SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1. FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 2 HON. RAYMOND CHOATE, JUDGE DEPARTMENT NO. 106 3 4 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 5 Plaintiff, 6 No. A-267861 VS. 7 CHARLES MANSON, 8 Defendant. 9 10 11 12 REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT 13 Tuesday, September 7, 1971 14 VOLUME 39 15 16 17 APPEARANCES: 18 For the People: JOSEPH P. BUSCH, JR., District Attorney ; 19 ANTHONY MANZELLA, BY: Deputy District Attorney -20 1 For Defendant Manson: IRVING A. KANAREK, Esq. 21 22 23 24 25 26 MARY LOU BRIANDI, C.S.R. 27 ROGER K. WILLIAMS, C.S.R. Official Court Reporters 28

RECROSS

INDEX PEOPLE'S WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RETZ, Frank EXHIBITS COURT'S SPECIAL EXHIBITS: FOR IDENTIFICATION IN EVIDENCE M series Ì0 19. 25 : 

2	10:10 A.M.
3	The same state of the same sta
4	THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
5	(Murmurs of "Good morning, your Honor," by the
6	members of the jury.)
7	THE COURT: I'm very happy to see you all here and
8	apparently in good health. I'm glad we have all survived
9	the last two weeks and I hope everybody is ready to be atten-
10	tive and listen carefully to the evidence.
11	Good morning, counsel.
12	MR. MANZELLA: Good morning, your Honor.
13	MR. KANAREK: Yes, may we approach the bench?
14	THE COURT: Yes.
15	. The Court orders that the record show that
16	Mr. Manson is present with Mr. Kanarek. All of the jurors and
17	alternates are present.
18	You may approach the bench.
19	MR. KANAREK: With the reporter, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Yes, with the reporter.
21	(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had at
22	the bench among Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the
23	jury:)
24	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, first I would like to state
25	that I have personally subpoensed Linda Kasabian to court, I
26	personally filed served Linda Kasabian to come to court.
27	THE COURT: I don't think anybody can hear you over
28	there. Raise your voice.

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1971

MR. KANAREK: I personally have subpoensed Linda

Kasabian in court today. She has not appeared, at least to

the best of my knowledge she is not here. Of course, I wish

to have this at the bench, and I wish to point this out to the

Court. And I ask the Court to issue a bench warrant for her,

for her appearance here. I don't wish to inconvenience the

lady. She's been given —

THE COURT: Was she served --

MR. KANAREK: No. I subpostaed her.

THE COURT: You served a subpoena?

MR. KANAREK: Personally, personally. I served her personally. And I order — I ask that your Honor have her here. I don't want to inconvenience her, but I think the Court can take judicial notice of the fact she was given immunity of seven counts of murder and a count of conspiracy to commit murder.

And, furthermore, there's very ---

THE COURT: Do you have the return of service on your subpoena?

MR. KANAREK: I don't have it at this instant.

THE COURT: Get your return of service.

MR. KANAREK: But I do represent to the Court I do have my -- the declaration that I have executed. I don't have it this instant, but I can give it to the Court momentarily.

I would like to point out to the Court Linda Kasabian committed perjury --

THE COURT: Now, that's a matter of argument.

MR. KANAREK: I just wanted to point that out, a very

ľ

salient ---

3

7

8

10

11 /

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: Well, let's not go astray from why you approached the bench. The reason you approached the bench was to have me issue a warrant for her; is that correct?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And if you will get your affidavit of service in to the Court, then --

MR. KANAREK: I will.

THE COURT: -- then I will consider issuing it.

MR. KANAREK: I don't want to inconvenience her. Honor can issue it and hold it as your Honor does in many cases.

THE COURT: Let's discuss that.

MR. KANAREK: I do ask -- I am invoking the jurisdiction of the Court and I would like to invoke the Fourteenth Amendment, due process, and -- due process at this earliest possible time, especially since Linda Kasabian has been granted the favors by the prosecution. It is just incredible.

THE COURT: Let's not lapse into argument.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

1 2

5

б

- 15 🏄

 MR. KANAREK: Actually, your Honor, it wound up, in connection with the publicity, we made a motion to sequester the jury.

During the interim period -- and I'm not saying this out of any reflection for the Court at all -- I understood that your Honor was in Lake Table --

THE COURT: I was camping, and I have not read the newspaper until -- the newspaper accounts of other trials and other events.

MR. KANAREK: Well, this is not out of reflection upon the Court, but it's just -- I'm sure that the Court has no personal knowledge of this, because the Court rightfully took its vacation and went where the Court certainly had every right to. But I am mentioning this, and I would like to mention it in some detail.

And I have, because I am sure -- in the other instances, the Court was present in the Los Angeles area. Here, we have the -- the Court -- and I do have --

THE COURT: Why are you bringing this to my attention at this time?

MR. KANAREK: Well, there are several reasons. Because I am asking -- I am asking your Honor to declare a mistrial; and also, in the alternative -- and/or -- well, actually, in the alternative, to sequester the jury.

But I think it's too late, in any event, and I ask for a mistrial. There are -- events have occurred -- for instance, people who are alleged to be Mr. Manson's friends were arrested in connection with the holdup --

 alleged holdup -- of a gum store in Hawthorne, that got widespread --

THE COURT: Go shead.

MR. KANAREK: -- publicity in the Los Angeles area, not only in the press, all of the press, including the -- the smaller papers, the Los Angeles Times and the Herald-Express -- the Herald-Examiner, but also on TV and radio.

Another event which occurred was an alleged plot by Mr. Manson and his friends to escape from the County Jail. This came out in the gigantic headlines, two inches high, in the Herald --

THE COURT: A plot to escape?

MR. KANAREK: From jail. Which purportedly involved -involved a situation where your Honor and Mr. Manzella were
to be taken as hostages.

I don't want to belabor it, because it's all in the -- in the exhibits that I would like to present to the Court at another time.

THE COURT: Outside of the presence of the jury?

MR. KANAREK: Well, of course, I hope your Honor would declare a mistrial, and then it would be irrelevant.

I would rather not do that at this time in the presence of the jury, and in the unlikely event your Honor does not declare the mistrial.

Also, furthermore, Mr.Grogan's mistrial occurred in Judge Call's court, and there was -- the reason that occurred, purportedly, was because of the fact that -- was because of the fact that -- was because of the fact that Mr. Retz -- there was a conspiracy

1

3

ξ.

O

7

8

9

10 11

\_\_

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

in connection with the killing -- or proposed killing of Mr. Retz.

Judge Call declared a mistrial, and Mr. Busch deigned to take on Mr. -- or Judge Call in the press and on TV and on radio, and indicated how wrong -- it's the first time in 20 years he has ever stated that a judge was wrong, and all kinds of language like that.

And so it's clear -- I am -- that this jury, knowing of these matters, these publicity matters and over and above that, the Tex Watson case, which has received widespread publicity, headlines, wherein Mr. Watson claims that Mr. Manson ordered him to do these various things, and -- on TV and radio; and it's -- the publicity made it abundantly clear that -- that, from that trial, the viewpoint of those people was that Mr. Manson was the one responsible, telling people what to do and all of that.

And we have the same kind of theory in this case.

Mr. Manson cannot possibly get a fair trial. It's a --

THE COURT: Well --

MR, KANAREK: To proceed with this trial would be a denial of due process and equal protection under the 14th Amendment. And we do so allege, and we ask for an evidentiary hearing.

THE COURT: This morning, the Court did read a compilation of clippings from the local press, which clippings were gathered for me. And I did read about the Hawthorne robbery and the arrest of people who were alleged to have been connected with Mr. Manson.

I did read news accounts to the effect that there was supposed to be a plot to assault this courtroom, by Mangon followers, and the plot involved an anticipated or planned kidnapping of Mr. Manzella and of me.

I have read also concerning the mistrial that was granted in the case of People vs. Grogan, and some clippings about the Watson case.

新建 设在特别的

2a fls.

2a

1

2

3

5

6

•

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

. •19. .

20

21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

MR. KANAREK; May I ask that your Honor voir dire the jury? That they have this evidentiary hearing?

THE COURT: I believe it's a justifiable request, to --

MR. KANAREK: It's our position, in any event --

THE COURT: -- to ask the jury whether or not they have heard, read or seen about any of these accounts --

MR. KANAREK: Notwithstanding --

THE COURT: -- during the course of the last two weeks.

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor. Notwithstanding whatever the jurors may state, I ask for a mistrial in any event. I can't -- because it's impossible for Mr. Manson to receive a fair trial.

THE COURT: Well, until such time as I've determined from the jury just what the states of minds are of the individual members, whether they have read, heard or seen any such material as you have made reference to, the Court does not believe that a ruling would be proper.

There's no basis for a mistrial, that I can see at this point, until such time as --

MR.-KANAREK: Well, I --

THE COURT: -- I have inquired of the jury. Because I cannot presume that they have read, heard or seen these things.

And as a matter of fact, I would assume that they have followed the Court's instructions to avoid any reference by the news media to Mr. Manson.

I would hope that they have done that.

MR. KANAREK: But your Honor, it's our view that -- it's our view that Mr. Busch made his statement concerning

2

3

4

5 б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 ,

15

16 17

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28 Mr. Call in order to intimidate your Honor.

THE COURT: Concerning Judge Call?

MR. KANAREK: Yes. It's our view that he did this to intimidate your Honor, knowing, as he did this, that we were going to make this motion that we are now making. And it's most unethical, improper, illegal state action of the -- of the worst sort. And he did -- he issued that statement, I believe, to intimidate your Honor; because he knew full well, with all these events occurring, that I would make this motion.

And it's my belief -- I state that.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. KANAREK: To make your Honor look bad, if your Honor denies the -- if your Honor grants the mistrial, to make your Honor look bad in advance. It was a very, very -- it was a scurrilous attempt to -- to invade the integrity of this Court, when he made that statement publicly.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know what Mr. Busch's motive was in making the statement which you attribute to him.

MR. KAWAREK It was widely --

THE COURT: But in any event, it would have no effect upon this Court.

Mr. Manuella?

MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor. I wanted to advise the Court and counsel that Mary Brunner is now in custody in the Los Angeles County Jail, under booking number 1656222; and she is available for cross-examination.

MR. KANAREK: I can't accept that factual finding, that she is available for cross-examination. I mean, I --

THE COURT: Well, the --

MR. KANAREK: I accept Mr. Manzella's representation that she is in the County Jail. But I don't -- I --

THE COURT: There's a bench warrant outstanding for her from this court, and the Court would order that the --

MR. KANAREK: Well, the reason I --

THE COURT: -- that Mary Brunner be brought here tomorrow morning.

MR. KANAREK: The reason I say that, your Honor, about the, quote, availability, end quote, is because I am sure that Mr. Manzella, if she is brought to this courtroom, is going to try to impeach her on bias and prejudice, by trying to show that she participated in certain events to get Mr. Manson out of jail.

