## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT NO. 104

HON. CHARLES H. OLDER, JUDGE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff,

46

vs.

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

Defendants.

No. A253156

REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT Friday, August 7, 1970

P. M. SESSION

APPEARANCES:

For the People:

AARON H. STOVITZ and VINCENT T. BUGLIOSI, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

For Deft. Manson:

I. A. KANAREK, Esq.

For Deft. Atkins:

DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Deft. Van Houten:

RONALD HUGHES, Esq.

For Deft. Krenwinkel:

PAUL FITZGERALD, Esq.

For Linda Kasabian:

GARY FLEISCHMAN, Esq. RONALD L. GOLDMAN, Esq.

VOLUME 46

JOSEPH B. HOLLOMBE, CSR., MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR.,

PAGES

6652 to 6724

Official Reporters

2

3 4

5

. 7.

9 10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20.

21 22

\* v t

23

24

25

26

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 1970 2:00 o'clock p.m.

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

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

I have asked you to come in chambers with regard to our juror Mr. Vitzelio whom I propose to call in to ask a few more questions, regarding his request to be excused, and to give counsel an opportunity to ask any questions, and then we will proceed from there.

Will you call in Mr. Vitzelio, please.

(Walter Vitzelio enters the chambers of the court.)

THE COURT: Sit down, Mr. Vitzelio.

I received your letter from the bailiff this morning and I wanted to have you come back in to make sure that you had a chance to express yourself on the matters set forth in the letter, and also to inquire as to your present state of mind and physical condition.

How is your health, sir?

MR. VITZELIO: Well, I am having trouble with my stomach. I suppose you know that.

I went to the doctor the other night over to

the General Hospital and --

THE COURT: Keep your voice up, please.

THE WITNESS: (Indicating.) (Witness indicates

dentures.)

MR. VITZELIO: That is the reason I can't. I have no gum raise. When I talk loud my teeth come out.

I went to the General Hospital. The way they

talked, they talked like they were going to pass a G.I.

on me, but they didn't, so I come back Tuesday night and

0

I think I had a glass of milk Tuesday night or something.

We came back late, after 8:00 o'clock.

18 fls.

25.

Last night I didn't even go down to eat.

18-1

-=

1

3

Ş

6

7

8

10.

1I 12

13

**15**,

14

16 17

18

19

21

20

22

24

23

25 26 THE COURT: Were you feeling badly?
MR. VITZELIO: Yes.

If I wat -- in the morning I at a breakfast.

Wednesday morning I at a breakfast. Then I started to get a belly ache.

So, then at noon, Wednesday, I got a turkey sandwich and I ate half of it, and a glass of milk.

Wednesday night I didn't eat at all. I didn't even go down when we went to lunch.

Yesterday morning I ate breakfast, and at noon yesterday I just had a glass of milk.

Last night I didn't even go down at all again. At night especially.

THE COURT: Because of the way you are feeling?

MR. VITZELIO: On account of my stomach. As soon as
I don't eat right, I get a belly ache. My stomach starts
to kick up.

What I am concerned with mostly is not myself but my wife. She is there herself, absolutely alone. She has got no transportation. If someone would tear the house down, nobody would be there. She is all by herself.

She is supposed to come down Sunday, and a party in Pasadena will bring her, but the party can't stay. She is going to bring me some checks that I have to sign.

THE COURT: Now, in your latter to me this morning you requested that you be excused from further jury duty.

2

L

3 4

5 6

7

\*

'n.

9 . 10:

11

13

15.

14

16 17

18

¥ \_ \$

20 21

> 22 23

24 25

26

.

18%

Are you still of the same mind?

MR. VITZELIO: Yes, I am. On account of my wife.

I know she is going to be a nervous wreck. She is scared to death.

THE COURT: Is that because of your concern for your wife?

MR. VITZELIO: Myself, too.

You see, around home you get out in the sun.
You see, I have arthritis. See my fingers how they are
doubled up? My elbow, too.

If I get out in the sun every day and get a lot of juices, fine. But here, like I tried to get papaya, and they don't have papaya.

THE COURT: Are you sleeping well?
MR. VITZELIO: No.

Not from 1:00 o'clock on. My nerves. I am worried about my wife.

of both your own physical condition and your wife's?

MR. VITZELIO: Yes, that's right.

My teeth, too. On my teeth here I got a spot now, on these plates. They are just rubbing.

When I am home, I fix them myself. I got a dental burr. I put it in a drill press and grind it out and with sandpaper I rub it off.

THE COURT: Does anyone wish to ask Mr. Vitzelio any question?

18a-1 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, if I might, sir. What do you think would happen if you were 2 asked to continue as a juror? 3 MR. VITZELIO: I wouldn't want to. 4 In what way? What do you mean? 5 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, in regard to your mental frame . 6 of mind? .t 7 MR. VITZELIO: I would be worrying all the time about 8 my wife. She is alone. She has got emphysems. She is a really sick. 10 I tell you what you do. You call up her 11 doctor and see what he says. 19 MR. FITZGERALD: We don't doubt that. I am simply 13 asking you what do you think will happen? What is your 14 frame of mind? Would it influence you? 15 MR. VITZELIO: Influence me in regard to the trial 16 as to which side I would vote for? 17 MR. FITZGERALD: Is it going to influence you in 18 any way? 19 MR. VITZELIO: No, it wouldn't influence me in any 20 way. 21 MR. FITZGERALD: Both the prosecution and the 22 defense are going to ask you to pay very close and 23 careful attention to the evidence in this case. MR. VITZELIO: That's right. 25

26

MR, FITZGERALD: Is it going to influence you?

18a-2

£

.7

3

2

5

4

6

9. 8.

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

2I 22

> 23 24

25

26.

MR. VITZELIO: No, it wouldn't influence me a bit.

Now, you take the other day --

MR. FITZGERALD: What is your problem then?

MR. VITZELIO: My problem? My health. I can't eat.

I have been missing all my meals and everything else.

I have got arthritis and everything else.

The way I am going now here, why, for the time being, I'm not used to -- take my legs. I am starting to get cramps now sitting there.

I got a cramp here the other day. I thought I was going to have to stand up. You just recessed the court in time. You had a recess or I would have had to stand up.

THE COURT: Doesn't all of this have some effect on your ability to concentrate on the testimony?

MR. FITZGERAID: Exactly?

MR. VITZELIO: That's right. I got a cramp. It came right here. I don't know if you noticed it. I was trying to stretch my legs and I didn't want to stand up. Then you said we would have a recess for ten or fifteen minutes.

THE COURT: Do you find these things are distracting you from carefully listening to the testimony?

MR. VITZELIO: Sure. What I am afraid of here,
I am laying awake nights worrying about my wife. Today
I was up from 1:00 o'clock.

The other night here I got up. I went to bed at 12:30 and I laid there until 2:00 o'clock. I looked at the clock and it was 2:00 o'clock. Then I fell asleep. 3:30 I woke up. I laid there until 4:00. I couldn't sleep no more. So I got up and went to the recreation room and I stayed there until a quarter to 5:00.

I came back in. I had the clock set for 6:00 o'clock. I got an hour and 15 minutes sleep.

So, I had about two hours or so before that.

I just can't do it.

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, may I ask a couple of questions?

18B-I

×

2

, **3** 

4

1

5

7

. 9

8

11 12

13

14

16 17

18 19

20

22

21

23 24

25 26 MR. SHIMM: These conditions that you are complaining about now, did you have them before the trial started?

MR. VITERIO: Yes, I had them, sure.

MR. SHIMM: I mean, theme conditions?

MR. VITEELIO: Yes, I had trouble with my stomach, but I was watching it.

I don't drink at all, and I was drinking a lot of juices and things like that and everything, and it was going all right.

If I knew then that we were going to be eating at 8:00 o'clock and going the way we are going, I would have never been on the trial.

I am morry, but I have got to tell you the truth. I would rather be on some other cases where I wouldn't be sequestered.

I like to be on jury duty. I wouldn't care if
I was sequestered four or five days for a jury. That would
be all right. I wouldn't mind that.

It is on account of the wife and myself.

MR. SHIMM: Before that, at the time when you were picked as a juror, we asked you questions and the Judge asked you questions --

MR. VITZELIO: That's right.

MR. SHINN: - and you thought there was nothing --

MR. VITZELIO: That's right. I was in good enough health. I didn't have no trouble at all, you might say.

but I was living differently than I am now. I would go and have juices, and one thing and another, and I was going to bed early.

