DISTRICT ATTORNE

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

vs.

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

Defendants-Appellants.

NO. 3014

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY
HON. CHARLES H. OLDER, JUDGE PRESIDING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL

APPEARANCES

For Plaintiff-Respondent:

THE STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL 600 State Building

Los Angeles, California 90012

For Defendant-Appellant Charles Manson:

IRVING KANAREK, Esq.

For Defendant-Appellant Susan Atkins: DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Defendant-Appellant Leslie Van Houten:

LESLIE VAN HOUTEN In Propria Persona

For Defendant-Appellant Patricia Krenwinkel:

PATRICIA KRINWINKEL In Propria Persona

VOLUME 14
Pages 3901 to 4200

J. Hollombe, CSR Murray Mehlman, CSR Official Reporters 211 West Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012 22b-1

On the other hand, if there is a verdict of murder in the first degree as to any defendant, then there will be a further proceeding on the question of penalty, and at that time the jury must decide which of the two alternative penalties provided by law, that is, life imprisonment or death, should be imposed.

Under the law of the State of California, the Legislature has not formulated any rules or standards to guide the jury in that determination but leaves the selection of the penalty, if there is a penalty phase, to the absolute discretion of the jurors.

I am going to ask each of you eventually, as you are individually examined, some questions regarding the death penalty, but, in the meantime, I would like for each of you to be thinking in your own minds as to what your honestly held opinions and beliefs are in relation to the matters that I have already mentioned.

We are conducting a portion of the examination of the prospective jurors in chambers and we are going to retire to chambers at this time to continue that examination.

Before we adjourn for the day, and whenever the Court does recess, the Court is going to admonish the jury not to converse among themselves -- and this goes also for the prospective jurors -- not to converse among themselves nor with anyone else on any subject

1,8

.22

23.

-4

23 fls.

.**24**.

relating to the case, nor to form or express any opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to them.

And there is a further admonition which is extremely important in any case which has received publicity or which is receiving publicity that you not read, watch or listen to any news reports so long as you are connected with the case in any way.

I would like each of you to promise me that you will follow these admonitions.

Are you all willing and do you so promise that you will follow these admonitions?

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

We are now going to retire into chambers, as I mentioned, and continue with the voir dire examination, which is simply an examination conducted by the Court and the attorneys to determine if there is any legal cause why any of you should not sit as jurors or alternate jurors in this case, and to insure that both sides have a fair and impartial jury.

I will ask the parties and the attorneys to join me in chambers and then we will continue with the examination.

(Recess.)

23

24

25

26

(The following proceedings were had in the chambers of the court, all defendants and their counsel being present, the District Attorneys being present, outside the presence and hearing of the members of the jury and the prospective alternate jurors:)

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.

(Mr. Porter resumes his seat.)

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. PORTER BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Porter, would you tell me again who your employer is?

A KCOP Television.

Q Do you know what the policy of your employer is with regard to payment of your compensation if your jury service should be prolonged?

A I am not really sure, to be honest about it.

I think they do, but I am not positive.

Q All right.

A Their contract is a little bit loose, so I'm not sure.

Q Are you a union employee?

A Yes, we have a small union.

Now, you were one of those persons who raised his hand, were you not, when I asked, I believe it was yesterday, whether any of the prospective jurors believed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

they could not be fair and impartial?

Yes, I was .

And would you tell us now the reason why you raised your hand.

Well, to be honest about it I would have to say that to start out in the case I would be somewhat partial in the case after having read all the newspaper articles on them.

That is not to say I would not try to be fair about it, but I would have to say that, I guess to sum it up, I mean I feel in my mind more like there is a greater chance of their being guilty than I do of their being innocent.

In other words, I would not start out feeling completely open about the case.

Q Did you ever hear or read anything which appeared to be a statement made by any of the defendants in this case?

Well, yes, I did, I read the one that supposedly A the girl told, I don't know if that was a statement or what,

	- 4		
24-1	1	, Ć	When you say the girl, you mean one of
= 12.	2	the defendants	s in this case?
<u>,</u> '	3	A ;	Yes, I do.
	4	Q'	Do you remember which defendant?
	5	A	Not for sure, no.
	6	Q	Are you now familiar with the names of
	7	the defendant	s?
	8	A	Yes.
	.9	Q	All right.
	10		There is Miss Krenwinkel on the far end
	.11	A	Yes.
	12	ବ	and Miss Van Houten in the center
	13	A	Yes.
	14	Q	and Miss Atkins.
	15	A	Yes.
	'16 -	Q	Does that at all refresh your recollection
	17	as to which o	ne it was?
	18	A ,	Well, I think it was Miss Atkins, but I
	19	am not sure.	It was quite a long while ago, when
	20	everything wa	s happening, that I read it, so I couldn't
	21	be sure.	
	22	Q	Was this in the newspaper?
	23	A	Yes, it was.
	24	Q.	Do you rememberwhich newspaper?
	25	A	The Los Angeles Times, I believe.
	26 .	Q	Now, what was the substance of the statement

	٠,	
	1	that you read?
	2	A Well, it was just describing what happened
	3	the night of the different murders that were supposed
	4	to have taken place.
	5	Q In other words, did it appear to be an
	6	eyewitness statement by someone who was present at the
	7	time of the killing?
	8	A No. It appeared to be more like a
	9	confession, from what I remember.
	10	Q And did it describe the killings them-
	11	selves?
	12	A Yes, it did.
	13	Q And the persons who were present?
	14:	A Yes.
	15	THE COURT: All right.
	16 :	Any questions?
	17	MR. REINER: No questions.
,	18	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.
*	19 .	
	20	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. PORTER
	21	BY MR., STOVITZ:
	22	Q Mr. Porter, how old are you?
	23	A 25.
	24	Q What do you do for KCOP?
	25	A Video tape maintenance and operations.
	26	Q Who is their main newscaster there?

	1	A Bill Johns.
	2	Q Have you ever watched any of his newscasts?
	8	A Well, not too many, really.
	4	Every once in a while I see one of them
	5	because I am there, but I mean I wouldn't turn it on
	6	if I was home.
	7	MR. STOVITZ: All right.
	. 8	THE COURT: Anything further?
ŕ	9	MR. STOVITZ: No.
•	10	THE COURT: All right, Mr. Porter. I will ask you
	1,1	then to go back into the courtroom, and will you refrain
	12	from discussing with anyone what has been said in here?
	13	MR. PORTER: Yes.
	14	THE COURT: Thank you.
	15	(Whereupon Mr. Porter leaves the court's
24a :	fls. ¹⁶	chambers.)
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	·••
	23	
	24	
	25.	
	26	
	۱۰۰ کو انځ	

24A2

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11.

12

13

1,4 15

16

17

18

19 20:

,21

22 23

24

25

26

MR. FITZGERALD: Challenge the juror for cause. under Penal Code Section 1073, Paragraph 2. Actual bias.

MR. REINER: Join.

MR . KANAREK: Join.

MR. SHINN: Join.

THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed.

Mr. Porter will be excused for cause.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I have two points that I would like to make at this time.

I didn't want to interrupt the Court when the Court was speaking to the mass media, but I cannot agree with the Court, and I say it with respect to the Court, that I cannot agree --

THE COURT: I don't expect you to agree with me.
Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Someone might, in the future, deem it to be a finding of fact.

I just want --

THE COURT: A finding of fact?

MR. KANAREK: Someone might advocate that your Honor made a finding of fact that none of those prospective jurors, that is, those that are — pardon me — none that have purportedly been sworn for the regular jury panel — have heard the confession, because it is my belief that they all have heard the confession, and it is my experience that the triggering off of a memory in a human mind is such,

44A2

`13

in a trial, the fact that they haven t enunciated it while sitting before your Honor is one thing, but it is my belief that during these proceedings that this will be triggered off in their mind, even assuming arguendo that they were candid with the Court, and I don't believe they were, but I don't want anyone to say that that is a finding of fact, which is not accepted.

May I request the Court to inform us as to what your Honor has found or done in connection with the interview of Paul Caruso today? I mean, to this point?

MR. STOVITZ: Our silence does not mean consent, your Honor, to Mr. Kanarek's statement.

THE COURT: Of course, this constantly rehashing of the same comments over and over again on the record does not change anything, Mr. Kanarek. You have stated your views now on a number of occasions.

I have stated my views with regard to the composition of the jury. The record will speak for itself as to the voir dire examination of these jurors, which was conducted under oath. They were under oath. In my opinion, they answered the questions frankly, honestly and sincerely.

None of those 12 jurors have read or heard of Susan Atkins confession or any other statement of any defendant.

In my opinion, they are fair and impartial.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I think that there is

THE COURT: There is no answer required now.

Ţ I don't want to prolong this. 2 MR. KANAREK: Very well. 3 THE COURT: There is nothing pending, but I simply wanted to answer your comments. 5 MR. KANAREK: May I respond to your Honor? 6 THE COURT: No. Let's call the next prospective 7 juror. 8 THE CLERK: Has Mr. Porter been excused? 9. THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Porter has been excused for 10 cause. 11 MR. KANAREK: May I have a response to the other 12 request? 13 THE COURT: We are not going to keep this up, 14 Mr. Kanarek. 15 MR. KANAREK: The other request as to what your 16 Honor has done in connection with the interview of Paul 17 Caruso. 18 THE COURT: You were present when I did it. 19. 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

25-1	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	-8-
	9
	10
	11
	12
-	13
	14
-	15
	16
	17
	18
-	19
	20
	21
	22

25

26

MR. KANAREK: No, I mean, your Honor has evidently had phone calls.

THE COURT: Well, what my phone calls are of no concern of yours, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. STOVITZ: I was wondering, your Honor, if whether or not on Monday or Tuesday if we are still in selection of the alternate jurors whether or not your Honor can give consideration to working, say, from 6:00 to 9:00 for the jurors' sake.

THE COURT: I gave consideration to all kinds of things, Mr. Stovitz.

(Prospective alternate juror enters the chambers of the court.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.

THE CLERK: The prospective alternate juror's name is R. H. McGowan, last name M-c-G-o-w-a-n.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. MC GOWAN BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. McGowan, if you were selected as an alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve?

A 1 No, I don't think so.

This is my second week, and I had 20 days, and I don't think I would have a job if I were selected as an alternate juror.

Q What is your job, sir?

ı		и -
1	A (- ,)	Jig builder for Fan Steel in Torrance.
2	Q ,,,	Do you know what that company's policy is
3	with respect	to the payment of your compensation if your
4	jury service	extends beyond that 20 days?
5	A	No, sir, I don't. I haven't had a chance
6.	to discuss it	with the personnel manager.
7	· Q	Are you a member of a union?
8.	A	No, there is no union.
. 9	Q	Could you determine what the policy is before
10	you come back	tomorrow?
11	A	Well, I have to pick up my check today.
12	Q	Today?
13	.A.	Yes.
14	Q	Could you determine that or ask someone in
15	charge there?	
16	A	Yes, Mr. Essex is in charge of personnel.
17	I can ask him	this afternoon.
18	Q Q	Tell him that the Court has inquired because
19	yoù are a pro	spective juror in this case.
20		We are concerned with what their policy is
21	about payment	of compensation in case you were selected
22	in a case that	went on, say, three or four months.
23	į. 	Would you let me know in the morning when
24	you come back	?
.2 5	A	I will.
26	Q	All right, Mr. McGowan, now aside from what
	t	

1	you already told me, is there any other reason that you
2	could not serve as an alternate juror in this case?
3	No other reason.
4	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
5	regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to
6	make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt
7	regardless of the evidence in the case?
8	A No.
9	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
10	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
11	refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the
12	case?
13	A No.
14	Q On the other hand would you automatically
15	impose it in every case without listening to the evidence?
16	A No.
17	Q That is, make up your mind to impose it in
18	every case without listening to the evidence?
19	You would not do that?
20	A No, I would not.
.21	Q You then, as I understand what you are
22	saying, you would be willing to listen to all of the
23	evidence in the case and if the case should get to
24	the penalty phase after listening to all of that evidence,
2 5	that you would then make up your mind as to which of the
26	two penalties was the appropriate penalty for this case,

	i	is that right?
	2	A Yes.
	3	Q Have you made any attempt to follow this
	4	case in the newspapers or on television or any other way?
*	5	A No, I work I sleep during the day and
	6 ·	I work the second shift, and other than the news flashes
	7	and things like this, it has been just vague.
	8	Q Do you read a newspaper regularly?
25a	fl \$.9	A No, I cancelled the Times.
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13 *	
	~14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18 ;	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	.25	,

		'Į!
5A-1	1	Q How long ago?
	Ž	A About October of 69. They increased their
	3	rates 50 cents, and I did not think it was justified.
	4	Q And I take it, then, you don't read any other
	5	newspaper on a daily basis?
	6	A I don't read any home delivery paper.
	7	Q Do you watch television news reports regularly?
	8	A Well, when I wake up it is time to go to work
i	9	and when I come home it is 2:00 o'clock at night so I don't
	10	have much chance of watching.
	11	Sometimes, like the weekends, I get the 11:00
'	12	o clock news at night.
_	13	Refore you came into this case did you know
	14	the names of the defendants in this case?
	15	A Mr. Manson's, I heard of that when it first
	16	happened.
,	17	Q When he was first arrested?
	18	A Yes.
	. 19	Q Did you know the names of the female defendants?
	.20	A No, not too well.
	21	I heard some of their names called but their
	22	names are odd, I did not try to remember.
	23	Q Have you ever read or heard anything that
	24	seemed to you to be a description by someone who was
(i)	2 5 .	actually there when the killings were taking place or any
	26 ·	of the killings?

4	
1	

A No.

2

Have you ever read or heard anything which seemed to be a statement made by one of the defendants, any of the defendants?

5.

4

A No. I have heard no statements made by any of the defendants.

7

6

Q Have you formed any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of any of the defendants in this case?

8

A I haven't followed the case that closely.

10

Q Do you think that if you were selected as a juror that you could give the defendants the benefit of the

12

11

A Yes.

presumption of innocence?

13

14

Q Do you recall I told the panel this afternoon -Did you come in this afternoon?

15 . 16

A I have been here all day.

17

Q You came in yesterday then?

18:

A Yes.

19 20 Q Do you recall my telling the prospective jurors that in every criminal case the defendant is entitled to the presumption of innocence.

21 22

23

In other words, he is presumed to be innocent, and that presumption lasts until the People are able to prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, if they are able to do so.

24

25

26

A Yes.

5a.3

25B

Q Now, would you be willing to follow that?

A Yes.

And if the People were unable to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt would you then be willing and would you vote to acquit the defendant or defendants, as the case may be?

A Yes

Q On the other hand, if the People were able to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to any defendant, would you then be willing and would you vote a verdict of guilty as to that defendant?

A Yes.

Do you know of any reason why you could not 25B-1 1 be fair and impartial if you were selected as a jurgr? 2 3 A No. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald. 5 MR. FITZGERALD: No questions, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Reiner. 7 MR. REINER: No questions, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Shinn. 9 MR. SHINN: No questions, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek. 11 MR. KANAREK: No questions, thank you, your Honor. 12 MR. STOVITZ: With the permission of the Court may I 13 ask this question? 14 15 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. MC GOWAN 16 BY MR. STOVITZ: 17 Mr. McGowan, sometimes it happens that a juror 18 wants to tell us something here in chambers that they 19 would not want to tell us outside in open court. 20 can you think of anything in your background 21 or anything like that that you might want to tell us here in 22 chambers that you may feel free to tell us? 23 A 24

25

26

A None other than what the Judge says, I have to inquire as to what the company will allow me. This is the only thing that is on my mind.

Q Do you have any little children at home or

24

25

26

	3919
anything li	ke that?
A	Yes, I have children at home.
. Q .	What are their ages?
A	From 14 to 16 years of age.
Q	Does your wife work at all?
. A	Me and my wife has been separated since
September o	£ 1965.
Q	Do you take care of the children?
Á	My mother takes care of the children.
Q	Your mother does?
A	They are attending summer school now.
Q	So if it is okay with your boss to continue
paying you,	you would be willing to serve, is that right?
A	Yes.
MR. S	STOVITZ: I have no further questions.
THE C	COURT: All right, Mr. McGowan, I will ask you
to go back	into the courtroom then and would you refrain
from discus	sing with anybody what has been said in here.

> MR. MC GOWAN: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Then you let me know in the morning, will you, about what you have been able to find out about your employment.

MR. MC GOWAN: Yes.

THE COURT: I think in view of the fact that it is ten after 4:00 now we should adjourn.

We don't know whether Mr. McGowan is going to

25B3

have a hardship problem or not until the morning, and we don't have time to fully examine another prospective juror.

So we will go back into the courtroom and I will admonish the jury before we adjourn.

which the state of the

ģ

26-1

· 18

(The following proceedings occurred in open court, all defendants, counsel, jury and prospective jurors being present:)

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present, the jury is in the jury box, and the prospective jurors are present.

We will adjourn at this time, ladies and gentlemen, until 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Again, remember the admonitions.

Do not converse among yourselves nor with anyone else on any subject relating to this case, nor form or express any opinions regarding the case until it is finally submitted to you.

And do not read, watch or listen to any news reports concerning the case so long as you are connected in any way with the case.

A TOP OF THE PROPERTY OF THE P

9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning, please.

(Whereupon at 4:15 o'clock p.m. court
was in recess until 9:00 o'clock a.m. of the
following day, Friday, July 17, 1970.)

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, JULY 17, 1970 1 2 3 (The following proceedings were had in the chambers of the court, all defendants and their counsel 5 being present, Deputies District Attorney being present as 6 well as Ronald Hughes, Esq.) 7 THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present. 8 I have been handed a document entitled Notice of 9 Motion To Substitute Counsel of Record. 10 It appears to have been signed by Leslie 11 Van Houten. 12 Is that correct, Miss Van Houten? 13 14 DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes. THE COURT: And which purports to be a motion to 15 16 substitute Mr. Ronald Hughes in place of Mr. Ira Reiner as 17 attorney of record. 18 I notice that Mr. -- first off, that Mr. Hughes 19 was formerly the attorney for Mr. Manson. 20 Is that right, sir? 21 MR. HUGHES: That is correct, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Which, of course, immediately raises the 23 question of a possible conflict of interest. 24 DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: At the time I hired Mr. Reiner he was on his own, you know -- at the time I hired Mr. Reiner,/ 25 26 he was also a prospective lawyer for Mr. Manson.

4.

,

η, ´

,21

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I can represent to the Court that there is no conflict between the defendants, Miss Van Houten and Mr. Manson.

THE COURT: Well, you can make the representation. I don't know whether I accept it as being true or not.

MR. HUGHES: I believe, your Honor, that Mr. Reiner will agree with that, that back in March of this year at the time that I became Mr. Manson's attorney, that Mr. Reiner was actively seeking to be Mr. Manson's attorney at that time, although at that time he was also representing — already representing Miss Van Houten, and at that time I do not believe that he felt that there was any conflict.

3.

.5

-8

.24

THE COURT: Well, assuming the substitution is permitted, are you prepared to proceed?

MR. HUGHES: I am prepared to proceed right now,
your Honor. I am familiar with the case. I have talked
with Miss Van Houten on several occasions. I am familiar
with the indictment against her, the charges that have
been brought against her, and I have seen the evidence and
I am up to date; and also I have read some of the proceedings
since the time I left the case on June 15th, or a little
earlier than that, actually.

THE COURT: What about preparations for trial? Had you undertaken preparations before --

MR. HUGHES: I am completely prepared for trial at this time, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am sorry, I didn't hear you.

MR. HUGHES: I am completely prepared for trial at this time.

THE COURT: In other words, there would be no continuance involved or request for continuance?

MR. HUGHES: I would not seek or request any continuance, your Honor.

I believe, your Honor, that this primarily is based upon what I would term and what Miss Van Houten has termed irreconcilable differences between herself and Mr. Reiner in the course and tactics which he proposes and which she proposes in the course of the trial.

2A

Is that right, Miss Van Houten?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes, that is right.

MR. HUGHES: Would you agree, Mr. Reiner?

THE COURT: If you were appointed, that is, if you were substituted as attorney of record — and I want the record to be perfectly clear that if the substitution is approved by the Court, that this is not an appointment under 987a of the Penal Code.

MR. HUGHES: I understand that.

THE COURT: You would not be entitled to any compensation whatever from the Court.

MR. HUGHES: I understand.

THE COURT: Or by virtue of any approval or order of the Court. This is strictly a private arrangement between you and Miss Van Houten.

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

THE COURT: If you are substituted in, Mr. Hughes, are you prepared to come in and act as an attorney and not simply -- the reason I am raising this question is because of your last statement.

The mere fact that an attorney, for example,

-- if such is the fact, and I don't know if it is or not -disagrees with his client as to the conduct of the trial
does not constitute an irreconcilable difference which
would warrant a substitution in the middle of the trial.

The attorney is in charge of the case. It is

not uncommon for attorneys and their clients to disagree as to the way a trial is handled.

The function of the attorney is to provide a professional representation for the client with skill, knowledge and ability to defend a client in his own best interest. Sometimes the client is the most incapable of judging what is best for him or her.

MR. HUGHES: I understand that, your Honor, and
I believe I would have Miss Van Houten's best interest at
heart and that I would be representing her as a professional
attorney notwithstanding the --

THE COURT: Would you be prepared to exercise your own best judgment in her defense?

MR. HUGHES: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, Miss Van Houten, as you know, Mr. Hughes, at one time, represented Mr. Manson.

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Who is a co-defendant in this case.
MISS VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

THE COURT: I have no way of knowing, because I don't know what the evidence is going to be, whether or not a possible conflict of interest may develop as between the defendants.

MISS VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

THE COURT: In other words, your interests and Mr. Manson's interests in this case may not exactly coincide.

- 24

 saying.

.6

1Ò

Do you understand what I am saying?

MISS VAN HOUTEN: Yes, I understand what you are

THE COURT: It might very well occur, and I don't know whether it will or not, that your defense and his defense are not exactly parallel, and that something that you or your attorney may urge or want to urge in your defense would be detrimental to Mr. Manson, or vice versa.

Do you understand?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Hughes, since he has represented Mr. Manson, would be in a position of possibly urging on your behalf a defense or some portion of a defense which would be inconsistent with what he would have done had he remained an attorney for Mr. Manson.

Do you understand that?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Or the other side of that coin is that conceivably, because of what he already knows about Mr. Manson's case, there is a possibility that this could in some way prejudice your defense.

Do you understand?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes, I understand what you are saying.

3-1

17.

THE COURT: I am not saying that he would do this consciously, but by virtue of the position that he has been placed in, do you understand that?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes!

THE COURT: Now, knowing all of this is it still your desire that Mr. Hughes represent you?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes. I don't see that there would be any conflict of interest.

THE COURT: Well, the fact that you may not see it does not mean it may not exist or possibly exist.

Have you had a chance to discuss this,

Mr. Kanarek, with Mr. Manson, as to what his feelings are
about a possible conflict that could arise as a result of
the substitution of Mr. Hughes?

MR. KANAREK: Mr. Manson does not oppose it, your

THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Manson?

MR. MANSON: That is correct.

THE COURT: You have heard what I just said to Miss Van Houten about a possible conflict arising because of the representation.

It may develop during the case that your interests and Miss Van Houten's interests or the interests of any other defendant do not exactly coincide as far as the strategy or the tactics of the defense are concerned.

MR. MANSON: I will accept that.

2· 3

,

5

Ģ

7² 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

ΤŢ

18 19

20

21

22 23

2425

26

THE COURT: You may be at different places different times; the facts might apply to one of you and not the other in such a way that one piece of evidence might be useful as being used in the defense of one of you, but might be harmful as against the other.

There are any possible number of combinations that I am not aware of, but what I want you to be aware of is the possibility that such could occur, and since Mr. Hughes has had the position that he has had, conceivably he may be in possession of information affecting you which he might how be obligated to use in defense of Miss Van Houten, which conceivably could be detrimental to you.

Do you understand that?

MR. MANSON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Now, knowing all of these things do you have any objection to Mr. Hughes being Miss Van Houten's attorney?

DEFENDANT MANSON: I have no objection.

THE COURT: You understand that when he becomes MissVan Houten's attorney he owes 100 per cent allegiance to her, and he has no allegiance to you whatever.

DEFENDANT MANSON: We accept that.

THE COURT: To the extent that there is any conflict he would be opposing you, notwithstanding the fact he formerly represented you.

ļ	DEFENDANT MANSON: I could accept that, too.
2	THE COURT: Does anyone else with to be heard in
3	this matter?
4	MR. STOVITZ: Just speaking as amicus curiae, your
5	Honor, I know that Miss Van Houten has graduated from high
6	school. At least I think she has.
7	I know she should be made aware of Mr. Reiner's
. 8	background with respect to what murder cases he has
.9	been involved in, and Mr. Hughes background as to what
10	criminal cases he has defended.
11	Although Mr. Hughes appears to be of my age,
12	I believe
13	MR. HUGHES: I will volunteer
14	MR.MANSON: We all know these things, he just wants to
15	bring this out.
16	MR. STOVITZ: I don't think the record knows these
17	facts:
18	Miss Van Houten should be made aware of these
19	facts. Mr. Hughes appears to be 45, is it, or 42
20:	MR. HUGHES: 35.
21	MR. STOVITZ: Are you 35!
22	MR. HUGHES: Yes, I am not your age, really.
23	MR. STOVITZ: He has just within the last year and
24	a half
,25	MR. HUGHES: Within the last year past.
26	MR. STOVITZ: Within the year been admitted to the

practice of law in the State of California. 1 Prior to that I don't believe he was admitted 2 to practice in any other state. 3 He did work for a short time in the Public 4 Defender's Office, is that right? 5 MR. HUGHES: That is correct. 6 7 MR. STOVITZ: As a clerk. .8 MR. HUGHES: Law clerk. MR. STOVITZ: To my knowledge, being head of trials 9 10 in the District Attorney's Office, I have not heard of Mr. Hughes defending any felony cases in the past year and a 11 half. 12 13 THE COURT: Are you acquainted, Miss Van Houten, with 14 these facts? 15 DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes, I am very familiar with 16 it. 17 THE COURT: You understand that relatively speaking 18 Mr. Hughes has not had a great deal of experience in the criminal field? 19 20 DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes. 21 THE COURT: That does not disqualify him because .22 everyone has to start sometime. 23 DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Right. 24 THE COURT: On the other hand, you should bear this 25 in mind, that this is a case which has complications of 26 many different kinds.

You need an attorney who has the intelligence, the ability and capacity and desire to represent you to the fullest.

(Defendant Van Houten nods in the affirmative.)

THE COURT: There are many attorneys in the criminal field who have far more experience than Mr. Hughes in murder cases and all types of cases.

Notwithstanding all of this you still wish to have Mr. Hughes as your attorney?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Yes, I do.

3a-1

2

1

.3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1:1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22 [†]

23

24

25

26

MR. STOVITZ: Before your Honor makes a final ruling, may we have about a ten-minute recess that I may hit the books -- we have a brief on this particular point that was recently prepared on another matter.

I would like to recheck the cases on it.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I would object to the District Attorney's Office interjecting themselves between the attorney-client relationship at this point.

MR. STOVITZ: We are not trying to interfere with the attorney-client relationship. We feel that the proper administration of justice --

THE COURT: There is no attorney-client relationship yet, Mr. Hughes. That is the point at issue, and this is the time for anyone who has an interest in this matter to be heard, not afterward.

MR. HUGHES: It seems, however, your Honor, rather strange that the District Attorney's Office would take an interest who the attorney for any particular defendant is in any particular case, and I believe that the record reflects that they actually in this case, they have taken an active and awkward position towards every attorney who has appeared, or toward many of the attorneys who have appeared.

They have taken a position of trying to exclude Mr. Kanarek from representing Mr. Manson.

They took various devious positions which

3a-2

2

1.

3

4

5

6

7

8.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22. 23

24

25

26

perhaps the Court is not aware of to exclude Mr.

Fitzgerald, and surely there is no more capable --

MR. BUGLIOSI: Will you articulate that for the record?

MR. STOVITZ: We oppose that statement.

THE COURT: We are getting far afield. The question now is whether or not this motion to substitute you for Mr. Reiner should be approved by the Court.

MR. HUGHES: Yes, I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: I see no objection to considering all of the aspects of this and permitting the People to consider the aspects of this too.

They have a legitimate interest in the outcome of this trial, and I see no objection to letting them throw whatever light they can before the Court makes its decision.

MR. HUGHES: For that matter I don't see that the Court -- I did not think that the District Attorney's Office then would mind having any light thrown on the opposition they threw in the path of Mr. Fitzgerald at the time --

THE COURT: Except that it has nothing to do with what the Court is now considering.

MR. HUGHES: It tends to show that the District Attorney's Office in this particular case has a tradition of interfering.

MR. BUGLIOSI: For the record, we never made any direct or indirect effort to have Mr. Fitzgerald removed from this case. There is no doubt in my mind about that. I have been on this case since its very inception.

There has never been an effort to have Mr. Fitzgerald removed from the case.

MR. STOVITZ: The only possible exception was Mr. Fitzgerald was in the Public Defender's Office, and when the Public Defender was first appointed in the case I think I did state in the record that there may be a conflict of interest because the Public Defender's Office represented Robert Beausoleil.

The Court with that in mind asked Mr. Fitzgerald to look into that conflict.

That is the only statement directly or indirectly that could be attributed to trying to block the Public Defender or Mr. Fitzgerald coming into the case.

I just make the Court familiar with that initial contact.

I was aware of the Public Defender, Leon Salter, representing Robert Beausoleil.

THE COURT: All right, then, you are requesting -- MR. STOVITZ: -- a ten-minute recess.

THE COURT: -- a brief recess.

Do you wish to be heard on this matter,

3a-4

2

1

3

4

5.

6

7

8

9 +

ĨÒ.

11.

12 13.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

Mr. Reiner?

MR. REINER: I don't know if there is anything I can ethically say at this point.

THE COURT: I am not asking you to say anything. I am just giving you the opportunity if you want to.

MR. REINER: Very well, I have nothing to state.

THE COURT: All right, then, we will recess for 15 minutes.

MR. STOVITZ: Before the recess, so the record is abundantly clear, Mr. Hughes is going to come in, he has not asked for a continuance. He made the representation to the Court as an officer of the Court that he is familiar with all of the proceedings that have taken place to date, and he is also familiar with the evidence in the case because he previously prepared his representation for Mr. Manson.

Is that right; Counsel?

MR. HUGHES: I believe I made that abundantly clear, Mr. Stovitz. Yes, that's right.

MR. STOVITZ: I just wanted to double check.

