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 Tuesday, October 20, 1970

APPEARANCES:

DONALD A. MUSICH, STEPHEN RUSSELL KAY,

For the People:

VINCENT T. BUGLIOSI, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

For Deft. Manson:

I. A. KANAREK, Esq.

and

For Deft. Atkins:

DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Deft. Van Houten:

For Deft. Krenwinkel:

RONALD HUGHES, Esq.

PAUL FITZGERALD, Esq.

VOLUME 132

JOSEPH B. HOLLOMBE, CSR.,

PAGES 14353 to 14584

MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR., Official Reporters

INDEX (Continued) EXHIBITS COURT'S SPECIAL EXHIBITS: FOR IDENTIFICATION IN EVIDENCE 12 - 12 photographs marked collectively 12-A - Photograph ٠б. 12-B through 12-G - Photographs 12-H - Photograph 12-I - Photograph 12-J - Photograph 12-J - Photograph 12-L - Photograph 2ĺ

Í	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1970
2	9:00 A.M.
3.	and may have \hat{Q}_i and made
4	(The following proceedings were had in open
5	court, in the absence of all counsel with the exception of
6	Mr. Hughes and the jury:)
۲.,	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes, are you represented, sir?
8	MR, HUGHES: Yes, I am, your Honor, I retained the
9 :	Public Defender to represent me, your Honor.
10	THE COURT: All right.
11	What is your name, sir?
12	MR. HANKI: Richard Hanki, H-a-n-k-i.
13	THE COURT: This is the time set for the appearance
14	of Mr. Hughes, pursuant to an order to show cause why he
15	should not be found in contempt for failing to appear in
16	this court yesterday at 9,45 a.m.
17	You may proceed.
18	MR. HANKI: The defendant would like to show reason
19	why.
20	THE COURT: First I want the record to show that
21	Mr. Hughes was not present in court at 9:45 a.m. I don't
22	suppose that is a disputed fact, is it?
23	MR. HANKI: No, your Honor, that is not disputed.
24	But the defendant would like to show cause
25	that he did not have the ability to appear in that he was
26	in custody of the Police Department on outstanding traffic

Ţ warrants. 2 I would like to call Mr. Hughes to the stand. 3 THE COURT: Very well. THE CLERK: Would you raise your right hand, please. 5. Would you please repeat after me. , 6 I do solemnly swear --THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear THE CLERK: -- that the testimony I may give --, 9 THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give --10 THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending --11 THE WITNESS: -- in the cause now pending --12. THE CLERK: -- before this Court --33 THE WITNESS: -- before this Court --14 THE CLERK: -- shall be the truth --15 THE WITNESS: -- shall be the truth --16 THE CLERK: -- the whole truth --17 THE WITNESS: -- the whole truth --ĨŜ. THE CLERK: -- and nothing but the truth --19 THE WITNESS: -- and nothing but the truth --20 THE CLERK: -- so help me God. 21 THE WITNESS: -- so help me God. .22 THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please. -23 . Will you please state your name. 24 THE WITNESS: Ronald Hughes, H-u-g-h-e-s. 25

RONALD HUGHES,

called as a witness by and on his own behalf, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HANKI:

8.

Q Mr. Hughes, on the evening of October 18, 1970 were you stopped by officers of the Los Angeles Police Department?

Property Contract

A. Yes, I was.

2-1 1	And as a result of your being stopped, were you
2	apprehended?
3	A. Yes, I was.
4	Q And what were you apprehended for?
. , , , , , , , , , , ,	A. A traffic warrant.
6	And did they inform you as to the amount of
7	bail that would be necessary?
	A. Yes, they did.
9	Q What did they inform you in that regard?
10	A. In the range of \$63, they said.
11	a And did you have the amount of bail necessary?
12	A. No, I did not,
.13	G How much did you have on your person?
14	A. \$48.51.
15	Q \$48?
16	A. \$48.51.
17	Q Now, did you inform the arresting officers at the
18	time that you were required to be in court, in this court,
19	on the 19th?
20	A. Yes, I did.
21	And in what way did you inform the officers?
22	A I told them that I was an attorney, that I was
23	in a long on-going trial. I mentioned this trial by name.
24	I mentioned Judge Older by name.
25	I asked to be released on my own recognizance
26	since I did not have the requisite amount of bail.

1	
1	Q And did they inform you that they would call th
· 2 .	Court?
3.	A. No, they did not.
4 ,	Q Did you determine whether they did, in fact,
. 5	call the Court?
Ġ	A. Later, yesterday, I determined that apparently
7	they had called the Court.
, '. <u>8</u>	And did they inform you that if the Court
9.	requested your presence they would release you on your own
10	recognizance?
11	A. No, they did not.
12	Q Were you able to post bail?
13	A. No, I was not.
14	Q Were you taken to some court on the 19th?
15	A. Yes, I was.
16	Q Which court were you taken to?
17	A The West Los Angeles Division 63 of the
18	Municipal Court of the State of California.
19	And how many warrants were outstanding at that
20	time?
.21	A. There were three warrants. One for defective
22	brakes and two for parking violations.
23	Q And what was the total bail for all three
24	citations?
25	A. I am not sure. I never learned what the bail
26	on the parking warrants was. However, I assume that it was
	1

1	\$10 apiece on those.
2	Q Did you appear in court?
. 3	A. Yes, I did.
4	Q Did you inform the Court that you had to be here?
. 5	A. I was taken out of the normal procedure of the
.6	flow of prisoners, and it became obvious to me and I had
. ~ 7 ·	the Public Defender represent me there that I was being
8	taken out of the flow, and was immediately brought in,
. 9	upon being brought into the jail section of the court, and
10	it seemed obvious that the Court was aware of who I was and
. 11	the fact that I was needed somewhere else.
ĮŻ	Q And at what time did you appear in court?
13	A. I appeared in court approximately 11:00 o'clock.
14	Q And to facilitate matters, did you enter a
15	plea?
16	A. Yes, I did.
17	Q What plea did you enter?
18	A Guilty.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
-	l

2a

1	And at what time were you released?
2.	A. I was released approximately 11:30.
.3	Q And where did you go upon release?
4	A. Upon release, I went to the office of the
5	Public Defender in West Los Angeles, whereupon, I called
6	this department, Department 104, and ascertained that the
7	court was then to reconvene at 2:00 o'clock yesterday
9	Thereupon, I went home and changed into court
10	clothes, and then I came to court here.
11	MR. HANKI: Nothing further, your Honor.
12	
13	EXAMINATION.
14	BY THE COURT:
15	Q Mr. Hughes, what time were you arrested Sunday
16	night?
17	A. Approximately 10:00 p.m., your Honor.
18	Q You had on your person \$48.51?
. 19	A. That is correct, your Honor.
20	Q Did you have available \$14.49?
21	A Did I have available? I am not certain what
22	you mean by that.
23	I would offer to stipulate that I could have
24	indebted myself to others and borrowed the money to bail
25	myself out.
26	Q On Sunday night?

1	A. On Sunday night.
2	I could have made telephone calls and done that.
3.	Q Did you possess \$14.49 on Sunday night?
4	In cash, no.
, 5 .	Or otherwise?
6	A. Well, I am not certain in what manner you mean.
. 7	Q Well, from any source.
8 .	Do your assets include \$14.49?
g	A If you look, at it from the standpoint of a
10	certified public accountant, I would say that I am probably
11.	bankrupt.
12	Q That is not the way I am looking at it.
1 3	Do you have a bank account?
14	A Yes, I do.
15	Q Is there \$14.49 in it?
16	A. I am not sure. There may be.
17	Q Is there more than that?
18	A. There may be. I am really not certain.
1 9	I did not have a check with me and I did not
20	have my bank statement with me, and I did not have my
21	check book with me, and I did not have my balance at hand
22	or in mind.
23	Q You don't know whether you had the amount of
24	\$14.49 in the bank?
25	A. That is correct, your Honor.
26	Q Is this a checking account?

`21

- Q Do you have a savings account?
- A. No, I do not.
- Q In any event, you concede that you could have borrowed the \$14.49?
- A. Your Honor, I could have called up and borrowed it from you, probably.
 - Q . Did you try to do that?
 - No. I did not.
 - Q Did you try to borrow it from anyone?
 - A No. I did not.
- Q Did you tell anyone in the Folice Department that you could make the bail but that you thought you would not because you thought it would be humorous for you not to appear in this court yesterday for that reason, or words to that effect?
- A I said words to the effect that I did not want to borrow the money, and I said words to the effect, to the officers, or my state of mind being to try to get them to release me O.R., that it would be interesting if I were still in jail in the morning, if I were not able to be at this trial, and I think my state of mind was that that would be an interesting thing from the standpoint of not having to I felt that I didn't want to become more indebted to anyone. I have become very indebted to a lot of people in this trial, and I think it is a startling and interesting thing.

İ

1Ò

0:

I am very poor, and I think I have made the Court aware of that before.

I would say that my financial problem has probably added to the problem of not being able to get my brakes fixed, which was — I did get my brakes fixed, I take that back — but added to the problem of not being able to appear on that warrant earlier, is the financial burden in this case.

23

24.

25

	۵.	Az	e you	. say	ing	that	your	fiņar	ncial	cond	ition	was:
such	that	you	could	not	rai	se \$	14.49,	the	balar	ice o	f the	
bail:	?	, e	1 100	•			•				•	

- A. Not without becoming indebted to someone.
- am talking about your financial condition.
- A Yes, your Honor, inasmuch as I would describe myself as in a bankrupt state.
- Q Well, that is not an answer to the question,
 Mr. Hughes, We are not talking about bankruptcy in the legal
 sense.

I am talking about assets, available assets in the form of money or some other readily available assets which could be converted into money.

Are you telling me you don't have assets of \$14.49?

A. I may be at this time able to write a check for \$14.49, your Honor, I'm not sure.

I think that if I were to write a check for \$14.49 now, I would probably not be able to write my rent check on the 1st of the month, nor would I be able to write -- draw money out or buy food later in the month.

I would imagine that the moment, if you're asking what my checking account balance is --

THE COURT: I am not asking that, Mr. Hughes. All I want to find out is whether on Sunday night you had

1	sufficient assets to raise \$14.49.
2	A Let's say my state of mind at that time, your
3	Honor, was
4	Q I am not interested in your state of mind, I
Ş	want to know what the fact is.
6	A I don't know what the fact is, your Honor.
7.	Q. You are not contending that you did not have it
8	is that right?
9.	A. I am not contending either way, your Honor.
10	I am not contending that I did or I didn't.
-1 <u>î</u>	I don't know whether I did or not. I do not know the state
12	of my balance.
13	Q Did you make any efforts to ascertain what it
14	was?
15	A. No, I did not.
16.	Q Now, in addition to the arrest for the brakes,
17	you had three warrants outstanding, is that right?
18	A. Two parkings warrants besides the warrant for
19	the brakes.
20	Q Were you arrested on an outstanding warrant or
21	were you given a citation for the brakes?
22 ′	A I was arrested on an outstanding warrant.
23	Q In other words, the alleged offense occurred
24	sometime ago?
25	A. That's correct.
26	Q Not Sunday night?

ì	A. No.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2	Q You were picked	up on a routine traffic stop,
ŝ	is that right?	,
4	A Ves	
. 5	Q And the warrant	was discovered?
6	A. Yes.	
7	Q And the other ou	tstanding warrants were dis-
.8	8 covered?	
9	A. Yes.	
10	Q Have you lived a	t the same address for some
11	time?	
12	12 Yes.	
13	Did you ever rec	eive any notice from the Police
14	Department that you'd be cit	ed for these violations?
15,	A I think I receiv	ed a notice from the Police
16	Department that one of the p	arking tickets was going to
17.	warrant.	
18	Q When was that, w	hen did you receive the notice?
19	A I don't know, yo	ur Honor.
20	Q Well, approximat	ely.
21	A. I don't recall.	I don't recall which warrant
22	22 It was or when I received th	e notice.
23	Q. Did you do anyth	ing about the notice when you
24	received it?	
25.	A I had received o	ther notices similar to that
26	in the past.	

1	I had taken them to the West Los Angeles
2	Police Station and paid some of them.
3:	I received other notices at other times and I
4	had taken them excuse me, that was the West Los Angeles
.5 .	Court
6.	I had taken other notices like that in the past
7	and taken them to the Office of the Public Defender in
8	West Los Angeles, and I think that there were some that I
·9	denied which ones were which, I don't know.
10	Which parking tickets wereinvolved yesterday
11	I have no idea.
12	Q Did you do anything about the three warrants
13	prior to Sunday; had you done anything about them?
14	A. No, I was not entirely certain that I did have
15	warrants.
16	Q You said you received notice of one parking
17	violation, is that right?
18	A. I received notice that it might go to warrant.
19	What about the others, had you received notice
20	of those?
21:	A Not that I know of, your Honor.
22	It's possible that notice came but I don't
23	recall it coming.
24	Q Did you make any effort at all, Mr. Hughes, to
25	get released on bail so that you could appear in this court
26	The Mark the Area of the Area

1	A.	I asked t
2,	your Honor,	I spoke w
3	watch comma	nder at We
4	had some di	scussion,
5	be in court	, and he w
6	nizance.	
7	· ,	He was aw
8	I would have	e been wil
9	in my posse	ssion.
10	. .	Did you m
11	than your c	onversatio
12	A	Other tha
. 13	the other p	olice offi
14	gentleman w	ho came in
. 15	to Mr. Fitz	gerald,
. 16		I think I
17	money from I	Mr. Fitzge
18	,	However,
19	only people	I was abl
20	people from	whom I wa
21	***************************************	I was una
22	evening, Su	nday eveni
23	Q.	At the ti
24	with someone	9 ?
25	A.	I was wit
,		Mana dhan

o be released on my own recognizance, ith the Sergeant who I believe was the est Los Angeles Police Station, and we and he was aware that I was required to rould not release me on my own recog-

are of the amount of money I had, and ling to put up the money that I had

ake any effort to be released other n with the Sergeant?

n my conversation with the Sergeant and cer and some other plain clothes I attempted to make a telephone call

would have been willing to borrow the rald.

I made other telephone calls, and the e to actually get in touch with were s unwilling to become indebted.

ble to reach Mr. Fitzgerald that ng.

me you were arrested were you alone or

- h someone.
- than one person?
- Ã, Yes.

1	Q How many?					
2	A. Two persons.					
3	Q Two?					
4.	A. Two.					
5	Q Did either of these people offer to put up					
6	\$14.49 so you could be released?					
7	A. One of them offered to go and borrow some money					
8	from his father, and it is my understanding that they					
9	later came and offered to actually put up some money.					
10	However, I did not want to become indebted to					
11	them.					
12	When you ascertained that the bail was approxi-					
13	mately \$63, you realized, did you, Mr. Hughes, that if you					
. 14	did not post the bail you would remain in jail until such					
15	time as you were brought before the Municipal Court on the					
16	following day?					
17	A. I thought there was some possibility, your Honor,					
18	that I would eventually be released on my own recognizance.					
19	As a matter of fact, my state of mind was					
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13.

14

15

16.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

You understand	that	was	to	be	done	by	a	judge
----------------	------	-----	----	----	------	----	---	-------

A I understand, your Honor, you were called that evening, and I understand you are a judge and you could have done something to see that I was released on my own recognizance.

I also understand that you didn't.
So I understand.

Q You understand that a Superior Court judge may release a defendant on a Municipal Court traffic case on his own recognizance, is that your understanding of the law, Mr. Hughes?

A. Yes.

THE COURT: Anything further, sir?

MR. HANKI: A few questions, your Honor.

for the brake violation only?

A Yes, that is what I understand, yes.

Q Were you aware if you posted \$62.50, there were other warrants and other bails that had to be posted above and beyond the \$62.50?

A. Yes, I had a strong belief or suspicion that there might be parking warrants.

As a matter of fact, I was open with the police, I told them that I felt that there might be parking warrants out, and they said that they were going to check that.

Q So as to your state of mind, were you aware if you posted a \$62.50, that they would not release you

ì	because of the other fraffic warrants?
.2	A I felt that that was a strong possibility or
3	probability.
4	And you did receive notice of at least one
5	traffic warrant?
Ģ	A. That's correct.
7	MR. HANKI: Nothing further, your Honor.
·8	May I have a few questions more, your Honor?
9	THE COURT: Yes.
ŢĢ.	Q BY MR. HANKI: Mr. Hughes, do you share your
11	bank account with some other person?
12	A No. I do not.
13	Q With someone other than yourself could
14: 15	someone other than yourself sign for whatever funds are in your checking account?
16	A. No, they could not.
17	Q Did you try yesterday afternoon to call your
18	bank to ascertain the amount remaining in your account?
19	A. Yes, I did.
.20	Were you able to contact the bank?
21	A. No, I was not.
22	MR. HANKI: Nothing further.
23	THE COURT: This was yesterday afternoon?
24	THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.
25	THE COURT: After you appeared here?
26	THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.

23

24

25

26.

THE COURT: You are unable to state then or give any estimate as to how much, if any, was in your bank account Sunday night, is that right?

THE WITNESS: I believe it somewhere between zero and \$50.

THE COURT: Did you make any effort on Monday morning to ascertain from the bank what your balance was?

THE WITNESS: No, I did not, your Honor.

THE COURT: You were aware, Mr. Hughes, that if you did not post the bail on Monday morning, you were aware Sunday night that you would be unable to appear in this court on Monday morning at the usual time.

THE WITNESS: I was only aware if I wasn't here at 9:45 I would not be here.

THE COURT: Anything further, sir?

MR. HANKI: No, nothing further.

THE COURT: You may step down.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. HANKI: That is the extent of our evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sorry, I did not hear you.

MR. HANKI: That is the extent of our evidence.

THE COURT: Do you wish to argue?

MR. HANKI: Yes, your Honor.

The cases hold that contempt being such a drastic remedy, it should be employed only when absolutely

necessary.

1

.2

3

5

6

8

ģ

10

11

12

13

14

15

16.

17

18

19.

20

2Ì

22

23

24

25

I believe that in order to be found in contempt a person must have the ability to appear, and he wilfully refuses to appear.

In this case Mr. Hughes had three outstanding warrants, one was for \$62.50, the others were for unknown amounts.

The defendant did not have the necessary funds. The defendant tried to call Mr. Fitzgerald and tried to have the officer call the Court, and it is the defendant's understanding that this Court was called long before 9:00 o'clock of the morning of the 19th.

THE COURT: What is the significance of that fact?

I was called about 2:00 o'clock in the morning as a matter of fact. That is, I received a message.

What is the significance of that?

MR. HANKI: In my opinion, which may be erroneous, the officers were willing to release the defendant on his own recognizance so he could appear in court at 9:00 o'clock if your Honor —

THE COURT: Are you suggesting that the police officer may release the defendant on his own recognizance?

MR. HANKI: No, I'm not suggesting that.

But it is -- they do grant certain favors for facilitating the administration of justice.

My understanding was they were of a mind that

ı zance at that time. 2 3 .5 indigent. 7 Submit it. 8 THE COURT: 9 MR. HANKI: Thank you. 10 11 12 . 13 14 comply; ¿ 15 16 17 Is that correct? 18 MR. ATKINSON: Right, 19 THE COURT: 20 21 THE COURT: 22, 23 (Recess.) 24 25

26

they would have released the defendant on his own recogni-

I feel that to find the defendant in contempt would be to punish him for his being an indigent, for being poor, which would be against the case of People vs. Antazo, which states that a person whould not be punished for being

I will take the matter under submission.

, MR. KAY: Your Honor, before you leave the bench, I filed a subpoena duces tecum with the Court this week. I believe Mr. Stan Atkinson is here this morning. been in touch with the attorneys of NBC, and he said he will

I think he wants this on the record, that he is turning this document over to me in response to the subpoena.

Very well. Anything further?

MR. KAY: Nothing further, your Honor. Thank you.

All right, we will recess until 9:45.

•

2

1

3

4

5

6

8

g

10

H

12

13 14

15,

16

17

18

19 20

21

22~

23

24

25

26

(The following proceedings occur in chambers.

All counsel present. Defendants absent.)

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

Gentlemen, I wanted to speak to you very briefly this morning.

I am not satisfied with the progress we are making in this trial and am seriously considering expanding the trial hours each day. What I have in mind, and I wanted to get your comments on it, is commencing at 9:00 going until 12:00, with a recess from 10:15 to 10:30, and starting at 1:45 in the afternoon and going until 4:30, with a recess from 3:00 to 3:15.

That would give us five hours and 15 minutes of actual trial time, not counting the recesses, which is a considerable increase over what we are getting now.

We are now starting at 9:45 and going to 12:00, with a 15-minute recess -- that is two hours -- and 2:00 to 4:30, with a 15-minute recess, which would be two hours and 15 minutes. So, it is four hours and 15 minutes against five hours and 15 minutes.

Any comments?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I think the Court's premise originally that the jury can only absorb so much is not changed by the fact that the Court now wishes to speed the matter up.

23

24

25

26

Now, the prosecution in this case has — they still have 23 witnesses, or something like that. It is not the defendants' fault, your Honor, and I would oppose any change.

THE COURT: I wouldn't put it exactly that way, Mr. Kanarek. Your cross-examination is one of the things.

MR. KANAREK: On Roni Howard and Virginia Graham -THE COURT: May I finish?

MR. KANAREK: I am sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't place the blame solely on you or solely on anyone, but one of the things that has convinced me that we had better start spending more time at it is the cross-examination.

MR. KANAREK: If I may respond to the Court? THE COURT: There is no point in responding.

That is one of the things that has influenced me. Whether it is right or wrong, you may argue to yourself, but there is no point in commenting on it.

MR. KANAREK: My purpose is to convince the Court.

THE COURT: I don't want any further comment.

If you want to comment further on the hours, you may do so. That is why I invited you in here.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

If I may.

I would like to convey to the Court that the same premise applies. Our purpose is to have jurors who

are going to absorb, not speed for the sake of speed in a latter-day sort of way. ŢĢ. 1:1 12 13 14 . 15 16 17 18 `Ì9 20 21.

4a

22

23

24

25

26

The prosecution, when you consider what they have done in this case, your Honor, for instance --THE COURT: Save it for final argument, Mr. Kanarek. 4a-1

2

1

3

4.

5

8

ġ.

10⁻

11

12

13

14 15

16 -

17

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

MR. KANAREK: I am talking about the speed now. I am talking about the substance of what we are speaking of right now.

All of the time that was consumed in chambers because they didn't have their statements proper as far as the deletions, the having to wait for Mr. Bugliosi to go and get his witnesses, and all of those things, if your Honor will look at what the prosecution has done --MR. BUGLIOSI: Wait a minute.

We put on a lot of other witnesses during that period.

THE COURT: I didn't call you in here in an attempt to assess blame. These delays are inevitable in any trial to some degree or another. No attorney, no matter how experienced or capable, could anticipate everything in advance.

I am not here to blame anybody. I am simply here to try to correct a situation that does exist. The trial is moving, in my opinion, much too slowly.

MR. KANAREK: May I make a suggestion?

I would suggest that the District Attorney
make an offer of proof as to Posten and Watkins, because
I believe all of that testimony is inadmissible, your
Honor, and I think a good saving of time will be if your
Honor asked for an offer of proof instead of allowing the
District Attorney to parade witnesses that have no

4a-2

2

1

.8,

4

5

6

7 8

9.

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

5 fls,

Ţģ.

18

20

.

23

24

25

26

materiality and that actually inject error, such as this witness Jakobson.

MR. BUGLIOSI: May I ask one question? I know we there are rushed for time, but in all sincerity, has/been one witness that we called to the stand whose testimony you thought was relevant?

MR. KANAREK: That is argumentative.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, I'm sorry. I am serious. You have stated it many times.

MR. KANAREK: Mr. Manson is immocent of these charges, and you know it. This is a political trial.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Why don't you answer that question?

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, a good part of the delay
has been occasioned by your statements similar to the one
you just made, by frivolous motions and objections,
multiple and repeated objections and motions, by arguments
that have no beginning and no end and go nowhere and say
nothing.

5-1

1 2

4

Ś

6

7

9

10 11

12

13

14· 15

16.

17.

18

19.

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

MR. KANAREK: I am --

THE COURT: These things, among others are the reasons I have arrived at the conclusion that we are going to have to increase the trial day.

Does anyone else wish to be heard?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree with the Court. I think it is an excellent idea.

MR. HUGHES: I would oppose any lengthening of the trial day, for Leslie Van Houten, on the basis that this is such a complex trial, there are so many complexities as to who is where and what, that I believe that the jurors cannot, as your Honor pointed out at the beginning of the trial, cannot absorb more than four hours and keep any degree of certainty as to who did what.

MR. KANAREK: And furthermore, there is a practical aspect of studying the transcript, just flesh and blood, your Honor, there are so many hours in the day and I have to study these transcripts at night.

