SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 2 DEPARTMENT NO. 106 HON. RAYMOND CHOATE, JUDGE 3 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 5 Plaintiff. ~VB-NO. A-267861 7 CHARLES MANSON, 8 Defendant. ģ 10 12 REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT 13 FRIDAY, JULY 16, 1971 16 17 18 APPEARANCES: 19 For the People: JOSEPH P. BUSCH, JR., District Attorney BY: ANTHONY MANZELLA Deputy District Attorney 20 21 For the Defendant Manson: 22 IRVING A. KANAREK, ESQ. 23 24 25 26 27 28

MARY LOU BRIANDI, CSR ROGER K. WILLIAMS, CSR Official Court Reporters

26

28

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, JULY 16, 1971

10:01 A.M.

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

THE PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Good morning.

THE COURT: Are we missing one? Mrs. Jordan?

We are in recess.

(Short recess.)

THE COURT: All right. The record will show that Mr. Kanarek is present with Mr. Manson. All the prospective jurors are present.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me again remind you to try to be comfortable when the Court -- is everyone listening?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor:

THE COURT: Let me again remind you to have everyone comfortable when the Court sets this matter in the morning, because we have a long way to go in the matter, in the case, and you inconvenience everyone when you are not on time.

The Court sometimes will not be ready for you because of other matters, but you should make it your business not to inconvenience the others and cause us to wait.

All right. The record will show that all prospective jurors are present. I think that the voir dire of Mrs. Jordan had terminated.

Do you both pass for cause as to Mrs. Jordan?
MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

The peremptory lies with the THE COURT: Very well. 1 People. Ż MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, the People would ask if 3 your Honor would allow -- or, I would ask permission to inquire of Mr. Rico on one point --5 THE COURT: All right. You may -б MR. MANZELLA: -- if I may. 7 THE COURT: You may do so. 8 9 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 10 EMILIO RICO 11 BY MR. MANZELLA: 12 Mr. Rico, I wanted to talk to you about the fact 13 that you had a relative who was accused of a crime. 14 Yes, sir. 15 I want to find out if anything occurred in that 16 case, which would cause you to have a bias or a prejudice 17 against law enforcement or against the District Attorney's 18 office or the prosecution in general? 19 No. sir. I -- I remember answering that question, 20 and I said: "No." 21 THE COURT: I think he did answer it previously. 22 MR. MANZELLA: Well, that was when Mr. Kay inquired, 23 and I wanted to talk to him. 24 25 THE COURT: Oh. MR. MANZELLA: That's why I asked permission --26 THE COURT: I think that was true. Mr. Kay was 27 28 present.

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
<b>'\$</b> '	1	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Yes. And I just wanted to
	2	you know, talk to you myself,
<b>2</b>	3	A Okay.
	4	Q to clear that up in my own mind.
*	5	What was the charge in that case?
	6	A Uh I believe that was a charge of possession
ha fls.	7	of narcotics.
	8	
	9 .	
	10	
	11	
•	12	
•	13	
*	14	
<b>,</b>	15	
	16	
	<b>17</b>	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
vá:	24 25	2 **.
· ·	25 26	
ì	26 27	
	21 28	
8	န္မဝ	

	ľ	
A2-1 á	1	Q All right. Did you become
<b>O</b> ,	2	A No.
*	3	Q personally involved in the case?
	4.	A No. It was a bunch of fellows in a car, and
<b>*</b>	.5	something was thrown out of the car and they arrested my
	6.	brother. He was in the car at the time.
	7	But it was proven that he didn't have nothing to
•	8	do with it.
	9 .	Q All right. So you felt that he was fairly
•	10-	A Yes.
	11	Q treated in that case, and so
	12	A Yes.
	13	MR. MANZELLA: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Rico.
*	14	Thank you, your Honor. The People pass for cause
<b>*</b>	15	as to all jurors, your Honor.
	16	THE COURT: The peremptory it is your peremptory.
	17	MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor. The People will accept
	18	the jury as presently constituted.
	19	THE COURT: It is Defendant's peremptory.
	20	MR. KANAREK: Thank and excuse Mrs. Reyes, your Honor.
	21	THE COURT: Miss Reyes? Do you mean Juror No. 5?
	22	Mr. Kanarek, do you mean Juror No. 5?
	23	MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.
•	24	THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Reyes. Room 253. Thank
₽.	25	you.
÷	26	THE CLERK: Louis B. Cohen; C-o-h-e-n; Louis is
	27	L-o-u-i-s.
<del>,</del>	.28	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF

LOUIS B. COHEN 1. BY THE COURT: 3 Mr. Cohen, were you present when the Court 4 explained the nature of this case, and when the Court ques-5 tioned the prospective juror, Mr. Winters? 6 A Yes. Would your answers be any different than 7 Mr. Winters' answers were to the questions of a general 8 9 nature? No, sir. 10 A 11 Q All right. Would it be a hardship to you to serve 12 in this case? 13 No., sir. A 14 Have you served as a juror before in any criminal Q 15 case? 16 Α I didn't serve as a juror. I was excused from 17 one case. 18 I see. Are you related to or a friend of any law Q 19 enforcement officer? .20 A No, sir. 21 What type of work do you do? 22 Α I am a shoe cutter. I am retired now, practically. 23 I had a job, but I called the boss not to expect me to come 24 back. 25 I didn't feel I would go on. 26 How long did you work as a shoe cutter? How many .27 years? 28 Α Oh, all the way since I was about 18 years old,

backwards and forwards and so on. 1 Mostly in Los Angeles? Q 2 No, back in Lynn, Massachusetts; and Framingham, Α 3 and mostly in -- oh, for a good deal -- not so much right 4 here in Los Angeles. I worked at -- oh, running -- Running --5 doing the same operation, practically, on other machinery. 6 Q How long have you resided in Los Angeles? 7 Α Since 1943. 8 Is there a Mrs. Cohen? Q 9 Α Yes. 10 And what type of work does she do? 11 Q She's a milliner, but she's retired, too. 12 Α In what area do you and she reside? 13 Q ab fls. 14 Α Hollywood. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Ab-1	1	Q Do you have such views concerning the death
<b>.</b> .	2	penalty that you could not be fair and impartial in
Ž	3	determining the question of guilt or innocence?
	4	A No.
ð	5	Q Or do you have such views concerning the death
	.6	penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it,
	7	regardless of the evidence?
	8	A If the evidence was sufficient, I think I'd
	9	go along with the
	10	Q You understand that there's no no criterion
	11.	set as to what is sufficient evidence? And that it is a
	12	matter simply of your own discretion?
	13	A That's true.
	14	Q You understand that. In other words, there's no
<b>)</b>	15	such thing as a "proper case"
*	16	A No.
	17	Q or a proper quantum of evidence that's
	18	spelled out by the law for the imposition of the death
	19	penalty?
	<b>20</b> .	A I see.
	<b>21</b> ,	Q You do understand that?
	22	A Yes.
	23	Q All right. What I am asking you is whether your
	24	views are such concerning it that you would automatically
×	25	refuse to impose it, regardless of the evidence?
1	26	A The evidence would have to be sufficient to have
	27	me have me go to a serious decision like that. The
<b>.</b>	28	evidence would

1
2
3.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
.16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27

28

	Q A	111	rig	ht.	Are	your	views	such	concerning	the
death	penalty	y ti	nat	you	would	i neve	er impo	ose it	:?	

A No.

Q Or are your views such concerning the death penalty that you would automatically impose it, upon a conviction of murder of the first degree?

A Yes.

Q In other words, if somebody were convicted of murder of the first degree, there would be an automatic reaction on your part?

You would vote for the death penalty regardless of the evidence?

A Right.

MR. KANAREK: 1073, Subsection 2, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR. MANZELLA: I would like to inquire, your Honor, --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MANZELLA: -- to make sure that he understands the question.

## VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

## BY MR. MANZELLA:

Q Mr. Cohen, do you understand that the death penalty is not automatic upon a conviction of first degree murder? In other words, the law does not require the death penalty upon a conviction of first degree murder.

Do you understand that?

A Will you explain the difference? Like I -- I

A b~3

2

1

feel that -- you say it's automatic? If the jury comes to a decision, with the jury, and a -- and if it's first -- and the law is that on first degree murder, as far as I know, that it entails the death penalty, or life imprisonment.

- That's right.
- Right. Or life imprisonment. Α
- Do you understand that there -- if the defendant is convicted of first degree murder, then there is in effect a second trial, at which the same jury determines whether the punishment will be life imprisonment or death? Do you understand that?
  - Yes. Now, yes.
- Now, do you understand, as Judge Choate has said, that the choice is entirely up to the individual jurors, as to what they believe --
  - Of course. A
- -- is justified, as the punishment in that particular case? This particular case?
  - Yes.
- All right. Now, if the defendant, Mr. Manson, were convicted of first degree murder by you, by this jury, if you sat on this jury, then you would go into the penalty phase, and either hear evidence or -- and then begin deliberations on what penalty should be imposed, whether it's life imprisonment or death.

Now, do you feel that if Mr. -- if you convicted Mr. Manson of first degree murder, that you would automatically vote for the death penalty, regardless of the evidence in the

16

17

13

14

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

Ab-4

Aĉ fls.

case?

A Well, going along with my decision, and -- in that debate, as you say, upon the panel as to what would be the penalty, as to the evidence, there is a choice of my either going -- or, voicing life imprisonment or death penalty.

That's the choice I have to make. That would be part of the things that would go along with the law of the thing, for first degree murder, you say; see?

That's the -- the -- the only -- the only difference there is in your thinking on that is either one or the other. But conclusively, it's either one or the other.

Q Well, right. The law sets down those two choices.

A Right, right.

to have been

Ac-1

1 2

3

4

5

0

•

\_

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20° 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Q But do you understand that there -- if I may say it this way, there are different kinds of first degree murder.

A Well --

Q The facts differ on first degree murders.

A Then we'd have to have the instruction, on some, to make those points clear, too. The Judge perhaps would state those differences to us, in his instructions.

Otherwise, unless we were trained in this thing, how would we know those different points?

Q Well, you see, there's no law that guides you, no standards given to you by the law on which penalty to choose.

A Well, there are instructions. Now, what instructions would we be given to point out the differences to us, to sort of inform us?

Q Well, the instructions that define crimes have to do with the guilt phase of the trial. In other words -- see, the crime of murder, the crime of murder will be defined for you. The law defines that, gives you the standards, on when a -- a particular set of facts you find to be true constitutes first degree murder.

But once a defendant has been convicted of first degree murder, then the law gives you no standards or no guidelines to tell you which --

A I see.

Q -- punishment he should get, life or death.

A In the first or second phase of it, you keep

mentioning, of the trial,

Q Right.

A First, we get the conviction, if possible; and then the penalty is up to another -- another decision of the panel, on top of the first decision.

Q Right, right. Now, the question that the Judge is asking you is: If Mr. Manson was convicted of first degree murder, would you automatically vote for the death penalty, regardless of the evidence that you've heard in the case?

In other words, without regard to the evidence, would you always vote for the death penalty in a first degree murder case?

That's in essence what the question is. Would you always vote for the death penalty for a defendant who was convicted of first degree murder, regardless of those facts which made it first degree murder?

A Well, you mention there are different points of first degree murder. Not knowing all those points, you can't say automatically you'd automatically do something, without considering -- considering those points.

And then we would have to be instructed on those points, in order to be able to consider the error.

I can't see why you say that it would be automatic.

I can't allow that -- that kind of a -- a phrase to enter

into it.

Q All right. Well, that s the question. The Judge asked you if you would automatically vote for the death

ŝ	1	penalty, and you said: "Yes."
	2	A Well
	3	Q Did you
₹.	4	A Conclusively thinking the thing, and not quite
*	5	understanding the word, you say "Yes" or "No" to the thing,
	6	unless the question is asked so that you have a chance to
	7	to think the thing over before you answer.
	8	If it's a "Yes" or "No" thing, you are inclined
*	9	to go along with the "Yes," and so you say "automatically,"
	10	which would include your "Yes." You see?
	n	Q Well, are you saying that you misunderstood the
	12	question?
	13	A It's possible, and possible that that there
क्ष	14	was a misunderstanding of the implication of the word
	15	"automatic."
•	16	Q Well, let me ask you the question again.
	17	If Mr. Manson was convicted of first degree
	18	murder, would you automatically vote for the death penalty,
	19	regardless of the evidence in the case?
	20	A That's clear to me, whether I'd automatically vote
	21	for something, regardless of something that might condition
	22	the vote.
Ad fis.	23	Do I make that clear to you?
	24	
*	25	
	26	
<i>•</i>	27	
	28	
2		

Ad- 1;

è

Ż

1

3

5

6 7

R

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

1,7

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Q I think you do. But you still haven't answered the question, though. You can answer the question, if I understand you correctly. You can answer it.

A Well, may I change the answer to my question, and say -- and condition the answer? I would vote no -- not automatically, but it would be conditioned by other factors of the evidence, that might change my vote from no to yes.

That's the -- see, that's up to me to decide, as of listening to the evidence, and in debate with the jurors.

Q Well, are you saying, then, that you would not automatically vote for the death penalty?

A Yes. I would have to say now: I wouldn't -- in consideration of the use of the word "automatic," I would not automatically vote death penalty, without consideration of the facts and everything else.

But I might change my thought -- say, not use the word "change my thought," but include -- include my thinking on the thing, so that it may decide it one way or another.

That's the debate in the jury.

Q Are you saying that your vote as to penalty and punishment depends on the evidence in the case?

A True.

MR. MANZELLA: All right. Your Honor, the People would oppose the motion. I think that Mr. Cohen misunderstood the question. I think he has made it clear that his vote would depend on the evidence in the case.

Q BY THE COURT: Upon a conviction of murder in the

1 2

first degree, Mr. Cohen, would you always vote for the death penalty?

A Uh -- I think the State attorney allowed that there were different -- different degrees of punishment for first degree murder.

Q Well, it's clear in your mind, is it not, that there are two punishments set out, and that the law decides neither, but leaves it to the entire discretion of the jury, as to which they should choose, the death penalty, or life imprisonment?

- A Well --
- Q Is that clear?

A Yeah, those two points are clear to me. But -- is there a chance of a variation between them?

Q All right. Very well. If that's clear to you, let me ask you this: Upon a conviction of murder of the first degree, would you always vote for the death penalty, regardless of the evidence?

A No, I would have to consider the evidence. If there was variations of penalty for the first degree murder, I would have to consider those, and I would have to have those points pointed out to me.

Q Well, I spelled out the variations. The variations are either life imprisonment or death. And that choice is left to the --

A Well, if the --

Q -- the jury and to the jury's discretion; is that understandable?

that choice.

29

Ae-1

Q Upon a conviction of murder of the first degree, would you always vote for the death penalty, regardless of the evidence? Yes or no.

A No.

Q Would you look at the evidence that would be presented in the case, to determine which of the punishments you should impose, --

A Of course.

Q -- in your own discretion?

A Of course.

THE COURT: All right. I think he did misunderstand.

Do you wish to ask him any questions?

MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor. Thank you.

Q BY THE COURT: Now, concerning publicity that you may have heard, seen or read, I wish to talk to you about that in the absence of the other jurors.

So, ladies and gentlemen, would you oblige me?
Don't talk amongst yourselves nor with anyone else.

Open both doors there, would you, please?

(Whereupon the members of the prospective jury panel exited the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had:)

## BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Cohen, before you ever came into this court, had you ever heard, seen or read the name Charles Manson?

A Oh, yes. Over the last couple of years, the papers have been filled of it. And I buy the Los Angeles Times, seven days a week.

1		
1	Q	And you read it regularly?
2	A	Regularly, yes, sir.
3	Q	And you've read it regularly over the past two
4	years?	
5	Ą	Oh, yes.
6.	Q	So that you know about the Tate-La Bianca trial
7	and the hom	icides therein?
8.	A	1
9	<b>Q</b>	The homicides of which Mr. Manson was accused?
10	A	I yes. I
11	Q	You know about the case?
12	A	I know about the case. But I never did
13	Q	Well, let me ask you this.
14	A	Thank you.
15	Ġ.	Would you simply answer my questions in as short
16	and terse a	way as you can? If it's a yes or no, answer it
17	in that way	•
18	٠	If we wish to have you expand on it, we will
19	do that.	
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	Will you follow that?
22	A	Yes, sir.
23	Q	Thank you. Do you know the result of that trial?
24	A	It was life imprisonment, as far as I as far
25	as I recall	. It was
26	Q	You believe that Mr. Manson was convicted of
27	what charge	?
28	<b>A</b>	He was convicted of murder.

1	Q And was sentenced to life imprisonment?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Was it more than one murder?
4	A The papers only having the information, what
5	the papers were there, the papers reported there were
6	several murders.
7	Q Had you ever heard the name Shorty Shea before?
8	A No.
9	Q Or had you heard the name Gary Hinman before?
10	A No.
11	Q Mary Brunner?
12	A No.
13	Q Bobby Beausoleil?
14	A No.
15	Q Had you heard the term Manson Family before?
16	A I heard that.
17	Q What does that mean?
18	A That apparently he had a group of like, you
19	might say, a small a small society, that he was the head
20	of; that and and it was more than that. They felt as
21	if they they felt as if he was there was a father
22	image idea there.
23	That's about
24	Q He was the leader of this group?
25	A Group, yes, sir.
26	Q Which is known as Manson's Family?
27	A Right.
28	Q Do you think it's possible for you to set aside

ι <b>έ</b>	1	what you may have heard, seen or read in the newspaper, over
	2	television, and over the radio, heard over the radio? Any-
ž.	3	thing that you may have talked about with your friends
	4	concerning Mr. Menson and that other case, or this case?
∜9	5.	And decide the case independently of such matters?
	6	A Yes.
	7	Q Are you capable of doing that?
	8	A I think so. Because may I expand on that?
	9	Q No, you need not expand on it at this moment.
	10	A Yes, thank you.
	11	Q And will you do that?
	12	A Yes.
	13	Q You understand that if you were to consider any
i	14	such matters that you may have heard, seen or read, that it
•	15	would be very unfair to the defendant?
	16	A (No response.)
	17	Q Is that puzzling to you?
	18	A Now, that that's sort of a it falls
Af fls.	19	between a yes and a no answer.
	20 21	,
	.22	
	23	
	24	
£	25	
-	26	
\$	27	
	28	
•	•	

î

All right. Well, there cannot be any in between. It would, in the Court's judgment, be extremely unfair to the defendant to rely on any news reports that you may have heard, seen or read, or any rumor that you may have discussed, in order to establish any element in the case.

A Well, I feel that I'd have to -- whatever I remember reading, I would have to consider that evidence, along with other evidence.

Q You think that whatever is -- whatever you may have read is also evidence in the case? That you'd have to consider?

