DISTRICT ATTORNEY

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Plaintiff-Respondent,

Ϋ8.

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

Defendants-Appellants.

NO. 3015

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 KRENWINKEL In Propria Persona

VOLUME 15

Pages 4201 to 4500

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

The name of the prospective alternate THE CLERK: 1 juror is Joseph Queen. J-o-s-e-p-h, Q-u-e-e-n. 2 3 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. JOSEPH QUEEN 4 BY THE COURT: 5 Mr. Queen, if you were selected as an alternate 6 juror in this case would you be able to serve? 7 It is almost impossible for me to serve, sir. 8 What is your situation? 9 Well, first, I have a family and my job, and 10 this is my fourth week on the jury. 11. My job will only pay me for 25 days. 12 By whom are you employed? Q 13 North American Rockwell. 14 THE COURT: We have had several people from North 15 American Rockwell. 16 Will there be a stipulation? 17 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, your Honor. 18. MR. HUGHES: So stipulated. 19 MR. SHINN: So stipulated. 20 MR. KANAREK: Because of hardship, financial 21 22 hardship, is that correct? ·23 MR. QUEEN: That is correct. THE COURT: Would you refrain from discussing with anyone what has happened here this morning? 25 MR. QUEEN: I surely will, sir, thank you. 26

7a-1

a-2 ₁	(Mr. Queen leaves the chambers of the court.)
2	(A prospective alternate juror enters the
3	room.)
4	THE COURT: Good morning.
5้	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
6	juror is Mrs. Floydie M. Redd, F-1-o-y-d-i-e, R-e-d-d.
Ť	
8.	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. REDD
9	BY THE COURT:
10	Q Mrs. Redd, if you were selected as an alternate
11	juror would you be able to serve?
12	A Well, I live all alone. I would not have
13	anyone to transact my business or anything for me, otherwis
14	you know
15	MR. STOVITZ: Mrs. Redd, we cannot hear you.
16.	THE COURT: Keep your voice up, please.
17	MR. STOVITZ: You wouldn't have anyone to transact
18	your business?
19	MRS. REDD: No.
20	MR. STOVITZ: Is that what you said?
21	MRS. REDD: Yes, that's right.
22	BY THE COURT:
23	Q Is this something that you could do by
24	telephone? In other words, suppose you were permitted to
25	call out, could you make your arrangements that way?
26	A Well I work at the Post Office and if they

ì	will permit someone to pick up my check, you see, then I
2	could use my checking account and pay my bills, but other-
3	wise I cannot.
4	Q Is that something that you could investigate
5	today and let us know, say, this afternoon?
·6	A Yes, I would have to call the Federal Building
7	and find out.
8	Q That is right over here on Los Angeles Street?
ġ.	A Yes.
10.	Q Or you can perhaps walk over there during the
11	noon hour?
1 2	A You would let me?
13`	Q Oh, yes.
14	A In 45 minutes I can hardly go that far.
15 . ;	Q I guess the Sheriff's Department takes you back
16	and forth to the County Courthouse, is that right?
17	A Yes.
18	Q Perhaps it would be easier to do it by tele-
19	phone.
.20	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, the bailiff could pick up
21	the check. I'm sure the Sheriff's Department can pick up
22	a Federal check, no great problem.
23	THE COURT: Do you have any authority to cite on
24	that point?
25	MR. STOVITZ: They could mail it to her and she can
.26	mail it to her checking account.

THE COURT: That is something that can be worked . 1 out I'm sure. If that problem could be solved would there 2 be any other reason you could not serve? 3 No. 4. BY THE COURT: 5 All right, I will ask you to check on that so Ġ you can tell us if there is a problem about it. 7 I'm going to ask you the same questions that 8. I put to the other prospective jurors about the death 9 penalty. 10 Do you entertain such conscientious opinions 11 regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to 12 make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt 13 regardless of the evidence in the case? 14 A None. 15 Do you entertain such conscientious opinions Ö. 16 regarding the death penalty that you would automatically 17 refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the 18 case? 19 A No. .20 On the other hand would you always vote to 21 impose the death penalty without regard to the evidence in 22 the case? 23 Ä No. 24 Then if I understand you correctly, and you 25 tell me if I am not correct, you would be willing to 26

1.	listen to all of the evidence in the case and then make
2 :	up your mind on the question of penalty, is that right?
.3.	A Yes.
4	Q Do you subscribe to any daily newspaper?
5	A The Los Angeles Times.
6	Q Do you read that on a regular basis?
7	A Not since I have been coming here.
8	Q Well, before that?
9 .	A Yes.
10	Q Have you made any conscious effort to follow
11	this case in the newspaper or on TV or on the radio?
12	A No.
13	Q Have you formed any opinion as to the guilt
14	or innocence of any of the defendants?
15	A No, I have not.
16	Q Have you ever read or heard anything which
17	seemed to be a description by someone who was actually
18	present at the time any of these people were killed?
19	A No.
20	Q Have you ever read or heard anything said by
21	any of these defendants on any subject?
22	A No.
23	Q Do you think that you would be able to give
24	each of these defendants the benefit of the presumption of
2 5	innocence?

You remember when you came into the court I

told the panel that in every criminal case a defendant is presumed to be innocent, and that presumption continues until his guilt is proved beyond a reasonable doubt, if the People are able to do that, do you remember that?

A Yes.

Q Would you be able to give each of these 7B-1 1 defendants the benefit of that presumption of innocence? 2 A Yes. 3 Q And if the People fail to prove any defendant 4 guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, you will then vote to 5 acquit that defendant? Á Yes. 7 Q On the other hand if the People were able to 8 prove the guilt of any defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, 9 would you then vote a verdict of guilty? 10 A Yes. 11 Do you know of any reason why you could not be 12 fair and impartial in this case? 13 Α No. 14 THE COURT: Do you wish to inquire, Mr. Fitzgerald? 15 MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor, no questions. 16 THE COURT: Oh, one other question: 17 Q. 18 Did you read any newspaper over the weekend? Ą No. 19 Q And specifically did you read the Times? 20 I only read the sports. 21 A Q In the Los Angeles Times? 22 Α That is all. 23 24 Q. Did you read the Herald Examiner? 25 A No. 26 Q Did you read any part of the Herald Examiner?

1	Texas and I was a nurse in East Texas Tuberculosis Hospital.
2	Q And do you have any children?
3	A I have a son.
4	Q How old is he?
5	A He is 32.
6	Q What does he do?
. 7	A He is a probation officer for the county.
8	Q Does he ever discuss his work with you?
9	A No.
10	Q Is he married?
11	A Divorced.
12	Q And I take it you are also divorced or
13	separated?
14	A Right, uh-huh.
15	MR. STOVITZ: I have no further questions.
16	THE COURT: Any questions?
17	MR. FITZGERALD: No. your Honor.
18	THE COURT: All right, is there some way that
19	Mrs. Redd can use the telephone?
20	THE BAILIFF: She can use it right here at the desk,
21	your Honor.
22	THE COURT: At your desk?
23 24	THE BAILIFF: Yes, your Honor.
24 25	THE COURT: In that way you can call up your super-
.26	visor or whoever you want to call.
.40	MRS. REDD: My supervisor reports to work at 3:30 in

7в4

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18.

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

the afternoon.

THE COURT: Is there someone else over there now that you can talk to that might be able to give you the information you need?

MRS. REDD: Well, I can call the personnel office at the Federal Building. That is where the transactions are.

THE COURT: The balliff will let you use the telephone in the courtroom.

MR. STOVITZ: As an alternate, if the counsel wish to exercise a peremptory now or accept the jury, People are ready to exercise a peremptory.

Again it may be a time-saving factor.

MR. KANAREK: We prefer that in open court, your Honor.

THE COURT: In any event you may go back in the courtroom now, Mrs. Redd.

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

MRS. REDD: Yes.

MR. HUGHES: Are you a Dodger fan, Mrs. Redd?

MRS. REDD: Yes, I am. I was so worried yesterday.

(Mrs. Redd leaves the chambers of the court.)

THE COURT: All right, than we now have six people sitting in the alternate jurors; seats. Any reason why we should not go back into open court?

MR. BUGLIOSI: The only reason I can think of, it

would not be common sense because we will be out there for a half minute and we will have to come right back here again. We do intend to exercise a peremptory challenge. I think it is within the Court's discretion. The Court should ask the defense at this time if they accept the jury and if they do we will exercise another peremptory. MR. KANAREK: We do not waive appearing in open court in this regard, your Honor. THE COURT: All right, then, we will go back out.

7C

(The following proceedings were had in open 7c-1 ì court in the presence and hearing of the jurors and the 2 prospective alternate jurors, all defendants and all 3 counsel being present:) 4 THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present. 5 6 The jury is in the jury box. Do you care to examine further, Mr. Fitzgerald? 7 8 MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor, we will pass this 9 prospective juror for cause. 10 MR. HUGHES: Pass for cause. 11 MR. SHINN: Pass for cause. 12 MR. KANAREK: Accept the alternates. 13 THE COURT: Very well. 14 Mr. Stovitz? 15 MR. STOVITZ: I believe the next peremptory 16 challenge is with the defense. 17 THE COURT: The People pass for cause? 18 MR. STOVITZ: Oh, yes, yes. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, you may exercise a 20 peremptory challenge. 21 MR. FITZGERALD: Patricia Krenwinkel will accept 22 the alternate jurors as they are now constituted. 23 MR. HUGHES: Leslie Van Houten accepts the jury 24 as they are now constituted. 25 ^f MR. SHINN: Susan Atkins accepts the jury as now 26 constituted.

1	MR. KANAREK: Mr. Manson, your Honor, accepts the
2	prospective six alternates.
3	MR. BUGLIOSI: The People thank and excuse Mr.
4	Fricker, your Honor.
5 .	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Fricker, you are excused
6.	I will ask counsel and the parties to join
7	me again in chambers.
8	(The following proceedings were had in the
9	chambers of the Court out of the hearing and presence
10	of the jury and the prospective alternate jurors, all
11	defendants and all counsel being present:)
12	(A prospective alternate juror enters the
13 ,	courtroom.)
14	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
15	juror is Gerald Schwartz, G-e-r-a-l-d, S-c-h-w-a-r-t-z.
16	
17	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. GERALD SCHWARTZ
18	BY"THE COURT:
19	Q Mr. Schwartz, if you were selected as an
20	alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve?
21	A Oh, I would be able to. It would be a very
22	difficult situation, your Honor.
23	Q What is your situation?
24	A I am president of our company and I have a
25	lot of people dependent on me.
26	Q What company?

Thank you, you are excused. THE COURT: 1 MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you. 2 (Mr. Schwartz leaves the chambers of the 3 court.) THE COURT: Before the next person comes in, Counsel, 5 I propose that the indictment be read to the jurors before 6 the taking of evidence commences as provided by the Code. 7 Now, that raises one or two questions and I 8 would like you to be thinking about them so you can make 9 any suggestions you would care to. 10 MR. FITZGERALD: We would like to ask leave to 11 waive it. 12 THE COURT: All right, that is one suggestion. 13 One of the problems that arises is the fact 14 that the various counts include the names of Defendants 15 Watson and Kasabian, Counts VI through VIII use the name 16 Leslie Sankston. 17 MR. BUGLIOSI: If it has not been amended at this 18 time, People so move. 19 MR. HUGHES: I believe it has been amended. 20 THE COURT: If it has, of course there is no 21 22 problem. If it has not, we move to amend it 23 MR. BUGLIOSI: at this time by interlineation. 24 THE COURT: All right, the motion is granted. 25 26 It will be amended to change Sankston to

8 fls.

Van Houten.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, in each instance. I believe there are six references.

THE COURT: All right.

Anyway, those were the questions I wanted to raise with you gentlemen, to be thinking about them.

MR. STOVITZ: The defendants are willing to waive the reading of the indictment; then we have no request that it be read, but that the jury should be reminded which counts are charged against which defendants, and that the defendants have entered a plea of not guilty. 8-1

THE COURT: I don't think that I would want to waive the reading of the indictment in its entirety. I think the jury should again be advised what the various counts are.

Now, if you want to shorten it up in some way,

I don't have any objection to that, but I think they should
start out with a clear picture in their mind as to what the
allegations are in general in the various counts so that
they can bear this in mind.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Would this be before or after the opening statement, your Honor?

THE COURT: This would be before the opening state-

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

THE COURT: You don't have to make any decision about it now. I just wanted to raise the question so that you could be thinking about it.

MR. STOVITZ: Raising those questions, your Honor, Mr. Bugliosi and I are thinking, if there is no objection to it by the defense, we would like to renumber count VIII to be Count I, and move all the other counts down.

Customarily, the conspiracy count is usually Count I, and then the other charges are Counts II, III, et cetera, on down the list.

However, it would be too confusing at this point, there will be no objection, we would merely explain to the jury that they have been given a number; for

instance, Counts I, II, III, IV and V do not necessarily 8-2 1 mean that the People died in that order, it is just that 2 they are given a number of some kind. 3 THE COURT: All right. Let's bring in the next prospective juror. 5 (A prospective juror enters the Court's 6 chambers.) 7 8 THE COURT: Good morning. MR. EHRENSTEIN: Hello. 9 THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate 10 juror is Peter R. Ehrenstein; P-e-t-e-r, E-h-r-e-n-s-t-e-i-n. 11 12 13 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF PETER R. EHRENSTEIN BY THE COURT: 14 15 Mr. Ehrenstein, if you were selected as an 16 alternate juror in this case, would you be able to serve? I'd rather not because I was just hired by the 17 A State a couple of months ago, and I don't think I could be 18 out on a case from three to six months. 19 20 Q I beg your pardon? 21 I was just hired two months ago by the State. A Q. 22 By the State of California? 23 Α Right. .24 Q What is your position? 25 Auditor; and I am on probation for six months, \mathbf{A} .

26

you know.

And I don't know how long my wage continues. I think it is about a month and that is it.

Q Well, I don't think you will find any difficulty with the State if you are called on jury service.

Mr. Ehrenstein.

A This, I don't know.

Q is there any other reason that serving might constitute an undue hardship?

A .Well, my wife. You know, she is sort of a child in many ways, and she just wouldn't be able to stay alone.

Q Do you have any children?

A - No.

Q Is she employed outside the home?

A Yes.

Q so you are talking about the evenings?

A Yes.

Q Weekends?

A Yes.

Q All right, sir. We will pass that for the time being.

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

A Yes.

24

25

26

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 quilt regardless of the evidence in the case?

I would have no problem in terms of the guilt, Α but under no circumstances could I render a death penalty. Under no circumstances.

Q Well, that is going to be the next question. 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?

Like I originally said, I could conceivably Α render a guilty verdict, but under no circumstances the death penalty.

Q So you would automatically refuse to impose it regardless of what the evidence shows?

Absolutely. Absolutely.

21

ŻŻ

23

24 25

THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald? 1 MR. FITZGERALD: No. your Honor. 2 MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor. 3 MR. SHINN: No questions. 4 Mr. Kanarek? THE COURT: 5 MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor. 6 MR. BUGLIOSI: No questions, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. You may go back out into the 8 9 courtroom, then. Mr. Ehrenstein, would you refrain from dis-10 cussing with anyone what has been said in here? 11 12 MR. EHRENSTEIN: Yes. 13 (Mr. Ehrenstein leaves the Court's chambers.) 14 MR. BUGLIOSI: The People move to excuse the juror 15 on the grounds of implied bias, under Section 1074a of the Penal Code, and under the United States Supreme Court case 16 17 of Witherspoon vs. Illinois. 18 MR. FITZGERALD: The defendants would appose the 19 challenge to the juror as to the guilt phase, depriving the 20 defendants of due process and equal protection of the law 21 under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United 22 States Constitution, and applicable portions of the 23 California Constitution. 24 MR. KANAREK: Join in Mr. Fitzgerald's statement, your 25 Honor.

MR. HUGHES: Join in Mr. Fitzgerald's statement.

1	MR. SHINN: Join.
2	THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed.
3	Mr. Ehrenstein is excused for cause.
4	THE CLERK: I called Mrs. Harriet L. Tave. That is
5	the juror that was missing Friday, your Honor.
6.	THE COURT: She is not here?
7	THE CLERK: She is here now, your Honor. She was
.8	missing Friday.
9	THE COURT: Bring her in.
1,0.	(Mrs. Tave enters the court's chambers.)
11	THE COURT: Good morning.
12	MRS. TAVE: Good morning.
13	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
14	juror is Mrs. Harriet L. Tave; H-a-r-r-i-e-t, T-a-v-e.
15	
16	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. HARRIET L. TAVE
17	BY THE COURT:
18	Q Mrs. Tave, if you were selected as an alternate
19	juror would you be able to serve?
20	A No.
21	Q What is your situation?
22	A Well, I have two children and I have to be
23	home.
24	Q Do you work during the daytime
25	A Yes.
26	Q outside the home?
	į

†

1	A Yes.
2	Q You will have to answer audibly.
3	A I am sorry. Yes.
4	Q Keep your voice up, please, so that everyone
5	can hear you.
6	A Yes, sir.
7	Q You were one of those persons who stoodup
8	and gave your name the other day when I asked if there were
9	any prospective jurors who could not be fair and impartial
10	is that correct?
11	A Well, I think I have formed an opinion.
12	Q I beg your pardon?
13	A I think I have formed an opinion.
14	Q What is the basis for your opinion? Is it
15	something you have read
16	A Yes.
17	Q or heard?
18	A Yes. In the paper.
19	Q Have you made any effort to follow this case
20	in the papers?
21	A No. Not since well, like, you know, when
22	the news came out, like about what happened and all that,
2 3	you know, but not since.
24	Q When you say what happened, you mean right
25	after the bodies were discovered?
26	Mo. When the people involved are armon way

8B

know, when they gave all those names.

Q Did you ever read or hear anything that appeared to be a statement describing what happened at the time of the killings by someone who was there?

A No. Just, you know, what the reporters said in the papers.

Q Have you ever read or heard something which seemed to be a statement by one of the defendants about anything?

A No.

8b-1	1	THE COURT: Do counsel wish to stipulate in this
	2	case?
	3	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. I will enter into a
	4	stipulation.
	5	MR. STOVITZ: Yes, your Honor.
	6	MR. KANAREK: So stipulated, your Honor.
	7	MR. HUGHES: So stipulate.
	8	MR. KANAREK: Because of financial hardship, your
	9,	Honor.
	10	MR. FITZGERALD: May I ask one question?
	11	THE COURT: Yes.
	12 .	
	13	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
	14	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
	15	Q Are you related to a police officer Clay
	16	Tave?
	17	A Yes.
	18	Q What relation is he to you?
	19	A He is my brother-in-law.
	20	Well, I am divorced now, but he is my brother-
	21	in-law.
	22	MR. FITZGERALD: We will stipulate.
	23	MR. HUGHES: Stipulate.
	24	MR. KANAREK: Stipulate.
Ä	25	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn, do you join?
	26	MR. SHINN: Yes.

1	THE COURT: Then you will be excused is it
2	Mrs. Tave?
3	MRS. TAVE: Tave, yes.
4	THE COURT: Will you refrain from discussing with
5	anyone what has been said in here this morning?
.6 .	MRS. TAVE: Yes. Thank you.
7	MR. KANAREK: Thank you.
8 .	(Mrs. Tave leaves the Court's chambers.)
9	(Another prospective juror enters the court's
1 ,0	chambers.)
11	THE COURT: Good morning.
12	MR. SHEELY: Hello.
13	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
14	juror is Harry D. Sheely; H-a-r-r-y, S-h-e-e-1-y.
15	
16-	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. SHEELY
17	BY THE COURT:
18	Q Mr. Sheely, if you were selected as an alternate
19	juror in this case, would you be able to serve?
20	A I don't know for sure. I would have to check
21	with my company.
22	Q Who is your employer?
23	A Pacific Telephone. To see.
24	Q I believe they have always paid the compensation
25	of jurors regardless of the length of the service; that
26.	is, where they are held over beyond their normal 30 days.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

8b-3	1	Is this something that you check this noon
•	2	to make sure?
	3 ·	A Yes, I could call and check.
	4	Q All right.
	5	Will you keep your voice up so that everyone
	, 6	can hear you?
	7	A Yes.
	8	Yes, I could check.
	.9	I am going to ask you the same questions
	10	regarding the death penalty that I put to the other
	11 .	prospective jurors.
	12	Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
	13	regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to
	14	make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt
	15	regardless of the evidence in the case?
	16	A No.
	17	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
	18	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
	19	refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the
	20	case?
	21	A No.
	22	Q On the other hand, would you always vote to
	23	impose the death penalty in every case regardless of the
	24	evidence?
	25	A In every case?
-	26	Q Yes.

8ъ-4	1	A Would you repeat the question?
	2	Q Yes.
,	3	Would you always vote to impose the death
	4	penalty in every case without regard to the evidence?
	5	A No.
	6	Q In other words, you would be willing to
	7	listen to all of the evidence and then make up your mind
	8	on the question of penalty; is that right?
	9	A Yes.
	10	Q Have you formed any opinion as to the guilt
	11	or innocence of any of the defendants in this case?
	12	A No.
	13	Q Have you made any effort to follow this case
j.	14	in the newspapers or on TV or radio?
	15	A No.
	16	Q Did you read a daily newspaper on a regular
	17	basis?
	18	A Not regularly.
	19	Q Have you ever read or heard any description by
	20	anyone who appeared to have been present at the time any
	21	of the people were killed?
	22	A No.
	23	Q That is the subject of this case?
	24	A No.
	25	Q Have you ever read or heard any statements of
,	26	any of the defendants in this case about anything?

1	A You mean, such as a news report on
2	television?
3	Q Yes.
4	A Yes.
5	Q What have you read or heard?
6 ·	MR. STOVITZ: Again, Mr. Sheely, will you keep
7	your voice up?
8	MR. SHEELY: Okay.
9	Do you mean specifically, your Honor?
. 10	THE COURT: Q Yes.
11	As specific as you can recall it.
12	A Well, they were Manson and the three
13	girls supposed to have been there, and I guess there
14	was Tate and La Bianca, and there was another person,
15	according to the newspaper, that was supposed to have
8c f1#.	been involved. I think Watson was his name.
17	
18	
19	
20	•
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

8c-1	1
	Ź
	ŝ
	4
	5
	6.
	7
	8
	ģ
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14,
	15
	16
	17
	18

Q All right.

You say they were supposed to have been. What do you mean?

A Or they were supposed to have taken part in the murders.

Q I understand that part of it, but what do you mean "they were supposed to"?

Was someone saying they were there or they had seen them there?

A Well, this was more or less the impression that I had from the news report.

You mean as far as my own opinion?

Q First I am trying to find out what you have actually heard or read, and then you can tell me what opinions, if any, you have about it.

A Yès.

Q Do I understand you correctly that you read or heard something which seemed to be a description by someone of what happened at the time of any of these killings?

A It was more or less the result of -- it was the end result more than what happened, what had actually taken place.

Q Did it appear to be a statement made by one of the defendants, or was it a description by somebody else?

A No. By a reporter.

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald?	
2	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions, your Honor. Thank	
3	you.	
4	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?	
. 5	MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor. Thank you.	
6	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?	
7	MR. SHINN: Yes.	
8	·. '	
. 9	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. SHEELY	
10	BY MR. SHINN:	
11	Q Do you know Mr. Kanarek?	
12	A Who?	
13'	Q Mr. Kanarek?	
14	A No.	
15	Q Do you know who he is?	
16	A No.	
17	Q You never read or heard about Mr. Kanarek?	
18	A No, not that I can recall, no.	
19	Q Where you in court the other day when the	
20	Judge introduced all the attorneys and the defendants?	
21,	A Yes.	
22	MR. SHINN: I have nothing further.	
23	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?	
24	MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.	
25	THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz?	
26 8 d fls.	MR. STOVITZ: Yes, sir.	
CC with		

G-8	1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. SHEELY	
	2	BY MR. STOVITZ:	
	3	Q Mr. Sheely, what do you do for the telephone	
	4	company, sir?	
	5	A I work in the central office, maintaining of	
	6	equipment.	
,	7	Q How long have you been with them, sir?	
	8	A About two years.	
1	9	Q Two years?	
	10	A Yes.	
	11	Q Do you know anything of your own personal	
	12	knowledge as to whether or not any telephone company	
.ii	13	employees are going to be witnesses in this case?	
	14 ,	A Not to my knowledge.	
	15	Q Assuming that telephone company employees were	
;	16	witnesses in the case, Mr. Sheely. Do you think that you	
	17	could judge their credibility like you would any other	
	18	witness?	
	19	A Yes.	
	20	Q Now, do you know the difference between rumors	
	21	and evidence?	
•	22	A I think so.	
	23	Q So far, Mr. Sheely, have you heard any evidence	
	24	in this case?	
	25	A No.	
_	26	Q Now, do you recall reading something in the	

8D2

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

newspapers about the arrests of the defendants and their being cited for this charge? You recall that, do you not?

> A Yes.

Did you ever read anything in any newspaper, Q magazine, or hear it on TV, as to whether or not Mr. Manson -- this defendant over here -- actually killed somebody himself?

No. I can't recall.

Q Do you know what Miss Krenwinkel's connection with this case is?

From what I have gathered from the news -- well, I am not sure who was -- from what I have gathered from the news about Tate and La Bianca, certain parties weren t involved in both, but I don't know who or which was which.

Q. Do you know where Miss Krenwinkel was arrested?

A No.

Now, do you think that if the Court asked you to promise to decide this case solely on the evidence, that you could keep that promise?

> A Yes.

Q. Are you married, sir?

A Yes.

Q Do you have any children?

A Two boys.

Q How old?

A Three and four.

4236 Now, if you were chosen as an alternate juror Q 8D3 1 in this case -- you do understand the role of an alter-2 nate juror? 3 Α Yes. 4 You will have to follow the evidence just the 5 same because you might take over for one of the jurors at 6 any time. 7 Do you understand that? 8 Α Yes. 9 And can you say beyond a reasonable doubt that Q 10 you would decide this case solely on the evidence and 11 nothing else? 12 That I would decide? 13 Α Q Yes, that you would? 14 Α Yes. 15 And you would not convict the defendants 16 Q 17 because of any type of rumor or any type of report that 18. may have appeared on TV or radio; is that right? 19 Α No. • 20 MR. STOVITZ: I have no further questions. 21 THE COURT: Anything further? MR. FITZGERALD: Nothing further. 22 THE COURT: All right.

24

25

26

I will ask you, then, Mr. Sheely, to go back into the courtroom.

Will you refrain, sir, from discussing with

anyone what has been said in here today? 1D4 1 MR. SHEELY: Yes. 2 THE COURT: And I'd also ask you to check with your 3 employer. 4 It is now 12:00 o'clock. Would you let us 5 know by this afternoon when we resume, if possible? 6 MR. SHEELY: Yes. 7 About your compensation? THE COURT: 8 MR. SHEELY: Yes. 9 I am sure you will find --THE COURT: 1Ô MR. SHEELY: I couldn't check until after 1:00 11 o clock. 12. THE COURT: All right. 13 I am sure you will find -- it has been my 14 experience in the past that the Telephone Company has 15 always paid the compensation of their employee jurors, 16 but I would like you to satisfy yourself on that. 17 18 MR. SHEELY: Okay. All right. 19 THE COURT: 20 We will take our noon recess at this time then until 1:45. 21 THE CLERK: Your Honor, I have been informed that so 22 far as Mrs. Redd's employment is concerned, there is no 23 24 problem. 25 THE COURT: Did she discover that there is no problem? 26 THE CLERK: Right.

á

21 ` .

recess.)

22.

THE COURT: I will come back out to open court and admonish the jurors again before the recess.

You may go back, Mr. Sheely.

(Mr. Sheely leaves the court's chambers.)

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

Additionally, do not read, watch, or listen to any news reports so long as you have any connection with this case; that is, reports regarding this case, so long as you have any connection with the case.

We will recess at this time until 1:45 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:03 p.m. the court was in

9-1

1 2

3

4

-5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, JULY 20, 1970 1:57 P.M.

---0---

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

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.

I wanted to ask Mr. Sheely to come back in because he was the gentleman, you may recall, who is sitting as a prospective alternate juror in seat No. 3, and he was going to check with the telephone company to see what his situation was.

So I will ask him to come back in now.

(Mr. Sheely enters the room and takes his seat.)

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. SHEELY BY THE COURT:

- Q Were you able to find out?
- A They said they would pay me.
- Q They will?
- A Yes.

THE COURT: That is my understanding. The phone company, being a public utility, fulfills its civic responsibilities and continues their employees full compensation during the period of jury service.

All right, sir, I will ask you then to go back 1 into the courtroom. I just wanted to make sure before we 2 proceeded, thank you. 3 (Whereupon, Mr. Sheely leaves the chambers of 4 the Court.) 5 THE COURT: Anything further, gentlemen, before we 6 go back into court? 7 Did we complete the voir dire examination with 8 respect to these six? .9 MR. STOVITZ: Yes. 10 THE COURT: So it is now just the matter of --11 MR. STOVITZ: We haven t questioned Mr. Sheely yet. 12 THE COURT: He is the only one? 13. That's right. MR. STOVITZ; 14 THE COURT: All right, then, we will go back into 15 court and continue the examination. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

(the fortowing brodesdrings occurred in Oben
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.
Do you wish to examine further, Mr. Fitzgerald
MR. FITZGERALD: Pass this prospective alternate
, juror for cause.
THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?
MR. HUGHES: Pass this prospective alternate juror
for cause also, your Honor.
MR. SHINN: Pass for cause.
THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?
MR. KANAREK: Accept the six prospective alternate
jurors.
THE COURT: Do you pass for cause?
MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Bugliosi?
MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you.
VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. SHEELY
BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
Q Mr. Sheely, just a few questions, sir.
What part of town do you live in, Mr. Sheely?
A Paramount.
Q Paramount?

