## 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,

Vs.

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

Defendants.

No. A253156

REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT Thursday, August 27, 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.

VOLUME 74 JOSEPH B. HOLLOMBE, CSR.,

9315

MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR.,

9407 PAGES

Official Reporters

ſ	Thursday, August 27, 1970 VOLUME 74 P.M. 9315 - 9407 1		
1 ·	INDEX		
2	PEOPLE'S WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS		
·3	GALINDO, Damy 9362		
4	BRODA, Gary L. 9364		
5 :	KATSUYAMA, David M. 9370		
6.	· .		
7	EXHIBITS		
8 .	PEOPLE'S: FOR IDENTIFICATION IN EVIDENCE		
9	214 - Envelope containing four kitchen utensils 9361		
10	215 - Photograph of face 9366		
11	216 - Photograph of face 9366		
12	217 - Photograph of male 9373		
13	218 - Photograph of portion		
14	of male 9373		
15	219 - Photograph of portion of male 9373		
16	220 - Photograph of portion		
17	of male 9373		
18	221 - Photograph of portion of male 9373		
19	222 - Photograph of portion		
20.	of male 9374		
21	223 - Photograph of portion of male 9374		
22	224 - Photograph of body of		
23.	male Caucasian 9374		
24	225 - Photograph of face 9378		
25	226 - Photograph of body 9379		
26.	227 - (Withdrawn)		

1.	INDEX (Continued)		
2	EXHIBITS		
3.	PEOPLE'S: FOR IDENTIFICATION IN EVIDE	NCE	
4	228 - Electrical cord 9381		
5	229 - Electrical plug 9382		
6.	230 - Two diagrams 9387		
7	231- Photo of Roseman La Buava Hear 232 " rt side face & neck	k -	
8	232 11 pt side face & neck	1	
ġ.	BACK LEFT Side.	-	
10	334 " FRont left side		
11	Davis to Aguard of DIII	week	
12	236 " FRONT of Chest & ABDOMEN	~	
13	Datha Quitter		
14		au	
<b>15</b> .		ner.	
<b>16</b>		•	
17		<b>s</b> i	
18			
19		1	
20			
21			
22 <sup>-</sup>			
23	1	, ,	
24			
25			
26			

.1-1

 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 1970 2:00 P.M.

---0----

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

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

The subject that I want to bring up is a matter that the Shoriff's Department representatives mentioned to me.

They are concerned about the passing of physical objects or documents through an attorney, that is, either to or from one of the defendants from some third person who is not either a party to the action or an attorney for any of the parties.

The jail rules are, as you all know, that theme things have to go through the jail censor for security purposes and for examination, and so forth.

Now, I am not talking about the passage of documents or objects from an attorney to his client unless he has received that from some person, as I have mentioned; nor am I talking about the passage of a document or an object from one defendant to another through an attorney.

What I am talking about is the circumvention of the jail rules insofar as it applies to non-parties and non-attorneys.

3,

•

Just so that it will be perfectly clear I propose to make an order but I wanted to hear from you first.

Now, I can conceive that any order I might make would be subject to some exceptions. I mean there may be occasions, and perhaps there already have been, where an attorney for some reason or another will think it is necessary to transmit from some third party something to his client without having to to through the usual jail procedures.

If so, I think that the only way to solve that kind of problem is to get permission from the court before-

As I say, I wanted to give everyone a chance to talk about it.

?· 

10.

25.

MR. STOVITZ: So far as the prosecution is concerned, your Honor, if we get any mail -- like I have now -- if it is addressed to the counsel, I hand it to them directly; if it is addressed to any of the defendants, I give it to the bailiff and let them process it in the ordinary course of business.

So, as far as our partaking in this discussion, we will just stay mute.

MR. FITZGERALD: Almost everything I can envision that is handed to a client comes from a third party, with the exception of documents that have actually been prepared by the attorney himself.

I will give you a good example. There are a number of witness statements in this case that we have obtained through discovery from third persons, be it the prosecution by way of the District Attorney, or of some witness out in the field that we have had an investigator take a statement from; or in the past we have passed documents to the defendants that have appeared in the media.

The source of almost every document is some third party, with the exception of those documents that are prepared by ourselves.

Now, if the Sheriff is talking about personal correspondence or something like that, you could certainly make an order in that regard that we, as attorneys, would

. 2

3

5

6

7

9

Ŕ

11

10

12

14

16.

15

17

`**18** . . 19

20

22

21

23

24 25

26

certainly scrupulously obey. But I would ask consideration in your Honor not making a blanket order.

Or maybe the Sheriff has something more particular in mind.

THE COURT: I don't know exactly what he has in mind.

He has mentioned a number of different things ranging all the way from physical objects of one kind or another to documents, letters, drawings.

I don't know if there is any one particular thing. There has been a wide range of things mentioned.

So that is the reason that I wanted to talk to you. I don't want to make an unreasonable order. On the other hand, I think that the jail rules are reasonable and necessary.

There must be some way that a happy medium can be reached so as not to interfere unduly with the defendants' trial preparation but at the same time to obtain the security necessary.

MR. FITZGERALD: Actually, I myself have almost literally abandoned attempting to hand anything to my client in the jail because not only are they censored, they are read.

I just can't take that risk as an attorney.

The Sheriff isn't neutral in this case. The Sheriff is an adversary. The Sheriff has cases pending against some of the female defendants and against Manson, and they are

asking for the death penalty, and you just can't take the chance.

.5

I take the position that legally they are not entitled to do what they do, but I can't stop them. I have tried legally to stop them and it has been to no avail.

So, I really don't hand them anything. I would rather read them the contents of the document, and in that way it is not censored, rather than actually showing them the document.

12a fls.9

1Ì

19.

(2A-1.

2

1

3

.5

6

8

10

11 12

13

15

14

16

17

18 19

.20

21, 22

23

24 25

26

MR. STOVITZ: I think what the Sheriff has in mind — and this is just speaking as a third party here — is that, I am sure, if you learned of anything such as an escape or any type of danger to third parties, you, as officers of the court, would make that known directly to the Court.

But assume for the moment that there are some people that are outside, in the outside world, that are interested in rescuing the defendants and that they pass them something without you reading it. This is a means of getting information to the defendants about this rescue attempt.

I think there has been a marked increase in security in the building.

For instance, I have seen uniformed guards on the parking lots. I have noticed uniformed guards on the various floors in the building.

Since the incident in San Rafael, I think all courts are aware of this particular thing. Before we were just sleeping thinking that this couldn't happen. But it has happened. Things that happen in South America can happen here also.

MR. FITZGERALD: In that respect, your Honor, I am no messenger boy for my client, and I am not going to participate, implicitly or explicitly, with any attempt of that nature.

I have never handed anything to my client that

17<sup>2</sup>

I wasn't sure what the contents were, and I will represent to the court that I will do that in the future. We wish to do things legally and properly.

THE COURT: Well, is it necessary, in your opinion, Mr. Fitzgerald, for example, for an attorney to give something to his client which he retains as distinguished from, say, handing him a latter to read or a document to read in connection with his preparation of the case? Does he have to have a copy of it?

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, usually not. Usually not, your Honor. But as we have set forth in the affidavit, from time to time we have attempted to give our client things to take back to the jail and to review and to study.

In my particular case, I wanted to give Patricia Krenwinkel a copy of the book Five To Die," which purported to be an analysis of the events that took place in this case. Also, I gave her copies of the gag order, for example, and I gave her some witness statements.

THE COURT: The pretrial publicity order?

MR. FITZGERALD: The pretrial publicity order, right.

Believe it or not, we did.

THE COURT: I am sensitive about the use of that term "gag."

MR. FITZGERALD: I am sorry. The pretrial publicity order.

By and large, at any time in the past when I

ij

. 

have done that, the Sheriff has pointed out that this creates some problems with the jail facilities in that they didn't want the girls taking items back up to the communal area in which they live. So we worked out an agreement early in the case whereby any documents or anything that was given to the defendants we would have to run the risk of them being censored and reviewing, and also they would be placed in the defendants' property, and that they could review them any time they like in the jail, but they would have to go to another location. Which is parfectly all right.

But in answer to your question, usually it is not necessary for us to give material to the defendants that they retain. But in some situations it is helpful if they review and analyze particular material. But that is the exception rather than the rule.

2

3

5 6

7

9

11

13

12

.14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

THE COURT: Two specific examples within the last several days:

I noticed yesterday, I noticed from the bench, one of the matters the Sheriff mentioned, I think it was Miss Krenwinkel had some kind of a plastic spider.

MR. FITZGERALD: All of the girls, right.

THE COURT: It was three or four inches in diameter, it appeared to be, it looked just like a child's toy.

Maybe that is all that it was. On the other hand it could very easily conceal contraband, if that was the purpose. I have no way of knowing.

MR. FITZGERALD: I think it belonged to Mr. Hughes, actually.

MR. HUGHES: Right, right.

THE COURT: I'm not suggesting there was anything wrong in having it.

MR. FITZGERALD: No.

THE COURT: But this type of thing creates a problem because the Sheriff has no way of knowing what is inside of it, yet it is a very simple way of transmitting something, even a weapon or something of that kind.

MR. SHINN: Well, she took it back -- she did not take it back to the jail, did she? Usually they give it back before they leave.

THE COURT: Now, that was an example of something coming in to a defendant.

13-2 1

The Sheriff informed me that there was a drawing, I believe, one or more drawings made by one of the female defendants that went out and got into the hands of the media.

Now, in and of itself I suppose that is relatively an innocuous form of diversion for the defendant. But it also could be a communication which, for example, involves an attempted escape, which does not go through the jail censors.

So since all these things have possibilities for bad as well as good, the Sheriff has to take them into account. He is responsible for the security of the prisoners, the courtroom, the Judge, the attorneys and everybody else.

This is what I am talking about.

MR. SHINN: We have the difficult task of trying to keep these clients happy, and calm and quiet, otherwise they would fall asleep, your Honor.

Many times I have to shake my client to wake her up.

