SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT NO. 104

HON. CHARLES H. OLDER, JUDGE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff,

Vs.

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

Defendants.

No. A253156

REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT Friday, October 2, 1970 A. M. SESSION

APPEARANCES:

*;***

DONALD A. MUSICH, STEPHEN RUSSELL KAY,

For the People:

VINCENT T. BUGLIOSI, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

For Deft. Manson:

I. A. KANAREK, Esq.

· "不可能,你就是你有什么。"

For Deft. Atkins:

DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Deft. Van Houten:

For Deft. Krenwinkel:

RONALD HUGHES, Esq. PAUL FITZGERALD, Esq.

LOIS R. JOHNSON,

VOLUME 111

PAGES 12523 to 12625

MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR., Official Reporters

1		,		
2	•	INDEX	,	
3	PEOPLE'S WITNESSES:	DIRECT CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
4	FLYNN, Juan		12586	12561K
5		,	•	12578H 12585K 12588K
6	•			*****
7	STRUBER, David	12593		
8				
9				
10				
n .				
12	,			
13	,			
14				
15	· · · · ,			,
16				
17	• .			
	,			
18	,	•		
19				,
20	• •			
21				
22				
23	,			
24		•		
25		•		•
26				
,	<u>.</u>			

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1970 1 SEAT A.M. 2 -----Ź (The following proceedings occur in chambers, 4 All counsel present, defendants absent.) 5. THE COURT: All counsel are present. I wanted to bring up two matters, gentlemen. 7 Pirst, with respect to the defendants. Have you 8 had an opportunity to talk with them about coming back into 9 the courtroom? 10 MR. FITZGERALD: Tes. 11 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: What is their desire? 13 MR. KANAREK; Mr. Manson told me he does not wish to, 14 your Honor. 15 THE COURT: He does not what? 16 MR. KANAREK: He does not wish to return to the . 17 courtroom, 18 MR. FITZGERALD: The female defendants indicated 19 to Mr. Hughes, Mr. Shinn and I that they could not assure us 20: of conduct that would be considered by the Court to be 21 decorous; but they didn't say they would act up. 22 They told us that they couldn't assure us they 23 wouldn't. 24 I am not trying to play word games with the 25

Court or anything. It is just that they did not say if they

ję.

were put into the courtroom and the Judge takes the bench, we are going to sing or say anything; on the other hand, they didn't give us any assurance that they wouldn't either.

My own personal opinion is that the situation has

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would request that we start out again with all of them in court. If they want to act up again. I think we should at least start with them in court. Maybe Manson won't act up. There is a chance that he won't. If he does, then he will have to be removed.

I would not like to have the proceedings continue with them outside the courtroom; especially with Mr. Flynn on the stand, who is one of the principal witnesses against

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, I think if they act up again, your Honor, it is going to affect the jury.

MR. BUGLIOSI: How long are you going to keep ---THE COURT! Whose fault would that be?

MA. SHINN: That I understand, your Honor, but we -have to have a solution where we have a happy medium. If they act up again in front of the jury, it is to their prejudice.

21

22

23

2.1

2

Ŀ

3

4

5

7.

9

10

,11

12 13

15

14

16

17

19

20 21

22

23

25

24

26

THE COURT: Well, the problem, from the Court's standpoint, is that I can't --

MR. SHINN: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: -- I can't get an unequivocal answer from anybody as to what the defendants want to do, whether they are willing to comply with the Court's rules and orders regarding their conduct.

I will indicate it to all of you they may return to the courtroom as soon as they are willing to conduct themselves in a proper manner.

MR. SHINN: I talked to them **

MR. FITZGERALD: They will not make such an affirmation. That's the problem.

I don't want to be equivocal but they are equivocal. When you sak them if they will agree to come back into the courtroom and not speak out of turn, they won't agree to that sort of a commitment.

THE COURT: Of course, it's been clear from the outset that the women take their -- the female defendants take their lead from Mr. Manson.

MR. HUGHES: I don't think that's clear, your Honor.

THE COURT: It's clear to me. That has been the pattern.

So I would suppose, from what's gone on in the past, if Hr. Manson behaves himself, they will, too.
Although we have no assurance of it.

2

1

3

4

5

Ģ

7

8

9

10

11·

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

'n

23

24

25

26

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, is it possible that all defense attorneys should talk to Mr. Manson together, then, your Honor, to try to convince him.

THE COURT: If you think it will do some good, yes.

MR. SHINN: Do you think it will help, Paul, if we all talked to him?

MR. FITZGERALD: Try.

THE COURT: I have no objection to that.

MR. SHIRM: Do you want to, Mr. Kamarek?

MR. KANAREK: Certainly.

MR. SHINN: All go talk to him.

MR. HUGHES: I don't see any necessity for my talking with Mr. Manson but --

THE COURT: I should think that Mr. Kenarek would be perfectly able to communicate with Mr. Manson his thoughts regarding his absence from the courtroom, but if you would like to have other counsel present there ---

MR. KANAREK: I have no objection to counsel -THE COURT: I'm not suggesting it. Someone also
made the suggestion. I'm just telling you I have no
objection to it.

MR. KANAREK: Perfectly agreeable in this connection, your Honor. I have -- perfectly --

THE COURT: Are you requesting that you have a joint conference?

MR. KANAREK: Certainly. I join with Mr. Fitzgerald

and Mr. Shinn and I regret that Mr. Hughes will not. MR. HUGHES: I'll go if I'm requested by Mr. Kanarek. 2 THE COURT: Is Mr. Menson in the lockup now? THE BAILIFF: He's in the lockup, your Henor. 4 MR. FITZGERALD: Maybe we can go in the back way . 5 and no one will see us. 6 THE BAILIFF: Is this a session with them inside the 7 Lockup? 8 THE COURT: Yes. They may go inside the lockup. Take them through the back door so they will not be ÌO. visible from the courtroom. 11 THE BAILIFF: Is that by themselves or with a 12 deputy in there? 13 THE COURT: By themselves. 14 MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor. 15 MR. BUGLIOSI: Then we are going to come back to 16 the chambers? 17 THE COURT: I assume this will just take a few 18. minutes, won't ft? . 19 MR. FITEGERALD: Less than five. 20 THE COURT: We will wait here in chambers unless 21 you gentlemen went to step outside. You are welcome to 22 atay. 23 MR. BUGLIOGI: I have some work to do outside. 24 (Defense attorneys and Mr. Bugliosi ratire from the court's chambers.) 3 fls. 26

24

26

THE COURT: All counsel are present.

Do you have anything to report, gentlemen?

MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Kanarek?

MR: KANAREK: What is that, your Honort

THE COURT: Do you have anything to report?

HR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

Mr. Manson wishes to remain in the lockup.

He feels that the oppression upon him by the Sheriff, by the arbitrary action, for instance, of yesterday's sui sponte, the sudden change of position as far as the lockup goes, the fact that he feels -- well, without belaboring it, your Honor, that is it.

THE COURT: Well, of course, that doesn't really answer the question, Mr. Kanarek.

He doesn't have any right to remain out of the courtroom while the trial is going on.

He has a right to be present. That right may be forfeited by disruptive conduct.

If all he is saying is that, "I prefer to remain outside," then he is coming back in.

MR. KANAREK: That is not what he is saying. I can't make that representation to the Court.

He is saying if he does come back in that there will be untoward conduct.

THE COURT: He is saying that?

MR. KANAREK: Well, what I am saying is that he is

16

17

· 18 *

19

2Ò

21

22

23

24

25

26

implying, he is telling us -- I cannot make -- we were all there, we all heard it, and I certainly can't make the representation other than what I am making, namely, that I cannot represent to the Court that he won't.

MR. HUGHES: I don't think he made any representation that he would make disruptive tactics.

THE COURT: We will start the proceeding with all the defendants back in the courtroom. I can't tell from what you gentlemen say what the intention of the defendants is, so I will give them the benefit of the doubt and we will start back in the courtroom.

I don't see any other way to handle it.

MR. PITZGERALD: I want to be clear that I am not playing any games with you, Judge, or this court.

THE COURT: No. I think the defendants are.

MR. FITZGERALD: That may be; but I hope you understand the equivocal nature of the representations made to us.

THE COURT: I have no criticism of counsel in this regard. I think you are all attempting to get them back into the courtroom where their best interests will be served.

Sometimes you can't control your clients.

I recognize that. I also recognize that there is no way that you can force an unequivocal answer out of a client if he doesn't want to give it.

3.

1

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20:

21

22

23

24

25·

26

On the other hand, since I don't have an unequivocal answer from the defendants, I am going to assume that they wish to be brought back into the courtroom and wish to continue the trial and observe the usual rules of conduct, and that is the way we will start.

If it becomes necessary to remove them again, I will tell you once more, they may return to the courtroom. et any time they are willing to affirm their desire to return and conform their conduct to the reasonable rules of the Court.

ţ

Ţ

3 ·

4.

6

5

7

9:

10

H.

12.

13,

14 15

16

17

18

19

20° 21

22

23:

24

25

26.

Now, the other matter I wanted to take up was this question of conversation on Page 12,265, which I indicated yesterday I was going to have stricken but the People wanted an opportunity to offer some points and authorities.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Before we get into that, I wanted to make one or two comments about the Court's ruling yesterday with respect to my contempt.

Does the Court want to hear me now very briefly, or after this?

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. BUGLIGSI: I'm not going to ask the Court at this point to revoke it. I may appeal.

Court's ruling was a gross, flagrant abuse of discretion.

I don't think the Court took into consideration some very obvious points and I would ask the Court in the future to consider two obvious points. Number one, this is the 16th week of a hotly-contested trial and the Court knows that in the heat of battle attorneys say things that they shouldn't say and this is understandable and I think should be condoned, unless it goes beyond permissible margins.

I would also ask the Court to keep in mind the inflammatory conduct of Mr. Kanarek yesterday. It was just kind of a culmination on my part. I don't think the Court took into consideration what this man has been doing in

Ł

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

.11

12 13

14

15

16[°] 17

18

19

20

21 22

23:

24

· 25

.26

front of the jury for several months and he continues to get by with it.

This was a response on my part. I did not initiate it. Everyone I've spoken to -- not that the Court is concerned at all -- but they are shocked and startled and surprised. They read in the newspaper what I said. I told him to keep quiet and I've had it up to here. And you might say I was just talking to my friends, but the impression I get is that everyone is totally shocked by the Court's ruling, feels it is a gross abuse of discretion.

And the only reason I bring it to the Court's attention right now is that in the Tuture I would ask the Court, please, to consider the two obvious points, that this is a hotly-contested trial and tempers become a little frayed and also take into consideration what Mr. Kanarek is doing which incites a response on my part.

I will try to control my outbursts in the future and just try to keep as quiet as I can in court, but I do want the Court to be aware of these twothings; a long, hot trial and the fact that he's constantly implying to the jury that I'm coaching these people, giving them a script.

He can argue that, and I think that even —

if he even argued that it would be bad, but he's not supposed
to do that in questions. My response yesterday, although
it was probably improper. I think it was understandable
under the circumstances.

I just wanted that to be in the record. That's all I have to say.

THE COURT: All right.

5

6.

7:

10:

12

13

14

15

16

17

18:

19

20

21

22

23

.24

- 25

26

Now, let's get on to the conversation,

Do you have any authorities you wish to offer or argument in connection with this conversation on Page 12,2657

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. I think Mr. Musich and also Mr. Kay are also going to argue the matter.