I didn't have no trouble with my wife, and she got sick since then.

How, the other day, when this newspaper deal come up, which you asked me about if I could give a fair trial to Mr. Manson, I said yes. I wanted to get out, the way I was feeling, but if I would have said no, I couldn't give you a fair trial, you probably would have excused me, wouldn't you, if I insisted on it? But I felt that possibly maybe it would be a mistrial, and I didn't want to see the State go through all the trouble because of a mistrial. So I said what I did. I didn't want to get out that way.

1	9-1 <sub>1</sub>	Q Well, you told the truth?
_	2	A That's right, I wouldn't go
	3	Q Even though your physical complaints were
	4	such as to make you want to be excused?
	5	A I could have said"I can't give them a trial,"
	6	and you would have said "You're excused,"
<u>,</u> ‡	7	But I didn't want to go that far, that is
- <del></del>	8	the way I felt about it.
<b>→</b>	9	THE COURT: We appreciate your frankness, Mr.
	10	Vitzelio, in telling us what is on your mind.
	11	Any further questions?
	12	MR. SHINN: No questions.
_	13	MR. KANAREK: No questions.
	14	MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.
	15	MR. HUGHES: No questions.
	16	MR. STOVITZ: Is your Honor going to request that
	. 17	the juror, if he is excused, not discuss anything that
	18	has gone on at the trial?
a f.	19	THE COURT: Yes.
F _ F	20	I don't know at the moment, Mr. Vitzelio,
d ; g,	21	what disposition is going to be made. I want to talk
	22	to the attorneys after you leave the room.
	23	But if you are excused, will you refrain
	24	from discussing
	25	MR. VITZELIO: Yes, sir.
	26	THE COURT: with anyone what has been said in
		·

19-2

2

3

5 6

.8.

7

io

11

9

12<sup>-</sup>

15 16

14

17

19 20

21 22

23

25

26

chambers?

MR. VITZELIO: I won't say anything.

THE COURT: Or your conversations with the other jurors while you have been on the jury.

MR. VITZELIO: No, I won't say nothing.

THE COURT: Then I will ask you to go back to the jury room, Mr. Vitzelio for the time being.

MR. VITZELIO: I thank you.

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

MR. FITZGERALD: Before the noon recess today I indicated to the Court and other counsel there would likely be a stipulation on the part of the defendants.

The District Attorneys pointed out to me that there would likely be a requiredment that the defendants join in any stipulation.

Since then we have discussed it among ourselves, that is, the attorneys themselves and the defendants themselves, and certainly we have no intent to mislead the court or other counsel, but there will not be a stipulation.

We won't argue the matter, but there won't be a stipulation as to him being excused.

MR. STOVITZ: So we understand, Mr. Fitzgerald,
would you require that the Court appoint a doctor to
examine Mr. Vitzelio to determine whether or not Mr. Vitzelio

À

3

4

Š

7

8

9

ě

بنر

6

OF

И 12

13 14

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

can continue physically and mentally, or would you waive such examination in lieu of Mr. Vitzelio's representation?

THE COURT: Well, we are not going to appoint a doctor.

As a matter of fact I did see a doctor's report of Mr. Vitzelio that was given to me, I believe, by the bailiff the other day, or Captain Alley, or somebody, that they obtained from the General Hospital. I think I referred to it in chambers when I asked you gentlemen in the other day while I was talking to you gentlemen about this matter, in which the doctor described belladonna and phenobarbital; that was the combination, and the other consisted of a prescribed antacid and other kinds of medicine for his abdominal pain.

So there is no question about it that he has been suffering and it appears clear to the Court now that this is preying on his mind as well as his physical distress, coupled with his concern for his wife, and he falls within the express terms of the statute, which provide that when a juror requests to be excused, if it appears to the Court that there is sufficient cause to warrant it, he may be excused and replaced with an alternate juror.

That is what I propose to do.

I think that he has lost his ability to concentrate.

ì

Ġ

19a fls.

He is distracted by his problems, and what I have heard from the bailiffs, it would appear to me that he is beginning to create a problem with the other jurors because of his constant complaining.

The bailiff mentioned some incidents to you before noon the other day where he yelled out on the balcony at night to the jurors who were passing below, this was from a sixth story window.

I think it is clear from his testimony here, in chambers, that he is not a hypochondriac -- well, he is not a hypochondriac in the sense he does not have anything physically wrong with him, because he apparently does.

He apparently has a number of things which in his mind appear to be wrong with him, whether or not that is true I don't know.

In any event, I find that there is good cause to excuse him.

19A

2

1

3

5 6

> 7 8

9.

10

12 13

14

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

25

26

MR. MANAREK: Before your Honor rules, your Honor, may I just make a motion, a very brief one?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KAMAREK: The motion is, and --THE COURT: Make it brief.

MR. KAMAREK: Yes, the motion is, your Honor, that your Honor appoint a physician to determine --

All of us here are not -- none of us purport to be experts, therefore we would make the motion that your Honor appoint doctors and then have your Honor make the ruling predicated upon medical testimony.

THE COURT: I am not going to do that, Mr. Ranarek, for two reasons:

First of all, he has been examined, and doctors have prescribed medicine for him.

The second reason is that the nature of his complaints are such that the doctors may very well not find anything organically wrong with him, or any objective findings.

It is sufficient that he thinks he is ill, and it is decreasing his effectiveness, and it obviously is, coupled with his concern for his wife.

MR. KANAREK: I was thinking of psychiatrists, your Honor.

THE COURT: He was able to convince the doctors at the General Hospital that he required prescriptions, and ±82

2

1

3

.5 6

7

8

IÓ

11

12

13

14

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

**23** 

24 25

26

not just a placebo, but, as I have indicated, two different kinds of prescribed medicines which he has been taking.

so I do find that there is sufficient cause to excuse him upon his request and I will do so in open court, and I will then request the clerk to draw by lot from the names of all of the alternate jurors a new regular juror to replace Mr. Vitzelio, after which the new juror will be given the regular juror's oath.

Anything further, gentlemen?

MR. SHIMN: For the record, on behalf of Miss Atkins I would object to the Court's position on the grounds that there is insufficient evidence to indicate that this juror is not capable of proceeding with his duties as a juror.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. KAMAREK: I will join on behalf of Mr. Manson.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. FITZGERALD: I have a matter that I would like the Court to hear me about -- is Mr. Bugliosi present?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, be is.

-- that I would prefer to handle in open court outside the presence of the jury, that I would very earnestly ask, strenuously urgs, the Court to hear.

I think there has been some misconduct on the part of an officer of the court, to-wit, one Gary Fleischman

A3

8.

11: 

 We would like to present to the Court, and this is an extraordinary matter that deals with the suppression of swidence and the preventing of the defense from subpoensing certain witnesses on behalf of the defense.

THE COURT: Do you wish to take it up at this time?

MR. FITZGERALD: I would prefer not to take it up in chambers. I would just as soon take it up in open court.

And I might point out in this regard that your Honor has been subject to a certain amount of pressure -THE COURT: When you say open court, you don't mean in front of the jury?

MR. FITZGERALD: No. I mean outside the presence of the jury in open court.

Although I might point out that the Court has been certainly subject to a certain amount of pressure from the general public, and counsel in this case have been subject to an immense amount of pressure to hold whatever proceedings is infinitely possible to be held in open court, in open court.

And I think it ought to be held in open court.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Can Mr. Fitzgerald just indicate the
general nature of the matter?

THE COURT: First of all, is it something -- I don't want to take up trial time. We start our trial at 9:45 in the morning.

3.

.98

 MR. FITZGERALD: All right.

THE COURT: We have from 9:00 o'clock or earlier, on, a good deal of time that could be used for motions and other collateral matters, and I prefer to use that time rather than take our normal trial time.

MR. HUGHES: I think this matter has such urgency now in the matter of time that we may be able to thwart the misconduct that has already taken place; we may be able to remady it if we bring it up at this time.

MR. FITZGERALD: If it is a question of raising it in chambers or raising it in the court at a later time, I will raise it now in chambers.

THE COURT: I am not going to force you to do that, Mr. Fitzgerald.

MR. KAWAREK: We can do it in open court.

THE COURT: If it is urgent we will do it in open court. The People are asking for some kind of a clue.

19b-1,

ŗ

MR. BUGLIOSI: Some type of clue.

