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 P. M. SESSION

APPEARANCES:

DONALD A. MUSICH, STEPHEN RUSSELL KAY,

For the People:

AARON H. SEE TATE and VINCENT T. BUGLIOSI, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

For Deft. Manson:

I. A. KANAREK, Esq.

For Deft. Atkins:

DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Deft. Van Houten:

Michigan was a particular and a company of the comp RONALD HUGHES, Esq.

For Deft. Krenwinkel:

PAUL FITZGERALD. Esq.

LOIS R. JOHNSON,

VOLUME 112

CSR..

12626 12729 PAGES to

MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR., Official Reporters

1		•			
	INDEX				
2:	PEOPLE'S WITNES			REDIRECT	RECROSS
·3 ·		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		12684	12685K
* 5	STEUBER, David (Cont'd)		7448044		
5 6		•			
7					
		•			
8 9					•
10		*· *			
11				•	
13		•		•	,
	4		•	,	
14				•	
15			•	• •	
16					
	,	•			
: 17	₫				
18		•			*
18 19		·			,
18 19 20					,
18 19 20 21		•	·		•
18 19 20 21 22			-		•
18 19 20 21 22 23				,	
18 19 20 21 22					

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

10-1

ŀ

2

3

, 5

∙6·

7 .8

9

Ĭ0

11 12

13

14 15

1,6

. 17

18

19

20 21

źż

23

24

25

26

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1970 2:05 P.M.

___0__

(The following proceedings were had in chambers outside the presence and hearing of the jury:)

THE COURT: All counsel are present.

Did you have something you wanted to bring up, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

During the noon hour, as best I could, your Honor, in the Law Library, I researched this point, and I believe that I would say -- I allege that going ahead with this witness' testimony at this point would be reversible error, your Honor.

Beginning with Priestly, which is 50 Cal. 2d, 812, which I'm sure is a case that your Honor knows about, the failure of the prosecution to respond to discovery means that whatever evidence that they have must be suppressed in view of the -- well, without belaboring it -- the circumstances of this case.

I have cases here that I would want the Court to consider. Because you can't unring the bell as far as this jury is concerned. Once that tape recording starts winding and they hear what Mr. Flynn purportedly said, the error is in.

Now, the only relief that the defendant --

ŀ

б

2Ò,

÷

THE COURT: Why don't you start out by telling me what subject we are talking about and what relief, if any, you are seeking, or motion you are making, or objection.

You are jumping right into —

MR. KANAREK: Very well, certainly, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- some kind of a statement that I don't know what it relates to.

MR. KANAREK: I'm making a motion to suppress, your Honor, all of the testimony of the officer and the tape that he's going to lay the foundation for, purportedly, because of the failure of the prosecution to respond to discovery.

There's 11 hours of tape there. There is no relief -- there is no relief --

.1

.5 ·

2Ò

THE COURT: Mr. Bugliosi said he didn't know about it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: In fact, I haven't heard the tapes myself. The only thing I have heard is one minute. I haven't heard it all myself.

MR. KANAREK: First of all, we have no declaration to that effect, we have nothing under oath. We have merely the protestations of Mr. Bugliosi in that regard.

THE COURT: That's right, Because the question was just raised a few minutes before noon.

MR. KANAREK: But, your Honor, what I am saying is, you see, it isn't a matter of good faith or lack of good faith on the part of the prosecution, or their allegation of good faith. What it is, what it means is, that the prosecution, because they didn't do their homework, here we have Mr. Manson arrested, we have 12 hours of tape, and —

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Kanarek, if you are contending that you have the right to something that hasn't yet been discovered, I am afraid I am not aware of any authority that requires that.

MR. KANAREK: Law enforcement, your Honor -- if I may, your Honor -- what I am saying is that, at the very minimum, I think that the Court -- and I make the motion to continue. I refer here to -- I have here Witkin on Procedure, and I am sure your Honor recognizes that there are certain situations which are so important that the Court can order a

17

18

19.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

5

continuance — but we don't have to actually continue this trial; your Honor can defer his ruling until they can present points and authorities, and I would want to present points and authorities in a more cogent manner than I can just over the noon hour.

I have the cases here, your Honor, which I think clearly substantiate. This is State action. It was in law enforcement officers' hands. There was coordination between the District Attorney of Los Angeles County and the District Attorney of Inyo County. There is 12 hours of tape.

The fact of the matter is that we were not furnished those 12 hours of tape.

So, the only relief --

THE COURT: You are going to be given an opportunity to listen to all of the tapes before cross-examination.

MR. KANAREK: But the damage is done, your Honor.

THE COURT: What damage?

MR. KANAREK: Well, in other words, purportedly, there is going to be some statement by Mr. Flynn about the knife and about some statements of Mr. Manson concerning the alleged Tate and La Bianca murders.

Now, we made discovery, your Honor. We did everything we could do.

THE COURT: How would discovery prevent those statements from coming in?

1 2

3

4 -

5

6

7

ģ

ģ

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

. 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. HUGHES: I think the point is, your Honor, that the discovery was not necessarily directed to Mr. Bugliosi personally. It was directed to the District Attorney's office, to the Police Department, and to various other agencies, and just because Mr. Bugliosi personally did not have knowledge of 12 hours of tape recordings, I don't think it means that it was not discovered.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't see how we could produce something we don't have.

THE COURT: I fail to see where the prejudice is myself.

MR. KANAREK: It is here --

THE COURT: Even assuming what you say is correct.
Where is the prejudice?

MR. HUGHES: The discovery comes today, supposedly, and Mr. Bugliosi, apparently, for several days, anyway, has known of those tape recordings.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, not several days.

THE COURT: What difference does it make? You will have an opportunity to listen to them before you cross-examine.

MR. BUGLIGSI: I called Fresno two nights ago and I asked if he had the tapes, and he said he did, and I asked him to bring them down, and he brought them down with him.

Was it yesterday?

MR. MUSICH: I think so. I MR. BUGLIOSI: I didn't know about the conversation 2 until Juan Flynn testified on cross-examination that he 3 told some sheriff in Shoshone about it. So, I called Don Ward, and Ward said yes, 5 he remembered a conversation in Shoshone. 6 And I said, "Who was it with?" 7 And he said, "Some guy from the CHP," and he 8 didn't know the name of the man. 9 So, I knew about Dave Steuber, and I said, 10. "Is it Steuber?" And he said, "Yes." 11 So, we called Fresno that night, and he 12 verified that he had the tapes, and I asked him to bring 13 them down. 14 Now, those are the facts. How is that a 15 violation of discovery? 16 MR. FITZGERALD: There is a factual inaccuracy. 17 The tapes were in the possession of the 18 District Attorney of Inyo County, Frank Fowles. I tink 19 one can make a substantial argument that you should have 20 known about it. 21 MR. BUGLIOSI: There is no question, perHaps, 22 that I should have known about it, but I didn't. 23 THE COURT: Have any of you listened to the tapes? 24 MR. FITZGERALD: I listened to a portion. 25 THE COURT: I mean, all the tapes? 26

•

. 13 . 14

Z fls.

MR. FITZGERALD: No. That was not possible.

MR. HUGHES: There are 11 hours of tapes, and we only had two hours over the noon recess.

THE COURT: I think maybe you are premature.

Maybe there is nothing in the tapes worth discovering anyway.

MR. FITZGERALD: That could be.

MR. KANAREK: That could be, if Mr. Fitzgerald says, but they are going to use a portion now in connection with the knife incident and the words uttered by Mr. Flynn, supposedly, to Mr. Manson.

THE COURT: Assume that you had discovered the tapes six months ago, Mr. Kanarek. What difference would this make? They would still offer the evidence.

MR. KANAREK: Not necessarily, because then, if we had knowledge of those tapes, then, perhaps, our questioning would have been different. That is the point.

1

THE COURT: What question?

2

Preparing for trial. MR. KANAREK:

3

THE COURT: What question?

4

MR. KANAREK: Questioning of Mr. Flynn. The only.

. 5

reason that they're offering it is supposedly because it's

rehabilitating him. There wouldn't be any need for

rehabilitation if they'd have made discovery and been --

8.

THE COURT: My recollection is that he testified,

9.

either on direct or cross, or perhaps both, that he did

10

tell an officer in Shoshone.

11

MR. KANAREK: Well, what I'm saying is, your Honor,

12

this type -- this interrogation, and what occurred, would be

13

-- would perhaps -- and there's some probability, would be

14

different if they had made discovery and we'd have had a

15

transcript of the tapes. Because this is now purporting to

16 17

rehabilitation if we'd have had -- if they'd have made the

rehabilitate him. And there would be no need for

18

discovery that we requested.

19

And in that sense, the very relevance

20

authenticity or credibility that doesn't exist, and need

of the word, it gives him -- it gives him an aura of

21 22

not have existed except for the fact that they did not make

23

discovery. And I think that the cases are clear.

24

THE COURT: You keep saying that but I see no evidence that they didn't make discovery.

25

26

MR. KANAREK: Well, but -- well, what I'm saying is,

24

25

26

if your Honor makes a judicial decision that they didn't make discovery, it will be too late. Because the bell would have been rung as to this point by playing these statements to the jury at this time.

THE COURT: Even if they didn't make discovery,
Mr. Kanarek ---

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: -- which at this point is a poor assumption on your part, are you contending that there's some automatic requirement that the Court must exclude the evidence?

MR. KANAREK: Yes. What I'm saying is if --

THE COURT: All right. You give me the citation.

MR. KANAREK: People vs. Seach -- I mean this is the application clearly -- the Priestly case.

THE COURT: Do you have what the case holds?

MR. KANAREK: I can't represent that to the Court.

215 Cal. Ap. 2d at 779 is one case.

THE COURT: People vs. what? What is the last name?

MR. KANAREK: Seach', your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: 779?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Any others?

MR. KANAREK: Yes. Well, the Priestly case, 50 Cal. 2d, 812. where there --

THE COURT: Do you know what it holds?

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. KANAREK: That had to do with informer evidence. Seach holds just the opposite of MR. BUGLIOSI: what you say, if this headnote --MR. KANAREK: Well, Mr. Bugliosi, again, is sliding off the point. MR. BUGLIOSI: I think it says that. It says exactly the opposite of what you are saying. MR. KANAREK: It doesn't, your Honor. It held in that -- if I may finish -- it doesn't hold that at all. MR. BUGLIOSI: Maybe the headnote is wrong. MR. KANAREK: The headnote says --MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Kanarek --

MR. KANAREK: May I finish, your Honor?

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.

MR. KANAREK: When Mr. Bugliosi has made very extended argument to the Court I have refrained, as your Honor may well recollect, from interjecting or interrupting.

> Here. The headnote itself says:

"In a burglary prosecution, though the prosecution may have shown bad faith in withholding the report of an expert witness as not having been received in time, in the time period covered by the Court's pretrial discovery , order, failure to furnish defendants with the report of an expert who had examined physical evidence taken from defendants was not

.2A

"prejudicial where defendants were furnished with a copy of the report on the day before the experttestified and nothing in the nature of the report supported defendants; contention that they lack ample opportunity to prepare for cross-examination of the expert."

THE COURT: That relates to a report that was known about.

MR. KANAREK: Well, but, if your Honor will bear with me just a minute, that's reading the headnote because Mr. Bugliosi --

THE COURT: I am now looking at the opinion, Page 785.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. What I'm saying is --

2

1

3.

. **5**

6

7

8

.9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Well, don't you see anydifference between something that is known to the prosecution and something that is unknown to them?

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor has to make the judicial decision. I don't think your Honor can make that decision based upon unverified protestations of a deputy district attorney.

