this way, is your position that it has materiality as showing aggression between Manson and Shea, as aggressive acts of Manson to Shea?

MR. KATZ: No.

THE COURT: Then what is the materiality?

MR. KATZ: I just said that I am not doing that.

THE COURT: All right. Then what are you trying to show?

MR. KATZ: I am showing that she no longer resided at this Gresham Street house. That she had moved to another location, to explain Mr. Weedman's claim that Shorty wasn't on his way down to visit Lee Saunooke because the house where she was residing at in 1968 was across from the Gresham Street house, which was rented by Bill Vance and occupied by the Manson family.

MR. WEEDMAN: I have no objection to that, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't see anything wrong with that.

MR. WEEDMAN: I have no objection.

THE COURT: All right, Let's go shead then.

Let's take a short recess at this time, gentlemen.

MR. WEEDMAN: Thank you.

Philip Carlotte Carlot

27

28

THE COURT: All right, now, gentlemen. Let's go ahead. People against Grogan. The defendant is here, counsel are here. Bring in the jury. THE COURT: You have been sworn. Please tell us your name again. THE WITNESS: Lee Saunooke. (The following proceedings were had in open court in the presence of the jury:) THE COURT: Now we have all 12 jurors, plus the three alternates. You may proceed, gentlemen, MR. KATZ: Thank you, your Honor. Lee, I believe you were telling us that at the end of 1968 you were living across the street from a house occupied by Bill Vance on Gresham Street. Is that correct? That is correct. J. And in the end of 1968, December of '68, were any members of the Manson family occupying the house? Yes, they were. Did you move to some other location after that? Yes, I did. When did you move to some other location? About the 1st of February. THE COURT: What year, lady? 26 That would be 1969. THE WITNESS:

BY MR. KATZ: Where did you move to?

•	<b>A</b>	21044 Community Street.
	Q	Where is Community Street in relation to the home
that	you ha	d on Gresham Street across from the Vance house?
	A	About a half mile south.
	Q	Now, Lee, let me, if I can, go back to this
conv	ersatio	n that you apparently overheard in March of 1970 at
your	house.	
		You said, I believe, after you slammed the truck
door	that s	omebody left the house. Is that correct?
	A	Yes.
	Ω	Who left the house?
	À	Well, when I went in, Clem was gone.
	Q	Were there people still in your house?
	À	Yes. Rocky was still asleep on the couch.
	Q	This is Rocky Todd?
	*	Yes.
	<b>Q</b> .	And what about Lis Moreland? Where was she?
	A	She was on a blanket in front of the fire.
	Q	Was she asleep or was she
	λ	She sat up and yawned and said, "Oh, what are you
doin	g home	so early?"
	Q	How about Rocky? Did he remain asleep?
	A	Yes. He never moved.
	Q	Did he eventually move?
	A	Hé was gone in the morning.
	Q	Now, lastly and I'm not trying to be crude;
plea	se unde	erstand the spirit in which the question is asked or

you -- you used the phrase "jacking off." What does that mean?

	1		To masturbate.
	2	. <b>Q</b>	Did Clem use those words, or are those your words?
	,3	A	No. He used the words "jacking off."
	4	MR. KA	72: Thank you. I have no further questions.
	5		
INDEX	6		CROSS-EXAMINATION
	7	BY MR. WEED!	; MAN
	8	Q	Mrs. saunooke, would you tell us again, please,
	9	what you ove	erheard, allegedly at least, my client say?
	10	λ	He said that he grabbed him by the hair and his
	11	head and pu	lled his head back and just chopped and the blood
	12	spurted out	, and while he was cutting off his head, that
	13.	Charlie had	been jacking him off.
	14	Q	And is that everything that you overheard my client
	15	say on that	occasion?
	16	A	Well, when Liz remarked, "Is that what happened
	17	to Shorty?"	he laughed and said, "Yes, who do you think I'm
	18	talking abo	ut2"
	19	Q	Did you ever see my client after that?
	20	A	Yeş.
	21	Ω	When did you see him after that for the very first
	22	time?	
	23	A	At Spahn's Ranch.
	24	Q	What, if anything, was my client doing at Spahn
	25	,	you saw him?
	26	. <b>3</b>	Kissing Liz Moreland.
•	27	Ď	Did you speak to Clem on that occasion?
	28	A	I have never spoken to him before that or after
•	•		j

<b>1</b> . :	that.
2 .	Q Did you actually see my client at this location
3 ,	where you claim to have overheard this conversation?
4	Xes, I did.
5	Q Do you recall testifying before the grand jury in
<b>,</b>	connection with this matter?
7	A Yes, I do.
8	MR. WEEDMAN: I will find it in a moment, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Take your time.
10 .	
11	
13.	
14	
15	· ·
16	
17	
18	
19	
<b>.20</b> .	
21	
22	
23	
24	
.25	
26	· ·
27.	
28	

1	A He has had various pistols and different sets of
2	pistols. He had a rifle at one time.
ŝ	Q Can you describe any of the other pistols,
4.	particularly sets of pistols that he had?
, · · · 5	A He never had a good set of pistols but once. He
6	had only had the one good set of pistols. The other were
7	mismatches or singles.
.8₁	Q Are you telling us that he had pawned those other
ġ.	guns?
10 .	A He had at times,
11	MR. KATZ: Excuse me. There is an objection on the
12	grounds it is ambiguous. What other guns, the matched set or
13.	the others?
14	MR. WEEDMAN: Counsel is correct.
15	THE COURT: All right.
16.	Q BY MR, WEEDMAN: The guns, other than the good
17	#et.
18.	A He had pawned them at times.
19	Q And he finally sold them, didn't he?
<b>:20</b>	No. They were stolen.
21	Q His other guns?
22	A Yos.
23	Q They were stolen?
24	I They were stolen.
25	Q Is that something that he told you?
26	A No, because they were stolen from me.
. <b>27</b>	Q You had them?
28.	A Later I had them.
	1

	*	·
1	Q	When was that, Miss Saunooke?
2	A	They were stolen out of a footlocker of mine in
3	1969.	
4	Q	What month in 1969?
5		I believe they disappeared in September of '69.
6 .	Q	So you had guns in your possession that belonged
7	to Mr. Shea	in September of 1969?
8	A	Yes, I did.
·9	Q	What guns did you have, Miss Saunooke?
10	* _	I had a rifle and two pistols.
11	Q	What kind of pistols were they?
12	<u>.</u> A	I believe he called them a .45. I don't know guns .
13	very well.	
14	2	They were locked in a footlocker which belonged to
15	him.	
16	. Õ	You had a footlocker that belonged to him?
17	λ	Yes.
18	Q	Would you describe the footlocker for us, please.
19.	A	It was a black footlocker.
20	Q	Have a name on it?
21	<b>A</b>	No.
22	Q	What did it have inside?
23	A	He had his guns and a couple pair of pants and a
24	pair of boo	ts.
25	Q	What kind of boots?
26	1	Western boots. That is all he ever wore.
27	MR. WE	EDMAN: I wonder if we have exhibits 9-A and 9-B,
28	your Honor.	

7-4

3.

5.

MR. KATE: They are in Department 106, your Honor.

MR. WEEDMAN: We have really reached the problem, your Honor, because I want to show those guns to the witness.

THE COURT: Well, let's go in chambers.

25<sub>.</sub>

7-5 1 (The following proceedings were had 2 in chambers:) THE COURT: I didn't want to argue this in front of the jury. Now, give me the question, please. 5 (The record was read by the reporter 6 as follows: 7 What did he have inside? He had his guns and a couple pair of pants and a pair of boots. 10 What kind of boots? 11 Western boots. That is all he 12 ever wore. 13 "MR. WEEDMAN: I wonder if we have 14 exhibits 9-A and 9-B, your Honor. 15 "MR. KATE: They are in Department 106, 16 your Honor. 17 "MR. WEEDMAN: We have really reached 18 the problem, your Honor, because I want to show 19 those guns to the witness.") 20 THE COURT: There we have our problem again. You are 21 entitled to them. I am not trying to argue that. 22 MR. WEEDMAN: I think they will be available tomorrow 23 morning, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: All right. Well, let me ask you this, are 25 there any other questions you can ask? 26: MR. WEEDMAN: No. yes. 27 THE COURT: Before you have to get to the exhibits? 28. MR. WEEDMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Maybe we can get in some questions. MR. WEEDMAN: Oh, sure, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Then we will try to get them back here for 3 you. All right. MR. WEEDMAN: I am sorry, I just kind of stumbled into 5 ъ that. 7 THE COURT: That is all right. MR. WEEDMAN: I suddenly was suddenly asking, and thinking 8. 9 about 9-A and 9-B and at the same time realizing that they 10 were over in 106. . 11 THE COURT: That is all right. 12 MR. WEEDMAN: So I will just go ahead and complete my 13 cross-examination of her but for that. 14 THE COURT: Why don't you do that. 15 MR. WEEDMAN: And perhaps she can come back tomorrow 16 morning. 17 MR. KATZ: Well, your Honor, this is the problem. I would like to conclude my case. 18 at The to 19 I will conclude my case today if we can get the 20 I think Mr. Weedman is entitled to all of the 21 evidence he needs. I think this court certainly should insist 22 we have the exhibits available this afternoon. 23 MR. WEEDMAN: Yes. Lat's get them this afternoon. 24 THE COURT: I know it. You see, there is the problem. 25 I have to use some latitude in the matter because I know we are in trial here. 27 Let's get Frank and get these exhibits, if you 28 can. I don't know how far they are.

Now, Frank --1 THE CLERK: Yes, sir. 2 We have got this hassle on again over exhibits. THE COURT: 3 We need these exhibits. Have you spoken to the clerk over there on the 5 20 exhibits? Is there any issue about us getting those at 6. 2 o'clock? We have to have them here, all of them. 7. The People are going to close, is that correct? 8 That is correct, your Honor. MR. KATZE 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 THE CLERK: Yes, sir. 11 · 12 THE COURT: Tell them the People are going to close. have to have them. See if there is any issue at all. 13 14 I can talk to Judge Choate. He has got the 15 physical possession of them. There is our problem. 16 You see, I can't send the sheriff over there and 17 break in the courtroom. I mean overliteralizing but that is 18 what we are up against. 19 I have got to have these exhibits. The People 20 can't close here. 21 THE CLERK: Well, your Honor --22 THE COURT: Right now Mr. Weedman wants the boots and 23 one of the other articles there. 24 MR. WEEDMAN: No, the guns. 25 THE CLERK: The guns. 26 This morning I received a call from Department 106 27 requesting all of our exhibits. 28 THE COURT: Tell them we need them all, and we will give

them back.

THE CLERK: I called the clerk in 106 just five minutes ago and told them we would need our exhibits back, and she says, well, she would see what could be done.

THE COURT: Tell them we need the gun. Right now, we need the gun. Mr. Weedman is going to go shead as far as he can.

Don't let anything more go. That is number one.

I have got to trade exhibits. I am going to hold these things.

I am not going to let any more go at this time. I can't run
the court this way.

Now, tell them we need these. I will talk to the judge if it will do any good. But I would rather you tried to say we have got to have these exhibits.

THE CLERK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: At 2 o'clock. We've got to have them.

THE CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you have any more questions up to the time we get the exhibits?

MR. WEEDMAN: I can ask some more questions.

THE COURT: Ask some more questions.

THE CLERK: Do you want them pow?

THE COURT: We've got to have them. We have to have those 20 exhibits, every one of them. I probably shouldn't have let them go, I guess, but that is water over the dam.

MR. WEEDMAN: It may not cause any delay because I can go on with the questioning.

THE COURT: Let's go as far as you can. (The following proceedings were had in open court in the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: We will have the exhibits. I'm just saying that to the jury.

Go ahead with your examination.

O BY MR. WEEDMAN: Can you further describe, Mrs. Saunooke, the other pistols that Shorty Shea had left in your possession?

MR. KATZ: Excuse me. I'll object on the ground that the reference to the other pistols is once again ambiguous.

THE COURT: Read the question.

(The last question was read by the reporter as follows:

27

10

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	"Q BY MR. WEEDMAN: Can you further
2	describe, Mrs. Saunooke, the other pistols that
3	Shorty Shea had left in your possession?")
4	THE COURT: Well, you can do so. Overruled.
5.	THE WITNESS: One of them had a black handle and the
6	other had a silver kind of a handle with a design in it.
7	Q BY MR. KATZ: Were these revolvers as distinguished
.8	from automatics, if you know what those words mean?
9 (	A The thing that goes around in the middle and has
10'	six bullets in it.
ir ·	Q Right.
12 .	A That is what it was.
13	Q The one with the black handle and the one with
14	the silver handle, then
15	A Yes; they were both the same type of gun but they
16	just didn't match.
17	Q Were they the kind of guns which you might
18	describe as sort of Western guns?
19	A Yes. And they each had a case.
20	Q What kind of case did they have?
21 .	A A holster.
22	Q A holster?
23 24	A Yes. Each one had a holster.
25	Q How long had you had these guns in your possession,
26	Mrs. Saunooke, up to the time you tell us they were stolen?
27	A I think they were stolen when my saddles were.
28	They were in the garage where the saddles were kept, and all
40	the stuff was stolen. But at the time the saddles were stolen.

1	said a half mile.
2	Q Can you give us an idea in city blocks how far
3	the Gresham Street house is from the Community Street house?
4	A No. I can't. I don't know what a city block is.
5	I don't live in the city.
6	Q I misunderstood.
7	A About a half mile. You've got regular blocks laid
8	out inside a city, They don't out there.
9	Q You are talking about
10	A You have a street here and a street setting there.
ii .	Q You are talking about well, let me withdraw
12 .	that.
13	Miss Saunooke, you are the one that talked about
14	city blocks, I believe, in the first instance, and I assume
15	that you had some rough idea as to that. Have you a rough
16	idea as to city blocks?
17	A No. Cities are laid out in blocks, the country
18	ișn't.
19	Q Would it be fair to say that the Gresham Street
20	house was about six blocks from the Community Street address?
21	A Is six blocks a half a mile?
22	Q Approximately six city blocks.
23	A If you want to call it that. To me it is a half
24	milė.
<b>25</b>	Q All right. Well, I presume we can produce a map
26	and show it.
27	When had you last seen Mr. Shea?
28	A From when?