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, Mr. Kenerek particularly has been attacked for attempting to impeach Linda Kasabian by way of statements made by her to a certain person who was a hitchhiker between Los Angeles and Taos, New Mexico, sometime in August or September of 1969.

I personally went to a considerable sacrifice to deliberately entice this individual to enter the State of California so that he could be served with process.

That person was seen by Gary Fleischman during the noon hour and has decided to depart the State of California.

I am referring to the Yana the Witch story that appeared in the Long Beach Press Independent Telegram, and I would like Mr. Fleischman to be interrogated by the Court in that regard.

We had attempted to ask questions of impeachment in good faith, intending to produce the person to whom the declarant made the statements.

MR. STOVITZ: We have no knowledge of this, your Honor, and whether your Honor sees fit to do this in open court outside the presence of the jury, or in chambers, whatever your Honor sees fit, we have no knowledge of it.

MR. KANAREK: We wish to do it in open court.

THE COURT: What is it you wish to do in open court?

MR. KANAREK: We wish to make motions, your Honor.

 19b-2

#

2

4

5

3.

1

7

8

10

12

14

15

16

17

19 20

21

23

22

24 25

26

MR. FITZGERALD: We wish to ask the good graces of the Court to ask Mr. Fleischman the present whereabouts and location of one James Breckenridge who is a percipient witness to certain matters testified to by Linda Kasabian, whom he talked to during the noon hour.

We are informed and believe, and on such information and belief allege, that James Breckenridge was a hitchhiker that was picked up by Linda Kasabian in a late model Volvo automobile traveling from Los Angeles, California, to Taos, New Mexico, in August or September of 1969, and that he made certain statements to her -- she made certain statements to him concerning the events that took place on August 8th and 9th, 1969.

That person was here in court this morning and saw Mr. Fleischman over the noon hour, and we have been informed by certain members of the press that that person has left the State of California as a result of a conversation with Mr. Fleischman.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, I agree, your Honor, this is a very urgent matter and very important to the defense, and I think it should be handled as quickly as possible.

But I don't see why it has to be handled in front of the press.

MR. STOVITZ: The only reason it has to be handled in front of the press is so Mr. Fitzgerald can go out and make a statement in front of the TV cameras about that

ŀ

ļ

3

2

4 5

6

7

9

11.

12

13

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

That is the reason why.

THE COURT: Well, gentlemen, I don't think that is a fair statement, Mr. Stovits.

MR. FITZGERALD: Let's handle the whole trial in chambers, Mr. Stovitz.

MR. STOVITZ: No, I think we should handle the whole trial in the courtroom.

THE COURT: The publicity order is still in effect. If testimony is expected or desired of Mr. Breckenridge, then the testimony concerning him would come squarely within the publicity order, when I say regarding him I mean regarding his expected testimony, if there is to be any, so I think that covers the situation so far as you mentioned, Mr. Stovitz.

Mr. Fitzgerald is as aware of the order as all other counsel.

MR. STOVITZ: Maybe your Honor does have the benefit of reading the Free Press, perhaps your Honor does not take the time to read the Free Press.

THE COURT: I must confess I am not a regular reader.

MR. STOVITZ: In the Free Press there are articles in there that are alleged to come from communist spies, and I assure you Mr. Bugliosi and I do not talk to the free press, your Honor.

MR. FITZGERALD: If there is any question about it

.

IJ

I have the interest of these defendants paramount in my mind.

If there is any question about my motives or my integrity I will stipulate the matter can be handled in chambers. I am only interested in securing the attendance of a witness. I am about willing to suggest that upon suggestion of the prosecution Mr.Fleischman suggested to this witness that he not be available for service.

MR. STOVITZ: I accuse Mr. Fitzgerald of latent untruths.

MR. FITZGERALD: Let's handle it in chambers.

THE COURT: One at a time.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I can represent that the first time I had heard about this guy being in court, the first time is now when you spoke about it.

MR. STOVITZ: I can testify under oath that is a fact as far as I am concerned.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am surprised he is here. He is crucial to the defendants. I think it should be handled with the utmost urgency for the sake of the defendants.

This is the first time I heard he was in the courtroom. I did not know the man's name. I did not know he was here.

I did not know he spoke to Mr. Fleischman, if you are implying I spoke to Gary about it you are 100 percent wrong. I am sure AAron is in the same boat I am in.

L9¢ fla.

THE COURT: What do you want to do, Mr. Fitzgerald, just tell me what you want to do.

MR. FITZGERALD: I would like to have you interrogateTHE COURT: I don't think that is appropriate, I know
nothing about it; there is nothing before me; there is
nothing in the way of an affidavit --

.×2-1

2

I

3

5

7

8

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

ļ8 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

MR. STOVITZ: May I suggest that Mr. Fleischman be called in before he has an opportunity to be contaminated by Mr. Bugliosi or myself.

THE COURT: The simple solution would seem to be to invite him in now. Perhaps he is willing to tell you everything he knows.

MR. FITZGERALD: Let's invite him in here now.

MR. KANAREK: The problem is this, your Honor has made the rule that which happens in chambers cannot be released.

Now, the prosecution has used the radio in order to garner witnesses.

I, myself, have heard on radio their request for a certain person to come forward.

Now if -- I don't mind --

THE COURT: That does not come within the publicity order, if you want to go on the radio and ask for Mr. Breckenridge, you may do so.

MR. KAMAREK: Very well. My purpose is not to embarrass anyone. The point is I just want to make sure we can broadcast for Mr. Breckenridge.

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. KANAREK: Without Violating the publicity order. THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. HUGHES: We are in a better position if the press is not aware there is an issue here.

.2

2

٠.

3

4 5

6 7

9: 10

8

11

12 13

15

14

16. 17

18

20 21

19

22 23

24

25

26

MR. BUBLIOSI: The problem is, spouses of the jurous reading it in the newspapers and visiting the jurous on the weekends.

I understand that came out in the Herald yesterday, there was a headline about new Tate evidence concerning a confession.

I don't know how they found out about it but they did.

THE COURT: Will you ask Mr. Fleischman to come in? It cannot do any harm. If you want to take some further action you can make your request.

MR. FITZGERALD: Please.

(Mr. Fleischman and Mr. Goldman enter the courtroom.)

THE COURT: You may sit there if you will.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I am informed that the gentleman from whom I borrowed this coat wants his coat back.

What is your Honor's pleasure?

THE COURT: You are going to have to wear a coat while you are in this court, Mr. Hughes.

,0-1

1.

**ģ**.

23.

THE CLERK: You can't refuse to give the man his property back. Counsel.

THE COURT: That is a matter that we will let Mr. Hughes worry about. All I am concerned about is getting on with the trial.

The record will show, first of all, that counsel and the parties are present; Mr. Goldman and Mr. Fleischman are also present.

I have asked you to come in in connection with a matter that was raised by Mr. Fitzgerald because we thought perhaps it could be cleared up right now without the necessity of taking it up in open court or going any further.

Mr. Fitzgerald, why don't you state what is on your mind?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, sir.

Inasmuch as you are an attorney-at-law, perhaps in the interests of expediency and time, I might just briefly state what information has come to my attention.

It is such that there was one James Breckenridge, who was present in Los Angeles County and actually present in this courtroom this morning, who purported to be a percipient witness to certain statements made by Linda Kasabian during an automobile ride, a hitchhiking tour, if it can be referred to as such, between Los Angeles, California, and Taos, New Mexico, during the months of August and September, 1969.

J-2

,g.

2

1

3

5

7

9.

10

11

13.

14

15 16

17

18

19

. 21

20

22 23

24 25

26

It is my information, Mr. Fleischman, that the identity of this person and the fact that he was in court was brought to your attention, and that you had a conversation with this person.

That subsequent to your conversation he left the immediate vicinity of the courtroom and informed you that he was leaving the State of California and would, therefore, not be available for the service of process on behalf of the defendants.

How, I understand that what I have alleged involved some compound facts. I wonder if you would waive any evidentiary objections and simply state what you know in that regard.

MR. FIRISCHNAM: I will indeed.

He came up to me. He told me generally who he was and he asked me what he should do.

I said, "That is up to you." And that was the conversation.

I spoke with him outside. I had nothing more nor less to say than that.

Where he has gone and who he is, in the sense of where he lives, I don't know.

I had no further conversation with him other than that. I said, "Sir, that is entirely up to you," and that was the conversation. It was very brief.