I have to prepare and do what is necessary for this courtroom. It is impossible to do what is necessary and maintain yourself as a human being and live and breathe.

Your Honor, I am sure, is aware that there are other factors involved here, such as the time outside of court in connection with this case.

It is fantastic, preparing for argument,

5-2 Ŀ 3: 4. Š 8 <u>.</u> 9 10 11 12, 13 15 16 17 18.

preparing the defense, you have to read these transcripts and do what is necessary.

If your Honor is imposing more court time, what we are doing is we are having a further characle.

MR. HUGHES: I object on the basis of equal protection. It is coming to the very end of the prosecution's case. Suddenly the burden is on us to put on a case.

Suddenly we find to put on instead of four hours, five and a quarter hours.

MR. KANAREK: I join with Mr. Hughes' statement on equal protection, your Honor.

MR. SHINN: I join in the motions, your Honor.

THE COURT: What motions?

MR. SHINN: All of these objections, your Honor, I'm sorry, the objections, not the motions.

THE COURT: Well, not only am I going to increase the trial hours, gentlemen, but if I don't see some concrete evidence that things are being moved along we may be working on Saturdays too.

MR. KANAREK: I don't mind working on Saturday, at so many hours per day.

MR. FITZGERALD: I think the Government Code prohibits that.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Oh, does it?

MR. FIEZGERALD: I believe it does, I checked it once.

25

19

1 20

21

22

23

5-3

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

, 20

21,

22,

23 24

25.

26

THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure, but I hope I don't have to explore that possibility.

All right, then, starting this afternoon we will commence at 1:45. We will take the afternoon recess at 3:00. While it is a scheduled 15-minute recess, due to the difficulties of moving the jury around it usually runs just a few minutes beyond that, but at any event it will be scheduled as a 15-minute recess.

We will go then from 3:15 until 4:30.

Starting tomorrow morning the hours will be from 9:00 until 12:00. We will recess from 10:15 until 10:30.

MR. KANAREK: I have a couple of points here.

One is that one of the statements of, I guess
it's the --

THE COURT: Before we get off on that subject.

Now, this will require a change in the
Sheriff's handling of the prisoners and the jury, so be
sure that they know about that, will you?

THE BAILIFF: Yes.

THE COURT: Commencing with this afternoon at 1:45.
THE BAILIFF: Yes.

THE COURT: Is that going to impose any particular problems?

THE BAILIFF: No, it shouldn't.

THE COURT: There should be plenty of time for lunch

5-4

2

. Ì

3

4,

.5

6

7

'8 '9

10

Ħ

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

if they depart promptly.

THE BAILIFF: We are generally back before then anyway.

THE COURT: Be sure the section that handles the prisoners knows about the change of time for both morning and afternoon.

THE BAILIFF: Yes, your Honor.

MR. HUGHES: A very short point:

In relation to my testimony this morning, the order to show cause in re contempt, I understand I said I had \$48.51. I don't know where I got that figure. The figure in actuality, and I would offer to be resworn, was \$38.51.

I remember I did have a booking slip.

THE COURT: That is what you said yesterday.

MR. HUGHES: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, I made a note of the difference this morning when you mentioned it, and you seemed to be knowing what you were saying so I didn't question it.

MR. HUGHES: Mr. Hank; pointed that out to me, the amount was actually \$38.51. I believe the jail records will show that.

MR. KANAREK: In one of the exhibits, I cannot tell exactly from my notes, Susan Atkins purported to confess to eight counts of murder and a count of conspiracy, which would inferentially bring in the Hinman case or

23

24

25

26

something like that.

I wonder if we could do something about that exhibit.

I'm sure your Honor will recall she said she was indicted for eight counts of murder.

23

24 -

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, I remember that. Why don't we just change that to 7?

MR. KANAREK: Again, my position is that you cannot. It is unknown in the law to change words.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You said you don't want 8.

MR. KANAREK: I say you have to strike it if it is incompetent, you cannot have it in if you want 7.

MR. FITZGERALD: She was not indicted for eight counts of murder.

MR. KANAREK: That's right.

MR. FITZGERALD: That is a factual inaccuracy.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The fact that her statement is not 100 per cent accurate -

THE COURT: If that is what she said, that is what she said. There is nothing implicating about that.

MR, FITZGERALD: I am not suggesting that.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would go along with seven.

MR. KANAREK: Of course, that is -- your Honor is the one to decide, but if it is incompetent, Aranda and Bruton contemplate deletion, not adding and changing.

If it is incompetent it has to go out.

THE COURT: It is not incompetent.

MR. KANAREK: It prejudices the defendants' case. It talks about eight counts of murder.

THE COURT: So she made an error, she misspoke.

MR. KANAREK: That invades against Mr. Manson because

26

of the close intimacy, Mr. Bugliosi charged conspiracy.

THE COURT: What does that have to do with Mr. Manson?

MR. KANAREK: Because the whole Bruton-Aranda approach,
because the jury cannot be depended upon to siphon off and
exclude --

THE COURT: We don't have to go through the arguments. Just tell me how that implicates Mr. Manson.

She made a mistake; she misspoke herself.

MR. KANAREK: In trying to clear it up, on argument or whatever, it is going to bring out another murder, and I say strike it because it is, I think, incompetent, and I make the motion to strike it.

THE COURT: You talk to her, and if she simply made a mistake, of course you can bring it out on cross-examination.

If she was talking about the Hinman murder, you'd better stay away from it.

MR. KANAREK: I don't represent the lady,

MR. BUGLIOSI: I wouldn't mention it in my argument.

THE COURT: It won't be brought out unless you bring it out.

MR. KANAREK: I move first that the jury be admonished not to consider that for any purpose.

I also move for a mistrial.

THE COURT: There are eight counts in the indictment.

MR. KANAREK: That is not what it says, your Honor.

THE COURT: I understand what it says, Mr. Kanarek,

25

26

I am simply pointing out to you it is an obvious case of a witness being mistaken.

MR. HUGHES: I join in the motion for it being struck.

MR. KANAREK: Not when you consider the Hinman case.

THE COURT: I don't consider the Hinman case at all.

The jury knows nothing about it.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor --

THE COURT: That will be enough.

MR. KANAREK: May I have a ruling on my motion for a mistrial?

THE COURT: Denied.

Let's bring the jury down.

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

THE COURT: All counsel and jurors are present.

Have the defendants expressed a desire to return to the courtroom and conduct themselves in a proper manner, Mr. Fitzgerald?

MR. FITZGERALD: Could 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: The defendants have not affirmed, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are speaking for all of them? MR. FITZGERALD: I am speaking for all of them. 2 THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Kanarek? 3 MR. KANAREK: That is correct. MR. HUGHES: That is correct. 5 MR. SHINN: That is correct. 6 MR. BUGLIOSI: I think every now and then your Honor 7 should get a direct statement from the defendants. I think that would be advisable, instead of 9. going through their attorneys, I think we should go directly 10 because this is an extremely serious constitutional right 11 they are waiving, the right to confront witnesses against 12 them, and be present at their own trial. 13 THE COURT: They have been advised on numerous 14 15 occasions what they have to do in order to return. There cannot be the slightest possibility of 16 17 misunderstanding. If each one of their counsel represents to the 18 Court that they have not expressed any desire to return, 19 there is no problem. 20 2Ì MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay. MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, while we are at the bench, 22 23 since your Honor won't strike that reference we had in chambers, the eight and seven, we stipulate the eight be 24 25 changed to seven. THE COURT: Let's take that up at the time it is

offered so that it comes in the context of the proceedings where it has some meaning.

MR. KANAREK: Very well.

THE COURT: I don't want to go through a long.
involved process now to bring it into relevance.

We will take it up at the time when it comes in.

MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor. I was trying to save some time, your Honor.

3

4

5 6

Ÿ

8

9.

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

·18

19

20 21

22.

23

24

25

26

(Whereupon all counsel returned 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: In accordance with our conference in chambers, gentlemen, the court hours will be changed, effective this afternoon, as follows:

The sessions will start each morning at 9:00 o'clock, run until 12:00, with a recess from 10:15 to 10:30.

The afternoon sessions will commence at 1:45 and run until 4:30, with a recess from 3:00 until 3:15.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, in regard to the hours, I wish sometime to be heard in open court; but perhaps your Honor does not wish it in front of the jury.

THE COURT: You were heard in chambers, Mr. Hughes. That was the purpose of the conference.

MR. HUGHES: Very well, your Honor.

THE COURT: You may proceed with your cross-examination, Mr. Kanarek.

. THE CLERK: Will you state your name, please.

THE WITNESS: Gregg Jakobson.

3

À

5

6

Ż

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1.22

23

24

GREGG JAKOBSON,

having been previously duly sworn, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Mr. Jakobson, directing your attention to the times that you spoke to Mr. Manson. During some of those times, were you under the influence of an hallucinogenic drug?

A Yes.

Q What drugs were you under the influence of while you spoke to Mr. Manson?

A Marijuana.

Q And were you ever under the influence of LSD at a time when you spoke to Mr. Manson?

A No.

Q Were you ever under the influence of any other drugs?

A No.

Q Seconal or anything like that?

A No, never.

Is it a fair statement that -- directing your attention to this period of time concerning which you have testified -- that you were a frequent and avid user of marijuana?

-4

3

5

6

8

9

'n

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23 24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: That is irrelevant, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. BUGLIOST: Withdraw the objection.

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Then, will you tell us, Mr. Jakobson, on what-directing your attention to the various conversations you have had with Mr. Manson, would you tell us on what occasions you were under the influence of drugs, marijuana, and on what occasions you weren't, referring to the matters concerning which you have testified?

A Well, for about the last 14 months, I haven't used any chemicals at all.

And before that, very infrequently I would smoke some grass with Charlie while at the ranch.

Q You say the last 14 months. Do you say that because you know of a statute of limitations in connection with a criminal offense?

I am asking for his motivation, your Honor.

A No. It was a personal reason that I quit using chemicals.

'. Q Now, marijuana is not considered a chemical drug, is it?

A Lt is a chemical reaction that takes place. I consider it a chemical drug.

Q You consider it a chemical drug; is that right?

A I think it is considered a chemical drug.

26

14,392 You consider it a chemical drug? I consider it a chemical drug. 6a-1

2

1

3 4

5

Right?

6

7

9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

2<u>1</u>

22

24

25 26. Q Let's go back 14 months. We are now around October the 20th, 1970. So that would take us back, say, to some time in August, 1969.

Is that when you stopped using marijuana?

A Right.

Q All right. Then I will reask the question, if I may.

Directing your attention to the times when you spoke to Mr. Manson, would you tell us what times you used marijuana while talking to him, and what times you didn't, referring to what you have previously testified to in this courtroom.

A Referring to what I testified previously, very infrequently; but on occasion, I smoked some grass with Charlie at the ranch.

Q Well, now, see, my question asks you to give us the times. Would you tell us the dates when you had particular conversations?

A No.

Q Pardon? You won't?

A I can't.

Q. You can't?

A No.

Q. Then, would you tell us, if you can't give us the dates, would you tell us the matters concerning

which you have testified as to what matters you were 1 smoking when -- I will withdraw that. 2 Will you tell us, referring to the subjects 3 that you testified to here in the courtroom, will you tell 4 us concerning what subjects you were speaking of when you 5 were under the influence of marijuana, and concerning what б. subjects you were not under the influence of marijuana? 7 · A. No. 8 You can't do that, can you? 9 No, I can't. 10 Impossible; right? Q 11 Right. A 12 All right. Q 13 Now, did you make this statement in your 14. examination when Mr. Fitzgerald was interrogating you? 15 Mr. Fitzgerald asked you: NQ. Didn't he 16 also feel that every human being was the personi-17 fication of both good and evil, if one assumes 18 that those terms are appropriate?" 19 And did you answer: 20 ľΑ Yes. I am answering yes to that." 2Ì And then Mr. Fitzgerald said: 22 ^HQ In other words" -- there was a statement by Mr. Bugliosi, and Mr. Fitzgerald said: 24 "Indeed, indeed. If you would like 25 to explain, you may." 26

,

And the witness:

"Yes. On a completely subjective level, having nothing to do now with reality, just the intellectual concept. I mean, nothing to do with the experience of it. That is why it is so hard, because our conversations jumped from one level to the next, from objective to subjective, from an intellectual concept to a reality or an experience. My answer to your question was 'Yes' strictly in a subjective vein."

Did you so testify?

A. If that is what it says.

MR. KANAREK: Well, may I approach the witness, your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

6b fls.

S . 15

16

I,

2

3

4.

5

6

و.

10

11.

12

13

14

17.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5b-1

2

3

~ .

5

Ż .

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

·16

17

18

19

20 21

22,

23 24

25

26

MR. KANAREK: Would you read over the transcript and see if the reporter didn't take it down right maybe, perhaps.

THE WITNESS: Beginning?

MR. KANAREK: Beginning at Page 14,191, Line 25.

Would you look at that, reading through -- may I have the transcript just a moment -- reading through Line 17, Page 14,192.

Did you so testify?

(Pause while the witness reads.)

THE WITNESS: That seems correct.

MR. KANAREK: Q It does relate what is correct? In other words, you uttered those words in response to the questions that were asked of you; is that correct, Mr. Jakobson?

A Yes

Now, Mr. Jakobson, before taking the witness stand, Mr. Jakobson, before you first took the witness stand, would you tell us how long had it been since you last spoke to Mr. Bugliosi?

A. Five minutes.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Hughes?

MR. KANAREK: No further questions at this time.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. HUGHES: 2 Mr. Jakobson, did it appear that the girls at 3 the Spahn Ranch were in love with Mr. Manson? 5 Sure. Α. And did Mr. Manson appear to genuinely love 7 people? MR. BUGLIOSI: Calls for a conclusion, your Honor. 8 9 is too broad, anyway. THE COURT: Overruled. .`IÒ You may answer. 11 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. HUGHES: Q Did you feel that he genuinely 13 14 loved you, sir? 15 A. Yes. And did you love him? 16 17 -Yes. Now, you said that you had long philosophical 18 discussions with Mr. Manson? 19 20 Yes. Q Did you find them interesting? 21 22 Ă, Yes. Did you find that he was an original thinker? 23 24 -A. Completely. And did you find him intellectually 25

stimulating?

Yes. A. ĺ Would Mr. Manson have an argument for every one Ø. 2 that you would throw up? 3 Yes. 4 Now, you said that Mr. Manson said that he had . 5 a thousand faces or a thousand masks; is that correct? 6 Yes. 7 And would you say that he had said that he had ₿: a face for every level or for every walk of life that he . 9 came in contact with? No. 11 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may the record reflect 12 that I objected to that line of questioning on the part of 13 Mr. Bugliosi, and I must object on the part of Mr. Hughes also, any reference to such. **1**5 THE COURT: Let's proceed. 16 MR. HUGHES: Q Did Mr. Manson state that he 17 had a thousand faces or masks so that he could deal with 18 everyone on their own level? ÌŶ. MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I will object to that. 2Ò THE COURT: Overruled. 21 MR. KANAREK: On the grounds previously enunciated. 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. 23 That would be from the cowhand MR. HUGHES: 24 at Spahn Ranch to yourself even? ,25 Yes. 26

•	,
1	Q And he met you on your own level, didn't he?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q Would you classify Mr. Manson's philosophy,
4	the philosophy of life, as being an eclectic philosophy?
5	MR. KANAREK; I cannot stipulate to this witness
6	
	having any expertise on this subject and I object on that
7	ground; and the grounds previously enunciated.
8	THE COURT: Overruled.
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
Ĩ0	
11	
12	
13	
î4.	
15	
16 	
ļ 7	
18	
19 : .	
20	
21	
22	
23	

.

3 .

4 · . 5

ć

7

8

9

10

12

ŢЗ

14

15

16

17

18

20

23

24

25

26

MR. HUGHES: Q And by eclectic, we mean borrowing from different philosophies; is that correct?

A. Yes.

And he was aware of the holy men in India, was he not?

A Yes.

And did he look up to them?

A. Yes.

Q Did he ever indicate to you some philosophy to the effect that what you do to someone else you are doing to yourself?

A. Yes.

And did he say that if you were to kill someone, you would be killing yourself?

A. Yes.

And actually, this was a great deal of the gap in your discussions, and the reason that you had these discussions was this gap between the subjective and the objective; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q Do you recall an occasion at Spahn Ranch having to do with pain and a ranch hand and a match?

A. Yes.

Would you explain what happened at that time?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I will object to that.

It is outside of the scope of direct.

. 1	THE COURT: Overruled.
2	You may answer.
3	MR. KANAREK: And the continuing objections which we
4	
	have enunciated previously.
5	THE WITNESS: This should be qualified by saying that
6	I wasn't there. This was told to me.
7	MR. BUGLIOSI: No objection to hearsay, your Honor,
8 ,	MR, HUGHES: Q Was it told to illustrate a
9.	philosophical point, Mr. Jakobson?
10	A. I don't know if the point was philosophical.
11	It was more physical than philosophical,
12	Q Had Mr. Manson told you that he was able to
ī3	transcend pain?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q And did he tell you about actually holding a
16	
17	match to his hand and it not burning him?
	A. Yes.
18	Q Did Mr. Manson ever indicate to you that some of
19	the Far Eastern races, the Indian races, had attained some
20	higher level than both the black and the white races?
21	A. We discussed that.
22	Q And was it his position that the Eastern races
23	had attained a higher level than the white races?
24	A. It was both of our positions. There was no
. 25	argument there.
. 26	Q So Mr. Manson did not put the white man above
	In the contract of the contrac

1.	all other me	an did ha?
	·	
. 2	A	No.
3	G.	So, he was not a white-man-first sort of person,
. 4	was he?	
5.	A.	No.
6	Q.	Did he feel that the white man was capable of
7	going on to	a more spiritual level?
8	A	Yes.
ģ	Q.	Now, going back, Mr. Jakobson, to the album,
10	to the Beat	les' white album.
11.		You maw this album at the ranch?
12	A.	Yes.
13		A lot of people played that album quite a bit;
14	is that cor	rect?
15:	A.	Yes.
16	Q	And generally, isn't it true, that rather than
.17	skipping ar	ound from song to song, that that album would be
18.	played thro	ugh from beginning to end?
19	A.	Generally, yes.
:20		· ·
21	,	
22		
23		
24		

22

23

25

26

	Q	Æ	hnd	th	at	is	eyen	th	ough	cert	ain	people	liked
some	cuts	on	the	at,	ali	bum	bette	ėr	than	othe	rs;	isn't	that
true?										٠			

A Yes.

Q Now, did you state that Mr. Manson said to you once that "I am already dead"?

A Yes.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, we have the same continuing objections, of course.

BY MR. HUGHES:

Q But didn't Mr. Manson also say that he was ready to die when it came?

A I don't recall that.

Q Did Mr. Manson believe in certain religious figures such as Christ?

A Yes.

Q Would you say that he was a religious person?

A In what sense of the word "religious"? That is pretty broad.

Q I will withdraw that question.

Did Mr. Manson ever say that he was Jesus?

A Yes.

Q And was there some qualification to that in the sense that everyone had within him a Jesus being?

A Yes.

Q And did he ever say that he was the devil?

•	
· .	- [
6d-2	r
	2
	3
٠.	4
_	5
	6
'1	7:
•	8
*	9
,	10
	11
*	12
,	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
٠.,	18
	19
	20
	21

25

26

A Yes.

Q And was there some qualification to that in the sense that he said that everyone had within him the devil?

A Yes.

Q Did he say that the white man had been the devil?

A Yes.

MR. HUGHES: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Redirect?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Mr. Jakobson, you said that you recorded some songs of Mr. Manson; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Were they ever sold commercially?

A No.

Q You testified that Mr. Manson felt strongly about young teenage girls who were hitting the streets and going to places like San Francisco where they would be very obviously mistreated and meet with bad ends.

Did Mr. Manson elaborate on who these bad ends were?

A Yes.

6d-3 ₁	Q And who did he say they were?
2	A Well, primarily the black man would be waiting
. 3 .	there for them.
4	Q Where at?
. 5	A On the streets, in parks.
6	Q Haight-Asbury?
7	A Yes.
8	Q You testified that you had a dog that Mr.
9	Manson had some type of a rapport with the dog; is that
io.	correct?
11	A Yes.
12	Q What type of dog do you have?
13	A A St. Bernard.
) . 14	Q Is he a watchdog?
15	A Yes.
16	Q How large is he?
17	A He is very large, a hundred and seventy-five
. 18	pounds.
19	Q Somewhat ferocious?
	A Well, I can't say that he is ferocious. He
21	is what is the word he is imposing, you know. He
7 fls.: 22	is a big dog.
. 23	

•	
-1	Q He can be a bad customer?
	A. He challenges strangers, yes.
	Q What type of rapport did Mr. Manson have with
* , ,	your St. Bernard?
	A. Complete rapport, it was as if Charlie went to
	the dog's level.
	He was like the dog I mean, you know, they
	would wrestle on the ground, and so on, lick each other.
	Q The dog showed no fury of any type toward
	Mr. Manson?
i	THE REPORTER: What was that word?
	MR. BUGLIOSI: Fury.
1	THE WITNESS: No.3
1	MR. KANAREK: I cannot believe it, but may it be
. j	read back to me?
. 1	MR. BUGLIOSI: You cannot believe what?
.\$.	MR. KANAREK: The question.
· 1	MR. HUGHES: I did not understand the word.
1	THE COURT: It was repeated, the word was fury.
2	MR. BUGLIOSI: F-u-r-y, I believe is the way you spell
· 2	L. lt.
2	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: You testified Friday afternoon
. 2	Mr. Jakobson, that in your lifetime you had spoken to me
2	six or seven times, is that correct?
2	A. Before the trial, yes.
.2	How many times hefore you took the witness

23

24

26

stand did you speak to me about the matters about which you testified here in court?

MR. KANAREK: That calls for a real conclusion, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: Two or three.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: In answer to this question, have you spoken with any other law enforcement officers other than Mr. Bugliosi?

You answered, "Oh, a great number, yes."

Now, how many times did you speak to representatives of the Los Angeles Police Department about matters that you testified to here in court?

A. Once.

Q And that was not about Mr. Manson's philosophy on life. I take it?

A. No.

You mentioned that you spoke to other members of the District Attorney's Office, in addition to myself.
You mentioned Mr. Musich, here, and a man named Howard, and a fellow named Tim.

A. Yes.

Q Could you enlighten me on who Howard and Timare?

A. They picked me up and drove me here on a couple of occasions. I did not have any transportation.

So you just spoke to them?

1	A. Sure.
2.	Q Not about the matters that you testified to
ą	here in court?
4	A. Oh, no.
5	Q. Nor with Mr. Musich?
6	A. No.
7	Q Without mentioning the names of any persons,
8	how far are you aware of, did Mr. Manson say he had
9	proceeded with this topless dancers program?
10	A. He had made arrangements with an agency that
11	books topless dancers.
12	Q Is that the Girard Agency?
13	A, Yes,
14	Q On Sunset Strip?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q And you are actually aware that arrangements
17	had been made?
1,8	A. Yes.
<u>19</u>	Q You, of course, know Susan Atkins, also known
20 ·	as Sadie Glutz?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q And she was known as Sadie before the white
23	Beatles album came out?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q Before the white Beatles album came out in
26	late 1968 or early 1969 did Manson speak of the black-white

war?

MR. KANAREK: I will object to that as assuming facts not in evidence.

This witness has enunciated on several occasions he does not know time.

So the foundation is not there.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. KANAREK: As well as the substance, your Honor. THE WITNESS: Yes.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: So before the Beatles white album came out, Manson used to talk about the black-white war?

MR. KANAREK: Argumentative, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Now, you testified that Mr. Manson frequently used to say that Helter Skelter is coming down, is that correct?

. A. Yes.

Before the white Beatles album came out what, if anything, did he used to say with respect to that?

MR. KANAREK: Assuming facts not in evidence, improper foundation. I would like to have the time, place, and people present.

THE COURT: Lay the foundation.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Did you ever hear Mr. Manson say something else was coming down before the white Beatles album came out?

2,

5

6.

7

8

9

10

11

Ì2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20,

. 21

22

23

24

25

1	A. Yes,
2 .	Q When did you hear him say it?
.a, `,	A. When?
4	Q Yes.
5	. A. Before the white Beatles album came out.
6	Q Approximately when approximately when and
7	where, if you recall?
8 .	A I can't recall.
9	Q More than once?
10	A. Maybė once or twice.
11	Q Okay, and do you remember who was present when
12	he made this statement?
13	A. I believe Dennis was once.
14	And I am pretty sure it was at Dennis' house,
15	but I'm not positive.
16	Q Do you have any idea how long he made this
17	statement before the white Beatles album came out?
18	A. That goes into the summer of '68.
19	Q Okay. What did he say instead of Helter Skelter
20	is coming down?
21.	MR. KANAREK: I object to that, it's/"When did you
22	stop beating your wife"type of question.
23	THE COURT: Overruled, you may answer.
24.	THE WITNESS: Just that s-h-i-t was going to come
25	down
ا م	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Then when the white Beatles

26 .

album came out, it was Helter Skelter coming down, is that correct?