THE COURT: All right, we will recess then for 15 minutes.

(Recess.)

4-7

1 2

3

4

5.

6

7

8

. 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

.23 24

25

26

(The following proceedings occurred in chambers, all defendants and all counsel, including Mr. Hughes, present:)

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.

MR. STOVITZ: We have not been able to find any
cases that would be particularly on point, your Honor. We
will submit the matter.

MR. REINER: Your Honor, before the Court rules, perhaps I should indicate this.

Mr. Hughes stated that there appeared to be certain irreconcilable differences between myself and Miss Van Houten, and I suppose that that is true.

Miss Van Houten has indicated in open court that it is her desire that I remain mute, that I not ask questions on voir dire, that I not exercise peremptory challenges, and presumably continue to remain mute.

It is my view of competent and ethical practice that I cannot accept such instruction.

I indicated to her that I cannot and would not accept such instruction.

She feels very strongly that that is what she wants and, for that reason, there is a difference between Miss Van Houten and myself, and it is an irreconcilable difference.

THE COURT: That is the reason that I asked
Mr. Hughes the question as to whether or not he intends to

25.

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- and is willing to pursue a vigorous defense as an independent attorney in this case.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, Miss Van Houten and I plan to win this case.

THE COURT: That isn't what I asked you, sir. Your plan to win it may not encompass putting on any defense whatever.

What I want to know is whether you are prepared to act in accordance with all of your responsibilities as a lawyer.

MR. HUGHES: Yes, I am, your Honor.

5-1

2

1

ġ

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: Do you wish to say something, Miss Van Houten?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: I was just going to say that Mr. Reiner is in one way, he is dividing the defense up, and that is the difference.

THE COURT: I don't understand what you mean. What do you mean, dividing the defense up?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: Well, he says the difference was because I asked him to be quiet, you know.

That is just one part of it.

He is like dividing up the defense.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Manson, so the record will be perfectly clear, I understand from what you said before that notwithstanding everything as I have stated it to you this morning, that you have no objection to the substitution of Mr. Hughes for Mr. Reiner as Miss Van Houten's attorney, is that correct?

DEFENDANT MANSON: No, your Honor.

The only thing I like to see --

THE COURT: My question was, is that correct?

DEFENDANT MANSON: Yes, that's correct.

THE COURT: All right.

DEFENDANT MANSON: If all the attorneys are happy together, then they can offer a better defense in front of the Judge in the court, that is the primary reason.

THE COURT: But you have in mind everything that

I said to you about the possibility of a conflict of interest somewhere along the line?

DEFENDANT MANSON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Notwithstanding all of that you are not objecting to the substitution, is that correct?

DEFENDANT MANSON: No, I don't object.

THE COURT: You do not object?

DÉFENDANT MANSON: No.

THE COURT: All right.

Anything further?

MR. STOVITZ: Submit it.

MR. REINER: Nothing further.

THE COURT: All right, the motion to substitute
Mr. Ronald Hughes in place of Mr. Ira Reiner is granted.

Mr. Reiner is relieved as attorney of record for Miss Van Houten.

MR. REINER: May I be excused?

MR. STOVITZ: Is there going to be some sort of arrangement made for the delivery of the Grand Jury transcript and the daily voir dire transcripts?

MR. REINER: Yes.

MR. STOVITZ: Also, I don't know, I was not present at the time Mr. Reiner was substituted in for Mr. Part, but at that time I believe certain medical reports of a confidential nature were turned over from Mr. Part to Mr. Reiner.

25

26

I think these, too, though not requested by Mr. Reiner, should be turned over to Mr. Hughes.

Also, in the event that we furnished any discovery, so that there will not have to be a duplication of efforts, if Mr. Reiner would want to turn those over we would appreciate it.

THE COURT: Can we have an agreement on that, gentlemen?

MR. REINER: Surely, I will make available to Mr. Hughes all of the transcripts and all of the matters of discovery.

THE COURT: Mr. Hughes, you'd better be listening to this.

MR. HUCHES: Yes.

THE COURT: This directly concerns you.

MR. REINER: I will repeat that.

I will make available to Mr. Hughes all of the transcripts in my possession and all the items of discovery in my possession with reference to the medical reports alluded to by Mr. Stovitz, those were never made available to counsel. The Court kept them sealed.

THE COURT: As of the noon hour today?

MR. REINER: No, your Honor, I can make them available over the weekend.

MR. HUGHES: I can come to your office today.

MR. REINER: They won't be at the office. I don't

24

26

expect that you will have need for 22 volumes of transcript between now and Monday anyway.

But I will make available everything I have. Probably tomorrow is as good a day as any.

In the meantime I think everything I have is in Mr. Fitzgerald's possession, if you need anything today.

MR. HUGHES: May I have a moment privately with Mr. Reiner.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: Yes, Miss Van Houten?

DEFENDANT VAN HOUTEN: I made some tapes with one of my original attorneys, Mr. Part, and they were handed over to Mr. Reiner and I asked him to destroy them.

Have they been?

MR. REINER: Yes, they have been destroyed quite some time ago.

THE COURT: All right, anything further then, gentlemen?

Now, I believe that the jury and the prospective jurors should be apprised of the substitution, so if any of them know Mr. Hughes, that that can be communicated to the parties.

So I think that we should go into open court at this time, announce the substitution and then we can resume the voir dire in chambers.

The Clerk will file the notice of motion to substitute Mr. Hughes as attorney of record. Ż 15: 21 -

6 fls.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

				•	
		•			
_					
6-	1				
~					
					•
		\			
	$\overline{}$	•			
					-
		\			
•					
	Ţ	7			
	-				
			•		

6.

ġ

(The following proceedings occurred in open court, all parties and counsel, the jury and prospective alternate jurors present:)

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present. The jury is present.

Ladies and gentlemen, there has been a substitution of attorneys for the defendant Leslie Van Houten.

Mr. Ronald Hughes has been substituted as the attorney of record in place of Mr. Ira Reiner for Leslie Van Houten.

Mr. Hughes, would you stand up and face the jury and the prospective jurors?

MR. HUGHES: Good morning.

THE COURT: Do any of you know Mr. Hughes?

(No response from anyone.)

THE COURT: Very well.

We will then resume with our voir dire examination in chambers and I will ask all parties and counsel to join me in chambers.

(The following proceedings occurred in chambers, all counsel and the defendants present.)

THE COURT: For the record, all parties and counsel are present.

The last prospective juror we were examining yesterday was Mr. McGowan.

Mr. McGowan had indicated that he might have a hardship problem with respect to his employment compensation.

3

and I think that we should call him back in at this time to find out if he has learned anything from his employer.

(Mr. McGowan enters court's chambers.)

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. McGowan.

MR. McGOWAN: Good morning, your Honor.

6

7

5

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. MCGOWAN

8

BY THE COURT:

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Were you able to find out anything from your employer, Mr. McGowan?

When I got there they had closed. I was able Α to pick up my check and from my check I am able to determine that they are not paying me for jury duty now, for last week. I only drew one day and I worked that day.

The personnel office was closed when I got there. THE COURT: Will there be a stipulation, gentlemen? MR. STOVITZ: May I inquire? THE COURT: Yes.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. McGOWAN BY MR. STOVITZ:

Mr. McGowan, if you were not paid, sir, would this create an unbearable financial hardship on you?

Well, it has already. This is my second week on jury duty and I only received \$36 for one day's salary, and all my bills and things are going on.

24

25 .

26

Although I didn't turn in the slip from court,

I don't know if I am going to get paid for jury duty or not.

MR. STOVITZ: We will stipulate, your Honor.

Mr. Fitzgerald indicated on behalf of all defendants that he will stipulate, and the People will join in the stipulation.

MR. FITZGERALD: So stipulated.

MR. KANAREK: So stipulated.

MR. SHINN: So stipulated.

MR. HUGHES: So stipulate.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. McGowan. Then you will be excused.

Will you refrain from discussing anything that is said in here?

MR. MCGOWAN: Yes.

THE COURT: You are excused from further jury service.

MR. McGOWAN: Thank you.

(Mr. McGowan leaves the Court's chambers.)

THE COURT: The record will show that Mr. McGowan was excused by stipulation of all counsel for hardship reasons.

/ -1 .	1	(A prospective alternate juror enters the
<u> </u>	2	room.)
	. 3	THE CLERK: The prospective alternate juror s name is
	4	Mrs. Anna H. Klowden, A-n-n-a, K-1-o-w-d-e-n.
	5	
	6	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. ANNA H. KLOWDEN
	7	BY THE COURT:
•	. 8	Q Mrs. Klowden, if you were selected as an
	9	alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve?
	10	A No.
	11	Q Keep your voice up, please, so everyone in the
	12	room can hear.
	13	A No. I would not.
	14	Q What is your situation?
	15	A Can I say frankly?
	16	Q I want you to say it frankly.
	17	A I am prejudiced.
	18 [.]	Q I am not talking now about your state of mind.
	19	I am just trying to find out if it would be an undue hard-
	.2Ò	ship.
	21	I will get to the other.
	22	A I have another responsibility. I have a small
	23	job that I have got to look after.
	24	I am the volunteer chairman for the Thrift Shop
	25.	for the Gateways Hospital, and there are four shops and I
	26.	am in charge of the volunteers.

1	I am afraid if I wasn't present to keep them
2	organized it would be a hardship in that particular
3	facility.
4	Q All right, now, I understand from what you said
5	that you feel that you are prejudiced in this case.
6	A I am afraid I am.
7	Q Does that mean that you have formed some opinion
8	as to the guilt or innocence of one or more of the defendants
ý .	A Well, I am very emotionally moved.
10	MR. KANAREK: Could she speak up.
11	MRS. KLOWDEN: I am very emotionally affected by it.
12	Q BY THE COURT: Affected how? What is your
13	present state of mind with respect to the defendants?
14	Do you think they are more likely to be guilty
15	than innocent?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Is that because of the nature of the
18	A Yes.
19	Q of what you heard about the case?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Would you feel that way about any criminal case
22	that received some publicity?
23	A Oh, no, no, I would not.
24	Q What is the difference about this case?
25	A It is horrible.
26	Q You mean the way the people were killed?
	·

A Uh-huh. I am very deeply
Q Suppose instead of these four people who were
arrested as defendants in this case, some other four
people were arrested, would you feel the same way about
them?
A Well, if there were no confession I would not
feel that way. Since there was a confession
Q By whom?
A By one of the young ladies.
Q Which one, do you remember?
A . I cannot remember the name exactly.
Q Well, their names do you know their
names now, the names of the female defendants?
There is Leslie Van Houten, Patricia Krenwinkel
and Susan Atkins?
A I think it was Miss Patricia Krenwinkel who
made the confession.
The paper gave it wide publicity. I read the
papers very carefully.
I read the morning paper from page to page
every morning.
Q Which paper was this?
A The Times, and somehow every word of the
confession is still in my memory, and I don't think I can
discount it.

THE COURT: All right. Any questions?

26

1	MR. FITZGERALD: No.
2	MR. HUGHES: No.
3	MR. SHINN: NO.
4	MR. KANAREK: No.
5	MR. STOVITZ: No.
6	THE COURT: All right, thank you, I will ask you to
7	go back in the courtroom, Mrs. Klowden.
8 .	Will you refrain from discussing what was said
9	in here?
10	MRS. KLOWDEN: I certainly will, thank you.
11	(Mrs. Klowden leaves the chambers of the court.)
12	MR. FITZGERAID: I will challenge the juror for cause
13	on the grounds of actual prejudice.
14	MR. KANAREK: Join.
15	MR. HUGHES: Join.
16	MR. SHINN: Join.
17	MR. STOVITZ: The People will stipulate, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: The challenge is allowed.
19	Mrs. Klowden will be excused for cause.
20	(A prospective alternate juror enters the
21	room.)
22	THE CLERK: The prospective alternate juror's name is
23	Joe E. Fuller. J-o-e, F-u-l-l-e-r.
24	
25	

1.	VOTE DIRE EXAMINATION OF JOE E. FULLER
2	BY THE COURT:
3	Q Mr. Fuller, if you were selected as an alter-
4	nate juror in this case would you be able to serve?
5	A Well, I don't think my company will go for it.
6	Q Who is your employer?
7	A North-American Aviation. They will only go for
8	21 days.
9	Q Is this something that you have ascertained
10.	for yourself?
11	A Well, it is written on our pay slip that we
12	bring to court that we can go for 21 days.
13.	Q How long have you been on jury service now?
14	A I have been on two weeks.
15	MR. FITZGERALD: There will be a stipulation.
16	MR. HUGHES: So stipulated.
17 .	MR. KANAREK: So stipulated.
18	, MR. SHINN: So stipulated.
19	THE COURT: All right, you will be excused,
2 0 :	Mr. Fuller.
21	Will you refrain from discussing the conver-
22	sation in here?
23.	MR. FULLER: Yes.
24	THE COURT: Very well, by stipulation of all counsel
25	Mr. Fuller is excused.
ôc'	

8-1 (Whereupon another prospective juror enters 1 the Court's chambers.) 2 MISS CHASON: Good morning. 3 THE COURT: Good morning. 4 THE CLERK: The prospective alternate juror's name 5 is Miss Frances Chason; F-r-a-n-c-e-s, C-h-a-s-o-n. 6 7 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS CHASON 8 BY THE COURT: 9. Miss Chason, if you were selected as an 10 alternate juror in this case, would you be able to serve? 11 A I believe so. 12 I'm going to ask you the same questions I 13 have put to other jurors regarding their opinions as 14 to the death penalty. 15 16 Have you had an opportunity to think about 17 your own views on this subject? 18 A Well, to be truthful, I really haven't given it any thought because I have never had occasion 19 20 to deal with anything of this sort. 21 I feel that I would judge as I sat if I was 8a fls. seated. 23 24 25 26

Q I am going to put two or more specific questions to you.

A Good.

Q So we would like to have your honest opinion and belief, if you hold any opinions with respect to these matters.

A Yes, sir.

Q First, do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt regardless of the evidence in the case?

A No, I have no opinion at all in that connection.

MR. KANAREK: Could she speak up just a little bit?

MISS CHASON: Yes.

THE COURT: Keep your voice up, please.

MR. KANAREK: May the last answer be read?

THE COURT: Yes.

(The answer was read by the reporter.)

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

THE COURT: The question is whether or not,
by reason of any opinions regarding the death penalty,
you would be unable to be impartial as to the determination
of any defendant's guilt or innocence.

A No, I wouldn't be able to be impartial. I

3954 would just judge according to what was presented. 8a-2 1 In other words, you would be willing and you 2 are able to be impartial? 3 A, Truly. 4 Now, the second question is: Do you entertain 5 such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it without 7 regard to the evidence? 8 No. I don't think so. 9 On the other hand, Miss Chason, would you 10 automatically impose it in every case? 11. No. I would not. A 12 Without considering the evidence? Q 13 Α I would not. 14 Then you would be willing to hear all of the Q 15 evidence in the case, and if the case does get to the 16 stage where the jury is called upon to decide the penalty. 17 only after listening to all of the evidence would you then 18 make up your mind; is that right? 19 20 Certainly. Assuming you were able to make up your mind. 21 Well, I hope so. 22 23 Very well. 24

.25

26.

Now, we want to know what, if anything, you have learned about this case, Miss Chason, over the past months.

8a-3	1	A Yes.
	2	Q Have you lived in Los Angeles County continu-
	3	ously?
	4	A Since 1948.
	5	Q You weren't away during the past year?
	6	A Just on a trip to Puerto Rico.
	7.	Q That is what I wanted to know.
	8	A Yes.
	9.	I made a trip to the Virgin Islands before I
	10	came home.
v	11,	Q During what period?
	12	A I was called for the jury in June and I telephone
	13	because I had my plans already made for my trip, and I was
.	14.	assigned July 13th as my day.
8b fls	15	
OD LLD	1 6	
	17	
•	18	
	19	
	20	
`.	.21	
	22	
	23	
	'24	
	25	
	26	

	,	1. 美工工作	
8b-1	1	Q.	What I want to know is what period were you
) ,	2 , ,	out of the	United States, out of California?
	3	A.	For about a week, the middle of June; just
	4	the middle	to the end of June.
	5	Q	1970?
	6	. A	Yes.
	7	Q	Do you subscribe to a daily newspaper?
	· 8 .	A.	I do not.
	9	Q	Do you read a newspaper on a regular basis?
	10	· A	I utilize the Christian Science Monitor.
	11	That is my	paper and my church.
	12	Q	Do you watch television news reports?
	13	A	Occasionally.
.	14	Q	Do you listen to the radio news reports?
	15	· .A	No.
·	16	Q	When did you first learn that there had been
	1,7	some killin	ngs which are the subject of this particular
	18	case?	
	19	A	Just over TV.
	2 0′	Q	Well, when was that? Do you remember?
	21	A ,	Oh, several months back. A long time ago.
	22	•	I really, to be frank and truthful, I read
	23	nothing ab	out the case because I am not interested in
	24	-	ds, so to speak.
	25		The paper I read does not carry these stories.
	26	ြ	that At some time you did learn/there had been

some killings? 1 A. By listening to the news, you see. 2 It is always interspersed and you, therefore, are just 3 4 bound to hear things. I couldn't say that I haven't heard anything. 5 Keep your voice up, please. 6 Q. I will do the best I can. 7 8 Now, you did subsequently learn that these .8 defendants had been arrested and charged with these 10 offenses? 11 A I don't know their names. I know there was **12**· such a thing, that it happened, but I don't know the 13 people involved nor their names. 14 Before you came into this case, did you 15 know the names of any of the defendants? 16 I did not, except the name of Manson, which 17 you couldn't help but hear on TV. 18 That is just what I want to know. Q A That is it. 20 Except for Manson, did you know the name of Q. 21 any of the other defendants? 22 A No. sir. 23 Did you know the names of any of the victims? Q. 24 A I believe I heard the Tate name. That is 25 the only one. 26. Sharon Tate? Q

1	A Yes.	
2	Q Any of the others?	
3	A No.	
4	Q Have you formed any opinion as to the guilt	
5	or innocence of any of the defendants in this case?	,
6	A No, I really haven't given it any thought.	
7	Q Have you ever read or heard anything which	
8	appeared to be a description by someone who was actually	
9	present at the time any of these killings occurred?	
10	A No, I have not.	
11	Q Have you ever read or heard anything which	
12	appeared to be a statement made by anyone of these	
13	defendants?	
14	A No, I have not.	
15	Q Do you know of any reason why you could not	İ
1 6	be entirely impartial if you were called upon to act as	
17	a juror in this case?	
18	A I do not.	
19	Q Do you think that you could put aside whateve	+
20	you have heard or read about the case and decide the	
21	case solely on the evidence that is introduced during	
22	the trial?	
23	A I believe so.	
24	Q Do you have any question about that?	-
25	A No, sir.	
26	Q Would you promise the Court to do so if you	

		were selected to serve?
	1	A I would.
O	2	
8c fls.	4	
oc TTS.	- 5	
	6. '	
	7	
	.8	
	.9	
	10	
	11	
	12	
ė	13	
	14	
	.15 16	· ·
-	17	
	18	
	19	
	20.	
	21	
	22	
	23	
<u> </u>	24	
.	25	
	26	
*	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

-1.	1	THE CO	URT: Mr. Fitzgerald?
	2	MR. FI	TZGERALD: Thank you.
	3		
1	4	Vo	IR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS CHASON
н	5	BY MR. FITZG	ERALD:
	6	Q	Miss Chason, you have heard Mr. Manson's name
-	7	on radio?	•
	8	À	Yes.
	9	Q	Is that correct?
	10.	A	That's right.
	11	Q	Have you seen references to him on television?
	12	A	On TV, yes. Whenever the news comes on.
	13	Q	Have you also read about him, perhaps, in the
	14	Christian Sc	ience Monitor, or anywhere?
	15	A	No, not at all.
	16	Q.	Would you be able to give Mr. Manson a fair
	17	trial?	
	18	A	I believe I could listen to the evidence and
	19	then decide.	,
	20		I believe in a fair trial, certainly.
	21	Q	But could you give him a fair trial?
	22 '	A	Certainly.
	23	Q	Do you have any preconceived notions that he is
	24	more likely	to be guilty than innocent?
j	25	A	I don't know the case. Therefore, I couldn't
-	26	say.	

8C2 10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

Q Have you ever heard of any of the attorneys in this case; specifically, Mr. Kanarek?

I don't know any attorneys.

MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you. I have nothing further.

No questions, your Honor. MR. SHINN:

THE COURT: The order in which we have been proceeding, Mr. Hughes, is that Mr. Fitzgerald has been asking questions first, then Mr. Reiner was second. So, if you wish to follow that procedure?

MR. HUGHES: I have no questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?

MR. SHINN: No questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: No questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz?

MR. STOVITZ: Yes. With permission of the Court.

17

18

19

20 -

21

22

23

24

25

26

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS CHASON

BY MR. STOVITZ:

Q ... Miss Chason, sometimes jurors feel more comfortable telling us things here in chambers than they do out in court.

Is there anything about your personal life or anything that you might want to tell us about yourself so that you would be able to show us, you know, sort of like, oh, any little thing that might have happened in your life

	ł	•
3C3	1	that would cause you to be prejudiced one way or the
	2	other?
<u> </u>	3	A No. I know of no prejudice.
	4,	I am a Civil Service retiree and free lance
	5	doing tax work when tax time comes around. I am single and
	`6	I live alone.
	7	Is there anything else? I will answer all
	8	questions.
	9.	MR. STOVITZ: Thank you very much. No questions.
	10	THE COURT: Then I will ask you if you will go back
	11	into the courtroom, Miss Chason, and will you refrain from
	12	discussing with anyone what has been said in here this
	13.	morning.
	. 14	MISS CHASON: Most assuredly.
	15	THE COURT: Thank you.
	16	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.
3	. 17	(Whereupon, Miss Chason leaves the Court's
	. 18.	chambers.)
,	19	THE COURT: Now, according to my records, the next
	20	prospective alternate to be examined here in chambers would
	21	be Mr. Ramirez; is that correct?
	22	MR. FITZGERALD: Correct.
	23	THE COURT: All right.
	24	We haven the jury a recess yet. I
•	2 5	think we probably should do that at this time.
	26	We will take a 15-minute recess.

) -1	1	(The following proceedings were had in the
	2	chambers of the Court, all defendants and all counsel
	. 3	being present.
	4	THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.
	5 .	Would you bring in Mr. Ramirez, please, the
	6	Mo. 5 alternate.
	7	(Mr. Ramirez enters the chambers of the court.)
	8	
	9 .	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. ARTHUR E. RAMIREZ
	10-	BY THE COURT:
	11	Q Good morning, Mr. Ramirez.
	12	A Good morning.
•	13 -	Q Mr. Ramirez, if you were selected as an
	14	alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve,
	15·	sir?
	16	A I would, your Honor.
	17	Q All right. I'm going to ask you now some
	18	questions regarding your opinions on the death penalty.
	19 .	Have you had a chance to think about these
	20	matters?
	21	A I have.
	22	Q The first question is this:
	23 . ′	Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
	24	regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to
	25	make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt
	26	regardless of the evidence in the case?

į.	
1	A No. your Honor.
2	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
ġ,	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
4	refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the
5	casé?
6 6	A No. your Honor.
7.	Q on the other hand, would you automatically
8	vote to impose it in every case without considering the
9	evidence in the case?
10.	A No.
11	Q In other words, you would be willing to listen
12	to all of the evidence in the case, and then make up your
13	mind on the question of penalty if the case should get to
14	that point.
1 5	is that right?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Now, we want to find out what, if anything, you
18	may have learned about this case over the past months.
19	Have you resided in Los Angeles continuously
20	since last August?
21	A No. in Gardena. That is part of L.A. County.
22	
2 3	
.24	
25	
26	

	٠F	- 	
10-1	1 1	Q	Do you subscribe to a daily newspaper?
	2	À	The Los Angeles Times.
	3	Q.	Do you read that regularly?
	4	A	Yes, sir.
	5	Q (Have you made any conscious effort to follow
	6	this parti	cular case in the newspaper or on television?
	7	A	Not particularly.
	8:	Q	Do you watch television news reports?
	9	Ą	Very seldom.
	10	Q	Do you remember when you first learned about
	11	this; that	is, about the killings that are the subject of
	12 ·	this case?	
	13		When did you first hear about it or read about
	14	it?	·
	1 5	A	It was probably following after the sensa-
	1 6	tion.	
	17	. Q	All right.
	18	A	The headlines.
-	19	Q	Then at some later time, Mr. Ramirez, did you
	20	learn that	t these defendants had been arrested and charged
	2 Î	with the	offenses?
	22	A.	Yes, I read that.
	23.	Q:	Have you formed any opinion as to the guilt
	24	or innoce	nce of any of the defendants?
	25	A	At this point I can't say I have.
	26	Q	Have you ever read or heard anything which

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

22

23

24

25

26

seemed to be a description by somebody who was actually at the scene of one or more of these killings?

I believe I read something, but I was confused as to who it was that had been at the scene.

Now, when I say "at the scene," I mean at the scene at the time.

The scene at the time?

- Of one or more of the killings.

A Yes. But I don't remember who it said in the newspaper.

Did it appear to be one or more of the defendants who was making a statement, or was this someone else?

A I just say that I read in the newspaper where there was supposed to have been someone up there at the scene but I don't recall just which one that it said in the newspaper. I didn't pay that close attention.

> All right. Q.

Now, I am not talking about the description in the newspapers immediately after the bodies were discovered.

> This was after the alleged --A

I am not talking about that. Q

I am talking about a later statement which appeared to you to have been made by someone who was present at the time of the killing or killings.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9.
	10
	11
	12
.	13
	14
	15.
	16
	17
10a	f1.8.
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
).	25
	26

A No, I don't recall that.

Like I just said, like what I recall, in the newspaper it stated that there had been -- there had been someone at the scene that had seen this. That is as far as I recall.

Q Are you talking about someone who was at the scene when the bodies were discovered, by whoever discovered them? Is that what you mean, Mr. Ramirez?

A No, I meant in the newspaper. It described someone of the alleged defendants had been at the scene. This is the part that I am saying.

I didn't pay that much attention to it. I really didn't.

B. Carlon

Q Do you remember who was making the statement?

A This was just a report in the newspaper that someone was seen there, but I don't recall which one of the defendants they were referring to that had been there at the scene of the crime.

10A-1	1	Q Was it one of these four defendants?
	ż	A It might have been. Possibly. It had to be
	3	one of them.
	4	That is what I say, I don't recall which one it
	5	stated in the newspapers.
	6	Q Have you ever read or heard any statement
	7	which seemed to be a statement of one of these defendants?
	8	A Not particularly, your Honor. I didn't pay
	9 :	that much attention.
	10	THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald?
	11	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, your Honor.
	12	
	13	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
()	14	BY MR. FITZGERÄLD:
	1 5	Q Have you heard about any of the defendants on
•	16	the radio?
	17	A Yes, I have.
	18	Q Have you seen references to them on television?
	19	A Yes, I have.
	20	Q Do you know anything from those sources about
	21	the defendants and their background?
i I	22	A Not too much.
1	28	Q Let's take the defendants individually.
	24	Could you tell us what you have heard, read or
	25	seen about Mr. Manson?
	26	A Well, all I remember hearing it was mostly

hearing, I didn't see too much on television they had
moved to some little ranch where there was a Family that
they called, and that he was the leader, I guess.
Q And what did the Family consist of, if anything?
A A group of individuals, so far as I know.
Q And how were they composed?
A In which manner are you asking? Composed in
which way?
Q In terms of sex.
A That, I don't know.
Q Were they all men?
A No. They were men and women; girls and boys;
whichever.
Q Do you know anything else about Mr. Manson?
A In which way?
Q Did you read, hear, or see anything about
Mr. Manson's good character?
A No.
Q Did you read, see, or hear anything about
Mr. Manson's bad character?
A That I can't say either, because like I said,
I didn't pay that much attention.
Q Have you heard anything about Susan Atkins?
A The only time that I recall reading about her
is when she was supposed to have done something in court
here, and I didn't read all that even.

11-1	1	Q Susan Atkins did something within the court?
	2	A As far as I can remember.
<u> </u>	3	Q What about Patricia Krenwinkel, have you read,
	4	seen or heard anything about her?
	5	A Just that she was one of the defendants.
•	6	Q And do you know why she is a defendant in this
	7	case or why she has been arrested?
	8	A Well, just from what I heard in the courtroom.
	à	Like I say, when it first came out in the
	10	newspapers.
	11	Q What about Leslie Van Houten, have you ever
	12	heard anything about her?
	13	A The same thing, what I read in the newspaper
—	14	and what I heard in the court.
	15	MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.
	16	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?
	17	MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.
	18	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
	19	MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.
	20	
	21	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. RAMIREZ
	22	BY :MR. SHINN:
,	23	Q Did you read the papers the last couple of
	24	days?
;	25	A Yes, I have.
	26	Q Did you read anything about this case?

		3971
1	A	No, I did not.
2	Q	Did you watch TV the last couple of days?
3	A	Yes, I have.
4	Q ;	Did you hear anything about this case in the
5	last couple	,
6	A	No.
7	Q.	Nothing at all?
8	À	No.
9		Did you hear anything about Mr. Kanarek
10	.	Do you know Mr. Kanarek?
	A	
11	r	Yes, I know him on sight.
12	, , Q	The attorney for Mr. Manson?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	Did you hear, say the last couple of weeks
15	or recently	~~
16	A .	One article I remember reading where he got
17	admonished	for coming in late, or something like that,
18	that's all	I can remember.
19	Q	Was it in the newspapers?
2Ò	A	I think it was in the newspapers as a
2 1	matter of fa	ct I did not read it, I think my wife was
22	reading it	and she was telling me about it.
23	Q.	But you don't recall anything else about
24	Mr. Kanarek	?
25	.	No.
2 ê	MD C	HTNN: No further questions

1	MR. KANAREK: No questions.
2	
, ş	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. RAMIREZ
4	BY MR. STOVITZ:
. 5	Q What is your business or occupation?
6	A I am a machine shop foreman.
7	Q For whom, sir?
8	A Hughes Aircraft.
9	Q And you mentioned a wife. Do you also have
10	children?
11	A Yes, I have.
12	Q What are their approximate ages?
13	A I have two daughters at home, one is 18 and
14	one is 20.
15	Q Now, very often jurors are freer to tell us
16	things about their own personal background, the background
17	of their children and relatives, here in chambers, that
18	they are reluctant to tell us out in open court.
18 19	they are reluctant to tell us out in open court. Can you tell us anything about your background
	*
19	Can you tell us anything about your background
19 20	Can you tell us anything about your background here which would cause either side to know whether or not
19 20 21	Can you tell us anything about your background here which would cause either side to know whether or not you could be fully free to decide this case on the merits.
19 20 21 22	Can you tell us anything about your background here which would cause either side to know whether or not you could be fully free to decide this case on the merits. Did any of your daughters ever get in any
19 20 21 22 23	Can you tell us anything about your background here which would cause either side to know whether or not you could be fully free to decide this case on the merits. Did any of your daughters ever get in any trouble or anything like that?

