#### 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.

No. A253156

vs.

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

Defendants.

REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT Monday, October 5, 1970 A. M. SESSION

APPEARANCES:

DONALD A. MUSICH, STEPHEN RUSSELL KAY,

For the People:

and VINCENT T. BUGLIOSI, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

For Deft. Manson:

I. A. KANAREK, Esq.

For Deft. Atkins:

DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Deft. Van Houten:

For Deft. Krenwinkel:

RONALD HUGHES, Esq. PAUL FITZGERALD, Esq.

VOLUME 113

JOSEPH B. HOLLOMBE, CSR.,

PAGES 12730 to 12800

Official Reporters

MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR.,

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

r

2

3

**4** 5

·6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 . 20:

źľ

22.

23 24

**25** 

26

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1970 9:43 o'clock a.m.

(The following proceedings were had in the chambers of the court out of the hearing of the defendants and the jury, all counsel being present:)

THE COURT: The record will show all counsel are present, and also Miss Roni Howard.

MR. HUGHES: For the record, your Honor, I would like to reiterate those objections that I made previously to this.

I am not waiving the appearance at this proceeding of Leslie Van Houten, just so the record is clear.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, for the record, may the record reveal it is 9:45. I am only saying this because of the fact that your Honor has found me in contempt for being two minutes late. It is now 9:45.

I am not asking that anyone be found in contempt. Mr. Bugliosi came in ten minutes after 9:00, and it is now 9:45.

I say this with regret, but I think that when things are not put on the record time has a way of confusing them and deluding them, and I do feel, I do feel that your Honor has, as the expression is, leaned on me end quote, unfairly in certain matters in this case.

---

 It is incumbent upon me, I think, to put this in the record because I think that it is of some significance.

THE COURT: Well, first of all your statement is inaccurate, Mr. Kanarek, you were seven minutes late on the occasion in which the Court found you in contempt, and that was an occasion after a number of other occasions where you had been warned to be present, and the time was the same time as had been set on the previous days.

Today we have a little bit different situation.

Apparently not just Mr. Hughes but, I understand, the prosecutors also were late, so apparently there was a misunderstanding.

Whatever it was, it was something that both sides apparently misunderstood, at least in part. I understand you were here on time, which I commend you for.

MR. KANAREK: My purpose, as I say, your Honor, I feel that under ordinary circumstances, as I say, prior to this trial I don't remember ever having put such matters on the record, and as your Honor knows, the difference in the clocks in this building, I would solicit your Honor to look at the clocks, for instance, on each of these floors, and your Honor will see discrepancies as much as five minutes between those clocks.

THE COURT: Well, I don't go by the clocks, Mr.

Kanarek. I have a watch that keeps good time and I set it

frequently.

-0

7<sup>.</sup> 

•

2 fls.

Æ

10.

-17

Š

All right, gentlemen, so the record will be absolutely clear, on Friday I did tell you that we would start at 9:00 o'clock this morning rather than 9:45.

Apparently this came after a long day, and one or more counsel forgot it. That is the reason for the problem this morning, and that is the reason I am overlooking it.

Apparently it was an innocent oversight by not just one counsel but several.

2-1

· 

4.

Ż

19.

 MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Judge.

MR. MUSICH: Your Honor, as far as the statement of Roni Howard, I talked to her this Saturday.

of the conversation. And in talking to Roni, I tried to put it in the best that she could recall as to a question and answer type situation the conversation that took place when she talked with Sadie.

There are references in the statement here where certain items and areas were covered in the transcript of her testimony, or recorded testimony, in the blue-backed transcript here.

As the Court can see, I numbered them the first and second conversations in regard to when the conversation first concerned the Tate incident.

The notes will indicate there evidently were three or four later conversations, which I did not go into in any detail, because Roni indicated that basically those were in regard to philosophy, and I have some notes here, general notes, they do not specifically go into detail, of statements by Sadie regarding murders that we are not concerned with here.

I was going to photocopy these, or I could have the Court look at them, or we could read them into the record.

THE COURT: Is this set of notes that you now have,

2

3

4

.5

7

8

10

11 12

13

. 14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

<u>2</u>6

is that in question and answer form?

MR. MUSICH: Yes, your Honor, basically.

THE COURT: And does this purport to be the entire conversations that Miss Howard had with Susan Atkins?

MR. MUSICH: Concerning the issues before this Court, so far as the Tate-La Bianca killings; and, basically, the Tate killings.

THE COURT: This is not an edited version of the conversations?

MR. MUSICH: No. It is only edited in the sense that I didn't go into any detail or what was covered in the transcript.

I failed to re-go into the statements that are part of the tape-recorded conversation with the police.

I do have page notations in some instances where there was some conversation that we talked about where there was some reference in the tape-recorded conversation.

THE COURT: As I mentioned to you on Friday, what I have to have is the complete statement by this witness, if she is the one that is going to testify, as to what these conversations were. Then, from that, I have to determine whether or not there is a Bruton-Aranda problem and, if so, whether effective deletion can be made.

2a

2A-1

1 2

Ś

5,

6.

7

8

9

10

12

13. 14

15

16

17

18

.20

2Ì

22

23. 24

25

26

MR. MUSICH: These are complete, your Honor.

Basically, what I am referring to, where they talk about driving up there, or where Sadie talked to the witness about cutting the wires and as far as driving, changing clothes, washing their hands in the yard, and all that.

I didn't go into detail as to what, if anything, was actually said by Sadie because that was fairly well covered in this police conversation.

THE COURT: Just so the record will be clear, what do I have to look at in order to see all of her conversations? Apparently it isn't all contained in one document.

MR. MUSICH: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: What documents constitute all of her conversations?

MR. MUSICH: I would suggest these notes here and the transcripts.

THE COURT: Are you talking about the blue-covered 47-page transcript?

MR. MUSICH: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then that will have to be marked as a special exhibit along with whatever else constitutes the remainder of the conversation.

MR. MUBICH: Yes.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, that note that you have in front of you, your Honor, what is that, your Honor?

That is the original tape recording of

1

(The Court holds up a document.)

**2** .

Roni Howard and the police officers?

3

MR. BUGLIOSI; Yes. The one with the blue back.

5

MR. SHINN: I see.

MR, SHINN:

6

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

7

THE COURT: On the first page it is entitled

8

"Transcript of Tape 32970. A recorded interview of Roni

9

Howard at Sybil Brand Institute on November 25, 1969.

10

Questioning by Sergeant M. J. McGann and Sergeant F. J.

11

Patchett, Robbery-Homicide Division. Transcribed by

12

Steven P. Taylor, Robbery-Homicide Division."

13:

MR. SHINN: Yes, Bir.

14

Now it has been identified, your Honor, and I

15

am going to object to the method that the District

16

Attorney is using now, your Honor, because I think the

17

Court should only read the original statement by her and a

18

deleted form.

19

Now, I believe when the District Attorney has talked to Miss Howard -- when was it, Friday?

20

MR. MUSICH: Saturday.

2I 22

MR. SHINN: I believe that in between the time she

23.

was released from jail to the present time she must have

24

read magazine articles and probably saw things on TV,

to separate what she heard from Susan Atkins and what she

25

accounts of this case, and it is very, very difficult for her

26

heard from the news media, and to try to say that, "I heard

this from Susan Atkins, and I heard that from the news media." 1 is very diffigult, your Honor. 2 So, I think the only thing the Court has to do 3 is to read the original conversation she had/the police, and .4 then they must present a deleted form, and the Court must 5 compare this with the deleted form, not her recent conversation with the District Attorney. 7 THE COURT: Well, to the extent that the recent 8 conversation, as you characterize it, contains her testimony as to additional conversations with Miss Atkins. I have to 10 know that also. 11 MR. SHINN: No. your Honor. I disagree with the Court, 12 because between the time she left Sybil Brand and the time that she last saw Susan Atkins she has read other articles 14 concerning this case and she cannot separate it, your 15 Honor. 16 THE COURT: That is a matter for cross-examination. 17 MISS HOWARD: May I say something? 18 THE COURT: If she says that there is some additional 19 bonversation which is not contained in the original recorded 20 interview, of course, we have to know about it. .21 MR. SHINN: Is the Court saying additional 22 bonversation with Susan Atkins, or additional conversation **2**3 that she remembers that Susan Atkins told her? There is a big difference there, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: What is the difference? She is testifying **26** 

under oath that this is what Susan Atkins told her. That is her recollection of what she told her.