MR, KANAREK: Leading and suggestive, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Going back to the song,
Helter Skelter, Mr. Kanarek spoke to you in depth yesterday
about the word "bottom". I am not going to talk to you
about that exact word, Gregg, I am going to talk to you about
this verse, "When I get to the bottom I go back to the top
of the slide."

Did Mr. Manson ever place any interpretation on what that verse meant in Helter Skelter?

7a-1

2

1

4

5

7

8

9

Ų

12

13

14 15

16.

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26 MR. KANAREK: It is assuming facts not in evidence, your Honor, because this witness has previously testified that the last portion, "I go back to the top of the slide," was never --

They got to the word "bottom," and they were in the pit, that was the end, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled, you may answer.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q What did he say that verse meant in Helter Skelter?

A He believed that was imparting the information to go to the bottomless pit, to get out, to get away from Helter Skelter.

Q Now, you say that Mr. Manson never actually sung all of these songs word for word, is that correct?

A Yes, correct.

Q But you say he did compose a song and in that song were contained the words Helter Skelter, is that correct?

A Yes. He used the words in the song.

Q He used to use the word "Helter Skelter" very frequently, is that correct?

MR. KANAREK: Leading and suggestive, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes

	}		
78-2	i	BY MR. BUGLI	OSI:
,	2	Q	With respect to the song, Blackbird, what
e de la companya de l	3	passages, 1	any, did Mr. Manson sing or quote?
,	4	Ą	One in particular.
•	5	Q .	What is that?
	6	A	"Take these broken wings and learn to fly."
, , ,	7		And the one with the word "rise" in it,
,	8	"Rise up."	
•	9	Q	He used to sing these passages many times?
,	10	. ,	He would use them in his music.
* *	11	•	Charlie would speak his music sometimes, then
, ·	12	he would go	into a lyrical verse; then he would talk
	13	another vers	se.
	14	•	They will go back and forth. It's not like
•	15	any standard	kind of music.
	16		It was his own.
•	17		Then it changed continuously, so it's hard to
	18 :	be specific	
	19	Q	But he did extract from the song, Blackbird,
	20	those passag	şes?
	21	A	Yes.
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	22		And you heard him sing those passages?
, \$\frac{1}{2}	23	A .	Yes.
	24 ·	Q	What about the song, "Piggies," did he ever
	25	extract any	passages from that song and sing those
	26	passages?	

a-3 _I	A Yes.
. 2	Q What passages if any?
). 3 .	A "Dama good whacking" I remember hearing him say,
	and "Playing in the dirt."
· . 5	Q Would he say "Damn good whacking," or "What
, <u>é</u>	they need is a damn good whacking"?
	A I just remember the damn good whacking part.
8	I cannot pin it down.
. · . 9·	Q You cannot remember the exact words?
.0 1	A No.
11	Q But you know they came from the song Piggles?
12	A Yes.
13	Q You mentioned yesterday that someone else at
14	Spahn Ranch had used the term "rip off," who was that?
15:	MR. KANAREK: Object, your Honor, I object to the name
16	of whoever it was.
17	As I understand it may we approach the bench?
18	I think it is outside the scope
. 19	THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer.
20	THE WITNESS: Clem Tufts.
21	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
. 22	Q When did Clem Tufts use the term "rip off"?
23	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, then I still continue to
. 24	object on the grounds it is outside the scope of our
25	cross-examination.
26	THE COURT: Overruled.

7a-4

2

3

7

4

5 .

. 7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

<u>1</u>7

18

. <u>2</u>0

21 22

. 23

24

25

26

THE WITNESS: Around the same time, spring.
BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Of 169?

A '69.

Q. When Mr. Manson told you all these things about Helter Skelter, Revelation 9 and the black people ripping off some white families like cutting them up, did he appear to be serious?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, that is a conclusion. I know we have continuing objection, your Honor, but it is so prejudicial it allows this witness to judge this case.

MR. BUGLIOSI: He is a percipient witness, your Honor: Holland vs. Zollner. This has been gone into on cross-examination.

MR. KANAREK: Furthermore, it is ambiguous. He has lumped together a myriad of subjects in that question.

It is compound over and above our continuing objection.

THE COURT: Read the question.

(Whereupon the reporter reads the pending question as follows:

"Q When Mr. Manson told you all these things about Helter Skelter, Revelation 9 and the black people ripping off some white families like cutting them up, did he appear to be serious?")

THE COURT: Overruled, you may answer.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

**	
,	•
7a-5	1
•	2
	2 3 4
	4
245	5
	6
~	7
, *	8
	9
•	· 10
	IJ
	12
· ·	13
	14
	15
	16
	. 17
	18
• •	19
	20
	.21

23

24

26

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q You testified that you had approximately 100 philosophical discussions with Charles Manson, and that during some of these discussions you were smoking marijuana with Mr. Manson, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Approximately how many times did you smoke marijuana while discussing Mr. Manson's philosophy with him?

A 20, 30 percent.

Q The other 70 or 80 percent of the time you were not smoking marijuana, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Many of the discussions you had with Mr. Manson about Helter Skelter, Revelation 9 and the black-white war, et cetera, were those while you were not smoking marijuana?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, that is another way of asking the same question.

He asked the negative.

Furtheremore, it is ambiguous, it is compound.

THE COURT: Overruled, you may answer.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can I have the question again.

THE COURT: Read the question.

(Whereupon the reporter reads the pending question as follows:

	1	"Q Many of the discussions you had with
	2	Mr. Manson about Helter Skelter, Revelation 9 and
, , ,	3,	the black-white war, et cetera, were those while
	4	you were not smoking marijuana?")
	5	THE WITNESS: Some of the time.
	6	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	7	Q Did you understand my question?
	8	MR. KANAREK: He has not indicated he does not under-
·, ' , •	9	stand it, because Mr. Bugliosi does not like the answer
٤.	10	MR. BUGLIOSI: I did not say I did not like the
•	11	answer. He just seemed to hesitate.
· ·.	12	THE COURT: Let's get on with it.
	13.	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
·	14,	Q Did you understand my question, sir?
, , , , ,	15.	A I'm not clear.
	16	THE COURT: Reframe the question, Mr. Bugliosi.
* A ,	17	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	18	Q Did you ever have a conversation with Mr.
	19	Manson about Helter Skelter while you were not smoking
•	.20	marijuana?
b fls.	21	A Oh, sure.
	22 .	
•	23	
	24	
	25	
•	26	

1 Many times. what many times means some 2 4 the term many " I mean three 5 More than not. 6 More times than not you were not smoking 7 when you spoke to Mr. Manson about Helter Skelter? marijuana 8 Yes. What about Revelation 9? 10 Yes. Α, 11 What about the Black-White war? 12 Yes. Α. 13 And the bottomless pit? 14 Yes. A. 15. Did Mr. Manson say that he borrowed any of the 16 philosophies of the Philosopher Nietzsche? 17 Yes. 18 What philosophy was that? 19: MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, that is clearly outside the 20 scope of cross-examination. We did not go into Nietzsche. 21 THE COURT: Overruled. 22. THE WITNESS: He was familiar with Nietzsche's 23 master race theory. 24 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: The master race being whom? White man. 26 When you say that Mr. Manson did have a concept Q,

ī	of good and bad, strictly in a subjective vein, as opposed
2	to an objective vein, what do you mean by that?
3	A. Did I say that?
4	Q Perhaps those are not your exact words. I
5	believe you testified something to the effect that his
.6	concept of good and bad was strictly subjective and not
7	related to reality, or words to that effect.
8	(No response.)
9	You don't recall that?
10	A. Not like that. If I could hear what I said,
11	I could identify it better.
12	MR. BUGLIOSI: (To Mr. Kanarek) Do you have that
13	passage you read from?
14	(To the Court) May I have just a moment?
· 15	(Pause.)
16	MR. BUGLIOSI: The question on Page 14,191:
17.	"BY MR. FITZGERALD: Q Didn't he also
18	feel that every human being was the personification
19 .	of both good and evil, if one assumes that these
20	terms are appropriate?
21	"A Yes. I am answering yes to that."
2Ž	Then you were asked to explain and you said,
23	"On a completely subjective level, having nothing
24	to do now with validity, just to intellectual
25	concept. I mean, nothing to do with the
26	experience of it:
	al · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

.1 Ž. 3 . 4. 8 10 11 12. 13 14 1Ŝ 16 17 **18**: 19 20 21. 22 23: 24

26

"That is why it is so hard, because all our conversations jump from one level to the next, from objective to subjective, from an intellectual concept to a reality or an' experience.

"My answer to your question was 'yes,' strictly in a subjective vein."

Do you recall testifying to that?

- A. Yes.
- Q Will you elaborate on what you meant by that?
- A Subjectively -- we are speaking strictly subjectively now, you could do no right or wrong because a subjective level is so refined that it is supported by nature. It would be like a tree doing something wrong; it's impossible; it's completely supported by nature, and in turn it supports nature, it's perfect, subjectively speaking.

And the reality I referred to there was an objective reality as opposed to a subjective reality.

Q You testified earlier that he thought there was no such thing as good or bad, is that correct?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, that is belaboring it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Now, are you speaking -- I am still -- do you mean subjectively or objectively?

y •	Now, that is the whole thing that we went back
1	
. 2	and forth on.
3	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Let's take subjectively first.
4.	Did he feel there was any such thing as good or
. 5	bad?
د. م	A. No. On the subjective level it was taken care
· _:.6	
7	
8.	It would be impossible for there to be either
ۏ	of those.
TO	Q What about on an objective level?
11	A. No, almost the same difference.
12	Q So subjectively and objectively Mr. Manson did
	not recognize good as opposed to bad or evil?
13	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I must object to that.
14	
15	The prejudicial value far outweight the probative
16	value.
17	It invades the province of the Court and jury.
18	THE COURT: Overruled.
19	THE WITNESS: Yes.
	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Your answer to my question is
20	yes?
21	
22	A. Yes.
23	Q My statement was a fair statement then?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q I show you People's Exhibit No. 60 for
26	identification. Have you ever seen what is depicted in that
2 2 2	

1	photograph, Gregg?
2	A. Yes
3	Q What is depicted in that photograph?
4	A A California State sign pointing in the
5	direction, to the Will Rogers Park.
6	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, whatever that is I believe
7	that it outside the scope of the cross-examination.
8	MR. BUGLIOSI: May I reopen direct for a limited
. و	purpose?
10	THE COURT: Very well, you may reopen.
11	
. 12	DIRECT EXAMINATION (REOPENED)
13	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
14	Q Now, you have been to Dennis Wilson's home
15	many times; is that correct?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q The one on 12,000 block on Sunset Boulevard?
18	A. Yes.
Ĭġ ,	Q How close is Dennis Wilson's home to this sign
20	which says "Will Rogers State Historic Park"?
2 i .	A Across the street.
22.	MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions, your Honor.
23	MR. FITZGERALD: No recross-examination.
24	THE COURT: We will take our morning recess at this
25	time, ladies and gentlemen, do not converse with anyone or
26	form or express any opinion regarding the case until it is

finally submitted to you. THE COURT: We will recess for 15 minutes. (Recess.) 7 ġ 1Ò. 11 12 13 14 15 16 1,7 18. 19 20 21 22 **2**3 .24 25 26

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Are you read to proceed, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: Sit down, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: I am trying to consult with my client.

THE COURT: Sit down.

All counsel and jurors are present.

Do you have any cross-examination, Mr. Shinn?
MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.

.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHINN:

Q Mr. Jakobson, you testified that you talked to Mr. Bugliosi about six or seven times?

A No.

Q About six times?

A I said two or three.

Q No. Before you testified in court today,
I mean, in this case, did you talk to Mr. Bugliosi about
six times?

A Before the trial started?

Q Yes.

A Yes, six or seven times.

Q Then Mr. Bugliosi asked you: Out of the six or seven times, how many times you talked about this case; correct?

A Yes.

		١,
n 'A	÷.	٠
8 ~ Z	Ţ,	
• •	·	,
	, , ,	
. •	5	
	, ə -	
	٠,	l
1 4	4	
•	-	
	,ex.	
•	5	
*	•	
	6	
	•	
,	7 8 9	l
	8	
	,	
;	·	
1	9	
	,	
	10	ŀ
	10.	·
ч ,	•	
3 1	ĮĮ.	
A	A	
* ¥ ,	7	
4. 5	12	
•	13	
	13	
	13	
· ·	13 14	
· ·	13 14	
· ·	13 14 15	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	13 14 15	
	15	
	13 14 15 16	
	15	
	15 16.	
	15	
	15 16 17	
	15 16.	
	15 16 17	
	15 16 17	
	15 16 17	
	15 16 17 18 19	
	15 16 17	
	15 16 17 18 19	
	15 16 17 18 19	
	15 16 17 18 19	
	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	
	15 16 17 18 19	
	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	
	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	
	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	

24

25

26

Q	And I	believe	you	said	two	times?
**.			*		,	

A I said two or three times.

Q Then the other three or four times, what did you talk about?

A Transportation, I needed a parking pass, and what time? Just things like that.

I had some trouble with my transportation, getting here, in other words.

Q And those discussions were just regarding your transportation then?

A Yes, for the most part. What time to be here, things like that.

Q Were these conversations over the telephone or in person with Mr. Bugliosi?

A . Most of the time over the telephone.

face to face only three times?

A No. There were some times when I would be at the Grand Jury that words between us would be exchanged like "Hello," "How are you," and so on.

Also, I was down here Thursday, but evaybody was in chambers, do I didn't testify, but I still had words with Mr. Bugliosi as to "Hello," "How are you,"

"Nice day." That type of thing.

Q Now, you testified that you talked to Mr.
Manson approximately a hundred times; correct?

8-3	1	A Well, yes, right.
· .	2	Q And most of these conversations were at the
	3.	ranch, the Spahn Ranch?
,	4	A No.
	5	Q Well, how many times at the Spahn Ranch would
•	6	you say that you talked to Mr. Manson?
	7	A Half of those were at the Spahn Ranch.
	8	Q About 50 times?
, ,	9	A Yes.
	jo .	I qualified the hundred times. Just to hit a
3 12	, 11,	number, because I was pressed to do so.
	12	Q All right.
2 21	18	In other words, it may be over a hundred times
; ·	14	that you talked to Mr. Manson; is that correct?
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	15 •	A Yes,
	16	Q And about half of that time was at the
	17	Spahn Ranch; correct?
•	18	A Half of those.
	19	Q Yes. Approximately half the times?
	20	A Yes. Roughly half.
	21	Q And this would be an all-day session at the
	22	Spahn Ranch?
a fls.	23	A No.
	24	
,	25	

•			·
8a-1	ı ļ	Q	Approximately what time would you arrive there?
	2	A	No specific time.
	3	Q	You spent a great deal of time at the Spahn
·	4	Ranch; corr	rect?
•	5	A	I don't think so.
		Q.	Would you just talk to Manson and then leave
	7.	right away?	
	8 .	· A.	No.
•	· '9'.	Q	You spent time there; correct?
•	10	A	Yes. Sure.
,	11.7	Q	Maybe sometimes three or four hours?
	12	A	Yes.
	13	Q	Sometimes maybe eight or nine hours?
	14	A	Yes.
	15	D	Would you always go home every night to sleep?
٠.,	16	A	Always?
• · .	17	Q	Yes.
	18	A	Always but once.
	19	Q	And you stayed overnight there; is that correct?
	20	Å	Yes.
· · :	2 F	Q	And if you can recall, when was the latest
٠.	22	time that	you left for home? Say, 2:00 o'clock in the
	23	morning?	3:00 o'clock in the morning?
	24	A	Sure.
	25	Q	But you would never sleep there?
. 	26	A	Always but once.

	· ·
1	Q You slept that one time?
2	A Right.
3. ⋅	Q Then you spentsome time out in Barker Ranch;
4	correct?
5	A Correct.
6	Q That was two days?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And most of the time when you talked to Mr.
9	Manson, at the time at Spahn Ranch, you smoked grass;
10	correct?
jī,	A Most of the time?
12	Q Yes.
*13	A. No.
14	Q Some of the time, then?
15	Yes.
16 °	Q And would you bring your own grass?
17	MR. BUGLIOSI: That is irrelevant, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Sustained.
19	BY MR. SHINN:
20	Q Would it be fair to state that the only
21	reason you went to the Spahn Ranch was to get some free
22	grass?
23	A No.
24	Q You mean you would have to buy it?
25	A No.
26	Q Where would you get it?
	l

1	A Grass has always been very plentiful. It is
2	always around.
3.	Q In other words, you were able to buy it and
4	bring it to the ranch?
5	A I never even had to buy it. People would give
6	it to me.
7	Q And you would bring it to the ranch and smoke
-8	it?
ĝ	A No. There was always some there.
10	Q And you would smoke it at home sometimes;
11	is that correct?
12	MR. BUGLIOSI: Irrelevant.
13	THE COURT: Sustained.
14	MR. SHINN: No further questions.
15	THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Kanarek?
Ì6	MR. KANAREK: Yes, sir.
17	
18.	CROSS-EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. KANAREK:
20	Q Mr. Jakobson, you say that Mr. Manson liked
21	animals. Mr. Manson liked people too; right?
22	A Yes.
23	Q Mr. Manson liked the world around him; right?
24	He enjoyed nature, he enjoyed people?
25	MR. BUGLIOSI: Compound.
26	THE COURT: Are you asking him what he said?

MR. KANAREK: Well, over my objection, your Honor, 1 Mr. Bugliosi has gone into conclusions. 2 The question is ambiguous. THE COURT: .3 Reframe the question. 4 MR. KANAREK: What is that, your Honor? 5 THE COURT: Reframe the question. б I will rephrase it, your Honor. MR. KANAREK: 7 Mr. Manson liked animals; is that correct? Q 8 A٠٠ Yes. 9 And he liked people; right? Is that correct? Q 1Ó A Yes. 11: He liked nature? Q 12 A Yes. 13 Now, you said something like a tree is perfect, Q 14 Mr. Jakobson. 15. When you say that a tree is perfect, I mean, 16 you recognize that trees, a tree is a natural type of 17 thing? :18 I said that a tree is perfect, and I qualified 19 it by saying that it is supported by nature and, in turn, 20 it completely supports nature. It can't do anything wrong. 21 It is perfect. 22 It is perfect. But you recognize there are 23 tree surgeons that correct imperfect trees; right? 24 I don't know if they do correct imperfect. A 25 trees. Not from where I stand. 26

From where you stand, a tree can have -- you 1 never heard of a tree having some kind of a fungus, a 2 disease, anything like that, Mr. Jakobson? 3 A I have heard of it, but those are natural things. 5 Those are natural things? 6 Q 7 A Yes. 8 Now, may I ask you: When you made comment to Q 9 Mr. Melcher concerning Mr. Manson's artistic ability, were 10 you under the influence of marijuana then? Had you been smoking marijuana? 11 12 I don't think so. 13 Q. But you may have? 14 A Yes. 15 MR. KANAREK: Thank you. 16 THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Hughes? 17 Yes, your Honor. MR. HUGHES: MR. KANAREK: One moment, your Honor. · 18 I think Mr. Kanarek has another question. 19 MR. HUGHES: 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

9 fls.

BY MR. KANAREK:

5

6

'.8.

9

10.

·ll

12

13.

14

· 15·

16

17

18

19

20

21

.22

23

24.

25

As a matter of fact, Mr. Jakobson, you sought out Mr. Manson for these recordings. You are the one who had the know-how; you are the one who sought Mr. Manson. You did the planning so he would get the songs on his recordings, is that correct?

A. No, to the first part of your question; yes to the second.

Would you tell us what part is no and what part is yes?

A. No, I did not seek him out. We mutually got together.

Yes, I did do the planning and the arranging for the studio and the music to be recorded.

Yes, and after you and he -- after you and he had come to see each other, you had been in his presence, you are the one who fostered, who planned, who arranged form. Manson to make recordings, is that correct?

A Originally,

Q Well, as far as your relationship with him is concerned, and the making of recordings, you fostered it, you planned it, you created it and you desired it?

A. No.

Q Well, you are the one who made the arrangements for the actual mechanical recording to take place, is that correct?

23

24

25

26

,	· · · ·	
i.	A.	Υe
	Q,	Ār
wante	d to	do :
, ,	•	KANA
•	ŢHE	cou
• .	٠,٠	
,	•	
BY MI	R. HŲC	HES
, , ,	ୟ	Mı
very	well	with
	A.	Ye

şB.

nd you did that because you decided that you it, right?

es.

AREK: Thank you.

Any questions?

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

r. Jakobson, you said that Mr. Manson got along h your dog?

eø,

Q Extremely well?

Yes. Α.

And you say that this is typical -- the way he got along with your dog was typical with the way he got along with most people you saw him get along with?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Too broad.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. HUGHES: He did not put on any face or any mask for your dog, did he?

Yes, he became like a dog.

I mean, he was able to really get along with your dog?

Oh, absolutely.

He got right down to the dog's level?

. 4		
1	A.	Right.
2	Q.	What did you have to do to become a member of
3	the Family?	
4	A.	I have no idea. I don't know what the
5	qualificati	ons are.
6	٠٠ - ٩	But you felt in these 100 or so conversations
7.	you had wit	h Mr. Manson that he was inviting you to become
8	a member of	this Family?
9	Α.	Yes.
ĺÒ	۵., ۵	Did you feel that you had to be white?
11	A.	Did I?
12 '	Q.	Yes,
13	A.	I didn't have any feelings like that. I never
14	thought of	it.
15	Q.	Did you feel that possibly being white might be
16	a prerequis	ite?
17	A,	I never thought of it. I am white so I
18 ′	wouldn't th	ink of that. That would be unnatural.
19	Q .	Did Mr. Manson ever say that he felt it was
20	necessary t	o choose one's sexual mate carefully?
·2I	. A.	Yes.
22	Q ,	Did he feel if you did not do so that you would
23	interfere w	ith the path of evolution?
24	A	That is not what he said.
25	Q,	Well, just what did he say in regard to that?
26	A	In regard to that he said that in the future you

. 1	would be making love to your own offspring of that union,
*	so that you had to choose carefully of the union now because
2	ultimately in the future those would be the partners of the
3 4	union, then.
	Did he indicate that this would that some
5	sort of sexual lisison with other races would create a
6	mixing up of the nervous systems?
7.	A. Yes, there is an analogy to that that makes it
8 . 9	very clear, that was used.
	Q What was the analogy?
10	A. A leopard does not mate with a cheetah.
11	Q Actually that was your analogy, wasn't it?
12	A. That was my analogy but we agreed on it.
13	Q Mr. Manson subscribed to 1t?
14	A. Yes.
	Q So actually you were not a mere spectator at
16	these philosophical discussions that you had.
17	You brought ideas to them, didn't you?
18	A. It would not be a discussion if I was a
19	spectator.
20	They were two-sided, yes.
21 22	Q Did Mr. Manson feel that when the white man
23	went on to a more spiritual level that the black man was
	going to have his turn at assuming the power?
24	MR. BUGLIOSI: That is ambiguous, your Honor.
25 .	THE WITNESS: I don't know what you mean by power.
26	

THE COURT: Reframe the question. BY MR. HUGHES: Did he feel that the black man · 2 was the last race to come out from under the feet of subjugation? Yes. 5 And did he often in his discussions, and you in your discussions with him, did you discuss ideas that are current, America was too hung up with material 8 possessions? Ã, Yes. 10 That was not an original idea with him, was it? Q. 11 A. Νo. 12 It was not an original idea with you, was it? 13 Α. No. 14 Would you say that is a current underground 15 credo? 16 Yes. 17 Now, as far as this bottomless pit, did you 18 say that that was based on a Hopi Indian legend? 19 The people living in the desert in a pit. 20 To my reference, it was. Now, I am not sure if 21. that was Charlie's source. 22 Well, you heard that idea of people living in 23 the desert in a pit from other sources than Mr. Manson, is 24 that correct? 25 26 Yes, it is a belief of a whole tribe of people.

You were never under Mr. Manson's spell, were Ŀ you? I don't know what you mean. MR. KANAREK: I must object to that as assuming a fact not in evidence, that there is such a thing as Mr. Manson's spell. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR, HUGHES: You were able to bring independent ideas to this discussion, is that correct? Yes. 10 11 : 12 13 15 16 17 18 Ţģ^ . 20 . 21 . 22 23 24 25

26

Q He did not keep you from bringing your own ideas there, did he?

A No.

Q And there were other people who were independent there at the ranch, were there not?

A Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: This calls for a conclusion, your Honor, motion to strike.