28

Now, is the question clear to you, or do you want

1 .	it re-read? ,
2	THE WITNESS: I understood it.
3	THE COURT: All right. You can answer it.
4 .	THE WITNESS: That is what he came over that is what
5	he said when he came in.
6	Q BY MR. WEEDMAN: You don't like Charles Manson in
7	the slightest, do you, Mrs. Saunooke?
8	A I have a reason.
9	MR. WEEDMAN: I move to strike that, your Honor. It is
10	not responsive.
11	Q Let me try again, Miss Saunooke. This is a death
12	penalty case. Are you aware of that, Miss Saunooke?
13	A Yes, I am.
14	Q You realize that your testimony can put my man in
15	the gas chamber?
16	A Yes, I do.
17	Q And you are testifying with that well in mind, are
18	you?
19	A Yes, I am.
.20	Q My question is, you don't like Charles Manson,
.21	do you?
22	A No, I don't.
23	Q And you don't like my client, either, do you?
24	A I'm afraid of him.
25	MR. WEEDMAN: I move to strike that, your Honor, as not
`26	responsive.
.27	THE COURT: It may go out.
28	Q BY MR. WEEDMAN: Did you make up your mind when you

1	came in this courtroom to load up your testimony, Miss
2	Saunooke?
3	A No.
4	MR. KATZ: I object.
5	Q BY MR. WEEDHAN: You realize you are under oath,
é	don't you?
7	A Yes, I do.
8	Q Do you recall testifying before the grand jury in
9	connection with this matter?
10	A Yes, I do.
11	Q Do you recall making these answers to these
12	questions by Mr. Katz?
13	MR. KATZ: Where are we, counsel?
14	MR. WEEDMAN: Looking at page 471 of the grand jury
15	proceedings.
16	THE COURT: Is the date there, Er. Weedman?
17	MR. WEEDMAN: Sometime last December, your Honor. I
<b>18</b>	don't have the exact date.
19	THE COURT: Go ahead.
20	MR. WEEDMAN: December 16, I believe, 1970, your Honor,
2Ì ·	is fairly close.
22	THE COURT: Thank you.
23	Q BY MR. WEEDMAN: Beginning at line 21 on this
24	page, you had been asked by Mr. Katz,
<b>25</b>	"And what happened?"
26	And then I'm skipping down to line 21.
27	"Rocky was out cold on the couch and
28	sound asleep. But it looked like he was out

cold the way he was laying. He was in an uncomfortable angle, and the whole room was full of
marijuana smoke. The whole place just stunk of
it, and they were laughing, you know. It was funny,
whatever they were laughing, discussing.

"O Clem and Liz?

"A Clem and Liz. Clem remarked it was so funny when you cut off a person's head. You just pull it back and chop it, and when they were doing this, that they had been jacking him off, and Liz said, 'So that is what happened to Shorty?' and Clem said, 'Well, of course,' and they roared with laughter.

"So I thought it's time for me to beat a retreat, and I snuck back around and came in the front door."

Do you recall making those answers to those questions, Miss Saunooke?

A Yes, about that.

Q You didn't mention Charles Manson at all when you testified before the grand jury, did you?

A I don't remember.

Q Well, didn't this just refresh your recollection?

Let me show it to you, Miss Saunooke. You can
begin on 471 and read that, and the next page, to yourself,
if you will.

A (The witness reads the document.)
THE COURT: Repeat your question now.

		].
٠	1	Q BY MR. WEEDMAN: Have you completed reading your
	2.	testimony in connection with what you purportedly overheard
	<b>3</b> . ′	my client say?
	4	A I have read it.
9 fls	<b>Š</b> :	•
	6.	
	<b>Ý</b>	
	8	
•	9	
,	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	1Š	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22 <sup>,</sup>	
	23	
	24	
	25.	ļ.
	26	
	27 28	
	28	

1 THE COURT: Is that all, gentlemen? 2 MR. KATZ: No. REDIRECT EXAMINATION INDEX BY MR. KATZ: Miss Saunooke, now, let's fix the dates, if we can. In March of 1970 you said you overheard a statement Clem 7 8 made to Lis Moreland, is that correct? 9 Yes, sir. ľÓ Using that as a frame of reference, March of 1970, 11 did you see Shorty after that? No, sir. 12 13 All right. 14 Now, you said -- you told Mr. Weedman the last 15 time you saw Shorty was July of 1970. Did you mean that? 16 I meant '69. 1.7 You are positive it is '69 and not '70? Q 18 **•69**. 19 Any doubt in your mind? 20 No, sir. 21. MR. KATZ: No further questions. 22 MR. WEEDMAN: Oh, I don't have any more questions. 23 Thank you. 24 THE COURT: That is all. 25 MR. WEEDMAN: I am sorry, your Honor. I do want to show 26 her the guns. Perhaps she can be directed to return at 27 2 o'clock. 28 THE COURT: Yes. We will have to go over to 2 o'clock,

I guess, to get the exhibits in here. 1 2 Do you have something else? 3 MR. KATZ: I think that is fair. 4 THE COURT: I can't operate any faster. MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, I would respectfully request the 5. court instruct Miss Saunooke not to discuss her testimony with 6 anyone until I have the further opportunity to examine her. 7 8 THE COURT: All right. Do not talk about the matter with 9 anyone, lady. 10 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: We will go to 2 o'clock. Is that correct, 12 gentlemen? 13 MR. KATZ: Yes, sir. 14 MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, sir. 15 THE COURT: We will go to 2 o'clock. 16 Ladies and gentlemen, kindly return promptly. Do 17 not discuss the case or come to any opinion or conclusion. 18 Thank you very much. 19 (at 11:20 a.m. the noon recess was 20 taken to 2 o'clock p.m. of the same 21 day.) 22 23 24 25 26 27

10-1

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 18, 1971

2:00 P.N.

3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12 13

14

15

16. 17

•

18

19

20

22

23

24

25 · 26

27

28

(The following proceedings were had

in chambers:)

THE COURT: We are in chambers, counsel and the defendant.

Here's the problem. Let me have your help here.

-Defense counsel wanted two of the exhibits.

MR. KATS: 9-A and 9-B.

THE COURT: Which you are entitled to have. There is no issue on that at all. They are over in Department 106 and I'm trying to get them.

Now, here's what I would like to do, and I'm not trying to push it. You are just down almost to the mechanical procedure at the moment. That is to say, if you withhold for a moment or a half hour or 20 minutes, the exhibits business, I don't think it will hurt your examination. It wouldn't do anything to hurt you.

MR. WEEDMAN: Not at all.

THE COURT: And let the People go shead and take what testimony they have. I would rather wait till we get the exhibits. We are going to stop dead. Do you see what I am trying to say?

MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honox.

THE COURT: Put on your testimony, cross-examination, so we can take as much testimony as we can.

If it was a civil case, I would say, "This is the way it is going to be done." But it is not a civil case, it

1	is criminal. So I won't do anything without the full st	tipula-
2	tion of both parties on any technical matter. But is the	ierė
3	any objection	
4	MR. WEEDMAN: No. your Honor.	_
5	MR. KATZ: I will accommodate the court.	- `q
6	THE COURT: I'm not trying to take the right from	you.
7	MR. WEEDMAN: No objection whatever to handling the	
8.	exhibits	
9	THE COURT: Let's go ahead. I'll try to talk to J	ıdge
10	Choate now. I've got a call in for him. He rang me, a	nd-it
11	must be over the exhibits.	· ".
12	MR. WEEDMAN: It is. I spoke with Judge Choate du	ring -
13.	the lunch hour.	**
14	THE COURT: What did he say?	
15	MR. WEEDMAN: He called me in chambers.	
16	THE COURT: That is this afternoon?	
17	MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, during the lunch hour.	
18	THE COURT: What did he say?	
19	MR. WEEDMAN: He is going to of course, he want	s to
20	keep the exhibits as much as he can, and I said, "Well,	it is
21	whatever whatever is worked out is satisfactory to m	8. <sup>¥</sup>
22	THE COURT: Yes.	-
23	MR. WEEDMAN: I told him that Mr. Katz especially	wanted
24	to get these exhibits introduced.	
25	THE COURT: Right.	•
26	And he needs all of them for that purpose.	
27	MR. WEEDMAN: But Judge Choate asked me what I nee	ded the
i	1	

exhibits for this afternoon, and I said, "Well, so far as I

1 can see, I only need 9-A and 9-B.\* 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 MR. WERDMAN: But I said Judge Call made it very clear 4 that he wants them all over here; that we are really kind of <del>-/</del> 5. stalled. 6. THE COURT: It is a criminal matter. They should be here for introduction by the People. 8 MR. WEEDMAN: So then Judge Choate said, "Well, I'll 9 attempt to reach Judge Call." 10 THE COURT: All right. 11 MR. WEEDMAN: That is when he apparently called. 12 THE COURT: That is where we are at the moment. 13 MR. WEEDMAN: Yes. That is when he apparently called and 14 left word. 15 Anything you want to do is agreeable with us. 16 THE COURT: Let's-go ahead as far as we can. 1.7 THE DEFENDANT: It is not agreeable. - 18. MR. WEEDMAN: What is not agreeable? 19 MR. KATZ: May I address your Honor? 20 THE COURT: Go ahead. 21 MR. KATZ: I was going to suggest to the court what I 22 anticipate to be the following course that the People will 23 pursue in concluding the case in chief: 24 25 26. 27 28

#11

.9· 10·

We, of course, are done with Lee Saunooke. Counsel wishes to show Lee Saunooke the exhibits 9-A and 9-B, which are the .45 revolvers belonging to Shorty. And he perhaps may have some additional questions in that area.

Now, I am willing at this time in order to accommodate counsel and the court, to put on Sgt. Whiteley out of order and commence his very short testimony.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KATZ: Then put on William Gleason, who is a deputy sheriff and put on his very short testimony in connection with the investigation, and then finally put on Sgt. Whiteley for the alleged admission that the defendant here made to Sgt. Whiteley when he was arrested pursuant to the grand jury warrant for the murder of Shorty Shea following the return of the grand jury indictment in September of 1970. And that will conclude my case.

of the People's case in chief to have all of the exhibits here and as counsel and I have previously discussed, to go in an orderly process and take each exhibit one by one, offer it.

If counsel has an objection, then he states his objection.

The court makes its ruling.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KATZ: Then after that orderly process -- and I discussed it with the court and counsel before and we all concluded it was reasonable, I then wanted those exhibits which are received in evidence to be viewed by the jury before I rest officially, and I would rest my case in chief.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KATZ: After the jury has viewed the exhibits.

I think counsel indicated he was going -- maybe

I am talking ahead of counsel now -- counsel may ask for a

few days --

THE COURT: That I am not worried about.

MR. KATZ: I think that is a reasonable request. But the reason I am saying this is this will give Department 106 once again a chance to have all of the exhibits to use.

THE COURT: Just one minute.

(Phone conversation between the court and Judge Choate, not reported.)



12-1

THE COURT: He says he will just order his clerk -- you see, they are cross-examining on these. He says he would like to ask his clerk to wait till you get through with your cross on A and B, and make your offer -- make the objection, if you have any, and let me rule.

MR. KATZ: Surely.

THE COURT: Then give them back to the clerk.

MR. KATE: What we want to do as soon as we rest and you have ruled on the introduction or admissibility of the exhibits, then we want the jury to view them before we rest.

THE COURT: I think we can work that out. Let's get over this hurdle here.

MR. KATZ: Fine. No problem at all.
THE COURT: Let's go ahead.

(The following proceedings were had in open court outside the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: Now, let's go ahead with our cross-examination.

The two exhibits -- you can take this all down -
are coming over and are in transit right now from 106, 9-A and

B.

Did you have some questions, or had you finished your questions with the exception of 9-A and B?

MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well then, do you want to start with your witness? You may have some preliminary questions of your next witness till the exhibits come.

,

20<sup>.</sup>

-	
1	MR. KATZ: Apparently he is en route from 106, and I
2 .	assume he will probably arrive about the same time as exhibits
3	9-A and 9-B.
4	If we can have five minutes at the most, or ten
÷ 5:	minutes
. 6	THE COURT: All right. Maybe it's the best thing. The
7	moment they come we will get that segment finished.
8.	MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: It's probably better thinking. They may be
10	here any minute.
11	As soon as they come, we will go ahead.
12	(Brief recess.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
.20:.	
.21.	
22	
.23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	

13-1 1	(The following proceedings were had
2	in open court outside the presence
3	of the jury:)
4	THE COURT: Now, gentlemen, we will proceed. People
5	against Grogan.
6	Defendant is here and both counsel are here. We
7	have our exhibits, I take it.
8	MR. KATZ: No, we do not, your Honor. We are going to
1.9	put a witness on out of order so we can move ahead.
10	THE COURT: Oh. All right.
- 11	MR. KATZ: We are ready to proceed.
12	THE COURT: Yes.
13	MR. KATZ: We need the jury.
14	THE COURT: How about your witness?
15.	MR. KATZ: Our Witness is here.
16	THE COURT: Don't you want to bring him in?
17	MR. KATZ: Right here.
18	THE COURT: Oh, I follow you. I wasn't following you then
19	You want to hold up the exhibit situation?
20	MR. KATZ: Yes. THE COURT: All right.
21 22	Bring in the jury, Sheriff, please.
23.	THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.
24	THE COURT: And you can take the stand, Officer.
25	
26	PAUL J. WHITELEY,
27	recalled as a witness by the People, testified further as
28	follows:
***	THE WITNESS: I have previously been sworn.

1	THE COURT: State your name again, please.
2	THE WITNESS: Paul J. Whiteley.
3	THE COURT: Thank you.
4	We will pull that right around. Thank you very
5	much.
ć	Here are the exhibits. Let's go ahead and finish
7.	with them.
8	MR. KATI: Yes. I agree.
9	THE COURT: Step down, if you will. Thank you very much.
10	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
11	(The following proceedings were had
12	in open court in the presence of the
13.	jury:}
1.4	THE COURT: Now we have all of our regular jurors and the
,15	three alternates.
16	The witness, you take the stand and state your name
17	please.
18	ر برد میسید سے میں ا
19	LEB SAUNOOKE,
20	resumed the stand and testified further as follows:
21	THE WITNESS: Lee Saunooke.
. 22	THE COURT: You have been sworn. All right.
23	Now, go ahead, Mr. Weedman.
24	Now we are continuing with the cross.
25 <sup>°</sup>	
26_	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
.27	BY MR. WEEDMAN:
`28 `	o Miss Saumooke. I would like to show you People's

exhibits 9-A and 9-B for identification, a pair of revolvers (handing) and ask you if you have ever seen those guns before. Yes, sir. ż 7. 23: · 25 

	į	1.
14	1	Q Were those Shorty's guns?
	.2	A I would say they were. They were more polished
	.3	before.
	4	Q Pardon me?
	5	A They used to be a little more polished, but I would
	6	say they were his guns.
	7 ,	Q Where were they a little more polished,
	8	Miss Saunooke?
	9 .	A He shined them all the time, continually.
	10	Q Did you ever see him cleaning the inside of these
	11	guns?
	12	A Yes, I have.
	13	Q Have you seen him then clean the inside of the
	14	cylinders, did you?
	15	A Yes. He always kept his guns clean.
•	16	Q Did you see him clean the inside of the barrels
	17	of both of these guns?
	18	A Yes. He had a kit that he used for it.
	19	Q When did you last see these guns, Miss Saunooke?
	20	A The last time I saw them was when he was living at
	21	my house.
	.22	Q That was in July of 1969?
	23	A That was in no. He wasn't living at my house
	24	in July of '69. He was there at that time. He lived with me
	25	in the latter part of February and part of March of '69, and he
• •	26 ,	had the guns there at my house at that time.
	27	Q Edd he have a case for the guns at that time?
	28	A Yes, he did.
	1	·

1	Q	When you saw Mr. Shea in July, did you see these
2	guns in his	possession?
3		That is, People's 9-A and 9-B for identification.
4	A	No, I didn't.
5	Ω	Do you know where the guns were at that time?
6	A	No. I didn't ask him.
7	Q	Did Mr. Shea tell you at any time that he had
8	pawned thes	e particular guns, 9-A and 9-B?
ş	A	No, he didn't.
10	Q	Did you assume because of his apparent attachment
11	for these g	uns that he would never pawn them?
12	A	I didn't know. If he had been broke, he might have
13	pawned them	•
14	Ω	Pardon me?
15	A	If he had been broke, he might have pawned them.
16	Q	Would it be fair to say that Mr. Shea was broke
17	most of the	time in 1969, to your knowledge?
18	A	No.
19	Q	He was not?
20	<b>.</b>	No.
21	MR. W	EEDMAN: All right. Thank you, Miss Saunooke.
22	That is all	I have.
23	THE C	OURT: Is that all, gentlemen?
24	MR. K	ATZ: Just a few questions.
25		
26		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
27 .	BY MR. KATZ	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
28	Q	Lee, I believe you told us that Shorty was living

X.

at your house sometime in February and March of '69, is that 1 right? Α Yes, sir. pld he help you move into that house? 5 A Yes, he did. Can you tell us whether or not he contributed to the payment of the rent and food? Ά Yes, he did. In other words, he helped support the family, is that right? 10 11 Yes. 12 MR. KATZ: Thank your No further questions. THE COURT: Is that all now, folks, from the witness? Did you want this witness back on call? -MR. WEEDMAN: Yes. Thank you. <sub><</sub>16 THE COURT: I believe I told you if not, I'm telling 17 you -- we may have to call you back. You may be called to come 18 back again. I don't know. Maybe not, maybe yes. But be what 19 we calk available, on call, please. I'm not asking you to 20 stay here, but you must be subject to call. 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. 22 THE COURT: All right. That's all. Thank you, lady. 23 MR. KATZ: Your Honor, now, pursuant to our discussion, 24 the People would ask that People's 9-A and 9-B be received in 25 evidence. 26 THE COURT: Now, is there an objection at this time? 27 MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, I will submit the matter. 28 THE COURT: All right. I will overrule any objection.

