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,

114

vs.

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

Defendants.

No. A253156

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

APPEARANCES:

DONALD A. MUSICH, STEPHEN RUSSELL KAY,

For the People:

VINCENT T. BUGLIOSI,
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

For Deft. Manson:

I. A. KANAREK, Esq.

For Deft. Atkins:

DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Deft. Van Houten:

Dirin Dirini, Tod.

For Deft. Krenwinkel:

RONALD HUGHES, Esq. PAUL FITZGERALD, Esq.

VOLUME 114

JOSEPH B. HOLLOMBE, CSR.,

PAGES 12801 to 12889

MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR., Official Reporters

	·
1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1970
2	2:10 o'clock p.m.
3	
4	THE COURT: All counsel are present; none of the
5	defendants nor the jury are present.
6	You may proceed, Mr. Bugliosi.
7	
8	MANUEL F. GUTIERREZ,
9	the witness on the stand at the time of the noon recess,
10	resumed the stand and testified further as follows:
11	THE COURT: For the record, Mr. Bugliosi, would you
12	state the nature of this particular proceeding.
13	MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, I believe it is a proceeding
14	under Section 1538.5 of the California Penal Code, your
15	Honor.
16	I believe the defense is making a motion to
17	suppress the officer's observations at Spahn Ranch on
18	November 25th, 1969, on the grounds that he had no consent
19	to enter the premises.
20,	Is that correct?
21	MR. FITZGERALD: That is correct.
22	THE COURT: Very well, you may proceed.
23	
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)
25	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
26	O Sergeant on November 25th, 1969, did you

	_ 1	brocess to phann wanch in charamorth' carriorniat
	1	A I did, sir.
)	2	MR. BUGLIOSI: People offer to stipulate there was no
,	3	arrest warrant or search warrant.
`. *	4	So stipulated?
	5.	MR. FITZGERALD: It is so stipulated between and among
` *	6	the parties.
,	7	MR. KANAREK: So stipulated.
*	8	MR. SHINN: So stipulated.
	.g.	MR. HUGHES: So stipulated.
	10	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	11	Q And you went there with whom?
	12	A Sergeant Broda, B-r-o-d-a, and I met Deputy
	13	Gleason from the Sheriff's Department at that location.
<i>.</i>	14	Q And you know George Spahn?
٠.	15	A Yes, sir, I do.
	16	Q An elderly gentleman in his eighties?
	17	A Yes, sir.
•	18	Q Did you see him that day, November 25th, 1969?
8 f1s.	19	A Yes, sir, I did.
A TTR	20	Tes, sir, r did.
	21	
ĸ	22	
	:23	
,	. 24	
) .	25	
	ne	

1	Α,	Yes, I did.
2	Q.	Where was the trailer located on the ranch?
3	A.	To the left of Mr. Spahn's residence as you
, 4	walk up a	s you walk toward it.
5	.	Was it close to the saloon area and the Longhorn
.6	Cafe?	
7	. A.	No, sir. It was to the left of Mr. Spahn's
.8	residence as	you are looking toward it, and to the left of
9	the kitchen	and saloon area. It is near a restroom.
10	e.	Did you walk into the trailer?
11	A.	I did.
12	Q.	Was anyone inside the trailer when you entered?
13	A.	Yes, sir. Mr. Juan Flynn.
14	Q.	I show you People's 261 for identification.
15		Do you know what is shown in that photograph?
16	A.	Yes, I do.
17.	Q.	What is shown in that photograph?
18	A.	Various writings on a cupboard door.
19		Did you see this cupboard door inside the
20	trailer?	
21	" A.	Yes, sir. It was visible when I walked in toward
22	the back of	the trailer.
2 3 ,	Q	And this was on the cupboard door, you say?
24	A.	Yes, sir, it was.
25	Q	This was printed right on the door?
26	A,	This was printed right on the cupboard door,

1	on the door	itself.					
. 2	. Q.	Do you know who took this photograph?					
3	A.	No, sir, I don't.					
4	Q	Was it taken under your direction?					
5	A.	No, sir.					
6	· Q	Does this photograph appear to be an accurate					
7	representat:	ion of the way the door looked when you observed					
8	it on Novem	per 25, 1969?					
9	A.	Yes, sir.					
10	Q.	It had all this writing on it?					
11	Α.	All except my initials, which I indicated on					
.12	there, "MFG".						
13	Q	Your initials are on the upper right-hand					
14	corner of the	ne photograph?					
15	- A.	Yes, sir, they are.					
16	Q	And actually written on the door itself?					
17	A.	Actually written on the door, yes.					
18	Q .	How did you get into the trailer?					
19	A.	I was led into it. The door was open and I					
20	was led into	o it.					
21	Q	Led by whom?					
22	Α.	By Mr. Flynn.					
23		-					
24							

Ž

8a

8a-1

2

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

J.i 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

Q Going back a moment.

When you were speaking to Mr. Spahn, was anyone else with you?

A I don't believe so.

I believe I walked in the house by myself. Mr. Spahn was there by himself also.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Q Sergeant Gutierrez, at the time that you went to the Spahn Ranch on November the 25th, you knew that a number of people resided at that location; isn't that correct?

A That is correct, sir.

Q You knew that there were a lot of young people, and for the sake of communication, we will refer to them as hippies, if you don't object.

You knew that there were a lot of young hippie-type people residing at that location at the time, did you not?

A At the time when I went back there, most of the younger "hippie" people had already gone. There were only the few ranch hands left there.

Q Was it your understanding that people actually lived in this trailer where you made your observations?

A Yes, sir.

		,	
8a-2	1	Q	So the record may be clear, this is what one
	2	would refer	to as a mobile home; isn't that correct?
	3	<u>`</u>	It is a trailer that was apparently designed as
,	4	living quar	ters; is that right?
	5 .	Á	At one time, yes, sir.
	6	3	I believe, at that particular time, there were
% €	7	no wheels o	n that trailer.
\$, 8	Q	But it appeared that there were facilities within
•	9.	the trailer	for human habitation?
•	ĮÓ	A	That is correct.
	11	Q	I have in mind specifically facilities, whether
	12	operative o	r not, for a refrigerator, stove, rest-room
	13	facilities;	that sort of thing.
<i>.</i>	14	A	That is correct, sir.
	15	Q.	It wasn't, for example, a trailer designed to
	16	haul things	or anything like that, was it?
	17	A	No.
* *	18	. Q	It was a trailer for people to live in?
•	19	, A	It was a living quarters trailer.
%	20	Q	Did it appear to you that the trailer was being
	21	lived in at	the time?
	22	A	It did, sir.
,	23	Q	Did you ascertain, at any time on the 25th, who,
,	24	in particu	ar, lived within the trailer?
	- 25	A	I did, sir.
	or.		And who rain that?

8a-3 A One was Juan Flynn. Q Were there any other tenants of the trailer? 2 I don't recall if there was or not, sir. 3 Q What sort of a conversation did you -- did you 4 have a conversation with Flynn? 5 I did. 6 Did you ask him if he lived there? **Q**., 7. A Yes, sir. 8 What did he say? Q 9 Α He said he was staying there, yes, sir. 10 Did he say he was staying with anyone? Q 11 No, he didn't indicate he was staying with 12 anyone, sir. 13 Did you ask Flynn permission, as well as Mr. ·14 Spahn? 15 Yes, I did. Ą 16 How did you do that? 17 I had a conversation with Mr. Flynn regarding 18 the object I was looking for, and he said there was some-19 thing similar to that in his trailer. 20. MR. FITZGERALD: Now, that concludes the questions. 2Ì your Honor, that I have on the issue of the search and 22 seizure. 23 As long as I have the officer on the stand, 24 though, I wonder if I might ask him one or two questions 25 for the purpose of interposing an objection on relevancy 26 9 fls. grounds?

ļ

2 .

4

5

6

Ř

9

10

12

13

14

.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ж, '

23

24

25.

26

THE COURT: You may.

Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: Did you direct that any representative of the Los Angeles Police Department perform any scientific tests upon that door to determine when the writings were placed on the door?

A. No, sir, I did not.

Are you in possession of any information from any source as to the date or age of the writing that appears on that door?

A I have been working on that particular subject for the last two months, yes, sir.

MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn, any questions?

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHINN:

Q Officer, did you determine at any time whose writing was on the wall at all?

A No, sir.

You made no efforts to determine?

A I am trying to determine that now, sir.

4 How are you trying to determine that?

A By contacting various people.

MR. SHINN: Nothing further, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.

9-2

2

1

3· 4

5

6

7

8° 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

Į9

20

21 22

23

24

25 26 MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sergeant, have you related all of the conversation that you had with Mr. Flynn on this occasion?

THE WITNESS: As near as I can recall, yes, sir, I have.

I did ask Mr. Flynn if I could remove that particular item from the place and he said yes.

THE COURT: Where were you when you asked him this?

THE WITNESS: Inside the trailer after I had seen it.

THE COURT: Did you have any conversation with Mr. Flynn outside of the trailer before you went in?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, I did. Mr. Flynn led me into the trailer.

THE COURT: What was the conversation before he led you in?

THE WITNESS: I told him what I was looking for; I was looking for a particular jug with some writings on it, and the writings was the words "Helter Skelter."

And Mr. Flynn stated he had not seen that jug for quite some time; that it was in the back, but he thought it might have gotten in one of the trailers — not in one of the trailers, but in one of the houses along the boardwalk, and then I asked Mr. Flynn if he would accompany me back to these different trailers and he said yeah.

And then he said, "I think I know what you are looking for," he said, "There is some writing on one of the cabinet doors."