A yes. 1 Q I understand that you are not opposed to the 2 death penalty; is that correct? 3 That is correct. Α 4 Let's assume, Mr. Sheely, that you are back in 5 the jury room three or four months from now. These 6 defendants have been convicted of first-degree murder. It 7 is your job -- it is an avesome responsibility, of course . 8 to vote on the issue of life imprisonment as opposed to the 9 death penalty. 10 Let's assume further that you feel this is a 11 proper case for the imposition of the death penalty. 12 Do you think that you would have the courage to 13 sign a verdict of death? 14 Yes. 15 16. Do you think you could vote for the death penalty for a female defendant? 17 18 Yes. 19 -20 The state of the state of the 21 22 23 .24 25 26

A

Are you of such a frame of mind that if a 10a-1 Ì particular defendant did not himself personally kill anyone 2 you would never, under any circumstances, vote for the 3 death penalty for that particular defendant? 4 Would you repeat that? 5 Q. Yes. 6 Are you of such a frame of mind that if a 7 particular defendant was not the actual killer, you would 8 never, under any circumstances, vote for the death penalty 9 for that particular defendant? 10 I don't know. A 11 You want to know if I would or would not vote 12 for the penalty? 13-I want to know what your frame of mind is 14 with respect to that particular type of a defendant, 15 one who did not actually kill anyone. 16 Would you automatically vote for life imprison-17 ment for that type of a defendant? 18 19-Α No. 20 In other words, you can conceive of circum-21 stances wherein you would be willing to vote for a verdict 22 of death? 23 A Yes. 24 For a defendant, even though the evidence at the trial showed that he was not the actual killer?

26

A

Yes.

10z-2	1 .	Q Do you recall the conspiracy example I gave
	2	the other six alternate jurors last Friday, A, B and G
	3	A Yes.
	4	Q conspiring to commit a robbery. B and C
	5	actually committing the robbery
	6	A Yes.
	7	Q But A being guilty of the robbery because he is
	8	a co-conspirator.
	9	Do you recall that?
	10	A Yes.
	11 ,	Q Do you feel that you understand the rule of
	12	conspiracy that I set forth in that example?
	13	A Yes.
	14	Q Do you have any prejudices against that rule
	15	of conspiracy?
	16	A No.
	17	Q Can you assure me that you will unhesitatingly
	18	and without any reservation follow the Court's instructions
	19	on that rule of law if you find it applicable to the facts
	20	in this case?
	21	A Yes.
	22	Q You realize that the prosecution only has the
	23	burden of proving the guilt of these defendants beyond
	24	a reasonable doubt, not beyond all doubt?
	25	Do you understand that?
	2 6	A Yes.

asked that you recall saying to yourself that your answer would have been different from the answer given by the jurors in the box? 11 fls. A No.

11-1	1	Q If I were to ask the same questions, your
	2	answers would be essentially the same?
	3 .	A Yes.
	` 4	Q You would give the prosecution, that is, the
	5	People of the State of California, a fair trial?
	6	A Yes.
	7	Q Any doubt in your mind about that?
•	8	A No.
,	9	Q Can you think of any reason whatsoever not
•	10	already touched upon why you would rather not sit as a
	11	juror in this case?
1	12	A No.
,	13	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you. Pass for cause.
	14	THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, you may exercise a
	15	peremptory challenge if you care to.
	16	MR. FITZGERALD: Patricia Krenwinkel will accept the
	. 17	alternate jurors.
•	18 .	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?
	19	MR. HUGHES: Leslie Van Houten will accept the
	20	alternațe jurors.
•	21	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?
	22	MR. SHINN: Miss Atkins will accept the alternate
	23.	jurors.
:	.24	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?
	25	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, we accept six alternate
	.26	imore

24

25

26

THE COURT: Very well. It is the People's next peremptory challenge.

MR. BUGLIOSI: People thank and excuse Mrs. Redd.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mrs. Redd, you are excused.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the bench?

THE COURT: We are going to return to chambers,
Mr. Kanarek, and you may take up any matter you care to at
that time.

I will ask counsel and the parties to join me in chambers.

MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor.

(The following proceedings were had in the chambers of the court out of the hearing of the jury and the prospective alternate jurors, all defendants and all counsel being present, with the exception of Mr. Stovitz.)

THE COURT: Is Mr. Stovitz coming in?

MR. BUGLIOSI: He will be here shortly. We can start without him.

THE COURT: All counsel and the defendants are present.

MR. KANAREK: I just wanted to state that this last
lady released by the prosecution is of the black or Negro
race.

THE COURT: Very well, the record will so indicate.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think it is proper for me to make a statement on the record in connection with this, in connection with Mr. Kanarek's statement as to the state of

1

2 3

4.

-5

7

8

9.

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

25

26

mind of the prosecution at this time.

The prosecution believes that the evidence at this trial will show that Charles Manson is extremely anti-Negro.

This is our state of mind at the present time in the selection of this jury.

It is somewhat of a rebuttal to Mr. Kanarek's statement, rather than looking back four months from now, I want the record to reflect this is our present state of mind and we believe the evidence will show that.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, in answer to that I would be willing to go randomly in the black community and take six alternates right now, any six.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am referring to the state of mind of the prosecution.

MR. KANAREK: There couldn't be any greater misrepresentation on behalf of the prosecution, I believe and allege.

Mr. Bugliosi, your Honor, is well aware anything he is alluding to is immaterial; it has no relevancy, and if the prosecution attempted to put any such matter into evidence at this trial it would be highly prejudicial and it would be cause for a mistrial; it would be cause for misconduct, because this case has nothing to do whatsoever, your Honor, with any racial questions.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It certainly does, your Honor, there

The state of the s

11A

will be a very, very sovere issue in this case of Manson's state of mind with respect to Negroes.

This will be developed upon in considerable depth. There will be an issue as to it; there will be evidence offered by competent witnesses.

It certainly will have relevance to the issues of this case, going toward the motive for these murders.

Maybe Mr. Kanarek knows more about the People's case than the prosecution does, but I can tell the Court that Mr. Manson's state of mind with respect to Negroes is going to be a very serious matter in this case.

11a-1

?

.9

20·

.22

MR. KANAREK: May I state this, your Honor, very briefly:

I allege, and I would ask to take sworn testimony, I allege that the reason the prosecution has eliminated the black jurors is not because of the self-serving statement of Mr. Bugliosi, but because he senses a sense of fairness among these black people who many times during life have suffered, and Mr. Bugliosi and Mr. Stovitz don't want fair jurors. They want programmed jurors, programmed to the viewpoint they have in this prosecution.

I allege Mr. Bugliosi has misrepresented to the Court the prosecution's reason for taking these black people off the jury, and I ask for an evidentiary hearing based upon the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, and I will ask for sworn testimony because he has stated this not under oath, and he has brought up this issue, and I ask for sworn testimony.

THE COURT: We are not going to have any evidentiary hearing and I don't see what the point of all this is at this time anyway, we are not going to try the case in chambers.

MR. KANAREK: Very well.

THE COURT: You have peremptory challenges. I am not aware of any law that prohibits the use of a peremptory challenge for any cause whatsoever including

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11a-2	1	racial discrimination if that is what you want to use it
<u> </u>	2 ,	for.
.	3 .	Now, let's get on with the selection of
	4	alternative jurors. Bring on the next prospective jurors
	5	I am not suggesting that is what it was used
	6	for, I am just saying even if it were, I know of no law
	7	that prohibits it.
	8	(A prospective alternate juror enters the
	9	chambers of the court.)
	10	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
	11	juror is Mrs. Nancy S. Crump, N-a-n-c-y, C-r-u-m-p.
•	12	
	13	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. CRUMP
	14	BY THE COURT:
	15	Q Mrs. Crump, if you were selected as an
	16	alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve?
	17	A As far as I know I would be able.
	18	Q Would you keep your voice up, please, because
	19	all of us, all the people have to hear you.
	20	A As far as I know I would be able to.
	21	Q You would be able. Are you married?
	22	A Yes, I am.
	2 3	Q Are you employed outside of the home?
	24	A Yes, I work for the Bank of America.
Ö .	25	Q And would your compensation continue while
	26	you were on jury service?

A As far as I know it would.

Q Now, I'm going to ask you, Mrs. Crump, the same question regarding the death penalty that I asked the other prospective jurors.

Have you had a chance to think about these matters?

A Yes.

Q The first question is, 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 I don't think I would be able to give the death penalty, if you put it that way.

Q This question is not asking you whether you would would vote for the death penalty, but whether you would be impartial in deciding the question of guilt.

The first part of the trial, as I explained to the panel, is devoted to the trial of the issue of whether the defendants are guilty or not guilty, and only if there is a verdict as to one or more of them of murder in the first degree will there be a penalty trial.

Now, I am asking you could you be impartial on the question of guilt, notwithstanding whatever opinions you may have regarding the death penalty?

	Į							
	1				Bı	ıt	tha	t i
	2				W	aat	Ľ	mea
• ·	3	. 1	nind,	or h	ave	уо	u a	1re
	4	Ç	luest	ion?				
	5	,		A	I	th	ink	: I
12 fls.	6		quest	ion.				
•	7							
	8							
	9							
	<u>1</u> 0							
	11							
	12							
	13							
	14							
	1 5							
	16							
	17		•					
٠.	18	•						
	19							
	20							
	21	,						
	22				•			
	·23							
<u> </u>	24		٠		4			, ,,
	25	-			,	;	•	**
	26				<u> </u>		71	

But that is not what I mean, you understand.

What I mean is would you listen with an open mind, or have you already made your decision up on that question?

A I think I have made my decision on that stion.

Q Well, what I need to know is whether you are 12-1 1 certain now on this point or whether you still have some 2 doubts in your mind as to whether or not you would, in every 3 case, automatically refuse to impose the death penalty. 4 I would refuse. 5 MR. HUGHES: I didn't hear the answer. 6 Read the answer. THE COURT: 7 (Whereupon, the reporter read the answer.) 8 In other words, what you are saying THE COURT: 9 is that you would automatically refuse to impose the death 10 penalty and it wouldn't make any difference what the evi-11 dence showed; is that right? 12 13 Α Yes, sir. Don't let me put words in your mouth. 14 No, you are not. 15 Α 16 . Do you have any mental reservations or doubts 17 about that statement? In other words, are you certain about 18 what you have just said? I am positive. 19 20 You are positive? 21 Yes. A 22 23

24

25

26

THE COURT: All right. Any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald? MR. FITZGERALD: No questions, your Honor. MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor. MR. SHINN: No questions. THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?

12-2	1	MR. KANAREK: No questions.
<u>~</u>	2	MR. BUGLIOSI: Just one or two, your Honor.
<u> </u>	3	THE COURT: Very well.
	4	
	5	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. CRUMP
	6	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	7	Q Mrs. Crump, is your opposition to the death
	8	penalty of such a nature that it would cause you to
	9	automatically vote against the death penalty for these
	10	defendants regardless of the evidence?
	11	A Yes.
	12	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you. No further questions.
,	13	THE COURT: All right.
	14	I will ask you to go back into the courtroom,
	15	then, Mrs. Crump, and will you refrain from discussing with
	16	anyone what has been said here?
1	17	MRS. CRUMP: Yes.
	18	THE COURT: Thank you.
,	19	(Whereupon, Mrs. Crump leaves the court's
	20	chambers.)
	2 1	MR. BUGLIOSI: The People will
	22	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may I get a glass of water?
•	23	THE COURT: Wait until the challenge.
•	24	MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.
	25	MR. BUGLIOSI: The People move to excuse Mrs. Crump
	'26	on the grounds of implied bias under 1074. Subdivision 8

and also on the Witherspoon grounds.

MR. FITZGERALD: The defendants will object.

To deprive the defendants of this juror on the issue of guilt would deprive us of due process and equal protection of the law.

We also feel that her statements are somewhat equivocal and ambiguous and don't fall within the purview of Witherspoon.

THE COURT: Is there any statement that you felt was ambiguous?

MR. FITZGERALD: She ends up by saying "I am positive," but she earlier said, "I think I have made up my mind."

I don't know if one cancels the other or not.

THE COURT: I believe that her statements clearly indicate that she has made up her mind and that she would automatically refuse to impose the death penalty.

I find no question at all in my mind regarding her meaning.

She made it unmistakably clear to me, and I think the record will reflect that without question.

23

24

25

26

12A-1	1	MR. HUGHES: I will join Mr. Fitzgerald's objection.
•	2	MR. SHINN: Join.
	3	MR. KANAREK: Join.
	4	THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed. Mrs.
	5	Crump will be excused.
	,6	(Whereupon, another prospective alternate juror
	7 .	enters the court's chambers.)
	, 8	THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.
	9	MR. BURGER: Good afternoon.
	10	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
	11	juror is Fred Burger; F-r-e-d, B-u-r-g-e-r.
	12	
	. 13	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF FRED BURGER
	14	BY THE COURT:
	15	Q Mr. Burger, if you were selected as an
	16	alternate juror in this case, would you be able to serve?
	17	A Well, I believe I could, except that I have
	18	interests that I would like to have I have interests that
	19	I would rather be out of it.
	20	Q You mean opinions that you formed?
	21	A No, sir, not opinions.
	22 .	I am real active in the Veterans of Foreign
	23	Wars.
	24	Q Oh, you mean outside interests?
	25	A Yes.
	26	I am a District Officer and I am just starting

Ŋ٠

10.

9

11 12

13 14

16

.15

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26 my Senior Vice Commander year. It is the beginning of the year, and if I spend two or three months here, it would make it hard for me to continue on in the chair and next year become Commander.

So, your Honor, I feel it would be a hardship in that respect.

Q. The lawyers have estimated that this case could take from three to five months.

> Α Yes.

We are just starting the year and, like I say, it would make it hard to get back in the swing of things. Somebody else would have to do it for me this year and, therefore, next year it would be that much harder for me to continue on.

If somebody does the job well, possibly they could pass me in something that I have been working for for some time.

on the other hand, as an officer in the VFW, I am sure you recognize the importance of the jury system to our way of life and the importance of individual citizens making themselves available for jury service when they are called.

Α I understand that. It is a hard situation ever to be in.

I can see both sides of it. However, in that respect, I think I am a little bit prejudiced toward myself

because it is a matter of years going through the chairs, and I would have to probably -- I would not say I would have to start over, but I may have to.

Q Do you think that if you were selected as an alternate juror, you might find your ability to concentrate on matters in the trial was being distracted by your outside interests?

A I would hope not but I have no way of knowing for sure.

Q Well, I am going to go ahead and ask you -- we will pass that matter for the time being, Mr. Burger --

A Yes, sir.

Q -- and I am going to ask you questions regarding the death penalty that I have put to the other prospective jurors.

A Yes.

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, sir.

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

A No, sir.

Q on the other hand, would you always vote to

impose the death penalty in every case without regard to the evidence?

A No. sir.

and you correct me if I don't state your beliefs the way they are in fact -- you would be willing to listen to the evidence and then make up your mind as to which of the two penalties; and this, of course, assumes the case gets to the penalty phase; it may not get there; do you understand that?

A Yes, I understand.

Q But if it does get there, Mr. Burger, you would be willing to listen to all of the evidence and then make up your mind on the question of penalty; is that right?

A Yes, sir.

2B

12b-1	1	Q.	Have you formed any opinion regarding the
	2	guilt or in	nocence of any of the defendants in this case,
	3 *	Mr. Burger?	
	4		No, sir.
	5	Q	Do you read a newspaper on a regular basis?
	6	A	Yes. Every day.
	7	Q	Which paper?
	.8.	A	The Examiner.
	9	Q	The Herald-Examiner?
	10	A	Yes.
	11,	Q	Did you read it yesterday?
	1 2	А,	I looked through it. I did see the article
	13	on this and	passed through it. I did not read it.
	14	Q	You saw that there was an article pertaining
	15	to this cas	e?
	16	A	Two pages of it.
	17	Q	Did you do anything more than read the
	18	headline?	
	19	,	I don't even know if there was a headline.
	20	Tell me wha	t you read.
	21	A	I saw your picture and the pictures of the
	22	defendants,	and there were pictures of a few other
	23	people, but	I didn't read through everything, like I
	24	said.	
	25	Q.	Did you read any part of the text?
_	26	. A.	No. sir.

			•
L2b-2	1	Q.	Would it be fair to say that you identified
	2	the article	from the pictures?
	.3	A	As much as anything, but I believe the headling
	4	did say som	ething about the Tate case. I am not positive,
	.5∙	but I belie	ve it did:
	6	Q ,	And as soon as you identified it, you turned
	7	to somethin	ġ else?
	8 .	Â	Yes.
. , ,	9.	Q	Did you discuss that article with anyone?
	10	A	No, sir.
-	11:		I am a bachelor and I have nobody to discuss
	12	it with.	
	13	Q;	Have you ever read or heard anything which
	14	caused you	to believe it was a description of one or more
	15	of the kill	ings by anyone who was either a participant
	16	or an eyewi	tness?
	17	A	I believe some months ago I saw something
	18	about it.	
	19	Q	What was it?
	20	A	Something about the witness that is going to
	.21	testify lat	er.
	22 .	Q.	Are you speaking about some woman or girl?
•	23	A	Yes, sir.
	24	Q	Linda Kasabian?
	25	A	Yes.
	26 :	O.	And you think you read something which was a

12b-3	1	statement by her?
	2	A Yes, sir.
	3	Q Do you remember where you read that?
	4	A In the Examiner, I believe, or else on
	5 `	television. One or the other, I don't recall positively.
	6	Q What do you remember about the statement?
	7	I don't mean that you have to tell me the
	8	details, but what was she talking about?
	9 .	A I believe at one time she is said to have
	1 0	given a complete description of the killing, and then I
	11	believe she if I remember right denied saying it,
	12	or something like that.
	13	Q In other words, you understood it to a
	14	statement by her amounting to a confession, shall we say?
12c fls	1 5	A More or less.
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22 .	
	23	
_	24	
•	,25	
	26	
	,	

	1	·
12c-1 1	Q	In other words, she admitted being there?
2	A.	I believe that is what I remember.
3	Q:	And named other persons who were there?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Is that what you understood the article was?
.6	A	Yes, sir.
7	Q.	Could that have been one of the other female
8	defendants	other than Miss Kasabian?
.9	A	(Pause.)
10	Q.	Do you know the names of the other defendants?
. 11	A	Slightly. Not positively.
. 12	Q	All right.
13		There is Leslie Van Houten.
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	There is Susan Atkins.
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	And Patricia Krenwinkel.
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Could it have been one of those?
20	A	It is possible. I'm not quite positive. It
21	has been se	everal months ago.
22	THE (COURT: All right.
23		Any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald?
24	MR.	FITZGERALD: No, your Honor. Thank you.
25	MR. I	HUGHES: No questions, thank you.
26	MR.	SHINN: No questions.
. 1	q	1

12c-2MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Kanarek, any questions? 1 THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Kanarek? 2 MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor. 3 5 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. BURGER 6 BY MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Burger, what is your business or occupa-7 Q tion? Postal clerk. 10 And are you working now or are you retired? Q 11· A No, I am working. 12 Are you certain that you didn't read an 13 article in the Los Angeles Times? 14 A I seldom read the Times. 15 Did you read any magazine concerning this 16 case --17 No, sir. A. 18 -- such as Life --Q 19 A Νo. 20 -- Time? Q 21 Ã No. 22 Do you remember anything concerning the Q 23so-called statement of Linda Kasabian, when it was made, 24 or how it was made, or whether she testified before the 25 Grand Jury or whether she didn't testify before the Grand 26 Jury? Anything like that, Mr. Burger?

1	A Maybe it was something about the Grand Jury,
2	but I am not positive about that either. I seem to
.3	remember something about the Grand Jury.
4	Q And is this a national office that you are
5	now
6	A No, sir. District.
7	Q A district office? That means the State of
8 .	California?
9.	A No. There are 22 districts in California.
10	It is the Southern Los Angeles County. That is the
11	district that I am in, the 4th District.
12	Q You have just been selected as Commander?
13	A No. Last year I was Junior Vice, and this
14	year I am Senior, but next year I hope to be Commander.
15	MR. STOVITZ: I see.
16	I have no further questions.
17	THE COURT: All right.
18	I will ask you, Mr. Burger, to go back in the
19	courtroom, and would you refrain from discussing with
20	anyone what has been said here?
21	MR. BURGER: Yes. Thank you.
22	(Whereupon Mr. Burger leaves the Court's
23	chambers.)
24	MR. FITZGERALD: The defendants will challenge
2 5	the juror for cause because of his exposure to prejudicial
26	pretrial publicity.

I think the young woman he is referring to is 1 indeed Susan Atkins and not Linda Kasabian, inasmuch as 2 she has never recanted or changed her position vis-a-vis 3 the other defendants. It would appear so. THE COURT: 5 MR. SHINN: Join. 6 MR. HUGHES: Join, your Honor. 7 MR. KANAREK: Join. 8 MR. STOVITZ: Submit it, your Honor. THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed. 10 12d f1s11 Mr. Burger will be excused for cause. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 24 2526

2D-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

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

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MRS. TUCCI: Hello.

THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate juror is Mrs. Gladys D. Tucci; G-1-a-d-y-s, T-u-c-c-i.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. GLADYS D. TUCCI BY THE COURT:

- Q Mrs. Tucci, is that the correct pronunciation?
- A Yes.
- Q If you were selected as an alternate juror in this case, would you be able to serve?
 - A Well, I tell you, I don't believe I could.

I manage an apartment house and the fellow that owns it, he lives there, he is going to Europe, to Russia, and I have to be there in the daytime. So, I would have to watch it.

You know, we have young people, around 18 to 35, and we have a swimming pool, and they have to have people watching them because they bring their guests and children and everything.

Q Is there anyone else who could do that while you were serving as a juror in this case?

A No, I don't think so, unless they got a new manager, is about all I can think of.

Ų2

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Q In other words, this is your means of compensation and livelihood, is it?

A Well, my husband works, but he is gone during —
he works the swing shift, from 3:00 to 12:00, and that place
almost has to be, you know, sort of watched between 3:00 to
12:00 because young people get kind of out of hand once in
a while.

Q I have heard that.

A Around the swimming pool.

MR. STOVITZ: I wonder if, your Honor, whether this lady could check with the owner of the bullding and find out whether or not he could more or less hire somebody additional for just the next two or three months.

The swimming pool is probably going to be used only during the summertime, and when it gets along about fall, we won't have to worry about swimming too much.

Do you think that would be possible?

THE COURT: Q I take it you live right in the apartment, do you, Mrs. Tucci?

A Yes.

Q In one of the apartments?

A Yes.

THE COURT: Well, I think that would be an imposition.

MR. STOVITZ: Whatever your Honor says.

You have no young children; right?
MRS. TUCCI: No, no young ones.

MR. STOVITZ: Just you and your husband? 12D3 1 MRS. TUCCI: Yes. 2 MR. STOVITZ: Are you asking to be excused because 3 of this reason? MRS. TUCCI: Yes. 5 MR. STOVITZ: You have to answer out loud, Mrs. Tucci. 6 MRS. TUCCI: Yes. 7 8 MR. STOVITZ: How big an apartment is this? 20 units? 9 30 units? How big is it? 10 MRS. TUCCI: No. It is 44 units. Q 44 units? 11 12 À Yes. 13 Here in Hollywood? 14 No. Los Angeles. 15 MR. STOVITZ: Thank you. 16 THE COURT: Q You are asking to be excused, are 17 Or is this something that you think you can work out? 18. I don't know. I just don't hardly see how, 19 how it could be worked out, because it is one of those 20 places where there are two of us, and I don't know if he 21 can get another one in for that time. 22 THE COURT: Stipulate, gentlemen? 23 MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Fitzgerald? 24 MR. FITZGERALD: We agree. 25 MR. STOVITZ: We will so stipulate, your Honor. 26 THE COURT: Do you join, Mr. Kanarek?

13-1	THE COURT: You will be excused, Mrs. Tucci.
2	Will you refrain from discussing with anyone
3	what has been said in here?
4	MRS. TUCCI: Yes, I will.
5 .	(Mrs. Tucci leaves the chambers of the court.)
. 6	(A prospective alternate juror enters the
7	chambers of the court.)
8,	THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.
9. ;	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
10	juror is Alan Kennan, A-l-a-n, K-e-n-n-a-n.
. 11	
12	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. KENNAN
13	BY THE COURT:
. 14	Q Mr. Kennan, if you were selected as an alternate
15	juror in this case would you be able to serve?
16.	A I don't think I can get free for the length of
17	time, three to five months.
18	Q Are you employed?
19	A Yes.
20	Q Who is your employer?
21	A Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Company.
22	Q Accountants and auditors?
23	A Right.
24	Q Are you on a salary basis?
25	A Yes, sir.
26.	Q Have you discussed this with your company, that

is, the prospect of continuing jury service beyond the 1 30 days? 2 À I asked them what their reaction would be; 3 It was very negative. 4. The reaction may have been negative, but what 5 was the decision? 6 Α How do you mean, decision? 7 Most companies hate to lose a valuable and 8 Q. trusted employee for any reason, but that does not mean 9 they are not willing to compensate him if he is called 10 to jury service. 11 12 Α Oh. I see. 13 Well, we did not make a decision. We sort of 14 talked about it. 15 They'd be sort of unhappy. I think their 16 . decision would be they would not let me do it, if I asked 17 them would I be allowed or could I serve on a jury for six 18 months, I'm fairly certain they would say no. 19 Of course they don't have any choice in the 20 matter whether or not you serve; all they can decide is 21 whether or not they can continue your compensation. 22 So the question should not be really posed in 23 that form. 24 What you want to know is "If I'm called would 25 you continue to pay me?" That is the important thing

as far as you are concerned.

26

All right, let's pass that for the time being, sir, and I will ask you some other questions. Perhaps you can place a telephone call this afternoon and talk with someone.

Do you think that is possible, and you can get an answer?

A I do.

Q If that problem were taken care of, is there any other reason you would be unable to serve?

A Well, there's been quite a bit of discussion out there about capital punishment.

Q Apart from that. I will get to that in a minute.

I'm talking now of anything on the outside, any undue hardship which might result other than what you have already indicated.

A No.

Q All right, now, I will ask you the questions about 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 defendant's guilt regardless of the evidence of the case?

I am talking now only about the decision on guilt.

A I hesitate to answer that yes or no. I would

just like to say I am against the death penalty and I cannot see any situation where I would vote for it.

Q All right. Well, I'm going to ask you that question too, in a minute.

But right now, you understand the first phase of the trial will be devoted to the question of whether or not any of the defendants are guilty or not guilty.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q It is only when there is a verdict of murder in the first degree, the jury will ever be called upon to make a decision on penalty.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q Now, sometimes a person's beliefs regarding the death penalty are so strong, not only would he not impose the death penalty but he could not be impartial in deciding whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty, because he knows that if he finds the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree then he will have to go one step further and be faced with the decision of the penalty, you see, that is what I am trying to find out from you now.

A Okay. I would be able to decide guilty or not guilty.

Q Impartially?

A Impartially.

,	· ·
1	Q Then we will get to the second question.
2	A All right.
3 ·	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
4	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
5	refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence?
. 6	A Yes, sîr.
7	Q Now, that question, if answered in the
8	affirmative means that you have made up your mind, unalterably,
9	that regardless of what the evidence in the case would show
10	you could not vote for the death penalty.
11	Is that what you mean?
13a f1 ¹² .	A That is what I mean, yes, sir.
13	
14	
15	
16 .	
17	
18 ° ,	
19:	
20	
21 ,	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

3	L,
i	
2	1
3	
À	
5	Ì
6	i
7	
· 8 :	
9	
10	
11	,
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	•
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

25

26

Q Do you have any mental reservations or doubts about your answer?

A No.

. / !

THE COURT: Do you wish to inquire?

MR. FITZGERALD: May I ask just one or two questions?

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF ALAN KENNAN
BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Q Can you visualize any case in which the death penalty might be an appropriate penalty?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I object to that question, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think it is ambiguous.

What we are concerned with is whether or not he is willing or capable of making such a vote.

He might in the abstract be willing to let someone else impose it.

Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: Is there any case or situation in which you feel the death penalty is an appropriate penalty and you could impose it, vote for it and impose it?

A That I can impose it? No.

Q No matter how horrendous the situation might be, in the sort of case you could conjure up in your mind, you would never be able to vote for the death penalty?

A That's correct.

_fa2

13a3

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

you undoubtedly heard about it, that they are now in this court to stand trial for those alleged crimes?

> Α yes, sir.

Α

Now, apart from that have you ever learned anything that causes you to believe that there is some connection between these defendants and those alleged crimes?

> In other words, have you ever heard or read --Well, I have read newspaper accounts.

I have seen pictures in the newspapers, just casually, but I have never made an attempt to locate every article possibly written on them, or search out newspaper accounts or anything like that.

Did you ever read anything which seemed to be a description by someone who was either a participant in one or more of the killings or an eye witness to them?

> No, not that I recall. A

Q. Have you ever read anything or heard anything. which purported to be a statement by any of these defendants on any subject?

> Α No.

Q. Do you know anything from what you have read or heard concerning the connection between these defendants and the alleged crimes other than the fact that you have read and heard that they were arrested and charged with these . offenses?

could I ask you to repeat that last question 13A4 1 again? 2 3 question as follows: 4 5 6 7 8 9 offenses?") 10 MR. KENNAN: No. 11 Q 12 13 A No. 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 the courtroom, Mr. Kennan. 22 23 24

25

26

(Whereupon, the reporter reads the pending Do you know anything from what you have read or heard concerning the connection between these defendants and the alleged crimes other than the fact that you have read and heard that they were arrested and charged with these BY THE COURT: Have you formed any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of any of these defendants? THE COURT: Any further questions? MR. FITZGERALD: Nothing, your Honor. MR. HUGHES: No further questions, your Honor. MR. SHINN: Nothing, your Honor. MR. KANAREK: No further questions. MR. STOVITZ: None, your Honor. THE COURT: All right, I will ask you to go back in Would you refrain from discussing with anyone what has been said in here? MR. KENNAN: I certainly will, thank you. (Mr. Kennan leaves the chambers of the court.)