(9A- 9B Evid -6

I will admit exhibits 9-A and 9-B in evidence.

Now, so the jury will fully understand, exhibits 9-A let me have them, will you -- 9-A and 9-B here, two revolvers, the People have offered in evidence these two revolvers. Heretofore, they have been marked for identification. That means there are numbers put on them and they are referred to by number, the revolvers marked for identification number so-and-so.

Now they are admitted in evidence as exhibits for the People. The People are moving that they be admitted in evidence. The court is admitting them in evidence, and at a later time they will be more fully shown to you, but I'll try to explain what has happened at this juncture.

Now, I'll return these at this time to the clerk in Department 106.

MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor.

15 12 fls

.

28-

And how long have you been a deputy sheriff?

1

3

5

6

7

8.

9.

ĴΟ.

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

15a

18

19

20

21

22

23<sup>.</sup>

24 25

**26** 

27

28

THE COURT: Now, we are in chambers. Defendant and both counsel.

Better back up for the purpose of any argument and read the last two questions, please.

(The record was read by the reporter as follows:

\*Q And I take it then it is fair to say you had the experience of working missing persons cases in connection with your homicide assignment, is that correct?

MA Yes.

"Q And can you tell us, without reference to this case, what generally is done when a deputy is developing a missing persons case; what do you do?")

THE COURT: Now, go shead.

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Hönor, I will object on the ground that it is irrelevant and immaterial to any issue in this case as to what this officer may or may not have done in connection with missing persons cases.

I assume that Mr. Katz is going to --

THE COURT: Well, either the D.A. is asking for conclusions, what is generally done, that is one thing that bothers  $m_{\rm C.o.}$ 

The question -- I am not ruling, I am debating it with you.

MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: What was done, could be another situation.

22

23

24

2Ŝ

26

27

28

What generally is done is conclusional. Depends on how you are framing your question.

Read the question again now.

MR. KATZ: I asked what generally was done.

THE COURT: Read the question again. See how it is framed.

(The question was read by the reporter as follows:

reference to this case, what generally is done when a deputy is developing a missing persons case; what do you do?")

THE COURT: That calls for conclusions and hearsay testimony.

MR. KATZ: Your Honor, the witness has testified he is a homicide investigator who works missing persons cases.

Now, there is a standard procedure which is followed by the homicide bureau of the sheriff's department in the ordinary course of the police business in connection with the development of missing persons cases. The evolvement, the evolution of a missing persons case.

He will tell you what they do in each and every instance. He then will be asked "What did you do in connection with the Shorty Shea case, if anything?"

THE COURT: Well, there is your germane question.

MR. KATZ: Well, it is really just as they did in the Scott case, the L. Ewing Scott case --

THE COURT: One thing, it is self-serving: "What did you

15-5

ŀ

Ś

8,

folks do in a previous case?" That is self-serving if anything else. "What procedure do you folks have to prove a man guilty?"

"What have you done respecting the Shea case" is proper, not what your general procedure with other people charged with crimes is.

MR. KATZ: Well, your Honor, I think we are fighting shadows. I don't care. I can ask him directly. I was just laying foundation, your Honor.

15-6

2

Ś

5

6

7

8: 9

10

 $\mathbf{n}$ 

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24 25

·26·

27.

28

THE COURT: Well, I think I will sustain the objection the way it is framed. That is why I stopped there to get the analysis of it.

In my mind I am not trying to be argumentative about it, but it is "What do you do? What is your general procedure in all of the cases that come before you? Every case, what do you do to prove missing persons?"

MR. KATZ: This is kind of like a business records exception in a sense.

THE COURT: This isn't business records. The Penal Code doesn't say you can go into this.

MR. KATZ: I have no objection if your Honor wants me to just ask "What did you do?"

THE COURT: I think if you say to this witness substantially this, something like this in substance, "What did you do? What steps did you take to ascertain the whereabouts of Shea?"

"We did this; we did this; we did this; we did this."

But you are asking for facts, and you are getting facts, that is my point.

MR. KATZ: I have no objection to frame it that way.

THE COURT: I don't think I would rule you out on that.

The defense counsel, if he desires, can make the objection.

But I think that would be permissible questioning.

MR. KATZ: This is precisely the question that was asked in the L. Ewing Scott case, on circumstantial evidence.

THE COURT: If you put it down to Shea, if you put it

factually "What did you do in this instance respecting Shea?"

MR. KATZ: Fine. I will be happy to do so.

THE COURT: Find out what facts you did determine.

MR. WEEDMAN: Well, your Honor, I think --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. WEEDMAN: Of course I don't know what Mr. Katz' later questions will be, but I anticipate that much of it will be calling for hearsay so that I will undoubtedly be objecting as he moves along. And then we will just see where we end up.

THE COURT: Well, you make your objections. I don't know what else to say. It is very difficult.

You are fully entitled to make your objections and if necessary I will advise the jury that counsel has the full right to make his objections. I have said that many times.

It is the responsibility and a right if he thinks there is an objection, to make it. I mean, then I will rule. I don't know quite how else to go about it.

Ż

6.

Q

1Ò

13.

ahead.

			***
MR.	weedman:	That's right, your Honor. Of course,	I
don't kn	ow exactly	what Mr. Katz' questions will be.	
The	COURT: I	understand.	
MR.	WEEDMAN:	And they may or may not be objectional	ble.
क्रमक	ביי ביינו	have may be no objection. Now let's o	0

MR. KATZ: Counsel, once again, has the grand jury record, and I intend to stay very close to the grand jury proceedings. So I think he is well apprised of the type of questions that I am going to be asking Sgt. Whiteley.

THE COURT: Let's go ahead. I will rule as they come up.

MR. WEEDMAN: Perhaps we might have some preliminary
ruling with respect to the testimony that will indicate that

Sgt. Whiteley went to various agencies and said, "Have you
heard from Shorty Shea?" and they will say, "No."

That kind of evidence I will object to on the grounds that it is hearsay.

For example, he might check Social Security records and see that no deposits have been made to Shorty Shea's Social Security account.

THE COURT: How long an examination do you have?

MR. KATZ: Very short, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's bring him in here. I will take it here and see what we have.

Bring the witness in here, please.

(The witness Paul Whiteley was ushered into the chambers.)

THE COURT: Be seated, Officer. We are in chambers with

2

3

4 5

6

7

Ą.

9.

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

the officer here.

Sheriff, tell the jury to take five minutes. Keep them right in the jury room, but they can take a recess.

We are going to take your testimony for purposes of ruling one way or the other. ( IN CHAMBER)

So, you go ahead.

## EXAMINATION

## BY MR. KATZ:

- Sgt. Whiteley, were you assigned to work a missing person's case entitled "Donald Jerome Shea, also known as Shorty Shea?"
  - Yes.
  - Later did this case develop to be a homicide case?
  - A Yes.
- Now, in the course of your investigation concerning the missing person's case of Donald Jerome Shea, what efforts did you make to locate one Donald Jerome Shea, or Shorty Shea?
- The first thing that I had to do was to establish who Donald Jerome Shea was, as I only knew that he was Shorty. I contacted friends and relatives --

THE COURT: Of Shea?

THE WITNESS: -- of Mr. Shea's. I sent teletypes out to his known employers, to Missing Persons Details, to the California Identification and Investigation Section, to the Identification Section of Texas, Massachusetts, Arizona and Nevada.

I contacted film makers unions. Social Security

throughout	the	United	States	giving	a	description	o£	Donald
Jerome Shea	<b>a</b> ?					44		

I sent several nationwide teletypes.

As a result of the above efforts that you made to locate the whereabouts of Donald Jerome Shea, were you able to determine the whereabouts of Donald Jerome Shea?

No.

THE COURT: I think it is permissible.

Now, did you have any objection, Mr. Weedman?

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, I do, because --

THE COURT: All right. Make your objection.

MR. WEEDMAN: -- in each instance Sgt. Whiteley will be testifying as to things that were told him by others.

THE COURT: That's right.

MR. WEEDMAN: And to the extent that that is being offered for the truth of the matter asserted, it is obviously hearsay.

THE COURT: It would be hearsay, - I concede that.

MR. KATZ: It is not offered for the truth, but for circumstantial evidence --

MR. WEEDMAN: Of course it is offered --

MR. KATZ: Of course it is not. It is offered as circumstantial evidence to show that there was no response to the information which Sgt. Whiteley had decimated nationwide by way of teletype, and this is admissible under L. Ewing Scott.

ĩ

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14.

15

16

MR. WEEDMAN: If it is not being offered to show, say, for example, that the Social Security Department didn't receive any deposits in the name of Donald Jerome Shea, it is hearsay, of the most obvious kind.

THE COURT: Well, it is hearsay. I think it does constitute, you might say, an exception, for one thing, but the jury instruction on the point could, I think, clear up — it could state to the jury this is hearsay, but has evidentiary value in going to the point of whether or not — what has happened to — let us put it that way — where is Donald Shea? Directed to that point.

I will admit the testimony, and your objection is noted.

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, supposing -- if I may be heard for a moment.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. WEEDMAN: Supposing Officer Whiteley testified that he talked with Mr. X and he asked Mr. X, "Have you seen Shorty Shea since August the 29th?" And Mr. X says, "No, I haven't seen Shorty Shea."

Now, that is hearsay. I don't think there is any question about it. And all Sergeant Whiteley is testifying to now is the same kind of evidence.

THE COURT: I concede it is hearsay, in my opinion, but I do think it is admissible for the consideration of the jury.

I will overrule the objection.

MR. KATZ: Now, your Honor, there is an additional part that I intend to elicit, and I don't want to surprise counsel,

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

so I will give him an opportunity to make any objection he has at this time. I will then ask Sgt. Whiteley what efforts, if any, he made to locate the body of Shorty Shea.

THE COURT: Let's get the question now, then, so I can -You can answer that, Sergeant.

THE WITNESS: From my investigation, I have spent, with my department, approximately 2000 man-hours. I have dug up areas in Devil's Canyon, Ybarra Canyon, Spahn's Ranch, Iverson's Ranch, and all the property surrounding Spahn's Ranch -- the Southern Pacific property -- and I have not found anything.

MR. KATZ: Your Honor, that would be basically the type of inquiry in this area. I might develop it a little further as to specifically how he -- specifically what efforts he made in this area, you know, what does he mean by "digging."

on the strength of the testimony. That testimony, of course, could be valuable testimony for the defendant in the fact that the People's case is directed — the direct testimony indicating that the remains of Shea were taken down the stream and buried under leaves or gravel, coupled with the fact that the shewiff has put several thousand, did you say —

THE WITNESS: 2000.

THE COURT: -- 2000 men looking for the remains and they are not there. If anything, I would say it would assist the defendant more than it would the People. But that is not my business. This is your case. I'm telling you the immediate reflection I have.

MR. KATZ: I understand. But, they didn't have 2000 men;

Š

13.

. 19

20.

23:

there were 2000 man-hours. 1 Let's go ahead. I note your objection. THE COURT: 2 Your Honor, I think, because I consider the MR. WEEDMAN: 3. point quite important, I think I had better make a record. 4 THE COURT: You want to object to this in open court? 5 I don't need to argue it in open court, MR. WEEDMAN: 6 but I think I'd better object so we will have a clear record 7 with respect to this. 8 THE COURT: You have an absolute right to do it. 0 MR. WEEDMAN: I think it is extremely important. It may 10 be a little tedious --11 THE COURT: I don't care. You have that right. 12 I will make it as swift as I can. MR. WEEDMAN: 13 (The following proceedings were had 14 in open court.) 15 Now, gentlemen, we will go ahead. We are 16 back in court. The defendant is here, both counsel are here. 17 Now, Sheriff, you can bring in the jury and we 18 will proceed. 19 You can take the stand, Officer, if you will. 20 State your name again, if you will, please. 21 THE WITNESS: Paul J. Whiteley. 22 THE COURT: Thank you. You have been sworn. 23 24 (The following proceedings were had 25 in open court in the presence of the 26 jury.) THE COURT: Now we have our jurors back, plus the 27 28 alternates.

end

16A

Voter's registration of Los Angeles County. And

#17

utility companies in both San Francisco and in Los Angeles 1 County and Ventura County. 2 The postal -- U. S. Postal authorities in California, 3 Arizona, Texas, Massachusetts. The Veteran's 'Administration 4 of California, Massachusetts, Arizona and, I believe, Louis-5. ville, Kentucky, is the main center. 6 I contacted credit bureaus in Southern California. 7 I contacted the mental hospitals for the State of California 8 and also for the State of Arizona. 9 I contacted the license bureaus of Los Angeles 10 County Sheriff's Office, and the Los Angeles Police Department. 11 Now, I don't know if you said this, so forgive 12 me for asking the question: Did you also contact the FBI and 13 ask for their assistance? 14 A Yes, I did. 15 Lastly, did you also contact the Internal Revenue Q 16 Service? 17 Yes, sir, I did. And I also contacted the police 18 departments of Texas, Massachusetts, Arizona, Nevada and 19 California. 20 And as a result of all those efforts that you made 0 21 were you able to determine the whereabouts of Donald Jerome 22 Shea or Donald Jerome Shorty Shea? 23 No, sir. 24 MR. WEEDMAN: Excuse me, your Honor. I will object on 25 the ground that all of the answers which presumably were 26 received by Sergeant Whiteley are hearsay, your Honor. 27 THE COURT: I overrule the objection, 28

1	MR, WEEDMAN: Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Go ahead.
. 3	g BY MR. KATZ: And in the course of your investi-
4	gation has anyone contacted you, Sergeant Whiteley, which
5	led you to knowledge of the whereabouts of Mr. Shea?
6	A No.
7	Q All right.
8	Now, in connection with your continuing investi-
9.	gation, did you make any efforts to locate the alleged remains
10	or a body of Shorty Shea?
11	A Yes, sir, I have,
12.	Q And when did you first begin looking for the body
13	of Shorty Shea?
14	A In November, 1969.
15	Q And where did you commence that investigation?
16	A In Devil's Canyon, which is adjacent to Spahn's
17	Ranch.
18	Q Approximately how far is Devil's Canyon from
19	Spahn's Ranch, if you know?
<b>2</b> 0	A Approximately a half a mile as the crow flies.
21	Q I take it you didn't fly with the crow, is that
22.	right?
23	A That's correct.
24	Q All right.
25	On land, approximately how far is it?
26	A Two and a half miles.
27	Q All right. And can you tell us if you know what
28 .	direction it is from Spahn Ranch?