THE COURT: Did you notice, Mr. Fleischman, when you

.

. 5

**.** 

AC

19. 

came in, whether he was in the courtroom now, by any chance?

MR. FLEISCHMAN: He is not here now as far as I can tell, and I had no further conversation with him other than that. It was very brief.

MR. FITZGERALD: Did he say anything to you? What did he say in terms of identifying himself?

20a-1

F

3.

5

6

4

7 8

10

11

12

9

13

15 16

14

17

18

19 20

> 22 23

21

24 25

26

MR. FLEISCHMAN: I chatted with him a bit. He went to Harvard College, as I did; he said in Adams House. I told him I was in Dunster.

We chatted about that, and that was the size of it.

MR. FITZGERALD: Did he indicate that he was one James Breckenridge?

MR. FLEISCHMAN: The name rings a bell because I went to high school with a man named James Breckenridge.

I think that is what he said.

MR. FITZGERAID: Did he say he was the man that traveled with Linda Kasabian from Los Angeles, or portions of the trip from Los Angeles, to Taos, New Mexico?

MR. FLEISCHMAN: He didn't identify himself as to how he knew her.

He told me that he was a man that had been at Harvard College and said something to the Crimson about her.

MR. FITZGERALD: Did he indicate and did you understand that he was indicating that he had participated in the article entitled Yans the Witch which appeared in the Harvard Crimson, a Harvard newspaper at Harvard College?

MR. FLEISCHMAN: I didn't discuss it with him.

He did tell me that he was going to Harvard. I had no further discussion except to say, "It is up to you what you do."

MR. FITZGERALD: Did he indicate to you that he was

~ 1	
2	in the courtroom this morning and had seen Linda Kasabian?
3	MR. FLEISCHMAN: Yes.
4	MR. FITZGERALD: And did he indicate that that was
5	the person with whom he had driven or ridden from Los
ć	Angeles to Taos, New Mexico?
7	MR. FLEISCHMAN: He simply said to me that he knew
8	Linds, and I didn't discuss it further with him.
9	He asked me what he should do?
10	And I said, "It is up to you."
11	MR. FITZGERALD: What he should do about what?
12	MR. FLEISCHMAN: With regard to staying here.
13	And I said, "It is entirely up to you, do as
14	you please."
15	MR. FITZGERALD: Didn't he indicate that he had some
16	connection with Linds in some form?
17	MR. FLEISCHMAN: He said he knew Linda. I didn't
18	discuss it with him. I didn't have time at that time.
19	MR. FITZGERALD: Actually, you took him down to the
20	seventh floor where you had an approximate five-minute
21 .	conversation with him; is that correct?
22	MR. FLEISCHMAN: No. As a matter of fact, I talked
23	to him outside the building when I was looking for my car,
24	very briefly outside in front of the building. We took
25	the elevator.
<b>26</b> :	MR. FITZGERALD: Did he make some statements to you

1	about some cross-examination by Mr. Kanarek of Linda
2	Kasabian?
3	MR. FLEISCHMAN: I don't have any recollection of
4	it.
. 5	I don't think we even discussed what happened
. 6	in court.
· <sup>2</sup> 7	MR. FITZGERALD: Did he apprise you that he was
8	not a resident of the State of California?
9	MR. FLEISCHMAN: He indicated to me that he was
10	unhappy with the cross-examination. Very briefly, he
, <b>11</b>	said, "This is disgusting."
12	That may very well be the reason that he left.
13	I don't know. He looked unhappy.
14	I said, "Look, I am not going to tell you what
15	to do, it is up to you."
20b fls16	And that was the size of it.
17	
18	
19	
20	
£ _¥ · 21	
22	
23	
24	
25.	
26	
ė	

THE COURT: Is he presently going to Harvard, did you 40B-1 1 2 MAY? MR. FIRISCHMAN: He told me he was out of school but he is going back next semester; and he also said he was 4 from Dallas, Texas. 5. MR. FITZGERALD: Did somebody refer you to him? 6 , MR. FLEISCHMAN: A newspaper reporter walked up to 7 me and said --8 MR. FITZGERALD: Mary Neicwinder? . 9 MR. FLEISCHMAN: Yes, She said, "This is Jim 10 Breckenridge." ÌI MR. FITZGERALD: Did you know her as a person who 12 had written an article entitled "Yana, The Witch"? 13 MR. FLEISCHMAN: I did not. I didn't connect the name 14 with the article. 15 MR. FITZGERALD: Didn't you think it was pretty 16paculiar that somebody walked up to you and said they knew 17 Linda and asked you whether they should stay around? 18 MR. FIRISCHMAN: I didn't have any opinion on it 19 whatsoever. 20 MR, FITZGERALD: Bearing in mind your responsibilities 21 as an officer of the court, have you told us everything 22 that you know about this matter that might be helpful to 23 us in our capacity as defense attorneys? 24

MR. FLEISCHMAN: Indeed I have, sir.

MR. SHIER: I have a few questions, your Honor.

25

26

26

Just a few, a very few.

THE COURT: Bear in mind that Mr. Fleischman is not testifying.

MR. SHIMM: Yes, I will bear in mind he is not a witness.

THE COURT: He is not testifying under oath. He hasn't been called by anyone. I asked him to come in informally, and I felt that perhaps the matter could be cleared up.

MR. FLEISCHMAN: I will be glad to.

MR. SHIMM: Could you describe his appearance for us?

MR. FLEISCHMAN: He is about six-foot two and I think he has blonde hair. I can't remember whether his hair was long or short, but I think it was longer than mine was when I was at Harvard.

MR. SHINN: Approximately how old would you think he was?

MR. FLEISCHMAN: 19 or 20.

MR. SHIMM: Was he sitting in the courtroom when you first saw him?

MR. FLEISCHMAN: Yes. I didn't know who he was.

MR. SHIMM: He was in the courtroom?

MR. FIRISCHMAN: I didn't notice him.

MR. SHINM: You didn't see him in the courtroom?

MR. FLEISCHMAN: He told me he was sitting in the courtroom.

MR. SHIME: Did be tell you wether he was sitting

20c-1	1	MR. STOVITZ: Have we talked to you on the telephone
	2	during the lunch hour?
	3	MR. FLEISCHMAN: Indeed not.
	4	MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Goldman, did you talk to us during
	5	the lunch hour?
	6.	MR. GOLDMAN: Not this lundhhour.
. P	7	MR. STOVITZ: Have you seen us during the lunch hour?
ಟ	8	MR. GOLDMAN: No.
•	9	MR. BUGLIOSI: Did you send any vibrations to us
	10	during this lunch hour?
·	11	MR. FIEISCHMAN: In my judgment, the guy left because
	12	he was irritated with the cross-examination. I don't know.
, 1	13	THE COURT: Anything further, gentlemen?
	14	All right. Let's go back to court and we will
	15	take
	16	MR. KANAREK: May we inquire from Mr. Frediani who
	17	obtained a seat for him?
	18	MR. STOVITZ: I would think it would be easier to
¥ #	19	do that outside. The bailiff knows everybody's seat.
• •	20	THE COURT: Yes. Can you do that, Mr. Murray?
s <u>4</u>	21	Find out if Mr. Breckenridge what is the first name?
	22	MR. FLEISCHMAN: James, I think it was.
	23	THE COURT: James Breckenridge, find out if he had
	24	a reserved seat, or find out if he came in on the public's
	25	seats.
	26	Put a note on the bench as soon as you have

20c-2

the information so I can give it to counsel.

THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: We will go back into court and take care of Mr. Vitzelio's matter first and then resume the cross-examination.

While we are here, Mr. Kanarek, do you have any kind of estimate? I don't intend to hold you to it.

MR. KANAREK: I have tried to follow --

THE COURT: Let's not prolong it. Do you have an estimate or don't you?

MR. KANAREK: No, I don't have any estimate. No, I don't, your Honor.

I want to be candid with the Court because, you see, this Breckenridge matter, I have not gone into the Yana the Witch article the way I would have because of this foundational aspect, trying to be in good faith with the Court, and there is material in here that would lay the foundation with Linda Kasabian.

If this man Breckenridge is going to be available, I feel free now to go shead and lay this foundation because this is the first that his name has been stated to me. I never knew his name until these proceedings right today.