THE COURT: Yes, but that really does not have anything to do with what we are talking about.

MR. SHINN: Yes, it does. If we keep them busy drawing stuff, that keeps them awake.

THE COURT: I'm not saying about the drawing. I'm speaking about the transmission to some third party outside

Ś

2Ľ

of the court.

Well, is there any practical reason why an order should not be made prohibiting the transmission back and forth through an attorney either from or to his client of either documents or physical objects, with the provision that if the attorney deems that such a transmission is necessary, without having gone through the usual procedures, that he get permission first from the Court.

I am not talking now -- to make sure we understand each other -- there is nothing wrong with an attorney handing a document to a client to read, obviously.

But if he retains that document, no matter what it is, then it creates a security problem or a potential security problem, and this is where the Sheriff becomes concerned.

MR. KANAREK: May I be heard, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: I think that we are actually without really realizing it treading in a very dangerous area of constitutional law.

I think that the burden, the moving party in this case, the Sheriff, should have some kind of a showing; there should be an initial showing perhaps by a pleading of some type by the County Counsel, because we are dealing in an area not only of equal protection but fundamental due process when we have the Sheriff judging some of these

ľ

matters.

13a £1s. 20

I feel, as much as I have no quarrel with the Court's over-all purpose, I think that it is incumbent upon me to allege to the Court that this is pregnant in what we are speaking with here because, I mean, in practicing in our courts, what we are doing in this case is presupposing.

We are more or less allowing this publicity that has come about in this case to prejudge these defendants, and assume that these defendants are different than all the other defendants that have gone through the Superior Court without a showing, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am not making any such assumption.

I am not talking about any rule that is peculiar to these defendants.

MR. KANAREK: Well, what I'm saying, it would seem like we are in an area which I think we should tread cautiously, your Honor, because absent something that has really -- that has some kind of weight to it, I don't think that the defendants --

There has been no showing of any misbehavior on their part, or on anyone's part on their behalf.

I tried to obey, and I'm sure all the other attorneys tried to obey the jail rules.

I don't know how else to enunciate it except that --

A-1

2

1

3

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

2<u>1</u> 22

23

24 25

26

THE COURT: The order that I am proposing is simply an implementation of that rule. It doesn't do anything except to clarify an area which apparently is not too clear to some of you, because things have occurred.

That is, simply that these matters shall go through the jail procedures.

MR. KANAREK: So is your Honor saying this so I will know what the ruling is, even though I will try to obey it.

Is your Honor saying that every time that something comes to us, Mr. Fitzgerald, let's say, we pass documents inter se, then what should we do, give them to the Sheriff before we hand them to our respective clients?

MR. FITZGERALD: We are talking about retained documents.

THE COURT: No, what I'm saying is that --

THE COURT: I am talking about retention of documents or objects by a client that are not simply displayed to him or discussed with him or shown to him but are kept by him.

MR. KANAREK: How about transcripts? Sometimes if the client takes a transcript to the jail overnight to read.

Sometimes a witness' statement, as Mr. Fitzgerald points out, is given.

It becomes — the mechanics of it — the administering of it becomes the tail wagging the dog kind of thing because it could become monumental as far as the

JA2

 housekeeping aspect of it is concerned.

THE COURT: That is what I want to avoid.

MR. HUGHES: At what point, may I ask, is a document retained?

MR. FITZGERALD: When they go back up to the jail.

MR. HUGHES: When they leave the courtroom?

THE COURT: I would think so.

MR. FITZGERALD: I don't think it is really a problem. When there are those exceptions when we would like something to go up to the jail, we will tell you briefly what it is, and ask permission to go up.

By and large when we give clients things to go back to the jail, we assume the risk that it is going to be read by other inmates or by the Sheriff, simply because of the nature of incarceration, and we are not carping about that, actually, so highly secret material to our defense does not get retained by the clients.

THE COURT: All right. Well, then, I will attempt to formulate an order here.

All right, the order will read as follows:

No unauthorized person shall transmit to

or from any of the defendants for retention by any such
defendant any physical object or document of any kind to

or from any person who is not a party or the attorney of a
party in this case.

Any such physical object or document must go through the jail censor.

.23 

If any attorney for a party believes that it is necessary for him to transmit any such object or document directly for retention by his client, that permission shall first be obtained from the Court.

MR. KANAREK: May I, in order to protect the record, object to it, your Honor?

I am sure your Honor doesn't object --

It is my belief, your Honor, that that order violates the equal protection under the 14th Amendment, and due process, the right to effective counsel under the sixth Amendment which is incorporated in the due process clause under the 14th.

And the right to a fair trial.

THE COURT: Let me point out, Mr. Kanarek, that that order, until such time as a request is made by a counsel and refused by the Court, has not precluded you from transmitting anything.

MR. KANAREK: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: It provides for an exception within the terms of the order.

MR. KANAREK: Right, right.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HUGHES: For the record, I would like to join in the objection.

MR. SHIMS: I will join in the objection for the record.

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald, I received a letter from a Dr. Harvey W. Oschrin which you can keep, if you like, or read it and give it back to me, I really don't care.

MR. FITZGERALD: He sent me a letter telling me he had written you a letter.

It is a common problem in the courts. I am not about to pay him any witness fees, and he wants money.

,3B ·

L

· 4

17.

13b-1

2

Ť,

ş

5

6

7 8

9

11 12

13,

ļ\$

14

16

17 18

19.

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

THE COURT: Is there anything else to be taken up, gentlemen?

MR. BUGLIOSI: This hair business still has not been resolved.

THE COURT: Would you state just what you are talking about for the record.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yesterday we put on evidence that a deputy Tebbe from the Sheriff's Office, took strands of hair allegedly belonging to Susan Atkins.

I was going to call Joe Granado to testify. He found some hair on the clothing beside the hill in the canyon area, as testified by Linda Kasabian; she threw it over the side of the car.

His testimony will be that he compared Susan Atkins' hair with hair found on some of the clothing. They seemed to have the same color, length and medullary characteristics, meaning the internal structure of their hair.

We offer it as circumstantial evidence.

Thus far we put on the recovery of the hair from the brush and the comb of Susan Atkins.

Then I believe Mr. Shinn made an objection on the grounds this violated the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

Of course our position is that, No. 1, there are several cases, I have in my notebook, including a

Ţ

2

3.

5

Đ

7 8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

è

21

22 23

24

25 26 United States Supreme Court case, holding that the Fourth and Fourteenth do not apply to civilians.

No. 2, even if it did apply to civilians the United States Supreme Court has found that the Fifth Amendment as incorporated into the Fourteenth does not apply to taking physical items -- not physical items, taking items that are actually a part of the defendant's body such as a breatholizer or blood under the Duroncelay case.

THE COURT: Schmerber vs. California, a United States Supreme Court case involving blood --

MR. BUGLIOSI: As long as it is taken in a reasonable fashion.

Now we are talking about hair by analogy.

Gilbert and Wade argued that if you take things
like that you don't even have to advise the defendant of
his rights to have an attorney present.

He doesn't have a right to have an attorney present.

Compulsion under the Fifth Amendment, the thing that is proscribed by the Fifth Amendment is compulsion. It refers to verbal testimony, not to commanding a defendant to walk in court or take some hair from him or blood samples.

It simply does not apply to that type of physical evidence.

I believe the cases he cited, the Wade

Į

MR. SHINN: May I respond to that?

2

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SHINN:

4

3

and the Gilbert case, I think holds that where a stage in

5

the proceedings is reached that the defendant has the right

6

to an attorney, that is brought out in the Gilbert and Wade

7

case, and I believe that the Massiah case states that a

8

defendant after he had been indicted has a right to have an

9

attorney present at all stages.

ÌÓ

77.7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2Ľ

22

23

24

25 26 Now, in the Massiah case, the language used there was the fact that they used, I believe, some deceit, and the courts felt that once a person has been indicted that he should be afforded all of the protections under the Constitution, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments.

Even in the Miller vs. California, which I believe is a recent case, where they put an undercover agent in the same cell with the defendant.

That case held against the defendant on the grounds that her statements were not incriminating per se.

But I think the language, if we read through all these cases, the language seems to indicate that this element of deceit or fraud, that the courts are not going to allow that.

Now, we have this situation here where the Deputy Sheriff went down with Miss Atkins to the beauty shop for the sole purpose of trying to obtain a sample of

14 fls. 19

23. 

her hair, and the Deputy Sheriff at that time knew she was represented by counsel.

I think that is a critical stage of the proceedings, where she should have at least been allowed to refuse her hair to the Deputy Sheriff.

MR. STOVITZ: I submit, your Honor, if she had refused, the Court could issue a valid order ordering the removal of her hair for analysis purposes.

THE COURT: Here the hair was not taken from Miss Atkins by the Deputy, but it was taken from the brush and comb.

I think this falls squarely within the Schmerber doctrine.

The test is, assuming the arrest was lawful, the Schmerber case was a blood test, and the means used are reasonable in obtaining a sample.

In this case it wasn't even taken from the defendant. It was taken from a brush and comb which she used.

İ3

MR. SHINN: She stole it, your Honor.

THE COURT: I beg your pardon?

MR. SHINN: She stole it, your Honor. The Deputy Sheriff stole it. It is still the defendant's property.

THE COURT: Let's concede that term can be used that she stole it. Unless the means used are unraasonable, I see no violation of any constitutional right.

MR. FITZGERALD: There is another aspect of the problem. That is one thrust of the objection. There is another aspect of the problem, and it is the seizure or the obtaining of property, to-wit, the clothing, from an area adjacent to Benedict Canyon by King Baggot and other representatives of Channel 7, after having read in the newspaper the published confession or statement of Susan Atkins, which the defendants allege was illegally and improperly obtained.

This aspect of the problem was discussed at the bench the other day, the aspect of the problem that the clothes at the bottom of the canyon were really the fruit of the poisonous tree, the tree being the illegal and unlawful confession in the manner which it was procured and published by way of state action, by the office of the District Attorney and Susan Atkins! then-attorney, Richard Caballero.