1	And I said, "May I look in there?"
2	And he said, "Yes."
ġ.	THE COURT: Any questions, gentlemen?
4	MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor, this is all on the
5	search and seizure issue, I gather.
6	THE COURT: That is what he is here for.
7	MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Anything further?
9	You may step down.
10	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
11	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I would say, based upon this
12	foundation, that the District Attorney
13	THE COURT: Just a moment.
14	Have the People rested on the motion?
15.	MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Do the defense have any evidence?
17	MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor. The defendant
18	Patricia Krenwinkel rests.
19	MR. SHINN: Rest, your Honor.
20	MR. KANAREK: Rest, your Honor.
21	MR. HUGHES: Rest, your Honor.
22	MR. KANAREK: But I do have a motion, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: We have a motion being heard, Mr. Kanarek.
24	MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor.
25.	THE COURT: Do you care to argue, Mr. Bugliosi?
26	MR. BUGLIOSI: Submit the matter, your Honor. I think

we put on a prima facie case of consent. It has not been controverted in any fashion. ŢŖ 24 -

9a

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

9a-1

2

1

3

5

6: · 7

8

10

11

,12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

MR. FITZGERALD: We submit that the People failed to meet the burden of proof on the consent issue, and also I will take the position that the prosecution has failed to establish that there were not co-tenants of the precise trailer whose consent would be necessary in order to secure belongings within the trailer.

MR. SHINN: Submit it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Argument?

MR. KANAREK: Submit it, your Honor. No, I have no argument.

MR. HUGHES: Submit it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We are not submitting into evidence the actual door itself, just a photograph of the door.

MR. FITZGERALD: I don't think that makes any difference. I think there is an identity of issues there, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: The Court indicated that, I think, previously.

THE COURT: It appears to the Court that consent was obtained both from Mr. Spahn, the owner of the ranch, and Mr. Flynn who was the tenant of the trailer.

It appears that that consent was freely and voluntarily given.

The search was made pursuant to that consent.

Accordingly, the defendants motions are depied.

MR. FITZGERALD: Could I be heard on the issue of

9a-2

2

4

5 6

7

8

1Ó

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

. 5

22

23 24

25

26

relevancy?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: I think that, as was brought out by the officer, there has been no scientific investigation to determine whether these writings were actually placed on the door the photograph was taken of, nor have they established the identity of the person or persons who placed the writing on the door, and I think that is material in two very crucial respects:

One is if this happened subsequent to the dates alleged for the conspiracy, and the dates alleged within the information for the substantive offenses, I think it is immaterial in that it is beyond the scope of the issues in this case, and it is irrelevant in the sense that the probative value of some subsequent writing is remote if it has any probative value whatsoever.

And I think furthermore, Mr. Shinn pointed out by his questioning, that we don't know if it was Patricia Krenwinkel, Susan Atkins, Leslie Van Houten, Charles Manson, George Spahn, Randy Starr or anyone of literally hundreds of people who had access to that location as a result of your Honor's hearing the evidence in this case, and could have placed it on.

In essence my argument is twofold:

One, there is no showing as to who put it there, and, two, there is no showing as to when it was put there.

25

26

THE COURT: Do you wish to be heard on that, Mr. Bugliosi?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, we know, No. 1, your Honor, that it was observed there within a matter of moments after these homicides. Irrespective of who put it there, it is just circumstantial evidence.

Our case would be stronger if we could show that Manson or one of the three female defendants did it, but that only goes towards the weight of the evidence.

I think the defense can argue this to the jury that we never put on specifically who made this writing.

But I think we are entitled to put this on as circumstantial evidence that at Spahn Ranch, even though subsequent to the murders, the extremely unusual and unique term, Helter Skelter, was inside a trailer near where the defendants lived, and of course Helter Skelter is on the refrigerator door of the La Bianca residence.

So Mr. Fitzgerald's argument is an argument to be made to the jury, and his argument only goes to the weight of the evidence, not to the admissibility of it.

I think it definitely is circumstantial evidence.

MR. KANAREK: May I respond just briefly, your Honor.

Your Honor, I think it is clear that Juan
Flynn lived there, and the inference could be that this

Ί

.3

9b fls.8

. 10:

2L

is Juan Flynn's.

They got permission from Juan Flynn to enter his premises. This is his property; it certainly is a prima facie situation or a presumption indulged in to that effect, to allow the prosecution to put this into evidence just because it happens to be within these many acres, your Honor, is very dangerous, and it is just -- how far can you stretch circumstantial evidence?

9b-1

2

Ŀ

3

4

5

6

7.

8,

ģ,

10

11

12

13 . 14

15

. 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

Mr. Bugliosi is using that as a bushel basket for all kinds of error, and I think it would be error to allow -- if this is their case as far as the foundation goes, as to who it belonged to and where it was, your Honor, it's clear it was Juan Flynn's.

Unless there is some other showing, I don't think the jury should see this prejudicial exhibit or the door, the picture, or any of that.

I don't think they have proved it has anything to do with any of these defendants.

THE COURT: Well, my recollection is that the evidence shows that the defendants spent a good deal of time in this trailer watching television, and socializing with other members of the group, and also Mr. Flynn.

I think it has some circumstantial evidentiary value.

The weight, of course, is a matter to be argued to the jury.

Are you offering it at this time, Mr. Bugliosi?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, I would like to offer this in front
of the jury, your Honor, once the jury resumes the jury
box.

THE COURT: Very well.

Anything further before we bring the jury in? (No response.)

THE COURT: Anything further before we bring the jury

in?

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, we are in session now, aren't we? So I don't interrupt in the presence of the jury, may I have an objection also on the grounds of hearsay, your Honor, as far as this Helter Skelter is concerned?

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. SHINN: Join that motion.

MR. KANAREK: And, of course, improper foundation.

MR. HUGHES: I will join those objections.

0-1	, Ι	(The following proceedings were had in open
	2 ,	court. All counsel and jury present. Defendants absent.)
-, ,	3	THE COURT: The record will show all of counsel and
,	4	all the jurors are present.
	, 5	You may proceed, Mr. Eugliosi.
	6	MR. BUGLIOSI: Sergeant Cutierrez.
,	7	
, ` <u> </u>		MANUEL F. GUTIERREZ,
	9	the witness on the stand at the time of the noon recess,
	10	resumed the stand and testified further as follows:
	. 11	MR. BUGLIOSI: May I proceed, your Honor?
	12	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
<u> </u>	13	
	14	DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
	15	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
•	16	G Sergeant Gutierrez, on November 25, 1969, did
•	17	you out to the Spahn Ranch in Chatsworth?
	18	A. I did.
	19	Q And whom did you go there with?
* č ,	20	A. I went there with Sergeant Broda, and I met
÷	21	Deputy Gleason from the Sheriff's Department at that
÷	. 22	location.
	23	Q About what time did you arrive at the Spahn
<u></u> .	24	Ranch?
	25	A Approximately noon.
	. 26	After you arrived at the Spahn Ranch did you

	1	
1	enter a traile	r at the Spahn Ranch?
2	<u>.</u>	er on I entered a trailer, yes, sir,
3	,	ut what time did you enter the trailer?
		und 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon.
. 5		where is this trailer located on the Spahn
	` '	where is furs craffer forsted ou one spaint
` .6·	Ranch?	,
7	A It	is located on the property itself. As you
8	face Mr. Spahn'	s residence, it was to the left, and to
9	the left of a r	estroom that was there.
10	g In	other words, the trailer is in the front
ij	part of the ran	ch?
12	A. No,	sir. It would be toward the back of the
13	ranch.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
14	Q Wel	1, you know there is a group of buildings
15	there at the fr	ont of the ranch? You are aware of that?
Ì6	A. Yes	, sir.
17	Q How	far was this trailer in relation to those
18.	buildings?	
19	A. App	roximately 50 feet.
20	Q In	other words, it was close to the front of
2Ì	the ranch?	
22	A. No,	sir. It was closer to the back of the ranch.
23	Q Whe	h you speak of the back of the ranch, are
24	you referring t	o the geographical boundaries of the ranch?
25 . '	A Yes	, sir, I am.
26	Q And	you feel that the trailer, then, was near

1	the geographical boundaries of the ranch, on the other side
2	of the front buildings?
3	You understand the ranch has several acres; is
4	that correct?
5	A. Yes, sir, it has.
6.	I am trying to orient myself here.
7	As you face Mr. Spahn's residence, the trailer
8.	was to the left. As you face the boardwalk with the numer-
9	ous little shacks on it, it is to the right of that.
10	Q Well, the boardwalk is in front of the ranch; i
11	that correct?
12	A. Yes, sir.
13.	It goes one way, and Mr. Spahn's ranch
14	Q. Mr. Spahn's house?
15	A. Rather, Mr. Spahn's house is on the other end.
16	That would be the west end, I believe.
17	MR. BUGLIOSI: May I have just a moment, your Honor?
, 18	THE COURT: Yes.
19	(Mr. Bugliosi gets some photograph exhibits
20	from the clerk.)
. 21	MR. BUGLIOSI: Q I show you People's 29 for
22	identification.
23	Do you recognize this as being an aerial photo
24	of Spahn Ranch?
.25 .	A Yes, sir, I do.
26	Q. Where is the boardwalk here?