MR. STOVITZ: We will challenge this juror for cause on implied bias. MR. FITZGERALD: The defendants object on the grounds of due process and equal protection. MR. HUGHES: Join. MR. SHINN: Join. MR. KANAREK: Join. THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed. Mr. Kennan made it unmistakably clear he would automatically refuse to impose the death penalty under any circumstances. the transfer of the same

13B

		·		
13b-1	1	(A prospective alternate juror enters the		
	2	chambers of the court.)		
,	3	THE COURT: Good afternoon.		
	4	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate		
	5	juror is Mrs. Laura M. Shaw, Laura, L-a-u-r-a, S-h-a-w.		
	-6	· ·		
	7	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. SHAW		
	8	BY THE COURT:		
	9.	Q Mrs. Shaw, if you were selected as an alternate		
	10	juror in this case would you be able to serve?		
	11	A Not very well, I don't think, I have a working		
•	12	husband and I have old parents, and a mother-in-law that		
	13	needs some care.		
	14	Q Keep your voice up, please.		
	15	A I'm sorry, I don't know, you know, always when,		
	16	is all.		
,	17	Q Do you have a job outside of your home?		
	18	A No, I don't.		
	19	Q You stay home and take care of your parents,		
	20	do you?		
•	21	A As they need it, yes.		
	22	Q Do they live with you?		
	23	A No.		
*	24	Q Is your husband employed?		
	25	A Yes.		
	26	Q Do you have any children?		

	420)
13b-2	A No, I don't.
1;	Q Now, I believe you were one of the persons
2	who stood up and gave your name the other day when I
4	asked if there were any prospective jrors who could not be
· 5	fair and impartial in this case.
6	A That's right.
` 7	Q Can you tell us upon what that statement was
8	based?
9	A Well, I was last week in a court with the same
10	type of case where I could have been fair and impartial
11	because I never heard of the people.
12	While this I feel like I know quite a lot
13	about it, and I am prejudiced.
14	Q Prejudiced against the defendants?
15	A Right.
16.	Q This is based on what you have read or heard
47	about the case?
18	A I have read not so much newspaper, but maga-
19	zine articles.
20	Q Do you remember what magazine?
21	A McCall's and the Journal and I am not sure
. 22	whether it was the Redbook or Good Housekeeping now.
23,	It was pretty well outlined between the

Q

A

25

26

What was pretty well outlined?

Well, everything I guess, the nature of the

Cielo Drive.com ARCHIVES

1	A Uh-huh.
2	Q You have to answer audibly.
3	A Yes.
4.	THE COURT: All right, any questions?
5 ´	MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor.
6	MR. HUGHES: No, your Honor.
7	MR. SHINN: No, your Honor.
ģ	MR. KANAREK: No. your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz?
10	
11,	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. SHAW
12	BY MR. STOVITZ:
13	Q Mrs. Shaw, are you related to the former Mayor
14	of Los Angeles?
15 .	A No.
16	Q Or the former Judge?
17	A No.
18 :	THE COURT: All right, I will ask you to go back into
19	the courtroom, Mrs. Shaw.
20	Would you refrain from discussing with anyone
21	what has been said in here?
22	MRS. SHAW: Of course.
23	THE COURT: Thank you.
24	(Mrs. Shaw leaves the courtroom.)
25	MR. FITZGERALD: We challenge the juror for
26	exposure to prejudicial pretrial publicity and for actual

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

bias. MR. HUGHES: Join. MR. SHINN: Join. MR. KANAREK: Join. MR. STOVITZ: Submit it, your Honor. THE COURT: The challenge is allowed. Mrs. Shaw will be excused for cause. 13c fis.

13C-1

ģ.

(A prospective alternate juror enters the chambers of the court.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate juror is Mrs. Freddie M. Smith, F-r-e-d-d-i-e, S-m-i-t-h.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. FREDDIE M. SMITH BY THE COURT:

Q Mrs. Smith, 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 in the case.

A Yes.

Q Would you tell us what your statement was based on, please?

A Well, it was just based on what I read and know and seen, which made me prejudiced.

Q Did you ever read anything which seems to be a description by someone who was present at the time any of these killings took place?

A Say that again.

Q I say, did you ever read or hear anything which seemed to be a description by someone who was present at the time any of the killings took place?

A No, not exactly.

Q Have you ever read anything or heard anything

1302	i	which appeared to be a statement by any of these defendants?
	2,	A I wouldn't say, no.
	3.	Q Do you read a daily newspaper?
	4	A I usually look at the TV news.
	5	Q You say you usually look at TV?
	6	A Yes, the news.
	. 4	Reep your voice up, please, so everyone can
	8	hear you.
	9	If you were selected as an alternate juror
	10	would you be able to serve?
	11	A No.
	12	Q What is your situation?
	13	A Well, I do have a family
Ò	1 4	MR. STOVITZ: I cannot hear you.
	15	MRS. SMITH: I have a family and I am working.
	1 6	Q BY THE COURT: You have young children?
	17	A No, they are teen-agers.
	18	Q And do you work outside of the home?
	19	A Yes.
	20	Q Where do you work?
	21	A A nursery school.
	22	Q Do you know whether that nursery school would
	23	continue your compensation?
ı	24	A No, they would not; they would not.
	2 5	Q Would that constitute a hardship if your
	26	compensation was cut off?

3Ć3	1	A Yes, it would; yes, it would.
	2	MR. FITZGERALD: May I ask a question?
	3	
	4	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. SMITH
	5	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
	6.	Q Are you inclined at least partially to tell us
	7 .	that you could not be fair and impartial whether it is
	8.	really a matter of an economic hardship for you?
	·9	A oh, no, no, that is not the reason.
,	10	Q If it wasn't for the hardship you could not be
	11	fair and you could not give these defendants a fair trial?
	12	À No.
<u>:-</u>	13	Q Do you think you would convict them regardless o
•	14	what the evidence was?
	15	A I believe I would.
	16	MR. FITZGERALD: We will offer to stipulate.
	17	THE COURT: All right.
	18	MR. KANAREK: On the basis of the hardship and both,
•	19	your Honor.
	20	MR. STOVITZ: Pretrial publicity and hardship.
	21	MR. KANAREK: Accept the stipulation.
	22	THE COURT: All I want to know is are you willing to
•	23	stipulate or not. You have your own reasons.
i	24.	All right, you will all stipulate.
	25.	MR. HUGHES: So stipulate.
_	26	MR. FITZGERALD: So stipulated.

MR. SHINN: So stipulate. 13c4 So stipulated. MR. KANAREK: So stipulated. MR. STOVITZ: 3. THE COURT: You will be excused, Mrs. Smith. Will you refrain from discussing anything that has been said in here? MRS. SMITH: Definitely. THE COURT: All right. (Mrs. Smith leaves the chambers of the court.) THE COURT: We will take our recess at this time for 15 minutes. (Recess.)

14-1

8, .

5

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

THE COURT: All counsel are present.

One of the jurors, No. 1, Mrs. McKenzie, appears to be having some personal problem and she has asked the bailiff if she could converse with me.

Does anybody object to having her talk to me about her personal problems?

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

MR. KANAREK: In other words, this involves --

THE COURT: Apparently some difficult she is having with her husband or their apartment or something.

I really don't know.

MR. KANAREK: Has she specifically asked that no attorneys be present?

THE COURT: She hasn't specifically asked me anything. She asked the bailiff if she could converse with me.

MR. KANAREK: If it doesn't involve publicity matters or any legal issue pertaining to that, I would have no objection to this Court --

THE COURT: I wouldn't talk to her about anything that had to do with the issues.

Apparently it is some kind of a personal problem, and I want to see if I can help her to solve it, whatever it is.

26

Of course, if we need assistance, I will let counsel know about it.

Perhaps a phone call can do it.

MR. STOVITZ: I have no objection to your Honor talking to the juror on this basis.

I imagine something like this may come up from time to time during the course of the trial, and later on your Honor can tell us whatever your Honor sees fit.

MR. FITZGERALD: I think we should all be aware that we are in a limbo situation, however. We don't have any alternates to replace main jurors, and I don't want to start this all over again.

Neither do I. That is why I want to see if I can help her solve her problems.

MR. FITZGERALD: All right.

MR. KANAREK: As far as talking to her alone, I have no objection, but after your Honor has learned what the matter is, I feel that we should be informed.

I would stipulate that the record could be sealed as far as the County Clerk is concerned, but I do

THE COURT: What record?

MR. KANAREK: The details of it.

And after, I would certainly accept your Honor's representation as to what occurred.

> I am not going to make any representation THE COURT:

1	to you other than what I have done, Mr. Kanarek.
2	If she tells me she doesn't want anybody
3	to know what she tells me, then I won't disclose it.
4	MR. KANAREK: Then I wouldn't stipulate.
5	THE COURT: If you don't want to agree to that, well
6	don't agree.
7	MR. KANAREK: That I can't agree to.
8.	THE COURT: All right.
9	I may do it anyway.
10	MR. KANAREK: I understand.
11	MR. FITZGERALD: If your Honor hears it, we are
12	in no worse off position than if you didn't hear it.
13	THE COURT: That's right. To me, the question
14	answers itself, but Mr. Kanarek apparently wants to read
1 5	something into it.
16	MR. KANAREK: No.
17	THE COURT: He is free to do that if he wants to.
18	MR. KANAREK: I don't believe the Court has the
19	power.
20	THE COURT: I have the power to talk to the juror,
21	and I may very well do it.
22 .	MR. KANAREK: Outside the presence of counsel,
23	your Honor?
24.	THE COURT: If it involves a personal problem, yes,
25	not in any way connected with the issues of the case.
26	MR. KANAREK: I must disagree with the Court on

that, your Honor. I don't believe that the Court has the power to speak to a juror outside the presence of counsel without an agreement being entered into.

THE COURT: And you don't want to enter into the agreement; is that right?

You would rather see this juror be unable to solve her problem, whatever it might be; is that it?

MR. KANAREK: No.

.21

THE COURT: What is your objection, Mr. Kanarek? I am still at a loss to understand your position.

MR. KANAREK: I don't believe, your Honor, that I have the power to do that except --

THE COURT: Are you an attorney or aren't you, sir?

MR: KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: Then you have the power to do it.

MR. KANAREK: No. I don't believe -- well, I don't believe that I can give the Court carte blanche.

THE COURT: I am not asking for carte blanche.

I told you that she had a personal problem which I want to talk to her about, to see if there was any way we could solve whatever the problem is.

I also told you that I do not intend to talk to her about anything in connection with this case.

MR. KANAREK: I accept the Court's representation on that, but I am asking that whatever it is, no matter what it is, that I be told what it is that she told the Court.

THE COURT: Well, I can undoubtedly tell you in general terms, but if she tells me that she wants it in strict secrecy, then I can't very well do that, can I?

MR. KANAREK: Then I can't enter the stipulation, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am going to talk to her anyway, Mr. Kanarek, whether you like it or not.

Please go outside.

14A2	1,	Ask Mrs. McKenzie to come in.
	2	(Whereupon, all counsel leave chambers.)
	3	(Mrs. Selma S. McKenzie, Juror No. 1, enters
	· 4	the Court's chambers.)
	5	THE COURT: Mrs. McKenzie, I understand you have
	·6	something you want to talk to me about?
	7	Do you have any objection to having this
	8	taken down?
	9	MRS. MCKENZIE: I guess not.
	10	Where does it go?
	11	THE COURT: It doesn't go anywhere. It is simply a
	12	record of the trial. It won't go anywhere except that
	13	every attorney gets a copy of it.
	14	It doesn't go to the press, or it will not be
	15	made public. All the proceedings in chambers are
•	16	confidential.
	17	MRS. MCKENZIE: I didn't expect this, sir.
	18	, THE COURT: Yes?
	19	MRS. McKENZIE: I am legally married but my husband
	20	and I have been separated for almost three years, that is,
	21	living in separate residences, although not legally
	22	separated.
	23	My legal residence is Palmdale, but I live in
	24	Commerce.
	25	I had placed winter clothing in a position that
	26	if anyone had to bring me additional things, it would be

14a#

1.

easy. I thought I could handle it, but my husband is upset.

He has put the telephone in storage, and now he is disconnecting it. He says he has got to get rid of the dog or destroy her.

Now he wants to vacate my apartment, and I am concerned, because when I get out of here I must be at work the next day and I must have a place to live and know whether I have any clothes and whatever.

THE COURT: Didyou say that you and your husband are separated?

MRS. McKENZIE: We are not legally separated but we just live in separate residences.

Quite frankly, we are trying to prevent a divorce. We were at the point of divorce and we are trying to prevent it.

But due to my work, I can't drive 150 miles a day, so I rented an apartment close to work, and I am here at least five days a week, sometimes six.

I go to my legal residence in Palmdale on the weekends.

14B

14B-1

25.

THE COURT: Who is your employer?

MRS. McKENZIE: Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services.

THE COURT: Oh, that's right.

MRS. McKENZIE: And the problem is that I have got to get some clothes, and I want to be sure that --

THE COURT: If you could make some outgoing calls, would that solve your problem?

MRS. MCKENZIE: I am trying to think who I could call to say don't let him give up my apartment.

If I was sure he wouldn't do it next week, and if he would give me the key to my apartment next week, that would be one thing, but if he vacates the apartment this week.

THE COURT: Why would he do that?

MRS. McKENZIE: He is unemployed and he is concerned about the expense.

We discussed it last week, and I mentioned I was thinking of having a girl friend move in temporarily and I asked his opinion, and he thought it would be better if I kept the apartment. Too many things could happen, and I had to have a residence when I got out, which made sense to him. He didn't think I could save money anyhow.

I was perfectly content with this arrangement, but this weekend I suppose he is more worried and he has decided the thing to do is vacate.

I am very concerned because it took me a year to find an apartment close to work that I could afford, and in that length of time the prices have gone up considerably and there are fewer available. I know because other people have been looking.

I must have a place to live.

THE COURT: Why would he rent your apartment?

MRS. McKENZIE: Because he thinks that is the thing to do. He is the head of the family, and that is the way he does things, and when it is all over he says, "I am sorry," but then I am the one that would be in a position -- right now the main problem is I don't want the apartment vacated.

If I called the landlord, he wouldn't know it is vacated until they go to turn the key in to him, and it will be too late.

And if I call a neighbor, they aren't going to stop my husband.

I told him yesterday that I would much prefer not to vacate and please just leave things as they were for now, because it was upsetting and he couldn't do that, and I think that I should have a choice when I am paying the bills.

THE COURT: Is there anything that we can do to help you while you are on the jury?

I am concerned with having a happy and content juror.

MRS. McKENZIE: I don't usually go to pieces. I was so startled. I didn't expect to talk to you at all, much less this soon, and I didn't want to hold up the case.

I asked the deputy. If I was going to be a problem, to maybe eliminate me now, because I have no intention of being a problem.

THE COURT: Unfortunately, that can't be done. Once the jury is sworn, that is it.

MRS. McKENZIE: I think maybe if I could talk to my husband and ask him not to vacate the apartment under any circumstances, not to vacate the apartment, and to bring me the key this weekend so that I feel sure that he can't vacate it; unless I can go out and put a padlock on it.

THE COURT: Do you know where you can reach him?

MRS. MCKENZIE: He should be at home in Palmdale.

THE COURT: Do you want to do that right now?

We will let you make telephone calls outgoing from the hotel.

THE COURT: If he is not here now vacating it. But he has already disconnected my phone and I can't reach him at the apartment here.

14B

14c-1

.8

12.

THE COURT: Do you want to make a call now or after court this evening?

MRS. MC KENZIE: If I may, I would like to try to call him in Palmdale now, because if he is here I can't reach him, he has disconnected the phone in my apartment.

And I would like to have some clothes. He scrambled the clothes up, and I don't know if I can tell anybody what to do.

I want to know if I can go out and get the clothes with a Deputy with me.

I can do beautifully for a week or two weeks.

THE COURT: All these things can be worked out. We have to go ahead with the selection of the alternate jurors here so that the case can get started, but I will do everything I can to help you solve your problems too.

MRS. MC KENZIE: That is what I wanted to know. I heard someone say that these problems can be worked out, and similar problems have been mentioned, and I thought I heard them say that in a case where there was no one to bring clothing that they will give you a Deputy to go with you. I am asking if it would be possible in my case. I don't want to stop the case or --

THE COURT: When there is a problem that isn't solvable, I want to know about it to help you solve it.

MRS. MC KENZIE: So, if I can make the phone call, and if I could later, sometime within a week or so, go and

13c-2

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

_, .

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

get my clothes, then I think I could handle the situation, or I can even wait until the end of court. I don't want to hold up the court. Surely it is not going to make that much difference.

THE COURT: Very well. We will recess at 4:15. Is that all right. And then we will have the bailiff put you through at that time.

MRS. MC KENZIE: Yes. And I do appreciate this, but I didn't want to be a problem. It is just that they said it was out of their jurisdiction.

THE COURT: We are going to solve the problem one way or the other.

All right. Now, if there is anything more I can do to help you, and if you have to go out there, we can send a Deputy along with you if that becomes necessary.

MRS. MC KENZIE: I won't have to go to Palmdale, just to Commerce.

THE COURT: I understand.

All right.

So, at 4:15, he will put you through on the telephone, and then you decide after that.

You won't have to go out there today, will you?

MRS. MC KENZIE: No. I can make out beautifully

for a week, and maybe two.

THE COURT: All right. Whenever the time comes.

MRS. MC KENZIE: But not for three months.

14c-3 THE COURT: Oh, no. 1 MRS. MC KENZIE: Or so. 2 THE COURT: Then you can make a telephone call this 3 afternoon after court. 4 MRS. MC KENZIE: Thank you. THE COURT: We will take care of all the problems. 6 Don't worry about it. 7 ·Ř MRS. MC KENZIE: Thank you. (Recess.) 15 fls. 1Ó. 11 12 . 13 14 15 16 17 18 **19** 20 21 22: 23 24 25

:26

15-1	1
·	. 2
	3
	4
•	5
	6
	.7
,	·8
٠	9
	10
	11
	12.
	13
	14
	15
•	16
	17
	1 8
	19
•	. 20
	- 21

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

THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.

The conversation with Mrs. McKenzie was reported, so you can read about it tomorrow in today's transcript.

Call the next prospective juror.

MR. FITZGERALD: I take it it is not going to impede her service or anything.

THE COURT: Not if I can help it it isn't, it doesn't appear to be anything that cannot be solved readily.

(A prospective juror enters the chambers of the court.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.

The name of the prospective alternate THE CLERK: juror is Calixto Rubalcava.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF CALIXTO RUBALCAVA BY THE COURT:

> Mr. Rubalcava? Q

Yes.

Mr. Rubalcava, if you were selected as an alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve? That depends -- if I'm paid. Α

22

23

24

25

	•	· ·
1.	Q	What company do you work for?
2	A	Safeway.
3	Q	Safeway Stores?
4	A	Safeway Stores.
5	Q	And do you know what their policy is?
6	. А	I know they pay up to 20 days.
7	ର	Do you know whether they pay if the juror is
8 ·	held over	for longer service?
9 . ·	Å	I don't know that.
10	Q	Is that something that you can find out between
11	now and to	morrow morning?
12	Å	I guess so, yes.
13	Q	Whom would you talk to to find out?
14 [.]	. .	Well, the manager of the plant.
15	Q	Do you know his name?
16	A	Mr. Cecil. Ernest Cecil.
1,7	Q	Is he the personnel manager?
18 [.]	A	Yes.
19	Q	Do you know the telephone number there?
20	. A	No.
21	Q	Where is that located, what street?
22	· A	In Vernon Vernon Street, between Soto and
23	Santa Fe.	
24 ·	Q	Is that the main office for Safeway?
25	. A .	No, their meat processing department.
26	Q	All right, will you try to find out between now
	,	1

Ί	and tomorrow?
2	A Yes.
- 3	Q And let us know then tomorrow morning.
4.	A Yes.
5.	Q Is there any other reason that you would not
6·	be able to serve?
7	A Well, the only reason is that I have a large
8	family and it would be hard for my wife.
9	Q How many children do you have?
10	A I have ten.
11	Q Ten?
12	A I have ten.
13	Q What is the range of ages?
14	A 21 down to 9.
15	Q They are all living at home?
16	A One is married and he is in the Service, in
17	the Armed Forces.
18	Q And your wife, she stays home and takes care
19.	of the children?
20	A She stays home, yes, that is the only problem.
21	It will be more difficult.
22	MR. BUGLIOSI: We will stipulate.
23	MR. FITZGERALD: We will offer to stipulate.
24	THE COURT: Do all join?
25	MR. HUGHES: Join.
26	MR. SHINN: Join.

•	
1	MR. KANAREK: Join.
Ź	THE COURT: You will be excused then, Mr. Rubalcava
3	Will you refrain from discussing with anyone
4	what has been said here?
5	MR. RUBALCAVA: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Thank you. You are excused.
7	(Mr. Rubalcava leaves the chambers of the
8,	court.)
9	(A prospective alternate juror enters the
10	chambers of the court.)
11	THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.
12 :	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
13	juror is Leon E. Blakely, L-e-o-n, B-1-a-k-e-1-y.
14	
15	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. BLAKELY
16	BY THE COURT:
17	Q Mr. Blakely, if you were selected as an
18	alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve?
19	A Well, I don't think so, sir. I am almost
20	61 years old now, and I'm having trouble with a little
21	bit of arthritis; my old ulcer kind of bothers me.
22	I don't believe I can go the distance on it.
.23	Q Well, of course you are going to be somewhere
24	during this period.
25	A Yes, that is true.
26	Q Is there something about this case that would

impose some special strains or stresses on you? 1 Á Well, I think it would. I am kind of 2 sympathetic toward people. ż I work with all races down here at the 4 Terminal. 5 Q. Are you with the Post Office Department? 6 Yes, sir, and -- I don't know -- it kind of Ά Works on my emotions. 8 Of course we don't have criminals down there, 9 but we have a little race trouble once in a while. 10 don't think I can go the distance on a criminal trial of 11 this nature, your Honor. 12 .What do you think would happen? 13 14 What? 15 16 When you say you don't think you can go the 17 distance, what would happen? 18 Well, I probably would have to ask to be A 19 excused later, and go over to Kaiser and get a little 20 overhaul, you know. 21 Are you presently under medical treatment? 22 No, I'm not. The fact is I bumped into a 23 truck and my darned arm hurts me. 24 I keep bumping that elbow. Of course I have 25 false teeth now, too, so --26 Are you asking to be excused?

Q

	- 1	
	i	A Well, I guess
	2	Q You would rather not serve?
	3	A I would rather serve on some of these cases
	4	just to my time, you see, I have a letter here from
	5	Uncle Sam (handing letter to the Court).
	6	Q That is just a form letter that they send
	7	out to the prospective employee jurors in the Post Office
	8	Department, isn't it?
• ,	9	A Well, they kind of give you to understand
15a fls.	10	that after August 4th I am not to accept any more cases.
:	11	
:	12	
	13	
, ()	14	
,	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
. •	19	,
	20	
,	21	
	22	
	23:	
,	24	
•	25	
	26	

AR-1

.14

16.

 Q Well, there is no problem with the Post Office Department about getting paid for jury service. They may not like it because no employer likes to lose the services of a valued and trusted employee.

A Yes, that is true. Well, I would say that I was asking to be excused on account of more or less nervous symptons, or something of that nature rather than --

This letter probably wouldn't hold any water.

MR. FITZGERALD: There won't be a stipulation. I discussed it with counsel, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We would ask the Court on its own motion.

THE COURT: Well, do you feel that you are physically unable to stand up to a trial that might last three to five months?

THE PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, that's right, at my age, if I was --

very old for some people and it may be old for others.

I'm talking about what is your physical condition, such that you are concerned with your ability to see this case through to the end.

A That's right, that's right.

Q And you're asking to be excused because of your physical condition, is that right?

A Yes, yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, then, you will be excused, Mr. Blakely, and will you refrain from discussing this with anyone?

MR. BLAKELY: I will, sir, I haven't told anybody outside.

THE COURT: All right, fine, thank you.

MR. BLAKELY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You may go back into the court.

MR. BLAKELY: Thank you, sir.

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

THE COURT: The record will show that the Court excused Mr. Blakely on its own motion by reason of his expressed concern for his physical condition, and the question of whether or not he was physically able to see through a trial of this estimated duration.

(A prospective alternate juror enters the chambers of the Court.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate juror is Mrs. Evelyn L. Horn. E-v-e-l-y-n, H-o-r-n.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. EVELYN L. HORN BY THE COURT:

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

	ŀ		.'
%a3	1	Α .	No, it would be quite a long time away from
Á	2	my family.	
	3	Q	What does your family consist of?
	4:	A	Well, a 12-year-old daughter
	Š	Q	Keep your voice up, please.
	6	· A	and a son that is 20.
	7	Q .	A daughter of 12 and a son of 20?
	8	A	Yes.
	.9	କ୍ଷ	They both live at home?
	10	A	Yes, they do.
	11	Q	Are you employed outside of the home?
	12	A	I have been. I took the summer off because I
_	13	was picked	for jury duty. I had to appear for jury duty.
	14	Ą.	You had to what?
	15	A	I had to appear for jury duty. I took the
-	16	summer off.	,
	17		They could get help during the summer but I
	18	planned to	go back to work when school opened.
	19	Q	Where do you work?
	20	A	At the Hickory Hot Coffee Shop in Pico Rivera.
	21	Q	Is there anyone else who could take care of your
	2,2	12-year-old	daughter if you were away?
	23	A	Well, no, the only relatives we have out here
	24	is my marri	ed daughter.
	2 5	ବ	Your husband is employed?
	26	A	Yes, he is.
ľ	,	सार्वक 🗸	وبمستوفيته منوفيته بالمراجع بالمراجع المراجع

MR. FITZGERALD: I will offer to stipulate, your 5a4 1 Honor. 2 MR. SHINN: So stipulated, your Honor. 3 MR. HUGHES: So stipulated, your Honor. 4 MR. KANAREK: So stipulated, your Honor. 5 MR. STOVITZ: So stipulated. 6 THE COURT: Then you will be excused. Mrs. Horn. 7 Will you refrain from discussing what has 8 been said in here with anyone? 9 MRS. HORN: Yes, I will. 10 THE COURT: All right, thank you. 11 MR. FITZGERALD: Do you stipulate, Mr. Kanarek? 12 MR. KANAREK: I am sorry, I did not hear the last 13 statement. MR. FITZGERALD: I actually asked counsel if he 15 stipulated. 16 MR. KANAREK: I was speaking with Mr. Manson and I 17 did not hear the last bit of colloguy. 18 THE COURT: I don't know what you're talking about. 19 MR. STOVITZ: The Court asked if all parties 20 stipulated. 21 MR. KANAREK: I said yes previously. Is this a 22 different stipulation or a repeat? 23 THE COURT: I don't know what you're talking about. MR. KANAREK: I already had said yes, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: I wasn't questioning you; it was clear in 26

	,	
د5a.5	1	my mind. I heard you say it.
	2	MR. KANAREK: Very well.
3	3	(A prospective alternate juror enters the room.)
	4	THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.
	5	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate
	6	juror is Herschel Watson, H-e-r-s-c-h-e-1, W-a-t-s-o-n.
	7	·
	8	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. HERSCHEL WATSON
	9	BY THE COURT:
	10	Q That is not Frank S. Watson?
	11	A No.
	12	Q I guess we have another juror by that name.
	13	You were not one of those persons who stood up
	14	and gave your name when I asked if there was anyone who
	15	could not be fair and impartial?
	16	A No. I wasn t.
•	17	Q All right. If you were selected as an
	18	alternate juror, Mr. Watson, would you be able to serve?
	19.	A I don't see how I could.
	20	I have a little business here in Hollywood.
	21	I cannot get away.
	22	I have to be there once or twice a week at
	23	least.
	24	Q Is this a business that you personally own?
•	25	A Yes, yes, that's it.
	26	Q Is there anyone that runs it for you?

	A There is a fellow I have there now, but he canno
1	be there on the weekends, you know, and sometimes nearly eve
2	day, it's a one-man operation.
3	Q You actually replace him on the weekends and
4	work there?
5	A Well, it's a garage; he is a mechanic and he
6	can be there a little while and he has another job at a
7	filling station. He cannot be there all the time so I have
8	
9	to check on it.
10	Q It is something that you could not do by
11	telephone?
12	A No, I could not.
13	Q Are you asking to be excused because of your
14	business problem?
1 5	A Yes. It would cost me quite a bit of money if
16	I had to hire someone to be there.
17	MR. FITZGERALD: I offer to stipulate.
18	MR. KANAREK: Join.
19	MR. HUGHES: Join.
20	MR. SHINN: Join.
	MR. STOVITZ: Join, your Honor.
21 .	THE COURT: You will be excused, Mr. Watson.
22	Will you refrain from discussing with anyone
23	what has been said in here?
24	MR. WATSON: Yes.
25	THE COURT: Very well, thank you.
26	(Mr. Watson leaves the chambers of the court.)

(A prospective alternate juror enters the 1 chambers of the court:) 2 THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir. 3 THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate 4 juror is Joseph A. Dilibert. J-o-s-e-p-h, D-i-l-i-b-e-r-t. 5 6 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF JOSEPH A. DILIBERT 7 BY THE COURT: 8 Q Mr. Dilibert, if you were selected as an 9. alternate juror would you be able to serve? 10 Well, I am a junior high school counsellor; I 11 A start working the 1st of September, actually, in my school. 12 Q 13 Are you employed by the Los Angeles City Schools? Α No, Burbank School District. 14 Q On a salary basis? 15 16 A Yes, a yearly contract basis, ten months. I 17 agreed to be on jury duty a year and a half ago, and they 18 offered me the opportunity to do it during the summer when 19 I was off. 20 Q. Well, the attorneys have estimated this case may 21 take three to five months to try. 22 Α Yes, sir. 23 Q. Actually I think it will be closer to three than 24 five, but no one knows for sure. If you were selected as an 25 alternate juror your compensation would continue as far as 26 you know?