And so the record is clear, I feel I have standing to object on behalf of Patricia Krenwinks. I

5.

2Ź

think that the cases are clear. I think it is clear from People vs. Ybarra, and other cases, that counsel not only has standing to object but I have a duty to object if this evidence is going to be introduced against my client as well. And it would appear that the prosecution is going to introduce the clothing found at the bottom of the canyon against all the defendants.

So, I would join not only with Mr. Shinn in his objection that the sample of hair was illegally obtained from the comb or brush of Susan Atkins, but also that the clothing at the bottom of the canyon was illegally and unlawfully obtained.

Of course, we have not had an evidentiary hearing, or we haven't got into the problem of whether or not Susan Atkins' confession was, in fact, illegally obtained as a result of state setion on the part of the District Attorney's office.

In connection with the statement itself, Mr. Shinn has, from time to time, actually since the beginning of this case, been seeking an opportunity, he did it by way of a motion to suppress, he did it by way of a 1538.5, and he most recently did it by way of a proposed writ of habeas corpus.

He has attempted in a number of ways to attack the validity of the statement of Susan Atkins.

That attempt has been largely thwarted and

frustrated by the prosecution because of their assertion 14-3 that they did not intend to put in evidence of the statement, which would render it moot. However, the effect of the statement is relevant in terms of how the clothing was obtained. 14A 9. 

14A-1

obtained.

22; 

.  In that respect, the Court may either want to determine whether the statement was illegally obtained, or the Court might want to decide that assuming arguendo it was illegally obtained, that it doesn't make any difference. The seizure is, in any event, immaterial.

THE COURT: What do you mean "immaterial"?

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I take it that the prosecution would contend that even if they illegally obtained the statement of Susan Atkins, that the finding or the seizure of the property by subsequent private person is not illegally obtained, even if the confession was illegally

THE COURT: Of course, there apparently was no search involved.

MR. FITZGBRALD: No. there wasn't.

THE COURT: In the conventional sense.

MR. FITZGZRALD: Although we are in doubt of the nature and character of the property from which the clothing was taken.

We could make the argument that there was a trespass onto private real property in order to obtain the belongings. But the statement on the record now is, apparently, that from a public thoroughfare they looked into a canyon, they saw what appeared to be clothing, they called the police, the police came out and photographed the clothing and removed it.

2 3

5· 

11:

B 26

MR. KANAREK: May I be heard?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I see your point, Mr. Fitzgerald.
There is some marit to it.

But assuming arguendo that Susan Atkins' statement was obtained unlawfully, we are still confronted with the law that the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments do not apply to civilians.

MR. STOVITZ: Also, as in the Tahl case, you cannot say that he would not have found the clothing after hearing the description from Linda Kasabian's statements.

You remember that the police went out searching with Boy Scouts and couldn't find it. A civilian found it without the help of the Boy Scouts.

MR. FITMGERALD: It would seem that the prosecution's statement that the state of the law is such that it does not apply to private persons is correct. But I can't devine what the law is going to be by the time this case is finally determined on appeal, if, indeed, the defendants are convicted, and I just want the record to be clear that we are objecting on both of those grounds. That is all.

THE COURT: What is the objection with respect to Miss Atkins testimony or confession, her alleged confession?

MR. SHINN: What is the objection? You mean, before the Grand Jury?

145-1 1

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Is that the same objection that you raised in your various motions and petitions?

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor. That two of her constitutional rights were violated: One, ineffective counsel in violation of the Sixth Amendment; and the Fifth Amendment, the right to remain silent.

I allege there was no waiver of her constitutional right to remain silent.

For the Court's information, I took it to the DCA and the DCA denied it.

Then I took it up to the State Supreme Court, and they denied it.

And now I am in the process of taking it to the Supreme Court on a writ of a certificati.

THE COURT: It would appear that insofar as this court is concerned that question has been decided.

MR. SHINN: At this level, yes.

THE COURT: Decided in the sense that although I haven't decided myself --

MR. SHINN: You did, your Honor, on my habeas corpus you denied it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Not this court.

MR. SHINN: Yes. I filed it in this court.

THE COURT: I never determined the matter on its merits, Mr. Shinn.

MR. FITZGERALD: That is correct. The Judge didn't.

The Judge denied you the opportunity to proceed by way of writ of habeas corpus.

MR. SHINN: Yes. I asked for an evidentiary hearing, and I believe the Court denied it.

MR. FITZGERALD: It might be better for this record if Mr. Shinn were to bring in a copy of his brief on the application for a writ of habeas corpus which would contain procedural facts and would contain, in a succinct fashion, the allegations of the impropriety of the statement.

We could then receive it into evidence as a special exhibit or by reference, or incorporate it somehow, and we could all join in it, and the record would be protected.

MR. STOVITZ: We have no objection to your Honor holding up on this.

Mr. Granado is going on vacation.

We could bring it in in a day or two, if your Honor wants an opportunity to fully consider it.

MR. KANAREK: May I be heard briefly on this?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: May I see the 1538.5 portion of the Penal Code very briefly, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Shinn informs me that there has actually been a copy of his application for a writ of habeas corpus and the appeal therefrom that was lodged in

-26

2Ì

14c fls.

the District Court of Appeal actually lodged with the Clerk of this court in Department 104.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I have a theory which I would like your Honor to consider which is independent of habeas corpus, and it goes under 1538.5, subsection (a) -
(2) Subsection 5.

14C-1

Í

 This code section says that a defendant may move for the return of property or to suppress as evidence any tangible or intangible thing obtained as a result of a seizure on the ground that —

Then under Subsection 2 -- a search or seizure with a warrant was unreasonable because --

And then under Subsection 5 -- there was "any other violation of federal or state constitutional standards."

My position is that Mr. Manson was arrested with a warrant which came about after the Grand Jury indichment. No question that was a warrant that caused his arrest up in Northern California.

Now, that came about as a result of a Grand Jury indictment which did not comport with Federal or State constitutional standards, in that it is our allegation that there was an illegal, illicit conspiracy which existed between the Los Angeles Times and members of the District Attorney's Office, including Mr. Ron Einstons and Mr. Cohen of the Los Angeles Times that has an office right in the District Attorney's Office, Mr. Richard Caballero, who is an ex-deputy district attorney, and people who are presently in the District Attorney's office, whereby there was this arrangement, either tacit or explicit, whereby \$90,000 was changing hands with one Mr. Schiller as an intermediary. Somehow or other, he participated in the \$90,000.

1C2

,

5.

14.

.

Mr. Caballero, as attorney, and Mr. Caruso, as attorney, participated.

THE COURT: What are you talking about, Mr. Kanarek? Let's get to some point.

MR. KANARHK: What I am maying, your Honor, is -THE COURT: I don't even know what subject you are
on, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: I am on the subject that the Grand
Jury indictments, which is predicated upon Susan Atkins'
statements, came about as the result of -- I hate to use
the word -- subornation of perjury, or invasion of --

THE COURT: Are you now attacking the indictment?
MR. KANAREK: Yes.

What I am saying is that under 1538.5 -THE COURT: Let's not waste any time with that,
Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: I am not attacking the indictment per se, but subsection 5 does say where the search or seizure with the warrant was unreasonable because there was either violation of federal or state constitutional standards.

It is my position that under the case of Poople vs. Ybarra, Mr. Caballero violated his duties as a lawyer to Miss Atkins.

14d-1

, .

3

1

. 6

7 8

9

11

12

13

14 15

> 16 17

18

20 21

22 23

24. 25

26

What I am saying is, that is why we are asking for a full-fledged hearing whereby your Honor would then determine whether or not what happened before and during the Grand Jury proceedings comported with the Constitution.

MR. STOVITZ: Where was the search? Where was the seizure?

MR. KANAREK: The seizure was by a warrant.

MR. STOVITZ: Of whom? Of Mr. Manson's body?

MR. KANAREK: May I finish?

There is no question that 1538.5 covers the situation with a warrant.

THE COURT: What is your point, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: My point is --

THE COURT: Give me the point first, Mr. Kanarek, and then the argument, so I can know what you are talking about.

MR. KANAREK: The point is that as a result of an illicit agreement with the District Attorney and Mr. Caballero, there came about a purported Grand Jury indictment.

THE COURT: Are you attacking the indictment now?

Is that what you are talking about?

MR. KANAREK: No. I am attacking the procedures.

I am attacking the relation between --

THE COURT: The time has long since gone by when I am going to consider the indictments. That matter has come up before and it has been passed on, and we are beyond that

13:

stage.

MR. KANAREK: What I am saying is that 1538.5 encompasses that, because if you take my theory under 1538.5, there was a seizure with a warrant as the result of a lawyer and the District Attorney coming to an illicit agreement.

Miss Atkins says that what she stated were lies. She has indicated that there is no question.

I am not the one to judge, but it sounds like subornation of perjury. In other words, getting an indictment by means of --

THE COURT: What does this have to do with anything?
MR. KANAREK: Well, we wouldn't be here today.

THE COURT: In other words, you are trying to attack the indictment?

MR. KANAREK: Not per se.

Under the 1538.5 statute, if we read the clear English of it, the clear English of the provision, it involves seizure with a warrant where there was either violation of federal or state constitutional standards.

It doesn't say "except what occurred at a Grand Jury hearing."

THE COURT: Then what is your point?

MR. KANAREK: Well, my point is that Mr. Manson was seized as a result of this purported Grand Jury action, and the Grand Jury action did not comport with federal or

state constitutional standards.

THE COURT: We are getting away off the subject.
We started out talking about clothes found on the side of
the hill in Benedict Canyon.

MR. KANAREK: Right, your Honor.

It is my position that --

14e fls.

TAR TTO

9,

3.

4E-1

2

1

ş

5

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2I 22

23

24

25 26 MR. STOVITZ: Was Mr. Manson wearing those clothes?

MR. KANAREK: It doesn't make any difference. He
does not have to have been wearing the clothes.

