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,

96

vs.

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

Defendants.

No. A253156

REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT Tuesday, September 22, 1970 P. M. SESSION

APPEARANCES:

DONALD A. MUSICH, STEPHEN RUSSELL KAY,

For the People:

VINCENT T. BUGLIOSI,
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

For Deft. Manson:

I. A. KANAREK, Esq.

For Deft. Atkins:

DAYE SHINN, Esq.

For Deft. Van Houten:

For Deft. Krenwinkel:

RONALD HUGHES, Esq. PAUL FITZGERALD, Esq.

VOLUME 96

JOSEPH B. HOLLOMBE, CSR.,

PAGES 11137 to 11244

MURRAY MEHLMAN, CSR., Official Reporters

Ţ,

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1970 2:05 P.M.

---0---

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

You may proceed, Mr. Bugliosi.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, can we approach the bench?
THE COURT: Very well.

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

MR. BUGLIOSI: I learned, your Honor, that that photograph was not taken on August 16th; the photograph and the property was recovered on November 25, 1969 at Spahn Ranch.

There was no search warrant, so we are not going to have to get into that.

However, he advises me, Gleason advises me, that he got Spahn's permission to enter the ranch on November 25th.

They entered this trailer and a Juan Flynn was living in the trailer and Juan Flynn gave him an Gutierrez permission to take possession of the helter skelter board.

So we are not dealing with a search warrant. We are not dealing with August 16th. We are dealing with a consent issue given by Mr. Spahn and Juan Flynn.

I would certainly like to go into that now.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, I think he has got to show us that this writing on the panel has some connection with the defendants in this case, your Honor.

I believe he said that he got it from Juan's trailer.

It might be Juan's, you know. He may not even connect the defendants in this case.

THE COURT: We have to take it one step at a time.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, furthermore, if I may in this connection, in order to get to the trailer he has to get permission to get on the land.

Also I don't believe that this person, I don't know if Mr. Bugliosi made the representation, that this man even knew who Juan Flynn is or was, or because someone happens to be located somewhere does not mean they are the owners.

There has to be the proper foundation.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Juan Flynn advised him that he was
living in this trailer.

It goes towards the issue of whether the officers acted reasonably or not.

They knew Juan Flynn -- in fact, Juan Flynn was arrested August 16th out at the ranch, so they were familiar with Juan Flynn.

26

25

10-1

5.

10a fls 17

MR. HUGHES: I think there is another ample question, and that is the question of just who the trailer belongs to, regardless of whose land it was parked on or who actually happened to be inside it at the time that the officer made the seizure.

It is my understanding that the trailer belonged to one Randy Starr, who recently died.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Well, your Honor, to facilitate the proceedings this afternoon -- we have wasted a lot of time this morning -- I will pass this for the moment.

This is a crucial bit of evidence, but I could probably get it in at a later time, and we can move on this afternoon. I do have other witnesses to call. But I do want to get into the fact that Helter Skelter was found printed on a door at Spahn Ranch, and that is the language found at the La Bianca residence.

MR. KANAREK: In the possession of Juan Flynn.

10A-1

1

3

5

6

7

, 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: We will put on evidence that Juan Flynn will testify that he did not write that there and that when he moved into the trailer it was already there.

MR. KANAREK: That is prejudicial. The prejudicial value /far outweighs the probative value.

The fact that it was found in the trailer -THE COURT: All right, Mr. Kanarek. Sometimes I would
like to have you explain that objection to me.

MR. KANAREK: I would be glad to point out that Witkin devotes an entire section to that, because --

THE COURT: Not now, Mr. Kanarek, This is not the time.

MR. KANAREK: Very well.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I will'pass this for the moment, your Honor.

I understand that there will be a stipulation as to the car?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There is also going to be a stipulation as to the car at the Tate residence?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I can enter into that also.

THE COURT: You are going to pass this whole matter?

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am going to pass the matter of Helter Skelter on the board, but I will put it on later. I have other witnesses to call, among whom is Michael

. 19

22,

 Hendricks.

Has the matter been resolved as to Michael
Hendricks? I feel that I have a right to call him to the
stand.

MR. KANAREK: He is supposed to be in Atascadero.

He spent less than a week here. The District Attorney got him out of the mental hospital.

THE COURT: I am not concerned with his present condition because I observed him and I am convinced that he fulfills the requirement of 701 of the Evidence Code. The point that concerns me as far as Mr. Hendricks is concerned is whether or not he was able, at the time that his testimony is related to, to perceive those events as to which he is being asked the questions now.

MR. BUGLIOSI: There is no evidence that he didn't, your Honor.

10B

_0B-1

3.

Ş

 THE COURT: Well, there is evidence in the file that raises some very serious questions. I don't think the evidence is conclusive by any means, but certainly it raises some questions which I can't ignore.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I think this is a matter of cross-examination, your Honor.

THE COURT: It is more than a matter of cross-examination.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have yet to hear of a case that -THE COURT: Look at People vs. McCaghan. That is
precisely the point they are talking about.

MR. BUGLIOSI: If a person is completely insane and you hold up your fist and they say they see a bus driving by, that is a different story. But this man, there is just no evidence in the record that at that time he couldn't perceive anything.

Right now he certainly answers all the questions responsively and intelligently and carries on a conversation, and there is no evidence that at any previous time he couldn't do it.

THE COURT: Except for the matters in the file which indicate various doubts on the part of some of the examining psychiatrists as to his mental condition, which raises the question in my mind as to whether or not he was capable at that time.

As I mentioned before, this question wasn't

24

25

26

addressed to them, so they didn't answer it. So, I don't know what their answer would be.

It may very well be that they would find that he was competent, but I have no way of knowing.

MR. BUGLIOSI: To me, it is almost --

THE COURT: Take a look at People vs. McCaghan.

I don't like the law, I just have to apply it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I don't doubt that.

This is a one out of a hundred situation where a person, no matter how crazy they are --

THE COURT: If it happens to be the one that is this case, I have no way of knowing.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Is there anything in the file that indicates that when he looks at a bus he sees an elephant?

I am serious.

THE COURT: Let's not raise that up here.

Call your next witness.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am wondering if there is anything in the file that says he can't see things; that when he looks at something he sees something else.

THE COURT: Take a look at the file.

MR. FITZGERALD: They do indicate that he had visual hallucinations. He used to see people at the end of his bed.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Many people have hallucinations.

THE COURT: Let's not argue it up here. We will take

I

the time when we get to that point.

I will look at the file again.

My present feeling is that he probably should be examined, or there should be some expert testimony. I will have to make the ultimate decision, but I think I will need some assistance in making it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Would the Court then order a psychiatric examination of him fairly expeditiously?

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. BUGLIOSI: As it is now, we are going to be calling him pretty far out of order.

THE COURT: He is presently in the County Jail?

MR. BUGLIOSI: He is upstairs on the 9th floor. He has been hanging around here and I have been wanting to bring him down every day and I haven't been doing it because of this problem.

So, if the Court could order the examination very rapidly?

THE COURT: When we get to that point we will have to have a conference. I want you to pinpoint the time and the general nature of the expected testimony so that in the order for the examination I can instruct the doctor what questions I want answered.

11-1

. 7.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I was going to call Mr. Hendricks as my next witness after this witness.

THE COURT: All right, then, perhaps we should retire to chambers. I can make the appointment after you inform me of these facts.

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

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to ask counsel to come into chambers for a few minutes. We have a matter that has to be discussed. I will ask the jury to stay in the jury box; hopefully we will be in in a few minutes.

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

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

Mr. Bugliosi, I think perhaps the best way to proceed would be if you could make a general offer of proof as to Mr. Hendricks' testimony, fixing a period of time to which his testimony will relate.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Hendricks advises me, your Honor, that he stayed at Spahn Ranch during July and early August of 1969, spending between two and three and four days a week at the ranch, spending the other days at his parents' cabin near Crestline.

ļ

2

4

5

7

_

9

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

He did not stay there permanently.

While he was at the ranch he met Mr. Manson. He had seen him almost every day but not every day. He did see Mr. Manson carry a gun around on his person.

He said it was a .22 caliber Longhorn revolver.

Mr. Hendricks will of course testify to his familiarity
with guns.

He said Mr. Manson used to carry the revolver in a black holster on his side.

I have shown him the revolver already, and he has identified it as being the one he saw Manson with.

He said that he liked the revolver, and he told Manson about it, that he would like to have it, and Manson said no, that the revolver was his, Mr. Manson's.

This occurred he believed in July of 1969.

He never saw anyone else at the ranch with that gun in their possession other than Charles Manson.

His duties at the ranch were guard duties, to guard against the Panthers attacking the ranch.

THE COURT: Whose duties?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Hendricks' duties at the ranch were to serve on guard duty to alert anyone -- to alert the people at the ranch that the Panthers were coming.

Manson spoke to him about the coming bloody revolution, and that Manson intended to cut a trail out in the desert and kill everyone on the way.

.6

When Hendricks eventually left the ranch in early August, 1969, Manson gave him a 9 millimeter automatic, told him to go out and blow up a pig.

He said when a police officer stops him and asks him for his identification, to pull out the automatic and shoot the officer.

His main testimony, your Honor, will be the identification of the gun and the fact that Manson said it was his gun.

THE COURT: All right. Then I will appoint two psychiatrists to examine Mr. Hendricks as expeditiously as possible.

I will ask that the reporters prepare a special transcript of today's proceedings in chambers regarding Mr. Hendricks, and also have the former testimony of Mr. Hendricks in this proceeding as to the question of his competency.

I don't recall the date now, but it was several weeks ago.

In other words, that I think should be the first part of the transcript, the special transcript so that the psychiatrists will have an opportunity to 'read the testimony with respect to his competency that has already taken place, plus the offer of proof so they will be able to fix the time and the general nature of the testimony.

And make three copies. That should be sufficient.

My thinking at the moment is I will appoint two psychiatrists, and in the event there is any serious conflict as to their testimony, then conceivably a third one will be appointed. That is why the third copy of the transcript.

MR. FITZGERALD: Your Honor, I wonder if your Honor might direct the Clerk to direct the doctors that you appoint that the file from Atascadero State Hospital and the California Youth Authority file are available to them, and also there has been filed by me a declaration in support of motion in re competency of witness Michael Hendricks.

That is also in the Superior Court file; that I could provide another copy to the Clerk. I wonder if that might be made available to the psychiatrists as well?

THE COURT: Have it made a part of the special transcript if you like, and attach it as an exhibit to the special transcript.

MR. KANAREK: We join in Mr. Fitzgerald's request, your Honor.