A Yes. Since the Court has allowed another -another trial for this. There must be somewhere information
in -- in the late evidence of the conviction, that --

Q Well, will you explain to me the difference between how you arrive at your present answer, after you have told me, in the first instance, that you would set aside anything that you may have heard, seen or read for the purpose of making a decision?

A I could set aside -- let me put it this way: I can set aside what I heard before, but if new evidence came along that pointed back at what had transpired, that I had looked at or especially read in the last couple of years, I may have to add the new evidence on to something that I might remember of what the old evidence, on which he was convicted on; see?

Q Oh, I see. You would use what you had heard in the -- over the news media, and -- to fill in the gaps?

af-2,

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

A Well, as new evidence shows -- that is -- shows, yes. It would -- you see, having backtracked on something that you had remembered or something like that.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR. KANAREK: Pardon?

THE COURT: Any question?

MR. KANAREK: I have no questions, your Honor.

MR. MANZELLA: No questions.

MR. KANAREK: At this point, is the Court finished?

to get the state of the state of

Q BY THE COURT: Mr. Cohen, if I were to instruct you that you were to disregard such matters that you may have read, completely -- wipe the slate clean from your memory, wipe your memory clean of those things -- solely for the purpose of deciding this case independently of such matters, could you do that?

A Yes. Yes, I feel I could do that, because of your instructions as such. I would have to.

- Q All right. Would you --
- A In fact, I feel I would have to --
- Q Excuse me, just a minute.
- A Thank you.
- Q If you were to receive instructions, and I were to so instruct you that anything that you may have heard, seen or read is not to be considered by you, unless it was heard, seen or read by you as evidence taken in this courtroom, could you do that?

A Yes. That would be the reasonable thing to do, yes.

Regardless of my thinking of what could have 1 been -- could not have been -- I -- not being a legal 2 having a legal mind, in a sense, I wouldn't --Q: Well, let me ask you: Are you capable of forgetting, for the moment -- or, for the course of this case -- anything that you may have heard, seen or read about Mr. Manson previously? Á Yes, I would have to do that. If I were to instruct you that you should not Q 9 let any such matter come in to your judgment, or come in 10 to your mind, in making any judgment that you'd be called 11 12 upon to make in this case, that you were to set aside such 13 matters, can you do that? 14 Yes, I feel I can do that. A 15 And will you do that? 16 I will. Α 17 Will you be fair and impartial? 18 Yes. Ą 19 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek? 20 Thank you. MR. KANAREK: 21 22 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. KANAREK: 24 Mr. Cohen, I -- I just have a couple of 25 questions to ask you. When the -- you were going to 26 explain to the Court why you thought a certain way, 27 concerning the evidence that -- or, the matters you had 28 read and seen on TV.

And the Court said that -- not to tell him the answer. Do you remember that? Ag fls. Yeah. A 11, 

Ag-I

ŝ

18.

.26 

Q Would you tell us the answer? Why you had these opinions?

A Well, I only look at this. I didn't follow the case very closely. Just -- other things that I like to think about and so on. And -- as the Court said, the conviction was finally altered from death to life imprisonment.

That was the -- the last thing, casually reading it in the papers; that was -- until an appeal came along.

Now, when the appeal comes along, and -- and all new evidence is presented, apparently, then all that new evidence, which is not yet in existence, as far as the jurors are concerned -- it hasn't been presented -- if some of that came along, and -- and then if you casually remembered some of the things that you read, pointing to the conviction, and the offering of the death penalty -- the altering of the death penalty to life imprisonment -- actually, then, if you remember it all, you think back at something perhaps, that the new evidence might be in connection with, that might be convincing -- or, might condition some of the evidence that was presented, that you might casually have read about in the paper, of the -- of the last conviction.

It's just a -- sort of a mental play there. So that -- that was the reason I have said that, that prior to his Honor's -- or, stating that -- asking the question, whether I would be -- be willing to just forget everything that I had seen or read or anything of the conviction and so on of the last case, of the last part of this case here.

I would then have to go along and say that I'd go

27

28

Ŷ

Ē

along with the answer to the question that the judge put to me, whether I would be willing to -- to forget anything I had read or seen prior to possible new evidence being shown to me.

And that's the answer now. That I -- whatever I had said before, it has to -- well, change -- change my thought on it. And say that anything that I had said "yes" to, that might have been conflicting, that now I'd have to say -- well, forget those answers entirely, and go along with the new statement, or question and answer, to the question of the judge, as of right now.

- Q Well, Mr. Cohen --
- A Is that clear?
- Q Yes.
- A If it is to you, good.

THE COURT: It's not clear to me, Mr. Cohen.

JUROR NO. 5: Well, ask me --

Q BY THE COURT: Excuse me, just a minute,
Mr. Cohen. Do you understand that this is a different case?
That is, this is not --

- A Yes. That's why I said: To forget everything.
- Q Excuse me, just a minute. This is not the same case that you read about in the newspapers over the last --
  - A But it's the same person.
  - Q The same defendant.
  - A The same defendant, that's right.
- Q But he is accused of different crimes, entirely different crimes.

Do you understand that?

1	A Yes. Now, I understand.
2	Q You understand that. Did you think this was
3	somehow or another an appeal?
4	A On a continuation. Or, it seemed to be, only
5	having read or or seen it in the paper, saying it's an
6	appeal, what the appeal was.
7	Q No, sir. This is weren't you present when I
8 .	read the indictment? You heard me read the indictment, didn't
9	you?
10	A (No response.)
11	Q You heard me read the accusation?
12	A Well, can you state that indictment again? This
13	was a week ago, and I have been here since a week. Can you
14	state the indictment again, briefly?
15	Q Mr. Manson is accused in the first count of
16	murder. He is accused of the murder of Gary Hinman.
17	In the second count, he is accused of conspiracy.
18	Do you recall me telling you that?
19	A Yes, those two points.
20	Q That, you heard. And in the third count, he is
21	accused of the murder of somebody named Shea.
22	A Yeah. Those names, I've never heard of.
23	·
24	
25	
26	
27	,
28	

Ah fls.

A , h-1

î

2

À

\_

6

7

8

ġ

-

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

true --

Q You are going to have four or five months of sitting as a jury here. If you forget what the charge is in one week, do you think you'd probably have trouble forgetting what --

A Well, I feel that --

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, do you have any further questions?

MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor. I have no further questions.

T think that Mr. Cohen is being candid as to -THE COURT: Do you -- would you explain to me his
candidness?

MR. KANAREK: His candor is --

THE COURT: As you see it?

MR. KANAREK: I think that all of the -- that many of the rest of us, if I may put it that way, including perhaps some of the jurors -- what I am saying is, his candor is reflective of what each of these people would be saying, if they were candid, your Honor.

I think he is most -- most perceptive of the effect of publicity and the fact these people give these automatic answers for reasons of -- one reason or another.

I think -- I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Well, the Court is interested in your observations, Mr. Kanarek. But you have no further questions?

MR. KANAREK: I have no further questions.

I believe that he -- that he is reflecting the

ş.

3

3

5

6

7

R 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

27

26

28

THE COURT: Well, if you have no further questions. --MR. KANAREK: -- viewpoint of the rest of the jurors --THE COURT: -- sit down.

Do you have any further questions? MR. MANZELLA: No, your Honor. BY THE COURT:

Mr. Cohen, are you still of the firm opinion that whatever you may have heard, seen or read in that other case, you can set aside, for the purpose of deciding the issues in this case?

According to -- according to the possible A instructions of the judge. I am.

- Well, that would be my instruction. Ω
- Yes. Then -- "Yes" is the answer. And may I say this? That as far as --
- If it's about the subject, yes. Go ahead. Q. Τ£ it's about your state of mind.

It's the subject of remembering points of this A thing, that the -- this case may run for months.

> Very well. Ø.

I feel that the jurors should be able to take notes in this thing. This is just a group of laymen, in a sense. They're not experts, and they're not memory experts,

- The Court will --0:
- And hundreds of thousands of thoughts might be A thrown at him. They must have a way of recollecting those things --

ŝ

Ai fls.

A I have no doubt about my ability to go along with the -- with the jury in their debate, and coming to my own decision.

ŝ

1 2

\_

4

6.

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

THE COURT: The Court finds that this gentleman would be incapable of separating the -- do you have something?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. I would oppose -- I -- on the basis --

MR. MANZELLA: Could we approach the bench for this argument, im it's going to be argued here?

THE COURT: No.

MR. MANZELLA: Because the jurors are coming in.

THE COURT: Very well. Perhaps the jurors could wait outside just a moment.

(Whereupon, the few prospective jurors who had entered the courtroom then exited the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Does your Honor wish me to do it at the bench?

THE COURT: You may do it here.

MR. KANAREK: I oppose this gentleman being excused.

This gentleman has been candid. This gentleman has been --

THE COURT: Do you believe that he is capable of setting aside what he may have heard, seen or read, and that he will do so, in making an independent judgment based on the evidence?

MR. KANAREK: On a relative --

THE COURT: Would you answer the question?

MR. KANAREK: Well, I must answer the Court candidly.

On a relative basis, since your Honor has allowed people on that I know are being --

aI-2

5.3

ŝ

 THE COURT: I am not asking you that, Mr. Kanarek. I am asking you what your judgment is and what you base your objection to the Court's releasing him on.

MR. KANAREK: If your Honor would allow me, on the relative basis, compared to some of the people who have been less than candid, in my view, this gentleman is --

THE COURT: That is your view?

MR. KANAREK: That is correct.

THE COURT: All right. Any person who is on this —
in this jury box, in the Court's judgment, has been found to
be a person who could set aside anything that he may have
heard, seen or read, via the news media; anything that he may
have talked about in connection with that other case, or
this case or Mr. Manson, and who will set such matters aside
and make an independent judgment fairly and impartially on'
the evidence in this case.

MR. KANAREK: It's my view that none -- no one in the box could possibly do that, with the publicity being what it is.

THE COURT: I understand your view. You have made it clear.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, that's correct.

THE COURT: Now, as to Mr. Cohen, do you wish to state anything?

MR. KANAREK: Yes. I wish to state that I oppose -- I contend it's a denial of due process and equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment. And I refer your Honor to Marion versus Beto, which says that excluding --

28.

•

THE COURT: I know what Marion versus Beto says. You've quoted it --

MR. KANAREK: -- that improperly excluding one juror -- THE COURT: You have quoted that a number of times.

MR. KANAREK: That's correct. And I'm saying that this man is being candid, and I say to the Court that excusing him from the jury is a denial of -- as I say -- of due process, equal protection and a fair trial.

THE COURT: You wish him left on the jury, then?
MR. KANAREK: Pardon?

THE COURT: You wish him left on the jury?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, most vehemently. And I do object to his -- and I do urge, and request and move the Court that he not be released.

THE COURT: The Court finds that Mr. Cohen is incapable of making that segregation of news reports from the evidence. I think he's in a very confused state of mind. His answers are unclear.

I don't believe he understands the nature of this proceeding. I don't believe he understands the importance of segregating what he has heard, seen or read previously from the evidence that might be produced in this case.

And it would be difficult for the Court to find, under the circumstances that he could be fair and impartial.

The Court has made an individual judgment as to each of these jurors who has been examined on this point, and the Court's observations of the various jurors have, in part, been the reasons for the Court's decisions as to whether

to excuse a juror on this point or to allow the juror to remain on, believing that the juror could be fair and impartial.

In this case, I am unconvinced -- I am not -- I am convinced that Mr. Cohen would have a great deal of difficulty.

The Court does excuse Mr. Cohen.

MR. KANAREK: May I point out to the Court -THE COURT: You needn't point out anything further.
Sit down.

MR. KANAREK: Then I have a request of the Court, your Honor, if I may.

THE COURT: All right. Let's hear your request.

MR. KANAREK: The request is that the Court -- and of course, we have the standing objection; and I know, theoretically, it's there in the record, for purposes of some other Court to look at the record. But --

THE COURT: Let's bring in the prospective jurors.

MR. KANAREK: Well, my point is that I request and beseech the Court not to ask leading and suggestive questions, wherein your Honor gets a misapprehension, because of the yes or no answers.

Someone can say yes or no, and --

THE COURT: The Court has not had any misapprehension.

If there has been any misapprehension, it has not been on the Court's part.

(Whereupon, the members of the prospective jury panel completed entering the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Select another juror. ĺ (To the clerk:) What do we have to do, surgery, to get that phone out of your ear? Select another juror, please. THE CLERK: Jose B. Flores; F-1-0-r-e-s. 6. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF JOSE B. FLORES BY THE COURT: Mr. Flores, were you present when the Court explained the nature of this case, when the Court talked to Mr. Winters, and questioned him? A. Yes, I was. 

2 fls.

1	Q Would your answers be any different than his?
2.	A No, they wouldn't.
3	Q To the questions of a general nature?
4	A Similar, similar.
5	Q All right. Would you suffer any hardship should
6	the Court should you be on this jury?
7	A No, sir. I believe I can't, at the present time.
8;	Q Keep that microphone close to your face.
9	A At the present time my two-year-old son has an
10	abnormal liver and I'm taking him at least once a week
n	Q You believe it would be a hardship by reason of
12	the fact that you must transport your son to the doctor?
13.	A That's right, sir.
14	Q Once a week?
15	A That's right, sir.
16	Q Where do you take him?
17	A To the Children's Hospital, Hollywood.
18	Q Is there anyone else to do that, Mr. Schwartz?
19	A No, sir, I'm the only driver. My wife doesn't
20	drive.
21	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I think your Honor is, I'm
22	sure, mispronouncing Mr. Flores name. It is Flores.
23	Q BY THE COURT: Oh, is it Flores?
24	A Yes.
<b>25</b> ,	Q I'm sorry.
26	Mr. Flores, your wife does not drive?
27	A That's right, sir.
28	Q And there is no one else in the family that could

3º

1- 1

ŝ

1-2

1-3

ŝ

1

2

3

6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

.16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

Ŷ

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

### VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

## BY : MR. KANAREK:

If a deputy sheriff or the Sheriff of Los Angeles County should transport your child -- in other words. is there any reason why you physically have to do it yourself, Mr. Flores?

THE COURT: You needn't answer that, Mr. Flores. The Court finds that it would be a hardship for you to serve on this jury as a result of what you have stated to me and the Court does excuse you. Thank you for being on the jury.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I wonder if we can approach the bench?

THE COURT: No, you may not approach the bench.

THE CLERK: Darryl Bergstrom, B-e-r-g-s-t-r-o-m, first name spelled D-a-r-r-y-1.

# VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF DARRYL BERGSTROM

#### BY THE COURT:

Mr. Bergstrom, were you present when the Court explained the nature of this case, when the Court conversed with Mr. Winters and questioned him?

> Yes. Α

Would your answers be any different than the answers of Mr. Winters to the questions of a general nature?

No, they wouldn't. A

1 a - 1MR. KANAREK: Yes. MR. MANZELLA: People will stipulate it would consti-2 tute a hardship. 3 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Kanerek. MR. KANAREK: Very well. 3 5 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. KANAREK: 8 Q I just wanted to ask, have you consulted with 9 your company, that's all? 10 A. Yes, I have. 11 MR. KANAREK: Thank you, stipulate. 12 THE COURT: The Court thanks the counsel for the 13 stipulation. Mr. Bergstrom, you are excused. MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mr. Bergstrom. 15 THE COURT: Room 253, forthwith, 16 THE CLERK: Mrs. Lorraine Chargin. 17 Did I pronounce your name correctly, Chargin? 18 JUROR NO. 5: Yes. 19 THE CLERK: Your last name is spelled C-h-a-r-g-i-n. 20 first name spelled L-o-r-r-a-i-n-e. 21 22 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 23 LORRAINE CHARGIN 24 BY THE COURT: 25 Mrs. Chargin, were you present when the Court 26 explained the nature of this case and conversed with Mr. Winters? 28

î

1	A Yes, sir.	Yes.
2	Q Would you	r answers be any different than his
à	answers?	
4	A No.	
5	Q To the qu	estions of a general nature?
6	A No.	,
7	Q Would it	be any hardship to you to serve in this
8	case?	
9	A Yes.	
10	Q What way?	
11	A Uh, my hu	sband and I reside in Los Angeles.
12	Q Keep that	just a little closer. You have a very
13	soft voice. It doesn	t carry well.
14	A We both 1	ive in Los Angeles, and he's employed in
15	Los Angeles, and I am	employed in Sacramento. I go there
16	once every month or i	ive weeks for a week. I am a boxing
17	promoter and I can't	get no one to take my place.
18	Q You are a	boxing promoter?
19	A A boxing	promoter, uh-huh,
20	Q There are	n't many women boxing promoters, are
21	there?	
22	A Three, I	believe.
23	Q Are you a	boxing promoter generally in Los Angeles
24	County or statewide?	, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
25	A No, in Sa	cramento.
26	Q It see.	The second secon
27	Is there	a license that's statewide or
28	A We have a	statewide license, but you have

ì

\*

THE COURT: Gentlemen? 1 MR. MANZELLA: People will stipulate it would constitute 2 a hardship, your Honor. 3 MR. KANAREK: Stipulate, your Honor. THE COURT: All right, thank you, gentlemen. 5 The gentlemen have stipulated, Mrs. Chargin, 6 that you may be excused, and the Court thanks you for serving 7 on jury duty. Room 253. Do you have time left on jury duty? 9 JUROR NO. 4: Yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: Room 253, forthwith, if you would, please. 11 JUROR NO. 4: Thank you. 12 THE CLERK: Here is your ticket. Lillian N. 13 Kleinbauer, K-1-e-i-n-b-a-u-e-r. 14 15 16 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF LILLIAN N. KLEINBAUER 17 18 BY THE COURT: 19 Mrs. Kleinbauer, were you present when the Court 20 explained the nature of this case and when the Court conversed 21 with Mr. Winters about the case? 22 Yes. sir. A 23 Would your answers be any different than his 24 answers of a general nature? No, sir. .... 1b fls. A 26 27 gother of the second 28

L	
	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	. 9
	10
	11
	12
	13′
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24

26

27

28

Q	You have	to h	old	that	right	close	to.	your	lips
---	----------	------	-----	------	-------	-------	-----	------	------

- A Okay.
- Q Would it be any hardship for you to serve on this case?
  - A Just the length of time. Not financially.
- Q You mean by that the length of time would be inconvenient for you?
  - A Yes.
- Q Well, I'm inclined to agree with you in that respect. It is for all of us, and the Court does ask a considerable sacrifice for anybody who serves for such a long period of time. And we would ask you to assume that sacrifice, then, if it is no personal or financial hardship otherwise.
  - A Could I explain?
  - Q Yes, go ahead.
- A I've worked for the same company for 21 years, and while I was working I was called several times. Finally, I came down and I said I could serve after the 30th of June. So this is my first week. I mean, I finally got the notice. And so I've been here this week. And I'm ready to stay until the 20th of August. But on the 20th of August, why, we do have tickets for a trip.
  - Q A trip?
  - A Yes.
  - O Tell me about that?
- A My husband is a coach for the Hollywood High School and he's off during the summer. And we just have a short cruise to the Carribean, 10-day trip.