He has a right to assert that he has been brought before the court by way of an illegal process.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We are not going to mark as an exhibit and introduce him into evidence, Mr. Kanarek. What is the problem?

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen.

MR. KANAREK: I would like to make a point very briefly, your Honor:

I would welcome your Honor studying this code section, 1538.5 --

THE COURT: I am familiar with the section.

I have no question about the section.

MR. KANAREK: Whether it happened at the Grand Jury hearing, the fact is that Mr. Manson is here as a result of this illegal activity.

Furthermore, your Honor --

THE COURT: You have challenged the Grand Jury indictments on many occasions, Mr. Kanarek, and apparently you are trying to do it again now. I am not going to entertain any further action on the indictment.

MR. KANAREK: Very well.

I would join in Mr. Fitzgerald's comments and in Mr. Shinn's comments, your Honor, on behalf of

4E2

6.

Mr. Manson also.

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald has made a suggestion with respect, as I understand it, to the purported confession of Susan Atkins and Mr. Shinn's attack on that, that the brief or briefs be filed in this case, if they have not already been filed or lodged, and that --

Did I understand you correctly to suggest that the Court determine, on the basis of those briefs, this question of -- perhaps you had better state it again, Mr. Fitzgerald. I am not sure exactly where you went from there.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

I felt that if the Court had the opportunity to read Mr. Shinn's brief, that the Court could read, in a succinct fashion, the allegations that Mr. Shinn was making concerning the alleged illegality of the confession.

That is all I was suggesting, your Honor. That the brief might be offered into evidence.

I had a further alternate also, and I was saying that the Court may choose ultimately to decide, after reading the succinct statement of the allegations concerning the confession, that the Court may decide that assuming arguendo that those allegations are correct, none-theless the seizure or the finding of the property by some civilian third person was, nonetheless, proper or all right.

I take it that is the People's position.

3

4

5

7

8

10-

11

12

13

14 15

16.

17

18

14F

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

THE COURT: I am certainly willing to consider anything that I haven't already considered in connection with that question.

I have read Mr. Shinn's various papers attacking the confession of Susan Atkins. And I believe the People responded, did you not, with some declarations and answers?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I read all of these materials. I think I understand what occurred.

MR. FITZGERALD: I see.

The only alternative is, it seems to me, to have actually an evidentiary hearing and go into the circumstances surrounding the obtaining of the confession, which may well take three or four days.

I was looking for some sort of method or procedure whereby we could obviate a hearing and the taking of evidence, and so on and so forth.

14f-1

3

2

5

7

9

10

12

14

16

**1**7

18

19

20

21 22

23. 24

25 26 THE COURT: Well, I agree.

I think the first step is to assume, for the sake of argument, that the confession is illegal or involuntary, and then determine whether or not that would make any difference.

If it would, then you can go to the next step as to whether or not it was, in fact, involuntary.

MR. FITZGERALD: Right.

THE COURT: If it doesn't make any difference whether it was voluntary or not if some civilian, using that information or using a newspaper article based upon that confession, went out on his own and found the clothing, then we don't have to go to the second step to be able to determine whether or not it was, in fact, involuntary.

MR. FITZGERALD: Correct.

MR. MANAREK: I wouldn't be adverse to that as an alternative procedure, your Honor.

THE COURT: The first stage is purely a matter of law. MR. FITZGERALD: Correct.

THE COURT: We don't have to take any evidence on that. All we have to do is consider the appropriate authorities.

MR. STOVITZ: We believe that under the appropriate authorities, your Honor, and of course assuming this point arguendo, we are in no way, of course, consenting with the defense's theory that the finding of the clothes by

1 2 '3

4

6

5

8

10

]1 12

14

16

15

17

19

20

22 23

24 25

26

the ABC news man was not with the connivance of the Police Department, it was not under their direction, they were not acting as an agent of the Police Department. They were acting as news men gathering a news story. It was the action of a citizen, and not barred by the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution.

THE CLERK: Pardon me, your Honor.

Do you want to let the jury take a break now so that we don't have to take a break later?

THE COURT: Yes, let's do that.

MR. SHINN: Are you going to put on that evidence on the hair now?

MR. BUGLIOSI: On the hair?

MR. SHINN: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is up to the Court, whether the Court rules it is admissible.

THE COURT: As far as the recovery of the hair from the brush and comb by the Deputy at Sybil Brand, I see no difficulty with that at all. It is clearly covered by Schmerber vs. California and other cases, that the samples were lawfully obtained and can be used.

As to the clothes, I would suggest that the People submit some authorities on that question.

MR. BUGLIOSI: As to the recovery of the clothing?
THE COURT: As to the recovery of the clothing by
the civilian.

MR. STOVITZ: By the civilian?

THE COURT: Yes.

,

14g fls.8

2Ó

In other words, assuming for the sake of this determination that the confession was involuntary and unlawfully obtained, as to whether or not it makes any different with respect to the recovery by the civilian relying on the information that he obtained through a newspaper article based on that confession.

14G-1 MR. STOVITZ: I would say that the case of People vs. 1 Helfand would be helpful there, where a Mexican border 2 guard stopped and searched --3 MR. BUGLIOSI: May I leave and come back, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes. 5 MR. STOVITZ: -- an automobiledriven by the defendant 6 and found a dead body in the trunk of the automobile. 7 We have all the authorities in that case. 8. It was decided approximately a year ago. It is in the new ---10 THE COURT: Helfand? 11 MR. STOVITZ: Helfand, H-e-1-f-a-n-d. 12 It is in the California Official Reports, the 13 brown book. I don't have the citation at the top of my head, 15 your Honor, but it is a case that I tried. 16 THE COURT: There is a table of the cases in the book. 17 MR. STOVITZ: Yes. I will look. 18 It is a DCA opinion, and review was denied 19 by the California Supreme Court. 20 MR. BUGLIOSI: Here are the cases, your Honor, on 21 this subject matter. 22 People vs. Johnson, 153 Cal. Ap. 2d at Page 873 23 and 874. 24 Stapleton vs. Superior Court, 70 Advance Cal. 25 101. 26

4H

.2

129.

ÌI

94.

Incidentally, Stapleton holds that even private detectives are not covered by the Fourth Amendment.

THE COURT: 70 Advance Cal?

MR. BUGLIOSI: 70 Advance Cal. 101.

Also, People vs. Superior Court, 70 Advance Cal.

People vs. Randazzo, 220 Cal. Ap. 2d 768.

In that case, incidentally, Randazzo held that

the Silver Platter Doctrine of Elkins vs. United States did not apply. The defense argued the Silver Platter Doctrine by analogy.

14H

2

1

4

3

5 6

7

8

10

11.

13'

14.

16

17 18

10-

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

The Supreme Court cases are Boyd vs. United States, 116 U.S. 616 and Berdo vs. MacDowell, 256 U.S. 465.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't myself have any other cases to give the Court.

You indicated you wanted authorities. Did you want a written brief on it?

THE COURT: No, that is not necessary.

MR. STOVITZ: The Helfand case, your Honor, imcCal. Ap. 3d, Page 880.

THE COURT: Do you have it there?

MR. STOVITZ: Yes. I have it right here.

THE COURT: All right.

You are not planning to get to that point this afternoon, are you?

of course, that evidence has been received but it hasn't been connected up.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, it hasn't been connected up, and I won't go into it until the Court makes a ruling.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I am sure your Honor agrees that under 1538.5 a defendant has a right to make a motion to suppress even though he or she is not the one from whom the evidence was taken.

I mean, we are agreed on that, I assume.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. That is People vs. Martin,

. . 2

3

4

б

7

.9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

**19** 

20

21 22

23

24

26

45 Cal. 2d. I would go along with that.

MR. KANAREK: So, therefore, I think that subsection 5 is quite important, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am sure it is. All you need to do is apply it to the proper facts.

MR. FITZGERALD: Everybody concedes that we all have standing to raise the issue, although it only relates to Susan Atkins.

MR. BUGLIOSI: You have standing, and I think it is wise for you to raise it, because conceivably the Court can go the other way and make it retroactive. I wouldn't be surprised if they do.

THE COURT: Is there anything pending before we go back into court?

I will read the authorities on this question of the confession of Eusan Atkins and the applicability, if any, assuming it to have been unlawfully obtained, to the discovery of the clothing.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I would like to give the Court, now that the Court has mentioned it, some other cases dealing with the poisoned fruit doctrine, standing for the proposition that just because there is an umbilical cord, as it were, between the recovery of the evidence and the unlawful search and seizure does not necessarily mean that the evidence is tainted.

The Court might read People vs. Garay, 247 Advance

Cal. Ap. 974. Also People vs. Martin, 240 Cal. Ap. 2d, 653 at Page 656. People vs. Wheeler, 243 Cal. Ap. 2d, 340 at Page 347. People vs. Thomsen, 239 cal. Ap. 2d, 84 at Page 90. People vs. La Peluso, 239 Cal. Ap. 2d, 715 at Page 724. People vs. Dumas, 251 Cal. Ap. 2d, 613. People vs. Koelzer, 222 Cal. Ap. 2d. I don't have the page on that. 4I 

141-1

. 2

3 4

5

8

7

9

11 12

13

15

16 17

Ì8

19 . 20

21

22

23

24

26

THE COURT: That should be sufficient.

MR. STOVITZ: Here you are, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. I will read these authorities.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Our next witness might be Dr. Katsuyama.

MR. STOVITZ: Actually, it will be Sergeant Brods.

Sergeant Galindo will be very, very brief, and then it will be Dr. Katsuyama.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right.

We have some color photographs of the victims, but the Court has already ruled with respect to the Tate victims that they are too prejudicial, so that issue is already resolved, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are talking about the Coroner's photographs?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes.

But we have black and whites again on Rosemary and Leno La Bianca, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have counsel seen the black and white photographs?

MR. STOVITZ: Yes. They have availed themselves of discovery and seen all the black and white photographs.

MR. FITZGERALD: They have availed themselves of a subpoena duces tecum on the Coroner's Office.