I think it clearly comes in under MO. And the basic rule, which the Court is already awars of, but I think it should be in the record, People vs. Peete, P-e-e-t-e, 28 Cal. 24, 306, Page 314.

"It is settled in this State, however, that, except when it shows merely criminal disposition, evidence that is relevant is not excluded because it reveals the commission of an offense other than that charged. The general tests of the admissibility of evidence in a criminal case are, does it tend logically, naturally and by reasonable inference to establish any fact material for the people, or to oversome any material matter sought to be proved by the defense. If it does, then it is admissible, whether it embraces the commission of another orise or whether it be part of a

"single design or not. Whenever the case is such that proof of one crime tends to prove any fact material in the trial of another . . , to prejudice the defendant in the minds of the jurges is no ground for its exclusion."

And then I have other cases. People vs. Lopez. Lopez even says — in Lopez it goes further. It adds whether the crime be similar in kind or not. Even if the other crime is not similar in kind it can still come in if there are some substantial similarities.

And I maintain, your Honor, that putting on this evidence of what Manson asked Mr. Flynn to do does logically, naturally and by reasonable inference cause the jury to believe that if he asked Flynn to do something very similar to what we are alleging he asked on the night of the 10th, there is a strong likelihood that he did, in fact, order his co-defendants to commit these murders on the two nights in question.

The Baker case, 25 Cal. 2d at Page 1, says,

"It is not essential that such similar transactions shall have resulted in the commission of a crime. It is sufficient if they tend to prove a scheme of the defendant which included the acts charged."

Now, in this case the murder was not completed but as the basic case says that's not important. Fir. Manson

22 .

23

24

25

26

we are not alleging that he murdered any of the Tate or the La Bianca victims. We are alleging that he ordered these murders or he asked that they be committed.

And this is what he did with Juan Flynn. The fact that Juan Flynn declined, as far as I can see, is totally irrelevant.

I think Mr. Musich, Mr. Kay, also --

MR. MUSICH: I would just like to make a point, your Honor, that basically this is the common scheme and design exception to show intent and motive.

MR. FITZGERALD: All those things? Each one of those -MR. EUSICH: I'm sorry, to show identity and motive.
MR. EUGLIOSI: Actually, MO is identity, actually,
when you come right down to it.

HR. MUSICH: All right,

In any case, the problem I feel the Court is having, or that the Court may be having, is as to the prejudicial effect as to outweighing its evidentiary value.

I submit to the Court, as the Court indicated itself, that it might be a form of rheteric. I would submit to the Court that that is a matter that can be argued, that the weight to be given to this statement is for the jury, and it does not go to its admissibility.

I also submit to the Court that we do not have a particular crime here. We do not have a completion of a criminal offense. Therefore, it has to be less prejudicial

24

.25

26 .

than evidence of similar crimes which is clearly admissible under the law of the State.

I would submit to the Court --

THE COURT: And also by that fact less probative.

WR. MUSICH: Not - well, not less probative in this case, your Honor, as far as the facts and circumstances and the evidence already introduced in this trial.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is not less probative. The fact that Mr. Flynn declines should not inure to the benefit of Mr. Manson. He can't claim credit for the fact that Mr. Flynn said no.

THE COURT: Well, if you examine the exact answer you find that there is no order, there is only a question.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well --

THE COURT: And the question is put in circumstances without any accompanying conduct or any further steps being taken to implement it if, in fact, there was an invitation to do something.

MR. KAY: May I be heard, your Honor?

THE COURT: And I simply don't think that it's enough.

MR. BUGLIOST: At the La Bianca residence there is no language that he ordered them to go in there either.

THE COURT: Well, but that was an entirely different situation. There they had conduct.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Because they were willing to carry out his wishes. The fact that Flynn was not willing, Manson can't claim credit for that.

3

Ĭ.

4

. 5 6

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

2<u>1</u>

23

22

24 25

26

THE COURT: Here we don't even have a member of the alleged conspiracy. All we have, in effect, is a stranger, Mr. Flynn, at some prior time.

MR. BUGLIOSI: But we are asking that it only come in as to Manson, not on the conspiracy count but on the seven counts of the murder; limited to Manson on the seven counts of murder, not the conspiracy sount.

Also, I direct the Court's attention to page 11,903 where this was gone into by Mr. Fitzgerald, and Juan Flynn said: "And then we got right in front of the house and this was right here, you know, asked me if I would go in there."

He was there, your Henor, Mr. Flynn, and he knows what Hanson wanted him to do.

Like Mr. Musich said, I think it is up to the jury to infer whether Hamson was just kidding or not.

There is no doubt in my mind that he meant it. I spoke to Mr. Flynn, and Mr. Flynn tells me he wanted him to go in there, and Flynn said "No."

MR. KAY: May I be heard a minute, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KAY: I am not denying anything that Mr. Musich and Mr. Bugliosi has said, but I am going to tell you how I read the cases.

I sm not going to ask for as much as they are, but I feel, after reading the cases, that this evidence

2

. .3

4

5

7

9.

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17.

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

26

would be admissible limited to Mr. Manson, but to the La Biance murders and not to the Tate murders.

Let me emplain my position.

First, we have the problem that I think the Court has brought out that the incident that occurred with Mr. Flynn was not a spine.

Well, the case of Feople vs. Baker, a 25 Cal. App. 2d case, page 1, which is a 1938 case, status;

"It is not essential that such similar transaction should have regulted in the commission of a crime but it was sufficient if they tended to prove a scheme of defendant which includes the acts charged."

And miso I cite to the Court a 1968 case of People vs. Haston at 69 California Reports starting at page 233.

are trying to bring out by what happened to Mr. Flynn --the identity is very similar hare as to what happened at
the La Bianca residence. We have people being tied up,
Mr. Manson mentioning on both occasions about -- well, with
Mr. Flynn he mentioned tying up, and at the La Bianca
residence they were tied up.

No. 2, and I think most significantly, we have Mr. Menson actually present at both the Flynn incident and at the La Bianca incident, whereas we don't have him

- .

2,

. Š

.9. .10.

> .

Sa fla

present at the Tate incident.

Two, we have Mr. Manson as the one that is doing the talking about what is going to happen inside the location. Here we have him talking to Mr. Plynn about tying people up and cutting people up; and here we have Mr. Manson at the La Bience residence with some of the defendants talking about, well, don't let them know that you are going to kill them.

I think that the identity there between the La Bianca incident and what happened with Mr. Flynn is very probative as to the identity of the fact that Mr. Manson is the one that did it with Mr. Flynn, because we know that from Mr. Flynn and from Linda Kasabian's testimony, and the jury can infer that just about the same thing happened.

2·

3.

5

Ź

ò

8

10

11

ÌŹ

13

14 15

16

17

18

Íð

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

but I think the main thing showing identity is that it is just unheard of, and I would mak the defense if they can come up with any other case. It is unheard of to drive up in front of a home where you have no animosity toward the persons, no contact, you don't want to rob them or tape them, you just want to go in there and murder them by stabbing.

This uniqueness is NO. It is so unique. I can't think of any other case where that happened before. If it has happened, I don't know where it is in the books.

You just don't go to strangers' homes and say let's tie them up and go in there and cut them up.

The absence of a pedestrian, garden variety, type of motive, the absence of that motive in itself shows identity and MG.

If he had told Mr. Flynn, "Let's go in there and rob them, and if there is a woman in there we will rape her," that is different. Here we are talking about something different. Just driving up in front of a home and saying, "Let's go in there and tie them up and cut them up."

It is the same thing as putting on evidence on the night of the La Bianca murders. I really think it can come in as to count I through 7. Just against Manson, not as to the co-defendants and not on the conspiracy count.

ì

2,

9.

1,7

2

3

There is such a remarkable similarity, that I think this is what they are talking about, that the cases say the fact that it may tend to prejudice the defendants in the minds of the jury is no ground for its exclusion.

THE COURT: That is not the basis.

Mr. MUSICH: Your Honor, similar conduct, too.
It doesn't have to be a crime.

Sykes, 44 Cal. 2d 166. Here the majority of the Supreme Court, at that time, sheld that the evidence of the fact that the defendant was attempting to solicit this minor for prostitution and pimping purposes was admissible as to a charge of furnishing a minor with a marijuana cigarette. This was part of his plan and conduct to influence this minor to become a part of his operation. The court held that that far-out evidence in that case was admissible. It is a very unique case.

THE COURT: I can see all that and I am familiar with most, if not all, those cases, but I think here we have scaething different.

Here we have a bare statement which is not, in my opinion, a clear invitation to commit murder, phrased in the form of what I consider to be, perhaps, a stupid or a vicious -- or you can characterise it in many ways -- statement, not implemented by any additional

tonduct.

4.

There is no evidence that there was a guz, a rope, a knife, or anything else present. No one took any steps to do anything.

It also occurred, as I recall, two months before the alleged murders.

I think it is too remote.

Now, I can conceive that depending on what defense, if any, the defendants put on, it might come in on rebuttel. I don't know. But at this stage, I think that the prejudicial effect would outweigh any possible probative value.

56 fls.

ÌÌ

12.

21^{*}

9B-1

.

ì

٠.

5.

8

9:

10. 11

12

13-

14 15

.16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

MR. BUGLICSI: We have another situation where there were knives in the car and Clem Tufts was with Mr. Manson. I tried to get that in before and the Court wouldn't let me get that in.

He told Juan Flynn to so inside, the them up, and then come out, and then they would all go in and cut these people up. That was in the Chatsworth area. It was an expensive home. And there were knives in the car.

I tried to get that in under MO and the Court never let that in. But Clem Tufts was in that car and Clem Tufts was with Manson on the night of the La Bianca murders also.

That is a little closer to home there. There were knives in the car.

At the house, we have got a similar thing. Go in and tie them up, and then we will go in and cut them up.

In the La Bianca murder, Manson tied them up,

supposedly, and then same out.

THE COURT: As a matter of curiosity, why wasn't Tufts prosecuted?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I can explain.

THE COURT: It is of no moment in this case but I am just curious.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There are several reasons, and I can't give the Court all the reasons.

One reason was that all we had at the time of the

23

24.

25,

:26

Grand Jury was Susan Atkins, and what she told me, her story was identical to Linda Kasabian's with one substantial departure. She said that after the La Bianca incident they drove straight back to the ranch instead of going to Venice where these other things occurred. In the Grand Jury the testimony was that he was with them at the La Bianca residence and they drove back to the ranch.

We didn't have him doing anything affirmative that night, not even disposing of anything.

There were other problems. He is a mental case,
Also, I had to put this Grand Jury thing
together in about three days, and I hadn't spoken to Tufts.

I was hopeful that maybe we could use him as a witness for us at that time. Maybe he would have testified for us at the trial.

There are several other reasons which I won't go into now, but'I am just giving the Court some idea.

THE COURT: You don't have to tell me.

MR. FITZGERALD: One of which involves pertain unprofessional and unethical conduct by the District. Attorney in obtaining the statement of Susan Atkins and the subsequent publication by the Los Angeles Times and a subsidiary of the Los Angeles Times.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Are you joining the remarks of Fr. Kanarek?

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

ļ

2

3

; 5

6

7.

ġ

10 11

12

13 14

15

1ģ-

17

18

19.