-	A.	This	is	the	boar	dwalk	in	froi	ņt 1	nere		. ,	
(Indi	cating!)					• ,		*	<i>',</i> *	j ,	*;	. ,
•	Q	Poin	ting	: to	the	group	of	bui.	lđi	ngs.:	right	off	
Santa	Susanı					(/-		, 9		<u>†</u>
,	A.				rect,		,						• 5
					•		r, On a ba		د ساد د	بداد ما داد	***	ί. Ο π. π. 14 π.	
	Q .	And	το τ	ne i	rignt	over	ner	'e', :	LB 1	CUIB	mr.	opani	n·s
house		r		•		,							
•	A.	Yes,	sir	•									
•		•			,				•				
•	•				*					•			
·		•				* .		•			,		,
		· .		*	•	. 8							•
									*				
·	,				•	•			•			•	
, ,					•						e e		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	•	•		,		•			•		,		
	•	•											
;		·	•			:	,						
•	•				•	<i>,,</i> .							.•
						*							
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-			3	•							,
· · · · · ·	,	•			•					,			
į		•	•						•			•	`
•			•			·							. ,
					, .			•					
٠.	•											•	
,													

10a

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

10a-1 Okay. Could you point out where on this photograph 2 the trailer was? 3 Sitting back in here, sir. 4 Now, you call this in back of the ranch right 5 here? 6 A Yes, sir. 7 What do you call this area right up here? Q 8 A That is the back part of the ranch also, sir. 9 That is the hilly part of the ranch. 10 So, you call this the back of the ranch? Q 11 I do. A 12, Okay. Q 13 Can you put an X where the trailer was that you 14 entered? 15 (The witness marks.) 16 MR. BUGLIOSI: May I mark this, your Honor, "Trailer"? 17 THE COURT: You may. 18 BY MR., BUGLIOSI: 19 This is the trailer, then, that you entered; Q .20 is that right, sir? 21 A Yes, sir. 22 What did you observe inside the trailer? Were Q 23 there any beds in there, or a refrigerator, et cetera? 24 There were living quarters. There was a bed, 25 as I recall, and a table, some chairs, a kitchen. And that 26

•	1		
10a-2	i	is about all	I recall being in there.
	2	. Q	Do you know if anyone was living in the
	3	trailer at	the time that you went out there on November the
	4	25th, 1969?	
	5	A	Yes, sir. The person that I spoke to.
	6	Q	Who is that?
•	7	A	Mr. Juan Flynn.
. 5.	. 8	·Q.	Was he living there with anyone else?
	9.	. A	I don't know, sir. I didn't ask him.
	JÒ.		I didn't see anybody in the trailer.
	11	Q	I show you People's 261 for identification.
	12		Do you know what that photograph depicts?
	. 13	A	Yes, sir.
O '	14	Q	What is that?
	15	A	This photograph depicts a picture of a cabinet
	16	door with s	ome various writings.
	17	, Q.	Where was this cabinet door?
	18	A	This cabinet was inside that trailer.
	19	વ	The trailer that you just mentioned?
₹	20.	A .	That I just mentioned.
	21	, ,	And it was in the kitchen. It was a cabinet
ê	22	door.	
	23	Q	You saw this writing here that is on this
	24	photograph,	you saw the writing on the cabinet door?
	25	A	Yes, sir.
	26	Q	Inside the tmiler?

10a-3	i	A Yes, sir.
.	2	Q On November 25th, 1969?
	3	A That is correct, sir.
	4 .	Q You didn't take this photograph?
	5	A No, sir, I did not.
•	6	Q Does this photograph appear to be an accurate
* ()	7	and fair representation of the way the cabinet door looked
*	8	on November the 25th, 1969?
,	9	A Identical, sir.
	įo ·	MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions.
<i>;</i> `	n :	THE COURT: Cross-examination?
	12	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.
v	13	I will make a motion to strike his testimony
,	14	on the grounds that it is irrelevant and immaterial; and
,	15	on the grounds heretofore stated.
. , ,	16 ;	THE COURT: Motion denied.
•	17	MR. SHINN: No questions. And I will join in
	18	Mr. Fitzgerald's motion.
	19	MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.
·	20	I will join in Mr. Fitzgerald's motion and
	21	also his comments before the jury entered. Join in those
eř.	2 2	comments.
•	23	I just have a couple of questions, if I may.
	24	
· ,	25	

104-4	1	CROSS-XXANINATION			
	. 2	NY ME. LANARKI			
	3	Q Officer, that was November the 25th of 1969;			
•	4	right			
	5	A That is correct, Mr. Kamarek.			
	6.	Q And the Juan Flynn that you are speaking of			
' • '	. 7	is the same Juan Flynn that you saw testify in this			
*	8	*Qurtrocm?			
	9 :	A Yes. The identical person.			
	10	Q Right?			
	1İ	A Yes, six.			
	12	Q Thunk you.			
· .	13	And he was living there; right?			
	14	A He told me he was, yes, sir.			
	15	MK, KAMAMKK: Thank you.			
	16	MR. MUGLICET: Just one more question, your Honox.			
* *	17	•			
	18	REDIRECT EXAMINATION			
	19	MY HR. MUCLIOSI:			
न्द	20	Q Did Mr. Flynn point this cabinet door out to			
	21	yeu?			
<i>E</i>	22	M. KANAREGI Immeterial and hearney, your Honor.			
	23	Also calling for a conclusion.			
	24	That is bearesy by conduct.			
	25	THE COURT: Sustained.			
10b f1	# 6				

105-1 MR. BUGLIOSI: On the grounds of hearsay, or on the - 1 other ground, your Honor? 2. 3 THE COURT: On the grounds stated, Mr. Bugliosi. BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Ŝ Did Mr. Flynn direct you to this door, this cabinet? б. MR. KANAREK: That's the same thing, your Honor. Ï It 8 is another way of saying the same thing, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Sustained. 10 MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions. MR. HUGHES: I have no questions, your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Any redirect? 13 Very well. You may step down. 14 MR. BUGLIOSI: Sergeant LaVallee. 15 (The witness enters the courtroom.) 16 17 THE CLERK: Would'you raise your right hand, please. Would you please repeat after me. 19 I do solemnly swear --20 THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear --21 THE CLERK: -- that the testimony I may give ---22 THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give --23 THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending --24 THE WITNESS: -- in the cause now pending --25 THE CLERK: -- before this court --26 THE WITNESS: -- before this court --

-- shall be the truth --THE CLERK: . 1 THE WITNESS: -- shall be the truth --2 THE CLERK: -- the whole truth --3 THE WITNESS: -- the whole truth --:4 -- and nothing but the truth --THE CLERK: 5 THE WITNESS: -- and nothing but the truth -ń THE CLERK: -- so help me God. 7 THE WITNESS: -- so help me God. 8 THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please. 9 Would you draw the microphone back, sir. 1Ò Would you please state and spell your name. 11 THE WITNESS: Albert J. Lavallee; L-a-V-a-1-1-e-e. 12 13 ALBERT J. LA VALLEE, 14 called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, having 15 been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as 16 follows: 17 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 20 What is your occupation, sir? 21 I am a Sergeant of Police for the Los Angeles 22 Police Department presently attached to the Scientific 23 Investigation Division. 24 MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I have here an aerial 25 photograph.

22

23

24

25

26.

May it be marked People's next in order?

THE COURT: 262 for identification.

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Sergeant, directing your attention to the

Q Sergeant, directing your attention to this aerial photograph, this People's 262 for identification.

Have you ever seen that before?

- A I have.
- Q I direct your attention to People's 98 for identification.

Have you ever seen this before?

- A I have.
- Q Did you prepare People's 98?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q How did you prepare People's 98?

A By taking a piece of tracing paper and placing it over the aerial photograph and then tracing the steets that I was directed to trace.

- Q You placed this sheet of paper over People's 262, the serial photograph; is that correct?
 - A Yes.
- And then you traced certain streets on People's 98?
 - A Yes.
 - Q You did not make the scale on 98?
- A I put in the approximate scale as near as I could determine.

		Q People's 98 was made by you, then?
	Ì	A It was.
	, 2	Q From People's 262?
	3	A That is true.
··	4	Q People's 98 is an overlay?
	. 2	A It is an overlay.
	ģ ·]	MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions.
•	7 .	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.
" /-	8:	MR. SHINN: No questions, your Honor.
	9	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?
	10	MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.
	11	MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.
10c f1s	12 •	THE COURT: You may step down.
	13	
,	14	
	. 15	
•• ′	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
T	20	
,	21	
÷	2 2	
	23	
_	24	
•	25	

MR. BUGLIOSI: People call Charles Friedman. 10C-1 (No witness appears in the courtroom.) 3 MR, BUGLIOSI: We are having a little difficulty, 4 your Honor, finding him. People call Lieutenant Jack Holt, (Witness enters the courtroom.) 7 THE CLERK: Would you raise your right hand, please. Would you please repeat after me. I do solemnly swear --10 THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear --_11 THE CLERK: -- that the testimony I may give --12 THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give --13 THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending --THE WITNESS: -- in the cause now pending --15 THE CLERK: -- before this Court --16 THE WITNESS: -- before this Court --17 THE CLERK: -- shall be the truth --18 THE WITNESS: -- shall be the truth --19 THE CLERK: -- the whole truth --20 THE WITNESS: -- the whole truth --21 THE CLERK: -- and nothing but the truth --22 THE WITNESS: -- and nothing but the truth --23 THE CLERK: -- so help me God. 24 THE WITNESS: -- so help me God. 25 THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please. 26

Would you please state and spell your name.

10c2 THE WITNESS: Jack Holt, H-0-1-t. 1 JACK HOLT. called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, being 4 first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 5 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7. BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 8. What is your occupation, sir? Deputy Sheriff for the County of Los Angeles. 10 11 What are your functions there with the 12 Sheriff's Office? I am the watch commander in the Sheriff's 13 Record Bureau; keeper of the criminal records. 14 I show you a group of documents. The front 15 sheet, the cover sheet, says "Certification of Records." 16 And I direct your attention to the lower left-hand corner. 17 Is that your signature, Lieutenant Jack L. Holt"? 38 Yes, it is. 19 MR. KANAREK: May I approach with Mr. Bugliosi, your 20 Honor? 21 22 THE COURT: You may. MR. HUGHES: May I also, your Honor? .23 THE COURT: 24 You may. MR. BUGLIOSI: Q These documents that I am 25 leafing through here, are these certified records of the 26

. ,	•	
10c3	} :	į
	; •	2
•		\$
	, ,	4
	,	5
	• • •	6
•	- ,	7
Á		8
***		ģ
		10
. •	٠.	11
	,	12
<u></u>		13
		14
•	•	15
	,* (16
•	·	17
		18
		19
,	•	20
Ę		21

23

24

25

26

Sheriff's office?