MR. KAY: Your Honor, we have no objection to them looking at the file from the Youth Authority and Atascadero, where other medical doctors have examined

26

1

2

3.

5

6

ġ

10

11

12.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

. 23

24

25

Mr. Hendricks.

2

3

But as far as Mr. Fitzgerald's document there, I just don't know the legal basis for that coming in to be

4.

viewed by the doctors.

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

THE COURT: Well, these are matters which, as understand it, Mr. Fitzgerald heard directly from Mr. Hendricks.

Is that right, Mr. Fitzgerald?

MR. FITZGERALD: That is correct.

MR. KANAREK: It is under oath, your Honor, under penalty of perjury by a lawyer in the case.

MR. FITZGERALD: For whatever value or weight it might have.

THE COURT: If you wish to cross-examine Mr. Fitzgerald on this declaration, I suppose that is appropriate.

On the other hand I don't see any reason why the doctor should not have the benefit of this testimony.

MR. BUGLIOSI: We don't question anything that Paul puts in that document there, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then the declaration of Mr. Fitzgerald will be attached to the special transcript.

The doctors will also have available to them, and these files will be in the custody of the Clerk of this department, a file from Atascadero State Hospital, No. 021770, pertaining to Michael Dennis Hendricks, and

the file from the Youth Authority entitled "Michael Dennis Hendricks, No. YA94580."

Both of these files will remain with the Clerk and may be examined by the doctors at any time.

1a-1

,

15-

MR. BUGLIOSI: Are the doctors going to be aware of Section 700, that that is the issue that they have to confront themselves with, and not insanity under McNaughton, or under 1368?

THE COURT: That is right, the doctors will be specifically instructed to give their opinion with respect to the competency of Mr. Hendrix to perceive the matters as to which his testimony will relate during the months of July and August, 1969.

I have already determined from the voir dire examination that he was competent under the provisions of 701 of the Evidence Code on the day that he testified in this Court.

what I am concerned about is whether or not he was competent to perceive the matters to which his testimony will presumably relate according to your offer of
proof.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Will the Court's observations with respect to his competency on the date he testified in court, will that also be given to the psychiatrists?

THE COURT: Well, that will be in the transcript, in the special transcript in the portion which contains Mr. Hendricks' testimony on it, as to the competency bearings some weeks ago, when I did find him competent under the provisions of Section 701 of the Evidence Code:

But again, so the doctors won't be confused by

1á ·

 all of this, that finding related only to that date that he was here in court.

What I am now concerned with is whether or not he was competent in July and August of 1969 to perceive and comprehend the things as to which his testimony will relate according to Mr. Bugliosi's offer of proof.

MR. KANAREK: Would your Honor amend the request, or include in the request that the doctors make an analysis as to his present competency?

In other words, as they view him right now, so to speak, because he will be taking the witness stand, and I think that since this is being done -- because our position is, of course, what we have enunciated previously.

THE COURT: I don't see any necessity, because under the Evidence Code, that finding is made by the Court in accordance with Section 701 of the Evidence Code, and simply covers whether he is capable of expressing himself concerning the matter so as to be understood, and whether he is capable of understanding his duty as a witness.

MR. KANAREK: That is what I am saying.

THE COURT: That is a matter I determine, and I already determined it.

The doctors' opinion won't help me on that.

MR. KANAREK: What I am saying, and I say this with
the greatest respect for the Court, I don't think the Court

the Court not being a psychlatrist --

2

3

5,

. 7

8

ğ

ÌÒ

11 12

13.

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

25

26

THE COURT: This does not have anything to do with psychiatry.

MR. KANAREK: Well, that is where I think where the person has this kind of a background, your Honor, that that section that your Honor just alluded to cannot be taken as literally as your Honor is purporting to take it.

THE COURT: I am not taking it literally. That is why I am appointing doctors.

MR. KANAREK: I am talking about his present competency, your Honor.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. KANAREK: So we ask that the doctors be requested in that regard.

MR. HUGHES: So that the record is clear, at the time that Mr. Hendricks testified previously Mr. Bugliosi and I had a stipulation that his testimony will not be received for any purpose against Leslie Van Houten.

MR. BUGLIOSI: so stipulated.

MR. KAY: Has your Honor indicated which doctors you are going to appoint yet?

THE COURT: I am about to.

I will appoint Dr. George Abe and Dr. Blake Skrala.

And I will request that these gentlemen expedite their examination and report so that we may have the benefit of their reports and testimony in court as soon as

possible, consistent with a thorough and complete examination of the witness.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I do object in any event to the offer of proof counsel made.

THE COURT: There is no need to object to it. That is not the purpose for which it was made.

We are not now concerned with the admissibility of the testimony.

I asked for the offer of proof simply to pinpoint the time and to generally advise the doctors as to
the type of testimony, and at what point in time the
testimony will relate to.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, I recognize I have a continuing objection on relevancy and materiality, but my point is --

THE COURT: You have your objection only when you ask for it, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: I already asked for it with respect to Mr. Hendricks.

out of an abundance of caution I will ask for it at this point in connection with Mr. Hendrick's testimony.

THE COURT: At any rate there is no need to make that objection now because all we are concerned with at the moment is competence.

MR. KANAREK: I thought maybe if your Honor sustained

22

23

24

25

26

it we would not have to go through the competency test because what he purports to want this man to testify to, I suggest to the Court, is not admissible.

All of this scurrilous and inflammatory and prejudicial material that he has referred to, it is just not admissible.

That is what I was suggesting to the Court, on legal grounds, I would make an objection and I do make an objection to the offer of proof.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KANAREK: May I have a ruling on that, your Honor, just for the record?

THE COURT: I am not going to rule on it, Mr. Kanarek, because it is ridiculous, and I will tell you the second time, the offer was not made in connection with admissi-bility. It was made on the question of competency.

MR. KANAREK: I agree.

THE COURT: Do you understand what I say?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: Then don't keep making the objection.

MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor.

MR. SHINN: May I add something, your Honor?

It is not clear to me whether or not the Court has decided to determine whether or not Mr. Hendricks is presently same.

I believe Mr. Kanarek requested that.

THE COURT: What?

MR. SHINN: Whether he is presently same. THE COURT: I am not concerned with that. no evidence to the contrary. We are not going into that question. . 8

22

23

24

25

26

DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION IN RE COMPETENCY OF WITNESS MICHAEL HENDRIX

I, PAUL J. FITZGERALD, declare:

THAT I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of California.

THAT I am the attorney for Patricia Krenwinkel in Case No. A-253156 currently on trial in Department 104 of the Los Angeles Superior Court.

THAT on September 7, 1970, at approximately 6:15 p.m., I interviewed Michael
Hendrix in the Los Angeles County Jail Attorney
Room, 441 Bauchett Street, Los Angeles, California.

THAT Hendrix informed me that he is eighteen years of age, having been born April 17, 1952, in Kansas City, Missouri, to Lewis and Lena Hendrix.

THAT in 1962, Hendrix moved with his family to Simi Valley, California, and has resided continuously in Ventura, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties.

THAT Hendrix informed me that in early 1970, he was arrested in San Bernardino County for numerous burglaries.

ŀ

2

3

5

8

. 10

11.

-12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

.

25

26

"THAT as a result of said arrests,
petitions in the Juvenile Court were lodged
against him.

THAT upon conclusion of the juvenile proceedings in San Bernardino County, Hendrix was transferred to Ventura County, where petitions were filed against him in the Ventura County Juvenile Court, charging him with additional burglaries.

THAT he attempted to interpose his 'insanity' as a defense to the charges in Ventura County.

THAT the aforementioned petitions were sustained against him and he was committed to the California Youth Authority.

THAT upon placement within the California Youth Authority, Hendrix attempted to commit suicide by cutting his left arm and attempted to blind himself by deliberately exposing his eyes to ultraviolet light.

THAT according to Hendrix, he (Hendrix) is insane.

THAT he (Hendrix) told a psychologist for the California Youth Authority that when he was released, he was going to blow up the new Police Department in Ventura County and was

2

3

5

6 7

8

a

IO

1ì

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

2Í

22

23 24

. 25

26

"going to go on a robbing, shooting spree.

THAT Hendrix maintains he is an 'expert' in the field of firearms; having been illegally engaged in the theft, transportation, receiving, trading and selling of firearms for a period of two years.

THAT Hendrk has owned, possessed, and used over seventy-five separate and distinct fire-

THAT Hendrix always carries a gun and stated he could easily kill anyone he chose to. 'I could shoot anybody and I could still get a good night's sleep. If I were on the street, I would snuff (kill) Manson myself. I would blow him up -- I would make it look as though it were an accident -- like the Mafia.'

THAT upon my release. I am going to jump on and maybe kill my father. He knocked my teeth out because I attempted to join the service.

THAT Hendrix stated he is an expert in the field of explosives and demolition, having manufactured and ignited hundreds of bombs. Hendrix alleged that he blew up a house in Ventura County with a bomb and riddled the house with machine gun bullets.

THAT Hendrix maintains he always carries a

"pistol in a shoulder holster and frequently carries materials for bomb making.

THAT Hendrix states he has a 'hang-up' about guns and that guns are the reason he is presently in an institution for the criminally insane, Atascadero State Hospital, which he refers to as 'Disneyland.'

THAT Hendrix stated that he would say anything on the witness stand, regardless of its truth or falsity, in order to secure his release from the California Youth Authority.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on September 9, 1970, at Los Angeles, California.

PAUL J. FITZGERALD /S
PAUL J. FITZGERALD
Attorney

12-1 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, just so the record will be crystal clear --2 THE COURT: It was up until now. 3 MR. KANAREK: -- your Honor is refusing to order a test as to his present sanity; is that correct? THE COURT: No, I am not refusing that, Mr. Kanarek. 6 I am doing just exactly what the record shows I am doing, 7 and that is all. 8 MR. KANAREK: Very well, your Honor. 10 (Whereupon the following proceedings occur in open court, all defendants, counsel and jury present:) İİ THE COURT: All parties, counsel and jurors are 12 13. present. 14 You may proceed, Mr. Bugliosi. MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I have here a photograph 15 of the back part of an automobile. 16 May it be marked People's next in order? 17 THE CLERK: 259, your Honor. 18 259 id. 19 THE COURT: 259 for identification. 20 21 WILLIAM C. GLEASON; the witness on the stand at the time of the noon recess. 22 23, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

24

25

26

*) 	
12-2	DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)
2	BY MR. BUGLIOSI:
3	Q I show you People's Exhibit 259 for identifica-
4	tion, a photograph.
5	Do you know what is shown in that photograph?
6	A Yes, sir.
7	Q What is shown in that photograph?
. 8	A A 1959 Ford sedan.
. 9	Q License plate No. GYY 435?
10	A Yes.
11	Q The license plate is depicted in the photograph?
12	A Yes.
. 13	Q Do you know to whom that car belonged?
. 14.	A To a John Swartz.
15	Q Was this car impounded on August the 16th,
16	1969, at Spahn Ranch?
17	A Yes.
. 18	Q Was this photograph taken of the car at
19	Spahn Ranch?
20	A Yes.
21	Q On August 16th, 1969?
22	A Yes.
23	Q I show you People's 38 for identification.
24	Do you know what is shown in that photograph?
25	A A 1959 Ford sedan.
26	Q Is that the Swartz car too?