· 20`

21 22

24

23

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: I want you to say for the record what the unethical conduct is.

MR. FITZGERALD: All right,

MR. BUGLIOSI: Tell me.

MR. FITZGERALD: The District Attorney secured, inappropriately, through the offices of a Superior Court
Judge, to get Richard Caballero to represent Susan Atkins,
and the District Attorney had knowledge that in a major
metropolitan newspaper, on Sunday, May 14, 1969, there was
to be published by the Los Angeles Times her confession.

Now, we also have information that Richard Caballero, who was acting as an agent of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, destroyed tapes and stenographic reports indicating that Susan Atkins denied that she made such statements to you and denied that she made such statements to any representative from your office.

We have tried to litigate this matter many, many times, Nr. Bugliosi.

I don't have any problems with your ethics, but I have problems with some of the ethics of some of the people in your office.

We tried to litigate this a hundred times, and every time I try -- I resent your putting one mide of the story on the record, when it doesn't happen to be the case.

5c-1

2

1

3

.5 6

7

.ġ

.6.

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

Ĭ8

, 1<u>9</u>

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: I solicited your response, Faul. I wanted you to state it for the record.

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. I assume responsibility for letting the conversation take a divergent turn. Hy question to Mr. Bugliosi simply was one of curiosity. It has nothing to do with what we are doing here.

Is there anything else before we go back in?

I am going to admonish the jury, strike the
conversation and admonish the jury not to consider it for
any purpose.

I went to do it in such a way that I will call their attention to it without unnecessarily rehabling it.

Do you have any suggestions as to that?

HR. BUGLIOSI: You could probably say the incident wherein Mr. Menson suggested that something be done inside of a relative's home.

THE COURT: I thought that what I might do is simply read the witness's enswer up to the point where he says:

"And then he says" -- this is Mr. Flynn telking about Mr.

Henson -- "Well, why don't we go in there and tie them

up and cut them up to pieces, you know."

In other words, the preceding parts of that answer describe there was one night they were going to an ice cream parlor and talking about some relatives of Flynn, 5c-2

2

Ť

3

4,

6

7.

8

1Ò

11

12

13 14

15

16 .

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

and they went looking for the house, and so forth.

This will prient them as to the conversation without giving them the actual conversation.

MR. RUGLIOSI: I think that will suffice.

MR. MUSICH: You are going to order that they disregard the conversation, not the fact that they went to an ice cream parlor?

THE COURT: The conversation?

HR. MUSICH: The conversation in front of the location, the conversation following this meeting at the ice cream parlor.

Or are you going to have him disregard that they were at the ice exeam parlor?

THE COURT: What I am inclined to do is to strike Mr. Flynn's snawer -- that is what is being stricken -- and admonish them not to consider the answer for any purpose.

HR. KAMAREK: Your Honor, may I state, I want to thank the Court for doing this, and I am prefacing it that way, your Honor, because I am going to ask for a mistrial, and I just wanted ---

THE COURT: Thanks are not necessary, Mr. Kenerek.

Let's get on with the trial.

MR. KANAREK: I understand that, but I don't want the court to think --

THE COURT: That you are unappreciative?

1

.2

ġ.

Ž

MR. KAMAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: I don't think you are.

MR. KAMAREK: But the point is, if I may just briefly state it, it is my position, without belaboring it, alluding to the language in Bruton vs. the United States, especially, that thinking that you can't unring the bell, I make the motion for a mistrial because of the prejudicial effect of that.

MR. HUGHES: I would join the motion.

THE COURT: The motion will be denied.

6 fls.

11

12

10

13.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23.

24

25

26

2,

1

₹ 5

7

.8.

9

11

12 13

14

15 16

17:

·18:

20

21 22

23

25

24

26

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I have another area, which is similar, and which concerns a statement, and that which also is a solicitation of a crime which did some in and which I would ask your Honor to consider striking and admonishing the jury about, and that is the testimony of Barbara Boyt to the fact that Mr. Manson solicited her to engage in an act of oral copulation with Juan Flynn, which would be solicitation of the commission of a felony.

I don't believe that that was brought up at the time, that it was a solicitation of a felony,

MR. BUGLIOSI: No. 1t wasn't.

MR. HUGHES: 288, I believe, of the Penal Code.

MR. FITZGERALD: A. 288a.

MR. HUGHES: 288a of the Penal Code.

And I would ask that on that basis that that that testimony be struck and that the jury be admonished to disregard that testimony.

On cross-examination, I think it was, Mr. Kanarek brought out that she engaged in voluntary sexual practices and this shows that it wasn't voluntary. There were things she did which were not voluntary. She testified this was against her will.

MH. FITZGERALD: I think we have the same problem in regard to testimony yesterday wherein Mr. Flynn testified that in order to rid the girls of their inhibitions Hanson

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

ordered them to, (a) copulate one another, and (b) to copulate him, which are, of course, felonies.

MR. KAY: That testimony was stricken.

THE COURT: That answer was stricken. The answer simply wasn't responsive to the question. I couldn't anticipate that he was going to give an unresponsive answer and it was stricken and the jury was admonished.

However, the other one, I think, was responsive and proper redirect.

MR. KANAREK: I have just another motion, your Honor.

MR. HUGHES: Well, I think we are acting on my motion.

MR. KANAREK: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. MUGHES: And my position would be that an admonishment not sufficing on the Barbara Hoyt's statement, that there be a mistrial declared.

THE COURT: Motions will be denied.

HR. KANAREK: May I join in Mr. Hughes' motion?

MR. SHINN: Join in that motion, too, your Honor.

MR, FITZGERALD: And I think the admonishment doesn't suffice in terms of Mr. Flynn's statement yesterday.

I happened, for example, to notice the press, where the press talked about Manson ordered sexual perversions among his followers.

The press, I think, is a reasonable barometer of what the general public believes or feels and I think it's a reasonable barometer of what the jury thinks. And if

1

2

3

5

б. .

9

10 . 11:

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

·20

22

23 24

25

26

the jury heard evidence, although I think they'll honestly do their best to keep it out of their mind, but if they hear evidence of sexual perversion of this kind of magnitude ---

THE COURT: But they didn't. You see, that is not what the answer said. Wr. Flynn didn't say that Mr. Manson ordered that. What he said was that Wr. Manson said you could do this and you could dothat. It was totally unresponsive to the question as to what, if anything, he did.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The Court is not going to let me go into it, but he did order these things.

THE COURT: That wasn't what the enswer was,

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, I got the impression the Court thought this was too prejudicial. That was the impression I got from the Court.

FR. FITZGERALD: These are my arguments. I'm arguing that it is too prejudicial.

MM. BUGLIUSI: Right: And I got the impression that that was the basis for the Court's ruling. I just went on to another subject. But I think it's very relevant and there is evidence that he did have them do these things.

THE COURT: Well, all right, gentlemen, we'll go back out.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, just one brief -- it will take a half a minute.

Your Honor, may I ask for your Honor to

admonish the jury not to consider for any purpose Mr. Bugliosi's solicitation from Mr. Flynn of testimony concerning Nr. Manson offering him LSD and mere admonishment not sufficing I ask for a mistrial. 4 Mr. Dugliosi did ask him whether Mr. Manson . 5 MR. KAY: That enswer was stricken. 6. MR. KANAREK: No. I don't believe it was. MR. KAY: Yes, it was. MR, BUGLIOSI: There was an objection. The objection 10 was sustained. Again, on cross-examination, he was asked 11 whether he took LSD out at the ranch. This is on redirect 12, that -- did Hr. Manson ever give by the LSD. All these things are coming in on redirect and I think they are proper. 13 You have to watch your questions on cross --15 MR. HUGHES: I would join in Mr. Kanarek's motion. 16 - because I read these transcripts MR. BUOLIOSI: 17 every night. 18 NR. SHINN: So do we. 19 THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. 20 MR. KANAREK: May I have a ruling on that last. motion? Your Honor didn't rule. .22 THE COURT: What was the motion? 23 For mistrial because of the solicitation DR. KANAREK: 24 in connection with the LSD. THE COURT: That the question was asked? 26 MR. KANAREK: You. Motion is dealed. THE COURT:

(The proceedings were resumed before the jury in open court.)

ALL FEMALE DEFENDANTS: (In unison.) Hail Cassar.

THE BAILLYP: No talking while court is in session.

DEFENDANT MARSON: Your Honor, may I suggest that

the Court continue to try itself, as it has been doing a

very poor job of showing the public may justice. You've

bely shown your force and your power.

THE COURT: Mr. Menson, I order you to sit down, sir. Remain quiet during the proceedings so that we can continue this trial. You are now disrupting this trial.

DEFENDANT HANSON: (Singing.) That old black magic has me in its spell. That old black magic that you keep so well. Those key fingers --

THE COURT: I order you once again to mit down, mir, and stop thim.

DEFENDANT HANSON: I'd like to go back to my room and relax. You can handle your own matters.

THE COURT: Six down, sir.

DEFENDANT MANSON: I find it hard not to do what I'm told because all my life I've done what I have been told.

THE COURT: All right, sir. We are going to continue this trial.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Now, your Honor, if you would allow me to maintain a voice, I could probably bring to

25

18

19

20

21

22

23

· 24

2

3

5

6

7

. g

10.

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

you the thought that I have done what I'm told.

THE COURT: I order you to stop, six.

personal Markon: You have been ordering an forever. All my life you have ordered me. You have extered me to came to live. You bring me in here and you charge me for marder and you say I have rights and you hold up rights in front of me but you give me none.

THE COURT: If you don't stop, Mr. Manson, I'm going to have you removed from the courtroom.

DEFENDANT HANSON: Okay. That's all right. I'm not here anyway. You wan put a picture up here and prosecute yourselves. Because that's all you're doing.

THE COURT: Are you ready to proceed now, sirt DEFENDANT MARKON: I've been ready to proceed. May I sak the man some questions?

THE COURT: No, you may not.

DEFENDANT HANSON: I can't spank? I'm a domny, a sumis.

THE COURT: We are going to go should now.

perendant manach: You are going sheed. But where are you going sheed to? Look at yourselves. Look at all of you. Where are you going? You're going to destruction, that's where you're going. You will end up being judged. That's what you're going to do. All of you. Everyone of you. It's your judgment day, not mine. I've already judged me.

24

25

26

THE COURT: Remove Hr. Meason from the courtroom.

You will be parmitted to return, Hr. Hanson, whenever you are willing to affirm your willingness to remain quiet.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Have a good day. I will. Every day is a good day for me.

DEFENDANT ATKINS: Who are you judging?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Look in the mirror. Follow
your own reflection.

THE COURT: I order you ladies to stop.

23

24

25

26

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: The guilt you find is yours.

DEFENDANT ATKINS: Who is going to order you on
judgment day?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: We look in the mirror and try

THE COURT: If you don't remain quiet, ledies, I will have you removed from the courtroom.

DEFENDANT ATKINS: For what?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: You did it when you took musy our pro per.

DEFENDANT REENVIRKEL: You let us have no advice, either.

THE COURT: Are you able to get down what these ladies are maying, Mrs. Reporter?

THE REPORTER: Yes.

DEFENDANT ATKINS: You don't hear it myway. It goes right in one sar and out the other.

DEFENDANT EMENGINEEL: You don't want to hear it.

DEFENDANT ATRIES: Look at yourself, man. You are nothing but a machine. You're a machine.