	•	
1:	<b>A</b>	It would be northeast of Spahn's Ranch.
2	Q	All right.
3-	Í	And was there any particular part of Devil's
4 -	Canyon that	you went to?
5	- <b>A</b>	I at that time, yes. I have searched sub-
6	sequently the	ne entire canyon.
7	· Q.	All right.
8		You are talking about Devil's Canyon?
9	A	That's correct.
10	Q	When was it that you first went to Devil's Canyon?
11	: A	November 1969.
12	. Q	What did you do in Devil's Canyon?
13	A	Dug and dug.
14	Q	Did you find anything?
15	A	No, I did not.
16	Q	All right.
17		Where is the next place you looked for the body
18	of Shorty Sh	nea?
19	Α	Spahn's Ranch.
20	Q	And where at Spahn's Ranch?
21 .	A	Its entirety. I also checked the adjacent areas;
22	the Southern	Pacific property to the south; the Iverson Ranch
23	to the north	east; Ybarra Canyon, which would be almost due
24	north; Santa	Susana Pass area.
25	Ō	All right.
26		Now, Sergeant, let's get some time periods in
27	there if you	can. Can you tell us, for example, when it was
28	or on how ma	my occasions you went to Spahn Ranch looking for

1 .	the body of Shorty Shea?
2.	A I personally had been to Spahn's Ranch at least
3	35 times.
4	Q And were you with a crew or team of deputies?
5 -	A Sometimes I was with just my partner. Sometimes
6.	I had as many as 45 additional sheriff's personnel with me.
7	Q And did you have the availability of any equipment
8	to assist you in that regard?
9	A Yes.
10	Q What kind of equipment?
11	A We had pumping equipment to pump water. We had
12	bulldozer. That's about it. And jackhammers.
13	Q And jackhammers?
14	And when you say that you searched every inch of
15	Spahn Ranch property, are you telling us that you dug up
16	every square inch of earth?
<b>17</b> .	A No, sir. I didn't.
18	Q Please tell us what you mean by searching Spahn
19	Ranch.
20	A We went over anything that looked like it could
21	be a place where a body would be secreted.
22 ;	Q All right.
23	So it is fair to say you did not dig up every
24	square inch of earth, is that correct?
25	A That's correct. It's almost an impossible task.
26	Q All right.
27	And can you just describe somewhat the terrain
28	at Spahn Ranch.

1	A Yes. It's quite hilly, with numerous boulders.
2	And at the time that we were searching the area
3	was overgrown with vegetation.
4	Q All right.
5	Now, when was the first time that you went to
6	Spahn Ranch to look for Shorty's body?
7	A In November 1969.
8	Q Now, between the end of August or the first part
9 .	of September 1969 and November of 1969, had there been any heavy
10 ·	rains?
11	A Yes, there had been.
12	Q When?
13	A Through the months of September and October.
14 .	Q And where were these rains, are we talking about
15	Los Angeles and Chatsworth?
16	A Yes. They were in the Chatsworth area.
17 -	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	! 
23	
24	
25	
26	A STATE OF THE STA
27	
28	

17A

1	Q And where else had you looked besides Spahn Ranch
2	and Devil's Canyon?
3	A Ybarra Canyon.
4	Q All right.
5	Now, where is Ybarra Canyon in relation to Spahn
6	Ranch and Devil's Canyon?
7	A It would be almost north of Spahn Ranch. It
8	connects into Devil's Canyon.
9.	And approximately how many man-hours were spent in
10	attempting to locate the body of Shorty?
11	Just an approximation, well over 2,000 man-hours.
12	Q You are not talking abour 2,000 mean, you are
13	talking about 2,000 man-hours?
14	A That's correct.
15	Q All right.
16	Did Sgt strike that. I just elevated him.
17	Did Deputy Gleason, the gentleman to my left,
18	assist in these searches?
19	A Yes. On numerous occasions.
20	Q And did you ever look for the body of Shorty Shea
21	at the Barker Ranch area?
22	A Yes, sir.
23 <sup>-</sup> 24	Q When was that?
25	A October of 1969, And also June of 1970.
•	Q And where did you look in the Barker and Myers
26 27	Ranch area?
21 28	A We looked on the property as well as the surround-
Ļ0	ing area.

17a-1

1		
I	Q	You looked for obvious grave sites and the like,
2	is that corn	rect?
3	A	That is correct.
4	Q	Is it fair to say you did not dig up all of the
5	property?	
. :6	· A	No, we did not.
7	Ď	All right.
8	·	Now, there is a creek located at Spahn Ranch, is
· 9 📗	that correct	
10	A	That's correct.
11°	Q	Where is that in relation to the main buildings
12	where the bo	pardwalk used to be located and the Longhorn
13	Saloon?	,
14	Ä	It runs directly behind them. It's to the south
15	of the main	buildings.
16	Q	In connection with your looking for the body of
17	Shorty Shea	did you dredge any portion of that creek?
18	A	Yes, we did.
19	Q	When did you do that?
<b>20</b> ⋅	A	January 1970.
21	Q	And how much of the creek did you dredge?
<b>22</b> <sup>-</sup>	A	We dredged it till it was dry.
23	Q	Well, that's a pretty long creek, isn't it?
:24'	A	We had some pretty big pumping equipment.
25	Q	All right.
26		Did you look at a particular section of the creek?
27	A:	Yes, we did.
. 28	Q	Where did you look?
	1	•

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

> 20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28 (The question was read by the reporter as follows:

"Q To this date do you know where

the body of Shorty Shea is?")

THE COURT: Well, you can answer the question.

THE WITNESS: No, sir, I don't.

MR. KATZ: Thank you. No further questions,

MR. WEEDMAN: Well, your Honor, for the record, this is an ultimate fact to be determined by this jury. And I must protest as to the assumption that this matter is a foregone conclusion.

THE COURT: Well, the record may show your position.

Overruled.

You may cross-examine.

MR. WEEDMAN: Well, your Honor, I would request at this time that the jury be instructed that the existence of a corpus delicti indeed is a fact ultimately for their determination. It may not be imposed upon them by the prosecutor or the court or anyone else.

THE COURT: Well, I only at this time rule. The objection overruled. The record may note -- show your exception.

That's all for the People?

MR. KATZ: Yes. With respect to this subject matter.

MR. WEEDMAN: Well, may I inquire if counsel has any further questions of Sgt. Whiteley.

THE COURT: Well, are you ready for your cross?

MR. KATZ: I said no, with respect to this subject matter!
We have concluded our direct examination of Sgt. Whiteley.

1	MR. WEEDMAN: Well, I have no questions until Sgt.
2	Whiteley is through testifying, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: That is all then. I have overruled the
4	objection.
5	Any further questions? He has answered your
6	questions. Any further questions?
7	MR. KATZ: I have no further direct examination at this
8	time.
9	THE COURT: Any cross?
10	MR. WEEDMAN: If counsel is going to call Sgt. Whiteley
11	back again I would like to know about it.
12	THE COURT: Any further direct?
13	MR. KATZ: Not on this subject matter. We will be going
14	into another area which has nothing to do with this particular
15	subject matter.
16	He is my last witness, and he will be called in
17	a few minutes.
18	THE COURT: That is what I want to know. Any cross?
19	MR. WEEDMAN: Well, I don't know, I think it is rather
20	unusual to keep calling a witness back and forth, your Honor.
21	When there is no apparent need for it.
22	He is on the stand. Let's hear the rest of his
23	testimony, then I will cross-examine.
24	THE COURT: All right. That's all at this time then,
25	Thank you.
.26	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
<b>27</b> .	MR. KATZ: The People wish to call Deputy Gleason.

	1	WILLIAM C. GLEASON,
	2	recalled as a witness by the People, testified further as
	3	follows:
	4	THE COURT: Now, you were sworn. State your name.
	5	THE WITNESS: William C. Gleason, G-1-e-a-s-o-n.
,	6	
INDEX	7	DIRECT EXAMINATION (Resumed)
	8	BY MR. KATZ:
	9	Q Deputy Gleason, in August of 1969 what was your
	10	assignment?
	ir '	A Assigned to the Record Bureau of the sheriff's
	12	department.
	13	Q And in connection with that assignment were you
	14	working exclusively the record bureau, or were you working
	15	some other assignment with another department?
	16	A I was assisting the Auto Theft Detail and the
	17	Malibu Sheriff's Substation regarding an auto theft investiga-
	18'	tion.
	19	Q All right.
	20	And as a result of your assignment in August of
	21	1969 did you thereafter become familiar with members of the
	22	Manson family?
	23	Ä Yes.
	24	Q Were you later assigned to work the so-called
	25	Manson cases with the sheriff's department?
	.26 °	à Yes.
	27	Q Incidentally, did you participate in the so-called
	28	August 16th, 1969 Spahn Ranch raid?

ļ	A Yes, I did.
2	Q Now, Deputy, at some point of time did you join
3	the homicide bureau of the sheriff's department?
4 ;	A Yes.
5	Q When was that?
6	A I was permanently assigned August 12th, 1970.
7	Before that time I had been on loan to them.
8	Q And were you working part of the so-called Manson
9	cases?
10.	A Yes.
11	Q All right.
12	Now, in connection with your assignment to the
13	homicide department were you particularly assigned to the
14	Shorty Shea case as an investigator?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And thereafter did you assist Sgt. Whiteley who
17	is seated to my left at the counsel table?
18	À Yes.
19	
20	
21	,
22	, , , ,
23	
24	
25 26	
26 27	
2 <i>1</i> 28	
<b>20</b> .	

	1	
•	2	
•	3	
	4	
-	5.	
	6	
	7	
	8	
•	9	
	10	
	Ĩ1	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	٠.
	17	
	18	
	19 <sup>.</sup>	
	20	
	21	_
	22	
-	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27°	
	28	•

- Q And in particular, did you make any checks or efforts to locate Shorty Shea, that is, the whereabouts of Shorty Shea?
  - A Yes, T did.
  - Q What did you yourself do in that connection?
- A I have contacted the CII, the Criminal Identification and Investigation section of the State of California.

  I have contacted the FBI, the voters' registration, the Department of Motor Vehicles regarding any driver's license information and also any vehicles registered to Mr. Shea.

Hospital, the Harbor General Hospital, the Long Beach General Hospital. I have contacted the Veteran's Administration,

I have contacted the Bureau of Public Assistance, or Department of Public Social Services, for Los Angeles County, and I have contacted other agencies that have arrested Mr. Shea in the past.

THE COURT: Now, wait a minute.

MR. KATZ: That's all right.

THE COURT: Just a minute. Leave the personal comments out, if you will. You contacted other agencies, is that right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: And I have contacted all of Mr. Shea's known friends and relatives, employers.

I have contacted the film makers' union, the Screen Actors Guild, the Social Security system, the Internal

1 .	Revenue Service, and other agencies.
2	Q BY MR. KATZ: Did you also once again contact the
3	FBI for assistance?
4.	A Yes.
5 .	Q And did you send any nationwide teletypes giving
6.	the physical description and other pertinent information
7 .	regarding Donald Jerome Shea?
8	A Yes, I have.
9.	Q Did you just ask for a location as to the where-
10	abouts of Donald Jerome Shea, or did you ask for it in multiple
11	names?
12	A I asked for information on both the name Donald
13	Jerome Shea and the name Donald Jerome, with the nickname of
14.	Shorty.
15·	Q How recently have you sent these teletypes?
16	A I believe the last one was on August 6, 1971.
17	Q Did you, in substance, update what Sgt. Whiteley
18	had been doing?
19	A Yes.
20	Q And as the result of your investigation and efforts
21	were you able to determine the whereabouts of Donald Jerome
22	Shea, or Donald Jerome, or Shorty Shea?
-23	A No, sir, I was not.
24	MR. KATZ: Thank you. I have no further questions.
25	THE COURT: Cross examine.
26	
27	
28	

}	
1	CROSS EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. WEEDMAN:
3	Q What general hospitals did you contact, Deputy
4	Gleason?
5 ,	A The Los Angeles County General Hospital, the
6	Harbor General Hospital, and Long Beach General Hospital.
7	Q What information did you provide them by way of
8	physical description?
9.	A Well, the information I furnished to the General
10	Hospitals was his complete name, both names; his sex; race;
11	and date of birth; and with that information they can look
12	in their files and determine if they have any person by those
13	names.
14	Q Are you personally aware that the Los Angeles
15	General Hospital Records Section checked every single patient
16	that they had had since August of 1969 in order to determine
17	if they had a matching physical description to that of Shorty
18	Shea?
19	A You say am I aware of that?
20	Q I'm asking you if you have any knowledge that they
21	did so.
22	A No, sir, I do not.
23	Q How soon after you made your inquiry to the Los
24	Angeles County General Hospital did you receive a reply from
25	them?
26	A I made it via the telephone and held on the phone

28

while they checked their records.

have you any idea the number of patients that have  $\mathbf{Q}$ 

been admitted to the Los Angeles County General Hospital since 1 August of 1969 to August the 6th of 1971? 2 No. sir. 3 Would it be fair to say that it numbers in the 4 tens of thousands? 5 MR. KATZ: I will object. He says he has no idea. 6 is argumentative, obviously. It would be fair to say nothing. 7 THE COURT: Let me have the question. **'8**' MR. WEEDMAN: I don't have to accept the fact that he 9 has no idea. He must have some idea, your Honor. He's a 10 deputy sheriff. 11 THE COURT: Wait a minute. Let me have the question. 12 (The record was read by the reporter 13 as follows: 14 M.O. Have you any idea the number of 15 patients that have been admitted to the Los .16 Angeles County General Hospital since August of 17 1969 to August the 6th of 1971? 18 A" No, sir. 19 Would it be fair to say that it 201 numbers in the tens of thousands?") 21 THE COURT: You can answer that question. 22 THE WITNESS: That would be a fair statement, yes. 23 BY MR. WEEDMAN: All right, thank you, Deputy 24 Gleason. 25 I take it, then, that with respect to your 26 inquiries to the Los Angeles County General Hospital, that it 27 is a fair assumption, assuming you are an expert in this area, 28