But over and above that is the fact that in Seach there's the clear implication -- it's implicit, if not explicit, that if you are deprived of fair crossexamination, or you are deprived of something that must take place, or that would have taken place had you been given this, then the evidence must be suppressed.

Now, in this case had we been given these tapes, the examination of Mr. Flynn would undoubtedly have been different. And so, therefore --

THE COURT: You don't know that. You haven't heard the tapes.

MR. KANAREK: Well --

THE COURT: I would suggest this, Mr. Kanarek: I think whatever you are trying to do is premature at this time. If, after you have listened to the tapes, you feel that you have grounds for some kind of a motion. then I think you should set that forth clearly in some kind of a declaration that I can consider in the light of whatever the tapes reveal

MR. KANAREK: By that time the damage will have been done because the jury is going to hear the portion that is probably the portion -- the very portion that we are -- that has to do with the allegations about the knife and the statements. And you can't unring the bell. And that is the error, your Honor.

That's why I am asking that this matter be continued, this witness he held in shevence until we can

That's why I am asking that this matter be continued, this witness be held in abeyance until we can convince the Court, or try to convince the Court, that the Court should suppress the tape and the testimony of this witness because the prosecution didn't make discovery.

Maybe your Honor will decide against us. But if you let the jury hear it now, it's going to be fatal. Because the jury -- then you can't unring that bell. And that's -- your Honor has the power not to allow that error to occur by just merely holding in abeyance what supposedly is going to take place in the courtroom right now.

Maybe the prosecution is right. But this way we can offer declarations, points and authorities, and then we can have this evidence.

There's nothing magic. This evidence doesn't have to go right now. But he's offering it only in connection, I gather, with this point about the knife and the statements of Mr. Manson allegedly in the kitchen.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, to clarify the issues, are you

25.

Ì

4,

Ś

23.

24

.25

26

alleging that the prosecution had this tape and deliberately never turned it over to the defense? I'd like to know if that is an allegation.

MR. FITZGERALD: I am not alleging that.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I am not going to make -- do I have -- is your Honor asking me to answer that?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am trying to find out what the issue is. Is that the issue, that we suppressed this tape?

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, I don't care whether you answer that or not.

MR. KANAREK: Very well. If I may --

THE COURT: But if you don't support your motion with something other than a bare assumption, you are not going to get very far. I can tell you that.

MR. KANAREK: I understand. But I think that we can convince the Court, your Honor, that if the District Attorney doesn't do their homework --

Now, I do not know for sure whether this was deliberate or not deliberate. How can I say that at this point?

And I'm not going to misrepresent to the Court, or just make something up out of whole cloth.

THE COURT: I think the suggestion that because the District Attorney comes into possession of something at a

23

24

26

later date and had no knowledge of it beforehand and is not acting in bad faith or deliberately covering up something, that that evidence automatically must be excluded, I think that that's absurd. And I know of no requirement in the law, statutory or case law, that requires any such result.

MR. KANAREK: Well, but what I mean, is, for instance the District Attorney, your Honor, deliberately did not go somewhere -- let's take that hypothetical.

THE COURT: Did not go somewhere and get something he didn't know existed? Is that what you mean?

MR. KANAREK: No. That he knew -- let's say hypothetically -- but what I'm saying is --

THE COURT: We are wasting time, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I want a continuance so that these matters may be handled by points and authorities. I ask your Honor for a continuance, or merely that this witness be held in abeyance, so that we can approach the Court with points and authorities to convince the Court that this evidence should be suppressed.

We have merely the protestations of counsel,
Mr. Bugliosi. They are not verified. No declaration.
No points and authorities.

Because I believe in the context of our discovery order, and the context of our request for discovery, and the context of the entire way that this

,12

case has been handled with the in depth -- the in depth supposed investigation, hundreds of people being spoken to --

MR. BUGLIOSI: Oh, really?

MR. KANAREK: What happens here constitutes a fact situation, your Honor, where your Honor must suppress this tape and it cannot be used as a remedy and failure to do that is a denial of due process and a fair trial in not the making/discovery that Mr. Manson's entitled to.

THE COURT: In the first place, Mr. Kanarek, all the People are offering, as I understand it, is a very brief conversation, or a portion of a conversation, that this officer had with Mr. Flynn. They are not offering the tapes.

MR. KANAREK: But, say, it turns out that that should have been suppressed. The jury now hears that. Your Honor makes an order that they shouldn't pay any attention to it.

What I'm saying is Bruton, and other cases, say you can't unring the bell in certain situations and this is one of them. And it's reversible error we allege.

THE COURT: I think you are creating a smoke cloud out of absolutely nothing.

MR. FITZGERALD: I have evidence that Mr. -- that
Officer Steuber told the Los Angeles Police Department about
the existence of these tapes well over six months ago.
And I think that at

12b fls.

we ought to be able to ask this officer, outside the presence of the jury, whether, in fact, that's true.

I hate to allege that based on the information I have, but based on other --

MR. BUGLIOSI: You may ask that.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- on other information I have, in which case we have a little more direct thain, if, in fact, the Los Angeles Police Department knew about it, I think they are agents of the prosecution.

12B-1

2

3

. **4** . **5**

б

8

7

.9 10

11

12,

14 . 15

16

17

18 19

. 20

21 22

23 24

25.

26

MR. HUGHES: I would ask that my defendant, Leslie Van Houten, be present for these proceedings in chambers.

THE COURT: She can be present whenever you tell me that she is willing to come back into court and conduct herself in the proper manner.

MR. HUGHES: Well, your Honor, I don't know that I can make that representation, and barring not being --

THE COURT: Until she is willing to so affirm, she is not coming back.

MR. HUGHES: She would not specifically answer the question, which I understand that the --

THE COURT: Well, I understand the game-playing perfectly, Mr. Hughes.

MR. HUGHES: Well, I'm not playing the game. They may be, your Honor, or -- I don't know. I don't understand the game playing. But I would ask either that she be present for the proceedings or that she be allowed to hear them in some manner.

THE COURT: She can hear them.

MR. HUGHES: All proceedings. She cannot hear these proceedings. I don't see any microphones, your Honor.

THE COURT: She can't hear proceedings when they have them at the bench or in chambers in any event.

MR. HUGHES: Well, I'm not waiving her presence at any proceedings, your Honor. No proceedings. To hear them or in any way.

Ì

ģ

THE COURT: That will make it about the sixth time you have said that today. Mr. Hughes.

MR. HUGHES: I want the record to reflect amply that that is my position and that she is not either --

THE COURT: Doesn't reflect it any more amply when you say it six times than it does when you say it once.

MR. HUGHES: I don't think the record reflects that this was not being broadcast to the defendants, number one, your Honor.

THE COURT: Chambers discussions? No chambers discussion has been broadcast to the defendants since this trial started, and you have made no objections before.

MR. HUGHES: Well, at this point, your Honor, the picture is changed and I am objecting now. And I think — I hope it's clear that I am objecting and that I am not waiving her presence at these proceedings.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, if I might, I would ask your Honor to read People vs. Estrada; 54 Cal. 2d --

THE COURT: What is the holding in that case?

Does it have anything to do with what we've been talking about?

MR, KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 713.

I prefer, rather than to synopsize it, I would prefer that the Court consider all of the language of the case rather than take counsel's --

THE COURT: Well, I'm not just going to read cases at

random, Mr. Kanarek. I want to get on with the trial.

ġ

22.

MR. KANAREK: Well, it's my position, your Honor —
THE COURT: I think when you cite a case to me you should be able at least to state what the holding of the case is so that I can have some idea whether it's relevant to anything under consideration.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, yes. I think -- you never get a case that's on all fours, but I'm saying that the ---

THE COURT: I'll settle for all threes.

MR. KANAREK: Very well. Either before or during trial an accused can compel the People to produce the written statement of a prosecution witness relating to the matters covered in his testimony.

And it is my position that when the prosecution doesn't respond to discovery, so that counsel in connection with conducting the case hasn't the use of that material which should have been discovered in connection — to prepare for his case, that the Court, the remedy that the defendant has is that the prosecution must not be able to use—that. The remedy is to suppress.

I ask your Honor to read the Estrada -THE COURT: That's one of the remedies.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: But that assumes a number of things that have not yet been demonstrated in this case.

MR. KANAREK: But you can't do everything at once. 1 2 That's why we are asking your Honor to hold this. THE COURT: You haven't even heard the tapes yet, 3 Mr. Kanarek. 4 5 MR. KANAREK: . I will make the motion that we hear the tapes before this witness is allowed to testify, lay a **6**. 7 foundation, or allow the jury to hear it. Furthermore, it's out of context. 8 9 only going to play a small portion. Maybe there's something two and a half hours later in that tape that's going to be 10 important in context with the small portion he is going to 11 12 play. 13 MR. BUGLIOSI: I can still bring it in, So I think that we can eliminate MR. KANAREK: 14 15 error, we can have a tendency not to inject error by post-16 poning this witness' --17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

26

13-1

1

3

5

[,]6

7.

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

THE COURT: Is there any reason why the part that you intend to offer couldn't be deferred until the first of the week?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Just that I don't see any need for it, your Honor.

The man is from Fresno. The defense has broken up our case several times. I just don't see any need for it.

This is prima facie evidence. I spoke to Mr. Flynn in my office. I gave the defense a copy of my conversation with him, which included that confession. So, there is the evidence right there that I am not trying to suppress it.

If I were trying to suppress it, I wouldn't have given you a copy of the confession.

MR. KANAREK: That isn't the point.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That is the point.

MR. KANAREK: That isn't the point.

We wouldn't have gone into certain aspects of the interrogation if we had known there was a tape from Shoshone.

MR. FITZGERALD: Speak for yourself, Mr. Kanarek.

THE COURT: I think you are making a mountain out of a mole hill. I don't have any idea what you are talking about in relation to any fact content. You are just giving us a make-weight argument.

. I MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor.

2

THE COURT: You haven't heard the tapes.

3

MR. KANAREK: I wouldn't have asked the questions if I knew about the tapes.

#

THE COURT: You don't know that any more than I do.

1. 5 * 6

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, if I knew there was a tape -

7

THE COURT: You are just talking and you are not making

•

any sense.

•

MR. MUSICH: If I might interpose?

10

The purpose of the evidence is only to rehabili-

.

tate the witness because of the cross-examination which

ΪĪ

raised the issue of the truth or falsity of this statement.

12

That is the only part of the tape that we are

13 14

going into, your Honor.

15

Counsel has heard that portion of the tape, and

16

whether or not Mr. Kanarek indicates he wouldn't have gone into that area on his cross-examination, there would hav

17

been no need to rehabilitate the witness if he hadn't, and

18

his credibility as to that witness would have been just as

19 20

well-founded and credible without cross-examination as we

2<u>1</u>

are now trying to do by rehabilitation.

22

So, Mr. Kanarek's theme and argument that he wouldn't have gone into it would have then alleviated the

23

problem of going into it with the witness.

- 24 25

MR. BUGLIOSI: I will take the stand and testify under penalty of perjury that I found out about the tapes,

26

I guess, two days ago, when I called him late one night in Fresno. That was the first time I found out about these I will state that under penalty of perjury. tapes. ٠ ļĺ

L3A

2

1

3

4

7

8

10

ġ

11

12

13⁻

15

16

that.

17

18 19

20.

21

22 23

24

25

26

MR. KANAREK: It isn't just a question of Mr. Bugliosi. Mr. Stovitz has been on this case, and there have been other deputies that have been on the case.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I will call Aaron up here.

MR. KANAREK: And it is a sterile act for Mr. Bugliosi to say that he didn't --

THE COURT: You are making a mountain out of a molehill, as I have already stated.