12-3 A 2 3 tion; is that correct? Yes, sir. . 5 . 6 7 8 10 BY MR. FITZGERALD: 11 12 13 14 15 THE COURT: 16 17. 18. 19 MR. SHINN: 20 THE COURT: 21 22 your Honor. 23

24

25

26

It appears to be the same car, yes, sir.

So, the car depicted in People's 38 appears to be the same car depicted in People's 259 for identifica-

MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

Did you find any Buck knives at the Spahn Ranch on the date of August the 16th, 1969?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may my previous point at the bench be preserved, your Honor, in regard to this?

Very well.

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Shinn?

No questions.

Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: No, I have no questions of this witness,

THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?

No questions, your Honor, MR. HUGHES:

THE COURT: Anything further?

23

24

25

26

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: You may step down, sir.

MR. BUGLIOSI: May the witness be excused, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, you are excused.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Your Honor, I have a few stipulations to enter into with the defense which I believe will be agreeable with the defense.

THE COURT: Have they been discussed with defense counsel?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

12-5

2

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

14

.15

16

17

18

20

21

22 23

24

25 26 MR. BUGLIOSI: May it be stipulated that Richard Bates was called by the prosecution here at this trial and testified that he is a tow-truck operator employed at Howard Sommers Garage located at 7252 Deering Street, Canoga Park, California;

That on August the 16th, 1969, he drove to the Spahn Ranch at 12000 Santa Susamma Pass Road in Chatsworth and at the direction of a California Highway Patrolman he impounded a 1959 Ford automobile with the license plate No. GYY 435 upon it;

That he transported said vehicle to the garage Impound Lot located at 7252 Deering Street in Canoga Park.

May it be deemed that he further testified that in being shown photographs of People's 38 and People's 259 for identification, he identified these photographs as depicting the subject 1959 Ford, license plate No. GYY 435.

So stipulated?

MR. KANAREK: So stipulated.

MR. FITZGERALD: So stipulated.

MR. HUGHES: So stipulated.

MR. SHINN: So stipulated.

MR. BUGLIOSI: May it be further stipulated that Betty Thomason was called by the prosecution at the trial and testified as follows:

That she is a clerk at the Howard Sommers

12-6

2

4

3

6

5

7

8

9

10

11

42

13 14

15

16

17

18,

19 20

21, 22

23

24

26

Garage located at 7252 Deering Street in Canoga Park,
California, and that she has checked her business records
concerning a 1959 Ford, license plate No. GYY 435, and
that said car was stored at the Howard Sommers Impound Lot
from August the 16th, 1969, to the present;

And that she also was shown photographs, People's 38 and People's 259 for identification, and identification, and identification as depicting the subject 1853 acre.

So stipulated?

MR. FITZGERALD: So stipulated.

MR. HUGHES: So stipulated:

MR. SHINN: So stipulated. .

MR. KANAREK: So stipulated.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I have another stipulation, your Honor, with respect to the automobiles.

May it be stipulated that the automobiles on the Tate premises as found by the police, August the 9th, the morning of August the 9th, 1969, were the following:

A 1965 Rambler registered to Wilfred or Juanita Parent;

A 1969 Chevrolet which was rented by Mrs.

10.00 Followski -- that is Sharon Tate -- on August the

100, 100, from Airrage Community, to at 1 and from

August the 4th, 1969, till August the 8th, 1969; 1 That this subject 1969 Chevrolet, then, was owned and registered to Airways Rent-A-Car. 3 Also, a 1968 Porsche, registered to Jay Sebring. 5, And a 1968 Pontiac registered to Abigail 6 Folger. So stipulated? . MR. FITZGERALD: So stipulated. MR. HUGHES: So stipulated. 10 MR. KANAREK: So stipulated. 11 12b fls.₁₂ MR. SHINN: So stipulated. 13 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

MR. BUGLIOSI: People call Deputy Olmstead. 12B-1 Your Honor, may I withdraw that? There are a 2 few other witnesses I would like to call just briefly to the 3 stand. THE COURT: Very well. 5 MR. BUGLIOSI: Mr. Marshall. 6 (A witness enters the courtroom.) THE CLERK: Would you please repeat after me. 8 I do solemnly swear --THE WITNESS: I do solemnly swear --10 THE CLERK: -- that the testimony I may give --11 THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give . 12 THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending --13 THE WITNESS: -- in the cause now pending --14 THE CLERK: -- before this Court --15 THE WITNESS: -- before this Court --16 THE CLERK: -- shall be the truth --17 THE WITNESS: -- shall be the truth --18 THE CLERK: -- the whole truth --19 -- the whole truth --THE WITNESS: THE CLERK: -- and nothing but the truth --21 THE WITNESS: -- and nothing but the truth --THE CLERK: -- so help me God. 23 THE WITNESS: -- so help me God. THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please.

26

Would you please state and spell your name.

THE WITNESS: Ralph Marshall, R-a-1-p-h, 12B2 1. M-a-r-s-h-a-1-1. 2 RALPH MARSHALL. called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, being 5 first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 6 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Are you a Sheriff's Deputy, sir? 10. No. I am a police officer for the city of 11 San Fernando. 12 Do you know a Sandra Collins Pugh? A Yes. 14 Q, Do you know a Mary Brunner? 15 Yes. 16 Q Did you book them into the San Fernando Police 17 Department on August the 8th, 1969? 18 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may I have a continuing 19 objection on materiality and relevancy? 20 THE COURT: Very well. MR. KANAREK: As to this witness? 22 MR. SHINN: May I join in that, your Honor? 23 THE COURT: Very well. MR. BUGLIOSI: Has the Court ruled?

THE COURT: Yes. You may have the continuing

25

26.

objection. 12B3 1 MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Did you book them on August the 8th, 1969? I did. A What time of day? 5 close to 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon. 6 Were they then transported down to Sybil 7 Brand Institute in East Los Angeles? 8 MR. KANAREK: That is calling for a conclusion on the ģ part of this witness, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Overruled. 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, they were. . 12 MR. BUGLIOSI: On that same date, August the 8th, 1969? 13 Yes. A 14 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I wonder, may we approach 15 the bench at this point? 16 THE COURT: As to his testimony? 17 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 18 I would like to make a point to the Court, if I 19 may. 20 THE COURT: As to something that has already occurred? 21 MR. KANAREK: No, no, your Honor. 22 I would like to make it outside the presence of 23 the jury so that there won't be the least possibility of --24

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

25.

26

THE COURT: All right, you may approach the bench.

1

3

4

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

Ì9

20

21

23

24

25

26

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

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

This is a situation wherein I believe that the prejudicial value clearly outweighs the probative value.

THE COURT: Why do you have to come to the bench to say that, Mr. Kanarek? You have said it all day out in open court.

MR. KANAREK: Because I want to make an argument. This is exceptionally important.

THE COURT: Get to the point then.

MR. KANAREK: The date is August the 8th. August the 8th is the date that is mentioned here.

Now, I don't think that the District Attorney is alleging that these girls had anything to do with these events. However, being very close to Mr. Manson, this testimony is pregnant with the possibility of all kinds of inferences being made by this jury because of that date.

12c-1₁

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

THE COURT: I haven't the faintest idea what the testimony is going to be.

MR. KANAREK: Then I would ask for an offer of proof, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why?

MR. KANAREK: Because I believe that it is --

THE COURT: If it is objectionable, object to it and I will rule.

MR. FITZGERALD: I will object, your Honor, on the ground that it is impaterial and irrelevant.

We are talking about the arrest of people not charged in the indictment.

MR. KANAREK: Right.

MR. HUGHES: I will join in that objection.

MR. KANAREK: Also, it is trivia which can be magnified way out of proportion.

I believe they were arrested for hitchhiking, and he is injecting this in here.

THE COURT: It hasn't been injected yet.

MR. KANAREK: I am trying to keep it away from the jury.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I am not going to go into the arrest.

I think it would be easy if defense counsel would agree to the period of their incarceration.

MR. KANAREK: No, I can't agree.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Then I will have to put on the evidence.

26

25

12c-2

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12.

13

14

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

23

26

MR. KANAREK: I can't agree.

Your Honor is the one to rule. I maintain that this evidence has no probative value.

THE COURT: We don't have any evidence yet, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: I mean, if he is going to put in that they were in custody on this date, your Honor, it will --

THE COURT: The record now shows that they were arrested and transported to Sybil Brand.

MR. KANAREK: And not having all of the facts, the jury is going to make improper inferences.

THE COURT: I assume that it has some relevancy.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: What is the relevancy?

MR. BUGLIOSI: May I get in here where the Court can hear me?

We have argued this point and the Court finally held that it would be admissible.

THE COURT: Does this pertain to the visit or the attempted visit by Linda Kasabian?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Yes. Not only on that issue, but also on the issue that the conversation that Manson had with Linda Kasabian was not before the Tate murders but after the Tate murders, to prove that she was in town during the Tate murders.

24 25 12c-3

· 18

12d fls.

When the Court looked at it from that viewpoint, the Court said that there wouldn't be any question as to its admissibility on that basis.

MR. KANAREK: I don't think that is a fair statement of what the Court said.

MR. BUGLIOSI: I remember the Court saying it was admissible on that point.

MR. SHINN: I believe the Court ruled against it.

THE COURT: What I said finally was that the relevancy of it was simply to show that it was possible for the meeting or the conversation to have occurred.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Right. Between Manson and Linda.

Forget about the fact that these girls -- that Linda visited these girls. Forgetting about that fact, the point is that Manson would not have told Linda to go down there if they weren't actually incarcerated.

So, your Honor, this is circumstantial evidence that when Manson spoke to Linda, when they had that conversation, it was not before the Tate-La Bianca murders, it was after.

12d-1

2

3

6

7

8

·9

11

12_.

14 15

16

17

19 20

.21

22

23

25

26

24

THE COURT: That is a matter for argument.