; lb-2	
\$	1
	2
*	į
•	4
<b>4</b>	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	ļľ
	12
	13
1	14
	15
	16
	17
,	18
	19.
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24.
<b>9</b> √	25
	26

28

Q	Have you purchased the tickets already?
A	I have purchased the tickets.
	I will be glad to come after that. I mean,

Q Perhaps you can go to the Carribean and after you came back we could fill you in on the evidence -- (Laughter.) -- But it doesn't work that way.

Gentlemen, any questions?

MR. KANAREK: No questions.

THE COURT: All right, we find --

MR. MANZELLA: We stipulate.

MR. KANAREK: Stipulate.

THE COURT: We find it would constitute a personal hardship which you should not have to suffer, so we'll excuse you.

JUROR NO. 4: Thank you.

THE CLERK: Theodore Chastain, C-h-a-s-t-a-i-n.

Did I pronounce your name correctly, sir?

JUROR NO. 4: Yes.

# VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF THEODORE CHASTAIN

#### BY THE COURT:

this is --

Q Mr. Chastain, were you present when the Court explained the nature of this case when the Court talked to Mr. Winters?

A Yes, I was.

Q Would your answers be any different than his to

b-3	
ق ق	
७,	
*	

ŀ

2

3

.4

5

the questions of a general nature?

A No. No.

Q Would it be any hardship to you to serve on this jury?

Well, it might. I have cataracts in both eyes, and they have developed to the extent where I can't read newsprint without a magnifying glass and a light before it.

And I'm supposed to have an operation this fall. He doesn't definitely say what date, so it may be in September or October, I don't know. 🦠 🕌

Is the surgeon a local surgeon?

Well, he's an ophthalmologist. He's locally in A Los Angeles, yes.

Is there any way that you can ascertain when he Q contemplated the operation?

Well, I won't know. I have an appointment the A 26th of this month, and probably I will know more about it then.

How about your far vision? Can you see faces? We're about twelve or fifteen feet apart.

Oh, yes, I see that. I see your eyes, but I Α wouldn't know what color they were. And if the light were all right --

well, they're red with -- just the whites are red.

If the light is behind a person, I wouldn't see Α their face at all. It is just the outline I see.

Well, we'll excuse you. The Court think's that Q

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

lc fls.

part of a juror's task is to observe witnesses on the witness stand.

I could do that, sir, but if I have to read any A great deal of material, I might fall down there.

Ĭŀ. 

28

Q You can't -- is it difficult for you to see features, however?

A Oh, it is. I'm in a fog, more or less.

Q At this distance?

A There's -- it's very milky -- the explanation would be if your glasses are smeared with milk and you try to look through them, that's the way I look and see you people.

Q The Court would excuse you from jury duty and excuse you from further service, if you would like.

A Well, I have no objection from serving. It wouldn't bother me financially in any way.

Q It is just you will have to have that operation?

A I presume sometime this fall, sometime, because my vision has been setting progressively worse. And even the last month it is worse.

Q Well, in view of the circumstances, the Court will excuse you from this trial, service on this trial, particularly in view of the fact it would extend well beyond the time when, perhaps, your doctor would want to operate.

A Okay.

Q And the Court thanks you.

And if you do sit on any other jury, try to get yourself close to the witness stand. Tell the Judge what your problem is and get yourself close to the witness stand during the remainder of your 30-day period.

A Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

\$.

Thank you, Mr. Chastain.

THE CLERK: Mrs. Florence Jones, J-o-n-e-s.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, would it be imposing to ask

THE COURT: We'll take a short recess, ladies and gentlemen. We'll be in recess for the next ten minutes.

During the recess you are advised not to converse among yourselves or with anyone else or permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with this matter, nor are you to form or express any opinion on the matter, should it be submitted to you, should you be chosen as a juror in this matter.

(Morning recess.)

THE COURT: The record will show Mr. Manson to be present with his attorney. The prospective jurors are in the box and beyond the rail.

A juror has called in and indicated he is ill and cannot return. And he was under doctor's care and was ill yesterday, and today he has been unable to be present.

May he be excused, gentlemen? His name is Bernard L. Scott.

MR. MANZELLA: So stipulated.

MR. KANAREK: So stipulated.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MRS. FLORENCE JONES

BY THE COURT:

Q Is it Mrs. Jones?

1	instructions?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Do you have any friends or relatives who are
4	law enforcement officers?
5	A A brother-in-law that's a police officer.
6	Q For
7	A In Philadelphia.
8	Q In Philadelphia.
9	Would that affect your judgment, Mrs. Jones?
10	A No.
11	Q Are you, as a result of that relationship, more
12	likely or less likely to believe a police officer or someone
13	who is not a police officer simply because of the police
14	officer's status?
15	A No.
16	Q You can judge a police officer's testimony on the
17	same standards as any other witness's testimony?
18	A That's right.
19	Q Is there a Mr. Jones?
20	A I am divorced.
21	Q And what type of work did he do?
22	A A professional baseball player.
23	
24 25	
26	
27 <sup>.</sup>	
28	

3,

ld fls.

18-2 Q Regardless of the evidence? 1 Ă Yes. 2 Or are your views such that you would never vote 3 to impose the death penalty? 5 Α Yes. Would you even consider the death penalty? Q 6 7 A No. Are your views concerning the death penalty such 8 Q that you would automatically, given the choice between life 9 10 imprisonment and death, vote for life imprisonment every time? 11 A Right. 12 Regardless of what might be produced? 0 13 That's right. A. 14 Q By way of evidence? 15 Right. A 16 MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, the People would respectfully 17 challenge Mrs. Jones for cause under Section 1073, Sub-18 division 2 of the Penal Code. 19 The Court grants the challenge. Thank you, THE COURT: 20 Mrs. Jones. Room 253 forthwith, please, Mrs. Jones. 21 THE CLERK: Mrs. Antonia N. Angus, A-n-g-u-s, first name **22** spelled A-n-t-o-n-i-a. 23 24 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 25 MRS. ANTONIA ANGUS 26 BY THE COURT: 27 Mrs. Angus, have you been present during all the Q 28 proceedings?

1	A	Yes.
2	Ω	Since I first called this case and had
.3	Mr. Winter	
.4	A	Yes, I have.
5	Ω	in the box.
6		Would your answers be any different than his were
7	to the que	estions of a general nature?
8	A	No.
9	Q	Would it be any hardship to you to serve in this
10	case?	
11	A	As far as I am concerned, yes.
12	Q	In what way?
13	A	My health is not very good.
14	Q	What?
15	A	Health.
16	. Ω.	Your health is not very good.
17		What's the problem with your health?
18	A	I have hypertension and ulcers.
19	Q	You have those all the time?
20	A	All the time. I take medication.
21	. Ω	Why should you have them in the courtroom?
22	A	This is too much of an emotional strain.
23	Q	It has been to this point for you?
24	A	It has been to this point, yes.
25	Q	It has caused you some aggravation?
26	<b>A</b>	Yès.
27	Q	How long have you been sitting here now, three
28	or four d	ays?

MR. KANAREK:

27

28

lady.

So stipulate, your Honor, and thank you

1d-5 THE COURT: We'll excuse you, Mrs. Angus. Thank you for 1 serving as a juror. 2 3 Do you have any time left? JUROR NO. 4: Yes. THE COURT: Report to Room 253. THE CLERK: Mrs. Agnes J. Kistler, K-i-s-t-l-e-r. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 9 MRS. AGNES KISTLER 10 BY THE COURT: 11 Mrs. Kistler, were you present when the Court 12 explained the nature of this case and conversed with 13 Mr. Winters? Yes, I was. 14 Α 15 Q Would your answers be any different than his 16 answers were to the questions of a general nature? 17 Α No. 18 Would it be any hardship for you to serve in the 0 19 case? 20 I am allowed 20 days. I work for McDonnell-Α 21 Douglas and I have used eight of those days. 22 And they will not pay you beyond that time? 23 le-fls. A No. 24 25 26 27

28

•			
1e-1	1	Q	Have you ascertained that?
	2	A	Yes.
	3	Q ·	From somebody who is an authority?
•	4	A	Yes. It is a
₫.	5	Q	As I asked you to do?
	6	<b>A</b>	Yes. It is a plant policy, anyway.
	7	Q	Your earnings are important to you?
	<b>8</b> .	A	Yes.
	9	Q	As a means of livelihood, are they?
	10	A	Yes, they are.
	11	Q	What do you do for McDonnell-Douglas?
	12	A	I am a developer in a plastic section, working on
	13	a DC-10.	We're working on our DC-10 real hard at the moment.
. <u> </u>	14	Q	How long have you been employed with McDonnell-
•	15	Douglas?	
•	16	A	Oh, about 27, 28 years.
	17	Q	It is not a matter of your losing your job, but
	18	you have a	job available for you when you come back
	19	A	Yes.
	20	Q	But you wouldn't be paid during the time that
	21	you	•
	22	Ą	I imagine.
	23	, Q	Is that correct?
	24	A	Yes, I imagine. I don't think I would get fired,
₩.	25	no.	
<b>5</b> ,	26	Q	You tre not sure about that?
	27	A	Well, I think each month it changes.
ţ	20	Q	So you're not really sure at the end of four or
	1		i i

1	five months whether you would have a job available?
2	A I imagine at my age I doubt that, you know
3	THE COURT: All right, the Court
4	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I make the motion
5	THE COURT: You make the motion that the County pay her
6	for her pay her wages during the time
7	MR. KANAREK: If she were working for the County, she
8	would get paid and, also, it is an invasion of her civil rights,
9	of her losing the job because of performing her civic duty.
10	And I believe that is the law, and there is federal law to that
11	effect.
12	THE COURT: The Court denies the motion, if it is a
13	motion, to have the County pay her salary while she's on jury
14	duty.
15	And the Court excuses you, and the Court thanks
16	you very much.
17	MR. KANAREK: Thank you very much, Mrs. Kistler.
18	THE CLERK: Miss Faith A. Kovach, K-o-v-a-c-h,
19	F-a-i-t-h.
20	
21	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF
22	MISS FAITH KOVACH
23	BY THE COURT:
24	Q Is it Miss Koyach?
25	A Yes, it is.
26	Q Miss Kovach, were you present when the Court
27	explained the nature of the case and conversed with
28	Mr. Winters?

1	A	I was.
2	· Q	Would your answers be any different than his
3	answers wer	e to the questions of a general nature?
4	A	No, they would not.
5	Q	Would it be a hardship to you to serve on the
6	case?	
7	A	No, it would not.
8	Ω	Neither financially or personal in any way?
9	A	No.
10	Q	Have you served as a juror in any criminal case
11	before?	
12	A	No.
13	Q	Have you any connection with law enforcement?
14	A	Yes, I do.
15	Q	Tell us about that.
16	. <b>A</b>	I work for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous
17	Drugs. It	is federal.
18	Q	You work for what?
19	A	For the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous
20	Drugs.	
21	Ω	And are you in the prosecution end of it?
22	A	No, I am a secretary.
23	Q	Do you work for people who are in the prosecution
24	phase of th	at bureau?
25	A	Yes, well we're a law enforcement
26	<b>Q</b> .	Is it a prosecution type agency or some of
27	it regulato	ry in nature?
28	A	It is a combination of both.

lf fis.

1f-1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13.

14

15

16

17

TQ

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28 Q Your views are such that you would not be in any way biased or partial in determining guilt or innocence?

A No.

Q All right. That was a poorly phrased question, but you think you could be fair and impartial in determining the first phase of the case regardless of what your views concerning capital punishment may be?

A Right.

Now, concerning the penalty phase, if you should be called upon to determine life imprisonment or death, would you automatically refuse to impose the death penalty regardless of any evidence that might be produced?

A Yes, I would,

Q Can you conceive of yourself ever voting for the death penalty in any case?

A No.

Q Your views are such that given the choice between life imprisonment and death, you would always choose life imprisonment regardless of the evidence?

A I would.

THE COURT: Any questions from either side?

MR. MANZELLA: No, your Honor. The People would respectfully challenge Miss Kovech for cause under Section 1073, Subdivision 2 of the Penal Code.

THE COURT: All right, the Court grants the challenge.

Thank you, and the Court asks that you report to Room 253

forthwith.

THE CLERK: Allan Solk, S-o-l-k, first name A-1-1-a-n.

And your work, what is the nature of it?

28

Q

•		
1f-3	1	A I am a real estate appraiser with the County
•	2	Assessor's Office.
	3	Q And is there a Mrs. Solk?
ţ	4	A Yes, there is.
•	5	Q What type of work does she work outside the
	6	home?
	7	A Yes, she is a school teacher.
	-8	Q In what area, generally?
	9	A San Pedro.
	10	Q In what area do you and she reside?
	n.	A In San Pedro
	12	Q Do you have such views concerning the death
	13	penalty that you could not be fair and impartial in determining
5	14	the question of guilt or innocence?
)	15	A. No.
•	16	Q Or do you have such views concerning that penalty
	17	that you would automatically refuse to impose it in any case?
	18	A Yes.
	19	Q Can you conceive of yourself voting for the death
	20	penalty in any case?
	21	A No.
	<b>2</b> 2	Q Are your views concerning the death penalty such
	23	that given the choice of life imprisonment and death, you
	24	would automatically choose life imprisonment, refusing to
\$	25	impose the death penalty without regard to the evidence,
·	26	rather?
ń	27	A That's true.
•	28	Q Would you ever consider in any way imposing the
<b>ģ</b> •		· ·

death penalty in any case?

A No.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, any questions?

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, the People would respectfully challenge Mr. Solk for cause under Section 1073, Subdivision 2 of the Penal Code.

THE COURT: The Court grants the challenge. Thank you, Mr. Solk.

THE CLERK: Mrs. Gloria W. Taylor, T-a-y-1-o-r.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF MISS GLORIA W. TAYLOR

# BY THE COURT:

Q Miss Taylor, were you present when the Court explained the nature of the case and conversed with Mr. Winters from your group?

A Yes.

Q Would your enswers be any different than his were to the questions of a general nature?

A No.

Q Would there be any hardship to you to serve on this jury?

A Yes, it would.

Q Tell us what it is?

A I have two children, one 7 and one 9 years of age. And it would be a financial burden for me to have to get someone to take care of them.

Q Who is taking care of them now?

î	
1f- 5	1
	2
	3.
-	4
*	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
2 fls.	14
•	15
•	16
	17
	17 18
•	18
•	18 19
•	18 19 20
	18 19 20 21
	18 19 20 21 22
	18 19 20 21 -22 23

28

	A	Well,	they're	with	their	grandfather	part	o£	the
day,	and the	en I pi	lck them	up.					

Q Is it that your -- the grandfather will be unable to care for them during the entire period of time?

A Yes, because they're quite energetic and they're quite a bit for him.

Q He will just eventually be worn down, is that it?

A Yes.

Q Do you anticipate that he will not be able to care for them during the entire period of four months, let's say, if you are on this jury?

A True, because I have to take them to school and pick them up. He doesn't drive or anything.

**经有效的** 

2-1 Well, is there anyone else who could care for them Q 1 in your absence? Other than the grandfather? 2 A Because it's just -- I'm the sole support 3 now. 4 What type of work do you do? 5 I am a recreation director. City of Los Angeles. 6 And I also spoke to them about this, and they said that 20 7 days would probably be all they could stand, with our 8 shortage of staff and budget. Q Well, the Court is not particularly concerned Q 10 about that. I think the City of Los Angeles would pay your 11 12 salary during that period of time. But the Court is concerned 13 about your child care situation. There would be no way you could think of to have the children cared for, later on, 14 15 when they're going to school? 16 No. Because I pick them up and I take them 17 every morning to school, and --18 Your hours are such that you can do that, Q 19 generally? 20 Yes. 21 And there's no one else who can do that? 22 No, I can't depend on anyone else. 23 THE COURT: Gentlemen, any questions? 24 MR. MANZELLA: No. your Honor. The People would 25 stipulate it would constitute a hardship. 26. MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, we would make the -- and do 27 make the motion that the County --

ŝ

28

THE COURT: That the County provide child care for

3

á

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

ΙZ

13

15

16 17

18-

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

Mrs. -- for this lady; is that right?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, that's right. We deem -- it's our belief that this expenditure would be minimal. There are child care centers in the County --

Q BY THE COURT: Would you be willing to take your child to a County child care center, during the time that you are serving on jury duty?

A I don't think this would be advantageous to them.

DEFENDANT MANSON: It sure wouldn't. That's how I got there.

THE COURT: Mr. Manson, you be quiet, please, or you'll have to leave the courtroom.

Q Well, somebody would have to transport them there.
You'd still have the same problem of transport, wouldn't you?

A Yes.

THE COURT: Well, is your motion, Mr. Kanarek, that the County provide someone to come to the home to transport them to school, and then pick them up at school?

MR. KANAREK: Yes. I think --

THE COURT: Is that it?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. I think that -- if this lady, if it could be worked out -- I think that the -- if it -- to her satisfaction, it could be worked out, that the people who would do the transportation were reliable people, and they went back and forth, and if she's willing to -- to do this, I think that -- and since she works, she would not suffer any --

THE COURT: Would you be willing to do that? Would you

2-3

ì

2

3

1

4

5. 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

76

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26.

27

28

be willing to do that? Would you be willing to have one of the Supervisors of the County, perhaps, pick the children up, or somebody of equally responsible stature, perhaps, pick the children up and deliver them? And so forth?

**建筑学》**这种自己介色

MR. KANAREK: Well, may I respectfully object to the Court's sarcasm, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. The Court will strike its own remarks in respect to that.

Q But it would --

MR. KANAREK: And I would like to approach the bench, if I may.

THE COURT: No, you needn't approach the bench.

The Court does not believe that the -- that you should be required to suffer this inconvenience or hardship. The Court finds that it would be a hardship to you, under the circumstances, regarding your children, and therefore would excuse you.

MR. KANAREK: May the record reflect she's being excused over opposition?

THE COURT: Yes. The Court -- the record may reflect that it's -- she's excused over your opposition, and in view of the Court's denial of the motion that the County provide child care to pick up her children at the home and deliver them to the school, and return them to the home, and otherwise care for them in her absence.

Thank you.

JUROR NO. 5: Thank you.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mrs. Taylor.