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen. We will resume at 3:00 o'clock.

. 24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, it is two minutes after 3:00 right now.

Oh, I am sorry. No, it is not. I have got the wrong time.

THE COURT: Do you want to take a little recess?

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: Can we make it 3:15, your Honor?

THE COURT: Let's make it 3:10.

MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor.

THE COURT: At 3:10 we will bring them back in.

All right.

(Recess.)

15-1

. 2

3

T

4

6

7 8

9 70

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 . 20

21

22 23

24

25 26 (The following proceedings were had in open court in the presence and hearing of the jury, all defendants and all counsel being present:)

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

You may continue, Mr. Stovitz.

MR. STOVITZ: Yes, with the permission of the defense counsel, if it's agreeable to the Court we have Dr. Katsuyama, who will be our witness in a moment or two in the courtroom.

Is that agreeable?

MR. FITZGERALD: No objection.

MR. HUGHES: No objection.

MR. SHINN: No objection.

MR. KANAREK: No objection.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STOVITZ: I have an envelope, your Honor. Contained within the envelope are four kitchen utensils.

May the envelope and its contents be marked as People's 214 for identification?

MR. HUGHES: Wasn't this witness excused?

MR. STOVITZ: Yes, I'm asking permission to recall him for this inquiry on direct.

THE COURT: Very well.

DANNY GALINDO,

recalled as a witness by and on behalf of the People, having been previously duly sworn, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

# FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR.STOVITZ:

Showing you Exhibit 214, these four utensils, are these the articles you referred to that were similar to the exhibit, 207, the kitchen fork previously to which you testified?

A Yes, sir.

Q You recovered these items, Exhibit 214, at the home of Mr. and Mrs. La Bianca at 3301 Waverly?

A That's correct.

And you recovered this exhibit, 207, from the stomach of Mrs. La Bianca at that same address?

A Yes.

MR. STOVITZ: You may inquire, Counsel.

MR. FITZGERALD: No questions, your Honor.

MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.

MR. SHINN: No questions, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.

MR. STOVITZ: May this witness be excused?

MR. FITZGERALD: He may, no objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are excused.

15a fls. 25

21

22

23

24

15a-1 <sub>1</sub>	MR. STOVITZ: Mr. Broda, would you kindly take the
2	witness stand?
3	THE CLERK: Would you raise your right hand, please.
4	Would you please repeat after me:
. 5	I do solemnly swear
6	THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear
7	THE CLERK: that the testimony I may give
. 9 8	THE WITNESS: that the testimony I may give
9	THE CLERK: in the cause now pending
10	THE WITNESS: in the cause now pending
. 11	THE CLERK: before this court
12	THE WITNESS: before this court
Ţŝ	THE CLERK: shall be the truth
14	THE WITNESS: shall be the truth
. 15	THE GLERK: the whole truth
16	THE WITNESS: the whole truth
17	THE CLERK: and nothing but the truth
<b></b>	THE WITNESS: and nothing but the truth
19	THE CLERK: so help me God.
<u>\$</u> ′ 20	THE WITNESS: so help me God.
21	THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please.
22	Would you state and spell your name.
23	THE WITNESS: Gary L. Broda, B-r-o-d-a.
24	THE CLERK: How do you spell your first name, sir?
25	THE WITNESS: G-a-r-y.
96	

Z.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

### GARY L. BRODA,

called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. STOVITZ:

- Q Is it Sergeant Broda?
- A Yes.
- Q And what is your business or occupation, sir?
- A Sergeant of police for the City of Los Angeles, presently assigned to Robbery-Homicide Division.
- Q Directing your attention to August of 1969, what was your assignment at that time?
- A I was assigned as a homicide investigator, robbery-Homicide Division.
- Q I direct your attention to a male person, depicted in the photograph Exhibit 92, and ask you did you; ever see that person depicted in that photograph?
  - A Yes.
- Q When did you first see the person depicted in that photograph which we have identified as Mr. Leno La Bianca?
- A On August 11, 1969, at approximately 10:00 a.m. in the morning at the Los Angeles County Morgue.
  - Q So then, the first time you ever saw this

15a-3 Mr. La Bianca was at the morgue, is that right? Yes. 2 And what was taking place at that time? Q 3 A A post-mortem examination was being performed. And did you see Mr. La Bianca in the position Q 5 as he appears now with a pillowcase covering his head? 6 A Yes. 7 Did you see if anyone removed that pillowcase 8 from Mr. La Bianca's head, and who it was? 9 A Yes. 10 Who was it? 11 I believe it was Dr. Katsuyama. A 12 Q And was that done in your presence? 13 Yes. 14 And after that pillowcase was removed from 15 Mr. La Bianca's head did you notice anything unusual about 16 his neck or throat? 17 A Yes. 18 What did you notice, sir? Q 19 Mr. La Bianca had a knife protruding, a 20. knife handle protruding from his throat, the knife blade 21 was secreted in his throat. **22** I show you Exhibit 210 for identification, Ü 23 directing your attention to that knife, sir, is that the 24 knife that was removed by the Coroner? 25 A Yes, it is. 26

15a-4 How do you identify it, sir? Q 1 By the inscription on the knife blade, and I 2 booked this knife after it was removed from Mr. La Bianca's 3 throat, and I had photographs taken of the knife. 4 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I gather I may have the 5 same continuing objection on the grounds of immateriality 6 and irrelevancy, as to this witness? 7 THE COURT: Very well. 8 MR. KANAREK: Thank you. 9 MR. STOVITZ: Your Honor, I have two photographs. 10 may the one photograph showing a partial face, chin 11 protruding, be marked as People's Exhibit next for 12 identification -- I believe it would be 215 for identifica-13 tion. 14 THE COURT: It will be so marked. 215 14. 15 MR. STOVITZ: And a second color photograph which 16 shows the nose and eyes of the face of Mr. Leno La Bianca, 17 as 216 for identification. 18 216 Id. THE COURT: It will be so marked. 19 BY MR. STOVITZ: 20 Sergeant, I direct your attention to Exhibit 21 215, do you recognize the scene depicted in that photograph? 22 A Yes. 23 Were you present when that photograph was Q 24 taken? 25 A Yes. .26

	particle of the state of the st
15a-5 <sub>1</sub>	Q And is this photograph an accurate portrayal
2	of Mr. Leno La Bianca as the pillowcase was being removed
3	from his face?
4	A Yes.
*	Q The knife shown in this exhibit, 215, is this
5.	the knife in front of you, Exhibit 210?
6	A Yes.
. 7	
ž 8.	Q I show you Exhibit 216 for identification,
, · g	is this another view after the pillowcase was further
10	removed, of Mr. Leno La Bianca?
. : n	A Yes.
12	Q And does this photograph accurately depict
13.	what you saw at that time?
	A Yes.
14	Q Were you present when this photograph, Exhibit
16	216 was taken?
17	A Yes.
18	MR. STOVITZ: You may inquire, Counsel.
19	MR. FITZGERAID: No questions.
20	MR. SHINN: No questions, your Honor.
. 21	MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor. Thank you.
22	MR. HUGHES: No questions.
23	MR. STOVITZ: May this witness be excused, your
,	Honor?
24	TIOTINE !

MR. FITZGERALD: No objection.

26

THE COURT: You are excused, Sergeant.

THE CLERK: Raise your right hand, please. 1 Would you please repeat after mes 2 I do solemnly awar --3 THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear --4 THE CLERK: - that the testimony I may give --5. THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give --6 -- in the cause now pending --THE CLERK: 7 THE WITNESS: -- in the cause now pending --8 THE CLERK: -- before this court --9 THE WITNESS: -- before this court --10 THE CLERK: -- shall be the truth --11 THE WITNESS: -- shall be the truth --12 HE CLERK: -- the whole truth --13 THE WITNESS: -- the whole truth --THE CLERK: -- and nothing but the truth --15 THE WITNESS: -- and nothing but the truth --16 THE CLERK: -- so help me God. 17 THE WITNESS: -- so help me God. 18 THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please. 19 Would you please state and spell your name. \* 20 THE WITNESS: My name is David M, Katsuyama, 21 last name is spelled K-a-t-s-u-y-a-m-a. 22 23 DAVID M. KATSUYAMA, 24 called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, being 25 first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 26

. 15B2

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q What is your occupation, sir?

A I am a licensed doctor to practice medicine in the State of California.

I am a deputy medical examiner for the Coroner and Medical Examiner of the County of Los Angeles.

Q Please state your education, training and experience in the field of medicine, including your duties and experience as a deputy medical examiner for the Los Angeles County Coroner's Office.

A I graduated from medical school in 1959, from the College of Medical Evangelists, Loma Linda.

I interned the following year at the Los Angeles County General Hospital.

I took a four-year residency next in pathology in 1960 to 1964 at the Glendale Sanitarium and Hospital.

I was certified by the American Board of pathology in clinical pathology in 1965, in anatomical pathology in 1966 and in forensic pathology this past May.

Since 1964 I have been with the Orange County Medical Center, associated with the Coroner of the County of Orange since approximately 1965 and since the 2nd of June, 1969. I have been associated with the Coroner and Medical Examiner's Office of the County of Los Angeles.

Q How many autopsies have you performed?

A I kept count until I counted to 2,000, and then I quit counting since then.

Very well, directing your attention, Doctor, to the data August 11th, 1969, did you perform an autopsy on the deceased body of one Leno La Bianca?

A Yes, I did.