A Yes, sir, they are.

Q What is this document right here, the second sheet?

A. It is a booking slip.

Q For whom?

A. Sandra Collins Pugh.

Q Is there also an aka, "also known as"?.

A. Sandra Collins Good.

MR. FITZGERALD: Your Honor, there has been an inappropriate foundation for business record hearsay, and I will object on those grounds.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is a certified copy of the official records of the Sheriff's Office.

MR. HUGHES: Join in the objection, your Honor.

MR. FITZGERALD: It does not fall within the official document --

THE COURT: If you want to argue, come to the bench and we will talk about it up here.

MR. FITZGERALD: I don't think it is necessary to approach the bench.

I will object on foundational grounds.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you want to withdraw the objection?

MR. FITZGERALD: No. I am not withdrawing my objection.

11-1

1

2 3

4

5

·6

8

. 10.

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25.

26

MR. FITZGERALD: May we approach the bench, your Honor?

THE COURT: Very well.

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

MR. FITZGERALD: Let me first point out, your Honor, that I know the import of this testimony and if your Honor has ruled that it is otherwise admissible, this officer is going to testify to a period of incarceration of Sandy Good.

We all discussed this and your Honor has ruled it is relevant and material, that's all right inasmuch as it is coming in on that ground, I have no real objection to its coming in and I would have stipulated to it, although now that there is going to be no stipulation, I would be incompetent if I let this evidence come in in the manner it is coming in.

All I am asking for is a business record foundation.

MR. KANAREK: I don't think this witness can give this business record foundation, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why not? What do you base that on?

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I would gather --

THE COURT: Just speculation on your part.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, yes.

THE COURT: Then don't waste our time with speculation, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right, I will try to lay a 1 foundation for it. 2 3 a valid objection. 4 5 7 8 10 record. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22-23 24 25

26

THE COURT: I am afraid you will have to. It is MR. BUGLIOSI: Although I think there is another exception to the hearsay rule, official documents section does not require business record foundation. MR. FITZGERALD: That Evidence Code section, I believe, has as one of its requirements being that by order of law the records are kept, in order for it to be an official In other words, the records must be kept pursuant to some State rule or regulation. I will stipulate to the facts themselves, no question. I offered to do that before, and I will. MR. BUGLIOSI: Can you try to convince Mr. Kanarek? I can say this, Mr. Kanarek, you come up to me for stipulations and I entered into them with you. Now, I think to save time ---MR. KANAREK: No, the point is that these records have all kinds of hearsay and all kinds of other material. MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, they took their fingerprints and stuff like that. That just takes up time. MR. KANAREK: I have seen those jail records. They make many mistakes in the jail, Mr. Bugliosi, many.

THE COURT: Well, 1280 is the record by public

employee.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

Ìŝ

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You have to show, among other things, the sources of information and method at time of preparation to indicate its trustworthiness.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right, I will try to lay a foundation.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I do -- I am asking for a continuing objection on materiality and relevancy as to this witness, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. HUGHES: May I join that objection, your Honor?
THE COURT: Very well.

MR. KANAREK: All of this testimony, thank you.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, I think the record was clear, we talked about it at length, your Honor may recall the argument which was later referred to as Mr. Bugliosi's spec argument.

THE COURT: You mean about the fact that these people were in custody?

Let's proceed.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay.

THE COURT: The objections are overruled except for the foundational objection.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

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

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

1	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: What are your duties?
2	A. I am the watch commander responsible for all
3	personnel on the day shift, responsible for the maintaining
4	of all criminal records in our possession and the custody
5	thereof.
_. 6	Q You say criminal records. Are you also referring
7	to records showing when a person is booked into the County
8	Jail and when that party is released from the County Jail?
9	A. That's correct.
10	Q Looking at this first document here, do you
11	recognize this document?
12	A. Yes, I do.
13	Q What type of document is that?
14:	A That is a Sheriff's booking slip and property
15	record.
16	Q One slip is two things, in other words, a
17	booking slip and also a property record.
18.	A. That is correct.
19	Q Same sheet of paper?
20 :	A. That's correct.
21	Q And who prepared this particular document in
22	the Sheriff's Office?
23	A Several people. It is originally prepared in
24	longhand.
25.	Q By whom?
26	A. The arresting officer, and it is later typed by
	a typist_clerk.

	li di			
1	Q When did these particular people make the			
2	entries on this document?			
3	A. The arresting officer makes this entry right			
4	here at the time of arrest.			
5	Q The date and time booked?			
б.	A That's correct, that is the time they reach the			
Ĩ.	Sheriff's facility, be it the station or one of the jails.			
8: .	Q Is this booking and property record a business			
9	record of the Los Angeles Sheriff's Office?			
10	A Yes, it is.			
11	Q It is made in the regular course of business of			
12	the Sheriff's Office?			
13	A. Yes, it is.			
14	Q You are looking at this first document here,			
15 .	the party who was booked, is that the party's name Sandra			
16	Pugh, also known as Sandra Good?			
17	MR. KANAREK: I object on the grounds of improper			
18	foundation.			
19	THE COURT: In what respect?			
20	MR. KANAREK: In the respect, your Honor, I submit			
21	the purported foundation that counsel has elicited is in-			
22	adequate at this point.			
23				
24				
25				

la

11a-1 THE COURT: In what respect? MR. KANAREK: It is inadequate because this witness 2 is merely stating what is done. 3 These papers are not the papers that were 4 These are papers he himself has said that have 5 been typed over by somebody else. They are not the original documents, they are 7 not the best evidence. 8 There is no showing that the original handwritten documents, if there were any, are available. 1Ó THE COURT: May I see the exhibit? 11 (Handed to the Court.) 12 THE COURT: Overruled. 13 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 14 When does this document here, the booking and 15 property record, reflect that Sandra Pugh also known as 16 Sandra Good was booked into the County Jail? 17 At 10:12 p.m. on August 8th, 1969. 18 It says 10:21 p.m. Q 19 10:21, I beg your pardon. A 20 On August 8th, 1969? Ø. 21 Yes, sir. Ą **22** At Sybil Brand Institute? Q. 23 Yes, sir. 24 Skipping a few sheets, are you familiar with 25

this document right here?

11a-2	i
· ·	2
	3
* , .	4
٠.	5
	6
. # ₹ , ' , ' ,	7
. ,	8
•	9
	10
•	11
·	12
	13
) .	14
	15
, .	16
	17
•	18
•	19
۵	20
. 	21

. 22

23

24

25

26.

A	Yés,	sir,	cam.	•
Q.	What	is the	at doc	ument?

A That is an envelope used to keep all of the documents pertaining to this particular party's case at the jail.

Q This would be Sandra Pugh or Sandra Good's jacket?

A That's correct.

Q Does this appear to be a photostatic copy of the front part of the jacket?

A Yes, it does.

Q I notice some entries on this document, here, do you know who would make these entries?

A No, I don't.

Q Who would normally make the entries on this particular document, not referring to the people who made the entries on Sandra Pugh's jacket, but on any jacket?

A It would have to be someone at the Inmate Reception Center, but who I don't know.

Q I'm not referring now to the name of the party, but who at the Sheriff's Office occupying what position would complete this particular document?

MR. KANAREK: That is calling for a conclusion, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

	•	
L1a-3	İ	THE WITNESS: Why, it's someone assigned to the
	. 2	Inmate Reception Center, a Deputy Sheriff.
	. 3	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	4	Q Inmate Reception Center?
	5	A That's correct, that is where these records
ı	ć	are maintained prior to sending them to us.
.5	7	Q How long have you been working for the Sheriff's
.	8.	Office?
* .	9	A Nine and a half years.
•	ÌO ,	Q How long have you been working in your particu-
	11	lar bureau?
·	12	A Ten months.
	Ĩ3	Q You are pretty familiar with the records there,
	14	aren't you?
	15	A Yes, sir.
•	16	Q The criminal records?
	17	A Yes, sir.
	18	Q Among those records are records indicating when
	19	somebody is released from jail?
•	20	A Yes, sir, that's correct.
	21	Q Who completes this particular document then?
*	22	MR. KANAREK: The man obviously cannot answer it.
,	23	THE COURT: Overruled, he may answer.
,	24	THE WITNESS: I do not know.
	25	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	26	Q It is not part of your job to know that?

11a-4 Α No, sir, it is not. Ì Some other specialist knows this job? 2 It would be someone at the Inmate Reception 3 Center who knows that. 4 I am not asking you whether you completed this, 5 but someone else in your department would know this? . 6 Yes, sir, that's correct. 7 Do you have any idea who that party is? 8 Possibly the watch commander at the inmate 9 reception center or the officer that brought the information 10 back from court and caused it to be entered. 11 Okay, turning the page here I see another 12 document also. It looks like a booking and property record. 13 Is that the same type of record you looked at 14 earlier, the one for Sandra Pugh also known as Sandra Good? 15 A Yes, sir, it is. 16 This is one for Mary Brunner? 17 A Yes, sir. 18 And this document also would be made in the 19 regular course of business of the Sheriff's Office, is that .20 correct? 21 A Yes, it would. 22 It is a business record of the Sheriff's Office? Q 23° A Yes, it is. 24 What does this document reflect as to the date Q 25

that Mary Brunner was put into Sybil Brand Institute?

MR. KANAREK: Improper foundation, your Honor, conclusion, hearsay.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: She was booked at 10:21 p.m. August 8th, 1969, at Sybil Brand Institute.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, I have no further questions.

MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.

MR. SHINN: No questions, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: May I, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Officer, is its fair statement you have no personal knowledge whatsoever concerning those documents?

By personal knowledge, you yourself had nothing

to do with the creating of these documents?

A That's correct.

Q You are merely -- it is a fair statement you are sort of -- you are merely bringing them to court here?