A I don't think so.

Q Well, I believe we now have on our jury at least one person, possibly two, who are with the Los Angeles Board of Education in various capacities, and there is no problem as far as they are concerned. Their compensation continues.

A Well, that may be. I really have no way of knowing. I don't know of anyone who has been on jury duty.

I realize this might work some sort of a hardship on somebody. You undoubtedly would have to be replaced, and so on, but that does not necessarily constitute
a ground for being excused.

Is this something you can determine between now and tomorrow morning?

A I don't really know. Generally speaking the only way I can do it would be to check with the superintendent's office.

Somewhere around 4:00 o'clock they close up shop for the evening so I don't know whom I can check with.

Q Perhaps you can place a phone call here from the court within the next few minutes.

A That is possible.

Q Let me ask you some other questions then: Apart from that, is there any reason why you would be unable to serve?

A Well, I have five youngsters ranging from ages

1	13 to 2.
2	I think that would present a hardship to my
3	wife particularly.
4	Q Is she employed outside of the house?
5	A No.
6	Q She stays home and takes care of the children?
7	A I'm afraid so.
8	Q Do you think you might find yourself worrying
.9	about too many things on the outside rather than concen-
10	trating on the evidence in the case?
11	A She may want to switch places with me halfway
12	through.
13	Q Are you asking to be excused?
14	A. On the basis of the amount of time, yes, sir,
15	I feel for that reason primarily, I think it is a hardship.
16	MR. FITZGERALD: There will be no stipulation, your
17	Honor.
18	Q BY THE COURT: Have you formed any opinion
19	about this case, Mr. Dilibert, or about the guilt or
20	innocence of any of the defendants?
21	A No, I don't think so, your Honor.
2,2	Q Have you followed this case in the newspapers
23	and on TV, made any conscious effort to follow it?
24	A Not particularly. I have been aware of it
25	obviously.
26	Q Do you read any newspaper on a daily basis?

1	No. of the second secon
1	A yes, the Times.
2	Q Have you ever read or heard anything which
3	appeared to be a description by someone who was either an
4	eye witness to or a participant in any of the alleged
5	killings?
6	A I believe I did when the arrests were first
7	made.
8 .	Q Do you think that you at that time read some
9	statement that was something more than just a reporter's
1Ò	description of the fact that the defendants had been
11	arrested and charged with the offenses?
12	A I think it was a rather detailed account by one
13	of the defendants.
14	Q Which one, do you remember?
15	A No.
16	Q Was it Mr. Manson?
17	A No, no, one of the girls.
18	Q Do you know the names of the girls?
19	There are Leslie Van Houten, Susan Atkins and
20	Patricia Krenwinkel.
21	A It seems to me as if it was Susan Atkins.
22	Q And is this something you think you read in the
23	Times?
24	A I think so.
25	Q What is your recollection of what you read? I
26	know you may not be able to remember the details, but what

was it all about, what was she talking about? It seems to me as though it was an account of the activities.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

	· ·
16-1 1	Q What do you mean by the activities?
2	A At the Tate household.
3.	Q What is that?
·4	A At the Tate home.
5	Q In other words, activities at the time of
6	the alleged killings; is that right?
. 7	A Yes.
Š ·	Q And did you gather from this account that
9	whoever it was that was relating the account had been
10	there at the time?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And was describing it first hand?
13	A Yes, I think so.
14	Q. And also was describing who else was present
15	with her at that time?
16	A Yes.
17	THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald?
18	MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?
20	MR. HUGHES: No questions.
21	MR. SHINN: No questions.
22	MR. KANAREK: No questions.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz?
24:	MR. STOVITZ: No questions at this time.
25	If the challenge is allowed, we will have
26	no further questions.

THEECOURT: I will ask you to go back into the courtroom, Mr. Dilibert.

Will you refrain from discussing with anyone what has been said in here?

MR. DILIBERT: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Whereupon Mr. Dilibert leaves the court's chambers.)

MR. FITZGERALD: There will be a challenge for cause, exposure to prejudicial pretrial publicity, actual bias.

MR. SHINN: Join.

MR. HUGHES: Join in the challenge.

MR. KANAREK: Join.

MR. STOVITZ: Submit it.

THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed. Mr. Dilibert will be excused for cause.

Are you trying to say something, Mr. Kanarek?
MR. KANAREK: I am joining in the challenge.

I was going to suggest to the Court, your Honor mentioned something about making a phone call before 4:00, it is now five minutes of 4:00; but it is academic now.

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

26

23

24

25

16-3 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 1 MR. DAUT: Good afternoon. 2 The name of the prospective alternate THE CLERK: 3 juror is Kenneth Daut, Jr.; K-e-n-n-e-t-h, D-a-u-t, Jr. 5 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DAUT 6 BY THE COURT: 7 How you pronounce that, sir? Q 8 À Daut. 9 Mr. Daut, if you were selected as an alternate 10 juror in this case, would you be able to serve? 11 Yes. A 12 Q All right, sir. 13 I am going to ask you the question regarding 14 the death penalty that I put to the other prospective 15 jurors. 16 Yes, sir. 17 Do you entertain such conscientious opinions 18 regarding the death penalty that you would be unable 19 to make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt 20 regardless of the evidence in the case? 21 Á No. 22 Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would automatically 24 refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the 26 case?

Ļ	b	-	4

1

4

5

6

8

9

10 · · 11

. ;12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425.

26

A No.

Q On the other hand, would you always vote to impose the death penalty in every case without regard to the evidence?

A Not necessarily.

Q Are you saying then, sir, that you would be willing to listen to all the evidence in the case and then make up your mind?

A Yes.

As to which penalty would be appropriate in that case?

A Yes. I'd have to hear all of the arguments before I would make a decision.

Q And the answer to my last question was yes?

A Yes.

Q You will have to speak up so the reporter can take down what you are saying and all the attorneys and parties can hear you.

A Yes, sir.

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

A No, sir.

Q Do you read a newspaper on a daily basis?

A I have been up until the last week in June when I went on a vacation, and after vacation I came on jury duty. I usually take a morning paper at work, and

16- X 5 ₁	I haven't been back to work, so I haven't read a paper.
2	Q What paper do you usually read?
3	A The Times.
4 .	Q Have you made any conscious effort over
5	the past months to follow this particular case in the
, '6 ·	newspaper?
, 7	A No. 40 Company
8	Q Or on TV?
9·	A I have seen it in the headlines. You would
10.	have to be blind to say you didn't. But I haven't made
11	any conscious effort to follow it.
12	Q All right.
i3	Now, have you ever read or heard anything
14	which appeared to be a description by someone who was
15	either an eyewitness or a participant in any of the
16	alleged killings?
16a fls. 17	A No, sir.
. 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
. 26	

	1	į,
16a-1	1	Q Have you ever read or heard anything which
i.	2 ·	appeared to be a statement being made by any of the
	3	defendants about anything?
•	4	A No, sir.
	5	Q Do you know of any reason why you could not
	6	be fair and impartial?
	7	A No.
	8	Q To both sides?
	9.	A Yes.
	10	I could be fair and impartial to both sides
	11	listening to the evidence presented.
	12	Q I told the panel when you came into the
	13	courtroom that in every criminal case a defendant is
	14	presumed to be innocent.
	15 .	A Yes.
	Ì6	Q Are you willing to give the defendants the
	17.	benefit of that presumption of innocence?
	18.	A Yes, sir.
	19	Q And do you believe sincerely that you can do
	20	so?
	21	A Yes, sir.
	22	Q If the People are able to prove guilt beyond
	23	a reasonable doubt, are you willing and would you then
	24	vote a verdict of guilty?
	25	A Yes. Just on a reasonable doubt. I mean
	26	Q If they prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

16a-2	1	. . .	Right.
_,	2	Q	Which is the burden that they have
	ż	A	Yes.
	4	Q	under the law.
	5	A	Yes. Then I would be able to make a
	Ġ	decision, ye	s.
	7	Q	In other words, if they prove their guilt
	8	as required	by law, you would so vote in your verdict;
	9	is that righ	t?
•	10	. A	Yes, sir.
	11 ;	Q	On the other hand, Mr. Daut, if the People
	12	were unable	to prove the guilt of any defendant beyond
	13.	a reasonable	doubt, would you then be willing and would
	14	you vote for	an acquittal?
	15	A :	Either that or not guilty, whichever is
	16	correct.	
	17	Q	Those terms are synonomous.
•	18		Actually, your verdict would be not guilty.
	19.	A	Yes.
	20	Q.	In other words, you don't have any mental
	21	difficulty w	ith either of those concepts?
	22	A . :	No, sir.
	23	Q	Do you think that you could put aside in
	24	your mind ev	erything you may have read or heard about
	2 5 ′	the case and	decide the case solely on the basis of
	26	the evidence	that comes in during the trial?

1	A Yes, sir, I think I could.
2	Q Do you have any question about it?
3 .	A No, sir.
4	THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald?
5	MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.
6	
7	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DAUT
8	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
9.	Q As just the man in the street, or a layman,
10	do you have any opinion as to who killed Sharon Tate
11	and those other people?
12	A Not really. I mean, I have seen the
13	headlines, that is about it. But, I mean, this case is
14	still going to be based on the facts.
15	The way I look at it, the People that are
16	on trial here are innocent until they are proven
17	guilty, and that is it.
18	Q Do you think that because they are charged
19	they are going to have to actually prove to you that
20	they are innocent, rather than the prosecution having
21	to prove that they are guilty?
22	A I don't quite follow you.
23	Q Did the headlines you read seem to indicate
24	to you that these defendants were guilty?
25	A Well, it seemed to indicate that they were
26	involved in it.

1	Q Would they have to prove to you that they weren't
2	involved?
3	A No. Because that would be contrary. I mean,
4	actually, they are innocent until they are proven guilty.
5	What you are saying is the opposite way around.
6	No, they wouldn't have to prove their innocence.
7	Q Well, sometimes people come into court, and
8	Judges tell them what the law is, that somebody is presumed
9	to be innocent, but that is contrary to what a juror believes
10	in his mind, and I am just asking you what you believe in
11	your mind.
12	A Well, I don't have any opinion whether they are
13 .	innocent or guilty. That is all.
14	I haven't made up my mind, you know. I'd
15	have to take it straight from the facts as presented whether
16	they are innocent or believe they are guilty.
17	MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. Thank you.
18	I have nothing further.
19 [.]	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?
20	MR. HUGHES: Yes, your Honor.
21	
22	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. HUGHES:
24	Q Mr. Daut, where do you live? What part of town?
25	A West Los Angeles.
26	Q I see.

:	
.1:	And what sort of work do you do?
2	You said you were laid off?
3 .	A No.
4	Q No?
5	You were doing some work and then you came to
6 · ·	jury duty?
16b fls.7	A I was on vacation.
· 8 :	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13.	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	· ·
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25.	
26	

	1	
16B-1	1	Q What sort of work do you normally do?
	.2	A I work for the State Division of Highways.
	3	Q What sort of job is that?
	4.	A I am in the Office Engineer's section and
	5	we advertise contracts and open bids for the contracts.
	6	MR. HUGHES: I see.
	7	Thank you. No further questions.
	. 8	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn, any questions?
	. 9)	MR. SHINN: Yes.
•	10	
	' ii	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DAUT
	12	BY MR. SHINN:
,	13	Q Mr. Daut, did you read anything about this case
	14	in magazines?
	15	A No.
: •	16	Q All the information you gathered was from the
:	17	newspapers?
	18	A Just the headlines, because I don't even bother
	19	reading the whole thing. I usually don't follow this kind
	´ '20.	of thing.
ļ.	21	I usually like to read the world situation and
ī	22	the stock market reports and things of that nature.
	28	Q How about television, radio?
	24	A I haven't watched a TV news thing for so long
	25	I couldn't even figure it, because I figure, really, a lot
<u>'</u>	26	of the W news reporters that are even remorting would

1	events or local political events are slanted one way or
2	the other.
3	Q In other words, you don't recall any particular
4	facts about this case?
5	A No, sir.
6	Q How about the victims? Do you know who the
7	victims were?
8	A No-
9	Q Do you know how they died?
10	A Well, the paper said that they were murdered.
11 ·	That is all that I know.
12	Q And you don't know the names of the defendants?
1,3	A Well, I know that he is Charles Mason; isn't
14	that it?
15	Q Manson.
16	A Manson. That is my knowledge.
17	Q Do you know the name of any of the girls
18	involved?
19	A Just from the way they read them off in the
2 0·	report. One is Van Houten.
.21	Q Yes. But before coming to court, did you
22	know their names?
23	A No.
24	Q Do you know what area these homicides occurred
25	in?
26	A No.

16b2

Q. You never discussed this with your family or 16b3 1 your friends or your club members? 2 A 3 NO. The only thing I discussed with my wife was if 4 I was on it would she be able, you know, to run the show at 5 home while I was on the jury. 6 And she said yes, that wouldn't be any problem. 7 I don't have much to say about how the house is 8 run anyway, if you want to be truthful about it. 9 10 THE COURT: You may not have any when you get back. Q 11 MR. SHINN: Did you hear of Mr. Kanarek before 12 coming to court? 13 Α No. 14 You never heard the name Mr. Kanarek? 15 A No. 16 SHINN: Thank you. Okay, thank you very much. MŔ. 17 MR. DAUT: Is that all? 18 ^½ THE COURT: Pardon? 19 MR. DAUT: Anything else? 20 THE COURT: Any other questions, gentlemen? 21 MR. STOVITZ: May we just ask a general question? 22 I don't know whether Mr. Shinn is through. THE COURT: 23 Yes, I am through. MR. SHINN: 24 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek? 25 MR. KANAREK: No questions. 26 THE COURT: All right.

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

Q sometimes a juror feels more comfortable telling us things about himself here in chambers rather than out in front where the other jurors and spectators can hear.

If you were in our position as the prosecutor, or defense attorneys in this case, and knowing what you know about your background, is there anything you care to volunteer so that we can make an intelligent choice as to whether or not you would be fair to both sides?

A No. I don't think there is anything.

	, 14	4337
		1 1 1 1
&C-1,	1	Q You have no brothers that are police officers?
	2	A I don't have any brothers or sisters.
	3.	Q You don't have brothers or sisters?
	4	A No.
	` 5	Q How long have you lived in Los Angeles?
•	(6 \	A Well, in the area, in the South Bay in the
	7	Southwest area, 25 years, I guess.
	8	Q And you have no young children at home?
	. 19.	A Yes. Three.
	10	Q Three young children at home?
,	11	A Well, they are not young. The oldest one is
	1 2	18, and he works down in Stanton, California.
	13	Q And you tell us that your wife lets you make
	14	the important decisions as to whether we should sell jets
	15	to Israel and she runs the house; is that right?
	16	A Yes, that is it.
	1,7	MR. STOVITZ: We have no further questions.
	18 [.]	THE COURT: All right.
	19	i will ask you to go out into the courtroom
	20	again, Mr. Daut, and would you refrain from discussing with
	21	anyone what has been said in here?
	22	MR. DAUT: All right.
	23	THE COURT: Thank you.
	.24	(Whereupon, Mr. Daut leaves the court's
	:25	chambers.)
	26	THE COURT: Anything, gentlemen, before we go back out

again and resume the voir dire in court? 1 MR. FITZGERALD: No. 2 MR. STOVITZ: No. 3 THE COURT: All right. 4 (Whereupon, the following proceedings occurred 5 in open court, all defendants, counsel, jury and prospective 6 alternate jurors being present:) 7 THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present. 8 All the jurors are in the jury box. 9 Any further examination, Mr. Fitzgerald? 10 MR. FITZGERALD: We will pass this prospective 11 alternate juror for cause. 12 THE COURT: Very well. 13 Mr. Hughes? 14 MR. HUGHES: I would also pass this prospective 15 alternate juror for cause, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Shinn? 17 MR. SHINN: Pass for cause, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek? 19 MR. KANAREK: We accept the six prospective alternates. 20 your Honor. 21 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Stovitz? 22 Thank you. 23 MR. STOVITZ: 24 25 26

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

Q Mr. Daut, if you continue to occupy that seat in this jury, sir, you understand that even though you are an alternate you will be one of the most important jurers we have.

The reason for that is that you will be the furthest away from the witness that testifies, and if you can't hear, you raise your hand, and you will be helping the other jurors.

Will you do that for us?

A Yes.

Now, our apologies to some of the jurors that have been here three or four weeks, but we still have a few questions to ask you.

Did you hear all the questions that we asked the other jurors two days ago when you first came into this courtroom?

A I think I did.

Q If each and every one of those questions were asked of you, would your answers be the same?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you belong to any organization whatsoever that has as one of its purposes the suppression of the death penalty?

A No. sir.

1.6D

Q Can you envision a situation where, if the facts warranted it and if a female defendant was found guilty of first-degree murder, you could vote for the death penalty?

À Yes, sir.

Q Can you envision a situation, if the facts warranted it and the defendant was convicted of first-degree murder on a conspiracy theory, even though he did not himself kill a human being, that you could vote for the death penalty for that type of individual?

A Yes, sir.

16d-1 Q All right. Now, do you understand the illustration on 2 circumstantial evidence, do you not? 3 A Yes. 4 Would you require the prosecution to prove 5 its case by direct evidence only? 6 Α No. 7 And in the event that the prosecution produces 8 direct and circumstantial evidence, do you have a frame of 9 mind that you must have at least one eyewitness to a fact 10 before you are convinced of that fact? 11 À No. sir. 12 . Now, sir, again thinking about all those 13 questions we asked the other jurors, asking yourself those 14 questions, if you were in our position and all you wanted 15 16 were 12 fair-minded jurors, would you choose somebody in 17 your frame of mind? 18 Yes, sir. MR. STOVITZ: Thank you very much. 19 20 People pass for cause, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, you may exercise a 22 peremptory challenge if you care to. MR. FITZGERALD: Patricia Krenwinkel will accept 24 the alternates. 25 MR. HUGHES: Leslie Van Houten will accept the

26

alternates.

MR. SHINN: Miss Atkins accepts the alternates, your 16d-2 1 Honor. 2 MR. KANAREK: We accept the alternates, your Honor. 3. MR. BUGLIOSI: The People thank and excuse Miss 4 Broome, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Broome. You are excused. 6 We will adjourn, ladies and gentlemen, at 7 this time, until tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock. 8 Do not converse among yourselves or with 9 anyone else on any subject relating to this case, nor 10 form or express any opinions regarding the case until it 11 is finally submitted to you. 12 Do not read, watch or listen to any news 13 reports regarding the case so long as you are connected 14 with the case. 15 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. 16 (Whereupon at 4:13 o'clock p.m. the court 1.7 was in recess.) 30 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

Cielo Drive.com ARCHIVES

Tuesday.	July	21.	1970	VOLUME 25	Pages	4343 -	4468
racouay,	Oury	و .د. س	1710	A CTIOTITE -	T 0000	-1-W-E-M	1 7 4 4

	ער או דא די אין אין די
1 2	<u>INDEX</u> VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
3	PROSPECTIVE JURORS: COURT FITZGERALD HUGHES SHINN PEOPLE
4	SCHNEIDER, Alex 4344 4346 4347
5	DOUGLASS, Robert R. 4356 4364 4369 4367 4369 4393
6	BROWN, Mary Jane 4374
7 8	ELLIS, John N. 4377 4382 4384 4385 4390 4389
9	4397
0	
1	
2	·
3	
4	
5	
6	
.7	
8	
9	
0	
1	
2	
3	
4 5	
	· ·
26	

1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, JULY 21, 1970
2	9:07 o'clock a.m.
3	Ann spen use top
4	(The following proceedings occurred in
5	chambers, all defendants and counsel present:)
6	THE COURT: All parties and counsel are present.
7	We have a note from Mr. Alex Schneider,
8	who is sitting in seat No. 2 as a prospective alternate
9.	juror which reads as follows:
10	"To the Court: I would like to
11	be called back into chambers or challenged by
12	prosecutor on the death penalty for the three
13	young ladies. Signed, Alex Schneider."
14	And we also have an empty seat No. 1, Miss
15	Broome having been challenged yesterday, or excused on
16	a peremptory.
17	Do you wish to call in Mr. Schneider?
18	MR. STOVITZ: Yes, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: All right, let's call in Mr. Schneider.
20	(Mr. Alex Schneider enters the court's
21	chambers.)
22	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Schneider.
23	MR. SCHNEIDER: Good morning.
24	
2 5	
26	

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. ALEX SCHNEIDER 1 BY THE COURT: 2 I have your note, Mr. Schneider. Would you Q. 3 care --4 Do you want me to elaborate on it? A 5 Yes. Q. 6 It is about the girls. A 7 As I said, I was against the death penalty, 8 and since this weekend, my sons were over, my two 9 daughter-in-laws, plus my prospective one, and it has sort 10 of leaned on me pretty heavy about the death penalty on 11 the girls or life imprisonment. 12 Well, have you changed your opinions; is that 13 what you are saying? 14 Yes. 15 Changed it how? 16 Well, I was asked if I could go along, as a 17 group, when Miss Abbatecola and the other one was sitting 18 there, the three of us, and we mentioned that we were 19 against the death penalty; and also the question was 20 brought up whether we would, if in this case we could 21 go ahead and come in with a guilty verdict on the girls, 22 23 and I shook my head, "Yes." 24 And I have changed my mind since. 1 fls. 25

26

MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor. 1 THE COURT: Mr. Bugliosi? 2 MR. BUGLIOSI: I have a few questions. 3 THE COURT: All right. 5 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. SCHNEIDER . ∙6 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 7 Mr. Schneider, your opposition to the death 8: penalty, I take it, is of such a nature that you would 9 automatically refuse to impose the death penalty for 10 these three girls, is that correct? 11 12 Yes, sir. Do you think that your opposition to the 13 death penalty is of such a nature that it might cause 14 you to -- strike that -- it might tend to prevent you 15 16 from being completely impartial on the separate issue of 17 guilt or innocence as to these three defendants? Ĭ8⁻ A I am so much against the death penalty, and 19 especially in this case, I would be against it. 20 Now, I am talking about the separate issue 21 now, guilt as opposed to innocence. I am not talking 22 about the death penalty except indirectly I am, of 23 course. 24 What I want to know is, because you are 25 opposed to the death penalty do you think this would 26. prevent you from being totally impartial?

A Yes. 1 Totally fair on the issue of guilt and 2 innocence as to these defendants? 3 A Yes, sir. 4 You don't think you could be fair and Q. 5 impartial? 6 I don't think so. A 7 On the issue of guilt or innocence? Q 8 A No. 9 MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions. 10 THE COURT: All right, just so the record will be 11 absolutely clear, Mr. Schneider, I'm going to put the 12 same two questions to you that I put to you previously 13 regarding the death penalty. 14 15. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. SCHNEIDER (Resumed) 16 BY THE COURT: 17 Do you entertain such conscientious opinions 18 regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to 19 make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt 20 regardless of the evidence in the case? 21 A Yes. 22 Do you entertain such conscientious opinions Q 23 regarding the death penalty that you would automatically 24 refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in 25 26 the case?

1	
1	A Yes.
2	Q Do you have any doubt in your mind about
3	your answers to those questions?
4	A No, sir.
5 .	Q In other words, you have made up your mind
6	on that?
7	A Yes, sir.
8	Q As to those questions?
9	A Correct.
10	THE COURT: Any further questions?
11 -	MR. FITZGERALD: No.
12	MR. SHINN: No.
13	MR. HUGHES: No.
14	MR. KANAREK: No.
15	MR. BUGLIOSI: No.
16	THE COURT: All right, sir, thank you very much
17	for letting us know what your views are and I will ask
18	you to go back out into the courtroom.
19 .	MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
20	(Mr. Schneider leaves the chambers of the
21	court.)
22	MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, the People move to
28	excuse Mr. Schneider on dual grounds, both for cause,
24	implied bias and also Witherspoon.
25	Also actual bias under Section 1073,
26	second paragraph of the Penal Code.
	1

MR. KANAREK: Object, your Honor, on the grounds 1 that this is a subterfuge. 2 This is a way the juror has got the message 3 as to how to get out of jury service. 4 The statements that prefaced his turnabout 5 are indicative, as I say, they are circumstantial 6 evidence of what is really going on here and why there can never be a fair trial in this case. 8 The juror is judge and jury of whether he is 9. on the jury at all. 10 He is deliberately making these statements **11**· to the Court and we are being deprived of a fair jury 12 by this technique. 13 It is obvious --14 THE COURT: It may be obvious to you, Mr. Kanarek, 15 but it is not obvious to me. 16 MR. KANAREK: What I am saying, looking at his 17 previous answers --18 THE COURT: It looked to me that he meant exactly 19 20 what he said. He had a chance to reflect further and these 21 22 are his present views. I believe differently, your Honor, 23 MR. KANAREK: and I believe it is a denial of due process. 24 25 MR. HUGHES: I would join with Mr. Kanarek's 26 objection.

MR. FITZGERALD: We object on the grounds to exclude this juror would deprive the defendants of due process of the law and equal protection of the law.

THE COURT: In what respect?

MR. FITZGERALD: In respect to I don't feel the prosecution is entitled to challenge a juror simply because he will not impose the death penalty on young women.

I think actually under existing California law that is one of the considerations this juror may take into consideration in not exercising the death penalty.

I think it is soon going to be the law in this country that to exclude a juror from jury service because he won't impose the death penalty on young women is an absurdity that the courts are not going to tolerate much longer.

I just want this record to be clear that we are objecting on those grounds.

2-1

1 2

24.

I agree with Mr. Kanarek that when the juror says he can't be fair and impartial on guilt or innocence,

I think, indeed, that is a subterfuge. I will give the
juror the benefit of the doubt on the issue of the death
penalty. He may have genuinely and conscientiously had
some soul searching over the weekend in regard to this matter.

But I am not willing to accept the juror's representation
that he couldn't be fair on the guilt or innocence.

MR. BUGLIOSI: For the record, your Honor, I would like to make one statement quoting from the Witherspoon case, since the defense has raised this issue, if I can find it.

(Pause.)

MR. HUGHES: In the meantime, I would join with Mr. Fitzgerald's objection.

MR. SHINN: Join, too.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Quoting from Witherspoon vs. Illinois, 36 LW 4504 -- Law Week, 4504, Page 4507.

The Court in the footnote says this:

The most that can be considered of a venireman in this regard is that he be willing to
consider all of the penalties provided by
State law and that he not be irrevocably
committed before the trial has begun to vote
against the penalty of death regardless of
the facts and circumstances that might emerge

1 2

17:

Ž4,

"in the course of the proceedings.

"If a prospective juror tells the court in advance that he would never vote for the death penalty for a particular defendant, he is not willing to consider all of the penalties provided by State law."

He is telling the court in advance that he will not consider both penalties, that he has already made up his mind. And if this type of juror were permitted to sit, this would be stipulating to a minimum of a hung jury; there could never be anything more so far as the prosecution is concerned than a hung jury.

I think this language in Witherspoon clearly indicates that excusing this juror for cause on the ground that he would never vote a death penalty against a female defendant is proper, citing that language.

⊉A-1

2

1.

3 4

5

6

7

.9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

26

THE COURT: Of course, his answers to my last questions were not limited.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, that 's right. The Court went beyond that.

THE COURT: That is why I asked him again.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed.

Mr. Schneider will be excused for cause.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, before the next juror comes in, I have a problem in connection with Mr. Manson in the jail, your Honor.

Your Honor, I believe, was going to do something in connection with the mail. Your Honor was going to look into that, I believe, the fact that they were holding Mr. Manson's mail.

THE COURT: Did you find out anything, Mr. Murray?
THE BAILIFF: As of Friday he had received no mail.

Any mail that he had received was turned over to him as of Friday.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I move for an evidentiary hearing in connection with Mr. Manson's custody in the jail.

I was up there last night speaking with him, and the statements about what is contraband, Mr. Manson's writings and the scrutiny that the jail gives to these is clearly violating his right to a fair trial.

THE COURT: As I indicated to you earlier, Mr. Kanarek

1

2

4

5

6.

7 . 8

9

10

11[.] 12

13

14

15 16

1Ť

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

- 26

if you wish to raise some collateral matter such as this, you will have to file a written motion supported with an affidavit or a declaration alleging what the facts are, citing some authority in support of it, and any exhibit that you care to, and then it will be taken up in the regular course.

THE CLERK: How many do you wish me to order in the next panel, your Honor?

THE COURT: Do you have any feeling on that? We have seven left.

MR. STOVITZ: There are seven left, yes, but I think two of the seven raised their hands to say they had a frame of mind that they couldn't sit. Now, that means that there is actually five left.

I would just bring over 24, your Honor. I think we could do well with 24.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There is an outside chance that we might make it with this panel, your Honor, but I would assume that we are going to go beyond this panel.

THE COURT: Let's bring over 30.

THE CLERK: Yes, sir.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I have one other point.