MR. SHINN: But I am trying to point out to the Court the dangers of that, your Honor, because of the fact that between the time she left Sybil Brand and the time she is relating now, she may have read and heard many things and she doesn't know whether she read it or heard it on TV or whether Susan Atkins told her.

### 

. В

### 

### 

### 

### 

### 

## 

# 

# 

# 9

### 

# .21

#### 

#### 23.

#### .24

ľ

Spe Ex.5<sub>16</sub>

. 

THE COURT: How do you know she doesn't?

MR. SHINN: Well, that is the danger that lurks behind her mind, your Honor.

THE COURT: Suppose she had never seen a police officer until this very day, today, and suddenly now after a year approximately, or whatever it is, she relates the conversation that she had with Susan Atkins.

MR. SHINN: That would go to the weight, but here we have information which she had fresh in her mind at the time she talked to the police officer.

THE COURT: That still goes to the weight.

MR. SHINN: May the record indicate I am objecting to the method of doing the proceeding in this way.

THE COURT: Let's take it one step at a time.

What, beside the recorded interview I just referred to, which will be marked Special Exhibit No. 5, what besides that do you have in the way of documentary notes containing any additional purported conversation between Miss Howard and Susan Atkins?

MR. MUSICH: Your Honor, I have six legal size yellow page notes in question and answer type form, except as to the last page, approximately midway in the middle of that last page, which basically there are some notes, some statements, but general conversations, general topics regarding third and fourth conversations and later conversations which we feel ---

1

2

3

4

5

7

THE COURT: Are those notes your notes?

MR. MUSICH: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Prepared from what source?

MR. MUSICH: From talking with Miss Howard on Saturday, and I focused her attention to the particular conversation that she had with Sadie at Sybil Brand, working dorm No. 8000, those conversations took place on a bed -in their beds, after dinner; it was after work at approximately 6:00 or 7:00 p.m. in the last week of October, 1969.

That is the first conversation I went into in detail.

The second conversation was one that took place a couple of days later; it was at the same place at approximately the same time.

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

·

.....

THE COURT: Well, do your notes contain portions of conversations that are not contained in the original recorded interview?

MR. MUSICH: Some of them do, your Honor, I did not go into it in detail.

There are page notations with the transcript in regard to the various areas that are covered in the transcript and that are covered in the notes and, for example, there is where Sadie said "I'll tell you," and she talked about "drove up there, and Charlie cut the wires," and so forth. We have the page notations on those.

THE COURT: Do you have an edited or deleted version which you propose to use?

MR. MUSICH: No, your Honor, we would probably just go into narrow areas.

I would indicate, and Mr. Bugliosi has indicated as to the questions and purported answers, that this would be in areas that we would be going into, and then the Court could look at the statements, and if it was a proper editing, then we would hope we could go into that area.

THE COURT: What does the edited statement consist of, the questions, or questions and answers, or what?

MR. MUSICH: Just Mr. Bugliosi's questions and his purported expected answers to those questions.

2

3 4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

1:7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

THE COURT: Has this been typed up?

MR. MUSICH: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think we are going to have to have it typed up. This is too important to have it in handwritten notes which may or may not be legible.

MR. MUSICH: Well, the court can look at mine -well, and I can have mine even typed up if the Court wish,
my handwriting isn't that bad.

We can have it photocopied.

MR. KANAREK: Just in the interest of completeness, your Honor, may the record reflect Mr. Buglisio left the room some -- I guess some ten or so minutes ago.

Mr. Musich is here slone representing the prosecution.

Is that a fair statement?

THE COURT: What is the significance of that, Mr. Kanarek, that you are taking up our transcript space for that kind of statement.

What does it mean?

MR. KANAREK: May this lady not be in the room (indicating Miss Howard).

THE COURT: Just answer the question.

MR.KANAREK: Well, I would like to answer it. I would be very candid if the lady would not be in the room when I speak to the Court, this potential witness.

		1			THE	COURT:	You	t al	ce just	. Wai	rting :	time, l	ir. K	marel	t.
<b>.</b>		2,			MR.	KANARE	K: Y	Cour	: Honor	, li	i is n	ot so.	I tl	ink	
	. * ,	3	the	kt v	/e #	re deal	ing l	ere	<b>)</b> ===						
		4			THE	COURT:	A11	L zi	ight, I	dor	r't wa	nt to	hear i	ny.	
		<b>5</b> . :	tóm	œ.							ŕ				
÷		6		٠	MR.	KANARE	Kı V	Ver)	/ well,	you	ır Hon	or.			
•		7	ļ.		THE	COURT:	Le	t m	r see t	he 1	ropos	ed edi	ted v	ersion	1.
		8.	}   		MR.	MUSICH	t: Ti	nat	is the	st.	itemen	t that	I to	aľo	
		9	the	ere.	•			٠,	*				į.		
		10.			THE	COURT	We.	11,	these	are	just:	notes,	aren	't th	ey?
		il			MR.	MUSICE	Li Yo	88,	those	are	notes	in qu	estio	n and	
3b :	fls.	12	an	swe:	r fo	rm.				•		•			
		13	. '						•						
	, ,	14									,				
	,	15			i	•									
	•	16													
,		17	ŀ												
		18		•											,
		19							•	*,,					
÷		20											,		
€.	•	21:									<b>x</b>				
,	,	22.					•								
		23													
		24.	, ,			•					•				
		25				•							1	•	
		<b>26</b> :		•											

ş

19.

0

22: 

 THE COURT: I must have said it 25 times in the last few days, but it doesn't seem to ring a bell with anybody.

MR. MUSICH: Those are not notes, those are actually the statements, the conversation.

THE COURT: What we should have is in one place the complete testimony of this witness, by testimony I mean the results of her interviews.

Now, do we have that here or do we have some short, new version of it?

MR. MUSICH: No, that is the actual conversation as I talked to Roni Saturday, that she had with Sadie, except for the margined notations with reference to what is already contained in that area, or that particular answer in that blue-backed transcript of her taped conversation.

sation, I merely have to go into the transcript there and put in her statements that are contained in her transcript.

THE COURT: I think what should have been done was that from this, and from the transcript of the original recorded interview, a new statement should have been prepared either with footnoted references as to which statements came from which document, that is, your notes or the original recorded interview, but containing a complete conversation.

MR. MUSICH: Well, I did that basically, but I did not go in the areas, like I said, where they said they went to

\_

17 ,

. 21

23° 

the house and they washed their hands. Those areas I don't know anybody can go into because they are in the plural.

THE COURT: We are not now talking about the edited version. We are talking about what Mr. Howard said Miss Susan Atkins told her, regardless of what she said.

MR. MUSICH: That is all there, with reference to what is in the transcript, I just did not bother to repeat or recopy what was in the transcript.

I can do that in those areas which I have indicated.

THE COURT: All right, may I see the proposed edited version, if that is what that is?

MR. MUSICH: Well, these are the original questions of Mr. Bugliosi. Whether or not these will be re-edited I don't know. I did not have a chance to talk to him as to whether or not he was going to go into the same areas in view of your statement.

a point where I can do anything yet, Mr. Musich. I know this is time-consuming, but it is of such tremendous importance to both sides that we are going to have to take the time to do it right, and I think what you are going to have to do is to prepare a new statement which contains, as I say, all of the conversation in one document, and if part of that conversation came from the original recorded interview, that should be either footnoted, or a reference in parentheses.

-

Ĩ. 

٠,

11<sup>.</sup>

. 20.

.

following statements should be put in.