DEFENDANT RECOVERED: You are headed for complete destruction of yourself because that's who you judge is yourself and only yourself.

THE COURT: Are you ready to proceed new! DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Now.

DEFENDANT ATKINS: Proceed.

2

.3

4

5

6 7

8

9

11:

12 13

.14

15 .

: 17

18.

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

THE COURT: Remove the ladies from the courtreom. DEFENDANT ATKINS: Have a nice day.

THE COURT: The jury is admonished to disregard the remarks of the defendants in their entirety. Counsel are again advised that their clients may return to the courk-room at any time that they are willing to affire their willingness to proceed and conform to the Court's rules regarding their conduct.

The record will show that all coursel are present and the jurors are present. All of the defendants have been removed from the courtroom.

Ladies and gentlemen, during the course of Mr. Flynn's testimony on Wednesday, during the afternoon session, Mr. Flynn was asked a question by Mr. Suglices during the course of redirect examination and I'm going to strike Mr. Flynn's answer from the record.

I'm going to read you a portion of the answer so that you will have in mind what question and what answer I'm referring to. I will not read you all of the answer. And you will be admenished to disregard the entire answer of Mr. Flynn, not only the part I read but the part that I don't read.

The answer to which I refer began as follows:

"Well, the conversation was that one
night -- " and I might say, in orienting you to the
specific question and answer, this was an answer

Mr. Flyan was giving regarding an alloged conversation that he had with Mr. Mangon on a particular occasion.

The answer began as follows:

"Well, the conversation was that one night, I can't say the date, but we went to the ice erose parlor and we was talking about some relations, some family, you know, relative. And I wanted to look into them, you sae, to see where they live. You know, I just wanted to see where they live, look up the street.

"So, you know, I maked Mr. Member if he would drive me there, you know. And he maye, yes, you know. So we went looking for the house and the street, you know, and we found it. And we parked outside.

"And them Mr. Menson saked me if they had a dog in there, you see, and I says, yes, they have a little dog."

And then there was some more conversation allegedly between Mr. Henson and Mr. Flynn which was related in this answer.

New, this is the snawer to which I refer and the entire answer of Mr. Flynn is being stricken and the jury is admonished to disregard it for all purposes.

You may proceed, Mr. Bugliosi.

1

2

3.

4.

5-.

б

7

8

' 9.

10

1Ĺ

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25.

MR. MURLIOSI: I believe there is skill crossexamination of Mr. Flynn.

I would ask the Court to state on the record that although the defendants have been removed from court microphones have been installed where they are and they are hearing these proceedings. I don't know if that's on the record right now.

THE COURT: Yes, that is the case. There is a microphone -- a speaker, rather, in the lockup for Mr. Hanson and there is a speaker upstairs in the room in which the female defendants are being kept and they will be able to hear all of the proceedings.

MR. FITZERRALD: I have no information -- I have no reason to doubt your Honor's statement, but I can't agree that they can hear the proceedings because I haven't been up there and determined whether they could hear the proceedings.

THE COURT: All right. Lat's proceed.

MR. KARAREK: Yes, your Honor,

MR. HUCKES: I wish to state for the record that the exclusion of Leslie Van Houten is ever my objection, your Monor.

A JUROR: Your Honor --

MR. KANAREK: Your Henor, I wonder if we might approach the beach.

A JURCE: We couldn't hear the and of Mr. Mughes'

20

21

- 22

23

24

,	ĩ
) .	2
	3
,	4
•	- '5,
	6
· ·	7
* **	8
٠,,	9
se fir	,10
•	11
, ,	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
•	17
<i>,</i> .	17 18
	19
•	20
i.	21
gr sa	22
	23
•	24
	25
	26
•	

THE COURT: Would you read that back. (Record read.)

THE COURT: Objection is overruled.

HR. KAMARK: Hey we approach the beach briefly?
THE COURT: Mr. Kamarek, we've had lengthy conver-

sations in chambers this morning.

Statement.

HR. KAMARKK: Very well, very well, your Monor.

THE COURT: I was no reason for another banch conference now.

1

3 4

5

б

7

8

9

11.

ÌŽ

10

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

26

25

RECROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed)

BY MR. KANAREK!

Mr. Flynn, is it a fair statement, Mr. Flynn, Q. that when you spoke with, you know, Mr. Davis and the other men that was with Mr. Davis --

Do you have those conversations in mind? Ivar Davist

> Ä Tes.

Is it a fair statement. Mr. Flynn, that you made no mention concerning -- I'm not new asking about the knife, but concerning the language, the words that you say Mr. Manson told to you in the kitchen.

HR. BUGLIOSI: Are you throught

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

HR. BUGLIOSI: Repetitious and beyond the scope of redirect.

MR. KAWAKEK: I doe't think that I've asked that question of this witness, your Honor, and it certainly --

MR. MIGLICEL: Beyond the scope of radirect, your Honor.

THE COURT: Rend the question.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. Hr. Fitzgereld brings up what I think is a valid point. If I'm not talking through the microphone he fears that --

THE COURT: Well, I wight say that it might assist your clients to hear through the speakers if you would use

1	the microphones in examination.
2	MR. KAWAREK: Yes, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: You may do so or not, as you desire,
4	but **
, 5	HR. KANAREK; Yes.
6	THE COURT: I'm sure it would assist them.
7 , ;	HR. KAHAREK: May I use that, Mr. Darrow?
8	Has your Honor ruled on that?
9	THE COURT: You started to say something about what
10	Mr. Fitzgerald had raised, Mr. Kamarek.
11	HR. KANARK: Yes, your Honor.
12	Mr. Fitzgerald raised the point, which I thin
13	is very welld, concerning the use of this microphone.
14	THE COURT: All right.
15	HR. KAMAREK: That the defendants would be able to
16	hear better if I used the microphone.
17	THE COURT: I had asked to have the question reveal
18	so just a moment.
19	(Question read.)
20	MR. KAMAREK: I'm breaking it up, your Honor, in
21	two parts. I don't believe that this question has been
22	asked.
23	THE COURT: Do you understand the question, Mr.
24	Flyon!
25	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
26	THE COURT: You may answer.
,	

1	ing withing; I won't remember.
2,	BY HR. KANAREK:
3.	Q Whether you did or not, Mr. Flynn,
4.	A I don't remember if I told him.
5	Q I see.
.6	A If I talked to him about that.
7	Q Now, Mr. Flynn, you and I had convergation.
8	Remember that?
9	A Beref
10	Q Wo, not here in court. I mean outside of
11	court,
12	A Yes.
13	Q And did I tell you to tell me any events
14	that you might know of concerning this case?
15	MR. MUGLICSI: Improper foundation.
16	THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer.
17	THE WITHESE: I don't memember.
18	BY NR. KANARRE:
19	Q You don't remember!
Ž 0.	A No.
21	Q Well, may I ask you this, Hr. Flynn:
22	Concerning the matter about the knife and the
23	matter of the words that you say occurred in connection
24	with the knife in the kitchen
25	A 7**.
26	q do you have that all in mind? You have

1	that all in mind, haven't yout
2	A Yes.
3 [']	Q What you've testified to here in court, have
4	you!
5	A Yes.
6	Q Did you at may time in talking with me ever
7	mention those matters to me?
8	A I don't remember if I did or not.
ġ.	Q You don't remember
10	A I don't remember.
'n	Q I see. Now, then, may I ask you, Mr. Flynn,
12	is it a fair statement that you have difficulty in rememberis
13	MR. EUGLIOSI: This implies assumes a fact not
14	in evidence. It implies that he did tell Mr. Kaparek this
15	and that he has forgotten it.
16	MR. KANAREK: This question stands on its own two
17	feet, your Honor. This isn't limited to
18	THE COURT: Objection is overruled. You may answer.
19	THE WITNESS: Would you repeat the question?
20	MR. KANAREK: Certainly.
21	Q Is it a fact, Mr. Flynn, that you have
22	difficulty in resembering?
23	A Well, I have as such difficulty as anybody
24	else. And if it's brought to me, you see, if it's brought
25	to me, you see, then, you know, then I scknowledge, you
26	know, whatever statement is brought to me, or, you know

24

25

26

Ar. Flynn. In other words, when you say brought to you, what you mean is if someone tells you semething, tells you that something occurred -- well, let me withdraw that and ask you:

What do you mean, Mr. Flynn, by "brought to me," rather than my suggesting it? You tell us what you mean by that.

A Well, I could be doing some work and someone comes up to me and says, "I went suimming today," and discusses the matter with me to a point, you know, to an effect, you know. Then it's brought to me, the effect is brought to me of what they've done, you know.

Well, have you finished that?

A Well, then, therefore, I become a part of it, you see. And that's it.

Q How, directing your attention to your own words, Mr. Flyan, "brought to me," did Mr. Bugliosi in his conversation with you bring snything to you?

A Well, I came here on my own free will, you see. I was asked by the police officers, you know, if I would see him, you see. So I didn't for a period of time. And then I came. You know, I felt like coming here, so I came. You see?

Q Well, now, when you just told us a few moments ago what you meant by "brought to me," you were referring to

Did Mr. Bugliosi bring any thoughts to you, bring any ideas to you, that you testified to here in court when he spoke to you!

Did he bring these ideas to your

MR. BUCLIOSI: Too ambiguous, your Honor. I object on that ground.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KANAREKI

You had convergation with Mr. Bugliosi before coming to court, right?

Yes.

And my question is now, directing your attention to the matters that you spoke of about the knife and the statements that you say Mr. Manson made in connection with the knife, now, were those metters matters that you spoke to Mr. Bugliosi about when you talked to hint

Well, I spoke to Mr. Bugliosi and the police about these metters.

And you spoke to Mr. Buglioni and the police about these metters in the last few weeks: is that correct?

Well, you could say nine months; about nine months, a year, somewhere around there.

6d-1 1	Q A year ago you mentioned these to the police?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Pardon?
	A Yes.
,	Q All right. That would be September of 19
6	in September of 19 or October, this is October the 2nd,
7	around October 2nd of 1969 you mentioned these matters to
	the police; is that right?
9	A I said from nine months to a year, sir.
10	Q From nine months to a year ago?
	A Something like that, yes, in that length of
12	time.
	Q I see. It could have been in October of 1969.
14	A year would be October 2nd, 1969. Could have been that
15	long ago; is that right, Mr. Flynn?
. 16	A It was from, I'll say, nine months you kno
17	eight months, nine months to a year, something like that,
18	
1,9	Q All right. So the extreme end of it would
:20	be October the 2nd, 1969. That would be what you are
. 5 21	
: 23	
24	· Æ
25	
26	

And it could have been in Ortober -- you're

•	1
. 1	
2	
3	
4	
5	,
ģ.	,
7	
8	
è	ţ
	1
1Ô	,
11	
12	
13	
14	1
14 15	
16	
17	-
17	
19	
.20·	
Ż 1	
22	
23	
24	
or	

Do you understand that?

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES.

1

3

5

6

8<u>.</u>

10 .

11 12

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

ind, as you think of yourself and the thinking that you do in connection with whatever you may do, is it a fair statement that your experiences in Viet-Nam have affected your thinking?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Repetitious.

MR. KANAREK: I don't think this question has been answered directly, your Honor.

I think if we had a direct answer to the question.

THE COURT: It is ambiguous, Mr. Kanarek. I don't see how the witness can possibly answer.

The objection is sustained.