So, therefore, I am going to go whead, and I want to inform Mr. Bugliosi that I feel free now, because there is a way of getting him here by way of a certificate

.8

9

2

.3

4

5

б

7

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

**2**0

21 22

23

24

25 26 Į.

Ż

'**8**',

20d fls.

20<sup>.</sup> 

23.

where the Court -- I don't have to belabor it -- so I feel free to lay the foundation by asking these questions.

THE COURT: It appears that there is such a man.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We have never questioned that, your Honor.

MR. FITZGERALD: And I represented to the Court in the Wednesday P.M. Session of this court that I was making every effort to bring this man within the State of California and subpoens him as a witness, and it was in good faith that we were attempting to lay the foundation for impeachment of Linda Kasabian.

20-D-1

2,

1

4 5

3

Ž

9

8.

ij

12

10

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

> 20 21

22 23

24 25

26

MR. STOVITZ: May I be excused for about eight minutes to see if I can get a jacket for Mr. Hughes?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: So far as we know, this man has the characteristics of being rather evanescent. He appears for one second and says a couple of things and then vanishes. He is almost a shadowy individual.

THE COURT: Yes. He apparently has some point of contact, Harvard University.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Assuming he is legitimate.

THE COURT: Some kind of an addressin Dallas.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Assuming he is legitimate, your Honor, and this is an assumption which I am not going to make.

THE COURT: I believe that Mr. Kanarak should be parmitted to -- what do you expect to do, inquire into the conversations that she had with this man?

MR. KAMAREK: That's right, your Honor.

THE COURT: As to what she said to him?

MR. KAMAREK: Statements that she made, right.
We can lay the foundation for impeachment.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, if she says, "No, I didn't make the statement" --

MR. KAMAREK: Then we will get Mr. Brackenridge.

MR. BUGLIOSI: They don't know where he is.

MR. KAMAREK: We don't have the resources of the District Attorney's Office but --

1

ż

4 5

6

8

10

11

12<sup>2</sup>

15.

14

16 17

18

19 20

·21· 22

23

24 25

26

THE COURT: Let's not get into that.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Give us all the leads you want and I will assure you that I will make available to you the District Attorney's Bureau of Investigation and the Sheriff's Department's Bureau.

Give me the leads.

MR. KANAREK: Lat's go into court and ask.

MR. FITZGERALD: That is good enough for me.

MR. BUGLIOSI: But it should be prior to this cross-examination.

I am sure Mr. Bugliosi will agree, that the statements contained, or the statements we purport were made by Linda Kasabian to James Breckenridge are in line with and in context with the evidence in this case. That is to say, that we expect that Linda Kasabian made certain statements concerning her character as a "witch," that she made certain statements about "piggies," and she made certain statements about persons who were members of the establishment in California, that she made certain statements about a group of people she was living with in Chatsworth, California, et cetera.

It would appear from the examination of the context of the material that it is relevant and germane to the issues here.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The other side of the coin is that she

1Ô

20B

· 13

. Ì5

informed me that she is going to answer that she was telling this evanescent individual, she was telling him what Mr. Manson and the other people in the Family told her, and these were not her words.

In other words, it appears that she is going to deny this.

In other words, who is going to refute the denial?

MR. FITZGERALD: In other words, she admits that she had a conversation with such a man?

20e-1	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	.6
.*	7
. 8	8
•	9
	10
	11
	12
<u>-</u>	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
÷ .	19
4.	20
د ع	21
	22
	23

MR.	BUGLIOSI:	There	is	no	question	about	that
				4.5	•		

MR. FITZGERALD: All right.

MR. BUCLIOSI: There is no question about it.

MR. FITZGERALD: Then we are obviously doing it in good faith.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am not saying you are not doing it in good faith. I am saying that she said she was so shocked by all these weird things she was told at Spahm.

Ranch that --

THE COURT: That is a matter of redirect, if it gets to that point.

MR.BUGLIOSI: The point that I am saying, she is going to deny saying she believed these things.

She is telling this man what they told her.

MR. KANAREK: The record reveals she said she was
a witch, and she told him she was a witch.

THE COURT: Let's not try the case in here.

Are you ready to proceed?

MR. HUGHES: I believe so.

THE CLERK: Mr. Stovitz is going to go and try to get Mr. Hughes a jacket.

THE COURT: We won't delay the trial pending that.

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

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

20e-2

2

3

-6

5

7

9

11

13

12

14 15

16 17

18

19

21 22

23<sup>.</sup>

24 25

26

Mr. Vitzelio, one of our regular jurors, has requested the Court to excuse him from further jury service for personal reasons, and after conferring with Mr. Vitzelio in chambers along with all the parties and counsel, I have concluded that there is good cause for granting his request, and he will be excused from further jury service.

I want to thank you, Mr. Vitzelio, for your service thus far. I know it has been a sacrifice for you and I do thank you.

You are now excused, sir.

The Clerk will draw the name of a new regular juror by lot from the names of all of the alternate jurors.

THE CLERK: Larry D. Sheely.

THE COURT: Mr. Sheely, will you please take Mr. Vitzelio's seat, and the Clerk will administer the oath to Mr. Sheely as a regular juror.

THE CLERK: Will you stand and raise your right hand.

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

MR.SHEELY: I do.

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

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

## (Linda Kasabian resumes the stand.) 1 2 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 3 BY MR. KANAREK: Mrs. Kasabian, did you see the tall man that you Q. hitchhiked with in New Mexico in this courtroom this morning? 6 I wasn't sure that it was him until on my 7 lunch hour. I questioned if it was him, and I found out it 8 WES. Q Whom did you question? 10 A My attorney. 11 And what did your attorney tell you? 12 MR. BUGLIOSI: This calls for hearsay. MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, this goes to state of 14 mind. 15 MR. BUGLIOSI: What the attorney told her is certainly 16 hearsay. 17 MR. KANAREK: It is not hearsay. 18 MR. FLEISCHMAN: Privileged. 10 MR. KANAREK: And it is not privileged either, your 20 Honor, in the context of these proceedings. 21 THE COURT: The objection is sustained. 22 BY MR. KANAREK: 23 Did you have a conversation with your attorney Q 24 concerning this person that you saw or think you saw this 25 morning in this courtroom that was in New Mexico with you? 26

MR. STOVITZ: I object to the question, your Honor, as being ambiguous.

She said she saw a person here in the courtroom. She says she thinks it is the same person. The way the question is asked, it is ambiguous.

MR. HUGHES: The answer is in.

MR. GOLDMAN: We also object on the ground of privilege.

THE COURT: Sustained.

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

THE COURT: It is not necessary, Mr. Kanarek. We have gone over this.

Let's proceed.

MR. KANAREK: Not in this connection, your Honor. However, I will proceed.

f-1		
		1
		2
		, <b>3</b> .
		4
	•	5
		6
* 12		7
٥		· 8
o e	¥	ģ
	•	10
		11
		12.
		13
<b>-</b>		14
		15
		16
		17
		18
€ ≱		19
**	9	20
اد د •		21
		22
		23
	,	24
		25
		26

•	Ω .	BY M	ir. Kanarek	: Mr#.	. Ka	abiar	1,	the ma	a that	
You	saw in	this	courtroom,	would	You	tell	u#	about	where	he
WAS	sitting	1?			20		i			

A I believe it was chair so. 77, or the one in the front of it. I can't really see.

Q The one in front of 77?

A Yes.

9 77, from where you are, is in which row?

A I guess it is the second row. It is hard to tell.

Q He was sitting in about No. 77, is that right?

A He was in the first row, so I believe it was that seat.

A Now, as you were testifying, you knew that there was an order excluding witnesses from the courtroom; is that correct?

MR. BUGLIOSI: This is argumentative, your Honor. It wise calls for a legal conclusion.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KAMAREK: Q Did you know that there was an order excluding witnesses from the court?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Same objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KANAREK: Q Was there any sign of recognition made by you to this person in the courtroom?

A No.