Then if the next sentence or next paragraph comes from your conversation with Miss Howard in relation to the same conversation that she is relating with Miss Atkins, then you will have to reference that again, being an interview with Mr. Musich on such-and-such a date.

So that when you get all through you will have a chronological order — I will state it differently — you will have the complete conversations that Miss Atkins had with Miss Howard, and as to any given conversation it will all be in the same place in the statement, although it may have come from different sources as far as your preparation is concerned, some from the original, some from a later interview with Miss Howard.

But it will be the complete conversations that Miss Atkins had with her.

That is the first step.

3c-1

2

T

3.

4

5 6

Ż

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 . 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

Then in addition to that, the second step then will be to prepare a proposed edited version, what as you propose to put into evidence in this case/to the testimony of Miss Howard as to these conversations.

Then I can compare the two, and counsel can compare the two, and make whatever objections they want to, and I can attempt to determine whether or not the editing, if there is any, is effective.

MR. MUSICH: All right.

THE COURT: I don't see any other way, and the thing is going to have to be typed up, I mean I don't think we can do it in a shorthand version. I don't think we can do it with handwritten notes. It is much too important for that.

It has to be entirely legible to anyone, and it has to be coherent in the sense the conversations Miss Atkins is alleged to have had must all be together in one place, and then if she had another conversation, all of that conversation must be together in one place in the statement, and so on.

MR. MUSICH: All right, that should not be very difficult.

Then I can just go through that and pick up what is in the transcript, and make the correct references.

But as I indicated, I did go into the later conversations --

3c-2

2

3

**4** 5

6

7

8,

· 9

11

12.

13 14

15 16

17.

1Ŕ.

19

20 21

22

23 24

· 25

26

THE COURT: And the same thing will have to be done with respect to the other witness, Miss Graham, assuming you have some statements of hers, as I understand you do.

I have seen just this one transcript with her conversations.

Now, I realize this will take some time. In the meantime can we proceed with the trial with some other witnesses?

MR. MUSICH: If I might have a moment, your Honor, I have to check. I don't know what witnesses are standing by.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, may I say something for the record in the absence of this witness, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, I will have her go out, but just a moment before she goes, she indicated to me a moment ago, and I did not let her say anything, that she had something to say.

What is it?

MISS HOWARD: I have been back in Minnesota for the last couple of months, and I tried to make it a special point not to read in the newspapers of what is going on, and I did talk to other police officers before this, that is why that blue transcript does not have quite everything in it, because I talked to two other police officers the night before about it.

THE COURT: Who were they? MISSKWARD: Special investigators. 2 THE COURT: Did they take down any statements? MISS HOWARD: I don't know if they did or not. THE COURT: Do you know their names? 5 MR. SHINN: I have their names. 6 THE COURT: Did they prepare statements? MR. MUSICH: I don't believe so, your Honor. Normally 8 what they do, of course, is talk to the witness and then :0∙ they decide to bring the tape. 10 3d fls. We did not have it for some reason. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 23 24 25

26

ŀ

2

· 4

` 5

6.. 7

9

10

11 12

13

14

**1**5

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

**25** 

26

THE COURT: Is there any reason why Miss Howard should not now go back outside?

MR. MUSICH: No, your Honor.

(Whereupon, Miss Howard leaves the chambers of the court and the following proceedings were had in her absence.)

THE COURT: All right, Miss Howard has left the chambers. Now, is there something else?

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.

I believe, your Honor, that there is information that Miss Roni Howard is one of the persons that helped write the book "Five To Die", your Honor, and I believe that since she had helped write "Five To Die," she must have had conversations with editors and other people that contributed to the book, and she read that book, your Honor, "Five To Die," and I believe, your Honor, that it would be very difficult for her right now to separate what she heard from Susan Atkins and what she read in the book.

THE COURT: Why isn't that a matter of cross-examination?

MR. SHINN: But your Honor, by that time, your Honor, all this damaging evidence would have been gone into on direct, your Honor.

THE COURT: If the witness is testifying under oath to a conversation she had, you cannot exclude it because she might have talked to somebody else if it is otherwise

admissible.

1 .

Ģ

--

 That goes to the weight.

NR. SHINN: That I understand, your Honor, but then

she is going to have a difficult time and we are going to have a difficult time to see, to determine whether or not which was the conversation she had with Susan Atkins and which is the information that she gathered after she was released from Sybil Brand, your Honor.

That is a matter for cross-examination.

That is why we have to stick with our original testimony.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I have a solution which I offered, but apparently I am not keeping time to the same drummer as everyone else, but the way I see this, we satisfy Aranda by giving the Court and defense attorneysher statement to the police and her statement to me, then the prosecution has to come forward with what they believe to be an effective deletion.

At that point -- I think right now we are at that point -- it is incumbent upon the defense to come forward and say, "Your Honor, this is not an effective deletion," and point out certain places in her conversation with the police or her conversations with me that should be in the questions and answers.

I think it is their burden right now. We have already come forward with what we believe to be an

effective deletion.

ı.

2

3.

4

5

б

8.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Unfortunately you were not in here,
Mr. Bugliosi, we were just discussing the matter again,
I don't believe you have reached that point.

I agree with you that is the procedure to be followed, but I don't think you have reached that point, and I am sure Mr. Musich will tell you what we have been talking about.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay.

THE COURT: I told him that what I have to have, and obviously it will take a certain amount of time, it is going to have to be typed up as part of the record. We cannot have handwritten notes.

The only question I have now is whether you are able to proceed while he is doing that, or whoever is going to do it is doing it, if we could proceed with the trial and get on with some other witnesses.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well --

THE COURT: Bearing in mind, too, that Mr. Shinn still has a motion pending once we get past the Aranda matters, and determine whether or not any of the testimony is admissible, then he still has his motion pending as to the suppression of the testimony.

MR. SHINN: That has to do with the Miranda case, whether or not it is admissible in evidence.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There are, I think, a couple of witnesses

23

.24

25

26

I could scrape up. They would not be long witnesses.

THE COURT: The same thing will have to be done with respect to the purported testimony of the purported conversations Virginia Graham had, so you might as well get it all done at the same time and save additional time.

Will you be ready to proceed then this morning?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think I can put someone on. I can

call Sergeant Gutierrez for certain things, and I can get

Sergeant McGann over here for some testimony, and Mr.

Friedman who testified to the scale on that map.

There won't be any stipulation on that scale?

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Kanarek, you want us to bring over the witnesses on Brunner's incarceration, period of incarceration? We have the actual records.

MR. SHINN: I thought we were going to stipulate to that.

MR. KANAREK: I am not going to stipulate to the incarceration.

THE COURT: To the fact of the incarceration?

MR. KANAREK: Pardon?

THE COURT: To the fact of the incarceration?

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, the inclusive dates. We already
put on evidence that they were brought down here on August
8.

One was released on the 12th, and/was released

I think the next month, I have shown him all the records, the fingerprints and everything, the three defense attorneys are willing to stipulate to those certified records of fact.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I believe, ruled at one time that there was no relevancy or materiality to this.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't want to raise that question now, your Honor, so I will pass on that.

MR. KANAREK: I don't think that --

4-1

1

3

2.

**4**.

6

7

8

: 10

11 -12

13

·· 14 .

. 15 16

17

: 18

19

20 · 21

22

23 24

25

26

THE COURT: I added at the conclusion of that discussion, whenever it was, Mr. Kanarek, that it was relevant on the question of whether or not it was possible for a particular thing to have occurred.

MR. BUGLIOSI: But you want us to call witnesses on that; is that right, Mr. Ksnarek?

THE COURT: I can't see why a stipulation as to the fact of incarceration for a particular period would present a problem to you. Mr. Kamarek.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, as I say, the prosecution in this case has done certain things --

THE COURT: You don't have to answer what I have said. You are under no obligation to stipulate to anything.

MR. KANAREK: I want to answer the court. I feel I have an obligation to the court.

THE COURT: I don't want to clutter up the record now with a long discussion about something else.