MR. KANAREK: Q May I put it to you this way.
May I ask you for a comparison. Mr. Flynn.

Is it a fair statement that your ability to remember and think was different before you went to Viet-Nam than it is now!

- A. I will say that as far as the commitment in Viet-Nam.
 - Q What im that?
 - A As to the commitment in Viet-Nam.
 - What do you mean by that?
- A Well, what I went there and saw, you know, and what I thought I was soing to see there.
 - Q Have you answered that question?
 - a Yes.

Well, now, before you went to Viet-Nam, Ç, Mr. Klynn, did you walk, for instance, along the streets of 2 Los Angeles without any shoes on? MR. BUGLIOSI: Irrelevant. Beyond the scope of redirect. 5 THE COURT: Sustained. б MR. KANAREK: Q Mr. Flynn, may I ask you this: 7 Since you have come back from Viet-Nam, do you find that 8 you have greater difficulty in relating and remembering 9 than you did before you went to Viet-Nam't 10 Ă. I don't understand the question, sir. 11 PardonT 12 I don't understand the question. Į. 13 You don't understand it? Q 14. No. A 15 Directing your attention to your own ability 16 to remember whatever you may see, Mr. Flynn, or hear. 17 Is it a fair statement that your ability to remember is . 18. less now than before you went to Viet-Nam, that which you **J**Ø. may have seen or heard? 20 I couldn't answer it yes or no. 21 22 would you answer it in your own way, please? 23 I will way that I remember, you know. I have 24got a pretty good head. I am asking for a comparison, Mr. Flynn. **25**. 26 IR. BUGLIOSI: Objection -

Ż

5.

6.

7

8

MR. KANAREK: A comparison before you went to Viet-Nam compared with right now. MR. BUGLIOSI: -- on the grounds it is irrelevant. THE COURT: Sustained. For instance, Mr. Flynn, you MR. KANAREK: Q have, at some time, stated that the car that you now think is a Ford ---Yes. -- a yellow Ford --Yes. -- at one time you stated that that was a Plymouth: is that correct?

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, I am going to object on the grounds it has been asked and answered.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You may answer.

MR. KANAREK: Is that correct?

Not that I thought it was a Plymouth.

I said a Ford is a Ford and a Plymouth is

Plymouth.

MR. KANAREK: Q Have you finished?

Yes.

23 24

'25

Do you remember telling Mr. Sartuaci that this

78-1

.

very car was a Plymouth?

2

MR. FITZGERALD; Asked and answered yesterday.

THE COURT: Overruled.

4

3:

You may whater.

5

THE WITNESS: I could have told him that.

7.,

NR. KANAREK: All right.

8

Would you tell us the reason why you said that

9

Ford that you now believe to be a yellow Ford is, in fact,

. .

a Plymouth?

10

I will withdraw that.

11

Could you tell us why you told, why you once

12

stated that the car you now believe to be a yellow Ford,

14

why did you previously say it was a Plymouth?

Pass, you know, from that direction,

<u>1</u>5

A. Well, I saw Mr. Charles Manson drive in the yard

16

one day -- one night, you see -- it was just starting to

17

get dark, you see - and he got out of the car, you know.

18.

He was with Brends. He was coming over the Santa Susanna

19 .

And he told so that he wanted me to so to a

20 21

place ---

22

MR. KAHAREK: Your Honor, I submit that he is not answering the question.

23

THE COURT: You asked him why. He is apparently trying to answer the question.

24 25

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor --

22

23

24

25.

26

THE COURT: Do you want to withdraw the question?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, I will withdraw the question.

Q Mr. Plynn, as you sit there on the witness stand --

A Yes.

the prosecution? In your own mind, do you consider your-self a witness for the prosecution?

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is tralevant. Also, beyond the scope of the redirect, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: It goes to bias, your Honor, and impassement, his state of mind in this matter.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Well, I am a witness as well for you, too, as for the prosecution.

MR. KANAREK: And in your mind, you are a witness for both sides; is that right?

A Well, I am a witness for the testimony that I serve, in my mind.

Q In your mind?

A Yes.

And in your mind, Mr. Flynn, is it a fair statement that you, at this time, like Mr. Manson?

Is that correct?

A I feel that although I don't agree with everything that he says, that he has everything and every right

1	of the british the modes and seek with a security a security have
2	know.
3	I will may that.
4	Q You don't dislike him?
	A. No.
5	Q I see,
6	Is it a fair statement that you like him?
7	MR. BUGLIOSI: Repetitious, your Honor. It was gone
8	into yesterday.
9	MR. KANAREK: No. your Honor. I don't believe that
10	I have gone into this yesterday.
11	THE COURT: Overruled.
12	MR. KANAREK: My notes don't indicate that, your
13	Honor.
14	THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
15	You may answer.
16	THE WITNESS: You could say. I san say yes.
17	MR. KANAREK: Q That you do not like him;
18	right?
19	[1 m , The control of the control o
20	A Well, that I like him, you know, and that I
21	don't like him.
22	Q Pardont
23	A. That I like him and that I don't like him.
24	Q Well, as you sit there in the witness stand, is
25	it a fair statement that you do not like him, Hr. Flynn?
26.	MR. BUGLIOSI: Asked and answered.

MR. KANAREK: I don't think it has been, your Ronor. The witness can give an answer. MR. BUGLIOSI: He said he does not dislike him. already testified to that. THE COURT: The question has been answered, Mr. Kanarek. The objection is sustained. 0.

	·····
1,	
2	
ś	spoke
4	
5	*
6	of ti
7	
8	
9	•
10	. ,
ù	
12	
13	
14	BY MA
15	
16	showe
17	,
18	
19	laces
20	day
21	
22	8180

25 26 threat notes; is that right?

Yes.

MR. KANAREK: All right.	
Now, Mr. Flynn, since yesterday, have you	
spoken to Mr. Bugliosif	٠.
A Yes.	
Q And you spoke to Mr. Bugliosi yesterday a coupl	
of times: right?	
A Yes.	
HR. KANAREK: Thank you.	
THE WITNESS: You are welcome.	
THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Hughest	: .
MR. HUCHES: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.	
RECROSS-EXAMINATION	
BY MR. HUGHES:	•
4 Juan, do you recall the leather laces that I	
showed you the other day, the four sets?	,
A. You showed them to me, yes. I recall them.	
A Now, do you remember any of those being the	
laces that you were wearing on the August 15th raid, the	
day of the August 16th raid?	
MR. BUGLIOSI: This was asked and answered. It is	
also beyond the scope of the redirect.	
THE COURT: Sustained.	

·‡ ·	And that they were washed in your pants a
2	couple of months after you received them; is that right?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q Did you make any Xerox copies of those threat
5	notes?
6	A. NO.
7	Q Did you take a picture of them?
8	A No.
9	Did you write them out somewhere else?
10	A. No.
11	Q What did those notes say, Mr. Flynn?
12	A. One of the notes said: "This is an indictment
13	on your life because it is coming down. In the course
14	and when in the course of human events life becomes
15	intolerable to sustain under a power, the people will
16	invoke their initial right to revolution."
17	And there was another little part there that
18	said, "Where the eagle flies, we will lie under the sun;
19	where the eagle flies, we will die to be one."
20	And that is one of the you see, I remember
21	it, you see, from one of the songs, you know.
22	Q Didn't one of the notes also say, "I am going
23	to sneak up on you and give you a kiss"?
24	A Yes, It is the same one. It said something
25	like that.
1	or them to train a strain or the transmission -

į	A Well, to start with, I felt that "This is an
2	indictment on your life" and "a kiss" didn't go too well,
3	you know. So I thought that I would take it for what
4	it was coming and the source.
5	Q Were there any drawings on the notes?
6	A. Yes,
7	Q Flowers?
8:	A There was a cross on it.
9 [.]	Q Little pictures of smiling faces?
10	A Well, they had a picture that looked like me,
11	you know.
12	4 Wers you smiling?
13	A Well, it was just a profile.
14.	Actually, besides being an actor, you are sort
1,5	of an amateur post, too, aren't you?
16	A I like to write.
17	4 You write limericks?
18	A I write who?
19.	Limericks
20	A Well, I just write what feels good inside.
21	You gave some of your poetry to the press the
22	other day, didn't you, to the news media?
23	MR. BUGLIOSI; That is irrelevant.
24	THE COURT: Sustained.

25.

26

MR. HUGHES: Q Didn't you actually make up that threat note, that poetry, yourself?

- A That threat note?
- Q ... What you call a threat note?
- A No.

I was at the Fountain Of The World one night, and I won't mention the name because I was asked not to mention those names but the source that it came from approached me at the Fountain Of The World and handed me this, you know.

- Q Didn't you recently ask some of the girls for the words to one of Mr. Manson's songs?
 - A Yes. Yes.
- And aren't those words, "Where the eagle flies," aren't those from one of Mr. Manson's songs?
 - A. Yes.
- And those are words that you say were in the note: is that correct?
- A Well, the note that says, "This is an indictment on your life." you see.
- Now, you say a couple of people same and threatened you physically with your life, is that right, when you had an ax, when you were chopping wood; is that correct?
- A Well, I was working, you know, and they came down there.

1	Q One of them was a girl?
2	A Yes.
3	Did you hold her hand?
4.	A I don't remember.
5	G Could you have?
6.	A Well, I like to be nice to girls, yea.
7	Q Did you go with her the next day for a car ride?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q Didn't you ask her the next day to drive you
10	down to the County Jail to see Mr. Mansen?
11	A. Well, they kept insisting that I should see
12	tir. Manson, you see,
13	Well, did you go with her?
14	A. No.
15	4 Are you afraid of Mr. Manaon?
1 6	MR. BUGLIOSI; Ambiguous; your Honor.
17	Now? Or at Barker Renon in the middle of the
18;	night? Or Spahn Ranch? Or what?
19.	MR. HUGHES: Aight now.
20	THE WITNESS: Well, of Manson himself?
21	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, before the mext question is
22.	enunciated, may the record reflect that at least 18 seconds
23	elapsed before the witness answered?
24	I can represent that to the Court,
25	MA. HUGHES: Did you understand the question?
.26	THE COURT: That is not evidence, Mr. Kanarek.

You are not testifying as a sworn witness. 1 MR. KANAREK: I would offer to be sworn, if your 2 Honor wishes. THE COURT: That won't be necessary. Let's procesd. 5 THE WITHESS: Would you repeat the question? . Am I afraid of Mr. Manson right now? MR. HUGHES: Yes. 8 THE WITNESS: Well, not of Dr. Manson himself, but 9 the reach that he has, you know. 10 You testified about a crossbow. . IIR. HUGHES: Q - 11 You had a crossboy at one time? 12 Yes. 13 Did you once shoot at an old man with a crossbow? . 14 MR. BUGLIOSI: Irrelevent, your Honor, 15 THE COURT: Sustained. 16 HR. HUGHES: 1 Mr. Flynn, you have been in 17. the movies somewhat. Have you ever used an English accent .18 in the movies, or can you do an English accent? 19 MR. BUGLIOSI: That is irrelevant. 20 THE COURT: Sustained. 21 22 24

	1	
74-1	1	BY MR. HUGHES:
	2	Q Can you do an American accent, Hr. Flynn?
	3	MR. BUGLICEL: Ambiguous. Also irrelevent.
, '	4	THE COURT: Sustained.
м	5	BY MK. HUGHES:
	6	Q Is how you are talking now an accent that
	7	you have put on for this court?
**	8	A I wouldn't say so.
e.gr	9	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may the record reflect
	10	at least a 15-second wait in connection with this last
	11	ADMET!
	12	I offer to be sworn on that, your Honor.
Ł	13	HR. BUGLIOSI: Do you want me to call you as a
<i>.</i>	14	witness, Mr. Kanarek''
•	15	THE COURT: The jury is perfectly sepable of
	16	observing the demensor of the witness and the manner in
,	17 .	which questions are snewered.
	18	MR. KANAMEK: If I may address myself to that,
	19	your Honor?
3	20.	THE COURT: It is not necessary for you to make
	21	such comments.
•	22	MR. KARAKEK: Very well.
•	23	It is just that the record is silent on
	24	time, your Honor.
,	25	THE COURT: The jury has to determine the facts in
	26	this case.