MR. KANAREK: Under equal protection of the law --

THE COURT: You want it to remain in, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: This is my point:

It is not a matter that I want it in.

THE COURT: Just get to the point.

MR. KANAREK: All right, if I may.

As a lawyer I am not asking that evidence be allowed just because it happens to be favorable. The point is on equal protection of the law, your Honor has allowed Mr. Bugliosi --

THE COURT: That will be enough. You may sit down, Mr. Kanarek.

The objection is overruled. Reframe the question.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, your Honor, you said the objection is overruled, yet you requested that Mr. Hughes reframe the question.

I don't quite understand the present status.

23

24

25.

THE COURT: Reframe the question. I MR. BUGLIOSI: Is the Court going to strike the 2 witness's last answer? 3 THE COURT: Was there an answer? 4 MR. HUGHES: I believe there was an answer. 5 THE COURT: The answer is stricken. б The jury is admonished to disregard it. 7 Reframe the question. 8 BY MR. HUGHES: 9. You were out to the ranch a great number of 10 times? 1:1 A Yes. 12 You saw a great number of people there at the 13 ranch? 14 A Yes. 15 And some of those people to you appeared to 16 be strong, independent individuals? 17 MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, that calls for a conclusion. 18 MR. KANAREK: Then, your Honor, I would reinstitute, 19 if I may --20 THE COURT: The objection is sustained. 21.-MR. KANAREK: May I make argument to the Court? 22 THE COURT: No you may not. 23 BY MR. HUGHES: $2\dot{4}$ Did you see other people at the ranch participate in discussions?

1	A Yes.
.2	Q Did you see them submit ideas?
3	A Yes.
4	MR. HUGHES: I have no further questions, your Honor,
5	thank you.
6	THE COURT: You may step down.
7	MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I have a couple of ques-
·8	tions.
9. :	THE COURT: That will terminate the examination.
10	You may step down, sir.
11	Call your next witness.
12	THE WITNESS: Your Honor, may I go?
13	THE COURT: You are excused.
14	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
. 15 * ~	MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I have some redirect
16	examination.
17	THE COURT: You have had your redirect examination,
18	sir.
19	MR. BUGLIOSI: Not after they have asked their
20	questions.
21	THE COURT: All right, let's proceed. Call your next
22	witness.
23	MR. BUGLIOSI: People call Mr. Hatami.
24	THE CLERK: Would you raise your right hand, please.
25	Would you please repeat after me.
26	I do solemnly swear

1	THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear
2	THE CLERK: that the testimony I may give
3	THE WITNESS: that the testimony I may give
4	THE CLERK: in the cause now pending
`5	THE WITNESS: in the cause now pending
6.	THE CLERK: before this Court
7	THE WITNESS: before this Court
8	THE CLERK: shall be the truth
9	THE WITNESS: shall be the truth
10.	THE CLERK: the whole truth
11	THE WITNESS: the whole truth
12 .	THE CLERK: and nothing but the truth
13	THE WITNESS: and nothing but the truth
14	THE CLERK: so help me God.
15	THE WITNESS: so help me God.
1 6	THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please.
17 '	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
18	THE CLERK: Please state and spell your name.
19	THE WITNESS: Yes. The first name is Shahrokh,
20	S-h-a-h-r-o-k-h. The second name is Hatami, H-a-t-a-m-i.
21	THE CLERK: Would you please spell your first name
22 ,	again?
23	THE WITNESS: S-h-a-h-r-o-k-h.
24	THE CLERK: Thank you.
กะ .	

1 SHAHROKH HATAMI. a witness called by and on behalf of the People, was examined 2 and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 6 Mr. Hatemi, what is your occupation, sir? 7 Q I am a photographer journalist. A Are you from Iran? Q. A I am from Iran, yes. Did you know actress Sharon Tate? 11 Q 12 MR. KANAREK: That's immaterial, your Honor. .13 THE COURT: Overruled, you may answer. 14 THE WITNESS: Very well, yes, very well. BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 15 16 And her movie director husband, Roman Polanski? 17 Also. 18 Were you ever at their residence located at 19 10050 Cielo Drive, Los Angeles? 20 That is the number, yes, but I know the resi-21 dence at Cielo Drive. 22 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I'm asking for a continuous 23 objection then on relevancy and materiality. 24 May I? 25 THE COURT: You may. 26 Thank you, your Honor. MR. KANAREK:

.24

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q I show you People's Exhibit 7 for identification, do you recognize what is shown in that photograph?

A It is an aerial view, and I can recognize the entrance to the house, and this is the grille -- no, this is the grille.

This is the yard; this is the main house; this is the swimming pool, and this is the back alley that goes to the guest house in the back.

Q You recognize this as being a photograph, an aerial photograph of the Tate residence?

A Yes.

2

4

6'

5

8

10

1) 12

13

15

14

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26

	୍ଦ	How	mar	y times	were	you	at	the	Tate	residence
appr	oximat	ely,	Mr.	Hatami?	•	•	,			

A Very often. Three — two times a week, at least.

Q Did you do any professional photography or filming of Sharon?

A Besides her being a personal friend, I was doing a TV show. She was a part of it.

Q. In March of 1969, were you doing any filming of Sharon Tate?

A Around the end of March - I mean, regularly, . I was working. Around the end of March I was at the house.

Q At the end of March of 1969?

A. Yes.

And you were filming Sharon inside her residence, or outside, or what?

A. No. It was inside.

She was packing to go to Europe, to Rome, and it was a part of her personal life which I was showing; She is packing, unpacking, going here, going there,

Q So, you were filming Sharon while she was packing to go to Rome?

A. Yes.

You don't know the exact date, I take it?

A No. It was just --

Q Late March?

Į.	,	
1.	A.	Around the end of March.
2.	. ର	1969?
3	A.	Yes,
4.	, Q	Did Sharon, in fact, leave for Rome?
.5	A.	A day or two after. It was just before her
6	departure,	
7	4	So, a day or two after you were filming her
8	packing, sh	e did go to Rome?
9	A.	Yes, she did.
10	Q.	Now, this particular day that you were filming
11.	Sharon, abo	ut what time of day did you arrive at Sharon's
12	residence?	
13	. A. :	It was around midday, around 11:00 o'clock.
14	Between 11:	00 to midnight.
. 15	Ģ.	Was Sharon alone?
-16	Å	Yes.
17	(a)	Was anyone else there?
18	A	No. She was alone.
19	. *, /	I presume the maid was there.
20	, Q	Winifred Chapman?
21	. A.	I beg your pardon?
22	9,	When you say the maid, Mr. Hatami, do you mean
-23	Winifred Ch	apman?
24	A.	I forget. What is her name?
25	•	Winifred or Winnie?
26	· A.	Winnie, yes. The dark
	.)·	

Ţ	. Q Yes. She may have been there?
2	A. Yes, she may have been there. She was always
3.	there,
4	Q Was Sharon's husband there; Roman Polanski?
5	A. No.
6	Do you know where Roman was?
7,	A. Oh, Roman went to Rio, the Film Festival of
8	Rio de Janeiro, a week or ten days before sometimes. I
9	took him to the airport with Sharon. I mean, we both
1Ô	together took him to the airport.
11	Q Do you know Abigail Folger?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q And Voityck Frokowski?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q And Jay Sebring?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q While you were there on this particular day,
18:	Mr. Hatami now, the day I'm talking about is the day
19	that you were filming Sharon in the process of packing
20	while you were there that day, Mr. Hatami, did Abigail or
21	Voityck or Jay Sebring arrive at the residence?
22	A. They arrived later on in the afternoon. I
23	don't recall exactly. Sometime between 12:00 and 1:30,
24	2:00.
25	

LOA

26

a I	Q Those three arrived?
2	A, Yes.
3	Q Were they living there at the time?
.	A. No. But Abigail and Voityck, they were in the
.5	process of moving in.
6	I mean, Sharon was packing out, and they were
7 8	moving in. Q Abigail and Voityck, then, were going to start
9 10	living at the Tate residence?
11.	Q Did you observe any person approach the residenc on this particular day?
13	A. What do you mean? I am sorry. What do you
14	mean by "person approach"?
15	Q Did you observe any person walking towards the
. 16	Tate residence on that particular day?
17	A. Yes.
18	I was in the living room, the large room, and
19	watching outside from the window. Not watching, I just
. 20.	saw from the window, that someone was coming to the
21.	property,
22	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the
25	bench at this point?
- 24	THE COURT: For what purpose?
25	MR. KANAREK: I would like to make argument to the
26	Court based upon Wade and Gilbert, in connection with

certain matters.

THE COURT: You may approach the bench.

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

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I would ask that there be a voir dire hearing concerning --

THE COURT: Get to the point, Mr. Kanarek. What is the point that you wanted to come to the bench for?

MR. KANAREK: I have reason to believe, your Honor, that this man is going to say that Mr. Manson is the person who approached, and I would like to have, outside of the presence of the jury, a hearing, an evidentiary hearing, as to how the prosecution — as to what pictures have been shown him, so that we can cross-examine him, because I believe that he is merely going to regurgitate —

THE COURT: Let's find out from Mr. Bugliosi what the testimony is going to be.

What is the witness going to testify to?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Manson has never been in any
lineup in front of this man, your Honor, so today I would
like to have him, during his testimony, I would like to
have Mr. Manson brought out in front of the man and see if
he can identify him.

MR. KANAREK: That is improper, your Honor. THE COURT: Why?

。. 3

1

•

.

. .

9

10 -11

12

13

14

15

16-

17

18

Ļ9

20

21 22

ci

23 24

25.

26:

MR. KANAREK: Because we have a right to know what pictures he has seen of Mr. Manson.

That is the whole reason that the Wade and Gilbert type of law has developed, because you bring the defendant out, and it focuses it. There is no way of cross-examining.

THE COURT: Who said anything about any pictures?

Did he identify him from a photograph?

Markey Control of the Control

14.

. 16

` 19

0B~1

5

7

8

6

9

Ħ

12 13

14 15

> 16 17

18

19

2Ó.

21 22

23

24 25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: It seems to me - I spoke to this man a long time ago, over a half a year ago -- I think I showed him the family album, photographs of the Family, if I am not mistaken, and I think he tends to pick out Manson, but he would have to see the man to make a positive identification.

I have never brought him to court or anything.
MR. KANAREK: He is talking too loudly.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I felt it might be a little too leading and suggestive.

I am going to just bring Manson out in front of him and, for all I know, he might say, "That is not the man." I don't know.

I never brought him to court to look at the man.

MR. KANAREK: In the context of this proceeding, even
taken at best, it becomes just a guess. Mr. Manson's
appearance at the present time, with all that we have been
through.

We are interested in Mr. Manson's freedom, and if a fair trial is predicated upon the whim and caprice of this witness --

THE COURT: What are you talking about, the whim and caprice? You mean he doesn't have a right to testify whether or not he recognizes him?

MR. KANAREK: Certainly.

THE COURT: Then what is your point?

MR. KANAREK: I am saying that we should have a Ŀ your dire hearing so that we could find out what pictures have been shown, so we can find out what has been shown, what his state of mind is, how his state of mind has been schooled, if it has been. 5 THE COURT: Have you shown him pictures? 6 You had better lay the foundation. MR. BUGLIOSI: I believe I showed him a family album of Watson and Clem Tufts and the whole group. 9 You had better pin this down. 10 THE COURT: MR. BUGLIOSI: It seems to me that he picked Manson's 11 12 picture out. ·13 MR. KANAREK: Then: I ask for an evidentiary hearing first outside of the presence of the jury, your Honor, 14 THE COURT: I don't know why you don't anticipate 15 16 these things, Mr. Bugliosi. 17 Anticipate what? MR. BUGLIOSI: 18 The fact that the objection is going to THE COURT: 19 be made, the fact that the defendants are going to want to 20 see the pictures, if you showed him pictures, 21 Has he ever made an identification? 22 I don't know yet what the offer of proof is. Yes. 23 MR. BUGLIOSI: 24. THE COURT: What is the offer? 25 MR. BUGLIOSI: The offer of proof is that he feels

that the man he spoke to that day is Charles Manson, but

26

he can't be positive unless he sees the man in court.

THE COURT: Based upon some photograph that was shown him; is that it?

MR. BUGLIOST: Yes.

THE COURT: I am going to sustain the objection, then, at this time, until we determine what, if anything, he was shown, and the circumstances.

10c-1

2

İ

Ş

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16. 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26 MR. KANAREK: Then may we have a hearing outside the presence of the jury?

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Kanarek, certainly.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: How do you want to proceed from here?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have to go downstairs and get the album.

THE COURT: How long will it take?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Not more than five minutes to get the album.

THE COURT: Are you sure about the five minutes now?

I don't want to leave the jury sitting in the box for a half an hour.

MR. KANAREK: It would be outside the presence of the jury, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. It would be outside the presence of the jury anyway.

THE COURT: In that case, I will excuse them for lunch at this time.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I might say this: There is not going to be any issue that it was Manson.

As a simple offer of proof, on this particular day, the day Sharon was packing, he sent the man, whoever it was, back to the back house, and Rudy Altabelli, the owner of the premises, who was there, will testify that the man who was sent back there on the same day that Sharon

10c-2

à.

, §

Į5[,]

was packing to go to Rome was definitely Charles Manson because he had seen Manson at a prior occasion.

THE COURT: Then why do you need this witness?

MR. BUGLIOSI: To show the kind of harsh confrontation on the premises between Mr. Manson and this man here. They had a harsh confrontation.

It is very, very important, your Honor. It goes towards --

THE COURT: He can testify that a man appeared on a particular day. The identification is going to be made by someone else; is that right? We are not really involved with identification at all with this witness, according to your statement.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, the only problem is that the defense could argue -- there is no question in my mind about it that it is the same man -- but the defense could argue that the man that he had a bad confrontation with on the premises is not Charles Manson.

There is no doubt in my mind that it was.

THE COURT: I am not going to tell you how to try your case, Mr. Bugliosi, but if you try it one way, you have certain problems, and if you try it another way, you have problems.

Now, you have a problem. There has been an objection made. Apparently, you are going to have some type of identification, and it is a question that is

10c-3Ŧ

going to have to be resolved out of the presence of the jury.

3

2.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Why don't we do this? Why don't we continue on with his testimony without bringing Mr.

5

Manson out here? In any event, he will be able to testify

б

as to what the guy looked like and the confrontation on

10d fls.7 the premises.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2Ò, 21

22

23

24

25 26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

10d-1 1

2

3°

5.

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I can have him testify to that.

THE COURT: But no identification.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No identification at this time.

MR. KANAREK: Based on this offer of proof, I will object to any confrontation. It is remote. It goes back to the last of March. The prejudicial value far outweighs the probative value.

THE COURT: There isn't any confrontation at this point.

MR. KANAREK: That is what he is going to testify to.

That is what Mr. Bugliosi is going to solicit of the witness.

MR. BUGLIOSI: A confrontation with a man.

THE COURT: He can testify as a percipient witness that he waw a man on the premises.

MR. KANAREK: But, your Honor, it is remote.

THE COURT: He already told you how he will attempt to connect it up. The identification will be made by someone else.

MR. KANAREK: But he said there is a question that this person might not be the same person.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There is no question in my mind about it. What I am saying is that you are probably going to raise the question.

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Let's proceed.

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

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q You may continue, Mr. Hatami.

You say you were in the living room of the Tate residence?

A Yes.

Q And you saw a man walking towards the residence?

A Entering the yard of the residence.

Q Could you describe the manner in which he was walking?

A Hesitant, not very sure where he is going; and somehow, at the same time, walking very aggressively in the yard. I mean, he was just coming in without knocking at the door or just looking around to see who is there or not, or ringing the bell or something.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may that be stricken on the grounds of hearsay and conclusion, the last portion for instance, the statements about --

THE COURT: It is merely descriptive.

Overruled. The motion is denied.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Now, the fact that he appeared to be walking somewhat aggressively, did this disturb you?

ľ A That is why I came out and I asked him what 2 is it he wants? 3 He mentioned the name, which was not very I didn't heard the name before. familiar to me. 5, I said, "This is Polanski's residence. б people you may be looking for, maybe they are back there. 7 You have to take the back alley to go there. 8 Polanski's residence." ġ to a control tell him 10 Before the next question, your Honor, MR. KANAREK: 11 may this be stricken? 12 I ask that it be stricken, the last statement. 13 I don't even believe it was solicited by the question. 14. May it be stricken on the grounds of conclusion 15 and hearsay, your Honor? There is no basis for that 10e fl8. being in the record. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: There is a question of whether it is hear-say at all.

Are you offering it for the truth of the matter stated?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't believe it is offered for the truth of the matter.

I am offering it to show that the conversation was, in fact, engaged in by Mr. Hatami and this other individual.

MR. KANAREK: But there are certain implications from this statement, your Honor, as to what the person was doing.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

MR. FITZGERALD: Hearsay as to the non-declarant defendants, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: And it is certainly hearsay as to Mr. Manson.

There is no connection of this statement with Mr. Manson.

THE COURT: I don't believe it is hearsay at all.

The objections are overruled.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Was the man by himself?

A Yes. He was alone.

Q Did you tell him that he could not walk in front of the Tate residence towards the back house?

A. Yes.

I indicated to him the back alley.

"If you want the people you may be looking for, they might be there, and you have to take the back alley," MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, would your Honor ask the 3, witness - I don't believe the witness is too familiar À with court rules -- I would ask that it be stricken on the 5 grounds of conclusion and hearsay, but I would welcome your Honor admonishing the witness THE COURT: The motion is denied. 8 Delay your answer when there is an objection, sir, until the Court rules on it. 10 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 11 MR. BUGLIOSI: Now, Mr. Hatami, the term Q. 12 that you used was "back alley"? 13 Yes. I used "back alley," yes. 14 Those are your words? 15. Yes. 16 "Back alley"? 17 Yes. 18 And those are the words that you used with this Q 19 man? **20**. Yes. 21 Were you somewhat angry at him when you were 22 talking to him? 23 Because he was entering on property of a . 24 friend of mine, which I was concerned about because Roman

isn't there and Sharon is there.

25

26

MR. KANAREK: May that be stricken on the grounds of conclusion and hearsay, all of it after "yes," beginning with the word "because,", your Honor?

THE COURT: That portion of the answer will be stricken and the jury is admonished to disregard it.

Q Did you communicate this anger of yours to this man in the tone of your voice when you spoke to him?

1-1

Ž

 \mathbf{I}

3,

Ļ

5

·6.

7.

9

10

ĺľ.

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

MR. KANAREK: Calling for a conclusion and hearsay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Would you demonstrate, sir, — you might step off of the witness stand briefly and demonstrate to the best of your ability the manner in which you spoke to this man, try to repeat the words you used and the inflection and tone of your voice.

MR. KANAREK: I will object to that on the grounds of a conclusion and hearsay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You may step down off the witness stand.

THE WITNESS: What I have to do? I'm sorry.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay, step off the witness stand, try to remember exactly what you told this man and the manner in which you told him, the same inflection; if you spoke loudly, then speak loudly, if you were angry, speak in an angry fashion; if you were friendly, speak in a friendly fashion.

Try to recreate what you said to the man.

A. T He was coming in; I went toward him. He stopped and I asked him who is he looking for.

He mentioned the name, and then I angrily, of course, I wasn't happy that he was coming to that property, and looking after people he doesn't know, so I angrily pointed out, "This is not the place. The people you want is

ľ	back there and you have to take the back alley."
.2 .	Q You spoke kind of loudly to him?
3 .	A. Yes, a little irritated.
4	MR. KANAREK: I move that be stricken, your Honor,
5.	on the grounds it's a conclusion.
7	MR. BUGLIOSI: You may resume the witness stand,
ੁੰ ੇ `` 8`ਂ	sir.
9	Q About how tall was this man?
10.	A Well, he was not very tall, just around here of
11	my height. (Indicating.)
12	Q . Up to your chin?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q How tall are you, sir?
15	A 175 centimeters, which is almost around five-
16	eight, five I don't know, I don't know really exactly
17 .	my height.
18	Q How many centimeters are you, sir?
19	A 175; one meter 75 centimeters.
20	Q And you estimate that this man came up to your
21	chin?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q You know how tall Roman Polanksi is, of course?
24	A Roman is coming to around this height
25	(indicating).
26	Q Was this man the approximate height of Roman
40,	A TOHOTT

ļ,	Polanski?
. 2	A. Yes.
3	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, that is assuming facts not
4.	in evidence. We have no measuring rod. That is immaterial.
5	THE COURT: Overruled.
6	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Did he appear to be, then,
7	medium height or heavy or what?
8	A. Medium what?
. 9	Q I'm sorry, in terms of weight, was he then
10	medium or heavy?
11	A. He was thin,
- 12	Q How old did he appear to be?
· 13 🔩	A 32, 30.
14	Q Did he have short, medium, or long hair?
15	A Long.
16	Q Now, when you said these things to this man,
17	how did he react? What did he say or what did he do?
18.	MR. KANAREK: That is a conclusion and hearsay, your
19	Honor.
20	THE COURT: Sustained.
21	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: When you said these things
22	to this man, what did he do?
23.	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, that again is soliciting a
24	conclusion.
25	THE COURT: Overruled.
26	THE WITNESS: He was avoiding me, I mean, doesn't

looking at me, turned back, and went to, toward the back alley. MR. KANAREK: I ask that that answer be stricken, 3 the avoiding part is a conclusion. I ask it be stricken as a conclusion and 5 hearsay. 6 THE COURT: Thatportion of the answer will be stricken, 7 "avoiding." The rest of it will stay The jury is admonished to disregard that portion. 10 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: When you told him these things 11 did he appear to be upset with you? 12 MR. KANAREK: Calling for a conclusion. 13 MR. BUGLIOSI: Demeanor, your Honor, Holland vs. 14 Zollner. · 15 THE COURT: Overruled, you may answer. 16 THE WITNESS: I would say he was upset by his attitude, 17 . as I said, avoiding me, he looked upset. 18 · I mean, in my interpretation he was upset 19 because he did not stay and talk to me politely or excuse 20 He just walked back. himself. 21 MR. KANAREK: May that be stricken, your Honor? 22 THE COURT: Motion denied. 23 MR. BUGLIOSI: Step off the witness stand, sir, and . 24 follow me over here. 25 Would you speak into this microphone. This is 26

1	a diagram here, People's 8, this is a diagram of the Tate
2	residence.
3	A Yes.
4 .	And this is the front door right here.
5	A. Yes, I can see.
6 -	Q Do you recognize this walk right here
.7	(indicating)?
8	Does that appear to you to be a walk leading to
9	the front door of the Tate residence?
10	A. Yes, it is.
11	Q When you were talking to this man was he on the
12	walk?
13	A. No, he entered from this door to the lawn.
14.	This is the back alley, isn't it?
15	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I'm sure the jury cannot
16	see this, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Sit down, Mr. Kanarek. Let the examination
18	continue.
19	If they cannot see it they will communicate to
20	the Court.
21	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Now, this is
.22	A. This is the yard, this part?
23	Q This appears to be the yard right here, sir.
24	The front lawn of the Tate residence, the area
25	right here.
26	A. Yes. There is the walk the back alley I
r ., '	am indicating is below this area.

	Ī		
11a-1	1	Q	You see where it says walk right here?
	2	A,	That must be the back alley.
	3	Q	That is the back alley? It starts right back
	4	hëre?	·
	5	A	Yes, it starts right back here.
	. 6	Q	And goes all the way back to the back house?
	7	A	Yes.
	8.	ନ	There are some hedges here by the pathway?
	9	A	Some kind of plants dividing the back alley
,	10.	from the ya	rd.
	ļ1	Q	When you say the back alley, you are talking
	12	about the p	lace on the diagram here that says "walk."
<u>.</u>	13:	A	That is what I call the back alley.
	14	Q	There is a narrow path?
	15	A	Yes, how do you call it?
	16	Q	I probably call it a pathway, but you call it
	17	a back alle	y.
	18	A	Yes.
	19	Q	Was it dirt?
	20	A	It was muddy, ground, yes, it was asphalt or
	21	bricks, lik	e, there are bricks here, red bricks here
	22	(indicating) .
	23.	Q.	Where was this man when you were speaking to
	24	him in rela	tion to this diagram here?
	25	A	If I could see this is the front porch,
	26	this is the	living room.