MR. BUGLIOSI; Right, Sure,

THE GOURT: All I am saying is that it is relevant to show that such a meeting would be possible since they were, in fact, in jail.

MR. FITZGERALD: Can Patricia Krenwinkel have a continuing objection as to the materiality and relevancy?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HUGHES: Same objection on the part of Miss Van Houten.

MR. SHINN: And I will join in Mr. Kenerek's motion.
THE COURT: All right.

I think it would be best if you could stipulate.

MR. FITZGERALD: Three of us are agreeable but one of
the attorneys is not agreeable.

MR. KANAREK: I can't stipulate to it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why not?

MR. KANAREK: The fact of the matter is we don't know what day, whether this has anything to do --

THE COURT: Never mind. You don't have to explain it to me, Mr. Kanarek. If you don't want to stipulate, that is enough, you don't have to stipulate.

All right, let's proceed.

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

```
MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions.
1
           MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.
2
           MR. SHINN: No questions, your Honor.
3
           MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.
           MR. HUGHES: No questions, your Honor.
5
           THE COURT: You may step down, sir.
6
           MR. BUGLIOSI: Deputy Olmstead.
7.
                  (The witness enters the courtroom.)
8
           THE CLERK: Raise your right hand, please.
9
                Would you repeat after me.
10
                 I do solemnly swear --
11
                         I do solemnly swear
           THE WITNESS:
12
           THE CLERK:
                      -- that the testimony I may give --
13
           THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give
14
           THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending --
15
                          -- in the cause now pending --
           THE WITNESS:
16
                        -- before this court --
           THE CLERK:
17
           THE WITNESS:
                          -- before this court --
18
                        -- shall be the truth --
           THE CLERK:
19
           THE WITNESS:
                          -- shall be the truth --
20
           THE CLERK:
                       -- the whole truth --
21
           THE WITNESS:
                         -- the whole truth --
22
           THE CLERK: -- and nothing but the truth --
23
                          -- and nothing but the truth --
           THE WITNESS:
24
           THE CLERK:
                       -- so help me God.
25
           THE WITNESS:
                         -- so help me God.
26
```

THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please. 1 Would you state and spell your name? 2 THE WITNESS: My name is Samuel E. J. Olmstead; 0-1-m-s-t-e-a-d. 4 5 SAMUEL E. J. OLISTEAD, . 6 called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, having 7 been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. BUGLIOSI: 12 What is your occupation, sir? 13 I am a Deputy Sheiff for the County of Los 14 Angeles stationed at Malibu. 15 Were you employed on the date of July 28, 1969? 16 Q A Yes, I was. 17 On that date did you proceed to Spahn Ranch in 18 O: Chatsworth? . 19 Yes, I did, 20 About what time did you proceed to that 21 location? I believe it was somewhere around 1:00 o'clock 23 in the morning. 24 Were you accompanied by anyone? 25 Q. Not in my vehicle, no. A 26

_2E-1

2

1

4

3

ć

5 .

8

7

9

11 12

13

14

16

17

222

19

.2<u>1</u> 22

20

23

24

25 26 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, then I will object on the grounds -- may I do this at the bench?

THE COURT: State the objection.

MR. KANAREK: On the grounds of illegal search and seizure, illegal arrest, Fourth Amendment rights.

I would like to elaborate on it at the bench.

This is the very same issue, your Honor, that
counsel has deferred as to other matters. The very same
issues prevail here, because there has to be a proper -I'd like to do it at the bench if I may.

THE COURT: You may approach the bench.

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

THE COURT: The question now pending is whether or not he can recognize him or can identify him?

What was the question, Mr. Bugliosi?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Do you recognize Mr. Manson?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: I believe that his recognition would take place -- it is the fruit of the poison tree type situation. He only knows Mr. Manson as a result of an illegal entry, an illegal search and an illegal arrest.

This evidence, which is clearly --

MR. BUGLIOSI: May I briefly be heard to save some time?

LZE2

1 2

3

б

7

Š

8

9

11

12

Į3

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26 He first saw him at Santa Susana Pass Road and Topanga Canyon Road, at the intersection, on July 28th, and Mr. Manson invited him back to the ranch.

They were going to the ranch, and Mr. Manson said. "Follow me," and they went to the ranch together.

We arenot going to put on any evidence of any search at the ranch. It is just for the conversation.

THE COURT: All right, let's proceed.

MR. FITZGERALD: We all knew that.

MR. KANAREK: I understand that.

What I am saying: Is counsel representing that he is not going to solicit any kind of conversation -THE COURT: You are just wasting time, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: No. I am not.

THE COURT: Now I am informed by one of the other defense counsel that you knew about it all the time.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, he may be asking about --

THE COURT: I don't want to hear any more. If you have an objection, state it and state it succinctly, and let's get on.

MR. KANAREK: My objection is that what took place on --

THE COURT: Your objection has been to everything whether it is good, bad or makes any sense.

If you have any objection to make at this time, state it.

L2e3

1 2

3

5

7

9

8

OL 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18.

19· 20.

21

22 23

24

26.

MR. KANAREK: Well; if there is anything here that is based on the August 16th --

> THE COURT: Nothing has been offered in that regard. Let's proceed.

(Whereupon, all counsel return to their respective place at counsel table and the following proceedings occur in open court within the presence and hearing of the jury:)

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may I have a continuing objection on relevancy and materiality as to this witness? THE COURT: You may.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q Directing your attention to Defendant Charles Manson seated to your right front in the blue shirt, do you recognize him, sir?

- Yes, I do. A
- Q Did you see him on July the 28th, 1969?
- A Yes, I did.
- Q Where, for the first time?

At the intersection of Santa Susana Pass Road and Topanga Canyon.

- This was about 1:00 o'clock in the morning?
- Approximately, yes. A
- What was Mr. Manson doing at that time?
- A He told me he was looking out for the Family; he was the look-out at that point and he was watching for Black Panthers who he expected to attack the Family at the

12E4

13

_

3.

•

5

·

·D

9.

10 11,

12

13

14

10

16

17

18.

19

20

21

23

24

Spahn Ranch.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I would ask that that be stricken on the grounds of hearsay.

THE COURT: Overruled. Motion is denied.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, may I ask that that be limited to the declarant only?

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 '

19

20

21

THE COURT: Very well, that will be limited to Mr. Manson.

The jury is admonished to so consider it.

- Q BY MR. BUGLIOSI: Did this person who you now know to be Charles Manson, did he give you his name?
 - A Yes, he did.
 - Q What name did he give you?
 - A Charles Summers.
 - Q : S-1 m m a-r-s?
 - A Yes.
 - Was he standing out in the road, or what?
 - A Yes, he was.
 - Q . By himself?

A When I arrived at the location there was two
Los Angeles Police officers and, I believe, four or five
-- wait. Four or six deputy sheriffs at that location.

Q After he told you what he was doing there, what was the next thing that happened?

A He asked if he could lead us to the ranch because he said that the people at the ranch were armed and if we went up there without him that there is liable to be some shooting.

Q What is the next thing that happened?



THE WITNESS: We followed him to the ranch.

MR. KANAREK: May that last statement be stricken on

24 25

26.

23

this time we came upon approximately 11 people in the 1 building at the location. 2 Did Mr. Manson later come out of the building and 3 talk to you? A Yes. 5 How long after he ran into the building did he 6 come out of the building? 7 A Almost immediately, just a -- maybe a few . 8. minutes. g. Did you have a conversation with Mr. Manson at 10 that time? 11 Yes, I did. Α 12 Where did the conversation take place? 13. In the parking lot in front of the Spahn 14. Ranch. 15 Who was present at that time in addition to 16 yourself and Mr. Manson, if anyone? 17 There was no one present with myself. There 18 were other deputy sheriffs, and Highway Patrol officers in 19 thearea there, though. 20 Did you have any conversation with Mr. Manson 21 with respect to Black Panthers? 22 Yes, I did. 23 What did he say to you? 24 KANAREK: I object on the grounds of hears 25 26.

THE WITNESS: He advised me that the Police

Departments and the motorcycle gangs should join forces and wipe out the Negro community.

Q Did he say anything else to you?

A Yes.

Q What did he say?

MR. KANAREKE Same objection, your Monor, on the grounds of Meersay.

THE WITNESS: Well, we talked about the reason the people at the ranch were armed and expecting an attack from the Black Panthers.

And he advised me that a Black Panther had come up there to ride a horse and apparently made advances towards one of the female members of the Family, or one of the women of the group, as he called it. I believe, and he said that they, the Family, or the members of the Family, had beat him up, and this is why the Panthers were going to attack him.

Did he say anything else about Black Panthers?

MR. MAREK: Object on the grounds of hearsay, your

THE WITNESS: He said that they had seen Black Panthers in the area walking around the ranch, and had seen quite a few of them driving by and apparently casing the place.

Q Did Mr. Manson say anything about his respect

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Q What did he say?

MR. KANAREK: I object on the grounds of hearsay,

your/Honor

THE COURT: Overruled

THE WITNESS: He told me that he respected the police, and that due to this respect, he said that he could, if he wanted to, he could kill me any time he wanted to, he said, all he would have to do is drive up next to me at a stop sign and stick a shotgun out of the window and blow my head off. (head trade Keerker T about March wanter)

THE COURT: No you may not.

WAR PRICE TORT

Q Did he say anything to you about any guns being trained on you during your conversation with him?

MR. KANAREK Leading and Suggestive your Honor.

THE COURT: Overbuled

THE WITNESS: Yes, he did.

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q What did he say?

MR. KANAREK: I object on the grounds of hearsey,

your Honor.

THE COURT: Oversuled.

THE WITNESS: I asked him where the rest of the people that live at the ranch were, because we came across warm sleeping blankets and what appeared to be bedrolls.

13a-2

1

3.

2

4

7

8 -

10

11

13

15 16

17

18 19 .

20 21

22

23.

25

26.

and things laid out where there was nobody sleeping in them.

And he told me that the people had scattered that into the hills around us and/at that time, he said, there were guns trained on us from the hills around us, and that on his command that we could be wiped out.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Hah, hah, hah, hah, a fairy tale, that is so far away from any truth.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Hanson.
BY MR. BUGLIOST:

Q Did you ask Mr. Manson to take you to these, people?

A Yes, I did.

Q What did he say?

MR. KANAREK: I object on the grounds of hearsay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: He said I could not reach them with the radio car; we would have to take dune buggles to get to them.

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q You eventually left the ranch that night?

A Yes, we did.

MR. BUGLIOSI: No further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Fitzgerald?