MR. KANAREK! Yes. Bir.

MR. HUGHES: I have no further questions, your Ronor.
Thank you, Mr. Flynn. Have a nice day.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Bugliosi?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

MR. KAMAREK: Your Honor, before he proceeds, I promise I will just ask one question, if I may respent the COURT: Very well.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Hr. Flynn, it appears to me, it may be erroneous, that there is a marked difference in your demensor on the witness stand now than before. I believe that is a fair statement.

MR. BUMIOSI: This is argumentative, your Honor. It is not time for argument.

MR. KAHAREK: I am asking him.

Q Is there some reason, Mr. Flynn, why your demeasor on the witness stand now is different than it was when you first took the witness stand?

HR. BUGLIOST: That is argumentative and manuses facts not in evidence.

THE COURT: Sustained.

HR. KAMAREK; Thumk you.

16

17

18

19

2Ŏ

21

22

23

24

7d-3 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION 1 BY MR. BUCLIOSI: 2 Mr. Flynn, this arrest on August the 18th, 3 1970, did that take place after you spoke to Sergeant 4. Sartucci and myself? . 5. Yes. 6 You had already spoken to us, and you were 7 arrested that some day; is that correct? Yes. 9 What were you arrested for? 10 For drinking a bear out in the depart. 11 ' And you requested that you be arrested for 12 that; is that correct! 13 Yes. I felt that I needed it. Ă. 14 Where is the Fountain of the World, Juan? 15 In Box Ganyon. 16 How far is that from Spalm Rench? 17 Five miles; something like that, 18 You testified in court as to some of the words 19 in these threat notes that you received, or these notes 20 that you received. . 21 22 Did you study these notes rather carefully? Yes 23 Å 24 Is that why you remember the words? 25 Tes. 26 You have also beard Mr. Manson sing songs out Q.

,	
•	
7e-1	1
	2
<u>,</u>	3
,	-4
•	5
	6
	7
40	.8
	Ģ
	10.
	11
	12
<u> </u>	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
Å	21 [.]

22.

24

26

Q Has Mr. Kenarek approached you several times outside this court and spoken to you, Mr. Flynn?

A Yes.

Q On any occasion, did he tell you not to say smything to anyone?

A Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. FITZGERALD: No recross.

MR. KANAREK: Tes, your Honor.

May I ask a question on this last point about my approaching --

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?

MR. SHIRM: No. your Honor. No questions.

THE COURT: Go shead, Mr. Kanarak.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KAHAREK:

Q Now, Mr. Flyan, would you tell the jury all of the circumstances when you say that I said that you shouldn't say anything to anyone?

A Well, after I requested to be arrested, you see, I called some people that I know and I told them where I was, you see. Then I spent two, three days in jail. And these people saked me, you know, if I wanted out, you know. I told them where I was.

THE COURT: Hr. Flynn, I don't think you are 1 susvering the question that Mr. Kenerek asked you. Would you reframe the question. Mr. Kanarek? 3. MR. KAMAREK: May it be read, your Honor, so that 4 there is no question? It is the same question. - 5 THE COURT: All right. Go back and read the ques-6 tion. 7 Listen to the question, Hr. Flynn. 8 THE VITARSS: Yes. 9 (The question was read by the reporter.) 10 THE WITHKSS: Okay. 11 I will say it like this. When I walked out-12 side, Mr. Kanarek balled me out of jail, you see, and 13 then I walked outside, and I said, "Oh, It is you?" 14 And Mr. Kanarak says, "Yes." you know. 15. So be says, "What happened to you!" 16 17 So I related -- I told him that, you know, I was in jail for drinking a beer, you see, 18 Then, he says, "Have you had enything to 19 eat," you know! 20 "Mo." I says to him. I says, "I haven't 21 had anything to eat because I was in -- how do you call 22 them places -- the hole, the tank, all day, you see." 23 24 And I told him that I wanted something to eat, 25 So, he offered to buy me something to eat, 26 And in the meantime, he told me that I shouldn't

worry, you know, and I shouldn't -- you know, I shouldn't 1 worry, you know, and that he would have some of the girls 2 to come down and pick me up. 3 Then we went and had some food, you know, and on this, he said that I shouldn't talk to snyone. In this 5 period of convergation, he told me not to talk to anyone, you see. Ť This is all Mr. Kenarek said: "Don't talk to 8 Mayone," you see. ġ, Then he says: "The girls are coming," you 10 know. 11 So I told him, "No. I am going somewhere 12 else," you see, 13 So. I had Mr. Kamarek drop me off in this 14 place, this remote place. 15 And he says, "Call me in the morning," you 16 know, and he gave me a card, you know. 17 And I said that I would, but I didn't. 18 and that was the relation of the conversation, 19 you know. 7f #1m 20 2Ì 22 23 24 25 26

THE WITHESE: Thank you.

KR. SUGLICSI: People call Dave Steuber. (Ir. Steuber enters the courtroom.) THE CLERK: Would you please repeat after me. I do solemnly awear ---THE WITNESS: I do solumnly swear --5 THE CLERK: -- that the testimony I may give --THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give --7 THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending --THE WITNESS: - in the cause now pending --9 THE CLERK: -- before this Court --10 THE WITNESS: -- before this Court --11 THE CLERA: -- shall be the truth --12. THE WITNESS: -- shall be the truth --13 THE CLERK: -- the whole truth --14 The WITHESS: -- the whole truth --15 THE CLURK: -- and notains but the truth ---16 THE WITHESS: 1 -- and nothing but the truth --17 -- so help me God, THE CLERK: 18 THE WITHESS: -- so help me God. 19 THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please, 20 Would you way the interophone back, sir, and 21 would you please state and spell your name. 22: 23 THE WITNESS: David Stauber, S-t-e-u-b-e-r. 24

MR. KANAREK: Also, it is improper.

I would like to approach the bench.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You may answer the question,

THE WITNESS: In Shoshome, California.

	Q BY MR, BUGLIOSI: Where is Shoshone, California
2.	A It's just east of Death Valley National
3	Konument in California.
4	Q It's a little stop in the road?
, 5	A. Yea, sir.
6	G Small little town?
, 7	A Population approximately 75 to a hundred.
. 8	And when did you speak to Mr. Flynn in Shoshone!
9	A On December 19, 1969.
10	Q Where did you speak to him in Shoshone?
·	A In a house that he was sharing with two other
12	occupants.
13	Who was present at that time in addition to
14	yourself and fir. Flynn?
15	A Paul Grockett, Paul Watkins, Brooks Postin and,
16	at one phase of the conversation, Deputy Don Ward, Inyo
17	County Sheriff's Office.
. 18 .	UR. KANAREK: Your Henor, if I may, I would like to
19	object on the grounds of due process and I'd like to do it
20	at the bench, if I might make my point to the Court.
21	THE COURT: Are you talking about this conversation?
22	ER. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: This witness' testimony?
24	MR. KANARLE: Yes, I don't believe it's
25	THE COURT: I assume you are going to offer th
26	conversation: is that right. Wr. Busilesi?

MR. BUGLIOSI; Yes, your Honor.

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

Ì5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Then let's approach the bench, gentlemen.

KR. HUGHES: Your Honor, may defendant Leslie

Van Houten be present for the bench conference? I don't

wish to have any proceedings outside of the presence of the

defendants.

THE COURT: I stated to you what the ground rules were, Mr. Hughes.

MR. HUGHES: Well, your Honor, may the record be clear, then, that there is no microphone and that the defendant is not able to take part in those proceedings at the bench and that accordingly --

THE COURTY You are, however, if you wish.

ME. HUGHES; Accordingly, your Honor, I wish to be able to make the point so that the defendant may hear it now.

Accordingly, your Honor, I will approach the bench. However, I will not waive Miss Van Houten's presence at any of the proceedings in this court.

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

THE COURT: Let's hear from Mr. (Kanarek first)

MR. KANAREK: I don't believe the District Attorney can put this on at this point because --

THE COURT: Put what on?

MR. KANAREK: This evidence. I don't think he can put

ï

2

0

5

6

8

9

11

12.

13 ·

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

this on at this point. He must do that on rebuttal. I disapprove of this witness coming on at this time.

In other words, because there has been some testimony by Mr. Flynn, I don't think that allows him to put this, what would normally be, rebuttal evidence on, and I will object to that because it pinpoints and causes an undue emphasis on the purported authenticity of Mr. Flynn's statement.

THE COURT: I assume the objection is going to be one of hearsay.

MR. KANAREK: Also, yes, your Honor.

HR. FITZGERALD: If he is not going to put the conversation on, it's immaterial and irrelevant. He can't put a witness on the stand and mak him if he's had a conversation.

MR. BUGLIOST: I am going to put it on.

MR. FITZGERALD: If he is going to put the conversation on itself, that's hearsay.

THE COURT: He has to lay the foundation first, Mr. Fitzgerald. In other words, he is entitled to try to get the conversation in, but he has to first lay's foundation.

MR. FITZGERALD: What exception to the hearsay rule? THE COURT: I don't know.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I'll make my offer of proof right now, your Honor.

21

22

23

24

25

26.

This goes towards by flare-up in court yesterday. Mr. Kanarek, and I have it in the record, I have an authentication for it, has implied that Juan Flynn's statement was recently fabricated. As early as this morning he started off by saying, "Did Nr. Bugliosi bring anything to you?" And then he went further. He says, "About the knife incident in the kitchen, were these matters brought to your attention by Kr. Bugliosi?"

He said that this morning.

Now, let me read you Section 791, your Honor:
"Prior inconsistent statement.

"Evidence of a statement previously made by a witness that is consistent with his testimony at the hearing --"
THE COURT: Keep your voice down.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Oh. ...

"-- is inadmissible to support his credibility unless it is offered after (b) an express or implied charge that has been made that his testimony at the hearing is recently fabricated."

Now, again, I turn to Volume 106 and I read some of the statements that Mr. Kanarek made to Mr. Flynn implying that he made up this story while talking to me. Says.

"As a matter of fact, it's a fair statement, Mr. Flynn, that you have not told us the

1 ·2· that, sir." 3 "Q HA. Š J. Q. ٠Ġ 7 8 10 11 12 13 14, 15 16 17 18 19 20 6: A 21 22 ĦΩ 23 , TA., 24 Ď.į 25 26

"truth in this courtroom concerning the knife at your throat." And he says, "You are saying

I'm asking you, Mr. Flynn.

I told you the truth.