	·	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
11a-2		I was in the living room here. He was almost
2	in the midd	le of this place here.
•	Q	About right there?
.4	A	Yes.
5.	Q	Did he ever come any closer to the residence?
. ć	A.	No, it was around there.
7	Q	Right there?
8	A	Yes, around there, 15, 20 feet from the door
9	here.	
10	Q.	About 15 or 20 feet from the front door?
n.	` A	Yes.
12	Q	Which was on the walkway?
13 :	.	Yes.
14	Q	It was not on the pathway?
15	· A	No.
1 6 [.]	Q	Not on the back alley?
i7	. A.	No.
18	Q	Could you place a little X on this diagram
19	where that	man was.
.20		(Witness complies.)
21		Where were you at the time you were speaking
22	to him, wer	e you close to him or were you far away or
23	what?	
24	.A.	Well, I was about four or five feet when I
25	got close e	enough to make my voice reach him.
26	ୃ	Four or five feet from him?
•	ľ	

		l l
11a-3	1	A Yes.
,	2	Q You were closer to the residence?
	3	A No, I was closer to him.
	.4	Q I'm sorry, but I mean you were not on this
	5 .	side of him, you were on the side of him that is closer
	6	to the residence?
	7	A Yes, I was between him and the residence.
	8	Q Then after you spoke to him did he turn around
	9 .	and walk away?
	10	A Yes.
	11	Q He walked in this direction?
	12	A Yes, and took this back alley and went
_	13	I did not follow him.
	14	Q You saw him taking this what you call the back
	15	alley?
	16	A Yes.
	17	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, sir, you may resume the
	18	witness stand.
	19	(To the Court:) May I mark this "Man Mr.
	20	Hatami spoke to"?
	21	THE COURT: You may.
	22	(Mr. Bugliosi so marks the exhibit.)
	23	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	24	Q You don't remember the name of the man whom
	25	this individual asked for?
,	26	A No.

	ŀ	
1a-4	1	Q You are not familiar with that name?
	2	A No.
•	3	Q In March of '69 were you familiar with the
•	4	name, Terry Melcher?
,	5	MR. KANAREK: Leading and suggestive, your Honor.
٠,	6	THE COURT: Overruled.
	7	THE WITNESS: I have not been familiar to that
	ġ. ·	name.
	9	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	10	Q So you don't know whether that was the name
	11	the man asked for or not, is that correct?
,	12	A No, I do not recall.
	13	Q As you were speaking to this man did anyone
	14	inside the residence come out of the residence?
	15	A When I told that man that he has to take the
	16	back alley, at that moment Sharon stepped out of the
	17	frame door of the entrance to the residence and asked
	1,8	who was it, or who is it.
	19	I said someone wants someone I thought is in
	20	there, and I indicated to him to go there.
	21	MR. KANAREK: May that last portion be stricken on
•	22	the grounds of hearsay, what his purported response was,
	23	your Honor?
	.24	THE COURT: The motion is denied.
	25	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	26	Q How far did Sharon step outside the door of

i i	
11a-5 1 :	the Tate residence?
2	A Maybe a feet or two, or didn't come out
3 →	really.
4.	Q When she stepped briefly outside, how far
5 5	away was she from this man?
6	A Well, five, fifteen
7.	Q feet?
8 .	A Yes.
9 .	Q Could they have seen each other?
10	MR. KANAREK: That's calling for a conclusion.
11	MR. BUGLIOSI: A percipient witness, he can testify
12	whether there was a capability for them to see each other,
13	your Honor.
14	MR. KANAREK: I don't think he can. I object on
15	the ground it is a conclusion and hearsay.
16	THE COURT: Overruled. You may enswer.
. 17	THE WITNESS: He could have seen her very easily.
18	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
19	Q As this man turned around and walked away and
20	then came back, walking on the pathway or the back alley,
.21 ·	was Sharon still standing by the doorway?
. 22	MR. KANAREK: That assumes facts not in evidence that
23	he came back, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Overruled, you may answer.
25	THE WITNESS: He could easily have seen Sharon there
.26	because Sharon did not immediately go in.
	•

	- 1	
11a-6	1	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	2	Q So he could have seen her at the beginning
•	3	and also when he was walking on the pathway?
	4	A Yes.
	5	MR. KANAREK: Compound, ambiguous, hearsay.
	.6	THE COURT: Overruled.
	7	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	8	Q Your answer is yes?
•	9	A Yes.
	10	Q Did Sharon stay outside for a while?
	ŢĪ,	A About four or five seconds, which I get back
	12	to the door.
	13	Q And when she was outside was she facing the
):	14	pathway or the back alley, as you call it?
	15 .	A Obviously.
	16	Q Did Sharon say anything to this man?
	17	A No.
	18	Q Did the man say anything to Sharon?
	19	A No.
	20	MR. BUGLIOSI; May we adjourn?
	21	THE COURT: Very well.
	22	The court will recess until 2:00 p.m., ladies
	23	and gentlemen, do not converse with anyone nor form nor
	24	express an opinion regarding the case until it is finally
	25	submitted to you
	26	1:45, correction, 1:45 this afternoon.

(Noon recess.)

12 fls.

CieloDrive.com ABCHIVES

5

8

. 10

11 . 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

24

25

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1970 1:50 P.M.

(The following proceedings occur in open court. All counsel and jurors present. Defendants absent.) THE COURT: All counsel and jurors are present.

MR. KANAREK: May I address the Court, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I apologize for being late.

I was in another court where it was arranged that I be there at 1:00 o'clock. I was there at 1:00 o'clock, and the Court did not come to the courtroom until about 1:30.

THE COURT: Yery well, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. FITZGERALD: May I approach the bench?

THE COURT: Yes.

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

MR. FITZGERALD: Your Honor, this afternoon at 1:30 I contacted the Superior Court Coordinator, Harold Frediani, in regard to putting somebody into a defense seat, and he refused on the ground that he didn't have time.

Now, I would like to point out to the Court

that I have sincerely attempted to abide by what I conceive to be ill-advised rules in regard to the seating in this courtroom to begin with, but they were the rules and, none-theless, I abided by them.

I lost my temper this noon, and I am still very, very angry.

I think the rules in regard to the seating in this courtroom are utterly capricious. For three weeks the seating in this courtroom has been sparse, to say the least.

I think this reserved seating is a preposterous sort of situation whereby the only rational motive I can see is an evil one, and the rational motive is that you, first of all reserve these seats, and then when the reserved people don't sit here, you can, therefore, exclude the general public.

THE COURT: Who is excluding the general public?
Anybody that wants to come into the courtroom, all they have to do is get in line with the rest of them and they will get in when their turn comes.

MR. FITZGERALD: It is their discrimination against me putting people in the seats.

.3'

4

5.

6

. · 7:

. **8**.3

10

11

12

13

14.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24.

Ţ

3.

5

``**6**,

9.

ÌÒ

1T 12

13

14 15

16

17

18.

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26 THE COURT: There are some reserved seats. That is correct, and the coordinator has many other things to do than to worry about the seating in this courtroom, so I don't think it is unreasonable for him to want to know the persons that are going to be put in the reserved seats a reasonable length of time in advance of the time, say, when it is desired they be seated.

But he told meabout the situation. I understand this was somebody from the Free Press.

They previously had a seat; they lost it because they did not use it. They can have another one if they want it.

If he doesn't happen to get in your seat because he wasn't on the list in time, all he has to do is get around in line with the public and he will be seated.

There are plenty of seats. I don't see what the problem is.

MR. FITZGERALD: If they can't show me some deference, I am not going to show the Superior Court some deference.

I've got other things to do, too, I cannot do one million things at once, and when I come in here at 1:30 and ask somebody be placed in one of my seats, I think that is reasonable.

If they don't want to do that for me, Judge, they don't have to.

THE COURT: I don't know who "they" is, but I assure

ź

Ħ,

5

you there will be no discrimination against anyone, Mr. Fitzgerald.

MR. FITZGERALD: I will set down in declaration form, and I will subpoens various members of the Superior Court, and I would like a hearing and I will make an allegation as a member of the Bar of the State of California that my client, Patricia Krenwinkel, is being deprived of a fair, public, open trial.

I am alleging as a member of the Bar there is discrimination in terms of seating in this courtroom, and I would ask your Honor to set down a convenient date for the taking or evidence.

I think that what has happened here, when we divided one-half of the courtroom and filled it with press; when they installed 28 telephones in the hallway and Teletype machines, in obvious deference to the press, in derogation of other members of the general public, I know well what I am saying and I can support it.

THE COURT: Well, how much more public can a trial be when you have all the media represented and the news come first and direct out of the courtroom to millions of people?

MR. FITZGERALD: Sure, it's just like Sheppard vs.

Maxwell. This Court has shown a sort of tragic deference to
the press.

The press can have anything in this courtroom.

THE COURT: That is absurd,

MR. FITZGERALD: I will support it by declaration and affidavit.

THE COURT: You do that, then.

MR. FITZGERALD: Can we have a convenient date for a hearing?

THE COURT: You file your affidavits and I will see what they consist of and whether it even warrants a hearing.

MR. FITZGERALD: Will you concede for the record that members of the press can come in here without any regard to general public seating; that they have reserved seats in this courtroom?

THE COURT: Certainly. They have been given reserved seats. No question about it.

It is perfectly obvious, Mr.Fitzgerald, I don't know what your problem is now, you apparently are upset about something.

MR. FITZGERALD: I am indeed upset.

THE COURT: There has to be a management of personnel; there has to be a management of the spectators; there has to be a management of the press. Otherwise, it is sheer confusion. That is all that is happening here.

If you did not get a guest in this afternoon, that is unfortunate but I assure you there's been no discrimination.

Let's get on with the trial,

25

1

2

. ġ

4

6

7

.8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16.

17

18

19

20

21

,22

23

24

I join with Mr. Fitzgerald. MR. KANAREK: Ŀ MR. HUGHES: I join. MR. SHINN: I join. 3 MR. BUGLIOSI: I've got two or three more questions of 4 Mr. Hatami and then the issue is going to come up of Wade 5 and Gilbert. .∙6 I guess the jury will have to be excused at 7 that point, is that correct? THE COURT: Yes. MR. BUGLIOSI: I have the photographs here. 10 THE COURT: Are you going to have him attempt an 11 identification? 12 MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't know how the Court is going 13 to handle that. 14 THE COURT: If he is not going to attempt to identify ``15 him ---16 MR. BUGLIOSI: Oh, yes, yes, I mean later, not now. . 17 I have the photographs I have shown him. 18 19 I think it might be a good idea to bring Mr. Manson out in front of Mr. Hatami outside the presence 20 of the jury, and also mark as exhibits the photographs that. 21 . 22 I showed him and see if they comply with Wade and Gilbert. 23 There are eight or nine of them. THE COURT: Wade or Gilbert don't deal with 24 photographs. .25 MR. BUGLIOSI: There is another name starting with S, 26

??

1	I forget the name of it, holding the same rule is applicable.
2	I forget the name of it, it's a Supreme Court
3	case.
4	THE COURT: I am familiar with it. I don't recall the
5.	name at the moment.
· <u>(</u> 6	MR. BUGLIOSI: I think I have it in my black notebook.
Ż	In any event, two or three questions from now
8	I will have reached that point.
9	THE COURT: At that time we will excuse the jury and
10,	proceed.
11	(The following proceedings were had in open
12	court in the presence and hearing of the jury:)
13	THE CLERK: State your name for the record.
14	THE WITNESS: Shahrokh Hatami.
15	
16	SHAHROKH HATAMI,
ì7	the witness on the stand at the time of the noon recess,
18	resumed the stand and testified further as follows:
19	
20	FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
2 2	Mr. Hatami, do you recall the color of this man's
23	hair, with whom you had this conversion in front of the Tate
24	residence?
25	A Dark.
26	Q Black?

٠,	d the state of th	
ί	A Dark brown or near to black.	
2	Q When you observed this man proceed in the	
Š	direction of the guest house	
4	A. Yes, he did.	
5	Q dld you see him come back from the guest	
6	house?	
7	A. Almost immediately or a minute, sometimes like	
-8	that, walking back.	
9	Q You saw him coming back?	
10	A. Back the same way.	
11	Q Okay.	
12	A. Looking towards the residence.	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18 .		
.19		
20		•
22		
23		
24		

14-1

2

1

.3 4

-5

б

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

^18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25.

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have no further questions at this time, your Honor.

There is another issue, of course, that will have to be resolved, perhaps at this time.

THE COURT: This matter will have to be taken up out of the presence of the jury.

I will ask the bailiff to take the jury upstairs temporarily while this matter is considered down here.

(Whereupon the jury leaves the courtroom and the following proceedings occur in open court out of the presence of the jury:)

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't know where the burden of proof is at this particular point. I imagine it is the defendants' burden. They are making a motion to exclude the in-court identification under Wade and Gilbert, and another U. S. Supreme Court case dealing with photographs, which I believe sets forth basically the same rule as Wade and Gilbert.

It depends on whom the Court wants to go forward first.

THE COURT: I think the People should go forward.

MR. KANAREK: Just for the record, I believe the burden is on the prosecution.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Very well.

Your Honor, I have here 12 photographs.

14-2	1	MR. SHINN: Can we see them first?
	2	MR. KANAREK: Yes. Can we see them?
	3	MR. BUGLIOSI: Of male Caucasians.
	4	May they collectively be marked as a Special
	5	Exhibit?
	6	A Special People's Exhibit No. 1, or some
	7	other designation, your Honor?
	. 8	THE COURT: What are the Special Exhibit numbers?
•	9	THE CLERK: The People's would start with 1. Ours
	10	is 12 next.
	11	THE COURT: They will be marked collectively as
Sp. Ex.	122	Special Exhibit 12.
•	13	(Mr. Bugliosi shows the photographs to Mr.
	14	Shinn and Mr. Kanarek.)
•	15	THE CLERK: Did you say 12 photographs, Mr.
	16	Bugliosi?
	17	MR. BUGLIOSI: 12 photos.
	18	I am sorry, your Honor. What is the designa-
	19	tion, the Special Exhibit designation?
	20	THE COURT: 12.
	21	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	22	Q Do you recall coming into my office, Mr.
	23	Hatami, about a half a year ago?
	24	A Yes.
	25	Q On the fifth floor of the Hall of Justice?
	.26	A I don't remember the floor. I came to your

		1	· ·
4-3	1	office.	;
	2 ,	Q	You will have to talk up a little more
	3.	loudly.	
•	4	A	Yes. I came to your office.
	5 .	Q.	And you were there with a man named Reeves
	·6	Witson?	
	7	A	Yes.
•	8	Q	He is a friend of yours?
	9	A	Yes.
	10	Q.	And I had a conversation with you about this
	11	man who wa	lked up in front of the Tate residence?
	12	A	Yes, you did.
	13	Q	Did I show you some photographs?
	14	A	Yes.
	15	. Q	I show you 12 photographs here marked
	. 1,6	Special Ex	hibit 12.
	17		Do you want to take a look at those photo-
	18	graphs and	indicate whether these are the photographs
	19.	that I sho	wed you in my office?
•	20	•	Take a look at all of them before you answer.
	21	; ; 	(Pause while the witness examines the
	22	photograph	us.)
	23	THE	WITNESS: I can't recall to having seen all
•	24	of them, b	out at least six of them I remember I have
	25	seen them.	
	26	. THE	COURT: What was the answer? Read the answer.

14-4	(The answer was read by the reporter.)
2	BY MR. BUÇLIOSI:
• · · 3	Q You mean you recognize six of the photographs?
14a f1s.4	A Yes.
.5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
19	
20	
21	
22.	
23	
24	
25	
.26	

14a-1 ¹	Q Did I show you more than six photographs?
. 2	A Yes.
, 3	Q But you can only recognize six of them?
. 4	A Yes.
5	Q About how many photographs did I show you?
; 6	A I didn't count them. There were several.
7	Many.
8.	Q More than six?
ġ	A Absolutely.
10	Q Looking at these photographs here, do you see
11	the man whom you have testified to as having had a conver-
. 12	sation in late March, 1969?
13	A I have to look at them one by one.
14	Q Okay. Go ahead.
15	(The witness spreads all the photographs out
16	on the witness stand.)
17	THE WITNESS: This one has the closest resemblance,
18	but the man did not have a beard.
19	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
20	Q He did not have a beard, the man that you
21	spoke to?
22	A No.
. 23	Q But this looks like the man?
24	A Not the hair so much back, but long hair.
25	Not pulled back. But that kind of clean face around the
26	eyes.

1
2
3
4
ʻ,Ś,
6
7
B
9.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
Į8
19
20
21
22

24

25

26

MR. KANAREK: May I approach the witness with Mr. Bugliosi, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. BUGLIOSI: May the record reflect that the photograph Mr. Hatami has picked out is a photograph of Charles Manson? Or so stipulated, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: Well, there is no need to stipulate. There is no need for a stipulation. We can mark it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: May the record reflect that, your Honor?

(The photograph is handed to the Court.)

THE COURT: The photograph should be marked, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: 127

THE COURT: Mark it 12-A, if you like.

(Mr. Bugliosi marks the photograph.)

MR. BUGLIOSI: May the record reflect, then, that 12-A is a photograph of Charles Manson, your Honor?

THE COURT: This is something either you are going to have to stipulate to or prove, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. KANAREK: I can't stipulate. There is no need to stipulate at this point, in any event.

THE COURT: Then there is no need to make any comments.

MR. KANAREK: Very well.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would request, at this time, your

Honor, that Mr. Manson be brought out and allow Mr. Hatami to view him.

MR. KANAREK: We are having a hearing as to the use of these pictures, your Honor. I don't think it is appropriate to have Mr. Manson brought out at this point because the foundation has to be legally laid.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have no other foundation other than I showed him several photographs and he has testified that he recognizes six of these as being among the photographs that I showed him.

THE COURT: I think he should indicate those photographs that he knows that he saw previously that were shown to him by the prosecution.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.

Q Would you indicate, sir, among these 12 photographs, the ones that you recognize having been shown before?

(The witness picks certain photographs up from the witness stand.)

THE WITNESS: These. And I remember that one too.

MR. KANAREK: Referring to 12-A, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

MR. HUGHES: May I approach the witness also, your Honor?

MR. BUGLIOSI: May I mark these other photographs
12-B, -C, -D, -E and -F?

:	1	THE COURT: Yes, they should be marked also.
	2	You will be given an opportunity to see the
	3	photographs, Mr. Hughes.
	4	(Mr. Bugliosi marks the back of the photographs
	5	BY :MR. BUGLIOSI:
	6	Q Do you recall seeing this photograph here
. 1	7	before?
	. 8	A I don't remember.
7. .*	. • • 9 .	MR. KANAREK: So we can have the record, your Honor,
t -	10	may those that
:	. 11	MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you want me to stipulate as to who
	12	this is, Mr. Kanarek? I will enter into a stipulation
····	13	with you.
	14.	MR. KANAREK: I am merely asking that it be marked
	15	because you are picking up a picture and the record will
	16	not reflect when we cross-examine as to which one.
	17	MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.
	18	May it be marked 12-G, your Honor?
2-G	19	THE COURT: Very well.
	20	(Mr. Bugliosi marks the photograph.)
	21	MR. BUGLIOSI: I have no further questions so far as
	22	the photographs are concerned, your Honor.
	23	MR. KANAREK: May we examine, your Honor?
	24	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
	25	Mr. Fitzgerald, any questions?
	2 6	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.

May I approach the witness to look at the pictures, your Honor?

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, may we take a brief recess?

THE COURT: Just a moment, sir.

(A disturbance occurs outside the courtroom.)

THE COURT: The Court will recess for 15 minutes.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: All counsel are present, the jury is not present. You may continue, Mr. Bugliosi: MR. BUGLIOSI: With respect to the photograph, I have no further questions. I will request an in-court identification at this point. THE COURT: We will have the cross-examination first. Mr. Shinn? MR. SHINN: Thank you, your Honor. May I approach 11 the witness? 12 THE COURT: 13 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. SHINN: 16. Now, which of these six pictures that you 17 state Mr. Bugliosi showed you --18 That one there (handing Mr. Shinn a picture.) 19 MR. SHINN: 12-A, 12-B, C, D, E, and F, 1s that 20 correct? 21 THE WITNESS: Whatever is marked there. 22 Now, what date was this when you saw these 23: pictures, do you recall the date, the approximate date? 24 Around -- wait a minute -- end of April, around 25 that time. 26 April of 1970? Q.`

25

26

obvious in those pictures, yes, that is what I am recalling, the eyes and the hair and the beard.

Q Yes, being a good friend of Miss Tate you followed this case pretty closely, did you not?

A No, unfortunately, or fortunately, I am disgusted with the memory of what has happened to my friend.

Q Yes, but because of your friendship with Miss Tate you followed this case pretty closely before you saw these pictures, did you not?

A No, because, as I told you, it's quite an emotional situation for me; I liked her and I admired her very much, so I did not want to care about what's happened and how did it happen as long as she doesn't exist any more; she is not alive any more, so I didn't try to find out how it happened.

Q But you were curious, were you not?

A I was curious in the beginning, until supposedly they caught the responsible ones.

I am not the one to judge, but when they caught them and the press and everybody was enthusiastic about the finding of the responsibles, I honestly, truly -- I am under oath -- I did not follow that, nor in the press nor in the newspaper and television.

Whatever I'm hearing on the radio or occasionally here, I have the biggest collection of photos on Sharon Tate; I did not circulate them. I don't make

business with them because I just did not want to think about the whole tragedy, how did it happen and why it's happened, she wasn't with us any more. 3. 5∵ .9 , .

20.

16-1	1
	2
	3
	4.
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
•	12
	13
	14
•	15
	16
	17
k	18.
	19
	20

22

23

24

25

26

Q But you are a photographer?

A Yes.

Q And being a photographer, you look at a person's face or picture and you can remember it pretty well; is that right?

A Yes, I do. Yes.

Q The fact that you saw his picture in other magazines and newspapers before you looked at these photographs, that kind of helped you pick out that picture; isn't that true?

A No. Because I pointed out to Mr. District
Attorney --

THE COURT: Sit back. You are a little too close to the microphone.

THE WITNESS: I am sorry, sir.

I pointed out to Mr. District Attorney that these pictures with the hair would block my memory because they are dominating in my memory of Charles Manson.

I did not know a man called Charles Manson before you arrested -- I mean, before someone arrested him.

So, in the pictures I remember him, the physiognomy of the man that I saw there. I didn't know Charles Manson. The man that I saw had the resemblance to that picture that I indicated. I mean, a little beard, which there is the appearance in that picture, and

23

24

25.

26

not too much long hair as it has in this picture.

I mean, that is what I am explaining, my observation of the photographs. I am not putting any views out.

Q My question was:

The fact that you saw the photograph of this person before you picked it out on these photographs, that kind of helped you pick out that one picture; isn't that correct?

- A Not really.
- Q But in a way it helped you, did it not?
- A I can't say yes because I was not looking after Charles Manson or being forced to choose any picture. I just chose what I thought was the closest resemblance to the person I saw, and I indicated that that is the closest resemblance to the man that I saw that day.
 - Q Now, you picked out one; correct?
 - A I beg your pardon?
- Q You picked out one of the six photographs there?
 - A The closest.

I picked one among the 12 shown to me now.

Q No. No.

My question is: When you first picked this picture out for Mr. Bugliosi months ago, he showed you approximately six photographs; correct?

I.	A No. It was a number of pictures more than	
2-	six.	
3	Q It was more than six?	
4	A Yes.	
, 5	Q Approximately how many pictures did he show	W
6	you?	
7	A Well, a bunch of pictures. I didn't count	:
.8	them one by one. I didn't need to count them one by one	ne.
9 (I just saw a bunch of pictures and I showe	d
10	to him that one as the closest resemblance to the pers	on.
11	Q Now, these other photographs besides Exhib	its
12	A to, I believe E, did he show you those other photogra	phs
13	too?	
14	A I just mentioned I do not recall correctly	
15	having seen all of them, but six of them definitely,	
6a fls. 16	which I indicated.	
17		
î8		•
19		
20 ⁻		
21		
22.		
23		
24		
25		
26		

23

24

25

26

Q Okay.

Now, out of the six, you picked out one; correct?

- A Well, I picked out one among the 12, which is one of the six I remember having seen.
 - Q Which one is the one you picked out?
 - A. That is the one that I picked out. (Indicating)
 - Q That is 12-A?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Okay.

Now, out of these five, are there any other pictures that you feel that may look similar?

A. Not when you put the two of them before me.

The resemblance of these eyes and those eyes are close, but not the resemblance of the physiognomy, because you remember people altogether, you don't remember their eyes if you are not closely associated with them very day or all the time. You just remember the resemblance of altogether. You do not go into details.

You put them in front of me, close to each other, so I see the resemblance of this picture to that one.

Q When you say this one to that one, you are referring to 12-F?

A When I referred to the pictures I didn't look behind them.

Q And 12-A?