The only purpose of the testimony to be elicited by the People is to show that the statements were made, not for the truth of the content.

Now, if you want to use the tapes for some other purpose, you have them.

MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have them.

If you want to recall Mr. Flynn, you may do

If you want to use the information in the tapes, whatever it is, and apparently none of us, except Mr. Bugliosi, knows what is in the tapes, because we haven't heard them --

MR. BUGLIOSI: I haven't heard them either.

THE COURT: He hasn't either.

MR. HUGHES: We don't know what is in them.

THE COURT: If there is something in the tapes that you want to use for some other purpose, you will have an

2 3

4

5

7

. 9

10

11, 12

.13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23.

24

25

26

opportunity to do so. That won't have the slightest effect on the testimony of the officer that the statements were, in fact, made.

MR. KANAREK: And in order to zero in on it, what I am saying is that the whole reason that Mr. Bugliosi went through this extreme effort to get him at this point is because Mr. Bugliosi knows that this, in the eyes of the jury, will purportedly rehabilitate Mr. Flynn because what he said happened in Shoshone allegedly did happen, and that is the vice of not making discovery, because if he had made discovery --

THE COURT: Now you are assuming something as to which there is no evidence whatever, that he didn't make discovery.

He told you just the opposite.

MR. KANAREK: That is why we have motions, your Honor.

I am asking merely that this witness's testimony be held in abeyance.

THE COURT: Mr. Bugliosi has offered to take the stand and be sworn to testify that he knew nothing about it. He is the chief counsel in the case.

MR. KANAREK: But on equal protection of the law, your Honor, you made it very important, you said we must have points and authorities and written motions.

There is no reason that this police officer's

3

J

4

б

Ś

.8

.9

10 11

12

13

do risi

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

<u>2</u>6.

testimony can't be held in abeyance.

THE COURT: Here you have the direct testimony of the witness.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you want me to testify in open court under oath?

THE COURT: No matter what anybody suggests, including the Court, you don't want it, even though it is diametrically opposed to the position that you take.

MR. KANAREK: My position is not to crucify Mr.

Bugliosi or to hold him up and say "You are lying."

My purpose here is merely -- if he will stay to the point-the point is that I believe the law is clear, that your

Honor has an obligation to suppress this evidence because
they didn't make discovery.

THE COURT: That assumes the very fact which has already been denied.

MR. KANAREK: That is why we have the power here -- we have a continuing, on-going trial --

THE COURT: You are objecting to Mr. Bugliosi taking the stand and denying the very thing you are claiming.

MR. KANAREK: I am not objecting. If your Honor wishes to?

THE COURT: It is not what I wish. It is your motion MR. KANAREK: But I am saying that we, also, under People vs. Crovedi, have a right to prepare.

THE COURT: Prepare what?

MR. KANAREK: Prepare points and authorities in a cogent, in a good lawyer-like manner, to convince your Honor that even if he didn't know, even if he didn't know, because the law says "knew or ought to have known," --

THE COURT: I thought you already cited those authorities to me.

MR. KANAREK: I haven't done it complete.

There is People vs. Cartier, 51 Cal. 2d --

THE COURT: You certainly will have the opportunity to do so.

MR. KANAREK: But by that time the jury will have heard it.

The only thing that I want, your Honor -- MR. BUGLIOSI: I will take the witness stand.

26

25

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. HUGHES: But 6 months ago, Mr. Bugliosi, you weren't chief counsel. Aaron Stovitz was chief counsel, and we don't know if he knew about it, and we don't know what the LAPD knew six months ago.

MR.BUGLIOSI: Are you now deciding who was chief counsel six months ago?

MR. HUGHES: Mr. Stovitz said he was.

I believe that you were chief counsel for all intents and purposes. However, I believe that Mr. Stovitz had that title, and I believe that you were pretty angry.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Who told you that I was angry?

THE COURT: Gentlemen, we are wasting time.

MR.HUGHES: Six months ago, I believe that LAPD knew about these tapes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The only one that called me and assistant was this guy over here. He called me Aaron's assistant in open court.

MR. KANAREK: May the record reflect that he is point to Mr. Shinn.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Aaron was my boss, obviously. He was the head of the trial department.

MR. KANAREK: Here your Honor has the power to avoid error getting before the jury, if your Honor decides to suppress this, and I believe, your Honor, that we did everything we could do, and I believe that the state of the law is that if the prosecution doesn't come up with it, then

they are --

Ţ

2

3

. 5

7

8

9

10

THE COURT: You keep saying that.

MR. KANAREK: Well, I can't do it without doing it, your Honor.

I think that in holding it in abeyance a couple of days is not going to hurt anybody.

13c fls.

. •

> 11 12

13

14

Į5

16

17

18

19

20

21 ·

22

23,

24

25

26

13C1

2

1

3

5

6

7

.9

10

Щ

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

MR. HUGHES: As a matter of fact, Mr. Bugliosi, you told me on numerous occasions that Mr. Stovitz used to come down and take things from your files, and that he did other things, and that he was always losing evidence; that you had a lot of evidence that he went through that you lost.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If he took something out, I had already looked at it.

Before I put it in there, I looked at it, and I had never seen or heard of these tapes until two days ago.

THE COURT: Then I will put it over until Monday to give the defendants counsel an opportunity to listen to the tapes.

Now, don't come in here on Monday, Mr. Kanarek, and tell me that you didn't listen to the tapes, because we don't want to delay the matter any longer than that.

MR. KANAREK: I won't. But is there, maybe, a day more convenient to the officer?

THE COURT: Let us worry about that.

All you are asking now is for the weekend, and that is all you are going to get.

MR. KANAREK: I have mechanical problems in that the weekend, in getting this tape -- what I am saying, mechanical problems of this type can --

THE COURT: Whatever the problems, you will have to solve them.

25.

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am worried about the possible destruction of the tape by accident.

MR. KANAREK: That is what I mean.

I don't want to have anything to do with the tape personally.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That is why I would like to play it today.

No matter what is on the other other portion of the tape, no matter what it is, this particular portion is admissible.

MR. KANAREK: That is the point. He wants it, and they didn't make discovery, you see, your Honor. He doesn't care about the rest of it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't know what is on the rest of

I am saying that irrespective of the rest of it, this particular portion is admissible.

THE COURT: That can be solved by having it played in chambers and having the reporter take down the portion you are interested in. It could be read into the record if, in fact, it were destroyed.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right. I would appreciate that.
Should we bring Mr. Steuber in here?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: The jury is in the box. They will see the police officer coming in here.

THE COURT: We won't be needing the jury the rest of Ţ the afternoon. 2 MR. BUGLIOSI: No. 3 Roni Howard is here, and Virginia Graham is 4 supposed to be here. -5 THE COURT: Let's take the jury upstairs, at least б until the mid-afternoon recess, and then we will have a 7 better idea whether they will be needed at all this ģ. afternoon. ġ MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you want Mr. Steuber back here now? 10 THE COURT: Wait until the jury leaves. 11 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. But do you want Mr. Steuber back 12 here? 13. THE COURT: Yes. 14 (Recess.) 15 (Mr. Steuber enters the Court's chambers.) 16 THE COURT: Did you bring the recorder in? 17 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. Do you have it, Mr. Steuber, 18. the recorder, with you? 19. MR. STEUBER: Yes. 20 21 22 23. 24 25 26

13d-1

Á

Ź

3.

4

:5

6

7

8

9

10

11:

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

2İ

22

23 24

. 25

-,5

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: And do you have the tape about the knife?

MR. STEUBER: Yes, I do.

MR. BUGLIOSI: This is Judge Older, Mr. Steuber.

MR. STEUBER: Very glad to know you.

Mr. Bugliosi, this tape isn't at the very beginning, but it is at the start of the knife story.

Is that where you want it?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: Maybe you can go back a couple of sentences, or have you?

MR. STEUBER: I think I have.

THE COURT: Before we get into it, let's clarify the record here.

All counsel are present, and the purpose of this proceeding at the moment is simply to have the reporter take down the substance of the conversation from the tape which Mr. Bugliosi desires to offer into evidence on Monday, so that in the event, for one reason or another, the tape should be destroyed or damaged, there would be a record of the conversation.

Is that correct, Mr. Bugliosi?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I do not anticipate that there will be any examination by counsel at this time.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

25

26

THE COURT: Since it is not being offered at this time. This is purely a recording.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Kind of a perpetuation of testimony, as it were.

THE COURT: A perpetuation proceedings.

MR. HUGHES: Since this is a recording of, purportedly, Juan Flynn, and for the other reasons I stated previously, I would ask that either Leslie Van Houten be present or these proceedings be broadcast to her.

THE COURT: When you assure me, Mr. Hughes -- I have told you a dozen times before -- if your client is willing to affirm a willingness to conduct herself properly in court, she may be present.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, she would not answer that question for me.

THE COURT: Let's proceed.

MR. KANAREK: Out of an abundance of precaution, although I see some infirmities in the argument, I want to join with Mr. Shinn's argument about the constitutional right of Mr. Flynn not being here.

I see no harm in joining with that argument. I would join in that regard.

Lack of foundation.

MR. HUGHES: Join.

THE COURT: Let's proceed.

MR. BUGLIOSI: May the record reflect what we are

doing now? We are going to play a tape recorded conversation of, what, December --2 MR. STEUBER: December the 19th, 1969. 3 MR. BUGLIOSI: Between yourself, sir? MR. STEUBER: Officer David Steuber, in Shoshone, 5 California. б MR. BUGLIOSI: With Juan Flynn? Ť MR. STEUBER: That is correct. 8 MR. BUGLIOSI: And we are back in chambers now, 9 and you are playing this particular portion of the tape 10 referring to the knife incident to perpetuate this 11 particular testimony. 12 MR. STEUBER: Correct, sir. 13 MR. KANAREK: Not testimony. To perpetuate the 14 tape. 15 MR. BUGLIOSI: This particular passage of the tape. 16 MR. KANAREK: If I may? Just a couple of questions, 17 so I can get ahold of Officer Steuber if I need him? 18 Just where I can locate him? 19 May I ask the questions, your Honor? 20 13e fls. THE COURT: Yes, you may, 22 23 24 25 26

MR. KANAREK: How could you be reached if I wanted 3E-1 1 to reach you? 2 MR. STEUBER: Let me offer you my business card. and 3 I may be reached 24 hours a day through the Highway Patrol à, Office at Fresno. The area code is 209. The number is 5 485-7440 6 MR. KANAREK: Thank you very much. 7 8. MR. STEUBER: Is it corrected on that card in the upper right-hand corner? 9 MR. KANAREK: 485-7440. 10 MR. STEUBER: Yes. 11 MR. KANAREK: Thank you. 12 MR. STEUBER: You are welcome. 13 14 THE COURT: All right, sir. You may press the button, Officer, and proceed. 15 MR. STEUBER: He asked me to run back two sentences 16 before, which I did, and it is about to start now. 17 18 I will manipulate the volume, if I may, if you will indicate whether you want it quieter or a little more. 19 .20 (Whereupon, the tape recording was played as follows:) 2İ All right. Now, did you ever 22 23 hear him say anything about the Tate killing or anything like that? 24 IIA. 25 Well, sort of, you know. 26 . He never mentioned anything to me

"about it, you see, but I know one time I came in the kitchen, you know. I was doing some heavy work outside, and after it was all done, you know, they were sitting down on the porch, just watching. There was a whole bunch. And after I got through, I went in the kitchen and I fixed something and I sat down. And there was some more girls in there, you know.

"So he came in and he went like that, you know.

"So everybody went outside, you know, and placed themselves outside.

"Then he was looking at me real funny.

"Then I started to get back down to where I was eating.