I would like this record to reveal that the Sheriff's personnel make the outstanding statement that Mr. Manson's own words are contraband in connection with this --

THE COURT: You can put this in your motion papers, Mr. Kanarek, along with everything else. MR'. KANAREK: They said they were holding his mail, your Honor. THE COURT: You just heard Mr. Murray indicate that he has received everything that has come in for him. All right, let's proceed. 16`

2в

2b-1(Whereupon a prospective alternate juror entered the court's chambers.) 2 THE COURT: Good morning, sir. 3 MR. DOUGLASS: Good morning, sir. 4 THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate 5 juror is Robert R. Douglass; R-o-b-e-r-t, D-o-u-g-1-a-s-s. 6 Is this seat No. 1 or 2, your Honor? 7 THE COURT: 1. 8 9 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DOUGLASS 10 BY THE COURT: 11 Mr. Douglass, if you were selected as an Q 12 alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve? 13 I feel no as far as my work goes. 14 Q. For whom are you employed? 15 Α 16 I am employed with the Government, the Army 17 Corps of Engineers, but I feel that a long stay or a stay of a long duration would be something that I would 18 not be able to take. 19 20 It is not a financial hardship, but I do know that my employer would not like to have me gone 21 22 for three to six months. 23 Well, that is probably true of everyone. Q. 24 A Yes, sir. 25 But I don't see how it could be a hardship 26 in this case.

2b-2

1

2

3

Š

.6 7

8

9

10

14 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

A Well, it is not a financial hardship, I agree to that.

I think that they don't want me to be on. Then was some question as to whether I should even serve the month's time.

I have some projects in process.

Q Well, they don't make the determination on that, sir.

All right.

Anything else? Any other reason why you cannot serve, Mr. Douglass?

A Well, I don't particularly want to serve and be tied up for three to six months as far as being a family man, although I would like to be a good upstanding citizen.

If I have to do it, I will do it, but on that basis.

- Q Well, that is the only basis upon which you have been called.
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q I am going to ask you the same questions regarding the death penalty that I put to the other prospective jurors, Mr. Douglass.
 - A All right.
- Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to

1	make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt
2	regardless of the evidence in the case?
3	A I don't believe so.
4	Q The answer is no?
5 .	A I think I can be fair, yes, make an impartial
6	decision.
7	Q Would you keep your voice up, please, Mr.
8.	Douglass, so that everyone can hear you?
9	A Yes, sir.
10	Q Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
11	regarding the death penalty that you would automatically
12	refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence in the
13	case?
14	A No, sir.
15	Q On the other hand, would you automatically
16	vote to impose it in every case without regard to the
17	evidence?
18	A No, sir.
19	Q In other words, you would be willing to listen
20	to the evidence and then make your decision with respect
21	to the penalty, in case you get to the penalty phase; is
22	that right?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Have you lived in Los Angeles County
25	continuously since last August?
26	A Yes, sir.
	1

	1	Q Have you made any conscious effort to follow
<u> </u>	2 .	this case in the newspapers or on TV or radio?
	3.	A No, not to follow this case.
3 fls.	4	
	.5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11 12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17.	
	18	
•	19	
	20	
	21	
	22 23	
	24	
	25.	
	26	

-T	1
•	
	Ž

Ą	Þο	you	read	any	daily	newspaper	on	a	regular
basis?									

A 'The Pasadena Star News.

Have you formed any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of any of the defendants?

A. No. I cannot say that I formed an opinion, but to be honest with myself, although I did stand up when you asked the question about maybe being biased, of course I had a little time to think out in the courtroom, and I think I could probably put myself in the right frame of rationals to make a fair decision in any event, whatever the outcome is.

Q Why did you stand up when I raised the question in the courtroom as to whether or not any of the jurors felt they could not be impartial?

A I tried to be honest with myself and I probably do have some prejudice against long hair and the hippie cult type, things that I admit to myself and notice, I am aware that I probably have these tendencies.

I don't particularly having them.

Q Well, of course my question was not directed to whether or not you like hippies or long hair, but whether or not you could be impartial in determining the guilt or innocence of these defendants.

A Well, my first thought was I probably could not, but like I say I have been sitting here for quite a while

	- 1	
,-2	1	and I ha
<u> </u>	2	Q
	3	A
	4.	Q
	5	other th
	6	the defe
	,7	Ą
	8	actually
	9	happened
	10	•
	11	you tend
	12	papers R
	13	Q
	1,4	Ā
•	15	Q
	16	A
	17	
•	18	factors
	19	others,
	20	Q
	21	concerni
	22	feeling
r	23	A.
	24	Q
	25	been arr

26

and I have had a lot of time to think.

Q Do you now believe that you can be impartial?

A Yes, I think I could.

Q Was your initial opinion based on anything other than the appearance or, say, the mode of living of the defendants?

A Well, I have read the papers when this actually had been going through the papers when it had happened.

Of course there is so much of it that goes on, you tend to get all the different things you read in the papers kind of mixed up together.

Q So much of what that goes on?

A Oh, murders and different --

Q You mean crime, generally?

A . Yes, crime in general.

This case was so long ago that pertinent factors that I read to this one are probably intermixed with others, reading of other crimes.

Q Was there anything in particular that you read concerning this crime that contributed to your initial feeling that you might not be able to be impartial?

A Not that I can state at the moment.

Q All right, you know that the defendants have been arrested and charged with the alleged offenses in this case?

ЗA

1

2

3

4

5.

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

145,

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

	Q.	Have	you :	ever	read	or	heard	any	statement	by
any	of the	se defe	ndan	ts on	any	sul	oject?			

A Not that I recall, not specifically.

Q If you were selected as a juror in this case do you believe that you would be able to give each of the defendants the benefit of the presumption of innocence?

A Yes.

Q And if the People failed to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to any defendant, would you be willing to and would you vote for an acquittal as to that defendant?

A Yes, sir.

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 to and would you vote a verdict of guilty in that event?

A Yes.

Q Do you think that you could put aside whatever you may have heard or learned about this case and decide the case solely on the basis of the evidence that comes in during the trial?

A Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

21

22

23

:24

1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DOUGLAS
2	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
3	Q Your first impression when you came into court
4	and you heard the name of the case, was that you could not
5 ,	be fair and impartial; is that correct?
6.	A Well, it was not a firm thing. I just had the
7	feeling that I might not be able to; there was some doubt as
8	to whether I should stand up or not, and I finally decided
9 (that I would stand up.
10	Q What was that opinion that you held at that time
11	based on?
12	A Well, I don't know if I can give you any firm
13	answer on that.
14	It is the complete background. I cannot
15	particularly pick out specific thing to say it was based on
16	this particular opinion.
17	Q Well, it was a result of what you had read,
18	heard and seen from media sources about this case and the
19	defendants, isn't that correct?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Was it anything in particular, any background
22	or history of any of the defendants?
23	A No, no.
24	Q It was their way of living?
25	A Well, I don't know if it is so much that.
26	I don't have a good rationale for laying out to

1	say why I made that decision, but at the time that is the
2	way I felt.
3	Q Was it an emotional reaction?
4	A Yes, you might say that.
5	Q And what sort of emotional reaction was it?
· 6	Was it anger or fear?
7	Are you afraid of these defendants or Mr. Manso
8	or the girls?
9	A. No.
10	Q Did you feel threatened by them?
11	A No. sir.
12	Q Was it disgust or distaste?
13	A Well, probably more along that line, yes.
14	Q Do you recall anything in particular did you
15	have any general impression of what you read, saw or heard
16	that gave you that feeling?
17	A Not that I can pin down.
18	Q I take it that you probably would not feel that
19	way about every defendant who was charged with a criminal
2 0	offense, would you?
21	A No. probably not.
22	Q It is these defendants, isn't it?
23	A Well, the whole case, and so on and, reading
24	in the past, being dragged into this not being dragged
25	in, but asked to do the duty on this thing, you know, I
26	feel it is not something that I like to do.

1	this case?
Ž	A No.
3	MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.
4	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?
5	MR. HUGHES: No questions.
6	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn.
7	
8	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DOUGLAS
,9 .	BY MR. SHINN:
10	Q Mr. Douglas, you read about this case in a
11	magazine or newspapers?
12	A Just newspaper, that is all.
13	Q How about a book?
14	A No books.
15	Q Paperback book?
16	A No books.
17:	Q Do you recall any names of the defendants before
18	coming to court?
19 20	A Well, Mr. Manson.
21.	Q How about the rest of the defendants?
22	A No, really the only name that I have heard was
23.	Mr. Manson.
24	Q You cannot recall either the first or last names
25	of the other defendants?
26	A Before I came here?
	Q Yes.

3B

1	A No, I could not.					
2	Q Do you know the name of the victims?					
3	A No. sir.					
4	Q Do you know the locality of where these homicide					
5	took place?					
6	A Not any more than I think it was over towards					
7	Hollywood, that area.					
8	Q Do you know how many victims there were?					
9,	A No.					
10_	Q Do you have any children?					
11	A Yes.					
12	Q And do you feel that because of the fact that					
13	these people live in a different type of environment than					
14	Yourself, do you feel because of that you may be prejudiced?					
15	A Well, I probably have some prejudices, if they					
16 ·	are recognized, you know, they would not enter into making					
17.	the decision.					
18	Q In other words, you feel that your subconscious					
19	mind may affect your position when it comes right down to					
20	whether they are guilty or innocent?					
21 .	A No, I think I can make a fair decision.					
22	Q Do you think there might be a chance of a little					
23	prejudice?					
24	A I don't know all right, there could be.					
25 .	Q I mean your subconscious mind may play tricks on					
26	You.					

1	A: I admit there may be.				
2	MR. SHINN: Nothing further.				
. 3	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek.				
4	MR. KANAREK: No questions.				
-5	MR. HUGHES: I do have a question.				
6					
7	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DOUGLAS				
. 8	BY MR. HUGHES:				
9.	Q Was your state of mind such the other day,				
10	sir, when you stood up, that at that time you would have				
11	required the defendants to prove their innocence rather than				
12	to you know				
13	Would you have assumed at that point that they				
14	were guilty and required them to prove their innocence?				
15.	A No, I would follow the fact that they are				
16 [.]	innocent until proven guilty.				
17	MR. HUGHES: Thank you.				
18	·				
19	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. DOUGLAS				
20	BY MR. STOVITZ:				
21	Q Mr. Douglas, what do you do for the United				
22	States Army?				
23	A I am a constructionist.				
24	Q Construction?				
25	A Yes.				
26	Q Do you work usually out in the field?				
	·				

1	A No. I work mainly in the office.				
2	I have traveled quite a bit, a couple of times				
3	a month, to Arizona and Nevada.				
4	Q Do you work with computers?				
5	A Not full time. I have experience with a pro-				
6	gram or two.				
7	Q Is your background that of engineering or that				
. 8	of accounting?				
9	A Engineering.				
10	Q And how many children do you have?				
11	A Two.				
12	Q Their ages?				
13	A 9 and 13.				
14	Q What part of town do you live in?				
15	A I live in Arcadia.				
16	Q And where do you work?				
17	A I work at the 300 North Los Angeles Federal				
18	Building downtown.				
19	Q And coming downtown here has not been too much				
20	of a chore for you?				
21	A It has been rather irritating since I have good				
22	hours and I have good traffic when I work, but when I come				
23`	in here it's a mess, and it is aggravating to have to do				
24	that when I know there are better ways to get in.				
25	Q Is this your first jury trial?				
26	A No.				

٧.

•	Q You have been a juror on other cases?					
1	A Well, I was two years ago, two and a half years					
2	ago, August of 167 I served jury duty and then I started					
3.	this tour on the 6th of this month.					
4	Q The 6th of July?					
. 5	A Yes.					
6	Q Now, about long hair, you are not prejudiced					
7	against people with long hair as such, are you?					
8 .	A No, no, I don't think so.					
9 .	Q You notice there is one alternate and one					
10 :	regular juror that has his hair a little longer than normal					
11 .	let's say, if your haircut is normal.					
12	You understand that?					
13	A Yes, I understand.					
1,4	Q All right, you are not going to be prejudiced					
15	against those people and avoid talking to them if selected					
16	on the jury, are you?					
17	À No.					
18	Q And style of living, you understand that some					
19	people do not have the 8 to 4, and 4 to 8 and 12 to 8 type					
20	of routine that you and I might have, you understand?					
21	A Yes.					
22.`	Q And you are not going to be prejudiced against					
23 ∙	any of these defendants if they don't have that style that					
24	you and I might have?					
25	A No.					
26	*** **** **** **** **** **** **** **** ****					

Q. 1 All right, now, you are the sole judge now. you know yourself better than anyone else, you have been 2 3 living with yourself some 40 years now --4 How old are you? Α 34. 5 Q. 6 All right, 34. 7 You have been living with yourself since 34 years now, and you know what influence the papers have had on you; 9 You know what influence the name of the case has. 10 You tell us if you were chosen as a juror would 11 you be able to promise and take an oath that you would be 12 fair and impartial to both sides and judge only the evidence? 13 Α Yes, sir. 14 Q You understand you would have to disregard 15 everything that you ever have heard or seen about this case 16 before today, would you do that? 17 A I would, yes. 18 Q Do you have any reasonable doubt that you could 19 not? 20 No, I don't think I have a reasonable doubt. 21 MR. STOVITZ: I have no further questions. 22 THE COURT: All right, I will ask you to go back into 23 the courtroom, Mr. Douglas, and will you refrain from dis-24 cussing with anyone what has been said in here this morning? 25 MR. DOUGLAS: Yes, sir. 26 THE COURT: Thank you.

1	(Mr. Douglas leaves the chambers of the court.)					
2	MR: FITZGERALD: Challenge the juror based on his					
3	exposure to prejudicial pretrial publicity.					
4	MR. STOVITZ: Oppose the challenge, your Honor.					
5	THE COURT: The challenge will be disallowed.					
6	(A prospective alternate juror enters the					
7	chambers.)					
8	THE COURT: Good morning.					
9 .	THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate					
10	juror is Mrs. Mary Jane Brown, M-a-r-y, J-a-n-e, B-r-o-w-n.					
11	·					
12	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS, MARY JANE BROWN					
13	BY THE COURT:					
14	Q Mrs. Brown, if you were selected as an					
15	alternate juror in this case would you be able to serve?					
16	A No, I don't believe I would.					
17	Q What is your situation?					
18	A Well, I don't believe in capital punishment.					
19	Q Well, I will get to that in a moment.					
20	Is there any extraneous reason other than your					
21	beliefs?					
22	A Well, I work.					
23	Q Who is your employer?					
24	A Pacific Telephone Company, and my mother is my					
2 5 ·	dependent, who is in her 80 s.					
.26	p.					

4-1	1	Q	Does she live with you?
À	2	A	Yes.
V	3.	Q	Is there anyone else living there?
	4	A	My son who attends Long Beach State.
	5	Q.	Your mother and your son are the sole occu-
	6	pants along	with you?
	7	A	Yes.
	8	Q	Is your mother able to get around all right?
	9	À	Well, she doesn't drive, of course, and she
	10	depends on	me.
	11	Q	She depends on you for what?
	12	A	Well, for groceries and taking her places.
خد	13	Q	All right.
	14		Now, I am going to ask you the same questions
	15	that I have	asked the other prospective jurors regarding
	16	the death p	enalty.
	17		Do you entertain such conscientious opinions
	18	regarding t	he death penalty that you would be unable
	19	to make an	impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt
•	20	regardless	of the evidence in the case?
	21	A ;	No. Not as to their guilt.
	22	Q ;	Would you keep your voice up, please, so
	23	everyone ca	n hear you.
	24 .	A	Yes, sir.
	25	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Not as to their guilt.
	26	Q	Do you entertain such conscientious opinions

regarding the death penalty that you would automatically 4-2 1 refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence? 2 Yes, I would. 3 Are you saying that you have now made up your Q. 4 mind irrevocably that under no circumstances would you 5 ever impose the death penalty? 6 A No. 7 Regardless of what the evidence shows? Q 8 Yes. A 9 Is this a belief that you have held for some Q 10 time? 11 Α Yes, it is. It has to do with my religious 12 background. 13 Is it a religious belief? Q 14 A Yes. 15 Any questions, Mr. Fitzgerald? THE COURT: 16 MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor. 17 MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor, 18 MR. SHINN: No questions, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek? 20 No questions, your Honor. MR. KANAREK: 21 Submit it, your Honor. MR. STOVITZ: 22 We will ask that the juror be excused for 23 cause. 24 THE COURT: All right, I will ask you to go back 25

into the courtroom, Mrs. Brown.

26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

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

MRS. BROWN: I surely will.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Whereupon Mrs. Brown leaves the Court's chambers.)

MR. FITZGERALD: We will oppose the challenge on due process and equal protection grounds.

MR. SHINN: Join.

MR. KANAREK: Join.

MR. HUGHES: Join.

THE COURT: You are making a challenge on what grounds?

MR. STOVITZ: 1074, Subdivision 8, that she is irrevocably opposed to the death penalty, and under Witherspoon vs. Illinois this is a proper ground for challenge.

THE COURT: The challenge will be allowed.

Mrs. Brown is excused for cause.

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

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. ELLIS: Good morning.

THE CLERK: The name of the prospective alternate juror is John N. Ellis; J-o-h-n, E-1-1-i-s.

22

23

24

25

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. ELLIS 1 2 BY THE COURT: 3 Mr. Ellis, if you were selected as an alternate juror in this case, would you be able to 5 serve? 6 A Yes, I think so. All right, sir. 7 Q. 8 I am going to ask you the same questions 9 I put to the other prospective jurors regarding the 10 death penalty. 11 A Okay. 12 Do you entertain such conscientious opinions 13 regarding the death penalty that you would be unable to 14 make an impartial decision as to any defendant's guilt 15 regardless of the evidence in the case? 16 17 Do you entertain such conscientious opinions 18 regarding the death penalty that you would automatically 19 refuse to impose it without regard to the evidence? 20 No. 21 On the other hand, would you always vote Q. 22. to impose the death penalty in every case regardless of 23 the evidence? 24 No. 25 I understand from your answers then, Mr. Ellis, 26 that you would be willing to listen to the evidence in

4-5 the case and then, if it became necessary for the jury to 1 decide the question of penalty, you would then make up 2 your mind; is that right? 3 A Right. 4 I mean, I believe in the death penalty. I 5 believe in capital punishment. 6 But you would not impose it automatically or --Q 7 A No. 8 -- refuse to impose it? Q. 9 A No. 10 Q You would first listen to --11 Α Yes. 12 -- all the evidence in the case --Q. 13 À Yes. 14 -- and then make up your mind; is that right? Q 15 A Yes. 16 Have you formed any opinion as to the guilt 17 or innocence of any of the defendants in this case? 18. No. I haven't. Α 19 Q What type of work do you do? 20 4a fls. 21 Telephone installer for General Telephone. A 22 was the same of the .23 24 25 ,26

a-1	1	Q Would you kee	ep your voice up, please,
	2	Mr. Ellis, so everyone ca	an hear you?
•	3	A Yes.	
	4 ~	Q; Do you read	a newspaper on a daily basis?
	75	A Yes, I read	the newspaper generally every day.
•	· 6	Q Which paper?	
	7	A The Times, t	he Los Angeles Times. Mostly the
	8	sports.	•
	9	Q Have you eve	r read or heard anything that
	10	appeared to be a descrip	tion by someone who was personally
•	11	present either as an eye	witness or as a participant in any
	12	of the alleged killings	in this case?
, ***	13	A No. I reall:	y haven't read too intensively about
	14.	this case other than	
	15	Q You haven't	made any effort to follow the
	16	case?	•
	17	A No.	
	18	Q In the news?	:
	19	A No.	
	20	Q Have you eve:	r read or heard of any statement
	21	by any of these defendan	ts about anything?
	22	A I probably ha	ave read I probably have read
	23	about it, but it hash it :	really stuck in my mind, I mean.
	24	Q When you say	you probably have read about it.
	25	what do you mean?	
	26	Mr. guadhlan	the thether or not been been and

read anything which appeared to you to be a statement 1 being made by one or more of the defendants about anything 2 at all, any subject? 3 I'd have to say yes, but I can't remember what 4 But I know I have read about certain things, statement. 5 you know. 6 Q Well, what? Can you remember? 7 It hasn't stuck to me, to my mind. It is just 8. a basic thing that I have read. 9 Can you remember what the subject was about? 10 Α Well, I remember when the defendants were 11 arrested. I just read the names, who was arrested, and that 12 was the extent of it. I mean, I didn't follow into it. 13 Q : Well, that is not exactly what I meant. That, 14 15 of course, was something written by a reporter --16 À Right: 17 -- or a writer for the newspaper. 18 Α Yes. Q. 19 What I was asking you was whether or not you 20, ever read anything or heard anything which appeared to be 21 something being said by one or more of the defendants 22 themselves. 23 I'd have to say no. 24 Now, you know, of course, that the defendants have been arrested and they have been charged with these 25 26 offenses and they are before the Court to stand trial: but

١ ١	
1	apart from those facts, do you know or have you heard
2	anything which causes you to believe that there is some
3	connection between the defendants and the offenses that
4	they are charged with?
5	A (Pause.)
6	Q Do you understand what I am saying?
7	A No. only that let's see in my mind, no.
8	I don't know that much about it, you know, myself.
9	And you read in the newspaper or you heard on
10	<u> </u>
11	A That is the only thing that I know.
12	Q that they have been accused of these offenses
13	A Right. That is the only knowledge that I have
14	is what I have heard on TV and the little bit that I have
15	read in the newspaper.
16	Q If you were selected as a juror, Mr. Ellis, do
17	you believe that you would be able to give each of the
18	defendants the benefit of the presumption of innocence?
19	That is, would you presume that the defendants are innocent
20	until their guilt was proved beyond a reasonable doubt?
21	A Yes.
22	Q And if the People failed to prove that guilt
23	beyond a reasonable doubt as to any defendant, would you
24	then vote for a verdict of not guilty as to that defendant?
25	A Yes, I would.
26	Q On the other hand, if the People were able to

prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to any defendant, 1 would you vote a verdict of guilty as to that defendant? 2 Α Yes, I would. 3 Q. Do you know of any reason why you could not be 4 fair and impartial? 5 A No. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald? 7 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you. 8 9 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. ELLIS 10 BY MR. FITZGERALD: 11 You said you believed in capital punishment. 12 What do you mean by that? 13 I believe this is the way the law is. 14. I don't know exactly. I believe this is what 15 the law says. I agree with it, until something better can 16 come. 17. My opinion is sort of what is the opinion of 18 19 some of the other people, that I am off and on the death penalty. 20 21 In other words, I don't think a person should be released after serving so many years in prison, and then be 22 released. I think if they have to go to prison for life, 23 24 that should be it. No parole at all. 25 And if it is not that way now, then I am for 26 the death penalty, until they can --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

22

23

24

25

26

In other words, if you felt that at some Q time during their lives defendants would be released from prison on parole, you would impose the death penalty?

> Α Yes, I think I would.

Now, if you were instructed by the judge that you were not to take into consideration the fact that they might ultimately be paroled or pardoned or released, do you think you could do that, or do you think --

Yes, I could.

You don't think you would have in the back of Q. your mind that they were going to be released or paroled?

> Α No.

If the law is that way, that is the way the That is the way I feel. Whatever the law says, law is. I don't question it. I mean, I do what the law says. This is my own personal opinion.

Now, there are some people who feel that if somebody is convicted of murder, that person ought to die automatically. If you kill somebody, they ought to be given the death penalty. And then, as you know, probably there are people who say there are people who should never receive the death penalty under any circumstances.

Now, I take it you don't feel either way?

A No, I don't. I feel just about neutral.

I don't feel that a person should automatically die even if they have committed murder. I don't feel

/L 2	
4ъ-2	1
	2
	3
	4
	.5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11,
	12
_	13
	14
	15.
	16
	17
	1,8
	19
•	20
	21
	. 22
	23 [.]
	24

26

that way at all either.

Q And you think you could acquit these defendants if you had a reasonable doubt?

A If I had a reasonable doubt?

Q Yes.

A Yes, I could.

MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.

MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?

MR. SHINN: Yes.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHINN:

Q Sir, you understand that you have the sole discretion; I mean, when it comes to the penalty phase, that you have the sole discretion whether it is life or death.

Do you understand that?

A Yes.

Q I mean, the Court, the Judge, doesn't instruct you that under certain circumstances you are supposed to automatically vote for the death penalty, and under certain circumstances you are supposed to automatically vote for the life penalty. It is up to you.

A Right.

Q You understand that?

b-3	1,	A Yes.
	2	Q Either life or death.
	3	A Yes.
	4	MR. SHINN: I have nothing further.
	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 MR. ELLIS
	11	BY MR. STOVITZ:
	12	Q Mr. Ellis, are you married, sir?
	13	A No, I am not.
	14	Q I take it, then, there are no children that
	15	are going to be depending upon you?
•	16	A No, not that I know of.
	17	Q Many times in chambers here jurors feel
	18	freer to tell us things personal to them that they would
;	19	be, well, not ashamed of, but they would be reluctant
.:	20	to tell us out in open court.
:	2 1	Is there anything about your personal life
:	22	that you would want to tell us here in chambers?
	23	A No, I can't think of any.
:	24	Q You don't have any outstanding traffic
	25	tickets that haven't been paid yet?
3	26	A Definitely not

4b-4	Q How long have you been working for the
1	
2	Telephone Company?
3	A Two and a half years.
4	Q Two and a half years?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Now, you say you work in installation; is
7	that right?
8	A - Yes, sir.
9	Q Do you know the jurors are going to be
10	sequestered if and when we choose the jury? Do you know
iì	what that means?
12	A That means locked up?
13	Q Yes.
14	A Right.
15	THE COURT: Not literally. It means that instead
16	of going home at night you will go to a hotel. Your
17	door will not be padlocked.
18	MR. ELLIS: Just like being in the Army.
. 19	THE COURT: We like to think it is better than
2 0	the Army.
4c fls21	
22	
28	
24	
<u>.</u>	·
. 25	
26	

4c-1

1 2

3

4

.5 6

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18[.]

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

BY MR. STOVITZ:

Q Now, in the event that -- all my questions that I ask you now will be assuming that you are chosen on the regular jury, you know, because with a three to five-month trial facing us, if any of the jurors might become ill or anything happens to them, you might take over. Even though you might be the sixth alternate juror placed here, you might be the first alternate juror take over into the regular jury.

Do you understand that?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, my questions then are assuming that you are a regular juror now.

A Yes.

Q Now, as a regular juror, you understand that you are going to have to promise the Court that you are going to decide this case solely on the evidence and disregard everything that you have ever read or heard about the case.

Can you do that?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, assume for the moment -- I am just taking a hypothetical thing -- that when the deaths occurred do you remember when the deaths occurred?

A Yes.

Q August of last year.

Yes. A Right. 1 Assume that when the deaths occurred you 2 might have read something about that the police suspected ż that they were killed by the Mafia, something like that. 4 Yes? 5 And you hear nothing about the Mafia in this 6 Q trial. 7 8 Are you going to wonder whether or not the Mafia had anything to do with the killings? 9 10 MR. KANAREK: That is improper voir dire, your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Well, it is just an example that is 13 being used to determine Mr. Ellis's state of mind. 14 You understand that he is not literally 15 referring to the Mafia but that he is illustrating a 16 point. 17 Do you understand that? 18 MR. ELLIS: Right. 19 THE COURT: Overruled. 20 MR. STOVITZ: Q Do you think you can eliminate 21 what you might have read about the Mafia and just concen-22 trate on the evidence? 23 Α Definitely. 24 Now, you might have read somewhere along the 25 line that there were five people arrested and charged 26 with this crime, or you might have read somewhere along

the line that there were six people arrested and charged with the crime, and you only see four people here.

Are you going to worry about the guilt or innocence of these other one or two people, or are you going to concentrate on the guilt or innocence of the people before you?

A On the people on trial.

Q And if you don't hear any evidence here about somebody else, are you going to wonder and speculate about that other person?

A No, sir.

Q So, I take it now that if you were selected as a juror, Mr. Ellis, you could concentrate solely on this trial and disregard all rumors and base your verdict solely on the evidence that you hear in this case?

A Yes, sir.

MR. STOVITZ: No further questions.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have just one or two, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. ELLIS BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q You indicated that because of the possibility of parole you are inclined to favor the death penalty; is that correct?

Yes, sir. A 1 But: you wouldn't automatically vote for Q. 2 the death penalty in all murder cases, would you? 3 Definitely not. No. This is just my --I think there should be a changing of the law, principally; 5 but, no, I wouldn't vote automatically either way. 6 Q. Just because a person is convicted of 7 first degree murder, you wouldn't automatically vote for 8 the death penalty? 9 No, I wouldn't. 10 \mathbf{A} 11 MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions. 12 13 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. ELLIS 14 BY THE COURT: 15 You think you could follow the Court's 16 instructions as to the law, Mr. Ellis, even though 17 those instructions might be different from what you now 18 think the law is or should be? 19 Oh, definitely, your Honor. Yes. This is 20 the way I feel. 21 You wouldn't have any trouble doing that? 22 This is the way I principally believe. A No. 23 I think the thing should be settled outside. 24 the law is the law. Then, if it is changed, this should 25 be done more or less in politics, or, you know, what 26 the State would believe.

4d fls.

But the way the law is, this is the way it has to be followed until it is changed, regardless of whether you believe it.

4D-	-1
	٥

THE COURT: All right, sir. I am going to ask you to go out into court.

Will you refrain from discussing with anyone what has been said in here?

MR. ELLIS: Yes, sir.

MR. STOVITZ: How old are you, Mr. Ellis?

MR. ELLIS: 25.

MR. STOVITZ: Thank you.

(Whereupon, Mr. Ellis leaves the court's chambers.)

MR. STOVITZ: Before going into open court, your Honor, and questioning these last two jurors, I would like to state for the record that if these jurors are passed for cause out in open court, it is the intention of the prosecution probably to accept the alternate jurors as now constituted.

So that the defendants are not placedin a bind of any kind, I would like them to know that.

THE COURT: Did you all hear that?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR. SHINN: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, then. If there is nothing further, we will go out into the courtroom.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court, all defendants, counsel, jury and prospective alternate jurors present.)

2

.

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

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

Do you wish to inquire further, Mr. Fitzgerald?
MR. FITZGERALD: No, your Honor.

