DISTRICT ATTORNEY

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

VS.

CHARLES MANSON, SUSAN ATKINS, LESLIE VAN HOUTEN AND PATRICIA KRENWINKEL,

Defendants-Appellants.

NO. 1007

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

HON. CHARLES H. OLDER, JUDGE PRESIDING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL

APPEARANCES

For Plaintiff-Respondent:

THE STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

600 State Building

Los Angeles, California 90012

For Defendant-Appellant Charles Manson:

IRVING KANAREK, Esq.

For Defendant-Appellant Susan Atkins: DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Defendant-Appellant Leslie Van Houten:

IESLIE VAN HOUTEN In Propria Persona

For Defendant-Appellant Patricia Krenwinkel:

PATRICIA KRENWINKEL In Propria Persona

VOLUME 7
Pages 1801 to 2100

J. Hollombe, CSR Murray Mehlman, CSR Official Reporters 211 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012

10C

Is there anyone who would be unable to do that?

Do you all believe that you would be able to
dispassionately consider and weigh the evidence in this
case and determine the case solely on the basis of that
evidence and in accordance with the Court's instructions?

you as to what the law is at the close of the trial.

Is there any one of you who believes he could not do that and, if so, would you kindly indicate by raising your hands?

10c-1

2`

3

4

5

é

7

8.

9.

10

11

12

13 . 14

15.

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

·OE

26

All right. I hope this subject will never have to come up again, but please remember the admonition because it will apply to anything which you may be exposed to from any source throughout the course of the trial.

Have you concluded your voir dire examination Mr. Stovitz?

MR. STOVITZ: No, not as to Mrs. McKenzie, your Honor. We just commenced and then this matter came up.

May I, with the permission of the Court, question Mrs. McKenzie for cause?

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. FITZGERALD: I wonder if counsel might approach the bench before we leave this matter?

THE COURT: Very well.

(Whereupon all counsel approached the bench and the following proceedings occurred at the bench outside of the hearing of the prospective jurors:)

MR. FITZGERALD: Throughout the course of this examination we have been referring to a newspaper article that appeared in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner of Tuesday, June 30.

I would like to mark that as an exhibit so that if there is any question, the record is clear as to its contents.

Unfortunately, I do not have a similar

article that appeared in the Los Angeles Times.

I don't want to hold the newspaper up in front of the jury, but at some convenient time may that be marked as a Defendant's special exhibit?

MR. STOVITZ: Not to go to the jury, just on this motion?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

THE COURT: Just for what motion?

MR. STOVITZ: Whatever motion is to be made here.

MR. REINER: I am about to make a motion, your

Honor, if Mr. Fitzgerald is finished.

MR. KANAREK: I join in that request.

MR. SHINN: I do too.

THE COURT: The article will be marked as Defendant's Special Exhibit --

MR. STOVITZ: I believe it is C.

THE COURT: Whatever the next in order is, for the purpose of this hearing.

It is not to be displayed to any prospective juror.

MR. REINER: Your Honor, I will move that all jurors, all prospective jurors in the courtroom, those in the box and those in the audience, be excused for cause for the reason that they have been exposed to and infected by the comments of Mr. Younger, and because these questions were asked in open court in the presence of other prospective

10c-3

.9

16[,]

2Ì

jurors, what Mr. Younger wasn't able to accomplish in the paper and on television, by asking the questions of Mr. Nordland, who is an avid reader, by his description, the prospective jurors have been infected by those comments.

It painfully illustrates, your Honor, the difficulty we have when we must examine jurors openly. The jurors who haven't heard it then hear it when they are in the presence of the other jurors giving answers. It is self-defeating. It was self-defeating in this case.

The jurors, with two exceptions, had all heard of Mr. Younger's remarks but were not precisely aware of the basis. Mr. Nordland, being an avid reader and watching the TV news for two and a half hours in the evening, was very much aware of the underlying basis, and in his answers to questions he so instructed every person in this courtroom.

I think that the Court should have initially permitted counsel -- should have gone along with counsel's request that these jurors be examined separately in chambers, so this would not have occurred. But the Court decided to accept the judgment of the defendants, which I think was irresponsible, and not accept the judgment of counsel, which I felt was informed and responsible judgments.

MR. KANAREK; Your Honor --

10c-4

10d-1

MR. REINER: And I might indicate further --

THE COURT: Mr. Reiner, I might say that you have changed your spots as many times as a chameleon on this subject in this trial.

You objected to holding the proceedings in chambers, and then you turned around and made exactly the opposite request, that they should be held in chambers.

Now, it was fairly evident to me from your voir dire examination of these jurors that you were deliberately attempting to make sure that everyone of those jurors knew everything that Mr. Nordland had heard and read.

Your examination could have been designed in such a way that you did not have to elicit that information. It was, in my opinion, done for that purpose.

MR. REINER: If the Court is finished?

THE COURT: I seriously question the good faith of the argument that you are making right now.

MR. REINER: Very well, your Honor. Then I feel that I want to respond to the Court's questioning of my good faith.

Your Honor is obviously confusing me with other counsel in this case, I do not know whom, because I have at all times asked that all proceedings of this sort be held in chambers. I had never asked that these proceedings be held in open court.

:9

10²

10d-2

19,

ŻŻ

It is only my client who has asked that it be held in open court.

The Court will recall that we had a lengthy exchange, at which time I begged the Court to have these proceedings in chambers and to ignore the judgment of my client, which judgment I said, at that time, was irresponsible, and again repeat that it is irresponsible.

Now, the questions that I asked these jurors did not educate them. I carefully avoided going into other matters. I just simply asked them if they had heard of the underlying basis before coming to this court.

The Court will recall that it was Mr. Nordland who specifically laid it all out. Am I supposed to assume that absolutely no one in this courtroom is:

listening to him? I had to repeat it to ask the questions. It was known when Mr. Nordland answered Mr. Fitzgerald's questions. I felt that it was then my responsibility to inquire of Mr. Nordland. He educated the jurors, as I feared someone would, whether or not they knew it in advance.

I deeply resent your implication that I am not acting in good faith. I am most certainly acting in good faith.

THE COURT: Let me point out to you that on at least two specific instances that I know of, both admitted by you, you deliberately disclosed to the press,

.9

knowing full well that these matters are being published, matters pertaining to the defendants in this case.

MR. REINER: I have not.

THE COURT: You have.

MR. REINER: The two instances that you must be referring to, your Honor, is one time when I told them that Mr. Manson addressed the Court and asked for permission to represent himself.

That does not go to any aspect of this case that would be harmful. That was at a time when you said that we might quote the transcript, and that is what I did.

The other occasion is when I indicated to the press that I had filed a document, an order to show cause re contempt of Mr. Younger, and I did not make any comment other than to indicate that I had filed the document and the contents thereof.

THE COURT: The newspaper articles speak for themselves, sir. Where did the details come from if they didn't come from you?

MR. REINER: The details in the article are that I simply filed a document which alleged that Mr. Younger had advance knowledge of a book that had since been published, a book that we have examined each juror about.

THE COURT: And which, according to your statement that you must have made to the press because it is in the newspaper article, that book purportedly contained

the confession of Susan Atkins. 1 MR. REINER: I said it contained a statement of 2 Susan Atkins. 3 THE COURT: That is not what the newspaper article 4 says. 5 MR. REINER: I appreciate that is not what it says, 6 but I indicated to the reporter that it contained the 7 statement of Susan Atkins. 8 This is a well known statement that 9 virtually every juror is aware of. 10 I find your conduct highly inconsistent. THE COURT: 11 In one respect you profess to be concerned about publicity 12 and in another --13 MR. BUGLIOSI: I have a comment to make concerning 14 the Court's comment about Mr. Younger's irresponsibility 15 that I want on the record, your Honor. 16 10e flsu THE COURT: All right. 18 19, 20 21 22 23 24 26

OE-1

7.

.9

MR. BUGLIOSI: I strenuously object to the Court's observation that Mr. Younger's comment was irresponsible.

I wouldn't mind the Court, of course, as the Court already knows, that Mr. Younger is the District Attorney, that Mr. Stovitz and I are merely his arm or his agents in this court, and hence, when the Court tells the jury that Mr. Younger has done something irresponsible, it is tantamount to telling the jury that the prosecution has done something irresponsible.

I would urgently ask the Court that in the future, if I or Mr. Stovitz, or if any defense attorney, does something which the Court feels is irresponsible, that this matter be taken up outside the presence of the jury.

The remark by the Court couldn't possibly have been helpful to the prosecution. It could very conceivably have been very, very injurious.

THE COURT: I think the jury is entitled to know, after hearing all of you, that there is nothing of substance involving that press conference with which they are to be concerned, and I wanted to bring it home to them very forcefully so that they can put it out of their minds.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I can't quarrel with the Court telling the jury that they are not to take that press conference into consideration in determining the guilt or innocence of these defendants, but the statement of the Court that it

1

3

2

4

• 5

6

7 8

9.

10

12

13

14.

15.

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

was an irresponsible act is harmful.

THE COURT: I made it quite clear to them that they were not to consider it in any way and not to let it affect them, and I specifically asked each of them -- well, you heard the questions. The record is perfectly clear.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I realize you made that point clear, but the prosecution was chastised in front of the jury.

THE COURT: I wouldn't say they were chastised.

I set the record straight in front of the jury for the sole purpose not of chastising Mr. Younger but letting the jury know that so far as they are concerned there is nothing of substance whatever in that press conference with which they are to be concerned.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't have any quarrel with the Court's telling the jury that.

THE COURT: Then let's proceed.

The motion will be denied.

MR. KANAREK: If I may be heard briefly?

I make a motion for a mistrial on the grounds, your Honor, that mere admonishment will not suffice.

Your Honor, absolutely what has occurred in connection with the District Attorney's actions has denied Mr. Manson the right to effective counsel, denied him equal protection of the law, and denied him due process and a fair, public trial.

On behalf of Mr. Manson, I urge the Court to

Œ3

ż

19·

grant a mistrial and ask that all of these jurors be dismissed.

That is my position, your Honor, and I do make that request of the Court.

I think it is clearly prejudicial, beyond any possible power to correct.

I refer the Court to the language in Bruton vs. the United States about mere admonishment.

THE COURT: Well, I am convinced from hearing the jurors on the voir dire examination that there is no need for declaring a mistrial with respect to the matters that came out of the press conference.

If anything, I think it's probably inured to your benefit, Mr. Kanarek, but that is beside the point.

I am convinced that the jurors or prospective jurors have not been influenced by any dispute you may have with the District Attorney. That would not in any way affect their opinion on the issues in this case.

Motion denied.

MR. KANAREK: I make a motion for an evidentiary hearing and would ask that an evidentiary hearing be held in connection with this subject matter wherein the District Attorney, District Attorney Younger, would be subposenaed to the Court and we would take testimony from him and from other sources in connection with this matter.

11-1

2°

9,

3.

25. THE COURT: That motion will be denied.

MR. REINER: Your Honor, I will join with Mr. Kanarek's objection that Mr. Younger has interfered with the defendant's right to effective counsel, with respect to Leslie Van Houten as well as with respect to Mr. Manson, for this reason:

Earlier Mr. Bugliosi, when arguing to the Court in favor of holding a hearing, argued that the jury's attitude towards Mr. Kanarek would surely flow over to the detriment of other defendants; that being Mr. Bugliosi's judgment at that time, which I agree with, if they have such an attitude toward Mr. Kanarek that it could flow over, I feel that the interference with Mr. Manson's right to counsel by Mr. Younger would perhaps have some effect on Leslie Van Houten.

I would join with Mr. Kanarek on behalf of Leslie Van Houten for that reason.

MR. STOVITZ: Submit it.

MR. FITZGERALD: Join on behalf of Patricia Krenwinkel, and submit the matter.

I might say at first blush, the motion does not appear to have much merit as to co-defendants, but when one takes into consideration there is a conspiracy charge in Count VIII, which is an allegation that the defendants are connected with and associated with one another for criminal activity; when one takes into

consideration that the prosecution intends to show that these defendants acted in concert, what is done to one of the attorneys, unfortunately, inures to the detriment of the other attorneys, and therefore interferes with defendants' respective rights to counsel.

THE COURT: I don't think the motion has any merit whatever.

MR. KANAREK: In connection with the George
Putnam Show heard last evening, the offer of proof is:

That District Attorney Younger stated in substance:

appeal, on conviction. That appeal will be they did not have a competent attorney; that Mr. Manson did not have a competent attorney, as Mr. Manson has stated in a public record, that Kanarek is the worst attorney in town, and the worst possible attorney to be given him.

"And I have in my hands," referring to statements by Mr. Younger, "testimony from eight judges and several lawyers stating Kanarek has been obstructionist, and I am presenting this to the State Supreme Court so we can have a pretrial declaration as to his competency."

That is the offer of proof as to what would show up in an evidentiary hearing.

19.

Furthermore, the evidentiary hearing would show that Mr. Manson did not so make -- did not intend any such statement on his part, that Mr. Manson's position, as he previously enunciated in this court, was that he wanted me to be his attorney because I was the best attorney from his standpoint and the worst attorney from the standpoint of the prosecution.

It is our position that District Attorney Younger deliberately distorted that so that I would then be tarred with the feather of being the worst attorney in town.

And that is not what Mr. Manson's state of mind is.

THE COURT: That is not before the Court.

MR. KANAREK: But that will be part of the evidence that we would ask the Court to consider.

THE COURT: That motion will be denied.

We will proceed with our voir dire.

(Whereupon the following proceedings were had in open court in the presence and hearing of the prospective jurors:)

MR. STOVITZ: May we proceed, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Stovitz.

24

25

.9

<mark>11،</mark>

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. THELMAS. MC KENZIE BY MR. STOVITZ:

Q Mrs. McKenzie, I don't believe I questioned you this morning, did I?

A No.

Q It seems like it has been so long, I completely forgot.

You heard the statement I made to the other prospective jurors, that we are interested in obtaining 12 impartial jurors, jurors that can decide this case solely on the evidence, solely on the exhibits that they see and hear right here in this courtroom.

Are you such a juror?

A Yes, I am.

lla fls.15

.23

1a-1

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8.

9 10

11

12, 13

14

16

15

17

18

19 20`

21

22

23 24

25

26

Q Now, Mrs.McKenzie, many of us have prejudices, some against pistachio ice cream and some against pineapple, and we are afraid if we admit our prejudices it shows some sort of ignorance, or some sort of sign of not being openminded.

Now, many people can be open-minded and still admit that they are prejudiced in certain fields.

You understand that? ...

A Yes.

Q And this is what we are attempting to do.

We are attempting to suggest certain views to you. Have you looked back in your own background? Have you looked back in your own background; have you put yourself in the place of the prosecution attorneys; have you put yourself in the place of the defense attorney and said.

"If/wes that attorney there would I want somebody in my frame of mind to sit on this jury?"

The only way we can know this is to suggest certain things to you.

Now, we necessarily cannot tell you what the evidence is, but you have told us that you would go by that evidence whichever way it comes out.

Is that right?

A Yes.

Q Now, assume for the moment that that evidence both the People's and the defense convinces you beyond any

.1a2

2

1

3

5

Ġ

7

8.

10

9

11

12

13 ·14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

reasonable doubt that this young lady that I am standing behind right now, this young lady, Leslie Van Houten, is guilty of murder in the first degree.

Would you have the courage to come back in a couple of months and say "Yes, my verdict is murder in the first degree"?

A Yes.

Q The fact that she is a young lady would in no way deter you from rendering that decision, if that decision was based on the evidence, is that right?

A That is correct.

Q All right now, let us assume that in producing the evidence in this case the People rely in part upon circumstantial evidence, and you say to yourself, "Boy, oh boy, all my life I have said I would never convict anybody on circumstantial evidence."

First of all, do you have that view that you would never convict anyone on circumstantial evidence?

A No.

Q So if you heard some circumstantial evidence in this case you would consider it along with the other evidence, is that right?

A yes.

Q All right, now, assume for the moment that in connection with one or more of the defendants in this case we introduce evidence of a conspiracy, and that evidence of

11a3

that there was in fact a conspiracy to commit murder.

If that evidence beyond any reasonable doubt convinced you as to all of the elements of that conspiracy.

Could you picture such a frame of evidence?

A Yes.

Q in a conspiracy the Court will tell you that all parties, whether they commit the particular crime of murder or not, are guilty of murder because of the doctrine of conspiracy.

Could you follow that instruction?

A Yes.

Q Do you have any prejudice at all about convicting one person when he is not the actual killer or murderer?

A No.

Q All right, then, let us assume for the moment that you have arrived at your verdict, and in your mind you say to yourself yes. I'm convinced that this young lady over here, Patricia Krenwinkel, is guilty of murder in the first degree.

But there is a possible doubt, a possible doubt, a shadow of doubt.

Would you be able to follow the Court's instructions and say, "I will put aside all possible doubt because that doubt is not reasonable", and vote accordingly?

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

25 26) e.

Yes.

Α

Q So then I take it you would not require conclusive proof or proof positive before you would bring in a verdict of guilt.

Do you understand the difference between proof positive and proof beyond a reasonable doubt?

Two and two is four, you understand that?

A Yes.

Q But for the purpose of proving any issue in a criminal trial the prosecution need not prove it to that absolute certainty.

You understand that?

A Yes.

Q All right now, let's assume that you have come back with your fellow jurors and have voted first-degree murder as to one or all of these defendants.

You understand there will be a second phase of this trial?

A Yes.

Q And during that second phase of the trial we will put on evidence pertaining to one defendant or several defendants.

The Court will instruct you that this evidence applies only to Defendant A or to Defendant B.

Will you be able to follow-that instruction?

A Yes.

2.

3

1

4 5

6.

7

9

8

10°

12

13 14

15

16

17

18.

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

Now, you are going to go back in the jury room and deliberate as to the proper penalty to be imposed.

You understand that?

A Yes.

Q You understand that you have an absolute discretion in deciding that proper penalty?

A Yes.

Now, are you of the frame of mind that under no circumstances would you vote for a death penalty because that particular defendant did not inflict the particular fatal blow in question?

MR. KANAREK: Object, your Honor, on the grounds it is improper your dire.

MR. STOVITZ: May I have the question read, your Honor?

THE COURT: Read the last question, please.

(Whereupon, the reporter reads the pending question as follows:

"Q Now, are you of the frame of mind that under no circumstances would you vote for a death penalty because that particular defendant did not inflict the particular fatal blow in question?")

THE COURT: Overruled, you may answer.

A No.

Q BY MR. STOVITZ: So then you can

11a6

2

1

3

5

6 7

8

9.

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18·

19 20:

21

22 23

.24

25 .26 envision circumstances where a person who was found guilty of first-degree murder should suffer the death penalty even though he did not himself inflict the fatal blow?

A Yes.

Q Now, Mrs. McKenzie, how long have you worked for the County of Los Angeles?

A Ten years, a little over ten years.

Q What particular office do you work at?

A East Los Angeles.

Q The fact you are a County employee, the fact Mr. Bugliosi and myself are County employees would in no way influence your verdict in this case?

A No.

Q The fact we might get our pay checks from the same auditor's office would in no way influence your verdict in this case?

A No.

Q The fact that we both get the same holidays, things like that, you understand it has nothing to do with the evidence in this case, right?

A Yes.

Now, Mrs. McKenzie, going to that \$64 question that we ask ourselves at the end, if you were in my place, you know everything about your own background that you know, is there any reason why you could not be fair to both sides?

Cielo Drive.com ARCHIVES

None that I know of. A MR. STOVITZ: Thank you very kindly. People pass for cause. THE COURT: Do you wish to wait until after the recess, Mr. Fitzgerald, before you inquire? MR. FITZGERALD: May we? THE COURT: All right, we will take our afternoon recess at this time, ladies and gentlemen. Do not converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject relating to this case, nor form or express any opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to those of you who are selected as jurors. 15 minutes, please. (Recess.) **8**

llb

11b-1	ì	(The following proceedings were had in
	2	open court in the presence of the prospective jurors,
	3	all defendants and counsel being present:)
	4	THE COURT: I want to announce that we will adjourn
	' 5	at 4:00 p.m. today rather than 4:15.
	6 .	The defendants and all counsel are present;
	7	all the prospective jurors are in the jury box.
	8	The defendants may exercise their next
	9	joint peremptory challenge.
	1 0	MR. FITZGERALD: There is no unanimity. A
	11	joint peremptory will not be exercised, your Honor.
	12	THE COURT: Very well.
	13	MR. FITZGERALD: Patricia Krenwinkel will accept
	14	the jury as it is now constituted.
	15	THE COURT: Mr. Reiner?
	1 6 ,	MR. REINER: Yes, your Honor, we will thank and
	17	excuse Juror No. 5, Mr. Dominguez.
	18	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Dominguez. You are
	19	excused.
	20	THE CLERK: Mrs. Rachel Quesinberry. R-a-c-h-e-1;
	21	Q-u-e-s-i-n-b-e-r-r-y.
	22	(Whereupon, Mrs. Rachel Quesinberry came
•	23	forward and was seated in seat No. 5 in the jury box.)
	24	THE COURT: Mrs. Quesinberry, did I pronounce
	25	your name correctly?
	26	MRS. QUESINBERRY: Quesinberry.

1	THE COURT: All right.		
2			
3	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. RACHEL QUESINBERRY		
4	BY THE COURT:		
5 .	Q Have you heard and understood everything		
6	that has been said in court since you came into this		
7	case?		
8′	A Yes.		
9	Q If you were selected as a trial juror would		
10	you be able to serve?		
11	A I am not sure, I think so		
12	Q Would you care to tell us what your doubt		
13	is about?		
14	A Well, I do work and I am not sure if I will		
15	be paid if I am here.		
16	Q Who is your employer?		
17	A IBM.		
18	Q IBM?		
19	A Yes.		
20	Q And you are not sure what their policy is?		
21	A No, I am not.		
22	Q Is there some way that you could find that		
23	out between now and tomorrow?		
24	A Yes.		
25	Q Would you do that, please?		
26	A Yes.		
	.1		

11b-2

11b-3

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

9.

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24.

25

.26

Q I am going to ask you the same two questions regarding the death penalty that I put to the other prospective jurors.

Have you had an opportunity to think about these questions and your answers to them?

A Yes.

Q The first one is, do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?

A No.

Q And the second question is:

Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?

A Yes.

Q Do you mean by that that you have now made up your mind, and nothing can change it on that point?

A Yes.

Q Regardless of what the evidence showed you would be unable and you would refuse to impose the death penalty?

A Yes.

Q Have you held that belief for some time,

1	Mrs. Quesinberry?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Do you have any mental reservation whatever
. 4	regarding that?
5.	A No.
6	Q Can you conceive of any possible case or
7	factual situation in a case where you might be willing to
8	impose the death penalty if there were a verdict of guilty
'9 ·	of murder in the first degree?
10	A No.
11	THE COURT: Do counsel wish to inquire.
12	MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor.
13	MR. REINER: No, your Honor.
14.	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn and Mr. Kanarek, do you wish
15;	to inquire?
16	MR. SHINN: Pass for cause, your Honor.
17	MR. KANAREK: No questions.
18	MR. STOVITZ: We would ask that this juror be
19	excused.
20	THE COURT: Very well.
21	MR. FITZGERALD: We jointly oppose it on due process
22	and equal protection grounds.
· 23 .	THE COURT: You are excused, Mrs. Quesinberry.
24	Thank you.
25	THE CLERK: Mrs. Opal A. Downs; O-p-a-1; D-o-w-n-s.
26	(Whereupon Mrs. Opal A. Downs came forward

1	and was seated in seat No. 5 in the jury box.)
2	
3	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. OPAL A. DOWNS
4	BY THE COURT:
5	Q Mrs. Downs, have you heard and understood
6	everything that has been said in court since you came into
7	the case?
8	A Yes, I have.
9	Q If you were selected as a trial juror in
10	this case would you be able to serve?
11	A I really don't feel that I could because
12	Douglas Aircraft where I work does not pay my wages
13	after 20 days.
14	Q Have you discussed that with someone at
15	Douglas?
16	A Well, that was the understanding that I had
17	with their industrial relations.
18	Q We have had in the past in other matters
19	I seem to recall, people working at Douglas I'm not
20	sure now what their announced policy was with respect to
21	these people.
22	Is this something that you could determine
28	between now and tomorrow?
24	A Oh, I could check it out again. I will
2 5	check it out again. But I also I also want to add this
26	I do not feel that I should get tied up on this jury

because of the length of it, because I have a daughter that is 19 years old that I'm trying to get through college.

And it lies solely upon my wages that she gets through college, and also she has ill health, and there is a lot of medical bills, and things on that order that I could not do on the \$5 a day that I get here.

THE GOURT: Well, I can understand that, but if you received your compensation from Douglas, that hardship would not be present, would it?

Á Well, there is another reason, and it is 1-cb 1 personal, that I don't want to make public here in the 2` gourtroom. 3 The reason why I do not want to sit on this 4 jury -5 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the bench, 6 your Honor? 7 8. MR. STOVITZ: Maybe we can ask the juror to 9 approach the bench and that would obviate it. 10 MR. FITZGERALD: She may approach alone. 11 THE COURT: Would you be willing to disclose this 12 to me, Mrs. Downs? MRS. DOWNS: Yes, I will disclose it to you if you 13 14 like, but I don't want it made public. 15 THE COURT: In turn, would you have any objection to 16 my disclosing it to the attorneys in the case only? 17 MRS. DOWNS: I am afraid if it was made public to the attorneys, there are too many things that get into the 18 19 paper, and I did not want this to come into the paper, 20 by all means. I'm sorry. 21 MR. REINER: Your Honor, we would have no objection 22 if your Honor were to take this in camera all alone without 23 disclosing it to counsel. 24 or I will have no objection --25 THE COURT: Well --

26

or I will have no objection -THE COURT: Well -MR. STOVITZ: Perhaps the best way to handle it, if

,c2

14.

the juror would hand a note to the bailiff addressed secretly to your Honor, it would not be in the court record and your Honor would see fit to disclose it to attorneys only in a session similar to what we have done in the past on one or two other items.

THE COURT: If I were to obtain the assurance of each counsel that it would not be disclosed to anyone else, would that be sufficient to your purpose?

A Yes.

THE COURT: All right, then, will you please come up here and tell me what it is.

MR. STOVITZ: On behalf of the People we waive our right to be present at that session.

THE COURT: Do all counsel join?

MR. FITZGERALD: I join.

MR. REINER: I join.

MR. SHINN: I join.

MR. KANAREK: I join.

(Whereupon, Mrs. Downs approaches the bench where a short conference was held with the Court and she returns to her seat in the jury box.)

THE COURT: Will counsel approach the bench, please?

(The following proceedings were had at the bench out of the hearing of the prospective jury:)

MR. KANAREK: I will stipulate this little portion can be sealed and given to the County Clerk.

THE COURT: We already have a publicity order covering conferences at the bench.

MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mrs. Downs' problem is she says she has a daughter who is not the daughter of her present husband, a daughter by a former marriage, and her present husband and her daughter do not get along well at all, and if she is called on the jury she is going to have to find some other place for her daughter to live.

That is her problem.

MR. STOVITZ: I will stipulate she may be excused.

MR. SHINN: So stipulated.

MR. REINER: So stipulated.

MR. FITZGERALD: So stipulated.

MR: KANAREK: So stipulated.

THE COURT: All counsel stipulate to excuse this prospective juror.

(The following proceedings were had in open court in the presence and hearing of the prospective jurors:)

THE COURT: You are excused, Mrs. Downs, thank you.

THE CLERK: Mrs. Clara E. Johanssen. C-1-a-r-a.
J-o-h-a-n-s-s-e-n.

(Whereupon, Mrs. Clara E. Johanssen was seated in seat No. 5 in the jury box.)

1	Voir dire examination of Mrs. Clara e. Johanssen
2	BY THE COURT:
3	Q Mrs. Johanssen, have you heard and understood
. 4 ;	everything that has been said in court since you came into
5	this case?
6	A Yes, I have.
7	Q If you are selected as a juror in this case are
.8	you able to serve?
. 9	A Well, I am not sure whether my employer will
10	go on paying my wages past the 20 days.
11	Q Who is your employer?
12	A Haven Insurance Agency in Hawthorne.
13	I am the first one from this agency that has
14	ever had to serve on a jury, so this is sort of a test case
15	with them.
16	I don't think they want to set a precedent,
17	either.
18	Q Where is your company located?
19	A Hawthorne.
20	Q Is this something you could ascertain between
21	now and tomorrow?
22	A I think so.
23	Q Apart from the question of your possible
24	compensation, is there any other reason why you would not
25	be able to serve?
26	A No. nothing I can think of.

Q All right. Well, if there is any question in your mind, or your supervisor or your manager, you might point out to them this is a valuable public service, one of the bulwarks of democracy, and many enlightened companies now are taking the position that when an employee serves on a jury he is entitled to be paid his full compensation for as long as that service lasts, notwithstanding he may be only called for 20 or 30 days initially.

Then if you will please check on that and let us know tomorrow the results of that.

A Yes, I will.

Q I am going to ask you the same questions regarding the death penalty, Mrs. Johanssen.

Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?

A No.

Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?

A No.

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, you may inquire.
MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you, your Honor.

11D 26.

11d-1	1	VOIR DIRE E	XAMINATION OF MRS. JOHANSSEN	
	2	BY MR. FITZGERALD:		
	3	Q What i	s your business or occupation?	
	4	A I am'a	n insurance secretary.	
	5	Q And I	believe you just stated you were	
	6	employed by an insurance agency.		
	7	What d	o you do there?	
	8	A Well,	I handle the commercial property fire	
	9	insurance, and I take dictation from the head man there.		
ļ	10	Q I take	it you are married?	
;	11	A Yes, I	am.	
;	12	Q By who	m is your husband employed?	
;	13	A Southe	rn California Water Company in	
)	14	Gardena.	•	
;	15	Q In wha	t capacity is he so employed? What	
,	16	does he do?		
;	17	A He ins	talls water service lines.	
	18	Q Do you	have any children?	
į	19	A Two, a	matried daughter of 22 and a son of	
;	20	20 at home.	•	
	21	Q Where	in the County do you reside?	
•	22	A Torrar	ce.	
	23	Q Have y	ou ever served as a juror before?	
	24	A Just o	nce on a case during this tour of	
)·	25	duty.		
	26	Q Was it	a criminal case?	

	I		•	
11d-2	1		A	Yes, it was.
	2		Q	Did it involve a charge similar to the one
	3	here?		• •
	4		A	No.
	5		Q	From your seat in the audience were you able
	6	to hear the questions that I asked the other prospective		
	7	jurors	?	, · .
	8		A	Yes.
	9		Q	If I were to ask you those same questions
	10.	would your answers be approximately the same?		
	11		A	Yes, they would.
	12		Q,	Is there any question you feel I should
	13	addres	s to yo	rů?
į, ·	14		A	No.
	15		Q	Are you familiar with any of the locations,
1	16	any of	the wi	tnesses, any of the victims, any of the
	17	attorn	eys, ar	ything like that?
	18.		A	No, nothing.
•	19		Q	Do you have any friends or relatives in law
	20	enforc	ement?	
	21	•	A	No.
*	22	•	Q	Do you have any quarrel with the various
	23	propos	itions	of law we discussed, presumption of innocence,
	24	reason	able do	
).	25	`	A	No, noné.
	26		Q	Can you think of any reason why you cannot be

11d-3	fair and impartial?
	A No. I cannot.
	Q Do you have any particular objection that is
	going to influence you in deciding this case in regard to
	the defendants' life style, or the way they dress or the
	way they act or the way they look?
	A No. certainly not.
	Q Do you feel that you could give these
	defendants the same fair trial you could give any defendant
:	in any criminal case?
;	A Yes, I could.
3	Q You are not going to require less evidence to
:	convict these defendants than you would anybody else, are
,	you?
<u>.</u>	15. A. No.
;	Q Can you think of any reason at all why you
:	cannot be fair and impartial?
:	A No, I cannot.
,	MR. FITZGERALD: Pass for cause.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Reiner?
:	MR. REINER: Yes, your Honor.
á	22
:	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. CLARA E. JOHANSEEN
:	BY MR. REINER:
, :	Q Mrs. Johanssen, you did hear the questions I
;	put to the prospective jurors earlier in the day, did you not?