	1.	A What do you mean by trouble, drunken driving,
	2	or something like that?
<u>,</u>	3	Q Nothing serious.
	4	A Nothing serious, no homicides.
	5 .	Q You don't have brothers or relatives that
	6 ·	are police officers?
	7	A My brother's stepson is a police officer with
	8	the Gardena Police.
	9	Q And now you know the difference between rumor
	10	and fact, right?
	11	A I do.
	12	Q And do you think that you could put all rumors
	13 ° ,	aside on this case and decide this case only on the
	14	evidence that you hear in this courtroom?
	15	A Yes.
	16	Q Do you understand that if you are selected
	17	as an alternate juror you are going to have to take an
	18	oath to do that?
ļla	fls. 19	A Yes, I understand.
	20	•
	21	•
	22	
	23 24	
	25	
	26	

And then if one of the jurors becomes ill and Q .LA-1 1 you take over for one of the regular jurors, that cath 2 becomes all the more important, you understand that? 3 A Yes. 4 If you give your promise to the Court to fulfill 5 that oath, will you do that? 6 Yes. Α 7 Beyond any reasonable doubt? 85 Yes. 9.* MR. STOVITZ: No further questions. .10 VOIR DIRE-EXAMINATION OF MR. RAMIREZ 11 BY THE COURT: 12 Q Mr. Ramirez, I am still not clear about some 13 of the things that you said, and I want to ask you some 14 more questions. 15 Now, to be specific, do you know what a 16 confession is? 17 I do. Α 18 Have you read or heard anything concerning 19 this case at all that makes you think that you were reading 20 or hearing a confession of anybody? **Ž**1 The only time I heard it, your Honor, was right A 22 here in the courtroom, one of the defense attorneys said 23 something about one of the girls is ready to confess that 24 she had something to do with it. 25

Q

26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

That is something you heard in the courtroom?

1@2	1	A	Yes.
	2	ୟ	From one of the defense attorneys?
	,3	. A	Yes, he was asking, "Would you separate the
	4	fact from th	ne evidence "
•	5	Q.	Was this when he was questioning some of the
	6 -	prospective	jurors?
	7.	A	Yes.
	8	Q	That is not what I am referring to.
	9		What I am referring to is whether or not you
	10	have ever he	eard or read anything that caused you to
	11	believe that	t it was one of the defendants speaking about the
	12	events that	occurred.
_	13	A	No, I don't recall reading that.
	14	Q .,	You don't recall any such thing?
	15	A.	No, sir.
	16 .	Q	But I think you said that you had read or
	17	heard someti	ning which seemed to place one or more of the
	18	defendants a	at the scene.
	19	A	I can say that is what I read, but I don't
	20	recall exact	tly the article stating which one of the
	21	defendants v	was at the scene.
	22	ବ	Well, now, you know, of course, that the defen-
	23	dants are cl	narged with having committed these offenses.
	24	A	Yes.
	25	Q	The State has charged them in an indictment with
	26	having been	at the scene and committing the offenses?

- 4	3 3
•	43.5

5.

.26

Yes	•
	Yes

Q Now, are you talking about something other than that?

A No, that is what I referred to so far as the article stated.

Q Did it state just that they were charged with the offenses?

A That they were charged with the offenses and were supposedly at the scene of the crime.

Q Did the article indicate the basis for that statement? Did it describe any fact?

A The only thing I can recall, your Honor, is that they had taken -- I don't remember again which one of the members appeared at the scene -- and they were supposed to have picked out where some of the garments were supposed to have been thrown out at the side of the road or something.

And that is the basis I am referring to.

Q Keep your voice up. I cannot hear you.

A That is the basis on which I am saying it, that particular article, I think they had taken one of the defendants to the scene of the crime and they were looking for evidence and I think there was some garments or something that they had thrown over the side.

Q Did the article seem to indicate that whoever this defendant was had admitted being there?

A yes, it is obvious that they had admitted being

there because the record was they had taken the police officers to the scene, not to the scene, but where they had thrown these garments.

Ğ

8,

23.

11B-1

,	
11b-1	1
	2
í D	3
	4
	5
	.6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23

.25

26

THE COURT: Any further questions?

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION (Reopened)
BY MR. STOVITZ:

Q Mr. Ramirez, assume for the moment -- this is just hypothetical -- that in the trial here you hear from the evidence that some independent person, a newspaper reporter for instance, found the garments all by himself.

Do you think you could block out what you think you remember about this newspaper article and just concentrate on the evidence in the case?

A I believe I could.

Q Do you think that you could eliminate completely any traces of that newspaper article and say to yourself "Well, I must have been wrong because here I hear testimony under oath, and the newspaper article was not under oath"?

A How far can you block it out?

Q ... Well, this is what we are asking you.

Can you do it?

Your oath will be to decide --

A Under oath and under instruction by the Court I believe I could.

MR. STOVITZ: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: All right, I will ask you to go back into the courtroom, Mr. Ramirez. Will you refrain from

discussing with anyone what has been said in here?

MR. RAMIREZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

(Mr. Ramirez leaves the chambers of the court.)

MR. FITZGERALD: We will challenge the juror for cause, because of his exposure to inflammatory pretrial publicity.

In connection with the challenge for cause
I might point out to the Court that one of the defendants,
Susan Atkins, was removed from the Los Angeles County
Jail for women on Sunday, December 14th, in the company
of Los Angeles police officers, and transported to the
Benedict Canyon area in the City of Los Angeles where there
was a search for certain items of physical evidence that
Susan Atkins had revealed to the police, there being a
possibility of their location.

It was also clear from the published account of Susan Atkins' so-called confession in the Los Angeles Times that physical items of evidence were disposed of in the Benedict Canyon area.

If I may be presumptuous, I think what the prospective juror, Mr. Ramirez, was referring to when he said he read an account -- I agree with Mr. Ramirez that obviously implicit in that search is the idea or the premise that she was present at the time the murders

were committed, and knew where the items of physical evidence were disposed of, and how they were disposed of.

MR. SHINN: Join in the motion.

MR. STOVITZ: I submit, your Honor, that the actual evidence that will be revealed at the trial will be that none of the defendants were present when the clothes or the murder gun was found.

That there was such a report in the newspapers of Miss Atkins being removed to look for the items.

I believe that the account was very sketchy at that time.

I believe that the juror's answers to the questions that he had followed the case very little and that he would be governed by the evidence, should control in this particular instance and that the challenge for cause should be disallowed.

THE COURT: Well, the does seem to be somewhat jumbled about what he has read and heard.

But it would appear to me that there is a good chance that he has read or heard about an alleged confession, and he so indicated.

Because of that I am going to allow the challenge.

Mr. Ramirez will be excused for cause.

MR. KANAREK: I think the record should reveal I

join with Mr. Fitzgerald on that challenge. THE COURT: It really doesn't make any difference. It has been allowed. Ş MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

2-1.

MR. FITZGERALD: I would ask the Court, and I apologize to the Court, but Mr. Kanarek pointed out to me that I inadvertently failed to challenge Miss Francis Chason, the previous juror, for cause, and I wonder if your Honor would entertain a challenge for cause.

The basis of the challenge for cause is her mere exposure to inflammatory pretrial publicity.

MR. KANAREK: Join.

MR. SHINN: Join.

MR. HUGHES: Join.

THE COURT: The record will show that the challenge has been made on behalf of all defendants.

MR. STOVITZ: We will oppose the challenge.

THE COURT: The challenge is disallowed.

It appears to me that Miss Frances Chason has had little exposure to pretrial publicity, knows nothing about any confession, alleged or real, on the part of any of the defendants, and can and will be fair and impartial if selected as an alternate juror or as a juror.

Mr. Ramirez has been excused, so would you send in the next prospective juror.

THE CLERK: Yes, sir.

(Another prospective juror enters the Court's chambers.)

THE COURT: Good morning.

MRS. O Neals: Good morning.

THE CLERK: The prospective alternate juror's name is

ւ22		
	i	
	*	

Mrs. Evelyn O'Neal.

The name is spelled as follows: E-v-e-1-y-n, o apostrophe N-e-a-1.

4 5

6

.9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

 $\mathbf{\hat{2}}^{\prime}$

3

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. EVELYN O NEAL BY THE COURT:

7 8

Mrs. O'Neal, you were one of those prospective jurors who stood up and gave your name when I asked if there was anyone who could not be fair and impartial?

> À That's right.

Would you tell us what that belief is based on?

Well, your Honor, if it was one murder, I would say that there might be some doubt, but when there are seven, there is no doubt in my mind.

Doubt as to what?

. That they were committed and by these people.

Well, I don't think anyhody seriously contends that they weren't committed, that seven people didn't die, but what causes you to believe that these defendants committed the offenses?

> Α Why are they here?

Well, would your feeling be the same in any criminal case: Why is the defendant before the Court? Or is there something special about this case, Mrs. O Neal?

> No. I was up on another case the other day, A.

1	a rape case, and I felt the same way, that the defendant had
.2	committed the crime before I ever got up into the jury,
3	for the simple reason that no sensible woman would drag her
4	name through the mud if it hadn't actually been committed.
5	Q You believe then that every time that there is
.6	a charge of rape that the defendant is therefore guilty?
7 :	A Well, the Judge said certain things that led me
8	to believe that this person had committed other crimes.
9.	In fact, he said he had committed other crimes.
10	Whether they were the same crime or not, that
11	I don't know. It could have been the same crime.
12	Q I am not talking about this particular defendant
13	Mrs. O Neal, but do you believe that every time some woman
14	charges a man with rape that he is therefore guilty?
1 ,5	A Well, if she was any sort of a decent woman she
16	wouldn't want her name drug through the mud. For what
17	reason?
18	Q Do you believe that every time a person is
19	charged with murder he is therefore probably guilty?
20	A No. No, not necessarily.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 :	
26	·

12A

12a-1	1	Q But if he is charged with seven murders,
	Ž.	then he is very probably guilty?
,	3	A Yes, and especially at two different places,
	4	the same people.
	5	Q Do you believe, then, that you would be
	6	unable to give these defendants the presumption of
	7	innocence?
	8	A I do.
	9	Q And you would require them to prove their
	10	innocence?
	11	A I do. They would have to.
	12	Q Incidentally, did you sit as a juror in that
	13	rape case?
	14.	A No. I was excused.
-	15	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mrs. O'Neal.
	16	I will ask you to go back into the courtroom.
	17	Will you refrain from discussing with anyone
	18	what has been said here?
•	19	MRS. O'NEAL: Yes.
	20	(Whereupon Mrs. O'Neal leaves the court's
	21	chambers.)
	22	MR. FITZGERALD: We will challenge the juror
	23	for cause, actual bias, your Honor.
	24	MR. KANAREK: Join, your Honor.
	25	MR. HUGHES: Join.
	26	MR.SHINN: Join.

12a-32 THE COURT: The challenge is allowed. Mrs. O'Neal 1 is excused for cause. 2 MR. STOVITZ: May we suggest that the juror be 3 referred to the civil department, your Honor? 4 (Whereupon another prospective juror enters 5 the court's chambers.) 6 Good morning. THE COURT: 7 MR. BURRIS: Good morning. 8 The prospective alternate juror's name THE CLERK: 9 is Noan Burris; N-o-a-n, B-u-r-r-i-s. 10 11 12 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. BURRIS 13 BY THE COURT: 14 Mr. Burris, you are one of those prospective 15 jurors who stood up and gave your name when I asked if 16 there was anyone who could not be fair and impartial; 17 is that right? 18 That's right. 19 And what is that belief based on, sir? 20 'On the fact that I believe they are guilty 21 before I ever sat there, so that lets me out. 22 Why do you so believe? 23 Because of the news that I have heard. 24 I don't know why I believe things, but if 25 there are certain things I believe, I believe them. 26 And would you require the defendants to prove

1	their innocence to you before you would acquit them,
2 .	or do you think it is possible?
3	A I don't think it is possible, sir.
4	Q Regardless of what the evidence is, you think
5	they are guilty?
6	A Right.
7	THE COURT: All right. You may go back into the
8	courtroom now, Mr. Burris.
9	Will you refrain from discussing what occurred
10	in here?
11	MR. BURRIS: Yes.
12 .	(Whereupon Mr. Burris leaves the court's
13	chambers.)
14	MR. FITZGERALD: Challenge the prospective juror
15	for cause, your Honor. Actual bias.
16	MR. KANAREK: Join.
17	MR. HUGHES: Join.
18	MR. SHINN: Join.
19	THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed. Mr.
20	Burris excused for cause.
21	(Whereupon another prospective/juror enters
22	the court's chambers.)
23	THE COURT: Good morning, sir.
24	MR. GARNER: Good morning, your Honor.
25	THE CLERK: The prospective alternate juror's name
26	is Douglas H. Garner; D-o-u-g-l-a-s, G-a-r-n-e-r.

	1 ;	VOIR I	DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. GARNER
	2	BY THE COURT	
	3	Q.	Mr. Garner, if you were selected as an
•	4	alternate j	ror in this case would you be able to serve?
	5	A,	I would have my doubts, healthwise.
	6	Q	What is your situation, sir?
	7	A :	I am on an anticoagulant and I am required
	8	to have a 1	aboratory test every 30 days.
	9	Q	Well, if arrangements could be made for that,
	10	that is, to	transport you to wherever
	11 `	A.1	Well, that is possible, yes.
	12	Q.	Where is this done? In a doctor's office?
	13	A.	At the hospital.
	14	Q:	Which hospital?
	15	A	Santa Fe.
	16	Q.	Santa Fe?
	17	A	Yes.
	18	- Q	Where is that?
	19	A	610 South St. Louis.
	20	Q	In the City of Los Angeles?
12 b	f15.	A	Yes.
÷	22	,	
	23	` 	
_ '	24		
	25		
	2 6		

2B - 1	1	Q If arrangements could be made to transport you
	2	to the hospital for that on a monthly basis, Mr. Garner,
<u> </u>	3	would that take care of the problem?
	4	A oh, I think
	5	Q of course, there would be a doctor either in
	6	the hotel or available on short notice at all times.
	7	A Yes.
	8	Q For any juror or alternate juror.
	9	A Yes, sir.
*	10.	Q Apart from that, is there
	11	A My job would suffer.
	12	Q Are you self-employed?
	13	A No.
:	14	Q Whom do you work for?
	15.	A The Santa Fe Railway.
	16	Q Do you know what their policy is with respect to
	17	continuing your compensation while you are on jury service?
	18	A Oh, I feel that the first 30 days are
ı	19	compensated, but after that I am not sure.
	20	Q Is this something that you could ascertain some
	21	time between now and this afternoon?
	22	A Yes, I believe so.
	23 [.]	Q All right. Would you do that?
	24.	A All right.
	2 5	Q Please.
	26	In the meantime, we will go ahead and ask you

some other questions. 12B2 1 All right. Ά 2 Q I am going to ask you the same questions 3 regarding the death penalty that I put to the other 4 prospective jurors. 5 Α Yes, sir. 6 Did you hear and understand everything that I 7 said to the panel yesterday? 8 Did you just come in yesterday? 9 Α No. I have been here about four days now. 10 Q Have you heard and understood everything that 11 has been said? 12 A Yes, I believe so. 13 Q 14 All right. Do you entertain such conscientious opinions 15 16 regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt 17 regardless of the evidence in the case? 18 Α No . 19 20 Q. Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically 21 refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the .22 case? 23 Á 24 No. On the other hand, would you automatically 25 vote to impose it in every case without considering the 26

•		
.2B	3.	• .
		-
,	,	

2

3

4

5.

6

Ż

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

evidence in the case?

A No.

Q So, then, you would be willing to listen to all of the evidence, and if the case gets to the penalty phase, after hearing all of the evidence, you would then make up your mind as to which penalty should be imposed; is that right?

A Yes.

Q Have you lived continuously in Los Angeles County since last August?

A Yes.

Q Have you made any conscious effort to follow this case in the newspapers or on television or radio?

A No. Just when it happened to appear, I might have listened to the news.

Q Do you subscribe to a daily newspaper?

A I take the Times, yes.

Q Do you watch television news reports?

A Not always. Occasionally.

Q When did you first learn about the killings that are the subject of this case? Was that shortly after they happened?

A Yes.

Q And then did you, at some time later, learn that these defendants had been arrested and charged with the offenses?

		3992
12B4	1	A Yes.
	2	Q Have you formed any opinion at this time as to
	8	the guilt or innocence of any of the defendants?
	4	A That is a difficult question.
	5	Q You know, of course, that they have been charged
	.6	with the offense.
,	. 7	A Yes, I realize that.
	8	Q It may very well raise the question in anyone ts
* 1		mind as to whether or not they are guilty.
	10	A Yes.
,	11	Q Or why they are before the Court.
! .	12	A Right.
	13	Q But aside from the fact that they have been
	14	charged with the offenses and they are before the Court to
,	15	stand trial, Mr. Garner, have you read or heard of any facts
	16 .	which would cause you to believe that they are directly
	17	connected with the commission of those offenses?
	18 ·	A Well, no, other than the accounts that I have
ı	. 19	read that seemed to give that impression.
	20	Q That is what I am talking about.
	.21	A Yes.
12C	22	
r	23	
_	24	
	25	
	26	•
		1

12c-1 ₁	Q. When you say they seemed to give that
2	impression, what do you mean?
3	Do you recall any particular statements or
. 4	the substance of any of these accounts that causes you
5	to think that that was the impression they were giving?
6	A Well, it seems to me that one of the females
7	confessed to a certain amount of participation in the
·8	crime and naming these other people.
9	Q Is that something that you read?
10	A Yes.
11	Q You read this where, in the Times?
12	A I believe so, yes.
13	THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald?
. 14	MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?
16	MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn? MR. SHINN: No questions, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?
19	MR. KANAREK: No. No questions, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: All right.
21	I will ask you to go back into the courtroom,
22	Mr. Garner, and will you refrain from discussing with
23	anyone what has been said in here?
24	MR. GARNER: Certainly.
25	THE COURT: Thank you.
26°	(Whereupon Mr. Garner leaves the court's

chambers.) 1 MR. FITZGERALD: Challenge the juror for cause, your 2 Honor. 3 MR. SHINN: Join, your Honor. 4 MR.HUGHES: Join, your Honor. 5 MR. KANAREK: Join. 6 The challenge will be allowed. Mr. Garner THE COURT: 7 is excused for cause. 8 MR. STOVITZ: While we are waiting, did your Honor 9 catch the "Tate-La Bianca trial uses no extra jurors"? 10 THE COURT: No, I didn't. 11 MR. STOVITZ: A report from the Jury Commissioner. 12 No extra jurors have been summoned because of this trial. 13 Perhaps we should send out an SOS for about 14 four or 500 extra. 15 (Whereupon another prospective alternate juror 16 enters the court's chambers.) 17 THE COURT: Good morning. 18 MR. HALL: Good morning. 19 THE CLERK: The prospective alternate juror's name .20 is Jesse E. Hall; J-e-s-s-e, H-a-1-1. 21 22 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. HALL 23 BY THE COURT: 24 Mr. Hall, you indicated, I believe, yesterday, 25 or on some earlier day, that you could not be fair and 26

1	impartial in this case.
2	A I am afraid that is true.
3	I have read in the papers and I have seen
4	Q Keep your voice up, please.
5	A From what I have seen on television and read
6	in the papers, I have already formed an opinion which
13 f1s. 7	would be hard for me to disregard.
√8	
9	
1Ò .	
11	
12	· ·
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
=	4.

· ·		
13-1		
سے جسر	,	
-		
	,	
		•
,		

3.

Q [°]	Wo	uld you	be	willi	ng and	able	to	give	to	the
defendants	the	benefit	of	the	presum	ption	of	innoc	enc	e?

A I would try, but as I say it would be difficult.

Q Have you formed an opinion that they are more likely to be guilty than innocent?

A I think I have, yes.

Q Is this based on anything that you read or heard which would seem to you to be a statement by any of the defendants?

A I could not say what the source was now, it has been some time ago, but I have read quite a bit about it in the paper and saw it on television newscasts. But I don't know what the sources were.

Q If you were selected as a juror would you require the defendants to prove their innocence?

A Well, this is what bothers me. I should say no, but that is probably the position I am in.

Q No one is being critical of you. We are just trying to find out what your actual beliefs are.

A I can say I am sure they are innocent until they are proven guilty, but I may feel the other way, and I suspect that I do feel that way.

Q Suppose that you had been charged with a criminal offense and you were here before the Court to stand trial, would you want someone on your jury having the same frame of mind as you now have?

	I.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
3-2	i	A I don't think so.
	2	THE COURT: All right, sir.
	3	Any questions?
	4	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.
	5	MR. HUGHES: No questions.
	6	MR. SHINN: No questions.
•	7	MR. KANAREK: No questions.
	8	THE COURT: All right, thank you, Mr. Hall, I will
	9.	ask you to go back into the courtroom, and would you
	1Q·	refrain from discussing with anyone what has occurred here?
	11	MR. HALL: Yes.
	12	(Mr. Hall leaves the chambers of the court.)
	13	MR. FITZGERALD: Challenge the juror for cause on
	14	the grounds of actual bias.
	15	MR. HUGHES: Join.
	16	MR. SHIN: Join.
	17	MR. KANAREK: Join.
	18	THE COURT: The challenge is allowed. Mr. Hall is
	19.	excused for cause.
	20	(A prospective juror enters the chambers of the
	21	court.)
	22	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
	23	juror is Louis W. Holland. L-o-u-i-s, H-o-l-l-a-n-d.
	24	
	25	
	26	

3-3 1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF LOUIS W. HOLLAND
2	BY THE COURT:
3	Q Are you any relation to Judge Holland?
4	A No, sir, unfortunately.
5	Q Mr. Holland, if you were selected as an alter-
6	nate juror in this case would you be able to serve?
· 7	A Not personally, no. I have personal reasons.
8	Q Would you tell us what your situation is?
9	A Well, my wife is anticipating visiting her
10	family and leaving the children at home. She is doing that
11	in August.
12	Q You have minor children?
13'	A Yes, teen-agers.
14	Q Is there anyone else that could care for
15	them?
16	A We have no melatives here.
17	Q What is your employment?
18	A Flight engineer, Lockheed Aircraft, Burbank.
19	Q Do you know what Lockheed's policy is with
20	respect to payment of compensation to employees called to
21	jury service?
.22	A only for the normal 30-day period.
23	Q If your compensation deased after 30 days,
24	would that be a hardship as far as you are concerned?
25	A Yes, sir, it would.
26	THE COTOR. Any stimulation?

1	MR. STOVITZ: I would like to ask just one question.
2	
3	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. LOUIS W. HOLLAND
.4	BY MR. STOVITZ:
5	Q Mr. Holland, is it possible to have your
6	child is it one child or two?
7	A one.
8.	Q To go back with your wife to visit the relatives
9 :	A Most anything would be possible, but in this
10	case I would say no.
11 ;	He has a part-time job and like everyone else
12 [.]	he is trying to struggle along with the money he can make
13	on his own.
14	Q How old is this boy?
15	A 17.
16	MR. STOVITZ: If the defendants are willing to
17	stipulate, we will.
18	MR. FITZGERALD: We will stipulate.
.19	MR. HUGHES: So stipulated.
20	MR. SHINN: So stipulated.
21	MR. KANAREK: So stipulated.
22	THE COURT: You will be excused, Mr. Holland, thank
23	you.
24	Will you refrain from discussing with anyone
25	what occurred in here?
26	MR. HOLLAND: Yes, sir. (Mr. Holland leaves the chambers of the court.)

L3a-1₁	(A prospective alternate juror enters the
2	chambers of the court.)
3	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
4	juror is Mrs. Gloria L. Overton. G-l-o-r-i-a; last name
5	Q-v-e-r-t-o-n.
6	
7	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. OVERTON
8	BY THE COURT:
9	Q Mrs. Overton, if you were selected as an
10	alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve?
11	A Well, I am working and I have been given time
12	off already for jury duty.
. 13	Q Will you raise your voice?
14	A I am working and I have been given time off
15	for jury duty. I don't know how itwould affect my job.
16	Q Who is your employer?
17	A I work for Cal. State College.
18	Q That is one of the State Colleges?
19	A Yes.
20	I've only been there four months. I am just
21	learning the job.
2 2	I really don't know the whole thing yet.
23	Q Are you a teacher?
24	A No, I am just a clerk-typist. I am working in
25	the library office.
26	MR. KANAREK: What were those last several words?

13	a.	-2	

2

3.

4

5

6

7

8.

9

10

. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

25

THE REPORTER: "I am working in the library office."
MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

BY THE COURT:

Q Now, Mrs. Overton, I am going to ask you the same questions I have put to the other prospective jurors regarding the death penalty.

Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any of the defendants' guilt regardless of the evidence in the case?

A I don't think I could vote for the death penalty.

- Q Well, that was not what I asked you.
- A If I understood your question.
- Q I am asking you now whether your beliefs regarding the death penalty would prevent you from being impartial in deciding the question of guilt?
 - A Oh, no, no.
- Now, you understand if you were a member of this jury and if there should be a conviction of one or more of the defendants of murder in the first degree, then there would be a second phase or a penalty trial.

Do you understand that?

- A Yes.
- Q And in that trial the jury would then have to determine which of the two punishments provided by law,

life imprisonment or death, should be imposed? 1 2 A Yes. Now, knowing that, and knowing that if there Q. 4 was a verdict of murder in the first degree you would then be called upon to make that decision, do you still think 5 that you can be impartial on the question of deciding each defendant's guilt? 8 Well, I could be impartial, yes. I don't 9 quite understand you. 10 Well, you see, if you were convinced that the 11 evidence otherwise showed that a particular defendant was 12 guilty of murder in the first degree, and the jury 13 rendered such a verdict, then you, along with all of the 14 other jurors, would be called upon to decide the question 15 of penalty. 16 Α Yes. 17 In other words, you would then be faced with 18 the problem of making that decision? 19 A Yes. 20 Now, do you believe that because you might be 21 faced with that problem that you would tend to find the 22 defendant not guilty so you might never be faced with 23 that problem even though the evidence might point otherwise? 24 I am afraid I might because I am used -- I 25 just cannot say that I think someone should die regardless 26 of what my feelings that they deserve it or not.

i	Q You think there is a strong likelihood that
2	you might not be impartial for that reason?
. 3	A Yes.
4	Q I'm talking now on the question of guilt.
5	A Oh, guilt?
6	Q Yes, that is what we have been talking about.
Ť	A No.
ķ	Q You have understood everything I said so
9	far?
10	A I am not sure whether I do or not. This is
11	the first time I have ever been on a jury panel.
12	Q That is all right. These are matters that
13	most people are not familiar with.
14	It is understandable that you might not
1 5	understand everything I am saying.
16	The first part of the trial will be devoted
17	to determining whether the defendants are guilty or not
18	guilty.
19	Do you understand that?
20	A I understand that.
21	Q During that portion of the trial the jury
22	should not consider in any way the question of panalty or
23	punishment because that has no part in the determination
24	of whether or not he or she is guilty or not guilty.
25	Do you understand?
26	A I do.

	1	Q However, sometimes people feel so strongly
	2	about the death penalty that it may affect their ability
	3	to be impartial in determining the question of guilt.
	4	That is what I am asking you now.
	5	A No, that would not affect my feelings.
	6	Q You could be impartial on the question of
	7	guilt?
	8 .	A No.
	9 .	Q I said you could be impartial on the question
	10.	of guilt?
	11	A No, I would not be impartial on the question
	12	of guilt.
	13	Q You know what I mean by the word, impartial,
	,	by the same and the same same same same same same same sam
	14	that means not partial?
• 13b	14 fls. 15	
13b	,	that means not partial?
13b	fls.15	that means not partial?
13b	fls.15	that means not partial?
13b	fls. 15	that means not partial?
13b	fls. 15 16 17 18	that means not partial?
13b	fls. 15 16 17 18	that means not partial?
13b	fls. 15 16 17 18 19 20	that means not partial?
13b	fls. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that means not partial?
13b	fls. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that means not partial?
13b	fls. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	that means not partial?
13b	fls. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that means not partial?

	₹-	"
13B-1	1	Q I am not sure you understand what I am saying.
<u>~</u> :	2	Could you be fair in determining the guilt of
	3	the defendants?
	4	A Yes.
	5	Q And not let your beliefs about the death
	é	penalty influence your decision on the guilt?
	7	A Yes.
	. 8	Q You could be fair?
	9	A Yes.
	10	Q All right, now, the second question goes to the
	11	penalty phase of the trial, if there is one, and there may
	12	be one.
	13	It will depend on what the jury verdict is.
	14	Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
	15	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
	16	refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the
	17	case?
	18	A Yes.
	19	Are you saying now that you have made up your
	20	mind at this point that regardless of what the evidence
	21	showed you would never vote for the death penalty, is that
	22	what you are saying?
v	23	A That is the way I feel right now.
	24	Q Can you think of any circumstances or any
	25	facts where you would be willing, first, to listen to all
	26	of the evidence, and then make up your mind whether to vote

 for life imprisonment or death?

A No. I am a very emotional person and I think this would be too much for me, to have that on my conscience, regardless of the verdict.

Q Well, is that because of your beliefs about the death penalty or do you believe the responsibility is too great, or what?

A I just don't know how to say it, I wish I had not got on anything like this because I hadn't even thought about it.

Q Well, would you rather not be a juror in this case?

A Yes, I would rather not be a juror in this case or in any murder case.

Q And is that because you don't think you can discharge your duties as a juror?

A Right. I am just too emotional and too nervous.

Q Well, I think that is probably true of many people who serve on juries, particularly in death penalty cases, but they do it even though they don't like to do it.

Now, do you think you could do it even though you don't like to do it?

A Well, I am here. I would have to do it, I guess, if I were told to do it.

In other words, you would try to do your duty the best way you could?