I would pass these/prospective alternate jurors for cause.

MR. HUGHES: I would also pass for cause, your Honor.

MR. SHINN: Pass for cause, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: I accept the six alternates, your Honor, as we have previously done.

THE COURT: Mr. Stovitz?

MR. STOVITZ: Yes, sir.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MR. ROBERT R. DOUGLASS
BY MR. STOVITZ:

Q Mr. Douglass, you have been in this courtroom for how many days now?

A Since last Thursday.

And I think you have projected yourself and said to yourself, well. I might be here for the next three months, too. Do the surroundings suit you okay?

A Yes.

Q And you have taken a look at the other prospective attertive — rather, the trial jurors and the prospective alternate jurors, and you think you can live with these people for the next three to six months? 4D3

-3

·4

__

13 .

2,2

A Yes.

Q And if you were asked every one of the questions that Mr. Bugliosi asked the other jurors, especially the alternate jurors — those are the only ones you heard; right?

A Yes.

Q Would your answers be in any way different?

A No. I don't believe they would.

5-1

1.

9.

Q All right, it may very well be, sir, that you will serve as an alternate juror throughout the entire trial; you will be like a bridesmaid and never a bride.

on the other hand, you may catch the bridal bouquet at the very end and have to take over for one of the jurors.

You understand that?

A Yes.

Q So it will be very important if an exhibit is passed around, it will be very important for you to take a look at that exhibit, you understand that?

A Yes.

Q If a witness is lowering his voice and your eyes are slowly closing because of the heat or the time of day, it will be important for you to stand up and wake up and listen to the witness just as if you were a regular juror.

A Yes.

Q Now, assuming for the moment, sir, and these questions I am going to ask you are assuming for the moment that the jury brought in a verdict of first-degree murder as to Mr. Manson.

Do you think that you could, if you felt that the evidence, that the aggravation at the end of the case was sufficient, do you think that you could bring in a verdict of death in this case?

ļ

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

A Yes.

MR. SHINN: Object to the question, your Honor, prejudging a state of facts, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. STOVITZ: Assume for the moment, sir, that the defendants, each and every one of them, were convicted of murder in the first degree, could you partake in a deliberation and a decision as to whether or not the defendant should receive a life sentence or a death sentence?

A Yes.

Q Do you belong to any organization whatsoever, fraternal, social, religious, any organization at all that has as one of its objectives the abolition of the death penalty?

A No.

Q Sir, you told us that you work with the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and sometimes you use computers.

You understand that in the trial of a lawsuit we have to depend upon humans to judge the credibility of witnesses, we do not have computers.

You understand that?

A Yes.

Q : And in weighing the guilt or innocence of the defendants, again we do not put the evidence into a machine

5-3

Ż

1 .

3

4

5

7

٨

10

11

.12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

and get out a tape recording of some kind that tells us what should be the verdict, we depend on moral jurors, human jurors, to decide moral evidence, you understand that?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you feel that because this is a murder case and because it is a case that the People are seeking the death penalty, if there is a conviction of first-degree murder that you would require the People to prove their case to an absolute certainty?

A No.

Q All right, Mr. Douglass, if you were in the position of either the defendants or their attorneys, or the attorneys for the prosecution, and you knew your own frame of mind, do you feel that you could be fair to both sides?

A Yes, sir.

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

Q Mr. Ellis, how long have you worked for the telephone company?

A Two and a half years.

Q Do you work with computers as well or mostly mechanical work?

A No. I work mechanical work.

Q It may very well be in this trial a

5-4	
•	
	,
•	

8.

represe	intati	rae or r	је .	ce te bud	one (iom p	iny w	rit ceac	TTY	
		You wil:	L n	ot give	hi:	s te	stimo	ny any g	reate	r
weight	just	bedause	he	works	for	the	same	company	that	you
đo?									-	

A Definitely not. He probably doesn't work for the same company anyhow.

- Q Which telephone company do you work for?
- A General Telephone.
- Q oh, General. As a competing telephone company, you would not give his testimony any less weight?
 - A Definitely not.
- Q Do you belong to an organization that has as one of its purposes the abolition of the death penalty?
 - A No. sir.
- Q In high school or college, anything like that, did you ever argue against the retention of the death penalty in California?
 - A No, sir.
- Q Assuming again that the defendants are convicted of murder in the first degree, could you partake in a discussion with the other jurors and render a verdict of death as to each of the defendants if that is what your decision was?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q You heard the questions of Mr. Bugliosi, that Mr. Bugliosi asked the other jurors?
 - A Yes, sir.

2

3

4.

5

6

7

8

9,

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Did you understand the doctrine of conspiracy as Mr. Bugliosi outlined it?

> A Yes, sir.

If you were instructed along the lines by the Court, along the lines of conspiracy, would you follow those instructions?

> A Yes, sir.

Q Do you have any prejudices against convicting a person for murder in the first degree when he, himself, did not inflict a fatal blow?

A No. sir.

Q Do you have any prejudices against voting for the death penalty against such an individual if the facts of the case warrant the imposition of the death penalty?

No, sir.

26

5a-1	1	Q All right, sir, Mr. Ellis, knowing your own							
•	2.	background, knowing everything that you went through to							
	3	reach your ripe old age, and knowing what little you							
	4	know about this case, do you think you could give the							
	5	People as well as the defendants a fair and impartial							
	6	trial?							
	7	A Yes, sir.							
	8	Q Do you have any doubts about that at all?							
	9.	A No, sir.							
	10	MR. STOVITZ: Thank you very much.							
	11 .	The People pass for cause as to these two							
	12	alternates, your Honor.							
	13	THE COURT: Very well.							
	14.	Mr. Fitzgerald, you may exercise a peremptory							
	15	challenge if you care to.							
	16	MR. FITZGERALD: Patricia Krenwinkel will accept							
	17	the alternates.							
	18	THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?							
	19	MR. HUGHES: Leslie Van Houten will accept the							
	20	alternates.							
	21	THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?							
	22	MR, SHINN: Miss Atkins will accept the alternates.							
	23	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?							
	24	MR. KANAREK: Mr. Manson once again accepts the							
	25	six alternates.							
	26	THE COURT. VOTA WOLL							

5a-2

2

Ì

4

5 .

7

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18. 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

Mr. Stovitz?

MR. STOVITZ: May the People approach the bench with counsel?

THE COURT: Very well.

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

MR. STOVITZ: Your Honor, it is the intention of the People to accept the jury and pass peremptory on these six alternates.

If that occurs the defendants have already accepted the alternate jurors.

When does your Honor anticipate starting the actual witnesses?

THE COURT: We will take a recess, and after the recess I would like to confer with all counsel and parties in chambers regarding further procedural matters, that is, the commencement of the trial, and also if you care to take up, for example, the reading of the indictment.

I don't think we have to decide that at this moment.

MR. STOVITZ: Well, the reason we ask is that we thought that your Honor would give these six alternate jurors at least a half day off to get their affairs in order.

THE COURT: I don't see how I can sequester them before tomorrow morning, because they haven't had any real warning, although I'm sure they realize it is imminent.

They probably did not bring their clothes with them, their suitcases.

MR. STOVITZ: So it won't be before tomorrow morning.

THE COURT: For sequestering?

MR. STOVITZ: For starting with the first witness.

THE COURT: That is what I wanted to confer with counsel about after the recess.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We have a slight problem with some of our witnesses.

THE COURT: At one time one or more of the attorneys had suggested that there be some one or more days between the final sequestering of the jury and the actual commencement of the opening statements, and evidence taking portions of the trial, which I don't think is unreasonable.

That is why I wanted to talk to you.

MR. STOVITZ: We appreciate that. Thank you.

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

THE COURT: People may exercise a peremptory

23

24

25

26

challenge.

MR. STOVITZ: People pass peremptory, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, before the alternate jurors are sworn as a group I want to put one question personally and individually to each of the alternate jurors.

Will you listen very carefully and give me your honest and sincere answer to these questions:

Mr. Douglass, do you swear on your oath as a prospective juror that you can and will act impartially and fairly upon the matters to be submitted to you, and that you can and will base your verdict in this case solely on the evidence received during the trial and in accordance with the Court's instructions?

Do you, Mr. Douglass?

MR. DOUGLASS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Ellis, do you?

MR. ELLIS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Sheely, do you?

MR. SHEELY: Yes.

THE COURT: Miss Chason, do you?

MISS CHASON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mrs. Kampman, do you?

MRS. KAMPMAN: I do.

THE COURT: And Mr. Daut, do you?

MR. DAUT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right, we are going to take a

recess at this time, ladies and gentlemen.

For 15 minutes, possibly a little bit longer before we resume.

The trial will not commence today. I am going to confer with counsel after the recess as to the exact starting time.

It is extremely important that you alternate jurors bear in mind my admonitions and I'm going to repeat them now.

You will not be sequestered today because I am sure you have not all made the necessary preparations and brought your clothes and other belongings.

However, you will be sequestered tomorrow morning, so you should come to court tomorrow with whatever you need to have with you.

Arrangements will be made so that you may obtain other things as you need them during the course of the sequestration.

But, as I say, it is extremely important that you do bear in mind these admonishments:

First, 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.

And do not read, watch or listen to any news report concerning this case so long as you are

connected with the case.

The Clerk will swear the alternate jurors.

THE CLERK: Will the six alternate jurors please rise?

Would you raise your right hands, please.

You and each of you do solemnly swear that you will well and truly try the case now pending before this court and render a true verdict therein according to the evidence and the instructions of the court, so help you God?

ALL SIX ALTERNATES: I do.

THE COURT: All right, we will recess at this time, ladies and gentlemen, for approximately 15 minutes.

(Recess.)

5-1

\$

1Ì

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

THE COURT: Is everyone here?

Where is Mr. Fitzgerald?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. I just moved over here so I can confer.

THE COURT: All right.

All parties and counsel are present.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, at this time, Miss Van Houten would re-raise the issue of the change of venue, and along with it introduces evidence of the newspaper article from the Herald Examiner which was introduced the other day during the jury voir dire.

The believe that it has become evident throughout the voir dire of the prospective jurors, your Honor, that we have been so circumscribed in finding potential jurors that this shows sufficient prejudice against these defendants that they are being deprived of their right to a fair trial as incorporated in the Due Process clause, the sixth Amendment Due Process clause, and that had your Honor been willing to grant this motion originally, had your Honor's feet not been so inextricably cemented into the idea of trying this case in Los Angeles County, that we could have avoided this long and tedious process of trying to get jurors.

I believe sincerely, your Honor, that you did

ó−2

3.

7

20.

make an effort to pick who you thought were fair jurors. However, the picking process was so unnecessarily hampered by the fact that the major brunt of the publicity has come down in Los Angeles and the major brunt of that publicity has come down at the hands of the District Attorney.

You will recall back a month ago when the contempt citation was brought up against Mr. Kanarek, that in the tape recording that was offered as evidence with Mr. Stovitz, that with that tape recording between Mr. Stovitz and David Felton, at one point Mr. Ron Einstoss from the Los Angeles Times came into the room, and that he was exposed to that publicity, to those things which the District Attorney as saying about the case.

Many of those items, your Honor, are reflected again in this newspaper article from this past weekend in the Herald Express.

And it is for these basic reasons of this whole area being tainted with the things that the District Attorney has put out about this case, many of them not admissible, that. I, at this time, remake the motion for a change of venue.

9-1

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

MR. SHINN: Join, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do the People wish to be heard?

MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Kanarek joining in that motion?

THE COURT: I haven t heard anything.

MR. FITZGERALD: I will join in that motion.

And are you joining?

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

MR. STOVITZ: We will oppose the motion for change of venue, your Honor.

It seems obvious that Los Angeles County, being as large a county as it is, we were able to select these 18 jurors.

Each of them has promised under oath to follow the evidence.

Each of them has testified under oath that they have not been exposed to any so-called confession or any story in the newspapers that they could not put out of their mind, put aside from their mind.

I think in no other county in this State could we secure 18 jurors of this same frame of mind. Wherever we would go in this State or any other state this case has been written up.

Now, it has not been written up in the District Attorney's Office, because we are not in the publishing business. It was written up long before the indictments were issued.

10.

1,2 · 13

 It was written up because of the defendants fashion, so to speak.

They gave three interviews when they were up in Inyo County, and there was no evidence whatsoever that the District Attorney's Office at any time used their office to put out anything concerning the evidence in this case.

I feel that through the searching examination of these jurors we have been able to obtain 18 impartial jurors which we could not obtain in any other county.

MR. FITZGERALD: I would like to briefly reply to what Mr. Stovitz said.

I think, first, that it is not the issue whether or not the prosecution deliberately disseminated some of the information, but I think if we get into that issue we can clearly and unequivocally demonstrate that it was the prosecution and prosecutorial agencies that released the information to the press.

What he is talking about, the People in Inyo County who released information to the press, those people are prosecution witnesses, Mr. Poston, Mr. Crockett and Mr. Watkins are not agents of the defendant, they are in fact agents of the prosecution.

And I think getting on to the greater issue, the one raised by Mr. Hughes, is this:

As intellectually honest people, I don't think we all can take the position that this jury is a

16~

- 18

representative sample of the community. The only people that are sitting on this jury or as alternate jurors in this case are people that, A, could withstand the hardship and all that it entails in terms of their family in order to be sequestered six months as a result of the publicity.

B, we only have people on the jury that can economically survive the paltry sum of money provided to them by the County of Los Angeles.

C. Your Honor, I think, made a conscientious, diligent effort to secure for the defendants a fair and impartial trial and you attempted personally, I think, your Honor, to secure for us the fairest possible jurors of the jurors available to us.

Who were conscientiously excluded for us the jurors who were consciously influenced by the prejudicial publicity. Anybody who indicated to the Court that they were influenced, your Honor excused those people, allowing us to preserve our peremptory challenge.

On the other hand we have no way of knowing the jurous that are going to be subconsciously influenced by this massive publicity.

We only see the tip of the iceberg; we only see those people who are willing to admit and are able to cognizantly bring up to their present conscious level what they have seen, read, or heard.

Additionally, we systematically excluded from

1:1

the jury, according to the law of the State of California, anybody who would not impose the death penalty in an appropriate case.

I think when one looks at the figures, we interviewed well over 225 jurors, ultimately arriving at 18 with only the exercise, I think, of 11 -- 17 -- 26 peremptory challenges on both sides.

I think we can recognize how unrepresentative a sample it is.

Had the defendants exercised all their peremptory challenges and the prosecution exercised all their peremptory challenges we would likely be here until this time in 1971.

I have taken the intellectual position, I think it is a proper one and a sound one, that the defendants would not be allowed a fair trial in Los Angeles County, and I still maintain that is correct, and I would still urgently urge this Court at this late date to grant a motion of change of venue.

I think we have the combined experience listening to all of these jurors. I think in the light of it it is impossible for the defendants to receive a fair trial.

We will make the best of it; we will try to do what we can.

THE COURT: Well, I believe we have a fair and

impartial jury --

13.

14.

.20

MR. KANAREK: Before your Honor rules, may I make a statement?

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KANAREK: My statement is as follows, your Honor:

It is my belief, your Honor, first of all, that our position is, as far as the challenges for cause go, it is our position that we challenged each and every one of the alternates and those people on the jury for cause at this point because of exposure to pretrial publicity, on the basis of actual bias and implied bias.

Furthermore, it is our position that your Honor should voir dire the People on the jury in connection with that Herald Express -- that is, on the regular jury, in connection with the Herald Express article.

It is our position that it is impossible and there is not a fair and impartial jury in the box, or the alternates are not fair and impartial and that there is -- it is impossible because of State action by the District Attorney to obtain in Los Angeles County a fair and impartial jury.

I also, in connection with the exhibit, I must refer the Court to the exhibits of -- that are in -- I don't know if they are in evidence, but they are the exhibits of the District Attorney's memoranda concerning publicity.

I don't want to belabor it, but we can go

through those and I can show your Honor where the District Attorney has by his conduct, by his actually fostering publicity in this case violated not only the spirit but the letter of the law of the land in Shepard vs. Maxwell, the Billie Sol Estes case, Stroble vs. California, deliberately and with malice, with the purpose of making sure there is not a fair trial, and if your Honor wishes —

I mean, as I say, I don't want to belabor it, but I can go through those memoranda and show to the Court where there is evidence in connection with this case that has been pointed out to the mass media in those memoranda.

8-1

3.

--

1Ĝ

,24

THE COURT: Which memoranda are you referring to?

MR. KANAREK: The ones that Mr. Stovitz brought
down, the 26 or 27.

THE COURT: Oh, I see. All right.

MR. KANAREK: May I do that?

THE COURT: It is not necessary. I just wanted to understand what you were referring to.

MR. KANAREK: What I am saying is that if we value our way of life, your Honor, then we value it. We cannot allow State action to interfere with a man's fair trial.

And that is exactly what happened here.

There couldn't be greater State action than the District Attorney of Los Angeles having a press agent and distributing to the media these memoranda, instead of doing just the opposite, doing what they should do.

Then the Court can take judicial notice that Mr. Younger has thumbed his nose at judicial orders, and your Honor can see that it is the office policy of the District Attorney -- I am referring specifically to the case of Judge Lloyd Davis, where the District Attorney publicly stated, publicly defied the Court to find him in contempt, and that was an order in connection with publicity.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, may I say something?
THE COURT: Very well.

2· 3·

.

,

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, I don't think that we can all sit here and in clear conscience say to ourselves that we have tried every possible means to give the defendants a fair trial.

Now, as I said before, I mentioned that the Sheppard case warmed the State courts that in a case like this -- now, this is a typical case that I believe the Sheppard case was talking about -- where there is massive publicity, they set forth certain guidelines that the State Court should follow, and I think that we haven't even followed one of the guidelines set forth by the Sheppard case, and also recommended by the ABA.

Now, we have made various motions which the Gourt denied. We made a motion for continuance until the publicity dies down. We made a motion today again for a change of venue.

Then I believe I made a motion to have jurors brought in from other counties; and I also suggested that we bring in another judge from a different county.

Now, these are minimum guidelines set forth in trying to give the defendants a fair trial, and I don't think we made a minimum effort, your Honor.

I feel, as other defense counsel feel, that I doubt very very much that the defendants will get a fair trial in this county, in this court.

MR. STOVITZ: I suggest, your Honor, if counsel is

5.

really interested in seeing that the defendants get a fair trial that they look into the mirror of their own conscience.

Mr. Kanarek has made certain accusations which earlier we said to the Court that when we remain silent our silence is not any accord.

It is purely his own vindictiveness that is set forth here. If he is really interested in having Mr. Manson get a fair trial, I suggest that he examine his own conscience.

8a fls.11

2 3

9.

26.

We are sure, your Honor, that if we were to sit here another 30 days or another 60 days, we could get jurors that were "less exposed" to the newspapers; but the jurors that we have, your Honor, although they have read articles, have told us that they have not read the ones that your Honor felt were crucial. They have not made up their mind on this case.

Jurors have been examined freely in chambers, and we have done everything we could to insure that these jurors would be fair.

If the defendants take an attitude of defeat, it is their own character that is being exposed, not the fair trial system of California.

I think the defendants can receive a fair trial from these jurors, and if the evidence points to their guilt, they will be convicted.

MR. BUGLIOSI: These press releases by the District Attorney's Office, as Mr. Kanarek knows, and I accuse him of every type of conceivable fraud and deceit imaginable, he knows that the press releases only contained statements of what had already been in the newspapers and done in open court.

The District Attorney has not taken any position in this case on any of those press releases, and Mr. Kanarek knows that.

MR. KANAREK: There, your Honor, he has answered it

implicitly if not explicitly, and I would suggest that we go over the press releases and see.

They have been given wider dissemination.

The articles that have the viciousness in them and the evidence in them, your Honor, the District Attorney's Office has alluded to and sent to whatever their mailing list is, so they have expanded the original error by their own volitional act.

We can go through them and show the Court.

THE COURT: What is important is not the press releases, but what, in fact, has been published and what has been, in fact, disseminated and what, in fact, has been digested by the people who are going to serve on this jury.

Now, we have spent five weeks in insuring in every possible way that we have a fair and impartial jury, and I am convinced that we have such a jury.

Many of these people have virtually no exposure to publicity in this county.

Now, this may seem strange in view of the fact that there obviously has been a good deal of publicity about the case. It is inconceivable there would not be publicity about a case in which there are seven killings involved. From that standpoint, you might say that it is the crime, or one of the crimes, of the century.

It is hardly remarkable that there has been

3.

.

20.

8b fls.24

publicity about a case involving seven alleged murders. But what is even more remarkable, is the fact that there are many, many people in this County, as we have seen right here in this chambers and in this courtroom, who have had remarkably little exposure to any of this publicity.

And that is what we have spent five weeks in determining, in selecting people who have had remarkably little exposure to any of this.

None of these 18 people have ever read or heard of any confession in the case.

about because, as Mr. Fitzgerald rightly stated, sometimes a juror may have read something that he might have forgotten or which might be dredged up in his memory at some later time. A confession is one of those things which I think even though he were consciously willing to admit and sincerely believed would not affect his ability to be impartial, might somehow, subconsciously, affect that.

But we have no such persons on this jury.

That is why we had to go through 175 people, or whatever the total number it turns out to have been in finding 18 people who are fair and impartial.

8B-1

2

1.

3 4

5

6.

7

ģ.

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

MR. KANAREK: May the record reveal, your Honor, if your Honor is purportedly making a finding of fact that such is the case, may the record reveal that we object to such a purported finding of fact.

THE COURT: I certainly am making such a finding of fact. That is exactly why we spent five weeks obtaining these 18 people.

MR. KANAREK: Your H_0 nor, I join in the motion for change of venue, but the record does reveal our position, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

The motion for change of venue will be denied.

Now, what is your thinking on the subject of when this case should resume?

MR. BUGLIOSI: We at least would like to have one day off. Tomorrow.

THE COURT: Today is Tuesday. Do you want to resume Thursday morning?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thursday would be all right with the People, your Honor.

MR. STOVITZ: Making our opening statement Thursday morning, your Honor, it will be less than 35 to 40 minutes. Then we can present our first witness right after that.

Is your Honor going to go back to the old time schedule now that the evidence has started?

THE COURT: I plan to, unless there are some other

8.

. 13

 thoughts regarding that.

I recall that that was 9:45 until 12:00 and 2:00 until 4:15.

MR. STOVITZ: Yes.

I was thinking about 9:30 instead of 9:45, and then 1:45 instead of 2:00.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I agree with the Court's original position, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't have any serious feelings one way or the other about that.

It has been my experience that in a jury trial it is difficult to have a jury concentrate for more than that amount of time in a day; plus in this case, we have problems of transportation and moving the jurors around.

I would suggest that we start out with those hours, and if it appears reasonable to change them, we can always make adjustments.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, may I, at this time, renew my motion, my pretrial motion to suppress the evidence; I mean, the admissions and confessions of Susan Atkins at this time?

The document has been filed already, and your Honor indicated the last time that you would take it at the time that the admissions or confessions would be introduced by the District Attorney.

THE COURT: Let's take one thing at a time, Mr. Shinn.

8d8

1 2.

.8

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

You may renew your motion, but let's decide one thing at a time.

Is Thursday morning agreeable with counsel?

MR. FITZGERALD: I was just going to say, I have
talked it over with my client and in community with the
other clients, and I had originally talked it over briefly
with Mr. Bugliosi, and the defendants would have no
objection if the matter went over to Friday.

We are not necessarily requesting that, your Honor. If the Court is ready to proceed on Thursday, we are happy to proceed on Thursday; but we can use the time to good end.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No objection to Friday, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that agreeable with everyone?

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor. Even Monday is satisfactory.

MR. HUGHES: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: Friday would also give the alternate jurors -- well, maybe I shouldn't get into that.

MR. KANAREK: That is agreeable, your Honor.

THE COURT: I realize that while you gentlemen have been busily engaged for five weeks in selecting a jury, you have been unable to spend that time in other pretrial preparation, and I don't think that a reasonable delay commencing Friday --

1	MR. STOVITZ: Friday what time, your Honor?
2	THE COURT: Do you have any other comments on the
3 .	hours that I have previously indicated?
4	MR. FITZGERALD: No. We agree that we would prefer
5	9:45 and 2:00 p.m.
.6	MR. KANAREK: Right. That is correct, your Honor.
7	MR. SHINN: No objection.
8	MR. HUGHES: No objection.
9	
10	
ii ·	
12	
13	
14	
1 5	•
16	
17	
18	
19.	
20 .	
21	
22	
23	
24 [.]	
25	
26	

8C

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

THE COURT: Then let's resume on Friday at 9:45 until further notice of change. The hours will be 9:45 to 12:00 and 2:00 until 4:15.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would like to discuss the opening statement briefly, your Honor.

MR. FITZGERALD: Before you do, Mr. Bugliosi, in that connection I am going to ask the Court for an order directing the prosecution to refrain from mentioning in their opening statement:

- (a) Any item of physical evidence the admissibility of which has not been determined;
- (b) Any admission or confession the admissibility of which has not been determined;
- (c) Any hearsay statement entered into to show the state of mind of the declarant;

And (d) Any evidence relating to the commission of any other crimes or offenses introduced for the purposes of establishing common scheme, plan, intent, modus operandi, motive, or for any other reason.

I haven't prepared that formally, but I typed that out.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think your motion has precluded opening statement.

MR. KANAREK: Join.

MR. SHINN: Join.

MR. HUGHES: Join.

26.

21

22.

23

.24

25

1	MR. FITZGERALD: I am particularly concerned with
2	two essential items, your Honor.
8	One is the matter that we have discussed at
4	length on other occasions, the mention of any admission or
5	confession in regard to any of these defendants.
6	The second major item which I am concerned
7	about is the introduction into evidence or the statement
8	of the introduction into evidence of other offenses.
9	MR. BUGLIOSI: We will not introduce or mention in
10	the opening statement other offenses. We will not.
11	MR. FITZGERALD: You had indicated to me from time
12	to time that you intended to introduce into evidence
13	during your case in chief the so-called Hinman homicide.
14	MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.
15	We might offer that during the trial for the
16	Court's consideration.
17	Mr. Stovitz and I still haven't made up our
18	minds on that.
19	MR. STOVITZ: That will not be mentioned in the
20.	opening statement.
21	MR. BUGLIOSI: That won't be in the opening statement
22	THE COURT: Do you have any objection to the other
23	things mentioned by Mr. Fitzgerald?
4	MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.
5	Everything he says there with the exception of
6	other offenses.

THE COURT: Let's take them one by one.

What about any item of physical evidence the admissibility of which has not been determined?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I definitely object to that. Definitely.

THE COURT: Let me remind you that we have not had a 1538.5 motion with respect to any of this physical evidence.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

THE COURT: And that I have told the defendants in our pretrial matters that I would permit such a motion to be made during the course of the trial.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

Now, for the Court's --

THE COURT: So the risk is obvious.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

For the Court's information, your Honor, to my knowledge, the only items of physical evidence that I am going to mention are the firearm and the clothing that the killers allegedly wore.

Both of these, I will represent to the Court, were found by civilian witnesses and turned over to the police.

But I definitely intend to mention that in my opening statement.

Whatever risk is inherent, Mr. Stovitz and I

25

24

assume that risk.

6.

10.

9 fls.

.

THE COURT: From what you are saying regarding that, it would appear that there was no search or seizure involved?

MR. BUGLIOSI: No.

MR. STOVITZ: We are going to mention, for instance, the automobile, a '59 Ford automobile that was used.

I don't know whether counsel will mention it as such, but we are going to introduce the fact that a '59 Ford automobile was used on both nights of the homicides.

There may be an indirect reference on August the 16th, 1969, that an arrest took place, but I don't think in our opening statement we will characterize it as an arrest.

13[.]

· 18

MR. BUGLIOSI: I won't mention that.

MR. STOVITZ: But during the trial it will be characterized that this '59 Ford automobile was at the Spahn Ranch; this '59 automobile was thereafter impounded pursuant to lawful impounding because they had on license plates that did not fit the car, and they believed it was a stolen car, and this '59 Ford automobile, photographs of it will be shown and introduced in evidence as being the car that was used by the perpetrators of the crime on both nights.

A speck of blood was obtained from the glove compartment of the Ford automobile, however, that blood has not been traced as to type or even that it is human blood.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I won't go into that in my opening statement.

THE COURT: We are again talking about content of the opening statement.

Mr. Fitzgerald's second point: "Any admission or confession, the admissibility of which has not been determined."

Of course, there has been no determination.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We do intend to mention in the

opening statement Susan Atkins' statements to co-inmates at Sybil Brand, and to Leslie Van Houten's statement to Diane Lake of Death Valley.

2

1

3

.4

5 6

7

8

9

11

12 13

14

.15 16

17,

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

.25

26

We will make reference to that. We will not go into any details at all. It will be a very general reference to her statement.

MR. SHINN: I think that is highly prejudicial, your Honor, in the event that it is inadmissible, your Honor.

THE COURT: No question about that, Mr. Shinn, that is the point.

MR. SHINN: Mr. Bugliosi is presupposing that the Court is going to admit the evidence, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That is true of any opening statement. The Court never rules in advance that all of the People's evidence is admissible before the trial.

There is always an issue of that.

MR. SHINN: Yes, but we have met to determine that before the trial begins. That is why I request we have a pretrial motion on the question of whether or not the confession is admissible or not, your Honor, that is one of my biggest points.

MR. HUGHES: Also, your Honor, I would object to
Miss Van Houten's purported statements to Diane Lake up in
Inyo County being brought out in the opening statement of
the District Attorney.

I believe it is too highly prejudicial: it is unclear at this time whether they will actually introduce that testimony.

I believe it would be so -- it would highly

2

1

3

5

6

7

.9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18′ 19

20

21 22

23

24

26

inflame and excite the jury, that my defendant could not get a fair trial if that were actually introduced.

THE COURT: I don't think that is the problem.