Did you tell Mr. - then there is 'some reason, there is some reason, did you tell Mr. Sartucci when you were at the Police Building on August the 18th, 1970, did you tell Mr. Sartucci about the knife at your threat Mr. Manson made these threats to you?" There's objections.

"Well, I told him the truth,

"Mr. Flynn, my question is, as a matter of fact, you made no statement to Mr. Sertucci in your interview of August 18, 1970, about a knife at your throat at a time when Mr. Manson supposedly made these statements to you, did you, because it did not happen? Is that right, Ar. Flynn?

I didn't mention it if it is not in the record because, you know, I says, you know, I'll bring it up here.

Oh, you'll tring it up here,

Yes.

You had in your mind -- in other words, you deliberately lied to Mr. Sartucci;

"is that right? 1 No." T'A. 2 "BY MR, KANAREK: You are holding that back, is that right, Mr. Flynn, to spring it 4 on us in this courtroom; is that right? 5. No. I told the officers about this before, you see. Ż And Mr. Flynn, are you telling us, do you remember when the man was there 9 taking down all the notes, like this Mr. Hollombe 10 is here in this court? 11 41 Yes. . 12 You were talking to Mr. Sartucci 13 on August the 18th, 1970? 14 XX. Yes. 15 You deliberately did not tell · 16 him about the knife at the throat? 17 You say deliberately. I say. 18 I might not come up with it. 19. MΔ. You might not have come out with 20 1t? 21 Yes. It wasn't a very important #Q 23 point. The reason it wasn't is because it. 24. never happened, is that right?" 25 Just constantly here. I'll go on further. 26

it.

24

25

26

"You were at the Police Building because you wanted to be there and help the police: is that right?

"A Well, you see, I was asked if
I was willing to testify by the officers, you
see, or come down and see the District
Attorney, you see, and I was -- and I says,
yes, you know. So it might not have sprung
right there, but I know it happened. You know,
it happened.

"Yes, I see.

HYOM.

made it up for the purposes of this courtroom?

Is that correct, Mr. Flynn?"

Direct - direct questions,

MR. BUGLIOSI: Direct. There is no question about

MR. KANAREK: I'm afraid he is going to have a hemorrhage here this morning.

MR. SHINN: What date is that?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am just taking some of it.

THE COURT: There is no question. There was an implied, if not express, charge of recent fabrication.

MR. FITIGERALD: I'll stand on my objection that it's.

84-1

2 3

1

4

5 6

7.

8

9 10

11

Į2

13

14 15

16

17

18

19_: 20

21

.22

23 24

25

26

THE COURT: There is a limiting instruction. If it's limited solely for the purpose of letting a jury determine whether or not the statements were made to this officer at the time he alleges it, not for the content or the truth of it.

point, I think our point is valid. This testimony does not come in in connection with their case in chief.

THE COURT: Certainly it does.

MR. KAWAREK: No, your Honor. I don't helieve that they can rehabilitate this witness -- I think the orderly procedure would be on rebuttel for them to bring in this type of a witness.

THE COURT: Then you would raise the objection that they were bringing in a matter that wasn't covered in your defense; therefore, they couldn't raise it on rebuttal.

MR. KANAREK: No. I think --

THE COURT: I think it's clearly admissible but there must be a limiting instruction.

MR. MUCLIOSI: Well, your Honor, I'm not too sure.

This might come in substantively. The inconsistent statements rule, I forget the name of the case, People vs.

Johnson, held that prior inconsistent statements cannot
come in substantively, they can only come in for impeachment
purposes.

I don't think there is any wase that says

that prior consistent statements can't some in substantively. They aren't hearsay but they come in under an exception to the hearsay rule.

I think we will have to do some research on this. But to my knowledge, they come in substantively.

THE COURT: If you want to pass it for the time

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't want to pass this because he has to leave. He is from Fresno.

THE COURT: I'm going to give a limited instruction.

MR. BUCLIOST: Well, there is no indication in the Ewidence Code that this can't come in substantively.

MR. KANAREK: This isn't Hr. Manson's declaration.

MR. FITZGERALD: It's covered by 1235 of the Evidence Code and the case you are referring to, most recent case, is People vs. Green.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That's on prior inconsistent statements. This is a prior consistent statement.

MR. FITZGERALD: Same rule applies.

MR. KANAREK: But yorcan't bootstrap that into evidence as against Mr. Manson.

THE COURT: 1236 covers the prior consistent statement.

HR. BUGLIOSI: Right. And 1236 refers to Section 791. And 791 in sub (b) they talk about an implied charge? recent fabrication.

21

22

23

24.

2

44-3

Ĺ

10.

MR. KANAREK: And we have the Sixth Amendment, right of confrontation, your Honor, involved. And we have a right to confront. And how can you confront your accuser if this mas is a gentlemen whom Mr. Manson has never seen.

THE COURT: Well, I think to swoid that problem -MR. BUGLIOSI: All right, your Honor, why don't you
instruct them now that it is limited for that purpose and
then maybe later, if I could give the Court some suthority,
the Court could reinstruct the jury.

Would that be okay, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: May we have an offer of proof as to what this witness is going to say in this regard? I think it's a fair request to have an offer of proof because Mr. Bugliosi has talked to him but certainly I don't think may of us have.

THE COURT: I think there should be an offer of proof.

IM. MUGLICAT: Oh, the offer of proof, your Honor, is that he saked Mr. Flynn in Shoshone if Mr. Manson had ever confessed to him or spoken to him about the Tate murders and Mr. Flynn says, "Well, there was one time in the kitchen at Spahn Ranch and Mr. Hanson put a knife at my throat, pulled my hair back, and says, 'You SOA. Don't you know I am the one doing all these killings!"

Almost precisely the testimony here in court.

84-4

2

ľ

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16.

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

.26

And it just couldn't be more consistent. The language is almost identical.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

I would object to the use of this evidence in any event because it is beersay upon bearany, if we want to get poetic about it, and the fact of the matter is, furthermore, that I don't believe that the jury -- the jury can make that fine distinction that your Honor is going to instruct them. I think that interferes and denies Mr. Menson a fair trial, a fair jury trial, because we are now dealing with a purported confession, your Honor, which has, as your Honor knows -- all the cases are legion that when you come to words of confession you get into an area that is very, very dangerous. And here is a purported confession that is coming in.

be allowed to hear any of this, not only on hearsay but --

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

Mr. BUCLICSI: Thank you.

MR. SHIMN: Join in the objections and it is hearsay as to Susan Atkins.

MR. HUCHES: Join in the objections and it is hearsay as to Defendant Van Houten.

So that the record is abundantly clear, I want it clear the Defendant Van Houten not only is not present but is not able to hear this conference.

8±-5

2

1

1.

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14.

. 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24. 25

26

THE COURT: Under Illinois vs. Alien there is no requirement that she even hear. She has a right to be present if she conforms her conduct to the reasonable requirements of the court and does not disrupt the trial. When she is removed under Illinois vs. Alien there is no right to hear.

MR. FITZGERALD: No, I disagree with your Honor.

MR. HUCHES: I'm not waiving her right to -
THE COURT: At any rate, she has a speaker and she

can hear.

MR.HUGHES: She cannot hear the proceedings that take place at the beach and I am not waiving her presence.

MR. FITZGERALD: She couldn't even hear it when she was in court.

THE COURT: Those are purely legal arguments.

MR. HUGHES: I am making a legal argument, your Honor, and it is that she cannot hear this conference.

THE COURT: You said that, Mr. Hughes. There is no need to repest it.

MR.HUGHES: I'm not waiving her presence at any proceedings before this Court. Any proceedings, your Honor --

MR. KANAREK: May I join --

MR. HUGHES: -- to hear or otherwise.

MR. KANAREK: -- on behalf of Mr. Menson with Mr. Hughes' comments.

26 .

THE COURT: Very well.

HR.KAMAREK: And Mr. Fitzgerald, if he did make a comment in connection with this subject matter.

(Whereupon the proceedings were resumed before the jury in open court.)

2 3

1

5

7

,8 9

10

1Ť 12

13

14

. 15.

. 16.

17

Î8 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

How long was the conversation you had with Mr. Flynn?

I don't recall the exact length of that conversation. There was a series of conversations during the day with each of the witnesses as I interviewed them and I started, perhaps, at 1:30, 12:00 o'clock in the morning, and it didn't conclude until somewhere around . 10:00 or 11:00 that night.

Was your conversation with Mr. Tlynn tapa recorded?

Yes, a good portion of it was.

Did you bring that tape recording to court with you today?

Yes. I did.

After the conversation at any time did you play the tape recording?

I have played just a small part of this tape within the last two days. It's the only time.

All right. With respect to that small part of the tape, did it appear to accurately record the conversation that you engaged in with Mr. Flyon?

MR. KAMAREK: Calling for a conclusion, your Honor. And I think that the best evidence is not this witness's editorialising, your Monor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It's a necessary foundation, your

Honor, to determine whether enything was deleted or Ì added. It's part of the foundation. 2 THE COURT: Well, you are not offering the tape. 3 MR. BUCLIOSI: We are going to play the tape, your Ś · Honor. We are going to offer the tape. MR. HUCHES: Furthermore, your Honor, I would object that this has never been made a part of discovery Ż and I would ask for an exclusion or suppression. MR. BUGLIOSI: This is legal argument that should be made up at the bench, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Objection is overruled. You may answer 11 12 it. 13 THE WITNESS: Will you repeat the question, please. 14 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. 15 When you played the tape, did you determine 16 that it fully and accurately reported the conversation 17 that you recall having with Mr. Flyon? Ĭ8` It did. 19 Was anything added or deleted, to your know-20 ledge, in that tape? 21 No. it was not. 22 And do you have that tape with you in court , 23 today? 24 Å I do. 25 And you have a tape recorder to play it on? Q 26 Æ I do.

8b+3

2

1

.3 .

4· 5

6 7

.8· .9

ÌO

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

Į9

20

21· 22·

23

24

25

*2*6

Q In the conversation that you had with Mr. Flynn, did he mention any knife incident at Spahn Ranch with Charles Manson?

MR. KAMAREK: Object, your Honor, on the grounds it's leading and suggestive and not the best evidence, if we have the tape, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. KANAREK: I wondered if we also might make a motion at the bench on this.

THE COURT: Objection is overruled,

The jury is admonished that evidence of the alleged conversation to which this witness is appearably going to testify will be received for a very limited purpose and that purpose is only to parall the jury to consider it with respect to the question of whether or not Mr. Flynn made these statements to this vitness at the time indicated. And the evidence is not received with respect to the truth of the statements which Mr. Flynn may have made.

In other words, you are not to consider the statements for the matters contained therein, but only for the purpose of determining whether or not Mr. Flynn made the statements to this witness on the date indicated.

MR.SHIMN: Your Honor, may I address the Court,

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SHINN: May I take this witness on voir dire to determine whether or not the constitutional rights of Mr. Flynn were violated or not?

THE COURT: That motion is denied.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I would nove for a continuance so that we can have time to hear this tape. And also I would move that all of the testimony of Hr. Flynn be struck because this tape was not made available to us and apparently the prosecution had full knowledge of it.