1.

2

4 . 5

6

7

9'.

8,

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25

26

A Yes, I did.

Q I am going to repeat some of those questions, substantially all of them.

You will understand it is necessary that we ask some of these questions, the more important ones, of each individual juror?

A Yes.

Q Now, you will be instructed that you must presume that Leslie Van Houten is innocent. Will you accept that instruction?

A Yes.

Q Do you in fact, as you sit here now, believe that Leslie Van Houten -- strike that.

Do you in fact presume that she is innocent until and unless you receive any evidence to the contrary?

A Yes.

Q And when I speak of evidence to the contrary, you understand that "evidence" means evidence beyond all reasonable doubt?

A Yes, I do.

Q So that after presuming at the beginning of the case that Leslie Van Houten is innocent, if the evidence that comes in thereafter is only enough to create a suspicion in your mind that she might be guilty, you would acquit her, would you not?

A Yes, I would.

.1d-5	1	Q A suspicion that someone might be guilty is
	2	insufficient?
)	3	A Right.
	4	Q If there are any subconscious inclinations
	5	you might have with respect to convicting any of the
	6	defendants because some of them in your view are guilty,
	7	will you make every conscious attempt to discipline your
	8	thinking so that you will not convict any defendant for
	9	whom there is insufficient evidence?
	10.	A Yes.
	11	Q You will not allow your emotions to over-
	12	whelm your judgment in this matter?
	1,3	A No.
	14	Q Are there any reservations in your mind
	15	with respect to any of the statements that you have made?
••	. 16	A No, there are not.
	17	Q Because of the publicity in this case.
•	18	Incidentally, you have heard of these
	19	defendants prior to being called as a prospective juror,
	20	have you not?
	21	A Yes.
•	22	Q You are at least in general terms familiar
•	23,	with the crime, or you were familiar with the crime before
	24.	you were called as a prospective juror?
	Ž 5	A Yes.
	26	O Do you feel that it would be more difficult

in this case than in the typical and obscure case to keep an open mind during the course of the trial; that it would require greater discipline on yourself to decide the case based solely on the evidence than it would be the case if this were an obscure case?

Would it be a little more difficult in this case to try it correctly?

A No, I don't think so.

Q Do you feel then, notwithstanding anything that you have heard or seen in the newspapers or television or radio or comments that you have heard within the community from your friends and acquaintances, that you would not have even a difficult time at all deciding this case based solely on the evidence?

A So, I would not.

∠1E-1

2

1

3

4

5

6

4.

9

10.

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23[.]

24 25

26

Q You did observe the conduct of Leslie Van Houten today, yesterday, and I believe on a prior occasion, did you not?

A Yes.

Q Without regard to your interpretation at this time. I won't ask you to reveal it, but will you allow her conduct in this court, such as it is, or such as it may be, to influence your judgment as to her guilt or innocence?

MR. STOVITZ: I object to the question, your Honor, as improper voir dire examination.

MR. REINER: Perhaps I may rephrase the question.

Q Do you understand the question -Strike that and I will rephrase it.

Would you allow Miss Van Houten's conduct here in court -- I am not referring to her conduct on the witness stand which is something that should be considered, of course -- but her conduct as she sits here in court, would you allow that to influence your judgment as to the sufficiency of the evidence as presented to you?

A No. I would not.

Q If you were offended by her conduct in any way you would still acquit her if the evidence was insufficient?

A Yes, I would have to.

Q And if it occurred to you that perhaps

Leslie Van Houten would want to be convicted, if any of

these defendants are convicted, would you nonetheless acquit

her if the evidence were insufficient?

A Yes, I would.

Q You would not allow her wishes in this matter to control; you would allow the evidence to control your judgment?

A Yes.

Q perhaps you recall earlier one of the Deputy
District Attorneys asking other prospective jurors whether
they had the courage to inflict the death penalty on any or
all of the defendants.

Do you feel that it would take courage to inflict the death penalty on any or all of the defendants?

Do you think it would take personal courage to do that?

A Yes, it would. But I can do it.

Q Do you feel it would take courage on your part to acquit even a single defendant in a case as notorious as this one?

A Not if I felt they were not guilty, or had a reasonable doubt.

Q Does it accord with your judgment that the general public opinion is that these defendants should all be convicted?

Is that your view of the general public opinion?

A No.

MR. KANAREK: May we approach the bench?

11E3	1
	Ż ·
	ş
	. 4
	5
	6
	٠,
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
.	14
٠	15
	1,6
	17
	18
	19
	20

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Did you say something, Mr. Kanarek?
MR. KANAREK: Yes. May we approach the bench?

I would like to have the last question read.

THE COURT: Are you objecting to the last question?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: Read the question, please.

(Whereupon, the reporter reads the record as follows:

Does it accord with your judgment that the general public opinion is that these defendants should all be convicted?

"Is that your view of the general public opinion?")

THE COURT: I will sustain an objection to that question.

Q BY MR. REINER: Mrs. Johannsen, you have heard this case and the persons in it discussed from time to time, have you not, over these last few months?

A Yes, I have.

Q That would include exposure to television, radio, newspapers and perhaps friends and acquaintances in your day-to-day activities?

A Yes, right.

Q And these comments in sum and substance related to the particular crimes involved.

Isn't that true?

Ŀ

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

23

24

25

26

A Yes, sir.

Q And is it correct that the general tenor of these remarks with regard to the crimes would be that the crimes were grotesque?

> A Yes.

Now, beginning last December you learned of the names of the defendants, or some of the defendants for the first time, is that true?

A SECTION OF THE

À Right.

Cielo Drive.com ARCHIVES

	1	•
11f-1 ,	Q	Prior to that time you did not know the
2	name of Mr. Ma	mson or any other defendant in this case?
. 3	A.	No, I did not.
. 4	Q	Since that time you have learned of the
5 ๋	names of the d	lefendants, and they have become familiar
6	to you?	
7	. A.	Some of them, yes.
:8	Q	Which ones have become familiar to you
9	and which one	s have not?
10	A	Charles Manson, Susan Atkins those two,
11	mainly.	
12	Q	I see. Prior to coming to court, the
13	name of Leslie	Van Houten was not familiar to you?
14	A	No, it was not.
. 15	Q	Was the face or likeness of Leslie Van
16	Houten familia	ar to you?
17	A	No.
. 18	Q	During the last few months since last
19	December when	these arrests occurred, you had occasion
20	to view various	us commentators on television with regard
.21	to this case?	
22	A	That's right.
23	Q.	And this would also include articles in
24	the newspaper	and exposure to radio?
25	A.	Yes, some.
26	ما	And comments by friends and acquaintances in

1	your day-to-day activities?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Isn't it true that most of the people that
4	you came in contact with indicated at least in their
5	general opinion that these defendants or some of them
6	were guilty?
7	A Yes.
8	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor
9	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, the question has been
10	answered.
11	MR. REINER: May I proceed, your Honor?
12	THE COURT: You may.
13	BY MR.REINER:
14	Q Notwithstanding the general attitude among
15	your friends and acquaintances in the community on a
16	day-to-day basis was that some of these defendants, if
17	not all of these defendants, should be convicted, would
18	you have the courage to acquit even a single defendant if
19	you felt that the evidence was insufficient to warrant
20	a conviction?
21	THE COURT: I think that question is improper,
.22	Mr. Reiner, as a misstatement of what the prospective
23	juror has previously stated.
24	Will you rephrase the question.
25	BY MR. REINER:
26	Q Notwithstanding what you have heard with

regard to the guilt or innocence of any of these defendants in this case, would you nonetheless have the courage of your convictions to acquit even a single defendant in this case if at the conclusion of the case in your judgment the evidence presented in court was insufficient to prove the guilt of that defendant beyond all reasonable doubt?

A Yes, I would.

Q And you would not feel that there was any pressure, or if you did feel that there was any pressure, you would ignore any pressure that you feel from friends and acquaintances towards convicting all of these defendants?

A Yes, sir.

Q There was unfortunately a press conference called by Mr. Younger, District Attorney Younger, with regard to one of the counsel in this case, Mr. Kanarek.

Did you see that press conference on television?

A Yes, I did.

killings.

Made Pro 12

1	A Yes.
2	Q The Court will give you a definition to be used
3	during the deliberations on what an accomplice is.
4	Will you apply that definition, whatever it is?
5	A Yes, I will.
6	Q And you will not apply some other definition
7	that perhaps you may or may not have heard in some other
8	case?
· 9	A No.
10	Q Now, if you decide in your own judgment that
1:1	Linda Kasabian was an accomplice to these killings, will you
12	then apply the instruction that the Court will give you as to
13	the consideration that you may give or that you must give
14	to the testimony of Linda Kasabian?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And if the Court instructs you that in the
17	event that you conclude that Linda Kasabian was an accom-
18	plice to these killings, that you may not consider her
19	testimony for any purpose whatsoever unless there is
20	independent corroborating evidence.
21	A Yes.
22	Q And you will follow that instruction whether
23	you agree with it or disagree with it; is that true?
24	A I will.
25	Q Do you have any strong feelings about that
26	particular instruction?

1	A OK. A
2	Q When I say "independent corroborating evidence,
3	do you appreciate that I am now referring to independent
4	corroborating evidence that relates to Leslie Van Houten?
5	.A Yes.
6	Q So that if there is independent corroborating
7	evidence that relates to one or more other defendants, you
8	will not regard the testimony of Linda Kasabian with
9	respect to you will not consider the testimony of
10	Linda Kasabian with respect to Leslie Van Houten; is that
11	true?
12	A Right.
13	MR. REINER: Thank you very much.
14	Pass for cause, your Honor.
15	MR. SHINN: Ass for cause.
1 ,6	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?
17	MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Bugliosi?
19	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you.
20	•
21	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
23	Q Mrs. Johanssen, you indicated that you had a
24	son who was 20.
25.	A Yes.
26	Q Is he living with you, ma 'am?

1	A Yes, he is.
2	Q Is he employed at all, Mrs. Johanssen?
3	A He is in the process of looking for a new job.
4	Q He has graduated from high school, I take it?
5	A Yes, he has.
6	Q And he is not going to college?
7	A No.
8 4	Q You have indicated, Mrs. Johanssen, that you are
.9	not opposed to the death penalty; is that right?
10	A That's right.
11	Q And you said that you would have the courage to
12 ′.	return verdicts of death against these defendants if you
1 3	thought it was a proper case under all the circumstances;
14	is that correct, ma am?
15	A Yes.
16	MR. KANAREK: I object to that question, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Overruled.
18	MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Your answer is yes, ma am?
19	A Yes, it is.
20	Q Mrs. Johanssen, could you vote for the death
2 1	penalty for a female defendant?
22	A Yes.
23	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I am sorry, I didn't hear
24	that question.
25	THE COURT: The last question?
26	MD VANADER. What is right.

THE COURT: Would you read the last question? 1 (The question was read by the reporter.) 2 The question is, could you vote MR. BUGLIOSI: 3 for the death penalty for a female defendant? 4 Yes, I could. 5 Can you conceive of any circumstances, Mrs. 6 Johanssen, under which you would be willing to vote for a 7 verdict of death against a particular defendant even though 8 the evidence at the trial showed that this particular 9 defendant did not himself personally kill a fellow human 10 being? 11 Α 12 Yes. May we approach the bench, your MR KANAREK: 13 Honor? 14 THE COURT: The same question has been asked a number 15 of times. Are you objecting to the question? 16 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 17 18 19 20 .21 22 24 25 26

12A

	1	
12a-1	1	THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
	2.	You may answer.
	. 3	MRS. JOHANSSEN: Yes, I can conceive of that.
	4 .	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	5	Q Do you understand the rule of conspiracy,
	6	Mrs. Johanssen, that says that one conspirator is
	7	criminally responsible for and equally guilty of the
	8	crime committed by his co-conspirators?
	9	A Yes, I understand that.
	10	Q You heard Mr. Stovitz and I talk about that
	11	rule on the last couple of days, have you not?
	12	A Yes.
_	13	Q Have you done any thinking about it,
	14	Mrs. Johanssen?
ŧ	15	A. Yes, I have.
•,	16	Q Do you understand the rule of law?
	17	A I do.
	18	Q Do you have any prejudices against it,
	. 19	ma'am?
	20	A No, I do not.
	21	Q You don't disagree with it, do you?
,	22	A No.
	23.	Q Can you promise me, ma'am, that you will
•	24	unhesitatingly follow the Court's instructions on that
	25	rule of law if you find it applicable to the facts in
	26	this case?

12a-2 ₁	A Yes, I will.
2	Q Assuming, Mrs. Johanssen, that a particular
3	witness for the prosecution is deemed to be an accomplice.
4	Will you follow the Court's instruction that only slight -
. 5	MR. FITZGERALD: Objection, your Honor.
6	This is improper voir dire, and it is a
7	misstatement of the law.
8	In that connection, I submit CALJIC 3,10,
9	11, 12 and 13.
10	MR. BUGLIOSI: I would submit People vs. Wayne,
11	41 Cal. 2d 814, at page 822.
12	THE COURT: We haven't heard the question yet,
13	gentlemen. I can't rule on it until I hear it.
14	MR. FITZGERALD: It is initially objected to for
, 15	the use of the term "slight." That does not appear in the
16	instructions.
17	MR. BUGLIOSI: May we approach the bench on this,
18	your Honor?
19	THE COURT: No.
20	I am going to sustain the objection on the
. 21	basis of what I have heard so far, Mr. Bugliosi.
22	I think the question can be put in another
. 23	form to elicit the point that you are interested in now
24	without instructing the jurors.

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: May I approach the bench, your

Honor, on this issue and give the Court the authority that

23

24

25

26

I believe I have on this particular question?

THE COURT: I am going to sustain the objection to this question. I don't care what your authority is.

The form of the question is bad.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Mrs. Johanssen, if the Court instructs you that the evidence in corroboration of an accomplice can be circumstantial evidence, will you follow the Court's instruction on that, ma'am?

A Yes, I will.

Q Do you realize, Mrs. Johanssen, that the prosecution in all criminal trials only have the burden of proving a defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

Do you understand that, ma'am?

A Yes, I do.

Q You understand that we do not have the burden of proving any defendant's guilt beyond all doubt?

A Yes.

Are you of such a frame of mind, Mrs.

Johanssen, that before you would return a verdict of guilty for these defendants you would require of the prosecution that we remove not only reasonable doubts from your mind but that you would require that we remove all possible doubt?

A No.

Q Do you recall my discussion about circumstantial evidence, Mrs. Johanssen?

12a-4	1	A Yes, I do.
À	2	Q Did you get the distinction by way of that
	3	cookie jar example between circumstantial evidence as
	4	opposed to direct evidence, ma'am?
•	5· ·	A Yes.
	6	Q Do you have any objection whatsoever to
	7	sitting as a juror on a case where the People rely in
,	8	part on circumstantial evidence, ma'am?
•	9	A No.
	10	Q Are you confident, Mrs. Johanssen, that
,	11 .	you can give the People of the State of California,
,	12	the prosecution, a fair trial?
·	13	A Yes, I am.
	14	Q Is there any doubt in your mind about that?
•	15	A No.
	16	Q Do you recall that the last few days I have
	17	asked several other jurors questions which I am not
	18	asking you now?
12b fls.	19	A Yes.
	20	
:	21	
	22	
•	23	
	24	
	25.	
	96	

		the state of the s
12 B-1	1	Q And when you were out in the spectator's section
	2	of the courtroom, Mrs. Johanssen, were you mentally asking
	3	yourself those same questions?
	4	A Yes, I was.
•	5	Q Was there any question that I asked or
	.6	Mr. Stovitz asked which caused you to say to yourself that
	.7	you would have answered it differently from the way the
	8 .	majority of the jurors were answering the questions?
	. 9	A In general, no.
	1 Ó	Q There is nothing that you can think of that you
	11	would want to tell me at this point?
	12	· A No.
	13	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, Mrs. Johanssen.
	14	Pass for cause, your Honor.
	15	THE COURT: It is the People's next peremptory
	16	challenge.
ı	. 17	MR. BUGLIOSI: The People thank and excuse Miss
à	18	Rose Pahn.
	e r	THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Pahn. You are excused.
	20	THE CLERK: Mrs. Barbra A. Lynch, B-a-r-b-r-a,
	21	ы-у-n-c-h.
•	22	(Whereupon, Mrs. Barbra A. Lynch was seated in
	23	seat No. 4 in the jury box.)
	24	
	25	
_	26	

1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. BARBRA A. LYNCH
2	BY THE COURT:
3	Q Mrs. Lynch, have you heard and understood
4	everything that has been said in court since you came into
5	the case?
6	A I believe so.
7	Q If you are selected as a juror in this case,
8	would you be able to serve?
9	A It would be a hardship because my only
10	daughter is planning to be married in August, and in a
1į	real family that only happens once in a lifetime.
12	Q Is there anything other than that fact that
13	would create a hardship for you?
14	A Well, I don't know if this is the proper time
15	to say that I do have a prejudice about the life style of
16	the defendants.
17	Q We will get to that in a minute.
18	I was inquiring now as to any undue hardship
19	which might result if you were called upon to serve.
20	A No.
21	What is the date of your daughter's marriage?
22	A August 15th.
23	THE CLERK: That would be Saturday, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Q saturday?
25	A Yes.
26	Q All right

,	
1	I am going to ask you, Mrs. Lynch, the
2,	questions regarding the death penalty that I put to the
3	other prospective jurors.
4	Have you had an opportunity to think about
5	these questions and your answers to them?
Ą	A Yes, I have.
7	Q All right.
8	The first question is: Do you entertain such
ģ	conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that
10	you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any
11	defendant's guilt regardless of the evidence developed
12	during the trial?
13	A No.
14	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
15	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
16	refuse to impose it regardless of the evidence developed
17	during the trial?
18	A No.
19	THE COURT: Do you wish to inquire, Mr. Fitzgerald?
20	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you, your Honor.
2 1	
22	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
24	Q What is your business or occupation?
25	A I am a homemaker.
26	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, could the lady speak up

1	just a little bit?				
2	THE COURT: Would you hold the microphone just a				
3	little closer, please?				
4	MR. KANAREK: Thank you very much.				
5	MR. FITZGERALD: Q Is your husband employed?				
6	A Yes, he is.				
7	Q By whom is he employed?				
8	A Los Angeles County.				
9.	Q What does he do for the County of Los Angeles?				
10	A He is an assistant superintendent of buildings,				
11	Department of Building & Safety, with the County Engineers.				
12	Q Does he work out of a particular office?				
13	A The Second and Main Office, the Main Office.				
14	Q Do you have any children, ma am?				
15	A I have three.				
16	Q The oldest?				
17	A Is a boy.				
18	Q Age?				
19	A 24.				
20	Q The youngest?				
21	A A boy 20.				
22	Q Where in the County do you reside, just				
23	generally speaking?				
24	A Whittier.				
25					

Have you ever served as a juror before? 12c-1Q 1 A No. I haven t. 2 And I believe you have indicated that the 3 life style or the apparent life style of the defendants 4 you react to in some fashion? 5 A That is true. 6 Rather than have me ask you a whole series Q 7 of questions not really knowing what is going on in your 8 mind, Mrs. Lynch, why don't you try to provide us with ġ what your feelings are in regard to the defendants and 10 their life style, even though it may be embarrassing. 11 We would appreciate what you honestly feel. 12 Well, I feel that the term "Family" in 13 connection with them is a mockery. It is more like a 14 harem. 15 THE COURT: Hold the microphone a little closer. 16 please, and speak right into it. Turn the end of it so 17 the end faces your mouth. 18 MRS. LYNCH: Yes, sir. 19 MR. FITZGERALD: I take it that you have read 20 æ. some publicity in connection with this case? 21 22 A Yes, I have. Have you read newspaper coverage of the case? 23 Q 24 A Yes. Have you also read about this case in 25 26 certain periodicals?

	<u> </u>		1861
12c-2		A	Yes.
	2	 Q	Magazines?
)	3	A.	Yes.
	4		
	ľ	Q	Have you seen material in connection with
	6	this case on t	•
		A	Yes.
	8	Q	Have you heard material concerning this case
	9	on the radio?	***
	0	A	Yes.
•	ĺ	Q	I take it you have heard certain things on
1:	_ 1		and seen centain things in the newspaper in
	_],		th these defendants, Leslie Van Houten,
1			winkel, Susan Atkins and Charles Manson?
, 1	Ì	A	Some of them.
	5	Q.	And you have heard something in connection
.1	ľ	,	refer to as the Family; is that correct?
	7	A	Yes.
	8	Q	Now, let me ask you this: Do you know
	'	anybody who k	nows personally any of the defendants?
	0	A	No.
	1	Q	Do you know anybody who has met these
	2.	defendants, M	rs. Lynch?
•	3	A	No.
	3 4 `	Ø.	Your knowledge, Mrs. Lynch correct me if
	5	I am wrong	your knowledge of these defendants is based
2	6	upon what vou	have read in the newspapers and periodicals.

12c-3

2

1

ş

4

Š

Ġ

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15.

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26:

seen on television or heard on the radio; is that correct, ma'am?

A That's right.

Q And you have heard something in connection with a Family; is that correct, ma'am?

A Uh-huh.

Q Could you give us a synopsis --

THE COURT: Would you please answer yes or no instead of uh-huh. The reporter has to take down the answers.

MRS. LYNCH: Yes.

THE COURT: We can't tell from that whether it is affirmative or negative.

MRS. LYNCH: Yes, sir.

MR. FITZGERALD: Q Would you give us a synopsis or summary or could you paraphrase what you have heard in connection with some Family that may somehow be associated with the defendants?

MR. STOVITZ: Sorry for the interruption, Mr. Fitzgerald.

I object to the question as it gives the juror an opportunity to tell, perhaps, other jurors what they have not seen, heard or read, and it may have some effect of causing the other jurors to learn things about this case that may not be introduced in evidence.

THE COURT: Objection sustained.

I think we will take an adjournment at this time, Mr. Fitzgerald.

MR. STOVITZ: May we, after the jury leaves the courtroom, your Honor, have a few moments with your Honor here in court? We have one or two matters that we would like to discuss.

THE COURT: Very well.

We will adjourn until 9:45 tomorrow morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Do not converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject relating to the case nor form or express any opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to those of you who are finally selected.

9:45 tomorrow.

We will be in recess for a few minutes.

Is this something that you wanted to take up in chambers or in open court?

MR. BUGLIOSÍ: It can be in open court, your Honor.

(Whereupon all prospective jurors leave the courtroom and the following proceedings occured in open court, all defendants and all counsel being present:)

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.

None of the prospective jurors are present.

12d f1\$6

12-D-1

.21

MR. BUGLIOSI: Just a few points, your Honor.

Number one, I would request on behalf of the prosecution that the Court rule within a few days on Mr. Stovitz's contempt action.

I would suggest perhaps Friday afternoon. I think Friday is a day where the Federal Courts are not in session. Perhaps the Court could excuse the jury Friday afternoon and hear the matter. Or if the Court does not want to excuse the jury at all, perhaps it could be heard Friday morning before the court session, or maybe Monday morning.

In any event, your Honor, we would urge the Court to rule as expeditiously as possible on that particular issue.

The second point, your Honor, we would request that the Court instruct the jury that when they go home at night or in the daytime, the morning, not to read the newspapers or listen to the radio or watch television with respect to this case.

Now, granted one or more jurors may violate the Court's instruction or disobey the Court's instruction.

On the other hand, some of them might decide to follow the Court's instruction, and perhaps all of them will.

I think we should start out with the assumption that they will all obey the Court's instruction.

There is too much coverage of this case right

A2

3.

4.

 now that is prejudicial, I would say, to both sides.

The jurors are the exclusive judges of the facts and the evidence, your Honor, and I do not think they should be exposed to some of the things that are being said over television.

So, we would urgently request the Court to instruct the jury.

THE COURT: Said by whom over television?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Said by, perhaps, both sides, your

Honor, or perhaps third parties.

In any event, I don't see how the jury, who are the sole and exclusive judges of the fact, can profit in that function by listening to television about this case.

During the trial of this matter the Court has indicated that the Court intends to sequester the jury for that very purpose, so that they will not be exposed to publicity concerning the case. It seems to me, to be consistent, the Court should, at this time, also instruct the jury not to read the newspapers or listen to the radio or watch television on any matter concerning this particular case.

THE COURT: I might point out to you, as you are well aware, Mr. Bugliosi, that the District Attorney of this County has consistently opposed the publicity order. He opposed the augmentation of that order covering matters in chambers and conferences at the bench outside of the

12B3

,}

presence of the jury and any release of information from the transcript covering those proceedings.

I find it a little difficult to understand the consistency of your present position in view of the position that the District Attorney has taken.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The District Attorney of this County, your Honor, has not said that the jury should be privy to things or happenings that occur back in chambers or up at the bench. He has never said that.

He has said that the occurrences back in chambers or up at the bench, the transcript of those proceedings should be made available to the press.

The District Attorney realizes, and he has made this abundantly clear, that there are many things that the jury should not hear or be privy to.

So, in all deference to the Court, I do not see any inconsistency.

THE COURT: The inconsistency is apparent to anyone.

Go ahead, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Does the Court wish to rule or indicate how it feels about those two particular issues at this time?

THE COURT: As far as the matter involving Mr. Stovitz,

I do not, at this time, wish to indicate anything one way

or the other.

As far as the request for further admonition to

the jury, I have no objection to that. MR. BUGLIOSI: Admonishing the jury? THE COURT: Yes. 1Ž· 25.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

12e-1 1

2.

2Ž

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you for that, your Honor.

The third point is prospective.

I am wondering if the Court -- it is hard for the Court to make a statement at this point, but I wonder if the Court, at the time of jury instruction three or four months from now is going to instruct solely on CALJIC?

The position of the District Attorney's

Office -- and I think the defense -- will be that the

Court should only use CALJIC as a guide, and if we, or

the defense, can give the Court authority for any proposi
tion of law not contained within CALJIC, perhaps the

Court should also give that instruction.

I am referring to, perhaps, language of the Galifornia Supreme Court directly in point on a particular issue.

The reason I am raising that at this time is that the California Supreme Court in the Wayne case, People vs. Wayne, 41 Cal. 2d, has clearly said that only slight -- they have used the word slight -- only slight evidence is necessary to corroborate the testimony of an accomplice.

Now, I grant the Court that that language is not contained in CALJIC, but I can't say that CALJIC is the law. These are only proposed instructions. To my knowledge, the Court wouldn't have to give any

.25 .26

14⁻

instructions in CALJIC, the Court could formulate its own instructions.

Now, if the Court is of the frame of mind that it will not be handcuffed, as it were, by CALJIC, then I think the issue has to be resolved at this time whether or not this word "slight" is a proper word.

If it is a proper word, your Honor, we would request that we voir dire the jury on the accomplice issue using that particular word.

THE COURT: The objection to the question was sustained not with reference to anything in CALJIC but because, as I have indicated to both sides repeatedly, I do not want to get into any differences of opinion before the prospective jurors as to what the instructions will be.

The only reason I have permitted you to go into the question of instructions at all is simply for illustration, not for instruction or indoctrination, and when you start to argue about what the meaning or what the instruction is going to be that is finally given by the Court or the nuances of definitions regarding these technical matters, I simply am not going to permit it as part of any your dire examination.

I have told you that. I repeat it now. It is improper and not necessary.

The same point which you are trying to get

at, Mr. Bugliosi, I assume can be arrived at by rephrasing the questions in some other form.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The only thing, your Honor, in rephrasing, the word "slight" apparently has to be dropped out of the picture, and the prosecution does not want to forget about the word "slight."

THE COURT: If your question turns solely on whether the word "slight" can be used or not used, then I would say it is probably an improper question.

MR. BUGLIOSI: An improper question?

THE COURT: Yes. Then I think you are attempting to indoctrinate or instruct where you should be testing the state of mind of the juror with regard to possible bias.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The vice of the Court's present posture is that the defense can go into this business of accomplice

THE COURT: I haven't said that you can't go into it, Mr. Bugliosi. You apparently keep wanting to misunder-stand what I say.

You may inquire but the thrust of your question has to be in a different direction.

2-F-1

9

.20

MR. BUGLIOSI: But Mr. Reiner's question — and his questioning is proper — I have not objected to, although originally he misstated the law with respect to accomplices; but right now I think he is stating the law of accomplice. Now, if he can state the law of accomplice, questioning the jury on that issue, it seems to me that in rebuttal the prosecution can also expand on what Mr. Reiner has said.

Mr. Reiner has told the jury that the corroboration has to be totally independent evidence.

Now, that is correct. But it is also correct that that totally independent evidence can be slight, and the position of the People is, if my statement of the law is correct, and if Mr. Reiner can make a correct statement, ergo, we should be able to make a correct statement to the jury.

THE COURT: All I can say is, again, you are talking about the very thing that I have told you I don't want to be raised in front of the prospective jurors, and that is technical definitions as to what the law or the instructions are.

The question is not whether they understand the technical definition but whether or not they are willing to follow it, whatever it is, as it is finally given to them.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Very well, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further, gentlemen?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. I'm sorry.

12F2

2 ·

MR. FITZGERALD: I will defer to Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, there is a problem in connection with the 30 pages of notes that Mr. Bugliosi represented to the Court that he found, his original notes.

It turns out, your Honor, and I may not be stating it right, I don't know, but Mr. Bugliosi has still not come up with the 30 pages of notes. What he has come up with is purportedly a copy, which is a Xerox or Thermofax, or some kind of a copy, which is predominantly, to a great extent, illegible.

Now, he represented to the Court, your Honor, that he had found those 30 pages of notes.

Now, this is most important. These are the original notes that Mr. Bugliosi took when he spoke with Susan Atkins, not making any changes or anything.

All we want is what he represented to the Court, and he has not -- he keeps saying --

13-1

.4

1<u>2</u>

0

THE COURT: Well, let's hear from Mr. Bugliosi as to what he has.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think Mr. Kanarek is implying that the District Attorney's Office, your Honor, has a particular type of photostat machine -- there is no patent on it apparently --

THE COURT: He wants to see the original notes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think he is implying we have a
particular type of Xerox machine, never patented --

THE COURT: He is not implying that. Let's not avoid the subject.

Do you have the original notes or don't you?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I told Mr. Kanarek if I found the original notes I would give them to him.

Susan Atkins own attorney, Daye Shinn, has seen the original notes and told Mr. Kanarek that what Mr. Kanarek has in his hands right now is identical to the original notes.

THE COURT: That does not satisfy the question.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I told Mr. Kanarek, and I will tell the Court, if I find these original notes, Susan Atkins, testimony is of no concern to me right now, and I have tubs of papers down there, if I find the original notes I will give them to Mr. Kanarek.

THE COURT: I take it that you have not found the original notes, is that correct?