IR: FITECHALD: Yes, your Monor.

13a-3	Ţ	CROSS-EXAMINATION .							
•	2	BY MR, FITZGERALD:							
<u>,</u>	3	Q What was your assignment at that time, Officer?							
	4	A I was assigned to Patrol Division, Malibu							
	5	Station.							
٠	6,	Q And did you consider this a bizarre incldent?							
\$	7.	A No, sir.							
÷.	8.	Q You did not consider this to be bizarre, somebody							
ж ,	9	telling you about attacks by Black Panthers and people in							
	10	the hills, armed, and that sort of thing?							
* *	11	MR. BUGLIOSI: I object, your Honor, on the grounds							
	12	it calls for conclusion and also it is irrelevant.							
	13	THE COURT: Sustained.							
D .	14	MR. FITZGERALD: Perhaps I can approach it another way.							
	15	BY MR. FITZGERALD:							
	16	Q Did you make a report of this?							
	17	A Yes, I did.							
	18	Q Do you have that report with you?							
	19	A No, sir.							
•	20 ⁻	Q Is that report available?							
	21	A I believe it probably is.							
	22	It was in the form of a memorandum to my							
×	23	captain.							
	24	Q And what was the substance of the memorandum							
	25	to your captain?							
,	26	A The activity that we observed at the location,							
34		• 1							

13a-4	i	and the people that we had talked to.
	2	Q No arrests were made at the location, is that
	. 3	correct?
	4	A That is not correct.
	. 5	Q. Oh, were arrests made?
·	6	A Yes, sir.
<u>.</u> .	7	Q Was there an arrest made of Mr. Manson?
	ં, 8	A No, sir,
3	·9	Q Was there an arrest made of anybody in the
•	10	immediate vicinity of Mr. Manson?
	11	A There was an arrest made of a person who lived
	12	at the ranch.
	13	Q Who was that?
, r	14	A I don't recall the man's name.
* * *	15	Q And what was the basis for the arrest, do you
• .	16	recall?
	17	A Oh
	18	MR. BUGLIOSI: This is irrelevant, your Honor, beyond
	19	the scope of direct examination.
5 .	20	THE COURT: Sustained.
	21	BY MR. FITZGERALD:
	22	Q And who was your supervising officer to whom you
. ,	23	submitted this report?
.c. v	24	A Captain Pearson.
Ö ; ″	25	MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further.
	26	THE COURT: We will take our afternoon recess at this

time.

Ladies and gentlemen, do not converse with anyone or form or express an opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to you.

The court will recess for 15 minutes. (Recess.)

13b fls.

7.

**

L3"-1

2

Ŭ

5

7.

6

8

10

11 12

. 13

14

15 16

17

.18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

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

MR. FITZGERALD: I have just a few more questions, your

Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Reopened)

BY MR. FITZGERALD:

- Q officer, are you familiar with the term putting somebody on "?
 - A I believe so.
- Q Did it appear that Mr. Manson was putting you on about these Black Panthers, and the raids on Spahn Ranch?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Calling for a conclusion, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: No, sir, it did not,

- Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: Did it appear to you he was serious in all respects?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q Did you search the immediate vicinity to determine if there were any Black Panthers in the area or people resembling Black Panthers or ostensibly Black Panthers?
- A We did look over the area, not specifically for Black Panthers, but we did not run across any Black Panthers.
- Q Now, did it appear that Mr. Manson was just kidding you along so that he could get to the ranch quick.

	and tell somebody to hide, to tell people to get out of the
1	room you refer to, where you were?
2	MR. BUGLIOSI: Ambiguous question.
3	THE COURT: Sustained.
4	Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: Was it your understanding
.5	that once Mr. Manson arrived, actually at the ranch, that
-6	he was going to wait for you and you both would go into the
· 7	building?
. 8	A Yes, I believe this was the understanding; he
9	would go in with us.
Ĭ0	Q So when Manson raced up there and jumped out,
11	You felt that he breached some agreement with you?
12	A Yes.
13	Q And what was your state of mind, what did you think
14	Mr. Manson was going to do inside that building?
15	A I had no idea what he was going to do in there.
16	Q But you wanted to check it out?
17	A Yes, I did.
18	Q so as soon as possible you ran into the
19	building?
.20	A I personally did not go into the building but
21	there were other deputies that did follow him.
22	Q Did you eventually go into the building?
23	A Yes, I did.
24	Q pid you discover some bed rolls there?
.25	A Yes, we did.
26	

	Q	And sleeping bags?
1.	A .	Yes.
2	Q	And I believe you previously testified that those
3	bed rolls an	nd sleeping bags appeared to be warm.
. 4	A	Some of them did, yes.
5	Q	As though people had recently been sleeping in
6	them or lay	ing in them, right?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	But you did not see anybody in the vicinity?
ڕؙۅؗ	Α.	No, we found 11 people at the ranch there.
10	Q	Where were they?
: 11;	A	Sleeping in different parts of the building,
12	and walking	
13		Some of them came walking out when we were
14	there.	Dome of Chair Come Activities one Aller he here
15	o o	Was that the first time you had been at the
16	Spahn Ranch	
17	spann Ranch	
18	#	No, sir.
19	,	Hadn't you been there previously?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q.	Actually you had been there on numerous
22	occasions,	had you not?
23	A	I believe so, yes.
24	Q	You participated in raids at that location on
	a number of	occasions, is that right?
25		No, sir.
26	·	

1	Q You had not?
2	A No, sir.
3	Q Was it on routine patrol matters you were there?
.4	A Yes, sir.
5	Q Had you ever seen Mr. Manson before the evening
6	of July 28th?
7	A I am not sure that I have, no.
8	Q Had you ever talked to anybody who represented
9	that they resided at the Spahn Banch before July 28th?
10	A Yes.
11	Q Had you talked to a number of people?
12	A Yes.
13.	Q Did they appear to be youngsters?
14	A Most of them were under 30 years old I would
15	say.
16	MR. FITZGERALD: I have nothing further, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Shinn?
18	MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.
19	
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. SHINN:
22	Q Officer, when you first met Mr. Manson on
23	this particular day, was he in an automobile or was he
24	walking?
25	A When I first met him he was walking.
26	Q Was he walking up the hill or down the hill?

·	Q And that is the only other time you	u sav
2	Mr. Manson, is that correct?	
.3	A As far as I can recall, yes.	
13C		
4		
6		
F 7		
8		
•		
9.		
10	· · ·	
. 11		;
12	Sz 1 1 V	,
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
. 18		
3.5		
19 5		
. 20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
•		

Q 13C-1 Do you recall whether or not Mr. Manson had a beard the first time you met him? 2 A Yes, sir, he did. 3 How about his hair? What about his hair? A 5 Q Was it long, short? 6 A Yes, it was very similar to the way it is now. 7 Q. And you also stated that Mr. Manson entered the R. ranch first, is that correct? 9 Α Yes, sir. Î0 Q And you were behind Mr. Manson? 11 A Yes, sir. 72 In an automobile? 13 . A yes, sir. How far behind Mr. Manson? 15 A I believe I was probably the third car behind 16 him. 17. There were about four cars, four or five cars. 18 Q What was the purpose of having Mr. Manson 19 enter the ranch first? 20 He advised us that there were members of the 21 Family at the ranch who were armed, expecting this attack 22 by the Black Panthers, and that if we went in there without 23 him that there was a possibility that someone would get 24 shot. 25 In other words, he wanted to protect you, is 26

1	that correct?
Ż	A That is correct.
3	MR. SHINN: I have nothing further.
4	THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Kanarek?
5	MR . KANAREK: Yes.
6	• •
7	cross-examination
8	BY MR. KANAREK:
9	Q officer, when you looked into the sleeping
10	area you found that people had in fact been sleeping, right?
11	There were sleeping equipment, beds, which had
12	been freshly used, right?
13	A Yes, sir.
14	Q And so is it a fair statement that your state
15	of mind was such that you recognized that there were no
16.	armed people about that ranch, is that a fair statement of
17	your state of mind?
18	A No, sir.
19	Q Well, was your state of mind you did see
20	beds that had been freshly used, right?
21	A Yes, sir.
22	Q And directing your attention to the number of
23	beds, about how many were there?
24	A We found beds in quite a few different
25	buildings. I could not give you an exact number of how
26	many beds we did find.

We found some buildings with, I would say, 1 probably as many as five or six bed roll-type mattresses. 2 one building even had a fire in the fireplace .. 3 and there was no one in the building. This building was 4 away from the general area. 5. Q And you went in and actually raided this place, right? 7 No, sir, I would not call it a raid. 8. Q Well, what would you call it? 9: We were actually looking for the people who 1Ó supposedly owned the automobiles that were reported to us 11 that were stolen from the place. 12 Q and you came down there with how many, six, 13 seven police cars that night? 14 I would say there were probably five, around 15 five cars. 16 Q Around four or five police cars? 17 A That's right. 18 And you needed Mr. Manson to get you onto the 19 premises with five police cars filled with police officers, 20 is that right, Officer? 21 MR. BUGLIOSI: That is a misstatement. He said 22 Manson said that. 23 MR. KAMAREK: I asked him whether he needed Mr. Manson 24 to lead him on this foray. 25 THE COURT: That calls for a conclusion. The 26

}	abjection to contained.
1	objection is sustained.
2	Q BY MR. KANAREK: Well, you had how many police
3	officers in that area, Officer?
4.	A Probably eight, eight or nine.
-5	Q Eight or nine police officers in five police.
6	cars, right?
7	A Yes, sir.
8	Q And you are telling us that here you have a man
9	who tells you what you have told us he said, and you allow
10	him to go on the premises first.
11	MR. BUGLIOSI: It is irrelevant.
.12	THE COURT: Overruled.
13	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, he did precede before us up
14	there.
15	Q BY MR. KANAREK: Then in fact is your state of
16	mind such that you think Mr. Manson tricked you?
17	Would you answer that?
· 18	A I don't understand the question.
19	Q Well, you were there with the purpose of going
20	onto the premises with a number of police officers, right?
21	A Yes, sir.
22	Q And Mr. Manson led the parade to the ranch,
23	right?
24	A Yes, sir.
.25	Q Now, would you say that this frustrated what
26	you were attempting to accomplish, the fact that Mr. Manson
	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i

	,								
1	went first,	instead of a police officer?							
2	· A	No. sir.							
\$	Q .	pardon?							
4	A	No. sir.							
, 5.	Q	Is it a fair statement that out of all these							
6	events you	got one traffic warrant?							
7	A .	No. sir.							
·8	Q	Pardon?							
þ	A .	That is not a fair statement.							
10	Q,	I see. Well, is it a fair statement that the							
11	only violation of law involved in these incidents was a								
12	traffic warrant?								
13	A	No, sir, that is not a fair statement.							
14	Q	I see. Now, before coming to court today,							
15	officer, di	d you read over your notes to refresh your							
16	recollection	n?							
17	A	Yes, sir.							
18	Q	Of these events?							
19	· A	Yes, sir.							
20	Q	But you did not bring with you that which you							
21	read over t	o refresh your recollection?							
22	A	Yes, I did bring that over with me.							
23	Q.	May I see it?							
24	. A	Yes, sir.							
25	MR. F	ANAREK: Thank you. May I approach the witness,							
26	Your Honor?								
	.1 .								

r- 	Ί.
	•

3

4

5

6

7

8.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

	Q	Was	your	stat	e of mi	nd,	Officer,	such	that	you
felt:	that M	r. Ma	ກຮດກ	hađ	sounded	the	alarm?	-,		

A Yes, sir.