Q There was no communication by any movement of 20F2 1 the face or any portion of the body as far as anything that 2 you have observed? 3 Well, I looked at him and I said to myself, 4 "I think I know you," but I couldn't quite place his face. 5 I #60. 6 Did he make any kind of a motion to you? 7 A No. 8 and did you tell your attorney about this 9. during the moon hour? 10 MR. GOLDMAN: Objection, your Honor. 11 MR. STOVITZ: It calls for hearsay, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: I didn't hear the question. Read the ÌЗ question. 14 (The question was read by the reporter.) 15 THE COURT: Sustained. 16 Did you have a conversation MR. KAMAREK: Q 17 with Mr. Fleischman during the noon hour? 18 MR. GOLDMAN: Objection on privilege, your Honor. 19 MR. KAMAREK: The fact of conversation, your Honor, 20: is not privileged. 21 MR. BUGLIOSI: Then what is the relevance? 22 I object on the ground that it is irrelevant, 23 then, your Honor. 24. THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer. 25 THE WITHESS: Yes. 26 Was that Mr. Fleischman? MR. KANARBK: Q

Now, you say that money has swer meant anything

	,	
.OF3	1	A Yes.
	2	Q Did you have a conversation with Mr. Goldman
	3	during the noon hour?
	4	A Yes.
,	. 5	Q During the moon hour, did you speak to
	6	Mr. Bugliosi?
». P	7	A No.
, i	8	Q Or Mr. Stovitz?
•	· 9	A No.
	10	Q Did you speak to any law enforcement officers
	11	during the moon hour?
	12	MR. STOVITZ: Other than the transportation officers,
	13	Counsel?
•	14	I am objecting to the question as ambiguous,
	15	Your Honor. There are transportation officers that are law
	16	enforcement officers, and I believe that she speaks to them.
,	17	THE COURT: She may say so if she did.
	18	MR. KANAREK: Presumably she will be questioned on
	19	redirect.
	20	THE COURT: The objection is overruled. You may answer.
~ <b>3</b> ′	21	THE WITNESS: Yes, I have spoken to the transportation
	22	officers, the officers that are with me all day.
	23	MR. KAMAREK: Q You spoke to them during the
	24	noon hour?
	25	A Yes.

26

	į	to you; is that right, Mrs. Rasabian?
	2	A I always usually managed without it somehow.
t .	ġ	Q You never have been concerned too much about
	4.	having money or not?
	5	A No.
	6	Q Is that right?
ρ.	7	A Right.
` ~	8	Q And you can get along without it?
	9	A Yes.
	10	Q Right?
	11	A Yes.
•	12	And you don't go out of your way to get money?
	13	A No.
	14	Q Is that right?
: .	15	A Right.
	16	Q Then would you tell us, Mrs. Kasabian, why, on
• •	17	the day prior to the date you were arrested, you made
	- 18	application for welfare in Milford, New Hampshire?
	19	MR. STOVITZ: Objected to, your Honor, as immaterial
. بة	20	and irrelevant, and assuming a fact not in evidence.
<b>.</b> .	21	THE COURT: Just one moment, Mr. Stovitz.
	22	Read the question, please.
•	23	(Whereupon, the question was read by the
	24	reporter.)
• •	25	

19.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: What was the objection?

MR. STOVITZ: Immaterial and irrelevant, and assumes a fact not in evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: On the latter ground, the objection will be sustained.

MR. KANAREK: Q Mrs. Kasabian, did you, on the day before you were arrested, the day before you knew that anyone was seeking you in the State of New Hampshire or anywhere in connection with this case, did you seek welfare? Did you go out and try to get some welfare?

A I don't know if it was the day before, but I did go out looking for welfare, yes.

Q You wanted the welfare because you wanted the money that the welfare brought you?

A Yes.

Q Correct?

A Yes.

Q Now, Mrs. Kasabian, would you tell me why it is that you don't trust Mr. Fitzgerald to talk to you?

A I spoke to him yesterday, and just the way he spoke, the things that he said made me distrust him.

Q I see.

What did he say that made you distrust him?

MR. STOVITZ: That is objected to as calling for hearsay.

THE COURT: Sustained.

		<u>.</u>
20g-2	1	MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, it is not offered
	2	for the truth of anything asserted. It is offered for the
	3	effect on her state of mind.
2	4	THE COURT: It is also irrelevant.
1	<b>5</b>	MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I think very well.
	6	May I have just a moment, your Honor?
***	.7	THE COURT: Yes.
<b>.</b> ₩	8	(Mr. Kanarek and Mr. Fitzgerald confer.)
<i>•</i>	9.	MR. KANAREK: Q Did you say, Mrs. Kasabian, that
,	10	Mr. Fitzgerald is the evilest one of all, that he was a
	11	devil?
	12	A No, I did not.
	13	Q You didn't make that statement?
	14	A No.
	15	Q Then would you tell us, Mrs. Kasabian, what
	16	was your conversation with Mr. Fitzgerald?
	17	MR. STOVITZ: That is objected to as outside the
	18	scope of direct examination, and being immaterial and
* <b>*</b>	19	irrelevant.
£.	20	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, it is offered on the issue
4 <b>4 4</b>	21	of bias and prejudice, your Honor, in that one of the
	22	grounds for impeachment is to show
	23	THE COURT: I don't have to hear the argument,
	24	Mr. Kanarek. I am familiar with it.
	25	The objection is sustained.

1	BY MR. KANAREK:
2	Q Well, then, Mrs. Kasabian, would you tell us
3	why it is that you don't trust Mr. Shinn?
4	A I was just told by my attorneys not to speak
5	to any of them.
6	MR. KAMAREK: I see.
7	Q Now, that is the real reason, isn't it, Mrs.
8	Kasabian?
9.	A Yes.
10	Q Your lawyers told you not to talk to anybody?
11	A Yes.
12	Q Right?
13:	A Yes.
14	Q Except them, or the prosecution; is that
15	right?
16	A Well, he told me not to talk to you because you
17	can't be trusted.
18	Q I can't be trusted; right?
<b>1</b> 9	A Yes.
20	Q Mr. Hughes can't be trusted?
21	A Right.
2,2	Q But Mr. Bugliosi can be trusted; right?
23	A I guess so.
24	Q That is what your lawyer told you; right?
25	A Yes.
26	MR. KANAREK: Them, your Honor, I would like to

approach the bench to make a motion.

THE COURT: Very well.

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

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, this is clearly a suppression of evidence within the contemplation of the Due Process clause of the 14th Amendment, both under California and Federal law.

You cannot deprive a person in a capital case, or in any case, of the power to speak with a witness, especially in the context of these proceedings.

20h £1\$2.

JH-1

1

3

5.

7

10

Q

12

13

11

14

15 16

17

18.

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

THE COURT: Neither can you force a witness to testify or to talk to anyone if she doesn't want to.

MR. KANAREK: But, your Honor, we have put in here we have state action here by way of this immunity.

THE COURT: State action?

MR. KANAREK: State action, because of negotiations THE COURT: We don't have to go through all that
again.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, then I make a motion that all of this witness' testimony — a motion to strike all the testimony of this particular witness; or in the alternative, your Honor, I make a motion that we be allowed to take her deposition out of the presence of the jurors.

MR. STOVITZ: What do you think you have been doing for nine days?

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I think the point is this:
The only constitutionally-permissible procedure would be
for this witness to take the witness stand, be asked
questions, and then to assert her privilege against selfincrimination, whereupon the prosecution would offer her
immunity, and she would testify.

With the mituation we have here now, she has a dual status, that of a witness and that of a defendant.

Now, your Honor may be sustaining objections because your Honor is concerned not only about the

20H2

. 2

4

6

8

9

7

**1**0

11

13

14

15 16

17

<u>1</u>9`

18.

20 21

22

24

25

. 26

attorney-client privilege but concerned about certain incriminatory statements she may have made to her counsel, and I think that is the thrust of Mr. Kanarek's objection.

If her status was clear --

THE COURT: That isn't the reason that I sustained the objection. I sustained the objection where the privilege has been asserted because of the privilege.

She has already made incriminatory statements from the witness stand. I don't see how she can incriminate herself any more than she has. That isn't the reason I sustained the objection.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, all witnesses, whether a defendant or not, are entitled to have a lawyer present them. The purpose of having a lawyer is to give legal advice.

Her lawyer apparently has advised her not to talk to these people. I find no suppression of evidence or anything in that.

THE COURT: That is perfectly true. But there is also something to what Mr. Kamarek and Mr. Fitzgerald said with respect to Mrs. Kasabian, who has a rather anomalous position in the case by virtue of her being a defendant and also the chief prosecution witness, or apparently the chief prosecution witness, or apparently the chief prosecution witness, at least so far, with a promise, apparently, if not of immunity, at least a recommendation for immunity; and in all probability, whether the Court

would grant her immunity or not, she would have it as a matter of law if you ever tried to use her testimony in this case against her. 5. 6. 