.3-2

2

ì

3

5

6

8

10

12

1:1

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, I found a photostatic copy of them and I have given Mr. Kanarek a photostatic copy, but apparently that does not please Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: No, it does not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, if he doesn't have it you cannot inspect it. Mr. Kanarek. It is just that simple. He says if he finds it he will furnish it.

MR. KANAREK: I believe he represented to the Court that he found his original notes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That was not my language. I found the notes, Mr. Kanarek. You might speak to Mr. Shinn who has looked at the yellow, original notes. He is Miss Atkins attorney. He is totally satisfied.

THE COURT: This point has been covered, Mr. Kanarek. Is there anything else, gentlemen?

MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor.

THE COURT: It has been covered in the discovery order; nothing has been changed since then. You will have the right to inspect the original notes if, as, and when they are located.

MR. KANAREK: As of right now we have not seen them. We will take by way of motion or whatever else we feel is necessary --

THE COURT: No motion is necessary. I am telling you you have the right to see them.

Mr. Bugliosi is representing to the Court that

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

he has not been able to find them.

MR. FITZGERALD: I have a matter I would like to bring to the attention of the Court.

As the Court adjourned this afternoon I was questioning a juror with regard to the information she read in connection with this case or heard on the radio or had seen on television.

I asked her a question, to relate in open court what she had heard in connection with the so-called Manson Eamily.

Mr. Stovitz interposed an objection and your Honor sustained it.

I would like to go into this matter again tomorrow morning, and I don't want to be traipsing to the bench.

THE COURT: I will consider it in the morning, Mr. Fitzgerald.

MR. STOVITZ: Does your Honor intend to have a full session Monday morning, in view of the Weber case?

THE COURT: Absolutely.

(Whereupon, an adjournment was taken to reconvene at 9:45 a.m., Thursday, July 2, 1970.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

22

23

24

25

26

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1970 9:54 A.M.

(The following proceedings were had in the chambers of the Court out of the hearing of the prospective jurors, all counsel being present:)

THE COURT: The record will show all counsel are present.

I wanted to find out why you were late this morning, Mr. Kanarek.

It is now, according to the clock in chambers here, six minutes to 10:00.

MR. KANAREK: I was here by ten minutes to 10:00. your Honor.

I had to park right next to the parking lot adjacent to Olvera Street.

THE COURT: I know you have to park somewhere, but why are you late?

MR. KANAREK: That is the reason I was five minutes late, your Honor. I just had to drive around from parking lot to parking lot and that was the closest one. I did not anticipate I would have to go to that far away a parking lot.

I am parked --

Every morning there seems to be something, THE COURT: or at least there have been several mornings

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

MR. KANAREK: I think it was yesterday and today, 1 is about the only time I have been late, I think, in the 2 last couple of weeks, your Honor. 3 Yesterday I was in court and had asked for 4 priority. 5 I was in the courthouse before 9:00 o'clock. 6 THE COURT: I am not talking about that. I can 7 understand when you are in another court you may not be 8 able to get back exactly on time. 9 What I am talking about is the unnecessary 10 tardiness caused by not finding a parking place. 11 12 Everybody else has the same problem; yet they 13 are here on time. 14 MR. KANAREK: I miscalculated by about, I gathered 15 about five minutes. 16 THE COURT: That is what I want to avoid, Mr. Kanarek. 17 and I admonish you again. 18 MR. KANAREK: Yes, sir. 19 I expect all counsel to be on time. THE COURT: 20 have enough unavoidable delays caused by one thing or 21 another. I want to avoid the avoidable. 22 23 24 25 26

ì

3

. 5.

6.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18.

19 .20

2į

22

23[.] 24

25

26

MR. KANAREK: I agree with the Court, your Honor.

I will just try to get down maybe a half hour earlier or something like that.

THE COURT: I don't want to have to take any drastic action, Mr. Kanarek. I am trying to understand the problems of all counsel. This is a problem I don't understand because I know that it can be solved, I know it is possible for you to be here on time, no matter how difficult it is to find a parking place.

So, I am just telling you to consider this to be an admonition.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And let's not have it again.

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: Anything else before we resume?

We simply don't have the time to waste in this case.

MR. KANAREK: I apologize to the Court and counsel, your Honor, for being late.

THE COURT: Anything else, gentlemen, before we resume?

Mr. Fitzgerald did raise the question regarding an objection that I sustained to a question that he asked Mrs. Lynch yesterday which, in substance, asked her to give a synopsis of everything that she had learned about the defendants, I believe, from the standpoint

22

23

24

25

26

of the publicity.

I don't believe that that is a proper question. I think the inquiry into any possible bias or challenge for cause can be gotten out without having her recite everything that she has seen, read or heard.

After all, it is not what she has seen, read or heard which is the important point, but what effect, if any, it has had on her. The same thing seen by ten different people may have ten different effects.

I see no occasion to recite before all of the other prospective jurors everything that she has read, seen and heard.

MR. FITZGERALD: I didn't create the publicity, your Honor, and if I ask her a question she is just going to come out with baldfaced conclusions.

I think I am entitled to find out what she bases those conclusions on.

I will abide by the Court's ruling.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may I just make the record?

I have joined with Mr. Fitzgerald, your Honor. We have a situation --

THE COURT: Joined in what?

MR. KANAREK: In his last comments.

I think we have a situation, if we have jurors who wish to be on the jury for one reason or the

other, who wish to be sequestered, they are willing to go through certain ordeals to be on this jury, I think human experience and our experience in the courts are such that we can -- and I would like the record to reveal on behalf of Mr. Manson -- it is our belief that we can infer that these people have some kind of a dedication in their mind to getting on the jury, and perhaps being less than candid with the Court and counsel, to the detriment, I believe, of Mr. Manson; especially the way the prosecution has conditioned the minds of the public; and it is my belief that merely asking a person "Are you prejudiced" after hearing all of this, and they say "No, I can set this aside," and then saying that means that they are not prejudiced and that there is no actual bias, I think it is winking at the true facts of life.

图2000 · A. 图1. 12

S. C. C. Bright C.

2a fls. 16

17

18

, 1.

2

3.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19:

20

21.

.22

23 24

25.

26

|A-1

1 2

3.

ġ,

THE COURT: I am not saying that you are limited to asking a person whether he is prejudiced or not. That is not what I said at all.

I have permitted you wide latitude in going into these questions, but I did sustain an objection to a particular question which Mr. Fitzgerald asked, and I was simply explaining to him what my thinking was on that.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

MR. REINER: Your Honor, if I may be heard?

I agree with your Honor's analysis of the problem, the quandary we face and the problem that exists when we ask one juror in the presence of other jurors, which some may have heard and other jurors not, but I think the problem is created by the Court's insistence that these matters be heard in open court when counsel has asked that the jurors be asked individually in chambers out of the hearing of the other jurors.

THE COURT: Let's not go back over that, Mr. Reiner.

I don't insist on it, as I explained to you.

You were, along with other counsel, objecting to the proceedings in chambers.

MR. REINER: No, your Honor, that is incorrect. That is absolutely incorrect. There is no point in stating something incorrect. That is incorrect. I argued vigorously against it.

I don't know how the Court can say I wanted it

1,2

done in open court.

THE COURT: If that is true, then it certainly is not true that the other defense counsel did not oppose conducting proceedings in chambers.

Mr. Fitzgerald, as a matter of fact, walked out of chambers yesterday, for some reason or other; but, in any event, he and others have expressed vigorous opposition to any proceedings in chambers. The District Attorney has expressed opposition to proceedings in chambers and keeping those matters confidential, including the transcript.

I have told counsel that if all of them are willing to stipulate to having these matters heard in chambers, and their clients are willing to weive any objections, they will be held in chambers; but my present feeling is that counsel are attempting to put the Court in a position between their clients and themselves with regard to this matter, and I have made my position clear.

MR. FITZGERALD: I personally think the Court has misquoted the record.

MR. REINER: Absolutely.

THE COURT: In what respect?

MR. FITZGERALD: In respect to where you said that we objected to proceedings in chambers.

This record will adequately reflect that I initially made the motion to have the jurors voir dired in

chambers on certain matters. THE COURT: You did not. MR. FITZGERALD: I did, and the record will so reflect. THE COURT: The record will reflect that you objected to having any further proceedings in chambers. MR. REINER: Your Honor, I think the record is clear. .9 $2\dot{2}$

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

3-1

MR. FITZGERALD: My reading comprehension is as good as your Honor's, and I can show you chapter and verse --

THE COURT: I have made my point. If all parties and counsel desire to have the proceedings in chambers I will accede to that.

Unless all are willing I will not.

MR. REINER: That is precisely what we are addressing ourselves to; all counsel have agreed it be in chambers.

THE COURT: I am talking about the parties also.

MR. REINER: That is exactly --

THE COURT: I don't want to go over it again.

I made the point clear.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you intend to admonish the jury hereafter not to read the newspapers, watch television or listen to the radio?

THE COURT: Yes, I do.

(The following proceedings were had in open court in the presence and hearing of the prospective jurors, all defendants and their counsel, and the two deputies district attorney being present:)

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.

All of the prospective jurors are in the jury box.

You may proceed, Mr. Fitzgerald.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. LYNCH BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Q I believe yesterday you had indicated,
Mrs. Lynch, that you had some feelings or some ideas about
the so-called Manson Family.

Is that a fair and accurate statement?

A Yes.

Q I don't think your microphone is on; it has a little button.

What was your answer?

A Yes.

Q And those feelings that you have about this so-called Manson Family are as a result of reading something about them, or hearing something about them on the radio or seeing something about them on television, is that correct?

A Yes, until you -- I am willing to listen, if you have something to offer otherwise.

Q We appreciate that.

But I take it that as you heard certain information or read certain information about these defendants and the so-called Manson Family, you had some feelings as a result of reading or hearing this material, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And some of this material that you read or you

1	saw or you heard influenced you adversely, at least in your
2	mind, against these defendants, isn't that correct?
3	A Not in connection with this charge.
4	Q Would it be fair to say that it did, though,
5	in terms of their general moral character?
6	A Yes.
7	Q And I take it that the feelings that you had
8	about their general moral character were honestly-held
.9	opinions?
10	A Yes.
11	Q You were not trying to be capricious in your
12	reasoning or in your feelings. They were honestly-held
13	opinions?
14	A That's correct.
15	Q what was it that you read or heard about the
16	Manson Family that gave you those adverse feelings?
17	A There was a number of things.
18 :	I heard they were arrested in Inyo County for
1,9°	car theft.
20	THE COURT: Keep the microphone a little closer,
21,	please.
22	MRS. LYNCH: I understand they were arrested in Inyo
23	County for car theft, and, oh, I understand that thee are a
24	number of young ladies involved that have a relationship
25	other than a father-brother relationship with various
26	men who belong to a group.

1.	I understand there are even children
2	THE COURT: Just a moment, Mrs. Lynch.
3	That will be enough, you may go to something
4	else, Mr. Fitzgerald.
5	MR. KANAREK: May we approach the bench?
6	MR. FITZGERALD: May the juror finish her response?
7	THE COURT: No.
8	MR. FITZGERALD: So the record is made clear, is the
9	Court making and sustaining its own objection?
Ì0	THE COURT: That is right.
11	Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: I take it that when you read
12	this material that you are talking about, or that you heard,
13	you felt that it was true, is that right?
14	A You cannot believe everything you read but
15	Q You cannot discount everything you read?
16	A No, there's a possibility of truth as well as
17	untruth.
18	Q And the opinions you held you formed as a result
- 19	of that possibility, or those possibilities, as the case
20	may be?
21	A Well, as I reminded you, they are just opinions,
22	and if you have something to offer I am willing to listen.
23	Q What if I did not have anything to offer?
24	A Well, then you cannot be a personal witness to
2 5	everything that happened, you cannot know personally all the
26	people, and so you come together with your thoughts and
	either you are open to correction it is always possible

· 25

26

to make a mistake.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the bench at this time as to this juror?

THE COURT: Not at this time. Wait until the voir dire is concluded, Mr. Kanarek.

Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: You said that you would certainly be willing to listen to anything we had to offer.

Would it be fair to say that you would be perfectly willing to listen and see if we, the defendants, could change your mind?

A Yes.

Q And that implies, does it not, that you do have some idea in your mind, at least, about their general moral character at this point?

A Yes.

6

Q.	And would it be fair to say that it would be
difficult f	or you to set aside that feeling you have about
their gener	al moral character in arriving at a decision
in this cas	e?

Well, I understand that you are to presume A a defendant innocence until he is proven beyond a reasonable doubt guilty.

That's correct. Q.

Α Yes.

You will have a little difficulty doing that inasmuch as you have some opinions about the defendants' general moral character, would you not?

Α I think a person should be fair when they are judging evidence.

Without telling me any particular denomination or religious affiliation you have, do you have some strong religious feelings of some kind?

> À No.

Are you a member of some organized religion? Q

Α No.

THE COURT: Mrs. Lynch, you are sitting directly under one of the speakers and I believe that is what is causing the noise with the microphone.

Will you point the microphone in enother direction rather than straight up.

MRS. LYNCH: All right.

21

22

23

24

25.

3.

4

5

6

7

8.

9.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

.23

24

THE COURT: Thank you.

BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Q Your reaction to the defendants, then, is based on some general moral standards you have adopted for yourself and perhaps your family?

A That is reasonable.

Q In other words, you are not comparing the defendants in this case against some objective moral standard; you are comparing them with some subjective moral standard that you yourself hold?

A Yes.

Q Let's say that instead of these defendants that were on trial there were four persons on trial who were of your particular moral persuasion.

I take it that it would be easier for you to arrive at a verdict in that case, would it not?

A I understand you arrive at a verdict by examining the evidence.

Q Yes, that is correct.

What I am trying to get at is your ability, yours, as a juror, in evaluating the evidence.

Is it going to be very difficult for you to carefully and impartially analyze the evidence as to these defendants inasmuch as you do have some feelings about them?

A I think that everyone has feelings, but you can

25 26

be fair when you are judging evidence. 1 Do you have any knowledge of psychology or 2 psychiatry as a result of a course of study? 3 . Oh, one semester of psychology. 4 Have you formed any opinion concerning the 5 validity of either psychology or psychiatry as a forensic 6 science, as a science generally? 7 (No response.) 8 Well, let me ask you this: 9. Do you think psychiatry is a medical science? 10 A Yes. 11 Do you have any personal opinion concerning 12 psychiatrists as individuals? 13 I don't know any. 14 Do you believe that psychiatrists are Q 15 reputable? 16 For the most part. 17 Would you automatically disregard what a 18 psychiatrist said? 19 No, neither would I automatically accept it. 20 And do you have any bias that you know of Q: 21 against psychiatrists? 22 A No. 23 Should a psychiatrist be called to testify 24in this case in regard to the sanity or mental illness or 25 mental or emotional disturbance or disorder of a witness 26

3a+3

in this case, would you carefully analyze that testimony in arriving at a verdict or examining the credibility of such a witness?

A I believe you carefully analyze each witness.

Q But you don't have any bias against psychiatric or psychological evidence?

A No.

MR. FITZGERALD: All right. This concludes my questioning, your Honor.

We challenge the juror pursuant to Penal Code Section 1073 for existence of a state of mind on the part of the juror with reference to the case and/or to the parties, which would prevent her from judging with entire impartiality, without prejudice to the substantial rights of the defendants.

4-1	1	MR. REINER: We will join on behalf of Defendant
	2	Leslie Van Houten.
) [,]	3	MR. KANAREK: May we approach the bench?
	4	MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, could we withhold the
	5	at-bench conference until Mr. Stovitz has voir dired
	.6	this particular juror?
	7	THE COURT: Is that agreeable, Mr. Kanarek?
	8 ,	MR. KANAREK: Certainly, your Honor.
	9	THE COURT: All right.
	10.	MR. KANAREK: Yes, certainly.
	11	THE COURT: You may take the matter up after Mr.
	12	Stovitz finishes his questioning.
	13	MR. KANAREK: Thank you.
	14	MR. REINER: Excuse me, your Honor. I will pass
	. 15	any questions I have with respect to this prospective
	16	juror.
	17	THE COURT: What about you, Mr. Shinn?
	18	MR. SHINN: Pass, your Honor.
	19	THE COURT: And you, Mr. Kanarek?
	20	MR. KANAREK: Pass any questions.
	21	THE COURT: All right.
	22	, ,
	23	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. LYNCH
	24	BY MR. STOVITZ:
)	.25	Q Mrs. Lynch, as you sit here now, from what
,	26	you have heard and what you have seen, do you feel that

the defendants are guilty? 1 Legally a defendant is presumed --2 Not legally. Your own personal feelings, 3. Mrs. Lynch. How do you feel as you are sitting there 4 as a juror? 5 I can't say. There has been no evidence 6 shown me one way or the other. T_{c} You have certain impressions from what you 8 have read and what you have seen, have you not? 9 That is what they are, they are Yes. 10 impressions. I never claimed they were decisions. 11 Now, as to those impressions, Mrs. Lynch, 12 have those impressions caused you to cast a burden on 13 the defendants to prove their innocence? 14 They aren't required to prove anything. 15 We are not talking about the law, Mrs. Lynch. 16 Q We are talking about your own personal feelings. 17 Do you remember the question I asked the 18 other jurors? If you knew everything about yourself that 19 you know, and if you were sitting in the place of one of 20 the defense attorneys here knowing this, are these 21. impressions you have, Mrs. Lynch, such that would cause 22 23 the defense to have to produce evidence to dispel those 24 impressions? 25 I think that I can be a fair person. A 26 All right. Mrs. Lynch, we have no doubt that Q

you can be fair and impartial. However, Mrs. Lynch, you realize that later on, if you were to consider this case and go into the jury room and make a statement to your fellow jurors, "See, first impressions are what I go by; I knew they were guilty the moment I looked at them and now I am convinced about it." That would be wrong, and this is what we want to know.

Both the prosecution and the defense are eager to find 12 fair jurors that start off this case with a clean slate, so to speak.

Now, you are not required to serve on this case if you have some impression from what you have seen and what you have read, from what people have told you, from your own personal environment, so to speak.

Will you tell us about those, Mrs. Lynch?

A I have already this morning, and I have no impressions on a mirder charge.

Q All right.

Now, yesterday you told us that you were going to check with your employer.

A No.

MR. STOVITZ: That was another juror. All right.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Have you concluded your questioning, Mr. Stovitz?

MR. STOVITZ: Yes, your Honor.

	1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. LYNCH
	2	BY THE COURT:
	3	Q Mrs. Lynch, as a result of your feelings
	4	about the defendants, and possibly other people's life
• ,	5.	style, do you feel that perhaps you would lean a little
•	6.	bit toward the prosecution in this case, that you would be
	7	more likely to convict because of your feelings regarding
	8	these other matters?
	.9	A (Pause.)
	10	Q Let me put it another way.
	11	Do you think perhaps, because of your beliefs.
	12	you would require the defendants to affirmatively prove
	13	their innocence in some way?
,	14	A I have never been a juror before, sir. All
4a £1	\mathbf{S}^{15}	I can go on is what I have heard.
	16	
	17	
•	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22,	
	23	
• ′	24	
)	25	
	26	

4a-1

2.

·8 9.

′

:26

Q All I want to know is -- I am delving into your conscience now -- your personal beliefs as you sit there right now. How do you feel about it?

Do you feel that you may, because of your beliefs, tend to lean one way or the other rather than being entirely impartial?

A I should hope that I could fairly judge from the evidence. I wouldn't want to feel otherwise.

I am sure you would try, Mrs. Lynch, but sometimes our beliefs cause us to lean a little bit one way or the other which would keep us from being entirely impartial notwithstanding the fact that you might be conscientiously trying to, and I am sure you would, and there is nothing wrong with this. We all have beliefs about one thing or another which we hold which affect our ability to make judgments about these things, and that is all we are asking you. There is nothing wrong about it. We simply want to know what your honest, personal beliefs are at the moment.

Do you think that you tend to lean toward the prosecution because of these beliefs?

A That seems to me to imply a prejudgment that they are right and I have nothing to go on that they are right.

Q That is true; but what I want to know is what is your personal belief about it? What is your feeling at

4a2	1
À	Ż
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10:
	1:1
•	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
Ö	25
	26

the moment?

A I thought I stated all that.

Q Well, you have made some statements about what the law is.

Q If you ask me if I would care to serve as a juror on this case or not. I think I could give you a definite answer.

Q That is not what I am asking you, Mrs. Lynch.

A I know.

Q What I want to know is what are your personal beliefs about, for example, the presumption of innocence.

Do you honestly presume and are you willing to continue that presumption of innocence regarding each of the defendants until such time, if ever, the People are able to prove their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A Yes.

Q Do you honestly believe and hold that belief now?

A Yes.

Q And you don't tend to favor the prosecution or the defendants because of any beliefs that you now hold?

A Well, I didn't realize that my impression and personal beliefs have to be a part of the job of being a fair juror.

Q Well, you see, the purpose of this examination now, Mrs. Lynch, is to permit the Court and the attorneys to learn if a juror holds any beliefs which would

prevent him from being entirely neutral at the outset, impartial.

A well, that is why I brought up my prejudice, because I thought that instead of a lot of long, complicated questions that get short yes or no answers, it would be better to have it out.

So, I would rather not serve on this case.

- Q Because of your personal beliefs regarding --
- A I believe in honesty.
- Q Why would you rather not serve, Mrs. Lynch?

A Oh, perhaps I am a middle-class, conservative person and I am out of another person's world, perhaps.

Q Do you think that might affect your judgment in this case?

A I should hope not but it could.

Q As you sit there now, do you believe that it would?

We are concerned with your state of mind at this particular moment in time, Mrs. Lynch, and you have not yet answered my question directly as to whether or not you believe that your beliefs would cause you to tend to lean one way or the other at this point, that is, toward the prosecution or toward the defense.

- A Yes, they would.
- Q They would?
- A Yes.

26

THE COURT: All right.

Any further questions, gentlemen?

MR. REINER: Nothing further.

MR. FITZGERALD: Nothing.

THE COURT: Do you wish to approach the bench?

MR. KANAREK: Well, if your Honor feels it is necessary,

THE COURT: I don't feel it is necessary, Mr. Kanarek. I thought you had requested to.

MR. KANAREK: In view of the witness statements, I would be willing to accommodate her.

THE COURT: Do you all join in Mr. Fitzgerald's

MR. KANAREK: I'd rather do it by stipulation, your

May we approach the bench then? THE COURT: Very well.

(Whereupon, all counsel approached the bench and the following proceedings occur at the bench outside of the hearing of the prospective jurors:)

MR. KANAREK: As your Honor knows, we previously asked that each juror be interrogated separately in the courtroom with all other jurors present, and I would rather, in the presence of the jury, stipulate to letting the lady go rather than enunciating a challenge for cause in the presence of the jury, but since we are at the bench, I do concur.

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald has made a challenge. 1 I have to rule on that. Do you want to join in that .2 challenge? 3 MR KANAREK: Yes. THE COURT: Do you join? 5 MR. SHINN: Yes. 6 THE COURT: Join? 7. MR. REINER: Yes. 8 THE COURT: Do you want to be heard? 9 MR. BUGLIOSI: No objection. We will stipulate, your 10 Honor. 11 THE COURT: Very well. The challenge will be 12 allowed. Mrs. Lynch will be excused for cause. 13 (Whereupon, all counsel return to their 14 respective places at the counsel table and the following 15 proceedings occurred in open court within the presence and 16 hearing of the prospective jurors:) 17 THE COURT: You will be excused, Mrs. Lynch. 18 you very much. 19 THE CLERK: Mrs. Thelma Thompson; T-h-e-l-m-a, 20 21 T-h-o-m-p-s-o-n. 22 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. THELMA THOMPSON 23 BY THE COURT: 24 Mrs. Thompson, have you heard and understood 25 everything that has been said in court since you came into 26

the case? 1 I believe so. 2 If you were selected as a juror in the case Q 3 would you be able to serve? 4 It would be inconvenient but I would be able, 5 your Honor. 6 Q Well, I would imagine it would be inconvenient 7 for everybody, Mrs. Thompson. 8. I am going to ask you the same two questions 9 regarding the death penalty. 10 Have you had an opportunity to think about 11 these questions and your answers to them? 12 Yes, I have. 13 14 All right. The first question is: Do you entertain such 15 16 conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that 17 you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any 18 defendant's quilt regardless of the evidence developed during the trial? 19 20 Α No. 21 Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions 22 regarding the death penalty that you would automatically 23 refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence 24 developed during the trial? 25 No. 26 THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, do you wish to inquire?

1, .	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, please.
2	,
3	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
5	Q Mrs. Thompson, are you employed?
6	A Yes, I am.
7	Q By whom are you employed, ma am?
.8	A The Monrovia Unified Schools.
9	Q The Monrovia Unified Schools?
10	A Right.
11	Q Are you married, madam?
12	THE COURT: Would you point that microphone in some
13	other direction other than straight up, please?
14	MR. FITZGERALD: I think that microphone is all right;
15	Mrs. Thompson. I will use this one.
16	Q I take it that you are married. Mrs. Thompson?
17	A Divorced.
18	Q What was the nature of your husband's business
19	or occupation?
.20	A He was a teacher.
.21	Q Do you teach in elementary or secondary
22	education?
23	A Sécondary.
24	Q Do you teach at Monrovia High School?
25	A Yes, I do.
26	Q Have you taught there for a number of years?

1	A Yes, I have.
2	Q Do you know the defendant, Leslie Van Houten?
3	A No, I do not.
4	Q Do you know about her connection with the City
5	of Monrovia?
6	A Her connection with the City of Monrovia?
.7	I don't knowwhat you mean.
8	*
9	
10	
11	•
. 12	
13	
14	
15	,
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
. 21	
22	
23 24	
24 25	

26	

4C

		· 1
4e+1	1	Q Do you know anything about Leville Van Houten?
1	2	A No other than what I have heard have and
	.3	. Trad.
	4	THE COURTS Can you all hour out in the courtroom
	· 5	VOICES: No.
	6	THE COUNT: Will you try to use the microphone;
	7	Mrs. Thompson
	·8	You will have to hold it right up close to
	9.	your mouth.
	10	HES, THOMESON: Yes, elf.
	11	HR. FITZGERALD: A Do you teach a particular
	12	subject, Mrs. Thompson?
	13	A I teach two periods, English and Journalism,
	14	and I do public relations work. I am chairman of the
	15	Departments
	. 16	O Do you also live to the Monrovia area of
	17	the County of Los Angeles?
	1,8,	A Yes, I do.
	19	A Have you served on a jury before, Mrs. Thompson
	20	A Yes, about 20 years ago.
	21	q: 20 years sgo?
•	22	Tex.
	23	G I take it there in nothing about that
	24	esperience that is going to influence you in arriving at
	25	a verdict level
	26	34

4c-2	1	Q Are you familiar with any of the locations
	2	or any of the persons we mentioned, or do you have any
	3	affiliation or connection with the Police Department or
	4	the District Attorney's Office or the attorneys or any-
	5	thing like that, Mrs. Thompson?
	6 .	A No, I don't.
	7	Q From your seat in the audience, Mrs. Thompson
	8	were you able to hear the questions that I addressed to
	9	the other prospective jurors?
	10	A Yes, I did.
	11 ,	Q If I were to ask you those same questions,
	12	Mrs. Thompson, would your answers be about the same?
	13	A Yes, they would.
	14	Q Would they differ in any material respect,
	15	ma'am?
	16	A No.
	17	Q Now, I take it that you have read the news-
	18	papers in connection with this case, have you not?
	19	A Yes, I have.
ı	20	Are you a regular subscriber to the Los
	21	Angeles Times or the Herald-Examiner?
	22	A The Los Angeles Times.
	23	Q Los Angeles Times?
	:24	A Yes.
	25	Q And do you read it regularly in addition
	26	to subscribing to it. Mrs. Thompson?

,		
4c-3	A Yes, I do.	
2	Q Have you followed this case at all?	
• 3	A Yes.	
4	Q Did you read the early publicity in connec-	,
5	tion with the offenses themselves back in August of	
6	1969, ma'am?	
7	A Not very much because I was out of the	,
5 fls. ₈	country in August.	
9		
10		
i 1		
12		,
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	•	
20		
21	h •. ,	
22		
23		
24		
25 26		
26		
		1

5-1	1	Q When did you return?
	2	A At the end of August.
	3	Q And have you resided in Los Angeles County
	4	continuously since the end of August, 1969?
	5	A Yes.
	6	Q Now, have you read anything about the
	7	defendants themselves, or have you seen anything on
	8	television in connection with the defendants?
	9	A Nothing other than what has been on the news.
	10	I mean, I have not tried to make a study
	11	of it; I have read about the case as I have read about
	12	other cases and other news.
	13.	Q Yes. Did you read though about the defendant
	14	themselves, anything about them, their background, their
	15	history, their attitudes, their good character?
,	16	A I don't believe so, particularly other than
	17	what was in the news article.
	18	I was able to give a resume of them because
	19	I don't know very much about them.
	20	Q As a result of being exposed to such
	21	publicity in connection with the defendants in the case
	2 2	did you form an opinion in regard to any aspect of this
	23	case?
	24	A No, I have not.
	25	Q Have you formed an opinion as to the
	26 .	defendants personally, that is to say, whether you like

any outside pressure or influence to arrive at a verdict

25

26

in this case, do you?

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

1	A No. Q Do you feel that you are going to be
2	intimidated by representatives of the State of California
3	or anything like that in arriving at a verdict?
4	A No.
5	Q Do you understand that when the prosecution
6	refers to the People of the State of California they
7	are referring to a legal title?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Do you understand that?
10	A Yes.
11,	Q You understand that you are one of the People
12	of the State of California?
13	À Yes.
14	Q I am one of the People and Mr. Manson and
15	Miss Krenwinkel are one of the People of the State of
16	California?
17	A Right.
18	Q Do you attach any particular significance to
19	the fact that these defendants are charged by way of an
.20	indictment by the People of the State of California?
21	A No.
22	Q Do you understand that an indictment is
28	simply a formal accusation?
24	A Right.
25	Q It is just an accusatory piece of paper?
26	A Yes.

1	A. No.
2	Q Some people, for example, don't believe in
3	psychiatric testimony?
4	A I believe in it.
5	Q Have you formed any opinion concerning the
6	validity of psychiatric testimony in court?
7	A I would accept it as any other testimony.
8	Q Should a licensed medical doctor who is a
9	psychiatrist testify in this case in regard to the
10	sanity or mental status of any one of the witnesses in
11	this case, would you examine his testimony by the same
12	standards you would any other kind of expert testimony?
13	A Yes, I would.
14	Q You would not, for example, require any
15	more from a psychiatrist than you would from some other
16	kind of expert witness, would you?
17	A No.
18	Q Are you familiar with the term Lysergic Acid
19	Diethylamide, LSD?
20	A Oh, I have heard of it a great deal.
21	Q In your work
22	MR. KANAREK: I'm sorry, I did not hear that last,
23	your Honor.
24	THE COURT: The question or the answer?
2 5	MR. KANAREK: The answer.
26	THE COURT: Read the answer, please.