"And then he grabbed me by the hair like that, and he put a knife by my throat.

"He said, 'You son-of-a-bitch, I am going to kill you.'

"I said, 'Well, I can't do nothing about that,' you know.

"And then he says, 'Don't you know I am the one who is doing all the killings,' you know.

"Q. 'Don't you know I am the one that is doing all the killings'?

"Now, when would this have been about,

24

25

26.

13F

"Juan?

"A. Well, I can't recall too well whether it was before or after the raid, you know.

"Q Uh-huh.

"A But he says, 'Are you going to come with me to the desert?'

"I says, 'Well, I am not planning to do it. I am right here. Here is where I am doing my work.'

"He says, 'I am going to kill you, you son-of-a-bitch."

"And then he turned around and he gave me the knife, you know, and I said, 'Well, I don't have no use for that.'

13f-1 "And then he says, 'Well, I will kill you, you know. 2 "He was going through this emotional 3 thing, you know, act. 4 "And then he says, 'Well, if you are 5 ready to die, or if you are dead, I want you to 6 go down the creek and make love to my girls, you Ž know. 8 "So I said, 'No." you know, 'I am not going to do nothing. 10 "And then, you know, I kept doing what 11 I was doing, and he stood there for a minute, and 12 he turned around, and I guess he walked out or 13 something. 14 He wanted you to go down to the 15 creek and make love to the girls there. Okay. 16 πA Yes. 17 ¹¹Q Now, he said he was the one that was 18. doing all those killings? 19 ηA Yes. 20 no. Did you ask him what killings he 21 meant or anything? 22 ĦД No. no. I. you know --23 ĦQ. Were you a little afraid of him? 24 ľΑ Well, I wasn't afraid of him, you 25 know, but if the man means what he talks about, 26

"you know.

[†]Q Yes.

"A I don't want to find out and put myself in a spot.

"Q Sure. Sure."

MR. STEUBER: At this point, Deputy Ward from Inyo County Sheriff's Office came to the door and entered, and that is why I introduced myself to Deputy Ward.

THE COURT: That is the end of what you want?

MR. BUGLIOST: Yes.

THE COURT; All right,

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor --

THE COURT: We are not doing anything except recording through the reporter now, Mr. Kanarek, so there is no reason to make any objection or anything else. Nothing is being offered.

MR. KANAREK: I understand.

THE COURT: So let's not clutter up the record with any speeches.

MR. KANAREK: No. I am just making a point. I hope it is helpful. I don't know. I certainly intend it to be.

I recall in the Huey Newton case, where Charles Geary was the lawyer, I remember in that case, one word in a tape recording played back to a jury, I think it had something to do with "Yes" or "No," or

25

21

22

23

24

something like that, that had a critical effect on the trial, as I recall reading it in the paper, and your Honor probably does too, and the jury -- there was a question as to what this one word meant, and it had a very critical effect, and the jury came back and wanted it.

THE COURT: Get to the point.

MR. KANAREK: What I am getting at, I think this tape should be in custodia legis.

MR. FITZGERALD: Oh, no.

13g-1 ₁

2

3

. 5

б

8

٠9

1Õ

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. KANAREK: Just a minute.

Mr. Fitzgerald can object, but I would like to be allowed to finish.

What I am saying is this: I don't know, and I would say, especially after Mr. Bugliosi's statements about the reporters being only human, I could not hear all the words in that tape.

I am sure that your Honor will agree that there are spots there where your Honor would not be able to say he heard the words, the English, fully enunciated.

I say there is a problem there. I am not going to stipulate to this record being a true reproduction of all the words that were uttered.

MR. FITZGERALD: This is just an incredible waste of time.

Could we get on, your Honor?
THE COURT: We are going on.

MR. FITZGERALD: There is nothing improper here.

Tape recordings have been played before.

THE COURT: That will be all, Mr. Kamarek. You have made your position clear a number of times.

MR. HUGHES: I want to make one point.

THE COURT: If you mention Miss Van Houten again, Mr. Hughes, I am going to be a little upset.

MR. HUGHES: I want to make the point that on this tape recording, purportedly of Juan Flynn, he has decidedly

24

25

26

less of an accent than Mr. Flynn had on the witness stand 1 today, in my estimation. 2 That will be enough. THE COURT: 3 You can stop right there, Mr. Reporter, because 4 we are going on to a new subject now. 5 MR. KANAREK: May I just have a ruling, your Honor? 6 THE COURT: A ruling on what? 7 MR. KANAREK: That the Court keep custody of this 8. tape? . .9 THE COURT: The motion is denied. 10 MR. KANAREK: Very well. I was just making the 11 motion. 12 THE COURT: You make many motions, Mr. Kanarek, 13 whether they make sense or not. 14 MR. BUGLIOSI: I hate to waste time, but I am 15 wondering now if you did get the crucial part there, 16 Mr. Reporter, about his saying he is the one that is 17 doing all those killings? 18 Could you look at your transcript? 19 MR. KANAREK: Mr. Bugliosi is interrogating the 20 reporter now. 21 MR. BUGLIOSI: This is informal. 22 THE COURT: He took down what was played. I assume 23 he heard it or he wouldn't take it down. 24 All right. Then, as to this witness, Officer 25 Steuber, when do you want him to resume? 26

1

2

3

4.

5

6

7.

8

9

10

11

12.

13: .14

15

16

17

18

19

20 · 21

22

23

24 ·

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: Monday morning.

MR. STEUBER: Your Honor, I am under subpoena for a court in Ansheim on a prelim there, with a number of witnesses. I have the subpoena.

THE COURT: You are in this court now.

MR. STEUBER: Oh, boy. They are hurting. There are about 20 people.

THE COURT: So are we.

MR. STEUBER: Mr. Bugliosi, is there any way that my being here could be delayed or you could put on another witness?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would like to put you on this afternoon, Dave, and I would ask the court again to permit him to play this tape recording this afternoon.

The Court has heard the recording. It is Mr. Flynn's precise testimony on the witness stand. It is classic textbook rehabilitation under Section 791.

Irrespective of what else is on the tape, that part is admissible. No matter what else is on the tape,

So, we could wait for five years, and there could be all types of other things, but the particular prior consistent statement would be admissible.

THE COURT: Well, there is a question in my mind as to whether or not because of the limitations of this particular recording machine, whether all of the jurors

12671 and alternates will be able to hear it when it is played. 1. 14-1 Now, one other suggestion which you gentlemen can think about. We can have copies made of the transcript 2 3 taken down by Mr. Mehlman, our reporter, and a copy of the transcript could be given to each of the jurors --5 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, I was going to suggest that. 6 THE COURT: -- during the course of the playing of 7 the tape. 8 MR. BUGLIOSI: In fact, they could keep that. 9 MR. SHINN: That would be prejudicial. 10 MR. BUGLIOSI: They could keep the written transcript 11 under People vs. --12 THE COURT: The transcript would be taken away from 13 them after the playing of the tape recorder. 14 MR. SHINN: You mean after they --15 THE COURT: For use only to assist them in hearing 16 the recording while it is being played. It would then be 17 taken away from them. 18. 19 20 transcript of the tape recording to be marked as an

MR. BUGLIOSI: People vs. Sears and Ketchel, your Honor, 59 Cal. 2d 503. The Court permitted the written exhibit ---

> I've already done this. THE COURT:

MR. BUGLIOSI: -- introduced into evidence --

THE COURT: It was done in the Jerry Weber case, for example.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. BUGLIÖSI:

THE COURT: Extensive use of the transcript.

Taken into the jury room during

2

3 4 deliberations.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

jury room. MR. BUGLIOSI: I am just saying that the Supreme Court of California does permit the jury to have these tran-

THE COURT: We didn't permit them to take it into the

scripts back in the jury room.

THE COURT: I don't think it's necessary. They have to rely on their memory just as they have to rely on their memory of any conversations. The transcript isn't for the purpose of reenforcing at some future date their memory. It's simply for the purpose of helping them listen to a tape which is not as clear as the conversation of a witness from the witness stand. That's all.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I would object to that. I would request that they listen to just the tape.

Now, it's my position that there are words, I'm sure, that --

THE COURT: Well, the words will be taken down -- have been taken down.

Now, if the testimony is received, or if the tape is played to the jury, then any party will always have the right to refer to the transcript and the record of that recording.

MR. KANAREK: Well, I would --

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: So you are not going to argue, Mr. Kanarek, that he didn't say what he said.

MR. KANAREK: Well, you see --

THE COURT: You can argue the meaning.

MR. KANAREK: I understand, your Honor. But what I'm saying is I believe that a motion to correct the transcript is conceivably in order. I haven't seen the transcript, of course, yet.

THE COURT: Well, we won't do it, then. I'm not surprised, but we won't do it.

MR. MUSICH: Your Honor, I think the Court would have to play this through the speaker.

MR. BUGLIOSI: This holds that we can actually produce the written transcript.

MR. KANAREK: What I mean is, your Honor, I think there are some infirmities in that tape recording that should allow us to have an independent word-for-word --

THE COURT: Well, you will have an opportunity to argue that at the appropriate time, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The Court does not desire that this be played this afternoon; is that correct, your Honor?

THE COURT: I can't see any possible ground for excluding it. I think we have wasted enough time talking about it. I see no reason why it should not be played at this time. So I'm going to do it.

MR. FITZGERALD: Can it come in subject to a motion to

strike?

2

1

THE COURT: Yes.

Ĵ

4

5

6

.

B

ĮŪ

ĬÌ

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23.

24

25

26

MR. FITZGERALD: Pending any subsequent relevant and germane evidence or argument we can present to the Court on Monday.

THE COURT: All right. I'll let it come in subject to a motion to strike and it will not be necessary for any of you gentlemen to renew these motions and objections in open court. They will all be deemed incorporated into the proceedings in front of the jury as to this taped conversation. So it will expedite the procedure.

MR. SHINN: In other words --

MR. KANAREK: Well, then -- very well, your Honor. Very well.

THE WITNESS STEUBER: Your Honor, may I set the tape back to the beginning to this conversation regarding to "What do you know about the Tate -- "?

THE COURT: Yes.

I really don't think the jury is going to be able to hear all of this the one time. I don't think it's loud enough.

Is that the full volume?

WITNESS STEUBER: The batteries are weak in the set. It sounds to me as though the batteries are weak. I think with fresh batteries it's somewhat clearer than this. However. I'm not an electronic or tape recorder expert.

THE CLERK: Your Honor, we could put the movable mike -- it might amplify it a bit. THE COURT: Well, we can try it. MR. KANAREK: Then -- very well, your Honor. All of my utterances are deemed ---THE COURT: Do you gentlemen want a recess before we resume? MR. KANAREK: May we, your Honor? MR. HUGHES: May we, your Honor? THE COURT: Ten minutes. MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor. (Whereupon, the proceedings were resumed before the jury in open court.)

.

THE COURT: The record will show counsel and the 1 jurors are present. Ž. Mr. Kanarek, has Mr. Manson indicated his 3 willingness to come back into court and to conduct himself 4 in the proper manner? 5. MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I haven't spoken with 6 him since we have been in chambers, your Honor. THE COURT: Well, whenever that is the case, let the Court know, and he will be brought back immediately. 9 The same is true with each of the other 10 defendants. 11 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 12 May I enunciate an objection -- I don't know if 13 I have -- on materiality and relevancy as well as the other 14 points that we have advocated to the Court in connection 15 with this witness' testimony and matters occurring while 16 this witness is on the stand, your Honor. 17 May I have that? 18 THE COURT: You are asking for a continuing objection? 19 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Very well. 21 . MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Bugliosi. 23 24 25 26

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13[.]