I mean, I imagine he would bring that before the jury, in any event.

THE COURT: I doubt that the Court would permit such a course of action, even if Mr. Manzella made an attempt to present such evidence.

But at least, you are representing to the Court that she is available for further cross-examination, if counsel wishes; is that correct?

MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: It was the Court's information that she had been arrested as a result of this City of Hawthorne robbery which Mr. Kanarek mentioned in connection with the press reports.

In any event, we'll have her in court tomorrow --

ŀ

23.

probably before the jury assembles here -- and you may have access to her, if you wish, either of you, to converse with you regarding the possible reopening of direct or cross.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor?

THE COURT: As to the question of mistrial, I suppose that your request to examine the jury should be disposed of right away; that we should go right to that point. So --

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor?

THE COURT: So let's go get to that.

MR. KANAREK: May the exhibits that I will subsequently file with the clerk -- that is, the newspapers -- may they be deemed to be at this time? I don't want to do it now, because

2b-1

. 5

28.

THE COURT: The Court will hear from you regarding their introduction at a later time.

MR. KANAREK: I have them here, but I just don't want to flash them in front of --

THE COURT: I think you've covered most of those things. You needn't present them to me for the purpose of this questioning, because I believe that you've covered most of the things about which I read this morning.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor may even have the -- have some of the clippings that I have, some of the newspaper clippings.

THE COURT: I assume I do. Most of it came, I noted from the Herald-Examiner.

Was that your recollection of it?

MR. KANAREK: Yes. But there -- but there are items in the Times, too, of course.

THE COURT: Yes. Now, I did, during the course of the -- of the period of my vacation, read articles in the Times.

MR. KANAREK: Which your Honor had delivered where you were?

THE COURT: They were available.

MR. KANAREK: I see.

THE COURT: I was camping where there was no access by ordinary road or vehicle.

MR. KANAREK: But the Los Angeles Times was there?

THE COURT: But the Los Angeles Times was available at
a Safeway store in South Tahoe, so I did see that.

2

3

5

5

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 &

23 \* 24

25

27

26

28

What procedure do you suggest? Shall we simply take it in open court?

MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Let's proceed.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, is there any -- you are just going to ask each juror individually, whether they have read or heard anything, or ask the panel as a whole if any of them have read anything?

MR. KANAREK: I would ask for individual voir dire. This is of such moment --

THE COURT: That's what I intended to do, just as a group, and find out whether or not any of them have read it.

I don't intend to prolong this. The --

MR. MANZELLA: Yesh. Okay.

THE COURT: If any of them have read it, then I intend to inquire about that particular juror's state of mind.

MR. KANAREK: Well --

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

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, can you hear me?

(Jurors indicating affirmatively.)

THE COURT: Is there anyone who cannot hear me?
(No affirmative response.)

THE COURT: During the period of the recess, I have been informed that there has been publicity in the news media in Los Angeles County, and in other counties, and the

Court is aware, from what it has read in newspapers, that there has been publicity.

And it's the purpose of the Court at this time to inquire of you ladies and gentlemen as to whether or not you have heard, seen or read anything during the course of the last two weeks, concerning Mr. Manson or this trial or any other trial with which Mr. Manson might be alleged to have been associated.

And so I'll ask all of you at this time whether, during the course of the last two weeks -- and if you have an affirmative response, raise your hand, then I'll question you individually and apart from the group -- whether, during the course of the last two weeks, you have heard, seen or read anything via any of the news media concerning Mr. Manson, touching upon this trial or any other trial alleged to have involved Mr. Manson?

3 fls.

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

1 2

2

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

I6 17

18

19

20

21

23 24

25

20 ; 27

9R-

· 28

Is there anyone of you who has heard, seen or read such material?

(Whereupon, there was a show of hands by members of the jury.)

THE COURT: Mrs. Luster, Mr. Mayer, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Rico, and Mr. Williams.

JUROR NO. 6: Wilson.

THE COURT: And Miss Heller.

Anyone else?

(No response.)

THE COURT: Now, the others of you, I take it, have not heard, seen or read anything whatever that made any reference whatever to Mr. Manson, I would judge, from your not having raised your hand.

Mr. Werner.

ALTERNATE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

THE COURT: You wished to -- you did raise your hand? ALTERNATE JUROR NO. 3: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there anyone else now who recalls that he or she has heard, seen or read anything whatever from any of the news media in which Mr. Manson has been mentioned?

Do we have a courtroom available where we can put the respective jurors?

Let's do it this way, we have, undoubtedly, a jury assembly room. The Court will order that all the jurors be taken to a jury deliberation room, our deliberation room, if we have it available, and it is not being used by another courtroom, and then I should like to have each of the jurors

б

who has raised his or her hand brought down individually and I'll ask you about what you may have heard, seen or read, other questions.

Counsel, approach the bench.

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

THE COURT: You have, either of you have any questions that you would suggest that the Court put to the group as a whole now before we send them to the deliberation room?

MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor. I would like -- I would ask to be allowed to inquire myself --

THE COURT: Well, when the --

MR. KANAREK: No. But --

THE COURT: You mean, when I bring the individuals down?
MR. KANAREK: Yes.

THE COURT: It was a question which had to be phrased in such a way, I think, in order to find out with some specificity whether anything at all had been read concerning Mr. Manson. It had to be put that way, the way the Court put it, but if either of you have a suggestion as to how it could be put without going into any detail at this moment --

MR.MANZELLA: You mean for the panel as a whole, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MANZELLA: I don't think you can ask anything else, really.

THE COURT: Do you?

3a fls.

MR. KANAREK: No -- well, I know I would welcome -I did move previously that your Honor do that, that your Honor
do what your Honor is doing. Of course, it is our request
to voir dire each of the jurors whether they have raised
their hands or not.

THE COURT: I don't think there is any point in voir diring those individuals who have not raised their hands.

3a-1

7,5

I6

28.

MR. KANAREK: As your Honor knows, there is a gag order on as well as a publicity order, and it is our belief that as a result of state action the publicity order was actually violated in the Herald Examiner regarding the alleged plot of Mr. Manson and friends to escape. There is, also, a mention in the Herald Examiner that the Sheriff's investigators were furnishing Mr. Blackburn with the information. It is also a part of our investigatory hearing that Mr. Blackburn be called to the stand and interrogated concerning it because it is our belief this was disseminated in the community as a result —

THE COURT: The Court may pursue that at a later time, but I don't think it is germane to the question that the defendant has asked that we examine on at this point.

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

THE COURT: Mr. Kuczera, do you have a deliberation room?

THE BAILIFF: Yes, in Department 103.

THE COURT: All right, fine.

You may take the jurors to the deliberation room for Department 103, and we'll leave -- ask Mrs. Luster to remain and the rest of the jurors to leave.

THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right.

(Whereupon, the jury retired from the courtroom with the exception of Juror No. 1, Mrs. Luster.)

THE COURT: All right, the record will show that all of 1 the jurors have left the courtroom with the exception of 2 Mrs. Luster, Juror No. 1. 3 4 Joyce, (Whereupon, the clerk approached the bench 5 and conferred with the Court.) THE COURT: Mrs. Luster --8 Joyce, would you hand Mrs. Luster that microphone. Pull it straight up. 10 EXAMINATION 11 12 BY THE COURT : 13 : Q': You, will recall the oath you first took when you 14 first entered this courtroom before the Court began to voir 15 dire you, to question you concerning your qualifications as 16 a juror? 17 A. I do. 18 That oath still pertains?  $\mathbf{a}$ 19 Α. Yes. 20 Do you understand that? Q, 21 Ä. Yes. 22 You have indicated in response to the Court's Q, 23. questions that you have read, heard or seen something in 24 connection with Mr. Manson or this case or that mentioned 25 Mr. Manson or this case? 26 A. Yes. 27 Q. Or some other case, perhaps, involving Mr. Manson, 28 allegedly involving Mr. Manson.

Would you tell us what you heard, seen or read in the last two weeks, then, just very briefly?

- A I don't know the date, but it was something about a robbery of guns and the reason for it.
- Q What did you see, just headline or did you read the entire article?
- A Well, may I -- can I -- can I go into a little detail about the reason I read it?
  - Q Yes, you may.
- I went on a trip to Oakland on my vacation for -- for -- I left Friday. And I left my husband at nome. And I drove up to see my children. And, as I said, he stayed at home.

So Saturday I hadn't paid any attention to the headlines. I heard the headlines. I heard the news about this thing, but I hadn't paid any attention to it.

All the papers were sayed at my house when I got back, but I had to come back Sunday unexpectedly.

- When you're speaking of Sunday, you're speaking of Sunday, the 22nd of August?
  - A My husband almost got killed and I had to get back.
  - o no:
- A. There was a shooting. The girl fell on my floor.

  And I was upset. This thing pertains to me. This gun business.

  I don't see any protection on me. And I don't think it is

  worth my life, and I'm really upset.

There was two girls shot right by my apartment. My husband happened to open the door and she ran in the apartment,

one of the girls, and he slammed the door, which is the only reason why he didn't get shot. The boy was still looking for the girl, because she was in my house and this girl died. 16 ' 18. , 20 

3b

3

5

6

25

26

27

28

Q.	Where	did	that	occur?
**		And the side	Annual section (%)	

- In my house. A
- What place is that?
- 3939 Stevely. He shot her in Apartment 10. I am in A. Apartment 12.

When she ran, she saw my husband at the door, and she ran right past him and ran in the house and hid. And then, I -- after he called me, I came home. I had to rush home, because he was sick. And then, I -- when I saw the papers and all of this thing going on, I just took all of this and read it. And I said this is not worth it, all of this stuff is not worth it.

- You mean by that --Q.
- A. When I read about this other business, too -- I had heard it. I wouldn't have paid any attention to it, but when I heard the news -- the headlines -- I heard the newscasts, I turned it off, you know. But when this thing happened at my house, and I see how nonsensical these things are, I read it to see what was going on.
  - Oh, I see.
- See. I just went in to detail to see what my life is all about, though I promised the Court I wasn't going to read anything. But I had a reason to read it.
- In other words, you were so concerned about the shooting at your house --
  - A. Right.
  - -- which was not in any way connected with the --Q.
  - No. that's right. V

going to be used for.

28

No, I just read about the 140 guns, what they were

1	Q I see. And what did you read that they were to be
2	used for?
3	L To come and get Manson out.
4	Q Is that what they were to be used, as you
5	understood it, for what purpose?
6	A To get to release him from court.
7	Q To take Mr. Manzella and the Court, the Judge
8	hostage; is that it?
9	A It didn't say. I didn't read that. They just said
10	they were going to release Mr. Manson.
11	Q I see.
12	A I didn't see anything about the the other part.
13	I didn't read that. I just read one paper.
14	Q Now, what is your personal situation now? Has that
15	been resolved in any way as far as your health is concerned?
16	A You mean about what?
17	Q The blood pressure and so forth?
18	A I haven't gone to the doctor yet. I just got home
19	Sunday. I didn't go to the doctor. But I take the medication.
20	Q Did you, after this incident at your home, which
21	caused you to return on the 22nd, did you then go back to
22	Oakland?
23	A No, I didn't go any place. I've just been home.
24	
25	
26	
27	

3c ,

24

25

26

27

28

Q I see.