1	that they merely checked their files for the name and did not
-, 2,	check against the physical description?
~. ↑ 3	A As far as I know, that is true, yes.
4	Q And the same would be true of the Long Beach
5-	General Hospital, would it not?
6	A Yes.
~ ~7	Q And any other hospitals that you may have checked
8	A Yes.
. 9	Q Did I understand you to say, Deputy Gleason, that
10	you had checked with the Social Security Administration?
11	A Yes.
12	Q Did you receive any information at all relative
13	to the name that you submitted to them?
14	A Yes.
15	Q What was that information?
16	A The information was that there was no activity
17	on Mr. Shea's account after September the 1st, 1969.
18	Q Did you ask them for any activity prior to
19	September of 1969?
<b>20</b>	A Yes. We asked them for the latest information
21	that they had indicating the most recent activity.
. 22	•
23	
24	
25	
.26	ana.
27	

18 A

Q Well, when did they tell you that a deposit had
last been made into Mr. Shea's account, if any?
A As I recall, they indicated it was sometime in
July of 1969.
O Did they tell you the source of that?
A Yes.
Q What was that?
A A place called the Swinger's Boutique.
Q And as far as you know, is that the same Swinger's
Boutique that was operated by Jerry Binder in Las Vegas?
A As far as I know, yes.
Q Any entries prior to that in his Social Security
file?
A We did not receive that information.
Q Did you assume, in connection with your searching
for Mr. Shea, that there would in all likelihood, if he were
alive, be regular entries into his Social Security account?
Mell, I had no way of knowing if there would be
regular deposits or reflections on his account because we only
made one inquiry, the latest information.
Q And I assume that you submitted only the two name:
that you have indicated, is that so?
Yes.
Q And I take it that you also submitted only one
Social Security number, is that so?
h Yes, sir.
Q Had Mr. Shea been using a different name, and had
he been issued a different Social Security card you would have

	<u>.</u>
1	Q Was Mr. Shea ever known through your investigation
2	to have any credit rating with any credit bureau?
3.	None that I could find, sir.
4	Q What film makers union or group did you check with
5	if I understand your testimony correctly?
6	A The address we had was, I believe it was, in the
7	7700 block of Sunset Boulevard in Hollywood.
8	Q What is the name of that organization again?
9	A That I do not recall, sir.
10	Q In any event, did you determine that Mr. Shea was
11	or was not a member of that organization?
12	A They had no record of him.
13	
14	, s-
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	,
25	
26	
27	
28	

18b

18B

67868 ID

1	Q I take it they had no record before or after Aug-
<b>2</b> '.	ust of 1969?
3	A None that I know of, sir.
4	Q Did you participate, Deputy Gleason, in this
5	rather massive search for at least a possible body of Mr. Shea
6	A Yes, I did, sir.
7	Q Did you turn up even a bone that you thought
<b>8</b> , ,	might be Mr. Shea's or any part of a corpse or a body at all?
9	A No, sir.
10	MR. WEEDMAN: Thank you, sir. That is all I have.
11	THE COURT: Is that all?
12	MR. KATZ: No. Just a few questions.
. 13	Your Honor, I have two aerial maps, and I ask that
14	they be marked People's next in order.
15	THE COURT: Is that in connection with this testimony?
16.	MR. KATZ: Yes.
17	THE COURT: All right. They may be so marked.
18	MR. KATZ: Mr. Hogan, may we have some exhibit numbers?
19	I don't know what our last exhibit number was.
20	THE CLERK: Your next exhibit, sir, would be No. 67.
21.	MR. KATZ: Thank you. I ask that one of these aerial
22	photographs be marked People's 67 and the second one be marked
23	People's 68 for identification.
24	THE COURT: All right.
- 25	MR. KATZ: May I approach the witness, your Honor?
26	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
27 ·	Q BY MR. KATZ: Let's start out, if we can, with
28	People's 68 for identification. Would you please explain to

1 photograph. Topanga Canyon Boulevard is the dark line running 2 up the right-hand lower center of the photograph. 3 The Southern Pacific Railroad tracks are indicated 4 as a line in the lower center portion of the photo that goes 5 across and curves and goes off the bottom of the photograph. 6 The Devil's Canyon area is the white line that 7 goes through the center upper portion of the picture. 8 Is that labeled on the map? 9 It is marked "Devil's Canyon." 10 Α Yes. All right. 11 There are other designations. The Johnson Motor-12 way -- that is a fire road -- is in the upper left-hand 13 corner of the photograph. 14 In the right center of the photograph are two 15 Camp designations, the River/and a Waterfall. 16 Where is that located? On what property? 17 That is in the Devil's Canyon area. Α 18 We have one more designation, or two more desig-19 We have marked here a tunnel, which is a landmark, nations. 20 where the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks go under Topanga 21 Canyon Boulevard. 22 Also just south of that tunnel is a rocky area 23 known as Stony Point. 24 Directly north of the Santa Susana Pass Road and 25 between Santa Susana Pass Road and the Simi Valley Freeway 26 That is a proposed is the designation of "Wonderland West." 27 housing development. It is a very rocky, hilly area. 28

**XR** 19

And up at the extreme top portion of the picture is a designation of the Sulfur Springs. Actually, the actual location of the Sulfur Springs would be off of this map by about two inches above the designation.

Q All right. Now, there is an X which you have placed somewhere on this People's 68. What does that designate?

A This X is just west of Topanga Canyon Boulevard and at the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks. That is where Mr. Shea's vehicle was found, or was removed from by a person --

Is blown up?

28.

5 6

7

8 9.

10 11

12 13

14

16

15

17

18

19

20 .21

> 22 23

24

25 26

27

. 28

Yes.

All right.

So let's go to People's 67 for identification. Will you explain what this photograph depicts?

This is a blownup area of the same map we saw previously. The heavy white line going across the top of the photograph is the Simi Valley Freeway. The dark line curving across the center of the photograph is Santa Susana Pass Road.

The Spahn Movie Ranch is almost in the middle of the photograph. The dark line curving and going to the bottom of the photograph, at the right lower right-hand corner is the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks.

There are other designations. The gray line going from Santa Susana Pass Road up to the Simi Valley Freeway is a two-lane road called Iverson Lane.

I have marked some of the areas of the Spahn Movie Ranch and the other surrounding area that we have conducted searches.

- How are they designated?
- Starting in the right-hand side of the picture --
- Is that east?
- The eastern part of the Spahn Ranch area, there in the upper right-hand corner is an area known as the Iverson Movie Ranch. We have searched the hills and several caves in that area and also several of the movie prop buildings that were still existing.

In the right center of the photograph in the area designated railroad tracks, the creek, this is a creek that

.2

.10

runs generally across the middle of the photograph up behind the Spahn Movie Ranch and up into the western edge of the photo or the left-hand edge of the photo.

We have searched along this creek. We have found camps. Campsites that we have searched. We have searched some caves that are both south of Santa Susana Road and north of Santa Susana Road.

We have searched the creek behind the Spahn Movie Ranch. And all of the creek area running across the middle of the photograph to the lower -- to the left center of the photograph, up to an area known as the farmhouse or outlaw shacks area.

Let me stop you there for a moment. With respect to this label here, farmhouse area and outlaw shacks, is this on the borderline between what was formerly known as Mary Kelly's property? The property that Frank Rets originally bought?

A Yes.

Q And this was the property borderline, that is, the western borderline which separated the Mary Kelly property from the George Spahn property, is that correct?

A Yes, the farmhouse and outlaw shacks were on the Kelly property. Also we have searched an area designated here as a sucalyptus grove. That is a large stand of sucalyptus trees. We have searched that area.

On west of these locations, off of the map, are several locations we have checked, including having the county flood control district bring one bulldozer and

jackhammers into the area to break up large rocks and to take apart a cave that we had received information on.

Also west of this area, approximately one mile west of the edge of this photograph, is the Los Angeles County-Ventura County line. We have searched some portions in Ventura County in an area known as Box Canyon.

I have been present when myself, Sgt. Whiteley, other members of our department have searched this general area, and I have participated in most of the searches.

Q All right.

Now, if you will resume the stand for a moment, Deputy Gleason. I note that as we look at both exhibits 67 and 68 it shows a rather undeveloped area of land, is that correct?

- A Yes.
- Q So with the exception of the few buildings that appear on these two exhibits, it's rather barren, is that correct?
  - A Yes.
  - Q And undeveloped?
  - A Yes.
- Q And with reference to People's 68 I will put this up for just a moment to hold it and I have specific reference to Devil's Canyon. Is this a developed area?
  - A No, sir.
- And would you once again point to Devil's Canyon and how it proceeds in a northerly direction on People's 68 for identification.

,	A Devil's Canyon starts approximately here on the				
, 1					
2	right center portion of the photograph. This is a deep canyon				
3	with what is known as a county fire road or county fire motor-				
4	way that goes across and up off of the upper center of the				
5	photograph.				
Ġ	The roadway is in the bottom of the canyon with				
7	steep gullys on each side.				
8	Q All right.				
9	Now, is there a lot of sand and sandstone in that				
10	area?				
11	A Yes.				
12	Q How about Spahn Ranch?				
13	A Yes.				
14	Q And how about Ybarra Canyon?				
15	A Yes.				
16	Q How about Box Canyon?				
17	A Yes. It's very sandy.				
18	Q All right.				
19	Now, did any fires occur in those areas during the				
20	course of your investigation?				
<b>21</b>	A Yes.				
22	Q And where did the fires occur?				
<b>2</b> 3	A It burned this whole area depicted on the map				
<b>24</b> .	down to it did not include the residences in the lower				
.25	right-hand corner. But everything else was burned in September				
26	of 1970.				
27	Q Just so I understand you, was Devil's Canyon burned?				
28	A Yes.				

						~
	. 1	Q Q	How about Spa	hn's Ranch?	,	
ř	.2	<b>a</b>	Yes, it was.			
	3.	Q	How about Box	Canyon?	* ,	* ************************************
	4	. <b>A</b>	Ŷes.		-	
	5.	Q	And how about	Ybarra Canyon?	in a p	
	6	À	Yes, it was.			e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
	7	Q	And after the	fire did you m	ake some ad	lditional
	8	checks with	regard to the	possibility of	discoverin	ig a body
	9	of Shorty S	ihea?	٠.	4-	enter de la companya
	10	λ	Yes, we did.			•
19a	11		•			
	12	•				
•	13.		•			
1	14.	•				
	15		•			
	16			÷		
	17					
	18	•				
•	19					•
	20				-	
	21	• •				
	22					
•	23					,
	24					
•	25					
	26				gen.	arte gan
	27		•	-	, ***. *	
	28				- -	^ -

1	Q So you made checks both before and after the fire,
2 .	is that correct?
. 3.	A Yes, we have.
4	MR. KATZ: Thank you. You may resume the stand.
5	Thank you. No further questions.
6	MR. WEEDMAN: I have no more questions. Thank you,
7.	your Honor.
.8	THE COURT: All right.
9	MR. KATZ: The witness wanted to confer with me for one
10	moment, if I may.
11	THE COURT: Yes.
12	(Witness and counsel conferring, not reported.)
13	MR. KATZ: No questions.
14	THE COURT: Is that all?
15	MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, it is. Thank you.
16	THE COURT: That is all.
17	MR. KATZ: Recall Sergeant Whiteley.
18	
19	PAUL J.WHITELEY,
20	Resumed the stand.
21	THE COURT: Now, you have been sworn. State your name
22	again, please.
23.	THE WITNESS: Paul Whiteley. W-h-i-t-e-l-e-y.
24	
25	DIRECT EXAMINATION (Resumed)
.26	BY MR. KATZ:
27	Q Sgt. Whiteley, incidentally, do you recognize the
28	areas that Deputy Cleason nointed out on People's 67 and 68

for identification? 1. 2. Yes, I do. Ά Do those fairly and accurately depict the general areas where you attempted to locate the alleged body of Shorty Shea? A Yes. Incidentally, I want to ask you this one last Q -question on the subject matter, you are familiar with the · 8, - manner in which the people are admitted to the hospitals such ~9 as Los Angeles County General Hospital? 10 Yes, I am. A 11 And assuming a person is admitted as a John Doe, Q 12 is there any procedure that is required? 13 A Yes. 14 What is the procedure? Q 15 It is a policy of almost all hospitals to contact A 16 the local Police Department, and a report is made of a Jane 17 Doe or a John Doe admittance. 18 Q All right. 19 So if a person did not have sufficient identi-20 fication or could not be sufficiently identified it would be 21 necessary to have a police report to accompany the admission 22 of that person --23 MR. WEEDMAN: Just a moment, your Honor. The question 24 is leading, it is suggestive, and there is absolutely no 25. showing that Sgt. Whiteley, whatever his other good qualifi-~ 26. cations may be, has any knowledge whatever in this connection. - 27 THE COURT: It may be conclusional. Leads read the 28

question again, please. 1 MR. KATZ: I will lay a further foundation, and I will Ź. withdraw it if you like. **3**. THE COURT: Is it withdrawn? :4 MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor. **Š**, THE COURT: All right. Withdrawn. 6 BY MR. KATZ: In the course of your working 0 7 homicide cases and missing persons cases for approximately Ŕ. four years, have you been required to check with the various 9 hospitals in an attempt to identify persons? 10 Yes, I have. 11 And in the ordinary course of your business as a 12 homicide investigator with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's 13 office, have you had occasion to go over to such hospitals 14 as Harbor General, Los Angeles County Hospital? 15 A Yes, I have. 16 Have you been required to familiarize yourself 17 with the admitting procedures in connection with your 18 investigation? 19. I haven't been required, but I have done this. 20 I have admitted many people to the Los Angeles County Hospital, 2:1 General Hospital-USC Medical Center, and numerous hospitals. 22 · All right. Q 23 And in doing so, have you ever participated in the 24 admission of a person who was known as a John Doe? 25 A Yes. 26 27 Q And were you required as a police officer to do 28 something in connection with the admission of a John Doe

1	before the hospital will accept that person?
2	A Yes.
3	Q What were you required to do?
4	A Write a report giving a description of the person
5	and the clothing worn, and it was to be transmitted to the
6.	Missing Persons Detail of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's
. 7 . **	office.
8	Q Now, with reference to a John Doe booking,
. 9	assuming strike that.
10	In the course of your investigation as a homicide
11	investigator, have you been exposed to John Doe bookings in
12	jail?
13	A Yes, I have.
14	Q And have you participated in such bookings?
15	A Yes, I have.
16	Q Once again, what is required before a person
17	completes the booking procedure if he is booked in as a John
18	Doe?
19 .	A An immediate telephone call to the Homicide Bureau
20	Missing Persons Detail, giving the information of the John
21	Doe booking, followed up by a report.
22	Q Did you receive any information from any hospital
23'	or from any police agency giving you a physical description
24	similar to that of Donald Jerome Shea, booked as a John Doe,
25	or admitted to a hospital as John Doe?
26	A The way you phrased it there, yes.
27	Q All right.
28	What did you do, what kind of information did

you receive then? 1 We received information of a couple of John Does 2 in San Bernardino County which I investigated and found out 3 ultimately who they were. 4 5 Q All right. And they were not Donald Jerome Shea? 6 A That is correct. 7 But you did act upon this John Doe information 8 you received, is that right? 9. 10 A Yes, sir. In an attempt to determine whether it was the 11 12 same person as Donald Jerome Shea, is that correct? That's right. Α 13 Your investigation revealed what? Q 14 Α It was completely negative in regard to Mr. Shea. 15 Sgt. Whiteley, as I understand it, you are one 16 of the investigating officers in this case involving Shorty 17 Shea, is that correct? -18 That's correct. 19 As such was there a grand jury proceeding in the 20 Q December of 1970 which resulted in the indictment of the 21 defendant? 22 A Yes, there was. 23 And as a result of the indictment charging the 24 defendant with the murder of Shorty Shea, did you go some 25 place? 26 Yes, I did. A 27 Where did you go? 28 Q

1	A To Independence, California, Inyo County.
2	Q Where is that located in relation to Los Angeles?
3-	A It is approximately 224 miles northeast of Los
4	Angeles. It is just off of Bishop and just north of Lone Pine.
5	Q How far is that from Ballarat?
6	A About 135 miles.
7	Q Can you tell us whether or not Independence is
8	the nearest police station or sheriff's department from
9	Ballarat?
10	A Yes, it is.
11	Q All right.
12	Now, did you see Clem in Independence in December
13	of 1970?
14	A Yes, I did.
15	Q And as a result of the Los Angeles County Grand
16	Jury warrant, did you arrest him for murder?
17	A Yes, I did.
18	MR. KATZ: Excuse me. May I confer with counsel?
19	(Counsel confer. Not reported.)
20	MR. KATZ: Your Honor, I think this would be a time to
21	approach the bench.
22	THE COURT: All right.
23	MR. KATZ: Thank you.
24	THE COURT: All right. Step in chambers, then, with the
25	reporter.
26	Let the jury go to the jury room for a few minutes
27	Do not discuss the case, ladies and gentlemen.
28	Step right in here, if you will.