21-1

23.

 That is a thought off the top of my head.

MR. STOVITZ: This case, People vs. Schwartz, holds that we cannot prosecute her.

THE COURT: I strongly doubt anyone could ever use those statements against her.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No matter what hat she is wearing, your Honor, whether as a defendant or a witness who is not a defendant, no matter what hat, she is entitled to a lawyer, and the lawyer can give her advice, and it is perfectly proper advice irrespective of what hat she is wearing, or if she is wearing two hats I think the same rule applies. She is a witness.

MR. STOVITZ: And when counsel say they did not have an opportunity to question her, yes, they did not have an opportunity to go up and say to Linda "When is the last time you had a normal menstrual period."

But they had full discovery; they have eight or nine handwritten notes; they even went back and investigated that she had an application for welfare in New Hampshire.

They have got, even, secret Social Service reports. Those Social Service reports are secret and cannot be subpostated without an order of the court. They got those.

They had full discovery from the very beginning of this case.

 Mrs. Chapman won't talk to the defendants' attorneys and she won't even talk to us unless she feels right.

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, while I understand what you are saying, I am at a loss to understand, for example, the necessity for a deposition.

If the witness is not willing to tell the truth under oath from the witness stand, what makes you think you are going to get anything out of her when she is not testifying under oath?

MR. KANAREK: If I may attempt to explain to the Court what my position is.

THE COURT: If she lies on the witness stand she jeopardizes her immunity.

MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor, the point is, the thrust of People vs. Walter and other cases is that her state of mind, when she is granted immunity, is that it is firm in her mind that she has the immunity, and not being granted the immunity poisons her testimony because she knows she is beholden to the prosecution.

It is her state of mind that is significant.

Whenever you get to a close question, let's

say, how she should answer it, she is going to answer
in a way that is going to be favorable to the prosecution.

People vs. Walter sets it out so beautifully.

In fact, in People vs. Walter there was a

Į2

• **₹** 

 conspiracy and it is remarkably analogous to this case and therefore it is incumbent, in so many words, in the Walter case, the prosecution must grant the immunity at the earliest possible time so that her testimony is not colored by the thought of reward.

And that is exactly what she is doing here.

Furthermore, if I may finish it, we have a

denial of due process in that Mr. -- and I say this with -
Mr. Bugliosi is going to say I am accusing him of
suborning perjury.

Mr. Bugliosi is an advocate. It is not for me to accuse him of suborning perjury.

I am merely stating facts. The fact is Mr. Bugliosi in many many interviews with him, it is my position, it is a fundamental denial of due process for Mr. Bugliosi to interview her and not record every word she has uttered, that is, stenographically and/or in a recording machine, because when Mr. Bugliosi was interviewing her he was -- let us give Mr. Bugliosi every benefit of the doubt, he was programming her.

21-A-1

2

1

4

3

5

7<sup>.</sup>

9 10

ļĮ

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

> 21 22

23

24 25

26

MR. STOVITZ: There is no regulation that we have to use a recording device, in Civil Service.

MR. KANAREK: I make a motion the prosecution give her immunity at this time.

THE COURT: I think she has already achieved her immunity.

MR. KANAREK: Let her know it.

THE COURT: I would have no objection to take her into chambers and tell her that.

MR. KANAREK: I wask the jury be excused and do it in open court.

THE COURT: I have no besitation to tell her I will grant her immunity if she asks for immunity.

MR. FITZGERALD: Her status is crucial.

THE COURT: Wait a minute, the prosecutors have stepped away for a moment.

MR. STOVITZ: Your Honor stated that if we present a petition for immunity to your Honor your Honor would sign the petition for immunity, because in effect she has been granted immunity by the District Attorney's Office, making the representation or the agreement with her attorney for immunity.

THE COURT: I did not quite follow your statement.
MR. STOVITZ: We have prepared immunity papers.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STOVITZ: We were going to ask a Superior Court

a2

2

1

3 4

5

7 8

Ò.

10

12 13

14

16

15

17

18.

19 20

21

22 23

24

26

to sign the order granting her immunity.

Your Honor could do it under Section 1099, if Your Honor were required.

THE COURT: I would be willing to do it on condition that I first have an opportunity, I would like counsel to assist me in researching questions as to whether or not she has not already achieved immunity as a matter of law.

I beliave she has.

MR. STOVITZ: I have the brief filed in Judge Parker's court on the Mary Brunner case on writ of habeas corpus.

It has the latest cases on it, according to the reasoning of Judge Parker Miss Brunner had received immunity by the promise of immunity by the District Attorney's office.

People vs. Schwartz, a 201 Cal. case, states when a District Attorney's office makes an agreement with a witness for conditional immunity, if that witness does not fulfill the conditions the office not only cannot use the statement against that witness, but cannot prosecute that witness.

I have those cases, your Honor, and there is a much more recent case. I think it is in 3 Cal. 3rd, which I also have.

THE COURT: Isn't there a United States Supreme Court case on this point?

MR. STOVITZ: Yes, your Honor, it might be a Circuit

21a3

2

1

3 4

5 6

8

9

7

10

11

12

13

. 14 15

> 16 17

18. 19

20 21

23

25

26-

92 24 Court of Appeals, but I have those cases.

THE COURT: How long will all this take?

MR. STOVITZ: It will take me one minute to get the brief from my case, and it will take me about five minutes to go down to my dask, get the petition, and we can do it right now.

THE COURT: All right, we will take a recess then. We will take a recess now and then resume when we are ready.

MR. HUGHES: It is 82 in the courtroom. I checked the thermometer.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Can this be handled in the chambers. the immunity bit?

THE COURT: I want to read the briefs first. MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand precisely what the law is on this point before I proceed.

MR. BUGLIOSI: The full discussion about the law?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Can that be handled in chambers? THE COURT: Yes.

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

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, do not converse with anyone, nor form or express an opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to you.

216-1

. 2

3

1

5

8

9

7

10

12

15

14

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

26

25

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

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

First, gentlemen, the bailiff has handed me a little note here regarding Mr. Breckenridge, and his seating in the courtroom this morning, and apparently, after talking with Mr. Frediani, the criminal court coordinator, he had learned from Mr. Frediani that Mr. Breckenridge was seated in seat No. 88 and he believes, although he apparently does not clearly remember, that it was at the request of an attorney.

He does not know whether it was Mrs. Kasabian's attorney or someone else.

MR. STOVITZ: It was not at the request of the People, your Honor, I can't get my own wife into the courtroom.

MR. KANAREK: Then I would ask that we have an evidentiary hearing under oath, because this is most important.

MR. FITZGERALD: I just might inquire --

THE COURT: Yes.

THE COURT: We know he was here. He already talked to Mr. Fleischman.

MR.HUGHES: No. 88 is the first row behind the rail.

ľ

•

g

 MR. STOVITZ: Right behind the glass enclosure there, the wire behind the glass.

THE COURT: That is a seat, as I recall, reserved by the Citizen News.

Apparently when they don't show up by a certain time those seats are made available to either the general public or, if they have special requests of some kind, by Frediani, they can accommodate somebody.

Now, on the immunity matter I have your agreement here -- of course this agreement does not really fit now.

MR. STOVITZ: Well, it does not fit in the sense that she has not refused to testify.

THE COURT: That's right.

MR. STOVITZ: However, the form of the petition, your Honor, is one that is commonly used when a witness is called to the witness stand and then states that she did not want to testify, and then the Court has her sign a waiver of her hearing, go shead and sign it.

Mr. Watson is concerned, and if necessary we would make the technical point that the Watson case is still pending and this would grant her immunity in this case as well as the Watson case and therefore she would be, to use the defendant's language, a free agent, and thereby be amenable to the oath more likely than she would be than

25

26

if she did not have this piece of paper signed by the Court.

I feel that it is sufficient under the circumstances.

Your Honor could also avail himself under Section 1099 of the Penal Code which states any time prior to the People resting a party defendant may be called to testify, and then the Court may dismiss the case against that party defendant so that she may be a witness for either side.

So no particular position is necessary under Section 1099 of the Penal Code, but I would submit that this 1324 is sufficient as far as the order is concerned, and the waiver is not necessary here, but it would be the order.

The order of the Court would be sufficient.

THE COURT: Assuming that I were willing to sign the immunity agreement as to this case, how could I sign it for Watson?

MR. STOVITZ: Because it is not immunity as to this case, it is immunity as to this witness.