(Mr. Shinn shows the witness the back of the photograph.) THE WITNESS: 12-F and 12-A, yes. MR. SHINN: Those are among the two that 4. Mr. Bugliosi showed you? The two were among the bunch of pictures that I 6 🐇 saw that day. 7 . Now, but of the bunch of pictures that you saw that day, were there any other photographs that you would 9 say look similar? 10 If there was, I wasn't quite -- I mean, I didn't И accentuate on any special pictures. I just gave my 12 observation of which is the closest resemblance. 13 14 I can't say that resemblance is the man that I 15 It is the closest resemblance. Because the man I saw 16 did not have any beard. He was not clean-shaven, but a 17 little hair. 18: MR. SHINN: Your Honor, may we approach the bench, your 19. Honor, before I ask the next question, your Honor? 20 It has to do with the photographs. 21 MR. BUGLIOSI: There is no jury. Why approach the bench? 23 MR. HUGHES: I would object to approaching the bench. 24 We are not in front of the jury, your Honor. 25 MR. SHINN: I'm sorry, your Honor. I forgot the jury 26 wasn't here.

Your Honor, in view of the fact that there are two pictures here that the witness has testified was shown by Mr. Bugliosi at that time, your Honor, I believe that there were no other two photographs of the same person except Mr. Manson's, your Honor, and I feel that under the Wade and Gilbert cases, this is even an unfair photo line-up. THE COURT: I didn't understand your statement. Mr. Shinn.

ż

5

7

"10

- 11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

2Ì

16b-1

2

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15.

16

17

18 `

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, I believe that there are two pictures of this group here, or of the group of pictures that Mr. Bugliosi showed this witness, and I believe under the Wade and Gilbert cases you cannot show two of one person. You have got to have all single or all double pictures.

This is an unfair photo lineup, your Honor. It is highly suggestive.

THE COURT: Suggestive of what?

MR.SHINN: Of Mr. Manson.

There are two of Mr. Manson's pictures, your Honor.

THE COURT: Of course, the witness is not sure how many photographs were shown. He only selected six that he recalled. He said there were others.

MR. SHINN: Yes. Then I asked him whether or not there were other photographs that looked similar to this one that he picked, your Honor.

I believe, your Honor, unless Mr. Bugliosi is going to demonstrate to us that he had two of each of the pictures that he showed this witness, your Honor, it is an unfair lineup to Mr. Manson.

THE COURT: This isn't the time for argument.

MR. SHINN: No. It is a motion.

THE COURT: Other counsel may wish to examine too, Mr. Shinn.

1,	MR. SHINN: Yes. This is my motion.
2	THE COURT: Are you through with your examination?
3	MR. SHINN: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Anyone else?
5	MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Very well, Mr. Kanarek.
7	MR. KANAREK: Thank you.
8	May I approach the witness, your Honor?
9	THE COURT: You may.
10	·
1Í	CROSS-EXAMINATION
1,2	BY MR. KANAREK:
13	Q This picture, 12-A, that you say you identified
74	when you saw Mr. Bugliosi six months ago is that correct
15	A Yes.
16	Q This picture says right on it "Charles Milles
17	Manson"; right?
18	A But
19	Q Would you just answer the question, Mr. Hatami?
20.	A I haven't seen it yet even before me here.
21	I am not reading the writing. I looked at the pictures.
22	Q I understand that Mr. Bugliosi called you as
23	a witness and all of that, but would you just answer the
24	questions, Mr. Hatami?
.25	MR. BUGLIOSI: The photograph speaks for itself.
26	MR. KANAREK: Many times in this case, your Honor,

24.

Mr. Bugliosi has used a document and said: Does this say this? I am asking for equal protection of the law.

not clear to me what it means, but it is code.

25

26

ability.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I ask that be stricken because that is not an answer to my question.

THE COURT: You asked him if he could read it. The motion is denied.

MR. KANAREK: I am asking him to read every item that is on here.

THE COURT: Ask your next question, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Very well, I will ask this question:

Q Would you read for us at the beginning, because this has to do with his perception, your Honor, and his ability to read.

Would you read for us, and I am not now asking you to comment, just read for us everything you see in the bottom of this picture directly across as if you were reading it, read it into the record.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I object on the ground it's irrelevant.
MR. KANAREK: It goes to show his perception, his

We are going to make certain motions to the Court. I think it is most important as to whether or not the man can read these items.

Mr. Bugliosi can make his argument, but on this issue it's very important.

- Q Just read,
- A I can read here:

"Charles Milles, 1113434 Charlie, 714 Brn Brn

"Cm 1071. 1530 HS Poss Marijuana." All right, you have left out the word Manson. Ish't the word Manson there? 3 THE WITNESS: But, your Honor, Manson is not mentioned 4 here, Manson, I don't see here any Manson. 5 BY MR. KANAREK: You don't see Manson, 6 M-a-n-s-o-n, on the second line? I can see a-n-s-o-n. There is no m on this 8 picture. 9 Q, You don't see that? ·10· There is no m, sir. Ų Pardon? 12 There is no m in this picture. 13 You notice there is no m? 14 I am just noticing now, but honestly I couldn't 15 have time to read this writing when the pictures were shown 16 to me because I am not judging the pictures by writing. I 17 just -- the pictures have been shown to me to choose the 18. resemblance of the pictures with the man I saw that day. 19: Yet I don't know Charles Manson, I haven't seen 20. him in person. 21 Your Honor, that may be the answer to MR. KANAREK: 22 some question, but I ask all of that be stricken. 23 THE COURT: Denied. 24. BY MR. KANAREK: Then may I ask you this, 25 Mr. Hatami, do you see on this picture, a-n-s-o-n?

+	MY. DAGRIORY: THE THE Deen with the four tottok,
.2	THE COURT: Sustained.
.3	MR. KANAREK: I haven't had an answer to that, your
4	Honor,
5	THE WITNESS: I
6	THE COURT: Just a moment.
7	Ask your next question.
8.	MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor.
9	Q BY MR. KANAREK: Now, do you know, Mr. Hatami,
10	how many pictures Mr. Bugliosi showed you?
11 ·	A No. I dor't remember.
Ì2'	And is it a fair statement that when Mr. Bugliosi
13	spoke with you, you say in April of 1970
14,	A. I —
. 15	Q Let me finish, I haven't finished.
16	that you knew the name Manson. You knew
17	that Charles Manson was arrested in connection with this
Ĵ8	case?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q You knew that name, right?
21	A Yes.
22	And this very picture, 12-A, is a picture that
23	you say you identified as that of Mr. Manson?
24	A I
25	Q Would you just answer that?
26	A. I did not identify. This is I said this is
	the closest resemblance to the man I saw.

17a-1	1	Q And this appears to be the very picture with
	2	the lettering beneath it that Mr. Bugliosi showed you,
	3.	right?
	4	A Yes.
	-5	MR. KANAREK: Thank you.
	6	Thank you, your Honor, no further questions
,	7	at this time.
	8	I don't know if Mr. Bugliosi rests or not.
	9	THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Hughes?
	10	MR. HUGHES: Yes, your Honor, thank you.
	п	
	12	CROSS-EXAMINATION
	13.	BY MR. HUGHES:
	14	Q When were you shown these photographs, Mr.
	15	Hatami?
	16	A Either at the end of April or beginning of
	17	May, I do not remember.
	18 .	Q At what time during the day?
	19	A It was sometime in the morning or in the
	20	afternoon, I don't remember.
	, 21	Q I see, and where was that?
	22	A In Mr. Bugliosi's office.
:	23	Q Here in the Hall of Justice?
	24	A Here in the building.
	25	Q Room 546?
	26	A Pardon?

		•	
17a-2	1	Q.	Room 546?
	2`	A.	I do not remember the number.
	3	Q	Were you wearing glasses?
	4.	A	I beg your pardon?
	5	Q	Were you wearing glasses?
	6	A	I wearing glasses? No, I don't.
	7	Q	How was the viewing set up, were you called in
	.8	to look at	the photographs or what?
	9	A	The viewing, it was normal for me.
	10	Q	Were you called in by Mr. Bugliosi? Did you
	n Î	come down or	n your own?
	12 :	A	No, I have been called by his office to come
	13	down.	
	14	Q	Who was present when you were shown the
	15	photographs	?
	16	A	Mr. Reeves Witson.
	17	Q	And Mr. Bugliosi?
	18	A	And Mr. Bugliosi.
	19	Q	And yourself?
	20	A	And myself.
	21	. Q	And no one else?
	22	A	No one else.
	23	Q	And what was said before you were shown the
·	24	photographs	by Mr. Bugliosi?
	25	A	I cannot recall the chronological conversation
1	26	There was a	conversation before, or questioning before or
	• •		

17a-3 1 showing pictures before or after. Did you come in the room and he did not say Q 2 anything? Ż A No, he spoke and he asked me about my being 4 in the house that day. 5 I said yes. б He said "Do you remember a man came to the 7 house?" 8 I said, "Yes." 9: And then I tried to refresh my memory by 10. thinking more and more in the case about what he was 11 12 asking me. And did you see where the photographs came 13 Q 14 from? 15 A No. And you don't recall how many there were? 16 Q 17 A No. 18 And do you recall in what order you were 19 shown the photographs? 20 Not a special order. A 21 Do you recall, were they in a pile, one on 22 top of the other? 23 They were one on top of the other. A 24 And do you recall which photograph was on Q. 25. top?

26

A

No.

17a-4 ₁	Q	Do you recall the picture which has the
2	legend, Mans	on, Charles Milles, was on top?
3	À	No, it wasn't on top.
4	Q	Did you look at the backs of the photographs?
5	A	No, because it couldn't be a photographer's
6	pictures.	
7		I mean, I look at the back of pictures when
8	it is photo	grapher pictures.
9	Q	Did you see any writings on the back of any
10	of the phot	ographs?
11	A	I did not look at them.
12	Q	Did you say anything while you looked at
ļá	photograph	No. 1?
. 14	A .	No, No. 1 on that pile showed to me? I did no
15	Q	Did you say anything when you looked at
16	photograph	No. 2?
17	A ,	No, I just looked at them once; I went back
18	again. I l	ooked twice.
19		I just choose the closest resemblance to my
20	memory.	•
21	Q	How about when you looked at photograph No. 3?
22	A	No, I don't recall seeing anything the first
23	time.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
24	Q	How about photograph No. 4?
25	A .	No.
26	Q	Did anyone say enything to you when you looked

1	at photograph No. 1?
2	A No.
3	Q Did anybody say anything to you while you
4	looked at photograph No. 2?
5	A Nothing happened except during my studying th
·6	pictures, not the first time and the second time.
7	When I finished studying and I pointed out
8	the closest resemblance to the person, then
9	Q Did you say anything when you picked out the
io	photograph of Mr. Manson?
11	A No, I just said "That is the closest resem-
12.	blance to the man I saw."
13	Besides I was always pointing out to Mr.
14	Bugliosi that the man did not have beard, without beard,
15	"Do you have pictures of him without beard?"
16	This is the closest resemblance to the man.
17	Q Did Mr. Bugliosi say anything in reply to
18	that?
19	A Mr. Bugliosi no, he didn't.
20	Q What first caused you to believe the photo-
'2 1	graph you picked out was that of the defendant?
22,	A I did not know that he is a defendant, and I
23 [.]	did not know that all those pictures shown, that they are
24	the defendants of any case.
25	There were a lot of pictures shown to me.
26	Q What made you think the photograph you saw

	1	was the man you had seen up at the house?
	2	A Resemblance, not having seen I said the
	. 3	resemblance.
	· - 4	Q Was there some characteristic of his face
	5	that called your attention was it his eyes, his jaw,
	6	his eyebrows, his nose, his chin, jaw, scars, something
	7	else?
	8	A The physiognomy of the face, I mean the form
	· 9 /	of the face which is in that picture closest to my memory
,	ıó.	of the person I saw that day.
•	1 i	Q Was it triangular shaped, oval? What was the
	12	physiognomy?
	13	A How do you call that, oval or triangular,
	14	I don't know, I'm not
	15	Q You are not a physiognomist?
	16.	A Yes, what you call it, I don't know what it
L7b	fls. 17	means.
	18	
	i 9	
	20	
•	2 1	
	22	, ,
	23	
	. 24	
	25	
•	.26	

23

24

25

26

Q Did you look through the rest of the photographs once you selected the one that depicted the man you had seen at the Altobelli house?

A. Sir, I knew the importance of my selection, or observation, whatever you may call it.

I did not hurry up to judge over the first pictures I saw, I went through them twice, three times.

But when you went through the photographs did you set more than one of them aside?

A. Not by the curiosity -- by curiosity of knowing who they are.

Q Which ones did you set aside?

A. The same picture I am curious to know, I didn't get any answer from Nr. Bugliosi, it was a picture resembling a painter I knew.

Q You don't see that picture there today, do you?

A. Yes, it's there, but I never got an answer from Mr. Bugliosi.

He said, "Never mind."

How did you determine that those you did not select were not the person that you saw at the Tate house?

A. Would you repeat the question, please?

How did you determine that the pictures which you did not select were not the person that you had seen?

A The other pictures I did not select, they had resemblance to the person I saw in the Tate house, I would

1 have pointed out. They did not resemble. 2 After you selected the photograph as being the 3 person you had seen at the Altobelli residence, did anyone 4 present in the room say anything to you? 5 6 No. After you made the selection were you told any-7 thing about the person whom you had selected or about one of 8 . 9 the defendants in this case? - Would you repeat the question? 10 After you made this selection were you told any-11 12 thing about Mr. Manson or any other defendant? No. I know only the name of Manson and one of the 13. 14. girls' names, possibly, Susan something, and I did not say 15 anything. Did you ask to see any more photographs? 16 17 Α. No. 18 Did anyone tell you that you have the right Q. 19 man? . . If anybody told me what? A. 21 Did anyone tell you that you have the right 22 man? 23 I remember in one phase that day another A 24 gentlemm came into the room, was presented to me as 25 Mr. Stovitz or something that way pronounce, and they talked together, Mr. Bugliosi and him,

I don't know what they saying together. 1, 2 Did Nr. Stovitz tell you that you had selected 3 the right man? 4 No, he did not. There were exchange of looks toward each other. Can you single out one characteristic in the 7 photograph that you picked out that is the most important in your identification, and I will give you the six photo-, 9 graphs again? ŤŎ . I will give you all of the photographs. MR. HUGHES: May I approach the witness, your Honor? Ц 12 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 13 MR. HUGHES: Thank you. 14 The characteristic, I would say, is THE WITNESS: the age and resemblance, because, for instance, this 16 picture is very young, younger than the person I saw. 17 You are referring now, when you hold that, when 18 you say that picture, which picture -- would you read the 19 back? 20 It has no number on it. 21 I see. 22 And this picture also is too young of the person 23 I saw; this is too old -- older than the one I saw. 24 This is 12-C. This is the picture, 12-F, which 25 is in the press, of course it is obvious it was Manson's · 26 picture.

This were older. 2 This is a younger man than Manson, that man's 3 age. This is older, and that has not the same face at all, he is a very tall -- looks like being on a tall body. Ť This one did not indicate anything to me, this ٠8, picture. .9, This is too young. 10 This is the painter which I suspected knowing 11 him. I did not get an answer. 12 And I did not pay at all attention to this one. 13 It is a dark picture. 14 This is the age and the resemblance. I would 15. very much like to see pictures without beard of him if there 16 is around. 17 Did the pictures appear similar then? 18: No. none of these pictures looked similar. 19 So none of the other photographs then had any of the similar characteristics which you picked out, is 20 21 that correct? 22 Resemblance, I would say, none of them had 23 the resemblance to the man I saw. ' 24 And did that one photograph of Mr. Manson have 25 information on it that led you to believe that he had 26 been arrested?

1	Α,	Well, it's obvious to me that it was a police
2 .	picture.	
. 3	Q	That was obvious to you at the time you saw
4	the pictures	in Mr. Bugliosi's office?
5	Å,	Pardon?
6	Q.	That was obvious to you when you saw the
7.	pictures in	Mr. Búgliosi's office?
8	A.	That it was police pictures?
9	Q , 100	Xes.
10	. A.	Yes.
11	۵	And did any dates appear on any of the photo-
12	graphs?	
13	A.	I did not look at the writing on any pictures.
14	Q	So you did not know when any of those
15	photographs	was taken?
16	A.	No.
17	Q.	Did any of the photographs contain more than
18	one angle of	any of the people that you saw?
19		I mean this is the same pictures of the same
20	person in to	vo different angles, is that what you mean?
21	Q.	Yes.
22	Α.	I saw a resemblance on one picture to another,
23	and this is	the two.
24		This is because of long hair. They are not the
2 5	same person	possibly, I don't know no, they are not the
26	same person	

'	·	1
· 1 .	MR. HUGHES: May I approach the witness?	Ì
2	THE COURT: Yes.	
3	Q BY MR. HUGHES: Now, referring now to 12-E and	
4	12-F, is that right?	ì
5	A Yes.	-
6	Q Is there a similar physiognomy on those two	
7	people?	
8	A. The beard.	
. j.	Does there appear to be similar structure?	
10	A. There is	
11.	Q Similar nose?	
12.	A. There is	
j ś .	Q Similar chin?	
14	A. It's covered by a beard. You cannot see.	
15	Q Similar color hair?	-
16	A They are black-and-white pictures.	
17.	Q Similar tone according to the black-and-white?	
18	A No, they are not similar tone.	
19	Q The pictures are of different grain	
20	and quality?	ŀ
21	A They are of different grain and quality.	
22	Q Is it difficult for you to tell if it's similar	
23	tone of the hair?	
24	A. I think I can say more that the eyes do not have	ŧ
25.	same lighting on, it could look different.	
26	They have the same long hair, but it is not the	

same person.

2.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 .

14

15

16

17

18

I mean, I cannot say that they are the same person because there is no resemblance except the hair and beard.

The faces are different, the construction of the face are different.

- Is it more likely that you saw at the Altobelli's residence, that you saw the person depicted in 12-G or the person depicted in 12-F?
- A None of them, because they both have beard and the person I saw there did not have beard.
- Going by the rest of the physiognomy is it more likely in your mind that you saw the person depicted in this photograph, 12-F, or this photograph, 12-E?
 - A. None of them.
 - Q You are unable to tell?
- A No, I am unable to tell.

18

19

20

.21·

22

23

24

25

.26

•	
	±
KRI	18-11
	. 2
	3
•	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	, ·9
,	. 10
	. 11
	12
	13
	14
	15.
	16.
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22

25

26

	ନ୍ଦ	How	many	of	the	photographs	there	before	you
have	beards	ž.							

A How many?

Q How many of the photographs before you have beards, depict a person wearing a beard?

A How many of the photographs here?

Q Yes.

A There are two, if you call yours a beard and you call this a beard. They are not the same.

This is a small beard. You have a big one.

Q Two of them have full beards and two of them have small beards?

A Yes, that is what they look like, yes.

MR. KANAREK: If I may, your Honor?

In order to perpetuate the record, your Honor, each of his identifications will be lost so far as the record is concerned unless we mark it for identification, unless we mark the back of the pictures that are not yet marked.

May they be marked, your Honor, so it isn't lost in the record?

THE COURT: This is Mr. Hughes' examination.

MR. HUGHES: If you would like to recross again, Mr. Kanarek, perhaps his Honor would allow you to.

Q How many of the pictures that you see there do the people have long hair?

.8∹2	1	A	It depends on what you call long hair.
<u> </u>	2	Q,	What do you call long hair, sir?
	3	A	Well, long hair? I think Mamson's hair is
	4	long hair, t	he photographs of Manson.
	5	Q	How many people have hair as long as that
	. 6	photograph?	·
	7		Is that 12-F, sir?
	8 ;	A	Only two persons here.
ı	9 .	Q;	Only two persons?
* *	10	A	Yes. As long as that one.
	11.	Q	How many persons in the photographs appear to
•	12	be of the sa	me height?
	13	A	It is a portrait, it is a close-up, and you
	14	can't say.	•
	15	Q	But some of them you were able to tell, is
	16	that right,	that they were taller?
	17	A	Yes.
•	. 18		I can say these two men are. They definitely
	19	are taller t	han me.
	20	Q:	Is that because they have a lanky physiognomy
	21	in their fac	e?
•	22	A	Yes, and also a long neck.
	23		There is a certain proportion to a human's
	24	body.	
	25.	Q	How many people of the photographs before
,	26	you, Mr. Hai	ami, appear to be of the same age?

18-3	
	1
	2
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
:	8
	9
	.1Ò.
	1Ĺ
	12
	13
	14.
•	15
•	16
	17
•	18
l8a fls.	19
	20
,	22

24

25

26

A	Would you repeat that?
Q	How many of the people depicted in those
photographs	appear to be the same age?

A They are close to each other, I could say, but I can't say the same age.

To my observation, maybe it is not the same as yours, but these two, maybe they have a close age to each other.

Q How old would those two appear to you to be?

A Between 20 to 24.

Q Now, directing your attention to Mr. Manson's picture, 12-F. I believe it is on your left there.

How old would the person in that picture appear to be?

A It could be anything from 28 to 38.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I know it is Mr. Hughes' examination, but I think due process allows us to have a complete record, and I would ask that it be marked so that we can have some kind of identification.

THE COURT: They have been marked.

MR. KANAREK: Well, there are some there that have not been that he is referring to in this examination, your Honor. They are not marked and the record is lost. We have nothing to refer to that we can tie into.

MR. HUGHES: May I approach the witness, your Honor?

MR. KANAREK: May they be, your Honor? I make a
motion that the rest be marked.

MR. HUGHES: Q Directing your attention to 12-G.

Will you tell us how old the person/that photograph appears to be?

A. Because he has a beard, he can be anything between 25 to 35.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I have several of these photographs that I would like to mark. What is the next in order, please?

THE CLERK: It will be 12-A to 12-L.

THE COURT: We will have to see how many have been marked with the letters, Mr. Hughes, and we can start from there.

THE CLERK: The People marked A to F.

THE COURT: The next will be G.

MR. HUGHES: There is one already marked 12-G, your Honor.

THE COURT: 12-H.

20

21

22

23

24

1	(Mr. Hughes marks on the back of the photograph.)
2	MR. HUGHES: This is a double mugshot of a male
3 '	Caucasian, marked 12-H.
4	Q How old does this gentleman appear to be,
5.	Mr. Hatami?
₋ 6	A. 12-H? Between 20 to 24.
7	Q And would you say that his hair is as long as the
8	hair depicted in photograph 12-F?
· 9	A. No. 12-F is longer than 12-H.
10	Q And does the gentleman depicted in that photo-
11 ,	graph, 12-H, appear to be much younger than the person
12	depicted in 12-F7
13	A Obviously.
14	Q And does he appear to be of a different height,
15	judging by his physiognomy and his neck?
1 ģ	A. Different height?
17	He looks to me shorter than these pictures, than
1,8	the man on 12-H.
19	MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I have another photograph.
20	12-I? A male Caucasian. May it be so marked, 12-I?
21	THE COURT: It may be so marked.
22	(Mr. Hughes marks the photograph.)
23	MR. HUGHES: Q Differentiating, now, between
24	12-H and 12-I. Does the gentleman depicted in 12-I
25	appear to be much younger than the person depicted in
26	12-F?

, 1	A. 12-I is much younger.
2	Q Can you tell us anything about what you suspect
3	his height would be?
4	A. I can't. It is not a very precise picture.
5	It only shows the neck. It doesn't go below the neck as
6	does this one.
7	This one goes just to the chest.
8	Q You are talking about 12-H now?
9	A. I am talking about 12-H.
10	12-H doesn't show 12-I doesn't show
ĮI.	more than the neck, and the neck is covered by the numbers.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
.22	
23	
24	
25	
	l · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

18b-1	Ļ	MR. HUGHES: May I mark the next photograph 12-J,
	2	your Honor?
	3	THE COURT: You may.
12-J	4	THE WITNESS: 12-J?
	5 -	MR. HUGHES: Yes, 12-J.
	6	THE WITNESS: All right.
	7.	(Whereupon Mr. Hughes marks the photograph.)
	8	BY MR. HUGHES:
•	9	Q Now, that photograph, sir, 12-G, does the
	10	person appear to be much younger than the person depicted
	II,	in 12-F?
	12	A They could be almost the same age. Around the
∸	13	same age.
	14	Q That is the age from 25 to 35?
	15	A I wouldn't say 25 to 35. I would say 30 to 35.
	16	Q I see.
	17	Is there snything else you can tell us about
•	18	this photograph as to the height or any other characteris-
	19.	tics of the man depicted in 12-J?
	20	A He is not very short. I mean, with this head,
,	21	he could be taller than
•	22	Q Does the man appear to have short hair?
	23	A He has short hair, yes.
<u>-</u>	24	Q Does the man appear to be partially bearded?
	25	A Yes.
	26	MR. HUGHES: May I mark the next photograph 12-K,

18b-2	ı	your Honor?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	2	THE CO	OURT: You may.
)	3		(Mr. Hughes marks the photograph.)
2-K	4	BY MR. HUGHI	ES:
	5	. Q	Referring you now to 12-K, Mr. Hatami.
٠.	6	•	Will you tell us the relative age of that
	7.	gentleman,	in your estimation?
	8	A .	In my estimation?
	9	. Q .	Yes.
	10	.4	The age, 21 to 28, 29.
	11	Q.	Does that picture have the markings underneath
	12	"Robert Bear	usoleil"?
i.	13	À	It is "Beausoleil, Robert."
	14	Q,	Does he appear to have a light beard; a small
•	15 .	goatee, but	fairly light?
	16	A	It is fairly light.
	_ 1 7		That is why the determination of age is not
	18	terribly ea	sy, because blond people are more difficult
	19	to judge th	eir age than darker people.
,	20	· Q.	Does he appear to have any different color hair
	21,	on the face	than this picture of 12-7?
	22	· A	12-K has a lighter complexion of hair than
·	23	what is thi	s one?
	24	Q	12-F.
	25	A	Than 12-F.
	26	Q.	Does he appear to have freckles?