1		(Whereupon the reporter reads the answer
2	as follows:	
3		"A Oh, I have heard of it a great deal.")
4	BY MR. FITZG	ERALD:
5	Q	Is that in connection with your teaching
6	duties?	
7	. A ,	No, I don't teach about it at all. I am not
8	an expert.	
9	Q	Is it a topic of conversation or the subject
10	of speeches	in your public speaking courses?
11	A	No.
12	Q	What is the nature of your experience and/or
13	knowledge or	expertise with Lysergic Acid?
14	A	Only the magazine and newspaper articles
4 5	that I read	about it.
16		I don't consider myself an expert in the
17	field at all	•
18	Q,	If the defendants in this case should
19	present psyc	hiatric evidence concerning the nature and
20	extent and t	he effect of the chronic use of Lysergic
21 .	Acid, do you	think you would be able to base your
22	évaluation ó	f that testimony solely on what you hear in
.23	court rather	than what you read by way of magazine
Ž4	articles, ne	wspaper articles or any other source?
25	A	Yes.
26	· Q	You understand unfortunately that in a court

i	of law we must base our decision on the evidence as actually
2	produced in court, rather than anything that has been
3	accumulated in the general public domain?
4	A Yes.
-5	Q And you won't have any problem doing that?
5a fls.6	A No.
7	
8	
9	
10.	·
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
21	
.22	
28	
24	
25	
26	
,	The Artist of the Control of the Con

Q Are you familiar with any of the publicity surrounding Mr. Kanarek? A Yes. Q Is that going to influence you in arriving at a verdict one way or another in this case? A No. Q Is that going to influence you in your determination of the guilt or innocence of any of the defendants in this case?
A Yes. Q Is that going to influence you in arriving at a verdict one way or another in this case? A No. Us that going to influence you in your determination of the guilt or innocence of any of the
Q Is that going to influence you in arriving at a verdict one way or another in this case? A No. Use that going to influence you in your determination of the guilt or innocence of any of the
verdict one way or another in this case? A No. Use that going to influence you in your determination of the guilt or innocence of any of the
A No. 7 Q Is that going to influence you in your 8 determination of the guilt or innocence of any of the
Q Is that going to influence you in your 8 determination of the guilt or innocence of any of the
determination of the guilt or innocence of any of the
decermination of the guitt of imposence of any of the
9 defendants in this case?
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
A No. it is not.
Q Do you have any particular aversion or reaction
to the purported life style of the defendants?
A No. I have not.
Q Do you have any problem dealing with or
communicating with persons or people?
A I don't think I do.
MR. FITZGERALD: All right, nothing further.
THE COURT: Mr. Reiner?
MR. REINER: Thank you, your Honor.
20
VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. THOMPSON:
BY MR. REINER:
Q Mrs. Thompson, for how long have you been a
teacher: in Monrovia High School?
A Sirce the Fall of 1949.
26 . Is your husband a teacher in Monrovia High
CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

26

		1
1	School as well?	
2	A No.	
à	Q A different school?	
4:	A He is retired, but we have been divorced for	
-5	20 years.	
6	Q I see.	
7	You do not recall Leslie Van Houten as a student	
8.	at Monrovia High School?	
9	A No, I have tried to, but I have not.	
10	Q Do you recall Leslie Van Houten as the home-	
11	coming princess, I think, in 1963 or '4 at your school?	
12	MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I object to this. This is	
13·	completely irrelevant voir dire.	
14.	It is obvious what the motivation of Mr. Reiner	
15	in that question is, your Honor. I move to strike that	
16	question.	-
L7	MR. REINER: Your Honor, may I be heard?	
18	MR. BUGLIOSI: She already said she never heard of	
19	her; she doesn't recall her. What is this business of	
2Ò	THE COURT: If you are making an objection in this	
21.	court, stand on your feet, sir, and make it.	1
22	MR. BUGLIOSI: I made my objection, your Honor, I thin	k
28	this Court heard the objection.	
24	THE COURT: You may sit down.	
•	To all the control of the first the control of the	

MR. FITZGERALD: I move to strike Mr. Bugliosi's remarks as gratuitous.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

The jury is admonished to disregard the remarks of counsel.

MR. KANAREK: May we approach the bench?

THE COURT: Very well.

(The following proceedings were had at the bench out of the hearing of the prospective jurors:)

MR. BUGLIOSI: I want to be heard. What is the purpose of telling me to sit down. I am an officer of this Court. I think this is unbelievable. I have never been told yet to sit down.

THE COURT: Well, you were just told, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I realize that, but I also realize that I am representing the People of the State of California --

THE COURT: Then why don't you comport yourself as an attorney?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I was, and I have been in the courts of this State for six years handling big cases, and I have never yet been told to sit down.

I want to know why the Court saw fit to tell me to sit down.

THE COURT: Because you had finished your statement.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You ordered me to sit down before I
had a chance to sit down.

Why didn't you give me a chance to sit down

śa4

3.

first? I did not want the Court prejudicing the People's case.

THE COURT: Then I suggest, Mr. Bugliosi, that you follow the same rules of decorum and conduct as any other attorney has been following in this case.

I have told you before when you have something to say, when you make an objection or argument, stand up.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I want to be heard further.

I want it to be made abundantly clear I don't like this. I resent it.

THE COURT: You don't like what?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't like the Court's conduct. The Court told me to stand up; swell, no problem, I stood up. I made my objection.

I am asking the Court right now why does the Court see fit to tell me to sit down? I don't like that.

THE COURT: I don't think I told you to sit down.

I think I said, "You may sit down," after you said you had nothing more to say.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would have sat down on my own or, if I wanted to, I would have gotten up and gotten a drink of water.

The Court told me to sit down. I don't appreciate that type of conduct from the Court.

THE COURT: I might say, Mr. Bugliosi, you are going to follow the same rules of decorum and conduct in this court

·3

9·

3

as anybody else.

If I have to make a comment for you to stand up on your feet when you address the Court, I will do it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am not objecting to that. I am not objecting to that.

I am objecting -- I want the record to be clear
I am objecting to the Court telling me to sit down.

I am an officer of this court. I am representing the People of the State of California.

THE COURT: Lower your voice. You are speaking too loud.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am sorry.

MR. REINER: If I may indicate for the record, the Court did instruct Mr. Bugliosi to sit down almost instantly --

THE COURT: You don't need to get into this portion of the argument, Mr. Reiner.

Do you have something else to say?

MR. REINER: I join with Mr. Bugliosi; as to your Honor's attitude towards counsel in this case, your attitude toward Mr. Bugliosi is similar to other counsel in this case, namely myself. I join with Mr. Bugliosi in his complaint.

THE COURT: I don't know what you're talking about,
Mr. Reiner. It has nothing to do with the matter on hand.
MR. REINER: Very well, with respect to the objection

5à.6

Ģ

Ŷ

.ð.

17.

5B

raised by Mr. Bugliosi to the question that the Court sustained, this prospective juror was in fact a teacher at a very small high school in a small community here in the Greater Los Angeles area at the time Leslie Van Houten was a student.

She said she does not recall her. I certainly believe her when she says that.

However, Leslie Van Houten had some prominence at the school, as a high school homecoming princess.

Now, that being the case, it is altogether possible that her memory could be jogged. I'm sure

Mr. Bugliosi is reasonably concerned that this may influence the prospective jurors favorably towards Miss Van Houten.

I agree it might.

Merely because it may influence them, that she might have had a life style different from the one that is apparent now, nevertheless it is a proper and appropriate question.

THE COURT: She already answered the question,

Mr. Reiner. She said she tried to recall, and she is unable
to recall.

5b-1

2

1

4

5

6.

·8

9

10

1:1 1:2

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

MR. REINER: Now, I wish to help her along to see if I can. Of course I have that absolute right to do so --

THE COURT: You have an absolute right?

MR. REINER: "Absolute" is an incorrect word ever to use in the law, I certainly have a right to do so.

It is incredible that I cannot try to refresh this juror's memory, that Leslie Van Houten was in the school newspaper as a homecoming princess, at a time fairly recent when she was a teacher at the school.

Certainly to my experience I am not held to just the witness's observation.

THE COURT: All right, I will permit the question.
Anything else, gentlemen?

MR. BUGLIOSI: May I be heard on that, your Honor.

I would not have objected to the question if the juror had not already said she never heard of her. She never heard of her.

THE COURT: In view of the fact that she apparently had some prominence at the school I think he is entitled to ask her that question.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Very well, your Honor.

(The following proceedings were had in open court in the presence and hearing of the prospective jurors:)

THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Reiner.

MR. REINER: Thank you, your Honor.

1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. THOMPSON	
2	BY MR. REINER:	
3	Q Mrs. Thompson, each year there is a homecoming	
4	celebration of sorts at Monrovia High School, isthat true?	
5 .	A Right.	
6	Q And as a teacher you in some way or another	
7	participate in some of the activities in regard to home-	
8 .	coming, is that true?	
9	A Well, I help to record them in the weekly	
10	paper.	
11	Q With respect to helping to record them in	
12	the weekly paper, do you recall I believe it was 1963	
13	or possibly '64 that Leslie Van Houten was school	
14	homecoming princess?	
15	A I do not recall it.	
16	Q Do you know a young student presently going	
17	to Monrovia High School by the name of Bessie Van Houten,	
18	Leslie Van Houten's younger sister?	
19	A No, I don't.	
20	Q Do you know a student by the name of David	
21	Van Houten, Leslie's little brother presently going to	
22	Monrovia High School?	
23	A No, I don't.	
24	Q Well, let's see, perhaps you are acquainted	
25	with some of Leslie's prior teachers.	
26	Do you know a Miss Gilman on the faculty of	

1	Monrovia High	h School?
2.	A	Gilman?
3	Q.	Yes, Miss Gilman.
4	A	No Gilbert.
5.	Q.	Do you know a Mrs. Johnson?
ģ	A	Yes, homemaking teacher.
7	Q	Do you know a Miss Clemens?
48	A	Yes, art teacher.
9 -	Q	Do you know a Mr. Simmons?
10	A	Yes, he is now assistant principal.
11	Q	Do you know a Mr. Jones?
12	A	Yes, he has been gone for two or three years.
13	I have not s	een him since he left.
14	Q	Do you know a Miss Trueblood?
15	A	Only by name, she is not there now.
16	Q	Do you read from time to time the local
17	Monrovia new	spaper, The Daily News Post?
18 ,	A	Yes, I sometimes write for it.
19 [.]	, Q, , , ,	Do you recall seeing a full page of stories,
20	pictures, wi	th respect to Leslie Van Houten shortly after
21 ·	her arrest?	
22	A	I know there was such an article there but I
2 8	did not know	her.
24	Q	Would it then be a fair statement, or may I
25	reasonably c	onclude from your enswers that you were aware
26 .	that a resid	ent or previous resident of Monrovia had been

	1	arrested in connection with these particular crimes?
_	2	A Yes, I was.
	3	Q But you did not know the name?
	4	A That's right.
	5,	Q And even at this time the name does not
	6	ring a bell to you?
	7	You just recall that a prior resident of
	8	Monrovia was arrested in connection with these charges?
	9	A I tried to recognize her when I came in the
	10.	court, but I could not.
	11	Q When you came in the court did you look at
	12	Leslie Van Houten to determine whether you could recognize
,	13	her?
	14	A Yes, before they were identified I looked, but
	15	I could not identify her.
	16	Q Where had you learned it was Leslie Van Houten
	17	rather than one of the other girls who was supposed to be
	18	from Monrovia?
	19	A I did not get that question.
	20	Q I understood your previous answer to be,
1	21	when you came into the court you looked at Miss Van Houten
	22	to see if you could possibly recognize her and you couldn't?
,	2 8	A I looked at the three girls and I did not
5c fls	24	know which was which.
	,25	
	26	

5Ċ-1

11²

17,

ŹĜ.

Q oh, all three girls, I see.

Now, do you feel that the fact that her younger sister and her younger brother are presently at Monrovia High School, that it may very well come to pass that you would be their teacher as they go through high school, that this would put some pressure upon you in this case, the sort of pressures that you perhaps would not wish to expose yourself to?

A No. I don't believe so.

Q Being very pragmatic about it, do you think you could condemn Leslie to death and look forward to the prospective teaching of her younger brother or sister?

Do you think that would put great pressure on your judgment in this case, perhaps more than you wish to assume?

A It certainly would not be pleasant.

Q I am sure it will not.

A But it would not change what I would do.

Q Taking the other side of the note, if the evidence in this case should indicate that perhaps one or more defendants are guilty but there should be insufficient evidence to establish the guilt of Leglie Van Houten, would you then acquit Leglie Van Houten?

A Yes.

Q Would you feel that perhaps you would be subject to great criticism for acquitting Leslie Van Houten by persons who might suggest after this case is over that

·6·

5

the reason that you have acquitted Leslie Van Houten is not because you believe there was insufficient evidence but because you, perhaps, would see yourself in the position of living within the community of Leslie Van Houten's family and perhaps might even find yourself the teacher of her younger brother and sister.

of course, you would be subject to that sort of criticism, but do you feel that would affect your judgment?

A It would not change my judgment, no.

Q Do you feel you could acquit her if the evidence was insufficient?

A Yes.

Q Without concerning yourself about any possible later claim that your reason for doing so was not the legitimate reason, that is, there was insufficient evidence, but was for perhaps the more human reason that you did not want to be in the position of convicting someone when you had to associate perhaps closely even with members of the family?

A It was a long question, but I think I can do what I'm supposed to do.

Q Very well, thank you very much.

MR. REINER: I have no further questions. I will pass for cause, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?

MR. SHINN: Pass for cause, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Does the Court wish to take its morning recess, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, we will take our morning recess at this time, ladies and gentlemen. Do not converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject relating to the case, nor form or express any opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to those of you who are selected as jurors.

15 minutes, please.

(Recess.)

6-1

1 2

4.

7[.]

19

23.

(The following proceedings occurred in chambers, all counsel being present, the defendants being absent:)

THE COURT: The record will show that all counsel are present in chambers.

I asked to have you come in so that I could go over a few matters with you in an effort to avoid any abrasive situations such as occurred a few minutes ago in court.

Let me state again the rules that I expect counsel to follow in the proceedings so that there won't be any misunderstanding, and then I will hear from any of you that wish to be heard from.

I have no objection to a counsel remaining seated at counsel table if all he is going to do is state an objection and the grounds thereto. That is common practice in the courts.

However, if there is going to be any argument or anything other than a bare motion or a bare objection and a brief statement of the grounds -- I am not talking about argument now, I am talking about the grounds -- then I expect counsel to stand up and address the Court.

That is common courtesy. It is a common practice in every court that I have ever been in.

one of the difficulties that has occurred, and I think all counsel have done it from time to time -- at

6-2

Ź

--

1

least many have — is that instead of stating at the outset what it is you are talking about, whether you are making a motion, an objection, or what, just to launch into some discussion or objection or comment without ever letting the Court know what the point of your statement is; and furthermore, in some instances, doing it while seated at the counsel table.

I think that was the cause behind what happened this morning. Mr. Bugliosi, on several occasions you have simply reached over and grabbed the microphone and in a loud voice launched into some comment or criticism, and so on.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right. Let me briefly be heard on that.

THE COURT: Just a moment. I will give everybody a chance to talk.

I understand that in the heat of litigation, people, including the Judge, sometimes say things spontaneously that perhaps would have been better left unsaid.

I want to avoid those situations. In the first place, I think they are entirely unnecessary, and I want to avoid them to the extent that we possibly can. For that reason, I think that it is absolutely essential that counsel conform to the reasonable rules and requirements of the Court. That is the purpose of them.

We are not going through some show just for the

メニる

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 sake of a show. These rules are designed to permit everybody to be heard, to make their objections, their motions, and so forth, and if argument is required or necessary, or desired by the Court, then that should be done at the bench or in chambers and out of the presence of the jury.

As I say, in a case where you have this many parties and this many attorneys, it is absolutely essential that these rules be complied with.

So, again, if you wish to address the Court, state at the outset what it is you are attempting to do, whether you are making a motion, a request, an objection, or what. State the grounds. Then, if you desire argument, or if argument is desired by the Court, we can either have it at the bench or out of the presence of the jury in chambers.

Mr. Bugliosi, you wanted to comment?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Just briefly on the standing up.

Mormally I do, your Honor. Not always. Nor-mally, I do stand up and I make my objections.

In this particular case, I haven't been doing that so much because there is a microphone seated on counsel table and I naturally go toward the microphone which is on the table.

However, I will try to stand up henceforth and make my objections.

Now, with respect to the Court's conduct this

morning, I have stated my position very clearly on the record; the Court, I am sure, heard everything that I said. I don't believe it is necessary for me to restate it at this time unless the Court has any doubt as to what my position is.

6a-1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14.

.15 16

17

18

19

20

ŹÌ.

22 23

24

25 26

THE COURT: Well, it was occasioned, Mr. Bugliosi, by the very thing I was just talking about. Instead of standing up and making an objection and requesting argument at the bench, you started right out speaking very loudly through the microphone, making a comment or criticism or something regarding what was going on without stating in advance just exactly what you were doing. This, of course, triggered off comments by other counsel. Then we were engaged in a colloquy in front of the prospective jurors, which is precisely what I want to avoid.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think I have stated two or three times -- and I am not going to state it ad nauseam -that is not why I made my statements up at the bench on the Court's conduct -- it had nothing to do with the Court's telling me to stand up and address the Court. I don't see why I have to state it a fourth time, why I made the statements that I did up at the bench.

THE COURT: All right, Anything further?

Yes. Perhaps there are some things MR. REINER: that I should say along the line of this subject that has been brought up.

I have no objection to any of the court rules, and I don't think I have ever indicated any objection to any of the court rules.

I think my objection -- and perhaps it might, in some respects, be the objection of other counsel -- is

6a-2

2

·1:

3

4 5

6

7 8

..9

10

11 12

13:

14

.15 16

17

18.

19

20

21

22

23 24

·25 ·

· 26

the Court's attitude toward counsel.

It is personally offensive when it occurs in chambers, and it is humiliating and embarrasing when it occurs in open court before the prospective jurors.

I have been told to sit down after I have finished saying what I have to say and indicating that I have nothing further to say. As soon as the words were out of my mouth on a couple of occasions, I have been told to sit down.

THE COURT: I don't recall any of those occasions, Mr. Reiner.

MR. REINER: I might also indicate that on two occasions the Court, when it no longer wished to hear from me, turned its back on me. Once was in chambers and once on the bench.

At the time on the bench --

THE COURT: I have never turned my back on anybody, sir.

MR. REINER: I point to the particular time in the record that the Court --

THE COURT: That simply is not true.

MR. REINER: In any event, the Court has seen fit on a number of occasions -- altogether too many times -- I feel one time is too many, but there have been a number of occasions -- when I have raised what I thought to be serious objections to a question, the Court has, instead

.10

of addressing itself to the merits of the matter of what I was raising, has questioned my motives and terminated the discussion and moved on to something else.

Yesterday the Court -- I believe it was yesterday -- the Court termed one of my motions, or whatever it was, absurd. The motion at that time before the Court was to dismiss the entire jury panel because they had been infected by a press conference of the day before, and to bring in an entirely new and different jury panel.

Now, whether or not the Court feels there is merit in that, it is certainly not absurd; and further than saying it is not absurd, a lawyer, to have failed to raise that type of an objection and make that sort of a motion, would not be competently trying this case.

This motion, incidentally, was made after it was demonstrated that all but one person on the jury had seen or heard of the press conference.

I think, at that point, I was obliged to make such a motion. If the Court wished to deny it, very well.

THE COURT: Do you have the reference in the transcript to this particular portion that you are talking about, Mr. Reiner?

MR. REINER: Of course it was in the transcript.

Everyting was reported. I don't have the transcript with

me. Does the Court not recall it? THE COURT: I don't recall the incident. 6b fls.

.11

MR. REINER: Your Honor also questioned my motives in even asking questions of the juror on that point, and I asked only one question of that juror, and I repeated that question as I went down the line.

I asked them two questions. I asked them, one, whether or not they had seen or heard of the press conference, without reference to the details.

Secondly, I asked them whether they had heard of the underlying basis for Mr. Younger's objection to Mr. Kanarek from television, radio or the newspaper, or whether they heard of it for the first time in open court, when Mr. Nordland, who described himself as an avid reader, described the underlying basis.

Now, obviously, I am not educating the jury at that time, but the Court said I was educating the jury and questioned my motives, and I think my motives were abundantly clear.

Before going out there, I indicated to the Court and other counsel that because of the possibility of that occurrence, I wished to have it done in chambers.

Again, if the Court wishes to have it in open court and doesn't wish to accept the judgment of counsel, that is fine, although I disagree with it, but I don't think my motives should be questioned when I raised the objection timely and then asked the appropriate

3.

questions in open court to establish the basis therefor.

I think that, perhaps, may be the underlying basis.

THE COURT: Your conduct on some occasions, Mr. Reiner, has been inconsistent with some of the things that you have said to the Court. That is why I mentioned it.

I don't question the motives of any counsel, but where the inconsistencies are apparent, I have referred to them.

MR. REINER: The inconsistencies are apparent?

I don't think they are apparent. We discussed that yesterday.

THE GOURT: Then we disagree on that point.

MR. REINER: I have not yet said anything that I
thought prejudiced the defendant or any of the defendants.

I, perhaps, tried to prejudice the District Attorney
as a matter of rebuttal; and remember, this was in
response to the District Attorney's comments. I didn't
initiate this.

THE COURT: I don't know what the purpose of what you are saying now is. We seem to be getting far afield from what we started out to talk about.

MR. REINER: I thought this was a general discussion to try to resolve what apparently is certain conflict between the Court and counsel.

ĺ

2

.3· 4

-5

6

7

9°

10

11

12 13

14:

15 16

17

18

19 . 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

THE COURT: I don't find that there are any conflicts. I just made a few comments. That is hardly unusual.

I assume, of course, that every attorney will continue to act in a professional manner and abide by the Court's rules, and I want to avoid any unnecessary difficulties, that is all. That is the only reason I called you in here.

I think if those rules are followed, we won't have a bit of trouble. The minute we violate them, then you have an exchange, you have a colloquy, you have an abrasive situation, and that is the thing that I want to avoid.

MR. REINER: The difficulties I have had from time to time in the trial, to my knowledge, to my recollection, have never involved the violation of a rule, just certain activities that have occurred.

THE COURT: Is there anything further, gentlemen?
MR. KANAREK: No. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, let's proceed.

(Whereupon all counsel returned to the courtroom and the following proceedings were had in open court, all counsel, the defendants and prospective jurors being present:)

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present, all of the prospective jurors are in the jury box.

You may proceed, Mr. Bugliosi. MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, your Honor. 6c fls. . 15. 17, . 24: **.25**.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 1 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 2 Mrs. Thompson, do you have any children, ma 'am? 3 Yes. I have a son 28. 4 Is he employed? 5 6 Here in Los Angeles? 7 Yes. For IBM. A 8 I understand, Mrs. Thompson, that you are not 9 opposed to the death penalty; is that correct? 10 A That is correct. 11 Q Do you feel that the religious doctrines of 12 any church that you may belong to prevents you from voting 13. for a verdict of death? 14 Α No. 15 16 Do you recall the discussion a few days ago about the fact that there might be two trials here, Mrs. 17 Thompson, a guilt trial and then a penalty trial? 18 Α Yes. 19 And in the guilt trial, the sole issue will be 20 21 guilt versus innocence, and in the penalty trial the issue will be death versus life imprisonment; do you understand 22 that? 23 I understand. 24 A 25 That there will not be a second trial unless 26 these defendants are convicted of first-degree murder.

ì	-
2	
3	
4	
.5	
6	
7	
8	
.ġ.	1
10	ŀ
11	}
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	•
20)
21	. `
22	:

24.

25

26,

A	Yes

Q Will you promise, Mrs. Thompson, that during the first trial, that is, the trial in which the guilt or innocence of these defendants will be an issue, that you will not let the issue of the death penalty enter into your deliberations?

A No. I won't.

Q It has no place during the first trial; do you understand that?

A I understand.

Q After hearing all of the evidence in this case, Mrs. Thompson, and considering all the circumstances, if you felt that this was a proper case for the imposition of the death penalty, would you personally have the courage and would you be willing to vote for a verdict of death?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I object on the grounds that this is improper voir dire.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You may answer.

MRS. THOMPSON: I would have the courage.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Could you vote for the death penalty for a female defendant?

A Yes.

Q Are you of such a frame of mind, Mrs. Thompson, that you could not, under any circumstances, vote for the death penalty for these three female defendants solely

because of their age?

A No.

Are you of such a frame of mind, Mrs. Thompson, that you would never, under any circumstances, vote for the death penalty for a particular defendant unless the evidence at the trial showed that this particular defendant himself personally killed a fellow human being?

MR. KANAREK: Objection, your Honor, on the grounds of improper voir dire, and I make a motion to approach the bench.

MR. STOVITZ: Haven 't we approached the bench sufficiently in regard to this issue?

THE COURT: Is it in regard to this question, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, I believe it is improper voir dire examination because of the absolute discretion vested in the jury, there is no necessity for that question except for the prosecution's viewpoint.

THE COURT: All right, read the question, please.

(Whereupon, the reporter reads the question as follows:

"Q Are you of such a frame of mind that you would never under any circumstances vote for the death penalty for a particular defendant unless the evidence at the trial showed that this particular defendant himself personally killed a fellow human being?")
THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

You may answer.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, just very briefly -- MR. STOVITZ: The objection is overruled.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right. I am concerned about these continuing objections by Mr. Kanarek, when the Court has already ruled on that.

THE COURT: Let's proceed.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you recall the question,

ma 'am?'

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A I think so, the answer should be no.

Q Can you conceive a circumstance where you would be willing to vote for a death penalty for an individual defendant even though he, himself, was not actually the perpetrator?

MR. KANAREK: Asked and answered. I object to it on the same ground.

THE COURT: All right, the question has been asked and answered.

Let's proceed.

O BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you understand the rules of conspiracy, Mrs. Thompson, which makes a conspirator fully guilty of the crimes committed by his co-conspirators even though he does not commit the crimes himself or perhaps was not present at the scene?

A I understand.

Q Have you done any thinking about that rule of law in the last few days?

A Yes, I have.

Q Do you have any prejudice against that rule of law?

A No. I have not.

And you promised me you would unhesitatingly follow the Court's instruction on that rule of law if you found it applicable to the facts in this case?

A Yes.

3.

3

Q Do you recall a discussion about accomplices; do you recall that, ma am?

A Yes, sir.

Q If his Honor instructs you that for one to be an accomplice one must knowingly and with criminal intent aid by act or advice in the commission of the crime, will you follow the Court's instruction on that?

A Yes.

MR. KANAREK: I object on the grounds of preinstruction.

THE COURT: Overruled, you may answer.

A Yes.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Assuming that Linda Kasabian is deemed to be an accomplice in this case — we intend to call her, as Mr. Reiner accurately predicted — if the Court instructs you that it is not necessary that the evidence in corroboration corroborate every fact to which an accomplice testifies, will you follow the Court's instruction on that?

A Yes.

Q If the Court instructs you further that the corroborating evidence may be circumstantial evidence, will you follow the Court's instruction on that?

A Yes.

Q If the Court instructs you, and defense counsel and of course the prosecution have to agree to this,

24

25

26

that the law requires that the prosecution prove the defendants guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, you have heard us talk about that?

A Yes, I have.

Q Would you require any burden of the prosecution.

Mrs. Thompson, over and above that which the law requires?

A No.

Q Am I correct in assuming then that you would not require that we prove the guilt of these defendants beyond anything more than simply a reasonable doubt?

A Right.

Q Do you understand that in all criminal trials, whether it is a murder case or a petty theft case, the prosecution has the same identical burden of proof, that doctrine of reasonable doubt.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q It is no greater in a murder case than in a petty theft case. Do you understand that?

A I understand.

Q Do you feel, Mrs. Thompson, that, "Gee whiz, a murder is 100 times more serious than a petty theft, and the prosecution should have a much greater burden in a murder case," do you feel that way?

A No, no.

Q I take it you would not require that we prove

2:

.

21:

the guilt of any of the defendants beyond all possible, conceivable doubt, but just beyond a reasonable doubt, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q Do you realize, Mrs. Thompson, that although a defendant at the start of a criminal trial is presumed to be innocent, if his guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt this presumption of innocence is thereby rebutted and no longer exists.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q You understand that if you are selected as a juror on this case, that as a juror you and your co-jurors will be the sole and exclusive judges of the facts of this case.

Do you understand that?

A 🦵 I understand.

Q Do you realize that in determining credibility of a witness, whether the witness is telling the truth or not, you can take into consideration such factors as the witness' demeanor on the witness stand, the witness' manner of testifying, the witness' interest in the outcome of the case, or any bias or prejudice the witness might have for or against the prosecution or the defense?

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q Do you realize that after listening to the testimony of a particular witness, and observing that witness's demeanor, it is perfectly permissible, and even normal and to be expected, that sometimes you will give more weight to the testimony of one witness than the testimony of an opposing witness on that point.

You realize that?

A Yes.

Q To my knowledge, Mrs. Thompson, there are only two types of evidence, direct evidence and circumstantial evidence.

If there is another type I have not been told about it yet.

Now, in that cookie jar example, do you recall that Johnny eating the cookies was circumstantial evidence of the fact that he may have taken the cookies?

You realize that?

A Yes.

Q You realize, Mrs. Thompson, that even if Johnny's fresh fingerprints were found on the cookie jar, that would also be circumstantial evidence?

A Yes.

Q Not direct evidence?

A Yes.

Q In fact even if Johnny confessed to his mother and he said, "Yes, ma'am, I took the cookies," that

7a-2	1	is circumstantial evidence?
	2	Do you understand that?
	3	A Yes.
	4	Q Direct evidence really is eyewitness testimony
	5	you understand that?
	6	A Yes.
	7.	All other types of evidence, no matter how
•	8 .	powerful and strong it may be, is circumstantial evidence?
	9	A Yes.
	10.	Q You realize that probably by definition that
	11	some types of circumstantial evidence are more powerful and
	12	more incriminating than other types?
<u>.</u>	13	You understand that?
,	14	A Yes.
	15	Q You understand further on the other hand that
	16	some types of direct evidence are more powerful
	17	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I object on the grounds
	18 -	counsel is arguing his case at this point. It is not
	19	proper voir dire.
	20	THE COURT: Well, I think you are getting into the
	21	realm of instruction, Mr. Bugliosi.
	22	I will sustain the objection on that ground.
	23	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	24	Q In this case, Mrs. Thompson, the People will
	25	rely on direct evidence, that is, eyewitness testimony,
	26	then we are also going to rely in part on circumstantial

7a-3	1
	2
<i>.</i>	3
•	4
	5
	6
	7
	8.
	9.
	10
	11
	. 12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	.21
•	22

evi	de	217	c.	27
C A "	•			-

8.

9.

23

24

25

26

Α

A I understand.

Do you have any objection at all to sitting Q. as a juror on a case when the People rely in part on circumstantial evidence?

No. I haven't.

If the Court instructs you, Mrs. Thompson, that the prosecution does not have the burden of proving the motive of these defendants for committing these murders, will you follow the instruction on that?

> A Yes.

If the Court further instructs you, however, that the prosecution has the right to offer evidence of motive, and that if we do offer evidence of motive, you may consider this evidence as circumstantial evidence of their guilt.

Will you follow the Court's instruction on that?

Yes, I will.

Now and then, Mrs. Thompson, a juror will go back in the jury room -- actually I am just going by what I have heard; I have never been back there myself -- will go back there with the idea, "Don't confuse me with the facts; I have already made up my mind."

> You are not going to be that way, obviously? I hope not.

12⁻

<u>2</u>2

.

26:

Q Let us assume further, Mrs. Thompson, that back in the jury room, three, four, five months from now -- let's hope it's not that long, we will try to be as brief as possible -- but lawyers are kind of traditionally gabby, but we will try to keep it brief in this case.

Let's say, Mrs. Thompson, that you find your view to be a minority view, say ten of the other jurors or maybe 11 of the other jurors are entertaining a view different from yours.