A That's correct.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you the custodian of the records, sir?

21

22

23

24

Is that one of your official duties? THE COURT: 2 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 3 THE COURT: You are familiar with the method of 4 preparing the documents? 5 THE WITNESS: Some of the documents, not all of them. 6 I have not worked the Inmate Reception Center .7. so I do not know who finalized or puts various entries in 8 all the documents. 9 THE COURT: As to those you did testify to you have 10 personal knowledge of the method of preparation. 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: Any further questions? 13 MR. KANAREK: Yes 14 15. FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. KANAREK: 17 Officer, you have personal knowledge of what 18 is written down in the book as to the way things are 19 supposed to be done, is that right? 20 Yes, sir. 21 But is it a fair statement you have no knowledge 22 whether the book was followed in this particular case, 23 no personal knowledge, right? 24 That is correct. 25 MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor. **26**

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, I am.

THE COURT: You may step down. Ì MR. BUGLIOSI: People call DeWayne Wolfer. 2 I see it is 3:00 o'clock, Mr. Bugliosi, THE COURT: 3 we will take our recess at this time. 4 Ladies and gentlemen, do not converse with 5 anyone or form or express any opinion regarding the case 6 until it is finally submitted to you. 7 The court will recess for 15 minutes. 8 12 fls. 9 (Recess.) 10 11 12 13 14 **15** 16 17 18 19 20 . 21 <u>22</u> 23 24 25 26

THE COURT: All counsel and jurors are present. 1 You may continue, Mr. Bugliosi. 2 MR. BUGLIOSI: DeWayne Wolfer. 3 THE CLERK: Please repeat after me. 4 I do solemnly swear --5 THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear --6 THE CLERK: -- that the testimony I may give --7 THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give --8 THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending -ġ THE WITNESS: -- in the cause now pending --ÌÓ THE CLERK: -- before this Court --11 THE WITNESS: -- before this Court --12. THE CLERK: -- shall be the truth --13 THE WITNESS: -- shall be the truth --14 THE CLERK: -- the whole truth --15 THE WITNESS: -- the whole truth --16 THE CLERK: -- and nothing but the truth --17 THE WITNESS: -- and nothing but the truth --18 THE CLERK: -- so help me God. 19 THE WITNESS: -- so help me God. 20 THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please. 21 Would you please state and spell your name. 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. It is Dewayne A. Wolfer: 23 D-e capital W-a-y-n-e, W-o-l-f-e-r. 24

.2-I

25

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

ı.

Ľ

2

.

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

3

5

6

7

8

.9

10

II: 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23.

24

25

26.

Q What is your occupation, sir?

A. I am a police officer for the City of Los Angeles assigned to the Scientific Investigation Division Crime

Lab where I act as a criminalist.

MR. BUGLIOSI: May it be stipulated that the witness is an expert in the field of firearms and ballistics?

MR. FITZGERALD: I'd prefer a foundation.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Please relate your training and experience in the field of firearms and ballistics.

A. Just in that field, basically, I got my
Bachelor's Degree from the University of Southern California
where I was a pre-med student and have a background in the
field of chemistry and physics, and all different types of
laboratory technique courses.

Since my graduation, I have served in the laboratory as a criminalist since 1951, during which time I served both in the capacity as a civilian criminalist and as a police officer criminalist.

I am currently a professor at California State College of Long Beach where I have been so employed for the past -- well, I am starting on my 16th year now.

During this time I have offered a year and a half course in the field of criminalistics, both the theory and

I

ĝ

12.

the laboratory science portions.

In addition to my present teaching assignment,
I have taught criminalistic subjects on the campuses of the
University of Southern California, El Camino College,
Fullerton College, Santa Barbara College and Ventura
College.

During the summer session, under the auspices of the State Board of Education, I have taught at Cal in San Francisco, UCLA, the California State College in Los Angeles.

13-1

4:

<u>26</u>

In the way of criminalistics in just the field of firearms I have traveled throughout the United States, through all the major firearm factories where I worked in the manufaduring processes for the purpose of forensic studies -- that would be the studies belonging to a court of law.

Some of the factories which I made these studies in would include that of Smith & Wesson, Colt, Iver-Johnson, High Standard, Harrington & Richardson, Great Western, Remington, Winchester and others.

In addition to these studies I made similar studies of all of the major munition factories, some of these factories again would include that of Remington, Peters, Winchester, Western, Federal and others.

I made all these similar studies of firearms and ballistics with major smokeless powder manufacturers.

I have testified hundreds of times involving firearms and ballistic matters here in our State, both in the Municipal Courts and the Superior Courts systems.

I have published my fourth adition of my laboratory manual.

In addition to my testimony here in the State of California I testified in at least eight other states on numerous occasions involving firearms and ballistic matters.

I'm a member of the American Association of Forensic Scientists, and others.

This is basically my background in ballistics.

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q When do you have time to work at the Los Angeles Police Department?

A I don't.

Q On the date August 18th, 1969, did you proceed to the Tate residence at 10050 Cielo Drive, Los Angeles?

A I did.

Q Did you proceed there with anyone?

A Yes, I went to that residence with an officer, Dave Buckler, and myself.

Q What was the purpose of your going there on that date and time?

A To make tests to see if certain sounds could be heard at different positions at that location.

MR. FITZGERAID: If the Court please, I wonder if counsel might approach the bench in regard to this officer's testimony. It is an important matter.

THE COURT: Very well.

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

MR. FITZGERALD: I take it that this officer is going to testify that William Garretson could not hear gunshots from his position in the back house at the Tate residence.

Is that essentially correct?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

22

23

24

13-3

.11

MR. FITZGERALD: Now, what I would like to allege, your Honor, and I'm alleging, is a total deprivation of discovery in this area.

And I particularly have been interested in obtaining reports concerning any such experiment that was conducted, and I have been told that there are no reports of any such experiment work done there other than were in the official police reports.

Now, on page 28 and 29 of the official reports of the Los Angeles Police Department which I received that pursuant to a court order directing/the prosecution turn over to me results of any and all lab tests of the Scientific Investigation Department concerning any examination, physical, photographic or written evidence connected with the investigation of the above-entitled case together with any and all written reports concerning said evidence.

I was informed that the only such reports relating to any tests were as follows, contained on page 28 and 29, on the first homicide investigation report.

It is brief and as follows:

Investigating officers went back to the crime scene and reviewed the physical and acoustical aspects of the scene as related to what Garretson, who claimed to have been awake all night in the guest house writing letters, claimed he heard or saw.

In the opinion of the investigating officers,

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.

14 fls. 26

and scientific research by the Scientific Investigation
Department, it is highly unlikely that Garretson was not
aware of the screams, gunshots and other turmoil that
would result from a multiple homicide such as took place
in his near proximity.

These findings however did not absolutely preclude the fact that Garretson did not hear or see any of the events connected with the homicide.

Now, I suggest they are going to put on an expert who testified that he conducted an acoustical investigation on August 18th, and we have been deprived all of these months of the reports concerning this acoustical investigation so that we could prepare for trial.

I suggest that either one of two things have happened:

Somebody has been grossly negligent or somebody has willfully suppressed evidence.

I have known Mr. Bugliosi for a long time. I am not suggesting he willfully suppressed any evidence.

But if representatives of the Los Angeles Police Department suppressed evidence, that is just as bad, and what disturbs me so terribly, substantially about this is that I sought on several different occasions to obtain this very evidence because I suspected it existed. 2

. 1

3

4

5 ... 6

7

. §

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: So have I. I have sought to obtain it, too.

I just got a copy about 20 minutes ago. My first copy that I had gotten.

MR. HUGHES: I want to join in Mr. Fitzgerald's motion, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: I join in Mr. Fitzgerald's comments and also, your Honor, I suggest that there are some subjects that — this man can't be an expert in everything, and I suggest there is improper foundation for him to be an expert in acoustics, no matter how many firearm factories he may have visited.

THE COURT: We don't know what he is going to say yet.

At least I don't.

Apparently everybody here knows what he is going to say except me.

MR. KANAREK: I would ask for an offer of proof.

THE COURT: How did you all find out what he is going to testify to?

MR. FITZGERALD: They are not going to call him to put on negative evidence, your Honor. I am smart enough to know that.

THE COURT: You seemed to know exactly what he was going to testify to when you came to the bench. I am curious to know how you knew that?

MR. FITZGERALD: We are all familiar with who and what

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

DeWayne Wolfer is.

Once he said he went to the Tate house on the 18th for the purpose of an acoustical investigation, I knew to what he was "going vestify to.

If I am wrong, correct me.

THE COURT: When did you find out that he went to the Tate house on the 18th?

MR. FITZGERALD: When I heard him say that he went to the house on the 18th.

I have dealt with the LAPD for a number of years, your Honor.

THE COURT: Today is the first time that you knew about 1t?

MR. FITZGERALD: Today is the first time.

MR. HUGHES: I had not known about it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: What is that?

MR. HUGHES: I had not known about his testimony.

' THE COURT: Did he prepare a report? And if so, what is the date of it?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't know the date, but I just got the report this afternoon for the first time. It was brought over to me by Mr. Wolfer.

MR. KANAREK: May we have an offer of proof, your Honor?

THE COURT: I think Mr. Fitzgerald has a point. I don't know how much of a point it is. I don't really know.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is very simple testimony, your Honor.

The testimony is that he went out there with Mr. Butler, and Mr. Butler test-fired — not test-fired, but fired a .22 caliber revolver similar to this one — from the driveway, and from inside the Tate residence and from the front part of the Tate residence, and Mr. Wolfer was in the back house, Garretson's house, with a certain type of machine to record sounds, and they turned the volume up on the stereo, and they could not hear the shots when they were fired.

THE COURT: That really isn't a test that requires an expert at all, is it?

All it requires is somebody with a pair of ears.