185-3	1	A Yes.
<u>.</u>	2	Q Did the man you saw at the Altabelli house
	3	have freckles?
	4	A I wasn't that close as I am to that picture.
	5	I don't remember.
	6	MR. HUGHES: May I mark the next photograph 12-L,
	7	your Honor?
	8	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
12-L	· 9 ·	(Mr. Hughes markes the photograph.)
•	10	BY MR. HUGHES:
, , ,	11	Q Referring you now to 12-L.
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	12	I believe you previously picked this picture
	13	up and said the man appeared tall; is that correct?
	14	A I never said so. If I said so, I don't remember
	15	Q Does this man appear to have short hair?
	16	A He obviously has short hair.
	17	Q Does he appear to have some very light beard
	18 ,	on his face?
	19	A He has.
x	20	Q Would you tell us how old he appears, sir?
	21	A Here, anything between 22 to 26, 27, 29.
	22	I can't really judge the age of blond people.
18c fls.	23	They can look younger than they are.
-	24	
	25	
•	26	

18c-1 1

2

3.

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

ŗi

12

14

15

16

17. 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

26

25

Q Would it have aided in the identification of the person who you saw if you could have seen him in person?

A I didn't get the first part of the question.

Q Would it have helped you, Mr. Hatami --

A What has helped me to identify the pictures?

Q -- if you had seen rather than photographs, if you had seen five, six, seven people in a lineup, alive, live people in a lineup, Mr. Hatami, would that have helped you?

A If he doesn't have a beard.

I mean, if you are referring to the case and to the person, I find the resemblance close.

Q If you would have had your choice, Mr. Hatami, would you have preferred to have identified people from a photograph or in person?

A I would say photographs are quite -- as a photographer, they could give me indication, but if a person would be there, I would recognize them. I mean, if the conditions are the same as I have seen them.

Q Would it have aided you in seeing full length pictures, full length pictures of all the people that you see there?

A If we are looking for the height, it would have.

Not the resemblance.

Q Would it have aided you if you had seen these

1	photographs closer to the time of the actual viewing of
2 :	this person who you saw at the Altabelli residence?
3	A Would you say that again?
4	Q Would it have helped you if it had been before
5	April, if it had been in August or September of last year?
6.	A August and September of last year?
7	It would be, of course, much easier to say
8	that is the man, without saying the resemblance, because
9 .	time and my detachment, I wasn't interested in the case,
10	I wasn't after anything, I didn't care, I don't care
11	who was it.
12	Q The image of the person's face that you saw
13	was clearer in your mind in September; is that correct?
14	A I don't get your question. I'm sorry.
15 · .	Q You saw a person at the Altabelli house.
16	Now, is his image in your mind, is it clearer now, or
17	was it clearer last September?
18 -	A I was not looking for any resemblance of anybody
19	last September to anything. So, I have not a precise memory
20	of relating anything to anything else.
21 .	Q Was it clearer last March 16th?
22	A March 16th?
23	Q A year ago, a year ago March 16th, 1969, than
24	it is
25	A I don't remember March 16th, 1969, what I was
26	doing or what was happening.

18d fls.

I don't remember the exact date of Sharon's packing, or I was filming her, the man that came to the yard. I don't remember the exact date.

So, you are trying to ask me the exact date of the situation.

2

3

4

5. 6.

_

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20.

21 22

23

24

25

26

All right.

Was it clearer the day after you saw this person than it is now, your image of him?

A How can I say when it is about a year and something, two years, almost passed? A year and a half, I would say. March, '69. We are at October, '70. It is far away, very far away.

Q So, you could conjure an image of him better the day after you saw him than you can now; is that correct?

A That is covious, what you are trying to get at, and I answered you.

MR. HUGHES: No further questions, your Honor, at this point.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, I have some questions, in view of this examination I have some further questions.

I would like to identify his remarks in connection with those photographs that now are marked, your Honor.

THE COURT: How do you propose to do that?

MR. KANAREK: By asking him once again to go through the photographs that were then unmarked and indicate his comments with a marking as he does it from the witness stand.

THE COURT: I think it was adequately covered by Mr. Hughes.

I want to ask Mr. Hatami some questions.

14,535 EXAMINATION.

BY THE COURT:

ŀ

Ź

5

9

10

11

. 12

`13

14

15

16

17:

18

Ĩġ,

20

Žľ

22

23

24

26

Mr. Hatami, you first saw the man, or you saw the man the only time in March of '69: is that right?

It was the time Sharon left. I do not remember.

Somewhere around March, '69?

The end of March. A.

And you saw these photographs in April of 1970; right?

Yes. Around the end of the period, or maybe early May.

Of this year?

Yes.

Now, in between that time, did you have any. occasion to recall this man?

No. Not especially for relating him to any special happening or events;

Well, do you recall thinking about him at all during that period?

Not really.

When did you first think that the man that you saw in 1969 might have some connection with the killing of Sharon Tate?

When I been asked by the District Attorney's office to come to see them, and when they tried to find out by refreshing my memory of that day, I realized there

1	should be a connection of the man they are trying to
2	nail down with the killing of Sharon Tate.
.3	Now, on the day before you were shown the
4	photographs in April or May of 1970, do you think that you
5	had a clear mental picture of what this man looked like?
6	A A resemblance, your Honor.
7	Q You think that you would have been able to
8	identify him from among a group of people on the day that
9	you saw the pictures?
io	A. What, your Honor?
u [You saw the pictures in April or May of this
12	year?
3	A. Yes
4	Now, think back to the day before that.
5	If you had seen this man in a group of people,
6 .	would you have been able to recognize him?
7	A. If that man, your Honor, had the same physical
3	setup. I mean, if he had that hair. Yes, I would.
,	
,	
,	

18E

23

18e-1

2

Ĺ

3

8

. 9

10

11

12 13

14

٠15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

On that day, would you have had such a clear mental picture of this man that you could have picked him out of a group of people?

Yes, sir.

You are sure of that?

Yes.

Do you have a clear mental picture of that man now as you saw him in March of 1969?

Not clear. A resemblance more.

I can say clear when I have seen my people, the people that I have seen very, very often. That is very clear. But people I don't know, it would be a resemblance, It wouldn't be that sharp. With the exception, your Honor. if there is a personal contact, if there is good conversation or a bad conversation, or something happening between me and him. I would remember him clearly. But if it didn't happen something very precisely or did not provoke my instinct to remember him, if I did not have any special reason to remember him later on, then I am asked did I see someone come to the house, I remember, because I interrupted my filming, because I was in the house, because I did what I said I did.

But you had no reason to pay any particular, attention to this man?

No, I did not have any reason that day or that time to give any particular attention to that.

1,	Q And it was a year later that you were asked to
· 2.	identify him?
.3	A. Yes.
4	Not identify him. I been questioned about my
` <i>:</i> 5	memory of that, and I told the District Attorney, and then
6	I been shown the pictures, and I picked out the pictures
7	with the closest resemblance to the man that I saw that day.
8.	Q Is the mental picture that you have now,
. 9	Mr. Hatami, the mental picture of the man as you saw him
10	in 1969, or is it a mental picture of someone that you saw
11	in a photograph?
12	A Your Honor, would you allow me to insist that
13	this picture has a beard, and that one did not, and yet,
14 · .	with this beard, the physical resemblance is the closest to
16	all these pictures to the man that I saw that day.
.17	Q Are you able to say that any one of those men
18	in any of those pictures is the man that you saw in 1969?
	A The resemblance, the closest resemblance, I
19.	would say, is the pictures that I pointed out.
20	You know, sir, the face changed very much.
21	My face, if I grow a beard, I would look
22	different. My long hair, maybe, makes people not recognize
23	me now.
24	Q But you are not able to say with assurance that
25	any one of those men in that picture is the man that you saw
26	A The assurance is the closest resemblance, yes,

18r

but I can't say it is the man, because that man did not have a beard. But the resemblance is very close. It is what makes me to say it is the closest resemblance to the man that I saw that day.

Q At the time you saw the photographs, were you told that any of the men in the photographs were in custody?

A I have not been told, sir, but I could presume they have, those with the marks and writing on them.

I could presume that they have been the one in custody of Justice or the police.

You weren't told that, though?

A I have not been told, sir.

	٠,
18f-1	•
	1
<u>.</u>	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22

25

26

_	
	Q Were you told that anyone had been arrested?
	A Not during that visit, that meeting with the
	District Attorney, and not the people that asked me to
	come over here.
	I didn't know the reason that I am asked to
,	come over.
ŀ	THE COURT: All right.
	Any other questions?
	MR. KANAREK: Not at this time of this witness, your
ľ	Honor, in view of your Honor's ruling.
ľ	THE COURT: In view of what?
	MR. KANAREK: I have asked to be allowed to interrogat
-	so that he would be able to go through the pictures.
	THE COURT: You cross-examined at length, Mr. Kanarek,
	as did other counsel that wanted to.
	MR. KANAREK: Yes.
	It is my position that: the parts of this
	record where he said "this picture" "that picture" is not
	tied down to any picture, and I ask that I merely be
	allowed to go through and see that that is done, your Honor.
	THE COURT: I think it has been fully covered, Mr.
	Kanarek.
	Anything further, Mr. Bugliosi?
	MR. RUGITOSI: No. Other than I would ask, request:

, request, an in-court identification at this time.

MR. KANAREK: I would object. We haven't finished this

interrogate

18f-2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hearing yet.

THE COURT: Do you wish to argue the motion?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, we haven't finished the hearing, have we?

I would like this witness excused from the room, and I want to call Mr. Bugliosi as a witness in connection with the voir dire, in connection with this evidentiary hearing.

THE COURT: Very well.

You may step down, Mr. Hatami.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We are getting a little too cavalier about calling the prosecutor to the witness stand, your Honor.

Unless the Court sees some particular reason for it, I want to get on with this trial.

THE COURT: Have the People rested on your motion?
MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, but I want to argue the issue.

I think we are dealing with two basic issues

here.

THE COURT: Just a moment, sir.

The defendants have a right to put on whatever evidence they want.

Proceed, Mr. Fitzgerald.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, your Honor.

Could we call Mr. Bugliosi?

THE COURT: Very well.

18f-3

2

1

.8 !

5

6 7

8,

9

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would request an offer of proof, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, if I understand the witness's testimony, you did participate in the showing of the photographs to the witness, Mr. Bugliosi. It is fairly obvious that defense counsel wants to go into it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have spoken to about 70 or 80 witnesses. I don't particularly care to take the witness stand every time Mr. Kanarek wants to talk to me. I want to get on with the trial.

THE COURT: There is a simple solution. We can suppress the evidence.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have no intent not to put on the evidence, your Honor. It is very valuable evidence.

THE COURT: All right, proceed.

VINCENT BUGLIOSI,

called as a witness by the defendants herein, for the purpose of this evidentiary hearing, having previously been sworn.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Q What is your business or occupation?

MR. KANAREK: May he be sworn, your Honor?

THE CLERK: He has already been sworn.

	1	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
. <u></u>	2	Q Are you in charge of the prosecution of the
	, 3	case of People vs. Manson, et al.?
	4	A I guess you could say that.
, ,		Q In connection with your duties thereto and
	6	therewith, did you have occasion to interview the preceding
	7	witness in your office in the month of April, 1970?
	8	A Yes. April or March, I don't remember the
	9	exact month.
	10	Q And was that the first time that you had spoken
	11:	with this witness?
	12	A Yes.
	13	Q Did you direct that he be present at your office
	Î4 ,	at a particular time?
18g	fls. 15	A Yes.
	16 ;	
	17	
	18	•
	`19	
	20	
	21 😁	
,	22 .	
	23	
	24	•
	25	
	26	

And how did you do so? Did you have a police 18g-1 officer contact him, or did you contact him by phone? 2 MR. MUSICH: I object to the question as immaterial, your Honor, how he got there. MR. FITZGERALD: It is just foundational, your Honor. 5 THE WITNESS: I learned about the existence of 6 Mr. Hatami from Rudy Altobelli, and at that time I contacted the LAPD and I told them to find Hatami and bring him to my office. And Reeves Witson, a friend of Mr. Hatami, and 10 Mr. Hatami appeared in my office. 11 12 Do you recall the date? MR. FITZGERALD: 13 À No. 4 14 Do you recall the time of day? I think it was around noon; if I am not mis-16 taken. Did you interview Mr. Hatami? 17 18 Α. Yes. <u>19</u> Did you show him some photographs before you interviewed him, during the time you interviewed him, or **2**0° after? 22 If my recollection is correct, he first related the incident, and it was after that that I showed 24 him approximately 12 photographs. 25 And where did you obtain those photographs? 26 From my file cabinet.

18g2 0 And were those photographs of particular 1 persons? Yes. 3. And who were those photographs of, if they can be referred to generically? All of them, I believe, are members of the 6 Family. I had another photograph here, I don't know who this individual is, but the rest of them were all 9 members of the Family. 10 MR. KANAREK: May that be marked, your Honor, where he 11 12 says -- where he had in his hand a photograph? THE WITNESS: This photograph is 12-H. · 13, I had it in my tubs, but I don't know this 14 gentléman. 15 MR. FITZGERALD: Q Generically, then, could we 16 refer to them as male members of the alleged Manson Family? 17 Well, there is a photograph here of Juan Flynn. **J8**, It is my understanding that Mr. Flynn is not a member of the 19. He associated with them and lived with them out at 20 Spahn Ranch. ŽÌ, The rest of them, I believe, are members of the 22 Family. 23 There is a photographthere, however, of Shorty 24 Shay, is there not? 25 Yes. A. 26

1	Q He was not a member of the Family or so-called
2	Manson Family, was he?
3	A. My understanding is that Mr. Shay possibly was a
4	member of the Family.
5	Q I see.
.6	A. I would say more so than Juan Flynn.
7	Q Now, during the course of the interview you had
8	with Mr. Hatami, did Mr. Hatami describe a person he had
9	seen at the location of the Polanski residence during the
10	month of March of 1969?
Iļ.	A. Yes.
12	
13	
14.	
15.	
16 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
.22	
23	
24	
25	

18H

14,545 18h-1 And did he describe that person as being a ľ male Caucasian? 2 A I believe so. .3 - Q And did he give you a height and weight? 4 A Yes. 5 He said that the man was about the same height 6 as Roman Polanski. 7 And I asked him to stand up. And he said the R man came up to his chin. Did he describe the man he allegedly saw at 10 the Polanski residence as having some particular type or 11 kind of hair on his head? 12 I believe he said hippie-type hair. 13 exceptionally long, it wasn't shoulder length, but it was 14 definitely long hair. 15 And did he describe the facial hair of the 16 person he thought he saw at the Tate residence or the 17 Polanski residence? 18 He said the man had a short stubby beard but 19 not any visible growth. 20 And did he describe the weight of the 21 individual? 22

A

as I recall.

23

24

25

A I believe he said he was rather light.

Attorney assigned to this case, wountaken on certain investigatory duties

A That would almost be an understatement.

Q You mean you have done a great deal of investigation?

A Unquestionably.

Q Now, in connection with your investigatory duties, were you aware that you could avail yourself of the facilities of the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office?

A. I did.

Q How long have you been a Deputy District Attorney
Mr. Bugliosi?

A Six years.

Q And I take it, in that period of time, you have prosecuted a number of cases?

A Right.

Q And you are familiar with what are referred to as mug shots, are you not?

A Yes.

Q And you are familiar with the fact that the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office have numerous mug shots and mug books, are you not?

26

17

18

19

2Ô

21

22

23

24

	1	A	Yes,
i e	2	Q	You are also ware that there is within Los
	3	Angeles Co	ounty a Los Angeles County Jail, are you not?
•	.4	. А	Right.
	5	Q	And you were also aware at the time that you
	6	interview	ed Mr. Hatami that there were approximately 10,400
	7	inmates in	the Los Angeles County Jail, were you not?
19	fls. 8	A;	I didn't know how many were there.
4	9		
	10	·	•
	н		
	12		
	13		
	14	,	
	15	:	
	16		
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20	,	
	21		
	. 22 .	•	
	23		
	24		,
	25	•	
	26 .		

. 4

5

5 7

8

9

10;

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

25

24

26

But you know there were a lot?

MR. MUSICH: I object to this line of questioning, it has no relevancy to the issues.

MR. FITZGERALD: I think I can take it up right now.

Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: Was there any reason, then, Mr. Bugliosi, that you did not utilize mugshots of the Los Angeles Police Department, or mugshots of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office in presenting this witness with a number of photographs from which he could select the person he allegedly saw at the Polanski residence in March?

MR. KAY: Your Honor, I object to that question ---

I received these mugshots from the Los Angeles
Police Department. Where do you think I got them?
That's okay, Steve.

a fair selection of mugshots to the witness?

A. Yes.

Did you, for example, present him with mugshots that contained persons who had long hippie-type hair?

A Yes, about five or six of these have kind of long hair.

Q Directing your attention to the long-haired photograph of Mr. Manson, is there any other photograph that has hair that long?

A. Well, Thomas Wallerman has long hair. It's not

.,.1	as thick as Mr. Manson's, but it's pretty long.
2	Q Mr. Wallerman has a decidedly receding hairline,
3 .	does he not?
4	A Yes, yes.
5	Bruce Davis has hair almost as long.
Ġ.	Paul Watkins, his hair is almost as long.
7	Robert Beausoleil, his hair is fairly long,
8	Do you want me to volunteer a particular point,
ģ	Paul?
10	Q Well
11	A. It might be applicable.
12	'Q Go ahead.
13	A. I wasn't too concerned with Mr. Hatami's
14.	identification.
15	I would have been satisfied with testimony on
16	his part that there was a resemblance, because the man whom
17	he sent to the back house, I had already learned from Rudy
18	Altobelli, that that man was definitely Charles Manson
19	and they were talking about the same day, because Altobelli
20	said that the day that a man was sent back there was the day
.21	that Sharon was packing to go to Rome.
22	Now, Rudy Altobelli told me that he had already
23	met Manson at Dennis Wilson's place several months earlier,
.24	so there is no question about the identification.
25	To be ultra fair I did not even have any lineup
26.	with Mr. Manson in it.
;	

I decided to bring Mr. Manson into court for the first time and show him to Mr. Hatami. For all I know Hatami might say that Manson is not the man. That is even more fair than the commandments. I would say, of Wade and Gilbert, the Supreme Court cases. 6 But had you so chosen, you could have had a lineup conducted by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office or the Los Angeles Police Department? · 10 Yes. I am sure in your experience you have found 11 that you are able to duplicate persons in terms of height, 12 weight, age and race, are you? 13 Yes. If'I were to have a lineup, I would have 14 contacted the Los Angeles Police Department and they would 15 have arranged for it. 16 But I thought it is even more fair not to have 17 18 even any lineup at all, and have Mr. Manson walk into court and have Hatami look at him for the first time in front of 19 a jury. 20 21 I think that is eminently more fair than that 22 which is required. 23 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I guess it is sort of an 24 argument, too. 25. I don't know, is this testimony?

MR. FITZGERALD: I have no further questions,

THE COURT: I'm not sure what it is.

1

BY MR. SHINN:

5

Mr. Bugliosi, you showed these pictures to

CROSS-EXAMINATION

7.

11

12

13

14

.15

16

_ 17

18.

19

20 21

22

23

. 24

25

Mr. Hatami, would it be fair to say you had two pictures of Mr. Manson and one of all the others?

It appears that way there. This was not a deliberate act on my part.

However, you will notice that these two pictures of Manson are completely different.

If it did anything, it would be favorable to the defense because these pictures, if you, look at them, they are completely different, the hair style and everything.

Yes, but by looking at those pictures there is no two pictures of anyone else, is there?

Yes, that's right. Well, there are two photos of this one man here.

> This one picture, side view and front view? O.

Yes.

Was there any reason for putting these two pictures of Mr. Manson

No, it was not a deliberate act on my part. but I have more photographs of Mr. Manson than of the other members of the Family. That is probably how it got in there.

Don't you think it's kind of unfair to

Mr. Manson to have two pictures and only one picture of the others, of the other persons? MR. KAY: I will object to that, argumentative. THE COURT: Sustained. 4 MR. SHINN: No further questions. 5. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. KANARÉK: Mr. Bugliosi, you are telling us that you feel 9 that it's fair --10 THE COURT; Let's not get into that. That is some-11 thing the Court has to decide. 12, MR. KANAREK: He stated this from the witness stand, 13 your Honor. .14 THE COURT: I know he stated it. 15 Get on to something else. 16 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor is not going to consider that 17 as evidence? . 18 THE COURT: No, I am not. 19 MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor. 20 May I approach the witness, your Honor? 21 THE COURT: For what purpose? 22 MR. KANAREK: I wanted to discuss these pictures, your 23 Honor. 24. THE COURT: Very well. 25 BY MR. KANAREK: Mr. Bugliosi, is it a fair 26

statement that you do not know whether these are in fact the 1 pictures that you showed Mr. Hatami, is that correct? 2 As a fact, no, but as a very firm belief, 3 because I remember these were the size of the photos I 4 showed him, and I remember exactly where I got them in my 5 tubs, and I went back there at noontime and took the same 6. photos out. But you cannot testify that these are the same 8 pictures? 9. No. I will not wager my life on it, no. 1Ò I'm not asking you ---II. I'm telling you that is my belief. I have a A. 12 very strong belief those are the photographs. 13 But you cannot say that they are? Q .14 Α. Not positively, no. 15 And you did not do anything to preserve for .16 this Court, for all of us, the exact pictures that you showed 17 Mr. Hatami? 18 I put those photographs back where I found them, 19 and then I did at noon time, I took the same photographs 20 out. .21 Now, concelvably someone could have entered 22 my tubs during this interlude, from the time I spoke to Hatami and today, and removed one of the photographs and substituted another one. 25 That is always possible. I did not do it myself. **'26**

25

24

.25

26

Q.	And your	state	of mi	nd was	such that you
recognized	there cou	ıld con	eivab	ly be th	e type of
evidentiary	hearing	that we	e are	now havi	ng, is that
right?	•				

A. I don't know if I thought of it at that particular moment but I was aware of the Wade and Gilbert cases. Actually the applicable case is Simmons vs. United States, really.

Q But you were very well --

A. I am aware of the law, yes.

And knowledgeable of the fact that the Court says in these types of matters we may have evidentiary hearings?

A. Yes,

Q Is it a fair statement that at the time you spoke to Mr. Hatami you knew of his affection for Sharon Tate?

A. Yes, he said she was a very beautiful woman in not more ways than one, just facially, but a very beautiful person.

And you knew that he knew that the name Charles
Manson was of a person who had been arrested in this case?

A I don't even know if I asked him that. I thin everyone knew that, and I probably inferred that he knew.

Q And Mr. Manson was a person --

A Right.

į	Q who was arrested for the very crime you were
2	talking to him about, is that right?
3	A I inferred that. I don't know whether I actuall
4	had a discussion with him, I just assumed that he must have
.5	known it.
6	Q And there is some probability that
7	A. This was a year later and
8	And there is some probability you discussed the
9	name Manson with him, right?
1Ò	A. I don't believe I discussed the name Manson
11	with him.
12	I think the only name I mentioned with him was
13	Terry Melcher, because he mentioned that the man was looking
14	for someone and he could not remember the name. He was not
15.	familiar with it, and I asked him does the name, Terry
16	Melcher, ring a bell? And he said no.
17	Q Well, but you and he, the name Charles Manson ma
18'	have been in your discussion with him, right?
19	A. It may have been, but I doubt it.
20	Q Well, there is some probability it could have
21	been?
22	A There is a possibility, not a probability.
23	Q Well, then, I show you the picture that you,
24	this 12-A, and I show you
25	A. Yes, I'm looking at it, yes.
96.	0 12-49

Yes, I have it. All right, now, and that picture has Mr. Manson's name on it beginning a-n-s-o-n? 3 If you were to look at it you would think the . 4 man's name was Charles Milles. 5. Way over to the left it says a-n-s-o-n. It does not say Manson. There are two other 7. 8 photographs that also have names below them. Q Well, that might -- everything you say may be so, Mr. Bugliosi, but is it a fact that that 12-A with the 10 A Charles M-1-1-1-e-s, Manson, that that picture was given by you at a time when you have spoken of that, you spoke 12 with Mr. Hatami, is that right? 13 Well, yes, I did not give it to him. I showed 14 him 12 photographs and he picked out this photograph here. And those words that are on that photograph Q: 16 were on that photograph then, right? 17 · . 🛦 Yes. :18 And you and he had the conversations which you 19. have spoken of? 20 Right. 2I · MR. KANAREK: Thank you. 22 Thank you, your Honor. 23

MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.