(The following proceedings were held 1. in chambers.) THE COURT: Now, we are in chambers. Now go ahead, Mr. Katz. 20 fls - 18 22: 23. 

20-1

1

. 2 . 3:

\_**4**; .-

-6-

7.

8-

.9-10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 .22

23

24

25

26 -

27 28 MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor.

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the matter outside the presence of the jury.

THE COURT: We had him about to be arrested, is that it?

MR. KATZ: Yes. The only thing I am going to inquire of

Sgt. Whiteley is the conversation he had with the defendant,

Mr. Grogan --

THE COURT: With Grogan?

MR. KATZ: -- when he took him in custody after fully advising him of his rights and receiving a full and complete waiver and compliance with Miranda.

THE COURT: Are you prepared to show it by the witness, that he so advised him?

MR. KATZ: That is right. That is why I brought him into chambers so counsel can inquire. As I understand it, I don't think I am in error. I don't think it is improper to bring the foundational questions in front of the jury so that counsel has a right to demand a hearing under 405 of the Evidence Code.

THE COURT: Is there any problem at this time?

MR. WEEDMAN: I think this is a preliminary fact for your Honor to discuss.

THE COURT: Do you want to bring it out at this time?

MR. KATZ: Yes.

THE COURT: We are in chambers. Go ahead. The witness is here.

IN	DEX
20	-2

5

Ż

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

.15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

## EXAMINATION

	4			
•		'DV	WÓ.	KATZ
	-A	DI	MAC -	

Q Sgt. Whiteley, were you armed with a warrant for the arrest of the defendant, Mr. Grogan, for the murder of Donald Jerome Shea?

A Yes.

Q Was that as a result of the grand jury indictment which occurred on or about December 17th, 1970?

A Yes.

And armed with this warrant, did you thereafter go to the City of Independence in California on or about December 18th, 1970?

A Yes.

Q And as a result of the murder warrant you had in your possession was the defendant turned over to your custody?

A Yes.

Q Did you have a conversation with the defendant concerning Shorty Shea?

A Yes.

Q Before having the conversation with the defendant concerning Shorty Shea did you advise him of certain constitutional rights?

A Yes.

And would you tell us exactly what you said to the defendant and what he said to you in that regard?

A I told Mr. Grogan the purpose that I was there for. I also introduced him to Deputy Gleason. I didn't have to introduce myself as he already knew me, and I read from a

ŀ sheriff's card, 477: 2 "You have a right to remain silent. Anything you say can and will be used against 3. you in a court of law. "You have a right to talk to a lawyer 6. before we talk to you and to have him present 7. while we talk to you. If you cannot afford 8 to hire a lawyer, one will be appointed to represent you before any questioning free of 10 charge.\* 11 Then I asked him three questions: 12 \*Do you understand each of the rights 13: explained to you?" 14 Mr. Grogan stated, "Yes." 15 "Do you want to talk about this case or not?" 16 1.7 Mr. Grogan stated "Yes." 18 \*Do you want a lawyer or not?\* 19 He stated, "No." 20 And thereafter did you have some sort of a conversation with the defendant concerning Shorty Shea? 21 <u>22</u> A Yes, I did. Just how did the conversation start in that regard? 23 I asked him to tell me what he knew of Donald Shea. 24 25 And thereafter did you and the defendant discuss 26. Shorty Shea? 27 Yes. MR. KATZ: All right. I have no further questions.

	1.	inquiry went to the foundation.
<b>.</b>	2	THE COURT: Do you want to ask some questions?
	3· .	MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, if I may.
	4	THE COURT: Go ahead.
•	5	
INDEX	6.	EXAMINATION
	7 <sup>.</sup>	BY MR. WEEDMAN:
•	8	o Sgt. Whiteley, you indicated that Mr. Grogan had
	9	known you before. What do you mean by that?
· ,	. 10-	A I had spoken to Mr. Grogan.
	11	Q When was that?
	12	I spoke to him during the Robert Beausoliel trial.
•	13	I spoke to him at the Spahn's Ranch. I spoke to him at county
	14.	jail.
	15	THE DEFENDANT: Did you come with a Capt. Davis?
	16	THE COURT: Just one minute. Wait a minute. Let him
~	17	finish with his questions.
	18	Q BY MR. WEEDMAN: Sgt. Whiteley, when was the first
	19	time that you had any contact at all with the defendant?
	20	A The first time I spoke with him was at the
•	20	Los Angeles main county jail. I can't remember when it was.
		It seems to me that it was in the last part of 1969 or the
	22	first part of 1970.
	23	
	.24	Q To help us perhaps pin that date down a little
	25	better, do you know why he was in custody at that time?
	26	A No, I don't. I know that he had been brought down
	27	from Inyo County.
	28	O Do you know whether or not the matter that he was

1.	in the Los Angeles County Jail for at that time was pending
2	in Van Nuys?
3 ,	A Sounds like it sounds like it. I think it was
4-	grand theft auto, but I can't remember what he was in jail for
5_	at the time.
6	2 And was anyone with you at this first contact with
7	Mr. Grogan?
8	· A Yes.
9	Q Who was that, Sergeant?
10	A Charles Guenther, deputy,
11	Q Was Mr. Grogan advised of his rights at that time?
12	MR. KATZ: I will object as being immaterial to these
13	proceedings.
14	THE COURT: You may answer the question.
15	THE WITNESS: No, sir, he wasn't.
16	g BY MR. WERDMAN: Did you have some conversation
17	with him?
18	A No. I don't think you would call it a conversa-
19	tion.
20	Q What was said at that time, Sergeant?
21	A We did all the talking, Deputy Guenther and
22	myself.
23	Do I understand you that my client was not advised
24	of any rights at that time?
25	A That's right, he was not.
26.	Were you interrogating him at that time in connec-
-27.	tion with the Shea case?
28	A No, sir. That came up in the conversation.

When I say "conversation," that came up. Either myself or Deputy Guenther said it. But Mr. Grogan didn't wan to talk to us.  Did not want to talk to you? A That is correct.  What did he say in that connection? Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve"  Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve"  statement of the effect of "Find o		•							
to talk to us.  Q Did not want to talk to you?  A That is correct.  What did he say in that connection?  A Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the effect of the talk to you?  Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the effect of the talk to you?  It is the talk to us.  It is correct.  O What did he say in that connection?  A Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the talk to you?  It is correct.  O What did he say in that connection?  A Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the talk to you?  It is correct.  O What did he say in that connection?  A Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the talk to you?  It is correct.  O What did he say in that connection?  A Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the talk to you?  It is correct.  O What did he say in that connection?  A Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the talk to you?  It is correct.  O What did he say in that connection?  A Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the talk to you?  It is correct.	1.		When I s	ay "conve	ersation	," that	came u	p. E	ither
A Did not want to talk to you?  A That is correct.  What did he say in that connection?  Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the effect of "Find out for yourselve to the effect of	2	myself or I	eputy Gue	nther sa	ld it.	But Mr.	Grogan	didn	't want
That is correct.  What did he say in that connection?  Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselve"  statement of the effect of "Fi	3.	to talk to	uș.			•		· · ·	. >
What did he say in that connection?  Something to the effect of "Find out for yourselv  something to the eff	4	Q	Did not	want to t	alk to	Aons.		* * *	₩.,
7	5	<b>A</b>	That is	correct.			* .		*
8 9 9 0 1 1 2 2 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 8 9 9 10 12 2 2 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 6 7 7 8 1 7 8 1 7 8	6	Q.	What did	he say i	in that	connect	ion?	, ,	
8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 0 0 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	7	A	Somethin	g to the	effect	of "Fin	d out f	or yo	urselve
9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7	-	. <u>.</u>			,			. –	
0 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 2 3 4 4 5 6	•						esterning of the second	-	. 1
2 3 4 5 5 5 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	;	·		,			* .	•	*
2 3 4 5 5 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7		`,		·					
		; [	•		•	u 1			• .
							•		
	3	:							
	ŧ.,		, .						
	; ;		•			•		_	
	, (	· · ·	· " (4	•		.*		7	
	, ,	· · ·					-		
	3					-		-	
	):	j.							
	)								•
	i i		•				•		
		  -  -	,		u u		:		
							•		
	í	•			,	•			
				,	•	•	•		*
7								** <del>-*</del>	
				•		·			3.
5		•					* **, .	, · · · · ·	ti ku i
	ş	*					-		*

20a

1	Q Then you, I believe, saw him after that but
2	before you saw him on December 18, 1970, and where was that,
3	Sergeant?
4	A I saw him at Spahn's Ranch, spoke with him there.
5	Q All right. When was that, approximately?
6	A The first part of-1970.
7	Q Did he decline to talk to you at that time?
8	MR. KATZ: I will object as being wholly immaterial,
9	your Honor. The only question is, was there a Miranda
10	admonition given to this defendant on or about the date of
11	the conversation in December of 1970 and whether or not the
12	defendant knowingly and intelligently waived it.
13	THE COURT: That could be correct, but let's get the
14 :	question answered.
15	Is there any further question now?
16	MR. WEEDMAN: There is one pending, your Honor. I
17	thought there was.
18	THE WITNESS: I forgot what the question was.
19	MR. WEEDMAN: I did, too.
20	MR. KATZ: We don't have the date or the time.
21	THE DEFENDANT: Did you talk to me?
22	MR. WEEDMAN: Just a second. I want to confer with you
.23	later. Keep this all in mind.
24	Q During this meeting with Mr. Grogan in early
25	1970 at Spahn Ranch, did you have any conversation with him?
26	A Yes.
27	Q Was he advised of his rights?

Excuse me. I will object on the grounds that

he has not, first of all, established the time period in which the conversation took place.

MR. WEEDMAN: Early 1970.

MR. KATZ: Early 1970 doesn't mean anything. It is ambiguous as to time.

Further, it is immaterial with respect to the foundation that was obviously given in December of 1970.

THE COURT: What is your answer to that, Mr. Weedman, the position of the District Attorney?

MR. WEEDMAN: My answer to it is, your Honor, that we are always entitled to go back and explore other contacts between an investigating officer --

THE COURT: Of course, he has testified to other conversations.

I'm inclined to sustain the objection. Sustained.

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, we know — and I'm not

accusing Sgt. Whiteley of this at all, but I think I have the

right to explore the possibility, certainly, and not in any

accusatory way at all — but we know that repeated interroga
tions of a suspect wherein he declines to testify will

vitiate consent even though it is ultimately gained. The

cases are pretty clear on that point.

THE COURT: I'll let you take your facts here. I'll make ultimate rulings in a little while.

Go ahead and ask your questions.

- Q BY MR. WEEDMAN: Did you have any conversation with Mr. Grogan at the Spahn Ranch in early 1970?
  - A Yes, I did.

1	THE COURT: Have you got your date?
2	Q BY MR. WEEDMAN: Can you fix it any closer than
3	early 1970?
4	A No.
5.	Q Did you discuss the Shea case with him at that
6	time?
7	A No.
8	Q Was he advised of any rights during this Spahn
9.	Ranch conversation?
10	MR. KATZ: Excuse me, your Honor. I will object on the
1,1	grounds, number one, it is immaterial because, first of all,
12.	he wasn't in custody; and second, they weren't even discuss-
13	ing the Shea case.
14	THE COURT: Ask the question. Overruled.
1:5	THE WITNESS: What was the question, again?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Did you advise me of my rights?
17	THE WITNESS: No, I didn't. This was not a conversation
18	where I was attempting to interview or interrogate him. It
19	was just pleasantries of the day.
20	Q BY MR. WEEDMAN: I see. Did you have any more or
21	any further contacts with Mr. Grogan prior to the December 18,
22	1970, contact?
23	A Yes.
24	Q What was that?
25	A I had a couple of conversations with him at the
26 	Robert Beausoleil trial and also an altercation with him
27 25	there.
28	Q Was Mr. Grogan in custody when you spoke with him

	i ,i	
1	in connection with or at the time of the Beausoleil trial?	-
2	A No, he was not in custody.	
3.	Q Did you advise him of any rights in connection	
4	with any conferences or discussions you had with him at that	
5	time?	.
6 :	A No, sir. It was not that type of a conversation.	
7	Q Was the Shea case mentioned during this contact	
8: 1	with Mr. Grogan during the Beausoleil case?	
.9	A No, sir.	
10	Q Did you have more than one contact with Mr. Grogan	•
11.	during the Beausoleil trial?	
12	A Yes.	
13	Q How many?	
14	A More than two.	
15.	Q As many as five or six, if you recall?	·
16	A I can't recall. More than two is all I can say.	
17	Q Did you prepare any reports, Sgt. Whiteley, in	
18	connection, first of all, with the first contact with	
19-	Mr. Grogan in the Los Angeles County Jail when Deputy Guenther	;
20	was with you?	*
21	A No, sir.	
22	Q Did you prepare any reports in connection with	
23	the Spann Ranch early 1970 contact with Mr. Grogan?	
24	A No.	
25	Q Did you prepare any reports in connection with	
26	your several contacts with Mr. Grogan during the Beausoleil	
27	trial?	ĺ
28 .	A No. sir.	ĺ

	ŀ	
	1	Q Did Mr. Grogan at any time during the contacts
	2	during the Beausoleil trial, decline to speak to you?
	3	A During the Beausoleil trial?
	4	Q Yes, sir.
	5	A My conversations with Mr. Grogan during the
-,	6	Beausoleil trial were orders that I was giving him and they
	7	were really not a conversation.
·	8	Q I see. So you are telling us that these would
	9	not be interrogations, then, as such?
	10	A No, not at all.
1 fls	11	
•	12	
•	,	
•	13	
,	14	
	15	
	16	
,	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	2.1	•
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
A	26	
	27	

21-1 1. ₹2° **3**-` .6-.7. ~, :8;-19. ~ 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21. 22 23 24 25 \*26` .27

28

_ Q	Are you	telling us	that you,	during	the Beausolie
trial c	ontacts with	Mr. Grogan,	did not	seek him	out as a
possibl	e suspect in	the present	Shea case	e?	