I take it that you will not be inflexible, but rather you will listen very carefully to the views expressed by your co-jurors, if you found these views to be reasonable and persuasive, you will at least reconsider your position.

Am I correct on that, ma'am?

A You are correct.

Q You realize that when defense attorneys properly ask you whether you will give their clients a fair trial, that the prosecution, that is, the People of the State of California, are also entitled to a fair trial.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q Can you think of any reason whatsoever why you might not be able to give the People of the State

1	of California a fair trial?
2	A No, I cannot.
3	Q There is no doubt in your mind about that?
4 .	A No doubt.
5	Q Can you think of any reason whatsoever other
· .6 .	than the inevitable hardship that we all apologize to you
7	for, that you would rather not sit as a juror on this case?
8	A No.
9	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, ma'am.
10	THE COURT: Pass for cause?
iı -	MR. STOVITZ: Yes, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: The defendants may exercise their joint
13	peremptory challenge.
14	MR. FITZGERALD: There will be no exercise of a
15	joint peremptory challenge.
16	Patricia Krenwinkel will accept the jury as
17	now constituted.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Reiner?
19	MR. REINER: Thank you, your Honor.
20	May I have a moment.
21	Your Honor, we will thank and excuse Juror
22	No. 6, Mr. Nordland.
7b fls.23	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Nordland, you are excused.
24	
25	
26	

THE CLERK: Arthur C. Barringer; A-r-t-h-u-r, 7B-1 1 B-a-r-i-n-g-e-r. 2 (Whereupon, Arthur C. Barringer took seat No. 6 3 in the jury box.) 4 5 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF ARTHUR C. BARRINGER 6 BY THE COURT: 7 Mr. Barringer, have you heard and understood Q 8 everything that has been said in court since you came into 9 the case? 10 Yes, I have, sir. 11 Q. If you were selected as a juror in this case 12 would you be willing and able to serve? 13 I don't think I would, sir. 14 What is your situation, Mr. Barringer? 15 A For health reasons. 16 Is this something that requires regular or 17 periodic medical attention? 18 I might explain it this way: 19 That about three and a half or four years ago 20 I had a nervous condition, and I feel the nature of this 21 case might interfere and perhaps redo the undoing of what 22 I already had, the medical attention I have had. 23 MR. STOVITZ: I believe it is the concensus of 24 opinion that the Court may exercise its discretion in 25

excusing the juror for hardship.

26

1 . 2:

> . 3

> > 4

5

6

•

7

. 9

10

1**1**

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26 If you want us to approach the bench further on this point we will be glad to do so.

THE COURT: I am not sure I understand your statement.

Perhaps you'd better approach the bench.

MR. STOVITZ: All right.

(The following proceedings were had at the bench out of the hearing of the prospective jurors:)

MR. STOVITZ: Yes, after the juror's remark I approached each counsel separately, and Mr. Reiner was willing to stipulate to excusing.

However, Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the Court should exercise its own discretion under the case I cited the other day in excusing the juror for hardship on its own motion.

We certainly feel that the Court has that authority and if your Honor wanted to question this juror further at the bench, as you did with the other juror, that would be agreeable with us.

But when a juror expresses a position that he did have a nervous condition at one time, knowing the statistics as they are, say one out of 20 people have some type of mental illness, it may be a case like this would trigger him and make him go into some sort of state that would make him again nervous.

I certainly think that the juror has expressed sufficient for a stipulation for hardship.

7b3

1 2

3.

4_; 5

6

7

8

-

10 11

12

,13°

14.

15 16

17

18

19

20

21; 22

23

24 25

26

However, counsel do not want to stipulate, so I ask your Honor to exercise your Honor so own discretion in excusing this juror.

THE COURT: Were all counsel approached and refrained from stipulating?

MR. REINER: No, there was not a unanimity of opinion. Some wish to stipulate and some not.

MR. KANAREK: I would stipulate.

MR. FITZGERALD: I am not inclined to stipulate.

MR. STOVITZ: But Mr. Fitzgerald will agree that the Court has the discretion to excuse the juror on its own motion.

MR. FITZGERALD: Certainly.

MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Shinn, you also agree with that, that the Court has the discretion to excuse the juror on its own motion?

MR. SHINN: Yes.

MR. REINER: I would agree that the Court has such discretion, and the Court in this case should exercise it.

I would agree to so stipulate.

THE COURT: I am not sure I heard what you said.

MR. REINER: I would agree to stipulate. However, I think the better procedure would be for the court to exercise its discretion to take the onus off of counsel in this matter.

THE COURT: There is no onus on counsel of any kind.

This is held out of the presence of the prospective jurors. They don't know if you are stipulating or not.

MR. REINER: That is true.

MR. STOVITZ: It doesn't count as a peremptory in any shape or form.

THE COURT: I fail to understand what you are talking about.

MR. REINER: Some jurors have been excused by stipulation of counsel and some not.

In situations where the juror has not been excused this may inure to the prejudice of one counsel or another, if the jury begins to speculate on who is responsible for not stipulating.

In this case I am willing to stipulate. However I think it is appropriate for the Court to take the action.

THE COURT: If you are worrying about my remarking to the prospective jurors that it is by stipulation of counsel, I can simply say they are excused. I don't have to say it is by stipulation, if you are objecting to that.

Is that what you prefer?

MR. REINER: I don't think that was the problem raised by Mr. Fitzgerald.

THE COURT: You don't care to stipulate?

MR. FITZGERALD: No. I'm not going to enter into a stipulation that this juror may be removed.

7C

What Mr. Stovitz is suggesting is that your Honor has power to excuse the juror on your Honor's own motion.

I would agree with Mr. Stovitz's statement.

Your Honor has taken a position in the past
that you don't want to excuse the jurors.

THE COURT: That is right, and I 'm not going to excuse this gentleman, at least at this time.

All right, let's proceed.

(The following proceedings were had in open court in the presence and hearing of the prospective jurors, all counsel and the defendants being present:)

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. BARRINGER
BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Barringer, I'm going to turn to some other matters at the moment.

Have you had a chance to consider the questions

I have asked the other prospective jurors regarding the

death penalty, and your answers thereto?

A Yes, sir, I have.

Q I'm going to put the same questions to you now.

Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?

A No, sir.

Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence developed during the trial?

A Yes, sir, I do.

Q Is this an opinion that you have held for some time?

Z4

7c-2	1	A It is.
	2	Q Can you conceive of any possible set of
	3	facts or any type of case where you would not automatically
	4	refuse to impose the death penalty?
	5	A Could I explain just one thing, sir?
	6	Q Yes.
	7	A I have dealt with young people all my life,
	· 8 ,	for the last 40 years, and I have also held in my
	9	estimation that the death penalty is the wrong thing,
	10	and I still maintain that and will forever.
	11	I am 68 years of age, and I am not about to
	12	sentence somebody in a case of this kind.
	13	Q Well, you understand of course that a person
	14	may in a philosophical sense or way disapprove or oppose
	15	something, and still be willing to consider it in a
	16	particular context, and that is what I am asking you now.
	17	I have to find out from you whether your
	18	opinion is such that you have already made up your mind
	1 9	at this point that you could under no circumstances
	20	impose it, or whether in fact you would be willing to
	21	listen to the evidence before you made that decision?
•	22	A I would not be willing to listen to the
	23	evidence.
	24	Q And you have made up your mind?
	25	A Yes, sir.
	26	Q There is no question or mental reservation?

	1	A None at all.
	2	THE COURT: All right, do counsel wish to inquire?
	. 3	MR. FITZGERALD: No.
	4	MR. REINER: No, your Honor.
	5	MR. STOVITZ: No, your Honor.
	6.	People ask that the juror be excused for
	7	cause.
	. 8	MR. FITZGERALD: We jointly oppose the challenge
	9	on due process and equal protection grounds.
	10	THE COURT: Very well.
	11	You are excused, Mr. Barringer, thank you.
3 fls.	12	MR. BARRINGER: Thank you.
	13	Company of the Compan
•	14	
	15	
	.16	A STATE OF THE STA
	17	
	18	
	19	
,	20 21	•
	22	
	28	•
	24	·
,	25	·
,	26	·

THL CLERK: Mrs. Clarissa Rily; C-1-a-r-i-s-s-a, 8-1 1 $R-i-1-\hat{y}$. 2 Is the last name spelled correct, Mrs. Rily? 3 MRS. RILY: Right. 4 (Whereupon, Mrs. Clarissa Riley was seated in Š seat No. 6 in the jury box.) 6 7 The state of the s VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. CLARISSA RILY 8. BY THE COURT: 9 Mrs. Rily, have you heard and understood 10 everything that has been said in the case since you came 11 into it? 12 A Yes, I have. 13 If you were selected as a juror in this case, 14 would you be able to serve? 15 No. No. I wouldn't. 16 What is your situation? 17 I work and maintain a home for my 17-year-old 18 son, and since I am a widow, I am the only one he has for 19 care and supervision. He cannot be left over a long 20 period of time alone. 21 Is he living at home at this time? 22 A Yes. 23 ' And will continue to do so over the next 24 25 several months?

Yes. He is in high school.

26

A

1;

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1**1**

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Q For the moment, Mrs. Rily, I am going to ask You some other questions.

Is there anything else other than what you have already mentioned about the hardship?

A No.

Q Have you had an opportunity to consider the questions regarding the death penalty and your answers as to those questions?

A Yes, I have.

Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilty regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?

A No.

Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinion regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence developed in the trial?

A Yes.

Q Is that a belief that you have held for some time?

A Yes, it is.

Q Is that before you were called as a prospective furor in this case?

A Yes, it is. I just couldn't do it, that is all.

Q Do you feel that your mind is unalterably made

up at this time on that point? 1 Yes. I just have great sympathy for anyone in 2 trouble and I just couldn't do that. 3 Q Can you conceive of any set of facts or any type of case where you would be willing to consider the 5. evidence before making up your mind as to whether or not 6 to impose the death penalty? 7 8 9 Was your answer no? 10 Ä No. I am sorry. 11 Do you feel, then, that without any question 12 or mental reservation your mind is made up on that point? 13. A Yes, sir. 14 And under no circumstances could you ever 15 impose the death penalty? 16 No, sir, I couldn't. 17 THE COURT: Do you wish to inquire? 18 MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor. 19 MR. REINER: No. your Honor. 20 MR. STOVITZ: The People exercise a challenge for 21 cause, your Honor. 22 MR. FITZGERALD: The defendants would jointly oppose 23 the removal of this juror for cause on the ground that it 24 violates the Due Process daws of the Fifth and Fourteenth 25. Amendment and the Equal Protection clause; and also that 26 this juror's statements do not fall within the purview of

i	10/4 or the renar code, Subdivision & thereor.
2	THE COURT: You will be excused, Mrs. Rily.
,	Thank you.
3 .	THE CLERK: Grast Barker; G-r-a-s-t, B-a-r-k-e-r.
5	
6	Voir dire examination of grast barker
7	BY THE COURT:
8	Q Mr. Barker, have you heard and understood every-
9	thing that has been said in court since you came into the
10	case?
11	A Yes, I think so.
12	Q If you were selected as a juror in this case,
13	Mr. Barker, would you be able to serve?
14.	A I think so. It would be quite a hardship, but
15	I think so.
16	Q I take it, then, that you would be willing to
17	serve and you are not asking to be excused; is that right,
18.	sir?
19	A Yes, that's right.
20	Q I am going to put the same questions to you
21	regarding the death penalty, Mr. Barker.
2,2	Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
23.	regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to
24	make an impartial decision as to any defendant s guilt
25	regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?
26	À No. sir.

; ; ;

8 a-1	1	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
	2	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
	3	refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence
	4	developed during the trial?
	5	A No, sir.
	6	THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, do you wish to inquire?
	7	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you, your Honor.
	8	
	9	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. BARKER
	10	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
	11	Q Mr. Barker, what is your business or occupa-
	12	tion?
	13	A I work for the Bank of America. I have been
	14	with them 23 years.
	15	Q And what do you do for the Bank of America,
	16	Mr. Barker?
	17	A I am a loan officer.
	18	Q Credit evaluations of people and determining
	19	whether or not they are eligible for a loan?
	20	A Yes.
	21	Q And whether their credit standing is suffi-
•	22	cient?
	23	A Yes. For a commercial loan, Time Plan Loans,
	24	all types of loans, yes, sir.
	25	Q Do you work out of a particular Bank of
	26	America facility?

8a-2	i	A	East Los Angeles.
	2	Q	Are you married, sir?
	3	A	Yes, sir.
	4	્	Do you have any children?
	5	A	I have two children.
	6	Q.	Are they grown?
	7	. A.	One is 20, one 28.
	.8	Q	In what area of the County do you reside,
	9 - '	Mr. Barker?	•
	10	A,	I live in Duarte.
	11 ,	Q.	Have you lived there for some period of time?
	12	A.	About 20 years.
<u>. </u>	13	Q	Do you have any feelings about these
	14	defendants i	n this case?
	15	A	Feelings?
	16	Q	Yes.
	17	A	From what I have read, yes. I don't think
	18 .	I approve of	the type of living that I have read about,
	19	some of the	stories or articles that I have read.
	20	Q	You have read the newspaper in connection
	21	with these d	efendants; is that right?
•	22	A	Yes.
	2 3	Q ,	Have you read anything in magazines or
, *	24	periodicals	about these defendants?
	25 .	A	I think so.
	26	Q	Have you seen things on television in regard

7

8

22

23

24

25

26

to these defendants?

Yes, sir.

Have you heard things on radio in regard to these defendants?

> Α Yes.

From any of those sources, Mr. Barker, have you learned anything about the good character of these defendants?

Not that I could observe.

Have you heard anything good about these defendants at all, Mr. Barker?

> A No.

Have you heard anything on the radio or seen anything on television, read anything in the newspaper, read anything in any magazine or periodical. that would lead you to believe that these defendants are innocent, sir?

> A Would you repeat that, please?

Q. Yes.

You don't know anything about this case other than what you have read in the newspaper, heard on the radio, seen on television, or read in magazines; is that right?

> That's right, sir. A

You don't know anybody that knows any of the defendants personally, do you?

A No. vir.

And I take it that you don't have any other source of information about this case or these offeners other than that you have read or heard in the publis?

A No. str.

And, considering everything that you have read or heard, he Barbor, has there been mything there in what you have read or heard that leads you to believe that these defendants are imment?

A I don't think I have read anything that would say one way or the other on it.

You haven't read mything or heard mything in the media that would lead you to bolicve that they are guiltry?

Ho.

That they are guilty of billion may of them propint

No.

Q You have formed some opinions, though, about the way these defendants have lived in the past; wight?

A Yes als.

4 And you learned that from the media; right!

A Tes, sir.

And you forced an opinion that you didn't approve of the way of life or type of life?

A That's right,

25 FLB 20

25.

•	1
	2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Would it be fair to say that you wouldn't want your son or your daughter to live the way --

MR. STOVITZ: He has two sons.

MR. FITZGERALD: Excuse me. I am sorry.

Q You have two sons?

A I have a son and a daughter. A daughter that was just married.

Q You wouldn't want either your son or your daughter to engage, apparently, in the kind of life style that you think these defendants have engaged in before; is that right?

A That is correct.

Q In your lifetime, Mr. Barker, have you ever been angry with anybody? At any time during your life?

Are you familiar with the emotion of anger?

A Yes.

Q Would you say that it has been possible for you, in your experience, to be fair with people when you are angry with them?

A Well, I think that sometimes when you are angry you lose sight of fairness.

Q And has it also occurred to you -- correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Barker -- has it also occurred to you that when you don't approve of people sometimes it is difficult to be fair and impartial in your dealings with them?

8B2	1	A Yes, that is true.
	2	Q You would have some difficulty in this case in
	3	trying to be fair and impartial, wouldn't you?
	4	A Yes.
	5	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you very much, sir.
	6.	THE COURT: Mr. Reiner?
	7	MR. REINER: Yes, your Honor.
	8	May we take the noon recess at this time?
	9	THE COURT: Yes.
	10	Before we recess, I wanted to ask Mrs. Johanssen
	11	whether you have had an opportunity to get the
	12	information we were discussing yesterday?
	13 ~	MRS. JOHANSSEN: I was able to talk to the assistant
	14	personnel manager last night, and it is very much in doubt
	15	that they would pay me, although they are having a huddle
	16	on it this morning with management.
•	17 '	THE COURT: I am sorry, I didn't hear you.
	18	MRS. JOHANSSEN: They are getting together with
,	19	management on it today.
	⁻ 20	THE COURT: On this question?
	21	MRS. JOHANSSEN: To confirm this, yes.
	22	THE COURT: And you will know when?
	23	MRS. JOHANSSEN: This evening.
	24	THE COURT: All right. Fine.
	2 5	Will you let me know, then, tomorrow?
	26 ⁻	MRS. JOHANSSEN: Yes.

recess.)

MR. STOVITZ: Will your Honor give the additional admonition to the jurors that your Honor indicated you would?

THE COURT: Do not converse among yourselves nor with anyone else on any subject relating to the case nor form or express any opinion regarding the case.

I admonish you further, ladies and gentlemen, not to read, listen or watch anything in the press, radio or TV regarding this case while you are prospective jurors, or if you are selected as jurors, and not allow yourself to be influenced by anything which you may read or see inadvertently regarding this case.

We will adjourn at this time until 2:00 p.m. (Whereupon, at 12:00 p.m. the court stood in

1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1970 2:18 P.M.
2	'est mil es-
3	,
4.	THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present. All
5	the prospective jurors are in the jury box.
6	Mr. Reiner, you were about to inquire.
7	MR. REINER: Yes, your Honor.
8.	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may I address the Court.
9	I would like to apologize to the Court,
10	counsel and the prospective jurors, your Honor.
11	I had an obligation to be in another court
12	at 1:30, and the court did not get to the courthouse at
13	1:30. It was sometime after 1:30 before the Court
14	arrived.
15	THE COURT: All right, Mr. Kanarek.
16 17	MR. KANAREK: I apologize for being late.
18	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. BARKER
19	
20	BY MR. REINER: Q Mr. Barker, you own a television set, is
21	
22	that true? A Yes, sir.
23	
24 ,	Q And do you have a radio? A Yes, sir.
2 5	
26	Q In your home?
•	A Yes, I do.

1	Q	In your car?
2	.A.	In my car.
3	Q	And you subscribe to a newspaper?
4,	A	Yes.
5	Q	Which paper is that?
6	A	The Monrovia Duarte News Post.
7	Q	Monrovia?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q;	Another Monrovia resident.
10		Do you subscribe to any other newspaper?
11,	A	Let me see not right now, no.
12	Q	Have you recently subscribed to any other
13	newspaper?	
14	A	No.
15	Q	Do you read any other newspaper whether you
16	subscribe to	it or not?
17	A	Oh, now and again I have read a paper but
18	not regulari	y.
19	ଦ	Other than the Monrovia newpaper that you
20	previouslyme	ntioned do you from time to time read the Los
21	Angeles Time	s?
22	A	From time to time, let's say I do get the
23	Sunday Times	
24	Q	The Sunday Times?
2 5	A	Yes, sir.
26	Q s	And you have been receiving the Sunday Times

for, oh, the last six or seven months? A Yes, sir.
A Yes, sir.
4
· ·
•
,

	-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
0-1	1	. Q	Do you read the Los Angeles Herald Express
	2	I am sorry	the Herald Examiner?
	3	À	No, I don't think so.
•	4	Q	In connection with the television shows that
	5	you watch,	Mr. Barker, do you, from time to time, watch
	6	television	news?
	7	A	Yes.
	8	Q	Do you watch the evening news or the dinner-
	ġ.	time news?	
,	10	A	The evening news, the 11:00 o'clock news
•	11 .	sometimes.	
	12	Q	Do you have any particular newscaster that
<u>:</u>	13	you watch i	nore than others, sir?
	14	A	No.
	15	Q.	Which newscaster do you watch?
٠	16	A	Let's see (Pause)
	17	Q.	Indicate them by name or perhaps by channel.
•	18	· A	Well, I guess it is Channel 2, and Channel 11.
	19		George Putnam I have seen.
	20	Q.	You do watch the George Putnam News on Channel
	21	11?	•
	22	Α .	Yes. Occasionally, yes.
,	23	Q	And the Jerry Dunphy News on Channel 2?
	24	A ·	Yes.
	25	Q.	The story of this case and the persons involved
,	26	in it was	carried in the Monrovia newspaper that you sub-

scribe to, was it not, sir?

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	A Yes.
2	Q And mention was made of the fact, was it not,
3	that one of the defendants in this case had previously
4	lived in Monrovia; is that true?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And that her family continues to live in
7	Monrovia?
8 ;	A Yes.
9	Q You were aware of that before coming to court?
10	A Yes, sir.
11 (Q Were you aware that it was Leslie Van Houten,
12 .	sir?
13	A Yes, sir.
14	Q When you read the Sunday Times, Mr. Barker,
15	did you read the articles that were in the Sunday Times as
1 6	they relate to this case, or you have, have you not,
17	over these last few months?
18	A I have, some of them.
19	Q Do you recall, Mr. Barker, a particular article
20	that appeared last December about one defendant in this
21	case, Susan Atkins? Without reference to the content of
22	that article, sir, do you recall the article that I am
23	talking about?
24	A I don't recall it.
2 5	Q I am referring specifically to December the
26	14th. Do you recall seeing on the front race of the

Sunday Times of that date an article ostensibly by 1 Susan Atkins? 2 I don't recall it, no, sir. A 3: Q You indicated earlier, Mr. Barker, in response 4 to some questions put to you by Mr. Fitzgerald that you 5 haven't heard or read or seen anything in the newspapers, 6 radio or television that would suggest that any of these 7 defendants are guilty; is that true? 8 You say "suggest"? 9 Q Yes, I say suggest. 10 I would have to say that, to my knowledge, they 11 did suggest that they were guilty. 12 All right. · 13 Then, it would be, Mr. Barker, at the very 14 least, a fair statement that based upon what you have seen 15 on television, heard on the radio and read in the newspaper, 16 that Mr. Manson's possible involvement in these crimes has 17 at least been hinted at in the media; is that correct? 18 ÌÌ. A Yes. That would be at least a fair statement, is 20 that correct? -21 A 22 Yes. 23 So, as you come into this trial, the totality of your exposure to this case from the media has been to 24 25. the effect that Mr. Manson and perhaps these other 26 defendants are guilty; is that correct, sir?

Yes.

A

5.

1QA

And if you were to read a story today, as you sit here, or when you go home tonight, considering that you are a prospective jury member, that suggested that any one of these defendants or more than one of them were guilty, you would make a conscious attempt to ignore the suggestion in that article, would you not?

> À Yes.

10a-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

And that is because you are sitting here as a prospective jury member; true?

Yes.

And you appreciate, Mr. Barker, that it is possible that you would sit on this case and that your mind should not be affected by suggestions of things that you read in the newspaper or see on television; is that true?

That's right. They shouldn't be but some-A times they are.

> True. Q.

Now, beginning with last December, Mr. Barker, it never occurred to you, did it, that some day you might be sitting in the jury box as a prospective jury member in this casek did it?

> À No, sir.

And at that time, as you read articles, and since then as you read articles in the newspaper and observed television news shows of this case, you did not feel the need to discipline yourself to ignore any suggestions that came to you from the media because you did not even anticipate that you would be a juror in this case; isn't that true?

> A. Yes, I would say that is true.

So, as you saw news accounts of this particular case or read news accounts of this particular

23

24

25

26

case, Mr. Barker, you formed opinions basedupon the suggestions that were before you much the same as you would ordinarily form opinions based upon other news items that you see or read about; isn't that true?

A That is true,

And it is based upon those things, that exposure to the media, that you drew conclusions such as they are about the guilt or innocence of these defendants?

A Yes, sir.

Q And those conclusions were to the effect that the defendants or some of them were guilty; is that true?

A Yes.

MR. REINER: Thank you. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?

MR. SHINN: Pass, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor, but I wonder if we might approach the bench.

MR. STOVITZ: May I inquire, your Honor, of the juror, that is?

THE COURT: Is it agreeable to you, Mr. Kanarek, until after the People have finished their examination?

MR. KANAREK: Very well.

10a-3 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. BARKER BY MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Barker, I didn't understand. At first Q. you told us that what you had read in the newspapers did not show to you that the defendants were innocent or guilty, then this afternoon you told us that what you read in the newspapers, heard on TV, did suggest that they possibly could be guilty. 11 fls. 8 13· **8** ·

11-1	į
	2
	3
•	4
	5
,	6
•	7
.•	.8
	9
	1Ő
	11
	12
<u></u> .	13
)	14
•	15
	16
	17
•	18
	19
	2 0

22

23

24

25

26

MR. KANAREK: That is misstating the evidence, the witness did not use the word "possibly," your Honor; that is a misstatement of the evidence.

MR. STOVITZ: I will reframe the question.
BY MR. STOVITZ:

Q Mr. Barker, as you sit here now can you distinguish in your mind from what you believe and from what the news media believe?

A I don't quite understand your question.

Q All right, all right.

Can you distinguish in your mind, sir, as you sit here now, what you as a person believe as distinguished from what somebody else believes?

A Yes.

Q All right now, as a result of listening to the television, listening to your radio and reading your newspapers and reading your magazines, have you formed any conclusions as to the guilt or innocence of the defendants or any of these defendants?

A I would say a tentative one, yes.

Q And is that tentative one one that they are more likely to be guilty than not guilty?

A Yes, sir.

Q And would evidence be required to remove that evidence of their possible guilt from your mind?

A Yes.

11-2

. 2

1

ġ

4

5

6

7

ġ.

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

MR. STOVITZ: I have no further questions. Thank you very much for your sincerity.

MR. KANAREK: May we, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

(The following proceedings were had at the bench out of the hearing of the prospective jurors:)

MR. FITZGERALD: On behalf of the defendants we will interpose a challenge for cause, your Honor, actual bias, 1073 of the Penal Code, for the existence of a state of mind on the part of the juror in reference to the case that would prevent him from acting with entire impartiality.

THE COURT: Is this on behalf of all of the defendants?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, on behalf of all of the defendants.

MR. STOVITZ: Submit the matter, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: Isn't it true, your Honor, that Mr. Fitzgerald speaks for all of us; that was one of our pretrial understandings, unless stated differently?

MR. REINER: That is not true, as a general proposition, it is not true. In this case it is okay.

MR. KANAREK: May the record reflect that any time on behalf of Mr. Manson, any time Mr. Fitzgerald has spoken -- he certainly speaks on behalf of Mr. Manson

when he says "we," and may the record be so deemed?

THE COURT: It is too confusing to have a continuing basis on that.

If counsel is in fact speaking for all of you and all counsel hear what he says, I assume you are stipulating unless you tell me otherwise.

I think each counsel should assert his own challenges.

MR. REINER: I agree.

MR. KANAREK: Where he used the word "jointly" for us or plural, may the record be deemed to be on behalf of Mr. Manson?

THE COURT: I am not going back if it has not already been done.

MR. STOVITZ: On behalf of the People we submit the challenge, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, the challenge will be allowed.

Mr. Barker will be excused for cause.

MR. KANAREK: May I make this one motion again, your Honor, and that is I would make the motion again that the jurors be examined individually outside of the presence of the other jurors.

The Court has that power by merely ordering all the other jurors, those in the box and otherwise, to be in the corridor.

26

I believe it would be to the best interest of everyone, that the examination like the one just finished should take place outside the presence of the other jurors.

THE COURT: The motion is denied.

I have explained to you before that if all counsel and all parties are willing to stipulate to that procedure, I will follow it.

MR. KANAREK: As your Honor knows, I believe all counsel have.

The parties have not.

THE COURT: All counsel have not.

MR. REINER: Who has not?

THE COURT: The District Attorney was opposed to any matter in chambers.

MR. STOVITZ: In regard to that --

THE COURT: So were some of defense counsel from time to time.

MR. STOVITZ: In regard to that, your Honor, if your Honor obtains the consent of the defendants personally to proceed in chambers pertaining to the publicity matters, we will abide by your Honor's orders.

THE COURT: That is an equivocal statement if I ever heard one, Mr. Stovitz, what do you mean by that?

You mean you stipulate to it?

MR. STOVITZ: If your Honor asks us into chambers

we will proceed in chambers and conduct the voir dire. 1 THE COURT: But that does not tell me mything. 2 MR. STOYITE: I think your Honor, as Mr. Fitzgerald 3 pointed out, has the discretion to hold these matters 4 in chashers. 5 THE COURT: I siready indicated on the record I 6 would do so even over the District Attorney's objection 7 if all partice and their counsel stipulated. 8 I have yet to receive my attoulation from 9 the parties. 10 MR. MINIKE I bulleye there is a stipulation shong 11 all defense commet that it be held in chambers. I don't 12 13 think there should be any question on that. I maine there is no question in the fourt's 14 mind on that. lin kin16 THE COURT: All right, well, let's proceed, 18 19 20 21 22· 23 24 25 26

Cielo Drive.com ARCHIVES

(The following proceedings were had in open ∠1-a-1 1 court in the presence and hearing of the prospective Ż jurors:) 3 THE COURT: Mr. Barker, you will be excused. Thank 4 you, sir. 5 THE CLERK: James E. Lee; J-a-m-e-s, L-e-e. 6 MR. STOVITZ: The middle initial is E, sir? THE CLERK: E as in Everett. :8, (Whereupon, James E. Lee was seated in seat 9 No. 6 in the jury box.) 10: 11 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF JAMES E. LEE 12 BY THE COURT: 13 Mr. Lee, have you heard and understood every-14 thing that has been said in court since you came into the 15 case, sir? 16 I think so. 17 If you were selected as a juror in this case 18 would you be able to serve? 19 It would be difficult for me to. 20 A Q In what respect? 21 A Due to illness in my family. 22. Q 23 Could you elaborate somewhat on that, sir? 24 A My mother is alone; my dad is in a rest home, and she is under the doctor's care, and I stay there at 25

26

night with her.

11a2

5

She has to go to the clinic three times a week now, which I have to make arrangements for her transportation.

I do her shopping and what-have-you.

THE COURT: She is dependent on you?

MR. LEE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And is this something that is likely to continue for some time?

A' It looks like it. I den't know, I don't know.

Q All right, sir, for the time being I will go to some other questions.

Have you had a chance to consider the questions I have asked the other prospective jurors regarding the death penalty?

- A Yes, sir, I have.
- Q And your answers thereto?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?
 - A No, sir.
- Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence developed during the trial?
 - A . No, sir.