MR. KANAREK: That's right.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I didn't even want to ask for his expertise, just to show that he is familiar with firearms.

THE COURT: The point I am getting at is that assuming there has been a failure of discovery. What is the prejudice? I mean, he either heard it or he didn't. That is the only possible results of the test.

Ì

2

Ş

. Ś.

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16.

17

18

19

.20

21

146-1

1

2

3

*

. 5

7.

8

ġ

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

. 19

20

21

22

.23

24

.25

26

MR. FITZGERALD: I believe that Mr. Garretson, in a sense, committed perjury.

I believe that Mr. Garretson, the witness who testified in this court on Friday, July 24, 1970, when he testified about the events surrounding his knowledge of the events of the evening of August the 8th and August the 9th, was subject to a great deal of suspicion, and I intend to argue it to the jury.

Also, I might point out to the Court that many police officers investigating this case from the Los Angeles Police Department were also of the opinion that Mr. Garretson was not being entirely candid with them in their investigation, and I can cite to you chapter and verse in the official reports of the Police Department in connection therewith.

I feel it is relatively important because he was the only person actually found at the scene at the time of the discovery of the bodies. He was the first suspect of the Police Department, and I suggest that he is a prime suspect.

THE COURT: Maybe I missed the point.

If I understood Mr. Bugliosi, he is going to say that he didn't hear the shot.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That he did not hear the shot.

THE COURT: Did not, right.

MR. FITZGERALD: That is exactly what Garretson said,

23

24

25

26

but I suggest that he could.

THE COURT: Garretson or Wolfer?

MR. FITZGERALD: I suggest that Garretson could.

I am also suggesting that somebody in the Police Department is not telling the truth.

I just read to you where their official conclusion was that he could hear. Now they are saying that he can't.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Doesn't the report say that they thought he could?

THE COURT: You have a right to go into any inconsistency.

What I am trying to ascertain at the moment is, are you making some kind of a motion with respect to an alleged failure to make discovery?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

Now, the last time we brought a similar subject up, your Honor made some comments about the effect of wilful suppression.

People vs. Teal, a 1965 California case in 63 Cal. 2d, Page 178, points out that the test in California for the effect of failure to comply with a proper discovery order is as follows:

One, where there is a wilful suppression of evidence, an adverse inference will be drawn and the jury will be so instructed:

And number two, if the failure is excusable, non-compliance to a discovery order does not go in front of the jury.

I am going to ask that your Honor admonish the Jury.

I would ask, number one, for an evidentiary hearing to determine if there was a wilful suppression; and I might point out that I am essentially about at the end of my line in dealing with the Los Angeles Police Department in terms of cooperation and concerning evidence in this case.

Mr. Bugliosi has been very open and helpful, but they have frustrated us at every turn in the road.

14B

· 24

14b-1

<u>2</u>6

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am the prosecutor and I have to put the evidence on first, and I have had just as much difficulty as you have had.

I have asked for this report for several months, and Mr. Wolfer just brought it in to me this day. I haven't had it.

THE COURT: What is the explanation?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't want to say on the record, your Honor. You know, it is just one of those things.

THE COURT: Let's start at the end and work backwards, Mr. Fitzgerald.

Let's assume everything you say is true, that it was a willful suppression of evidence. Now, how have the defendants been injured? What is the prejudice and what, if anything, can be done about it?

MR. FITZGERALD: Okay.

First, I would like to at least argue in an attempt to demonstrate that Mr. Garretson, in fact, killed some of the defendants in Counts I through V of the information -- of the indictment.

Okay. This, in a very material respect, exculpates Mr. Garretson on an important point. It does not relate directly to the defendant, it relates to an extraneous --

THE COURT: How does it exculpate him? If he was involved in a killing, he wasn't where he said he was in

14b-2

the first place. He not only heard it, he caused it, under your theory.

MR. FITZGERALD: That is quite true.

THE COURT: There couldn't be prejudice in that regard.

MR. FITZGERALD: I am prejudiced in the sense that it is pretty difficult for me to cross-examine something, not having been presented with the report.

THE COURT: That I agree with you on. If you need additional time, that is another matter. Do you know where the report is now? Have you seen it?

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I just got it.

THE COURT: Why don't we do this. It appears, at least it is questionable, there is no explanation yet as to why discovery was not made, if it wasn't. In any event, why don't we --

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is just a short report. We could take a ten-minute recess. Then I will show it to the defense counsel right now.

It is a short report, your Honor, saying that Buckler fired a revolver, and he was in the background and couldn't hear it. He had turned up the stereo and couldn't hear the shot.

THE COURT: It doesn't even require any expertise.

MR. KANAREK: That is correct, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There is a certain amount of expertise required because he did use, basically, the same type of a revolver and cartridges to fire.

14c-1

2

3

4

5.

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

15

16 17

18

19

21

20

22. 23

24

25 26 THE COURT: In other words, similar conditions?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

So, he will be testifying to that.

I didn't want to go into a long background.

I thought there would be a stipulation, but there wasn't.

MR. KANAREK: You hit the nail on the head. There are some things that are just not the subject of expertise, and Mr. Witkin points out that --

THE COURT: Of course, there is nothing to keep an expert from testifying to a fact, even though it doesn't require expertise.

MR. KANAREK: But it gives an added synthetic dignity to it.

Furthermore, your Honor, there has to be an exact duplication of conditions if you are to conduct a test.

THE COURT: That goes to the weight.

MR. KANAREK: There has to be a showing as to whether or not the conditions are the same. How do we know?

Just because Linda Kasabian has testified concerning bullets and firing?

MR. BUGLTOSI: So, could we just take a ten-minute recess? We have been getting so little evidence in in the last couple of weeks, your Honor. Could we just take a ten-minute recess? It is a very short report. Then we

could put him back on.

I will give them the copy. I just got it.

MR. SHINN: How long will your examination be?

MR. BUGLIOSI: About three or four minutes on direct.

THE COURT: How long is the report?

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is just one sheet.

THE COURT: I will leave the jury in the jury box, and if you want to come into chambers for any further discussion, very well. Otherwise, let the Clerk know when you are done and I will come back.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Very well. Thank you.

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

THE COURT: We are going to take a very brief recess, ladies and gentlemen.

I will ask you to remain in the jury box.

I am going to leave the bench for just a few minutes until counsel tell me they are ready to proceed.

(Recess.)

25

23

24

15 fls.

2

. 1

3

4 5

6

7.

. . 9.

10

II 12

13

14 15

16

. 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

(The following proceedings were had in the chambers of the court, out of the hearing of the jury:)

MR. FITZGERALD: If the Court please, we were in fact given a one-page report signed by DeWayne A. Wolfer. Interestingly this report is dated October 5th, 1970.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have another one here; I didn't even give it to you, you will get it later, but I'm not going to get into it, dated 10-5-70, isn't that today's date?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, these were where fired weapons at the Tate residence, and sought to hear the sound other places, other than the back house, far-away places, a mile away, but I'm not going into that. I'm just concerned with the back house now.

MR. FITZGERALD: I had a brief conversation with Officer Wolfer. He declined to discuss the circumstances surrounding the late date of the report with me without Mr. Bugliosi being present.

But he said, and I quote, "The reports were lost. The original reports were lost and they have been recently rediscovered."

MR. BUGLIOSI: He gave me a report about three weeks or a month ago, totally inadequate, and I gave it right back to him and I told him I want a report on exactly what happened out there.

This afternoon he brought this in, what you have

ì

there.

2[.] 3

v

4

∕5.

6

7

8

10

11.

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

So this is the first report I've got that I kept.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, and the testimony has already
indicated the test took place in August of 1969.

THE COURT: I agree it seems a little tardy.

MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Kanarek had some point he wanted to make to the Court.

MR. KANAREK: This was a Colt revolver which he used. He did not use a High Standard.

THE COURT: I don't know anything yet --

MR. KANAREK: That's what the report says, your Honor. I think it is incompetent evidence.

MR. BUGLIOSI: He said it makes the same sound, uses the same cartridges.

I think it's a matter of cross-examination. According to him it is the same sound.

MR. KANAREK: But I agree with the Court, you cannot be an expert on everything. You are adding a synthetic dignity to it by putting a man, who calls himself a criminalist, in front of a lay jury, have him go out and shoot a couple of guns, one of the police officers yelled, "Help." He could not hear it.

It dignifies Mr. Garretson and I think it deprives us of certain inferences, without the prosecution having any competent evidence there.

I mean, why couldn't any of us go out there?

THE COURT: It depends on the circumstances of the test, if the test was performed under reasonably similar conditions.

MR. KANAREK: He did not even use a High Standard gun.

THE COURT: There would be nothing wrong with it.

On the other hand, if the conditions were so dissimilar that
the jury were likely to be confused or misled, that is
something else.

MR. KANAREK: A Colt gun -- I don't know whether a High Standard is different --

THE COURT: I don't know either. Presumably that is why an expert was called to testify.

MR. KANAREK: I think, your Honor, with all of this there are grave questions as to whether or not the duplication is anywhere near -- especially when they use a different gun, he used a Colt gun, he did not use a High Standard --

THE COURT: That is a matter that will have to be determined when Mr. Wolfer testifies, if he testifies.

I won't determine that in chambers in a vacuum.

I don't know what he is going to say.

MR. KANAREK: I think the prejudice far outweighs any competency or probative value.

THE COURT: I think the first question that was raised, namely the discovery, until we have some further statement from someone who knows the facts, the Court is in

15a

1

no position to know whether there was a wilful or inadvertent failure to make discovery. Apparently it was a failure to make discovery.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't know why the police would want to suppress this information.

Apparently they suppressed it from me. I just got it today.

MR. KANAREK: Mr. Fitzgerald asked for an evidentiary hearing. Again it is one of those things you cannot unring the bell.

THE COURT: Let's assume for the purposes of this discussion that it was a wilful failure to make discovery, what then?