- A No, sir, I did not.
- Would it be fair then to say that the only time that you sought him out to speak to him in connection with the Shea case was the latter part of '69, early '70 at the Los Angeles County Jail, or did —
- My primary reason for going was in connection with the Gary Hinman murder. Mr. Shea was a secondary thing at that time.

MR. WEEDMAN: May I confer with Mr. Grogan for just a moment, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

(Conference between counsel and defendant not reported.)

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, inasmuch as it appears that my client was questioned the latter part of 1969 or the early part of 1970 and declined to make any statements --

THE COURT: Set the date.

MR. WEEDMAN: Well, I don't know the date.

THE COURT: Well, as close as you can approximately.

MR. WEEDMAN: Well, I don't know, your Honor, because the only person that I know that has the date is Sgt. Whiteley, and the best he can do -- and it is understandable -- is to say the latter part of 1969, early part of 1970. But --

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

MR. WEEDMAN: But in any event he was questioned in

1 connection with the Shea matter. He declined to make any 2 statements in that connection. And I would hold that any purported consent to-make 3 a statement in December of 1970 is vitiated by that earlier ã refusal to discuss the matter. Therefore I would object to 5 6 it, your Honor, on that ground. MR. KATZ: Your Honor, there is one last --7 8 THE COURT: Wait a minute now. I will listen to you. 9 MR. KATZ: There is a question I was going to ask before 10 your ruling. **1T** THE COURT: Wait a minute. 12 Now, that is your objection, Mr. Weedman? 13 MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, it is, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Well, I would be inclined to overrule the 15 objection. You have an argumentative position there. I am not 16 demeaning it at all, but I think the statements to the officer 17 going to the '70 -- December of '70 conversation -- is that 18 correct? 19 MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: That is the date I thought you said. 21 MR. KATZ: Yes. . 22 THE COURT: And I think that the rights were given to the 23 witness -- excuse me, the rights were given to the defendant 24 at that time, and there has been laid a sufficient foundation 25 for the testimony of the officer. 26 Now, to the extent that earlier conversations or 27 attempted conversations with officers or law enforcement 28 with Grogan and his not answering or from which there was no

		· ·
	1	conversation, that is another matter. It could or not have
	2	bearing on this December 1970 conversation.
÷ -	3,	My ruling would be that there has been adequate
<del></del>	4	advice, and the statements of Grogan are in order. That is
<del></del>	<b>5</b> - ' '	my ruling.
٠.	6	MR. KATZ: Thank you.
rank r rank r ray na r	7	One last question, your Honor, in this regard.
	8	I think I should ask it.
J.,	9	THE COURT: Well, I have ruled.
<b>~</b> *	10	MR. KATZ: There is a question I should ask.
	11	THE COURT: All right.
-	12	
INDEX	13	EXAMINATION
	14	BY MR. KATZ:
	15	Sergeant, the statements that Mr. Grogan made to
	16	you, on or about December 18, 1970 in Inyo County, were they
• .	17	made freely and voluntarily?
	18	A Yes, they were.
-	19	MR. KATZ: Thank you. That is the last of my foundation.
	.20	THE COURT: I will make that ruling. Let's go ahead,
	21	gentlemen.
*	22.	(The following proceedings were had
•	23	in open court outside the presence
•	24	of the jury:)
	25	THE COURT: Now we are in court. Defendant is here and
	26	the witness is on the stand. Both counsel are here.
	27	You can bring in the jury, Sheriff.
٠,	28	
	1	THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.

(The following proceedings were had 1 in open court in the presence of the 2 jury:) 3 THE COURT: All right. The jurors are here. 4 Ask your question. 5 Yes. Thank you. MR. KATZ: 6 7. DIRECT EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MR. KATZ: 9 Sgt. Whiteley, I believe you were telling us that 10 on December 18th, 1970 in the City of Independence, County of 11 Inyo, and of course the State of California, you took the 12 defendant, Steve Grogan, into custody for the murder of Shorty 13 Shea, is that correct? 14 That's correct, with my partner, Deputy Gleason. 15 Yes. And did you have a conversation with the 16 defendant relative to Shorty Shea? 17 18 Yes, I did. Where did the conversation take place on December 19 18th, 1970? 20 A In the Inyo County Jail. 21 And who was present? 0 **22** Deputy Gleason, Mr. Grogan and myself. 23. And what did you say and what did Mr. Grogan say 24. and Deputy Gleason, if anything? 25· I asked Mr. Grogan if he knew or if he would tell 26 me what he knew of Donald Shea. He stated that he had met 2.7 Donald Shea at Spahn's Ranch in 1969 and that Mr. Shea would 28

index

come and go from the ranch. That the last time that he had seen Mr. Shea, Mr. Shea told him that he was going to go to work in San Francisco in either a talcum or a salt mine.

Mr. Grogan then asked me how many witnesses testified at the grand jury hearing. And I told him it was approximately 43.

And Mr. Grogan stated, "I don't understand how this could have happened. You haven't found his body."

I then -- I then asked or told Mr. Grogan that a Manson member by the name of Gypsy had told me that --

1

2

3.

4

5.

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12 13

14

15,

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28.

MR. WEEDMAN: Excuse me, your Honor.

I'm certainly going to object to any statements made by somebody else even though they were purportedly made during the course of an interview with my client, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that your objection? Have you stated your objection?

MR. WEEDMAN: Yes, indeed, your Honor.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

Go ahead.

MR. KATZ: Thank you, your Honor.

Q Would you continue?

THE COURT: Continue right from that point.

THE WITNESS: I told him that Gypsy--

MR. WEEDMAN: Excuse me, your Honor. I do want to make a better record on this. It permits the introduction of all kinds of hearsay, and presumably the jury would feel free to use it against my client. In other words, this officer is free to say any darn thing he wants to, and then it is received as part of a conversation had with my client.

It is highly prejudicial, it is highly unfair, and I mean that sincerely, and certainly its probative value is far outweighed by its --

THE COURT: The jury may draw their conclusions. It is a statement of the officer, as he says, to Grogan and his reply, if any, or reaction in respect thereto.

I'll overrule the objection. It can be argued to the jury.

MR. WEEDMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: But I think it is permissible.

MR. WEEDMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

I will request an instruction to the jury that it may be considered only in the light of my client's reply, if any, to wit, not for the truth --

MR. KATZ: I think that is fair.

THE COURT: At the proper time I will give an instruction on the matter. Not right at this time. Overruled at this time, but not without prejudice to --

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, I'm not going to renew this motion now because I know that the weeks will roll by and, frankly, I'm going toforget to do it. I'm making the motion right now that the jury be instructed that any statements made by Sgt. Whiteley may be received by the jury and considered only insofar as they may shed light on any responses, if any, made by my client; that they may not be received as such, as the truth of any purported matters contained therein.

MR. KATZ: With respect to Gypsy, that is correct, and I think the jury can be instructed --

THE COURT: That is in substance a correct statement. The jury may so consider it.

MR. KATZ: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, I have in my possession what appears to be a report that was prepared by Sgt. Whiteley and by Charles Guenther on December 19, 1970, and with respect to purported statements made by this person, Gypsy, there do not appear to be any replies or anything pertinent by way of any statements made by my client. They are gratuitous

ł

2.

3

4

5

Ġ

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16.

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

remarks made by the officers in connection with their interrogation. They are highly prejudicial. We have no way, of course, of countering these, of proving them or disproving them, your Honor.

My point is that these statements purportedly made by a person named Gypsy, have no probative value in this case, none whatever. According to the report, they were not asked in the form of a question of my client, nor apparently, according to this, was there any opportunity by virtue of the way it was stated for my client to affirm or deny, and indeed they apparently involve matters at which my client was not even present by their very nature, your Honor.

It is the kind of inflammatory and prejudicial material here, your Honor, which is bound to affect my client's position in this case.

THE COURT: I will overrule the objection.

You may finish your answer as to what was said -- what you said to Grogan and what Grogan said to you. Nothing further than that.

Q BY MR. KATZ: You were at that point where you were telling Clem, or the defendant, something about what Gypsy told you. Do you have that in mind now?

A Yes.

Q Would you please continue now and tell us what it was you told Clem and what he said, if anything.

A I said that, "Gypsy has told me about finding the car down by the railroad tracks and taking it down to Gresham Street and dumping it."

1	Mr. Grogan stated, "Yeah. She told me that she
.2:	had talked with you and also that Deputy Guenther had threat-
3	ened her with the gas chamber."
4	Q That was a partner of yours, Deputy Guenther?
.5	A Yes.
6	Q Charles Guenther?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And he still works homicide, is that correct?
9.	A Yes.
10	Q All right.
11	A I then asked Mr. Grogan if he had ever seen
12	Shorty's two .45 caliber revolvers, and he stated that he had
13	seen guns like this in the possession of Danny De Carlo.
14	Q Did you describe the guns to the defendant?
15	A Yes, I did. I said that they were two .45 caliber,
16.	long-barrel revolvers, frontier type.
17	I then said to Mr. Grogan that a number of the
18	witnesses that testified against him at the grand jury hear-
19	ing had related that he had told them about cutting off
20	Shorty's head, and Mr. Grogan stated, "People will say any-
21	thing. You haven't found where his body is."
22	I then said, "Did you, in fact, kill Shorty?"
23	And he leaned back in the chair with a big grin
24	on his face and said, "You haven't found his body."
25	I then asked him again the same question, and I
26	got the same answer.
27	Q What was the same answer?
28	A "You haven't found his body."

1	Q Was that the sum and substance of the conversation
2	A Yes. There was a little more, but I don't remember
3	it.
4	MR. KATZ: No further questions.
5	
6	CROSS EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. WEEDMAN:
8	Q In the same conversation, Sgt. Whiteley, didn't
9	Mr. Grogan deny ever seeing Mr. Shea's brown attache case?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And didn't he deny knowing anything about any
12 .	altercation between Mr. Manson and Mr. Shea?
13 .	A Yes, he did.
14	Q And didn't you take that to mean that he himself
15	then did not participate in any altercation between Mr. Manson
16	and Mr. Shea?
17	A I have to explain that,
18	Q All right. Go ahead.
19	A We were speaking of an altercation that took
20	place down on Gresham Street between Mr. Shea and Mr. Manson
21	back in 1967, I believe it was, or '68.
<b>22</b> .	Q And Mr. Grogan told you that he didn't know any-
23	thing about that altercation, is that so?
24	A That is correct.
25	Q Now, Sgt. Whiteley, on direct examination, I
26	believe you testified that in response to your telling him
27 .	that there were 43 witnesses, approximately, at the grand jury
28	that Mr. Grogan said, "I don't know how this could happen

	,	$\cdot$
3-1	- L	Your testimony is that my client said, "I don't
	2	know how this could happen. You haven't found his body."
	3	And yet in your report your reflect, do you not,
	4	that what my client really said was, "I don't know how this,
	5	could have happened. You haven't found a body.".
	6	A That's correct.
	7	g So isn't it true that what my client really said
	8	was "I don't know how this could have happened. You have not
	9	found a body"?
•	10	A That's correct.
, .	11	Q All right.
	12	Thank you, sir.
	13	Finally, were any of the conversations or any
	14	portion of the conversation that you had with my client
	15	recorded or transcribed in any fashion?
	16	A No, sir.
	17	Q Did you take any notes during the direct conversa-
	18	tion with Mr. Grogan?
	19	A No, sir.
	.20	Q When did you prepare the report of the December
<b>N</b>	.21	18, 1970 conversation?
	22	I On December December the 18th.
	23	What about the report that I have laid in front of
	24	you? Did you prepare that rather, did you prepare this
	25	report?
	26	A Yes.
	27	Q That bears the date 12-19-1970. Is that when the
	28.	report was prepared, or was it prepared earlier?

1	It was prepared in the evening hours of December
2	18th. By the date there I would imagine that it was typed on
3	the 19th.
4*	Q All right.
5	And was this report prepared by you upon your
6.	return to Los Angeles?
7	A Yes, it was.
8	Q And how did you go from Independence to Los Angele
9	on that occasion?
10	A I drove. It was Mr. Grogan, Deputy Gleason and
11	myself.
12	Q And what is the approximate distance from
- 13	Independence, where you began your automobile journey, to
14	Los Angeles?
15	A Approximately 225 miles.
16	Q And about how long did it take you to make that
17	trip?
18 -	A Approximately four and a half hours.
.19	Q And it was after you returned then, to be clear
20	about it, that you prepared the report relative to the
21	conversation; is that so?
22	A That's correct.
23	Q In any event, Sergeant, does the report contain
24	the exact words of the conversation that you had with my
25	client?
26	A Yes, they do.
27	Q And you remembered the exact words even though
28	you drove that distance in a police unit, is that correct?

23-3 ľ Yes, sir. 2 MR. WEEDMAN: All right. Thank you, Sergeant. 3 THE COURT: Is that all, gentlemen? 4 MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor. 5 May we approach the bench before the jury is :6 excused. ~ Ť THE COURT: Well, all right. But can we -- are we 8. through with our witness? · 0. MR. KATZ: Well, that is the problem. I think we are 10 but I have to confer with the court. 11 THE COURT: All right. Better step up here. Bring the 12 reporter. 13 (The following proceedings were had in chambers:) . 14 15 THE COURT: All right. Now, we are in chambers. Defendant 16 and counsel. 17 All right. Now go ahead. 18 MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor. 19 I asked for this conference out of the presence of 20 the jury so that I could have the assistance and guidance of the court. 21 22 I am deeply disturbed by Mr. Weedman's questions of all of the witnesses, but particularly the questions that 23 he propounded to Deputy Gleason which relate to the apparent 24 25. time period which followed the alleged killing of Shorty Shea 26 and before the grand jury indictment was actually returned. Now, obviously counsel has -- he has already --27 indicated by way of his questioning and by his argument, is 28

·-2

· <u>3</u>

-6

`#:

28 .

going to by way of this evidence argue that "Well, by gosh, they had the statements." He has already developed, I think, by way of questioning of Paul Watkins "They had Watkins and Grogan's statement. They had Brooks Poston's statement. They had Paul Crockett's statement in regard to the alleged confession of Clem concerning the killing of Shorty Shea."