A No, I wasn't able. I was hardly able to drive home.

Well, is your state of mind now such, Mrs. Luster, that as a result of your having read that article that you could not follow the Court's instruction to decide this case only on the evidence that's produced here and the Court's instructions of law?

A I could decide the case, as far as what I have heard, the same way that I would have decided it all the time. But that doesn't keep the fear out of me. Me sitting here deciding that --

Q Are you afraid now?

A Yes, I am afraid.

Q What are you afraid of?

MR. MANZELLA: Excuse me, your Honor. Excuse me. This inquiry, if I may just say this, is supposed to be directed just at publicity. I was wondering if we could defer inquiry on the other matter, the matter the Court is going into now until after we've inquired of all of the jurors with regard to publicity. It is just a suggestion I am making, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, what we are interrogating on is -- may we approach the bench?

THE COURT: Well, there is no necessity to. The Court believes we must determine the individual states of mind of each of the jurors.

BY THE COURT:

	. 1
	2
	3
	4
	5
<b>.</b>	6
, <del>ė</del>	7
	8
	9
	10
	ļl
	12
	13
	14
4 <sub>3</sub> fls.	15
ar America	16
. 3.	
হ	17
হ	17 18
্ব	
9	18
3	18 19
•	18 19 20
€ <b>4</b>	18 19 20 21
	18 19 20 21 22
4	18 19 20 21 22 23
4	188 199 200 211 222 23
4	18 19 20 21 22 23 24 21
4	18 19 20 21 22 23 24 24 24

	Q	Whe	it are	you	afraid	of,	Mrs.	Luster,	as	a	result
of	having	read	this?								

A Well, when I walk through -- when I walk -- I notice that when all the witnesses come in, they're taken to the rest-room with some law enforcement officer or somebody. When we come through, I see a lot of people. I don't know who these people are,

Q You mean you are afraid?

A There is no protection for me in here. I don't see anybody protecting me.

Q You are afraid as a result of this news story that there may be some shooting in the courtroom?

A I won't use the word "may be," I just say it could be. I'm not getting paid to do that. I don't have anything to do -- to protect myself with.

Q Well, is that what your -- basically, that's what you are afraid of, that there might be some shooting, which would cause you some harm?

A It could be. I -- with my state of mind, my state of mind, from what I -- what I've gone through, and what people will do, I -- I wouldn't say they won't be done.

THE COURT: As a result of this -- this occurrence in your neighborhood, --

A Sure.

Q -- in your home; is that what you --

A Sure. When I least expect -- the people that you lease expect it from. These were nice people. But they just went off.

Q Do you mean in -- in your --

A The man that did the killing was a nice man.

Q Are you talking about the situation around your neighborhood?

A. In my home, yes.

Q Well, what I'm asking, basically, I suppose --

A . I am nervous every time I come in here. I'm nervous.

Q Would this nervousness -- would this feeling on your part, would it cause you to be prejudiced against Mr. Manson --

A No.

Q -- in making any decision that you may be called upon to determine in this case?

A No. I would still go by the evidence that -- that

20%

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Ţ

. -

has been presented here, and -- I would be as fair as possible with this evidence that I have had, that has been shown me or given to me.

And when I hear the other side, I would be just as fair with both sides as I could. I mean, I'm not that way.

It's just being nervous. That has nothing to do with him. Me -- anything against him. It's just me being nervous, period. Whether I will be -- would be able to fall out here or not, I don't know. I mean, as I say, they wouldn't have to kill me. I would just fall over dead from high blood pressure.

THE COURT: The Court understands, and the Court notices that you are visibly affected. I can understand how you might be, as a result of what did occur in your home.

Mr. Kanarek, do you wish to ask any questions?

MR. KANAREK: I have no questions. I --

THE COURT: Mr. Manzella?

MR. MANZELLA: No, no questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thanks, Mrs. Luster.

Mr. Manzella -- or rather, Mr. Kuczera, would you get Mrs. Luster back to the jury deliberation room? And the Court willask Mr. Mayer to be brought in.

All right. Mrs. Luster, the Court will talk to you later.

JUROR NO. 1: Thank you.

EXAMINATION OF MR. STANLEY L. MAYER

3

2

**4** 5

б

7 8

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

18

19

20

22

23. 24

25

26 27

28

a fls.

BY THE COURT:

Q Mr. Mayer, the Court wishes to ask you why, in response to its questions, you raised your hand.

What have you heard, seen or read about what I 've talked about?

A Well, I've seen a headline or two. I have heard a thing or two on the radio.

Q Can you tell us what -- anything specific that you might remember?

A Yes.

Q Concerning the headlines?

Let's start with those.

A Something about Manson Followers -- and the same on the radio -- Attempt to Rob a Store of Guns.

And something about attempting to free Mr. Manson.

Q Is there anything more that you can recall now?

A Well, I also remember a headline -- no, I take that back. I think it was on the radio. It was something about a mistrial of one of the cases that you previously mentioned.

Q The case of People vs. Grozen?

A I believe that's it, yes.

Q Well, let me ask you: As a result of what you have heard in that radio news report, and as a result of what you read in the headlines, do you believe that your state of mind is any different than when you began this trial?

A No, it's not.

1	Q Can you still determine this case based solely
2	on the evidence that's produced here by either side, and the
3	Court's instructions of law?
4	A Yes, I could.
5	Q Has this have these headlines or this state-
6	ment over the radio in any way raised any prejudice in
7	your mind against Mr. Manson?
8	A No, it hasn't.
9	THE COURT: Do either of you gentlemen have any questions:
10	MR. MANZELLA: No questions, your Honor. Thank you.
וג	MR. KANAREK: No questions, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Mayer.
13	Would you return to the deliberation room?
14	MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mr. Mayer.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Williams? Do you want to bring Mr.
16	Williams in?
17	THE BAILIFF: You mean Mr. Wilson, sir?
18	THE COURT: Juror No. 4, yes.
19	Just have a seat down there at the end.
20.	
21	EXAMINATION
22	BY THE COURT:
23	Q The record will show Mr. Williams
24	A. Wilson. Wilson.
25	THE COURT: Mr. Wilson? Thank you.
<b>2</b> 6	Mr. Wilson to be present. No other jurors are
27	present.
28	4. 

Mr. Wilson, you raised your hand as a result of the 1 Court's questioning. 2 The Court would ask you certain questions now about 3 what you may have heard, seen or read, and you must consider that you are under cath --5 Yes, your ilonor. -- as -- since you took that oath? You remember that oath that you took ---A. Yes. 9 -- at the beginning of this procedure, when you Q. 10 first walked into this courtroom? 11 Yes, sir. 13 You must consider that you are still under oath. The Court inquires now: Why did you raise your 14 , ľ5 hand? What have you seen, heard or read, in other words? Your Honor, nothing in detail. Only as I would be 16 going in the Post Office, I think on one occasion, the paper --17 18 it's a newsstand there, and you go -- and going into the --10 the employees' entrance, well, quite naturally, the headline's up there. 20 21 I read nothing, and I do as you say: "Don't read: 22 don't listen." 23 But the headline was there. And I intended to tell 24 the truth. That's why I raised my hand. 25 That's the only thing. But nothing in detail. 26 Was it one instance or more? Q. 27 ħ. One instance that I can recall. Just one. And what -- what was the headline? Can you recall Q.

1 that? I didn't -- I didn't -- I just glanced at it, something about a robbery of guns, something like that. 3 Was Mr. Manson's name in the headline? 5 A. . No. I didn't -- I don't recall seeing his name. I . б. don't recall seeing his name. 17 Q . How did you ---It sounded -- because I just glanced, you know. 8 Just as you be going in, you see something of a headline. 10 Did you learn that that was somehow or another 11 connected with Mr. Manson, or allegedly connected with 12 Mr. Manson? 13 No, because I didn't -- I aidn't do nothing in A. 14 detail. I just saw only that, and I went into the Post 15 Office. 16 How is it that you are now raising your hand --Q. 17 how do you know that it is allegedly connected with Mr. Manson? 18 Had you heard something else, or --19 Well, in -- sitting on the primary, you hear people A. 20 talking. You know, you hear clerks talking what they have 21 read. 22 You mean in your work, you mean? 0. 23 In my work. A. 24 I see. Q 25 Just a lot of clerks, and we be sticking mail in, A. 26 and the guy over there, he's talking about, "Did you hear this? Did you hear that?" 28 Well, what else did you hear concerning that? Q.

```
That is, that led you to believe that it was connected with
Mr. Manson?
         Woll, the guy -- like on the primary --
 A.
```

4b.

4b-1	1	Q	<u>)</u>	The primary is what? That's your job?
	2	A	<b>L</b> ,	That's my job. A bunch of people a bunch of
	3	people	e sitt	ing at a bunch of cases, just casing mail.
•	4		<b>}</b> .	In other words, sorting mail?
	5		<b>3</b> ,	Sorting mail.
*	6	·	<b>.</b>	So you were on the primary sorting rack or sorting
	7	area -	Me aver	
	8.	i	ì.	Yes.
	9		).	and you heard somebody talking about
	10:		r	Yes, they made a comment.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	iı '	,	Į.	What did you hear?
	12	, I	<b>.</b>	Nothing in detail. I can't even I can't even say
	, j3	it wo	rd for	word, because when they started talking, and they
	14	said -	lik	e I heard them bring up Mr. Manson's name, well, I
; . <b></b>	15	just	jot uj	and walked away.
·	16 .	1	THE CO	URT: Mr. Kuczera, would you turn that mike up,
	17	please	e?	
•	18	។	che by	ILIFF: Yes, sir.
	19	. t	THE CO	URT: Thank you.
	20	Ş	)	When you heard them talking about Mr. Manson in
	21	connec	ction	with the Hawthorne gun robbery,
	22`	1	A.	Yes.
,ª	23	\$	<b>)</b>	you walked away?
4	24	1	<b>1.</b>	Yes. I got up and went on into the just walked
	25	away.		·
	26	1	Ď.	All right. Let me ask you this:
;	27			As a result of having read that headline or as a
	28	result	of he	earing these things, do you have any prejudice agains