MR. KANAREK: But I feel an obligation. Your Honor is the duly constituted judge, and I feel an obligation to your Honor.

THE COURT: You don't have any obligation to stipulate to anything.

MR. KANAREK: Pardon?

THE COURT: I say, you don't have any obligation to stipulate to anything.

MR. KANAREK: But I do have an obligation to respond to the court.

THE COURT: I am telling you that no response is necessary.

MR. KANAREK: Very well.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You will not stipulate; is that correct?

MR. KÁNAREK: No.

THE COURT: Now, how long will it take before you are ready to proceed?

Had we finished with the sergeant that played the tape on Friday? He was excused, wasn't he?

As I recall, he was.

MK. MUSICH: Yes.

MR. BUGLICEI: Yes, he was excused.

He is testifying today, I think, down in Orange

County.

21.

24

26

Do you want to cross-examine him?

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I could put on Sergeant Gutierrez in about ten or fifteen minutes; and then by the time he is through, I should have Sergeant McGamm over here for some limited testimony.

Maybe after him I could put on Sergeant Patchett.

And then I will try to round up these people from the Sheriff's

Then I will get Friedman over here. We can put on some supplementary witnesses

THE COURT: My question is: How soon can we start? MR. BUGLIOSI: 15 minutes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

today.

Now, a new subject.

Are you gentlemen able to tell me whether or not your respective clients are willing to come back into the courtroom and conduct themselves properly?

MR. FITZGERALD: There has been no change in position. THE COURT: What is the position as to which there has been no change?

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I asked my client if she was willing to return. She replied "Is the Judge willing to return to justice?"

I am not trying to be equivocal, your Honor.

A STATE OF THE STA

# 21

4+4

2

1

3. 4.

**Š**.

7

Ġ

8

10 11

12:

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 . 21

22

24

. 23

25

26

THE COURT: We are not going to keep playing games. As long as we get equivocal answers like that, I am going to bring them back into the courtroom and we will just have to see what develops.

If the same thing develops that happened the other day, they will have to be removed, obviously, despite your comments on TV to the contrary, Mr. Fitzgerald, concerning the disruption.

In that regard, I might ask you --

MR. FITZGERALD: I think my comments were very fair.

I don't think this was disruptive within the purview of Allen vs. Illinois.

As a matter of fact, your Honor, I have the case here.

THE COURT: Would you explain to me how the trial can be conducted in a setting in which four defendants are on their feet and either singing or carrying on a monologue?

MR. FITZGERALD: I think, as I read Allen, when I see what the defendant in Allen did, threatening the Judge with his life; where, throughout the opinion, they refer to the conduct of the defendants as outrageous, when they refer to the conduct --

THE COURT: If it will help any, I will characterize the conduct of these defendants as outregeous. Let there be no mistake about that.

MR. FITZGERALD: I think they were about through, your

Honor. I mean, if you would just let them finish, we could continue with the trial.

I really do feel that way, your Honor.

THE COURT: If you look at the record of Friday's proceedings, I let them go on quite a while.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, you did.

THE COURT: I wanted to make sure that they weren't going to just say one thing and then stop. But it was apparent that every time I ordered them to stop and sit down and proceed, they just started all over again.

So, after this went on a number of times, as the record will indicate, there was no other choice. That is all.

MR. FITZGERALD: You don't need to be worried about being vindicated by the public. You have already been vindicated.

THE COURT: It is not a question of vindication, I assure you. I want the trial to get on, and I don't want to jeopardize any defendant's rights. On the other hand, I am not going to let the defendants jeopardize the People's right to a fair trial either.

So, we will just have to take it step by step.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, for the record, may I have a
continuous objection each time my client, Susan Atkins,
is not present in the court proceedings, your Honor, so
I don't have to keep making that motion?

25

1

3

Ÿ,

б

7

· 8.

9

10

И

12

13

14

16

17

18.

19

20

21

22

23.

24

THE COURT: No, you don't have any continuing objec-

tion If you have any objection, Mr. Shinn, you make 1t. 4 I will object to any further proceedings MR. SHINN: in open court without Susan Atkins being present in open court. THE COURT: I just told you they are coming back in. 8 MR. SHINN: Very well. 9 THE COURT: Then, Mr. Bugliosi, you need about 15 10 minutes? ij MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Let the Clerk know when you are ready to 13 proceed. 14 MR. BUGLIOST: Okay. 15 (Recess.) 4b fla 16 17 18 19 20 21 .22 23 24 25 26.

22

23

24

25

**26** 

(The following proceedings occur in open court, all defendants, counsel and jurors present:)

THE COURT: All parties, counsel and jurors are present.

You may proceed, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Sergeant Whiteley.

THE CLERK: Would you please repeat after me.

I do solemnly swear --

THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear --

THE CLERK: -- that the testimony I may give --

THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give --

THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending --

THE WITNESS: -- in the cause now pending --

THE CLERK: -- before this Court --

THE WITNESS: -- before this Court --

THE CLERK: -- shall be the truth --

THE WITNESS: - shall be the truth --

THE CLERK: -- the whole truth --

THE WITNESS: - the whole truth --

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

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

THE CLERK: -- so help me God.

THE WITNESS: -- so help me God. -

THE CLERK: Be seated, please.

Pull the microphone back and will you please state and spell your name.

1	THE WITNESS: Paul Whiteley, W-h-1-t-e-1-e-y.
2	
3	PAUL WHITELEY,
4	called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, being
5.	first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
6	
7.	DIRECT EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
9 .	Q Sergeant, what is your occupation?
1Ò	A Detective Sergeant, Los Angeles County
n	Sheriff's Office, assigned to Homicide Bureau.
12.	Q Do you know a Robert Beausoleil?
13	A. Yes, I do.
14	Q Did you ever book Mr. Beausoleil into the
15	Los Angeles County Jail?
16	A. Yes, I did.
1,7	Q On what date?
18	A August the 7th, 1969, at approximately 3:45
<b>19</b>	a.m.
20	Was he incarcerated during the month of August,
21	1969?
22	A. Yes, he was.
23	Q At the County Jail?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q Here in Los Angeles?
26	A. Yes.

ŀ	And eventually he was transferred out of the
2	County Jail?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q To some other place?
5	A Yes.
6	Q That was when?
7	A. That was in June, 1970.
8	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you. No further questions.
9	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.
10	MR. SHINN: No questions.
11	MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. May we have an
12	objection to the materiality and relevancy concerning this
13	matter, your Honor?
14	THE COURT: Very well.
15	Mr. Reporter, will you read the last question
16	and answer? I missed it.
17	(The record was read by the reporter.)
18	THE COURT: Any examination?
19	MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor.
20	DEFENDANT MANSON: Yes. May I examine him, your
21	Honor?
22	THE COURT: No, you may not.
23	DEFENDANT MANSON: You are going to use this court-
24	room to kill me?
25	THE COURT: You may step down.
26	DEFENDANT MANSON: Are you going to use this courtroom

to kill me? Do you want me dead?

THE COURT: Mr. Manson!

DEFENDANT MANSON: The minute I see you are going to kill me, you know what I am going to do. '

THE COURT: What are you going to do?

DEFENDANT MANSON: You know. You have studied your books. You know who you are talking to?

THE COURT: If you don't stop, Mr. Manson -- and I order you to stop now -- I will have to have you removed as I did the other day.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Order me to be quiet while you kill me with your courtroom? Does that make much sense? Am I supposed to lay here and just let you

kill me?

I am a human being. I am going to fight for my life, one way or another. You should let me do it with words.

THE COURT: If you don't stop, I will have to have you removed.

DEFENDANT MANSON: I will have to have you removed if you don't stop. I have a little system of my own. THE COURT: Call your next witness.

25

1

2

3

5

8

9

10.

11

12

13.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

**22** 

23

24

MR. BUGLIOSI: Sergeant Gutierrex.

DEFENDANT NAMSON: Do you think I'm kidding!

THE COURT: Mr. Manson, I'm going to have you removed if you don't stop it immediately.