		<b>Y</b>
15C-1	1	MR. KANAREK: May I have the continuing objection on
	2	immateriality and irrelevancy as to this witness also?
	3	THE COURT: You may.
4	4	MR. KANAREK: Thank you.
	5	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Where did you perform the
	6	autopsy?
•	7	A The autopsy was performed at the offices of the
*	8	Coroner and Medical Examiner of Los Angeles County,
•	9	Los Angeles.
H	10	Q What time of the day on August 11th did you
	11,	perform the autopsy?
	12	A The autopsy began approximately at 1:30 p.m. on
	13	August 11th, 1969.
	14	Q And it was finished approximately when?
	15	A I don't have the exact time of finishing; I
	16	would say approximately an hour to an hour and a half.
	17	Q Did you reduce your autopsy findings to an
	18	autopsy report?
	19	A Yes, I did.
\$	20	Q Do you have that autopsy report with you today
#.	21	in court?
	22	A Yes.
~	23	MR. BUGLIOSI: Any objection to the doctor referring
	24	to his report as he testifies?
	25	MR, FITZGERALD: No objection, your Honor.
	26.	MD HIGHES. No objection ways trans-

5C-2	1	MR. SHINN: No objection, your Honor.
	2	MR. KANAREK: No objection, your Honor.
	3	Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: As a result of your autopsy
	4	examination, Doctor, of Leno La Bianca, did you form an
	5	opinion as to the cause of death?
	6	A Yes, I did.
*	7	Q What is that opinion?
2	. 8	A That death was due to multiple stab wounds to
	9	the neck and abdomen, causing massive hemorrhage.
	10	MR. BUGLICSI: Your Honor, I have here a photograph
	11	of a male, may it be marked People's next in order?
217	12	THE COURT: 217 for identification.
218	13	MR. BUGLIOSI: I have another photograph of a portion
	14	of a male, may it be marked 218 for identification?
	15	THE COURT: It will be so marked.
	16	MR. BUGLIOSI: I have here another photograph of
19	17	another portion of a male, may it be marked People's 219
	18	for identification?
	19	THE COURT: It will be so marked.
£	20	MR. BUGLIOSI: I have here another photograph of
1220 <sub>s</sub>	21 -	another portion of a male, may it be marked People's 220
	22	for identification?
	23	THE COURT: It will be so marked.
	24	MR. BUGLIOSI: I have here another photograph of
	25	another portion of a male, may it be marked People : 221
:1	26	for identification?

THE COURT: It will be so marked.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have here another photograph of another portion of a male, may it be marked People's 222 for identification?

THE COURT: It will be so marked.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have here another photograph of another portion of a male. May it be marked People's 223 for identification?

THE COURT: It will be so marked.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have here another photograph which shows the entire body of a male Caucasian. May it be marked People's 224 for identification?

THE COURT: It will be so marked.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have here another photograph of another portion of a male, may it be marked People's 225 for identification?

THE COURT: It will be so marked.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have here another photograph depicting another portion of the body of a male Caucasian. May it be marked People's 226 for identification?

THE COURT: It will be so marked.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have here another photograph of a male, may it be marked People's 227 for identification?

THE COURT: It will be so marked.

Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: I show you People's 217 for identification, Doctor, was that photograph taken under your

This shows his back.

I show you People's 219 for identification, is

25

26

4 . 5

6

8

9

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

20 21

19

22

23 24

25 26. that also a photograph of Mr. La Bianca taken under your direction at the Coroner's Office on August 117

A Yes, it is.

Q What portion of the body is depicted in that photograph?

A It shows the upper right side of the trunk and a part of the right side of the face.

Q I show you People's 220 for identification, what is shown in that photograph? Is that also Mr. La Bianca?

A Yes, this is also Mr. La Bianca. This shows his hands with what appears to be a material tying his wrists together.

Q That photo was taken under your direction on August 11th?

A Yes, this photo was taken under my direction.

Q I show you people's 221, was that also taken at your direction, of Mr. La Bianca?

A Yes, it was taken prior to the removal of it before the clothing was removed, it shows the head covered with a pillow case, and a portion of the electric cord knotted around the pillow case.

Q Taken on August 11th?

A Yes.

I show you People's 222 for identification, is that also a photograph of Mr. La Bianca taken at your direction at the Coroner's Office on August 11th?

A Yes, another photo taken of the neck area.

This one from the left side showing the knife protruding from his neck.

Q I show you People's 223 for identification, what is shown in that photograph?

A This is another photograph, very similar to the one previous with the hands, showing a thong-like material tying his wrists together.

15d-1 That is of Mr. La Bianca taken on August 11th 1 under your direction at the Coroner's Office, is that correct? 3 A Yes, it was. 4 I show you People's 224 for identification, Q 5 what is shown in that photograph? 6 224 shows an over-all general front view of 7 the body with the abdomen exposed, with a lettering on the 8 surface of the abdomen above the umbilica, the belly 9 button, also showing several stab wounds there. It also 10 shows the pillowcase as it was found, and the electrical 11 cord shown wrapped around it. 12 Was that taken under your direction on 13 August 11? 14 A Yes, it was. 15 I show you People's 225 for identification, 16 . was that also taken of Mr. La Bianca under your 17 direction? 18 A Yes, it was. 19 At the Coroner's Office on August 11? Q **2**Ò A Yes, it was. 21 What is shown on that photograph? Q 22 A It shows the stabbing wound of the neck, 23 it encompasses the front portion of Mr. La Bianca's 24 chest, neck and face.

25

26

I show you People's 226 for identification,

15d-2

2

. 3

4

5 6

7

8

ģ

10 11

**1**2

13

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25.

26

is that also a photograph of Mr. La Bianca's body?

A Yes, it is,

Q Taken under your direction on August 11th at the Coroner's Office?

 $\Lambda$  Yes, it was taken under my direction at the Coroner's Office.

It showed the -- it better exposed the view showing the four stab wounds, several scratch marks on his abdomen with the lettering of "War", w-a-r, and several superficial marks on the skim, which are of the kind of the time marks of the fork.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, may I withdraw People's 227 for identification?

THE COURT: Very well, 227 will be withdrawn. BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Doctor, are the exhibits, People's 217 through 226 for identification, all of these photographs, are these all fair and accurate representations of the respective portions of Mr. La Bianca's body depicted therein?

A Yes, they are.

Q At the time these photographs were ordered under your direction?

A Yes, they were.

Q Referring to this photograph, People's 221 for identification, does there appear to be a pillowcase over Mr. La Bianca's head, sir?

24

25

26

A Yes, a pillowcase is over his head and around the pillowcase and on it is an electrical cord.

The plug of an electrical cord is visible. by the identified number card.

- Q Was this pillowcase covering Mr. La Bianca's head when his body arrived at the Coroner's Office on August 11?
  - A Yes.
- Q And was the electrical cord on top of the pillowcase at the time you observed Mr. La Bianca's body?
  - A Yes.
- Q So the pillowcase was over the head and then the electrical cord was wrapped around the head, is that correct?
  - A Yes.
- Q Was the electrical cord tied in some type of knot around Mr. La Bianca's head?
- A In a knot. That knot is visible at about the center of the photograph.
- Q Was the electrical cord tied tightly, loosely, moderately or what?
- A It was moderate in tightness. The cord itself could not be removed without cutting, and it was not so tight that it could not be slightly moved on pressure.
  - Q Did you remove the pillowcase from around the

`.	ľ	head of Mr. La Bianca?
	1	A Yes, I did.
*	2	Q What did you do with the pillowcase?
	3	A The pillowcase, I believe, I recommitted it to
	4	the people of the Police Department who were present at
	5	the autopsy.
	б	Q You turned the pillowcase over to a representa-
	7	tive of the Los Angeles Police Department?
	8	A Yes.
10 1d.	9	MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I have here an electrical
	10	cord. May it be marked People's next in order?
	11	THE COURT: 228 for identification.
	12	MR. BUGLIOSI: 227 was withdrawn I believe.
	13	THE COURT: Make it 228.
*	14	MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.
	15	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
	16	Q I show you People's 228 for identification, an
		electrical cord, have you ever seen that electrical cord
	18	before?
1	19 20	A Yes, I have.
		Q Does this appear to be the electrical cord that
1	21	was tied around Leno La Bianca's head when his body arrived
	23	at the Coroner's Office?
	24	A It does.
	25	MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I have here an electrical
	26	plug, may it be marked People's 229 for identification?
	40	·

229 1d

2

3

4

7.

8

٠9

10

11

12.

13

14

THE COURT: So marked.

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q I show you an electrical plug, 229 for identification.

Was this plug attached to this cord at the time that the cord was wrapped around Mr. La Bianca's head?

A Yes, it was, and the wire itself was cut before removal.

The end of the wire that was cut was tied with string and labeled so that the relationship could be preserved.

Q Did you turn the electrical cord and the plug over to a representative of the Los Angeles Police Department

A Yes, it was turned over.

15e fls.

¥:

17

16

18

19. 20

21

**2**2

23

24 25

26

K5-E

2

3

4

1

5

7

8

10

11

. 13

14

16

17

18

19 . 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

Q I show you People's 215 for identification, do you know what is shown in that photograph?

A It is a color photograph of the upper portion of the body of Mr. La Bianca, with the pillow case still in place, the cord still in place, the neck exposed with the knife handle — with the knife with its handle still protruding out, and with the blade embedded into his neck.

Q I show you people's 210 for identification, a knife, have you ever seen that knife before?

A I believe I have.

Q Is that the knife that was in Leno La Bianca's throat?

A I believe it is.

Q Did you remove that knife from his throat?

A I removed the knife from his throat after looking at it and noting the serrations on one edge, and handed it to a member of the Scientific Investigation Division of the Los Angeles Police Department.

Q Directing your attention once again to People's 215 for identification and specifically the knife which was People's 210 for identification, was this knife visible when Mr. La Bianca's body first arrived at the Coroner's Office?

A No, it was not.

Q Do you know why it was not?