	1	
B3	1	A i would try to do my duty, right.
	2	Q All right, do you have any opinion about the
	. 8	death penalty at all, one way or the other; are you for it
	4	or against it, in the abstract?
	5.	A In the abstract, as long as I don't have to
	6	make the decision, I don't think about it too much.
	7	I mean, I have not given it that much thought.
	8	Q All right now, let's say that you were a
	9	juror in a case where you did have to make a decision; there
	10	was a penalty phase of the trial, would you be able to
	11,	listen to the evidence and then make your decision?
	12	A Yes.
**	13	Q You might not like it, but you could do it?
	14	A You mean and would I have to vote for the
•	15	death penalty?
	16	Q No, you would not have to vote one way or the
	17	other. The law says that it is up to the absolute dis-
	18	cretion of every juror to make the decision for himself.
	1,9	What I want to know is have you already made
	20	that decision or would you be willing to listen to the
	21	evidence and then make the decision?
	22	A Definitely I would listen to the evidence and
	23	then make the decision.
	24	
	25	
	26	

	1		
13C+1	1	Q	All right, now, have you consciously tried
• .	2	to follow th	nis case in the newspapers or on the television
	8	news reports	the radio?
	4	A	I read about it but I haven t I am not
	5	that interes	sted in that sort of thing.
	6	Q	Do you subscribe to a daily newspaper?
	-7	A.	Yes.
	8.	Ą	What paper is that?
	.9:	A	The Times.
	10	Q ,	Did you first read about this case in the Times?
	11	, A	Yes
	12	Q	Was that shortly after the deaths were
	13.	discovered?	Vac
	14	À	Yes.
	15	Q.	And then did you later read or hear that these
•	16 ,	defendants)	had been arrested and charged with the offenses?
•	17	. A	I did not know about all three of the girls.
	18	Q	Before you came into this court you had not
	19.	heard about	the girls?
	20	A "	I did not realize there was going to be three
	. 21	girls, no.	
	22	ବ	Had you ever heard the name Leslie Van Houten
	23	before you	came into this case?
•	24	A	No.
	25	Q.	Susan Atkins?
	26	A	Yes.
		I	

	:	
13c2	i Ì	Q Where did you hear that?
	.2	A I have read it in the paper and heard it on
	3	television.
	4	Q Do you remember in what context you read it
	5	or heard it, what was being said about it?
	6	A I am not sure if she was the one that wrote the
	7	article for the paper.
	8	Q What article is that?
٠	9	A The Times had a big
	10	Q What did it say?
	11	A The details of the whole crime.
	12	Q In other words, an eye witness account, is that
	13	what you mean?
	14	A Yes.
	15.	Q of someone who was there?
	16	A Right.
	17	Q Who told who else was there?
	18	A Yes.
•	19	THE COURT: Any questions?
	20	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.
	21	MR. HUGHES: No questions.
	22	MR. SHINN: No questions.
,	23	MR. KANAREK: No questions.
	24	MR. STOVITZ: We do have questions on another
	25	subject matter which we will, of course, take up outside
	26	of the presence of the juror if the anticipated event does

not occur. 1 THE COURT: Mrs. Overton, I will ask you to go back 2. in the courtroom, please. 3 Would you refrain from discussing with anyone Å. anything that has been said here this morning? 5 MRS. OVERTON: Yes. 6 THE COURT: Thank you. Ź MRS. OVERTON: Could I state one thing: My husband 8 is a Superior Court clerk. Would that have anything to do with it? 1 10 THE COURT: In this County? 11 MRS. OVERTON: Yes. 12 THE COURT: In a criminal department? 13 MRS. OVERTON: No, he works in Department 95. 14. THE COURT: No, that does not necessarily disqualify 15 you. It might disqualify him, but not you. 16 MRS. OVERTON: Well, okay. 17 Thank you. MR. KANAREK: 18 (Mrs. Overton leaves the chambers of the court.) 19 MR. FITZGERALD: We will interpose the challenge for 20 cause. 21 MR. HUGHES: Join in the challenge. 22 MR. SHINN: Join in the challenge. 23 MR. KANAREK: Join in the challenge. 24 THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed. 25 Mrs. Overton will be excused for cause. 26

1	Did you want to say something else now,
2	Mr. Stovitz?
3	(Off-the-record discussion.)
. 4	(A prospective alternate juror enters the
5 .	chambers of the court.)
é	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
7	juror is Albert M. Cohen. A-1-b-e-r-t; last name, C-o-h-e-n
8	
9	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF ALBERT M. COHEN
10	BY THE COURT:
11	Q Mr. Cohen, if you were selected as an alternate
12	juror in this case would you be able to serve?
13	A No, sir, I would not.
14	Q Would you keep your voice up, please, and would
15,	you tell us what your situation is.
16	A Well, I am employed with the Internal Revenue
17.	Service, Federal Government.
18	I carry an inventory of work process. I have a
19	special project I am working on and I have waivers of prior
20	years I have to process and get out.
21	THE COURT: There might be a lot of people that might
22	be glad to see you get jury service.
23	MR. FITZGERALD: We are willing to stipulate.
24.	MR. HUGHES: So stipulated.
25	MR. SHINN: So stipulated.
26	MR. KANAREK: So stipulated.

MR. STOVITZ: So stipulated. THE COURT: Are you asking, then, to be excused, Mr. Cohen? MR. COHEN: Yes, sir. THE COURT: You will be excused. Will you refrain 6. from discussing with anyone what has been said in here this morning? MR. COHEN: Yes, sir, I will. 9. THE COURT: All right, thank you. (Mr. Cohen leaves the chambers of the court.) 11. Entry Control

14-1		1
		2
,		ş
		4
		5
		6
		7
	٠	8
		9
•		10
		11
		12
		13
		14
		1,5
		16
		17
		18
		19
		20
		21
		22
		23
		24

25

26

(Whereupon another prospective alternate juror enters the court's chambers.)

THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate juror is Mrs. Victoria Kampman; V-i-c-t-o-r-i-a, K-a-m-p-m-a-n.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. KAMPMAN BY THE COURT:

Q Mrs. Kampman, if you were selected as an alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve?

A Yes, I believe I could.

Q Would you please keep your voice up so everyone in the room can hear you.

A Yes, I could.

Q All right.

Now, I am going to ask you the same questions that I put to the other prospective jurors regarding the death penalty.

Have you had a chance to think about these matters?

A Yes, I have.

Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt regardless of the evidence in the case?

A No. I don't.

14-2

Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the case?

'A' No, I don't.

Q On the other hand, would you automatically vote to impose it in every case without regard to the evidence?

A No. I wouldn't.

Q Would you be willing to listen to all the evidence in the case and consider it, and then make up your mind, if it becomes necessary, on the question of penalty?

A I don't understand.

Q Did you understand it?

A No.

Q All right.

You understand that only if there is a conviction of one or more of the defendants of murder in the first degree will there be a penalty phase?

A Yes.

Q If there is a penalty phase and if you were called into the box as a juror, you, along with the other jurors, would then have to determine which of the two punishments, that is, life imprisonment or death, should be imposed.

14-3	1	Do you understand that?	
	Ż ,	A Yes.	
	ع:	Q Now, if such should be the case, would you be	
	4	willing to listen and consider all of the evidence in	
	5	the case before you made your decision as to which of	
	the penalties should be imposed?		
	7.	A Yes, I would.	
	8	Q In other words, you haven't made up your mind	
	9	in advance?	
	LÓ .	A No. I have an open mind.	
j	L1 ,	Q Have you made any conscious effort to follow	
3	12	this case in the newspaper or on television or by listening	
13		to the radio?	
	l 4 : ,	A Well, I can't help but listen to the radio	
. 1	(5	because I put it on.	
ā	L6 .	Q Do you read any newspaper on a regular basis?	
1	L7	A Not too much.	
;	18	Q Do you subscribe to any paper?	
3	Ļ9	A The Times. I like the Times.	
5	20	Q Keep your voice up, please.	
*	21	A Yes, sir.	
2	22	Q When did you first learn about the deaths	
5	23	that are the subject of this case?	
_	24	A I heard about it on TV in Chicago last	
•	25	summer. I was in Chicago.	
2	26	Q How long were you back there?	

14-4	1	A Three months.
•	· 2 ·	Q And you came back when?
	3 `	A Oh, about the end of August.
	4	Q You returned to Los Angeles the end of August?
	5	A Yes.
	6	Q Then did you later learn that these defendants
	7	had been arrested for these offenses?
•	8	A I heard that somebody was arrested but I don't
	9	know who. I wasn't interested.
	10	Q Keep your voice up, please.
	11	A I heard that they were arrested but I didn't
14a fls.	12	know who or what. I was not interested.
<u> </u>	13	
	14	
	.15	
•	16	
	17	
	18	
	19 .20	
	21	
•	22	
-	23	
	.24	
	25	
_	26	

4A-1	1	Q Have you, at this time, formed any opinion as
	2	to the guilt or innocence of any of the defendants?
	3	A No. I have not.
	4	Q Have you ever read or heard any description by
	5	anyone who appeared to have been present at the time that
	6	any of these people were killed?
	7	A No. I have not.
	.8	Q Have you ever read or heard anything that has
	9	been said by any of these defendants?
	10	A No. I have not.
	11	Q Do you know of any reason why you could not
	12	be fair and impartial if you were selected as a juror in
1 1 -	13	this case?
	14	A No, I do not.
	15	Q Now, you have heard me tell the panel when you
	16	came into court that in every criminal case the defendant
	17	is entitled to the presumption of innocence.
	18	Did you hear me say that?
	19 :	A Yes, I did.
	20	Q And that presumption continues until his guilt
	21	is proved beyond a reasonable doubt.
	.22	Do you understand that?
	23′	A Yes, I do.
	24	Q Would you be willing to give each of the
	25	defendants the benefit of that presumption of innocence?
	26	A Yes. T would.

ï	
1	Q And if the People were unable to prove guilt
2	beyond a reasonable doubt, would you then vote for an
3	acquittal?
4	A Yes, I would.
5	Q on the other hand, if the Poople were unable
Ĝ	to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, would you vote a
7	verdict of guilty?
8.	A Yes, I would.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald?
10	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.
11	
. 12	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. KAMPMAN
13 [.]	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
14	Q Is anything you have read going to influence you,
1 5	do you think, Mrs. Kampman, in arriving at a verdict?
16	A No, I don't think so.
17	Q Have you heard anything about Mr. Manson?
18	A No. I have not. Just
19 .	Q Have you read anything about him?
20	A In the Times once in a while, like they would
21	quote him in the paper, that he was a bearded hippie.
22	Q A bearded hippie?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Anything else?
2 5	A No.
26	Q Anything about his background or history?

- 1	
1	A No.
2	Q Anything about his powers?
3.	A No.
4	Q Do you think you could be just as fair and
5 .	impartial in evaluating Mr. Manson as you could any other
6	Young man?
7	A Yes, I would.
8	Q And you have read nothing about the female
-ģ.	defendants in this case?
10 ⁻	A No. I have not.
11	FITZGERALD: Thank you.
12	Oh, one moment.
13	Q Have you heard about Mr. Kanarek?
14	A (Pause.)
15	Q Do you know who Mr. Kanarek is, first of all?
16	A Prior to when I was called here, I did not.
17	Q You didn't read, see, or hear anything in
18	connection with Mr. Kanarek?
19	A No, I have not.
20	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions. No further questions,
21	excuse me.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?
23	MR. HUGHES: No questions.
24	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
25	MR. SHINN: No questions.
26	MR. STOVITZ: No questions, your Honor.

L4B

MR. KANAREK: No.

THE COURT: All right.

Mrs. Kampman, I will ask you, then, to go back into court, and would you sit in seat No. 5 for the alternate jurors.

Would you refrain from discussing with anyone what has been said in here this morning?

MRS. KAMPMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MRS. KAMPMAN: You are welcome.

(Whereupon, Mrs. Kampman leaves the Court's chambers.)

·	2
	3
	4
	5
	Ģ
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26

14b-1 1

MR.	FITZGERALD:	Challenge	the juror	for cause	
because of	f her exposur	e to prejud	licial pret	rial publicit	y.

MR. SHINN: Join.

MR. HUGHES: Join.

MR. KANAREK: Join.

MR. STOVITZ: We will oppose the challenge, your Honor.

THE COURT: I find no basis for allowing a challenge for cause as to this prospective alternate juror and the challenge will be disallowed.

I believe we will recess at this time, gentlemen, for the noon hour.

I am going to come out into open court and admonish the panel again, the usual admonishment, before we recess.

So, we will go back into open court.

MR. FITZGERALD: There will be publicity in connection with the substitution of attorneys, obviously. I it would appreciate/if the Court would emphasize in its admonishment to the jury about reading, hearing, and so on.

MR. STOVITZ: I think the Court should --

THE COURT: I will give the usual admonishment, including that.

MR. STOVITZ: And would the Court give the further admonishment about the fact that they aren't to draw

14b-2

Ģ

ġ

.21

any conclusions about the fact that there was a substitution of attorneys?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. Would your Honor do that? I think it would be helpful.

(Whereupon the following proceedings occurred in open court, all defendants, counsel, jury and prospective alternate jurors present:)

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present. The jury is in the jury box.

Ladies and gentlemen, we will recess at this time until 1:45 this afternoon.

Do not converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject relating to this case nor form or express any opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to you.

Do not read, watch or listen to any news reports concerning the case so long as you are connected in any way with this case.

Now, with respect to the substitution of attorneys this morning, that is, the substitution of Mr. Ronald Hughes for Mr. Reiner as attorney for Miss Van Houten, this is not an uncommon circumstance in a trial, and you should not speculate as to the reasons for it or draw any conclusions therefrom.

1:45 this afternoon.

(Whereupon at 11:57 o'clock a.m. the court stood in recess.)

5 - 1	1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, JULY 17, 1970
	2	1:52 P.M.
	4	(The following proceedings were had in the
	.5	chambers of the court, all defendants and all counsel being
	. 6	present:)
	7	THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.
	8	Let's bring in the next prospective juror.
	9,	(Prospective alternate juror enters the
	10	chambers of the court.)
	. `	· · ·
	11	TATE ETRICTOR OF MEASURE METAGEN
	12	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS DONNA MELINKOFF
<u></u>	13	BY THE COURT:
	14	Q You are Miss Donna Melinkoff?
	15	A Yes.
	16	Q Miss Melinkoff, if you were selected as an
	17	alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve?
	18	A Yes, I Would.
	19	Q All right, I am going to ask you the same
	20	questions I put to the other prospective jurors regarding
	21	the death penalty.
	22	Have you had a chance to think about those
	23	questions?
	24	A yes, I have.
	25	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
	26	regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to

ì	make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt
2	regardless of the evidence in the case?
' 3	A No. I do not.
4	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
5	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
-6	refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the
. 7	case?
8 .	A No. I do not.
.9	Q on the other hand, would you automatically
10	vote to impose it in every case without respect to the
11	evidence in the case?
12	A No.
13	Q Would you be willing to consider all of the
14	evidence in the case and then make up your mind on the
15	question of penalty, assuming that the case gets to the
16	penalty phase?
17	A I Would.
18	Q Now, we want to know what you may have learned
19	about this case over the past months from news, television,
20	radio, and so forth.
21	Do you subscribe to a daily newspaper?
22	A I do.
23	Q What paper is that?
24	A The Los Angeles Times.
. 25	
.26	

	,	
16-1	1	Q Have you made any conscious effort to keep
	2	up with the news reports concerning this case?
•	3 .	A No, I have not.
	4	Q Have you been in this county continuously
ı.	5	since last August?
	6	A I have.
	7	Q When did you first learn about this case?
	. 8	A Let me tell you: I have sat in this
	9	courtroom so long and I have heard so much that I am
	10	unclear what I knew before I came in.
	11	I would assume that I first learned of the
	12	case at the time that the first stories came out, which
_	13	would be August of 169.
	14	Q All right.
	1 5 (And then at some later date, Miss Melinkoff,
	16	did you learn that these defendants had been arrested
-	17	and charged with the offenses?
*	18	A Yes. At a later date.
	19	Q Now, at this particular moment, have you
	20	formed any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of any
	21	of the defendants?
	22	A No, I have not.
	23	Q Have you ever read or heard any statement
	24	or description and I am not suggesting there has
	25	been such but have you ever heard or read of any
	26	statement that appeared to be a description by someone

who was present at the time of any of the killings?

A I do recall an article appearing in the L. A. Times which did have that appearance. I did not read the complete article.

16a-1 Well, when you say it had that appearance, 1 what did you think it was? 2 A story to sell newspapers. A 3 4 Well, I am not asking you for the purpose that the Times may have published it, but what did you think 5 that the story itself was about? What was the substance of 6 what you read? 8 It was allegedly an account of the events that Α occurred at the time, that the crimes took place. 9 Q 1Ò By whom? Who was giving the account? A 11 Yes. Whose account was it? 12 Q Well, in view of the time -- one of the persons 13 arrested and charged with the crime. 14 One of these defendants? 15 16 17 Was it Mr. Manson? 18 Mo; it was not. Α 19 Q One of the girls? **20** Yes, it was. Α 21 Do you remember which one of the girls? Q 22 I believe it was Miss Atkins. Α 23 Susan Atkins? 24 Yes. 25 THE COURT: All right. 26 Any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald?

		· ·
6a2	1 .	MR. FITZGERALD: No.
	2	MR. HUGHES: No questions.
	3 :	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
	. 4	MR. SHINN: No questions.
,	5	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?
	6	MR. KANAREK: No questions.
	7	THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz?
	8	MR. STOVITZ: Yes, sir.
	9	
	10	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS MELINKOFF
	11,	BY MR. STOVITZ:
	12	Q What is your business or occupation,
	13	Miss Melinkoff?
	14	A I am a social worker with the Los Angeles
	. 15	County Department of Public Social Services.
	16	Q I take it you are less than 30 years of age; is
	.17	that right?
	18	A Yes, I am.
	19	Q If the Court were to ask you to promise to
	20	disregard that which you read in the newspapers, Miss
	./21	Melinkoff, do you think you could retain that promise and
	22	decide this case solely on the evidence?
	23	A I could.
	24	Q Do you have any question in your mind that you
	.25	could do that?
_	26	A I do not.

.623	1	Q You have been in this courtroom for, what?
<u> </u>	2	Three weeks?
	3	A Four weeks.
	4	Q Four weeks?
	5	A Yes.
	6	Q I take it that you were on the second panel
	7	that came over; is that correct?
	.8	A I was.
	9	Q You have, from time to time, looked at Mr.
	10	Manson; is that right?
	.11	A Yes.
	12	Q And he has looked at you?
	13	A Yes.
	14	Q Has there been anything that he has portrayed
	15,	in his eyes that has refreshed your memory as to the con-
	16	tents of that article?
	17	A No
	18	MR. KANAREK: May I have that question read back
	19	your Honor?
	20	THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Kanarek; but if you want to
	2 1	participate in the proceedings, would you listen to them?
	- 22	MR. KANAREK: I am sorry. I was conferring with
	23	Mr. Fitzgerald, I do admit that.
	24	THE COURT: Read the question.
	2 5	(The question was read by the reporter.)
16B	26	

16b-1MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, that is most prejudicial. 1 I would ask that he be cited for misconduct for that 2 statement, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Overruled. 4 You may answer the question. 5 MR. STOVITZ: Q Have you looked at Mr. Manson's 6 eyes from time to time? 7 A I have. 8 And did he give you the appearance that he was 9 smiling at you? 10 On occasion. 11 And did you give him the appearance that you 12 were smiling back at him? 13 I believe I have. 14 Did any of that conduct refresh your memory as Q 15 to the contents of the article that you read? Anything 16 about his powers from his eyes, or anything like that? 17 А No. 18 From time to time have you looked at Miss 19 20 Susan Atkins? I have. 21 A 22 And did she look at you? Q 16c f133. She has. Α 24 25

26

		·
16c-1	1.	Q Has anything that went forth that way refreshed
	2	your memory as to the contents of that article?
,	3	A Nothing.
	4	Q From what you have read and seen in the
	5	newspapers or on television, Miss Melinkoff, do you know
	6	how the police sort of arrested these defendants, why
	7	they arrested these defendants?
	8 9	A No, I do not. MR. STOVITZ: I have no further questions.
•	10	THE COURT: All right.
	11	Miss Melinkoff, I will ask you to go back into
	12	the courtroom and will you refrain from discussing with
	13	anyone what has been said in here today?
	14	(Whereupon Miss Melinkoff leaves the court's
	15	chambers.)
	16	MR. FITZGERALD: We will not challenge the juror.
	17	MR. STOVITZ: I take it that the "we" is an editorial
	18	we, or do you speak for all defendants?
	19	MR. FITZGERALD: No. I am referring to all the
	20	defendants.
	21	The defense will not exercise a challenge.
	22	THE COURT: She has indicated that she read a
	23	portion at least and is aware of the confession of Susan
	24	Atkins.
	25	You heard that, did you not?
	26	MR. FITZGERALD: I did hear that.

But what we feel is taking place, your Honor, is that it is getting almost impossible to find a jury that hasn't been exposed in one facet or another to extremely prejudicial pretrial publicity.

We think this is a fair juror and we think we ought to alter our position about challenging some of these jurors for cause, otherwise we will never get to trial.

THE COURT: I don't think that is true at all.

MR. KANAREK: My position, again, is this. It is a relative position. My position is that it is impossible to get a fair jury, and since your Honor insists on going ahead --

16D-1

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, unless you are making a motion or an objection or you are seeking some relief, I am not really interested at this point in some more conversation on the same subjects that we have gone over many times before.

Are you making a motion or an objection of some kind?

MR. KANAREK: Mr. Fitzgerald made a comment, and I wanted to point out that I have a slightly divergent attitude on this.

My position is that since you can't get any fair jury, you have to take that which is most fair, and that is why we are not challenging.

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, I do not want the record to be cluttered up with repetitious statements.

Now, you have made your position clear on many occasions. Unless you have something new to say, there is no point in going over it all over again.

Are you challenging this juror?

MR. KANAREK: No. your Honor.

I join with Mr. Fitzgerald in not challenging.

THE COURT: Then there is no necessity to make any statement about it.

MR. HUGHES: I join with Mr. Fitzgerald also.

MR. SHINN: Join also.

THE COURT: You join in not challenging; is that what

you are doing?

MR. HUGHES: That is correct, your Honor.

MR. SHINN: Yes.

THE COURT: Are the People challenging this prospective jurge?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I just asked the Court to exercise its own challenge.

MR. STOVITZ: If the defense attorneys, on behalf of their clients, with their clients present here, if they are not seeking to challenge this juror, fine.

We have other ways, if we desire to excuse this juror, to do something.

17-1

. **4**:

. _

19·

MR. BUGLIOSI: The only thing I think the Court has on the record, the prospective juror has been exposed to a confession by one of these defendants.

The Court was not going to let that party sit on the jury. I can understand why the Court has taken that position, so irrespective of the defense's position, I should think the Court on its own would excuse a juror like this.

THE COURT: Well, I don't --

MR. KANAREK: I might say this, your Honor, if I may.

THE COURT: You can say it after I finish what I'm going to say, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't think that any juror is disqualified as a matter of law simply because he has heard or even read a confession.

I consider that in this case there was no necessity for having a juror on the jury who had read or heard about it, and that is the reason I determined not to do so.

But I do not want to get placed in the position of excusing a juror that the defendants want even if it is for their best interest, and then having that raised later as a ground of error.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think the Court's position is very

ş

13.

14:

well taken.

THE COURT: I am not going to excuse this juror if no defendant is willing to challenge her, notwithstanding her statements.

I don't think she is legally disqualified by virtue of what she said.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No.

THE COURT: So if that is some kind of a ploy on the part of the defendants, I am not going to --

MR. FITZGERALD: It is a ploy. We are here to ploy; we are here to strategically, tactically and equitably represent our clients.

THE COURT: Then I want the record to clearly reflect that you are doing this with full knowledge of what you are doing, and the reasons you are doing it.

MR. FITZGERALD: I am doing it with full knowledge and I will offer to stipulate she may remain on this jury, period, and if the prosecution would like to call our bluff about the ploy, let her sit on the jury. We are perfectly happy.

I think she is a fair juror.

THE COURT: Very well. But I want the record also to show that I have not changed my opinion that it would be safer for the defendants not to have such a juror.

Of course she is not legally disqualified.

If a challenge for cause were interposed by the defendants

4:00 --

I would be consistent in line with what I have said and done in the past, I would sustain that challenge on the basis of her statements.

MR. FITZGERALD: We think your Honor's position is forthright. I think your Honor's position is intelligent and it is reasonable.

It is simply that we want to evaluate each juror by his or her own self.

THE COURT: All right, as long as that is clearly understood and the record so reflects, we will proceed then.

Now, my notes indicate that all of the six prospective alternate jurors have been examined in chambers by all counsel, that is, that all counsel who care to examine, and unless there is some other reason why we should not, we will go back into court at this time where you can continue your voir dire examination.

MR. STOVITZ: Are we going to go to 4:15 today, your Honor?

THE COURT: Is that a leading question, Mr. Stovitz?

MR. STOVITZ: It is leading and suggestive that, seeing it is Friday afternoon, the traffic on the freeways the Court can take judicial notice of is heavier than on other days.

Balancing the equities, if we can recess at

THE COURT: Any objection? 1 MR. KANAREK: I have no objection, your Honor, except 2 that I believe probably Mr. Stovitz has some place he wishes 3 to go. 4 I don't think he is being candid with the Б I have no objection. Court. 6 MR. STOVITZ: I'm going to be downtown for the ball 7 8 game tonight, Counsel. THE COURT: What better reason would there be to 9 suggest an early adjournment than having some place to go? 10 MR. KANAREK: I certainly would not oppose an early 11 adjournment, your Honor, but I believe in being candid with 12 13 the Court. MR. STOVITZ: Let the chips fall where they may, eh, 14. 15 Mr. Kanarek. 16 THE COURT: I believe that is a reasonable suggestion. 17 Unless some counsel has objection to it we will adjourn 18 at 4:00 o'clock. 19 MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor. 17a f120 MR. STOVITZ: Thank you. 21 的 15 · 通行通信 经 16 · 16 22 23 **全位** 24 25 26

(77% <u>-</u> -1	
1.7A-1	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	'9
	10
	1,1
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
<u> </u>	
	25

26

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

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present; all of the jurors are in the jury box.

Do you wish to examine further, Mr. Fitzgerald?

MR. FITZGERALD: No. your Honor. I will pass these
prospective alternate jurors for cause.

THE COURT: Very well.

Mr. Hughes?

MR. HUGHES: I have no questions and I will pass them for cause, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?

MR. SHINN: I will pass for cause, your Honor,

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: We accept the six prospective alternates, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Bugliosi?

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF ALTERNATE JURORS
BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Onfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, I am going to be a little more gabby than all of the defense counsel put together.

Your Honor, may I again address one general question to all of the prospective jurors seated in the

17a2

1

2

3[,]

5.

6

7.

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

.23

24 25

26

courtroom?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

Do all of the people in the courtroom hear what is being said, can you all hear?

(Many jurors indicate in the negative.)

THE COURT: Will you turn the volume up a little, please, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Can you hear me now?

(Prospective jurors indicate in the affirmative.)

gestions, so if and when you are seated up in the jury box.

I will not have to go over the question with you again.

Do you all promise to do that?

(All indicate in the affirmative.)

Q Thank you. Do you all understand what I just said?

(All indicate in the affirmative.)

Q Ladies and gentlemen, and I am referring now to you six, in a trial as long and protracted as this trial promises to be, there is always a possibility that one or more of the regular jurors might become ill -- let's hope they don't -- but they might become ill during the conduct

.7a3

.4

__

17B 17

of the trial, or unable to continue as a juror for various reasons.

If that happens, then it becomes necessary for one or more of you to replace the regular juror, as you understand.

You will see, then, that the role of the alternate juror is an extremely important one.

It is not beyond reason to believe that one of you conceivably would end up on the regular jury, so with this in mind will you promise if you are selected as an alternate juror to listen very carefully to the evidence that comes from that witness stand so in the event you are required to replace a regular juror you will be able to step right in without any difficulty whatsoever.

Do you all promise to do that?

A Yes.

	1	
17b-1 ₁	-Q	Mr. Schneider, do you have any children, sir?
2	A .	Yes, sir.
3	Q.	How old are they?
4	A	19, 21 and 24.
5	Q	Would you indicate their gender, male or female,
6	whether the	y are married or single and where they work?
7	A .	One works at Douglas Aircraft and the other
8	one goes to	college.
. 9	ବ	What college?
10	A	Fullerton.
11	ବ	They are not married, anyone of them?
12 [.]	A	No.
13	MR. B	UGLIOSI: Thank you, Mr. Schneider.
14		
15		VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS CHASON
1,6	BY MR. BUGL	IOSI:
17	ર	Miss Chason, do you have any children?
18.	A	No, I do not.
19	MR. E	UGLIOSI: Mrs. Kampman, do you have any
20,	children?	
21	A	Yes, I have two children.
22	Q	How old are they?
23	A	21 and 23.
24	Q	And are they married?
25	A	No, they are not:
26	Q	What are they doing at the present time, are

1	they employed or are they going to school?
- 2 ·	A They are going to San Fernando Valley State.
	Q Both of them are going to San Fernando Valley
3 .	
4	State College?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Have either one of them ever mentioned my
7	name with respect to a prosecution of a felony, of
8 .	state students a couple of months ago?
9	A No.
1 0.	Q Do you know my name?
11	A No, I do not.
12	Q My name is Bugliosi, you know it now?
13	A Yes.
14	Q Have you ever heard that name around the
15	household?
16	A No, I did not.
17 ;	Q Are you aware of the prosecution of Valley
18	State students recently?
19	A I know about the militancy but I didn't know
20.	about the prosecution.
21	Q If the jury in this case returns a verdict
22	of first degree murder against these defendants, it is
23	the intention of the prosecution during the penalty trial
24	to ask for the death penalty for all these defendants.
25	You all understand that?
26	There is another defendant named in the

indictment, his name is Charles Watson. He is presently 1 back in Texas. Ź MR. FITZGERALD: Objection, your Honor, I don't 3 have any information that Mr. Watson is in Texas. 4 I think that assumes facts not in evidence, your Honor. .5 Objection sustained. THE COURT: 6 MR. BUGLIOSI: As you can see, Mr. Watson is not 7 presently at the counsel table. 8 Apparently he will have to be tried separately 9 from these defendants. 10 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the bench, 11 your Honor? 12 MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, this is not a big issue, 13 Mr. Watson is not at the counsel table and I/merely 14 informing these people he is going tobe tried separately. 15. MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the 16 bench? 17 THE COURT: Very well. 18 (The following proceedings were had at the 19 bench out of the hearing of the members of the jury and 20 the prospective alternate jurors:) 21 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor --22 THE COURT: Yes, state your objection. 23 MR. KANAREK: I object. This is improper voir 24 dire, your Honor, and I ask for a mistrial. 25 26 THE COURT: What is improper about it?