1	Mr. Manson?
2	A I don't have any prejudice against Mr. Manson.
3	Q Would you still decide this case, basing your
4	decision
<b>5</b>	A Yes, sir.
6	Q only on the evidence?
7	A. Only on the evidence.
8	Q And the Court's instructions of law?
9	A, That's right.
10	Q Would you let this in any way this reference
11	that you have read in the headlines, and have heard from your
12	fellow workers in any way enter your mind?
13	A. No. I haven't thought of I haven't thought of
,14	this one way or the other, because like I say, I'm not
15	interested. I don't read that kind of stuff.
16	And I just happened to see this at the headline.
17	I could have easily said I didn't, but to be truthful about
18	it, I held my hand up, because I did sed that.
19	THE COURT: Either counsel have any questions?
20	MR. MANZELLA: No, your Honor. Thank you.
21	MR. KANAREK: No questions.
22	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Wilson.
<b>23</b> .	MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mr. Wilson.
24	JUROR NO. 6: You're welcome.
25	MR. KANARIK: Your Honor, may I is it
26	THE COURT: Mr. Wilson is still present in the courtroom.
27	MR. KANAREK: Oh, I see. I was just going to ask for
28	THE COURT: De sure to return them to the deliberation

1 room. And we will ask Mrs. Jenkins to come in. 9 3 Now, did you have some --MR. KANAREK: Yes. A recess. Would it be possible to 5 have a recess? THE COURT: It's 11:00 o'clock. б The Court will take a ten-minute recess. MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Let's see. Did the deputy Public Defender arrive in the courtroom yet? 10 11 All right. We'll take a ten-minute recess. 12 (Mid-morning racess.) 13 (Proceedings had on unrelated matters.) 14 All right. The record will show that THE COURT: 15 Juror No. 7, Mrs. Jenkins, is in the box. 16 Mr. Wilson, Mrs. Holt, is Juror No. 6, is he not? 17 THE CLERK: Yes. 18 THE COURT: All right. The record will show that 19 Mr. Manson is present. 20 Where's Mr. Kanarek? 21 Mr. Kuczera -- off the record. 22 (Whereupon, a discussion off the record ensued.) 23 THE COURT: Now, the record may show that Mr. Kanarek 24 is present with his client, Mr. Manson. Mrs. Jenkins is in 25 the box. 26 27 EXAMINATION 28 BY THE COURT:

Mrs. Jonkins,	you	will	regard	yourse	Lf a	as be	ing
under the same oath that	you	took	previou	sly, w	hen	you	first
entered this courtroom.	And	you	remember	that,	do	you,	that
oath							

- A Yes.
- Q -- for the qualification of jurors? You under-stand that?
  - A Yes.
- Q You raised your hand when I asked you whether you had read, heard or seen anything during the course of the recess.

What had you heard, seen or read?

A Well, I was over to some friend's house, and I heard on the news that part, by -- it was by accident, really -- that part of the -- some of the Manson Family had tried to rob a surplus store.

4c-1	1	Q A surplus store in Hawthorne?
	2	A Yes. And this is all that I had heard. I didn't
	3	hear the details. But I heard this.
	4	Q Did when that came on, when that program came
	5	on, did you make an attempt to obey the Court's order and
હ	6	ignore it, or did you just sit
<b>.</b> *	7	A Well, at first, I didn't know exactly what
•	8	because we were talking
	9	Q Yes.
	10	A And then all of a sudden, you know, the conversa-
•	11	tion died down, and I just heard this part.
	12 .	And so they looked at me kind of funny and cut
	13	it off.
	14	Q Cut it off?
₹,	15	A Yeah.
	16· ·	Q While you were there?
À	17	A Yes.
•	18 .	Q Did they know that you were involved as a juror
	19	in this case?
ž.	20	A Well, they knew that I was on this case.
	21	Q Yes.
4	22	And you did hear the name Manson?
•	<b>23</b>	A I heard Manson Family.
, <del>i</del>	24	Q I see. Let me ask you: As a result of having
	<b>25</b>	heard this, has it changed your state of mind about your
	26	qualifications as a juror?
	27	A No.
	28	Q Can you still decide this case fairly and

c-2	1	impartially?
	2	A Yes.
*	á.	Q Would it raise did it raise any prejudice
	4	in your mind against Mr. Manson, hearing that?
	5.	A No.
*	6	Q Will you still decide the case as you stated
r	7	you would at the beginning, basing your decision solely on
	.8	the evidence in the case, and the Court's instructions of
	9	Law?
	10	A Yes.
	11	THE COURT: Any questions? Any question?
	12	MR. MANZELLA: No. Thank you.
	13	MR. KANAREK: Just
<b>.</b> .	14	Q BY THE COURT: Have you heard, seen or read
<b>)</b> 3	15	anything else in connection with Mr. Manson?
SQ.	16	A No, this is all.
A)	17	THE COURT: Thank you, Mrs. Jenkins. Would you
	18	MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mrs. Jenkins.
	19	THE COURT: Would you return now to the jury
	20	deliberation room?
	21	Let's have Mr. Thompson.
ă.	22	THE BAILIFF: Yes, your Honor.
1	23	
3,	24	EXAMINATION OF
4	25	MR. JONATHAN THOMPSON
	26	BY THE COURT:
<b>)</b> .	27	Q Mr. Thompson, you remember the oath that you
	. 28	think when you first same into this countriow?

4c-3	1	A Yes, sir.
	2	Q You will regard yourself as being under that same
	3	oath,
•	4	A Yes.
	5.	Q During the Court's questioning of the jurors,
À	.6	while they were in the box, you raised your hand.
	7	Why did you raise your hand? What have you
<b>.</b> *	8	heard, seen or read?
	9	A I raised it because of the fact my wife mentioned
	10	something about the plan in which the group was
	11	Q Get that a little closer, would you?
	12	A (Continuing) the plan in which the group
	13	was going to try to take Manson out of the courtroom. And
	14	she
) .x	15	Q Your wife mentioned that to you?
<b>.</b>	16	A Yes. Because she told me, she said, "You better
7.	17	be careful."
•	18	So I says, "You know, I'm not supposed to Listen."
	19	And she said, "You better listen to this, then."
	<b>20</b> <sub>1,</sub>	Q And your wife your wife told you that you'd
	21	better listen to that; is that right?
	22	A Yes.
· <b></b>	23	Q You didn't deliberately seek this information
; <b>&gt;</b> .	<b>24</b> ,	from her?
	25	A No, sir. She she had heard something about
	26	a robbery, and then after she saw this plan, then she told me
Y	27	about that.
,	28	Rut she know that I'm not supposed to be seeing

5. 海南山流色灌溉。 1982

24

25

26

27.

28

jurors and alternates.

### EXAMINATION OF

# MR. EMILIO J. RICO

#### BY THE COURT:

- Q Good morning, Mr. Rico.
- A Good morning, sir.
- Q Mr. Rico, you must regard yourself as being under the same oath that you took when you first entered this court. You remember that oath, do you not?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q All right. You raised your hand when I was asking you -- or asking the jurors as a group about whether or not they had heard, seen or read anything.

Could you tell us what you had heard, seen or read?

A Well, this was a -- before the news stories, they have like a news flash, and they give, you know, like a rundown on it.

Q Yes.

A And it was something to do with Mr. Manson's Family, that had held up a surplus store or something like that.

It was just a flash. And then another one was something about Mr. Watson, that -- had confessed to something, and said that Mr. Manson had made him do what he did.

That's all. I didn't -- you know, I didn't

listen to all the news, but it was just like a flash before the news starts. 4c-5 5 fis. 

5-1	1	Q The Watson case concerning the Tate-La Bianca
	<b>2</b>	matter?
	3	A Right,
	4	Q And the news flash concerned the Hawthorne
	5	surplus store?
*	6	A Yes, I believe so.
	7	Q And these were things which you
<b>#</b>	8	A Now, before I could turn the TV off or anything,
	9	it was over with. It just said it
	10	Q You didn't deliberately
	11	A No, I did not.
	12	Q seek those news articles?
	13	A No. At 10:00 o'clock it said they were going to
	14	tell everything about it. It was like a flash. That's all.
}	15	That's all I heard, you know. I don't know whether I should
ż	16	have raised my hand or not.
į	17	Q Well, you recall that you were one of those that
	18	stated you would base your judgment on the case and solely
	19	on the evidence that's produced and on the Court's instruc-
	20	tions of law?
	21	A Right.
	22	Q Has that seeing those references to Mr. Manson,
**	23	has that in any way changed your mind?
Ą	24	A No, sir.
	25	Q Has it raised any prejudice against Mr. Manson?
	26	A No, it hasn't.
	27	Q Which would cause you to decide the case in any
	:28	other way then on the evidence and on the law?

1	A No, sir.
2	Q Do you still think you can be fair and impartial?
3	A I believe so.
4	Q When you say "I believe so"
Ŝ.	A I am. I am.
6	Q You're sure?
7	A I'm sure, but, you know
8	Q You're sure about it?
9	A I'm sure about it.
10	THE COURT: Any questions, gentlemen?
11	MR. MANZELLA: No.
12	MR. KANAREK: No, thank you.
13	Q BY THE COURT: Now, is there snything else that
14	you have heard, seen or read?
15	A No, sir,
16	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Rico.
17	Send the next juror in, if you would, please.
18	
19	EXAMINATION OF
20	ANTON L. WERNER
21	BY THE COURT:
22	Q Mr. Heller
23	A Werner.
24	Q Mr. Heller, you have
25	A No, sir, it is Werner.
26	Q I'm sorry, it is Mr. Werner.
27	Mr. Werner, you remember the oath you first took
28	when you came into this courtroom?

ļ	A Yes, sir.
2	Q You must still consider yourself to be under oath
3	then; you understand that?
4	A Yes, sir.
5	Q Now, the Court wishes to inquire of you why you
6	raised your hand when the Court asked the questions that
7	it did? What have you heard, seem or read?
8	A Well, I saw the headlines in the paper about
9	the robbery and the gang, and also about taking you for a
10	hostage.
11	Q In other words, you read
12	A. I didn't read it, but then
13	Q You read the headlines?
14	A And then
15	Q You read the headlines in the news about the
16	Hawthorne surplus store gun robbery?
17	A Yeah, that is correct.
18	Q Have you heard, seen or read anything else?
19	A No. I never read snything, but the people were
20	discussing one night about the Manson case, so about the
21	robbery and stuff going on.
22	Q Who was discussing it?
23	A It was relatives that came over Friday night.
24	Q I see, and did you engage in the discussion?
25	A No, I didn't.
26	Q Pardon?
27	A I didn't engage in it.
. 28	Q Pardon?

1	A They'd ask questions and I'd tell them
2	Q You told them about your obligation?
3	A Yeah, and that's how it is. And I said it is
4	slow.
5	Q And your obligation
6	A But I never discussed the case.
7	Q You did not?
8	A No.
9	Q Let me ask you this, has your mind changed in
10	any way, Mr. Werner, from what it was when you entered upon
11	your duty and obligation as a juror here?
12	A. No, it hasn't changed.
13 .	Q Would you have any prejudice against Mr. Manson
14	as a result of having read that article and having heard
15	these comments about your associates?
16	A No, sir.
17	Q Will you decide this case, basing your decision
18	only upon the evidence and the Court's instructions of law?
19	A Yes, sir.
20	Q Is there anything else that you may have heard,
21	seen or read or heard talked about?
22	A No, that's all. Just Friday night.
23	Q When did that occur, then? Last Friday night,
24	you say?
25	A Last Friday night.
26	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek or
27	MR. KANARHKI Yes.
28	THE COURT: Mr. Manzella?