THE CLERK: Miss Carol A. Smallwood; S-m-a-1-1-w-o-o-d. 2-4 1 Incidentally, ladies and gentlemen, if THE COURT: 2 the Court strikes anything that it says, or that anybody else 3 says, you are to treat such matters as though it had never been uttered, as though you had never heard it. 5 Do you all understand, and will you follow that б instruction? 7 (No negative response.) 8 Thank you. THE COURT: 2a fls. 10 11 12 13 14 **15** 16 17 18 19: 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

A

No.

\$

1	٠
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	,
12	
13	
14	,
1,5	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28

	Ç	3	You	think	you	coul	d st	ill :	be	fair	and	impartia	1
to	the	defe	ndani	t, in	spite	e of	that	con	nec	tion	with	ı law	
en:	force	ement	:3										
	ל	۸	¥o.a										

- Or a law enforcement officer? Q
- Α Yes.
- Q Would you be more inclined to -- to give credence to the testimony of a law enforcement officer, simply because of his status, because of that connection?
  - No, no more so than anyone else.
  - What type of work do you do, Miss Smallwood?
- I have been an elementary school teacher. I am unemployed at the moment.
- And are you willing to remain unemployed during the course of this trial?
  - Yes. Α
- You wouldn't be overly concerned about seeking employment, if you were to sit here in this courtroom for four or five months?
  - No. \*
  - Is it Mrs. Smallwood?
  - A Miss.
  - In what area do you reside? Q

- The Wilshire district. Α
- Do you have such views concerning the death penalty that you could not be impartial in determining the question of guilt or innocence?
  - Α No.

ŝ

2	explained the nature of this case and talked to Mr. Winters?
3	A Yes, sir.
4	Q Would your answers be any different than he
5	responded to the questions of a general nature?
6	A No, sir.
7	Q Would it be any hardship to you to serve in this
8	case?
9	A Not financially. Perhaps, physically.
10	Q Tell us about that.
11	A Well, I have emphysema. I have a circulatory
12	trouble from my hips down, which sometimes immobilizes me for
13	three or four days at a time.
14	I never know when it's going to hit.
15	Q Other than that, you're in good shape, huh?
16	A Well, I was noticing, this morning, since the
17	21st of June, I have lost eight pounds.
18	Q Well, the Court's sorry to hear that. This
19	emphysema, does it give you some considerable problem, or
20	A Very much short of breath, particularly if there's
21	any smog to speak of, or
22	Q How do you think this these ailments would
23	affect your service as a juror?
24	A Well, the only I don't think it would affect me,
25	except the fact I could never promise that I could perhaps
26	when this circulatory trouble hits me, I'm not able perhaps
27	to get out of bed for a day at a time, or maybe out of the
28	get out of the apartment for two or three days.
	1

Mr. O'Donnell, were you present when the Court

Q

I see. The circulatory problem is -- has been Q with you for some time, and it -- that has been your experience, that occasionally you are laid up? 2b fls. Α Yes. å 

2b- 1

1

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MANZELLA: And the People would stipulate it would constitute a hardship, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: Stipulate, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. The Court does excuse you. The Court appreciates your service on jury duty, Mr. O'Donnell, under the circumstances.

The Court thinks it's quite a hardship.

JUROR NO. 5: Thank you.

THE COURT: Do you have any further time left?

JUROR NO. 5: I'm going to ask -- I have some more time left, but I'm going to ask to be terminated.

THE COURT: All right, Would you -- pardon?

JUROR NO. 5: I'm going to ask them, when I go back over there, to the jury assembly room, to terminate me.

think I have got till the 26th of July.

THE COURT: Very well. You may tell them that this Court concurs that you should be excused, in view of your physical condition.

JUROR NO. 5: Thank you.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mr. O'Donnell.

THE CLERK: Charles Pineda; P-i-n-e-d-a.

## VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF CHARLES PINEDA

## BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Pineda, were you present when the Court explained the nature of this case and when the Court talked

25

26

27

28

to Mr. Winters?

A Yes.

Q Would your answers be any different than his, as to questions of a general nature?

A No, sir, they wouldn't.

Q All right. Would it be any hardship to you to serve?

A Well, sir, at this time, the only thing involved would be my employment. And being absent from --

Q Would you tell us about that?

A Well, I work for the Bureau of Customs, and right now, we are having a very -- a very detailed inspection of -- inspection of parcels coming from Vietnam, from our GI's returning home.

And naturally, the most essential thing here is the narcotic problem. And therefore, if I stay here six -- five, four or five or six months, this is my first time on jury duty, and it could be my last.

Q What do you mean by that?

A Well, I mean -- I don't know; they just might take up and hire somebody else; I don't know.

Q How long have you been with the Customs?

A 11 years, sir,

Q Civil service, isn't it?

A Civil service, yes.

Other than -- other than that, well, I am willing to serve, if -- if I am accepted.

Q . Well, the Court believes that the Customs Service

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26

27

28

will have to forego your	presence regrettably,	The Court
does find that they could	probably not find as go	od a man,
but perhaps they could f	ind someone who could fi	.11 in there
for you, Mr. Pineda.		

- A Thank you, sir,
- Q Have you had any jury experience in criminal cases?
  - A This is my first time.
- Q Are you connected with any law enforcement officer in any way?
  - A Well, if I ---
  - Q Any type of law enforcement officer?
- A Well, yes. In two different ways. I had a cousin that used to work for the L. A. Police Department, Sergeant Rudy Diaz. And my son is studying law; and at the same time, works for the California State as a parole officer.
  - Q What did Mr. Diaz do?
- A Uh -- I think he used to -- when he started with the L. A. Police, I think he was with the narcotics squad.

In later years, he was with the Homicide, I'm sure. He's retired now. He is retired from the Los Angeles Police Department now, --

- A Yes, sir.
- Q -- isn't he?
- A Yes, he is.
- Q Are you yourself a law enforcement officer, in certain respects?
  - A In certain respects, yes.

Q Have you ever testified as a witness in a case?

A No.

Q Have you ever assembled evidence for the presentation of --

A No. I missed it by a few -- maybe a couple of months. Because a new ordinance states that, should I find any narcotics, or intercept any narcotics, I am entitled to go to the state, town or city, wherever the narcotics are going, and testify that I did intercept them,

But I missed that by about two months.

And May the

27

28

Q	You	haven't	done	that	at	a11?
---	-----	---------	------	------	----	------

A No, sir. I haven't had a chance to testify -- although I do -- I do have makes and interceptions of nercotics.

Q Have you made arrests?

A No. At certain -- at one time that I remember,
I made an interception of narcotics from Vietnam, and it was
from the son, who was a GI, to his father and mother.

And this is another thing, though. I just wanted you to know what -- how it works.

Q Okay. Do you think that because of this connection with law enforcement, and your relationships with these people that you've spoken about, that you could not be fair and impartial in this case?

A I couldn't see why I -- no, I think I can be impartial.

- Q Would this in any way affect your judgment in the case?
  - A No, sir, it wouldn't.
  - Q Is there a Mrs. Pineda?
  - A Yes, there is.
  - Q What type of work does she do?
- A She doesn't work, sir. She's a housewife, retired -- not in very good health.
  - Q In what area do you reside?
  - A East Los Angeles.
- Q Do you have such views concerning the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it in

â

any case?

A No.

Q Or would you -- would you, because of your views on the death penalty, be unable to be fair and impartial in determining the question of guilt or innocence?

A Can you repeat that question?

Q Would you be unable, because of the views that you have concerning the death penalty, to be impartial in determining guilt or innocence?

A No.

Q Would you automatically impose the death penalty upon a conviction of murder of the first degree, without regard to the evidence?

A No, sir, I wouldn't,

Q Now, at this time, I wish to ask you about what you may have heard, seen or read in connection with this case whether you can set that aside; whether you have the ability to set that aside, and whether you will set it aside and be fair and impartial.

And for that purpose, I wish to examine you outside the presence of the other jurors, and I'll ask them all to leave and go to Department 107;

And not to converse about this case or permit anyone to converse with them in connection with it, until the matter has finally been submitted to them, and they're in the course of deliberations.

(Whereupon the members of the prospective jury panel exited the courtroom, and the following

Ř

1 Yes, there was a -- I'm answering this because A 2 you are asking me. Yes, there was a verdict of guilty. And was there a penalty returned, that you Q. 5 remember? 6 Yes, sir. The jury returned a verdict of guilty; A 7 and later on, returned a verdict of a death penalty. 8 All right. Now, do you know whether there was Q 9 more than one murder charged? 10 Yes, sir, I think there was more than one. 11 Do you know the name Sharon -- excuse me. Q 12 Do you know the name Susan Atkins? 13 Yes. They were some of the -- Mr. Manson's A 14 girl friends or friends, 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 25 26 . 27 28

3:fls.

1	Q	Susan Atkins is one of Mr. Manson's associates,
2.	is that rig	ht?
3	A	Yes, that's right.
4	Q·	All right.
5		Was there anything that you heard, or read about
6	the name Sh	orty Shea?
7	A	Yes, sir, there was.
8	Q	Tell me about that.
9	$\mathbf{A}_{c}$	Well, he disappeared.
.0	Q	From where?
.1	À	I understand that he was a stunt man for the
2	studios in	Hollywood and in later he disappeared all of a
.3	sudden.	
.4	Q	Have you heard the name Gary Hinman previously?
5	A	Yes, sir, I read about that.
6	Q	What happened to him?
7	. A	You want me to say?
.8.	Q	Yes, what you read.
9	A	What I read in the papers, he was killed by some
:0	persons in	Santa Monica or somewhere around
1	Q·	And do you know the name Spahn Ranch?
2	A	Uh, yes, I've heard it.
3	Ω .	What does that mean to you?
24	<b>A</b> 3	Spahn Ranch?
25	Q	Spahn Ranch.
26	A	Yes, well, apparently it was a place where some of
27	the people	stayed. Probably Mr. Manson and some of the girls
28	and maybe -	- what I to put it another way, what the Manson

22<sup>.</sup> 

Family meant.

Q What does Manson Family mean to you?

A Well, many girls and many boys, and probably enjoying life there.

- Q Mr. Manson is the head of the group?
- A That's what I read in the papers.
- Q Well, now, let me ask you, if I were to instruct you, Mr. Pineda, that you were to set aside anything you may have heard, seen or read in the newspaper or over television or over the radio, that is not forget such matters but set them aside for the purpose of making any decision that you might be called upon to make in this case, are you capable of doing that?

A Yes. What I have read, seen on television or the verdict rendered by the other jury has nothing to do with this case here. And I believe that the man should have every opportunity to prove himself not guilty.

Q Well, do you understand that that's not his burden. He doesn't have to prove himself not guilty. From what I read to you, there is a presumption of innocence. I told you --

A Yes, I understand.

Q I told you, it is the presumption of innocence and it is the burden of the People to prove he is guilty.

A What I meant -- I guess what I meant, the man should be given the opportunity to talk, to present his side of it, and that's what I meant. That's what I probably meant.

ģ

 Q Let me ask you this: Let's suppose in one of these cases, either one of the cases, Count I or Count III, the People are unable to prove one of the elements that is required in the proof of a case of murder. And they're unable to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt and to their moral certainty, would you kind of fill in the evidence with what you might have learned about either Mr. Shea or Mr. Hinman's alleged death from the newspapers?

4,14,

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I object to the Court's question in that respect, and I would like to make argument at the bench, if I might, in connection with it.

THE COURT: No, your objection is overruled.

Q BY THE COURT: Would you fill in with any news article that you may have heard, seen or read?

A No, I would have to go strictly by the evidence presented by both sides. I wouldn't be able to say, well, they're missing this, I'll put it in myself and make up a decision myself. I couldn't do that, sir.

Q You understand that would be very unfair to Mr. Manson to do that, right?

A Correct. I wouldn't want to do that, sir.

And if you should find yourself thinking about what you heard, seen or read outside of this courtroom or talked about with your friends in connection with that other case or this case, would you immediately put that out of your mind for the purpose of making a decision --

A That's right.

2 . ( -- independent -- would you wait until I finish

the question? A Yes. Q -- put that out of your mind and wait -- strike that. Would you put that out of your mind and make a decision independently of such matters? б Yes, sir, I would. 3a fls. Ą 

Ė

		į,
3a-1	1	Q Do you think you are capable of doing that?
	2	A I am very capable. I'm I'm I've always
	3	been good at making decisions.
*	4	Q Are you capable of completely, for the minute,
d.	5	or for the period of time that's required to make a decision
	. 6	on any issue in this case, of forgetting anything that you
	7	may have heard, seen or read in the news media?
	8	A Well, it would have to be fair to Mr. Manson. I
	9	would have to.
·	10	Q The Court realizes that.
,	ıı	A Yes, I would be.
	12	Q But what I am asking and you will do that,
	13	is that correct?
į.	14	A Yes, I would.
	15	Q Can you be fair and impartial?
4	Ì6	A Very, and I could be very fair with any individual.
	17	Q In spite of the opinion you might have formed
	18	and in spite
	19	A Correct.
	20	Q of what you may have heard, seen or read, is
	21	that correct, sir?
	22	A Correct.
	23	THE COURT: Go shead.
	24	MR. KANAREK: I have no questions, your Honor.
ž.	25	MR. MANZELLA: No questions.
	26	MR. KANAREK: 1073, Subsection 2.
ع <sub>د</sub> د	27	THE COURT: The Court denies the challenge. The Court
)	28	believes that this gentleman can be fair and impartial in spit

•

4

3

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

5

26 27

28

of what he has heard, seen or read. The Court finds that he will set aside any opinions that he might have formed, any information that he may have received from the news media or from conversations previously about Mr. Manson, this case or any other case, that he will set it aside and be fair and impartial.

All right, bring the panel back. I think we have a full jury box now and are ready for a general voir dire.

THE BAILIFF: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mrs. McKissack.

THE BAILIFF: She stepped outside.

THE COURT: See if you can find her, will you?

(Whereupon, an unrelated matter was called before the Court.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen --

The record should show the prospective jurors are in the box.

There are only three left beyond the rail?

THE CLERK: There should be four. Should be four.

THE COURT: We are missing one.

Do you want to call roll?

THE CLERK: Mrs. Evelyn Saks?

MRS. SAKS: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mrs. Corrine Roat?

(No response.)

THE CLERK: Franklin Tilley?

MR. TILLEY: Here.

THE CLERK: Glenn Marker?

THE COURT: Anyone know anything about Mrs. Roat? THE CLERK: R-o-a-t, your Honor, 3 THE COURT: R-o-a-t. Would counsel approach the bench? 5 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 6 (Whereupon, the following proceedings were had 7 at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the 8 hearing of the prospective jurors:) THE COURT: Let's see, it is your paremptory now? 10 MR. MANZELLA: Right. We have to do the general 11 voir dire of Mr. Pineda. 12 13 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor THE COURT: How about this missing juror? I don't 14 know anything about her. Shall we just proceed without her? 15 MR. KANAREK: Not with only four left. 16 17 MR. MANZELLA: We'd have to stipulate she could be 18 excused. 19 MR. KANAREK: I can't do that with only four left. 20 THE COURT: We'd have to delay the proceedings. 21 MR. KANAREK: I know. 22 Your Honor, if I may say this. I previously have 23 stipulated, but there is only four people there, and one of 24 them will not be called. I have -- it is not a course, your Honor, at all -- I have the same feeling as the Court, but 26 this is a person -- I don't know this -- I don't know what 27 the matter is. I just don't -- if there were 30 people --28 THE COURT: Of course you wouldn't stipulate any

'n,

1

MR. MARKER:

Here.

26

27

28

پ

juror or we -- not being able to do that, we'll either have to stipulate or determine should be done when we find out.

And it might delay the proceedings considerably.

MR. KANAREK: I don't see how. It is a quarter of 12:00. It could be determined over the lunch hour. It need not create any problem, whatsoever.

THE COURT: We'll find out where she is, if we can.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court within the presence and hearing of the prospective jurors:)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, you are excused now until 2:00 o'clock.

During the time that you are in recess, you are admonished that you are not to converse amongst yourselves or with anyone else, or permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with this matter, nor are you to form or express any opinion on the matter until it has finally been submitted to you, should you be chosen as jurors.

Have anyone of you seen Mrs. Roat this morning,

R-o-a-t?

What is her first name?

THE CLERK: Corrine, C-o-r-r-i-n-a.

THE COURT: Corrine Roat. She was here yesterday.

THE CLERK: Apparently she was here today.

According to count.

THE COURT: And she was here yesterday, according to what we know, but it is Mrs. Corrine Roat.

Does anyone of you know her? Anyone of you behind the rail know her? All right, I'll see you at 2:00 o'clock. In the meantime, we'll try to find her. (Whereupon at 11:50 o'clock a.m. the noon recess was taken, the proceedings to be resumed at 2:00 o'clock pim, of the same day.) 

ì

3

5 6

7

8 9

10

12

11

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, JULY 16, 1971, 2:08 P. M.

One of the jurors is absent from beyond the THE COURT: rail. Her name is Mrs. Corrine Roat. Her absence appears to be without excuse and without permission of the Court. information the Court has is that she has left for Mexico on a short trip, or on vacation.

The Court finds that she is in contempt. The Court issues a bench warrant for her, no bail on the bench warrant, but will order that it be held until Monday morning.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, there was a colloguy between -- this is directed to those of you who are in the jury box. The record should show that Mr. Kanarek is present with Mr. Manson, and there are three jurors behind the rail. and everyone's in the jury box; all the prospective jurors are in the jury box.

There was a colloguy between Mr. Kanarek and one of the prospective jurors and the Court, regarding the prospective juror's hardship in not having a day care for her children.

In that colloquy, thinking over what I had said, I believe that my remarks and questions may have been overly sharp and critical of Mr. Kanarek and his motions and his And really, that type of sharpness has no place in comments. That type of remark does not add to the lawsuit at a lawsuit. all, but rather it detracts from it.

The Court does wish to apologize to you and to Mr. Kanarek, and the Court's remarks are stricken, ladies and gentlemen. You'll remember that I told you that anything that ĵ.

5

 I strike from the record is to be treated as though you had never heard it.

All right. Well, I will strike the remarks that I made this morning in your presence in connection with Mr. Kanarek's motions and his comments -- and except the remarks that I made denying the motion to have the County pay for the lady's child care, or to have the County to provide someone to care for her children during the time that she's at work, or to provide transportation for her children.

All right. I will have the prospective jurors come in now, and we'll proceed as we had this morning.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, we have general questioning of Mr. Pineda yet to do.

THE COURT: Oh, that s true. Thank you for reminding me.

You may question Mr. Pineda generally, if you wish.

Mr. Kanarek, you may begin.

Hold the panel -- well, no; they may come in.

Yes, they may come in.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: So send the panel in.