1	THE C	OURT: Do you wish to inquire, Mr. Fitzgerald?
	MR. F	ITZGERALD: Yes, your Honor, thank you.
2		
3 4		VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. JAMES E. LEE
	BY MR. FITZ	GERALD:
5	Q	What is your business or occupation, Mr. Lee?
6	Ą	I work for the City of Gardena as a bus driver.
8	Q	Are you married, sir?
	A	Yes, sir.
9	Q	Do you have any children?
10	^ .A	I have one daughter.
11 .	Q *	How old is she?
12	A	26. She is married and has two children.
13	Q	Is your wife employed outside of the home?
14 3 15 1	A	Yes, sir.
16	Q	By whom is she employed?
17	Å	Harbor General Hospital.
18	Q	And what does she do at Harbor General?
19	. A	RVN.
20	Q	Registered nurse?
21	A	Registered vocational nurse.
22	Q.	RVN.
23	Α.	RVN -
24	Q	I see. Have you ever served as a juror before?
25	Å	No, sir, I have never been in a courtroom.
26	Q	You have never been in a courtroom?
ņo ,	ļ ,	

.1a3

1	Ą	Not when it is in session, no, sir.
2	Q.	Can you think of any reason why you cannot be
3	fair and im	partial to both sides of this case?
4	A	I don't think of any.
ŝ	Q.	Do you have any feelings or attitudes about
6	the defenda	nt in this case?
7	Å	No. sir.
8		Have you read any publicity in connection with
9	this case?	
10	A	Yes, I have.
11	Q.	You read newspaper publicity?
12	A	Yes, sir.
13	Q	Have you read about this case in magazines?
14	À	I don't think so.
15 ·	Q	Have you seen this, or aspects, or material
16	in connecti	on with this case on television?
17	A	Yes, sir.
18:	Q.	Have you heard it on the radio?
19	A	Yes, sir.
20	Q	Have you heard anything about the defendants !
21	good charac	ter in the media anywhere?
22	A	Not to my knowledge.
23	Q.	Have you read or heard anything good about the
24	defendants?	
25	A	No. I have not.
26	Q	Have you read or heard anything bad about the

11a4

11a5	į.	defendants?
	2	A I suppose
	3	Q Pardon me?
	4	A I suppose, yes.
	5	Q You have, haven't you?
	6	A Yes.
	7	Q As a matter of fact, you have read a consider-
	. 8	able amount of material that reflects adversely on the
	9	defendants, right?
	10	A Yes.
	11	Q And I take it that did most of this material
	12	that you read about the defendants, did you read it in the
	13	newspaper?
	14	A Yes.
	15	Q When you were reading it, I take it you under-
	16	stood what you were reading?
	17	A I hope so.
3	18	Q okay, and I take it you thought what you were
	19	reading was true?
	20	A Well, I don't have to I don't know how to
	21	answer that.
	22	Everything isn't true that you read, I'm sure.
:	23	Q Of course not, certainly not, everything that
	24	one reads is not true.
	25	A No.
İ	26	Q But did you think that what you were reading

11a6	1	was true?	
	2	A	Probably. I had no reason to doubt it, if I
· • ·	3	knew nothin	g about it.
	4	Q	You have no reason to doubt it if you knew
	5 .	nothing abo	ut it.
	6	A	That's right.
•	. 7	Q.	Would it be fair to say, then, that im smuch as
	8.	you did not	have any other information about the case, you
	9 :	accepted wh	at the newspapers had to say about it?
	10	A	Right.
	11 -	Q	Aren't you going to have a difficult time
	12	being fair	and impartial, and right down the middle in
	13	this case?	, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	14	A	I don't know, to be truthful.
	15	Q	Pardon me?
	16	A	I don't know.
	17	Q.	Is it going to be a little difficult for you?
	18	A	I don't think so, but I don't know.
	19	Q	You have just heard one side of the case,
	20	right?	
	21	A	That is right.
	22	Q.	In the newspaper you heard the bad, right?
	2 3	À	Right:
_	24	Q	You have not heard any good?
	25	, A	No.
	.26	ø	Dogan it that kind of watch wour mind in favor

1	of the prosecution or in favor of these defendants being
.2:	guilty?
.3	A It could be.
4	Q If it were up to you, if you had your preference
5	wouldn't you prefer to sit as a juror on a case where you
6	did not know anything about it, and you made up your mind
7	simply on the evidence in the case?
8	A Probably.
9.	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.
, 1 0	
.11	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. LEE
12	BY MR. REINER:
13.	Q Mr. Lee, you do read the newspaper on a fairly
14 .	regular basis, do you not?
15	A Yes, sir.
16	Q . Which newspaper is that?
17	A I don't subscribe to one, but I see one every
18	day.
19	Q Which newspaper is that?
20	A All of them.
21	Q You read the Los Angeles Herald Examiner, the
22	Times?
23	A I have to clean them off the bus, the seats and
.24	things, so I might grab any one of them.
25	Q It would be a reasonably fair statement that on
26	a regular basis you read both the Los Angeles Herald Examine

Yes, sir. 2 And do you make any attempt to reasonably well 3 inform yourself by reading the stories with some care? 4 No. I don't, I don't. A 5 Do you watch television? Q 6. A. Yes, I do. 7 Q The evening news? 8 Á Yes. ġ Q Any particular program on the evening news 10 that you favor? 11 No, I switch. A 12 Q Which ones do you generally watch? 13 Probably 7 and 11, probably. Α 14 That would be Bill Bonds' Evening News and the 15 George Putnam Evening News? 16 Yes. 17 Since last December when these arrests 18 occurred, you have seen this case discussed on television: 19 you read about it in both newspapers on a fairly regular 20 basis, have you not? 21 Fairly regular. 22 When I speak of "this case," I am referring to 23 any participant in the case, the defendants, the lawers, or 24 anyone else. 25 am referring/anything to do with this case. 26

and the Los Angeles Times?

1;

24

25

26

A I have watched occasionally.

Q If you were to watch television this evening or see something in the newspapers this evening that suggested that perhaps one or more of these defendants were guilty, you would discipline yourself to ignore the suggestion in the story, would you not?

A Well, the Judge informed us not to.

Q That is true.

Before his Honor informed you not to read the newspaper, not to watch television, before he informed you of that this afternoon, you had previously been reading the newspaper and watching television?

A Yes.

Q That was after you were called as a prospective juror?

A Yes.

However, since you anticipated that you might be a juror in this case did you discipline yourself not to accept any suggestions that might be contained in any of these stories relating to the guilt of any of these defendants?

A Yes.

Q Was the reason that you did that because you recognize that as a prospective juror it would be necessary for you to base your judgment solely on the evidence in this trial?

A Yes.

4.4	_	-
11	C -	J.

3:

19:

Q Since last December when you read about this case in the newspaper, saw it on television and heard about it on the radio, you did not anticipate that you might some day become a jury member in this case, did you?

A No, I did not.

Q So from that time and up until the very recent past you had no reason whatsoever to discipline yourself to ignore any suggestions that were presented to you in the stories that you read and the news that you saw on television, is that true?

A I had no reason.

Q I'm sorry, I did not hear you.

A I had no reason.

And so because you had no reason to resist any of these suggestions, in fact you accepted these suggestions much in the same manner you would accept the suggestions that appear in the news relative to other matters.

Is that true?

A True.

Q Would it be a fair statement to say that the totality of the suggestions that appeared in the media, newspapers, television, was to the effect that the defendants or some of them were guilty of these crimes?

A True.

11c-2	Q And you accepted that, if I may use the
÷	language, which you used in response to one of Mr.
2	Fitzgerald's questions, as probably true. Is that
3	
4	correct?
` 5	A Yes.
6	Q So prior to being called as a prospective
7	juror in this case it was your judgment that it was
8	probably true that the defendants were guilty?
9 .	A That's right.
10	Q And this judgment of yours was based solely
11 :	upon the suggestions that were contained in the informa-
12	tion that you received from the media?
13	A Yes, sir.
14	MR. REINER: Thank you, I have no further questions.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
16 [.]	MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor, I have one or two
17	questions.
18	
19	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. LEE
20	BY MR. SHINN: .,
21	Q Mr. Lee, did you read or hear about Mr.
22	Kanarek, Mr. Manson's attorney the other day?
12 fls. ²³	A Something about it, yes, sir.
24	
25	
26	

1 -	Q	Did you read it in the newspapers?	
2	' A.	Yes.	
3	Q	And did you watch the TV that night?	
4	A	I saw something about it, yes.	
5	Q	And do you recall who you saw?	
6	A.	I saw the District Attorney with a news	
7	conference o	er something.	
8	Q.	Do you recall what he said?	
9	A	Well, he was trying to get a hearing, the	
10	way I unders	stood it, to have the attorney I don't	
11	know out	of the case.	
12	Q.	Do you recall him saying something about	
1,3	Mr. Kanarek'	s competence?	
14	. A	Yes, something to that effect.	
15	ର	That he was not competent?	
16	A	Yes.	
17	ଦ	And did you also read the newspapers about	
18	Mr. Kanarek		
19	À	Yes.	
20	Q.	And what was it, the Times or the Herald-	
21	Examiner, si	Lr?	
22	A	The Times.	
23	વ	Now, sir, do you recall what you read?	
24	A	It was to that same effect.	
2 5 ,	Q	What do you mean "to that same effect"?	
26	A	The same idea, that he was trying to get	•
	1	,	

12-1

12-2	a hearing that he wasn't capable of handling the case.
2 ⁄	Q Now, sir, would that in any manner affect
3	strike that would that in any manner prejudice
4	Mr. Manson?
5.	A No, sir.
Ġ.	Q The fact that you read that his attorney
ŋ	may be incompetent?
. 8	A No.
.9	MR. SHINN: Thank you.
10	I am through, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?
12	MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz?
14	MR. STOVITZ: Yes, sir.
. 15	
16,	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. LEE
17	BY MR. STOVITZ:
. 18	Q Mr. Lee, as you sit here now, are you telling
19	the Court that from what you have read in the newspapers
20	and seen on television that the defendants would have to
21	produce evidence to cause you to vote for their
22 °	innocence; is that right?
23	A That's right.
. 24	Q So, then, in other words, you have your
25	mind made up now; is that right?
26	A Well, I wouldn't say it is made up, but it

1,	indicates, from what I have heard, that they are guilty.
2	Q I see.
3	So that they would have to produce evidence
4.	to remove that impression that you have; is that
.5	correct?
6	A Yes.
7	MR. STOVITZ: I have no further questions.
8	Thank you.
9	MR. FITZGERALD: We would like to enter an
10	objection or a challenge for cause, your Honor.
11	MR. REINER: Join the challenge for cause under
12	1073 of the Penal Code.
13 :	MR.SHINN: Join, your Honor.
14	MR. FITZGERALD: Actual blas.
15	MR. KANAREK: Join.
16	MR. STOVITZ: Submit the matter, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: You are excused, Mr. Lee. Thank you
18	very much.
19	THE CLERK: Miss Jean DiSalvo; J-e-a-n,
20	D-i-S-a-1-v-o.
21	(Whereupon Miss Jean DiSalvo came forward
22:	and was seated in the jury box.)
23	, ,
24	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS DI SALVO
25	BY THE COURT:
2 6′	Q That is Miss DiSalvo?
	<u>.</u>

1	A Miss.
2	Q Have you heard and understood everything that
3	has been said in court since you came into the case, Miss
4	DiSalvo?
5.	A Yes.
6	Q If you were selected as a juror in this case,
7	Miss DiSalvo, would you be able to serve?
8	A No, sir.
9	Q What is your situation?
10	A A critical hardship and financial problem.
11	I have been unemployed for quite sometime.
12	Q Are you presently employed?
13	A Yes, and I am a self-supporter. I do need
14	the employment to support myself and to meet my expenses.
1 5	Q . I'm going to ask you some other questions,
16	Miss DiSalvo.
17	Have you had an opportunity to consider the
18	death penalty questions that I have put to the other
19	prospective jurors?
20	A Yes, sir.
21	Q I am going to ask you the same questions,
22	Miss DiSalvo.
23	First, do you entertain such conscientious
24	opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be
25	unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's
26	guilt regardless of the evidence developed during the trial

A No. sir.

Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence developed during the trial?

A No, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, do you care to examine?
MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, your Honor.

2-A-1	1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
	2	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
,	3	Q Have you made an application to anybody to be
	4	excused from jury duty itself, Miss Di Salvo?
	5 .	A No. sir.
	6	Q sitting in the courtroom imposes a hardship or
	7	an imposition on you; is that right?
	8	A Yes, it does.
	9	Q As well as sitting as a juror in this particular
	10	case; isn't that true?
	11	A Right.
	12	MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.
	13 .	THE COURT: Mr. Reiner?
	14	MR. REINER: Thank you, your Honor.
	15	
	16	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
•	17.	BY MR. REINER:
	1,8	Q Miss Di Salvo, you have read of this case in
	1 9	the newspapers from time to time, have you not?
	20	A Yes.
	21	Q Since last December, have you not?
	22	A Yes.
	23	Q And you have watched the evening news on
<u></u>	24	television, have you not?
, <u> </u>	25	A occasionally.
	26	Q In watching the evening news, you observed,
	,	did you not did you watch certain newscasts relating to

8

.9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

this trial and the persons involved in it?

Α Yes.

Q Have you as yet heard anything or read anything or seen anything in connection with this case that was favorable toward Mr. Manson or any of the defendants in the case?

> Α No. sir.

Q You haven't heard a good word yet?

A No.

Q You have heard many bad words?

À Right.

Q Now, Miss Di Salvo, you were listening to the questions put to other prospective jurors while you were seated in the audience; is that true?

> A Yes.

Q. And you heard the question put to the other prospective jurors with respect to whether -- strike that.

As you listened to these questions, Miss Di Salvo, you did consider your possible answer, did you not?

> \mathbf{A} . Yes, sir.

Q And you heard the questions put to the other prospective jurors with respect to whether or not they had ever heard a single good word that appeared in the news media with respect to any of these defendants?

> Α Yes, sir.

Q. And you considered your answer ever since you

first heard that question put to the other prospective jurors, have you not?

A Yes, sir.

Q And in all that time, thinking about it,
Miss Di Salvo, you haven't been able to recall a single
instance of a single word that has appeared in any newspapers, any radio show, or any television news program that
was in any way, shape or form favorable toward any of these
defendants; is that right?

A Right.

Q In fact, the exact contrary was true, was it not; every word that you ever heard or seen was unfavorable to the defendants?

A Right.

Q And in fact suggested their actual guilt in this case?

A Yes.

And while you read these stories and saw these television newscasts, Miss Di Salvo, you had no reason, at that time, not to accept -- that is, to resist -- the suggestions that appeared in the media with respect to the guilt of the defendants? Isn't that true, Miss Di Salvo?

A Yes, sir.

And you, in fact, did accept the suggestions in the media with regard to the guilt of the defendants to the same degree and extent that you might accept the

12a4

-

suggestions that appeared in the media with regard to other news stories?

A Would you please rephrase that? I want to get that straight.

Q Surely.

Generally, Miss Di Salvo, when you read the newspaper or watch the television news, you receive certain suggestions in the content of the news, and unless there is some reason that you have to doubt the content or the suggestions that are contained in the news, you tend to accept it, do you not?

A No.

Q Well, with respect to this case, in these last few days that you sat in the audience as a prospective juror, Miss Di Salvo, you did read of the case in the newspaper, did you not?

A Yes, I did.

Q And you saw some television newscasts that were related to this case; is that right?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, at that time, since you were a prospective juror in this case, you did, I assume, discipline yourself not to accept any suggestions that would appear in any of these stories; is that right?

A Right.

Q That would suggest the possible guilt of the

12B

defendants?

A Right.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, if I may interrupt, is the witness answering audibly to that last question?

MR. STOVITZ: Her answer was yes.

THE COURT: Please keep your voice up, Miss Di Salvo, and speak directly into the microphone.

MISS DI SALVO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I don't believe it is on. Would you try the switch.

MISS DI SALVO: Yes, sir.

18,

22,

3

BY MR. REINER:

Q Miss DiSalvo, going back to last December when the stories of the arrests of these defendants first began to appear in the newspaper, at that time it did not occur to you that you might some day be a juror in this case, did it?

A Right.

Q So at that time there was no particular reason that you knew of that you had to discipline yourself not to accept any suggestions that would appear in the media with regard to the guilt of the defendants; isn't that true?

A Right.

Q So, as you read those stories and saw the newscasts on television, you, in fact, to one degree or another, did believe and accept the suggestions that appeared in the media with regard to the guilt of these defendants; isn't that true?

A Some, yes.

· MR. KANAREK: What was that last?

(The answer was read by the reporter.)

BY MR. REINER:

Q All of these suggestions, as you have indicated before, Miss DiSalvo, were to the effect that the defendants were guilty; none of these suggestions were to the effect that the defendants were not guilty;

24

25

26

is that true?

A Right.

THE COURT: Miss DiSalvo, we can't hear you.

MISS DI SALVO: I am sorry. I thought I was speaking loud.

THE COURT: Keep your voice up, please.

MISS DI SALVO: Yes, sir.

BY MR. REINER:

Q All right.

Would it be a fair statement to say that based on all you read and heard and all that you have seen prior to the time that you found out that you might be a prospective juror in this case, Miss DiSalvo, you had formed certain opinions as to the guilt of the defendants?

- A I wouldn't say that.
- Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.
- A I wouldn't say that, no.
- Q You do not feel that you had any opinions whatsoever prior to the time that it occurred to you that you might be a juror in this case?
 - A I don't think I would have been a juror.
 - Q I'm sorry?
 - A I don't think I would have been a juror.
 - Q What?
 - A I didn't think I was going to be a juror.
 - Q I appreciate that. Perhaps my question was

not clear, Miss DiSalvo.

During this time that you were exposed to the in the in the information media, all of which you have previously indicated suggested that the defendants were guilty, or some of them were guilty, you did form some opinions, did you not, Miss DiSalvo, with respect to the actual guilt of the defendants?

A We form some opinion but we wait for evidence.

Q We do if we know that we are going to be a prospective juror.

A Right.

Q But at that time, Miss DiSalvo, you did not know that you were going to be a prospective juror, did you?

A No.

Q So, you had no compelling need at that time, did you, Miss DiSalvo, in your own mind, to wait until you heard evidence?

A Right.

Q You never expected to be in a position where you could hear evidence in a courtroom; isn't that right?

A Right.

Q All right.

So, at that time, irrespective of what you may do from this point on, at least at that time you did form opinions, tentative as they might have been, opinions

with respect to the guilt of the defendants? 1 A Yes. 2 And these opinions were based solely upon 3 information that had come to you through the media and 4 suggestions that had come to you through the media; is 5 that right? 6 A Right. 7 All of which pointed toward the guilt of 8 the defendants? 9 Right. A 10 MR. REINER: Thank you. 11 T have no further questions. 12 13 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS DI SALVO 14 BY THE COURT: 15 Miss DiSalvo, what we are trying to do is to 16 ascertain your state of mind at the present time. 17 Now, in the questions asked of you by any 18counsel, I hope that you will not, or I hope that any 19 prospective juror will not, simply give an answer which 20 he or she thinks the attorney is trying to elicit. 21 You don't have to agree with a leading question. 22 But what we want you to do is to consider it very carefully 23 and give your answer to the question, not necessarily the 24 answer that is suggested if it does not comply with or **25**. conform to your opinion. 26

1 ·	Do you understand that?
12c fls	A Yes, sir.
3	
4	
5	
. 6	,
·7	
8	
9	
10	
11.	The state of the s
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
17	
18.	
19.	
20	,
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
.26	

24

25

26

Q Now, when you say that you have formed some opinions regarding the guilt of any of the defendants in this case. Miss Di Salvo, was this because they were arrested and charged with these offenses?

À Yes.

Q Would you say that your opinion in that regard is any different than it would be in any other case where a defendant is arrested and charged with an offense?

A Not necessarily.

Q Any time a person is arrested and charged with an offense, I suppose it might be natural to wonder whether he is guilty; isn't that right?

A Yes, sir.

Q Is that what you mean, Miss Di Salvo?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you think that there was anything about the publicity in this case that has caused you to form any opinion that will stay with you if you are selected as a juror in this case?

A I believe so.

Q You believe so?

À Yes.

Q What sort of an opinion is that?

A An opinion of guilt.

Q I beg your pardon?

A An opinion of guilt.

C 2	1	Q And what is that based on?
	2	A The fact of what they have done.
	3	Q I understand. But is this because of the fact
	4	that they have been arrested and charged with these crimes.
	5	and brought before the court to stand trial? Is that why
٠	6	you have that opinion? Or is it for some other reason?
•	7	A No. That reason.
	8	Q Is that it?
	9	A Yes.
	10	Q I am not trying to put words in your mouth,
	11	Miss Di Salvo. I want you to tell me.
	. 12	Is that 1t?
	13	A Yes
	14	Q Would you feel the same way in any case if
	15	you were called in to sit as a juror in a criminal case with
	16	respect to a defendant who had been arrested and charged
	17 .	with a crime and brought before the Court to stand trial?
	18	A Probably so.
	19	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn, do you care to examine?
	20	MR. SHINN: Oh, yes, your Honor. Thank you.
	21	
	22	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
	23	BY MR. SHINN:
	24	Q Miss Di Salvo, have you read or heard about
	25	Mr. Manson's attorney, Mr. Kanarek, in the last few days?
	-26	A Tin 11 's have have have

1	Q	You mean you heard while you were sitting in				
2	the court here?					
.3	A	Yes. I did not read the paper and I had no				
4	television	on.				
5	Q	Do you take the paper?				
6	Å	Occasionally.				
7	Q	What paper is that, Miss Di Salvo?				
8	A	The Times on Sunday.				
. 9	Q	Just on Sunday?				
10	A	That is all.				
11	Q,	You don't take the daily?				
12	Ą	No.				
13	Q	Was Mr. Kanarek discussed by other persons in				
14	the court with you?					
15	A	I don't recall very well.				
16	Q	Oh, you don t?				
17	Ă	I don't follow it that closely.				
18	Q	You don't recall whether or not you had a				
19	discussion with any of the people in the courtroom					
20	regarding Mr. Kanarek?					
21	A	No. I have had no discussion.				
22	Q	Then how did you learn about Mr. Kanarek?				
23	A	From what was said in here yesterday.				
24 .	Q	Oh, you mean by the other attorneys questioning				
25	the jurors?					
·. 26:	A	Yes.				

12C3

26.

		i
12d-1	1	THE CLERK: Alvin B. Bonner; A-1-v-i-n, B-o-n-n-e-r.
-	2	(Whereupon Mr. Alvin B. Bonner came forward
,	3	and was seated in jury seat No. 6.)
	4	
	5	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. ALVIN B. BONNER
	Ģ ·	BY THE COURT:
	7	Q Mr. Bonner, have you heard and understood
	8	everything that has been said in court since you came
	9	into the case, sir?
	10	A I have.
	41	Q If you were selected as a juror in this case,
	12	would you be able to serve, sir?
-	13	A I would be.
	14	Q Have you had an opportunity to think over
	15	the questions that I have asked the other prospective
	16	jurors regarding the death penalty and your answers to
	17	those questions?
	18	A I have.
	19	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
	20	regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to
	21	make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt
	22	regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?
	23	A No, sir.
	24	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
Ď	25	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
	26	refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence developed
		, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

1	during the trial?
2	A No, sir.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, do you care to inquire?
4	MR. FITZGERALD: If I may.
5	•
6	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. BONNER
7	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
-8	Q What is your business or occupation, Mr.
9	Bonner?
10	A Postal supervisor.
11	Q Do you work out of a particular post office
12	facility, Mr. Bonner?
13	A The Terminal Annex.
14	Q Are you married, sir?
15	A Married. No children.
16	Q No children?
17	A None.
18	Q Is your wife employed outside the home?
19	A No, she is not.
20	Q In what area of the City or County do you
21	reside, Mr. Bonner?
22	A Altadena.
23	MR. STOVITZ: What was that, sir?
24	MR. BONNER: Altadena.
25	MR. FITZGERALD: Q Altadena?
26	A Yes.

- 1	•
1	Q Have you ever served as a juror before, Mr.
2	Bonner?
3	A Never served.
4	Q From your seat in the audience, Mr. Bonner,
5	were you able to hear the questions that I asked the other
6	prospective jurors?
7	A I was able to hear.
8 .	Q Is there any particular question that you
9	would like to address yourself to, or is there any
10	particular question that you would answer any differently
11	than any of the other prospective jurors, sir?
12	A Nothing except for the fact that I don't
†3 ,	subscribe to newspapers except for one periodical,
14	Better Homes and Gardens, that is because I don't particu-
15	larly appreciate many of the things that I read in
16	newspapers, but Better Homes and Gardens is much more
17	relaxing; if that makes any sense.
18	Q You don't subscribe to a newspaper?
19	A None.
20	Q Do you own a television set, Mr. Bonner?
21	A Yes.
22	Q And do you watch television occasionally?
23	A Occasionally.
24	Q Do you watch news programs on television?
25	A Occasionally.
26	Q Occasionally?

1	A Yes.
2	Q What about radio? Do you own a radio and
3	listen to it occasionally, Mr. Bonner?
4	A We own radios but we don't listen to them.
5	Q Do you have a radio in your car?
6	A Yes, I have, but I don't listen to it.
7	Q Have you read anything about this case any
8	place, sir?
9	A Well, even though I don't subscribe to
10	newspapers, whenever I have a few minutes or something,
11	like maybe sitting in the jury room or in a barbership,
12,	I may pick up a paper and read it.
13`	Now, the headlines pertaining to this case I
14	read whenever it occurred, and then I just let it go at
15	that, it was just so much headlines.
16	Since that time I had never followed the case
17	because these kind of cases don't appeal, you know, to
18	me. So I didn't pay any attention any more to it, until
19	I was called for this particular jury thing.
20	Q But during your coffee break or something at
.21	work, I take it there are newspapers and magazines on the
22	table that you have access to, and things like that;
23	right?
24	A Right.
2 5	Q But you can't ever recall ever actually
26	reading anything about this case?

1	A That is what I said. I did read.
. 2	Q Just headlines?
3	A The headlines, right.
4	Q Or notes at the top of a column in larger
5	type, or something like that?
.6	A The headlines only, yes; the headlines and
7	the bold print underneath, you know. Then as soon as
12e fls.	I find out what it is, I am gone on something else.
.9	
10	
11	
12	
. 13	
14	
15	
16 ,	
17	
18	·
19	,
20	
21	
22	
23	1
24	. •
25	
26	

12e-1 Have you ever served as a juror before on Q. 1 any kind of a case? 2 Α No, sir. 3 Are you familiar with any of the witnesses 4 or any of the locations or anything like that? 5 No, I am not familiar with them. 6 Do you have any bias or prejudice against 7. psychiatric or psychological testimony? 8 Not at all. Α 9 Do you have any professional experience with 10 or have any knowledge or degree of expertise in the field 11. of LSD or related hallucinogenic drugs? 12 A No. sir. 13 Do you have any quarrel with the presumption Q. 14 of innocence or reasonable doubt? 15 A Not at all. 16 Would you carefully and critically analyze Q. 17 any circumstantial evidence that might be introduced 18 against any of the defendants in this case? 19-Á I would. 20 Would you require that the defendants prove 0 21 their innocence to you? 22 A Would I require that they prove their 23 innocence? 24 Yes. Q. 25 No, because, getting back to the newspapers, Α 26

there was a question that you asked the previous people that were sitting here pertaining to the news item relating to their innocence or guilt, and as I said, even though I don't subscribe to any newspaper, when I am in the barbershop, or something like that, I pick up the newspapers and read them.

Q I understand that.

A All right.

In conjunction with that, there was one newspaper particularly that adhered to their innocence. So there you are.

Q What newspaper was that, Mr. Bonner, do you recall?

A The Free Press.

Q Mr. Bonner, you don't belong to any organizations that has as one of its tenets the increase of the number of offenses punishable by death in California or anything like that?

A No, I don't.

Q You have been asked whether you would automatically impose a sentence of life imprisonment in a case
without regard to the evidence. Let me ask you if you
would automatically impose the death sentence without
regard to the evidence?

A No. I would have to listen to the evidence.

Q Now, Mr. Bonner, let's go back for a moment to

2526

this proposition of reasonable doubt. 1 You have stated that you wouldn't require 2 the defendants to prove their innocence to you. 3. A Right. 4 If you had, after listening to all the 5 evidence, Mr. Bonner, a reasonable doubt as to the 6 defendant's guilt, would you vote to acquit them? 7 A If I had a reasonable doubt, I would acquit 8 them; I would vote to acquit them. 9 Would you require that the defendants prove 10 to you who committed these offenses if they didn't? 11 I don't think that has anything to do A 12 with the case as such. They are on trial and not somebody 13 else. , So I wouldn't be concerned with their proving that 14 somebody else did or did not do whatever it might have been. 15 All right. 16 Now, let's take some recent exposure that 17 you have had to the media. 18 Have you read or heard anything in the 19 newspaper, on television or on the radio in connection 20 **21** with Mr. Kanarek? 22 A Yes, I have. What was the source of that information? 23 Q. 24 A This was television, recently, perhaps some 25 time this week, since I have been on this case as a 26 prospective juror.

It was District Attorney Younger's attempt 1 to have Mr. Kanarek removed from representing Mr. Manson. 2. MR. FITZGERALD: Fine. Thank you very much, sir. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Reiner? 4 MR. REINER: Yes. 5 Does your Honor wish to take the afternoon 6 recess at this time or shall I start now? 7 THE COURT: Yes, we will take the recess. 8 9 Do not converse among yourselves, ladies and gentlemen, or with anyone else on any subject relating to 10 11 the case nor form or express any opinion regarding the 12 case until it is finally submitted to those of you who 13 are selected. 14 15 minutes. 13 fls. 15 (Recess.) 16 17 · 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 **26**

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present; 13-1 1 all the prospective jurors are in the jury box. 2 You may proceed, Mr. Reiner. 3 MR. REINER: Thank you, your Honor. 4 5 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. BONNER 6 BY MR. REINER: 7 Mr. Bonner, you indicated that the only magazine Q 8. that you read on a regular basis is Better Homes and Gardens. 9 That's correct. 10 They do not have seemed to have covered this 14 1Ž case with any degree of thoroughness. 13. A None at all. Q 14 You find that more relaxing than other magazines? 15 16 Ä Yes, definitely, yes, sir. 17 Perhaps it may come to pass if you become a 18 juror in this case you may welcome going back to reading 19 Homes and Gardens. You did hear the questions put to the other 20 jurors by myself and the other lawyers? 21 22 Yes, sir. Α 23 And you were considering your answersat that 24 time, considering the answer that you might give if you 25. were called to the jury box to also answer questions. :26 A Yes, sir.

2 - 3			1
			2
			3
			4
•	•		5
			6
			Ż
			8
			9
•	*		10
			11
			12
À			13
			14
			15
			16
		,	17
			18
			19
			20
			21

23

24

25

26

	Q.	W	ith req	jarđ	to	the	public	ity	given	this	case,	r
You	have	read	about	the	ca	se fr	om tir	ne to	time,	at	least	
the	head!	Lines	there	of,	in i	these	last	few	months	sin	ce the	3
arre	ests (occuri	ed?		•		-					

A Yes.

Q And of course the headlines, of course, are the worst of all.

Do you recall any of the headlines that you did read?

A Frankly, no.

Q But it would be a reasonable -- well, would it be reasonable to say that the headlines generally suggested that the defendants or some of them were guilty of the crimes with which they had been charged?

A The headlines being what they are, this is the suggestion.

You meant to state, I assume, that the headlines are perhaps the most sensational of the material that would appear in the newspaper?

A Yes, to my knowledge, yes.

Q Pardon?

A I agree, yes.

Q And if the body of the story suggested that perhaps the defendants would be guilty, surely, then, the headlines generally speaking would do more than merely

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

but

suggest or hint at the possibility, /: would exclaim it. Would that be true?

> That's true. A

Q If you were to be exposed to such headlines, such stories presently, you would, of course, discipline yourself not to be influenced by such suggestions because it may occur that you would be a juror in this case.

Is that true?

Α That is also true.

Q. But when these headlines first began and they were at their very worst, the early part of the year, at that time it did not occur to you there was a likelihood or any possibility to you, that you might some day be a juror in this case?

> A Not the remotest possibility.

> Q Not the remotest possibility.

So at that time you did not make a conscious attempt to discipline yourself so as to avoid receiving any suggestions, did you?

À

Actually, if we are to be completely candid, it would be impossible for you to say whether your judgment prior to the time that you were called as a prospective juror was influenced in any way subconsciously or otherwise by these constant suggestions from the media with respect to the guilt of the defendants.