In other words, Linda Kasabian is the one that is requesting the immunity.

We petition the Court to say she is a necessary witness in the case.

THE COURT: That's right, she could not be prosecuted in any case.

21c fls.18

MR. STOVITZ: That's right, and it says "After complying with this order the above-named witness shall not be prosecuted or subjected to penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any question which in accordance to this order the witness was required to answer or produce."

This order is effective for this case or any other case concerning this subject matter.

For instance if she applied falsely for aid in New Hampshire she could be prosecuted there.

If she defrauded Joe Sage out of \$600 she could be prosecuted in New Mexico.

But as far as the alleged events of August 8th and August 9th of 1969 she could not be prosecuted for any of those events.

MR. SHINN: In the document does it state whether or not as soon as immunity is granted she is to be released immediately or after the trial? There is a danger there in case we call her back.

21c-1

1,

3

4

5 6

7

8

10

Ţ1 12

13

14 15

16

17<sup>\*</sup>

. 19

20

22

23 24

25

26

MR. STOVITZ: The document doesn't may anything about her release. It merely mays she won't be prosecuted.

We assure counsel and the Court in the event she is required to return as a witness, number one, she and her attorney have agreed to come back wherever she is.

Number two, we will use all of the processes of our office and the Court to return her in the event she refuses to come back.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may I see a copy of these matters?

(Copy handed to Mr. Kanarek.)

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

THE COURT: While Mr. Kanarek is reading, it is not clear from the cases I read so far whether if the Court refused to grant immunity and the People attempted to prosecute her, she would in fact have immunity as a matter of law in any event, or whether simply the confession would be involuntary as a matter of law and thus not admissible in a subsequent proceeding.

There might be a difference as far as her of rights were concerned as to which/those theories is applicable.

Those two forms of protection might not be co-extensive.

At the moment I am not sure which theory applies.

11C2

9. 

. 17

 MR. STOVITZ: I think the reasoning of Judge Parker was that so long as the witness fulfills her agreement that the prosecuting agency, although we don't have a noile prosequi motion in California, they do in the Federal Court, nevertheless the agreement by the prosecuting agency that she will receive immunity is tantamount to an agreement by the State that she will not be prosecuted, seeing the State is the prosecuting agency; that she therefore cannot be prosecuted and is entitled to be released under a writ of habeas corpus.

Now, I cannot tell what is going to happen in the future.

Frankly, I feel that she will be returned —
she will return if there is the necessity for rebuttal.

I feel that she will return if and when Watson returns to
the State of California, upon a mere telephone call.

She will not have to be subpensed by interstate compact.

I feel that she has been trustworthy, she has answered not only the questions that are pertinent to this case but everything pertaining to her life that was asked on cross-examination, and our independent investigation, your Honor, has proved to us that she is telling the truth in all perticulars.

THE COURT: Of course, if she fails to return or to complete her examination the order would not be effective.

3 1

.3

4

5.

6

7

8

. .9

10

11 12

13

15 16

Ţ7

18 19

20

21 22

23

25

24

26

The order of immunity would not be effective,

MR. STOYITZ: That is something that the law review writers are now considering, whether or not there is conditional immunity.

I feel that the order of the Court granting her immunity does give her immunity.

THE COURT: I am speaking of the last paragraph of the proposed order.

It says, "After complying with this order the above-named witness shall not be prosecuted or subjected to penalty or forfeiture, et cetera."

In other words, if she is sworn, asserts her privilege against self-incrimination, is thereafter granted immunity and thereafter refuses to testify, the order obviously is not effective.

MR. STOVITZ: That is one view of the textbook writers.

Another view is the only power the Court has is your Honor could institute contempt proceedings against her for violating the court order by refusal to testify.

This is an unsettled area in California and this is an area in which we are seeking legislation for conditional immunity.

THE COURT: All right, then to get back to this case what, if anything, are you proposing?

MR. STOVITZ: I am proposing upon the patition I

1C4

2

3

1

б

7

Ś

8

9:

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

21D

19-20

> 21 22

23

24

25 26 filed with the Court that the Court, after binds Kasabian signs the waiver for the hearing, that the Court does sign the order granting Linda Kasabian immunity so the case may be dismissed against her within the next day or so.

We will request the Superior Court to dismiss the charge against her perhaps on Monday.

It requires the signature of Mr. Younger for the dismissal request which I have prepared conjunctly with this one.

THE COURT: I think the order would have to be redrafted to fit.

I am not going to sign the order in its present form.

It is predicated on a situation which did not occur here, namely that she was sworn, was asked a question, asserted the privilege and then was granted immunity.

That did not occur in that sequence.

21d-1 All right, your Honor. MR. STOVITZ: 1 THE COURT: Do the defendants wish to be heard? 2 is what you asked for, Mr. Kanarek. 3 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald? 5 MR. FITZGERALD: That's correct. 6 MR.KANAREK: It comes a little late, your Honor. THE COURT: Late, how? You are in the middle of your cross-examination. 9 MR. KANAREK: I know, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Well, how is it late? You made the 11 statement; I don't know what it means. 12 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I think this should 13 have been done at the beginning. 14 THE COURT: All right, assuming for the sake of 15 argument that's right. What prejudice has resulted? 16 MR. KANAREK: In People vs. Walter, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: What is that? 18 MR. KANAREK: Well, what I'm saying, your Honor, 19 that this witness's testimony is tainted. 20 You see, her testimony --21 THE COURT: Let us assume for the moment that it 22 23. is tainted up until now. 24 MR. KANAREK: Yes. THE COURT: And she is now granted immunity. Your 25 cross-examination may continue. 26

25

26.

MR. KANAREK: That is true.

THE COURT: Now she is testifying untainted.

MR. KANAREK: Right.

MR. FITZGERALD: That is correct. I think what Mr. Kanarek is trying to assert is the very human quality that once somebody has taken a position, certainly when one has taken a position publicly, it is a little difficult to recant.

The defendants took the position that because she was granted immunity, her testimony would have to comport with what she felt the prosecution wanted to hear in order to petition the Court for immunity.

Now, we have obviated that problem. The only problem we face is the problem of her having given one version or state of facts on the record, but as your Honor pointed out --

THE COURT: I have a message here for Defendant
Manson's attorney, one Charles Watson is on the telephone
asking for him.

MR. STOVITZ: Stipulate it can be received in your Honor's chambers.

MR. KANAREK: No.

THE COURT: Well, he is on hold on my telephone, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Well --

THE COURT: The call is for you.

MR. STOVITZ: Is it person to person or collect, your Honor? 2 MR. KANAREK: May I take the call, your Honor? 3 THE COURT: Do you wish to take it here or in the 4 courtroom? 5 I will take it in the courtroom. MR. KANAREK: 6 MR. STOVITZ: You mean you are not to let us exvesdrop, 7 Irving? 8 (Whereupon Mr. Kanarek leaves the chambers and ġ finally returns.) 10 THE COURT: Is there anything else we can do today? 11 MR. FITZGERALD: No. THE COURT: If you propose to offer the agreement I 13 suggest the order be retailored and perhaps the statement 14. of fact, the preamble, so it conforms to the facts of 15. this case. 16 I don't want to sign an order that obviously 17 does not fit the facts of this case. 18 MR. STOVITZ: We will have that at 9:00 o'clock 19 Monday morning. 20 THE COURT: All right, then we will adjourn until 21 9:45 Monday morning. 22 MR. BUGLIOSI: It seems to me there is something 23 left undone. 24 MR. KANAREK: Mr. Manson has mail, and Mr. Maupin, 25 the sheriff has it. 26

23

24

25

.26

If your Honor would tell Mr. Maupin to turn over this mail.

THE COURT: I ordered that all mail that comes in the court to any defendant has to go through the jail facility in order to preserve the security afrangements. That is the only way it can be done.

Mr. Maupin has been so advised.

MR.KANAREK: After that happens will Mr. Maupin turn it over to me?

THE COURT: He won't have it any more. It goes to the jail.

MR. KANAREK: Then Mr. Manson doesn't get his mail, your Honor.

THE COURT: If he doesn't get it you let me know and I will find out why he didn't get it.

MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor. We asked on other occasions that Mr. Manson would like to get his mail.

THE COURT: Anything else? Thank you.

(Whereupon an adjournment was taken until Monday, August 10, 1970, at 9:45 o'clock a.m.)