HR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, this is legal argument 9-1 and should be up at the bench, and defense counsel knows it. MR. HUGHES: This was not made a part of discovery. 3 THE COURT: Do you wish to make an argument at the bench Mr. Hughes? 5 MR. HUGHES: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. 7 MR. HUGHES: However, I also wish to point out that I 9: am not waiving --10 THE COURT: I don't want any more argument in front of the jury, mir. I am giving you the opportunity to 11 . 12 · come to the beach. MR. HUCHES: Yes, sir. 13 (Whereupon, all squasel approach the bench 14 15 and the following proceedings occur at the banch outside of the hearing of the jury:) 17 MR. HUGHES: I just wish to point out, also, again, 18 that I do not wish to waive defendant Van Houten's rights. 19 THE COURT: You said that now about three or four 20 times. Mr. Hughes. Don't clutter up the record by saying it 21 any more. You don't add anything to it. 22 You have made your objection. It has been 23 overruled. 24 MR. HUGHES: May I have a continuing objection, then. for any time there is any proceeding outside of her hearing?

26

THE COURT:

You may,

1

2 .

1,

4

5 6

.7

8

9.

10

'n

12 ·

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

.24

25

26

MR. KANAREK: May I join and have the same on behalf of Mr. Manson?

THE COURT: All right.

Let's get on.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Will the Court admonish the Jury to disregard his comment that we never furnished enything?

Again, your Honor, it is argument in front of the jury that the District Attorney is doing something wrong.

THE COURT: Let's get on.

MR. HUGHES: We have never been furnished or did we even have knowledge of the existence of the tape recording which is here alluded to, and I would move, number one, that all of the testimony of Juan Flynn — this is a tape recording of Juan Flynn, and Juan Flynn is a critical witness — that all of his testimony be struck for failure of the prosecution to comply with the various discovery orders made in this case.

THE COURT: Your contention, first, is that it comes within the discovery order; is that right?

MR. HUGHES: Yes.

WR. FITZGERALD: Yes. The statement of the witness. I will agree.

I move for a one week's continuance — he said this was an il-to-12 hour conversation — I move for a one week's continuance to listen to it. It will take a week to

listen to it.

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16:

17

18

·19

20

2Ì

22

23

24

25

26

MR, BUGLIOSI: I just got this yesterday myself. I didn't know about it.

I called him in Fresno and he came down with the tape.

The first time that I found out about it is when Mr Flynn was on the stand and he testific that on a previous occasion he made a statement at some Sheriff's up Office/in Shoshone. I started inquiring, and I found out it was the CHP officer.

So, I just got this tape myself. I was totally unaware of it.

MR. HUGHES. In the event that --

THE COURT: Just a minute.

I want to make sure that I understand.

Did you gentlemen know about the existence of Officer Steuber?

26

MR. HUGHES: No.

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

MR. KANAREK: No.

THE COURT: Did you know about him?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I knew of his existence, of course.

I didn't know that he had spoken to Flynn until he related this.

THE COURT: Didn't Officer Steuber report this conversation to somebody?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, he reported it to Frank Fowles, the District Attorney in Inyo County.

Somehow it never reached the LAPD or me.

The first time that I found out about this is when I spoke to Mr. Flynn in my office and he stated that Manson put the knife to his throat. That is the first time that I found out about it.

THE COURT: Well, I agree that if there is a tape, in view of the fact that counsel have not, apparently, had an opportunity to hear it -- is that right?

MR. FITZGERALD: Right.

THE COURT: -- that they should have an opportunity to hear it.

MR. NUGLICSI: We could do that at 2:00 o'clock.

THE COURT: Obviously, in connection with their cross-examination.

How long is it going to take for them to listen

to it?

. I

2

ż

5

6

7

8 .

ġ,

10

11

12

13

14.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

M. BUGLIOSI: This particular portion here is extremely short. This is the only thing that I am bringing in right now.

THE COURT: I know, but before they are in a position to cross-examine, they have a right, and will want to, I am sure, to hear the antire tape.

MR. FITZGERALD: And it is my understanding from the witness's testimony that that is 11 or 12 hours in length.

THE COURT: Now, let's consider also, gentlemen, that this evidence is being received for a limited purpose. That is, only as to whether or not it was said, not for the truth of the matters stated therein.

MR. KANAREK: That is theoretical, though, your Honor, as far as the jury is concerned.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Kamarek, that will make about the 357th time you said that in this trial. You don't need to say it again. This is not final argument.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, but the point I was trying to make to the Court is that I believe that the objection of the best evidence rule is valid. I think that the present Evidence Code indicates that higher evidence should be used as opposed to just oral testimony.

Therefore, in the context of these proceedings with the jury knowing there is a tape, there is a synthetic authenticity given to this men if he is allowed to testify.

25

26

I think that if there is a tape, then he should try to use the tape.

THE COURT: Why is that any different than a man who testifies after having made notes of a conversation?

MR. KANAREK: I am maying that the tape is higher

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am going to play the tape.

MR. FITZGERALD: I think that essentially there are problems, and I wouldn't like to see them confused.

One is that this officer, if he testifies to a tape recording, I tank we are entitled to hear the entire recording, because other portions may amplify or smellorate or contradict.

THE COURT: No question.

98-1

2

İ

3 4

5

7

. .

LÓ.

11

12

13

16

17

.18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. FITZGERALD: Number two, I think this is the tape recording of Juan Flynn, who is a major prosecution withess, and we ought to be entitled to listen to that tape in order that we might be able to bring Mr. Flynn back for further cross-examination in the event that the tape recording contains any contradictory statement, any prior inconsistent statements.

So, your Honor, we are talking about two things. We are talking about this officer's recorded statement, and we are talking about Juan Flynn's recorded statement.

That seems to be the big problem.

THE COURT: I have no problem with that at all, gentlemen. You are entitled to hear it in its entirety, and as far as I am concerned, you are entitled to play it, if you want to, any portion that Mr. Bugliesi does not play, so far as it has any relevance.

The only question now is how will we proceed?

Mr. Bugliosi apparently has a very brief portion that he wishes to offer under --

MR. BUGLIOSI: Extremely brief. About a half a minute or a minute.

THE COURT: -- 791 of the Evidence Code.

MR. KANAREK: I would ask that before this witness testifies any further, that as far as his testimony goes, the matter be adjourned.

THE COURT: We are going to adjourn in a minute because

it is after 12:00 noon.

2

MR. FITZGERALD: Let me ask him if he has the tape with him, or you can ask him. Inyo county is 240 miles away.

THE COURT: He said that he has it.

5

MR. PITZGERALD: The entire tape.

7

Can I ask hin?

HR. SHINN: May I be heard, your Honor?

THE COURT: One thing at a time.

10

HR. FITAGERALD: As to the logistics. Would you ask

Ϊľ

him if he has the entire tapes here, because if he doesn't,

it is unlikely that we are going to hear them over this

12

weekend. We won't be able to hear them until the first

13.

part of next week.

to hear the tapes.

14 15

Let's find out what he has got available that

we can listen to. . 16

17

THE COURT: If he has them all here, they can be listened to over the weekend. Mr. Bugliosi can then proceed

to play the limited portion that he is interested in and

19

at the end of the direct examination of this witness.

20 21

will then adjourn until such time as you get an opportunity

22

MR. PITZUERALD: All Pight.

particular portion right now.

23

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think we should be able to play that

25

26

24.

" THE COURT: That is what I said.

MR. BUGLIOSI: At this particular moment. THE COURT: When we come back after lunch. MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. . 10 : 11 ` 12 13 14 15 16 17 **为,还是否是**多数。 18 19 20 - 21 22 23 24 25 26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

9c-1

2

J

3

5.

7

ä

9

. 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22.

23

24

25

26

HR. KAMAREK: I would object to it being used at this time under the doctrine of People ys. Crowedi, the right for the defendant to prepare.

THE COURT: You will be given a complete opportunity to prepare.

MR. KAMAREK: But the effect on the jury of allowing the jury to hear it, and then going sheed to prepare, that deprives, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are not going to have to crossexamine before you hear it.

HR. FITZGERALD: He said he has five reals of taps that purport to be Juan Flynn's conversation. He actually has two with him in this building and three are in his car.

THE COURT: So they are all here in Los Angeles?
MR. FITZGERALD: Apparently.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SHIMN: May I say something now, your Honor?

THE COURTS Yes.

MR, SHIMN: I think we should take up the question of whether or not the tape, or this witness's testimony regarding the conversation with Mr. Flynn, is admissible or inadmissible.

We have a constitutional question here, your Honor, whether or not Mr. Flynn was swere of his constitutional rights. We have a right to go into that before he

25

26

even goes into the conversation, your Honor, before Mr. Bugliosi goes into that.

THE COURT: What is your authority for that?

HR. SHIRN: It is a constitutional right, your

Honor. We should know whether or not Mr. Flynn gave up
his constitutional right.

THE COURT: You cits me some cases after the noon recess on that.

We are going to recess at this time, but what I anticipate doing, gentlemen, is letting Hr. Bugliosi go sheed and play that portion of the tape that he desires to.

We will then edjourn until -- I suppose it will take until Monday -- or we long as you indicate -- and you can play the tapes over the weekend, and you can commence your excess-examination.

HR. HUGHES: Would the Court order empire made for each counsel so counsel can prepara?

I don't know, logistically, whom we are going to do that.

THE COURT: Just get together and play them. You are going to listen to them here in court. Put the tape on the machine and play it.

MR.HUCHES: Will the Court make this building with a machine syellable, or what? I don't understand.

THE COURT: You and Mr. Bugliosi can work out the

9D-1

1 2.

3

5

'7

<u>8</u>.

10

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: Before you go any further. I will be through in five minutes after 2:00 o'clock. I suggest that we might utilize this afternoon for Roni Howard and Virginia Graham, to bring them into your chambers.

I have my original notes now on Virginia Graham, and I had them photostated.

Did the Court get a copy of the Roni Howard notes?

THE COURT: I think so.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We can either discuss the legal aspect of this or bring them in this afternoon, but I think we should utilize this afternoon.

Things have slowed down tremendously at this trial, and I don't think we should throw away the afternoon.

THE COURT: I certainly agree with you, if there is something that can be done.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Does the Court want me to bring in Virginia Graham and Roni Howard this afternoon, or does the Court want to just consider the legal aspects of the admissibility?

I think we already discussed the admissibility aspect. It seems to me that the issue now is: What are they going to testify to?

THE COURT: As I indicated to you the other day, and counsel seemed to be in accordance, that this is what they wanted done, to have the witnesses come into chambers and

25

- 26

testify as they are going to testify, and then, on the basis of that testimony determine whether or not effective deletions can be made.

Is that agreeable, gentlement

MR. FITZOERALD: Agresable.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I can have them here this afternoon.

MR. KANAREK: Can we hear what counsel is going to play this afternoon now, before he plays it, your Honor?

THE COURT: I have no objection to that.

MR. KANAREK: Would your Honor order that?

THE COURT: We will take a recess now until 2:00 of clock this afternoon anyway.

MR. KANAREK: But will your Honor order it?
THE COURT: How long will it take to play?

MR. BUGLIOSI: This particular portion that we will play in the courtroom after the noon recess will take a minute.

THE COURT: Why don't you work it out between you during the recess.

MR. KANAREK: Very well.

(Whereupon, all counsel return to their respective place at counsel table and the following proceedings occur in open court in the presence and hearing of the jury:)

THE COURT: We will take the noon recess at this time, ladies and gentlemen.

Do not converse with anyone or form or express any opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to you.

The Court will recess until 2:00 p.m. (Whereupon, at 12:07 p.m. the court was in