Is that true?

3-5

2

ì

3

4

5

Ť,

Ř

•

9.

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

.23

22

24

25.

26

A In relationship to the guilt of the defendants, that is true.

However, in reading the headlines, it occurred to me that somewhere down the line that somebody had seriously failed in their responsibilities to these people, and this is the thing that occurred to me. That is what I would think of.

Q Yes, I agree --

THE COURT: Justa moment.

MR. BUGLIOS : Your Honor --

THE COURT: I don't understand that answer. Would you state what you mean?

THE JUROR: What I mean is that somewhere, somehow, in the background or in the upbringing or in the particular society that people belong to, they were failed.

THE COURT: You are speaking now of the defendants.

THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Of the defendants.

THE COURT: All right, go ahead, Mr. Reiner.

MR. REINER: Thank you, your Honor.

Q BY MR. REINER: Notwithstanding anything that you have seen or heard or read, were any impressions or opinions that you presently may have prior to coming into this case -- you will be instructed if you are a juror in this case to presume that the defendants are innocent.

Will you so presume?

A I would.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

26

Q Do you in fact presume that Leslie Van Houten is innocent until and unless evidence to the contrary is offered?

> A I presume she is innocent.

Q I speak of evidence being presented to the contrary, I mean evidence beyond all reasonable doubt and evidence that relates to Leslie Van Houten, not evidence that would relate to some other defendant or defendants in this case.

Do you appreciate that?

A I appreciate that.

L3A-1	1	Q So even if there was evidence in this case that
-	2	proved to your mind beyond all reasonable doubt that one
	3	or more defendants were guilty, nonetheless you would
	4	acquit Leslie Van Houten if the evidence as it related to
	5	her was insufficient?
	6	A I would vote for an acquittal.
	7	Q You have no reservations about that?
	8	A None at all.
	9	Q If it appeared to you in observing Miss Leslie
	10	Van Houten's conduct the past few days that it was her
	11	desire to be convicted if any one of these defendants were
	12	convicted, would you nonetheless base the case on the
	13	evidence, not on her wishes and desires in the matter?
	14	A Based on the evidence only.
	15	Q So even if she wishes to be convicted, if
	16	any member of this Family is convicted, you would nonethe-
:	17	less acquit her if the evidence as related to her was
	18	insufficient?
	19	A I would vote for an acquittal.
	20	Q It would not be her wishes in the matter that
	21	would be controlling; it would be the evidence.
	22	A The weight of the evidence.
	23	MR. REINER: Thank you very much. I have no further
	24	questions.
	25	T will mass for cause, Your Honor.

MR. SHINN: Pass for cause, your Honor.

26

2

3.

4

5

6 7

·8

9.

10 11

12

13 14

1**5**

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.

MR. STOVITZ: No questions, your Honor.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. BONNER

BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Bonner, do you think you will be able to put aside, assuming you are selected as a juror in this case, that you will be able to put aside everything that you read or heard about this case, and decide the case solely on the evidence developed during the trial?

A Yes, sir.

- Q Do you have any question about that at all?
- A None whatsoever.
- Q As of this moment have you formed any opinion one way or the other as to the guilt or innocence of any defendant in the case?

A No, sir, I have not.

Q Do you think that you will be able to dispassionately consider and weigh the evidence and apply the law as given to you by the Court in its instructions, and base your decision solely on that evidence and in accordance with the law?

A yes, sir, I think so.

THE COURT: All right, sir.

MR. KANAREK: May we approach the bench?

THE COURT: Very well. 13a3 1 (The following proceedings were had at the 2 bench out of the hearing of the prospective jurors:) 3 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I do interpose a challenge 4 for actual bias. 5 THE COURT: I cannot hear you. 6 MR. KANAREK: I interpose a challenge for actual 7 bias. 8 THE COURT: Actual bias? 9: MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: On what basis? 11: MR. KANAREK: On the basis of the man's exposure to 12 the publicity, and because of all the publicity involved. 13 MR. REINER: I wish to withdraw my previous 14 indication that I pass for cause in regard to this 15 prospective juror. 16 I enter a challenge for cause under Section 17 1073 of the Penal Code. 18 THE COURT: I did not hear the last part. 19 MR. REINER: Pursuant to 1073 of the Penal Code. 20 THE COURT: All right, very well. 21 Mr. Shinn, do you have any remarks? MR. STOVITZ: 22 MR. SHINN: No remarks. 23 MR. STOVITZ: The People have no remarks. 24 THE COURT: The challenges will be disallowed. 25 MR. KANAREK: I have another request. 26

13a4

Ż

1

3

4

5 6

. 7

8

ìò

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

-, •

18^{*}

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

I have a request that -- I'm sure -- in any event, Mr. Reiner --

THE COURT: Keep your voice up.

MR. KANAREK: Mr. Reiner uses the word "Family."

I object to the use of that word, "Family."

There is no showing of any family in that usual sense of the word.

I would object and ask your Honor to admonish the jury that the word "family" is not to be used for any purpose whatsoever.

There is no eyidence before them of anything about a family, and that they should strike from their minds — a pure admonishment not sufficing. I would ask for a mistrial because this conspiracy count that has been made against Mr. Manson is one wherein this constant use of the word "Family" has a prejudicial effect which denies him a fair trial.

We ask for the admonishment, and as I say, the relief that we asked for.

I think that this is very damaging to Mr. Manson. There is no evidence -- I don't want to be repetitive, but that is my request of the Court, that I have enunciated.

THE COURT: Well, did I understand you correctly that you made a motion for a mistrial?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, my motion is that, your Honor,

first, my motion is that your Honor admonish the jury that there is nothing before them that there is any Family or any kind of such relationship, and there is no evidence 3. before them of anything, including any Family relationship. A mere admonishment not sufficing, I ask for a mistrial. Well, let me see if I understand you. THE COURT: You want me to admonish the jury first and then declare a mistrial? MR. KANAREK: The reason I say that is this, your Honor, I am asking for a mistrial 12.

13B

13b-1

-5

15.

THE COURT: This is based upon Mr. Reiner's statements--

MR. KANAREK: Not just Mr. Reiner's, the constant reiteration, and the use of the word, "Family," what has been in the press, for instance, the inculcation in their mind of this is conducive to the prosecution's theory of conspiracy, and therefore I think that the admonishment --

THE COURT: Well, I don't think there have been any prejudicial references to any Family, a term that has been used only in the context of questions trying to elicit any actual or implied bias on the part of these prospective jurors.

These have been perfectly legitimate inquiries.

Counsel have simply been trying to find out
what the jurors' state of mind is with respect to what
they have read and seen.

MR. KANAREK: I know, your Honor, but what I am saying is I think the cases hold in order to raise this matter on appeal you must first ask for the admonishment, and then if you feel the admonishment is not enough and it would not cure the defect, the bell having been rung, actually what I am asking for is a mistrial.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KANAREK: And I am asking for what I asked for -- that is, that the Court admonish them that there is no evidence before them, including anything -- including the relationship.

13b-2 ₁	THE COURT: The prospective juror having been fully
2	admonished as to all aspects of the voir dire examination,
.3	the motion will be denied.
4	MR. KANAREK: Including the admonishment, your Honor?
5	Your Honor will not admonish them?
6	THE COURT: I will certainly admonish them whenever
7	I feel it is necessary.
8	I don't feel it is necessary at this time
. 9	with regard to the matters you mentioned.
10	MR. KANAREK: Very well.
11	(The following proceedings were had in open
1,2	court in the presence and hearing of the prospective
13	jurors:)
14	THE COURT: It is the People's next peremptory
15	challenge.
16	MR. STOVITZ: People thank and excuse Juror No. 6,
17	Mr. Bonner, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bonner, you are excused.
19	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, in order to conserve time,
20	your Honor, I will mention that on another occasion
21	THE CLERK: Ned E. Daughdrill, N-e-d; D-a-u-g-h-d-r-i-l-1
22	THE COURT: Spell that last name once more.
23	THE CLERK: D-a-u-g-h-d-r-i-1-1.
24	THE COURT: How do you pronounce the last name,
25	sir?
26	THE JUROR: Daughdrill.

THE COURT: Daughdrill? 1 THE JUROR: Yès. 2 (Whereupon, Mr. Ned E. Daughdrill came forward 3 and was seated in seat No. 6 in the jury box.) 4 5 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OR MR. NED E. DAUGHDRILL 6 BY THE COURT: 7 . Mr. Daughdrill, have you heard and understood 8. everything that has been said in the court since you came 9. into the case? 10 Yes. If you were selected as a juror in this case 12 Q, would you be able to serve? Yes. 15 Have you had an opportunity to consider the 16 death penalty question that I have asked the other 17 prospective jurors, and your answers thereto? 18 À Yes. 19 Do you entertain such conscientious opinions 20 regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to 21make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt 22 regardless of the evidence developed during the trial? 23 Α No. Do you entertain such conscientious opinions 25 regarding the death penalty that you would automatically 26 refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence developed

1	during the t	rial?
2	A	No.
3	THE CO	URT: Mr. Fitzgerald.
4		·
5	VOI	R DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DAUGHDRILL
6	BY MR. FITZG	ERALD:
7	Q	Good afternoon.
8	A	Good afternoon.
9	କ୍	What is your business or occupation, Mr.
10	Daughdrill?	
1Ĭ	. A	I am an engineer.
12	. Q	By whom are you employed?
13.	A	Hughes Aircraft.
14	Q	Are you married, sir?
15	A	No.
16	Q	Where in the County of Los Angeles do you
17 .	reside?	
18	À	Palms.
19	Q	In the City of Los Angeles?
20	.A.	Yes.
21	ବ	Have you ever served as a juror before?
22	A	No.
23	Q	Have you read or heard anything about this
24	case?	
25	A	Yes.
26 ,	ବ	Anything that would influence you in arriving

,1	at a verdict in this case?
ž	A No.
3	Q Have you thought that over before you took
4	your seat in this trial?
5	A Yes.
. 6-	Q Do you subscribe to the Los Angeles Times or
7	any other newspaper?
. 8	A Yes, I subscribe to newspapers, more than one.
, , ,9	Q Do you subscribe to the Los Angeles Times?
1Ô·	A The Sunday Times only.
11 `	Q . Do you read the Los Angeles Times on a regular
12	basis even though you don't subscribe?
13	A Fairly often.
14	Q Have you read anything in the Times about
15	this case?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Have you also read other newspapers in connec-
18	tion with this case?
13c fls. 19	A Yes.
20	
21	
22	
23	
. 24	
25	
.26	

	- 1	
3 - c-1	1	Q Have you also read about this case in
	2.	periodicals?
•	3	A I believe so.
•	4	Q Have you seen material concerning this case on
	5	television?
	6	A I do not own a TV.
	7	Q Pardon me?
	8	A I do not own a TV. I have/seen it.
	ġ. :	Q Nor have you seen it on anyone else's TV, I
· .	1Ò .	take it?
•	11	A That's correct.
	12	Q Do you own a radio?
<u> </u>	13	A Yes, through part of the time I owned a radio.
	14	Q Have you resided continuously in Los Angeles
	15	County since August of 1969?
	16	A Address during the period of the killings I-
	17	was not in the country.
	18	When did you come into the country or back into
	19	the country?
	20	A In late September of 169.
	21	Have you read anything good about the defendants
	22	in any of the materials you have been exposed to?
	23	A Yes.
<u>. </u>	2,4	Q And what was the source of that information?
	25	A The L.A. Free Press.
,	26	Q Other than that publication did you read

13C2

2

1

3

4

5 6

÷

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18.

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

anything good about the defendants or anything concerning their good character?

A No. I -- well, I read -- I am an avid reader and read the papers, I am also fairly selective, and I don't read that type of material in the paper, so while I have read periodically, it has not been a continuous deluge of articles.

THE COURT: Keep your voice up, please.

MR. DAUGHDRILL: Excuse me.

THE COURT: I heard the answer, but it was a little difficult to hear, and I think some of the people in the back of the court may have trouble.

Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: Were you exposed to any of the publicity in connection with Mr. Kanarek and Mr. Younger?

A Not until it was brought up in the courtroom.

Q Your exposure to it has been based on the materials that have been presented here in court?

A After that episode here in the courtroom I did read about it.

Q - And was that in the Los Angeles Times and the Los Angeles Herald Examiner?

A It was in the Los Angeles Times.

Q If I were to ask you all the questions I have asked all of the other preceding prospective jurors, would your answers be approximately the same?

1303	j	A Yes, as far as I can recall any questions.
<u> </u>	2	Q Is there any question you think you would
	3	answer any differently?
	4	A Well, I have a little bit of trouble association
	5	your questions with everybody else's questions.
	6	Q Well, all right, just assume the amalgam of
	· 7	all the questions, all those weird, hundreds of questions
	8	were asked of you, is there any particular area of
	9	questioning to which you would respond any differently?
	10	A No.
	II	Q You obviously understand what my role is in
	12	this proceeding?
	13	A I guess I would have to say that I just barely
	14	began a law study, but it's not a planned thing, it is a
	45	personal thing.
	16	Q on your own you are studying law?
	17	A Yes.
	18	Q And is that through some organized program of
	19	studying, a correspondence school?
	2 0	A Yes.
ı	2 1	Q Lasalle University?
•	22	A Yes.
	23	Q Are you in your first year, first materials?
	24	A That's correct.
	25	Q Are there any materials concerning criminal
-,	26	law?

	A None at all.
1	Q Contracts, torts, that sort of thing?
2	A Contracts.
3 4	Q Is there any other area or any other particular
5	question that you feel should be asked of you?
6	A No.
7	Q If you were in my shoes would you ask you any-
8	thing?
9	A No.
10	Q If you were on trial here would you be satis-
11	fied to have a juror in your state of mind to sit in judg-
12	ment?
13	A Yes.
14	Q can you think of any reason why you cannot be
15	fair and impartial to the defendants in this case?
16	A No.
17	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you very much.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Reiner?
19	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DAUGHDRILL
20	BY MR. REINER:
21	Q Mr. Daughdrill, you indicated that you are an
22	avid, although a selective, reader of the newspaper, is
23	
. 24	
25	
26	recently you have been selective to the point of not

· 1	reading the stories about this case with any degree of				
2	care or regularity?				
3	A on the contrary, the opposite is true.				
4	Q Oh, so lately you have been reading the				
5	stories on this case with some degree of care?				
6	A Well, not quite to that extent, but let's				
7	say lately I have read on the case whereas before I				
8	specifically avoided reading about it.				
9 ,	Q When did it begin that you started to read				
10	more carefully about this case?				
11	A Since I have been on jury duty.				
12	Q Was that since you were called to this court-				
13	room or since you were called to meet in the assembly room				
14	across the street?				
15	A I think since I was called to this courtroom.				
16	Q To this particular courtroom. Prior to that				
17	it was not your practice to read very much about this case,				
18	is that the truth?				
19	A That is true.				
20	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
21	,				
22	•				
23					
24					
25					
26.					

	,	•	•
14-1	1	କୃ	However, when the case first broke, that is,
	2	when the arr	ests first occurred, at that time, presumably
	3	you did read	about the case; would that be true?
•	4	A	No.
	5	Ą.	Even at the time that the case strike that
	6	even at the	time that the arrests occurred, your interests
	7	or your atte	ntion was not attracted to this particular
	8	case?	
	ģ.	A	Offhand I could not even recall when the arrests
	10	occurred.	
	11	Q:	But the name Manson was familiar to you?
	12	A	Very familiar.
	13	ବ	How was it that you became familiar with the
	14	name Manson?	Was it through the newspapers, radio, television
	15	conversation	s that you overhead?
	16	A	A conglomerate of all of these.
	17	Q	You do recall reading of Mr. Manson in, say,
	18	the Los Ange	les Times from time to time?
	19	A	Yes.
	20	Q.	And you saw his name mentioned in, oh, just
,	21	a number of	headlines?
	22	A	Innumerable.
	23	Q	Innumerable headlines?
	24		Would it be a fair statement to say that
	25 ,	in these hea	dlines the guilt of Mr. Manson was hinted at?
	26	· A	Definitely.

14-2 Perhaps it was even more hinted at: the 1 headlines seemed to suggest that his guilt was a foregone 2 conclusion; would that be a reasonable statement? 3 That is my opinion. 4 A 5 Q: It is not your opinion that his guilt is --6 A That is my opinion of the papers. 7 Q. Yes. 8. Now, of course, would you agree that it is, 9 as a practical matter, impossible to know for sure whether 10 our subsconscious is perhaps influenced by suggestions that 11 we receive over many months from the media? 12 I believe that you tell someone some-13 thing long enough and he will believe it. 14 Q So, at this time, you would accept as a 15 reasonable proposition that it is possible that you have 16 a belief in the guilt of these defendants, or some of them, 17 because of the constant exposure to headlines in the 18 newspapers which assumed his guilt? 19 Would that be a reasonably fair statement? 20 Definitely not. 21 It would not? 22 No. 23 So at this point you feel that you have not 24. been influenced by these headlines that you have seen? 25 That is correct. Ą 26 You feel that if you were instructed that you Q

ŀ	
1	must presume the defendants are guilty, you will presume
2	they are guilty? I am sorry. That these defendants are
3	innocent, you will presume that they are innocent?
4	A I am presuming that at the present time.
. 5	Q You, in fact, do presume that they are
6	innocent?
7	A Yes.
-8	Q Unless and until there is evidence to the
.9	contrary?
10	A That is correct.
11	Q You are presently an engineer at Hughes
12	Aircraft?
13	A Correct.
14	Q And you are studying law/evenings or in
15	your spare time?
16	A In my spare time is a little more apt.
17	Q Why in the world would you want to leave
18	the field of engineering to become a lawyer?
19	A Well, as I indicated, it really wasn't my
20	expressed purpose to become a lawyer; more for personal
21	interests.
22	MR. REINER: I have m further questions. Thank you.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
24	MR. SHINN: Pass for cause.
25	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?
26	MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.

MR. STOVITZ: The People have no questions, your Honor.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DAUGHDRILL
BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Daughdrill, do you believe that if you are selected as a juror you will be able to put out of your mind anything you may have read, seen or heard about the case or any of the defendants and decide the case solely on the evidence presented during this trial?

A I find the two statements very hard to connect or to -- well, I find that I am in disagreement with the part about putting it completely out of my mind. I don't think that it is possible.

Q If I said that, I will reword it.

Do you think you would be able to put aside what you may have read, seen or heard? I know it is difficult to ask yourself not to think of something because you find yourself thinking about it, but can you put aside, recognizing what you may have read, heard or seen, and separate that from what you would hear and see and what you would learn through the evidence and the Court's instructions at the trial and decide the case solely on the evidence at the time?

A Yes.

•

14a fls.

la-1	1	Q Do you have any questions or mental
_	2	reservation about that, Mr. Daughdrill?
	3	A None.
	4	Q As you sit here today, have you formed any
	5	opinion as to the guilt or innocence of any defendant in
	6	this case?
	7	A I formed an opinion that they are innocent
	8	because they are supposed to be innocent, but aside from
	9	that, your Honor
	10	Q By that you mean you are willing to accept the
	11	Court's instruction that every defendant is presumed to be
	12	innocent until the contrary is proved? Is that what you
	13	mean, sir?
	14	A I hope I go further than just accepting it, your
	15	Honor.
	16	Q I beg your pardon?
	17	A I hope I go further than just accepting it.
	18	I believe it.
	19	Q Yes. But I mean, you have not formed any
	20	opinion that any defendant is guilty; is that right?
	21	A That is correct.
	22	THE COURT: Any further questions, gentlemen?
	23	MR. STOVITZ: No questions.
	24	MR. REINER: No, your Honor.
	25	MR. KANAREK: May we approach the bench, your Honor?
	26	THE COURT: Yes.

(Whereupon, all counsel approached the bench

and the following proceedings occurred at the bench out-_4a2 1 side of the hearing of the prospective jurors:) 2 3 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. Because of the exposure, your Honor, I must challenge this man for 4 actual bias. 5 MR. STOVITZ: Submit it, your Honor. 6 MR . KANAREK: That is my motion, your Honor. 7 8. MR. REINER: We would also interpose a challenge for cause based on 1073 of the Penal Code. 9 10 MR. FITZGERALD: Join. 11 MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Shinn, do you want to join in the 12 motion for actual bias? 13 MR. SHINN: Join. 14 MR. STOVITZ; We will stipulate to actual bias as to this juror, your Honor. 15 16 MR. KANAREK: I am not going to stipulate. **17** THE COURT: I beg your pardon? 18 MR. STOVITZ: They all made a motion to excuse this 19 juror for actual bias, and I will stipulate with them that 20 this juror is biased. 21 MR. REINER: Okay, we will accept the stipulation. **22** MR . KANAREK: No. 23 MR. REINER: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Just a moment. 25 MR. STOVITZ: I was going to say that if ever a juror 26 expressed disinterest in a case and shown that he can be

	ļ	
14a3	1	completely objective, this juror has.
_	2	THE COURT: I take it that your remarks were made to
	3	be facetious?
	4	MR. STOVITZ: Yes, your Honor.
	5	THE COURT: I find no evidence of actual bias on the
	6	part of this juror and the challenge will be disallowed.
	7	MR. KANAREK: May the record reveal that both
	8	Mr. Stokes and Mr. Bonner were of the black and Negro race?
	9	May the record so state?
	10	THE COURT: Yes.
	11	MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.
	12	(Whereupon, all counsel returned to their
	13	respective places at the counsel table and the following
	14	proceedings occurred in open court within the hearing and
	15	presence of the prospective jurors:)
	16	THE COURT: The defendants may exercise a joint
3	17	peremptory challenge.
	18	MR. FITZGERALD: There will not be the exercise of a
	19	joint peremptory at this time, your Honor.
	20	Defendant Patricia Krenwinkel will accept the
	21	jury as now constituted.
	22	THE COURT: Mr. Reiner?
	23	MR. REINER: Your Honor, we would thank and excuse
	24	juror No. 2, Mr. Rollins.
	25	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Rollins. You are excused.
	26	THE CLERK: Harold F. Fogt; H-a-r-o-1-d, F-o-g-t.
	I	

1	Would you pronounce your name, please?
2	MR. FOGT: Fogt.
3	THE CLERK: F-o-g-t, is that the correct spelling?
4	MR. FOGT: Yes.
5	THE CLERK: Thank you.
6	(Whereupon, Mr. Harold F. Fogt was seated in
7	seat No. 2 in the jury box.)
8	
9	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF HAROLD F. FOGT
10	BY THE COURT:
11	Q Mr. Fogt, have you heard and understood every-
12	thing that has been said in the court since you came into
13	the case, sir?
14	A Yes.
15	Q If you are selected as a juror will you be able
16	to serve?
17	A No.
18	Q What is your situation, sir?
19	A My wife is a semi-invalid and she can't be
20	alone at night.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

.4B

146-1	1	Q And you are required to be present to care
	2	for her?
	3,	A Yes. She has no sense of balance and she
	4	also has a heart condition, and in the dark she is
	5	helpless.
	6	Q And does she rely wholly on you for her care?
	7	A Yes.
	8	Q Is this something that is likely to continue
	9	indefinitely?
	10	A She has had it for about 17 years.
	11	Q And there is no one else that can care for her
	12	A No.
<u>.</u>	13	Q Are you asking to be excused, sir?
	14	A Yes.
	15	THE COURT: Very well, you are excused, then, for
	16	hardship reasons.
•	17	THE CLERK: Oscar A. Graf; O-s-c-a-r, G-r-a-f.
	18	(Whereupon Mr. Oscar A. Graf came forward
	19:	and was seated in the jury box.)
	20 ·	
	21	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. OSCAR A. GRAF
	22	BY THE COURT:
	23	Q Mr. Graf, have you heard and understood
	24	everything that has been said in court since you came
	25	into the case?
	26	A Way T 111

A

Yes, I did.

1	Q I think you may not have the switch on the
2	mike.
3	A Yes, I did.
4	Q If you are selected as a juror, Mr. Graf,
5	would you be able to serve?
6	A No. I would like to be excused.
7	I am going to make a trip to Germany for a
8	reunion with the family. It has already been paid for.
9 .	Q When is that/scheduled?
10	A The middle of August.
11	Q That is something that has been planned for
12	sometime, has it?
13	A Yes. It was planned before this trial
14	started.
15	Q How long do you anticipate being gone?
16	A Oh, about six weeks. And when I come back,
17	I could serve again.
18	THE COURT: I am afraid we couldn't wait.
19.	Very well, you will be excused, sir, for
20	hardship.
21	MR. GRAF: Thank you.
22	MR. FITZGERALD: May we approach the bench?
23	THE COURT: Just one moment, Mr. Graf. Would you
24	be seated for just one moment.
25	MR. GRAF: Yes, sir.
26	THE COURT: All right.

(Whereupon all counsel approach the bench 1 and the following proceedings occurred at the bench 2 outside of the hearing of the prospective jurors:) 3 MR. FITZGERALD: On behalf of Defendant Patricia 4 Krenwinkel, I will object to the Court excusing this 5 juror for hardship. 6 I don't think his situation amounts to an 7 actual hardship. 8 MR. SHINN: Join. 9 Join, your Honor. MR. KANAREK: 10 MR. STOVITZ: Unless we are going to resume the 11 case aboard ship or aboard a plane, I think it is going 12 to be difficult for him to think about this trial with 13. his family going to Germany for a reunion. 14 I submit, your Honor, that you have the 15 inherent power to excuse this juror for actual hardship. 16 MR. FITZGERALD: I am not questioning your Honor's 17 I am suggesting that there is insufficient showing. 18 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I must join with Mr. 19 I do join with Mr. Fitzgerald. Fitzgerald. 20 THE COURT: On what basis, Mr. Kanarek? 21 MR. KANAREK: What is that, your Honor, 22 THE COURT: On what grounds, Mr. Kanarek? 23 The same grounds he raised? 24 MR. KANAREK: I feel that I must. It is my obliga-25 tion to the defendant. 26

THE COURT: I am not questioning your right to 1 I'm trying to find out on what basis. 2 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I think that the present 3 state of the record is such that there is an insufficient 4 basis for the somewhat summary action of discharging him. 5 THE COURT: Well, I will exercise my discretion 6 and excuse this juror for hardship. 7 (Whereupon all counsel return to their 8 respective places at the counsel table and the following 9 proceedings occurred in open court within the presence 10 and hearing of the prospective jury:) 11 THE COURT: All right. You are excused, Mr. Graf. 12 Thank you. 13 MR. GRAF: Thank you. 14 THE CLERK: Virgil L. Mead; V-i-r-g-i-1, M-e-a-d. 15 (Whereupon Mr. Virgil L. Mead came forward 16 and was seated in the jury box:) 17 18 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. VIRGIL L. MEAD 19 BY THE COURT: 20 Mr. Mead, have you heard and understood 21 everything that has been said in court since you came 22 into the case, sir? Ą. Yes, sir. 24 And if you were selected as a juror, would 25 you be able to serve? 26

Well, I'd like to make a statement, if I 1 2 may. I believe I would be prejudiced in this case. 3. I have already formed too strong opinions. 4 5 Well, I will ask you some other questions, 6 but right now I am asking you if there is any reason why you would be unable to serve; that is, a personal 8. hardship reason? À No, there is no hardship reason, I don't 14c f1s10 suppose. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 23 24 25 26

14c-1

2

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16.

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

.25

26

Q Have you formed some opinion about the guilt or innocence of any of the defendants in this case? Is that what you meant to say, Mr. Mead?

A I am afraid I have, sir.

Q Do you believe that you could put aside your opinion as to the guilt of any defendant and listen to the evidence in the case and fairly and impartially decide the case on the evidence?

A I don't believe I could, sir, because I followed this case and I have discussed it at work too many times, and I have pretty strong opinions to begin with.

Q You feel that you would be unable to be impartial, sir?

A I feel like I wouldn't be a fair juror, your Honor.

Q And this is based upon your presently-held opinions as to the guilt of one or more of the defendants?

A Well, it has been since, as I say, since whenever they apprehended them, in December sometime, I believe.

Q Yes. But what I am trying to do is to ascertain your state of mind as you sit here now, Mr. Mead.

A Well, as I say, I don't believe I could put that out of my mind.

Q Are you saying that you now hold opinions concerning the guilt of one or more of the defendants?

A I am afraid so.

And you believe that you would be unable to put

those out of your mind and decide the case solely on the ,4C2 1 evidence? 2 A Right. 3 I beg your pardon? 4 I said that is right. I wouldn't. Α •5 Q Is there any question in your mind about that? 6 7 A Not now, no. 8 THE COURT: Do counsel wish to inquire? MR. FITZGERALD: No. 9 10 THE COURT: Pass for cause, Mr. Fitzgerald? 1.1 MR. FITZGERALD: Hardly. 12 The defendants would interpose an objection for cause pursuant to Penal Code Section 1073, Subdivision 2. 13 14 MR. REINER: Yes, your Honor. On behalf of Leslie Van Houten, we would also challenge the juror for cause 16 pursuant to Penal Code Section 1073. 17 MR. SHINN: Join, your Honor. 18 MR. KANAREK: Join, your Honor. 19 MR. STOVITZ: Submit it, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: All right. You will be excused, sir, 21 thank you. 22 THE CLERK: Donald W. Jackson; D-o-n-a-1-d, 23 J-a-c-k-s-o-n. 24 (Whereupon, Mr. Donald W. Jackson was seated in seat No. 2 in the jury box.)

26

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DONALD W. JACKSON BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Jackson, have you heard and understood everything that has been said in court since you came into the case?

A I have.

Q If you were selected as a juror, Mr. Jackson, would you be able to serve?

A I don't believe so, sir.

Q What is your situation?

A I work for the Boy Scouts, and for 30 days or so we can serve, but I don't believe they would continue our salary beyond that period, sir.

Q Is this something that you know to be a fact?

A This was mentioned when I first came on jury duty. I can't say definitely on it, but this was the impression I got, your Honor.

Q Is it something that you might be able to ascertain between now and tomorrow morning?

A I am sure it is.

Q Is it a matter of official policy of the Boy Scouts?

A We have four more people on jury duty right now, your Honor. This is part of it.

I will ask you, then, if you will, Mr. Jackson, ascertain tonight whether or not your compensation would be

24.

.25

26

continued if you were selected as a juror in this case and let us know in the morning.

Would you do that, sir?

A Yes, sir.

Q In the meantime, I will ask you some other questions.

Have you had an opportunity to consider the death penalty questions that I have asked the other prospective jurors and their answers to those questions?

A I have.

Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?

A No. I do not.

Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence developed during the trial?

A No, I do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, do you wish to inquire?
MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you, your Honor.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Q Mr. Jackson, what is the nature of your

1	duties with	the Boy Scouts of America?
2	A	I am what they call a District Executive and I
3	have charge	of a geographical area.
4 .	ତ୍	Do you supervise the supervisors of boys?
.5	A	Yes.
6	Q.	Are you married, Mr. Jackson?
7	A	Yes.
8.	Q.	Do you have any children of your own, sir?
9	A . •	I have three.
10	Q `	Three?
11	A	Yes.
12`	Q	Could you give me their ages and sex, please?
13		They are all boys; ages 17, 20 and 22.
14.	Q,	Is your wife employed outside the home?
15	A	No, she is not.
16	Q ; ,	Do you reside in the County of Los Angeles?
17	A	In La Canada.
18	` Q	La Canada?
1 9	A	Yes.
20	Q	Have you ever served as a juror before,
21	Mr. Jackson	?
22	A	If I may elaborate on this? I am not quite sure,
23	your Honor.	
24		In civilian court, no. In military court, I
25	have had ex	tensive service on all levels of military trials.
26	Q.	Did you have some experience in the military?