A Because the lower portion of the pillow case,

the bloody portion of it, was still down, pulled over the lower portion of his face and neck. 2 Therefore, it was covering the knife handle. 3 You first became aware, then, of this knife 4 when you removed the pillow case from around Mr. La Bianca's 5 head? A Yes. 7 Doctor, how many stab wounds were there in the 8 body of Mr. La Bianca? 9 There were six major stab wounds, a total of 10 12 stab wounds, not including one exit wound. 11 Q. So there were a total of 12 stab wounds, is 12 that correct? 13 A Yes. 14 Q Could you break down the location of these 12 15 stab wounds very briefly? 16 A Yes, I did. 17 What are the locations of these 12 stab wounds? Q 18 Five were on the anterior portion of the neck. 19 A Q You say "anterior," you mean the front? 20 The front of the neck, one of which included Á 21 the knife wound -- the one with the knife embedded in it. 22 Another on the left side of the neck. The back 23 showed one; the chest showed one and the abdomen showed 24 four. 25 Q That is a total of 12. 26

A total of 12. A 1 Did you notice any fork wounds on Mr. La 2 Bianca's body in addition to these 12 stab wounds? 3 Yes, there were seven pairs of double-tined 4 fork wounds. 5 In other words, two needle-like or prick-like 6 marks on the abdomen, a total of 14 puncture wounds. 7 Q So then Mr. La Bianca -- you counted these 14 8 separate time wounds and 12 stab wounds -- he had a total 9 of 26 separate wounds, is that correct? 10. A Yes. 11 Q Were all of these 26 wounds penetration wounds? 12 A Breaking the skin, yes. 13 Q Did the seven pairs of fork wounds all appear 14 to be essentially the same? 15 A They appeared similar to each other. 16 Q. I show you people 's 207 for identification, 17 have you ever seen that fork before? İg Not prior to being present in this courtroom. A 19 This fork was removed from Mr. La Bianca before **2**0 the body arrived at the Coroner's Office. 21 A Yes. 22 Now, looking at this fork right now, does it 23 appear to be the type of fork that could have caused the 24 seven pairs of double-timed wounds that you refer to? 25 A Yes. 26

Q In addition to the 26 wounds to Mr. La Bianca. 1 did you find any other wounds or cuts or abrasions on his 2 body? 3 Yes, on the abdomen, the word "war," was 4 scratched on the surface of the abdomen between the lower 5 portion of the rib cage and his umbilious, his belly б button. You say war, w-a-r, is that correct? 8 W-a-r. 9 I show you People's 226 for identification, 10 is this the w-a-r that you observed carved on Mr. La 11 Bianca's abdomen? 12. A Yes, it is. 13 How many of the 26 wounds, do you feel, 14 Doctor, were fatal in and of themselves? 15 I believe six of them would have been fatal 16 separately over a certain period of time. 17 Q Over a period of time, what do you mean by 18 that? 19 Within a matter of minutes or within a matter 20 of several minutes. 21 Q I take it you prepared some diagrams on the 22 body of Leno La Bianca, is that correct? 23 Yes, I have them in the courtroom, and the Ά 24 wounds are traced upon them. 25 How many diagrams did you make of the body of 26

Leno La Bianca? Two diagrams, one of the front and one of the back. MR. BUGLIOSI: May I mark the diagrams next in order, your Honor? 5, THE COURT: 230 for identification. 

15f-1

2

3 4

6

5 .

7.

.9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19.

20

21

22

23° 24

25

26

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q Doctor, would you please step to the diagram, and insert on the diagram the location of all 26 wounds.

Also the location of the w-a-r on Mr. La Bianca's abdomen.

When you come to a fatal wound, indicate the wound as being fatal.

Tell the Judge and Jury why it was a fatal wound.

Also indicate the organ or part of the body that the wound penetrated, such as the speen, the heart, the lungs, whatever the case may be.

Also indicate the direction of thrust of each wound.

A I will indicate according to the numerical sequence I have utilized in my report.

Stab wound No. 1, which was the one that had the knife still present, was in the anterior portion of the neck.

It had gone into the neck in a direction from up toward downward and actually from left to right.

It partly transected his right carotid artery.

- Q Was that a fatal wound there, by the way?
- A Yes, it is.
- Q And you marked it as such. Thank you.
- A Stab wound No. 2, slightly to the left side of

15f-2

2

4

à

б

5

7 . 8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

the body, slightly to the left and down towards -- it cut through a portion of the trachea.

The other four major wounds were on the abdomen -- (witness draws on the diagram) in about these locations.

These are Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6.

It penetrated the abdomen and portions of the mesentery, the small bowel, and colon, and all of their directions of penetration were from the left to the right in a front to a back direction, and in a downward direction.

These I considered inevitably fatal if no medical attention would be given.

> Have you marked them as fatal? (Witness so marks.) Put a parenthesis and then another paren. (Witness complies.)

A In addition there were several other stab wounds, four stab wounds relatively superficial in nature in the neck, and a small abrasion at that location (indicating), also a stab wound on the front part of the chest, which was also superficial, relatively long but not penetrating a vital structure.

The word war, I will use another color, was present at about that location, and with a third color I will place the seven pairs of time marks as best as I can 15f-3

in their locations.

2

1

May I see the photograph?

4

(Photograph handed to the witness.)

5

These are the locations of the injuries found

6

in the front part of Mr. La Bianca's body.

7

This shows the back of Mr. La Bianca's body, what appears to be the exit wound of the knife was at

8

about this location.

9

I will use the proper color, according with the

10

other one, and another relatively deep penetration, as far as penetration goes, in the back, however no vital

11

12

structures were pentrated or transected by this particular

knife wound.

16 fls.

Z

15

14

16

17

18

19

20

21, 22

23

24

25 26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

16-1	1	Q Is that the extent of the wounds, Doctor?
	2	A This is the extent of the wounds, except for
	3	the skin slippage that I noted next to the wrist of his
	4	hand.
	5	MR. BUGLIOSI: All right. You may resume the stand,
	6	Doctor.
•	7	THE COURT: Mr. Bugliosi, I don't believe that the
Ļ	8	doctor testified as to whether wound No. 2 was fatal or
; .	9 :	non-fatal.
	10	The chart does not indicate.
	11	MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you.
*  *  *	12	MR. STOVITZ: I believe it is marked, your Honor.
	13	Let's see. No. The trachea no, it doesn't.
	14	(Whereupon the witness marks.)
	15	THE WITNESS: I believe that wound No. 2 would
	16	eventually have proven fatal, provided no medical treatment
	17	was given.
	18	BY MR. BUELIOSI:
	19	Q You are now talking about within a few minutes
<b>&amp;</b>	20	after its infliction?
٠	21	A Within several minutes or so.
	22	MR. BUGLIOSI: All right. You may resume the stand.
	23	Q Doctor, did you personally examine each of
	24	Mr. La Bianca's stab wounds?
	25	A Yes, I did.
	26	Q And based on your examination of these wounds,

	l l	
16-2	1	Doctor, did you form any opinion as to the type of weapon
_	. 2	or weapons that caused the wounds?
	3	A Yes, I did.
	4	Q What is that opinion?
•	5	A By measurement, including the depth of the
,	6	measurement
•	7	Q Before we get into measurements, Doctor, basically
ş	8	what type of a weapon was it that caused the wounds?
,	, 9.	A A sharp cutting type of instrument like a
	10	knife.
	11	Q All right.
	12	Now, based on your examination of the wounds,
	13	did you form any opinion as to the dimensions of the blade
	14	that caused the wounds?
	15	A Yes, I did.
	16	By the maximum opening size of the wounds,
	17	it was about one and one-quarter of an inch in maximum
	18	is it width?
	19	Q Well, let's start out with length, Doctor.
L	20	A Length?
¥	· 21	By the maximum penetration of depth, approxi-
¥.	22	mately five and a half inches in length.
	23	Were many of Mr. La Bianca's wounds five and
	24	a half inches in depth, Doctor?
	25	A At least two of them were five and a half
î e	26	inches in length. Others about five inches in length.

	1	Q Did any wound have a depth in excess of five
· ,	2	and a half inches?
	3	A Not that I can remember.
,	4 .	Q So, you feel that the blade had a maximum
	<b>5</b> . 1	length of five and a half inches; is that conect?
	6	A It could possibly be.
*	7	Q At least five and a half inches?
**	8	A At least one was five and a half inches.
	9	Q And it could be longer?
	10	A Yes.
	11	Q But you found no wounds which had a depth in
	12	excess of five and a half inches?
_	13	A Yes.
	14	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I don't wish to interrupt,
	15	but I think counsel is again assuming facts not in
	16	evidence, that it is one weapon, that this is a single
	17	weapon.
	18	That is implicit in his questions, your Honor.
	19	THE COURT: It is merely descriptive of the type
£	20	of weapon, as I understand it.
ŭ.	21	If that is an objection, it is overruled. That
16a	f1s. 22	is a matter for cross-examination.
	23	
	24.	
	25	
	26	
	,	

L6A	-1
4244	

3

1

5 6

7

8,

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25 26 MR. BUGLICSI: Q What about the width? I am not talking about the thickness now, I am talking about the width. The width of the blade or blades that caused the wounds to Mr. La Bianca. Doctor.

A The width, I believe, was approximately 1-1/4 of an inch in maximum width. Perhaps 1-1/8, 1 inch.

Q There was a rather large wound around the word "war," is that correct, Doctor?

A Yes.

Q What width did that particular wound have?

A That was approximately 1-1/4 of an inch.

Q There were other wounds with a width of about 1-1/8 inches?

A Yes. Slightly over 1 inch in width.

Q What about the thickness of the blade?

A The thickness of the blade appeared to be ranging from about an eighth of an inch to 3/16ths of an inch in thickness.

What about that large wound around the word "war"? Do you have any opinion as to the thickness of the blade that caused that wound, Doctor?

A Yes.

Q What is that opinion?

A I would say that it was about a little over an inch in width. Approximately an inch and a quarter.

Q I am talking about thickness now.