The record will show that Mr. Manson came over the counsel table in the direction of the beach and was subdued by the bailiff, and I order him removed from the courtroom.

DEVENDANT MANSON: Don't let me get the jump on your boys, the jump on your boys.

In the name of Christian justice someone should cut your head off.

DEFENDANT ATKINS, DEFENDANT ERENWINKEL.

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Moem be one decaie, Noem be oro decalo. Noem be oro decalo. >

THE COURT: I order you ladies to stop or I will order you be removed also.

DEFENDANT ATKINS, DEFENDANT KRENWINKEL.

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Noem be oro decalo, Noem be oro decato. Noem be oro decato, Noem be oro decato, Noem be oro decalo.

THE COURT: I order you ladies to stop or you will be removed.

DEFENDANT ATKINS, DEFENDANT KRENWINKEL.

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Hoem be oro decaio, Noem be oro decaio. Nom be oro decaio.

2

1

3 4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

**17** -

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

5a fl. 26

THE COURT: If you don't stop I'll have you removed. DEFENDANT ATKINS, DEFENDANT KRENWINKEL.

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Noem be oro decalo, Noem be oro decalo, Noem be oro decalo.

THE COURT: All right, remove the female defendants from the courtroom.

I want the record to reflect that the female defendants repeated over and over again, despite the Court's order for them to stop, some phrase, what it was I did not understand.

Did counsel understand what the phrase was? MR. BUCLIOSI: No. your Honor.

THE COURT: In any event, they repeated it, chanting it in unison over and over and over again despite the Court's order, and I have ordered them removed from the courtroom.

The record will further show there is a speaker in the room in which Mr. Manson will be kept, and he will be able to hear all the court's proceedings.

There is also a speaker upstairs in the anteroom of the jury room, and the female defendants will be able to hear all of the proceedings.

I personally tested both of the speakers and they are loud and clear.

Counsel are welcome to check the speakers themselves if they care to. İ

2.

3

4

5

6

7

ğ

**1**0

11 12

13

14

15 16

**17** ·

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

**25** 

26

MR. FITZGERALD: I wonder if counsel might approach the bench.

THE COURT: Very well.

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

THE COURT: I want the record to clearly reflect that Mr. Manson came completely over the counsel table and ended up on the floor directly in front of the bench.

The bailiffs, in order to get at him, had to take the same route, at least one of them, and there was a violent scuffle when the bailiffs attempted to subdue him, and then he had to be forcibly removed from the courtroom.

I also want the record to reflect again, although I stated it many times to counsel, the defendants may come back into the courtroom at any time they are willing to affirm their willingness to conduct themselves properly, and when you gentlemen can advise me that such is the case they will be immediately returned to the courtroom.

Do you have something?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. With all due respect to the Court, and I sincerely mean that, I wonder if I might ask your Honor a question.

Is your Honor able to state with any degree of certainty concerning your state of mind as to the intent of Mr. Manson's coming over the counsel table.

THE COURT: He looked like he was coming for me.

3 .

\_

\_

Źľ

MR. FITZGERALD: That is what I was afraid of, and although --

THE COURT: If he had taken one more step I would have done something to defend myself.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That is right.

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, inasmuch as that is the case, my client, Patricia Krenwinkel, has been removed from the courtroom for engaging in disruptive conduct; I still feel that there is a difference in her conduct vis-a-vis Mr. Manson's, obviously I think you agree to that.

THE COURT: A difference in fact, but of course it's quite obvious to me that they take their cue from Mr. Manson; they sit quietly until he does something and then when he is doing something, or finished doing whatever it was that he wanted to do to disrupt the proceedings, then they join in unison, and go on with their little act.

MR. FITZGERALD: But inasmuch as it is your state of mind that he was attempting to actually physically attack you, I think it is incumbent upon me on behalf of Patricia Krenwinkel to move for a mistrial.

I think it is going to be difficult indeed to receive a fair trial at the hands of the jury who sat, witnessed and might be of the same state of mind as your Honor, and inasmuch as your Honor is of the mind that they are intimately associated with one another, that is, the three girls with Mr. Manson, that what happens to one is

likely to happen to all. THE COURT: It isn't going to be that easy. Mr. Fitzgerald. MR. HUGHES: I join in that motion. MR. FITZGERALD: I don't see it being easy. I don't want to try this case over again. I know, but they are not going to profit THE COURT: from their own wrong, and they are just as culpable as he 8 is, the fact they did not come over the counsel table 9 doesn't mean a thing; they were ready, willing and able to 10 engage in disruptive conduct, and that is what they did, ·II all of them. 12 There isn't the slightest difference in their 13 culpability. As far as I am concerned there will be no 14 mistrial... 15 MR. HUGHES: Join in the motion for mistrial. 16 17 MR. SHINN: Join in the motion THE COURT: Denied. 18 MR. KANAREK: I join in the request for mistrial. 19 Also I would ask your Honor to voir dire the 20 21 .jury, obviously, regardless --22 I am not going to voir dire the jury. THE COURT: We are going to proceed with the trial. .24 MR. KANAREK: May I just make my point to the Court? I would make the motion, your Honor, to voir 25

26

dire the jury.

12,770 I believe after the incident involving the headlines concerning President Nixon -- I think this is certainly, this is certainly an incident, I'm sure your Honor doesn't wish anyone convicted --THE COURT: I will admonish the jury to disregard what they saw and heard. MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I would disagree with the Court on that, THE COURT: Well, that isn't evidence

Ť

Έ.

9.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 -

22

23.

24

25

, 26

5b-1

- 2

ī

.

5.

6

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

do that:

20

21

23.

24 25

> . 26

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, if a defendant hypothetically gets up in court, let's say, and confesses, they can consider that.

They are percipient witnesses of that.

I would ask the Court not to admonish the jury.
THE COURT: This is not a confession.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There are many things that were said which are very valuable to the prosecution, your Honor, and I don't see any reason why the Court has to strike it from the record.

No. 1, the jury saw it already, and, No. 2, I don't see anything to be gained by striking it from the record, and I would ask the Court not to.

THE COURT: It is not a question of striking it from the record. The record is the record.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Or asking them to disregard it.

I don't see any reason why the Court has to

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, there is a basic proposition of law that the jury's verdicts are to be based on the evidence and solely on the evidence.

THE COURT: I think the question is more of relevency, Mr. Bugliosi.

The defendants may do many things for reasons unknown to anyone but themselves. That has nothing to do with the question of guilt or innocence.

5b-2

2

3

4,

5 6

7

8

10

11 12

13

15

14

**16** 

17 18

19

**2**0

21 22

23

24 25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: There are several things that he said, your Honor, which I find very relevant from a prosecutorial standpoint.

I don't mean the threats on the Court or anything like that. I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about certain other words he said which I find extremely relevant.

Now, the other way to handle that is to call a witness to the stand to testify that they heard him say these things, and put on evidence of it, but I don't think it is necessary.

I think he mid it within the earshot of the jury, and there is no reason for the jury to disregard it.

THE COURT: I am going to do this, Mr. Bugliosi, I'm going to admonish the jury because I think that is the proper thing to do.

However, if you have any authority to the contrary, I am perfectly willing to consider it, and if I am persuaded that the admonishment is not proper, I will so inform the jury that they are not -- they are not going to forget what they saw, that is obvious, but my feeling is it has no relevancy on the question of guilt.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, of course, I do Welcome
your Honor to admonish the jury, but my motion for voir
dire I think is well taken, your Honor, in this sense:

All of us agree -- may I just be heard, your

Honor?

THE COURT: Well, you have already said it, Mr. Kanarek. Your motion for a mistrial is denied.

MR. KANAREK: I am asking them to be voir dired.

THE COURT: That motion is also denied.

MR. KANAREK: I think I can convince the Court, your Honor, and appeal to the Court's inherent powers as well as try to appeal to the Court's --

THE COURT: No, sir. When the defendants deliberately set out to disrupt the trial they are going to have to suffer the consequences, whatever those consequences might be.