Q So, in fact, your state of mind was that Mr. Manson fooled you; there were nine police officers there and he led the raid on his own ranch; is that correct, Officer?

A No.

Q Pardon?

A No, sir.

Q Well, he, in fact, was in front of you, in front of the police officers; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q Then, is it a fair statement, Officer, that this one arrest that you say that you did make, that involved a traffic violation; is that correct?

A No, sir.

Q Now, you say, Officer, that you have been to the ranch on a number of occasions; right?

A Yes, sir.

Q And have you gone to the ranch there with other police officers?

A Yes, sir.

Q And I am now speaking prior to the time of this July 28 entrance.

You went there with other police officers?

14-2

2

1.

.3

5,

4

6

′ .7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

<u>2</u>0

2Ì

22

23°. 24

25

26

A Yes, sir.

Q And on these occasions when you went with other police officers, your intent was to raid the place; is that correct?

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is irrelevant.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KANAREK: Q It is a fact, is it not, Officer, that your purpose and intent and motive for harassing and raiding the Spahn Ranch was because of the fact that you didn't like the life style up there, you were unhappy with the way that you thought these people lived personally?

MR. BUGLIOSI: That assumes a fact not in evidence.

It is also a lecture.

MR. KANAREK: It is cross-examination, your Honor.
THE COURT: It is argumentative.

Sustained.

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Officer, would you tell us, what was your state of mind, your personal feeling, towards hippies?

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is irrelevant, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: It is most relevant, your Honor. It goes to the bias of the witness.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: My personal opinion of hippies?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

3.

· 1

4

5

7

8.

10

11. 12

13

15 16

17

19

18

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

THE WITNESS: Hippies can take in a vast field of people.

MR. KANAREK: We give you carte blanche.

THE WITNESS: There can be clean hippies and there can be dirty hippies.

MR. KANAREK: You tell us.

THE WITNESS: It is up to a person. If he wants to wear his hair long and dress in a certain style, you know, that you call hippie dress, that is his prerogative.

BY MR. KANAREK:

- Q And you don't have any resentment of that?
- A No.

I don't like to be around hippies that are dirty and smell bad, but that is their problem.

- Q What about the people at the Spahn Ranch? What was your state of mind toward them?
 - A I had no problems at the Spahn Ranch.
- Q My question was: What was your state of mind towards them? Did you like them?
 - A I didn't dislike them.

I didn't like them as friends, but they are people who lived in our area and they got police protection just like anybody else that lives in the area.

- Q Were you there that night to protect Mr. Manson and the other people at the ranch?
 - A I was there that night to investigate a possible

14-4

stolen car at that location.

Q I see.

And so, you were not there on that night at least to protect the people at the ranch; right? Is that correct?

A No. You just don't turn on protection and turn it off when you go to investigate a crime.

14a fls.

8

2

3.

4

9

10

Įį.

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25,

2Ų`

14-5

2

1

3 4

6

5

8

9

7

1,0

12

13

11

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26 Q Officer, will you give us an instance when you ever protected anybody at the ranch?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Irrelevant, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KANAREK:

- Q As a matter of fact, Officer, is it a fair statement that you didn't like the people at the ranch?
 - A No, that is not a fair statement.
 - Q You liked them, then?
 - A I didn't dislike them.
- Q Well, what do you mean by that? You used the double negative, "I didn't dislike them." What do you mean by that?

MR. BUGLIOSI: It is irrelevent, your Honor. It is also repetitive.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q As you testify on the witness stand right now, Officer, presently, what is your state of mind towards hippies?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Asked and answered.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I asked him previously as to his attitude at that time.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained, Mr. Kanarek. Ask your next question.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, sir. 1 What is your state of mind presently, Officer, Q. towards Mr. Manson as you testify? 3 He is a defendant in this case. That is the 4 only thing that I know about Mr. Manson. 5 Is it a fair statement, Officer, that your state 6 of mind is that you are completely neutral in this case and 7 you don't care whether Mr. Manson is convicted or acquitted? Just whatever happens is okay with you? Is that your state of mind? 10 MR. BUGLIOSI: Compound and also argumentative. 11 THE COURT: Sustained. .. 12 BY MR. KANAREK: 13 Would you tell us then, Officer, what is your 14 state of mind toward Mr. Manson? 15 MR. BUGLIOSI: Asked and answered. 16 THE COURT: Sustained. . 17 MR. KANAREK: Well, may I ask this? 18 Do you like Mr. Manson? 19 It is irrelevant, your Honor, MR. BUGLIOSI: 20 THE COURT: Sustained. 21 MR. KANAREK: In view of the Court's rulings, your 22 Honor, I have no further questions. Thank you. 24 25

21

22

23

24

. 25

26

THE COURT: Mr. Hughes?

MR. HUGHES: Yes, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. HUGHES:

- Q Deputy Olmstead, this document which you just gave to Mr. Kenarek, you prepared that, did you?
 - A Yes, sir, I did.
 - Q Did you prepare it soon after the events?
 - A No, sir.
 - Q When did you prepare this document, Officer?
- A I am not actually sure of the date that I prepared the paper you have there. I believe it was in the first part of this year. I am not actually certain.
 - Q Do you recall writing:

"At the ranch we found 11 people in different buildings and evidence that many more had fled the buildings as the alarm was sounded that we were there.

"Incidentally, we felt that Manson sounded the alarm for as we entered the ranch he was driving ahead of us and he disappeared into the buildings before we could stop him."

Did you write those words?

- A Yes, sir.
- Q Did you write these words, Officer:
 "While the crews were checking identification

"on the people and the cars at the location, I engaged Charles Manson in conversation in an attempt to discover the type of operation going on at the ranch.

"I asked him who the leader of the group was, and he told me there was no leader, that they were just all living at the same place."

Did you write those words?

A Yes, sir.

MR. HUGHES: I have no further questions.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may this be marked as an exhibit, or if the officer needs it, I would ask that a copy be marked for identification in connection with this case.

THE COURT: Do you wish it marked as a defendants' exhibit?

MR. KANAREK: May we?

Yes, your Honor.

Is it inconvenient, Officer?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

MR. KANAREK: Do you need this particular copy?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

THE CLERK: FF.

THE COURT: It will be marked FF for identification.

FF d.

14 b fls. 26

22

23

24

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Any redirect, Mr. Bugliosi?

MR. BUGLIOSI: No, your Honor.

Oh, one more question if I may.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUGLIOSI:

Q This area where you first saw Mr. Manson, was that a dark area?

A Yes, sir,

Q Were there any lights, artificial illumination or anything like that?

A There were artificial lights on Topanga Canyon, but where he was positioned, apparently, before he was discovered by the police officers, it was very dark.

It was in the midst of some trees and bushes.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you.

No further questions.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. FITZGERALD: Nothing further, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: No.

MR. HUGHES: No questions.

MR. SHINN: No.

THE COURT: You may step down.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Deputy George Grap, or former Deputy George Grap, rather.

(The witness enters the courtroom.)

14b-2THE CLERK: Would you raise your right hand, please. Would you repeat after me. 2 I do solemnly swear --3 I do solemnly swear --THE WITNESS: 4 -- that the testimony I may give --THE CLERK: 5 THE WITNESS: -- that the testimony I may give 6 THE CLERK: -- in the cause now pending --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 -- the whole truth --THE CLERK: 13 THE WITNESS: -- the whole truth --14 THE CLERK: -- and nothing but the truth 15 -- and nothing but the truth -THE WITNESS: 16 -- so help me God. THE CLERK: 17 THE WITNESS: -- so help me God. 18 THE CLERK: Would you be seated, please. 19 Would you state and spell your name? 20 THE WITNESS: George D. Grap. The last name is spelled 21 22 G-r-a-p. 23 GEORGE D. GRAP, 24 called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 26

1		DIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. BUGLA	COSI:
3	ି ପ	Now what is your occupation, sir?
4	A.	I am currently a real estate salesman.
5	· Q	On the date of July the 28th, 1969, were you
6	a Deputy She	eriff?
7	Λ	Yes, sir.
8,	Q	On that date did you proceed to Spahn Ranch
9	at 12000 Sar	nta Susanna Pass Road in Chatsworth?
10	A	Yes, sir.
11	Q	You were accompanied there by fellow deputies,
12	I take it?	
13	A	Yes.
14	ବ	Was one of them Deputy Olmstead?
15	A	Yes.
16.	Q	Directing your attention to the Defendant
17	Charles Man	son seated to your right front in the blue
18	denim shirt	. Have you ever seen him before?
19.	A	Yes, sir.
20	ବ	Was July 28th, 1969, the first time that you
21	saw him?	
22	A	No, sir.
23	Q	Did you see him on July 28th, 1969?
24	A	Yes, sir.
25	Q.	Where did you first see him on that date?
26	A	At approximately the intersection of Santa

Susanna Pass Road and Topanga Canyon. 1 Is that near the ranch? It is approximately a half mile, a half to three-quarters of a mile south, or east. Did you have any conversation with Mr. Manson that night with respect to the Black Panthers? Yes, sir. Did the conversation take place at that location or at the ranch? Both. 10 All right. 11 With respect to the conversation that took 12 place at Santa Susanna Pass Road and Topanga Canyon, who 13 was present during the conversation? 14 Mr. Manson, Deputy Olmstead, and there were approximately two officers from LAPD, and a number of 16 CHP units. 17 Q What did Mr. Manson say? 18 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may I have a continuing 19. objection on relevancy and materiality as to this witness? 20 THE COURT: You may. 21 MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor. 22 And may I also object to this particular question 23 on the grounds of hearsay? THE COURT: Overruled. 26

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

_4C -1

2

ŀ

3

5

6.