	*	
16A2	r	A Thickness? About 3/16ths of an inch in
	2	maximum thickness. Perhaps an eighth.
	Ś	THE COURT: I don't think it is clear, Mr. Bugliosi,
	4	which wound you are talking about.
	5	MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. I am going to mark it right now,
	6	your Honor.
₹	ã,	THE WITNESS: That would be wound No. 5, I believe.
*	8	MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.
	9: .	Q You are talking about this wound right here
*	<b>10</b>	(indicating)?
,	n	A Yes.
	12	Q That is wound No. 5 on the diagram; is that
	13	correct?
•	14	A Yes.
	15	MR. BUGLIOSI: May I encircle that, your Honor, and
1	16	put "wound No. 5"?
	17	THE COURT: Yes.
	18	(Mr. Bugliosi so marks.)
	19	MR. BUGLIOSI: All right.
Å.	- 20	Q And you feel that the thickness of the blade
•	21	that caused wound No. 5 was what, Doctor?
	. 22	A Approximately an eighth to 3/16ths of an inch
	23	in thickness.
	24	MR. BUGLIOSI: May I mark that, your Honor, as an
	25	eighth of an inch to 3/16ths in thickness?
	26	THE COURT: Very well.
	Ì	

JA3

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

(Mr. Bugliosi marks.)

MR. BUGLIOSI: May it be stipulated that People's 210 for identification, the knife which was removed from Mr. La Bianca's throat, had the following measurements:

The blade has a length of 4-7/8 inches. A thickness of just under 1/16 of an inch. And a blade width of 3/16 of an inch at its widest point, and 3/8 of an inch at its narrowest point.

So stipulated?

MR. FITZGERALD: So stipulated.

MR. SHINN: So stipulated.

MR. HUGHES: So stipulated.

MR. KANAREK: So stipulated, your Honor.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Doctor, looking at this knife here, People's 210 for identification, and in view of the stipulated dimensions of the blade, do you have an opinion as to whether or not this particular knife which was removed from Mr. La Bianca's neck caused all of the other wounds to his body?

A May I measure it?

Q Would you like to measure the blade?

A Yes, I would.

Q You are not going to accept the stipulated dimensions. Doctor?

A No.

MR. BUGLIOSI: All right. Very good.

(Pause while the witness measures.) THE WITNESS: The blade length is --MR. BUGLIOSI: I hope you don't prove me wrong, Doctor. I am going to be in serious trouble if you come out with different measurements. 16B 

16b-1

2

3

. 5

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20:

21

22

24

25 26 THE WITNESS: The length is less than five inches. Four and 13/16 approximately.

Just a hair over three-quarters of an inch in width.

Q You say in width? Are you talking about the maximum width?

The blade at different points varies in width; is that correct, Doctor?

A Yes, it does.

At its maximum width it is just a little over three-quarters of an inch, and it narrows down progressively towards the tip.

The thickness is about one-sixteenth of an inch.

These dimensions are much smaller than many of the wound: which I previously described.

Q So, it is your opinion, then, Doctor, that People's 210 for identification, this knife, could not have caused many of the other wounds on Leno La Bianca's body; is that correct?

A Yes, it is.

Q Did you form any opinion as to whether the knife or knives which caused Mr. La Bianca's wounds was single or double-edged?

A It appears to be a double-edged blade.

The wound comes to points at both sides

of the wounds that I have described, indicating a doubleedged blade.

A single-edged blade I would expect to form a blunt edge, a blunt margin, at one of the sides, one of the ends of the stab wounds.

- Q You, of course, do not know the number of knives that were used to kill Mr. La Bianca; is that correct, Doctor?
- A I cannot state, except probably a minimum of two.
- Q Showing you People's 92 for identification, particularly the two wounds which are in the immediate vicinity of the word "war."

Were those two wounds caused by a knife or by the double-timed fork?

- A These large gaping openings?

  (Indicating.)
- Q Yes.
- A These were caused by a knife rather than a double-timed fork.
- Q Referring now to the word "war," w-a-r, which was carved on Mr. La Bianca's abdomen.

Do you have an opinion as to the type of weapon used to carve that wound?

A Whatever was used did not have a very sharp edge. It probably did have an edge sharp enough to scrape,

say like the end of a mcrewdriver or, for that matter, an electrical plug, the portion that is placed into the plug.

Q Showing you People's 229 for identification, the electrical plug which has been severed from People's 228 for identification, the electrical cord.

Could the metal prongs on this electrical plug, the two metal prongs, could that have been the instrument that caused the word "war" to come upon Mr. La Bianca's body? Could the word "war" have been carved with those two metal prongs?

- A Possibly, yes.
- Q Or else a screwdriver-type of an instrument?
- A Something of that type of an edge.
- Q But not a knife?
- A Not the sharp edge of a knife.

.6C-1

. 2

1

4

3

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

. 26 Q The fork that you were shown on the witness stand, Doctor, could the double-timed edges or points or tips of that fork have caused the "war" on Mr. La Bianca's stomach?

A Used singly, it could possibly have. One side at a time it could have.

However, no parallel marks of that distance were noted.

Q Did all of Mr. La Bianca's wounds appear to have been inflicted while he was still alive, or did any of them appear to have been inflicted after death, Doctor?

A The time mark appeared to have been inflicted in his last phase of life, or shortly after death.

Q The fork wounds?

A The fork wounds. And also the word "war" appeared to have been in the dying phase or shortly after death.

Q Why do you form that opinion?

A The lack of significant bleeding into the scratched areas.

Q The wounds were, comparatively speaking, light colored?

A Light colored, and bloodless in comparison to the other wounds.

Q When a person has died, obviously the heart

1

3

.5

6

8

10

12

13

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

stops pumping blood. Is that why the wounds are more light colored?

A Yes,

Q If the wound is inflicted prior to death, it is usually darker around the wound?

A There is usually a little bit of bleeding into the area causing a darker shade, a reddish to a brownish shade.

Q Did you find any defense wound on Leno La Blanca body?

A No defense marks that I could consider defense marks.

Q Did the absence of any defence marks or wounds have any significance? Was that of any significance to you?

A In my opinion, Mr. La Bianca was tied up prior to being killed.

Q You associate his being tied up and incapacitated, then, with the lack of defense wounds; is that correct?

A Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, would this be a convenient time before we get into Rosemary La Bianca?

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may we approach the bench before the Court leaves, but after the jury leaves.

THE COURT: Yes.

16C3 Ladies and gentlemen, do not converse with 1 anyone nor form or express any opinion regarding the case 2 until it is finally submitted to you. 3 The jury is now excused until 9:45 tomorrow 4 morning. 5 . Do counsel wish to approach the bench? MR. KANAREK: Yes. (Whereupon, the following proceedings occur 8 at the bench:) 9 MR. SHINN: First of all, we would like to have a 10 15-minute meeting, your Honor, with all of the defendants. 11 THE COURT: Fine. 12 MR. SHINN: The second thing, your Honor, Mr. Kanarek 13 will present. 15. MR. KANAREK: Yes. These are certain items that --16 17 MR. STOVITZ: What is that? MR. KANAREK: There are certain items that we 18 would like Mr. Manson to have with him. 19 I wonder if your Honor would peruse them, in 20 view of your Honor's order. 21 16D 22 23. 24 25 26

16d-1

1 2

3

5 6

7

8

.9

11,

12

10

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

22

23

25

26

THE COURT: What is the nature of the items, Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: They are statements of witnesses and they are reports, allegedly homicide reports.

THE COURT: It is something that you obtained in the course of your investigation? Is that it?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

MR. SHINN: And this book. It is all entered here.

MR. STOVITZ: Is there anything sharp in the book that they can take the book apart and use it as a weapon?

THE COURT: Is there some way of identifying these, Mr. Kanarek, without revealing the contents?

MR. KANAREK: It would be quite lengthy. I would be willing to do it. I mean, I will do it if the Court wishes.

THE COURT: Just classify them generally. MR. KANAREK: Yes, sir.

They are written documents which are interviews, which purport to be interview statements and investigation reports concerning matters pertaining to this case.

THE COURT: All right. You may have permission, then, to give them to Mr. Manson, and he may retain them with him.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

MR. HUGHES: I am aware, your Honor, from my

1 incarceration that the Sheriff will take away the binder. THE COURT: Will take away what? 2 MR. HUCHES: Will take every the ring binder because 3 4 of the metal objects, your Honor. .5 im. SHIRN: This binder here. THE COURT: I thought you were talking about the 6 7 matters that you are holding in your hand, Hr. Kanareke 8 MR. MAMASEN: Yes. There are two separate items. ġ These and the matters in the binder, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All of the matters in the binder? 11 MR. KANAREK: Yes. 12 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Stovitz took a look at the 13 material. 14 MR. STOVITZ: Yes. I parused these, and these are Ì5 primarily witness statement sheets that we have furnished 16 to the defense, plus summaries by counsel. 17. We see nothing barnful, your Henor, so long 18 as the defendants do not give these statements to their 19 friends so that their friends can go out and intimidate 20 witnesses. 21 MR. SHINN: He will have it in the jail. 22 THE COURT: I don't think that is the problem. 23 The binder may very well be a problem. I 24 don't know. 25 Mk. KANAKLA: I would be willing to take everything 26 out of the binder, so far as the binder is concerned.

\*

MR. SHINN: It is indexed though.

MR. STOVITZ: The point is that you can put a string in the holes instead of the metal binder.

THE COURT: What I am saying is that because of the metal portions of the binder, the Sheriff may consider this to be a hazard of some kind. I don't know.

MR. KANAREK: I would be glad to take them out of the binder, and I think they can be kept in sequence.

THE COURT: And simply placed in a large brown envelope or something?

MR. KANAREK: That is correct. We can do that, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SHINN: We will withdraw this today, your Honor, and bring it in tomorrow. I will put some string in it.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. KANAREK: Will your Honor inform the Sheriff?

I have seen on other occasions where the Court makes an order and it doesn't get down to the working personnel.

So, if your Honor would make an order --

THE COURT: All I can do is make the order. I don't have any idea what person in the Sheriff's Department will be connected with it.

You will have a copy of the transcript with the order in it.

MR. KANAREK: We want h have it tonight, and the

transcript won't be done until later this evening. Ì THE COURT: You may represent to anyone involved that I have made such an order. MR. KANAREK: Very well. Thank you, your Honor. (Whereupon at 4:15 p.m. the court was in recess.) 26.