MR. KANAREK: Whether he is going to be tried is one thing, your Honor. It is one thing for him to be a percipient witness or something of that type, but whether the District Attorney intends to try him or not has no probative value as far as voir dire is concerned, absolutely not.

MR. STOVITZ: The point of this, your Honor, is we want this jury to concentrate on the guilt or innocence of the four defendants before them, not to speculate on someone else's guilt.

That is the purport of the question.

MR. KANAREK: That is a different matter.

THE COURT: What has been said so far that you object to?

MR. KANAREK: I object to his statement that Mr. Watson is going to be tried.

I object to that, your Honor.

Furthermore, it is not in evidence. He may never be tried.

THE COURT: Well, the point is he is not going to be tried in this case whether he is tried at all, it is obvious he is not going to be tried in this case.

MR. KANAREK: But the point is the prosecution's motivation towards Mr. Watson has nothing to do with this voir dire.

THE COURT: I think you are reading something into

24

it -- I don't know what you are reading into it, but what has been said so far is perfectly harmless.

It is simply an obvious fact that he is not going to be tried in this case.

MR. BUGLIOST: The purpose of it is for clarification of the jury.

The Appellate Court repeatedly makes the statement that the jurors should know what is going on and they should be told certain things.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled, let's proceed.

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

MR. BUGLIOSI: I'd better repeat myself.

The other defendant I was referring to, his name is Charles Watson, as you can see he is not presently being tried with these defendants.

If he is tried at all it will have to be in a separate trial from this particular trial right here.

I would like to ask you some questions now about the death penalty and several other subjects.

Most of the questions I'm going to ask are going to be asked of you collectively as a group, but if my question pertains to you individually, then I want

you to raise your hand and I will address myself to you alone.

And if I ask a question which does not specifically pinpoint your problem, that does suggest something or touch upon a subject that you think I ought to know about, I would also want you to raise your hand so I will be able to question you further about the subject.

was the same

18-1

13.

. .

I want to make one initial observation.

For some of you, this is the first time that you have been in a court of law. You are probably a little hesitant about raising your hand and speaking out freely. It is a crowded courtroom; most, if not all of the people, you do not know. So you are a little tense.

But let me say this: I think it should be much more difficult later on back in the jury room in front of your co-jurors to express your views upon a particular subject when your co-jurors know that either the Court or defense counsel or Mr. Stovitz or I asked you a question which should have prompted you to speak out and, of course, it would be a violation of your oath not to speak out at the present time.

Do you all understand that?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

18A-1

1 2

3

4

~

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

. 24

25

26

Q So when I ask you questions about the death penalty or any other subject, please feel very free to speak out.

Now is the time to do it, not later on.

Even though a particular question of mine easily lends itself to a yes or no answer, don't feel so restricted. You are perfectly welcome to elaborate on or qualify any particular given yes or no answer.

Do you all understand that?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: In fact, I would encourage it.

His Honor clearly went over this area, but because of its importance and because of the fact that none of you are. I assume, lawyers, I am going to go over it again for emphasis so that there is no question in your mind about what we are talking about.

In all of my questions of you, rather than prefacing my question by saying "assuming you are going to end up a regular juror." rather than prefacing my question, I am just going to assume -- or you should assume -- that you will be seated as a regular juror eventually; although,

of course, that might never happen.

. Do you all realize -- and if you don't realize, tell me now -- that if one or more of these defendants are convicted of first-degree murder, there will follow a second trial called a penalty trial, and in the penalty trial you will also be the jury.

Do you understand that?

Do you understand that, Mr.Schneider?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You realize that it is only during the penalty trial, that is, the second trial, that you will be permitted to pass on the question of life imprisonment as opposed to the death penalty.

Do you all understand that?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

22

23

24

25

26

18B-1

2

1

Ì

4

5

6

8

-

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you understand further that if these defendants are found to be not guilty of the charges against them, or they are found to be guilty of some degree of criminal homicide lesser than first-degree murder, such as second-degree murder, the question of the death penalty will never arise.

Do you understand that they have to first be convicted of first-degree murder before the issue of the death penalty arises.

Do you all understand that?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you understand further that during the first trial, during the trial when you folks will have to determine the guilt or innocence of these defendants, you will not be permitted to consider or discuss during your deliberations the question of the death penalty. It is not applicable during the first trial.

Do you all understand that?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

18b2

1

2

3. 4

5

6

8

y

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: With respect to what is or what is not a proper case for the imposition of the death penalty, neither his Honor nor defense counsel nor Mr. Stovitz nor I can tell you that, for the simple reason that there is no legal definition of what is or what is not a proper case for the imposition of the death penalty.

The law as it presently exists leaves it up to the absolute discretion of the jury to decide that issue. There are no guidelines or standards for you to follow.

The state of the law as it presently exists leaves it up to each individual juror's individual decision whether he or she feels that the circumstances are sufficiently aggravating to warrant the imposition of the death penalty.

Do you all understand that?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I want to make it abundantly clear that the law states no preference for the death penalty over life imprisonment or for life imprisonment over the death penalty

Most of the questions I will ask, as I indicated, will be collective questions, although I have one or two here that I will be asking you individually.

Do any of you belong to or contribute to or support any organization which has as its objective or one of its objectives the abolition or the suspension of the death penalty in the State of California?

MISS BROOME: No.

MISS ABBATECOLA:

MR. SCHNEIDER: No.

MISS KAMPMAN: No.

MISS MELINKOFF: No.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Do any of you feel that the religious doctrines of any church that you may belong to would prevent you from voting for a verdict of death?

Miss Chason, I believe you said that you belong to the Christian Science Church?

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Forgive my ignorance, but do they have any tenets at all on that in the Christian Science

No.

MR. BUGLIOSI: They have not taken any position on

No.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you.

Are any of you opposed to the death penalty? Are any of you against the death penalty? MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes. MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, Miss Abbatecola? MISS ABBATECOLA: I am opposed. It all depends. I can't say for sure, but I am not completely for it.

18c-1 1

2

Ś

4

5

6

7

.8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: Would you elaborate on that a little bit in a narrative fashion, what your state of mind is, in respect to the death penalty, Miss Abbatecola?

I think at one time you indicated that your position on the death penalty has changed from time to time; is that correct?

MISS ABBATECOLA: Well, I believe that there has to be something else besides -- if there isn't a death penalty, I don't believe that a convicted murderer should maybe be allowed, in ten, 15 or 20 years, to --

MR. FITZGERALD: May we approach the bench?

MISS ABBATECOLA: So I have decided, as far as that

goes --

THE COURT: Very well.

(Whereupon all counsel approach the bench and the following proceedings occurred at the bench outside of the hearing of the jury and the prospective alternate jurors:)

MR. FITZGERALD: In open court the prospective jury panel has received something indirectly that they could not receive directly.

I am referring to Miss Abbatecola's statement that in the absence of a death penalty there would have to be some sort of governmental measures not to allow a convicted murderer to be on the street within 20 years.

This is the same problem we raised with the

Court on a number of occasions earlier, the problem of the Morris Instruction.

I feel that if we get into an area where we ask jurors the basis of their feelings or opinions in favor of the death penalty or against the death penalty, that we are frequently going to get this type of response, and if we get this type of response, it is our position that it will infect the jury in accordance with the theory that something once received in your head cannot be easily erased.

We have a problem of creating some error.

I think that during the course of the trial, if the prosecutor were to say in argument, your Honor, that a convicted murderer may get out in 15 or 20 years, it would be reversible error per se under People vs. Morris.

I suggest that a prospective juror saying it has the same effect, to wit, it infects the prospective members of the jury on the panel.

MR. STOVITZ: Your Honor --

MR. KANAREK: If I may, before Mr. Stovitz answers.

THE COURT: Are you making some objection, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, I am.

First, I am making a motion to admonish the jury not to consider the last question and answer for any purpose.

Furthermore, your Honor, I ask your Honor to cite the prosecution for misconduct. They are deliberately doing this to infect the entire prospective jury panel.

We went into chambers and in chambers, your Honor, we inquired concerning the death penalty.

Mr. Bugliosi deliberately injects this out in open court, and it is an issue that as far as the jury is concerned has already been decided in chambers.

I ask your Honor to cite him for misconduct.

THE COURT: There is no evidence whatever that this was not done spontaneously. The answer was spontaneous. There is no suggestion that this was a conscious or deliberate thing.

The question was asked, I think, why she opposed the death penalty, and she popped out with this answer.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, this entire subject matter has been covered. That is one of the reasons your Honor asked it in chambers.

THE COURT: You are objecting to the answer?

MR. KANAREK: I would object to the question and the answer.

I would ask that your Honor admonish Mr. Bugliosi not to go into anything in regard to the death penalty.

He had an opportunity to do it in chambers,

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

your Honor, and he is deliberately doing it here for the Very purpose in connection with --18d fls. .20 2

18D-1

THE COURT: I am inclined to agree with the latter part, that since you had an opportunity in chambers to do it, Mr. Bugliosi, you would run the risk of getting spontaneous, unsolicited answers of this kind.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I will not ask the other jurors on the basis of their position.

I thought that it had been established that the voir dire on the death penalty would be in open court except for the Court's two preliminary questions, but I will not hereafter ask any of the jurors for their basis, you know, for their opposition.

THE COURT: I will admonish the jury that Miss Abbatecola's statement does not constitute the law of this state; that they are to disregard the statement entirely, and the Court will instruct the jurors fully on the law at the proper time.

MR. KANAREK: I am afraid that admonishment will not suffice, your Honor, and I ask for a mistrial.

I ask that all these jurors presently in the courtroom be dismissed from any consideration in this case, whether it be by mistrial or what; that the Court order all the jurors out of the room.

If the Supreme Court of the State of California in People vs. Morris can reverse that in that particular case on this point of law, then it is apparent that this same principle applies in this court and,

18D2

.2

17.

therefore, these jurors, having heard what has happened, it is our position that Mr. Manson cannot get a fair trial.

THE COURT: I hardly think that anyone in the courtroom believes that Miss Abbatecola is any fountainhead of
law or that her words carry any authority.

I am going to admonish them that such is not the case.

I don't think that any harm has been done. An admonition will easily cure any misapprehension or any question that may have been raised in any person's mind.

MR. FITZGERALD: I will join in Mr. Kanarek's motion.

MR. HUGHES: Join in the motion.

MR. SHINN: Join, too.

THE COURT: The motion will be denied.

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

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I admonish you that the statement that was contained in Miss Abbatecola's answer, which I'm sure she was sincere in giving, does not constitute the law of this State, and you are admonished to disregard that statement entirely since it does not constitute the law.

This Court will instruct you fully on the law applicable to this case at the proper time.

18D3

1.

,

You are not to speculate on anything she may have said in her answer.

All right, let's proceed, Mr. Bugliosi.
MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you.

Miss Abbatecola, is it your present position that you are opposed to the death penalty?

MISS ABBATECOLA: At the present time, I would say that I don't really know what I believe regarding that.

I would say I am for the death penalty but -- MR. BUGLIOSI: Neutral?

MISS ABBATECOLA: But I would render it if I felt it absolutely necessary.

MR. BUGLIOSI: In other words, you can conceive of circumstances wherein you would be willing to vote for a verdict of death; is that correct, Miss Abbatecola?

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Miss Melinkoff, I am not a mind reader, but when I asked that question there was something in your eyes that indicated to me that perhaps you are opposed to the death penalty.

Is that right?

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes. My position is not too much unlike the other young lady.

I think that in a good many circumstances I would be opposed to the imposition of the death penalty, but I can conceive of their being circumstances where I

would be willing to impose it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay. Thank you.

What about the other four of you?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I am in agreement.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Schneider?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Now, I think it is probably a fact that many people are not opposed to the death penalty but they personally do not want to sit as a juror on a case where the death penalty is involved and return a verdict of death. In other words, they want to let someone else do it, "Let George do it."

certainly, no one can criticize that type of a person. It is not an enjoyable task, it is not easy for any juror to come back into this courtroom and, in effect, by his verdict, tell a defendant that he must die.

With that in mind, I do want to ask each of you this individual question.

18e-1

2

1

3.

4. 5.

6

7

8.

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

-.

18

19· 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

I will start out with you, Miss Broome.

Let me mentally transport you, if you will, three or four months from now. You are back in the jury room. Let's assume that these defendants have been convicted of first degree murder and, as the saying goes, all the chips are on the line.

Let's also assume that you felt that under all of the circumstances and reviewing all of the evidence, that you felt this was a proper case for the imposition of the death penalty.

Do you think that you would personally have the courage and would you be willing to come back into this courtroom with a verdict of death?

MISS BROOME: Yes, I would.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay.

Now, again, now is the time to speak out.

. How about you, Mr. Schneider?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, I would also.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Miss Abbatecola?

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes, I would.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Miss Chason?

MISS CHASON: Yes, I would.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Miss Kampman?

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes, I would.

MR. BUGLIOSI: And Miss Melinkoff?

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes, I would.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you. 1 You will notice that three of these defendants, 2 Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel and Leslie Van Houten, 3 are females. Now and then a juror will say that under no 5 circumstances would they ever vote for the death penalty 6 for a female. 7 Are any of you of that frame of mind? 8 MISS BROOME: No. 9 MISS ABBATECOLA: No. 10 MR. SCHNEIDER: No. 11 MISS CHASON: No. MISS KAMPMAN: No. 13 MISS MELINKOFF: No. 14 MR. BUGLIOSI: . You understand my question? 15 You will also notice that these same three 16 defendants, although they are adult -- make no mistake 17 18 about that -- they are young adults. Are any of you of the frame of mind that you 19 20. would never, under any circumstances, return a verdict 21 of guilt as to these three defendants solely because of 22 their age? 23 MISS BROOME: No. 24 MISS ABBATECOLA: No. 25 MR. SCHNEIDER: No. 26 MISS CHASON:

MISS KAMPMAN: No. 1 MISS MELINKOFF: No. .2 MR. BUGLIOSI: Are any of you of such a frame of 3 mind that if a particular defendant did not personally kill anyone you would never return a verdict of death .5 as to that defendant? 6 Do you understand my question? 7 MISS BROOME: Yes. MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes. 9 MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. 10 MISS CHASON: Yes. 11 MISS MELINKOFF: Yes. 12 . MISS KAMPMAN: No. 13 MR. BUGLIOSI: Miss Chason, you did not understand 14 my question? 15 MISS CHASON: I am Miss Chason. 16 MR. BUGLIOSI: I am sorry. 17 Miss Kampman? 18 MISS KAMPMAN: No, I didn't understand. 19 MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay. 20 A person, Miss Kampman, may be convicted of 21 first degree murder even though he is not the actual killer. 22 Do you understand that? 23 MISS KAMPMAN: Yes. 24 MR. BUGLIOST: Now, taking that type of a person, 25. and let's assume that he has been, or she has been, 26

1 2

convicted of first degree murder.

3

Can you conceive of circumstances wherein you would be willing to return a verdict of death?

MISS KAMPMAN:

5 6

MR. BUGLIOSI: As to that particular individual even though the evidence at the trial showed that he was not the actual killer?

. Can you conceive of circumstances like that?

9

MISS KAMPMAN:

10

MR. BUGLIOSI: Now, I would like to ask some

11

questions not about the death penalty -- we are through

12

with that -- I suppose you are all very happy we are

13

through with that particular subject -- but about other

issues that if you are selected as a juror you are going

15

to be intimately involved with in this case.

16

As you know, there are eight counts to this

17.

Grand Jury indictment.

18 19

winkel are charged with seven counts of murder. Leslie

Mr. Manson, Susan Atkins and Patricia Kren-

20

Van Houten, on the other hand, is only charged with two

21

counts of murder, Count VI and VII.

22 23

All of the defendants, however, are charged in the eighth count with the crime of conspiracy to commit

24

murder.

25

26

At the conclusion of the evidence in this case, but before you deliberate, his Honor-is going to instruct

on the law applicable to this case.

Among other things, he will undoubtedly instruct you on the law of conspiracy.

Now, if his Honor instructs you that a conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to commit a crime followed by an overt act to carry out the object of the conspiracy, will you follow the Court's instruction on that?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If his Honor further instructs you that once a conspiracy is formed, each member of that conspiracy is criminally responsible for the crime committed by his co-conspirators if those crimes were committed to further the object of the conspiracy, will you follow the Court's instruction on that?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

18f fls.

24

25

26.

18F-1

14.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I will give you a brief example because I think examples are always good to illustrate a point.

Let's assume that Parties A, B and C conspired to commit a bank robbery. In other words, they got together and they agreed that they were going to rob this bank.

But let's assume further that only parties B and C actually committed the robbery.

A, being a co-conspirator, would be equally guilty of that robbery even though he, himself, did not commit the robbery and even though he may not have been even present at the scene, he may have been somewhere else.

Do each of you feel that you understand that rule of conspiracy at least to the extent to which I have explained it in the example?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Do any of you disagree with that rule of conspiracy?

Do any of you have any prejudices against it?

Are you with me now? Are you keeping time to

JF2

2

1

3

4.

5

6

7

8

9.

11

12

13

14. 15

16

17

TO

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

the same drummer that I am keeping time to with respect to this conspiracy issue?

Do you understand what I am talking about?

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MR. CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Lawyers always give a fancy name to legal concepts so that they are the only ones that understand what they are talking about, and they call this theory the vicarious liability theory of conspiracy.

But forgetting about the name, do you understand that example I gave you?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would like to ask each of you this question, then. I think, thereafter, my questions will be collective.

Miss Broome, can you promise me that you will unhesitatingly and without any reservation whatsoever follow

23

.24

25

26

the Court's instructions on that rule of conspiracy if you find it applicable to the facts in this case?

MISS BROOME: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Schneider, how about you, sir?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Miss Abbatecola?

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Miss Chason?

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Miss Kampman?

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Miss Melinkoff?

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You have heard the Court and defense counsel tell you that the prosecution has the burden of proving the guilt of these defendants beyond a reasonable doubt.

You have heard the Court and defense counsel.

I don't know if defense counsel have said it yet to you
prospective alternates, but defense counsel certainly
mentioned it earlier to the regular jurors.

Now, would any of you require any burden of the prosecution over and above that which the law requires?

MISS BROOME: No.

MISS ABBATECOLA: No.

MR. SCHNEIDER: No.

8F4

5

MISS CHASON: No.

MISS KAMPMAN: No.

MISS MELINKOFF: No.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Am I correct in assuming, then, that none of you would require that we prove the guilt of these defendants beyond anything more than simply a reasonable doubt?

Am I correct in assuming that?

Do you all understand that in all criminal trials, whether we are prosecuting a defendant for murder or whether the crime is petty theft, drunkdriving, assault and battery, no matter what the crime is, the prosecution has the same identical burden of proof, to prove a defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, not beyond all doubt, because his Honor will instruct you later on that everything relating to human affairs and dependent upon moral evidence is open to some possible or imaginary doubt.

So we have the same burden of proof regardless of the crime.

Do you all understand that?

MISS BROOME; Yes.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MISS CHASON: Yes.

MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.

25

26

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you understand that our burden of proof is no greater in a murder case than it is, for instance, in a petty theft case?

Do you understand that?

Are any of you of such a frame of mind that you would say to yourself, "Gee whiz, murder is probably a thousand times more, or infinitely more, serious than petty theft; therefore, the prosecution in a murder case should have a much, much greater burden of proof."

Do any of you feel that way?

MISS BROOME: No.

MR. SCHNEIDER: No.

MISS CHASON: No.

MISS KAMPMAN: No.

MISS MELINKOFF: No.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You do feel that way?

MISS ABBATECOLA: Somewhat, absolutely.

18g-1₁

.8

MR. BUGLIOSI: You feel that the more serious the crime the greater the burden the prosecution should have?

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Okay.

If the Court instructs you, however, Miss Abbatecola, that the burden of proof is identical regardless of the crime, will you follow the Court's instruction on that?

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: And if the Court tells you that the prosecution only has the burden of removing reasonable doubts of the guilt of these defendants from your mind, not all doubt, will you follow the Court's instruction on that?

MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I appreciate your candor, Miss Abbatedola. This is what we want from jurors. We want you to speak up. None of us are mind readers, so if you don't tell us what is on your mind, there is no way in the world we can know. All we can do is guess.

I take it, then, that none of you would hesitate to come back into this courtroom with a verdict of guilty of first degree murder if we prove the guilt of the defendants beyond a reasonable doubt.

Am I correct in assuming that?
MISS BROOME: Yes.

1	MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.
2	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
3	MISS CHASON: Yes.
4	MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.
5	MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.
6 .	MR. BUGLIOSI: Without asking you to prejudge the
7	evidence, the prosecution in this case is going to rely
• . 8	on circumstantial evidence as well as direct evidence.
9	I guess you could say that circumstantial
10	evidence is all evidence other than eyewitness testimony,
11	eyewitness testimony being direct evidence.
12	His Honor will instruct you that the
13	crimes of murder and conspiracy to commit murder can
14	be proven by circumstantial evidence.
15 .	I think he will further in fact, I am
16	relatively sure that he will instruct you that the law
17	shows no preference for direct evidence over circum-
18 .	stantial evidence as a means of proof.
19	If he instructs you to that effect, will you
20	follow the Court's instruction on that?
21	MISS BROOME: Yes.
22	MISS ABBATECOLA: Yes.
23	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
24	MISS CHASON: Yes.
25	MISS KAMPMAN: Yes.
26	MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.
	1

MR. BUGLIOSI: Before asking you whether or not you are opposed to sitting as a juror on a case where the People rely in part on circumstantial evidence, let me briefly indicate to you the distinction between circumstantial evidence and direct evidence so that you will be better equipped to answer my question.

Direct evidence is evidence which proves a fact in issue without the necessity of drawing any inferences; whereas, circumstantial evidence, on the other hand, is evidence that tends to prove a fact in issue by proving another fact.

Now, to illustrate this distinction, let me give you a brief example showing the difference between the two types of evidence.

Let's assume that a television repair shop has been burglarized in the depth of night, and one television set has been stolen.

About an hour later, a man by the name of Emil Weisner -- don't ask me where I got that name -- is stopped in his car by the police for a traffic violation, and the police find the stolen TV set in Emil's car.

19 fls.

∠9-1

ō

8-

9.

Now, the TV set being in Mr. Weisner's car is a fact in and of itself, but it is circumstantial evidence of the ultimate fact that it may have been Mr. Weisner who took that set.

Now, if the police or some third party had actually seen Mr. Weisner break into the TV repair shop in the middle of the night and remove the television set, of course that would be direct evidence.

With that very brief legal background, and it is precious little background, by the nature of things we cannot go into it in depth at this time, are any of you opposed to sitting as a juror on a case where the People rely in part on circumstantial evidence?

I am sorry, Miss Abbatecola.

MISS ABBATECOLA: I must say something. Yesterday during the questioning you had asked if I had remembered a type of --

THE COURT: Just a moment, before you answer that question. before you state what you were going to state.

Will counsel approach the bench, please.

(The following proceedings were had at the bench out of the hearing of the jurors and the prospective alternate jurors.)

THE COURT: I have a feeling of what she is about to say, that she may have read or heard about the confession.

Do you have any objection to my having her come

up here and ask her what it is she was going to say, before she 9-2 1 says it? 2 MR. FITZGERALD: Absolutely not. 3 MR. BUGLIOSI: It is a good idea. God only knows 4 what she is going to say. 5 I thought she would talk about publicity or 6 something -- well, that would be it. 7 8 THE COURT: All right. 9 Is that agreeable, Mr. Kanarek? 10 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I would ask it be done in chambers. .11 12 I don't think it is necessary to do it THE COURT: in chambers unless it turns out to be something long and 13 14 involved. 15 MR. KANAREK: She may have spoken to other people 16 about it, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Let's find out what it is first. 18 MR. KANAREK: Very well. 19 THE COURT: I was simply going to have her come up. 20 MR. FITZGERALD: Fine. 21 I don't want to keep the answer from you, THE COURT: 22 I want to know what it is before she blurts it out. 23 MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Kanarek can stay. 24 If it is something we don't want the THE COURT: 25 rest of the jurors to hear we can go into chambers and 26 explore it fully.

.

1Ō

MR. KANAREK: Very well.

would you be good enough to come up to the bench for a moment, please.

(Miss Abbatecola approaches the bench where the following proceedings were had out of the hearing of the jury and the prospective alternate jurors.)

THE COURT: I was somewhat apprehensive about what you were about to say, and I wanted to have you come up there first and tell me what it is.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Okay. Yesterday there was a big point made if I had read anything like a confession, and I said no because I did not recall.

But, you know, the question was stressed and I began thinking about it afterwards, and I had read an article, I don't remember by what girl who was in prison, who had told another cell-mate, and if that would in any way you know, influence what had happened regarding the Biancas, and that type of thing.

THE COURT: Then I think because of this we'd better go back into chambers and give the attorneys a chance to hear what you have to say.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Okay.

THE COURT: And to ask you further questions if they want to.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Okay.

THE COURT: We will retire to chambers at this time. I will ask all the defendants and counsel to join me and then, Miss Abbatecola, if you wait a moment I will have the bailiff escort you in.

(The following proceedings were had in the chambers of the court out of the presence and hearing of the jury and the prospective alternate jurors, all of the defendants and all counsel being present, Miss Abbatecola also being present.)

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

Would you bring in Miss Abbatecola, please.

13

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS ABBATECOLA BY THE COURT:

16

Now, Miss Abbatecola, I understand that, from what you told me at the bench, just a few moments ago, that you now recall after thinking further upon the questions asked to you by the Court and counsel yesterday, that you have read an article in the newspaper, is that right?

A Yes.

22

19A

23

24

25

26

			·
19a-1	1	କ	At some time in the past which appeared
	2	to be a sta	tement by whom?
	3	A	I don't recall.
	4	ୡ	One of the defendants?
	5	A	Right, I think it was Miss Atkins.
	6	Q.	You think it was Miss AtKins?
	7	A +	Yes.
	8	Q	And what did her statement purport to
	9	relate?	
	10	À	Well, I don't recall, but she was in the
, .	11	prison ward	; she had told her cellmate about the two
• •	12 . ;	murders, an	d the reasoning behind it supposedly.
	13	Q ³	And you did read all of the statement, did
) ,	14	you?	
	15	A	Yes, what I recall of it.
	16	Q	Now, did the killings that she was referring
	17	to in that	article, did you understand those to be
	18	victims in	this case?
	19	A	Yes.
	.20	Q.	Do you remember the names by any chance?
	21	A	The victims?
	22	Q	Ÿes.
	23	A	The same victims you want me to name
4	24	the victims	·
	25	Q	If you remember the names as referred to
	26		hat article.

.9a-2	1	A Well, Sharon Polanski, Mr. and Mrs. Bianca,
les.	2	Abigail
	3	Q That is enough, I just wanted to make sure
	4	you were talking about what I thought you were talking
	5	about.
	6	A Yes.
	7	THE COURT: Do you wish to ask any questions,
,	8	Mr. Fitzgerald?
	9	MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor, I will defer
	10	to Mr. Shinn.
	11	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes, do you have any questions?
	12	MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.
	18	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
	14	MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.
	15	
	16	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS ABBATECOLA
	17	BY MR. SHINN:
	18	Q You said that you read something about one
	19	of the girls?
	20	A Yes.
	21	Q What did you read, the newspaper?
	22	A Yes.
	23	Q And did you talk with someone yesterday or
	24	last night?
	.2 5	A No, not at all.
	26	Q Now, how did it refresh your memory?

A Because I was giving every question that I recall a great deal of thought, and then I asked myself how did I remember certain things about, you know, the motive or whatever, supposed motive.

And then I recalled this article and immediately I thought I should say something then, but I thought I would wait for -- you might have gotten another juror in my place, and I did not want to bring it up in open court because of the other jurors out there.

Q In other words, you did not discuss this matter with anyone yesterday, last night or this morning?

A No, absolutely not.

Q And do you recall reading a newspaper or magazine?

A Yes, when I said I know a great deal about the case, and after the questioning, maybe I don't know -- or I had read as much as I thought I read, because I did not specifically read the articles -- I never went out of my way to read anything about the case.

Q As far as you know you think you read it in a newspaper or a magazine?

A I know I did read it in the newspaper.

I believe the day the story came out.

1	Q And do you recall reading any magazine articles
Ź	regarding this case?
3 .	A The ones I mentioned yesterday.
4	I cannot even remember which ones, because
5	I did not make any special reason for remembering anything
é	about the case.
7	MR. SHINN: I have no further questions.
8	THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Kanarek?
9	MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Stovitz?
11	MR. STOVITZ: I have no questions at this time.
12	However, I am anticipating that the defendants-
13	THE COURT: Anything further, gentlemen?
14	MR. FITZGERALD: No.
15	MR. SHINN: No.
16	MR. HUGHES: No.
17	MR. KANAREK: No.
18	THE COURT: I will ask you to go back into court,
19	Miss Abbatecola.
20	Now, regardless of what happens will you
21	refrain from discussing with anyone what has been said
22	in here, particularly if any more questions are asked
23	of you in open court?
24	Do not refer to this or any statements of the
2 5	defendants or any confession or anything like that.
26	We are trying to keep that from the rest of

the prospective jurors who have not heard that. MISS ABBATECOLA: I understand. THE COURT: All right, thank you very much. (Miss Abbatecola leaves the chambers of the 19b fls. 5 court.) 10. . 21 · 22

19B-1

*~*1

MR. FITZGERALD: May we just have one moment to confer?

MR. STOVITZ: Your Honor might want to check this juror's answers yesterday.

I think she was completely candid yesterday, that she was exposed to a great deal of information from the press.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If the defense moved to excuse this person, will the Court wait until I complete my voir dire? Otherwise -- well, I guess we can excuse her now and then I would continue my voir dire with only five, that would be preferable to bringing a person in at this time in the middle of my voir dire.

MR. FITZGERALD: We have had an opportunity to discuss it among ourselves, and I think our brief discussion has been intelligent, and we have taken into consideration aspects of the evidence that are likely to be introduced during the course of the trial, and we think we are making an intelligent judgment, your Honor.

We choose not to challenge this juror for cause, if the Court please.

MR. STOVITZ: I take it you are speaking for all defendants?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, we just discussed it.

MR. STOVITZ: May the record show that yesterday there was a specific challenge for cause made by the

19B2

7 8

11·

14.

·

defense due to the juror's statement that she had read extensively.

I take it by your statement now you are not challenging for cause; that you are withdrawing your request yesterday of challenging for cause.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may I just -THE COURT: Just a moment, let Mr. Fitzgerald
finish.

MR. FITZGERALD: I haven't checked the record, but I suspect Mr. Stovitz is correct and I will accept his representation.