_

, **9**.

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24 25

26

MR. HUGHES: May I ask that it be limited to the declarant, your Honor?

THE COURT: It will be limited to Mr. Manson, and the jury is advised to so consider it.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Q You may answer the question.

This is the conversation, now, at the intersection or near the intersection of Santa Susanna Pass Road
and Topanga Canyon Road.

A Right.

Would it be acceptable for me to explain what I asked and what his reply was?

Q Yes. You can relate the conversation you had with him, right.

A Okay.

I asked Mr. Manson why he had been hiding in the bush area close to the intersection in a dune buggy.

And he related that he was on lookout for the Black Panthers.

That seemed rather unusual, so I asked him why he felt the Black Panthers might be coming to the Spahn Ranch or to that area.

Mr. Manson responded, using his own words, he said, "We got into a hassle with a couple of those black mother-fuckers and we put one of them in the hospital, and," he said, "they said they would get us for that."

Q Okay.

3.

4

5

6

7

8

9

1Ò.

11

12 13

.

15

16

17

18

19.

20

23

24

25 26 Q All right, what did he say to you and what did you say to him?

MR. KANAREK: Object on the grounds of hearsay, your

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Manson indicated to me by a sweep of his hand the mountains to the north; that they had fortified these positions in expectation of the Black Panthers arriving, continuing as I was filling out the cards, and so forth, Mr. Manson said:

"You know, you guys, you cops ought to get smart and join up with us," he said, "Those guys are out to kill both you and us."

He said, "I know you hate them as much as we do, but if we join together we could solve this problem."

And he said, "Well, they are out to stop us,

we should stop them first."

Q All right, so you are no longer with the Sheriff's Office, is that correct, sir?

A That's correct.

MR. BUGLIOSI: Thank you, no further questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. FITZGERALD:

Q The first conversation you had with

Mr. Manson in regard to the Black Panthers, Deputy Olmstead

22

23

24

25

.26

was present and heard that entire conversation?

MR. BUGLIOSI: Calls for a conclusion, your Honor, it is also compound.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: You used the term "ear-shot," what does that mean?
 - A Within good hearing distance.
- Q Was Deputy Olmstead within earshot of Mr. Manson at the time Mr. Manson had the first conversation with any regard to the Black Panthers?
 - A I don't know, sir.
- Q I thought you said Deputy Olmstead was present.
- A He was. I was not concerned with Deputy Olmstead at that time.
 - Q What does present mean to you?
- A In close proximity; it could be within 50 feet.
 - Q In close proximity is different from earshot?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q And you don't know whether he was within earshot or not?
 - A No. I don't.
- Q Did you ever have a conversation with Officer Olmstead subsequent to the first conversation and determine in fact he heard the conversation?

l	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
1.	A Not at that time.
2	Q At any time.
3;	, A. Yes,
4	Q And did you determine that he had heard the
5	conversation?
6	MR. BUGLIOSI: Calling for hearsay between the two
7	officers, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Sustained.
·ġ.	Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: Did you prepare a report
10	of this matter?
11.	A This particular matter?
12	Q of this particular matter, yes.
13	A Yes.
14	Q What did you think I was talking about?
1 5	MR. BUGLIOSI: Argumentative, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Sustained.
17	Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: Did you prepare a report
18	of this particular matter?
19	A Yes.
20	Q In the regular and ordinary course of business
21	as a police officer?
22	A Yes.
23	Q Did you submit it to your superior?
24	A Yes.
25	Q Who was your superior?
26	A At the time it was Captain Pearson.
;	·

1	Q When did you submit the report to Captain
2	Pear son?
3	A Quite some time after the incident.
4	Q Is there some reason for that, that you
5 .	submitted it quite some time later?
6	A There was no relevancy in submitting it at
7	that time.
8,	Q In other words, you did not make a report of
9	this after it happened?
J 0	A of the entire incident that occurred that
11	evening, a report was filed, an official report.
12 🖟	Q Does that official report contain the conver-
13	sation you had with Mr. Manson in regard to the Black
14	Panthers?
15	A No.
16	Q Is there some reason for that?
17.	A It was not part of the case.
18	The case concerned, I believe, stolen license
19	plates or a stolen vehicle.
20	This had nothing to do with evidence in that
21	respect.
22	Q Do you have a copy of the report you later
23	submitted to your superior?
24	A Yes.
.25	Q Do you have it with you?
. 26	A Yes.

	* •.
1	Q May I see it, please?
2	A Sure.
3 .	(Document handed to Mr. Fitzgerald.)
4	Q Now, Officer, did you check the mountains to
5	see if in fact they were fortified?
6	A No.
7	Q Did you examine the hills to determine if any-
8	body was armed in the hills?
9	A No.
10	Q I take it that if there had been people
n	strike that.
12	If you felt there were people in the mountains
13	that were armed, it would have presented a police problem
14	that warranted investigation, is that correct?
15.	MR. BUGLIOSI: It is hypothetical and not based on the
1 6	evidence, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Sustained.
. 18	Q BY MR. FITZGERALD: Did you conduct an
19	investigation to determine if anybody up in the hills was
.20	armed?
21	A Just visually.
22	Q Did you see anybody?
23	A No.
24	Q of course it was dark, wasn't it?
25.	A Very dark, right.
26	Q People could easily have been hiding with guns
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

26

in the hills, correct?

A It is possible.

Q Was one of the reasons you did not conduct an investigation of the hills because you did not believe there were people up there that were armed?

A It seemed like a useless task, you might say.

The area covered by Mr. Manson's sweep of his arm, the darkness, the terrain, made it virtually impossible to check.

Q How many police cars were there present, do you recall?

A I believe there were five.

Q And did those five police cars go from the intersection of Santa Susanna Pass Road and Topanga Canyon Boulevard into the Spahn Ranch?

A Yes, sir.

Q Did you actually have a -- during that period of time, during July of 1969 the Malibu Sheriff's office had a helicopter patrol, did they not?

A I don't recall if it was active at that time, sir.

Q Did you report to your superiors that Mr. Manson had indicated that there were people in the hills that were armed, or that the hills were fortified?

A No, sir.

Q Did you return at any time during the daylight

	•		:
15a-1	i	. Q	You knew of Mr. Manson before July 28th, did
	2	you not?	
	3	Å	Yes.
•	4	Q	Had you met Mr. Manson prior to the 28th?
×	5	A	Yes.
	6	Q	Was that at the Spahn Ranch?
•	7	A:	That's correct.
٠. پ	8	Ġ.	Was that during some previous raid?
	9	· A	No, sir.
	10	. G	What, briefly, were the circumstances of your
·	11	initial mee	ting with Mr. Manson?
	12	A	Just casual conversation.
_	13	Q	And was that the only time before the 28th that
	14	you met him	, was the time you had a casual conversation,
	15	with him?	e de la companya de l
•	16	À	No, I met him once prior to that.
	17	ę.	What was the circumstances of that meeting?
, , ,	18	A	His being brought to jail.
•	19	, é	And you were bringing him to jail?
;	20	A.	No, sir, another crew.
, •	21	Q	Pardon me?
٠	22	A	A different crew was bringing him to Malibu
•	23	Station.	
	24	, Q	And you were at Malibu Station?
	25	A.	That's correct.
	26	Q	Actually you had not known of Charles Manson
1	,		

15a-2 from sources other than meeting him before the 28th. correct? That is true. 3 Actually his name appeared on a wall at the 4 Malibu Sheriff's Station, did it not? 5 No, I believe there was a warrant outstanding 6 for him but that was all. 7 There was a warrant outstanding, and outstanding 8 warrant? 9 Not at this time. There had been in the past 10 and his name was on the warrant, obviously and it was, in 11 other words, my recollection, having talked to Charles 12 Manson and remembering that this warrant was outstanding 13 at one time, he had already taken care of the warrant. 14 But it was just that that brought his name to 15 my mind. 16 Had you heard other police officers discuss Q 17 Mr. Manson before the 28th? 18 Only that he, on various circumstances, had 19 been arrested for various crimes. That is it. That was the extent of the conversation, 21 purely business? 22 Correct. MR. FITZGERALD: I have no further questions. 24

THE COURT: Mr. Shinn?

MR. SHINN: Yes, your Honor.

25

15a-3 2 3 10 11 12 13 14 15 17 18 19 20

21

22

23

25

26

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHINN:

- Q Sir, you stated that you at the present time are a real estate salesman.
 - A That's correct.
 - Q When did you leave the force?
 - A When did I leave?
 - Q Yes.
 - .A July 3rd, 1970.
- Q July 3rd, 1970. I believe you testified you met Mr. Manson on July 28th, 1969, is that correct?
 - A On this particular incident, yes.
- Q Yes, and this report that you handed to Mr. Fitzgerald is dated March 19, 1970?
 - A That's correct,
 - Q That is approximately eight months later?
 - A Uh-huh.
- Q When you made this report. Is there a reason for the delay?
 - A Yes, as I stated there was no reason to file a report of Mr. Manson's comment on the night in question. I in no way related it to the case in hand, that of stolen vehicle plates or a stolen vehicle, I don't remember exactly what the charge was, but it in no way related to it until further investigation by Sheriff's Homicide Bureau, linking the two.

15a-4 At that time they requested I submit a report 1 of the comments he made. On July 28th, 1969, when Mr. Manson made his 3 remarks did you just pass it off as a joke, is that correct? 4 A No. 5 It was not very serious? A No, these remarks were upusual to me, the idea of joining forces to combat. So you thought in your mind at that time it was just a joke? ar I did not lend too much credence to it. 11 You did not think it was too serious at that 12 time, correct? 13 A Correct. 14 And did you take notes of Mr. Manson's conversa-15 tion on this particular day? 16 A No. 17 You did not take any notes at all? Q 18 A No. 19 And you did not make any other police reports 20 regarding this conversation with Mr. Manson? 21 A No. 22 In other words, eight months later you decide Q. 23

24

25

26

that correct?

A

to make this report and you made it all by memory, is

Substantially, right.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

	1
	Q And since it was all by memory some of these
2	statements that Mr. Manson said, you may have been mistaken
3	as to what he actually said, is that right?
4	A I don't believe so.
5	In other words, you have a very good memory
. 6	for this date of July 28, 1969?
15b f1s. 7	A For this conversation I do.
. 8	
9	
jo	
. 11	
12	
13	
. 14	
15	
16	
. 17	
18	
19	
20	
ž 21.	
22,	
23	
24	
25	
26	

22

23

24

25

26

	Q	As	to	other	comments,	would	you	say	your	memory
was	very	good :	for	that	day?			:•		

A It depends on how unusual the statement is in regards to the surrounding circumstances.