And, Mr. Kanarek, you may proceed with your questioning of Mr. Pineda.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, as to this particular juror,

I have no questions. But does your Honor think it would be

fruitful to -- since it's general, and all of the jurors are

going to be present, it might be productive to have the entire

1	new paner nere, for whatever that may be worth.
2	THE COURT: They're on their way now from 107.
3	Go ahead.
4	MR. MANZELLA: Thank you.
5	MR. KANAREK: Well, I have thank you, your Honor,
6	
7	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF
8	CHARLES PINEDA
9	BY MR. MANZELLA:
10	Q Mr. Pineda, I have a few questions that I would
11	like to ask you.
12	Do you know anyone involved in the defense of
13	criminal cases, as a defense attorney, investigator, or any-
14	thing of that kind?
1Š	A No, sir, I don't.
16	Q All right. Do you know anyone who has ever been
17	accused of any crime?
18	A No, sir, not that I can remember.
19	Q Have you heard the questions that I've asked the
20	other jurors?
21	A Yes, sir, I have.
22	Q All right. Did you hear the answers given by the
23	other jurors to my questions?
24	A Yes, I have.
25	Q Did any of the questions I asked or any answers
26	given by any of the jurors bring to your mind anything that
27	that you feel would bear upon your ability to be fair and
28	impartial to the People in this case?

No, I don't think so. A All right. Would you have answered the questions Q substantially the same as the majority of the other jurors answered my questions? Yes, I think I would. MR. MANZELLA: All right. Thank you. The People have no further questions, and pass for cause, your Honor. 5 fls. 

THE COURT: Both sides pass for cause? 1 MR. MANZELLA: People pass for cause, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Pass for cause? 3 MR, KANAREK: Pass for cause, yes, your Honor. THE COURT: It is the People's peremptory challenge, 5 both sides having passed for cause. ۰6 7 MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor, the People accept the jury as presently constituted. 8 Ò THE COURT: The Defendant's peremptory challenge. They can excuse Mr. Eidelman. Thank you, 10 MR. KANAREK: 11 Mr. Eidelman. 12 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Eidelman. The Court thanks 13 you for your jury service, and has your jury time terminated 14 now? 15 JUROR NO. 2: No. sir. 16 All right, report to Room 253, please. THE COURT: 17 THE CLERK: Mrs. Evelyn D. Saks, S-a-k-s. 18 THE COURT: Excuse me, would counsel approach the 19 bench? 20 (Whereupon, proceedings were had at the bench 21 among Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the jury, 22 which was not reported:) 23 (Whereupon, the following proceedings were had at 24 the bench among Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the 25 jury:) 26 THE COURT: Before Mrs. Saks' name was called, 27 Mr. Kanarek had requested, in view of the fact that one of 28 the jurors was missing, that the Court put the three

′

10.

22.

 prospective jurors' names -- that is, the three who remained on the rail in a -- in with the panel of newly arrived prospective jurors and selected -- then select prospective jurors for the box from that combined group. And the Court indicated that it would do that.

And is that still your request?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You wish to leave her on?

MR. KANAREK: Well, I --

THE COURT: There are only two left. There were three before her name was selected. There are two left now beyond the rail.

The juror who failed to appear this morning, the Court has issued a bench warrant for her, and we'll hold the bench warrant until Monday. I'm informed by the clerk that he has found that this lady, Mrs. Roat, I believe her name is, simply left for Mexico or some place on a vacation without asking the Court or anyone for permission to be absent from jury duty.

MR. KANAREK: That certainly is agreeable. I would welcome the Court indicating that the Court -- was just sort of a clerical mistake and that everybody that was left over was intended to be mixed up, just so she doesn't feel she's singled out. I think it makes sense to everyone in the room, and that this would also save the time of informing the jurors as to the general questions.

THE COURT: The Court will follow your suggestion.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

\*

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

THE COURT: Mrs. Saks, we were in error in calling your name now and having it separate and apart from the other group that's come in. It must be, by our agreement, mixed with the other names. So we'll put your name back in the box and ask you to go back beyond the rail. And then, we'll draw at random from amongst all of the prospective jurors.

Will all of you who have just come into the jury -- come into the courtroom, who are prospective jurors, please rise and raise your right hands.

Just those of you who had not been previously sworn.

THE CLERK: You and each of you do solemnly swear that you will well and truly answer such questions as may be asked of you, touching upon your qualifications to act as trial jurors in the cause now pending before this Court, so help you God?

(Whereupon, the prospective jurors answered in the affirmative.)

THE CLERK: Thank you, be seated.

THE COURT: Is there any one amongst you who did not take that oath and who would prefer to affirm?

I see none.

There are three names -- wait just a moment.

There are three names I have here of persons who had previously been called in this case as prospective jurors and who have been excused: Mr. Hopper, Melvin Hopper.

Would you stand, Mr. Hopper? ľ I don't see him here. 2 Nathan Johnson, Mr. Johnson. 3 And Earnest James. 4 The Court does remember that Mr. Hopper, Mr. 5 Johnson and Mr. James had been previously called. 6 May it be stipulated that they may be excused, 7 gentlemen? 8 MR. MANZELLA: So stipulated. 9 MR. KANAREK: So stipulated. 10 THE COURT: That their names need not be --11 12 MR. KANAREK: So stipulated, your Honor. THE COURT: Very well. :13 Mr. Hopper, you may not remain, then --14 THE CLERK: Would you take these back, please? 15 MR. KANAREK: Mr. Hopper isn't here, I gather. 16 There were one gentleman or two that weren't here. 17 18 I wonder if that means, perhaps, through some 19 oversight there may be other people that were sent here? 20 THE COURT: We'll inquire about that at this moment. 21 Is there any one of you who has previously been 22 called to this case and who has been excused? 23 Would you state your name? .24 MRS. SHERMAN: Mrs. Rachael L. Sherman. 25 THE COURT: May she be excused? 26 MR. KANAREK: Certainly, your Honor. 27 MR. MÁNZELLA: So stipulated, your Honor. 28 THE COURT: You may be excused. You need not wait.

Now, have we called roll and is everyone present 1 who should be? 2 THE CLERK: We haven't called the roll. 3 THE COURT: Do you have a list? Go ahead and call their names very quickly. 5 As I call the names of the jurors, please THE CLERK: 6 7 answer. MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, excuse me, the People 8 would be willing to stipulate that the court reporter would not 9 have to take down all the names as they are being read by the 10 clerk. 11 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 MR. KANAREK: That's agreeable, your Honor. It is 14 agreeable. 15 (Whereupon, a roll call of the prospective jurors 16 was had.) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 **25** 26 27 28

6 fls.

THE CLERK: I had a response to each name called, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, you are called here as prospective jurors in the case of People vs. -- the People of the State of California vs. Charles Manson.

Mr. Manson is seated there at counsel table, in a blue shirt. He is accused by this indictment — which the Court has before it — with the crime of murder, in violation of Section 187 of the Penal Code, a felony, in that on or about the 27th day of July, in the County of Los Angeles, he did willfully, unlawfully and feloniously and with malice aforethought murder Gary Alan Hinman, a human being.

Incidentally, if you can't hear me, let me know. Raise your right hands, in the back of the courtroom, if you can't hear me.

That's Count I. The accusation of Count I is a Count of violation of Section 187, murder.

Count II is a Count alleging conspiracy to commit murder and robbery, in violation of Section 182.1 of the Penal Code, a felony, in that it is alleged that on or about the 25th through the 28th day of July, 1969, at and in the County of Los Angeles, Mr. Manson, Susan Denise Atkins and Bruce McGregor Davis did willfully, unlawfully and feloniously and knowingly conspire, combine, confederate and agree together, with other persons whose true identity is unknown, to commit the crime of murder, in violation of Section 187 of the Penal Code, a felony, and of robbery,

10<sup>.</sup>

 a violation of Section 211 of the Penal Code, a felony;

That pursuant to and for the purpose of carrying out the objects and purposes of the aforesaid combination, agreement and conspiracy, the defendants committed the following overt acts at and in the County of Los Angeles:

Overt act No. 1 is alleged as being that on or about the 25th day of July, the said defendants Bruce McGregor Davis and Susan Denise Atkins and Robert Beausoleil did travel to the vicinity of 964 Old Topanga Canyon Road, Malibu, in the County of Los Angeles.

The second overt act, it is alleged, in Count II, the Count of conspiracy, is that on July 26th, Mr. Manson, Susan Denise Atkins and Bruce McGregor Davis did enter the residence at 964 Old Topanga Canyon Road, Malibu, in the County of Los Angeles.

Overt act No. 3 alleges that on July 26th, 1969, Mr. Manson and Bruce McGregor Davis did drive away from 964 Old Topanga Road in a Fiat automobile owned by Gary Hinman.

Count III of the indictment alleges a Count of murder, in violation of Section 187 of the Penal Code, in that it is alleged therein that between the 16th day of August 1969, and the first day of September, 1969, in the County of Los Angeles, the said defendants Charles Manson, Bruce McGregor Davis and Steven Grogan did willfully, unlawfully and feloniously and with malice aforethought murder Donald Jerome "Shorty" Shea, a human being.

Those are the Counts alleged in this indictment.

A Count of -- the first Count, of murder; the second Count

6-3

ļ

22,

alleges a crime of conspiracy to commit murder and robbery; and the third Count, as I've stated to you, a Count of murder.

To each of those Counts, Mr. Manson has entered a plea of not guilty, and this is the time set for trial.

Is there anyone -- strike that. I will state to all of you beyond the rail that this trial is -- it is anticipated that it will take four to five months to try.

The Court does not intend to sequester you; that is, to place you in a hotel room or to separate you from your families at night. You can return home each night — unless something unusual should happen, which should impel the Court, on its own motion, to sequester you; or, to grant a motion to sequester.

This indictment which I have read, ladies and gentlemen, is not evidence. It's not to be regarded as evidence by you.

It's simply a means of bringing this matter before this Court and this jury.

Would you call a name from the box now? Would you mixt them up and call one?

THE CLERK: Wallace R. Nethery; N-e-t-h-e-r-y.

## VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF WALLACE R. NETHERY

## BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Nethery, you'll take your place in seat No. 2.

I will direct questions to Mr. Nethery of a
general nature, and sometimes a specific nature. And up to

6-4

6a £1s.

the time when I ask him about the question of hardship, I should like to have you listen very carefully, because I will be asking you whether your answers would be the same as Mr. Nethery's to the questions I am about to put to him.

Ź

.3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

24

25

26

27

28

Mr. Nethery, you have heard the Court refer to Mr. Charles Manson, and the Court has identified him as the gentleman in the blue shirt, seated at the counsel table.

医乳球性 医动物性坏疽 医二烷酸

Do you know Mr, Manson or do you know anything whatever about the alleged incidents which the Court has spoken of in the indictment?

- A I -- I do not know Mr. Manson. I have --
- Q Just a minute. Would you do this? And would all of you present please observe this? The microphone will not work unless, first, the button is pushed; and secondly, unless it is directed toward your face and held about an inch from your face. You'll hear it pick up.

Go shead with your enswer.

- A I do not know Mr. Manson. I -- I have read, in the newspapers --
- Q You have read, heard or seen something in the news media --
  - A Yes.
  - Q -- concerning these allegations?
  - A Yes.
- Q All right. The Court will ask you about those -those matters that you've heard, seen or read out of the
  presence of the other jurors.

Each juror, each prospective juror is, by our processes and our methods here, is questioned outside of the presence of the other jurors, about what he may have heard, seen or read.

But do you have any personal knowledge of any

	1
1	
2	
3	
4	
·5	
6	
7	Ì
8	
9,	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
<b>2</b> 7	

of these alleged incidents?

A No, your Honor.

Q Mr. Manson is represented by Mr. Irving Kanarek, attorney, and -- thank you, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

Q BY THE COURT: And the People are represented by Deputy District Attorney Anthony Manzella.

Do you know either of these lawyers who have been presented to you?

A No. No, your Honor.

Q Have you ever been represented by either of the lawyers or by any firm that they have been partnered or associated with in any way?

A No.

Q Have you ever worked for law enforcement, or has anyone close to you ever worked for law enforcement?

A No.

Q Have you ever been the victim of a crime of violence, or has anyone close to you been the victim of a crime of violence?

A No.

Q Have you ever been a witness in a criminal case, either for the prosecution or for the defense?

A Yes.

Q All right. Would you state what that was?

A Uh -- it was a misdemeanor charge. I worked at a university, and it was a -- it had to do with at least a beginning -- an incipient attack in an office against a

secretary. 1 Of a violent attack --Q. Yes. A 3 -- against -- in other words, a physical attack? 4 A Yes. 5 And you were a witness in the case for the 6 prosecution or for the defense? 7 For the prosecution, your Honor, R Do you think that would arouse any bias or prejudice in your mind against a person who is accused of a ÍO. crime? I don't believe so. A 12 Well, are you certain? The way you say that, --0 13 Yes. A 14 -- it indicates that you may be hedging a bit. 15 You are not hedging by that answer? 16 No. 17 A All right. Have you yourself been charged with 18 a criminal offense, other than a minor traffic violation, or 19 had any of your close friends or relatives been accused of such a thing? 21 A No. Now, at the conclusion of this case -- strike that 23 Q. At the conclusion of the presentation of the 24 25 evidence and argument in this case, the Court will instruct you concerning the law in the case. 26 Now, regardless of what you believe the law should 27 be, or what you believe the law to be, you are to take the 28

*	1.	instructions concerning the law from the Court. Would you do
	2	that?
	3	A Yes.
*	4	Q Do you understand that the indictment that I have
*	5	read or paraphrased is not evidence? This paper that I
	6	A Yes.
	7	Q read to you is not evidence?
	8	A Yes, I do.
	9	Q It's simply the charge itself, to which Mr.
	10	Manson has entered a plea of not guilty.
	n	A Yes.
	.12	Q Have you had any legal experience? Have you been
	13	in any way connected with a law office of any type?
à	14	A No, I haven't, your Honor.
	15	Q Are you inclined to take the testimony of a
*	16	police officer, giving it more credence than some other
	17	persons, simply because the witness is a police officer?
	18	A (Pause.) I believe I'd tend to think of a
6b fls.	19	police officer as being trained, professional; so perhaps
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
•	25	
<u>ķ</u> .	26	
` 	27	
•	28	

2

3

5

24

25

26

27

28

Well, I am stating simply, because of his status, are you inclined to give him more credence than somebody else? MR. KANAREK: 1073, Sub section 2, your Honor. JUROR NO. 2: Yes. BY THE COURT:

If I were to instruct you that credibility is to be judged on certain standards, would you apply those standards equally to a police officer as well as to anyone else?

> Α Yes.

In following those standards, then, would you -would you apply them impartially to people who were nonpolice officers and police officers as well?

Yes, I would.

THE COURT: The Court believes that -- that the prospective jurgr will do that; and accordingly, will find that the challenge should be denied.

There's two District Attorneys here. DEFENDANT MANSON:

THE COURT: Mr. Manson, you are going to have to be quiet, or you'll have to leave the room.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Yes, sir.

(Whereupon, Defendant Manson arose and proceeded to walk toward the detention room.)

THE COURT: He needn't leave now.

THE BAILIFF: Apparently he wants to.

THE COURT: Pardon?

THE BAILIFF: Apparently he wants to.

THE COURT: Do you mean to say, Mr. Manson, that you are

2

3.

3

1

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18.

19

20°

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

leaving now?

DEFENDANT MANSON: You told me, if I couldn't keep quiet, to leave the room. And I am leaving the room.

THE COURT: You can't keep quiet?

DEFENDANT MANSON: Well, I --

THE COURT: Well, can you be quiet?

DEFENDANT MANSON: No.

THE COURT: You can't be?

DEFENDANT MANSON: No.

THE COURT: Very well. The Court will ask that he be removed, then.

(Whereupon, the Defendant Manson exited the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, even though there may be, during the course of this trial, remarks made by Mr. Manson, the Court instructs you that you are not in any way to allow his conduct in the courtroom, in making such remarks, to in any way enter into your judgment on any decision that you must make in this case.

- Q will you follow that instruction, Mr. Nethery?
- A Yeş.
- Now, the Court wishes to ask you at this time, now, having in mind the last few questions that we've talked about -- or, that we've -- having in mind the subject that we have discussed concerning police officer's testimony -- do you have any doubt about your ability to be fair and impartial, and to follow the Court's instructions in judging credibility, in respect to a police officer's testimony?

3 fls.

A No, I don't.

Q The Court will instruct you that a defendant in a criminal case is assumed to be innocent until the contrary is proved; and in case of a reasonable doubt whether his guilt is satisfactorily shown, he is entitled to an acquittal.

This burden -- this presumption places upon the State the burden of proving him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Reasonable doubt is defined follows:

It's not a mere possible doubt, because everything relating to human affairs and depending on moral
evidence is open to some possible or imaginary doubt. It is
that state of the case, which, after the entire comparison and
consideration of all of the evidence, leaves the minds of
the jurors in that condition that they cannot say that they
feel an abiding conviction, to a moral certainty, of the truth
of the charge.

7-1.

1 2

9.

\_\_\_

The testimony of a witness, a writing, a material object, or anything presented to the senses offered to prove the existence or non-existence of a fact is either direct or circumstantial evidence.

Direct evidence means evidence that directly proves a fact, without any inference, and which in itself, if true, conclusively establishes that fact.

Circumstantial evidence means evidence that proves a fact from which an inference of the existence of another fact may be drawn.

An inference is a deduction of fact that may logically and reasonably be drawn from another fact or group of facts established by the evidence.

It is not necessary that facts be proved by direct evidence. They may be proved also by circumstantial evidence or by a combination of direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Both direct evidence and circumstantial evidence are acceptable as a means of proof. Neither is entitled to any greater weight than the other.

You are not permitted to find a defendant guilty of any crime charged against him based on circumstantial evidence unless the proved circumstances are not only consistent with the theory that the defendant is guilty of the crime, but cannot be reconciled with any other rational conclusion and each fact which is essential to complete a set of circumstances necessary to establish the defendant's guilt has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

Also, if the evidence as to any particular Count

**#** .

10.

18.

is susceptible of two reasonable interpretations, one of which points to the defendant's guilt and the other to his innocence, it is your duty to adopt that interpretation which points to the defendant's innocence, and reject the other which points to his guilt.

A conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to commit a public offense and with the specific intent to commit such offense, followed by an overt act committed in this state by one or more of the parties for the purpose of accomplishing the object of the agreement. Conspiracy is a crime.

In order to find a defendant guilty of conspiracy, in addition to proof of the unlawful agreement, there must be proof of the commission of at least one of the overt acts alleged in the indictment.

Where a conspirator commits an act which is neither in furtherance of the object of the conspiracy nor the natural and probable consequence of an attempt to attain that object, he alone is responsible for and is bound by that act, and no responsibility therefor attaches to any of his confederates.

Each member of a conspiracy is liable for each act and bound by each declaration of every other member of the conspiracy if said act or said declaration is in furtherance of the object of the conspiracy.