Now, I'm going to minimize those consequences to the extent I possibly can by admonishing the jury, and I have no reason to doubt they will follow the instructions and base their verdicts solely on the evidence.

But we are not going to have a mistrial.

MR. KANAREK: Hypothetically, your Honor, if your Honor will beer with me for a moment, hypothetically let us assume --

THE COURT: I am not interested in hypothetical cases. Let's go on with the case.

MR. KANAREK: If the jury would say they cannot render a fair decision, would your Honor still want them to be jurors?

MR. HUGHES: I join Mr. Kanarek's motion.

2

1

4

5.

6.

7.

**'8** 

9

10

11 ,

**12**°

13

15

16

17

. 18

19'

**2**0

21

22

23

24

25

ŀ

MR. SHINN: I also join.

2<sup>,</sup>

 $\mathbf{Z}$ 

ġ.

THE COURT: I want it to be perfectly clear, gentlemen, in view of what has happened I am not going to bring

the defendants out here after every recess. I'm going to have to rely on you as counsel to tell me when your clients

are ready to come back into this courtroom.

I simply cannot risk the kind of violent conduct that went on here this morning by having the defendants come back into the courtroom after the recess, by asking them if they are willing to come back and behave

6 fls.

12

10

ÍT

properly.

I3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 \*

22

-23

24

25

•

1

J-1

3

2

4,

5

6

7 .

. Ò

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

proceed?

21

22

23,

24

25

26

MR. FITZGERALD: I will do that.

THE COURT: I am telling you right now, if your client wants to come back, he will have to communicate it through his counsel.

All right.

MR. FITZGERALD: Sorry, Judge.

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

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I admonish you to disregard what you saw and what you have heard here this morning.

You are to base your verdict, when this case is concluded, solely on the evidence introduced during the course of the trial, and in accordance with the Court's instructions to you at that time.

We will now proceed with the trial.

Is Mr. Bugliosi present? Are you ready to

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor.

Sergeant Gutlerrez.

THE CLERK: Would you repeat after me.

I do solemnly swear --

THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear --

THE CLERK: -- that the testimony I may give --

-2		ì	THE WITNESS: that the testimony I may give
		2	THE CLERK: in the cause now pending
<b>O</b> 1,	* ·	<b>.3</b>	THE WITNESS: in the cause now pending
•		4	THE CLERK: before this Court
	* .	5	THE WITNESS: before this Court
· Î.	,	6	THE CLERK: shall be the truth
\$7		-7:	THE WITNESS: shall be the truth
		:8	THE CLERK: the whole truth
•	,	, <b>9</b> ·,	THE WITNESS: the whole truth
•	,	10	THE CLERK: and nothing but the truth
	*	- <u>H</u>	THE WITNESS: and nothing but the truth
	, • ·	.12	THE CLERK: so help me God.
	· · · ·	13	THE WITNESS: so help me God.
<u>.</u>		14	THE CLERK: Would you please state and spell your
		15	name?
	. •	16	THE WITNESS: Sergeant Manuel F. Gutierrez;
	ī	17	G-u-t-i-e-r-r-e-z.
		18	
		19	MANUEL F. GUTIERREZ,
<b>6</b> 5.		20	called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, being
•. •:		21	first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
		22	
•		23	DIRECT EXAMINATION
·	,	<b>24</b>	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	* * *	<b>25</b> -	Q . What is your occupation, sir?
	• • •	26	A Police officer for the City of Los Angeles,

22.

23

24

26

currently assigned to the Homicide-Robbery Division.

Q On November the 25th, 1969, did you go to Spahn Ranch?

- A Yes, I did.
- Q Did you go there with anyone?
- A Yes, sir.

I went with Sergeant Broda of the Los Angeles
Police Department and Sergeant Gleason of the Sheriff's
Department.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I have here a photograph.

May it be marked People's next in order?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor ---

MR. FITZGERALD: May we approach the bench for the purpose of interposing an objection?

I think it is very germane and important.

THE COURT: He is asking just to mark the photograph.

Shouldn't it be marked before you come to the bench?

MR. KANAREK: That is agreeable.

MR. FITZGERALD: That is agreeable; but it is about the photograph about to be marked, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then we should have it marked so it can be referred to.

MR. FITZGERALD: We would object to having the officer testify for the purpose of identifying the photograph.

THE COURT: It will be marked People's 261 for . ndx ŀ identification. Ž You may approach the bench. ĮŠ 

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

6a-1

2

3

**4** 5

6

7

8

9 10

ÌI

12

13 14

15<sup>.</sup>

16

**1**7

· 18

Ĩġ

20

21 22

23

24 · 25

. 26 (Whereupon all counsel approach the bench and the following proceedings occur at the bench outside of the hearing of the jury;)

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, the offer of proof is that this is a photograph as the police saw it at Spahn Ranch in a trailer. It has got Helter Skelter on it.

This was out at Spahn Ranch.

THE COURT: It may be called "Helter" but it isn't
"Skelter."

MR. BUGLIOSI: If you look at it closely, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am not referring to the spelling.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It might look like a "Sketer," but there is kind of an "1" in there and there is a "t."

THE COURT: It is conceivable the letters were run together.

MR. BUGLIOSI: "Helter Skelter is coming down fast." This was found out in a trailer at Spahn Ranch.

THE COURT: On November 25th?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: It is our position that this photograph — it is our understanding that this photograph was taken within the trailer at Spain Ranch located in Chatsworth, California, by the police officers who enered the trailer without a warrant for the arrest or a warrant for the search of the trailer; nor did they have

68 - 2

2

3. 4

5

é

ġ

. 9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22:

23 24

25

26

reasonable and probable cause to enter.

Essentially, we wish to make a motion to suppress on the ground that this evidence has been illegally searched and selzed.

Now, this problem came up before the prosecutor informed us that he actually had the door itself and -MR. BUGLIOSI: Which I do.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- that he was going to attempt to introduce that into evidence, the door itself; and we agreed among ourselves that at the time that he would attempt to take testimony relative to the door, we would object.

I think the same objection is well taken here.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Tentatively, I am not going to offer
the door itself. Then we will get away from the removal
of the door.

This is a photograph.

MR. FITZGERALD: I understand that.

MR. KANAREK: It is the same thing.

THE COURT: It would be the same thing, wouldn't it, if the officer made an illegal entry into the room and observed what was written on the wall? The problem would be the same.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I can call the officer. He tells me that he got consent from Mr. Spahn again.

THE COURT: I think we are faced with 1538.5, as

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

. 17

18

19

20

I understand it.

MR. FITZGERALD: We might be able to do it this way. If you want to show him the photograph and ask him if that photograph accurately depicts what it purports to depict, fine. But we are going to object to any testimony relative to what the photograph shows.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right. I am not going to go into that at the moment, but where he observed it.

MR. HUGHES: Furthermore, your Honor, there is another copy of this photograph sitting on counsel table in very close proximity to where the jury is.

I am afraid the jurors can see it. You have warned Mr. Bugliosi before.

THE COURT: I don't see it.

MR. HUGHES: It is behind his briefcase there.

THE COURT: I seriously question whether anyone can read it from even two feet away.

MR. HUGHES: I could read it from where I was sitting.

THE COURT: I will ask you to be careful, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

6b £18.22

23

24

25

6b-1

2

,

5

6

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

**19** ,

20 21

22

23

24

25

.26

MR. SHINN: I think he should lay a foundation as to which of the defendants this is directed to. We don't know who the trailer belonged to. It might belong to an outsider.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is circumstantial evidence.

You don't put a gun directly in someone's hand, or a knife. It is circumstantial evidence.

MR. FITZGERALD: I think we understand the evidentiary import of the testimony.

THE COURT: What do you want to do about the defendant's motion to suppress?

MR. BUGLIOSI: We are going to resist the motion, and I would ask that the Court have a hearing outside the presence of the jury.

The offer of proof is that this was a consensual search.