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 '

25

26

DAVID STEUBER,

the witness on the stand at the time of the noon recess, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION (RESUMED)

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

- Q Just going back a little bit, Mr. Steuber, this conversation, you say, was on December 19, 1969, in Shoshone, California?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q . Between yourself and one Juan Flynn?
 - A That is correct.
 - Q And the conversation was tape recorded?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q You say there was a portion in the taperecorded conversation that pertained to a knife incident between Mr. Flynn and Mr. Manson; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- And you have the tape recorder and the tape with you in court here today?
 - A. That is correct.
 - And you have already played the tape?
 - A Yes, I have.
- Q And you find it to be an accurate reproduction of your conversation?
 - A. It is.
 - Q And nothing has been added or deleted?

	,
1	A No, sir.
2:	. Q And you recognize your voice on the tape?
3	A. Yes, I do.
4	Q You recognize Mr. Flynn's voice on the tape?
' 5'	A I do.
6	Q All right, sir. Would you please play the
7°	particular portion of the tape pertaining to the knife
8	incident. Play that portion for the Judge and the Jury.
9,	You might increase the volume on the recorder
10	as high as you can.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18.	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	•

.4B

14B

follows:)

5.

17.

(Whereupon, the tape recording was played as

"VOICE: They mentioned it a couple of times (unintelligible.)

"VOICE: All right. Now, did you ever hear him say anything about the Tate killing or anything like that?

"VOICE: Well, sort of, you know.

"He never mentioned anything to me about it, you see, but I know at one time I came in the kitchen, you know. I was doing some heavy work outside, and after it was all done, you know, they were sitting down on the porch, just watching. There was a whole bunch of them, you know. And after I got through, I went in the kitchen and I fixed something and I sat down.

And there was some more girls in there, you know.

"So he came in and he went like that, you know.

"So everybody ran outside, you know, and placed themselves outside.

"Then he was looking at me real funny. Then I started to get back down to where I was eating.

"And then he grabbed me by the hair like that, and he put a knife by my throat.

1 "He said, You son-of-a-bitch, I am going 2 to kill you.' 3 "I said, 'Well, I can't do nothing about 4 that,' you know. 5 "And then he says, 'Don't you know I am 6 the one who is doing all the killings?' you know. 7 "VOICE: 'Don't you know I am the one that 8 is doing all the killings'? Now, when would this 9. have been, about, Juan? IO. "VOICE: Well, I can't recall too well 11 whether it was before or after the raid, you know. 12 . "He says, 'Are you going to come 13 with me to the desert?' 14 "I says, 'Well, I'm not planning to 15 do it. I'm right here. Here is where I am doing 16 my work. 17 "He says, 'I'm going to kill you, 18 you son-of-a-bitch. * 19 "And then he turned around and he 20 gave me the knife, you know, and I said, 'Well, I 21 don't have no use for that. 22 "Then he says, 'Well, I'll kill 23 you, you know. 24 "He was going through this emotional 25 thing, you know, act. 26 "And then he says, 'Well, if you

"are ready to die, or if you are dead, I want 1 you to go down the creek and make love to my Ž girls,' you know. 3 "So I said, 'No,' you know, 'I'm not going 4 to do nothing.' Ş "And then, you know, I kept doing what 6 I was doing, and he stood there for a minute, Ż and he turned around, and I guess he walked out 8 or something. . 9 "VOICE: He wanted you to go down there to 10 the creek and make love to the girls there. 11 Okay. 12 "VOICE: Yes. 13 "VOICE: Now, he said he was the one that 14 was doing all those killings? 15 "VOICE: Yes. 16 "VOICE: Did you ask him what killings 17 he meant or anything? 18 No, no. I -- you know. "YOICE: 19 Were you a little afraid of "VOICE: 20 him? 21 Well, I wasn't afraid of him, 22 you know, but if the man means what he talks 23 about, you know, I don't want to find out and 24 put myself in a spot." 25 26

14c-1	1	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	2	Q Is that it, sir?
	3	A That's correct.
	4	Q The particular portion about the knife incident?
	5	A That's correct.
	6	Q And that was yourself talking to Mr. Flynn?
	7	A Yes, sir.
	ŝ.	Q And this tape will be made available for the
	9	defense to listen to, in toto?
	10	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I'll object to that question
•	11	I mean, that question
,	12	MR. BUGLIOSI: I'll withdraw the question.
	13	THE COURT: It will be, so there is no secret about
ř	14	it, Mr. Kanarek.
•	15	MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, in the context of
	16	these proceedings I don't think that's a proper question.
	17	THE COURT: Anything further?
	18	MR. BUGLIOSI: I'll withdraw the question.
ŝ	19	Q You just heard the conversation now, yourself;
: ب	20	is that right, sir?
•	21	A That's correct.
	22	Q And you recall that the conversation you heard
	23	on tape, was that the actual conversation that took place
	24	at Shoshone, California, on December 19, 1969, between
);	25	you and Mr. Juan Flynn?
•	96	A mb_sti_s_surret

14c-2	, 1 ·	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you. No further questions.
· .	2	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.
.	3 .	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
	4	MR.SHINN: Yes, your Honor, I have a few questions.
•	5	
•	6	CROSS-EXAMINATION
•	7	BY MR. SHINN:
•	8	Q Officer, when you talked to Mr. Flynn, was he
, ,	9	in custody?
	10	A No, he wasn't.
	11.	Q How did you happen to meet him?
r	12 .	A I had interviewed other witnesses in this case
,	13	I was working and they had brought Mr. Flynn's name into the
•	14	case as a potential witness.
	15	Q And how did you contact Mr. Flynn?
	16	A I went to Shoshone with the express purpose of
	17	interviewing Crockett, and Watkins, and Mr. Flynn was
	18	there working in the cafe at the time and was also available.
.	19	MR. SHINN: I have nothing further, your Honor.
	20	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek.
	· 21	MR. KANAREK: I have no questions, your Honor.
•	22	MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.
	23	MR. BUGLIOSI: Just one more question.
	24	
	25 .	

. 26

.4c-3	1	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
	2	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
.	3	Q You said you had been interviewing witnesses
	4	in this case. You are not referring to the Tate-La Bianca
•	5	murder case, are you?
,	6	MR. KANAREK: I'll object to that, your Honor, as
	7	calling for a conclusion on the part of this witness.
Ė	8	Because at that time if we may approach the bench, your
·	9	Honor? I don't think
	10	THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer.
,	iı .	THE WITNESS: I was not investigating the Tate-
	12	La Bianca. It was another situation pertaining only to
•	13 .	Inyo County.
	14	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	15	Q All right. Had nothing to do with these murders
•	16	A No.
	17	MR. KANAREK: Calling for a conclusion, your Honor.
	18	THE COURT: Overruled.
÷	19	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you. No further questions.
í.	20	MR. KANAREK: Officer, at the time may I inquire,
	21	your Honor?
	22 .	THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, do you have any questions?
•,	23	MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor.
	24	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
	25	MR. SHINN: No, your Honor.
	26	THE COURT: You may.

14c-4

3

5

6

7

8

TÓ.

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

	BY	MR.	KANAREK
--	----	-----	---------

Q On December 19th, 1969, Officer, is it a fair. statement that Mr. Manson was in custody?

MR. BUGLIOST: It's irrelevant.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor --

MR. BUGLIOSI: Also calls for a conclusion.

MR. KANAREK: Gounsel raised this issue about this case, is what he's asking, your Honor, and I'm questioning in connection with the issue that Mr. Bugliosi raised.

THE COURT: Objection is sustained.

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Officer, on December 19, 1969, you purported to interrogate Mr. Flynn about the Tate-La Bianca murders; is that right?

A And other matters on the case I was working on, sir.

Q Well, Officer, if I may -- is it a fair statement, Officer, that you spoke to Mr. Flynn concerning the Tate-

- A That is correct.
- Q So-called, right?
- A Right.
- Q And so no matter what else you may have interrogated him on, you were interrogating concerning the very matters that we're in this courtroom for; is that

25 26

	190	
l4c-5	ı	correct?
	2	A That is also correct, sir.
	3	Q And so you were a law enforcement officer on
ř	4	the California Highway Patrol?
	5	A That's correct.
	6	Q What was your rank, Officer?
•	7 '	A A traffic officer,
•	8	Q And you were doing this at the instigation of
	9	the District Attorney of Inyo County?
• ,	10	A This is correct.
•	11	Q Mr. Fowles?
	12	A Mr. Frank Fowles.
	13	Q How do you spell that, sir?
	14	A F-o-w-l-e-s.
	15	Q And was your state of mind, Officer, such that
	16	you were attempting to get evidence in connection with the
	17	very case that we're here before Judge Older on?
Ж	18	A My primary concern was the case pending in Inyo
' •,	19	Count, sir. This was of a secondary nature.
	20	Q Directing your attention to December of 1969,
é	21	as a matter of fact, this case was more important, was more
•	22	important to law enforcement officers, than the very matters
	23	that you are alluding to; is that correct?
	24	MR. BUGLIOSI: It's irrelevant, your Honor, and also
· .	25	conclusionary.
	26	THE COURT: Sustained.

26

14c-6

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9`

10 11

12

13

14⁻ 15

16.

ļ7

18

19

20 21

22,

23

24 25

26

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Now, is it a fair statement, Officer, that you knew when you were interrogating Mr. Flynn that Mr. Manson was being accused of the very matters that we're in this courtroom for?

MR. BUGLIOSI: It's irrelevant.

MR. KANAREK: This is the tape.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It's irrelevant, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: It's most relevant because this is -Mr. Bugliosi has brought this tape to the courtroom. Otherwise, your Honor, why are we having this tape?

MR. BUGLIOSI: To hear the conversation.

MR. FITZGERALD: The jury has been instructed on the limited purposes for which this tape has been received.

THE COURT: That's right. And the jury is again reminded of that limited purpose which I stated to you this morning, which is simply on the question of whether or not Mr. Flynn made these statements to this officer. And the testimony as contained on the tape recording is not received for any other purpose. It should not be considered as evidence of the truth of the matters contained in that conversation.

The objection is sustained.

BY MR. KANAREK;

Q And so, Officer, it is a fair statement that you knew of this very case that we're trying before Judge

14c-7

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

.23

24

25

Older when you conducted this interrogation?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Irrelevant.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KANAREK: What?

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor.

I want to make a motion to the Court in connection with this and I wondered, I don't want to do it in the presence of the jury unless your Honor wishes me to.

THE COURT: No, I do not wish you to.

MR. KANAREK: Very well. May I approach the bench, then, your Honor?

THE COURT: Have you finished your examination?

MR. KANAREK: Yes. I finished except for a motion I'd like to make to the Court perhaps while this witness remains.

THE COURT: All right. Do you have any questions, Mr. Hughes?

MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any further questions, Mr. Bugliosi?

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, your Honor. But I was wondering if the Court could inquire of the jury if they all heard the tape, if there is any one of them that would like to hear it again if they didn't hear it the first time?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, if I may, I would object to

that. This evidence is no different than any other evidence. I think the jurors would raise their hands if they wished to hear it, like any other evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: I assume so. I hope none of you will sit there and not let us know if you can't hear anything because we will have it replayed or restated, if that is the case. All you have to do is raise your hand at any time if you do not hear anything or you do not understand anything that has been said.

All right. You may approach the bench, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

4D-1

2

ì

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

.13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22 23

24

25

26

(The following discussion was had at the bench outside the hearing of the jury:)

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, in order --

THE COURT: Make your motion.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. My motion is that your Honor tell the jury directly that this evidence is not to be used against Mr. Manson for any purposes; that it only goes as to the state of mind of Juan Flynn. I think that will —that is the motion that I make.