MR. MANZELLA: No questions, your Honor. MR. KANAREK: One point. 2. BY MR. KANAREK: · You said you heard something shout the Court and Mr. Manzella? 5. 5a fls. A Yeah, about taking them for hostages, breaking in.  $\mathbf{n}$ 20: 

	• 1.	
ia-1	1	And these people were discussing that?
	2	A. Yeah,
	3	Q In your home?
	4	A Yes
	5	MR. KANAREK: Thank you, sir.
×	6	BY THE COURT:
<b>.</b>	7	Q When they began to discuss this, did you stay and
•	8	listen or did you cease the conversation or cause it to halt
	9	in any way?
	10	A I didn't cause it to halt, but I never bothered to
	n ·	talk to them or anything.
	12	Q You didn't cause it to cease?
	13	A. No.
	14	Q But you overheard what they were saying?
,	15	A I overheard what they were saying.
•	16	Would this affect your judgment in any way concerning
7	17	this case?
	18	A No, sir,
	19	THE COURT: All right, thank you, then, Mr. Warner.
	20	ALTERNATE JUROR NO. 3: All right.
	21	THE COURT: Mrs. Heller, then.
.•	22	
•	23	EXAMINATION OF
3	24	MRS. ANNE M. HELLER
	25	BY THE COURT:
	26	Q Mrs. Heller, you must regard yourself as being
	27	under the same oath that you took when you first came into
<del>-</del>	28	this courtroom and the voir dire examination began of you; you

ı	understand?
2	A. Yes, your Honor.
3	Q You raised your hand when I asked you those
4	questions that I put to the group as a whole.
.5	Why did you raise your hand?
6,	A. I was at a friend's house and they had the TV on,
7	and when that came on I just walked in the kitchen and I just
.8	disregarded it.
9	Q What came on?
10	A. Uh, "Robbery, gun robbery."
11	Q The Hawthorne Surplus Store robbery?
12	A Yes, that's what it was. So I just walked out.
13	Q How much of it did you hear? A minute
14	A. Oh, no, not much of it. Just gun robbery, and the
15	Manson Family. When I heard that, I walked in the kitchen and
16	that was it.
17	Q You simply heard Hawthorne Surplus Store gun
18.	robbery and the Manson Family was connected with it?
19	A. I heard the name "Manson," and then I walked out.
20	Q I see. Would this affect your judgment so that you
21	would be prejudiced against Mr. Manson?
22	A None, whatever.
23	Q Would it affect your judgment, Mrs. Heller, to such
24	an extent that you could not be fair and impartial?
25	A No, your Honor.
26	Q Would you still decide this case, basing it
27	basing any decision that you might be caused to make in this
28	case solely upon the evidence and the Court's instructions?

Yes, your Honor. A. 1 THE COURT: Any questions, gentlemen? MR. MANZELLA: No, your Honor. 3 BY THE COURT: Anything more that you may have Q 4 heard, seen or read? 5. No. No. your Honor. б THE COURT: Thank you, Mrs. Heller. 7 MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mrs. Heller. THE COURT: Now, I believe there was one more juror. I'm . 9 not sure. I may have seen his hand, because I was under the 10 : impression that Mr. Williams was one of those that was 11 supposed to be called back. 12 MR. KANAREK: Yes, sir. 13 THE BAILIFF: It will be about ten minutes, your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: Very well. (Short recess.) 16 17 THE COURT: It is the Court's information that Mr. Williams, Juror No. 4, did not raise his hand. He so responded 18 19 to Mr. Kuczera, so that corresponded with what you, 20 Mr. Manzella, and Mr. kanarek had seen. 21 MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: I was mistaken. 23 I'11 ---24 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor --25 THE COURT: Anything further on this? 26 MR. KANAREK: Yes. I would like to call Mr. Blackburn 27 as a witness. 28 THE COURT: The Court does not believe that's necessary

at this time. 1 Anything further now with respect to the 2 examination of the jury? MR. KANAREK: Not of the jury, but we do ask for an evidentiary hearing that we requested previously. THE COURT: The motion is denied for an evidentiary hearing in respect to whether or not there has been a 7 violation of the Court's publicity order. 8 ģ MR. KANAREK: May I have a moment, your Honor? 10 THE COURT: The Court will simply at this time handle 11 your motion for a mistrial and will hear argument from you or hear anything further that you might have to offer in 13 respect to ---14 MR. KANAREK: I do have --15 THE COURT: You do have some clippings. 16 MR. KANAREK: I do have some exhibits here. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

5b ?

5b-1

\$

1 2

3

5

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 record will show that the jurors are entirely removed from the courtroom.

You have a pile of papers six inches deep in front of you, there, and we don't want to burden the Clerk with that. Can you clip that --

MR. KANAREK: I wanted your Honor to see these, since your Honor wasn't in the Los Angeles area, to get the context and the effect. These matters are -- here, for instance, this "MANSON PLOT" Sunset Edition of the Herald-Examiner dated Monday, August 30, 1971, and in this article, which was written by Mr. Blackburn, he purports to have information from sources according to the investigator and clearly these people are within the publicity order and it is a clear violation of state action, invading Mr. Manson's right to a fair trial.

I mean, it is clearly, uh --

THE COURT: Well, you wish to introduce those based on your motion to have this Court examine Mr. Blackburn on the issue as to whether or not anyone has violated the publicity order?

MR. KANAREKI No.

THE COURT: You wish to introduce it likewise on your motion for a mistrial?

MR. KANAREK: It is our position that state action is involved here. It goes beyond just the mere intent --

THE COURT: Well, are you introducing it for the mere purposes of --

MR. KANAREK: Well, yes.

THE COURT: -- your motion for a mistrial?

MR. KANAREK: And for an evidentiary hearing.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: To show that state action -- to show that the prosecution has gone shead -- law enforcement people in the District Attorney's office have deliberately gone shead with Mr. Blackburn to subvert Mr. Manson's right to a fair trial.

THE COURT: All right. How about the issue as to whether or not the Court should declare this mistrial based upon exposure of the jury to publicity? Do you have any further argument in respect to it?

MR. KANAREK: No argument, your Honor. I think these exhibits speak more eloquently than anyone.

THE COURT: How many exhibits do you have? Do you wish to take them as a group? If you do -- rather than take the whole papers, the want ads and all the extraneous matters -- just simply take those pages on which the pertinent articles are involved and perhaps cut them out and give them to the Clerk?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, be glad to.

THE COURT: How many do you wish to offer? Do you wish to take them as a group and label them next in order?

MR. KANAREK: Yes, certainly, whatever is convenient to the Court and Clerk.

THE COURT: We'll label them as your next in order, then, in connection with your motions, and that would be the Defendant's --

M-1 through

1

4

Ś.

6

7

8

9

10.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE CLERK: Special M.

THE COURT: -- M-I through however many you have there.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me see them, would you, please.

There are some articles in this group that I have not read and, therefore, since it is part of your motion, it is incumbent upon the Court to, I think, read and consider those articles along with anything else that is pertinent to your motion.

MR. KANAREK: The clippings that your Honor has previously been furnished, may they be marked as an exhibit to go along with the file that your Honor indicated that your Honor had previously read?

THE COURT: Yes. The Court sees in just looking at what you have compiled here, that there are none of those clippings that are not in here, so I would ask you now to simply mark for me or cut out for me what you wish for me to read of those exhibits here and of these newspaper articles.

MR. KANAREK: Certainly,

THE COURT: The Court will be in recess until 2:00 o'clock.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll return these to you now so you can work on them now and give them to me.

(Whereupon, as the Defendant Manson was being taken by the bailiff to the holding tank, the following proceedings were had:)

5c fls.

28

5c-1

1

2

3

5

0

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15.

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

**.** 25

. 26

27

28

THE DEFENDANT: May I speak to you?

THE COURT: Yes, with your attorney present.

Mr. Kanarek, would you please approach the bench?
The defendant has indicated he would like to speak with the
Court.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, with the Defendant Manson being present:)

THE DEFENDANT: It seems we created a monster here. tried to express to the Court maybe two or three weeks ago -- a week ago -- I am absent in time, but not too long ago, that there was some things that I was not a party to or responsible for, you know. I seem to be getting in the middle of a lot of things. If I cared to do anything to you or Mr. Manzella, I would do it myself. I am not mad at anyone. I don't have anything to do with Mr. Busch. I didn't know Mr. Busch than -- you know. I am dead in all of these thoughts There is a lot of people in the Family -- I guess we got one. I never had one before I got arrested. But it seems I am forced to have one. These people -- I can't be responsible for all their actions. It just keeps piling on and on and on. I am dead in this thought. I don't care if the sun don't come up tomorrow. It doesn't mean that much to me. You know, I am content in whatever I am doing. And --

THE COURT: The Court realizes that you are in custody and you could not possibly be responsible for many of the things that the press attributes to you, but the Court would say this to you, and Mr. Kanarek, that even though I have read these

articles, I certainly have no prejudice against you as a result of having read those or as a result of having read anything, anything I have read or heard on television.

THE DEFENDANT: I see the whole thing. I have lived in that jail house all my life. I am at home. You are just doing it to yourselves. You are not doing anything to me. You kicked me out of the last penitentiary. You people are crazy.

THE COURT: All right, anything else?

THE DEFENDANT: No, everything is all right. Everything is perfect.

THE COURT: All right, see you at 2:00 o'clock.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken to reconvene Tuesday, September 7, 1971 at 2:00 p.m.)

2:16 P.M.

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1971 3 THE COURT: The record will show Mr. Kanarek to be 4 5 present with Mr. Manson, Mr. Manzella for the People. 6 The jurors and alternates are not in the court-7 reom. Ω Is there anything further, gentlemen, that you wish ٠9 to submit to me? The Court has read Defendant's A-1 through -26. 10 11 MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor? 12 Nothing further, your Honor. MR. KANAREK: 13 THE COURT: Any further argument? 14 MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, the People would ask the 15 Court to call in the other jurors individually, the ones who 16 did not raise their hands in answer to the Court's general 17 question; to call each of those jurors in individually, to give 18 Mr. Kanarek the opportunity to perhaps ask a question, if he 19· has any questions to ask of those jurors. 20 Your Honor, I -- if they would -- if they MR. KANAREK: 21 would reiterate what they have already said, it would be a --22 MR. MANZELLA: The point is --23 MR. KANAREK: -- a negatory act. 24 My point is, as I've indicated to the Court, if 25 they just make the self-serving statements as they undoubtedly 26 will, since they did not raise their hand, since they said they 27 heard nothing --28 THE COURT: You don't wish to examine?