If the record reflects that this juror was previously challenged for cause because of her exposure to prejudicial pretrial publicity, we would ask leave of the Court to withdraw that challenge.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, as far as we are concerned we may paraphrase the Court previously, consistency being the hobgoblin of small minds, we do not join, and again it is on a relative basis, your Honor.

our position is that because we are forced to go to trial, this --

THE COURT: What do you mean "forced"? Who is forcing you?

MR. KANAREK: Mr. Manson is here. The point is that we cannot get a fair trial in any event.

THE COURT: What do you mean by that?

19B3	1
	2
	3
, .	4
	5
,	6
	7
	8
	.9
	10
	11
	12
~	13
	14
	15
	16
v	17.
	18.
	19
	20.

21

22

23

24

25

26

MD	KANAREK:	Pardon?
MK -	KANAKEK:	rardoni

THE COURT: What do you mean by that?

MR. KANAREK: I am saying, your Honor, we have to choose the least reprehensible of the jurors.

THE COURT: You do not have to select this juror, sir. You may exercise a challenge.

MR. KANAREK: We are not choosing to.

THE COURT: Then don't say you are forced to do something.

MR. KANAREK: In the sense Mr. Manson is forced to go to trial. Mr. Manson is forced to go to trial.

THE COURT: Yes, there was a challenge for cause as to Miss Abbatecola on Page 3806 of the transcript.

Mr. Fitzgerald said, "We will challenge the juror for cause, actual bias, 1073, P.C., Paragraph 2."

That was joined in by Mr. Reiner, Mr. Shinn and Mr. Kanarek.

The People opposed it. There was some further discussion.

The Court said, "I don't see any basis for a challenge for cause here."

There was some further colloquy between Court and counsel, and statements made, and eventually the Court disallowed the challenge.

MR. STOVITZ: Since the defendants have changed their position, the People now reserve their right to change our

position.

We do not oppose a challenge for cause if one is to be made or if the Court desires to exercise its own discretion and excuse the juror for cause.

THE COURT: Are you making a challenge for cause?

MR. STOVITZ: We do not believe that this juror will be unfair to the People.

However, we believe that it may very well be that Susan Atkins may not take the witness stand.

It may very well be that in our introduction of Roni Howard and Virginia Graham's testimony, that their testimony will be restricted only as to what Susan Atkins allegedly said to them.

This juror may have triggered in her mind, just as it was triggered in her mind last night, thinking about her answers, the fact that Susan Atkins said more in her, quotes, jailhouse confession.

For instance, the juror even read there was a motive attributed by Susan Atkins to her step.

This may come back to the juror. The juror may try to be as honest as possible, but I feel out of an abundance of caution that this juror has been exposed to a pretrial confession which, if we do introduce -- and we will endeavor to introduce it, we will limit it, it will not be the fullnewspaper account.

I think it was either the Hollywood Citizen News,

or the Long Beach paper or some paper that carried the Virginia Graham story, or the Roni Howard story, rather -it was Roni Howard's story.

. 23

.9c-1

Í

ģ

11,

THE COURT: That is the long way of answering a simple question.

All I want to know is are you exercising a challenge?

MR. STOVITZ: We do not believe that this juror will be prejudiced against the People.

I don't see how we can say we challenge this juror for cause, because there would have to be a challenge for bias towards our interest.

MR.BUGLIOSI: We are not challenging her for cause.

THE COURT: Now, I take it that the defendants are changing their position, that is, withdrawing the challenge previously made to Miss Abbatecola for the reason they believe that no grounds exist for the exercise of a challenge for cause as to her, and that she can be a fair and impartial juror.

Is that correct?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, the defendant's position is that she can be a fair and impartial juror under the circumstances. We legitimately believe that.

About your Honor's observation that there is no basis for challenging for cause; I would not like to necessarily agree with that, although I would say that we are certainly going into this with our eyes open and we discussed this amongst ourselves and we feel she can be fair and impartial under the circumstances.

THE COURT: All I am saying is that you --19c-2 1 MR. FITZGERALD: We are aware of challenges for cause. 2 You are not aware of some ground and THE COURT: 3 withholding it, I take it? That's correct. MR. FITZGERALD: 5. THE COURT: I assume you are doing your duty and if 6 you had a good ground to challenge her for cause, in the 7 best interest of your clients you would exercise the challenge. 9 MR. FITZGERALD: We would. 10 THE COURT: Since you are not doing it I assume you 11 have no such cause or are not aware of such. 12 MR. FITZGERALD: That is correct. 13 THE COURT: Do you all agree with that statement? 14 MR. KANAREK: I agree with it but not to belabor it, 15 your Honor, I am not challenging. 16 I refer your Honor to my previous challenge. 17 THE COURT: Do you agree with that statement? 18 I agree, I agree. MR. KANAREK: 19 THE COURT: In that event then Miss Abbatecola will 20 21 not be excused. Now, is there any reason why -- we will take 22 23 a recess, but is there any reason why we should not resume 24 voir dire examination in court? 25 MR. STOVITZ: None whatsoever. 26

MR. STOVITZ: None whatsoever.

THE COURT: All right, we will take a 15-minute recess.

(Recess taken until 3:25 o'clock p.m. after

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

which the following proceedings were had in open court in the presence and hearing of the jury and the prospective alternate jurors, all defendants and all counsel being present:)

1	9	Đ) -	-]
			Í	

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.

All of the jurors and alternate jurors are present.

You may continue, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, your Honor.

Q In the trial of these defendants the prosecution will not offer eye-witness testimony to all seven murders.

We will offer for your consideration and your evaluation eye-witness testimony to some of the murders in this case, but not all seven.

Are any of you in such a frame of mind that you would never under any circumstances convict any defendant of murder unless the prosecution offered eye witnesses to those murders?

Are any of you in that frame of mind? Do you understand my question?

Are any of you of such a frame of mind that before you would convict any defendant of murder you would require of the prosecution that they produce a certain type of evidence against that defendant such as a confession, or fingerprints, or what-have-you?

Do you understand my question?

In other words, now and then a person will be heard to say, "I will never convict anyone of murder unless he confesses." I am just giving you an example:

Are any of you of that frame of mind?

. 25

Here is a question which I don't like to ask, but in the nature of things I have to ask it:

Have any of you or anyone in your family or any close friends or relatives ever been charged with or accused in any fashion whatsoever, not necessarily legally, but accused in any fashion whatsoever of the crimes of murder or conspiracy to commit murder?

Have any of you or anyone in your family, or close friends or relatives ever worked for the Public Defender's Officer here in Los Angeles or elsewhere, or for any criminal defense attorney?

Is any member of your family or any close friend or relative presently a criminal defense attorney?

Yes, Miss Melinkoff.

MISS MELINKOFF: I have a cousin who is a professor of law at UCLA and I believe a volunteer counsel for the ACLU and he does do defense work.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Is that Mr. Abrams?

MISS MELINKOFF: No. Mr. Nimmer.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Nimmer.

MISS MELINKOFF: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Is his first name Ralph?

MISS MELINKOFF: Melvin.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Melvin Nimmer. I'm sorry. I know who he is, but I just temporarily forgot his name.

Have any of you ever met or spoken to or been

19.

represented by or had any type of association with the following attorneys:

Charles Holopeter, Richard Walton, Marvin
Part, Karl Ransom, Leon Salter, Donald Barnett, Richard
Caballero, Paul Caruso, Luke McKissack, Alan Steinberg,
Gary Fleishman and Ronald Goldman.

Do any of those names ring a bell?

MISS ABBATECOLA: I heard some of them.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You heard the names, but you have not had any association with any of them?

MISS ABBATECOLA: No.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Now, there might be evidence at this trial, ladies and gentlemen, that another party other than Linda Kasabian -- you probably heard her name, she s gonna be a witness for the prosecution and she is presently charged with the same murders as these defendants are.

There may be evidence that another party in addition to Linda Kasablan and Charles Watson, whom I previously referred to, was with these defendants during the alleged commissions of some of these crimes with which they are presently being charged.

Now, if the evidence at the trial shows this, do you realize that the reason this other party is not presently being tried with these defendants should be of no concern to you during your deliberations.

That there may be a multitude of reasons for

9 E

that, none of which should legitimately concern you back in that jury room.

Do you understand that?

MISS CHASON: You mentioned somebody's name just now and I have never heard of that person.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I mentioned the names, Linda Kasabian MISS CHASON: I never heard of her.

MR. BUGLIOSI: And Charles Watson, and I said there might be another party in addition to those two, the evidence might show another party might have been with these defendants during the commission of some of these crimes.

Did you understand the rest of my question?
MISS CHASON: Yes, I did.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If the Court instructs you that the prosecution does not have the burden, does not have the burden of proving a motive of these defendants for committing these murders —

In other words, we do not have the burden of proving the reason why they committed these murders --

19e-1

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I must object, no one has been convicted of committing any murders.

THE COURT: The question had not been finished, Mr. Kanarek.

Wait until the question is finished then you may interpose an objection if you care to.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If the Court instructs you that we do not have the burden of proving the motive for these murders, will you follow the Court's instruction on that?

If the Court instructs you, however, that the prosecution has the right to offer evidence of motive, and if we do offer evidence of motive, you may consider this evidence as circumstantial evidence of the guilt of these defendants, will you follow the Court's instruction on that?

Did you understand my last question?

In other words, we do not have any burden,
but we have the right to offer evidence of motive, do you
understand that?

I only have a few more sheets of paper left here, so you will all be happy to hear that.

I think the Court has indicated that we might go home early today, probably 4:00 o'clock.

At the end of this case, but before you retire to the jury room, as I have already indicated, the Court, his Honor, is going to instruct you in the law applicable 19e-2

Ĺ

to this case.

If the law given to you by the Judge is different from what you thought the law was, or different from what you think the law should be, do you nevertheless follow your oath, set aside your personal beliefs, follow the law as given to you by the Judge.

Do you all promise that?

Do you all understand that as a juror in this case you and your co-jurors are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts in this case, and you are also the sole and exclusive judges of the credibility of the witnesses; that is, whether they are telling the truth or not.

Do you understand that?

Do you understand that in determining credibility you have the right to take into consideration such factors as the witness's demeanor on the witness stand, the witness's manner of testifying, the witness's interest in the outcome of the case, any bias or prejudice that witness may have for or against the prosecution or defense?

Do you understand that?

You are not just limited to what they say, but the manner in which they say it and their background and several other factors.

Do you realize further that after you listen to the testimony of a witness and observe that witness's

19e-3

9,

19f f1¹⁶

demeanor, et cetera, it is perfectly permissible and in fact to be expected that you will sometimes give more weight to the testimony of one witness than the testimony of an opposing witness on the same point.

Do you understand that?

Let us assume now that two things -- that you are selected as a juror and, No. 2, you are back in the jury room deliberating, and, No. 3, actually you find that your view is a minority view back there and most of the other jurors are entertaining a view different from yours.

I take it that none of you would be, shall we say, inflexible, but rather you would listen very carefully to the views expressed by your co-jurors and if you found these views to be reasonable and persuasive you would at least reconsider your position.

19F-1

1

2 3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

"11 12·

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

.24 25

26

Am I correct in assuming that?

Do each of you understand that whenever any of the defense counsel say that they want you to give their clients a fair trial, and the defendants certainly are entitled to a fair trial, that the prosecution, that is, the People of the State of California, are also entitled to a fair trial?

Do you understand that?

If you are selected as a juror on this case do you all feel you can give the People of the State of California a fair trial?

Is there any doubt in any of your minds about that?

Can any of you think of any reason not already touched upon why you think you might not be able to give the People of the State of California a fair trial?

Can any of you think of any reason not already touched upon by his Honor or defense counsel or myself why you feel you would rather not sit as a juror on this case?

The one final question, I probably commenced my questioning of you, oh, I don't know, 40 or 45 minutes ago, and I'm sure some of you or all of you have thought over the answers that you gave to some of my questions.

Have any of you had any second thoughts or change of mind to your answers to any of the questions that

1

I asked?

. B

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

ļÓ

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

.23

25

26

For instance, Mr. Schneider, you indicated your position on the death penalty. Have you done any more thinking about that, sir, your basic position — correct me if I m wrong — is that you are basically opposed to the death penalty but you would be willing to come back with a verdict of death if you thought the circumstances merit it.

Is that your position, sir?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: And that is also the position of Miss Abbatecola, and Miss Melinkoff.

That is not the position of Miss Broome, Miss Chason, and Mrs. Kampman, is that correct?

MISS CHASON: I am Miss Chason.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Are you opposed to the death penalty?

MISS CHASON: I did not say I was opposed to it.

I indicated I would have to hear the case before I made a decision.

Is that the answer you wanted? I mean, is that correct? I don't understand.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Actually you don't quite know what answer I do want. Actually, the answer I want is your state of mind. I want to know.

MISS CHASON: I would judge the case fairly.

\$

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't want to put any words in your

mouth or I don't want to suggest anything. 1 In other words, you don't have an opposition to 2 the death penalty. 3 MISS CHASON: No. 4 MR. BUGLIOSI: Is that also true of Mrs. Kampman? 5 MISS KAMPMAN: No, I do not have any objection to the 6 death penalty. 7 MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you very much, ladies and 8. gentlemen. 9 THE COURT: Do the People pass for cause? 10 MR.STOVITZ: Yes, your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: The People may exercise a peremptory challenge. 13 MR. BUGLIOSI: The People thank and excuse Miss 14 Melinkoff. 15 16 Thank you, Miss Melinkoff, you will be THE COURT: excused. 1.7 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 2526

20

20-1	THE CLERK: Mrs. Jean P. Covalt; J-e-a-n,
2	C-o-v-a-1-t.
3	THE COURT: I will ask counsel and the parties
· 4	to join me again in chambers.
5	MR. STOVITZ: Would your Honor think that questions
6	on hardship might be asked here? Maybe it might
7	facilitate some movement.
.8'	THE COURT: We will take it up in chambers, Mr.
9	Stovitz.
io.	MR. STOVITZ: All right.
11	THE COURT: Then I will ask the bailiff to
12	escort Mrs. Covalt in.
13	(Whereupon the following proceedings occurred
14	in chambers, all defendants and counsel being present:)
15	THE COURT: Is Mr. Stovitz coming in?
16	MR. BUGLIOSI: I thought he was. We can proceed
17	in his absence.
18	MR. KANAREK: He is busy with the press.
19	MR. BUGLIOSI: Here he is.
20.	THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.
21	Would you ask Mrs. Covalt to come in,
22	please.
23	(Mrs. Covalt enters the court's chambers.)
24	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
25	MRS. COVALT: Good afternoon.

26

I don't believe that I would be an impartial

juror in this case. 1 Would you feel this way about any criminal case 2 in which you were called as a juror, or is there something 3 special about this case? 4 I don't know of anything special, but I have a 5 feeling -- I feel that the man is -- to my way of thinking, 6 I feel that he is sick and he is guilty. 7 You will have to keep your voice up, Miss Q 8 Covalt. 9. Yes, I am sorry. 10 THE COURT: Read the answer. 11 If this is not your answer, Miss Covalt, let 12 us know. 13 (The answer was read by the reporter.) 14 Now, does this feeling that he is THE COURT: 15 guilty result because of the fact that he has been arrested 16 and charged with the offenses, or does it stem from something 17 else? 18 I have no other information than what has À No. 19 appeared in prit. 20 Well, that is what we want to know. 21 Q A Yes. 22 What information are you basing it on? 23 Q Of course, I have no other source of information. 24 A 25 But that doesn't tell us what you do know. Q What have you learned from the press or 26

1	television or from whatever source? What causes you to
2	think
3.	A I don't know that I can pinpoint it to any
4	particular account.
5	Q Did you ever read anything, for example, in
6	which Mr. Manson said he was guilty?
7	A No, I think not. I don't recall that in the
8	press.
9	Q Did you ever read any statement by any of the
10 .	defendants?
11	A No.
12	Q I beg your pardon?
13	The question is whether you have read or heard
14	anything by anyone
15	A Not a confession
16	Q Wait until I finish the question.
17	A All right.
18	Q Have you read or heard any statement by any of
19	these defendants about any subject whatever?
20	A There again, I can't pinpoint particular
.21	statements, but I just read
22	Q I'm not asking you about a statement, but have
2 3	you ever read or heard any statement, no matter what it
24	said.
25	A Well, the account in the press, no, did not assur
26	guilt.

Let's put it as an emotional reaction then that I have, right or wrong. 20a fls. Ż . 11 - <u>1</u>8

22

24

25

26

Q What we are trying to do is find out upon what that reaction is based, Mrs. Covalt.

Have you ever read or heard any statement which you thought was a statement made by any of the defendants in this case?

A No. I don't believe so.

Q Have you ever read or heard anything which appeared to be a description by someone -- anybody -- who was present at the time any of the persons were killed?

A Well, one of the girls whose name I don't recall, the one who presented State's evidence, of course, appeared in the press.

Q You are saying now that you read a statement by one of the girl defendants; is that right?

A One of the participants, let's say, had confessed, as I understand it.

- Q By participants --
- A As I understand it.
- Q -- whom do you mean?

Do you know the name of the person that you are talking about?

- A I am not certain of which one of the girls.
- Q Is it one of the defendants in this case?
- A That I don't know.
- Q I am afraid I don't understand your statement then.

Are you saying that someone who has no 1 connection with this case said something which appeared in 2 the paper and appeared to you to be a confession? 3 Well, the young woman who first brought to the 4 attention -- who first brought the case -- pointed out the 5 location of the Family, that first broke the case. 6 Now you are talking about someone who is not a 7 defendant in this case; is that right? 8 A (Pause.) 9 Do you know who the defendants are in this case, 10 Mrs. Covalt? 11 A (Pause.) 12 There is Mr. Manson -13 Of course. Α 14 There is Leslie Van Houten Q 15 Α Yes. 16 There is Patricia Krenwinkel and --Q 17 A Yes. 18 Q -- Susan Atkins. 19 A Yes. 20 Q Are you referring to someone other than these 21 four? 22 A Well, it was Linda --23 Q Kasabian? 24 A Yes, Kasabian. 25 Q. What about Linda Kasabian? She is a defendant 26

20aw

20a3 in this case. Α Yes. 2 But she is not going to be tried with the other 3 defendants. Did you read a statement? Was it an account 5 given by her? 6 A Well, I understand it was: that she is the one 7 who first confessed her involvement in the case. 8 Did you read this statement? 9 Α Yes. 10 Did the statement reveal the names of any other 11 persons who were present with her? 12 Well, I think there were several participating 13 in the --14 How do you know that? 15 Well, that is my understanding from her account. 16 THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald? 17 MR. FITZGERALD: No. your Honor. 18 MR, HUGHES: No questions, your Honor. 19 20 MR. KANAREK: No questions. THE COURT: Mr. Shinn? 21 MR. SHINN: No questions. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz? 23 MR. STOVITZ: None, your Honor. 24 25 THE COURT: All right. 26 I will ask you, then, to go back into the

courtroom, Mrs. Covalt. 20a4 Will you refrain from discussing with anyone what has been said here today? MRS. COVALT: Yes. Surely. 20b È 10. · 26

THE COURT: Before you do go, let me ask you. 20b-1 1 don't think I asked you this question. 2 3 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. COVALT 4 BY THE COURT: 5 Q If you were selected as a prospective juror in 6 this case, would you be able to serve? 7 No. I would not. 8 Why not? 9 Well, we have vacation plans beginning August 10 10th. 11 August 10th? 12 .13 Your husband and yourself? Q 14 Α Yes. 15 How long is your vacation? 16 Two weeks. 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And please 18 refrain from discussing what was said. 19 MRS: COVALT: Thank you. 20 (Mrs. Covalt leaves the court's chambers.) 21 MR. FITZGERALD: Challenge the juror for actual 22 bias, your Honor. 23 24 MR. SHINN: Join. 25 MR. HUGHES: Join, your Honor. MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 26

1 I don't know if it is appropriate at this time, 2 Your Honor --3 THE COURT: It is not appropriate while I am 4 considering a challenge. 5 MR. KANAREK: Oh, I am sorry. I am sorry. 6 THE COURT: Unless you are arguing on the challenge. 7 MR. KANAREK: No. I am sorry, your Honor. .8 THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed. 9, Mrs. Covalt will be excused for cause. 10 Now, Mr. Kanarek? 11 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I would like to point out 12 to the Court that Mr. Manson is not getting his mail. 13They have put a hold on his mail. 14 THE COURT: How do you know that? 15 MR. KANAREK: Mr. Manson tells me that, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: How do you know that he has any mail? 17 MR. KANAREK: Well, you are certainly welcome to 18 have colloquy with Mr. Manson. 19. THE COURT: I am just trying to get some facts. 20 MR. KANAREK: People come to visit Mr. Manson and 21 they say that they sent letters some weeks ago, and the 22 letters haven t been received by him. 23 Evidently, the senior deputy who is in charge 24 at any particular time has informed Mr. Manson there is a 25 hold on his mail. 26 THE COURT: Did he inform him for what reason?

1 it is being held? 2 MR. KANAREK: They don't give Mr. Manson any reason. They just tell him. ' 3 .4 THE COURT: I will ask the bailiff to check into that 5 While you were out of the room, Mr. Murray, 6 Mr. Kanarek stated that Mr. Manson's mail is being withheld 7 for some reason or other. 8 Would you investigate this and report back to .9 me as to the reason, if it is being held, and if so, why? 10 THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 I think we have time to at least begin with one 13 more prospective alternate juror. 14 (A prospective alternate juror enters the 15. court's chambers.) 16 THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir. 17 MR. THORNTON: Good afternoon. 18 The name of the prospective alternate THE CLERK: 19 juror is Kenneth F. Thornton; K-e-n-n-e-t-h, T-h-o-r-n-t-o-n. 20 21 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF KENNETH F. THORNTON 22 BY THE COURT: 23 Q Mr. Thornton, if you were selected as an 24alternate juror in this case, would you be able to serve? 25 A Well, I wouldn't get, after my 20 days was 26 up, I wouldn't get paid for it.

1	
1	Q Where do you work?
2	A Douglas Aircraft.
3	Q Douglas?
4	A Yes.
5	Q Do they have a policy of not paying their
6	employees for service beyond the 20-day period?
7	A Yes.
8.	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	•
16	
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

20c

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

	- 1	
20c-1	1 .	Q And do you rely on that income?
	2	A Yes, I do.
	3	Q Are you married?
	4	A No, I am not.
•	5	THE COURT: Any stipulation, gentlemen?
	6	MR. FITZGERALD: We will stipulate.
	7	MR. KANAREK: Stipulate, your Honor.
	8	MR. SHINN: Yes.
	9	MR. HUGHES: Stipulate.
	10 .	MR. STOVITZ: Stipulate.
	11	THE COURT: You will be excused then, Mr. Thornton.
	12	Thank you very much.
	13	Will you refrain from discussing what has
	14 ,	been said here with anyone?
	15	MR. THORNTON: Yes.
	16	(Whereupon Mr. Thornton leaves the Court's
	17	chambers.)
	18	THE COURT: Mr. Thornton will be excused by
	19	stipulation of all parties.
	20	(Another prospective alternate juror entered
	21	the court's chambers.)
	.22	THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.
	23	MR. SPIRO: Good afternoon, your Honor.
	24	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
À	.25	juror is Eugene Spiro; E-u-g-e-n-e, S-p-i-r-o.

20c-2	1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. EUGENE SPIRO
<u>~</u>	2	BY THE COURT:
	3 .	Q Mr. Spiro, if you were selected as an alternate
	4	juror in this case, would you be able to serve?
	5	A It would make a hardship on me, your Honor.
	6	Q Would you keep your voice up, please?
	7	A It would make a hardship on me because I am
	8	working.
	9	Q Where do you work?
	10	A I work for the Bank of America.
	11	Q Bank of America?
	12	A Yes.
1.4.	13	Q Do you know what the bank's policy is with
	14	regard to paying compensation for jury service?
	15	A They allow 20 days, or 30 20 working days
	16	for jury service. This is what I know.
	17	Q Then do they stop the compensation after that?
	18 ,	A I really don't know. I never had a chance to
	19	find out.
	20	Q I see.
•	21	Now, if they kept your compensation going,
•	22	then would you be able to serve?
	23	A Well, I have other reasons also.
	24	Q What is that?
	25	A It would be a hardship on me to stay away
	26	that long. My wife isn't too well.

1	Mostly for the reason that my wife isn't well.
2	Q Keep your voice up, please.
3,	A She needs me at home, and it would be just
4	very much of a hardship on me if I would have to stay
5	that long.
6	In other words, your Honor, I would be worried,
7	more worried not to see my family.
8	Q You think that you might not be able to
9.	concentrate on both the trial and your problems at home?
10	A I might not.
11:	She is constantly ill, and not to see her would
12	be a hardship on me definitely.
13	MR. FITZGERALD: May I ask a question?
14	THE COURT: Yes.
15	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.
16	
17	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. SPIRO
18 [,]	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
19	Q How old are you and your wife?
20	A I myself am 64. My wife is 60.
21	Q Do you live alone?
22	A I live with my family.
23	Q I mean, you and your wife live alone?
.24	A I have a son.
25	Q Does he reside with you?
26	A Yes.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

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

I am not sure as to the nature of the Q hardship with your wife.

Is it simply that you don't want to be separated from her, Mr. Spiro?

My wife is not well. She is not a well person. She has sinus headaches and arthritic pains. And especially in the evenings, she is in bed around 7:00 o clock practically every night.

Does she rely on you for some kind of medical care?

Well, yes. I help her along.

MR. FITZGERALD: We will stipulate.

MR. STOVITZ: So stipulated.

MR. KANAREK: So stipulate.

MR. HUGHES: Stipulate.

MR. SHINN: So stipulate.

THE COURT: You will be excused then, Mr. Spiro.

Will you refrain from discussing with anyone what has been said in here?

MR. SPIRO: Yes, sir.

(Mr. Spiro leaves the court's chambers.)

THE COURT: I don't think we will have time to take anyone else this afternoon. So, we will go back in the courtroom and I will admonish the jury before adjourning for the day.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had

in open court, all defendants, counsel, jury and 1 prospective alternate jurors being present.) 2 THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present, 3 all of the jurors and alternate jurors are present. 4 We will adjourn at this time, ladies and 5 gentlemen, until 9:00 a.m. Monday morning. 6 Again, please remember the admonitions. 7 Do not converse among yourselves nor with anyone else on Ŕ any subject relating to this case, nor form or express any 9 opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted 10 to you. 11 And additionally, do not read, watch or listen 12 to any news report concerning the case so long as you 13 have any connection with this case. 14 9:00 o'clock on Monday morning. 15 Have a good weekend. 16 (Whereupon, at 4:01 p.m. the court was in 17 adjournment.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, JULY 20, 1970 1 9:08 o'clock a.m. 2 à (The following proceedings were had in the 4 5 chambers of the Court out of the presence and hearing of the jurors and prospective alternate jurors, all defendants 6 and all counsel being present:) 8 THE COURT: The record will show all parties and 9 counsel are present. 10 I have two notes from prospective alternate 11 juror No. 3, Miss Catherine Abbatecola, which counsel 12 should look at for their information. 13 Incidentally, Mr. Hughes, are you familiar 14 with the publicity order in the case? 15 MR. HUGHES: Yes, I am, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: And as augmented? There has been an 17 augmentation. MR. HUGHES: I don't believe I am familiar with the 19. augmentation. 20 THE COURT: Very well. You should familiarize 21 yourself with that. 22 MR. FITZGERALD: There is a matter I would like to 23 call to the Court's attention: 24 It is an article that appeared in yesterday's 25 Herald-Examiner, Sunday Edition, Sunday, July 19th. 26 It is an article referred to as "The Trial of

· 14

Charles Manson and His Family."

I wonder if the Court has seen this article.

THE COURT: No, I haven't.

MR. FITZGERALD: I wonder if I might hand it to your Honor.

(Article handed to the Court.)

It appears to cover at least two entire pages in the Sunday Herald-Examiner, pages A-5 and A-6, I believe.

This report includes photographs of all the defendants as well as photographs -- a photograph of the Judge.

The article purports to set out the evidence against the respective defendants, including references to statements made by Miss Atkins to her former attorney, Richard Caballero, to and before the Grand Jury of Los Angeles County, and statements she allegedly made to inmates in the Los Angeles County Jail.

I also have, your Honor, what appears to be some sort of a banner. It appears to be approximately ten inches long by about 14 inches wide, and it says "Sunday Herald-Examiner."

And in large bold type it says "The Trial of Charles Manson and His Family."

And this was an advertisement that was used to display the Sunday Herald-Examiner.

2 fls.

The evidentiary import of that small bill-board or poster is that the Herald-Examiner apparently was attempting to call attention, or as much attention as possible to the article.

2-1

Ģ

15.

16° - 17

--

°

24,

5

Now, obviously, the article is extremely prejudicial if any members of the prospective alternate jury panel has read it.

Your Honor certainly admonished these jurors on Friday not to read or submit themselves to any of the publicity by way of newspaper, radio or television.

I might point out, however, that this is the Sunday Edition of the paper, it is the second largest metropolitan newspaper in Los Angeles, and it has a widespread circulation, although I haven't recently read any newspaper readership study.

It seems to me that because the paper is generally available to the public from approximately Saturday in the a.m. through Sunday evening that there is a great deal of exposure to the public, and I suggest that perhaps -- or even more than perhaps -- I am suggesting that some members of the alternate jury panel have indeed been infected. It would appear that if a family subscribes to the Los Angelss Herald-Examiner Sunday Edition, it would be difficult to avoid it.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I don't want to be absurd, your Honor, but I think that in light of this type of publicity, particularly this article in a major metropolitan Sunday newspaper, that I am going to request on behalf of Patricia Krenwinkel that your Honor consider and that

your Honor sequester the entire prospective alternate jury panel.

I know of no way that we can otherwise insure that these prospective jurors just won't be subjected to this material in the future.

2a-1

ż

Secondly, I think perhaps an inquiry on the part of the Court might be in order to determine if, in fact, any members of the prospective alternate jury panel have read this particular article.

THE COURT: Well, I think we should continue with our selection of the alternate jurors. Of course, that is a legitimate area of inquiry, if anyone has read it. That fact can certainly be brought out.

I don't think there is any need to question the panel as a whole, because we are going to have the individuals in and we can examine them in chambers.

MR. STOVITZ: I have no objection, if you want to requestion the six out there that we have already questioned here concerning this one point. It seems that we did that on some other matter that came up when your Honor thought that the Susan Atkins' statement was that material and we called back each of the jurors and questioned them on that.