THE COURT: The motion is denied.

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

THE COURT: You may step down, Officer.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, may I be excused from this courtroom?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. KANAREK: Subject, your Honor, to -- in case -- may I just inquire whether the officer is going on vacation or something like that in the next foreseeable future?

THE COURT: Very well.

Q BY MR. KANAREK: Officer, are you -- if we need you, are you available in the next foreseeable future? Are you going on vacation or anything like that?

A. There's two sides to this question. Number one, I'm subpoenced to another court for Monday, and perhaps Monday and Tuesday. And then I, hopefully, will be going

on a vacation that I missed last year. I'm planning on ĭ hunting in Idaho starting the 15th of this month through November 1st, But I would make myself available, break my vacation, if you will just let me know. MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Officer. 5 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, am I excused? 6 THE COURT: Yes, you are excused. 7 MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, may we talk to the .Ŗ. witness, the attorneys, just for a short period of time? MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, may we have a moment? 10 (Conversation was had off the record out of the 11 hearing of the jury.) 12 MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, the People's next witness 13 is Virginia Graham. I believe there will be some legal 14 discussion back in chambers on it. 15 THE COURT: As soon as counsel have finished talking 16 to Officer Steuber. 17. Will counsel approach the bench, please. 18 (The following discussion was had at the bench **1**9 outside the hearing of the jury:) 20 THE COURT: I take it from what you have said a 21 moment ago, Mr. Bugliosi, that you now want to proceed with Roni Howard and Virginia Graham. 23 MR. BUGLIOSI: Right. And they are both here, as I 24 understand it. 25

26:

THE COURT: All right. Now, previously we discussed

20

21 (

22

23.

I think it was mentioned briefly this morning, about a preliminary proceeding in chambers out of the presence of the jury where these witnesses would testify to the alleged conversations that they had with Susan Atkins at Sybil Brand Institute and which conversations would, if true, constitute confessions and admissions on the part of Susan Atkins and which might implicate one or more of the codefendants.

Counsel at that time indicated an agreement to such a procedure. Is that still agreeable for all of you?

MR. FITZGERALD: It is agreeable.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, before we go into that, I think we should take up the question of whether or not it is admissible.

THE COURT: I forgot to say one thing. The purpose of the proceeding in chambers is to then, from their testimony, determine whether any or all of it is admissible and whether any or all of it raises any Bruton-Aranda problems.

And if so, whether or not effective deletion can be made.

MR. FITZGERALD: It is an agreeable procedure and a preferable one and I would request that we do it in that fashion.

MR. SHINN: In open court?

MR. FITZGERALD: Oh, Mr. Shinn is referring to his motion to suppress statements on other grounds.

THE COURT: Yes, now, you do have pending a motion to suppress.

MR. SHINN: Yes.

1

2

3.

4

5

6

7

· ģ

10

11

12.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 .

22

23

24

26

THE COURT: However, I think that the proper procedure is to first determine whether or not the statements are admissible, apart from your motion, and whether or not effective deletion can be made, if it's required. Because it may well be that your motion will become moot.

Then if it's determined by the Court that all or a portion of the statements are admissible, then we can hear your motion to suppress.

Is that agreeable?

MR. SHINN: Yes, that's satisfactory, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, it's not on this point, it's on a slightly different — or a different point. I wonder if the ground rules are changed in view of the fact that your Honor, over objection, allowed the tape recording and the officer to testify, Officer Steuber. May we not have to, during this weekend, use the time, because I have other things to do, in connection with the 12 hours of tape?

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, I don't care if you ever listen to the tape recordings. It doesn't make the slightest bit of difference to me.

MR. KANAREK; Right. Your Honor, may I say this:

· #

23

24

25

26

Your Honor indicated in chambers that we were to do it and I was prepared to sacrifice some personal --

THE COURT: That was in a different context. That was if the testimony of the officer was going to be deferred until Monday.

MR. KANAREK: Right.

THE COURT: I didn't want to wait until Monday and have you tell me you hadn't listened to the tapes, since that was going to be the reason for the continuance.

MR. KANAREK: Right. Now --

THE COURT: Since he's already testified, it doesn't make any difference to the Court whether you ever listen to the tapes.

MR. KANAREK: Right. I was just going to say, there are some matters, personal and otherwise --

MR. BUGLIOSI: Let's not take up the Court's time on that. That's between you and me.

MR. KANAREK: I have just one further request.

The officer turned the tapes over to

Mr. Bugliosi. Will your Honor at this time make the order
that those tapes be made available to us?

THE COURT: Well ---

MR. KANAREK: They are obviously tapes which --

MR. FITZGERALD: He's agreed to make them available.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We will furnish them.

THE COURT: This is something you can work out

.22

23

24

25

26

between yourselves.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, now, Virginia Graham is here. Do you want me to bring her back into chambers?

THE COURT: Yes. We will go back into chambers.

We are going to excuse the jury, since we won't have any use for them for the balance of the day.

MR. KANAREK: I have one request, your Honor.

MR. FITZGERALD: Let's answer the Judge's question.

No, we are not going to have any need for the jury this afternoon. Are we, gentlemen?

MR. BUGLIOSI: It's twenty to 4:00 and we've got a lot of issues to discuss.

MR. KANAREK: May I just have Mr. Bugliosi tell us how many tapes the officer turned over.

MR. BUGLIOSI: 'I believe five, but I think only two pertained to Juan Flynn,

MR. KANAREK: But all five are available?

MR. BUGLIOSI: All five are available.

MR. HUGHES: I want it clear that my earlier position remains.

THE COURT: (To the jury:) Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to adjourn at this time so far as the jury is concerned and the Court and counsel have some matters to take up in chambers.

Again, I remind you not to converse with envone on any subject relating to the case, nor to form or express

any opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to you, The Court will adjourn until 9:45 Monday 3 morning. 4. (Whereupon, the jury was excused at the hour of 5 3:45 p.m.) 9. 10 11 1Ż 13 14 15. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

21

22

23

24

.25

26

(The following proceedings occur in chambers.

All counsel present. Defendants absent.)

MR. KAY: Do you want the witnesses in?

MR. FITZGERALD: One at a time. Roni Howard first.

THE COURT: That was my understanding of what Mr. Bugliosi wanted to do.

MR. FIRZGERALD: We discussed this with him, and he is going to bring in Roni Howard first, and Virginia Graham second.

As a matter of fact, he told her she could be excused until Monday morning.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Let's wait until Mr. Bugliosi comes in, Mr. Kanarek, so he can hear whatever it is you have to say.

(Roni Howard enters the Court's chambers.)

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

This is Roni Howard?

MR, BUGLIOSI: Yes, that is Roni Howard.

This is Judge Older, Roni.

THE COURT: Is it Miss or Mrs.?

RONI HOWARD: Miss.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I was going to bring Virginia Graham back but --

THE COURT: Perhapsyou should state, Mr. Bugliosi, what you plan to do.

15-2

·8 ġ

Oľ

2

Let me change that. I will state what my understanding is, and you gentlemen can comment if you don't agree.

I had suggested the procedure in connection with the possible Bruton-Aranda problems involving the testimony of this witness that rather than go over various, perhaps, somewhat disjointed written statements of her testimony, that it would be simpler and more effective to bring her into chambers and have her testify just as she would testify but for the problems in open court, and then with the transcript in hand, the Court and counsel could, Monday, or some other day, determine what the problems are, and if there are Bruton-Aranda problems, if effective deletions can be made.

I do not anticipate that there will be anything in this proceeding other than the bare questioning of the witness by Mr. Bugliosi.

There is no need for any cross examination since, if her testimony is admissible in whole or in part, it will be testified to by her in open court in front of the jury, and the opportunity for cross-examination will exist.

Does anyone disagree with that?

MR. BUGLIOSI: The only thing that I am a little concerned about, the defense have been given her statements with the Los Angeles Police Department and her conversation

15-3

1. 2

3

4

5· 6

7

·8, s

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

15a fls. ₂₂

23 24

25

26

with me. They have that.

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Now she is going to give it o_n ce again.

This is just something the defense can use as impeachment. There has to be inconsistencies in words and clauses. It is just another opportunity, basically, for the defense to impeach her once she takes the stand.

They have the statement from the LAPD and my prior conversation with her, and now this conversation back in chambers.

I am wondering, your Honor, whether the defense is entitled to that?

They are entitled to the two statements that have already been given, one to LAPD, and one to me.

They have been given that.

Now, in effect, this is a third statement, and I am just wondering whether we could get around it some other way by my relating what I think she will testify to, and maybe she can say, "Substantially that is what I am going to testify to."

If there is any significant departure, then she can advise. But otherwise, it will just be a third statement.

15a-1

MR. MUSICH: It would be a problem if the defense were allowed to impeach, under the circumstances, with times, place and persons present. It might have some detrimental effect for one side or the other with the jury, depending on what the type or manner or area of impeachment was.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would say this is kind of unusual for the defense to have another shot at a prior inconsistent statement.

I am not implying that any witness that would be called to the stand would deliberately state a falsehood, but in human nature, people make mistakes in relating an incident. I mean, every time they relate it, it comes out slightly different. We are all human beings. If she tells the story ten times, basically, you will have ten slightly different versions. The defense can then avail themselves of every one of the versions for impeachment purposes.

So, I am just a little concerned about that aspect of it.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, may I make a suggestion?

THE COURT: The difficulty with what you have handed

me in the past, Mr. Bugliosi, let's say, in respect to this

witness, Roni Howard, I have here a typed statement which

says "Statement of Roni Howard," but it really isn't a

statement of Roni Howard, it is somebody else's statement of

what they think she is going to say or what they heard her

say.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

.10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1,7

18

19 20

21

22

23 . 24

25

26

That is the problem.

MR.BUGLIOSI: It shouldn't say "Statement" on there, your Honor. It is not a statement of Roni Howard.

THE COURT: That is exactly the point.

MR. BUGLIOSI: What this is right here, your Honor, is what I expect her testimony to be, based on her conversation with the LAPD, which the Court has right here, I believe-yes, right there -- also based on the statements she made to me.

MR.SHINN: Your Honor, may the witness be excused while we discuss this?

THE COURT: That is not necessary.

MR. SHINN: It is not necessary? Very well, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Also, based on a conversation that she had with me, which I think I gave the Court a copy of.

Based on those two things, I reduced those conversations to termtive questions and answers.

Basically, your Honor, you have here the expected enswers that she is going to give to my questions.

The two statements are the LAPD statement and the conversation she had with me. That is, with the LAPD, and my statement here. This one right here.

These lines that are crossed out. I always do that. I am converting my interviews into tentative questions

5b fls.

and answers, and after I go over a certain area and I am through with it, I cross it out.

Now, there is one issue that I think we can resolve right now, your Honor.

Mr. Shinn, apparently, has some evidence, or he is making an allegation that Roni Howard was an agent of the Los Angeles Police Department.

MR. SHINN: It is not an allegation. We have a right to go into that.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am not questioning that.

Maybe we can handle it right here.

15-B-1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1Ó

11.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

ŽŽ

23

24 25

26

THE COURT: Let's not confuse the two.

Mr. Shinn does have a pending motion to suppress the testimony of this witness along with that of Virginia Graham. We have just covered that at the bench not 10 minutes ago as to how we were going to handle it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

THE COURT: So I don't think we need to take it up at this time.

You will have an opportunity to go into that fully, Mr. Shinn.

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor. I understand that.

THE COURT: Now, are you saying that you don't want to proceed in this way. Mr. Bugliosi, or what?

MR. BUGLIOSI: It wasn't my idea to bring her back in chambers. The defense wanted to bring her back.

MR. SHINN: No. No, we didn't.