1

2

٥

À

MR. KANAREK: Well, I do, but I am not going to -- I am not going to -- it's our belief that there would be -- that their response would be that --

THE COURT: Well, in view of those beliefs, do you wish to have those jurors present so that you may directly ask them any questions? Or do you just simply wish to -- as you apparently indicated to me; I'm not sure -- withdraw any request to question them --

MR. KANAREK: Well --

THE COURT: -- individually?

MR. KANAREK: It puts me on the horns of a dilemma. We have an ongoing trial --

THE COURT: Well, you may do so. But I am asking you to take either one horn or the other.

MR. KANAREK: I understand that. And I choose not to do that, at this point --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KANAREK: -- because of --

THE COURT: All right. Well, ask them --

MR. KANAREK: -- because of what I view the Court's position to be. I think it would be useless to do that.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, my point was, briefly, that the Court's question to the panel as a whole, of necessity, was a general question. And questioning these other jurors individually might make it clearer exactly what the Court was asking in that general question.

THE COURT: All right. The Court realizes that the question that I had to put to them of necessity had to be

rather general, although it had to refer to Mr. Manson, and 1 it may have been misunderstood. 2 Let's see. Let's take Mrs. Nieves -- no, it's 3 Mr. Nieves. Let's ask him to come in. And after Nieves, 4 Mr. Williams, Miss Sierra; then Mrs. Love, Mr. Hunt, Mr. 5 Garcia, Hills and Banks. 6 7 EXAMINATION OF 8 MR. ALBERT S. NIEVES Q BY THE COURT: TO Mr. Nieves, did you fully understand the question Q 11 that I asked you this morning? 12 ĺ3 A Yes, I did. 14 When you were part of the group? Q 15 A Right. 16 Then do you have anything whatever to add verbally 17 to your apparent response, that you have not seen, heard or 18 read anything concerning Mr. Manson? 19 No. I wasn't in town in the first place. 20 Pardon? Q. 21 I wasn't in town in the first place. I spent two 22 weeks water-skiing. 23 Where did you do that? 24 One week at Pine Flats; and the other one on the 25 Colorado River. 26 All right. So you have heard, seen or read nothing 27 in connection with Mr. Manson during this entire recess? 28 a fig. A No, nothing whatever.

٠

6a-1 THE COURT: Any questions, gentlemen? 1 MR. KANAREK: No questions. 2 3 Thank you, Mr. Nieves. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Sierra. 5 Mr. Mieves, rather. We'll have Miss Sierra in 6 shortly. 7 I'm sorry. Did you have any questions --8 MR. MANZELLA: No, your Honor. THE COURT: -- Mr. Manzella? 9 10 MR. MENZELLA: NO. 11 12 EXAMINATION OF 13 MISS MARY RUTH SIERRA 14 BY THE COURT: 15 Miss Sierra, just on the chance that some of the 16 jurors might have misunderstood the Court's questions this morning put to the group as a whole, I now wish to ask you for 18 your personal response. 19 Rave you seen or read anything during the period of 20 the last two weeks concerning Mr. Manson? 21 Well, as soon as I see the name "Manson," I don't 22 -- I stop, you know. 23 I see. Well, had you heard, seen or read anything 24 at all during the last two weeks? 25 No. My brother is saving me the papers, so I 26 don't read the papers. 27 I see. He saves you papers, and you are going to 28 look at them after the trial is over?

1	A Yeah, after the trial. Yeah.
2	Q Oh. All right. I think that's what I suggested to
3	the jury several times; if they're curious, they should just
4	A. Yes. I would be tempted to read it.
5	THE COURT: All right. Any questions from either of you
6	gentlemen?
7	MR. MANZELLA: No, your Honor.
8.	MR. KANAREK: No. Thank you, Mrs
9	THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Sierra.
10	MR. KANAREK: , Sierra.
ıı ,	THE COURT: Where are we now? Love?
12	THE BAILIFF: Love.
13	
14 🗇	EXAMINATION OF
15	MRS. LUELLA LOVE
16	BY THE COURT:
17	Mrs. Love, you can just be seated at that first seat
18	at the opening, if you wish, please.
19	I just wanted to make sure that there was no mis-
20	understanding regarding the question that I put to the group
21	of jurors this morning, or the questions that I put to them,
22	when you were all assembled here as a group.
23	Do you understand?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q And I want you now orally to respond to those
26	questions or this question:
27	Have you heard, seen or read anything whatever
28	concerning Mr. Manson during the last two weeks?

1 Ài No. THE COURT: All right. Gentlemen, anything further? 2 MR. MANZELLA: No questions. 3 MR. KANAREK: No questions. 4. . 5 THE COURT; Thank you, Mrs. Love. . MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mrs. Love. May I just ask one --, by Mr. Kanareki 9 Mrs. Love, are you aware of any other trials going 10 on at the present time in Los Angeles County concerning 11 matters allegedly involving Mr. Manson? 12 Well, I have heard of some, when I was in here 13 before. 14 I see. Q. 15 THE COURT: Perhaps you'd better be seated, please. 16 MR. KANAREK: Well, no. Just at this time --17 THE COURT: Take the microphone. I couldn't hear you from 18 here. 19 Thank you, Mrs. Love. What was your answer to 20 Mr. Kanarek's question? I didn't hear you. 21 JUROR NO. 9: I did hear of some before, before the 22 recess. 23 BY MR. KANAREK: At this time, do you -- do you --Q 24 is your state of mind such that you believe there are any 25 trials concerning matters involving Mr. Manson going on 26 presently in Los Angeles County? 27 Ă. Do I believe? 28 Q. Yes.

Γ	
1	A I don't know.
2	Q You don't know whether there
3	A I haven't even heard about it or thought about it.
	MR. KANAREK: Thank you. Thank you.
,	THE COURT: Thanks, Mrs. Love.
	Mr. Hunt?
,	
	•
,	
,	
,	•
,	of the second of
,	
,	• ·
ì	
,	•
<b>)</b> ;	
3	
Ļ	
5	
5	
7	
3	

1	EXAMINATION OF
2	DANIEL W. HUNT
3	BY THE COURT:
4	Q Good afternoon, Mr. Hunt.
5	A Good afternoon.
6	Q The Court just simply wished to have your oral
7	response to the questions that I put this morning, just because
8	there might possibly have been some misunderstanding when I
9	put the questions to the group. And I would like to ask you
.0	now whether, during the two-week recess, you have heard, seen
a	or read anything at all concerning Mr. Manson?
12	A No, I have not, your Honor, and I have proof.
13.	(Whereupon, Juror No. 11 removed a pair of
14	sunglasses.)
15	I was offered a newspaper and I refused to even
16	look at the headlines, and this is the result.
17	Q You have a black eye?
L8	A That's correct.
19	Q Well, you're carrying the Court's admonition to
ķ0	a fine point, and the Court appreciates it.
21	A Thank you.
22	THE COURT: Do you have any questions?
23	MR. KANAREK: Yes.
24	BY MR. KANAREK:
<b>25</b>	Q Would you tell us the events surrounding that?
26	A Well, a friend supposed to be a friend there
27	was a group of us in the place having a drink and there was
28	something in the newspaper that he wanted me to see and I spoke

28

up and I said, "Well, I cannot read a newspaper. Save the paper and I will read it at a later date."

So when I looked around, he mumbled that I was looking down on him, see. So I walked on to the back of the room and when I looked up somebody said, "Look out, Hunt," and there he was. When I looked out, it was --

THE COURT: It was too late?

JUROR NO. 11: It was.

THE COURT: Anything further, gentlemen?

MR. MANZELLA: No.

MR. KANAREK: No.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hunt.

MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mr. Hunt.

THE COURT: Garcia. Bennie Garcia.

THE BAILIFF: He was questioned this morning.

THE COURT: Was he? Was he one of those that was questioned this morning? Was he?

MR. MANZELLA: No.

MR. KANAREK: No.

THE COURT: No, I don't believe so.

THE BAILIFF: He is upstairs. Can we take another one in the meantime?

THE COURT: All right, do you have another one outside?
Banks or Hills?

THE BAILIFF: Yes.

#### EXAMINATION OF

MRS. WANDA L. BANKS

1	BY THE COURT:
2	Q Your name for the record?
3.	A Mrs. Banks.
4	Q Mrs. Banks, I simply want to inquire from you,
5	so that we can hear your verbal response because you are under
6	oath at this time as to those questions that I put to you this
7	morning.
8	In other words, what I am asking you now is
9	whether you have, during the course of the last two weeks,
10	heard, seen or read anything concerning Mr. Manson?
11	A No, I have not.
12	THE COURT: All right, any questions?
13	MR. MANZELLA: No, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek?
15	MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mrs. Banks.
16	THE COURT: Hills or Garcia.
17	
18 ,	EXAMINATION OF
19	MRS. OTEAL HILLS
20	BY THE COURT:
21	Q Good afternoon, Mrs. Hills.
22	A Good afternoon.
23	Q We've asked you to come in separately and apart
24	from the other jurors to get your verbal response to the
25	questions I put to you this morning in the event there should
26	be any misunderstanding. In other words, what I am asking you
27	now is whether, during the last two weeks, you have heard,
28	seen or read anything concerning Mr. Manson?

No, I haven t. A 1 THE COURT: Gentlemen? 2 MR. MANZELLA: No questions. MR. KANAREK: Thank you, no questions. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. 5 Now, Mr. Garcia, I think, is the remaining juror. 6 THE BAILIFF: Sammie Williams is here. Sammie Williams, 7 your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Williams has not been called. He should be 9 called, and so should Garcia. I don't think I called 10 Williams either the first or second time, so there are two 11 12 jurors remaining. 13 14 EXAMINATION OF 15 SAMMIE C. WILLIAMS 16 BY THE COURT: Mr. Williams, the Court has called you in this 17 afternoon simply to inquire of you whether you understood 18 19 what was said this morning concerning publicity, exposure to 20 publicity? 21 Did you understand those questions? Yes, sir, I did. Α 7a fls. 23 24 25 26 27 28

7a-1 To have your verbal response for the record now, . 1 did you, during the last two weeks, hear, see or read any-2 thing whatever concerning Mr. Manson? 3 Frankly, no, sir. A 4 Now, I do read, see, but -- the last couple of 5 weeks I've been off. Well, I've been pretty busy. 6 So have you --Q 7 A No. 8 Q. Have you, during the last two weeks, heard, seen 9 or read anything concerning Mr. Manson? 10 A Nothing concerning Mr. Manson, because what I 11 tell you, for one reason, my oath; and 12 No. 2, I work until 3:30, and I've been doing 13 some extra work, see, after leaving my job. 14 Post Office? Q. 15 No, sir, carpenter work. I've been doing some 16 repairing -- alteration for a lady, see. 17 Q I see. 18 And so when I get in at night, well, I'm too tired 19 to read, so I go to bed. And my wife, she helps me in 20 avoiding television. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, Mr. Manzella, any questions? 22 MR. MANZELIA: No questions. 23 MR. KANAREK: No questions. Thank you, Mr. Williams. 24 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Williams. 25 26

EXAMINATION OF BENNIE D. GARCIA

27

28

28

## BY THE COURT:

Q Good afternoon, Mr. Garcia.