Furthermore, query whether there was any search. They entered a trailer, but we are not getting into the removal of this, just the observation of it.

It was in open sight. It wasn't hidden.

MR. KANAREK: It is on private property. In order to go into that trailer, it is like going into a room.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I will put on the evidence as to consent.

MR. KANAREK: That is the issue.

MR. BUGLIOSI: But it is extremely relevant.

"Helter Skelter" is on the refrigerator door, Į. and here it is at the Spahn Ranch. 2 MR. FITZGERALD: I concede arguendo it is relevant. ξ, We are not concerned with its relevancy. 4 THE COURT: Are you ready to proceed with the motion Š to suppress at this time? MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. I will proceed with this officer 7 here. 8 . I will ask him and he will say that he asked 10 Mr. Spahn to look around the premises, and that Mr. Spahn gave him consent. 11 THE COURT: All right. I will ask that the Jury 12 13 taken out for the time being. MR. KANAREK; May I, at this time, enunciate my 14 15 objection, my continuing objection, on relevancy and 16 materiality, and also that the prejudicial value far out-17 weighs the probative value. It isn't being offered yet. We have a 18 THE COURT: preliminary problem first, the motion to suppress. 19 20 MR. KANAREK: Yes. But may I have a continuing 21 objection on the materiality and relevancy? 22 THE COURT: It makes it too confusing. Wait until the 23 question is put to the witness, and then make your 24 objection. .25. MR. FITZGERALD: Can you ask him other questions in

the meantime to get you to the noon hour?

ŗ

2

4

5

.7

6.

.8. .9.

10

11

12

14

15

16 ·

17

Ì8

19

20 21

22

23 24

. 2Š

-26

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have a few other questions.

Just very few. It will never get me to the noon hour, no.

THE COURT: Why don't you ask whatever you can before we excuse the Jury. Then you can indicate when you are ready.

MR. HUGHES: I would ask for a continuing objection on the removal of Miss Van Houten.

Number one; it doesn't fall within the purview of Allen vs. Illinois; and number two, considering the technological advances we have made — and I am not waiving the bench conferences and the chambers conferences — these proceedings should be broadcast to her.

Third, I ask that I be given a device so that I can in some fashion communicate with my client, such as a telephone at the table.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think there is some merit on that point.

I think the case - it is the Sleepy Lagoon case - said that the right to counsel implies the right to communicate.

In that case, they reversed where the attorney and client were separated in the courtroom and it was difficult for the defendant to get in touch with the attorney.

So, I would think there was merit to that. They should be able to talk to their clients up there.

60-1

Z.

3

5.

. 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

1Ś

, 16

17

18

15

20 21

22<sup>\*</sup> 23

24

25 26

THE COURT: If you will read Illinois vs. Allen very carefully, you will find that they didn't even have a speaker. We have speakers here, so they can hear everything that is going on.

You gentlemen have free access to your clients at any time when they are outside of the courtroom and in the courtroom when the trial is going on. You may, if you deem it necessary, go talk to them.

You can certainly see them during every recess and during all adjournments.

That goes far beyond Allen vs. Illinois.

MR. BUGLICSI: There is a California case, your Honor, that says that during the proceedings the defendant can communicate with their attorneys. I can get the Court that case.

THE COURT: Communicate how?

MR. BUGLIOSI: If they want, they can come up and give them a note, or whisper in their ear. It is a California case.

THE COURT: While they are out of the courtroom?
MR. BUGLIOSI: No.

I am saying that in this California case there were 22 defendants, and because there were that many, they were separated from the defense attorneys. The conviction was reversed because it was too difficult during the case to communicate.

MR. HUGHES: I think that was Mr. Shibley's case, People vs. Zamora.

THE COURT: They have now forfeited their right to be present during the trial.

MR. BUGLIOSI: They have forfeited that right but not the right of effective counsel under the Sixth Amendment.

THE COURT: That is why they are being provided with speakers, so they can hear everything that is going on, and they will be given free right of access for their attorneys to interview them.

MR. HUGHES: So that the record is clear, I do not --would your Honor say this: that if we wanted to, in the
middle of the proceedings, we could recess and we could confer with our clients?

THE COURT: Yes. If you deem it of sufficient importance, I will let you confer with your client at any time.

MR. HUGHES: Because at the moment, your Honor, I don't even know where my client is of my own knowledge.

THE COURT: That is because you haven't bothered to find out then.

I just stated on the record they were upstairs in the jury room, the antercom.

However, I would trust that if counsel would not abuse the privilege of interrupting the trial at any time to go confer with their client, or if you deem it of

1

2

'3

4

5.

7

8

Ì0 .

11 12

13

14

15 16

10

17

18

19 20

21

**22** 23

24

25

sufficient importance, you would be permitted to do so.

MR. HUGHES: That is why I felt that some sort of telephonic equipment would make it much easier on everyone.

MR. FITZGERALD: There is something that I wanted to mention to the Court while I was up here that occurred to me as soon as I went back and sat down. That is, your Honor, that Mr. Murray, who is your bailiff, the Deputy Sheriff assigned to you, is a man that I personally have a great deal of respect for and I like him very much --

MR. HUGHES: He is a beautiful person.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- he has handled our clients very, very well.

Unfortunately, now, I am afraid that he has become somewhat of an adversary.

He is the man that had to jump over the counsel table and had to restrain, physically, Mr. Manson.

I am only concerned now with his contact with the jury.

I wonder if you would consider an order, your Honor. Unfortunately, he is the person that handles the jury every day and sees that they are transported back and forth to the hotel.

THE COURT: He is only one of many. They rotate them. There is a schedule of rotation. Some weeks he doesn't have any contact, and when his tour of duty comes up with the jury, he serves that tour of duty, and then he is rotated.

6d-1

2

. 1

3

5

7

8

è

ÌÒ.

12

13

7.4 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25... .26 MR. FITZGERALD: Maybe he can be relieved of that duty. I think it puts him in a terribly compromising position. The least we can say, he might have a tendency to be angry. I certainly hope that he would live up to his oath, and I expect he would, but it may be too much to ask of him now in view of what occurred.

THE COURT: I will talk with him and see what his thinking is on the subject.

He is extremely aware of his outh and what his duty is, and he has been my bailiff now for three years.

MR. FITZGERALD: He is an honorable, ethical man.
MR. SHINN: Why don't we give him a medal.

THE COURT: I think he just considers this as being in line of duty. I don't think he holds a grudge against anybody. He has had to do it before with other people.

MR. FITZGERALD: Does the prosecution intend to call Mr. Murray as a witness in any of these proceedings?

MR. BUGLIOSI: No.

MR. KANAREK: I join with Mr. Fitzgerald's comment concerning Mr. Murray:

I would like to state that I know where Mr. Manson is. He is in the lockup immediately in back of the courtroom. But I join with Mr. Hughes' motion and comments.

THE COURT: The motions are denied.

We are now going on with the trial. We have wated enough time this morning. 2 MR. KANAREKT I also join with Mr. Bugliosi's 3 comment regarding People vs. Zamora. 4 (Whereupon all counsel return to their 5. respective places at counsel table and the following 6 proceedings occur in open court within the presence and 7 hearing of the jury:) 8 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 9 Sergeant, you recall Linds Kasabian, of 10: course? 11 A Yes, sir. 112 Were you present in court during part of her 13. testimony on the witness stand? 14 Yes, sir. 15 Were you present the second day that she Q 16 testified? 17 I was, sir. 18 Did you make any observations of her and 19 Mr. Manson? 20 I did, sir. 21 Where were you seated in court at the time of 22 the observations? 23 Directly behind you in the seat nearest the 24 rail. Just inside the rail? Q: 26

ľ	A Yes, sir.
2	Q Did you see Mr. Manson make any motion in
· <b>ġ</b> .	the direction of Mrs. Kasabian?
4	MR. KANAREK: Leading and suggestive, your Honor,
5	and also on the grounds of relevancy and materiality.
6	THE COURT: Overruled.
7	MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I am concerned that possibly
8	the defendants are not able to hear Mr. Bugliosi since he
`.9	is not speaking into the microphone.
10	THE COURT: Will you use the microphone, Mr. Bugliosi
11	MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor.
12	Q Do you recall my last question?
13	A Yes, I do.
14	Q Did you see Mr. Manson make any motions?
15	A Yes, sir, I did.
16	Q Towards Mrs. Kasabian?
17	A I did.
18	Q What time of day was it?
19	A It was in the morning session. I don't recall
20	exactly what time.
21	Q Where was Mr. Manson at the time he made the
22	motion?
23	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may I further object on
24	the grounds that we made a motion to exclude witnesses.
25	THE COURT: Overruled.
26	The state of the s

THE WITNESS: Mr. Manson was sitting next to the 6e fls. Ţ left of -- where Mr. Kenarek is now. 