The problem is whether or not it is eventually going to be admissible.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, may I ask your Honor why the purpose of the Court not wanting to hear these pretrial motions?

THE COURT: One thing at a time, Mr. Shinn. I will permit you to be heard on that, but let's just take things up in an orderly fashion.

MR. SHINN: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Now we are considering the content of the opening statement.

Well, I am inclined to agree that any admissions or confessions should not be mentioned in the opening statement, Mr. Bugliosi, as well as --

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't intend to classify it as an admission or confession, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I know that. I cannot see how this would prejudice the People in any way, and yet it might very well prejudice the defendats, depending on what eventually results from the Court's determination as to the admissibility of the statements.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Here is the problem, your Honor:

Number one, it is an opening statement and the

0_4

.

6.

9.

9A 18

5

prosecution as far as I know has the right in an opening statement to tell the jury what evidence they expect to offer.

NOW, we expect to offer this evidence. We are very confident the Court is going to accept it.

The Court has already made a preliminary tentative ruling that certain portions of it will probably be admissible.

I want to mention this in my opening statement.

Furthermore --

THE COURT: Let's not characterize what I said as a tentative ruling.

I made that quite clear on the record.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, the Court's position.

in the

さい かけい

THE COURT: Well, it was a mere indication of present feeling without having heard any of the evidence or the arguments, pro and con.

9a-1

MR. BUGLIOSI: Furthermore, your Honor, as to these defendants, this is the only evidence we have against them.

I feel I should mention that in my opening statement.

If the Court were to rule during the trial that these statements are not admissible as against Susan Atkins and Leslie Van Houten, I think as a matter of law they would be entitled to an acquittal, so I am not worried about any risk I am assuming, because this is the only evidence we have against these two girls.

MR. STOVITZ: In addition to Linda Kasabian's testimony,

MR. BUGLIOSI: Assuming she is an accomplice, this is the only evidence I have.

If the Court rules during the trial this evidence is inadmissible, no prejudice will inure to these two defendants for the simple reason that as a matter of law I would think that the Court would have to order an acquittal, assuming Linda Kasabian is an accomplice.

This is our only evidence.

All I am mentioning is the only evidence we have.

THE COURT: Can it be mentioned without stating the character of it?

That is, can it not be mentioned in the form

of a conclusion rather than characterizing it as a statement of one or more of the defendants?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I was not going to classify it as a statement.

I was merely going to mention she had conversations.

THE COURT: That is the same thing.

Can't you simply say that the evidence will show that she was present at a certain time or place or whatever it is, without saying that the evidence consists of a conversation or a statement?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't want to sound like a fool or look like a fool in front of the jury.

I intend to tell the jury what evidence the prosecution is going to offer in this case to convict these people of seven counts of murder.

I do not intend to classify it as a confession.

The Court indicates this might be argumentative. I don't think it is; I think it is perfectly proper. The Court indicates it is in the nature of an argument.

I won't use the word "confession," but I don't see why I should be precluded from telling the jury we intend to offer evidence that Susan Atkins had a conversation with three people in which she told them of her involvement with the three murders.

I won't mention in this opening statement,

which I think I have to, although it is delicate because certain portions will have to be deleted, I won't mention what she told these people, "I stabbed Sharon Tate" -- "I held her hands down."

I won't mention anything like that. I think
I am entitled to tell the jury the only evidence we have
against these two defendants, and I don't see any
risk at all because if the Court later on during the
trial says that we cannot introduce any portions of those
statements, in effect the Court will be directing an
acquittal.

. This is the only evidence we have.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, may I be heard, your Honor?

THE COURT: All right, as long as you recognize

what the risk is.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I recognize the problem.

THE COURT: I don't want you to come back and say
I have made a determination on the admissibility.

I want the record to be perfectly clear I have made no such determination.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That's right, your Honor, we discussed this a couple of days ago, I think the Court agreed with my characterization of the Court's position at that time; your tentative position was that certain portions would be admissible.

THE COURT: It appeared to me from reading the

statements that you presented to me with the underlinings which I understood were those portions you thought could be excised, that such deletions could be made without harming the rights of any party.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right. The Court has not made a ruling.

The Court might very well rule no portion of it is admissible later on.

THE COURT: I also made it perfectly clear that that ruling was based on not having considered in detail the statements from one end to the other, or not having heard any of the evidence in the case to which these statements might relate, and that it was entirely possible that that tentative appearance or observation might turn out to be incorrect.

MR: BUGLIOSI: I agree, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

9B-1

2.

MR. STOVITZ: Before we go on to another point, your Honor, would your Honor excuse the jury now since we have already made up our minds we are going to resume --

THE COURT: They are not going anywhere. They have to wait here until lunch time anyway.

MR. SHINN: May I say something along the same lines in response to Mr. Bugliosi, Your Honor?

Now, I have not seen the Court's version of what will be admissible or what will not be admissible.

THE COURT: It is not my version. I don't have any version, Mr. Shinn.

MR. SHINN: If in fact, your Honor, the confession or admission of Susan Atkins is going to be admissible, is going to be introduced in evidence, your Honor, then at this time I would move for a severance, your Honor, because the deletions may prejudice my client.

so right now I don't know what parts the Court is going to delete, what part the Court is not going to delete.

So it may be a deletion to the prejudice of my client, and I would move for severance, your Honor.

MR. STOVITZ: Your Honor, if counsel moves for severance and he has the consent, of course, of his client to delay this trial, it would necessitate a second trial.

MR. SHINN: That is beside the point.

Land Hally to the

3

4

5

.6.

7

8

. 9 .10

11

12.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

MR. STOVITZ: There also would have to be a waiver of jeopardy which attached when this jury was sworn.

MR. SHINN: I took that all under consideration, but if the deletion is going to prejudice my client, Miss Atkins, I have no other choice but to move for severance.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Did you talk to your client about it?

MR. SHINN: Regardless if I talked to my client.

It may be, your Honor, the way the deletions are going to be it will prejudice Miss Atkins.

THE COURT: Well, again, Mr. Shinn, let's wait until we get rid of these other preliminary matters. Then you can make any motion you care to.

MR. SHINN: Right.

THE COURT: Now, what about any evidence relating to the commission of other crimes or offenses?

MR. BUGLIOSI: There will be none of that.

THE COURT: There will be none in the opening statement?

MR. FITZGERALD: There were some representations to me that there might be.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

MR. FITZGERALD: That is why I included it.

THE COURT: Well, then, what about any hearsay introduced statements/to show the state of mind of the declarant?

I don't know what Mr. Fitzgerald means, of

9B3

course, because I don't know what the evidence is.

MR. STOVITZ: There will be no hearsay mentioned in the opening statement, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you care to be more specific, Mr. Fitzgerald?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, I think I can refer briefly to that area.

The evidence they intend to introduce to show statements they will introduce into evidence, statements made by Mr. Manson and some of the other defendants which would in themselves be hearsay, they would in themselves be immaterial and irrelevant in that they don't apply to any of the facts or issues in this case, but might be introduced to show some common scheme, plan, intent and particularly motive.

I have in mind reference to Mr. Manson's racial attitude, and statements in connection with racial prejudice, statements in connection with blacks and the black revolution.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That will be discussed in a fair amount of depth in my opening argument, of course, his position on blacks, not what he told other people, but I will state what the evidence will show at this trial from many witnesses.

MR. FITZGERALD: So we shall narrow the issue down a little bit. I take it you are going to put people on the

3

4 5

6

7 8

9.

10: 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

witness stand who are going to testify that Manson and perhaps some of the other defendants said those things which would be hearsay statements to show Mr. Manson's state of mind, also to show some sort of common scheme and also to show motive, correct?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Motive, yes, not common scheme and design.

We will offer many witnesses to testify to motive, yes, and motive does have something to do, of course, with black people, right?

I will not quote Mr. Manson or anything like that, but I will say that witnesses will testify to Charles Manson's philosophy on life with respect to black and white people, and tell them what that philosophy is. as I expect the witnesses to testify.

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, during the course of the trial we all anticipate, when I use the term "we all," I talk about the defense attorneys anticipate that there will be objections raised to evidence of this type, so we are in the position as we are with several of the other items, that the admissibility of this evidence has not been determined.

Mr. Kanarek intends to object to the introduction of that philosophy evidence by way of hearsay, and I think it might be prejudicial not only to Mr. Manson, but to the rest of the defendants to bring it up during an opening statement.

9c-1

MR. BUGLIOSI: It goes to the very heart of our case and we will offer many witnesses to testify to it, so it will be mentioned in the opening statement.

THE COURT: Now, had you put this in the form of a motion?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, I did when I stated it. It is a motion.

The motion is requesting the Court for an order directing that the prosecution not mention in their opening statement certain items.

THE COURT: As to item A, any item of physical evidence, the admissibility of which has not been determined.

I understand there will be no such reference in the opening statement.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Just to the firearms and clothing found by civilian witnesses.

THE COURT: All right. We have already discussed the admission or confession problem, and the other matters.

In view of our discussion and the People's response to this motion I am not going to make such an order.

The motion will be denied.

Now, another matter that I do want to take up is the question of reading the indictment.

9c-2

1.

23°

MR. BUGLIOSI: Can we return to the opening statement later, your Honor, because I have several other things I want to discuss about the opening statement in addition to that.

THE COURT: Let's proceed with the opening statement.

MR. BUGLIOSI: My remarks to the Court are necessitated, your Honor, because of the presence of one of the attorneys in the case.

I have no question about Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Shinn or Mr. Hughes. I know their motions will be made in good faith and their objections will be made in good faith, so I am making these comments with respect to the other attorney.

In an opening statement you are not permitted to argue. The question now is, what is argument?

I intend to use the English language in my opening statement, and when you use the English language you use adjectives.

I intend to use many adjectives. This is not argument.

I think an example argument would be something like this, this is just hypothetically:

"If he did this, it is obvious he must have realized that blah, blah, blah, period."

And another example:

"If this was his state of mind,

"why would he have blah, blah, blah?"

This to me is argument. This cannot be in an opening statement.

An opening statement, however, can be spirited; it can be forceful, and the prosecution not only is limited to telling the jury what evidence they intend to offer, but we can tell the jury what we expect to prove by that evidence.

We can draw conclusions.

"We expect that the evidence would prove that blah, blah, blah."

Now, I cite to the Court Goldstein on trial technique, which is frequently used in the seminaries a among -- as a basis for/seminary among trial lawyers, and of course Goldstein properly states that in an opening statement you cannot argue.

However --

MR. SHINN: What edition is that?

MR. BUGLIOSI: What edition? To show you how good this book is, it was printed in 1935.

As of a couple of years ago there were ten printings. It is still sold.

I think it is the best book I have seen on trial technique. I don't think much of it, but I think it is the best of the worst.

But it is used among trial lawyers.

hour."

To give the Court an example of what Goldstein thinks of proper statements in an opening statement, he is talking about civil cases and he cites examples proper in his opinion, proper opening statement, which have been used in seminars throughout the country, as I say.

Here is an example, this is in a civil case which of course by definition is infinitely more mild than a criminal case, specially where murder is involved. Talking about a car:

"It was still traveling at a high rate of speed," as opposed to saying,

"It was traveling at 67 miles an

"Mrs. Linn was thrown from her seat very violently."

These are what the author feels to be proper statements. He is quoting them as classical examples of opening statements after he said you cannot argue in an opening statement.

Another example:

"Mrs. Linn remained in the hospital for nine weeks, throughout most of this period she suffered extreme and excruciating pain."

Again the attorney giving the opening statement is using the English language which I am sure one of the attorneys in this case would prefer I not use, but I intend

9D-1

, 1

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10·

.11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

26

to use the English language. I intend to use adjectives.

Another example:

"Mr. Rand's stubborn refusal to stop and let Mr. Simmons pass, or lese it was his negligent inability to stop his car."

Now there, that goes to the very issue of the case in a civil case, the issue of negligence.

Yet this is cited, this is the tenth printing, as a proper opening statement, talking about negligent inability.

I do not intend to go quite that far, to use words like that.

I had another example here:

"As a consequence neither Carl Fugio or Charles Warn were exercising that due care and caution for their own safety which the law requires. We are terribly sorry for what happened to Fugio, but it is not our fault. We are blameless. We did everything we could under the circumstances."

I just mention this to the Court because I am trying to avoid gross discourtesy on the part of one of the lawyers in this case, and I can represent to the Court that I will not make any statement in my opening statement that I do not intend in good faith — that Mr. Stovitz and I do not intend in good faith to offer evidence of at the trial.

on appeal the appellate courts are constantly

9D2

1 2

'

,

 when they are looking at the character and content of an opening statement, they examine the good faith of the prosecutor.

Did they really believe they could prove what they said?

I will make the representation to the Court that I will make no statement upon which we will not offer considerable evidence.

THE COURT: Of course that is only part of the problem. Your good faith may not be in question, but the manner in which it is said might be objectionable.

MR. BUGLIOSI: In my characterization of what argument is, "If he did this, obviously he must have done that, that is argument.

That is what I am going to avoid in my opening statement.

But I do intend to make a fairly forceful opening statement. I do intend to use adjectives to characterize what certain witnesses would testify to.

Actually the alternative of not doing that would be for me to go into detail as to what each witness would testify word for word. I am not going to do that.

I am going to summarize what the witnesses are going to testify to.

I am going to summarize it to save time, and I have to use my own adjectives to summarize what they are 9D3

1

20⁻

 going to testify to.

I have nothing further to say, your Honor, but I want to tell the Court this in advance.

My statements are directed, as I indicated, toward a particular attorney who would prefer I not use the English language, but I do intend to use the English language; it is the only language I know.

I do intend to use adverbs and I do intend to use descriptive phrases.

But I will not argue, using my definition of what is argument.

And I think I have support in Goldstein's Trial Technique, and also my own experience in opening statements.

I did not have any trouble at all in any case I ever tried with an opening statement.

I deliberately stay away from things which I think will not be admissible.

There is a considerable amount of evidence in this case, your Honor, and I am not going to touch on hardly any of it.

I am going to go into a fair amount of depth on motive and Linda Kasabian's testimony. Otherwise I am going to just skim over almost everything. This is my M.O. in an opening statement. I don't believe in going into or depth because there is always a possibility one/more things

9D4

9E

_

.6

.

16,

that the Court will rule were inadmissible that the jury has heard.

It will be a short opening statement.

Our final summation to the jury will not be short, but the opening statement will probably be 20 to 25 minutes.

It is a summary of what the witnesses will testify to and what I believe the evidence will show.

There will be powerful, colorful, descriptive adjectives.

I have nothing further to say, your Honor.

9-E-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

THE COURT: I don't think any response is called for by the Court on that.

MR. BUGLIOSI: That's right.

THE COURT: I expect counsel to be courteous to each other.

I don't expect any counsel to give up any rights or to forego any rights.

on the other hand, there is no reason why the trial within that framework cannot be conducted so that all parties are adequately protected and yet there is the dignity and decorum and respect for each other as professional men.

MR. BUGLIOSI: This is what I was referring to.

THE COURT: That should be the hallmark of every trial.

Now, I wanted to talk to you about the question of this reading of the indictment.

The indictment names in addition to these four defendants both Charles Watson and Linda Kasabian in certain of the counts.

Do you have any feelings about the reading of the indictment, and the reading of these names in connection with the indictment?

MR. STOVITZ: Unless the defendants object thereto,
I think the indictment should be read as is, your Honor,
with the Court telling the jury that these defendants

1 .

2

ş

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

.22 23

24

25

26

here are the only ones on trial.

THE COURT: Any comment, gentlemen?

MR. FITZGERALD: I personally would like to waive on behalf of my client the reading of the indictment.

I see no useful purpose in reading to the jury statutory language for seven counts of murder and one count of conspiracy to commit murder.

I agree with Mr. Stovitz that the title of this case is properly People vs. Manson, Van Houten, Krenwinkel, Watson, Kasabian and Atkins.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. FITZGERALD: But I would like to waive the reading of the indictment.

THE COURT: I have no objection to summarizing the indictment so that all of the statutory language is not read. I think that is unnecessary.

On the other hand, the statute provides for it.

But I do not want to forego orienting the jury
and the alternate jurors immediately before the evidence

are specifically charged with.

MR. STOVITZ: I might say that that is the second paragraph of Mr. Bugliosi's opening statement. He will be telling the jury the counts against each respective defendant, your Honor.

taking place and the trial begins as to what the defendants

So if your Honor is concerned in that regard --

THE COURT: Do the defendants desire to waive the 1 reading of the indictment? 2 MR. SHINN: Susan Atkins will waive, your Honor. 3 MR. HUGHES: Leslie Van Houten will waive, your 4 Honor. 5 THE COURT: If you are all willing to waive the 6 reading and if the People in their opening statement are 7 going to refer to the charges so that the jury is oriented 8 as far as which defendants are charged with which offenses -MR. STOVITZ: Yes, your Honor, we intend to do it. 10 THE COURT: I would not object to not having the 11 indictment read. 12 Otherwise, I think there should be a statement 13 before the trial commences because it's now been five weeks 14 with respect to some of them. 15 MR. BUGLIOSI: I will make a statement, your Honor. 16 MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Hughes, on behalf of your client 17 you are willing to waive the reading of the indictment? 18 MR. HUGHES: Yes. 19 MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Shinn, you already indicated it is 20 all right with you? 21: MR. SHINN: That's correct 22 MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Kanarek? 28 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I would prefer that your 24 Honor do the summarizing. 25 THE COURT: Are you willing to waive the reading of 26

the indictment?

2

3.

4

5

6

Ż

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2Ò

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KANAREK: I waive the reading, yes, your Honor, I do waive the reading.

THE COURT: And Mr. Fitzgerald?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, your Honor.

MR. STOVITZ: People have no objection to waiving the reading.

THE COURT: All right, now, anything else?

MR. STOVITZ: The only other thing, I notice by my morning Green Sheet that Mr. Fitzgerald subpoenaed a newspaper reporter for Friday, this Friday.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, yes, I'm glad you brought this up.

MR. STOVITZ: If we were going to take any type of evidence on it I would not want to rob the jury of any time, maybe we can start at 9:15 on Friday so we can get that evidentiary hearing out of the way.

MR. FITZGERALD: I have filed an application for a subpoena D.T. For the Court's edification I will hand you a copy.

What I have done, I have attempted to subpoena this witness. This witness has been served. He is a reporter from a Long Beach newspaper. He has been served in connection with the identity of a person who gave certain information as to the -- well, the subpoena speaks for itself.

I think, however, your Honor, that that reporter intends to have the legal department, or he intends to retain counsel of that newspaper to come to court and assert her privilege under CCP, the privilege concerning the source of a newsman's information in California.

THE COURT: Well, is this something --

MR. FITZGERALD: We can set it for any time within the next few days and I would anticipate that the attorney for that newspaper would come in with a motion to quash.

THE COURT: Why don't we set it, perhaps, sometime 10-1 i next week? It doesn't have to be done on Friday. 2 MR. FITZGERALD: No, it doesn't have to be done on 3 It is just that I selected an arbitrary date 4 and the date happened to be Friday. 5 It doesn't make any difference to me when it 6 is taken up. Any date that is convenient with the Court. 7 Tuesday? Wednesday? 8 I would say any day next week along THE COURT: 9 toward the middle or latter part of next week. We can set 10 it at 9:00 or 9:15 in the morning, if you care to. 11 MR. FITZGERALD: What about next Thursday? 12 THE COURT: That would be the 30th. July 30th. 13 MR. FITZGERALD: The 30th at 9:15? 14 THE COURT: Is that agreeable? 1Š MR. STOVITZ: Yes. 16 THE COURT: 9:15 on July 30th. Very well. 17 Now, Mr. Shinn, you had some motions that 18 you wanted to take up at this time? 19 20 MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor. .**21**· THE COURT: All right. 22 MR. SHINN: I wanted to renew my motion to hear the suppression of Susan Atkins' admissions. 23 24 THE COURT: Just one moment, Mr. Shinn. 25 Mr. Darrow, did you make a note of this July 30th? 26

THE CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: Very well. Remind me of that date and time.

Go ahead, Mr. Shinn.

MR. SHINN: And I think we should take it up before we even start the trial.

Mr. Bugliosi agrees with me.

I can't understand the Court's position of not wanting to hear this before trial.

I believe the case that I cited to the Court,
I believe last week, indicated that the majority of the
judges and the courts do hear these pretrial motions
before the trial starts, and I believe the case points
out the advantages of it.

THE COURT: I would guess that probably the majority do just the opposite.

MR. SHINN: The opposite of what, your Honor?

THE COURT: The matters are not heard pretrial but are heard during the course of the trial, if and when the matter is offered.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, it is my understanding from the case that I have read, your Honor, that where there is a question of whether or not a confession or admission was made, they are heard at pretrial motions.

THE COURT: One of the reasons that I have thought that your motion was premature in this case is because it

10-3 has pertained, as I understood your motion at least as originally made, to matters which the People have 2 indicated that they don't intend to offer. So, it would 3 seem to me to be a waste of time to have a prolonged 4 hearing on something that isn't going to happen. 5 MR. SHINN: That is one of the purposes of my 6 motions that I filed to suppress. 7 First of all, your Honor, I wanted to suppress 8 if possible, or get an evidentiary hearing, on her testi-9 mony at the Grand Jury. 10 THE COURT: That has already been disposed of. 11 MR. SHINN: No, your Honor, it hasn't. 12 We never had an evidentiary hearing to test 13 whether or not her constitutional rights were violated. 14 THE COURT: At the Grand Jury? 15 MR. SHINN: 10a fls. 16 Yes. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

10A-1

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

1Ż

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

.22 23

24

25 26 THE COURT: If you are talking about the admissibility --

MR. SHINN: Plus other confessions.

THE COURT: If you are talking about the admissibility of what she said at the Grand Jury in this case, that is one matter. If you are now attempting to attack the Grand Jury indictment, that is something different.

MR. SHINN: Her testimony at the Grand Jury.

I believe that is why, when I asked the Court,
I believe last week, whether or not you are going to hear
that, and the Court said no, therefore I immediately filed
my habeas corpus.

Under habeas corpus, your Honor, a defendant has a right to an evidentiary hearing where it involves any violation of a constitutional right.

THE COURT: My feeling is still the same. I think it is premature.

MR. SHINN: Premature on the Grand Jury testimony or premature on the admissions or confessions that are going to be introduced at the trial?

THE COURT: Well, if you are still trying to attack the Grand Jury indictments --

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor. The testimony at the Grand Jury under habeas corpus is possible.

MR. BUGLIOSI: This has already been ruled on, your Honor.

1 MR. STOVITZ: 2 3 4 State Supreme Court. 5 6 7 8 your Honor. 9 10. 11 12 13 14 they are offered. 15. MR. SHINN: Yes. 16 17 18 time. 19 20 21 offered. 22 23 24 25

26

THE COURT: Right. It has already been ruled on. I understand that counsel is now up at the DCA seeking a writ.

MR. SHINN: Yes. And from the DCA it will go to the

If the State Supreme Court directs this Court to give us a hearing under the habeas corpus, you will then have to stop this trial and give us an evidentiary hearing,

THE COURT: There will be no stay unless there is an order from a higher court.

MR. SHINN: Yes, I understand that.

THE COURT: Which leaves this Court with the problem of the admissibility of these statements, if, as, and when

THE COURT: As I indicated to you on a number of different occasions, I will determine that question at that

MR. SHINN: You mean at the time that it is introduced? THE COURT: That it is offered. If it or they are

MR. SHIMN: Then we may run into the danger, your Honor, that you may make a certain type of deletion that would be prejudicial to the declarant and I would have to move for a severance again.

THE COURT: Of course, I am not going to make that kind of a deletion.

MR. SHINN: That is the Court's personal opinion.

THE COURT: If I / any deletion, it is because I will have determined that it will not be prejudicial to either the defendant or the declarant.

MR. SHINN: Then, as I stated last week, this is not a confession. It is going to be an admission. It is going to be testimony by a third party.

Now, the danger there is that we don't know exactly what she is going to testify to.

She may slip and make some statement that may prejudice the other defendants. Then we would have to move for a mistrial.

Now, Mr. Bugliosi says well, she may testify to certain statements only; but it is very difficult to control a witness once she gets on the stand.

And then, your Honor, if Mr. Bugliosi has narrowed this down to a certain point, I may have to cross-examine her in different areas to protect my client.

I doubt if the Court is going to say, "You can only cross-examine in this limited area," when that limited area may be highly prejudicial to Miss Atkins.

10B

24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: I can say that the other areas would be much more prejudicial than the areas that would be admissible if the Court allows it.

MR. SHINN: We don't know yet.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think if you look at the statement, any other area that you might want to go into would be just going deeper and deeper into her involvement.

MR. SHINN: I may have to go into different areas to soften the blow to my client.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I say that the deeper you go the harder the blows if you look at that statement.

MR. SHINN: I doubt very much if you know right now, Mr. Bugliosi, what she is going to testify to.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is dependent upon what the Judge rules.

I am saying that if he deletes certain portions and if you want to go into those portions, it seems to me that you are just hurting yourself.

It is up to you, Mr. Shinn.

MR. SHINN: I don't know about that. I don't know what she is going to testify to yet.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It won't be too much, I will tell you that.

THE COURT: I have given you my indication, Mr. Shinn. Are you making a motion at this time?

MR. SHINN: Yes. I want to renew my motion to

105-2

3

have this heard by the Court in a pretrial motion.

THE COURT: The motion is denied without prejudice.

Anything further?

MR. SHINN: Nothing further.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, at this time I make a motion to associate in Leslie Van Houten as co-counsel with me.

Essentially, she would be a pro per, your Honor, with associated counsel myself.

However, I, as counsel, ask to associate her in as co-counsel with me.

THE COURT: This motion has been made a number of times before, as I recall. I don't recall now whether it was in respect to Miss Van Houten or one of the other defendants.

The motion will be denied.

Anything else, gentlemen?

MR. HUGHES: I believe back in February, when Mr. Part was Miss Van Houten's attorney, there was a request for an investigator and a certain amount of money was allotted, and I would like to find out from the Court if that investigator is still available or if that money is still available for Miss Van Houten.

THE COURT: I don't know. I wasn't in the case at that time, Mr. Hughes.

I don't know what the status of that motion

is or what has been done, if anything.

You are free to review the record yourself and make your own determination.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I would like to make a motion on behalf of Mr. Manson, your Honor, also, that he be his own lawyer in connection with this case, your Honor.

THE COURT: The motion will be denied.

MR. KANAREK: And I also make a motion, your Honor, that Mr. Manson be co-counsel.

Mr. Manson is very articulate. He has the capacity to ask questions, your Honor, He has this capacity, and the record will reveal it, that he has the capacity to articulate.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We have no objection to that.

MR. FITZGERALD: I think, actually, that the motion is very, very well taken, your Honor, and I am serious.

I vividly recall a very, very respected member of the Bar, Joseph Ball, representing to Judge Keene that under the circumstances present in this case that one of the only ways that he, in his opinion, Mr. Ball's opinion, that Manson might receive a fair trial would be if he were allowed to participate in his own defense, albeit a minimal sort of participation.

10c fls. 2

.20

23.

10C-1

· 17

24·

I think Mr. Ball had in mind, obviously, and what we have in mind, is that Mr. Manson be allowed to ask a few innocuous questions of various witnesses, certainly not all witnesses, and participate in some respect where the jury will be able to view him in open court, will be able to see his demeanor and his conduct.

ordinarily I wouldn't make such a representation to the Court, and I wouldn't ask a court to make such a ruling, but I think in this case, where your Honor is well aware as a result of the publicity that made Manson out to be some sort of vicious hypnotic ogre, some hippie cult leader, that his very demeanor and manner of speaking, talking and feeling is in issue, and I think that can be substantially rebutted.

I would also be willing to represent to the Court, and I think all counsel present would be able to represent to the Court, that we could set out guidelines under which Mr. Manson could operate; that he would not be subject to the same pitfalls that the ordinary pro per defendant is.

There are competent counsel here to handle the legal aspects. He would only be handling certain factual matters.

Additionally, I would like to point out to the Court that there are many joint aspects to this case.

Everybody wants to emphasize the significance of conflicts

L0C2

·8

8

.22

and the separateness but, basically, this is a joint defense. We have taken the position that all of the defendants are innocent, and we are certainly not taking the position that they didn't know each other before they were indicted for this offense.

As a matter of fact, we would be willing to represent to the Court that they were intimately associated with one another.

As a result thereof, Manson is in a position where he is in possession of a good deal of information concerning various witnesses who will testify for the prosecution and the defense, and he would be invaluable in assisting not only in his own defense but assisting in the defense of others, and we would certainly be happy and willing and able to undergo any sort of program that the Court might agree upon in terms of the regulation of Mr. Manson's behavior.

Now, in the past there has been some problem about Mr. Manson's character and conduct in the jail.

We are not asking, for example, that he be allowed to go pro per in jail, that he be given pro per facilities.

What we are asking is that he be allowed, in this courtroom, before your Honor, to participate in his own defense in a very limited fashion.

We have talked this over with the prosecution on a number of occasions. Not only do they feel that he is

competent, but they don't feel that he would be an obstructionist. They don't feel that he would be dilatory. As a matter of fact, your Honor, I think that Manson's participation in this defense would materially expedite and facilitate it. MR. KANAREK: That is correct, your Honor. MR. SHINN: We agree with Mr. Fitzgerald. Then we would even go one step further. We would have an iron-clad waiver signed by Mr. Manson in the event that there is a reversal. THE COURT: A waiver? What is that? MR. SHINN: I mean, in the event that he later states that he waived his counsel. 22.

10d-1

17.

THE COURT: Let me state one thing, gentlemen.

Mr. Ball, to begin with, was associated with this case a very short time and had very little opportunity to observe Mr. Manson.

At least four judges, to my knowledge, of this court, have, after observing Mr. Manson, acquainting themselves with the transcripts of the various proceedings, determined that he is not competent to represent himself, notwithstanding the fact that he may or may not be articulate.