Murder of the first degree, which we'll be talking about, is a murder perpetrated by a willful, deliberate and premeditated killing, with malice aforethought, or a murder

committed by torture, or in the course of a burglary or a robbery. That is murder of the first degree.

A person aids and abets the commission of a crime if he knowingly and with criminal intent aids, promotes, encourages or instigates by act or advice, or by act and advice, the commission of such crime.

All persons concerned in the commission of a crime who either directly and actively commit the act constituting the offense or who knowingly and with criminal intent aid and abet in its commission or, whether present or not, who advise and encourage its commission, are regarded by the law as principals in the crime thus committed and are equally guilty thereof.

The Court will read you, ladies and gentlemen, further instructions of law. These are not meant to be all encompassing. They are not all of the law that the Court will read you in connection with this case.

Q BY THE COURT: But I'll ask you, Mr. Methery, whether you have any quarrel with those principles of law that the Court has read?

A No, I do not,

Q And will you follow the law as I shall state it to you, regardless of whether you do have any question in your mind concerning it?

A Yes, your Honor,

THE COURT: In a case in which the offense charged is punishable by death, the Court is required to ascertain if any prospective juror entertains such conscientious opinions

1 2

as would preclude his finding the defendant guilty, if the evidence should justify such a finding, or if he would, under no circumstances, vote for the death penalty, or ifupon a conviction of murder of the first degree, the prospective juror would automatically, automatically vote for the death penalty without regard to the evidence.

Now, at the outset of this trial, the Court has no way of knowing whether or not you'll be called upon to determine the issue of penalty, and I don't mean to imply by talking about the death penalty that you will ever arrive at a stage where you will be considering it.

The defendant, as you have been previously informed, is charged with the crimes of murder. And in arriving at a verdict in this case, as to the guilt or the innocence of the defendant, the subject of penalty or punishment is not one that's to be discussed by you or considered by you in the course of your deliberations as jurors in the case, as penalty or punishment is a matter which, under our law, must be considered and determined in a separate proceeding, if your findings are, in the first phase of the trial, that the defendant is guilty of murder of the first degree.

If the defendant is found guilty of something less than murder of the first degree, then, you never enter into the penalty phase. You never enter into the discussion as to whether life imprisonment or death should be imposed.

So when the defendant, if he is, found guilty of murder first in the State of California, when and if a

11, 

 defendant is found guilty of murder of the first degree, an offense punishable by life imprisonment or death, then the jury shall fix the penalty as either death or life imprisonment. And the law imposes neither death or life imprisonment, but presumes the two alternatives to the jurors, and it is left to the absolute discretion of the jury as to

The Legislature has formulated no rules. The Court will give you no rules to guide your discretion.

Therefore, I'll be excusing you, ladies and gentlemen, who are beyond the rail. I'll be asking Mr. Nethery these questions:

which of these penalties should be imposed.

Are your opinions concerning the death penalty such that you would automatically refuse to impose it without regard to any evidence that might be developed?

Are your opinions concerning the death penalty such that if a defendant were convicted of murder of the first degree, you would vote to impose the death penalty without regard to any evidence that might be developed during the case?

Are your views of the death penalty such as would prevent you from being impartial in determining the issue of guilt or innocence?

Are your views such that you would never vote to impose the death penalty?

You may be thinking about the answers that you will give and searching your mind before the Court calls you to the box.

ļ

6.

8 fls.

O TTR

Now, I'm going to take a short recess. I'll take a recess for ten minutes.

During the recess you are obliged not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor either permit anyone to converse with you on any subject connected with this matter, nor are you to form or express any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you, should you be selected as jurors.

We're in recess now.

(Afternoon recess.)



KX XX

5

Я

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: The record will show Mr. Kanarek to be present, and the prospective jurors beyond the rail and in the box.

Q Mr. Nethery, the Court's going to ask you some questions of a more personal nature now, beginning with the question of hardship.

Would it be any hardship for you to serve as a juror in this case?

- A Yes, it would, your Honor,
- Q Tell me about that.

A I am a librarian in a departmental library at a university. I am the only full time employee -- the only employee in that library, aside from student assistants.

And it was difficult to be replaced for roughly a month, and it would be terribly difficult to be away for several months.

- Q There's nobody who could fill in for you?
- A I would say that T m not indispensable, but if I -- under the present situation, I am being replaced now by a student assistant.
  - Q What library is that?
- A It's the University of Southern California, the philosophy library.
- Q What sort of hardship would that entail to you?

  It certainly would entail some hardship to the people of the school, who would have to find someone who could replace you during the time that you are gone.

But what is the hardship to you? Would you be

paid during this period of time that you are here?

And incidentally, ladies and gentlemen, the Court will ask all of you who may have this question in your minds to inquire of your employers as to whether or not, if you remain on jury duty, for a period of four or five months, you will be paid.

The Court has noted that, generally speaking, the County and City employees generally are paid during all of the period of time that they must remain on jury duty. But there are some circumstances wherein you may not be paid, and the Court would ask you to inquire of somebody in authority, who has some firm word on it as to whether or not you will be paid.

A I -- yes. I am being paid for this present tour of duty, but I --

Q If it should extend beyond 30 days, would you be paid?

A I'm not sure about that, other than -- other than if I weren't paid, it wouldn't be a personal hardship. It's a professional -- or, an institutional problem, really.

Q It's kind of a problem to the people who are left behind at the library.

A Yes.

THE COURT: Yes. Either of you gentlemen have any comment you wish to make?

(No response.)

Q BY THE COURT: Have you served as a juror before?

ž	1	A No, I haven't, Just this week.
	2,	MR. KANAREK: May I ask this, your Honor? Does Mr.
	3	Nethery have a preference?
•	4	Q BY THE COURT: Are you asking to be excused?
`	<b>5</b>	A Yes, I would like to be excused.
	6	Q You have never served as a juror before?
	7	A No, I haven't,
,	8	Q And you on a criminal case or a civil case?
	9	A No. Well, just this week.
	10	Q Oh. Have you served as a juror in a criminal
	11.	case before?
	12	A No.
	13	Q You have already told us about your job. How
•	14	long have you been with the University of Southern California?
) <sup>*</sup>	15	A 15 years.
·	16	Q And are you connected with the do you have
	17	friends or relatives who are law enforcement officers?
	18	A No, I haven't.
	19	Q And is there a Mrs. Nethery?
9 fls.	20	A No, I'm not married.
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24 .	
<b>;</b>	25	
•	26	
	27	
٤	28	
	•	

23<sup>.</sup>

THE COURT: Do either of you have any questions with respect to the question of hardship?

MR. MANZELLA: Well, your Honor, it sounds like Mr. Nethery said it is an institutional hardship more than a personal hardship, if he is going to be paid by the library for the time he's on jury duty.

Court would probably ask you to ask the university to try to find somebody. I do realize when you come back, you sometimes have to pick up the pieces, and that may be difficult from a personal standpoint, but the Court realizes that jury duty is one of the highest obligations that a citizen can undertake, and it is one that very frequently involves some personal sacrifices, and the Court would request that you make that sacrifice. And the Court realizes that it is a considerable one. However, if there is any financial hardship, the Court would ask you to let us know that, if you discover that that is the case.

## BY THE COURT:

Q Concerning the death penalty, now, about which I have told you, the law about which I've told you in the State of California, you understand that the Court is not in any way inferring that it will become necessary for you to enter into a penalty phase. I'm not inferring, by talking about the death penalty, that the defendant is guilty of any of the crimes charged against him; you understand that?

A Yes.

Q It is simply that the same jury which determines

"

14. 

the question of guilt or innocence, is also the jury which determines the penalty, life imprisonment or death.

And since we're in the process of selecting that jury now, we must inquire about your views concerning the death penalty.

Do you understand that?

A Yes, I do.

Now, are your views concerning the death penalty such that in the first phase of the case, the phase involving guilt or innocence, that you could not thereby be impartial, fair and impartial in deciding that issue of guilt or innocence?

A No.

Q Are your views concerning the death penalty such that you would automatically refuse to impose it regardless of the evidence in the case?

A May I impose a question of -- guilt or innocence or --

Would you, going beyond that first phase, now, and assuming that you are one of the jurors who are deliberating in the second phase, involving penalty, are your views concerning the death penalty such that you would automatically refuse to impose it?

A Yes, they are.

Q Are your views such concerning the death penalty that you would never impose it in any case regardless of the evidence?

A Yes.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	•
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
1ļ	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
95	

27

28

	Q	Wou1	d you	refus	e to	even	consid	ler	imposing	the
déath	penal	ty in	any	case?						
	A	I do	n't b	elieve	I w	ould	refuse	tó	consider	, bu

A I don't believe I would refuse to consider, but I -- But it would be just a matter of time, at the end of the consideration that I would say, no, I will not go for the death penalty.

Q In other words -- I'm not quite sure what you mean by that.

If -- can you conceive of yourself at any time, under any set of circumstances, ever voting for the death penalty?

A No, no, I'm sorry, I misunderstood. No, I can't.

Q If you would give consideration to the evidence in the case, do you think under any set of circumstances you would ever, after considering the evidence, impose the death penalty?

A No.

Q You would automatically vote against it, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Regardless of whatever evidence might be produced?

À Yes.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, the People would respectfully challenge Mr. Nethery for cause under Section 1973, Subdivision 2 of the Penal Code.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

## VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Mr. Nethery, you've stated that you would discuss these matters with the -- with your fellow jurors, right?

A Yes, that swhat I said. I was -- I was trying to say, I think, that I wouldn't vote immediately to cut off discussion, but I would know in my own mind at the end of the discussion, and under no circumstances, would I vote for the death penalty.

Now, as far as the guilt or innocence phase goes, there's no reason you couldn't sit in judgment as far as that aspect of it is concerned?

A No, I'm sure that there isn't.

Q Well, then, not having experienced it, not having gone through it, would you say that perhaps you would -- you might even convince your fellow jurors that there need not be any death penalty in any particular situation?

I'm not thinking of this particular case, because we're speaking in a vacuum, without any particular person or defendant in mind.

A Yes, I think that's a possibility. I might be able to convince them.

10 fls.

THE CLERK:

Yes.

Q And so therefore, you wouldn't have to vote
for the death penalty; right?
A Possibly, yes.
MR. KANAREK: Oppose the challenge, your Honor.
THE COURT: The People?
MR. MANZELLA: The People renew the challenge, your
Honor.
THE COURT: The Court finds that Mr. Nethery would
automatically vote against the death penalty, regardless of
the regardless of the evidence;
And therefore, the Court does grant the challenge
for cause.
Mr. Nethery, thank you is it Nethery?
JUROR NO. 2: It's Nethery.
THE COURT: I'm sorry. I have been mispronouncing
it
JUROR NO. 2: Nethery.
I'm used to having it mispronounced.
THE COURT: all the way through. I caught that as
an "m" and not an "n".
Mr. Nethery, the Court thanks you for serving
as a juror. You are excused, to report to Room 253
THE CLERK: Wednesday.
THE COURT: Wednesday?
THE CLERK: Yes.
THE COURT: You are going to give Mr. Nethery three
days off?

3

7

Я

21

25

THE COURT: It sounds rather lenient. But you don't have to report back until Wednesday, Mr. Nethery, at 9:00 o'clock.

THE CLERK: Edward J. Byrd; B-y-r-d.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mr. Nethery.

## VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF EDWARD J. BYRD

## BY THE COURT:

Mr. Byrd, were you present when the Court explained the nature of this case, instructed the jurors in regard to the law, and talked with Mr. Nethery?

> A Yes.

Would your answers be any different than his Q. to the questions of a general nature?

> In one instance, I believe. A

Q All right.

On the matter of police officers. A

Tell us about that. How would your answer be 0. any different?

I don't believe I would give them any more credence than any other --

Would you give them any less credence, because of their status?

> No. A

You would judge their credibility according to the standards that you would apply to each witness?

> Yes. A

2.

23.

Q Incidentally, while we are talking about the subject of credibility and the standards, the Court will tell you that every person who testifies under oath is a witness.

You are the sole and exclusive judges of the credibility of the witnesses who testified in this case -- who testify in this case. In determining the credibility of a witness, you may consider any matter that has a tendency and reason to prove or disprove the truthfulness of the testimony, including but not limited to the following:

His demeanor while testifying and the manner in which he testifies; the character of his testimony; the extent of his capacity to perceive, to recollect, or to communicate any matter about which he testifies; the extent of his opportunity to perceive any matter about which he testifies;

His character for honesty or veracity or their opposites; the existence or non-existence of bias, interest, or other motives; a statement previously made by him that is consistent with his testimony; a statement made by him that is inconsistent with any part of his testimony;

The existence or non-existence of any fact testified to by him; his attitude toward the action in which he testifies, or toward the giving of testimony; his admission of untruthfulness; his prior conviction of a felony.

Will you follow that instruction, as well as all the other instructions that the Court gives to you, Mr. Byrd?

_	1	<b>.</b>	Yes.
	2	Q	Would there be any hardship to you, Mr. Byrd,
<b>.</b>	3	if you were	to serve in this case?
ŕ	4	A	Uh not if I were paid.
ŧ	5	Q	For whom do you work?
	6	.A.	The County.
	7	Q.	County of Los Angeles.
	8	A	Yes.
	9	Q	What type of work do you do?
	10	A	Principal program.
	11	Q.	I'm sorry.
	12	A	Principal program.
	13	Q.	For what department?
	14	A	Data processing.
•	15	Q.	You work for the data processing in the Civil
	16	Center here	?
	17.	A.	No, County Hospital.
	18	<b>Q</b>	Have you been a juror before?
	19 20	A	No.
	20	Q.	How long have you been employed with the County?
	22	A	Ten years.
	23	Q	And is there a Mrs. Byrd?
10a fls.	24	A	No, I'm divorced.
,	25	,	
	26		
<b>*</b>	27		
	28		
ż			

10-a	
Pg	1

1	Q Are you related to or a friend of any law
2	enforcement officer of any type?
3	A No.
4.	Q Is there anything can you think of any reason
5	why you couldn't be impartial and fair in this case?
6	A I I'm not sure. I'm not sure.
7	Q The basis of that, we'll examine on that question
8	perhaps at a later time.
9	Are you referring to anything in particular that
10	makes you unsure?
11	A Un yes; previous comments and previous trials.
12	Q Something that you may have heard, seen or read in
13	the news media?
14	A Yeah.
15	Q Let me ask you about your attitude towards the
6	death penalty.
7	Is it such that you couldn't be fair and
.8	impartial in determining guilt or innocence?
9	A Yes. I think that it is, yes.
.0	Q In other words, knowing that you would be unable
1	to strike that.
3	Knowing that the penalty phase would follow, you
4	would be unable to be impartial in determining the first phase
5	of the trial?
6	A I think I would be governed by that, yes.
7	Q By what?
8	A By the first phase; my views would affect the
_	second phase.

10a-2 Well, I'm not sure I follow that. Q 1 Would you be unable to be fair and impartial in 2 determining guilt or innocence, because of your feelings 3 concerning the death penalty? A Yes. ٠5, Are your views such concerning the death penalty 6 that you would automatically refuse to impose it, regardless 7 of the evidence? 8 Α Yes. 9 Are your views concerning the death penalty such Q 10 that you would never in any case vote for the death penalty? 11 12 A Yes. Are your views such that you would refuse to even 13 Q 14 consider the death penalty, regardless of the evidence? 15 Uh -- I think -- yes. A Is there a -- any hesitancy or reservation on your 16 Q. 17 part? 18 I might discuss it. But I don't think that I A 19 could -- would change, you know. 20 In other words, you might discuss the evidence with 21fellow jurors, but you don't believe that you could ever vote 22 for the death penalty; is that what you are saying? 23 That's right. Ά 24 THE COURT: Any questions, gentlemen? 25 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 26 27

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. KANAREK:

28

1	A Yes.
2	Q Whatever it may be. In all phases of the case;
á.	right?
4	A I believe so.
, Ś	MR. KANAREK: Oppose the challenge, your Honor.
6	
7	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
. 8	BY MR. MANZELLA:
9 ,	Q Mr. Byrd, after discussing the evidence with
10	your fellow jurors, would you automatically refuse to vote
11	for the death penalty, regardless of what evidence may be
12	introduced at the trial, and regardless of those discussions?
13	A Yes.
14	MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, the People would respectfully
<b>1</b> 5	challenge Mr. Byrd under Section 1073, Subdivision 2 of the
16	Penal Code.
17	THE COURT: The challenge
Ì8	MR. KANAREK: Oppose the challenge, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: is granted.
20	The challenge is granted.
21	MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mr. Byrd.
22	THE COURT: Room 253 on Wednesday.
23	Do you have more time to serve?
24	JUROR NO. 2: Yes,
25	THE COURT: How much time do you have left?
26	JUROR NO. 2: About two weeks.
27	THE COURT: All right. Room 253, Wednesday.
28	THE CLERK: Leonard H. Burke, B-u-r-k-e.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF LEONARD H. BURKE BY THE COURT: Q Mr. Burke, you were present when the Court explained the nature of this case, and instructed on parts of the law, and talked to Mr. Nethery; is that correct? ll fls. That's correct. 

1	1
	2
	<b>3</b>
	4
	5
	·6
	Ź.
	8
	9
	10
	11.
	12
	13 ·
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
•	22
	23
	24
	95

27

28

Q	Wou!	ld yo	ur answer	s be	any	diff	erent t	han M	F .	
Nethery's	to	the	questions	of	ä ge	neral	nature	that	I	have
put to him	Ù.									

A Uh, yes, I am associated with officers.

I am a parking control checker for the City of
Los Angeles, and as such, have a policemen supervisor, a
sworn officer, I should say.

Q Would that raise any bias in your mind in favor of police officer testimony, do you think?

A I know it wouldn't.

Q Do you think that you can judge a police officer testimony on the same basis as any other person's?

A Yes, sir.

Q Are you an officer, yourself, I mean, are you a peace officer, yourself?

A No, sir. I am a parking control checker, which is a civilian capacity.

Q I see. You work with officers constantly in your work; is that it?

A Yes, I have an officer for a supervisor.

Q Is Mr. Nethery's response to the Court's question -- was, in the first instance, that he believed -- that he believed -- that he believed -that he would give greater credence to the testimony of an officer because of his relationship with police officers in the past.

And then, later, when the Court explained that he was to judge witnesses' testimony all on the same basis, that is judge credibility on the bases that are set forth by

the Court in his instructions, he changed that.

Now, you are stating right from the first that you are not in agreement with him. But in respect to that, that you would not give any greater credence to a police officer's testimony; am I correct?

That's correct, your Honor.

Would you give any lesser credence to a police officer's testimony simply because of his status?

Now, I'm assuming that you are talking about "status" as I have been, and as a reason for credibility or non-credibility.

No, I wouldn't give any more credence or less, either.