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

THE COURT: The suggestion was mine originally, and it seemed agreeable with everyone.

I went through and asked you again several times if that was agreeable, and the indication was in the affirmative.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Why don't I read into the record what I expect her testimony, essentially, will be. I would like to have it in my words, not her words. Then I can ask her: Miss Howard, is this essentially what you expect to testify

to?

2

3

5

б

10

11

. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

¥20°

21

22

23

24

If I have her using her words, the defense just has another statement for them to impeach her with.

I don't think we should be forced to give them a third crack at it.

THE COURT: I think you are making a lot out of nothing.
MR. BUGLIOSI: They have two.

MR. FITZGERALD: Actually, we have more than that.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You do?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

We have statements that she made to her attorneys, and also we have been trying for a number of months to get letters that Susan Atkins allegedly wrote to her that are in the possession of Mr. Stovitz, that we know the contents of, but we have been unable to get copies.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I want to talk to her about the letters myself.

But here we have two statements, the LAPD statement and her statement to me, and I have no other knowledge of any statements she made.

That is the point that I am trying to make. Her exact articulation of this conversation I don't think is necessary at this point.

THE COURT: The point that I have tried to make to you,
Mr. Bugliosi, on a dozen occasions is that I see no way
that the Court is in a position to evaluate the Bruton-Aranda

25

2

3.

5

6

7

ġ 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20.

21

22

23

25

26

problems and to know whether effective deletion can be made unless I see her testimony. Not your testimony, hers.

MR. BUGLIOSI: This is the statement she made right here.

THE COURT: That is part of it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, that isn't the statement she made. This one with the blue back, the statement that she made to the LAPD: and this one here is the statement that she made to me.

THE COURT: I can't read your notes, to begin with. That doesn't tell me anything. It isn't testimony, it is notes. Unintelligible notes.

Now, I would suggest, for your own good as prosecutors in this case, that you make abundantly clear to the Court what this witness is going to testify to.

I don't care whether we follow this procedure or some other, but there is a very grave danger that there is going to be a serious problem here.

15c-1

2

1

3.

4

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

Ìб

Ì7

18 19

20:

21

22

23

24 25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: That sheet right there is what I expect her to testify to. That sheet right there, your Honor.

THE COURT: This is not her testimony, as I pointed out and as you admitted several times. This is apparently something prepared by you.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I got this from those two documents.

THE COURT: I can't make it any clearer than I have, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, the Aranda rule doesn't permit the presecutor to condense the original confession of the defendant, your Honor.

If Mr. Bugliosi can show me a case that permits

THE COURT: That is correct, if you are talking about what goes to the jury. We are not going to hand this condensed statement to the jury and say that is the testimony of Roni Howard. That is perfectly true.

MR.SHINN: Correct.

MR. BUGLIOSI: To save time, I have my tentative questions and answers, may I ask her the questions now?

THE COURT: You may.

THE CLERK: Shall I swear the witness?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't think it is necessary. She is not testifying under oath right now.

MR. FITZGERALD: Unsworn isn't any good. 1 MR. BUGLIOSI: It is like the other two statements. 2 They were not sworn. THE COURT: With Bruton-Aranda situations, the Court 4 is always looking at unsworn statements to determine where 5 the deletions are going to be. The witness has not testified 6 MR. FITZGERALD: But there is nothing to prevent her 7. from getting on the witness stand and testifying to something 8 entirely different. ġ THE COURT: Is there any reason why she shouldn't JQ. be sworn? Íŀ Swear the witness. 12 THE CLERK: Will you please stand one moment. 13. Would you raise your right hand. 14 Would you repeat after me? 15 ′ I do solemily swear -- . 16 MISS HOWARD: I do solumly swear --17 THE CLERK: -- that the testimony I may give --18 MISSHWARD: -- that the testimony I may give --19 THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending --20. MISS HOWARD: -- in the cause now pending --21 THE CLERK: -- before this court --22 MISS HOWARD: -- before this court --23 THE CLERK: -- shall be the truth --24 MISS HOWARD: -- shall be the truth --25 THE CLERK: -- the whole truth --26 MISS HOWARD: -- the whole truth --

THE CLERK: -- and nothing but the truth --

1 MISS HOWARD: -- and nothing but the truth --2 THE CLERK: -- so help me God. 3 MISS HOWARD: -- so help me God. 4 THE CLERK: Would you state your name. 5 MISS HOWARD: Roni Howard. 6 THE COURT: Keep your voice up, please, so everyone 7 in the room can hear you. 8 MR. SHINN: May the record state, are you offering .9 this as the proposed deleted form of the confession now? 10 Is that right? 11 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. 12 Miss Howard --13 THE COURT: No. No. 14 Proposed, I said, your Honor. MR. SHINN: 15 Let's make sure we are not talking about THE COURT: 16 different things. 17 If it is going to have any value at all, this 18 must be the complete statement of this witness as to the ŢÒ complete conversation that she had with Susan Atkins. 15d fls.20 21 22 23 24 25

26

15-D

1 .

., б.

:

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am not prepared to do that. I am not even prepared to do that with her.

MR. FITZGERALD: That is the whole point.

THE COURT: How can I possibly pass on the Bruton-Aranda problems if I don't have the entire picture?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am not even prepared for that because, from the very beginning, when I spoke to her I was aware of the Aranda problem, and I didn't concern myself with anything that she said that Susan Atkins told her about other people. It was worthless to me. I didn't concern myself with it because I knew it was valueless.

I only concerned myself with what she told me that Susan told her that she did.

MR. FITZGERALD: The whole point was that we were going to get together and we were going to determine what she knew, in toto, so we could determine what could be edited sufficiently within the realm of Bruton-Aranda.

As a matter of fact, we suggested earlier that the Judge conduct the questioning. The Judge suggested that he had to know what she was going to say in toto so that he could have something from which he could decide what the probabilities or possibilities of Aranda error creeping in could be.

MR. BUGLIOSI: What I would suggest is this: That I go over with her now what I expect her testimony to be on the stand.

4.

6.

0 ·

Now, the defense has access to a statement that she gave the LAPD. If they find anything in that statement which they feel is favorable to their clients, then we can discuss that particular issue.

THE COURT: That doesn't do it, Mr. Bugliosi.

You don't seem to get the point.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There is her whole statement to the LAPD, that blue one. That is the whole statement she gave. That implicates other parties.

THE COURT: That isn't all her testimony. She talked to you.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There is only a little extra, which will come out right now.

As I say, from the very beginning, my only concern was --

Mr. Bugliosi, and let's review it once again, in determining whether the admission or confession of a co-defendant comes within Bruton and Aranda, the Court has to review everything that the witness knows in the way of the conversations that were purportedly had with the declarant defendant, for the may reason that no matter how you/think they are being edited, as Mattola, the opinion in People vs. Mattola, points out, the error may be made not on direct examination but on cross-examination or redirect examination or recross examination, and I have to look at the entire statement of

U

.7

.9

14 .

what this witness purportedly heard from Susan Atkins to determine whether there are any of those problems present and, if so, whether there can be effective deletions.

It isn't going to help me one bit if all you do
is ask her your edited version of what she heard, because
that isn't going to stop the co-defendants' counsel, all
defense counsel, from going on, on cross-examination, and
finding out what else she heard.

15e-1

14·

 MR. BUGLIOSI: I can say this, then. Every person in this room is just as capable of asking her what Susan Atkins told her, just as capable as I am. I am more capable than anyone in this room of asking her what I expect her testimony to be at this trial.

But if the Court wants the whole statement, anyone can ask her exactly what Susan Atkins told her. The Court could or anyone.

THE COURT: Then ask it. That is all.

MR. BUGLIOSI: When I spoke to her at the very beginning I told her: Don't concern yourself with anything that Susan Atkins said other people did. Just tell me what Susan Atkins said she did.

And this is all that I know. I wasn't even concerned with other people.

THE COURT: That doesn't solve the problem, unfortunated MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you want me to just ask her to relate the entire --

THE COURT: I want everything that the witness claims that Susan Atkins told her.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.

MR. FITZGERALD: The Judge has asked the question.

Can she answer it?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I will nominate myself to ask.

MR. SHINN: Why can't she tell it in a natural way? I think the questions you are going to ask will be

leading. 1 THE COURT: What I would suggest you do is lay the 2 foundation as to the, place, and persons present, and then 3, just let her state everything that was said by Susan 4 Atkins without any deletions whatever. 5 MR. BUGLIOSI: All right. ·6 Have you ever been incarcerated at Sybil 7 Brand Institute for Woman here in East Los Angeles? 8. MISS HOWARD: Yes. 9 MR. BUGLIOST: During what period of time were you 10 incarcerated? 11 From September to about February. MISS HOWARD: 12 MR. SHINN: I can't hear. 13 I am sorry. I have a cold. MISS HOWARD: 14 Turn the air conditioning down. THE COURT: 15 MISS HOWARD: From September, I think it was, until 16 about February. 17 MR. BUGLIOSI: September of '69 to February of 1970? 18 MISS HOWARD: Yes. 19 MR. BUGLIOSI: What dormitory were you in over there? 20 MISS HOWARD: In the working dorm. 21 MR. BUGLIOSI: 80002 22 MISS HOWARD: 8000. 23 MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you know the Defendant Susan Atkins? 24 MISS HOWARD: Yes. 25 MR. BUGLIOSI: Did you know her as Sadie Glutz? 26

1

MISS HOWARD: Yes. 1 MR. BUGLIOSI: Was she with you in dormitory 8000? 2 MISSHOWARD: Yes. 3 MR. BUGLIOSI: And that consisted of several beds 4 there in the dormitory? 5 MISS HWARD: Yes. 6 MR. BUGLIOSI: Where was her bed in relation to your 7 bed? 8 MISS HOWARD: Next to mine. Right next to mine. 9 MR. BUGLIOSI: Did Miss Atkins, or did Sadie, ever 10 say anything to you with respect to the fact that her bed 11. was next to yours? 12 MISS HOWARD: Just that she felt we were put next to 13 each other for a reason. 14 MR. BUGLIOSI: Did you ever have conversations with 15 Susan Atkins which -- with respect to murders of any kind 16 whatsoever? 17 MISS HOWARD: Yes. 18 MR. BUGLIOSI: Did you have several conversations 19 with her with respect to murders? 20 MISS HOWARD: Quite a few. 21 MR. BUGLIOSI: More than one? 22 MISS HOWARD: Uh-huh, yes. 23 MR. BUGLIOST: How many, approximately? 24 MISSHOWARD: Maybe six. 25 MR. BUGLIOSI: During what period of time? 26

Ž.

MISS HOWARD: I started just before she went for İ arraignment on the Hinman case, which was probably the last week in October, I imagine. Somewhere around there. 15f fls. ø, Ì1. 12:

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

: 11

12

13-14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: That was your first conversation with her?

MISS HOWARD: About the murders,

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, about all murders; is that correct?

MISS HOWARD: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We are not just talking about the Tate-La Bianca murders now, we are talking about all murders.

MISS HOWARD: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If she did, in fact, talk about other murders.

MISS HOWARD: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Would you please relate, then, all of your conversations that you had with Susan Atkins, commencing with the first one in late October, '69, pertaining to murders of any kind whatsoever and her involvement in them, if any.

MISS HOWARD: Well, it started off we were talking about the Hinman case.

She told me that the police had it all backwards and everything, because she said that, "Imagine, how can they figure a little girl like me could hold a man almost 200 pounds."

So I was sympathizing with her, and that is why we were talking about that.

I mean, shall I just tell you briefly? We don't

ľ

have to go into details, do we?

2,

THE COURT: I am afraid so.

3.

MISS HOWARD: I mean, it is so long.