THE COURT: Well, I think we should just proceed with our selection, and if anyone does want to call back the alternates to ask them about this article, I have no objection.

MR. STOVITZ: For instance, Miss Abbatecola, the juror that submitted the two notes, I think that she should be questioned in chambers to clarify her knowledge of the La Biancas.

i

THE COURT: Well, yes, of course. That is another matter. I agree.

She apparently is trying to tell us something, I am not sure what at the moment.

Do you want to call in Miss Abbatecola first?

Does anybody have any preference on that? I think probably it would be a good idea to call in Miss Abbatecola and find out what is on her mind in view of the notes that she has submitted.

Do you want the newspapers back?

MR. FITZGERALD: Would the Court mark them?

I bear in mind what the Court said recently that your Honor doesn't want to clutter up the files with every newspaper article, but I think this is one that is of tremendous importance inasmuch as we are still in the process of selecting alternate jurors.

THE COURT: It is really only important if someone read it, someone connected with this case. It doesn't make any difference if someone who has no connection with the case read it.

MR. FITZGERALD: It is simply for the coherence of the record, if we are going to refer to it in questioning prospective alternate jurors. It would be helpful if any reviewing court had the availability of the exhibit.

THE COURT: All right. We will mark it.

2ь-1

1 2

MR. STOVITZ: This is a good example of the fact that you can't believe everything you read in the newspapers. They have got a fact in there that is completely erroneous. They list me as 50 years of age. I am 46.

MR. KANAREK: Mr. Stovitz fails to perceive that this entire matter concerning Mr. Manson is erroneous.

THE CLERK: Are we ready yet?

THE COURT: Before you bring her in, Mr. Darrow, we will mark the copy of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner for Sunday, July 19th, 1970, and a copy of this --

MR. KANAREK: It is a placard, your Honor, that was on every -- I can't say every, but I believe --

THE COURT: Did you obtain it, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: Where did you obtain it?

MR. KANAREK: I obtained it from the stand at the United Airlines -- adjacent to the United Airlines gates at the Los Angeles International Airport. It is the area just as you go in the doors off the street on your way to the gates.

THE COURT: All right. These will be marked for identification.

Would you bring in Miss Abbatecola?

(Prospective alternate juror Miss Catherine Abbatecola enters the Court's chambers.)

THE COURT: Good morning.

MISS ABBATECOLA: Good morning, your Honor. 1, $\mathbf{2}^{\cdot}$ VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS ABBATECOLA 3. BY THE COURT: I have your two notes, Miss Abbatecola. 5 I am not sure I understand what you are referring to 6 when you talk about a psychiatric examination of the 7 defendant. 8 What are you referring to? . 9 Well, I heard in other cases that it is 10 done sometimes. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

3 fls.

į

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 Q What does that have to do with you?

A Well, I was just wondering if any mention was going to be made.

As I said, I was wondering if I have a right to know; it was just curiosity, I guess.

Q It may well be that there will be psychiatric testimony in the case. I have no way of knowing at this point.

A I see.

Q If there is you will hear it if you are on the jury or one of the alternate jurors.

Now, there is another note here --

A Right.

Q -- I received this morning from you in which you asked to speak with me and counsel regarding information about your family and the La Biancas.

A Right. I was informed this weekend, because I had no way of knowing before, that my grandfather knew Mr. La Bianca, although I was a child when my grandfather died, so I never heard the name.

Also about 15 years ago in, I guess, Mr.

La Bianca is in some way connected with Gateway Food

Stores. My uncle was a salesman, and about eight or nine

years ago my brother was a box boy at Gateway, although I

don't think my brother ever met Mr. La Bianca, and I never

heard the name before.

*) We
-2	1	But I just thought you should be aware of it.
	2	Q I appreciate that. That is the sort of
	3	information that all counsel would like to hear.
•	4	Sometimes it has some significance; sometimes
	5	it doesn't, but we want to hear it so we can determine
	6	whether it does or not.
	7	Now, does anyone wish to question Miss
•	8	Abbatecola?
	9	MR. FITZGERALD: No. your Honor.
' 1	LO .	MR. HUGHES: No. your Honor.
1	11	MR. SHINN: No. your Honor.
Ĺ	i.2	MR. KANAREK: We have no desire for any questions,
ı —	13	your Honor.
. i	L4 :	THE COURT: Now, Miss Abbatecola, did you have any
i	15	occasion to read any newspaper over the weekend?
1	16	THE WITNESS: No, I have not spoken about the case
. i	17	with anyone.
ı	18.	Q That is not what I asked. I asked you if you
1	1,9	read a newspaper.
. ?	20	A I read parts of the Times.
. 2	21	Q Did you by any chance look at or read the
2	22	Los Angeles Herald Examiner yesterday?
2	23	A No.
2	24	Q For yesterday?
	25.	A No.
2	26	Now, is there anything else you wish to talk

	1	
3-3	Ţ,	about as long as you are in here?
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2	A No, other than that I have disclosed everything
•	3	I can think of.
	4	Q I take it, then, that you are still able to
•	5	serve as an alternate juror if you are selected?
,	6	A If I am selected.
	7	THE COURT: All right, and please do not forget the
; ;	8	admonitions which have been previously given to you about
	9	talking with anyone else, and so forth, particularly
i N	. 10	reading, watching, or listening to any newspaper reports
1	11	concerning the case.
	12	All right, I will ask you then to go back into
	13.	the courtroom and we will call in the next prospective
	14	alternate juror.
•	15	Thank you, Miss Abbatecola.
•	16	
-	17	(Miss Abbatecola leaves the chambers of the
	18	court.)
•	19	MR. FITZGERALD: If the Court will entertain a
	20	stipulation, all counsel are willing to stipulate she may
	21	be removed, your Honor.
	22	MR. STOVITZ: Yes, your Honor, Peo ple will so stipu-
	23	late.
ì	24	MR. HUGHES: So stipulated.
	· 25 ·	MR. SHINK: So stipulated.
	26.	MR. KANAREK: So stipulated, and also on the basis of

cause, because of the fact she heard it, she read the Susan Atkins confession, or remembered it.

THE COURT: Well, you passed the other day when that fact was mentioned.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, I am saying again on a relative basis we have to take people in this case that, to my knowledge, has never happened before --

THE COURT: You don't have to explain it. I just commented on the fact that the other day when this fact was fully known you passed her for cause.

MR. KANAREK: Because of the reason enunciated, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, Miss Abbatecola will be excused by stipulation of all counsel.

(A prospective alternate juror enters the chambers of the Court.)

THE COURT: Good morning, sir.

THE CLERK: The prospective alternate juror's name is Milton B. Horenstein, M-i-l-t-o-n, H-o-r-e-n-s-t-e-i-n.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MILTON B. HORENSTEIN BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Horenstein, you did stand up the other day to give your name when I asked if there are any prospective jurors who could not be fair and impartial in this case.

A Yes, sir.

Well, the newspaper articles on that, TV; I sort of formed an opinion on that from the newspapers and 3四十二

1

3

4

5

Ģ

7.

9

8

10

11

12.

14

15 16

17

1**8**

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

Q You believe that you could not be fair and impartial in this case and base your decision solely on the evidence that came out during the trial?

A Well, that changes the picture. I mean, this was a matter of opinion, without being on the basis of being put on a jury.

But it would -- naturally it would have to be on the evidence.

Q Do you think you would be able to put aside what you already have read or heard and decide the case solely on the evidence that came out during the trial?

A To a good extent.

Q Well, I don't know what you mean by that.

In order to be qualified to sit as a juror, or an alternate juror, you should first have to be fair and impartial, and any decision or opinions that you reach in the case would have to be based solely on the evidence that came out during the trial.

Now, do you think that you would be able to do that?

A Well, that was the point that I meant, from the type of work I do I can have an opinion but I have to judge on all the evidence of what I find.

- Q Are you telling me you would be able to do that?
- A I believe so. There is one drawback.
- Q Keep your voice up, please, so everyone can

hear you. 1 There is, incidentally, one drawback: A 2 I had to receive a postponement for jury duty 3 because of the fact that I was getting shots, allergy shots. À I still am. 5 Q Howoften? 6 Once a week. 7 Well, if you were selected, could that be done, 8 say, at the hotel; the doctor could come to the hotel and 9 give the shot? 10 A Yes, I believe so. 11 Q Have you ever read or heard anything with 12 regard to this case that appeared to be a description by 13 someone who was actually present at the time any of the 14 persons were killed? 15 A No. 16 Q Do you understand what I am saying by an eye 17 witness? 18 Yes, an eye witness account. 19 You never heard or read anything? 20 A Not that I recall. 21 Q Have you ever read or heard anything that 22 appeared to be a statement made by one of these defendants 23 about anything at all? 24 Yes. A 25 Q What was that 26

1	A A confession.
2	Q Well, that is what I was referring to in the
3.	first place.
4	Whose confession was it?
5 .	A Miss Atkins.
6.	Q And you understand from that that she was
7	present?
8	A Uh-huh.
9	Q At the time of the killings or some of the
10	killings?
11	A That's right.
12	Q That is what I meant in the first place.
13	A Oh, I'm sorry.
14	THE COURT; Any questions?
15	MR. FITZGERALD: No. your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?
17	MR. HUGHES: No, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
19	MR. SHINN: No questions, your Honor.
20	MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.
21	
Ž 2	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. HORENSTEIN
23	BY MR. STOVITZ:
24	Q What is your business or occupation, sir?
25	A I am the supervising collection investigator
26	for the County of Los Angeles.

MR. STOVITZ: No questions. 1 THE COURT: All right, sir, I will ask you to go back 2 in the courtroom, please, and will you refrain from dis-3 cussing with anyone what has been said in here this morning? 4 MR. HORENSTEIN: Yes, sir. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. 6 (Mr. Horenstein leaves the chambers of the 7 court.) 8. MR. FITZGERALD: The defendants will interpose a 9 challenge for cause, actual bias, Penal Code Section 1073, 10 Paragraph 2. 11 MR. HUGHES: Join, your Honor. 12 MR. SHINN: Join, your Honor. 13 MR. KANAREK: Join, your Honor. 14 MR. STOVITZ: Join. 15 THE COURT: All right, the challenge will be allowed. 16 Mr. Horenstein will be excused for cause. 17 18 19 20 21 22 2324 25 26

3B

3b-1	1	(A prospective alternate juror enters the
	2	chambers of the court.)
	3	THE COURT: Good morning.
	4	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
	5 ;	juror is Dennia A. Fricker, D-e-n-n-i-s, F-r-i-c-k-e-r.
	6	
	7	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. FRICKER
	8	BY THE COURT:
	9	Q Mr. Fricker, if you were selected as an
	10	alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve?
	11:	A It would be hard.
	12	Q What is your situation?
	1,3	A I get paid for 35 days.
	14	Q Who is your employer?
	15	A The Post Office.
	16	Q Well, the Post Office as far as I know
	17	continues compensation of anyone whose jury service
	18	extends beyond that period?
	19	A I looked it up. It only said for 35 days.
	20	That is what I thought anyway.
	21	THE COURT: I don't believe so. Has anyone else
	22	had experience with Post Office employees?
	23	It has always been my understanding they get
	24	paid just as any other Government employee.
)	25	MR. STOVITZ: None of the other Post Office
	26	employees raised that point. I assume by their silence

it was held by them at any rate they are paid continually.

THE COURT: How long have you been with the Post Office?

THE WITNESS: Seven years.

BY THE COURT:

Q That is something we can check and you can also check.

A I came here Monday and I checked Tuesday.

I went over there in the morning and read 35 days on the jury, 30 calendar days or 35 days on the jury, I'm pretty sure.

Q Well, would you check further on that with your supervisor or manager?

A Yes.

Q Apart from that, is there any other reason why you would not be able to serve?

A I guess not, not really.

Q All right. Then would you check on that just to make sure.

A Yes.

Q We don't want to create any undue hardship, but I believe that you will find your compensation will continue.

Now, I'm going to ask you the same questions regarding the death penalty that I put to the other prospective jurors.

3b-3

2

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

. 12

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25⁻ 26 Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt without regard to the evidence in the case?

- A Just guilt you mean?
- Q Just on the question of guilt.
- A No.
- Q The answer is no?
- A I would not be prejudiced.
- Q You would be able to make an impartial decision?
 - A Yes.
- Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the case?

A I don't know. I have been thinking about it like you said, and I would find it awfully hard to do.

Q Well, would you on the other hand automatically impose the death penalty in every case without regard to the evidence?

A No.

Q All right, would it be fair to say that you would be willing to listen to all of the evidence in the case, now, assuming it gets to the question of penalty, and the case may never get that far, you

3b-4

4fls.

understand?

A Yes.

Q But if it gets to the question of penalty, which means there will have been a conviction of murder in the first degree of at least one of these defendants, are you then willing to listen to all of the evidence and then make up your mind on the question of penalty, or have you already made up your mind?

That is what we are trying to find out.

A That is what I was trying to find out myself over last weekend. I don't know.

I just -- even if a person was convicted of first degree murder, I don't know, I just don't know that I could actually, you know, say, give him the death sentence.

Q Can you think of any case or any set of facts or circumstances where you would consider imposing the death penalty?

A I have in the past, but it was only a moment's anger or something, you know, reading something in the paper, or like when Kennedy was assassinated, or something like that, you know.

But the more you think about it afterwards,
I don't know, it wouldn't make me any better than the
person convicted of it, I don't think, to actually do
this, even though it was sanctioned and it was all legal.

3

4 5

1

6

7

8)

9

11 12

13 '

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

1	Q Do you think that this belief or opinion of
2	yours has reached the point where you would, in every
8	case, automatically refuse to impose the death penalty?
4	Or would you wait until the end and consider all of the
5 '	evidence and then make your decision?
6	A Well, I don't think any consideration would
7	lead me to want to give the death sentence, after
8	thinking about it.
9	Q Well, we will go on to another subject for
10	the moment.
11	Have you formed any opinion as to the guilt
12	or innocence of any of the defendants?
18	A No.
14	Q Do you read a daily newspaper on a regular
15	basis?
16	A Yes.
17	Q You will have to answer audibly.
18	À Yes.
19	Q. What paper is that?
20	A The Independent Press-Telegram of Long
21	Beach.
22	Q Long Beach?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Keep your voice up, please, because all
2 5	these lawyers in here have to hear everything you say,
26	Mr Frinker

Α Yes. 1 Have you ever read or heard anything which 2 seemed to be a description by someone who was actually 3 present when any of these killings took place? Not that I can remember. Α 5 Have you ever read or heard anything which 6 seemed to be a statement made by one of the defendants, 7 one or more of the defendants, about anything? 8 A I don't think so. 9 I remember reading it, but it was quite a 10 while ago -- something, I know. Reading what? 12 About the arrests. But I think that was about Α 13 a year ago, wasn't it? Something like that. 14 I don't remember what I read about it actually. 15 I believe that the defendants were arrested 16 somewhere around December. 17 Is that correct? 18 MR. FITZGERALD: That is correct. 19 Now, of course, at the time that THE COURT: Ø 20 they were arrested there was some publicity in which their 21 names were given. 22 A Yes. 23 And the charges were described. 24 A Yes. .25 Is that what you are referring to? 26

Yes.

Q Do you believe that if you were selected in

A

this case that you could put aside whatever you have read or heard about the case and decide the case solely on

the evidence that came out during the trial?

4a fls.

A Yes.

5

1<u>9</u>

.**21**

23

24

25

26

	•	4146
	Q -	Do you have any question about your ability to
be fa	ir ar A	nd impartial, Mr. Fricker?
	Q.	Now, you may recall that when your panel first
came	into	the courtroom, I made some remarks to them,
inclu	ding	the statement that in every criminal case a
defen	dant	is presumed to be innocent
	A	Yes.
	Q	until his guilt is proved beyond a reasonable
doubt		

A Yes.

Q Do you remember that?

Α Yes.

Q Would you be willing to give each of the defendants in this case the benefit of that presumption of innocence?

> Å Yes.

And if the People were unable to prove the guilt of any defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, Mr. Fricker, would you then vote for an acquittal?

> A Yes.

On the other hand, if they were able to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, you would then vote for a verdict of guilty?

> A Yes.

Now to get back to this death penalty matter,

2

3

5

-6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1,6

17

18

19

20

21

22

 23°

24

25

26

Mr. Fricker.

What we have to ascertain -- and you don't have to justify your opinion in any way; everybody is entitled to his own opinion; we are really not interested in whether you think one way or the other, as long as we know what it is you think -- do you understand?

A Yes.

Q We are not here to criticize anyone s opinions but only to determine what they are.

A Yes, sir.

Q Would you say that your opinion with respect to the death penalty is such that you still have some question in your mind as to whether or not you could impose it in any case, or have you unalterably made up your mind at this point so that you could say that you would never impose it in any case?

I know that is a difficult question but can you answer it?

A I just don't want to be in a position to have to give it.

Q Well --

A I don't know if I can be talked into it or not.

I don't know.

Q You realize that if you were selected as an alternate juror, you could conceivably end up on the jury of 12 who has to make that decision, do you not?

_		_
4	7	3

A Yes.

Now, I don't suppose there are very many people who look forward with any degree of enthusiasm to being faced with having to make that decision. It is a difficult decision to make. Yet, obviously, someone has to make it.

A Yes.

Q If it becomes necessary.

A Yes, sir.

Notwithstanding your rejuctance to make it,
Mr. Fricker, do you think that you could make it?

A No, I really don't think I could.

Q Well, I am not sure that I understand your answer.

Suppose you were on the jury and that you determined that one or more of the defendants was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and you so voted. Nowwe come to the second phase or the penalty phase of the trial.

A Yes.

Would you just refuse to do anything? Or would you have your mind made up before you ever heard any evidence or arguments on the question of penalty? Or would you listen to the evidence and the arguments of counsel and the Court's instructions and then make up your mind as to what you are to do?

4a4	
•	
ı	

.5

	A	I.	think	мy	mind	is	pretty	well	made	up	that
I	wouldn t	giv	re the	đea	ath se	ente	ance.				
	Q,	Do	you l	have	any	que	estion a	about	that	as	to

A No, not really.

whether or not your mind is made up?

THE COURT: Do you care to examine, Mr. Fitzgerald?
MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, your Honor, if I might.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. FRICKER BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Q You understand, Mr. Fricker, that in the event you get to some second phase of the trial, you don't need to impose a death penalty.

A Right.

Q But Would you keep an open mind and just listen to the evidence that might be introduced at any kind of a trial like that?

A What do you mean?

Q Would you listen to the evidence?

A Would I listen to the evidence during the trial, or on the penalty?

Q Well, there may be two trials is what the Judge is trying to point out to you.

A Yes.

The trial on guilt or innocence, and then maybe some penalty trial to follow.

A Yes.

4b - 1

2

1

3

4

5

6.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16:

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26 Q In which evidence in aggravation of the offense is introduced and evidence in mitigation is introduced, and there may be witnesses called at the second trial.

Could you listen to the evidence, Mr. Fricker?

A Yes, I could listen to it.

Q Could you discuss that evidence with your fellow jurors in the jury room?

A Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. FRICKER

BY THE COURT:

Q When you say you would listen to the evidence, he doesn't mean just listen politely because you don't have any choice, Mr. Fricker, he is talking about listening with an open mind and considering what is being said and then making your decision.

Do you understand that?

A Yes? But I am afraid I would be listening, though, just waiting for my turn to also talk against the death penalty.

Q In other words, while you were listening all this time, would your mind have already been made up?

A Yes, sir, I am afraid so. I don't think I could be persuaded to change it, to give the death sentence

4b - 2So, when you say you would be listening, you Q 1 would be listening merely out of courtesy, is that right, 2 because you didn't have any choice? 3 Yes. I am afraid so. 4 But you would already know what your decision Q. 5 was going to be on the question of imposing the death penalty? 7 Α Yes. 8 THE COURT: Any questions? 9 MR. HUGHES: Yes. 10 11 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. FRICKER 12 BY MR. HUGHES: 13 Might there not indeed, Mr. Fricker -- is it 14 Flicker or Fricker? 15 Fricker. A 16 Might there not indeed be some possibility 17 that you would listen to this evidence in some particular 18 case and would possibly vote for the death penalty? 19 A Possibly only if I was ganged up on and browbeaten 20 into it, if you know what I mean. 21 MR. HUGHES: No further questions. 22 MR. SHINN: No questions. 23 MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz? 25 Yes, sir. 26 MR. STOVITZ:

1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. FRICKER
2.	BY MR. STOVITZ:
3	Q Mr. Fricker, how old are you, sir?
4	A How old am I?
5	Q Yes.
6	A 27.
7	Q Are you married?
8	A Yes, sir.
9	Q Now, assume a situation where do you have
10	any children?
11	A Yes.
12	Q Assume a situation where a man came in and
13	raped and murdered your wife and killed your children.
14	Do you think that in that case the jury should give the
15	man the death penalty?
16	MR. KANAREK: Improper voir dire, your Honor.
17	MR. STOVITZ: I agree, your Honor. I am trying
18	to get to this man's frame of mind. I agree it is
. 19	improper voir dire.
20	THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
21	MR: STOVITZ: Q Mr. Fricker, we want to
22	know your frame of mind.
2 8	We don't want to know some hypothetical
24	case.
2 5	We want to know your frame of mind.
26	Do you think that you are so prejudiced

4c fls.

and I use the term, you know, not in any demeaning manner - is your mind so well made up that you would in no case ever vote for the death penalty?

A If I was on the jury in the circumstances you said, I would vote for the death penalty, probably because I would probably want to kill him; but under no circumstances, I don't think, do I have the right to take someone else's life.

Under certain circumstances I might want to take someone's life.

Q All right. Now, you are on this jury.

A Yes.

Q And let's assume that the State has proven the defendants and each of them guilty of the various counts of murder that they are charged with. And let's assume that the circumstances are very aggravating. And let's assume that their guilt is not only beyond a reasonable doubt but conclusive.

Would you, in this case, consider the imposition of the death penalty?

A No.

	ļ	·
4c−1	1	Q So that in no case would you ever consider
	2	giving these defendants the death penalty?
	3	A No.
	4	Q When you say no, do you mean that you agree
	5	with my statement, or you would not give them the death
s	6	penalty?
	7	A I would not give the death penalty.
	8	Q To any of these defendants?
	9	A No.
	10	MR. STOVITZ: I have no further questions.
	11	THE COURT: Anything further?
	12.	MR. HUGHES: No.
<u>.</u>	13	MR. FITZGERALD: No.
	14.	MR. SHINN: No.
	15	MR. KANAREK: No.
	16	THE COURT: We will ask you to go back into the
	17	courtroom, Mr. Fricker.
	18	Will you refrain from discussing with anyone
	19	what has been said in here this morning?
	20	MR. FRICKER: Yes, sir.
	21	(Whereupon, Mr. Fricker leaves the court's
	22	chambers.)
	23.	THE COURT: Is there going to be any challenge with
	24	respect to Mr. Fricker?
	25	MR. BUGLIOSI: No.
	26	MR. STOVITZ: Not for cause, your Honor.

4c2 THE COURT: Very well. 1 (Whereupon, another prospective juror enters the 2 court 's chambers.) 3 THE COURT: Good morning, sir. 4 MR. MATTIS: Good morning. 5 THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate 6 juror is Kenneth L. Mattis; K-e-n-n-e-t-h, M-a-t-t-i-s. 7 8 9 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF KENNETH L. MATTIS BY THE COURT: 10 Mr. Mattis, if you were selected as an alter-11 nate juror in this case, would you be able to serve? 12 I don't think so. I am an Internal Revenue 13 agent and the cases that I have in process I don't believe 14 could be deferred for the length of time that I would be 15 16 here. MR. HUGHES: Could that answer be read back? 17 I wasn't able to hear Mr. Mattis. 18 19 MR. MATTIS: I am an --THE COURT: That is all right. We will have it read. 20 21 Please keep your voice up. 22 (The answer was read by the reporter.) 23 MR. HUGHES: Thank you. 24 THE COURT: Q Mr. Mattis, are you employed out of the Los Angeles office here? 26 MR. MATTIS: West Covina.

4C3	

10-

°

25.

	-			
'n		T. T	~	i
Q		West	Covina?	

A Yes.

Q I am going to put to you the questions regarding the death penalty that I put to the other prospective jurors.

Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt without regard to the evidence in the case?

A Well, I haven't really thought about it until last week, until you told us to, and I am of the opinion that I would be opposed to the death penalty.

Q This question is not asking about imposing it.

It is whether or not by reason of your opinions you would
be unable to be impartial on the question of guilt.

A I think I could be impartial.

Now, the second question goes to the penalty itself.

Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the case?

A Well, again, since I have thought about it last week, I think I would be opposed to the death penalty in any -- under any circumstances.

Q Would you say that you have unalterably made up

C4

your mind on that? Or would you be willing to listen to all of the evidence and then decide the question of penalty?

A No, I think it is a matter of conscience.

We generally follow the rule that killing is wrong in any instance, and I would think it would follow through the death penalty.

Q That is not an answer to the question that I asked you.

What I want to know is whether you have now made up your mind so that regardless of what kind of a case it was, what the circumstances were, what the evidence was, under no circumstances would you vote for the death penalty, or whether, on the other hand, you would be willing to listen to all the evidence and then decide whether or not to vote for the death penalty or life imprisonment.

A I don't think I could vote for the death penalty under any circumstances. Life imprisonment possibly, but if I listen to the case, regardless of the type of case or the evidence that was presented, I would feel that I couldn't vote for the death penalty.

Q Have you formed any opinion about any of the defendants in this case with regard to whether or not they are guilty or not guilty?

A I don't really think so.

As far as the three girls are concerned, I know absolutely nothing about them. As far as Mr. Manson is concerned, I read something some month or so ago.

,
4d-1
_

2

3

5

6

Ž

.8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

MR. STOVITZ: I couldn't hear you, sir.

MR. MATTIS: I read something a month or so ago in one of the magazines, but I don't think I formed any opinion.

BY THE COURT:

Q What was it that you read?

A I think it was either Life or Time, because those are the only two magazines we get; and I think they had an article, four or five pages, about the case.

I don't, again, recall specifically what it was about exactly.

Q Well, was this about his past life? The way he lives? Or did it have anything to do with the alleged crimes? What was the substance of the story?

A I think it might have had to do with the way he lived but I just don't recall.

Q Have you ever read or heard anything which seemed to be a description by someone who was actually present at the time any of the killings took place?

A No.

Q Have you ever read or heard anything which seemed to be a statement by one of the defendants about anything at all, any of the defendants?

A No, not that I recall.

Q. The story that you read about Mr. Manson, that did not purport to be a statement by Mr. Manson but

25

was somebody else describing him; is that right? 4d - 21 A. I believe it was an article by one of the 2 3 reporters for the magazine. 4 Again, it was a month or so ago and I just don't recall what the substance of the article was. 5 Have you ever read anything, any statement by Q. any of the female defendants? 7 8 A No. 9 Did you read any newspaper over the weekend? Q 10 A The San Gabriel Tribune. 11 That is the one that we get. 12 Any other paper? Q 13 A Well, we also get the Whittier Daily News. 14 Do you read the Times, the Los Angeles Times? Q: 15 Well. I was glancing through this morning's. A 16 What about yesterday? Q 17 Α No. 18 What about the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner? Q. 19. Α No. 20 You didn't read that, yesterday's Herald-21 Examiner? 22 No. A 23 Do you believe that you would be able to 24 put aside whatever you may have learned about this case 25 and decide the case solely on the evidence that comes 26 out during the trial?

	.]	
1	A	I think that would be possible, yes.
<u> </u>	Q	Well, it is possible. I want to know whether
3	you can do	it?
. 4	A	Well, I think I can do it, yes.
5	ે	Do you have any question about that?
6	A	No. No question.
7	. Q	Would you be willing to give each of the
. 8	defendants	in this case the benefit of the presumption of
. 9	innocence?	
5 fls. 10	A.	Yes.
11		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
12 ²	- !	
13		
14		
' 15	, ,	
16	•	•
1.7		
18 19		
20 [.]	1 <u>-</u>	**
21,		
. 22		
23	•	
24		
25		
26		
•		

-1	1	Q And acquit them unless the People were able to
•	2:	prove their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?
	3	A Yes.
	4	Q on the other hand, if the People were able to
	5	prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to any defendant
	6	would you then vote a verdict of guilty as to that
	7	defendant?
,	8	A Yes.
	. 9 .:	THE COURT: Do you have any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald?
,	10	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, your Honor.
	11	
	12	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. MATTIS
<u> </u>	13	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
	14	Q Do you subscribe to the Los Angeles Times?
	15	A No.
	,16	Q You do not?
	17	A No.
	1.8	Q Do you read it on a regular basis, sir?
	19	A Fairly regular since I have been down here, I
	20	read it each morning, but otherwise very infrequently.
	21	Q In other words, you mentioned that you read
	22	occasionally.
,	23	Have you read anything about this case or the
	24	defendants in this case?
	25	A If I have, it has not left any impression.
	26	Q But have you, as far as you know, read or seen

anything in the newspapers?

A I would presume

A I would presume at some time I saw something about them.

Q And you read something about them in the magazines, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q You also I take it, have seen news reports on television in connection with these defendants and this case?

A I believe so.

Q What about radio?

A I usually have the news on going to and from work, so I probably did.

Because of what you have read or seen or heard about Mr. Manson, is that going to influence you in arriving at a verdict?

A I don't think so.

Q Is there any hesitancy on your part?
You used the term "I don't think so."

A Well, only for the reason that in the case of Mr. Manson I have read something, so I have, I guess, some slight feeling in his case as opposed to the three girls.

Q Do you recall what it was that you read, or do you have an impression of what you read?

A It was a Life or Time magazine article.

Again, I believe it delt with the way

1	Mr. Manson lives, but I don't really recall.
Ż.	Q Did it contain some allegation of fact?
3	A I just recall a long article, and I read the
4	article, and what the contents of it was I just don't
5	remember.
6	Q Even though you don't remember the contents,
7	you have formed a slight opinion, is that right?
8-	A Well, I have talked with my wife some, because
9	it so happened that when the crime took place we were out
10	of the city, and it made headlines in the city we were
11	in.
12	And it rang some bell to that extent.
13	Q And I take it your wife does not personally
14	know Mr. Manson nor does she know anybody who personally
15	knows him?
16	A No.
17	Q So would it be fair to say that what your wife
18	knows is based on what she has heard, read or seen about
19	this case from the media?
20.	A Definitely.
21	Q You talked it over, and as a result of those
22	conversations you have formed a slight opinion, you think?
23	A Well, all I can say I am more conscious of
24	Mr. Manson's existence than I am of anybody else's
2 5	because I have seen some reports about him.
26	Q What is the nature of that opinion?