MR. KANAREK: Then it would not be admitted.

This was reported in 10-5-70, but it took place in August of '69.

15a-1

2

i

3. 4

5

Ġ

7

9

. 10 . 11

-12.

13 14

15.

16

17

ĬŖ

19 20

21

23

24

25)

MR. FITZGERALD: If there was a willful suppression, I think we are entitled to an instruction to the jury that an adverse inference should be drawn to the testimony of an agent of willful suppression.

THE COURT: Let us assume it is not a willful but an inadvertent suppression, then what?

MR. FITZGERALD: Under existing California law, if the failure was excusable, then certainly counsel should be provided with an opportunity to absorb the recently acquired discovery, but there would be no instruction to the jury, or the evidence would not of itself be inadmissible.

Now, maybe at some point negligence is so gross that it becomes almost reckless, and maybe we can argue like you do in civil areas that at some point the negligence becomes a willful suppression even though it is without intent.

They just exercised a careless disregard with respect to their reports so that no one, you know, can ascertain them. That would border on willful suppression.

MR. BUGLICSI: This is not the kind of document anyone would want to suppress even if someone had an evil intent.

Furthermore, how does the suppression hurt you?

MR. FITZGERALD: I don't know. Maybe I am making a

mountain out of a molehill, but this is about the 48th time

XXXX2

Ŀ

2

3.

4

5.

6

7

8:

Oľ

H

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19.

20

2ŀ

this has happened in this case.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have been on the phone for months trying to get reports from the Los Angeles Police Department. You may say they are trying to suppress it from me.

This is not a case of suppression -- there is another word for it. I am not going to use.

MR. FITZGERALD: Incompetence.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am not going to use it. If anyone were over theretrying to sabotage the defendants, this is not the type of document they would suppress.

MR. FITZGERALD: No, no, I am reacting and it is almost emotionally, Judge, you try to minimize the variables in these cases.

I try, to get this stuff out of the way if I can get this on discovery, read it carefully, plan some strategy; I know where I am in terms of a lawsuit.

What is happening in this case is there constantly is all this new material that change various perspectives in materials of the entire case.

Maybe I am overreacting to the fact they are suppressing this.

15b fls.22

23. 24

25

15b-1

2 3

I.

4

5

б. 7

- 8_.

10 11

12

13. 14

15

16 17

18.

19

20 21

22

23

.25

26

THE COURT: Well, if it turns out that it was unintentional and not grossly negligent to the point of being
intentional, how much time do you anticipate you will require
before you will be prepared to proceed?

MR. FITZGERALD: Actually I am prepared now. I mean, I read the report; there is nothing earth-shaking in the report except it is diametrically opposed apparently to some other reports.

I mean, essentially it did not involve any material difficult to absorb.

THE COURT: How do you wish to proceed then?

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I mean I don't want to withdraw any of my remarks, and I certainly don't want to withdraw any motions I made, but I certainly am willing to submit it.

If your Honor is disinclined to follow my suggestions, I am ready to proceed.

THE COURT: What suggestions are those?

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, my suggestion that we assume that it is a wilful suppression of evidence, and we be entitled to a contemporaneous instruction to the jury to that effect.

THE COURT: I cannot assume that, if you are going to make objection and request that relief I have to give the People an opportunity to be heard as to what the reason for the non-discovery is.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I should think we would all be very concerned about expediting this trial.

MR. FITZGERALD: I am, I am.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is not you; usually it is Mr. Kanarek, and we are just taking up a lot of time here.

I told the Los Angeles Police Department three months ago, and I realize it was a very complex, intricate assignment I gave them, to find out who made the scale on that map that Mr. Kanarek won't stipulate to.

THE COURT: We still don't know.

MR. BUGLIOSI: They brought in the wrong party today.

He said he told them he could not do it.

So I am saying if we could stipulate to some of these things we could save a lot of time.

THE COURT: It is rather difficult to stipulate to the scale of an aerial photo when you don't know what the scale is.

I don't blame anybody for not stipulating to that. I wouldn't either.

But as to something like this, I don't know. If it isn't important, why don't we get on with it?

If it is important, let's get on with it also.

MR. KANAREK: Let the prosecution stipulate that it is a wilful -- well, you see, he verbalizes, "Let's all cooperate," but when it gets down to nitty-gritty, he won't do it.

25

1

2

3

5

·6 7

8

. io

. 11

12 13

14

15

16

17 . 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

This has been a year in coming --

THE COURT: We don't have to go over that again.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I will bring out in front of the jury that this report was very belated; it took a long time.

I will bring that out in front of the jury.

MR. KANAREK: We need that instruction because Mr. Garretson has made some very --

MR. FITZGERALD: It is probably not that terribly crucial. It is vexing; it shows to me a pattern of conduct, but aside from that --

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, I think your point is a good one. I don't think we can just simply ignore it.

It is there. Unless you are willing to withdraw it it has to be met. If it isn't met, I probably would have to rule in your favor.

In other words, the People will now have the burden of showing some justification for not making a discovery just as in any other case.

I see no problems in that.

What I want to know is, what do all of you want to do? Do you want to continue to assert your objection?

Then it is clear the People have the burden of going forward to show why the discovery was not made.

If it turns out to be wilful I will have to consider that in light of what the facts are.

If it turns out to be non-wilful, maybe I can consider that.

15c-1

2

4

5

6

8

9

10 11

12

14

13

15 16

. **17**

18

· 19 · 20

21...

23

22

24

25 26 MR. FITZGERALD: Maybe we can do that in the way of a short hearing. I don't anticipate I will have many questions.

Maybe we can ask Mr. Wolfer some questions outside the hearing of the jury. Is that agreeable?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Actually, wasn't the discovery directed toward the People?

MR. FITZGERALD: Right.

MR. BUGLIOST: So I cannot give you something I don't have.

MR. FITZGERALD: That's right.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Actually, you should be questioning me.

MR. FITZGERALD: That's right, except, you see, I have been through this before, fortunately, and so I served a copy of the discovery order upon the Police Department as well.

MR. BUGLIOSI: But they were not directed, though, the Court directed the prosecution to turn over everything.

I don't think the Court, Judge Lucas, or any of the other judges in this case, have ever directed the police. Maybe I'm wrong on it.

MR. FITZGERALD: They directed the police to turn it over to you who in turn would turn it over to the representative of the defendants.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Is there an order there directing the police to turn things over to me or to the prosecution?

15c+2

2

ņ

5

6.

8

10

IJ

· 12

14° 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

MR. FITZGERAID: Yes. These are my copies but, you see, "It is hereby ordered that you and each of you transfer all items," and so forth.

And then it is further ordered -- we will get it out of the Superior Court file and I will show you exactly.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We are taking up time. Do you want to interrogate Wolfer or me, either one, I don't care.

MR. FITZGERALD: I accept Mr. Bugliosi's representations that he did not have it until today.

I don't see any reason to question Mr. Bugliosi.
Maybe some other counsel would, but I do not. I don't
think it is Mr. Bugliosi's problem.

But I do not think we can obviste the whole problem by saying "Well, the District Attorney is not culpable."

Actually the Los Angeles Police Department are agents of the prosecution.

THE COURT: That's right, the prosecution is the State of California represented by the District Attorney's Office.

MR. FITZGERALD: If your Honor is inclined to feel that it is impaterial --

THE COURT: I don't think I am called upon to make that kind of decision, Mr. Fitzgerald. You are defending; I am not.

MR. KANAREK: The last probable cause hearing was very brief, your Honor. Mr. Wolfer is the only witness. It could be very brief.

THE COURT: All right, let's send the jury upstairs, adjourn for the day as far as they are concerned.

We still have a few minutes left for a normal adjournment. We will have a brief examination of Mr. Wolfer.

Is that agreeable?

MR. FITZGERALD: That is agreeable.

Ż

12.

.20

16 fls. 10

1.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11·

12

13

14 15

16

17:

18

19

20

2Ì

22

23′

24

25

26

(The following proceedings are held in open court. All counsel present. Defendants and jury absent.)

THE COURT: All counsel present. The jury has been excused for the day and is not now present in the courtroom.

DE WAYNE A. WOLFER,

You may proceed.

called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

q Officer Wolfer, you went out to the Tate residence on August the 18th, 1969, and you conducted some type of an experiment out there to determine whether if a .22 caliber revolver were fired, if the sound could be heard from the back house; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q Did you prepare any report on the result of your experiments?

A I did.

Q . When did you prepare the report?

A I believe within a day or two after that.

Now, several months ago you received a request from me to send the report over to me; is that correct?

A That is correct.