4

THE COURT: I understand that but, unfortunately,

Ş

it is necessary.

6

MISS HOWARD: You want me to go into all the details?

conversation, will you tell us, if you can, approximately

Will you tell us each time you go into a new

7

THE COURT: Yes.

8

9

10

11

12

13.

·14

15

16

. 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

.26

talking about LSD, or something, one time.

And anyway, she was telling -- Sadle told me

Anyway, from there we went on to -- we were

when it occurred and who was present, if there was someone other than just the two of you present.

MISS HOWARD: I will try.

We were alone the first time.

I was trying to help her figure out how to defend herself against the Hinman case.

And she went on to tell me how she and this other girl and this guy were in the house, and they were going to tear the house up and make it look as if a fight had been there and everything, so it would like somebody had robbed Gary, or something.

Anyway, they wanted some money out of Gary, and he wouldn't give it to them.

Anyway, that is why they killed him.

that she done everything that there is to be done, and she was thinking, she said, "There is nothing that would shock her or anything." She said she had done just about everything there is to do.

And I said, "Oh, really?"
And she said, "Oh, yes."

And anyway, that is when she went on to tell me about -- she says, "Well, you know about the Tate murder."

I said, "Yes."

She said, "Well, we are the ones that did it."

And I said -- I didn't believe her at first -I said, "Oh, really?"

And she said, "Oh, no, really. We did it." I said, "Well, anyone can say that."

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: May I interrupt her now for a point?

MISS HOWARD: I wish you would ask me what you want
because it is such a long detailed thing.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Excuse ma.

May I read this report, your Honor, because I recall something a little different.

MISS HOWARD: It was so long and detailed.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I realize that.

MISS HOWARD: I can't remember all of the details.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I want to find the place in here where you are talking about the murders.

MR. FITZGERALD: Maybe we can ask her to relate any conversation she had with Susan Atkins where Susan Atkins mentioned other persons, and then we could get right to the heart of the Aranda problem.

MISS HOWARD: I see what you mean. Okay.

For example, the Tate case?

MR. FITZGERALD: The Tate case.

MISS HOWARD: Okay.

THE COURT: Well, I am not sure that would necessarily solve all the problems. I think the entire conversations have to be considered together.

It is 4:15 now, gentlemen. We obviously aren't going to finish with Miss Howard this evening.

MISS HOWARD: I think I know the point that you mean.

You mean regarding other persons? Isn't that

1

2

3

5

6

7

· 8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

₫.

21 22

23

24

25

26

what you mean?

THE COURT: I think we had better adjourn at this time and resume on Monday morning.

Will you gentlemen have any objection to starting this proceeding, say, at 9:00 o'clock on Monday morning rather than 9:45, since we are going to be in chambers and there isn't any problem of the jury being here.

MR. KANAREK: I know, your Honor. I could do it a day later.

Your Honor indicated that 9:45 was the starting time. If we could do it a day later?

THE COURT: I don't understand.

MR. FITZGERALD: I don't either.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I hadn't planned on being here at 9:00 o'clock Monday morning.

MR. KAY: There is no objection from me.

These two witnesses, Roni Howard and Virginia Graham, are the next two witnesses. So we have to clear this matter up before they can go on.

So, your Honor, 9:00 o'clock is fine.

THE COURT: I am afraid this may take longer than we anticipate, and I want to get on with it and use as much time every day as possible.

MR. BUGLIOSI: To save time, your Honor, here was the statement she made when it was still relatively fresh in her mind, November 25th. It is a complete statement

to the LAPD.

In addition to this, there were a couple of other little points that I forgot when I spoke to her.

I am wondering if she has to go through -- here we have 50 pages.

MR. MUSIGH: Maybe it would be possible that we could take a statement over the weekend, or whenever we can, take a complete statement as to everything Susan Atkins told her.

. MR. BUGLIOSI: What is the purpose of that?

MR. MUSICH: That is what we are doing here.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That is what the police did.

THE COURT: All you need is a supplement to this present statement. Why don't you prepare the supplement, then, over the weekend, in testimony form, not your version of what she said, but the actual questions and answers?

MR. BUGLIOSI: That is not my version right there.

What I put down on the paper is what she told me, her words.

THE COURT: Put it in question and answer form.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have that right here. I have it in question and answer form, what she told me.

THE COURT: All right.

Then we can have her indicate if that is the complete record of the conversations that she had with Susan Atkins, and Monday, if so, that will obviate the necessity of having her testimony to it all over again.

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

2Ż

23

24

25

26

I just want to make sure that whatever I am considering in connection with this problem is the total testimony of this witness with respect to those conversations and not just selected portions.

,		
.6 -1	1	MR. BUGLIOSI: All right. I already have written
	2	out here in question and answer form what I believe her
	3	testimony will be.
	4	What I have on that sheet, your Honor, are the
·	5	answers taken from this page. I don't have the questions
4	6	but I have the answers.
	7	THE COURT: Do you need this sheet back?
	8	MR. BUGLIOSI: No, no, you can have it.
. °	. 9	THE COURT: All right.
	10	MR. BUGLIOSI: I've got the answers right here.
	11	THE COURT: Is that agreeable, then?
	12	MR. BUGLIOSI: In fact
	13	THE COURT: To prepare a supplement
	14	MR. BUGLIOSI: What I can do is just photostat this
•	15	and give everyone a copy of it.
	16	MR. KAY: The Judge has a hard time reading your
	17	handwriting.
	18	THE COURT: It doesn't have the answers on it.
3	19	MR. BUGLIOSI: It has the answers. I asked the
÷	20	question, "What dormitory?"
,	21	Parenthesis, "8,000" Do you want this in typewritten form, your
	22	Honor?
	23	THE COURT: I've said it so many times I'm
	24	MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you want this in typewritten form?
	25	MR. KAY: Yes, he does.
٨,	26	THE COURT: Yes. I want it in testimony form, not

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

-8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18.

1ġ-

20

21

22

23

24

shorthand, not condensations, not paraphrasing, but the actual questions and the actual answers this witness gives to those questions.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.

MR. MUSICH: Our questions?

MR. SHINN: May I make a suggestion, your Honor:

read the tape recordings that we have and let her refresh her memory to it, your Honor, and then she can read it and study it and then we can ask her if this was the answer that she gave on a particular day, your Honor. And then Mr. Bugliosi could try to delete from that, your Honor.

Because this way we'd have three different versions here.

THE COURT: She can do the same thing with the transcript.

MR. FITZGERALD: Logistically I will estimate that we will not be in front of the jury at all on Monday.

If we conduct a proceeding in regard to Roni Howard and with Virginia Graham and we hear in open court outside the presence of the jury Mr. Shinn's motion, it's likely to take the balance of Monday.

MR. MUSICH: If we could do away with the sworn testimony and prepare statements of the witnesses as to everything Susan Atkins told, present that to her, in addition, is there anything that isn't in the statements

25; 26 that Susan Atkins told her, put that in, and put them all together, and if the witness could be sworn if that's substantially the same, or if that is substantially all that she heard Susan Atkins tell her, maybe that would eliminate the need to have her go through the question and answer and the statement under oath.

THE COURT: I think it probably would. That might

THE COURT: I think it probably would. That might alleviate some time. No necessity to duplicate anything that's already been done if, in fact, that is all that's been done.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, I have the questions and answers here. I will type this up and give a copy to the Court and the defense attorneys. Questions and answers I expect her to testify to at the trial.

THE COURT: In the meantime, hopefully before Monday, she will have had a chance, if she hasn't already, to review everything that you are preparing, or have prepared, and then be prepared to testify that that is --

MR. MUSICH: Refresh her memory and if there is anything else --

THE COURT: -- that that is all of the conversations that she had with Susan Atkins.

MR. SHINN: Vince, you have one other alternative.

MR. BUGLIOSI: What is that?

MR. SHINN: Admit the confession.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I knew you were going to say that.

Í

4.

THE COURT: Miss Howard, I do want to remind you, if you are not already aware of it, that there is a publicity order which the Court put out in connection with the proceeding which covers all witnesses, not only those who have testified but those who will testify, which includes you. And you are not to discuss the substance of your testimony with anyone other than the lawyers in this case, and specifically members of the media, —

THE WITNESS: I understand.

THE COURT: -- television, newspapers and so forth.

Anything else, gentlemen, before we adjourn?

MR. SHINN: Is it 9:45 or 9:00? I did not --

THE COURT: Let's make it 9:00 o'clock, gentlemen.

I don't think that's unreasonable.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I depended upon the Court's being at 9:45, your Honor.

16a-1

ĮÒ

18:

ŹŹ

MR. BUGLIOSI: For clarification purposes, will I be satisfying what I'm supposed to do by typing up the questions and answers -- the questions I intend to ask her, or want to ask her, and the answers I expect her to give me on the witness stand?

MR.MUSICH: Your Honor, may I --

THE COURT: No.

MR. MUSICH: -- state that the Court wants the witness to look over the statement she made, the statement that she told Mr. Bugliosi, and the Court wants to know if there is anything else in addition to those that the Defendant Susan Atkins told her in regard to these incidents

THE COURT: And, if there is, then we will either have to have her testify to it or it should be included in the supplemental that you prepare --

MR. MUSICH: Some report.

THE COURT: -- in the form of her actual testimony.

It's the only way that I can consider the Bruton-Aranda problems. If you examine the cases, that's exactly what the Court has to do. I can't simply take an edited version and anticipate the problems. I have to know everything that this defendant allegedly told this witness to be able to anticipate the possible problems that may come out not just in your examination on an edited version but their cross-examination on everything that was said.

Ï

2

į

5

7

Ω

9

10:

II

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

MR. MUSICH: This is basically the sum and substance of what was said.

MR. KANAREK: Very briefly, your Honor, I think just for the record, if I may, hopefully, to convince the Court, I believe that the prosecution, your Honor, has waived their right to use any of these statements by virtue of the fact that they did not take down all the words that were uttered. They had the power to, if I may, your Honor, if I may, they had the power to tape record and take down all the words that were uttered, or at least stemographically record. As a result, we have an editing by a biased — obviously an advocate. So, therefore, it's a violation of due process and a fair trial.

THE COURT: Didn't you hear what I just said, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: It isn't your Honor's fault.

THE COURT: We are not talking about fault. I just told them that there must be a complete statement of her testimony relating the conversations in full.

MR. KANAREK: Right, your Honor. And I'm -- what I'm saying is that if this is possible, that's one thing. If it isn't, then I believe that there is no alternative but that it cannot be used at all.

We also have a 1204.5 problem.

THE COURT: Well, you have had either tapes or transcripts of these conversations for months, haven't you?

26

MR. KANAREK: Oh, yes, your Honor, purportedly. But what I'm saying is --

THE COURT: Well, what's the objection?

MR. KANAREK: The objection is, your Honor, that the only thing that's put down, the only thing that's put down is Mr. Bugliosi -- Mr. Bugliosi, for instance, has interrogated the lady and he has not made a tape or a word for word statement by a stenographic reporter.

As far as it went, it was perhaps okay. But he has spoken --

THE COURT: You are saying that the prosecution has some duty to anticipate questions that defense counsel may want to ask a witness?

MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor. I suggest that the prosecutor, being a sophisticated person, and especially in the posture that they have in this case, or in any case, they have an obligation not to edit, not -- but they have an obligation to take down all the words that are uttered. This is what I'm suggesting.

Your Honor is the one to rule.

I say there is a 1204.5 Penal Code problem also.

THE COURT: This court is now adjourned until 9:00 o'clock Monday morning.

MR. SHINN: 9:00.

(Whereupon the evening adjournment was taken at the hour of 4:32 o'clock p.m.)