I guess it is not the way I would want to live, 1 the way he lives. That is about it. 2 I don't have any --3 Now, you may have formed some opinion about his Q, 4 life style, the way he lives, the way he acts, whatever? 5 Á Yes. 6 Q But what we are concerned about is an opinion 7 concerning his innocence or guilt. 8 Do you have an opinion in that regard? Have you 9 formed an opinion at all in that regard? 10 A I don't think I have formed an opinion in that 11 regard. 12 Have you formed a slight opinion? 13 The slight opinion would be I would think that Α 14 he could have been capable of doing it, but if he did or 15 did not --16 THE COURT: He what? 17 THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He could have been capable of 18 performing such a thing, but if he did or did not I don't 19 know. 20 BY MR. FITZGERALD: You have not formed any 21 opinion about that? 22 I don't think so. 23 Do you recall what you read that led you to 24 believe that he would be capable of it? 25 26 A Again, I have not read anything about him in --

5A

it used to be a month or two, and what it was specifically I just don't remember.

Are you going to let any opinion you might have in connection with his life style or how he lives influence you in arriving at a verdict on innocence or guilt?

A I don't think that would influence me at all.

5a-1 1	Q Based on your feeling in connection with his
· 2	life style, and based on your wife's feeling, do you think
	it would be more typical for you to be impartial?
4	A I could conceive of instances where it might
5	be easier to be impartial, but I don't know.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Q Would it present any impediment to impartiality
Ý	A Well, I don't think so. I think I can be
.8.	impartial.
9.	Q Well, if the evidence so indicated could you
· 10 .	acquit Mr. Manson?
11	A No question, I think so.
12	Q If the prosecution did not prove to you beyond
13	a reasonable doubt, I take it you would vote for an
14	acquittal?
15	A Yes.
16	Q Is there any reason at all to believe that
17	you would not?
18	A No.
19	MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.
20°	MR. HUGHES: No questions.
21	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
22	OF.
23	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION/MR. MATTIS
24	BY MR. SHINN:
25	Q Mr. Matthews?
26	A Mattis, C.
•	1

	,	
5a-2	1	Q I'm sorry, have you read anything about this
	2	case in the last couple of days or weeks?
	3 :	A No, not other than the fact you go through a
	4	paper, you see a headline, you cannot avoid the headline.
	5	THE COURT: Keep your voice up, please, Mr. Mattis,
	6 .	it is hard to hear you.
	7 -	BY MR. SHINN:
	8	Q Do you know Mr. Kanarek?
	:9	A No, I don't know if I am looking at the right
	10	person now.
	11	Q You did not see his picture or read about him,
	12	say, last week?
	13	A No.
	14	Q The first time you saw Mr. Kanarek was when he
	15 ·	was introduced in court?
	16	A I presume this is Mr. Kanarek?
	17	, Q Yes.
	18.	A As far as I know last week was the first time
	19	I saw him.
	20	MR. SHINN: I have nothing further, your Honor.
	21	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?
	22	MR.KANAREK: No questions.
	23	THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz.
	24	
D	25	, ,
	26	

23

24

25

26

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. MATTIS BY MR. STOVITZ:

Q Sir, are you asking the Court to excuse you because of your work hardship?

A Yes.

Q Is it possible for someone else over there in the Department of Internal Revenue to take over your assignments?

A It is possible but not too practical I think, because of the type of case, and the length of time we have been involved in it, it would require my assistance in any case to complete it, to whoever they did assign.

Q Don't you have two people working on every case over there?

A We do in some instances, but generally we have one man per case, generally.

Q Now, with respect to your views on capital punishment, is this a religious belief or a philosophical belief?

A Well, you might say it is religious but I would say it is just more the feeling of our family; that is the way we raise our children, and the way we feel, that killing is wrong.

Like I say, until last week I never really thought about whether I was or was not for the death penalty, but on thinking about it I think it is just a

		l
5a-4	1	strain that we use in our family.
	2	Q What church, if any, do you belong to?
)·	3	A St. Louis of Francis, a Catholic church.
	4 ′	Q You know of no principle of the Catholic
	5	church that has as one of its beliefs the suppression of
	6	the death penalty?
	7	A Not as far as I know.
	8 ·	Q Now, can you envision any case whatsoever
•	9	in which you yourself would return a death penalty?
	10 '	A I think I have to answer no to that. I think
	11	I would have to say no to that.
	12	Q So in the event that any of these defendants
	13	here, including Mr. Manson, was convicted of first
	14.	degree murder, and the trial proceeded to the penalty
	15	stage and you were one of the jurors on that case, you
•	1 6	would then cause a deadlock or a hung jury, is that
	17	right?
	18	MR. KANAREK: That is assuming that the other people
	19	would not see the merit, your Honor.
	20	That is an unfair question.
	21	MR. STOVITZ: I will reframe the question.
	22	Q The other jurors were voting for the death
	23	penalty, you would then cause a deadlock, is that right?
	24	MR. KANAREK: The tone of that question is improper
	25	voir dire, your Honor.
	26	THE COURT: Well. I think the question is unfair.

It is probably unclear in the juror's mind. 1 MR. STOVITZ: I will reframe the question. 2 BY MR. STOVITZ: 3 Assume for the moment that anyone of these defendants were convicted of first degree murder, involv-5 ing the killing of seven people. 6 Assume furthermore that you were then selected to 7 sit in the jury to decide the penalty and you heard the 8 evidence and you now went back into the jury room and 9. 11 of the jurors were voting for a return of the death 10 penalty. 11 Do you have that set of facts in mind? 12 À Yes. 13. Would you automatically insist upon voting Q. 14 for life imprisonment? 15 I think I would have to say yes to that 16 because, again, upon thinking about it I think I have 17 to feel that causing of death is wrong for any reason, 18 whether it be a legal reason or any other reason. 19 All right, now, with respect to the Life 20 magazine article, were you getting Life magazine in ·21 December of 1969? 22. We have been getting Life magazine for a 23 5b fls. 24 good number of years. I am sure we were. 25 26

B-1	1.	Q Do you remember whether or not the particular
	2	magazine that had four or five pages on Mr. Manson, had a
	. 3	picture of Mr. Manson on the front cover?
	4	À No.
	5 .	Q You cannot remember that?
	6	A I don't recall.
	7	Q In this article did it just talk about
	. 8 ,	Mr. Manson or did it talk about some of his followers?
	·9 ,	A Well, I think it was about the way he lived,
	10	so I presume it talked about his followers.
	11	MR. FITZGERALD: It assumes facts not in evidence.
	12	We object. "Mr. Manson's followers."
	13	Q BY MR. STOVITZ: Well, associates.
	14	A I don't recall, I don't recall. I think it did
	15	but I don't recall.
	16	Q were these associates girls or boys or a
	17	combination of both?
	- 18	A I don't recall.
	19.	Q Did it talk about the forthcoming trial?
	2 0,	A I don't think so, but I don't recall again.
	21	Q you think you read the article about a month or
	22	two months ago?
	23	A Whenever it appeared, and I am guessing around
	24	two months ago.
	25	Q The reason I ask it, are you in the habit of
	26	keeping Life magazines in the house and then going back and

reading old issues?

A No. no. we keep it there for about a month.

Q so if this article came out in December you probably read it either in December or January.

A I would have read it when it first arrived and that would have been the end of it.

MR. STOVITZ: I have no further questions, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have some questions, your Honor.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. MATTIS
BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Mr. Mattis, you are opposed to the death penalty is that correct, sir?

A Yes.

Q Is your opposition to the death penalty of such a nature that it would cause you to automatically vote against the death penalty for these defendants irrespective of the evidence in this case?

A Well, if I understand the question, if you mean could I vote for the death penalty, the answer is I could not vote for the death penalty under any circumstances, whatever the evidence is.

Q You cannot conceive of any circumstances where you would be willing to vote for the death penalty against these defendants, is that correct?

And what does "allowed" mean?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Does allowed mean the number they are entitled to or the number they exercise?

THE COURT: I don't know.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think the Court's determination on this issue will influence somewhat our exercise of these peremptories at this particular stage right now.

I would like to have some vague idea of what the outer limits are going to be as far as the number of our peremptories is concerned.

THE COURT: Just a moment. That same language is used in Section 1070.5.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right, same language about "allow."

THE COURT: My interpretation would be, and I cannot claim that it is based on any law I have read on the subject, would be that the People are allowed the same number of challenges -- that that word "allowed" means the same number that the defendants in fact use or exercise, or whether than the total which they potentially might use or do not use.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have always been under the impression, your Honor, that whether or not they exercise their number of peremptories, that is irrelevant to the number of peremptories the People have.

Again, I have no authority on the point, but -THE COURT: Well, you would have six in any event, no

5C

matter what they did.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right now, if we only have six we would like to knowright now,

THE COURT: Just as under 1070.5, you would have 20 in any event, no matter what the defendants jointly or individually used.

I think the same principle should carry over.

In other words, six is the basic number, and
you will get some additional ones or not, depending on
what the defendants did.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Is the Court's preliminary determination that if the defendants do not exercise any peremptories, the prosecution has a total then of six peremptories, no more?

THE COURT: Well, let's look at it another way:

What would you have if there were only one
defendant?

MR. BUGLIOSI: We would have six.

5c~1

2.

1

3

4 5

6

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

²4 25

26

THE COURT: That is the way I view it.

In other words, if there were only one defendant each side would have six; if there were six alternates to be selected, no problem there.

And I think the same thing should hold. The People get six regardless of what the defendants do.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Six for each defendant?

THE COURT: No, excuse me, the People get six regardless of what the defendants do.

I am talking now about joint defendants.

The People get six plus whatever number -- the section unfortunately could be interpreted several different ways. You could interpret it to mean the defendants have six which must be exercised jointly, for example.

It does not say so, but it could be interpreted that way, plus six additional individually.

But I think the clearest interpretation of it, in view of the fact that it is ambiguous, is that the People have six in this case, since there have been alternates selected in any case, regardless of what the defendants do, the defendants have six each which they may or may not exercise, and the People have an additional number equal to the number of challenges actually exercised by the defendants.

MR. STOVITZ: Of course we disagree with that interpretation.

5c-2

· 2

4.

:

9:

20.

In that case the word "used" would be the word, rather than allowed.

"Allowed" is permissive.

THE COURT: What it says is when two or more defendants are tried jointly each defendant shall be entitled to as many peremptory challenges to such alternate jurors as there are alternate jurors called. The prosecution shall be entitled to additional peremptory challenges equal to the number of additional separate challenges allowed the defendant or defendants to such alternate jurors.

MR. STOVITZ: We submit the word "allowed" there is permissive and therefore -- they did not use the word "used," "all the alternate peremptories used."

MR. BUGLIOSI: In other words, "allowed" would have to mean permissive, your Honor, because if the defendants choose to exercise their number of peremptories, I guess it is 24 in this case, I don't think the proper language would be that the Court allowed them to exercise these peremptories.

As a matter of law, as a matter of right they have the power to exercise the peremptories, and the Court could not say "I'm not going to let you do it."

So I don't think the Court would ever be in a position to allow the defendants to exercise the peremptories they are entitled to under Section 1089, I

5c-3

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

,10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18.

19

20; 21

22

23 24

25

26

think when they use the word "allowed," as Mr. Stovitz is saying, they are talking about the fact that the defendants are permitted; that they have a right to use a certain number of peremptory challenges.

Whether or not they exercise that right, does not affect the number of challenges the People have.

I would think that both sides, I know the they prosecution for sure,/should do some research in that area.

I think we are negligent in not having done some already, I'm referring to the People, your Honor.

It makes a big difference whether we have six peremptories at this point or 24.

Tt is something I think we should know right now and -- not after we exercise our sixth peremptory.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't think, your Honor, that the People should be bound by the number of peremptories exercised by the defendants. It just does not seem to be good law.

We are entitled to a certain number of peremptories, I would think, irrespective of what the defendants do.

It is a matter of discretion on the part of the defense which jurors they want to excuse. Maybe they don't want to excuse any.

I don't think the number of challenges to be

exercised by the People should be dependent upon the number of defense challenges exercised.

I don't think we are subject to their whims. They have an unbridled discretion to exercise as many as they want under the law. I don't think the People are in any way bound or affected by the number they use.

THE COURT: This is all very interesting but let's see if we can find some law on the subject.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, yes, right, right.

THE COURT: Will one of you go up in the jury room on the top of the stairs here and get 85 Cal. App., there is a case cited in Fricke that may throw some light on it.

MR. STOVITZ: What is the name of it?
THE COURT: People vs. Pilbro.

MR. STOVITZ: It may shed more light on it. I read that Pilbro case.

MR. KANAREK: Just plain Cal. App., your Honor? THE COURT: Yes.

(Volume handed to the Court.)

THE COURT: Well, in this case, the statement is made that the challenges are allowed by law to the State, and the number to be exercised is not made dependent on the number of challenges exercised by the defendants.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Is that 1070.5 or 1089?

MR. STOVITZ: At that time there was no 1070.5, 1089 covered both issues. THE COURT: It was 1070 at that time. MR. STOVITZ: But 1089 at that time covered additional challenges for joint defendants. May I be excused to get an ALR, your Honor, I think there is some language in there. THE COURT: We will take a recess at this time for 6 fls. 9 15 minutes. (Recess.) 1Ò 24.

6-1

(The following proceedings occurred in chambers, all defendants and counsel present:)

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.

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

I was downstairs at the coffee machine and I didn't

realize the time, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Were you able to find anything?

MR. STOVITZ: I am reading 21 ALR 3rd dealing with peremptory challenges. They primarily deal with the rights of defendants to peremptory challenges.

The word "allowed" is always meant that the defendants may have those. In other words, they are allowed by statute and not by the Court.

The ones that are given, it would seem that the interpretation is that the People are entitled to 24 challenges.

Not that we are intending to exercise 24 challenges or delay the trial in any respect, your Honor.

In the case of Mr. Mattis, no matter which way the Court resolves this issue, we intend to challenge him for cause under Witherspoon and actual implied bias.

In the case of the previous juror, if the Court were to interpret it that we are entitled to only six, we would prefer to question the juror and show that he has, in fact, made up his mind so unequivocally that he also

6-2

-

should be challenged under Witherspoon.

However, as a matter of saving time, we thought that rather than, you know, try to show that the juror is biased in some other way, we would just use a peremptory.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, I don't know about that. I don't concur with what Mr. Stovitz is saying at all, your Honor.

THE COURT: The only case on the subject that I have been able to find is People vs. Pilbro, which would indicate that the People are entitled to everything that the statute says they are entitled to regardless of what the defendants do.

That would appear to indicate in this case that they are entitled to six plus an additional number equal to the number of defendants times the number of alternate jurors being selected, which would be 24.

MR. STOVITZ: Yes. 24.

THE COURT: You could even interpret it to be six plus 24.

MR. STOVITZ: I think six times four is the interpretation that I gave it.

THE COURT: The literal language would indicate that it is 30 under that interpretation of People vs. Pilbro.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The Court's position is that at this point we would have at least 24; is that correct?

THE COURT: Under the authority of that case, I would say yes.

S-3

5 ·

10⁻

11¹

6A

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you.

THE COURT: I Shepardized the case and I was unable to find any other case on that point.

It was cited in People vs. King on a question raised by the defendants in that case as to their own exercise of challenges. It was their contention that there was a denial of equal protection as to the general class of defendants with regard to the use of the peremptory challenges, but was not cited on the point with respect to the People's peremptories.

MR. BUGLIOSI: For the record, your Honor, irrespective of the Court's ruling which it has just enunciated, there are many reasons, multiple reasons, why the People might excuse Mr. Fricker peremptorily, reasons over and above and beyond and in addition to the position that he took on the death penalty.

6a-1

*

20.

.

THE COURT: I think his position on the death penalty is equivocal. I think taking the totality of what he has said, he is not clear in his own mind what he believes at the moment.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

MR. STOVITZ: However, he did express other statements about not wanting to serve, et cetera, and from his appearance and his demeanor in answering the Court's questions, we were anticipating exercising a peremptory.

THE COURT: On the basis of People vs. Pilbro, it appears to me that the People are entitled to at least 24 challenges. Hopefully, we will never get to that question.

MR. STOVITZ: Thank you.

THE COURT: Now, we have six alternate prospective jurors sitting in their seats at the moment.

MR. STOVITZ: We intend, at this time, to exercise a challenge for cause as to Mr. Mattis, the gentleman that was just here.

THE COURT: On what ground?

MR. STOVITZ: On the ground that he has an implied bias against capital punishment, and under the Witherspoon case he should be excused.

MR. SITZGERALD: We will object to the juror being excused for cause.

3

4

5

6

8

ġ

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

We think the juror's answers, or the prospective alternate juror's answers, taken in total do not make it unmistakably clear or unambiguously clear.

He used terms such as "I am of the opinion that," "I would be against imposing," "I would be opposed to," "I think that," "I don't think."

I think, by semantic definition alone, the use of those qualifying adjectives render his statements ambiguous.

MR. STOVITZ: Counsel himself just used the words "I think" in announcing his position. People quite normally use such words as "think." We don't form an opinion out of bricks and mortar.

MR. FITZGERALD: I suggest that the Appellate Court has only the printed word before it.

I am convinced that is true, and THE COURT: after reading opinions on the Witherspoon question, I feel the Appellate Court had to second guess what happened at the trial. It was undoubtedly clear to all those present at the time, but on the cold record it is another thing.

Well, I am not completely satisfied and I will not allow the challenge for cause as to Mr. Mattis-at least on the Witherspoon question -- and I don't see any other ground for a challenge for cause.

So, the challenge will be disallowed. 1 MR. STOVITZ: Counsel is not making a challenge for ź cause as to Mr. Mattis? 3 MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor. 4 That would appear to complete our THE COURT: 5 chambers voir dire with respect to these six prospective 6 jurors. 7 So, unless there is some other reason, we 8 should now go out, then, back into open court and you can 9 complete your voir dire in open court, and we can proceed. 10 (Whereupon the following proceedings occurred 11 in open court. All defendants, counsel, jury and prospec-12 tive alternate jurors being present:) 13 THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present. 14 The jury is in the jury box. 15 You may continue the examination, if you care 16 6b fls.17 to, Mr. Fitzgerald. ter the land 18. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

MR. FITZGERALD: I don't, your Honor. We will 1 pass -- or I will pass the six alternate jurors for cause. 2 THE COURT: Mr. Hughes? 3 MR. HUGHES: I will pass for cause. THE COURT: Mr. Shinn? 5 MR. SHINN: Pass for cause. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek? 7 MR. KANAREK: I will go one step further and accept 8 the panel, or the prospective alternates, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 Mr. Bugliosi, do you have any further examin-14 ation? 12 MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Stovitz does, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz? 14 MR. STOVITZ: Thank you. 15 16 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF DENNIS A. FRICKER 17 BY MR. STOVITZ: 18 Mr. Fricker, you were in this courtroom for 19 what? About three days? 20 I came in last Thursday. Ă 21 Q Last Thursday? 22 A Yes. 23 And did you have an opportunity to hear 24 Mr. Bugliosi's questions of the alternate jurors? Yes. À 26

,∸1

6B2

2

1

3

4

5.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13[.]

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

26

And you understand that it is conceivable that any time during the course of the trial, just as there was a change of attorneys after four or five weeks, there might be a change of a juror.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q And the fact that a juror becomes ill or incapacitated, or if there is a change, one of you six might take over for that juror; right?

A Right.

Q Now, sir, assume a hypothetical state of facts.

Assume that the regular jury has voted one or more of these defendants guilty of first-degree murder, and that during the penalty phase one of the jurors becomes ill. In fact, I recall a case where a juror tripped going up and down the stairs and had to be hospitalized for that.

And assume your name is selected as a member of the trial jury now.

You understand that you are going to have to sit on the penalty phase.

A Yes.

Now, you hadn't participated in the guilt phase.

A Yes.

Q And assume that the jury had found the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1Ò

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

defendants guilty of first-degree murder, and that wouldn't have been your verdict. Now --

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, could we approach the bench?

THE COURT: Not at this point, Mr. Kanarek. Wait until the question is finished.

MR. STOVITZ: Q Do you think that you could accept the verdict of the other jurors and continue on in deliberating on the proper penalty to be imposed?

- A (Pause.)
- Q Do you follow the question?
- À Yes.
 - Q Do you have the hypothesis?
- A Yes.

I could agree with the verdict probably from that point, but I don't know if I could go on.

- Q And vote for the penalty?
- A Vote for death over life imprisonment.
- Q You would have to vote for one or the other.
- MR. HUGHES: Objection, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. STOVITZ: Q Well, let's put it this way, sir:
You would be able to accept the verdict of the regular
trial jury?

- A Yes.
- Q Even though that was not your verdict, you had only come in on the penalty phase?

1

A Yes.

2

Q All right.

3 4 Mr. Fricker, one of the questions that counsel

5

going back to your background, all of the things that have

asked last week of all of the alternate jurors was that

6

happened to you in your lifetime, your service in the

7

Army or Navy, whatever it was, your friends, relatives,

8

everything of that nature, and now you are sitting as a

9

prosecutor in this case, and you know everything about

10.

your background that you know of, is there any reason that

11

you would want to tell us about that you couldn't give

12

the People a fair trial? Anything that you want to tell us

13

A No.

about, Mr. Fricker?

14 15

Q All right.

16

So, putting the hat on the other side of your head, suppose you were in the defendants, position and you

17

wanted a fair trial for them, and you know your own state

18

of mind. Is there anything that you would want to tell the

19 20

defense counsel about your background?

21

A No.

22

23

24

25

26

6e-1	1	Q No brothers or relatives in the Sheriff's	
•	2	Department or anything like that, or the Police Department	
	3	or anything like that?	
	4	A No.	
	5	Q Now, Mr. Fricker, assume for the moment that	
	6	you were a juror and that you did vote for the verdict	
	7	of murder in the first degree, and then you were faced	
	8	with the decision that you have to vote for the penalty in	
	.9	this case. Could you conceive of any circumstance what-	
	10	soever in which you could vote for the death penalty for	
	11	a female, or one of these three females?	
	12	A No.	
	13	. Q You could not?	
	14	A No.	
	15	MR. STOVITZ: All right. Now, Mr. Mattis.	
	16		
	17	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF KENNETH L. MATTIS	
	18	BY MR. STOVITZ:	
	19	Q I believe we asked you quite a number of	
	20	questions back there, so we are not going to ask you too	
	21	many out here.	
, ,	22	Did you hear all the questions of Mr. Bugliosi	
4	23	last week?	
	24	A Yes.	
	. 25	Q If each of those questions were asked of you,	
	26 [.]	44 66	

would your answers be any different?

1	A I think the only different one would be as			
2	to the girls here on the death penalty.			
3	Q You don't think you could vote for the death			
4 :	penalty?			
, 5	A No.			
6	Q But you think you could vote for the death			
7	penalty for a man?			
.8	A I don't think so either.			
9	Q What is that, sir?			
10.	A I don't think I could for a man either; but I			
11	think in the case of a girl, it is even more so.			
12	Q How many children do you have, sir?			
13	A Two.			
. 14	Q What are their sexes?			
15	A A boy and a girl.			
,16	Q Their ages?			
17	A Three and eight.			
18	Q And I believe you told us that you lived in			
19	Govina?			
20.	A Whittier.			
21	Q Whittier?			
22	A Yes.			
23	Q But you read a San Gabriel newspaper?			
24	A Right.			
25	Q If I were to ask you the question I just asked			
26	Mr. Fricker, putting yourself in the position of the			

prosecution in this case, knowing all you know about your background, do you think you could give the People a fair trial?

A Well, if I could concentrate on the trial,
I could, but I would be thinking about my work, I am afraid.

Q You think that you would be thinking about your work, sir?

A Yes.

Q Why don't you try to do this: Put yourself in the position of all of those people that you are investigating for income tax violations. Put yourself in their position and look how happy they will be.

A I can't argue with that.

Q All right.

Now, suppose you were in the position of the defense attorneys, knowing everything you know about your own background, do you think you could give the defendants a fair trial?

A I think I could give the defendants the same benefit of the doubt that I could give to the prosecution.

Q And you actually think that thinking about your work would cause you to let your mind wander away?

Is there no way that you could take your work to the hotel and work on it over there?

A No. Because like we have statutory problems involved where we have to complete the examinations within

certain time periods. To a degree it is discretionary 1 with the taxpayer if they will extend the statutory 2 period. ·2 In my particular cases that I am working on. we have some six months, approximately, on certain cases, 5 at which time we must have some decision. If we don't, 6 the statutory period could expire if the taxpayer doesn't 7 extend the period, and there is an indication that they 8 might not. . 9 MR. STOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Mattis. 10 The People pass for cause as to Mr. Fricker. 11 And abiding by the Court's ruling on Mr. 12 Mattis, we will also pass for cause on his account. 13 THE COURT: You are passing for cause as to all of 14 the alternates? 15 MR. STOVITZ: Yes. 16 THE COURT: Do the defendants also pass for cause as 17 to the alternates? 18 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. 19 MR. KANAREK: Mr. Manson accepts them, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, you may exercise a 21 peremptory challenge if you care to. 22 MR. FITZGERALD: Patricia Krenwinkel will accept the 23 alternates. 24 THE COURT: Mr. Hughes? 25 26 MR. HUGHES: Defendant Leslie Van Houten will accept

the alternates. 1 THE COURT: Mr. Shinn? 2` MR. SHINN: Defendant Susan Atkins will accept the 3 alternates. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek? 5 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, we will accept the 6 alternates. 7 THE COURT: Very well. 8 MR. STOVITZ: The People thank and excuse Mr. Mattis, ġ your Honor. 10 Thank you, Mr. Mattis. You are excused. THE COURT: 1:1 All right. We will now go back in the chambers 12 and I will ask counsel and the parties to join me there, 13 and we will then call in the next prospective alternate 14 7 fls. juror. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22. 23 24 25 26

7-1		ļ
		2
		3
		4
		5
		6
		7
		.8
		9
		10
		11
		12
		13
		14
		15
	,	16
		17
		18
		19
		20
		21

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

(The following proceedings were had in the chambers of the Court out of the presence of the jury and the prospective alternate jurors, all defendants and all counsel being present:)

> THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present. Bring in the next prospective juror.

(Prospective juror enters the chambers of the Court.)

THE COURT: Good morning, sir, would you sit over here, please.

THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate juror is Darrel H. Mahnke, D-a-r-r-e-1, H. M-a-h-n-k-e.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF DARREL H. MAHNKE BY THE COURT:

Mr. Mahnke, you were one of those persons who stood up and gave your name the other day when I asked if there were any prospective jurors who could not be fair and impartial.

> A Yes.

What was that opinion based on, sir?

À General news.

MR. KANAREK: I cannot hear.

THE COURT: Will you keep your voice up, please, so everyone can hear you.

MR. MAHNKE: Just general news.

4197 &_@ 1 2 I'm sorry. 3 Q 4 5 6 to have been killed? 7 8 in the paper. 9 Q What are you referring to? 10 Α 11 Q 12 you read? 13 14 A in the paper which colored my thinking. 15 16 Whose confession was it? 17 18 19 MR. FITZGERALD: No. your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Hughes? 20 21 MR. HUGHES: No questions. MR. SHINN: No questions. 22 23

24

25

26

THE COURT: You are not just talking to me personally, all these lawyers have to hear you, too. Have you ever read or heard any statement or material which appeared to be a description by someone who was present at the time any of these people were alleged It seems to me that there was a story like that Wasn't there a confession or something? That is what I want you to tell me. What did Well, that is what I read, the confession was I believe it was Miss Atkins. THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald? MR. KANAREK: No questions. MR. STOVITZ: No questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will rek you to go back in the court-

room, Mr. Mahnke. Would you refrain from discussing with

1 anyone what has been said in here? 2 MR. MAHNKE: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 (Mr. Mahnke leaves the chambers of the court.) 5 MR. FITZGERALD: Challenge the juror for cause, your 6 Honor, actual bias. 7 MR. HUGHES: Join, your Honor. 8 MR. SHINN: Join, your Honor. 9 MR. KANAREK: Join, your Honor. 10 11 12 THE COURT: Good morning. 13 14 15 16 17 BY THE COURT: 18 Q 19 20 21 and impartial, is that right? 22 À Yes. 23 What is your status? 24 25 26

THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed. (A prospective alternate juror enters the room.) THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate juror is Miss Olive C. Mitchem, O-1-i-v-e, M-i-t-c-h-e-m. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS OLIVE C. MITCHEM Miss Mitchem, you were one of the persons who stood up and gave your name the other day when I asked if there were any prospective jurors who could not be fair A . I don't think I understood you. I did not mean to say I would not be fair and impartial. I must not have understood the question. CieloDrive.com ARCHIV'ES 7-4

1.

,11°

3

Q That is what I asked the prospective jurors, if there were any who believe they could not be fair and impartial.

Do you believe you can be fair and impartial if you are selected as a juror, as an alternate juror?

A Oh, yes, yes, I would not be unfair to anybody.

I misunderstood that.

Q All right. If you were selected as an alternate juror would you be able to serve?

A No.

Q What is your situation?

A I just don't think I could stand it. In fact,
I am a heart patient and I have to see a doctor at least
once a month, and at times I have to be out in the open
air.

I just have to be out, and I don't believe I could be shut up for that long a time.

Q Well, if you were permitted to see a doctor once a month and if you did get outside, how long do you have to be outside?

A Oh, not long, the thing is -- I will try to explain what I am saying.

Some mornings I get up and I stay in my house, I've got something to do in the house.

All of a sudden I ve got to get out where there is some air, just for a few minutes, for a little while.

Most often I just go out and work in my yard 1 a while, but it just seems like things closing in on me, 2 and I cannot get my breath or something. 3 I cannot explain just exactly how I feel, 4. but that is the reason I don't want to be closed in. 5 MR. BUGLIOSI: I believe there will be a stipulation 6 on this, your Honor. 7 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, there will be. 8 THE COURT: All right, then you will be excused, 9 Miss Mitchem, and will you refrain from discussing with 10 anyone what has been said here this morning? 11 MISS MITCHEM: Oh, yes, I sure will. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. 13 (Miss Mitchem leaves the chambers of the court.) 14 MR. FITZGERALD: We offer to stipulate that the juror 15 may be excused. 16 MR. KANAREK: So stipulated because of her physical 17 condition. 18 MR. HUGHES: So stipulated. 19 So stipulated. MR. SHINN: 20 MR. STOVITZ: So stipulated. 21 THE COURT: She will be excused by stipulation of 22 all counsel. 23 24 25

26