> Ø Very well.

> > Would it be a hardship to you to serve in the case?

Only if I wasn't paid. A

And you are paid by the City of Los Angeles, are Q you not?

> Yes. Yes, your Honor.

Well, you should inquire, but it has been the experience of the Court and the counsel that those who are employed by public agencies are paid throughout the jury service, no matter how long it might be.

Have you served as a juror in a criminal case before?

Yes, one.

What was the nature of that case, and state to us whether there was a verdict, without stating to us what

kind of -- what the verdict was? Just state what kind of a case it was and whether there was a verdict. 2 The case was -- the case of possession of 3 marijuana, and the verdict +-4 5 0 There was a verdict? No, there was no verdict rendered. A 6 0 A mistrial? 7 A mistrial, sir. R A Very well, sir. 9. Q Have you sat as a juror on any other criminal 10 case? 11 19 No. A 13 Will you set side whatever you may have learned 14 from that case and decide this case solely on its law and 15 its instructions? 16 I can. A 17 All right. Is there a Mrs. Burke? Q 18 A Yes, there is, 19 And is she employed outside the home? Q 20 Α No. a student. 21 Now, are you related to any law enforcement Q 22 officer? 23 No, I am not. A 24 Or are you a close friend of any of these law 25 enforcement officers that you have been talking to? 26 No. sir. I've just been in this area for two 27 years and I haven't had a chance to become acquainted. 28 By law enforcement officer, I mean any Highway Q

11-3

Patrolman, policeman, deputy sheriff, deputy prosecutor of 11-4 any type, Deputy District Attorney, City Attorney, a Deputy 2 Attorney General, anyone in that category? 3 No. sir. A Or any one of those categories? Q 5 Other than checkers that do the same job as I do, A that s all. 7 In connection with the death penalty, are your Q. views concerning it such that you would be unable to be impartial in determining the question of guilt or innocence? 10 A No, they're not. 11 Or are your views such concerning the death 12 penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it 13 regardless of the evidence? 14 No, they're not. A Or do you have such views concerning the death 16 penalty that you would never vote to impose it? 17 11H fls. 18 No. I don't, sir. A 19 20 21 22 23 25 27

28

11a-1

25.

8

Or are your views such that you would automatically impose it upon a conviction of murder in the first degree, regardless of the evidence that might be produced?

A Yes, I could.

Q Well, would you automatically impose upon a conviction of murder in the first degree, regardless of the evidence?

A No, not unless the evidence so stated, and that's what it called for.

Q In other words, you would look at the evidence to determine whether or not in your judgment, in your sole judgment and discretion, the death penalty should be imposed?

A That's true, your Honor.

Q Now, we're going to ask you about what you may have heard, seen or read in the press concerning this or any other case involving Mr. Manson.

And in doing that, we're going to question you separate and apart from the other jurors. That means that the other jurors, the prospective jurors are going to have to leave the room and go to Department 107. So, as you do that, do so quietly and quickly, and maybe the first one or two out of the door there — would you hold both of the doors open so it can be done very quickly.

Do not discuss this case amongst yourselves or anyone else during the time that you are out of this court-room.

All right, the record will show that the prospective jurors have left the room. Mr. Burke remains.

1	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
2	BY THE COURT:
3	Q Mr. Burke, have you heard, seen or read the name
4	Charles Manson before you came into this room?
5	A Yes, I have, on should I state?
6 .	Q Yes.
7	And was it in connection with the so-called Tate-
8	La Bianca homicides?
9	A I am quite sure it was, your Honor. The only
10	headlines I never perused it much, but the headlines and
11	the TV's, I have seen his name and associated it with a prior
12	trial.
13.	Q With a prior trial?
14	A Yes.
15	Q And do you remember the nature of that trial at
16	all?
17	A Only that it was a murder case. As I say, I
18	Q Do you know whether or not Mr. Manson was convicted
19	of anything in that trial?
20	A I'm not positive as to the verdict, no, sir.
21	Q Do you know whether he was a single defendant or
22	whether he was with other defendants in that trial?
23	A This I remember. There were other defendants, yes
25	sir.
26	O Do you know who they were?
27	A No, I don't.
28	Q You don't remember any names?
	A No.

•

1	Q	Do you remember the name Susan Atkins?
2		I've heard it.
	<b>A</b>	
3	Q	And in what connection? Do you know that name?
4 <sup>.</sup> 5	A the name.	No, sir, only I can say that I remember hearing
6	Q	Before you came into this courtroom had you heard
7	the name Gar	ry Hinman, heard, seen or read it?
.8	A	No, not Gary Hinman.
9	Q	Or had you heard, seen or read the name Shorty
10	Shea?	
11	A	No, sir.
12	Ω	Had you heard, seen or read the name Manson
13	Family?	
14 ,	A	Yes, I had.
15	Q	Tell me in what connection?
16	, A	Well, here, too, it was through headlines that I
17	read on	articles, and through the TV media.
18	Q	How about in this case, have you heard, seen or
19	read anythi	ng in connection with this case in either in
<b>20</b>	the press o	r in the over television or via radio; had you
21	heard, seen	or read anything?
22	A	Not prior to this morning. And I in the jury
23	room I hear	d it.
24	Q	Well, what did you hear in the jury room?
25	A	That some of the jurors had been selected to come
26	up here for	questioning and that they had been returned.
27	Q	Other than that, you hadn't heard anything, what-
28	ever?	
		<b>!</b>

illb fls.

£

A Details, none, your Honor.

Now, let me ask you, if I were to instruct you, Mr. Burke, that anything you may have heard, seen or read concerning this case, or any other case in which Mr. Manson was involved, or anything that you may have heard, seen or read about Mr. Manson, or that you may remember during the course of this trial, and/or your deliberations concerning Mr. Manson, that you were to set aside such matter, set aside such reports, and any discussions that you may have had—not erase them from your memory, not forget them, rather, but just wipe the slate clean temporarily for the purpose of making any judgment you might be called upon to make in this case; do you think you could do that?

A I'm fairly positive I could.

In other words, you re saying just use the evidence as presented in this trial relative to what shappening -- I know I could.

11b-1 Q You're certain you could? Yes. sir. A 3 And will you do that? Q I would. A And would you be fair and impartial in the case Q б in spite of what you may have heard, seen or read in the press 7 or discussed with anyone concerning Mr. Manson or this case or 8 any other case? Yes, sir, I can, and would do this. 10 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Kanarek. 11 12 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION . 13 BY MR. KANAREK: 14 Mr. Burke --15 That's correct, sir. A 16 Mr. Burke, you certainly would intend to follow Q the Court's order, wouldn't you? 17 18 That is correct. 19 As to publicity. Q. 20 But not having -- not having actually gone 21 through it, not having experienced it, do you think that you 22 don't know whether you could actually not consider matters that you heard by way of publicity concerning Mr. Manson? 24 I speak only from experience on the last trial 25 that I had, that I was able to show impartiality there and 26 I believe I could do it in any future jury I sit on. 27 Q But in the last trial there was no publicity 28 problem?

11b-2

Z fls.

A No, sir.

And I hope we are in agreement -- you understand this is no reflection upon you, the fact you read newspapers and watch TV, you understand. No one -- the point is, what we're discussing here, is a very unique and unusual situation, namely, the mass of publicity that you have spoken of here. And so the question is really not -- it is not directed towards your -- towards anything that happened in that other trial where, I presume, there was no publicity problem; is that correct?

A No, sir.

Q There was a publicity --

A No, no publicity.

Q I see.

So, therefore, not having lived through it, you really don't know whether you could do it? Any of us might be in the position that you are in right now.

You don't -- you would certainly intend not to remember these matters that you have heard, but is it a fair statement you don't know whether or not you would not consider those matters?

A I am almost positive I wouldn't. Knowing myself, I don't think I would.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you very much, Mr. Burke. Thank you.

MR. MANZELLA: No questions, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: 1073, Subsection 2, your Honor.

2

3

5

6

7

8.

10

11

19

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

**21** 

22

23

24

26

27

28

## BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Burke, do you understand that if you were to consider anything that you have heard, seen or read concerning Mr. Manson, which was of a detrimental nature, that it would be very unfair to him?

A I realize this, your Honor.

And you think that you are objective enough, so that you can segregate those things that you have heard, seen or read from -- from the evidence in this case, and decide the case independently of those things that you had heard, seen or read? And only on the evidence?

A I am almost positive I could.

Q When you may "almost positive," are you hedging at all?

A Not in the least, sir.

Q Is there any uncertainty in your mind?

A No, there isn't. I -- as I said, I have had experiences which put me to the test, to let me know that I can view things impartially and unemotionally, and make a good judgment on it.

Q Would you do that?

A I would.

THE COURT: The Court denies the challenge.

The Court finds that Mr. Burke can set aside any information, any opinion that he may have formed, and that he will be fair and impartial.

All right. Bring the other jurors back in.
(Pause in the proceedings.)

1	THE COURT: All right. The record will show that the
2	prospective jurors are in the jury box and beyond the rail.
3	I was looking at the second hand on the clock
4	up there, ladies and gentlemen. You moved off the record.
5	(Discussion had off the record.)
6	THE COURT: Gentlemen, you may question, if you will.
7	MR, KANAREK: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.
8	
9	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. KANAREK:
n	Q Mr. Burke, may I ask you, in connection with
12	you say that you work for a police officer?
13	A Yes. My immediate supervisor is a police
14	officer.
15	Q Is he a Los Angeles Police Department
16	A Yes.
17	Q police officer? LAPD?
18	A Right, sir.
19	Q And may I ask, where is that physically located,
20	with respect to this building?
21	A It's located in the Wilshire District, on Pico.
22	Q Oh. Is that at Wilshire Station?
23	A Yes, sir.
24	Q I see. And that's on Pico, near West Boule-
25	vard?
26	A That's right. 4426 West Pico.
27	Q I see. So that you work in that parking lot
28	immediately adjacent to the Police Building?

1	A No, that's not my responsibility, the parking
2	1ot. (1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1
3	My responsibility is do you want me to
4	explain?
5	Q Yes, please.
6	A We cite vehicles that are overparked. We are
7	meter maids, to an extent.
8	MR. KANAREK: Oh, I see. I see. Oh. Thank you very
9.	much. Pass for cause, your Honor.
ļ0	THE COURT: That's all?
11	MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Manzella?
13	- ▼
14	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. MANZELLA:
16	Q Mr. Burke, did I hear you correctly? In other
17	words, you cite vehicles for parking violations; is that
<b>18</b>	correct?
19	A That's true, sir.
20	Q All right. You work for L. A. City, then?
21	A That's right.
22	Q Mr. Burke, do you understand that the question
23	that was asked of you with regard to credibility has to do
24	with whether or not the status or occupation of a person
25	alone would cause you to give more or less credence to
26	their testimony, whether it be a police officer or a doctor,
27	or lawyer or or an Indian chief, anything? Do you under-
28	stand that question asked of you dealt with occupation, and

whether a person's occupation alone would cause you to give more or less credence to their testimony? Did you understand the question that way? Uh -- well, I am -- I would exempt a professional A witness, such as a -- a professional person, such as a 12 a f1s.6 chemist, a doctor, et cetera. 26. 

12a-1

1

·2 3

ř

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

.22

23

24

ŻŠ

26

27

28

Q Well, do you understand -- maybe I can make it clear. After you've heard a person testify, no matter who it is, whether it's a police officer, a chemist, no matter what occupation or status that person has, you have to make a judgment as to credibility.

In other words, whether you will or will not believe the person. You understand that, do you not?

A Yes.

Q All right. So the question is not whether you would give more or less credence to a police officer's testimony, because you may very well decide to do just that, after you've heard a particular police officer testify.

Do you understand that?

- A Yes, I understand what you are saying.
- Q Right. What we are concerned with is whether or not, beforehand and regardless of how the person testifies, and all of these other things the Court talked about, in giving you the standards by which you judge credibility whether or not the fact that the person is a police officer, alone, would cause you to give more credence to his testimony?

Do you understand that?

- A You are saying that -- would I give prior credence because of the occupation?
  - Q Right, exactly.
  - A I would not, no, sir.
- Q All right. Okay. But I want to make sure that you understand that, after a person testifies, no matter who he is -- a police officer or not -- then you may -- then you

)

1

Ś

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

have to make the judgment as to whether or not you are going to believe a particular witness; do you understand that?

- A Yes, sir.
- Q All right. Now, having in mind -- do you know anyone that's involved in the defense of criminal cases, or has been involved in the defense of criminal cases? A lawyer, investigator, anything of that nature?
  - A No. I don't.
- Q All right. Do you know anyone that's ever been accused of any crime?
  - A Not personally, no.
- Q All right. When you say "not personally," my question is designed to get at your feelings with regard to the prosecution of criminal cases.

In other words, if you have had any experience in that regard which would cause you to be biased or prejudiced against law enforcement or against the District Attorney's office or against prosecution in general.

- A No, there's nothing in that respect.
- Q All right. Have you ever taken a course in law?
- A No, I haven't.
- Q You say you served on a jury, which did not reach a verdict; is that correct?
  - A That's correct, sir.
- Q All right. Would your experience on that jury in any way hinder you from entering fully and completely into discussions with fellow jurors in this case?
  - A No, it wouldn't, sir. No

12a-3

· •

Q You've heard the Court's instructions with regard to the burden of proof on the prosecution, and there's a burden of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, that burden is the same in all criminal cases, whether it's a burglary, a theft, or a murder case.

Would you hold the People to a greater standard of proof, or a higher standard of proof, a higher burden of proof because this was a murder case?

A No, I understand that they -- the prosecution is -- it's necessary to have a preponderance of evidence, without a reasonable doubt; and this, I would abide by.

Q You would hold them to the standard of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

A Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You did mention one thing there, preponderance of the evidence, Mr. Burke, did you not? You understand that a preponderance of evidence is the standard in civil cases, for a plaintiff to — to prevail in a civil action. He must show a preponderance of the evidence, just simply show a greater weight of the evidence than the defendant in a civil action.

But in the criminal action, the burden of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt, in order to overcome the presumption of innocence, and the People must establish proof beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty.

Do you understand that?

JUROR NO. 2: Yes, your Honor. I guess I used the wrong terminology.

THE COURT: And you have sat on civil cases, too? JUROR NO. 2: No. THE COURT: You haven't? JUROR NO. 2: Just one case. THE COURT: You've heard the phrase "preponderance of the evidence," however? JUROR NO. 2; Yes, I have. 8. THE COURT: And you understand now that it is the burden of proof in a civil action, and not in a criminal action? 12b fls. JUROR NO. 2: Yes, your Honor. 

.

--

24.

## BY MR. MANZELLA:

Q Mr. Burke, do you have any quarrel with the law which permits a person to be convicted of first degree murder, even though there were no eyewitnesses to the killing?

A You'll-have to restate that. I don't think I understood it.

Q All right.

The law does not require a particular type of truth, to proof a murder of first degree. Some people may feel that it is unfair to convict a person of first degree murder, if there are no eyewitnesses who can testify to the killing.

What my question is designed to find out, if you feel that way, do you feel it is unfair or unjust, for the law to permit a person to be convicted of first degree murder, even though there were no eyewitnesses to that killing?

A May I ask, are you saying that circumstantial -if circumstances still point to it, would I be in agreement
with the law?

Q I'm not sure if that's what I am saying.

Let me ask it another way.

If you believed, based on all of the evidence presented here at the trial, that Mr. Manson was guilty of first degree murder, and that we had proven guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, would you be able to vote for a conviction of first degree murder, even though were no eyewitnesses to the killing?

12b-2

ġ

ļ9

12b end 13 fls.

MR. KANAREK: That's improper voir dire, your Honor.
THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Essentially, according to the Court's instructions, circumstantial evidence is evidence which is other than eyewitness testimony.

In the course of our daily lives, we often use circumstantial evidence to make judgments. The other jurors have already heard just a small example I gave with regard to a situation in which your wife tells you she's going out to buy groceries, and she's going to take the car, and you are sitting in the house.

Sometime later, you look out the end of the driveway, and you see your car parked there. You see your wife walking from the car, and she's carrying a bag full of groceries.

Now, you never saw her actually drive the vehicle, drive the car, or shop in the market. But you assume from that that she drove the car, without thinking about it. You assume that she drove the car to the store, bought some groceries, drove it back, and is now coming into the house with a bag full of groceries.

That's an example of circumstantial evidence.

There's no eyewitness to the fact that your wife is driving the car.

That's an example of the use of circumstantial evidence in our daily lives.

The law permits the use of circumstantial evidence as well as the use of direct evidence.

Now, my question to you is, do you have any quarrel with that law which permits a person to be convicted of first degree murder even though there were no eyewitnesses to the killing?

A No, I don't have a quarrel with that. I understand now.

Q All right. I thought you did, but I wasn't sure.

Now, do you have any quarrel with the law which permits a person to be convicted of first degree murder even though the body of the deceased has not been found, cannot be produced?

MR. KANAREK: Improper voir dire, your Honor.

THE COURT: Objection is sustained.

BY MR. MANZELLA:

Q Do you have any quarrel --

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, if I may, I would ask your Honor to please make a statement to the jury concerning it.

THE COURT: Yes, the Court wishes to tell prospective jurors that it is not the function of either counsel to instruct concerning the law. You take the instructions, ladies and gentlemen, from the Court as to the law, and counsel are not in the guise of questions to instruct you concerning the law in the case. And the Court does strike Mr. Manzella's last question. Anything stricken, of course, as I told you before, is to be treated as though you never heard it.

BY MR. MANZELLA:

Q All right, Mr. Burke, do you have any quarrel with the law which permits a person to be convicted of first degree murder where the death is proved by circumstantial evidence?

A No, I don't.

Q All right. You understand that all my questions are based on the assumption that other evidence convinces you, personally, beyond a reasonable doubt, the truth of the charge; you understand that, don't you?

A Yes, I do.

Q All right. I'm not asking you to vote now as to guilt or innocence.

All right, Mr. Burke, you've heard the Court's instructions with regard to aiding and abetting and conspiracy.

Do you have any quarrel with the law which permits a person to be convicted of first degree murder based upon either of those legal doctrines?

A No, I don't.

Q Now, Mr. Burke, if the defendant testifies in this case or if he calls witnesses on his behalf, would you judge the credibility by the same standards you would use to judge the credibility of any witness?

A Yes, I would.