Just in the event there may have been any misunderstanding this morning, the Court wishes to put the question to you and to have your oral response on the record.

Have you, during the last two weeks, heard, seen or read anything concerning Mr. Manson?

A No, I haven't, your Honor. We have the paper delivered to our home and, in accordance with the Court's instruction, why, my wife cuts out those things, and then she leaves it.

THE COURT: All right, any questions?

MR. MANZELLA: No, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, I think that does include an examination of all the jurors, alternates and all the jurors.

Any further argument, gentlemen?

MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, the motion for a mistrial is denied. The Court is satisfied --

MR. MANZELLA: I would like to be heard with regard to one juror, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's see if you wish to be heard after I have commented.

MR. MANZELLA: All right.

THE COURT: The Court has listened to these jurors and watched them as they have responded to the Court's questions and to counsel's questions. And I am convinced that except

2· 

in one case that the exposure to any publicity was unintentional on the part of the jurors and I'm convinced, except in one case, that there's no likelihood that what the jurors have been exposed to will affect their judgment in the case.

The Court is convinced that the jury remains fair and impartial and that the jury will base its judgments called for in the case solely upon the evidence and the Court's instructions of law.

However, the Court invites any comment from either counsel as to the situation in the state of mind of Mrs. Luster. She has had a shooting occur in her neighborhood, apparently in front of her house, and the person as a result of that shooting has apparently died in her living room. And she did appear to the Court to be quite emotionally upset when she was responding to the Court's questions this morning.

I'll hear your comment, Mr. Manzella.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, it appears that at least Mrs. Luster's reading of the newspaper articles, no matter what her reasons, amounts to at least a technical violation of the Court's admonition.

THE COURT: She has violated the Court's admonition not to read the newspaper.

MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor, and it would appear the reason for that violation, it seems to me, is irrelevant, and because of the violation of the Court's admonition that she must be excused.

MR. KANAREK: Is counsel finished?

MR. MANZELLA: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: Well, this -- the violation of the Court's admonition would be --

THE COURT: It is really beside the point, isn't it?

MR. KANAREK: That would be a contempt -
THE COURT: It is.

MR. KANAREK: It is. And it is our view, it is our view -- it is our position, since your Honor is not granting the relief being requested here, that we would oppose this lady being released. We oppose -- I think she is more candid than the rest.

ĬO

THE COURT: Well, she has had something unusual happen to her. And she states she is afraid. And she states that, nevertheless, being afraid of firearms and what might happen as the result of the use of firearms, that she can be fair and impartial in making any decision that she is called upon to make in this case.

MR. KANAREK: That's correct.

THE COURT: However, I am concerned about her emotional state. It was quite demonstrable while she was being asked questions that she was crying and that she was upset.

MR. KANAREK: Well, my father is passed away. If your Honor should dwell upon that subject, I might become emotional, too. In other words, the subject that made her emotional has involved something that purportedly has nothing to do with this trial.

Now, based upon -- based upon what the Court's rulings have been, again, it is -- it is a Hobson's choice kind of thing, the horns of a dilemma type of thing. We oppose this lady being released, being ordered released from jury duty. It is our view it would be a violation of equal protection and due process, as well as statutory and the case law of the State of California for your Honor to release this lady, because she stated -- and your Honor has taken many, many times the representations of jurors, potential jurors and so forth, as to their state of mind -- she said she would be fair and impartial. And so there's no reason to single her out from anyone else. And I do oppose your Honor releasing this lady or ordering this lady to be released from

.20

\_\_\_

Zį

jury duty. It would be denying Mr. Manson a fair trial.

THE COURT: Well, I don't believe so. In the cases where these jurors, various jurors and prospective jurors have expressed to me their resolutions to be impartial and their abilities to be fair and impartial, I believe them.

That is in the cases of those jurors who are now in the box. And there were some whom I did not believe who stated during the course of the selection of the jury that they could be fair and impartial. And in this case, because of Mrs. Luster's emotional state --

MR. KANAREK: I have another motion before your Honor makes any ruling.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KANAREK: It is a motion to sequester the jury.

Now, your Honor indicated --

THE COURT: In this case -- let me finish -- because of Mrs. Luster's state of mind, I am uncertain as to her ability to remain fair and impartial.

MR. KANAREK: That's no --

THE COURT: She has expressed a fear of gunplay in the courtroom, a fear because of a lack of protection of her person, while other people involved in the trial are protected. She named or did state that witnesses were accorded some protection by officers but she was not. It seems to me, in that state of mind, that it would be quite unlikely that she could remain fair and impartial or that she is fair and impartial.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor --

ė,

 THE COURT: Accordingly, the Court will excuse Mrs. Luster at this time.

I am not, however, because of her emotional state, going to take any steps against her in respect to the contempt in disobeying the admonition of the Court. That would be a sufficient cause, perhaps, in itself, for her to be relieved. But I am inclined to agree that the more relevant matter is her current state of mind.

MR. KANAREK: I don't think -- I'm sure your Honor feels that is -- or, feels that he is not a psychiatrist, and I do ask that doctors be appointed to examine --

THE COURT: The motion is denied.

MR. KANAREK: We do oppose her release.

THE COURT: I understand that, and it is clear on the record. So, accordingly, I am going to release Mrs. Luster and excuse her from further service in this case. That would leave three alternates.

MR. KANAREK: I would like to point out to the Court, and re-emphasize the principle of Marion vs. Beto. I think that's the case where the excusal of one juror improperly in a capital case --

THE COURT: The Court realizes that. That if I have improperly excused this juror that it would be grounds for a reversal. But the Court believes that Mrs. Luster is being properly excused.

I hadn't heard any argument from either of you in respect to Mrs. Luster before the Court made its ruling, but do either of you have anything to say about any of the

other jurors?

MR. MANZELLA: No, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: It is our view they all should be excused. If you are going to take the protestations or the self-serving statements or whatever, or the statement of one juror like this, your Honor, and — in other words, there is a premium on lack of candor. A juror who wishes to remain and wishes to crucify Mr. Manson for persons — for reasons of their own, all they have to do is verbalize that they make no response or something like that, and that is manifestly unfair.

THE COURT: Would you call Mrs. Luster in to the court, please?

THE BAILIFF: She is right outside.

8 fig.

,#

8-1

1

2

3

5

6. '

9

10-

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

BY THE COURT:

Mrs. Luster, the Court realizes that you have suffered, as a result of your husband's traumatic experience, a considerable emotional shock. And I could observe, from the way you reacted this morning when I was questioning you, that you did appear to be under considerable nervous strain.

And I do wish you well, upon your seeing your doctor, as you stated that you would.

EXAMINATION OF

MRS. LILLIAN LUSTER

I must tell you that you are in violation of the Court's admonition — and, as you freely admitted, and I believe that you knew — but you said that you were unable to resist looking at the newspapers —

- A. (Indicating affirmatively.)
- 0 -- because of the circumstances.

Now, I am taking that into consideration, and the Court is not acting to, in any way, punish you or even chastise you at this time, because I do realize that this was an emotional situation, and I can understand it.

However, because of your state of mind, the Court will relieve you as a juror. The Court thanks you very much. You have, as I have been able to note, during the course of these weeks, you have been very attentive.

And I certainly appreciate the sense of responsibility that you must have, which permitted you to assume these obligations as a juror.

I am sorry that this incident did occur. The Court

28

at this time, then, will excuse you from further attendance 1 in this trial. 2 JUROR NO. 1: Thank you. 3 THE COURT: All right. MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, on behalf of the People, I 5 would like to thank Mrs. Luster for her service as a juror in 6 this case as well. MR. KANAREK: Thank you. Thank you, Mrs. Luster. 8 THE COURT: Good luck, Mrs. Luster. 9 Take the three names of the alternates for now 10 and select one. 11 Let's have all the jurors present when you do that. 12 THE CLERK: Put them in the box? 13 14 THE COURT: Put them in the box, and draw one of the 15 three. 16 (Whereupon, the members of the jury entered the 17 courtroom, and the following proceedings were had:) 18 THE COURT: The record will show that the jurors and 19 alternates are present, with the exception of Mrs. Luster. 20 The defendant is present with Mr. Kanarek. 21 Ladies and gentlemen, the Court has relieved 22 Mrs. Luster of further service in this case, and now the Court 23 will request that the Clerk select one of the names of the three alternates. 25 THE CLERK: Mrs. Hills. 26 THE COURT: All right. Mrs. Hills? You now are Juxor 27 No. 1, then. 28 Would you take the -- take your seat, Mrs. Hills,

where Mrs. Luster was? 1 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I believe your Honor misspoke. 2 I believe it was inadvertent, but there are four alternates. 3 I just wanted --THE COURT: Thank you, thank you, Mr. Kanarek. 5 Did you select that --6 THE CLERK: Yes. -- one name from four? THE COURT: R THE CLERK: Yes. Q THE COURT: From the four alternates, then? 10 THE CLERK: Yes. 11 THE COURT: I did misspeak. 12 MR. KANAREK: Yes. That's all I -- thank you. 13 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kanarek. 14 Is there anything further that you gentlemen wish 15 to say at this time? 16 MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor. 17 MR. MANZELLA: No, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: At the bench or otherwise? 19 MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: All right. Let's proceed, then. 21 MR. MANZELLA: All right. 22 The People call Mr. Frank Metz. THE COURT: Do all of you have your notebooks and pen or 24 pencils? Is there anyone who doesn't? (No affirmative response.) 27 THE CLERK: Would you raise your right hand, please, to be sworn?

Now the state of t

You do solemnly swear that the testimony you may give in the cause now pending before this Court shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. б FRANK RETZ, called as a witness by and on behalf of the People, testified as follows: THE CLERK: Please take the stand and be seated. THE BAILIFF: Just state and spell your full name. THE WITHESS: My name is Frank Retz; R-e-t-z. 8a 3 €21 

8a-1	1	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	2	BY MR. MANZELLA:
	3	Q Mr. Retz, do you know a man by the name of
	4.	George Spahn?
	5	A Yes, I do.
£	6	Q And when did you first meet Mr. Spahn? What year?
	7	A Either 1967 or '68.
<b>\$</b>	8	Q Now, sometime after meeting Mr. Spahn, did you
	9	purchase some property in the area of the Spahn Ranch in
	10	Chatsworth?
	11	A Yes, I did.
,	12	Q And from whom did you purchase that property?
	13	MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant and immaterial.
	14	THE WITNESS: Mrs
	15	THE COURT: Just a minute. The objection is sustained.
Ţ	16	THE WITNESS: Mrs. Mary
<b>2</b>	17	THE COURT: Just a minute. When I sustain an objection,
	18	THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry.
	19	THE COURT: you don't have to answer, Mr. Retz.
	20	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Mr. Retz
	21	THE COURT: Wait for the next question.
	22	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Mr. Retz, what property
<u>.</u>	23	did you purchase?
•	24	A I purchased the west side of the Spahn Movie Ranch.
	25	Q And was this property which was adjoining the
	26	Spahn Movie Ranch?
	. 27	A That's correct.
	28	Q And approximately what was the strike that.