And then Mr. Weedman of course will argue, based upon the record, "Well, why is it that they took so long? They obviously didn't believe that this statement made by Poston and Crockett and Watkins — what was wrong with their case? They had confessions."

Well, the jury being lay people do not understand that it is necessary to develop an investigation. Especially where there is no body, so that independent — there is prima facie evidence of the corpus delicti.

In addition thereto, this officer, Sgt. Whiteley,—and this is why I asked you to give me some advice here,—would testify that there were very specific reasons as to why there was such a long lapse of time before there was a natural grand jury indictment returned in December of 1970; and there were three reasons:

Reason No. 1, was of course, they wanted to conduct an independent investigation showing prima facie evidence of the corpus delicti of the crime of murder;

Reason No. 2, was that they were working the other Manson cases together with Los Angeles Police Department and in particular two main cases, the Gary Hinman case and the Tate and La Bianca case;

ļ

r

.26

28 . .

Reason No. 3, was that the district attorney himself — and I was present at the staff meeting, and I refer now to the present Attorney General Evelle J. Younger, — indicated to the sheriff's office that the joint staff meeting with the Los Angeles Police Department, the sheriff's department and members of the district attorney's office, that there would be no filing on the Shorty Shea case because such an indictment would be returned not only against Mr. Grogan, who was not charged with any other crime at that time, but against Mr. Manson and Mr. Dayis.

At that time the Tate and La Bianca proceedings were under way, and Mr. Younger expressed concern, as did LAPD, that any indictment returned with respect to a new crime involving Charles Manson would be so prejudicial as to undermine possibly the integrity of the proceedings in Department 104 before Judge Older.

As a result the filing date was pushed forward or backwards in terms of time so that it would not affect or prejudice not only the Tate and La Bianca proceedings but also the Gary Hinman case in which Robert Beausoliel was on trial for his life.

And lastly, there was one other reason why there was no filing against the defendant, Mr. Grogan. And that reason was that Mr. Grogan was a suspect in the Tate and La Bianca case and in particular the La Bianca case where our evidence showed and the district attorney was in possession of the evidence, that Clem, the defendant, went —

#24

1

2:

3

4

5

.6

. 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16.

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25.

26

27

28.

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, counsel has no right now to bring into the record --

THE COURT: I may agree with you, but let him finish.

MR. KATZ: This is out of the presence of the jury.

MR. WEEDMAN: I don't care if it is outside the presence of the jury.

THE COURT: Finish your statement.

MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, this matter may go up on appeal. I'm going to object strenuously to counsel -THE COURT: Overruled. Make your statement.

MR. KATZ: And lastly, as I was saying, the district attorney's office, because of information we had, namely, that the defendant, according to Linda Kasabian, had gone to the La Bianca home, that is, the outside of the home, with Charles Manson, Leslie Van Houten, Tex Watson, and Susan Atkins, and that was on the night of the La Bianca killings, and thereafter went with Linda Kasabian and Susan Atkins and Charles Manson to Manhattan Beach, where there were certain orders given by Charles Manson.

It was our hope at that time -- I say the district attorney's office hoped to use the testimony of Clem -- and when I refer to "Clem," I mean Mr. Grogán -- and therefore once again we were hoping for his assistance and cooperation.

So these are reasons why we did not -- may I finish my point -- these are the reasons why we did not file immediately after the statements were made known to the officers, and I just don't want to be placed in a position where the record is void or barren of the real reasons as to

.26

27

28

why there was no filing.

Now, Mr. Weedman, based upon the record, your Honor, will argue that "My God, they have these statements in October of 1969. If they had a case, why didn't they file it?"

I'm giving you full reasons that I can establish by evidence.

THE COURT: I won't let any of them in because they are all highly prejudicial. If you got a conviction with any of that testimony in it, it would come back, anyway.

But that is beside the point. I think it would be entirely immaterial to this lawsuit. That is one thing.

It would be highly prejudicial. It wouldn't prove or disprove one iota of material facts concerned with this case.

Now, these are serious problems and they are problems of the district attorney. I'm not demeaning the seriousness of your problems. But they are your problems, and I don't think they should be inflicted in this case, and I would sustain objection —

MR. KATZ: Let me ask you this question -THE COURT: -- to their going in evidence.

MR. KATZ: I appreciate your guidance. This is the reason why I obviously did not raise them in front of the jury and wanted to get your feeling on this.

THE COURT: Keep away from it because I'll just sustain objection.

MR. KATZ: Are we going to permit, based upon the record, Mr. Weedman the opportunity to argue that --

THE COURT: I don't know. I'm going to decide something on that.

MR. KATZ: Are you going to foreclose me from presenting evidence?

THE COURT: I'm certainly going to stop you from going into all this other business of these other murders. This man is charged with one murder, killing Shea. I'm going to hold the testimony right in there. Why you didn't file is your own business.

MR. KATZ: Now, let me ask you this question: This is the only question I have: --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. KATZ: Will Mr. Weedman be able to argue, will you permit him to argue, based upon the evidence in this record at this time, that our case must have been weak or we must have submitted to some political persuasion because we didn't file until almost a year after, or indeed, over a year following the statements being made known to the police? Will he be permitted to argue that?

THE COURT: I don't know what he is going to argue.

But I'll tell you right now, I'm going to disallow that

testimony. I won't fight that shadow until it gets in front

of me and I'll take it on. But not until then.

MR. KATZ: I can't stop Mr. Weedman once he has made the statement in front of the jury.

THE COURT: I can't help these things. They filed a year afterwards. I'm not blaming in any way. I'm not criticizing in any way. But this is a fact. It is a fact.

3. 

11; 12°

24A

2Ó

23.

It is again a shadow. I won't let the shadow in on this case. You've got to hold your facts. What is the testimony and what have you got to show this man guilty? That is your business. No question about it. But you couldn't possibly go into all this business of all these other problems, as serious as they are. But Shea is not a party in those —

MR. KATZ: Not Shea.

THE COURT: I don't mean Shea. I mean Grogan. He is not on trial here for any of these awful problems that exist, any of these other alleged murders, and they shouldn't creep in this record anyway. They would only be prejudicial, for one thing.

MR. KATZ: Again I appreciate your Honor's ruling. I will abide by it. I just wanted some guidance in the area, and I didn't want to be in a position --

THE COURT: I say keep away, because I would sustain objections if it goes in there, and I think it would be highly prejudicial error, number two.

24a-1

2

1

3

4 5

.6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1:5 1:6

17

18

19

20

Ż1

2Ž.

23

24

25

26

27

28

MR. KATZ: All right. Your Honor, I will abide by the court's ruling and I thank you for your advice and guidance.

MR. WEEDMAN: May I say something for the record?

I have ruled, but if you want to, go ahead.

MR. WEEDMAN: This may come as a shock to Mr. Katz, but, you know, I have discussed this matter at great length with Sgt. Whiteley, and Sgt. Whiteley has told me a good many things in connection with the long delay. So, I'm not entirely a stranger to it, although I must say that Mr. Katz is now if what he is saying is, of course, accurate -- I have no reason to believe that he is not being forthright and candid, but, of course, he may not have been directly present at some of these decisions made by the district attorney's office -but at this point, your Honor -- and I mean this quite seriously -- based upon what Mr. Katz has now informed the court, I respectfully move for a dismissal of this action on the ground that a 14-month delay in even arresting my client and notifying him of the charges is a gross denial of due process. It has robbed my client of the ability to secure adequate witnesses in his defense, a 14-month's lapse of time which, according to Mr. Katz, was deliberately and premeditatedly planned by the district attorney's office.

I didn't realize that, if such be the case, until
just now when Mr. Katz made the statement. In other words,
all the information, as I understand it, that has been
presented to the court and to the jury during this trial was
substantially known to the district attorney's office and to the

1 sheriff's department by the middle of October --2 MR. KATZ: That is not true. 3: MR. WEEDMAN: You let me make a statement. 4 MR. KATZ: I'm sorry. 5 MR. WEEDMAN: -- by the middle of October 1969. My client 6 was not arrested until December the 17th of 1970, a lapse of 7 approximately 14 months, your Honor, and in 14 months my client 8 could surely have made substantially better gains in securing 9 witnesses in his behalf, your Honor. 10 MR. KATZ: Your Honor, with respect to Mr. Weedman's statement --11 12 THE COURT: Let me cut it down, gentlemen. 13 MR. KATZ: I have to answer --14 THE COURT: Let me say something. Everybody is talking 15 but me. 16 I think you have -- there is a strong argument, 17 strong inferences, that may be drawn from your position. 18 However, the motion is denied. 19 MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, I would respectfully request .20 an evidentiary hearing with respect to my motion for a 21 dismissal on the ground that the extended lapse of time is a 22 denial of due process to my client. 23. I would propose during such evidentiary hearing 24 to produce evidence that in fact my client's position with 25 respect to defending himself against the charge has been 26 substantially and unalterably prejudiced because of the some 27 14-month delay in even arresting him and notifying him that he was in fact a suspect in connection with this case. 28

THE COURT: Denied. Let me rule. Motion denied. Let's 1 2 go ahead. Have you finished? I have ruled. - 3 MR. KATZ: The problem is the record is silent --THE COURT: I know. MR. KATZ: -- on one point. THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. KATZ: We were not in possession of all of the evidence that counsel suggests we were 14 months prior to the 9\_ filing. As a matter of fact --10 THE COURT: You have stated that in detail. 11 MR. KATZ: The only thing I stated was that we were in 12 possession of statements. 13 THE COURT: I'm going to cut you off. That has been 14. carefully stated. 15 MR. KATZ: Thank you. 16. THE COURT: I'm not demeaning you, but it has been stated. 1.7 MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, I can only submit in connection 18 with that that the record of this trial speaks for itself, 19 and I think the dates of the purported conversations are quite 20 clear. 21 THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. I have made my ruling. 22 Let's go. 23 (The following proceedings were had 24 in open court:) 25 THE COURT: We are in open court. \_26 MR. WEEDMAN: Your Honor, I respectfully move for a \*27 mistrial at this time because of the statements which were .28 received in evidence as being purportedly made by a person by

the name of Gypsy in connection with Sgt. Whiteley's testimony on the ground, of course, that such statements were not accusatory in nature and therefore played no pertinent and probative value in the interrogation of my client by Sgt. Whiteley; that their prejudicial value highly outweighs any possible probative value in this case, your Honor, and we have, obviously, no way at all to counter the effect of those unfortunate statements purportedly made by one Gypsy as against my client.

Ì.

THE COURT: Motion denied. MR. WEEDMAN: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Yes, sir. Now, before we get the jury, where are we with the People? .5 MR. KATZ: Well, the People have no redirect. concluded our examination. THE COURT: We are through with the witness? · 📜 7 MR. KATZ: That is correct. THE COURT: You can sit down. Thank you. 9. Now, where are we on the People, do the People -10 rest? 11 MR. KATZ: No, I cannot rest until we have the issue 12 on the exhibits. **F**3 THE COURT: Let me ask a question. The jury is not . 14 here. -15 MR. KATZ: Yes. 16 THE COURT: We don't have -- I can speak freely because 17 the jury is not here. 18 MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Part of our exhibits are in Department 106. 20. Part of them are here. Theoretically you would rest and --21 strike that. .22 Theoretically, you would offer the exhibits in 23 evidence, subject to whatever objections there may be --24 MR. KATZ: Yes. 25: THE COURT: The court would rule, plaintiff would rest. 26.

Is that correct?

MR. KATZ: Yes, and then we would ask your Honor to **CieloDrive.com** ARCHIVES

permit the jury to view the exhibits. 2 3. at this time. MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor. will say they are in 106. MR. KATZ: That is correct. 9 10. this moment. 11 £2 13. 14 ÌŜ, 16 17 18 19 20 by 11:00 a.m. tomorrow. 21 THE COURT: Tomorrow. 22 23 24 . 25. case? 26 MR. WEEDMAN: That is correct, your Honor. 27. THE COURT: Is there any objection to that?

THE COURT: Well, all right. I understand that. Now, I am backing up again. We have part of the exhibits only. So it would be piecemeal to attempt to move THE COURT: And Judge Choate has the other half, or I THE COURT: So we can't very well proceed further at Now, for the clerk. You can come in the picture. Now, what did Judge Choate say, if anything, about letting us have those, or where do we stand? THE CLERK: Your Honor, Department 106 said they would send the exhibits over this afternoon. THE COURT: They said they would? THE CLERK: Exhibits No. 1 to 20-H, which they have, they said they would send them this afternoon to you. They would hope to have exhibits I through 68 returned to them Now, do you see any reason after I rule, gentlemen, tomorrow morning, why I can't send all the exhibits back to Judge Choate? Do you want a little leeway in your

MR. WEEDMAN: No. your Honor. 1 MR. KATZ: There is no objection after the jury has had 2 an opportunity to view them. 3 THE COURT: No, after the jury as seen it, then send 4 them back to Judge Choate. 5 MR. KATZ: No objection at all. 6 THE COURT: Well, you can advise him -- I should call 7 him myself and tell him that. I think he wants to know. 8 THE CLERK: Your Honor, he said if he could have those 9 exhibits by 11:00 a.m., tomorrow, that would be satisfactory. 10 THE COURT: I can't move until I get them. 11-12 THE CLERK: They will be here tonight. 13 THE COURT: We will get the exhibits and then move. 14 That's as far as we can go at this time. 15 MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor. 16 MR. WEEDMAN: Yes. 17 THE COURT: We will get the jury in and recess till 18 tomorrow at 9:30. That's as far as we can go at this time. 19 (The following proceedings were in open 20: court in the presence of the jury.) 21 THE COURT: Gentlemen, will you step up here again 22 before I proceed. 23 Yes, your Honor. MR. KATZ: 24 THE COURT: On our time, step over here. 25 (Conference at the beach with both 26. counsel and defendant present, not 27 reported.) .28 THE COURT: Now, ladies and gentlemen, we are back in

court. Defendant is here. Both counsel are here. Our regular jurors are here and our alternates.

ladies and gentlemen, we have gone considerably over our time, but there are very important matters that have arisen, and I have attempted religiously to abide by the time schedule I have set. But very important matters are here.

Now, we will recess at this time. Now, I caution you to this point because of the fact that it is important, and other matters are pending in other courts, that we act tomorrow early.

Is it fair to say this, there are no further -- am I correct -- I am not trying to bind you by anything -- MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: There is no further direct testimony by the People. Tomorrow morning the People expect to offer in evidence all exhibits. There may be objections by defendant. The court must rule on those that will be admitted. Those that may be rejected.

Then after that those exhibits that are admitted in evidence will be shown to the jury. The People then rest.

That is a fair statement, isn't it?

MR. KATZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Without taking in any factual matter.

MR. KATZ: Completely fair, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I would appreciate and would ask the jurors please return promptly at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow.

Now, can you all make that, folks? We have

got so many problems here. Nine o'clock tomorrow and we'll be ready to go. To not discuss the case or come to any opinion or conclusion. Return at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow. Thank you very much. MR. WEEDMAN: Thank you, your Honor. MR. KATZ: Thank you, your Honor. At 4:40 p.m. adjournment was taken until the next day, Thursday, August 19, 1971, at 9:00 a.m.) 22 . 25.