.24

25

1 .	EXAMINATION
2	BY THE COURT:
3 ,	o Mr. Bugliosi, how many photographs were shown
4	to Mr. Hatami?
5.	A. I believe those 12 right there, your Honor.
'δ	a You heard him testify that there were more?
7	A. I don't know if he said there were more.
8	He identified six out of that group. He
9`	recognized six, but he said he was shown more than the six.
10	I don't remember him saying he was shown more
ц	than 12. He may have.
12	Q I take it you are not sure how many were shown.
13.	A I believe just 12, that is my recollection.
14	Q You are not sure of which 12?
15.	A. I believe these are the 12 right here.
16	Q. You say you believe. You also indicated that
17.	it might not be the fact.
18	A That's right, there is always a possibility
19	that someone could have removed one of those pictures that
20.	I showed him and substituted another one.
21	But I doubt that very much. It's extremely
22	doubtful.

THE COURT: Any further questions?

MR. KAY: May I ask a couple of questions for clarification?

22

23

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KAY:

Ļ

2

3

4

5.

6

7

8

9.

10

11:

12

13

14

- 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q Mr. Bugliosi, when you say these photographs were in your tubs, would you explain to the Judge exactly what you mean by that?

A. File cabinet.

And these file cabinets are located in your office?

A. Right.

And you and I are the only ones that have a key to those file cabinets?

A Right.

Those file cabinets, remain locked except for the times you and I go into the file cabinets?

A Right.

Q Unless you or I went into the file cabinet to take those photographs, it would be highly unlikely anyone else could get into those cabinets without breaking the lock, is that correct?

A Right.

MR. KAY: No further questions.

THE WITNESS: I am not aware of a burglary at my office in the last couple of months.

19b

25

.24

19a-1 3 4 5 6. 7 8 9 10. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

22.

23

24

25

26

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHINN:

Q How about Mr. Stovitz, does he have a key?

A Aaron did, and then I believe Aaron turned the key over to Mr. Musich and Mr. Kay.

THE COURT: Was there any written record made of the number of photographs shown or which photographs were shown this witness?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: Any further questions?

(No response.)

THE COURT: Anything further for the defendants on the motion?

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

THE COURT: Both sides rest on the motion?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

THE COURT: Argument?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes --

THE COURT: The People have the burden, so they have the right to open.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Wade and Gilbert of course are the landmark cases in this area, and then Simmons vs. the United States, 390 U. S. 377, and 88 Supreme Court 967 --

THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Bugliosi, would you hand me the photographs, please.

(Whereupon the exhibits are handed the Court.)

19a-2

2

3

4

5

6. 7

·8

9

10

12:

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21.

22

23 24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: The Simmons case, as I read Simmons, adopts the rationale of Wade and Gilbert, so really we are talking about the same rule of law.

I think Simmons, Wade and Gilbert, each of them deal with the two basic issues:

No. 1, was the out-of-court lineup either a physical lineup or a photographic lineup, was it unfair.

In fact, was it so impermissibly suggestive as to give rise to a substantial likelihood of irreparable misidentification?

That is the first issue.

I don't think this photographic lineup that I have for Mr. Hatami was so impermissibly suggestive as to give rise to a substantial likelihood of irreparable misidentification.

Now, even assuming arguendo that Wade, Gilbert and Simmons were violated, and I'm certainly not going to stipulate to that because I don't think that has happened, Wade, Gilbert and Simmons, even making that assumption, do not preclude a witness from making an in-court identification.

They only preclude the prosecution putting on evidence that the witness made an identification outside of court. They do not preclude in-court identification unless the unfairness of the out-of-court identification was so severe as to contaminate the in-court identification,

19a - 3

1

2

3

5

6

8

9.

10 11

12

13

14

15

16-

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25.

26

and surely we don't have that type of situation here.

I think we are talking now about Wong Song, the connection between the out-of-court identification and the in-court identification, the poison fruit doctrine.

If it was so extremely unfair that the likelihood is that when a witness sees the defendant in court, what he is really doing is identifying the defendant from a photograph that he has seen of him, as opposed to seeing him during the incident, then I think you have not only in-court identification -- I mean out-of-court identification being stricken, but also in-court identification being stricken.

But Mr. Hatami SRW this gentleman, I would assume for several minutes. It was daylight; there was no indication that he has faulty vision.

He has already given a fairly good description of the man. He was relatively close to him.

So even assuming the Court feels that the outof-court photographic procedure was violative of Wade,
Gilbert and Simmons, this still should not preclude him
from testifying in court.

In fact, I did not intend to put on any evidence in the first place that he identified him out of court in the photographic lineup.

I don't intend to put on any evidence of that.

I will rest on that, your Honor.

19a-4

1 2

3

4

5

7

8

ġ

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22[°] 23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald?

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I simply say that Mr. Hatami had a very short period of time in which to view the person he later is identifying as Mr. Manson.

In response to your Honor's question, Mr. Hatami indicated there was nothing outstanding, unusual or peculiar about the confrontation in which he identified or talked with Mr. Manson.

There was nothing traumatic, nothing unusual.

Eleven months later he sees what I would contend is an unfair, grossly distorted group of persons in a series of photographs.

Only two of the persons in the photographs contained what could honestly be referred to as beards.

The photographs themselves do not depict the same they are not the same type of photographs.

Some are full-length photographs; some are partial face photographs; some are profile; some depict people standing; some depict people with almost no hair on their head.

Others depict persons with a great deal of hair on their head.

There seems to be a wide variety and range of ages as well as heights and obviously there is a wide range in ages.

It cannot be said that when this witness was shown this group of photographs he was provided with an

19a-5

6.

ĮĪ

14·

0

honest and fair choice.

Also I think it is interesting to note that the identification or tentative identification of Mr. Hatami was made in April of 1970 after photographs of Mr. Manson had been widely published and displayed in the popular press.

Without being facetious I would submit that in 1969 and early 1970, or at the end of 1970, Mr. Manson may receive an award as being the most photographed man in America.

I think that by and large that the photographs that were presented were of an extremely heterogeneous group.

When the prosecution had at its disposal and at its avail procedures for a fair and impartial mug shot identification, they could have used the multitudinous mug shot photographs of the Los Angeles Police Department or of the Sheriff's Office or, as the testimony of Mr. Bugliosi indicated, they could have actually conducted a very fair lineup, and as we all know the inmate population of the Los Angeles County Jail is vast.

It is easy to duplicate any particular height, weight, stature, hair coloration, race, et cetera.

Certainly Mr. Manson is not of such a distinguishing or peculiar physiognomy that he cannot be duplicated.

19a÷6

2

1

3

4 5

Ġ.

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22.

23

24

25.

26

Further, the fact that he wears long hair, wears a beard in some sort of hippie fashion, it would not be difficult to duplicate him in Los Angeles County.

I think, as Mr. Bugliosi indicated, he was not interested in identification actually of Mr. Manson; that he was interested only in obtaining from this witness some sort of a statement that Manson appeared to resemble this person.

Now, when you bear in mind also Mr. Manson's wide known notoriety and the fact that his name actually appears on one of the photographs, that in itself would appear to be violative of due process.

I think we cannot say beyond a reasonable doubt that his in-court identification of Mr. Manson is going to be any different.

I don't think we can say beyond a reasonable doubt that his in-court identification is not based on the illegality of the unfair mug shot identification that took place at the hands of the prosecution.

MR. KANAREK: Join in Mr. Fitzgerald's comments, your Honor.

MR. SHINN: Join.

THE COURT: Anything further, gentlemen?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Just very briefly, your Honor.

With respect to the alleged widespread exposure of Mr. Manson's physiognomy, I would draw the

19a-7

2;

1

3

4

5

6 7

8.

9

ŢĿ

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

Court's attention that the photograph of Manson that Hatami selected is totally dissimilar from those that had appeared in the national publications.

I add the further point that I am not concerned with the out-of-court identification because I had no intent to put on that evidence in the first place.

I am only concerned with an in-court identification.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, just one rejoinder to that and that is, it is not in the evidence here --

THE COURT: Mr. Kamarek, you were given an opportunity to argue. The People have a right to close.

MR. KANAREK: There is nothing in the evidence to show one kind of picture had more publicity --

THE COURT: You have gone by your chance to argue this motion.

MR. KANAREK: Very well.

THE COURT: In view of the uncertainty as to the number or identity of the photographs shown, because of the duration of time between the meeting of Mr. Hatami and the unknown person, and his being shown the photographs which apparently exceeded one year, because of the intervening arrest of Mr. Manson for the murder of someone Mr. Hatami had known and admired, I think that the probative value if any, of his identification, and it really wasn't an identification, and any identification he might make with

respect to an in-court confrontation with Mr. Manson would be far outweighed by the possible prejudicial effect on the jury.

I am now going to exclude it.

It is now five minutes to 4:00.

Are you prepared to proceed, gentlemen?

I think perhaps a ten-minute recess would not be out of order.

The court will recess for ten minutes.

(The following proceedings were had in open court in the presence and hearing of the jury, all counsel being present.)

THE COURT: All counsel and jurors are present.

You may continue, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Cross-examination.

MR. FIEZGERALD: No questions, your Honor.

MR. SHINN: No questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?

MR.KANAREK: Your Honor, may this witness -- I don't know -- may this witness be put on call, your Honor, if there is any necessity to call him back?

THE COURT: Do you have him under subpoena now?

MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor. I would like for him-I will ask him this:

Sir, are you intending to leave our area here?

THE WITNESS: I have been on assignment. I would

like to leave -- I would like to be finished and over with

so I can go back to my work.

MR. KANAREK: I understand, but if it should be necessary to bring you back, Mr. Hatami, are you going to be in Los Angeles for the next month or two?

THE WITNESS: Next month or two?

MR. KANAREK: Or several mweeks?

THE WITNESS: No.

19

20

2F

22

23

24

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have to go back to my work. Ž MR.KANAREK: Back to where? Š THE WITNESS: Back to my work, 4 MR. KANAREK: Where is that? 5 THE COURT: Where is that? 6 THE WITNESS: I am on assignment. I have to go back 7 to Europe. 8 MR. KANAREK: When did you intend to go back? ġ THE WITNESS: Well, if you don't need me, as soon as 10, I can. 11 MR. KANAREK: You mean like the next few days? THE WITNESS: Well, possibly, yes. 13 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I cannot tell at this time 14 when we would have any need for any interrogation of this 15 16 witness. I don't know what Mr. Bugliosi's next -- I 17 would ask that he remain --18 I will make a motion if I may at the bench 19 then concerning this, a motion to strike. 20 THE COURT: You have the right to cross-examine now, 21 Mr. Kanarek. Do you wish to exercise it? 22 MR. KANAREK: Well, I don't believe it has been 23 connected up in any way, your Honor. I don't think it 24 has any relevancy or materiality. .25 On that basis -- there has been no showing that 26

MR. KANAREK: You are leaving Los Angeles?

anything this witness has said concerns Mr. Manson. 1 therefore I ask that it be stricken. 2 MR. BUGLIOSI: That is a misstatement, your Honor. 3 The motion is denied. THE COURT: 4 I take it you do not wish to cross-examine. 5 MR. KANAREK: Well, there is nothing to cross-examine 6 on. 7 MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I object to this argument 8 in front of the jury. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Hughes, do you wish to cross-examine? 10 MR. HUGHES: Yes. 11 124 CROSS-EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. HUGHES: Mr. Hatami, excuse me, I forgot your name for 15 a moment, you were Sharon Tate's personal photographer? 16 I have not been Sharon Tate's personal photo-A 17 grapher, but personal friend. 18 And in the course of your friendship with Q 19 Miss Tate you had occasion to photograph her on numerous 20 occasions? 21 A Yes. 22 Did you take publicity photographs of Miss Q. 23 Tate? 24 It depends on what you call publicity. A 25 Were any of the photographs you ever took used Q 26

	1	in her professional career?
	2	A Yes, definitely.
	3	Q Would those be professional photographs?
	4	A Yes.
	5	Q Publicity photographs?
٠,	6	A If the publication if the pictures are
,	7	beautiful, the woman has publicity, you may call it
	8	publicity pictures.
,	, ,	Q Did you have some connection with a movie in
í	10	which Sharon Tate starred, called "The Fearless Vampire
	11	Killers"?
	12	A No connection.
	13	MR. BUGLIOSI: I move to strike the question and
·	14	the answer because it assumes a fact not in evidence,
	15	your Honor.
	16	THE COURT: What fact?
	.17	MR. BUGLIOSI: That she starred in a picture by that
	18	name.
	19.	THE COURT: Very well, the answer will be stricken.
	20	The objection is sustained.
9c	fls. 21	The jury is admonished to disregard the answer.
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	

	ì	
9C-1	1	BYMR. HUGHES: Do you know of your own knowledge
O	2	if Miss Tate starred in a picture by the name of "Fearless
:	3	Vampire Killers"?
	4	THE COURT: What is the relevancy of it, Mr. Hughes?
	5	THE WITNESS: That might be
, ',	6	THE COURT: Just a moment.
,	7	MR. HUGHES: May I confer a moment with Mr. Fitzgerald
· ·	8.	THE COURT: Yes.
· · · · ·	9	(Pause.)
*	10	MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, at this time I will withdraw
	u	that question.
•	12	Q Now, you testified that on March 15th, 1969
, it	13	there was a party, a going-away party for Sharon.
	14	A I did not testify in this court, and I never
	15	said that before.
	16.	Q Was there a party at the Altobelli residence,
	. 17	the Altobelli house, 10050 Cielo Drive on March 15th, 1969
	18	as a going-away party?
	19	A. There has not been a going-away party for Tate
• ;	.20	or Mr. Polanski, for Sharon Tate or Mr. Polanski.
	ŽÌ	There was many parties there but never a
.•	22	farewell or send-away party.
	23	Q Were you present excuse me, I'm sorry, go
	24	ahead.
	25	A I was not present in a farewell party.
	26	If there was any I was not present, but there

υį	was parties there, friends come, drop in.
2	Q There were often parties there, is that correct?
3	A. What do you call parties? Reunion of a few
4	friends, yes, if that is parties. I have been there very
5	often.
6	There were other few friends, we eat, drink
Ž	and spend the evening and go home, if that is the
8	parties, then there was parties.
9	Q Were any of these parties taking place in the
10	evening?
11	A. A few of them, yes.
12	Q After dark?
13:	A. Yes.
14	Q Were you ever at any large parties, many people,
1 5 .	25, 30, 40 people?
16	A. There was once a party around 200 peoples.
17	Q When was that, Mr. Hatami?
18	A I don't remember.
19 .	Q In 1969?
20-	A. It could be. It was then because she got the
21:	house in early 1969 and the party was there somehow because
·22 `	the house was new and they gave a party for a lot of peoples.
2 3·	Q Many people there at that party with long hair?
24	A. Well, yes.
25	Q Hair longer than mine?
26	A. Yes.

1	. Q .	Longer than yours?
2	A	Around.
3	Ġ.	Young people?
4	A	Every kind, every age.
5	Q	Some people in hippie attire?
6	A.	Yes, hippie attire.
7	Q.	Some people wearing dungarees?
8.,	A.	Casual, we call it, yes.
9: :	Q.	Levis?
10:	A.	I beg your pardon?
1i	Q	Levis? Levi trousers?
12		Blue denim, you mean?
13	,	Yes.
14	A.	Yes.
15	Ç.	Were there some people there barefooted?
16	(A.)	I didn't specially notice that. People comes
17	there tired	and take off their shoes.
18		I do not know if they came or they didn't,
19	Q .	Have you seen hippie types on other occasions,
20.	other than	this large party?
21	A.	I am just not very precise with the word hippie.
.22		What do you call hippie? People who wear long
23	hair and be	ard, et cetera?
24		There was many kinds of people, they may look
25.	like hippie	s if you call them that. What means hippie? I
-26		really.

1	Q Your hair is a little longer. Do you consider
2	yourself a hippie?
.3	A. No, I'm sorry.
4	Q Were there people there with long hair at the
5	party?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q Beards?
8	A. Not all of them, very few.
9	Q Some?
10 .	A. Some, yes.
u,	Q Some dressed casually?
12	A. Yes.
13	Some were wearing blue jeans?
.14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Some possibly were barefoot?
16	A. Possibly.
. 17.	Q You did not notice?
18	A. I don't notice those things because they are
19	not relevant to me.
20	Q Does Mr. Polanski have long hair?
, 21	A Along mine, yes.
22	Q When was the last time you were at a party at
23	the 10050 Cielo Drive residence when there were people
24	with long hair, some people with beards, sort of hippie
· 25	types?
26	A. Well, not many people these days among those

young people, artists or otherwise, that have short hair; İ so there have been a few parties, there have been people with long hair. Ĭ9 . 24 25..

E V

۱۰۰).	The Aspir. r discommon not Etoube or Deobre co
2	come up to the Polanski residence, was it?
3	A. Would you repeat the question?
4	Q . It was not uncommon I will rephrase it
, 5	it was a common occurrence for there to be groups of people
6	there at the Polanski residence; is that correct?
7	A Yes, occasionally, when asked to come, or there
<u>8</u>	was an occasion that they were there.
g ^{, ,}	I don't know what you want, what you mean by
10	that.
11.	Q In the evenings; right?
12	A. Well, evenings as well as days.
13 , ;	When is the last time that you were at the
1,4	Polanski residence on Cielo Drive?
15	A. After the tragedy or before the tragedy?
16	& Before the tragedy.
17	A. I was there maybe the day before the crime
18	happened or the murder happened.
19	Q Now, sometime in March, Sharon Polanski went to
20	Europe; is that correct?
2 <u>1</u> .	A. Yes.
22	Q And she returned when?
23	A I don't keep a diary when she is gone or when she
24	gets back.
25	Q Was it a couple of weeks before the tragedy?
26	A. It could be around that time, Maybe more.

	Two, three weeks. Two weeks, three weeks.
1	Q During the time excuse me I didn't mean to
2.	cut you off. I didn't mean to cut off your answer,
3	Mr. Hatami.
4	A Around three weeks before, I think.
5	Q During the time that Sharon Polanski was away .
. 6 °	in Europe, did you have occasion to go to the Polanski
7 .	residence?
8	A Maybe two times.
9	And did you go up there to any parties?
10	A. There was a big party given there by a friend
11	of Polanskis',
12	Q Was that Mr. Frykowski?
13	A. No. This was a Mr. Brian Morris.
14	Q. Mr. Brian Morris gave a party?
15.	A. Yes.
16	Q And that was sometime between March and July,
17	or March and August?
18 .	A. In the absence of the Polanskis from the resi-
19	dence.
20	Q Was Mr. Morris living there?
21	A. No.
22,	Mr. Morris was a close friend of Polanski and
23	Miss Tate.
24	Q And he just borrowed the residence, so to speak?
25	A. Yes.
:26:	

Ţ	A. By arrangement with Voityck, Frykowski, whatever
2	his family name is.
3	Q Mr. Frykowski?
4	A. Yes. Voityck.
. 5 6	a And you were present at this party?
` 7	A, Yes.
8	Q And how many people would you estimate came to
9	this party, sir?
10	A. Possibly 200. Maybe less. It was full of
ıĵ.	people.
12	And was that party closer to the time of
13	Sharon Tate's departure to Europe or closer to the time that
14	she returned to the United States?
1 5	A. I do not remember the exact date of that party.
16	It could be the middle of that period. I don't recall
1 7	exactly.
18	Q And of your own knowledge, sir, were there any
19	other parties at the Polanski residence during the time
2 0	that Mrs. Polanski was in Europe?
21	A. The only one I was present, I mentioned it.
22	It was that big party.
23	At that party, Mr. Hatami, were there predominantly younger people or predominantly older people?
24	A Young and old. I could not count who were
25	younger than others, et cetera. There were all kind of
ne	The commence of the control of the c

From Mr. Polanski?

			peoples.
	•	1	Q You said you were at the Polanski residence
		.2	the day before the tragedy; is that correct?
٠.		3	A. A day or two before the tragedy.
, ,	· ·.	4	Do you recall which day of the week it was,
• '	. , .	~5	sir?
سبمسمه	f	6	A. It was either Wednesday, Tuesday or Thursday.
		7	One of the three. I mean, the few days before. One or two
	• • •	8	days before.
		9	I think she was murdered on Friday, possibly.
		10	Yes, Friday, August 1st August 8th, yes.
,		ŢŢ	It was Thursday of Wednesday I was there.
20a		12	
		13	
	;	14. 15	
. '	,	16	
	• .	17	
٠.		18	
	, , ,	19	
	· '''-,•	20	
٠,		20	
•	•	22	
		.23	
		24	
<u>:</u>		7	

20a-1 Q Possibly the day before that you were there? Ą Possibly what? 2 Bossibly before, then, you were there? Q 3 Possibly the day before the tragedy, I call it. A 4 Q Or possibly two days before the tragedy? 5 Possibly, yes. One or two. A 6 What time of the day or night, if you remember, Q 7 were you there, sir? 8 You know, I just dropped in any time. Α. 9 I could drop in there any time. I was welcome to the 10. house any time. 11 But you recall actually going there, do you 12 not? 13 I do, because Sharon was pregnant, and I have 14 a close relationship with her, I am a close friend -- I. 15 was a close friend with her. So, I was concerned about 16 how she is doing. And I was doing a film with her. I. 17 wanted to know when is the right time to do it, continue. 18 She was pregnant. I didn't want to make her tired or 19 oblige her to do anything, or impose myself. 20 So, I was just going there and hanging around 21 to see what was happening. It was --22 Excuse me. Go ahead. Q 23 Well, it was a welcome house to many peoples. A 24 Many people were welcome there? Q 25 Many good friends of hers, yes. A 26

21

22

23

24

25

26

Q So,			it	might	have	been	during	thë	night	01
during	the	day;	you	don'i	reca	11?				

A No. I don't.

Q Do you recall who was present besides Mrs. Polanski?

A Was Voityck, was Abigail, Gibbie. That is how they called her.

Q Anyone else, sir?

A There was personal companions there. They didn't leave the house immediately if Sharon came, because Sharon was pregnant and they were helping her. She needed company. Her husband wasn't there.

Q Did you arrive by car, sir?

A Everybody arrived by car in this city.

Q Were you accompanied by someone else in the car?

A I don't remember, sir, really.

Q But you drove there yourself; is that correct?

A It could be.

Q Do you recall Mr. Sebring being present while you were there?

A He was very often there. He was dropping in too.

Q You recall the guest house in the back, do you not?

A Yes, but I have never been there.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

20a-3	1	Q	Were you aware that someone was living there?
	2	A	Yes.
) -	3	Q	And did you know who that person was?
	4	Ą	The owner of the house.
	5	Q	Had you seen a young boy living there?
	6	A.	No.
	7	MR. H	JGHES: May I have a moment, your Honor?
	8		(Mr. Hughes retrieves an exhibit from the
	ģ	exhibit file	·)
;	10	MR. H	JGHES: May I approach the witness, your Honor?
5	11	THE C	OURT: You may.
,	12	BY MR. HUGH	ES:
;	13	Q	Directing your attention, Mr. Hatami, to
)	14	defendants'	K for identification.
	15.		Do you recognize the gentleman depicted in that
	16	photograph?	
· · · ·	17	A	I don't.
	18	Q.	You have never seen him before?
1 ×	19	À	I have not seen a man like him before.
	20	Q	Miss Tate or Mrs. Polanski had several dogs;
	21	is that cor	rect?
	22	. A	One definitely, but I don't think several.
	23	Q ;	Do you recall there being several dogs on the
	.24	premises of	the Polanski estate?
).	25	A	I know the one which was always around, and that
.	26	is the one	I know.

20a-4

2

ŀ

3.

4

5.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

I don't recall having seen many constantly.

Maybe some guests or some friends had one or two with them.

Q Are you familiar with a dog called a Weimaraner?

A No.

Q What type of dog that is?

A No.

THE COURT: Mr. Hughes, it is 4:30.

MR. HUGHES: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: We will adjourn at this time.

Ladies and gentlemen, do not converse with anyone or form or express any opinion in regard to the case until it is finally submitted to you.

The court will adjourn until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow

morning.

MR. KANAREK: Is your Honor ordering Mr. Hatami back for tomorrow?

THE COURT: Yes, of course. His exemination has not been completed.

MR. WANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

(Whereupon at 4:30 o'clock p.m. the court was in recess.)

23`

24

,25