So, I have no reason to change my opinion on that in that regard.

Now, I don't know what you are talking about in the way of some limited form of representation.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, Mr. Manson has the capacity to articulate.

THE COURT: That doesn't necessarily make him competent, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: No. But what I state is this: Your Honor has control over these proceedings. Mr. Manson, if at any time Mr. Manson does not comport himself properly, your Honor has the control, as your Honor has control over all of us, and what I am saying is -- what I am saying is -- I would welcome that your Honor allow Mr. Manson, in a very limited way, to ask the questions.

In other words, in certain areas, just like it

10d-2

8:

.23

5

is our position, the prosecution, Mr. Bugliosi and Mr. Stovitz, as your Honor knows, when there is more than one attorney present, an attorney takes a portion of the case.

Now, Mr. Manson has the capacity to ask questions in a very limited manner, and he could ask these questions.

THE COURT: Well, I see no reason to change any previous order with respect to this.

I might also point out that this has gone up to the California Supreme Court and been affirmed.

MR. KANAREK: May Mr. Manson speak to you, your Honor?

THE COURT: I don't know. On what subject?
This subject we are talking about now?

DEFENDANT MANSON: Your Honor, when approaching something you know nothing about, as I approached the courtroom --

THE COURT: What do you want to talk about?
Tell me what the subject matter is first.

DEFENDANT MANSON: The subject matter in your Honor's mind in regard to the decision that was made by the other four judges. The information that was in the transcript that formed the decision that you hold in your mind.

If I could shed some light on that, maybe

I could open up a few channels of understanding.

THE COURT: It has already been considered. The ruling has already been made. There is no reason to reopen it at this time.

Anything else, gentlemen?

DEFENDANT MANSON: Would you tie your own hands?

THE COURT: Let's go back into court and we will then adjourn until Friday at 9:45.

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

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

The alternate jurors will go to lunch with the jury today and will then be excused until tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. You should have with you tomorrow your personal belongings that you care to take with you to the hotel.

This trial is adjourned until next Friday, that is, July 24th, at 9:45 a.m.

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

Additionally, do not read, watch or listen to any news report concerning the case so long as you are

connected with it.

As far as the regular jury is concerned, that will be Friday at 9:45; and the alternates, after lunch today, are excused until 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. FITZGERALD: Your Honor, was that just for the alternate jurors tomorrow morning?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Whereupon at 12:03 o'clock p.m. the court was in recess.)

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, JULY 24, 1970 9:50 o'clock a.m. 2 3 THE COURT: People vs. Charles Manson, Susan Atkins, 4 Patricia Krenwinkel and Leslie Van Houten. 5 All parties and counsel and jurors are present. 6 Are the People ready? Ž, MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Are the defendants ready? . 9 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. The defendants are Τα ready to proceed, your Honor. 11 We would ask your Honor to synopsize the .12 charges, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Do the parties waive the reading of the 14 indictment? 15 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, we would welcome the 16 Court to synopsize the charges. 17 THE COURT: I am not going to synopsize the charges. 18 MR. FITZGERALD: The defendants waive a formal 19 reading of the indictment, your Honor. 20 MR. KANAREK: That is correct, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Very well. Do the People care to make 22 23 an opening statement? MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor, yes, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: You may proceed. 25 MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, defense counsel, ladies 26

Š.

and gentlemen of the jury,

The purpose of my opening statement is to give you a very brief preview or outline of what evidence the prosecution intends to introduce at this trial and what we expect to prove by that evidence so as to assist you in following the evidence and the testimony as it comes from the witness stand under oath.

After five and one-half weeks of extensive voir dire, and I know you folks were as tired of it as I was, it was a necessary process. You probably already have some rather general idea of what this trial is going to be all about.

2 fls.

ġ.

Ġ

15 .

. 19

2-1

2

1

3 4

5

6

.8

9

10

12

13 .14

> 15 16

17

18,

19

20

2I -22

23

24 25

26,

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I submit that is not a proper opening statement.

Your Honor, he is supposed to state what the People purportedly will prove, and I must object.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may proceed.

MR. BUGLIOSI: By the time this trial ends, you folks will probably be as familiar or even more familiar with the facts and the evidence as we attorneys.

Now and then an attorney will give a rather lengthy opening statement, going into considerable detail as to what each witness will testify to.

My particular style, if you will, is not to do this. Like most attorneys, I believe in rather brief opening statements.

In the prosecution's final summation to you, three or four months from now -- let's hope it is not that long -- you won't be quite so lucky. At that time we will go into considerable depth with you, reviewing the testimony of each witness, tying each witness's testimony in with the testimony of other witnesses.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I must object. This is not a proper opening statement. He is telling what the argument is going to entail.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Tying each witness's testimony in with the testimony of other witnesses, analyzing the

testimony, drawing inferences from the evidence, et cetera, et cetera.

In fact, don't be overly surprised if our final summation takes between two and three full court days. But today I am merely going to provide you with a very broad structure of the People's case.

The testimony of the witnesses given from that witness stand under oath will supply all the necessary bricks, as it were.

2a fla.

ΪΊ

5 ·

It is the custom of many lawyers to preface everything they say in the opening statement with the repetitious phrase, "The evidence will show." Although I intend to use that phrase myself frequently, I do not intend to use it any more than I have to. However, on those occasions when I do not preface a statement of mine with the words "The evidence will show," please understand it is implicit in everything I say.

As you know, there are eight counts to this Grand Jury indictment. The first seven counts are murder counts, the eighth count charges the crime of conspiracy to commit murder.

The first five counts of the indictment charge murders allegedly occurring on August the 9th, 1969.

MR. KAMAREK: Your Honor, I must object. This is not an opening statement.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You may proceed, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR.BUGLIOSI: These five murders are commonly referred to as the Tate murders.

Counts VI and VII of the indictment charge murders allegedly occurring on August the 10th, 1969, the following day. These are the murders of Mr. and Mrs. Leno La Bianca.

Patricia Kranwinkel are charged with all seven murders; that is, the five Tata murders on August the 9th, 1969, and the

.

1<u>1</u>.

1<u>8</u>.

2A2

à

4.

21.

murders of Mr. and Mrs. Leno La Blanca on August the 10th, 1969.

Each of these three defendants are also charged in the eighth count of the indictment with the crime of conspiracy to commit murder.

The defendant Leslie Van Houten, on the other hand, is not charged in the first five counts of the indictment, the five Tate murders. She is only charged in Count VI and VII of the indictment, the murders of Mr. and Mrs. Leno La Bianca.

so, I would remind you that any evidence at this trial that pertains solely to the five Tate murders should not be considered by you against Miss Van Houten for the simple reason that she is not charged with these murders.

2b-1

2

1

3

5

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14 15 .

16

17

18.

19

20. 21

22

23:

24 25

26

In addition to Miss Van Houten's being charged in Count VI and VII of the indictment with the murders of Mr. and Mrs. La Bianca, she is also charged, along with her three co-defendants, in the eighth count of the indictment with the crime of conspiracy to commit murder.

So, in summary, then, the Defendants Charles Manson, Susan Atkins and Patricia Krenwinkel are charged with all eight counts of the indictment. The Defendant Leslie Van Houten, on the other hand, is only charged with Count VI. VII and VIII of the indictment, the last three counts of the indictment.

Mr. Stovitz and I, representing the prosecution, that is, the People of the State of California, expect to offer evidence in this trial proving that on or before August the 8th, 1969, Defendants Charles Manson, Susan Atkins and Patricia Krenwinkel, together with Charles Watson, who is not presently being tried with these defendants, entered into a conspiracy to commit murder.

Whether or not a fifth person, Linda Kasabian, was a member of that conspiracy would probably be up to you ladies and gentlemen to decide.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I must object. This is argument, your Honor. This is not an opening statement when he starts speaking of Linda Kasabian.

1

2

3

`5

б

7

ģ

3 £1#40

Ш

12

13

15

16

17.

18

19

...

20

21^{*} 22

23

24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, could we approach the bench so I can get through this opening statement?

THE COURT: Overruled. Let's proceed.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Pursuant to the aforementioned conspiracy to commit murder, in the early morning hours of August the 9th, 1969, Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel and Charles Watson murdered five human beings at the Roman Polanski residence, a secluded home at the top of a long winding driveway located at 10050 Cielo Drive in the City of Los Angeles.

ŀ

2

3 .

4.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 · 15

16

17

4.4.

18,

20

21

22

23. 24

25

26

This area of Los Angeles is contiguous to Beverly Hills and $B \in 1$ -Air.

The five victims who were murdered at the Roman Polanski residence were Mr. Polanski's wife, Sharon Marie Polanski whose stage name was Sharon Tate, Abigail Folger, Wajiciech Frykowski, Jay Sebring and Steven Parent, as I previously indicated, these five murders are commonly referred to as the Tate murders. In the interest of brevity I will hereafter refer to them as such.

I will also refer to the Roman Polanski residence as the Tate residence hereafter.

As I indicated, the Tate murders took place in the early morning hours of August 9, 1969.

Later that same day in the late evening of August 9, 1969 the defendant Leslie Van Houten joined the continuing conspiracy to commit murder. Pursuant to that conspiracy in the early morning hours of August 10, 1969 these defendants murdered Leno and Rosemarie La Bianca at their residence located at 3301 Waverly Drive in the Los Feliz-Griffith Park area of Los Angeles.

A question you ladies and gentlemen will probably ask yourselves at some point during this trial, and we expect the evidence to answer that question for you, is this:

What kind of a diabolical mind would contemplate

1

or conceive of these seven murders?

2

3

what kind of mind would want to have seven human beings brutally murdered?

4

We expect the evidence at this trial to answer that question and show that Defendant Charles Manson owned

6

that diabolical mind.

7 .8-

Charles Manson, who the evidence will show at times has had the infinite humility, as it were, to refer to

9

himself as Jesus Christ.

10

Evidence at this trial from several witnesses will show Defendant Manson to be a vagrant wanderer, a

1:1: 12

frustrated singer-guitarist, a pseudo philosopher, but most

13

of all the evidence at this trial will conclusively prove

14

that Charles Manson is a killer who cleverly masqueraded

15

behind the common image of a hippie, that of being peace loving.

16

17

18

19.

20

.21 22

23

24

25

26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

3#-1

2

4

5

7

g.

10

12 13

. 14

16

17

18.

.19 .20

2Î

23

24 25

26

The evidence at this trial will show Charles

Manson to be a megalomaniac who coupled his insatiable

thirst for power --

MR. KANAREK: I must approach the bench. I must ask that we approach the bench.

THE COURT: Does this pertain to the opening state-

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled, you may proceed, Mr. Bugliogi.

MR. BUGLICSI: -- a megalomaniac who coupled his insatiable thirst for power with an intense obsession for violent death.

The testimony at this trial from several witnesses will show Charles Manson was the unquestioned leader and overlord of a nomadic band of vagabonds who called themselves "The Family."

All of these defendants were members of Charles Manson's Family. At the time of the date of the La Bianca murders, the Family led a communal type existence at isolated Spahn Ranch, located in suburban Chatsworth, California.

Although Manson's Family varied in size from time to time, it invariably consisted mostly of females, and the evidence will show that this was by Mr. Manson's design. He felt that to become powerful he needed men, but he could not attract men to his Family without

3a-2

1 .

3,

4

5 6

. 7

ġ.

9

10 11

12

. 13

14

15

16

17

18,

Ž0.

21, 22

23

24.

25

26

there being women to satisfy every need.

We anticipate that Mr. Manson, in his defense, will claim that neither he nor anyone else was the leader of the Family and that he never ordered anyone in the Family to do anything, much less commit these seven murders.

MR. KANAKEK: Your Honor, he is now making an opening statement for us.

THE COURT: Overruled, you may continue, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We are going to make it through this

opening statement despite the gross discourtesy of Mr.

Kanarek.

We therefore intend to offer evidence at this trial showing that Charles Manson was in fact the dictatorial leader of the Family; that everyone in the Family was slavishly obedient to him, and that he always had other members of his Family do his bidding for him; eventually they committed the seven Tate-La Bianca murders at his command.

This evidence of Mr. Manson's total domination over the Family will be offered as circumstantial evidence; that on the two nights in question it was he who ordered these seven murders.

We have already discussed ad nauseam what circumstantial evidence is, and the distinction between circumstantial and direct evidence, during four or five weeks of voir dire.

1Ò

Ì5

16.

19.

2L

3b fls.

Although the evidence will show that Charles
Manson did not himself personally kill any of these seven
Tate-La Bianca victims, we intend to show that since he
was a member of the conspiracy to commit that murder, in
fact the leader of the conspiracy, he is equally responsible
and equally guilty under the laws of conspiracy for the
seven murders committed by his co-conspirators.

3B1

. 1

· 12

13 ·

21,

.

The principal witness for the prosecution will be Linda Kasabian, and you heard her name mentioned innumerable times thus far.

Linda is also charged with the seven Tate-La Bianca murders, but we intend to petition the Court, that is, ask the Court to grant her immunity from prosecution.

The evidence will show that Mrs. Kasabian was not a hard core member of the Family, having just come to live with the Family only one month before the Tate-La Bianca murders.

In very brief outline form, Mrs. Kasabian will testify that on the evening of August 8th, 1969, at Spahn Ranch, Charles Manson instructed her to get a knife, a fresh change of clothing, her driver's license, and to go along with Charles "Tex" watson, Susan Atkins and Patricia Krenwinkel and do everything that Tex told her to do.

She will testify that pursuant to those instructions, but without being specifically told by Mr. Manson what was going to happen, she accompanied Charles Watson, Susan Atkins and Patricia Krenwinkel in the late evening hours of August 8, 1969 and the early morning hours of August 9, 1969 on to the Tate residence.

Although she did not enter the Tate residence, and the evidence will show that she did not commit any of the five murders, she will testify to her observations, including an eye witness to the

.

.1

6

2<u>1</u>

murder of Steven Farent, by being shot to death by Charles Watson in the driveway of the Tate residence.

She will also testify to observing the murders of Wajiciech Frykowski and Abigail Folger by Charles Watson and Patricia Krenwinkel on the front lawn of the Tate residence.

The evidence will show that Sharon Tate and Jay Sebring were murdered inside the Tate residence.

Mrs. Kasabian did not actually observe these two murders; however she will testify, for instance, that she observed Susan Atkins coming out the front door of the Tate residence, and to Miss Atkins telling her that she had lost her knife inside the residence.

Mrs. Kasabian will testify that after Tex watson, Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel and she left the Tate residence, at Tex Watson's instruction she threw the knives, which had been used to murder the victims, and the blood-splattered clothing the killers wore, over the side of the hill in the Benedict Canyon area in Los Angeles.

When the group returned to Spahn Ranch after the five Tate murders, Charles Manson was waiting for them.

Tex Watson reported to Charles Manson what had happened. After this Mr. Manson asked each of them if they felt any remorse whatsoever for having committed these murders, to which they all replied they did not.

3c-1

. 5

6.

.8

2Ž

Mrs. Kasabian will testify that actually she was personally filled with remorse over what had happened, but she was afraid to admit this to Charles Manson.

There will be testimony that after the murders the word, pig, p-i-g, was found printed in blood, human blood, on the outside of the front door to the Tate residence.

Among other things we will introduce into evidence the firearm which was used to shoot Steven Parent to death, a .22 caliber Long Horn BUNT LINE revolver.

We will also introduce into evidence the actual clothing the killers wore during the commission of these murders, both the revolver and clothing were found by civilian witnesses on the side of a hill in the Benedict Canyon area in Los Angeles.

We will also offer evidence that the car the killers drove during the night of the Tate murders was a 1959 Ford, California license plate No. GYY 435, a car that was owned and registered to one John Schwartz, a ranch hand at Spahn Ranch who was not a member of the Family.

Dr. Thomas Noguchi, the Coroner of Los
Angeles County, will testify that he conducted the
post-mortem examination, that is, the autopates on the
bodies of the five victims, and that the cause of death of

.

.

18_.

20-

Sharon Tate, Abigail Folger, Wajiciech Frykowski and Jay Sebring was multiple stab wounds.

He will also testify that the fifth victim, Steven Parent was shot to death.

Wajiciech Frykowski and Jay Sebring were also shot but their gunshot wounds were not fatal.

Dr. Noguchi will testify that Mr. Frykowski and Mr. Sebring died from multiple stab wounds.

Dr. Noguchi will also testify there was no medical evidence of sexual molestation to any of the victims bodies.

The evidence will show that Charles Manson know the former occupant of the Tate residence, one Terry Melchior, a music publisher and record producer who in a rather subtle and oblique fashion rejected Charles Manson's efforts to have him record Manson commercially as a singer-guitarist.

Mrs. Kasabian will further testify in the late evening of August 9, 1969, Charles Manson told Tex Watson and the others that they had been too messy, mind you, the night before, and this time he was going to show them how to do it.

She will testify that on the evening of August 9th, 1969, she accompanied Charles Manson, Tex Watson, Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel and Leglie Van Houten and a man named Steve Grogan in a car to various

2 ` 3

4

6

7. 8

9

11 11

12

13⁻

15

16 17

18

19

.20

21 22

> 23 24

25

26

locations in Los Angeles County. Their mission, ladies and gentlemen, was murder.

Mrs. Kasabian will testify that she did not want to go along with the others on this night, but when Mr. Manson instructed her to do so, she felt she had no other choice and went out of fear of Mr. Manson.

Linda Kasabian's testimony will clearly show, it will clearly demonstrate that on this evening, August 9th, 1969, as contrasted to the previous night when they drove directly to the Tate residence, in this vast sprawling metropolis of over seven million people, no one, be he in a home, apartment or an automobile, was safe from Manson's lust for death, blood and murder.

MR. FITZGERAID: Objection, your Honor, improper opening statement.

THE COURT: Sustained. The jury is admonished to disregard that remark.

MR. RANAREK: May we approach the bench, your Honor.

THE COURT: The objection has been sustained.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The testimony will show that at Manson's direction the killers roamed about initially looking for their victims, totally at random.

Among several other places they even stopped at a church in Pasadena, but they drove off when Mr.
Manson discovered that the door to the church was locked.
Ultimately, however, Manson directed Linda,

4 fls.

who was driving the car, to the address, 3267 Waverly Drive in the Los Feliz-Griffith Park area of Los Angeles.

4-1

1

Ź

3

4

5

·6.

8

9

10.

11

12 13

. -14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

A year earlier, Manson had, on several occasions, visited the former resident at that address, a man named Harold True.

Manson got out of the car alone, walked to the home next door to Harold True's former residence, the home next door being the residence of Leno and Rosemarie

La Bianca at 3301 Waverly Drive,

When Manson returned to the car several minutes later, he told Tex Watson, Fatricia Krenwinkel and Leslie Van Houten to get out of the car.

He then told them, among other things, that he had tied the hands of the occupants of the home, and then instructed them how to murder the victims.

He told them not to cause panic and fear in the victims the way they had the previous night.

Dr. Katsayama, of the County Coroner's office, will testify that he conducted the autopsy on Leno and Rosemarie La Bianca, and Mr. and Mrs. La Bianca and four out of the five Tate victims died from multiple stab wounds.

Linda Kasabian will also testify that after
Tex Watson, Patricia Krenwinkel and Leslie Van Houten left
the car and Mr. Manson and the others drove off, Charles
Manson gave her Rosemarie La Bianca's wallet and eventually instructed her to hide the wallet in the woman's
restroom of a gasoline station in Sylmar, which she did.

Later in the night, Manson instructed Linda,

.

4

5 6

7

8

10

11

1Ż

13

14: 15

16

17

18

19

20

2**1**

23.

24

25

26

Susan Atkins and Steve Grogan to murder a man in his apartment in Venice, a man whom Linda previously knew.

MR. KANARFK: Your Honor, I must approach the bench.

This is in violation of a representation made to this Court,
a direct misrepresentation made to this Court.

THE COURT: I don't know what you are referring to.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I will enunciate it,

THE COURT: Are you objecting to the opening statement?

MR. KANAREK: I am objecting because there was a representation made to the Court. Mr. Bugliosi made a representation to the Court as a result of colloquy we had in chambers, and this is misconduct on the part of Mr. Bugliosi. Misconduct, your Honor.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. Let's proceed.

MR. BUGLIOSI. Let me go back just a few lines.

Later in the night, after the La Blanca murders, Charles Manson instructed Linda, Susan Atkins and Steve Grogan to murder a man in his apartment in Venice off the ocean, a man whom Linda previously knew, but Linda prevented the murder by deliberately knocking on the wrong door.

There will be other evidence at this trial connecting Mr. Manson with both the Tate and La Blanca murders, which I will not go into at this time.

will the evidence at this trial show the motive for these seven murders?

4.3

· -1

•

.

9.

11.

4A

24,

As the Court will instruct you at the conclusion of the evidence, but before you deliberate, the prosecution does not have the burden of offering one single, solitary speck of evidence as to the motives these defendants had for committing these murders. We only have the burden of proving that they committed these murders. We do not have the burden of proving the reason why they committed these murders. Legally, motive is never a necessary part of the People's case.

However, where we have evidence of motive, we will naturally offer it because if one has a motive for committing a murder, this is circumstantial evidence that it was he who committed the murder.

49-1

5,

11:

6

1ġ

21:

In this trial, we will offer evidence of Charles Manson's motives for ordering these seven murders. We believe there to be more than one motive.

Besides the motives of Manson's passion for violent deaths and his extreme anti-establishment state of mind, the evidence at this trial will show that there was a further motive for these murders which is perhaps as bizarre, or perhaps even more bizarre, than the murders themselves.

Briefly, the evidence will show Manson's fanatical obsession with Helter Skelter, a term he got from the English musical recording group the Beatles.

Manson was an avid follower of the Beatles and believed that they were speaking to him across the ocean through the lyrics of their songs. In fact, Manson told his followers that he found complete support for his philosophy from the words of the songs by the Beatles in their songs.

of one of their songs, indicated the black man rising up against the white establishment and murdering the entire white race; that is, with the exception of Charles Manson and his chosen followers, who attempted to escape from Helter Skelter and living in the Bottomless Pit, a place that Manson derived from Revelation . 9. Revelation 9 is the last book of the New Testament, from which

ĺ

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

- 21

22 23

24,

25

26

support for his philosophies.

The evidence from several witnesses will show that Charles Manson hated black people, but he also hated the white establishment, whom he called pigs.

Mr. Manson told his followers that he found further

As I previously indicated, the word "pig" was found printed in blood on the outside of the front door to the Tate residence.

The evidence at this trial will also show that the words "death to pigs, Helter Skelter," and "rise" were found printed in blood inside the La Bianca residence.

The evidence will show that one of Manson's principal motives for these seven savage murders was to ignite Helter Skelter; in other words, start the blackwhite revolution by making it look like the black man had murdered these seven victims, thereby causing the white community to turn against the black man, ultimately leading to a civil war between blacks and whites, a war which Manson told his followers would involve blood baths in the streets of every American city, a war which Manson predicted and foresaw the black man as winning.

There will be some circumstantial evidence in this trial pointing to Mr. Manson's efforts to make it appear like the black people had committed these murders.

Ž.

ġ.

18,

23·

Although Mr. Manson originally wanted, in fact, on a day-to-day basis he constantly predicted that black people themselves would start Helter Skelter, as spring wore into summer, 1969, he became impatient with the black man, and his own words he said, "I am going to have to show 'Blackie' how to do it."

+B-1

1,

3

4

Ų.

6_.

8

ġ

10.

11

12

13 14.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

Manson envisioned that black people, once they destroyed the entire white race and assumed the reins of power, would be unable to handle the reins of power because of inexperience. They would, therefore, have to turn over the reins to those white people who had escaped from Helter Skelter; i.e., turn over the reins of power to Mr. Manson and his Family.

In Manson's mind -- in Manson's mind -- his Family, and particularly he, were the ultimate beneficiaries of a black-white civil war:

when we offer this evidence on Manson's philosophy on life, please remember that it is not really necessary to your determination of the guilt or innocence of these defendants. We are simply offering this evidence of Manson's philosophy to help you understand how and why these murders came about, and we are offering this evidence of Manson's motive for these seven murders as circumstantial evidence that it was Charles Manson and these defendants who committed these murders.

I want to add one further point. We intend to offer the testimony of not just one witness but many witnesses to testify to Manson's philosophy on life.

These witnesses will be among the last witnesses.

Most of these witnesses will be among the last witnesses
whom we will call to the witness stand.

Among the main witnesses whom the prosecution

4.

5.

.

13:

Źl.

intends to call to the witness stand to testify to Charles Manson's philosophy will be Greg Jacobson, a friend of Charles Manson who was not a member of the Family, and Paul Latkins and Brooks Losten, both of whom were members of the Family, who knew Manson very intimately.

We intend to offer the testimony of several witnesses on Manson's philosophy, because the evidence at this trial will show that they are so strange and so bizarre that if you heard them only from the lips of one person you folks would probably not believe it. So, when we offer the testimony of several witnesses on Helter Skelter, et cetera, although it will be somewhat repetitious — and I apologize to you for that — please understand the reason why Mr. Stovitz and I feel it is necessary to do so.

MR. FITZGFRALD: I am going to object. That is improper opening statement. Mr. Bugliosi's motives aren't in issue here.

MR. KANAREK: Join.

THE COURT: The statement will be stricken and the jury is admonished to disregard it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Although this Helter Skelter motive is admittedly far out, Mr. Stovitz and I intend to ask you ladies and gentlemen to realize that murders as strange and bizarre as these murders were are not likely to have the type of garden variety motive that one would expect to find contained within the pages of some conventional text book on

Ž

6.

8.

ļO

12.

· 21

-22

police science.

What about Charles Manson's followers, the other defendants in this case, Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel and Leslie Van Houten?

The evidence will show that they, along with Tex Watson, were the actual killers of the seven Tate-LaBianca victims.

4c-1

T.

.6

ĝ

İŀ

ģ

We expect the evidence to show that they were very willing participants in these mass murders. That by their overkill tactics -- for instance, Wajiciech Frykowski was stabbed 51 times, shot once and struck violently over the head 13 times with the butt of a revolver; Rosemary La Bianca was stabbed 41 times -- by their overkill tactics, these defendants displayed that even apart from Charles Manson, murder ran through their own blood.

As I previously indicated, the evidence will show that the five Tate murders took place in the early morning hours of August the 9th, 1969. The two La Bianca murders took place the following night, the early morning hours of August the 10th, 1969.

In addition to Linda Kasabian's testimony implicating Defendant Susan Atkins with the seven TateLa Bianca murders, the evidence will, at this trial, show that in late October and early November, 1969, approximately three months after the murders, while Susan Atkins was incarcerated at Sybil Brand Institute for Women here in East Los Angeles --

MR. SHINN: I object, your Honor. I know what he is going to say now and I object.

We discussed this matter before and we decided it was improper opening statement, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

2

3

4.

6

Ť

ĝ.

9

10

П

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

2I' 22

23

24 25

26

THE COURT: Overruled.

You may proceed.

MR. BUGLIOSI: While she was incarcerated at Sybil Brand Institute for Women here in East Los Angeles, she had conversations with three of her co-inmates, Virginia Graham, Veronica Williams, also known as Roni Howard, and Rosanne Walker, in which the told them of her involvement in these murders. And there will be other scientific evidence, which I will not go into at this time, connecting Miss Atkins with the five Tate murders.

With respect to the defendant Patricia
Krenwinkel, in addition to Linda Kasabian's testimony
implicating her in the seven Tate murders, we will prove
by scientific evidence that her fingerprints were found
on the inside of the back door to the master bedroom of
the Tate residence.

We will offer other circumstantial evidence against Patricia Krenwinkel connecting her with these seven murders, which I will not go into at this time, except to say that it will concern conduct of Miss Krenwinkel, conduct which showed a consciousness of guilt on her part.

With respect to the Defendant Leslie Van Houten-MR. HUGHES: Object, your Honor. I object on the same grounds as stated by Mr. Shinn. We went into this in chambers the other day.

MR. BUGLIOSI: With respect to the Defendant Leslie Van Houten, as I have indicated, she is only charged with the two La Bianca murders, not the five Tate murders, in addition to Linda Kasabian's testimony implicating Defendant Leslie Van Houten with the La Bisnca murders, we will offer evidence that at Death Valley in late September, 1969, she had a conversation with Diame Lake, snother member of the Family, in which she told Miss Lake of her involvement in the La Bianca murders.

Although it will not be your duty to return any kind of a verdict, guilty or not guilty, against Charles Watson, since he is not presently being tried with these defendants, inasmuch as Mr. Watson is named in this indictment as a co-conspirator with these defendants. we will offer evidence connecting Mr. Watson with these seven murders.

4d £1s.

19

20

22

24

25

,26

4D-1

2

3

4

5

8.

ġ

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

J9

20 21

22:

23

24 25

26

In addition to Linda Kasabian's testimony implicating Charles Watson with these seven murders, we intend to prove that his fingerprints were found on the outside of the front door to the Tate residence.

The evidence at this trial will show that Charles Manson started his Family in the Haight-Asbury district of San Francisco in March of 1967.

The Family's demise, as it were, took place in October of 1969 at Barker Ranch, a desolate, secluded, rock-strewn hideout from civilization on the shadowy perimeters of Death Valley in Inyo County, California.

Between March, 1967 and October, 1969, seven human beings and an 8-1/2 month baby boy fetus in the womb of Sharon Tate met their death at the hands of these members of the Family.

The evidence at the trial will show that these seven incredible murders were perhaps the most bizarre, savage, hightmarish murders in the recorded annals of crime; of course, excluding wartime atrocities.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor --

MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Stovitz and I intend to prove not just beyond a reasonable doubt, which is our only burden, of course, but beyond all doubt that these defendants committed these murders, that these defendants are guilty of these murders; and in our final arguments to you at the conclusion of the evidence, we intend to ask you to