- Q In other words, your report only reflects the substance of the conversation, is that correct?
 - A No.
- Q You mean to say your report is word for word of the conversation you had with Manson?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q okay now, would you relate to us what his exact words were?
 - A What his exact words were?
 - Q Yes, the conversation you had.
 - A As to which conversation?
 - Q The whole conversation you had with Mr. Manson.
 - A All right.

I asked Mr. Manson why he was hiding in the brush at this intersection.

Mr. Manson replied, "I am a lookout for the Black Panthers."

At this point I asked him why he felt the Black Panthers might be en route.

Mr. Manson responded, "We we got into a hassle with a couple of these black mother-fuckers and we put one of them in the hospital. They said they would get us for

that."

continuing to the ranch, in the process of filling out the cards, Mr. Manson approached me and said, "You know, you cops ought to get smart and join up with us; those guys are out to kill you just like they are out to kill us. I know you hate them as much as we do, and we join together we could solve this problem."

or let me think -- it's either, "Solve the problem," or "clear the problem."

"We we got to stop them before they stop us."

MR. SHINN: Your Honor, may the record reflect -
I will represent to the Court that I have

followed his testimony --

THE COURT: If you are going to testify, Mr. Shinn, you will have to wait until an appropriate time and be sworn like any other witness.

MR. SHINN: I just want to make a representation to the Court, your Honor.

May this be marked as next in order for defendants exhibit, your Honor?

THE COURT: GG for identification.

MR. KANAREK: GG, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

Q BY MR. SHINN: Officer, do you remember any other conversations you had with any other persons on this day?

A The majority of my conversation concerned the car and the identification of the people.

.gg ∻

	·	
16 0 1	Ţ	Q Well, did you have any other conversation with
	2	anyone else on 7/28/69?
	3.	A Not of a nature that wasn't strictly in a
È	4	police sense.
	. 5	Q Well, do you recall how many persons you talked
•	` 6	to that day?
۵	7	A Approximately five.
* <u></u>	8	Q Five persons you talked to the whole day?
	9	A Well, not the whole day. At this one incident.
•	İO	Q I am speaking of this day of 7/28/69. How many
	11.	people did you talk to?
	12	A Exactly or approximately?
	13.	Q Well, approximately is all right.
	14	A Perhaps 60 people.
	15	Q 60 people?
	16	A Yes.
	17	Q Do you recall who you talked to first, the
	18	first person that you talked to that day?
*	. 19	A No.
4	, 20	Q Do you recall the second?
•	21	A No.
,	22	n Do you recall any of the persons you talked to
•	23	that day, the 60 persons?
_	24	A Yes.
	25	Q How many do you remember?
	26.	A Perhaps four or five.
ï		

Officer, did you memorize what occurred on that occasion, or did you memorize what you wrote down on this paper?

That paper Indicates --

MR. BUGLIOSI: That assumes facts not in evidence, your Honor, that any memorization is involved here.

> The objection is sustained. THE COURT:

25.

21

· :2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Officer, when you just testified from the witness stand -- I will withdraw that.

Prior to the time that you took the witness stand, Officer, did you attempt to memorize what we have marked as Defendants' Exhibit GG?

- A No. I read over it.
- Q You have read it over frequently?
- A No. I read over it.
- Q Pardon?
- A I read over it. Not frequently.
- Q When you wrote this on March 19, 1970, up until March 19, 1970, had you had any occasion to remember your conversations with Mr. Manson?
 - A Yes. Just to myself.
- Q That is, between the time that you saw him and March 19, 1970?
 - A Yes.
- Q Before you spoke with anyone from the District Attorney's Office, you kept turning these things over in your mind?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Constantly; is that correct?
 - A That is correct.
 - Q I see.

And directing your attention to this, you felt

very strongly about what Mr. Manson had told you, right, when he told it to you?

A How do you mean I felt strongly about it?

Q Well, you are telling us that before anyone from the District Attorney's Office spoke to you concerning this matter, you nevertheless turned it over in your mind time after time from July of '69 to sometime before March of 1970?

A The only reason it kept recurring in my memory is because of the notoriety Mr. Manson had achieved.

Q But from July of 1970 -- pardon me, of *69 -- '
until the time in November or December of '69, you had
no occasion whatsoever to think about these things; right?

A Not as often as perhaps later I thought about them.

Q Well, up until the fall of 1969, from July of '69 till the fall of '69, you had no occasion to associate Mr. Manson with this case; right?

A No. But then, again, it is the idea -- it was so erratic, the idea of joining the police with whatever you want to call it, a motorcycle-oriented gang, in the hopes of combating the Black Panthers. It seemed outlandish, and because it was so outlandish, in my memory it just kept recurring.

16a fls.

16-A-1

2

1

3 .

5

. 7

8

10

11

12

14.

15

16

17

18

20

21 22

23

24

25 26 Q You say it was so outlandish, but you didn't cause any investigation concerning that, concerning what you are speaking of, this outlandishness, to be instituted by the Sheriff's Department or the District Attorney; right?

A That is correct.

Q Now, when Mr. Manson made these statements to you about joining up with the Black Panthers — pardon me — when he made these statements you say about the police and Mr. Manson and his friends joining up with you, what did you tell him?

A I don't believe I even remarked to him.

Q In other words, you made no response to him whatsoever?

A I don't believe I did, no.

Q Directing your attention to all of what you told us that Mr. Manson told you, Mr. Grap -- is that it?

A That is correct.

Q Would you tell us what you told Mr. Manson?

You have told us various statements. You have
told us various statements that you say Mr. Manson made.

Will you tell us what you said in connection with this
subject matter, these two conversations?

A Well, it wasn't actually a two-way conversation. It was more or less Mr. Manson just independently relating, you might say, in a poisterous sense or in an

outward going sense. Nobody had actually engaged him in .oa2 1 this conversation. He just independently took it upon him-2 self to expound on these subjects. 3 And you made no response to it? A No. 5 Q. Did you tell him it was outlandish? 6 ·A No. Q You are telling us now that you thought about 8 it for months? 9 A I did. 10 Q But you didn't tell him at the time it was out-11 landish? 12 Well, it seemed rather silly to tell him it was 13 outlandish when he just made the statement. 14 Q You thought that then was no time to tell him? 15 No, I didn't think it would accomplish any-A 16 thing. 17 Q I see. 18. You thought about it and decided that you 19 wouldn't tell him it was outlandish as you heard these 20 statements; right? 21 A Okay . 22 Q Pardon me? A Yes. All right. 24 Q Well, --

25

26

A

Substantially, that is it. I didn't make a

comment. Q I see. 2 Now, when did you talk to Mr. Bugliosi con-.3 cerning these matters? I believe it was probably after -- it would be 5 March 18th of this year. . Q Pardon? I am sorry? .7 March 18th of this year. A 8. And did Mr. Bugliosi contact you concerning Q 9 these matters? 10 No. Mr. -- what is his name -- he is another 11 District Attorney, Bernard, -- yes, Burton Katz contacted me 12 in regard to the Hinman case, and this is when I related 13 this. 14 In other words, is it a fair statement, Officer, 15 are you trying to get any notoriety because of this? 16 MR. BUGLIOSI: Oh, that is argumentative, your 17 Honor. 18 Sustained. THE COURT: 19 officer, then may I ask you MR. KANAREK: Q 20 this: 21 It is a fair statement, then, that the District 22 Attorney's Office solicited you for these statements, 23 you didn't contact the District Attorney; is that right? A No . 25 Q That is not right? 25

	ř
16b-1 ₁	Q But he contacted you in connection, supposedly,
· · · · · 2	with Mr. Manson; right?
3	A Correct.
4	Q And you, all these months you had this turning
. 5.	over in your mind, this outlandishness and all of that,
6	and at no time did you contact the District Attorney's
7	Office to tell them about these conversations, which were
¢ 3 8	never put down in writing until the District Attorney's
9	Office contacted you; is that correct?
. 10′,	A Correct.
11	Q And so, in fact, it wasn't that outlandish,
12	was it?
13	MR. BUGLIOSI: Argumentative, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Sustained.
15	BY MR. KANAREK:
. 16	Q Would you tell us, Officer, when were you
17:	first contacted by any representative of the District
18.	Attorney's Office concerning Mr. Manson?
19	A I don't know the precise date, sir.
	Q Pardon?
ž 21	A I don't know the precise date.
. 22	Q Well, will you give us an estimate of when
23	it was?
24	A Okay.
25	It was late February of this year.
26	Q 1970; right?

16b-2Yes. And after you had this conversation -- was Q 2 tis by telephone? 3 No. No. Someone came over and spoke to you in person? 5 A member of the Sheriff's Homicide Bureau A 6 requested that I attend a meeting with Deputy District 7 Attorney Burton Katz. 8 All right. Q 9 Now, it was at this time that you, after 10 being solicited by the District Attorney's Office, that 11 you related these events, these conversations; is that 12 correct? 13 Yes. 14 Pardon? 15 A Yes. 16 And in order to relate or in order to write 17 up what was written up here, did you refer to any reports? 18 Just the field interrogation cards that we 19 had filled out that night. 20 And those field interrogation cards reflected 21 none of the language that you have told us occurred? 22 . A Right. 23 24 Is that right? 3 A That is correct. 25 And as a matter of fact, is it a fair statement 26 Q

25

26

17 fls.

that nowhere did you cause to be put in writing any of the outlandish statements, what you term outlandish statements, until the District Attorney's Office contacted you, is that right, or until the investigation or some investigatory officer of the Sheriff's Department contacted you?

A Yes. But I am afraid you are getting the wrong idea.

MR. KANAREK: Well, all I want is just a correct answer to the question.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Correct.

MR. KANAREK: Pardon?

THE WITNESS: You are correct.

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q And at no time did you cause any writing whatsoever until you were approached by law enforcement people; right?

A That is correct.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you. :

Ţ

2

. #1

ġ

4 5

6

.8

9

10 11

12

13

15

16

17

18:

19

20

22

23

24 25

26

THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Hughes?

MR. HUGHES: Yes, I do have, your Honor, I see it is 4:19 and I expect my questions might last ten minutes or so.

THE COURT: All right, we will adjourn at this time.

Ladies and gentlemen, do not converse with anyone or form or expressany opinion regarding the case until it is finally submitted to you.

The court will adjourn until 9:45 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, an adjournment was taken to reconvene at 9:45 a.m., Wednesday, September 23, 1970.)