And if, after judging their credibility by those standards, you decide in your own mind that those witnesses are not telling the truth, either in whole or in part of their testimony, would you reject that whole or that part of the

testimony, which you did not believe? 1 2 A. Yes. 3 All right, Mr. Burke, finally, I have a few 4 questions with regard to the death penalty. 5 Now, you understand by now that the decision as 6 to whether or not the death penalty will be imposed is a 7 personal and individual decision of each juror. Haying given the matter some thought, now, do you 9 feel that if you, after listening to all of the evidence in 10 this case, do you feel that you could, if you felt that this 11 case warranted the imposition of the death penalty, do you 12 feel that you personally and individually could vote for the 13 death penalty? 14 Α Yes, I could, sir. 15 MR. MANZELLA: All right, thank you. The People pass 16 for cause, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: It is the peremptory challenge of the 18 People. 19 MR. MANZELLA: The People accept the jury, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: The peremptory challenge of Defendant. 21 MR. KANAREK: Thank and excuse Mr. Chastain. Thank 22 you, Mr. Chastain. 23 THE COURT: I don't see any Mr. Chastain. 24 MR. KANAREK: The gentleman --25 THE COURT: There is a Mr. Pineda who is seated --26 MR. KANAREK: I'm sorry, Mr. Pineda. 27 THE COURT: Juror No. 4 -- or 5, rather. 28 MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 5? 1 2 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. Thank you, Mr. Pineda. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Pineda, thank you very much. Room 4 253 on Wednesday, if you would, at 9:00 o'clock. Thank you 5 for being here. 6 7 Call another name. 8 THE CLERK: Mrs. Celia Brent, B-r-e-n-t, first name C-e-1-i-a. 9 10 11 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 12 CELIA BRENT 13 BY THE COURT: 14 Q Mrs. Brent, were you present when the Court 15 explained the nature of this case? 16 A Yes, yes. 17 When the Court conversed with Mr. Nethery and 18 questioned him? 19 À Yes. 20 Would your answers be any different than his Q 21 were to the questions of a general nature? 22 A No. 23 24 25 26 27 28

13 a fls.

Į,

13a-1	1	Q	Would you turn that microphone on and get it
)	2	closer to y	our face?
	3	A	I don't know, have I got it on?
<b>-∰</b> ₩	4	· `	Oh, it is on, okay.
•	5	Q	Would your enswers be any different, Mrs. Brent,
	-6	than the an	swers he gave to the questions of a general
	7	nature?	
	8	A	No, they wouldn't be any different.
	9	Q	Now, concerning the judgment of credibility of
	10	witnesses,	would you follow the instructions that I give you
	n	and have gi	ven in connection with judging the credibility of
	12	witnesses?	
	13	Ą	Yes.
<b>′</b> •	14	Q	Would it be a hardship to you to serve in this
)	15	case?	
<b>3</b>	<b>1</b> 6	A	No.
	17	Q	Have you served as a juror before in any criminal
	18	case?	
	19	A	No.
	20	Q	Are you employed outside the home?
	21	· A	Just part time.
	22	Q	And doing what?
	23	. <b>A</b> .	Sales lady.
	24	Q	What area?
ŗ	25	A	May Company, Wilshire.
•	26	Q.	Are you related to or a friend of any law
>	27	officer?	
•	28	A	No.
•			

	<u>-</u>	
13a-2	1	Q Law enforcement officer?
	2	A No, no, sir.
	3	Q Is there a Mr. Brent?
**	4	A No, I am a widow.
<b>.</b>	5	Q Well, what was Mr. Brent's occupation?
	6.	A He was a civil service employee, Post Office.
	7	Q Do you have such views concerning the death
	8 .	penalty that you could not, because of those views, be
	9	fair and impartial in determining guilt or innocence?
	10	A No.
	11	Q or do you have such views concerning the death
	.12	penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it?
	13	A No.
ł	14	Q And would you, upon a conviction of murder of
	15	the first degree, automatically impose the death penalty
•	16	regardless of the evidence?
	17	A Yeah.
	18	Q In other words, if a person is convicted of murder
	19	of the first degree, as far as you are concerned, that's it,
	20	regardless of whatever evidence may have been produced,
	21	you're going to vote for the death penalty?
	22	A Yeah.
Ť	23	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, any questions?
	24	MR. KANAREK: 1073, Subsection 2, your Honor.
*	25	THE COURT: All right, the Court will excuse you,
ŧ	26	Mrs. Brent. Would you report to Room 253 on Wednesday, please
<u> </u>	27	MRS. BRENT: All right.
<b>.</b>	28	MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mrs. Brent.
1		ı

13a-3	1	THE CLERK: Arthur D. Thompson, T-h-o-m-p-s-o-n.
)	<b>2</b> .	•
·§	3	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF
•	4	ARTHUR D. THOMPSON
*	5	BY THE COURT:
	6	Q Mr. Thompson, you have been present during the
	7	proceedings since I've spoken to your group of prospective
	8	jurors and to Mr. Nethery?
	9	A Yes, I have.
	10	Q Would your answers be any different than his
	11	were to the questions of a general nature?
	<b>12</b> ·	A Uh, no, they would not.
	13	Q All right. Would it be a hardship to you to
•	14	serve in this case?
)	15	A Yes, it would.
	16	Q Tell us about it.
	17	A I get paid for 20 working days.
	18	Q And then, it stops, is that correct?
	19	A Right.
	20	Q By whom are you employed?
	21	A Systems Development Corporation, Santa Monica.
	22	MR. MANZELLA: People would stipulate it would constitute
	23	a hardship, your Honor.
	24	MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor, I would make a motion that
ż	25	this gentleman may I ask a question or two?
	26	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
. <del></del>	27	
	28	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
<b>€</b>		- The state of the

.13a-4 BY MR. KANAREK: What type of work do you do? Q. 2 I am a systems analyst. A MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor --THE COURT: Pardon? 5 JUROR NO. 5: I am a systems analyst. THE COURT: A what, systems analyst? 7 JUROR NO. 5: 8 Yes. MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor, I would refer your Honor-Q THE COURT: Use the microphone, Mr. Kanarek. 10 11 MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. 12 I make the motion the County pay this gentleman 13 the same wage they would have paid the gentleman who worked 14 for the General Hospital who was in data computing, and it 15 is my motion whatever his salary is he not be excused because 16 of hardship, because it matters not what pocket it comes out 17 of, the County still has to pay it. And that is my motion. 18 THE COURT: In other words, you're asking me to order 19 the County of Los Angeles to make payments to him during the 20 course of the time that he is a juror in this case? 21 MR. KANAREK: Yes, fundamental due process. 22 THE COURT: That is your motion? 23 MR. KANAREK: Due process and equal protection under 24 the 14th Amendment and --25 THE COURT: Excuse me. 26 MR. KANAREK: And if your Honor wishes, I could approach 27 the bench and make further argument. 28 THE COURT: Well, if you wish to, you may.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, if I may, thank you.

13b fls.

13b-1

1 2

3

**4** 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

\_.26

27

28

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the jury:)

MR. KANAREK: I think the issue is in clear focus.

The previous gentleman --

THE COURT: State it very quickly.

MR. KANAREK: The issue is in clear focus, your Honor. The previous gentleman worked in data processing for the County of Los Angeles. And he clearly was not excused because of hardship. As a matter of fact, it was because of the death penalty. And so I make the point that it is arbitrary, it is discriminatory, it is a violation of equal protection and due process for someone who works for the County to be allowed to get their full salary and for someone who does not work for the County not to. That is a strikingly -- for systems development corporation not to -so what difference does it make where the money -- out of which pocket it comes. It is obviously -- the Court has the power to, if necessary, to issue an order to show cause and serve it upon the board of supervisors, because they are entitled to the constitutional protection of equal protection and due process.

THE COURT: The motion for such an order is denied.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court within the presence and hearing of the prospective jury:)

THE COURT: The Court does thank you, Mr. Thompson, and

1 does excuse you, Mr. Thompson. Room 253. 2 MR. KANAREK: That may be shown over opposition, your 3 Honor? 4 THE COURT: Yes, it may so show. I think the record is 5 clear in respect to that, the Court denies the motion to 6 cause the County to respond to an order to show cause as to 7 why they shouldn't pay Mr. Thompson's wages during the time 8 that he serves as a juror in this case. 9 You may call another name. 10 THE CLERK: Carroll C. Smith, C-a-r-r-o-1-1, last name 11 spelled S-m-i-t-h. 12 13 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF 14 CARROLL C. SMITH 15 BY THE COURT: 16 Q. Mr. Smith, were you present when the Court 17 explained the nature of this case and conversed with 18 Mr. Nethery? 19 A Yes, I was. 20 Q Would your answers be any different than his 21 answers were to the questions of a general nature? 22 A No. 23 Would you follow the Court's instructions 24 in deciding the credibility of witnesses? 25 Yes, I would. Α 26 Q Would it be a hardship to you to serve in this 27 case, Mr. Smith, in any way? 28 A If I got paid.

1	Q	Well, by whom are you employed?
2	A	Uniroyal, Incorporated.
3	Q	Have you checked with them yet?
4	A	No, I haven't.
5	Q	Would you do that in the course of the next
6	recess over	the weekend?
7	A	Yes, sir.
8	Q	Fine.
9		Have you served as a juror before in a criminal
10	çase?	· · ·
11	A	No. sir.
12	9	What do you do for Uniroyal? What is the
13	nature of ŷ	our work?
14	A	I am a quality control supervisor.
15	Q	And are you related to or a friend of any law
16	enforcement	officer?
17	A	Retired.
18 19	Q	Tell me about that.
20	A	I have an uncle that was on the L.A.P.D.
20 21	Q	How close are you to your uncle? Do you see
22	him all the	time, talk to him?
23	A	No, he lives in Texas now.
24	Ω	I see. During the time that he was an active
<b>25</b> .	police offic	cer, did you see him from time to time?
26	A	From time to time.
27	Q	Do you think that that relationship would
28	_ affect your	judgment in this case in any way?
	A	No, sir.

·	1	Q Or in your judgment of credibility?
	2	A Not at all.
1	3	Q Is there a Mrs. Smith?
•	4.	A Yes.
<b>3</b> .	5	Q And is she employed outside the home?
	6.	A Yes.
	7	Q What does she do?
14 fls.	8	A Market research analysis.
	ð	
	10	
	n	•
	12	
	13 14	•
•	15	. •
•	16	
	17	
	18.	
H	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
Ł	25	
	<b>26</b>	
•	27	
	28	
*		

Q In connection with the death penalty, do you have such views concerning it that you would automatically refuse to impose it in any case?

A No.

Q Or do you have such views concerning the death penalty that you would automatically refuse to impose it, regardless of the evidence that might be produced in any case?

A No.

Q Do you have such views concerning it that you could not be impartial in determining guilt or innocence?

A No.

Q Or upon a conviction of murder of the first degree, would you automatically impose it, without regard to the evidence?

A No.

We'll leave it until then -- about whether or not you will be paid, if you were to serve for a period of four or five months.

And the Court will inquire also of you, should you answer in the affirmative to that, about your previous knowledge or your knowledge of previous publicity concerning this or any other trial in which Mr. Manson may have been involved.

The Court wants to know whether or not you can set aside anything that you may have heard, seen or read, and are firmly convinced that you can set it aside; and

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

25

26

whether you will set aside anything that you may have heard, seen or read and be impartial in determining any issue that you are called upon to decide in the course of service on this jury.

Do you understand?

- A Can I answer that now?
- Q Well, yes, you can answer that.
- A Well, yes.
- Q You think that you can?
- A I could be impartial, yes.

THE COURT: All right, We'll examine you.

You believe that you can set aside that which you may have heard --

· 1. 19 · 1. 11 · 2. 20 · 2.

JUROR NO. 5: Yes, I can.

THE COURT: -- heard, seen or read?

JUROR NO. 5: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, we wish to examine you in more detail, out of the presence of the other jurors, about any publicity that you may have read in the newspapers, magazines, seen on television or heard via the radio. And we'll inquire on Monday morning.

Would you all --

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes?

Yes, Mr. Kanarek? Did you wish to approach the bench, or did you have something --

MR. KANAREK: Yes. Well, may I approach the bench, then? THE COURT: Yes, you may. Do you want the reporter?

28,

2

3

5

ô 7

R

Department 107.

10

'n

19 13

14

15 16

17

18.

19

24

27

28

MR. KANAREK: Oh, it's not necessary.

among Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the prospective jury panel, which was not reported.) THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the Court will excuse you until 10:00 o'clock on Monday morning, -- excuse me just a moment. 9:45 on Monday morning. You may report to

(Whereupon, proceedings were had at the bench

I want you to observe this admonition during the time that you are on this recess, or any subsequent recess, should you be chosen as a juror, or while you are a prospective juror.

You are not to converse amongst yourselves nor with anyone else on any subject connected with this matter, nor are you to form or express any opinion on the matter until it is finally submitted to you.

You are not to see, hear or read anything that -you are not to see anything over television, or in any of the news media; you are not to listen to anything; you are not to read anything whatever; you are to ignore any news article or news item in connection with this case, or in connection with Mr. Manson.

If by -- just by happenstance, you should turn the radio on and hear the case being talked about, the Court would order you that you turn it off, or not listen; and the same is true of a headline. If you pick up a paper and see a headline, you perhaps could not help doing that, but you are not to go any further with it.

.28

And I expect that, during the course of this trial, that you will all obey that rule; that you will avoid reading any news release concerning this trial or my other matter in which Mr. Manson may be involved.

Have a pleasant weekend. I'll see you all on Monday. Good night.

Now, there is one juror whose last day it is. What is your name, sir?

JUROR LAUDERDALE: Lauderdale, sir.

MR. MANZELLA: The People would stipulate he may be excused.

MR. KANAREK: So stipulated.

THE COURT: Since this is your last day, we will excuse you, Mr. Lauderdale. You need not come back on Monday.

\_

3

1

2

<del>7</del> 5

6

7

9

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

**ļ9** 

20· 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

Now, may we have Mr. Manson out here, just briefly, --

THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- when the jurors are all gone?

(Whereupon, all the members of the prospective jury panel exited the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: The Court has, because of what Mr. Manson had indicated to you yesterday, about somebody possibly opening his cell, and someone harming him, has gone through the jail and has looked at the measures that have been established for security in the cell block where Mr. Manson is.

I am no expert, whatever, but I was curious as to what had happened, what steps had been taken --

DEFENDANT MANSON: Worry about someone else being harmed.

THE COURT: -- to safeguard Mr. Manson.

DEFENDANT MANSON: No, safeguard the other fellow.

THE COURT: And the Court does not find anything that would be dangerous to Mr. Manson. The circumstances seem to be such that the security there is well taken care of.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I would like to ask your Honor to --

THE COURT: Do you have any further information?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: In connection with that matter?

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

DEFENDANT MANSON: Don't mention the names. Just keep the name in your pocket. Just tell him that you — that it's documentary; it's not hearsay. You know, like we are not making any accusations we can't prove. You know, it's that simple.

You know, the only thing I am concerned is, someone else is going to get hurt, if the people keep pushing me in the wrong direction. That's what I'm scared of.

I'm not afraid of me being hurt.

THE COURT: Ask the jail whether or not they can get Mr. Manson some decent clothes.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Well, they're decent clothes.

They're clean clothes, and they're good clothes. But they have large clothes. That's the only difference.

THE COURT: Well, you wear about a size 36, and they gave you apparently a size 44.

THE BAILIFF: They draw their own size.

THE COURT: Oh, I see.

DEFENDANT MANSON: They can't do that with anybody.

They have a high enough time the way it is. I am in sympathy with --

THE COURT: Is there anything else you wish to say to the Court in respect to this point that was raised yesterday, concerning --

DEFENDANT MANSON: Tell him what I told you.

THE COURT: -- concerning jail security, and the threat to Mr. Manson?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. We have certain

**4**b

×

information, documentation. It is documented, in connection with a -- people who, I believe would be percipient witnesses.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Tell him whoever's setting on that file up there with the key -- that's what you tell him. Tell him they're paranoid, setting on me, and I don't like -- appreciate setting them in fear.

They're the ones that are afraid, and they're projecting their fear at me.

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, I didn't hear what the defendant said. But do you have anything further to say?

MR. KANAREK: Well, I just -- your Honor --

THE COURT: Have you revealed this to Captain Kennedy, who is in charge of security up there, in charge of the jail?

MR. KANAREK: I'm going to take this up personally. I have the names, and I'm going to take it up personally with the jail people tonight, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The Court would ask you to do that. Now, you have requested that the Court alter the time of this meeting of Mr. Manson and Mr. Grogan and Mr. Davis --

MR. KANAREK: Right. Mr. Denny --

THE COURT: -- and their respective attorneys, with respect to --

MR. KANAREK: That's right. We wish to accommodate Mr. Denny and Mr. Weedman, and so it's going to be seven to nine, instead of six to eight.

THE COURT: All right. That's satisfactory to the Court, and the Court so orders.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

14mb-1

/

.3

7

8

Q

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

~26

27

DEFENDANT MANSON: If you make it 6:00 to 8:00, they will be there at 7:00 to 9:00. That's what I tried to explain to you yesterday.

Your Honor, I have been doing this for 24 years, living this procedure. It's a long time. I understand the procedures.

And all I am asking is that my cell not be opened, when it's not supposed to be opened.

In other words, they have a procedure, and when they break that procedure, I get all nervous; see? Because I know the little things that move in and out of those chambers in there. That's my chambers in there.

THE COURT: Tell Mr. Kanarek about it, and have him talk with Captain Kennedy. If there is anything specific, well, I want to know about it.

DEFENDANT MANSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

DEFENDANT MANSON: I thought you'd sent him. That's who I thought.

THE COURT: What?

DEFENDANT MANSON: I thought you d sent him.

THE COURT: Captain Kennedy?

DEFENDANT MANSON: No, the guy that come in my cell. I thought he was your man.

THE COURT: So far as I know, there was no one in your cell that -- that the people up there know about.

Now, the Court -- I went up to the jail today, Mr. Kanarek, to determine just what the setup was up there,

14b- 2

÷

and whether or not the situation was such that it offered any threat to Mr. Manson,

It apparently does not -- although, as I say,
I'm not in any way qualified as a expert. I simply wanted,
as a layman, to determine whether there appeared to be any
danger.

And there does not appear to be to me. If you know otherwise, why, let me know.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I think it's possible -- THE COURT: We are in recess.

MR. KANAREK: -- that the jail may be physically -- may look okay, when your Honor's there, but doors can be opened, when your Honor isn't there.

Obviously, if someone has access, he has a key.

There are things that are possible that -- in any physical setup. I'm sure your Honor would agree with that statement; so it isn't --

DEFENDANT MANSON: See, those keys turn both ways.

THE COURT: Well, tell Mr. Kennedy -- Captain Kennedy what you know, Mr. Kanarek. And if there is any reason for any tighter security measures, why, let the Court know.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

MR. MANZELLA: Good night, Judge.

MR. KANAREK: Yes. Thank you. And have a good weekend, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good night.

(Whereupon, at 4:22 o'clock p.m., and adjournment was taken until 10:00 o'clock a.m. on Monday, July 19, 1971.)