SE.

1	A. At the	chin the neck.	
2	I am so	orry, Mr. Bugliosi. It was the neck.	
3	Q You are	e not having any difficulty today now	
4	with the chin and t	the neck?	
5.	A No, sir	r. It was the neck,	
.6	Q Are you	u absolutely positive it was the neck?	
7	A. I am po	ositive, sir.	
8	Q So, it	was with the right index finger, you	
<b>.9</b> .	say, and it was fro	om his left to his right?	
10	A. Left to	o'right.	
ÌI.	Q Across	his neck?	
12	A. Yes.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
13	Q And he	was looking at Mrs. Kasabian when he	
14	made the motion?		
15	A. He was,		
16	Q And she	e was looking at him?	•
17	A. That is	s correct, sir.	
18	Q You has	ve been in court several days during this	8
19	trial, Sergeant?		
20	A I have,	, sir.	
21	Q Did you	u observe an X on Mr. Manson's forehead?	
22	A I dia,	sir.	
23.	d Do you	recall the approximate time that you	
24	first observed this	s on Mr. Manson's forehead?	
25	MR. KANAREK:	Your Honor, if I may, I would object on	
26	the ground that	I gather I have a continuing objection	or

materiality and relevancy; is that correct, your Honor, as to all this witness! testimony? May I? THE COURT: You have to ask for it. Š MR. KANAREK: I am asking for it. THE COURT: You have been told to do that about 50 5 times during the course of this trial, MR. KANAREK: I am asking for it, your Honor, yes. 7 THE COURT: All right, you may have it. MR. KANAREK: Thank you. 9 I also object on the ground that the prejudicial 10 value far outweighs the probative value. 11 Also, your Honor, on the grounds of violation 12 of freedom of religion. Seriously. Freedom of religion. 13 THE COURT: You had to add "seriously"? 14 MR. KANAREK: Yes, because I heard someone smicker. 15 THE COURT: Who did you hear snicker? 16 MR. FITZGERALD: I did. 17. THE COURT: It would be a question of relevancy. 18, Mr. Bugliosi. 19 MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you wish to have me approach the 20 bench and discuss the matter? :21 THE COURT: Do you wish to discuss it? 22 MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. 23 24

25

6f-1

J2 

(Whereupon all counsel approach the bench and the following proceedings occur at the bench outside of the hearing of the jury:)

MR. BUGLIOSI: The relevance, again, goes toward domination, specifically of these three girls, not just the Family. Domination of these three girls, your Honor.

The offer of proof is, his testimony will be, that the very next day these three girls also were observed to have X's on their forehead.

They are following, the very next day -- these specifically/three girls -- this domination over them.

Of course, I am going to ask the jury to infer, during my opening and closing arguments, that he dominated them on these two nights in question; that they were following instructions by him.

MR. KANAREK: There is also the aspect of freedom of speech. I think the defendant not only has a right to freedom of religion, but even though he is a defendant, he has an inherent right to protest procedure, whatever the procedure may be.

THE COURT: Denying him freedom of speech?

MR. KANAREK: It shouldn't be used against him in the trial.

I would say that the first amendment rights are guaranteed even --

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, that objection is so

frivolous that it is absolutely beyond comprehension. How a responsible attorney in a capital case of this nature can make a statement like that, I am certainly smazed.

MR. KANAREK: If I may, your Honor? He can object. It would seem to me that he would have the freedom of speech to object.

THE COURT: I don't want to hear any more on that point.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The jury has already seen the X's, so we are not bringing in any prejudicial material. They have seen the X's on the four defendants. The only relevance is that Manson did it first and the girls did it second, they did it immediately after Manson, the next day.

THE COURT: I think the evidence is relevant for that purpose.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That is all I am offering it for.

THE COURT: The objections will be overruled.

MR, HUGHES: I want it clear that I have joined all of the objections, including relevancy and materiality.

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

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Do you recall the approximate

	1	time that you first observed an X on Mr. Manson's forehead?
<b>.</b>	2	A No, sir, I don't recall the exact date.
	3	Several months ago.
	4	Q Do you know the approximate date?
	5 .	A No, sir, I don't.
** **	6	Q Do you know what month it was?
<b>₩</b> ' '	7	A I believe it was August, sir. I am not sure.
	8	I take it back. September.
6g fls.	9	I am not sure, sir. August or September.
,	1,0	
	11	
	12.	
<u> </u>	13	
<del>,</del>	14	
•	15	
	16	
,	17	
	18	
	19	
£v ĕ	20	
<b>.</b>	21	,
	22	
•	23	
	24 25	
	25. 26	
	<b>4</b> g.	

	• .	
6 <b>QQ1</b>	1	August or September, 19
,	2	A. 170,
	3	Q 1970.
	4	And you observed Mr. Manson with an X on his
•	, 5	forehead here in court; is that correct?
	6	A. Yes, sir, I did.
	7	Q You are familiar with the three female defendants
, ,	.8	Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel, and Leslie Van Houten?
	9	A. Yes, sir, I am.
	10	Q Did you ever observe any X's on their forehead?
*	11	A. Yes
	, 12	When did you observe X's on their forehead with
	13	relation to when you observed the X on Mr. Manson?
	14	A. The following day that they appeared in court.
*	15	Q Did all three of them have X's on their fore-
	16	heads the following day?
•	17	A. Yes.
	18	So you observed an X on Manson's forehead one
	19.	day, and the very next day there were X's on all three of
` · · ·	20	the girls' foreheads; is that correct?
	21	A That is correct, sir.
•	22	MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions at this time,
	23	your Honor.
	24	THE COURT: Cross-examination?
• •	. hr	MD PTM7CPD/TD. Mhomb stars

## CROSS-EXAMINATION 1 BY MR. FITZGERALD: You are sure these girls appeared with X's 3: on their foreheads the very next day? 4 Yes, sir. 5 You are positive? Yes, sir. MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further. I have nothing, your Honor, MR. SHINN: ٠ġ THE COURT: Mr. Kandrek? 10 MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor. 11 Thank you. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Hughes? 13 MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: You may step down, Sergeant. 15 Ladies and gentlemen, we have a matter to be 16 taken up outside of your presence. So, I am going to ask the 17 bailiffs to take you back up to the jury room, and as to 18 the jury we will now recess for the noon hour and we will 19 reconvene at 2:00 p.m. as usual. 20. (Whereupon, the jury leaves the courtroom.) 21 THE COURT: The record will show that the jury has 22

You may continue, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: People recall Sergeant Gutierrez.

(Sergeant Gutierrez resumes the stand.)

departed from the courtroom.

23

24

25

26.

THE COURT: Just a moment.

We have a problem, Mr. Bugliosi, because of the fact that the speaker upstairs is immediately adjacent to the room in which the jury is and they may be able to overhear this testimony.

So, I think we will have to hold it up forjust a moment until we can check that.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: It will take a few minutes to arrange matters upstairs. So, I am going to recess at this time until 2:00 p.m.

We will resume at 2:00 p.m. this afternoon. (Whereupon, at 2:52 a.m. the court was in

recess.)

15

ì

ź

. 7

8

9

10

1Î

12

13

14.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

. 24

25