* I	٠	·
, đ.	Q.	And at that time did you search for the report?
2	A.	I searched for the report, yes, and was unable
.3	to find it.	
4	Q (-)	All right.
. 5 . ;	·	Now, subsequent to my original request for the
6	report, did	you again look for the report?
7	A.	I did, yes.
8	9	And were you able to find it?
9	A.	I wasn't able to, no.
10	Q	Okay.
\mathbf{n}°		Was anyone able to find it?
12	A.	Yes.
13		Just a week or two ago, the Captain when I
14	returned fro	om a trip said that the report and several
15	other repor	ts had been found.
.16	Q.	Okay.
17	,	Over at the Police Department?
Ĭ8	A.	That is correct.
. 19	Q.	Now, you gave me a report today dated 9-21-70;
20	September th	ne 21st, 1970.
21		That was not the report that was originally
22	lost?	
23	Α,	No.
24	Q	This was a new report?
25.	Å.	That is a new report.
26	Q .	And how come you made a new report?
^		•

· A. Because I was requested to make a narrative 1 report. 2 The original report merely stated on it several 3 facts, and that they wanted in narrative form, and after 4 the report was found. I made up that report that I handed to 5. you here in the courtroom. I made it up yesterday at home. 6 Well, there is one report dated September 21st, Ż and another one dated October the 5th, 1970? 8 Well, the one report that you have is Officer ٠9 Butler's report. I did not make that report. 10 The report you made is dated October the 5th: 11 is that correct? 12 Yes. 13. And that also makes reference, of course, to 14 what happened on August the 18th, 1969? 15 That is correct. **16** A couple of weeks ago you showed me the original 17 report: is that correct? I don't believe I showed you it. 19 I believe when the Captain found it, it was 20 a possibility that an officer brought it over to you, or 21 something, I don't know, but I did not show you the original 22 report. 23 Do you recall my discussing it with you, though, 24 on the 5th floor? 25. Yes. 26

.5

- 3	
1	Q And I told you that I wanted a more complete
2	report?
3	A That 1s correct.
4,	And then, based on that, you prepared this
5	report dated October the 5th, 1970?
· 6· .	A That is correct.
7	Q Using your original report as a basis?
·ĝ	A. Yes.
9	MR. BUGLIOSI: I have no further questions.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald?
ŢŢ	
. 12.	
13	
14	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
21	
22	, :
23	
24	
25	
56	

16A

16a-1	1
	1 2
	á.
	4
	5
N	6
\$	7
*	7 8 9
,	9
	10
	11 12
	13
	14.
	15 16 17
	17
*	18′
	19
•	20
	21
ad '	22

23

25

26

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. FITZGERALD:

- Q When you originally prepared this report the very first time, what did you do with it?
- A The report was made in at least four copies that would be turned over to my lieutenant.
 - Q And is that Lieutenant --
 - A Lieutenant Don Mann.
- Q And he is in charge of the Scientific Investigation Division of the Los Angeles Police Department?
 - A Well, no. I would say Captein Martin was.

Don Mann is a lieutenant. I would say he was watch commander of the Division of Criminalistics only.

- Q And you never saw the reports again for approximately one year?
- A I did not see the reports until I returned, and the captain said that he had found the reports; which would be, well, yes, about a year, yes.
- Q Do you know how the Captain received the information that the reports were lost?
- A Yes. Because they were asking for the reports, and I said that I had made the reports and I refused to make any additional reports because I had no figures to base the reports on.

So, with this, there was a search made, and for several weeks there was a search made.

16a-2

1

3

ż

4

5 Ğ

Ŕ

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21.

22

23

24

25

26.

Do you know when the search was begun? Or do you know when the first inquiries were made of you in regard to the lost copies?

Well, I believe -- I mean, it is hard for me to recall now, but it was when they were asking for all the reports in this case.

- Do you remember when that was?
- I could only guess.

I would believe it was the early part of this year, but I am not sure.

And were they looking for the reports for discovery or for transmittal to the District Attorney's Office, or for what purpose were they looking for all the reports in the case, if you know?

Well, they came to me and asked for all the reports that I had involving the case.

I said that I had filed all my reports.

So, then they came back to me, and they said, well, there were some reports missing regarding some sound tests.

And I said, that is correct, I made sound tests. I had no idea where the reports were.

And this was a continuous -- they continuously kept coming to me and asking me if I knew anything about these reports for several months.

When you say they kept coming to you, are you

16a-3

2

y.

5

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 . 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

16b fls. 26

referring again to the Captain?

A I am referring to the Captain of our division, a captain of Homicide, the lieutenant of Homicide, the investigators of Homicide, the District Attorney's Office, everybody. I mean, just everybody involved.

Q Now, I believe that the conclusion of your test was essentially --

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I object to this. It is beyond the scope of this hearing.

The only issue here is whether there has been a willful suppression of evidence.

Now he is going into substantive matters, also calling for hearsay.

This is a matter of cross-examination in front of the jury if you want to bring this stuff up.

MR. FITZGERALD: Correct, it is hearsay.

What I have in mind is for the Court, on this issue, to present evidence that in the reports made available to the defendants the results of the tests purport to be different than the results of the test contained in the lost reports.

I think that is circumstantial evidence of possible suppression.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If there was suppression, you wouldn't have been given the original reports showing the difference. That report would have been suppressed also.

6b-1

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

71

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

2à

2I; 22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: I think this is a matter that you can go into on cross-examination, surely, Mr. Fitzgerald.

I don't see how it is relevant to this inquiry.

MR. FITZGERALD: Q Do you have the original report with you. Officer?

A I don't, but the office has it. I can have it brought over in a matter of minutes.

And the typewritten report that you gave to Mr. Bugliosi is an embellishment? I don't mean any untoward connotations either. It is an embellishment of your original report? It is a more expanded report; is that right?

A No. I would say quite to the contrary. It is a more concised report.

MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, I believe the officer testified that he has his original notes at the office.

Could we have a copy of them, your Honor?

Could he also be directed to bring us a copy of them, the original report?

He said this is a condensed form. We would like the original.

THE COURT: You mean the notes from which the original report was made?

MR. SHINN: Yes. Either the notes or the original

1 report.

2,

3

4

5

6.

7.

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

25

26

He stated that he did have the original report, which is a more expanded one than this one here, your Honor.

We want to see his original report.

THE COURT: Can you bring those notes?

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor. I can have them here in five minutes.

THE COURT: I am not sure I understood your testimony.

When you discovered that the reports you had transmitted to the Police Department were lost, why could you not then make up some new reports?

THE WITNESS: Well, your Honor, it was to relate to all of the figures and reading of decibel levels taken at the scene.

Q Well, weren't those in your notes from which the reports were made?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I had no notes. Those notes were destroyed. The reports were made and right after the notes were destroyed at that time.

THE COURT: What were you referring to, Mr. Shinn?
MR. SHINN: Your Honor, I believe that the officer
testified that he does have an expanded version of this
report that he gave us today.

Is that right, Officer?

THE WITNESS: I have the original report that was made and filed with my lieutenant. It was later found.

That report is available now if the Court so 1 wishes it. 2 THE COURT: But you don't have any handwritten 3 personal notes from which these reports were made? THE WITNESS: Well. I don't recall any handwritten 5 notes anyway. 6 I returned to the office and made up the report, 7 which was typed. . 8 THE COURT: Go ahead. ġ MR. SHINN: Could we have the expanded report of this? 10 THE COURT: Yes. He has agreed to bring that, 1Ĺ MR SHINN: Thank you. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek? 13 MR. KANAREK: Just a couple of questions, your Honor. 14 15 CROSS-EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. KANAREK: 17 I notice there are two separate reports here. 18 Officer. 19 Can you explain, within your knowledge, Officer, 20 how many separate times the police officers went to the 21 Tate residence in order to make the purported sound tests? 22 Counsel, I wouldn't know. **2**3 I know the number of times that I went, but I 24 would not know the number of times that policemen went. 25

16C

26

16c-1	Q How many times did you go, Officer?
2	A Twice.
. · 3	Q On what days?
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	A I went on August the 18th and on September
	the 22nd.
6	Q And directing your attention to do you know
7	Mr. Garretson, who was originally arrested?
* · 8	A I do not know him. I don't believe I ever
9,	saw him.
1,0	Q Do you know the name?
11	A Yes.
	Q Now, is it a fair statement, Officer, that
13	before August the 18th, when you say you first went,
14	there were other ballistics or sound tests made at the
15	Tate residence by other law enforcement officers? Do
16	you know that of your own knowledge?
17	A No, I do not.
18	Q Is it your knowledge that you were the first
19	one to conduct a test as to sound?
20	A As to my knowledge, Counsel, that is correct.
21	They were waiting for me to return from vaca-
÷ 22	tion so that I could do this. That was my instructions.
23.	Q Well, now, to your knowledge, Officer, do you
. 24	know when Mr. Garretson was released?
25	A No, I do not.
26	Q To your knowledge, were the tests that you were
	·

2

3

4

6

7

9

. 10 11

12

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

21, 22

. 23

24

25

making going to be used in connection with making the determination as to whether Mr. Garretson would be released or not?

A Counsel, I am not certain here today, but I was on vacation and I am almost certain that Mr. Garretson was released before the 18th when I came back, but I don't know.

Q You don't know that?

A No, I don't.

Q So, therefore -- now, I am asking of your own knowledge, and asking you to recall or try to recall other police officers that you have talked to. Now --

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, this doesn't go to the issue of suppression.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, it does. There may be other reports.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It goes to the credibility of the report itself.

THE COURT: Why don't you ask him, then.

MR. KANAREK: That is what I am trying to do.

THE COURT: Just ask him. You are wasting time.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, sir.

Q To your knowledge, Officer, -- let me ask you this -- have you ever had conversations withpolice officers concerning sound tests made at the Tate residence before you returned on August the 18th, 1969?

.6c-3 , I	A No, I have not.
2	Q You have not?
3	A I have not, no.
4	Q I see.
5	You had no such conversation?
6	A No.
a 7	MR. KANAREK: Thank you.
S	MR. SHINN: Your Honor, I have one more question,
9	your Honor.
10	
н	CROSS-EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. SHINN:
13.	Q Officer, you stated that you went back to the
14	Tate residence twice; correct?
15	A Yes
16	Q Does your report that you are going to bring
17	to us, does that include both of those visits?
. 18	A Well, yes. I was soing to bring you there
19	are two separate reports. I had fully intended to bring
20	both reports, yes.
21	MR. SHINN: Thank you.
. 22	MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I am not going to ask any
23	questions of this officer inasmuch as Mr. Bugliosi has
24	agreed to enter into a stipulation that it is not to be
25	offered in any way against Leslie Van Houten.
26	MR. BUGLIOSI: So stipulated.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

THE COURT: Very well. Now, do you wish to continue with Mr. Wolfer in the morning, Mr. Bugliosi? MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. 4 THE COURT: All right. 5. We will adjourn at this time. Ģ 9:45 tomorrow. 7 (Whereupon at 4:20 o'clock p.m. the court was in recess.) 9 10 11 12 13. 14 15 16 17 18 19 21 22 23 24 25 - 26