1	A Yes. I am retired from the military.
2	Q What branch of the service were you in,
3.	Mr. Jackson?
4	A I was in the infantry.
5 .	
6.	
7	
8	
۰9.	
10	
11 12	
12 13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
,29·	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	· .
26	

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

÷		<u>[</u>	•
15-1	1	Q	In the Army, the United States Army?
);	2	A	Army, that's right.
	3	Q	How long were you in the Army?
	4.	A	20 years.
	5	Q (You were recently discharged from the Army?
	6	A *	About six and a half years ago.
	7	Q	And what rank were you?
	8	A	I was a Major.
	· 9 ,	Q N	And what was the nature of your duties
	10	toward the en	d of your tour of duty?
	11	A '	My general assignment at that time?
	12	Q + 3+	Yes.
	13	A	I had several.
	14	٠	I was a headquarters commandant in a
	15	training cent	er.
	16		I was echelon personnel officer for a
	17	training regi	ment, and I was an escort supply officer
	18	for a training	g regiment.
	19	Q	Did you sit on summary court martials.
	20	A.	I was a summary court martial; I was a member
	21	at times of a	special court martial; and I was a member
•	22	of a general	court martial.
•	23	ବ	Did you sit on any courts martial is
	24	it courts mar	tial?
1	25	A	I believe the term is martials, yes.
	26	Q	Involving charges of criminal homicide?
		į.	

	A Yes, I have. I have also been a witness in
1	a case such as that, and I have performed the Article 32
2	investigations that are required prior to referral to
3	general court martial of such cases.
5	Q Do you consider that you were identified
ę́	with law enforcement, by and large, what I mean by law
ÿ ,	enforcement, we are all interested in the enforcement of
.8. :	the law, we refer to police officers, investigators,
	investigative agencies, that sort of thing?
10	A Not in that sense, actually, no, although
111	I do have some relatives on police forces.
12	I have a nephew on the Deputy Sheriff of
13	Los Angeles County and a brother-in-law in the Glendale
14	Police Force.
15 `	Q Do you see these relatives occasionally?
16	A Yes, I do.
17	Q From time to time when you see them do they
18:	discuss with you their views of crime and law enforcement,
19	et cetera?
20	A Yes, they do.
21	Q Are their opinions by and large your opinions
22	or is there a community of opinion on most of these
23	subjects?
24	A For the most part, we have some differences.
25.	Q But by and large you are in agreement?
'26 ·	A That is correct.

1	Q In your seat in the audience were you able
Ż	to hear the questions I addressed to the other prospective
3	jurors, or that defense counsel generally or all counsel
4	addressed to the prospective jurors?
5	A Yes, sir, I did.
6	Q If each of those questions were asked of
7	you, to the best of your recollection would your answers
8	be approximately the same?
' 9	A Yes, other than the tings I have indicated
10	here already.
11	MR. FITZGERALD: Fine, thank you.
1 2	MR. REINER: If the Court will bear with me for
13	just a moment, your Honor.
14	Your Honor, I have no questions.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn, do you have any questions.
16	MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.
17 .	
18	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. JACKSON
19	BY MR. SHINN:
20	Q Mr. Jackson, did you hear or read about
21	Mr. Kanarek?
22	A Yes, I did.
23	Q Mr. Manson's attorney?
24	A Yes, I have read and seen it on television.
25	Q Which paper do you read?
26	A . I subscribe to the Los Angeles Times, the

1	Examiner and the Glendale News-Press.
2	Q You read it in all three papers?
3	A Yes, I did.
4	Q Do you recall what you read about Mr.
5	Kanarek?
6	A Generally, yes.
7	Q Do you remember what you read about him?
8	A Yes, I could not quote it verbatim, but I
9	know the general substance.
10	Q What was the general subject of Mr. Kanarek
11	MR. STOVITZ: That is objected to as immaterial,
12	your Honor.
i 3 .	MR. SHINN: It is the same question I asked the
14	other jurors before, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Objection overruled, you may answer.
16	MR. JACKSON: Generally that he was being charged
17	by the District Attorney, Younger, for incompetency,
18	based on previous actions, I guess.
19	BY MR. SHINN:
20	Q And I believe you stated you saw it on
21	television too?
22	A Yes, I saw Mr. Younger's press conference,
23	I believe it was the portion that was televised.
24	Q And do you recall what was said on the
25	television show?
26	A Part of it. ves.

	1	
•	1	Q Was it regarding Mr. Kanarek's incompetency?
	2	A Yes, that's correct.
	š	Q Now, would the fact that you heard about
	4	Mr. Kanarek's incompetency, would that in any way
	5	prejudice Mr. Manson?
	6	A. Not in my opinion, no.
•	7	MR. SHINN: No further questions.
	8	THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Kanarek?
l5a fls.	9	MR. KANAREK: No questions, thank you.
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13 ′	
	14	
	15	
	16	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	17	
	18	
•	19	
	20	3
, `	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	

-A-1	1	MR. REINER: With leave of the Court, may I ask a
	2	few questions of this prospective juror, your Honor?
	3	THE COURT: Yes.
	4	MR. REINER: Thank you.
	5	
	6.	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. JACKSON
	7	BY MR. REINER:
	8	Q Mr. Jackson, before being called to court as a
,	9	prospective juror in this case you were familiar with
	10	Mr. Manson, at least his name and likeness, is that true?
	11	A Yes, that's correct.
	12	Q Were you as well familiar with the name and
	13	likeness of any other defendants in this case?
	14	A Some of them, although if I heard them I
	15	would recognize them; if I heard the name spoken, I would
	16	not necessarily remember them on the spur of the moment.
	17	Q Before coming to court had you heard the name
	18	Susan Atkins?
	19	A Yes, I had.
	20	Q Patricia Krenwinkel?
	21	A Yes.
	22	Q Leslie Van Houten?
	23	A Yes.
	24	Q Did you recognize Susan Atkins when you saw
	25	her, from her pictures as they appeared in the newspapers?
	26	A No. I did not.

•].		
5a2	1,	Q I	liss Krenwinkel?
	2	A 1	None of the girls.
	3	ં & ગ	But you did recognize Mr. Manson?
	4	A t	Chat's right.
	5	Q 1	Did you hear the questions that were put to the
	6	other prospec	ctive jurors by Mr. Fitzgerald and myself
	7	earlier?	
	. 8	A	That's correct.
	9	Q ;	And at the time you heard those questions you
	10	anticipated	that perhaps you would be asked the same
	11	questions if	you were called to the jury box?
	12	A !	That's right.
	13	ે & ક	So at the time you made some attempt to answer
	14	the question	s in your own mind as they were being asked?
	15	A ·	That's right.
	16	Q (Since that time you have spent the time here in
	17	court consid	ering what your answers might be, is that true?
	18	A.	That is true.
,	- 19	Q ;	Now, up until his Honor admonished you during
	20	the noon rec	ess not to read newspapers or watch television
	21	with regards	to matters pertaining to this trial, prior to
	22	that time yo	u did, of course, read about this case in the
	23	newspaper an	d you did watch newscasts made in this case,
	24	didn't you?	Sometimes, not continually.
	25	Â.	Sometimes, not continually.
	26	Q	Well, from the time you were called

∡5a3

18[,]

6

to court as a prospective juror and the time that his Honor admonished you that you were no longer to read the papers, you did see some stories in the newspaper, you did see some stories on the news programs relating to this particular trial, did you not?

A Not to the trial itself, other than Mr. Kanarek and the District Attorney, that was the only thing I saw on television.

- Q You did watch that on television?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q You read about it in the newspapers?
- A That's right.
- Q Now, if there appeared any suggestion in any of these articles or anything that was on television relative to the guilt or innocence of any of the defendants in this case, you would have disciplined yourself not to accept such suggestion because you recognized you were a prospective juror in the case.

Would that be fair to say?

- A Yes, it would.
- Q However, last September at the time these arrests occurred it did not occur to you that you might be a juror in this case, did it?
 - A No, definitely not.
- Q That was perhaps the furthest thing from your mind at that time, was it not?

2	

3

4

5

6

7 R

9

10

11 12

13

14.

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Α That's right.

Q so at that time there was no reason that you knew of that you had to discipline yourself to ignore any suggestions that might come to you from the media with respect to these respective defendants, is that true?

> That's right. A

Q In fact, you did not discipline yourself at that time?

> That's right. A

Would it be a fair statement to say that the totality of all of the information that you received from the media, newspapers, radio and television, that the sum and substance pointed toward the guilt of the defendants or some of them?

> Α Yes, it would.

Q And at that time you accepted the suggestions and assumed tentatively perhaps, but at least assumed at that time that these stories were substantially accurate, and that the defendants or some of them were in fact guilty?

A . Yes, you could say that.

All right, and nothing has occurred to date to change the impression that you have, is that true?

> That's right. A

MR. REINER: Thank you. I have no further questions.

MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Shinn?

MR. SHINN: I pass. sa5

9

MR. KANAREK: No questions.

MR. STOVITZ: May we continue tomorrow?

THE COURT: It is 4:15.

MR. STOVITZ: Would your Honor be able to indicate one way or the other whether or not we will have, say, a 3:00 o'clock recess tomorrow or are we going to go to 4:15 again?

It is just the Friday afternoon traffic.

THE COURT: Well, I am sorry, Mr. Stovitz, no one would like a holiday more than I.

Unfortunately tomorrow is not a legal holiday, and I plan to go the full session.

MR. STOVITZ: Just so we can plan.

THE COURT: We need all of the time we can get for the trial matters.

Ladies and gentlemen, do not converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject relating to the case, nor form or express any opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to those of you who are selected as jurors.

Please do not forget my further admonition not to read, watch or listen to anything about the case on any of the media, or allow yourselves to be influenced inadversently, or otherwise, by anything read, seen or heard by you concerning the case or any of the parties, witnesses, attorneys, or anything else relating to the case.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

9:47 A.M.

iiQ

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22.

24

25

26

Cielo Drive.com ARCHIVES

And at that time you accepted the

suggestions and assumed tentatively perhaps, but

"at least assumed at that time that these stories 1 were substantially accurate, and that the 2 defendants or some of them were in fact guilty?" 3: And I believe you answered, "Yes, you 4 could say that," And the question by Mr. Reiner was: 6 "All right, and nothing has occurred 7 to date to change the impression that you have, is 8 that true?" 10 And I believe you answered "That's right." Is that the way it went yesterday, sir? 11 12 I believe that is substantially correct, yes. 13 Now, you believe that these defendants, like 14 all defendants, are afforded the presumption of innecence 15 at the start of a criminal trial. 16 Do you understand that? 17 I appreciate that. 18 Are you willing to afford these defendants 19 that presumption of innocence? 2 fls. 20 Yes, if I was on the jury I would. 21 22 23 24 25 26

ģ

.

.

A -			١,	4	4 - 4 -	•		
	T.A. Trad		47.4.44	7110	***	CM C	question,	C 40
₹,		CADIA	YVV	3.40.		W (C)	メベイや (サンバ)	

can you promise the court, can you promise the defendants and their attorneys and the prosecution, that you will base your verdict solely and only and exclusively on the evidence that comes from that witness stand under oath, and not be influenced in any fashion whatsoever by anything you may have read or heard about this case outside of court?

A Yes, I believe I could.

Are you confident you can do that. Mr. Jackson?

A Yes, I am.

Q You stated that you served, sir, on several military court martials in different capacities during your career as an officer, is that correct, sir?

A . That is correct.

And were the court proceedings, Mr. Jackson, governed by the Uniform Code of Military Justice?

A Yes, they were.

I believe there is a Manual on Courts Martial also that is applicable?

A Yes, that is correct.

Q You realize, sir, that military law may, in several respects, differ from the law applicable to this case, correct? You do understand that?

A I am fully aware of that.

1	Q You understand that the law applicable to this
2	case will be given to you by the Judge? You understand
3	that?
4	A That's right.
5	Q Do you think you could sit as a juror in this
6	case and follow the law given to you by the Judge and not be
. 7	influenced by your previous exposure to military law?
:8:	A Yes, I could.
9,	Q Mr. Jackson, the prosecution as well as the
10	defense may offer psychiatric testimony in this case. Do
11	you feel that the study of psychiatry is an exact science,
12	sir, or do you feel it is more in the nature of an art?
13	A I believe it is a science.
14	Q An exact science?
15	A That's right.
16	Q Do you believe, then, sir, that the testimony of
17	a psychiatrist is the gospel truth, whatever he says is
18	infallible?
19	A No, I don't believe it is necessarily infallible
.20	any more than any person's testimony can be subject to some
21	errors.
22	Q In other words, Mr. Jackson, you do believe
23	that psychiatrists can make errors?
24	A Yes, I do.
25.	Q You understand that frequently psychiatrists
26	disagree in their evaluations, do you not?
	d .

1	A Yes, I am familiar with that.
2	Q You realize, sir, that the purpose of psychi-
3	atric testimony is
4	MR. KANAREK: I object, your Honor, to this
5	question as preinstruction of the jury.
6	What the purpose is would be up to the Court to
7	state in the jury instructions.
8	MR. STOVITZ: Your Honor, may counsel parmit other
9	counsel the opportunity to finish the question?
10	MR. KANAREK: But why inject error if it is obviously
11 ;	wrong.
12	THE COURT: I am going to overrule the objection.
13	I don't think it has reached the stage of
14	instruction yet, but it is illustrative of the point that
15	Mr. Bugliosi is trying to make.
16	MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Do you realize, sir, that the
17	purpose of psychiatric testimony is merely to assist the
18	jury during their deliberations?
19.	A Yes.
20	MR. KANAREK: I object to that, your Honor, on the
21	ground that it is an attempt to preinstruct as to what the
22	purpose is.
23	THE COURT: Overruled,
24	MR. BUGLIOSI: Q You understand that?
25	A Yes, I do.
26	Q And you understand, Mr. Jackson, that the jury

will be the trier of the fact, not any psychiatrist who may testify for the prosecution or the defense?

You understand that, sir?

A Yes, I do.

Q If the prosecution or the defense offers the testimony of a psychiatrist, will you promise to consider the psychiatric testimony in the light of all the evidence, and only give the psychiatrist's testimony that weight to which you think it is entitled?

A Yes.

Q You realize that as a juror you have the right to accept or reject the testimony of any psychiatrist, do you not?

A Yes.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

	ſ
2a-1	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
٠	7
	8
	9.
	9 10 11
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
•	20

22

23

24

26

And that is so because a psychiatrist is a witness, and you can accept or reject the testimony of any witness.

Do you understand that, sir?

A Yes, I do.

Q I understand, Mr. Jackson, that you are not opposed to the death penalty; is that correct, sir?

A That is correct.

Q After hearing all of the evidence in this case and considering all of the circumstances, you felt that this was a proper case for the imposition of the death penalty, Mr. Jackson, would you have the courage to come back into this courtroom and, in effect, by your verdict, tell these defendants that they must die?

MR. KANAREK: I object again as improper voir dire examination.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. JACKSON: Based on the evidence submitted, yes. BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Could you vote the death penalty for a female defendant, sir?

A Yes, I would.

Q You understand the rule of conspiracy which makes a conspirator equally guilty of the crime committed by his co-conspirators even though he may not have even been at the scene of the crime, do you not?

			•
2a-2	1	A	Yes.
) :	2	Q	Do you disagree with that rule of law, sir?
	3	À	No, I do not.
	4	Q.	Do you promise me that you will unhesitatingly
	5	and without	reservation whatsoever follow the Court's
·	6	instructions	on that rule of law if you find it applicable
	7	to the facts	in this case?
•	8'	A	Yes, I will.
	9.	Q.	You realize, sir, that the prosecution does
	10	not have the	burden of proving any defendant's guilt
	11	beyond all d	oubt; do you understand that?
	12 ,	A	Yes, I do.
	13	Q.	That our burden is only to prove a defendant
	14	guilty beyon	d a reasonable doubt; you understand that?
	15	A	Yes.
	16	· Q.	Do you think, Mr. Jackson, you can give the
.'	17	prosecution	a fair trial, sir?
• • •	18	. A	I believe so.
	19.	Q	You recall that Mr. Stovitz and I asked
	20	several othe	r questions of the jurors that we are not
•	21	asking you n	ow, do you not?
	.22	A	Yes, I do.
,	23	Q.	Did you mentally ask yourself the same
	24	questions?	
	25	A	Yes.
	26	Q.	Was there any question we asked to which you

2a- 3	1
	2
•	3
	4
v	5
	6
	7
	. 8
	ġ
	10
	11
	12
÷.	13
	14
•	15
	16
	17
,	18
	19
	20

said to yourself that your answer would have been different to those given by the majority of the jurors seated in the box, sir?

A The only other thing that I can think of -and I don't remember whether it was the defense or the
prosecution that asked it -- I do have some familiarity
with some of the areas that were mentioned. The Los
Feliz area, for example, and the Benedict Canyon area.

I have had a little exposure to those. More in the Los Feliz area than anything else.

Q Have you lived in or worked there, or what, Mr. Jackson?

A This is part of my area that I am responsible for.

Q In your capacity as an administrator for the Boy Scouts?

A That's right.

Q Can you think of any reason whatsoever, Mr. Jackson, why you would rather not sit as a juror on this case other than the inevitable hardship?

A No. Other than that, none.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Do the People pass for cause?
MR. STOVITZ: Yes, your Honor.

25

21

22

23

24

26

_	
1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. JACKSON
2	BY THE COURT:
3	Q Mr. Jackson, I wanted to ask you a few
4	questions.
5	Did you indicate to me yesterday that you
6	had some question about the payment of your compensation
7	if you were selected as a juror?
8	A Yes, I did.
9	Q Were you able to learn anything additionally
10	on that subject?
11	A Yes.
12.	I contacted the head of my organization last
13	night and he said that he feels that it is an honor and
14	a necessary thing for jury duty to be performed by all
15 .	people. However, since we are a non-profit organization,
16	that all compensation would stop at the end of 30 days,
17	and in all probability, on a prolonged period of time,
18	they would have to get a replacement for my job.
19	Q Is this your superior who said this?
.20	A This is the top man in our organization, yes,
21	sir.
22	Q Did you understand him to mean that that was
23	the final decision of the organization on that point?
24	A There is no higher authority to appeal to
25	in this case, sir.
26	Q Is it your understanding, then, that your

compensation will stop at the end of 30 days?

The state of the state of the

A That is correct. And also, if we go into a prolonged session, as this would in all probability do.

I probably would not have a job at the end of that time, or at least the same job if nothing else.

	- 1	·
-1	1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. JACKSON
	2	BY THE COURT:
	3	Q Do you have a family, Mr. Jackson?
	4	A Yes, I do.
	5	Q What does the family consist of?
	6	A I have a wife and three sons, and a mother-in-
,	7	law living with me.
	8	Two of the sons are currently in college. The
	9	third one is in high school; he will be starting his senior
`	10	year this fall.
	11	Q Are you the sole support of these members?
	12	A I am.
	13	Q What is the name of your company?
	14	A Los Angeles Area Council. Boy Scouts of
	15	America.
	16	THE COURT: All right, I am going to excuse you then
	17	on hardship grounds.
	18	Thank you very much, sir.
	19	MR. JACKSON: Thank you.
	20	THE COURT: Mr. Jackson, one thing, I take it you are
	. 21	asking to be excused, is that correct?
,	22	MR. JACKSON: This was my initial request, yes, sir.
	23	THE COURT: Is it still your request?
	24	MR. JACKSON: It is.
	25 .	THE COURT: All right, thank you, sir.
	26 :	THE CLERK: Michael E. Parrish: M-i-c-h-a-e-l.

P-a-r-r-i-s-h. 3-2 1 (Whereupon, Michael E. Perrish was seated in 2 meat No. 2 in the jury box.) 3 THE COURT: Before I ask Mr. Parrish any questions, 4 Mrs. Johanssen, have you been able to find out anything 5 regarding your status? 6. MRS. JOHANSSEN: Yes, I was. 7 THE COURT: What is that? Ŕ MRS. JOHANSSEN: They don't intend to pay me for a 9 prolonged period of time, over 30 days. 10 THE COURT: They will not pay you over 30 days? 11 MRS. JOHANSSEN: Right. 12 THE COURT: Would that result in an undue hardship 13 as far as you are concerned? 14 MRS. JOHANSSEN: Well, I think so, yes. 15 THE COURT: Are you asking to be excused on that 16 17 ground? MRS. JOHANSSEN: Yes. 18 THE COURT: All right, I will excuse then on hardship 19 20 grounds. 21 MRS. JOHANSSEN: Thank you. 22 THE COURT: Thank you, Mrs. Johansson. THE CLERK: Wallace P. Paxton; W-a-1-1-a-c-e, 23 24 P-a-x-t-o-n. 25 (Whereupon, Wallace P. Paxton was seated in 26 seat No. 5 in the jury box.)

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the 1 bench briefly? 2 THE COURT: Very well. 3 (The following proceedings were had at the 4. bench out of the hearing of the prospective jurous:) 5 MR. FITZGERALD: We are going to object to the Court -6 excusing the last two jurors. 7 THE COURT: Why didn't you object before they left the court? MR. FITZGERALD: I did not want to object in the 10 presence of the jury. 11 THE COURT: You waited until they left the courtroom? 12 13 MR. FITZGERALD: All right, well, forget about it, Judge, we will forget about it. 14 15 MR. KANAREK: I will enunciate on behalf of 16 Mr. Manson the fact --17 THE COURT: I cannot hear you, Mr. Kanarek. 18 It is our position, your Honor, that MR. KANAREK: 19 out of public funds there should be paid proper compensation 20 to prospective jurous; that the payment of this \$5 per day 21 is inadequate. 22 It is a violation of due process and equal 23 protection in that the criminal defendant in this case, 24 Mr. Manson, whom I represent, is denied capable jurors; 25 he is denied a proper cross-section of the community 26 representation on the jury panel, by virtue of this excusal

25

26

on the grounds of sconomic hardship.

I wonder if my objection would stand prior -THE COURT: What is the objection?

MR. KAMAREK: The objection is in excusing the jurors on economic hardship.

The point is they should be paid out of public funds to keep a good jurgr.

If you balance the benefit to the administration of justice of having capable people on the jury against the expenditure of funds, there just is no balance.

When you are trying to take a man's life away, especially, it is our position that there should be payment made out of public funds for jurors.

This is not a criterion, otherwise you get 12 dinosaurs, so to speak, on the jury, if I may use that expression.

You get the kind ---

THE COURT: You may use it. I don't know what it means. You may use it.

MR. KANAREK: Well, it is used to some extent among lawyers, your Honor.

What it means is you get the kind of people on the jury who have some personal are to grind who have some -

THE COURT: Well, I think you are just making a general argument now, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KAMAREK: Yes.

??

· 21

-26

THE COURT: Your objection is, of course, noted for the record.

Anything further?

MR. KANAREK: I would ask your Honor to do what your Honor can to see to it that, by way of using the power your Honor has -- your Honor is the judicial officer in charge of this case -- to see to it that people get paid.

THE COURT: How do you propose I do that? I have no power to change the statute.

MR. KANAREK: No, but your Honor does have the power to discharge the jury penel on the basis of a violation of equal protection and due process, and your Honor can say, and that is part of our request, that your Honor discharged the jury panel and say to the Legislature, "Unless you make provision for proper compensation for capable jurors, that the people in my court," meaning yourself, "are not getting shake.

THE COURT: I think that is something that any citizen should properly address to the Legislature.

But I don't think this Court can do anything about it.

MR. KANAREK: I think the constitutional basis, in other words, your Honor's administrating the Federal and California Constitution --

THE COURT: All right, let's not go any further.

I have your objection in mind.

1	The objection is overruled.	
2:	MR. SHINN: I join in the objection, your Honor.	ŀ
3	THE COURT: All right.	
4	MR. FITZGERALD: I join in Mr. Kanarek's objection on	
5	behalf of Patricia Krenwinkel.	
- 6	MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.	
7.	MR. REINER: Join.	
. 8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		-
16		
17		
18		
19 [.]		
. 20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

3a-1 1	(The following proceedings were had in open
.2	court in the presence and hearing of the prospective
3	jurors:)
4	
.5	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. PARRISH
6	BY THE COURT:
7	Q Mr. Perrish, have you heard and understood
8	everything that has been said in court?
9	A The name is Paxton, sir.
10	THE COURT: I'm sorry, I am addressing my remarks
11	to Mr. Parrish.
12	I will be speaking with you in a minute,
13	Mr. Paxton.
14	MR. PARRISH: Yes, sir, I have.
15	BY THE COURT:
16	Q If you were selected as a juror in this
17	case, Mr. Parrish, would you be able to serve?
18	A It would be difficult, but I think I could.
19	Q Have you had an opportunity to think about
20	the death panalty questions I put to the other prospective
21	jurors?
22	A Yes, I have.
23	Q And your answers to those questions?
. 24	A Yes, I have.
25	Q All right. I am going to put those questions
26	fo von now.

First, do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?

A No.

Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence developed during the trial?

A Yes, I would, for the simple reason that I don't think it is harsh enough.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I did not hear you.

A For the simple reason I don't think it is harsh enough.

There ought to be something worse than death, you know, for certain crimes.

If it is punishable by death or life imprisonment, it is not bad enough, you know.

They ought to be given a worse punishment than that.

Q Of course the Legislature presents to the jury just two alternatives, life imprisonment or death, in the case of murder in the first degree.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

3a-3

2

1

3

4

5, 6

Ż

8

10.

11

12

13

14 15

16

1/7

18

19

20

21^{*} 22

23

24

25

26

Q And it presents those alternatives to be selected by the jurors in their absolute discretion without any guidelines or standards of any kind by which to make that selection.

You understand that?

A Yes.

- Q Now, what I'm asking you is simply have you now made up your mind that you would under no circumstances impose the death penalty by reason of your conscientious opinions regarding it, or would you consider the evidence in the case and then decide which of the two alternatives?
 - A I would consider the evidence in the case.
 - Q I beg your pardon?
 - A I will consider the evidence, yes.
- Q And you have not automatically made up your mind one way or the other?
 - A No, I have not.
- You would be willing to consider the testimony in the case, and then make your decision as to penalty and I am assuming in asking that question that the case has got to that point, you understand my question assumes, which of course may not be the fact at all, but it assumes for the purpose of the question that there has been a conviction of murder in the first degree.

	1		•			
3a-4	1		Do you understand that?			
	2	A	Yes.			
•	3	Q	Now we are talking about the penalty phase			
	4	and I am ask	ing you if you would be willing to listen to			
	5	the evidence	before you make up your mind as to selecting			
	6	which of the	two penalties is appropriate for the case in			
	7	your opinion?				
	8	· A	Yes, I would.			
	9	Q	All right, would you pass the microphone down			
	10	to Mr. Paxton, please.				
	14		•			
	12		VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. PAXTON			
	13 '	BY THE COURT:				
	14	Q	Mr. Paxton, have you heard and understood			
	15	everything that has been said in the case since you came				
	16	into court.				
	17	A	Yes, sir.			
	18	Q	If you were selected as a juror in this case			
	19	would you be	able to serve?			
	20	A	No, I would not.			
	21	Q	What is your situation, sir?			
•	22	- A -	My employer will compensate me for 20 days			
	23	only; ten of	those days will have expired by the end of			
	24	this session	, and I wish to be excused.			
	25	· Q:	Who is your employer?			
	26	*	Wallanna Latteria Lat Compression			

1	Q Have you discussed this with some of the
2	management personnel there?
3	A Yes, sir.
.4	Q And what is the company policy again?
, ,5	A 20 working days, 20 working days only.
.6	Q And they have told you if you are selected as
7	a juror in this case or any other case that after 20 days
. 8	you would not receive any compensation?
9	A That's correct.
10	THE COURT: All right, I'm going to go to some other
11	questions at this time, without developing any further on
12	the hardship aspect, Mr. Paxton, at this time.
13 °	MR. PAXTON: All right.
14	BY THE COURT:
15	Q I'm going to put some questions to you regard-
16	ing the death penalty.
17	Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
18	regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to
19	make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt
20	regardless of the evidence developed during the trial?
21	A No, sir, I do not.
22	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
. 23	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
24	refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence?
25	A No.
3b fls26	

3B-:

1

2

3.

4 5

6

7

8 è

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18[.]

20

21 22

23`

24

25 26 THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, you may inquire.

MR. FITZGERALD: Let's start with Mr. Parrish.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. PARRISH BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Are your opinions concerning the death penalty such that if the issue were presented to you you would automatically impose the death penalty without regard to any evidence in the case?

A No. I would not.

You indicated to the Court that your feelings in connection with the death penalty were that in some respects the death penalty was not harsh enough.

Is that correct?

A That's right.

Q What did you have in mind, the rack and screw?

A Well, I am not a sadist, but something like that.

I mean, you know, well, let's say for example, you know, in a case where somebody was brutally, you know—let's say they were kidnaped and then tortured, or something like that, where they take the guy in and he goes through his trial, they might give him life imprisonment and he gets out at the end of seven years, and that is nothing.

Q How do you know he gats out at the end of seven years?

A		24
	1	42
MR.	2	
part.	3,	
jury.	4	
THE	5.	
kind?	6;	
	7	:
MR.	. 8	
Court, if	9	
THE	10	
w.' w	11	'
bench out	12	
MR.	13	
MR.	14	
MR.	15	
•	. 16	
jury not	17	
and more	18 . (
because I	19	•
in the Mo	20	•
Supreme C	21	:
out	22	Mar de de
	:23	

25

26

A.	Sometimes	they	do and	sometimes	they	don't.
	That was	iust m	y opini	on, you k	now.	•

MR. KANAREK: May we approach the bench, your Honor?

I don't wish to argue in the presence of the

THE COURT: Do you wish to make an objection of some kind?

MR. KANAREK: I also wish to make a point to the Court, if I may.

THE COURT: Very well.

(The following proceedings were had at the bench out of the hearing of the prospective jurors.)

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor --

MR. SHIMN: Speak up, I can't hear you.

MR. KANAREK: I'm sorry.

your Honor. I ask that your Honor admonish the jury not to consider that last statement for any purpose. and mere admonishment not sufficing, I ask for a mistrial, because I believe in view of the Morse decision. I believe in the Morse case, that was one of the very points why the Supreme Court ruled, that this idea that somebody can get out --

In other words, the jury being told, I think it was the prosecutor in that case --

THE COURT: I am familiar with the Morse case.

What is your objection?

b3

1 2

3

4

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

26

MR. KANAREK: I believe, your Honor, this is highly prejudicial to this entire panel, this entire jury panel.

I make a motion that the Court admonish the jury not to consider that last statement for any purpose, our position being, the bell having been rung, it cannot be unrung.

I make a motion for a mistrial, and that all of the jurors in the box and in the room be discharged from further service in this court.

THE COURT: Well, I will admonish the jury.

But I point out to you, Mr. Kanarek, that if there is a conviction in this case of murder of the first degree, on the penalty phase, that one of the mandatory instructions will be the so-called Morse instruction, and the jury will be fully instructed at that time as to what they can consider and what they cannot consider with regard to the possibility of parole, and so forth.

MR. KANAREK: Very well, that is my motion.

THE COURT: It will be specifically brought to their attention under the Morse instruction.

I will admonish them to disregard the gratuitous statement of this prospective juror which, although the statement itself was not specifically elicited, he was asked what he meant by what he said.

I think it could have been anticipated that after the initial statement that he wanted something worse