8a-2	1	What was the acreage of the property you
	2	purchased?
	3	A 27-1/2 acre.
	4	Q 27-1/2?
	5	A That's right.
	6	Q And when did you buy that property?
**	7	MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant and immaterial, your Honor.
<del>i</del>	8	THE COURT: Sustained.
•	ġ	MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, may we approach the bench?
	10	THE COURT: You don't have to answer that, Mr. Retz.
	11	MR. MANZELLA: May we approach the bench, your Honor,
	12	for an offer of proof?
	13	THE COURT: All right, You may.
	14	(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had
	15	at the bench, not within the hearing of the jury:)
7	16	MR. MANZELLA: We are trying to show, from the testi-
*	17	mony of this witness, that he was part of the he and his
	18	actions and his desires with regard to his property and the
	19	property of the Spahn Ranch were part of the motive for the
	20	killing of Donald Shea.
	21	Among other things, we want to establish
	22	THE COURT: Well, the question to which an objection was
•	23	raised was: When was the property acquired?
*	24	MR. MANZELLA: Right.
	25	THE COURT: And that
	26	MR. MANZELLA: This is to establish that the
<u> </u>	27	testimony would be strike that.
	28	The testimony would be that the property was

3a~3

4. 

7<sup>.</sup> 8<sup>.</sup>

ŧ

purchased on -- in May of 1969; that they went into escrow on June 30th of 1969; and that on that date -- and he recalls that date specifically, because that was the date that escrow was opened on the property -- that an incident occurred between -- well, strike that.

That he found Mr. Manson and members of the Manson Family in a -- in a farmhouse on his property; that he called the Sheriff's Office and told Manson that he wanted him --

THE COURT: That's related to this other incident which has been spoken of by the officer?

MR. MANZELLA: This is another incident.

THE COURT: Still another?

MR. MANZELLA: Right. On June 30th. The incident that Deputy Wachsmuth testified to was on August 24th of 1969.

This incident occurred on June 30th.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. MANZELLA: And I am attempting to -- the offer of proof is that the witness would establish the presence of the Manson Family on his ranch, and that he talked to George Spahn about getting rid of the Manson Family; that he talked to George Spahn about hiring Shorty Shea or Donald Shea as a watchman to get rid of the Manson Family.

And that's the purpose of the testimony. And I think the date of when he purchased the property is relevant, because it — it establishes when he began his ownership of the property.

And it also establishes the date that he had the first incident with Mr. Manson and members of the Manson

Family.

MR. KANAREK: But this is irrelevant and immaterial as to Mr. Manson, your Honor. It has no probative value. Mr. Manson can't be saddled with those facts.

MR. MANZELLA: Mr. Manson was present, your Honor. That's the point.

MR. KANAREK: And also, it's not the best evidence. The escrow is the best evidence.

I'll object on the grounds that it's hearsay, and it's conclusion, and not the best evidence.

The Evidence Code -- if you want to prove that up, you can prove it up with instruments.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

. 21

22

¢

23 24

25

26

27

28

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, that's ridiculous, --

MR. KANAREK: It's not ridiculous.

MR. MANZELLA: -- to require the formal papers to be brought in, instead of just asking a witness when he bought certain property.

MR. KANAREK: Well, that --

THE COURT: The question of his title is certainly not in contention in this --

MR. KANAREK: Well, it is as far as --

THE COURT: -- lawsuit.

MR. KANAREK: The Evidence Code doesn't make any distinction on best evidence. Just because you -- you -- counsel makes some -- some kind of --

MR. KANAREK: But you are trying to prove --

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, we are not attempting to prove the contents of the escrow agreement. --

MR. MANZELLA: -- or the purchase contract. We are merely trying to prove when the -- the date that he was on the property, and that he was there-- he was looking over the

property to determine the acreage of the property, because

that's when he was purchasing the property.

And this is when he found -- as he was touring the property and checking it, examining the property -- that's when he found Manson and the Family in the farm house, and when he chased them out and so on.

THE COURT: Well, I am more concerned about your ultimate goal in this course of questioning of Mr. Retz.

You wish to put into evidence the statements of

Retz to Spahn, or Spahn to Retz, concerning what Spahn wished 1 to do toward hiring --MR. MANZELLA: No. THE COURT: -- Shorty Shea? MR. MANZELLA: No. What Mr. Retz -- Retz's statement to Mr. Spahn, with regard to what Retz wanted to do about hiring 7 Shorty Shea. MR. KANAREK: Well, Mr. Manson cannot be saddled with 8 9 that. That's no -- you have to show --10 MR. MANZELLA: And we will --11 THE COURT: In other words, --12 MR. MANZELLA: -- connect it up. 13 THE COURT: -- you claim that it would be an exception to 14 the hearsay rule, in that it shows an expression of intention 15 on Retz's part --16 MR. MANZELLA: That's right. 17 THE COURT: -- to retain --18 MR. MANZELLA: Exactly, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: -- to retain or hire Shorty Shea? 20 MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor. That he did in fact 21 seek to hire Shea as a watchman, to get rid of Manson and the 22 . Family; and that we will prove through other witnesses that 23 Manson knew about the fact that Shea was going to be hired by 24 Retz to rid the property of the Manson Family. 25 THE COURT: I think it's reasonable under the circum-26 stances, then, to allow him -- I'll permit him to answer as 27 to when he acquired the property. 28 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, that's irrelevant and

4

٠

1

7

8

9

10 -

'n

24

25

26

27

28

immaterial as to his -- his conversation with Mr. Spahn is irrelevant, immaterial, hearsay, --

MR. MANZELLA: If --

MR. KANAREK: -- as to what he intends to do, whether he intended to go to Europe or hire Mr. Shea. Mr. Manson is not saddled with that conversation.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor --

MR. KANAREK: It's a conversation which cannot be used against Mr. Manson.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, we will show that Mr. Retz intended to hire Shea as a watchman. We will show that Shea received the offer.

We will show that Manson knew about the offer to Shea, and that that formed part of the motive for the killing of Donald Shea.

MR. KANAREK: But your Honor, he may -- but we still have the rule -- the law -- we still have the Evidence Code, that that cannot be used.

He can't go in and prove a conversation between Mr. Retz and Mr. Spahn, for this purpose.

8c-1

1 2

3

\_

6

8

9

10

12 13

**14**:

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26 27

28

THE COURT: Why not?

MR. KANAREK: Because -- because it -- it's irrelevant, and it's immaterial as to Mr. Manson. It doesn't -- it doesn't -- Mr. Manson can't be saddled with that conversation.

MR. MANZELLA: He can, your Honor, if we prove that

Mr. Manson knew about the intention of Retz to hire Shea.

THE COURT: All right, I will permit it.

I will sustain the objection to this question, even though I have said that it's admissible, because I think it does -- it probably does call for a conclusion.

Perhaps the title papers would be the best evidence as to when he specifically acquired the property.

HR. MANZELLA: Okay. All right.

THE COURT: But the general line of questioning, the Court believes, is not improper.

MR. MANZELLA: All right. Thank you, your Honor.

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

- after you met George Spahn in 1967 or 1968, did you begin negotiating with Mr. Spahn for the purchase of the Spahn Ranch?
  - A That's correct.
- Q Can you pull that microphone at all closer to you, Mr. Retz?

THE COURT: Just lean forward, Mr. Retz.

THE UITNESS: Okay. Yes.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Now, was that before or after you purchased the adjoining property?

	•
1	A. Before.
2	Q And do you know the acreage of the Spahn Ranch?
3	A Yes, I do.
4	Q And what is that?
5	A Exactly 27-1/2.
6	Q. Acres?
. 7	A. Acres.
8	Q Now, while you were carrying on negotiations with
9	Mr. Spahn, did you meet with him on one occasion or on more
10.	than one occasion?
11	MR; KAWAREK: That's irrelevant and immaterial,
12	THE WITNESS: More than.
13 '	MR. KANAREK; Your Honor? Would your Honor ask the
14	witness not to answer until your Honor rules?
15	THE COURT; The objection is overruled.
16	Mr. Retz, if there is an objection, wait until
17	after the Court has made a ruling in respect to that objection,
18	and then you may answer or not, depending on how the Court
19	rules.
20	THE WITNESS: Okay.
21	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: You met with him on more than one
22	occasion?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q And where did you meet with Mr. Spahn?
25	A. In his home.
26	Q Was that on Spahn Ranch?
27	A. Yes.
28	And for how long, approximately, did you carry
- 1	i de la companya de

1 on these negotiations with George Spahn? 2 MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant and immaterial, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Overruled. 4 (No response.) THE WITNESS: 5 BY MR. MANZELLA: You can answer the question, if Q 6 you can. Mr. Retz. 7 For about -- since last January, when I bought the 8 ranch. And when you say "last January," --10 Yes. 11 -- of what year are you referring to? 12 1971 13 That's when you bought the Spahn Movie Ranch? 14 That's right. 15 Now, prior to that time, prior to the time you 16 actually bought the ranch, did you carry on negotiations with 17 Mr. Spahn? 18 A. All the time. 19 MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant and immaterial, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: The answer may remain. The objection is 21 overruled. 22 I'm sorry. I didn't hear the answer. MR. MANZELLA: 23 THE WITNESS: Yes. 24 Give me again the question. 25 Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you carry on negotiations 26 with Mr. Spahn before you bought the ranch in January of 1971? 27 A. Yes. 28 Now, when you were carrying on negotiations, you Q.

have already said that you met with Mr. Spahn at Spahn Ranch; is that correct?

A Correct.

And if you can tell us, approximately how many times did you go out to Spahn Ranch?

MR. KANAREK: That's irrelevant and immaterial, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. MANZELLA: May we approach the bench for an offer of proof, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

No, permission is withdrawn. You may continue with your questioning.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
<b>1</b> ,5	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

. 0	BY MR.	MANZELLA:	Now, after	you met	George Spahr
in 1967	and 1968,	how often	did you go	out to Sp	pahn Ranch?
MR.	KANAREK:	Asked and	answered;	and also	, irrelevant
and imma	terial.				

THE COURT: Sustained.

THE WITNESS: Sometime every day.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right, Mr. Retz. You can't answer that question.

THE COURT: That's stricken, ladies and gentlemen. That answer is stricken.

The objection is sustained.

- Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you go out to Spahn Ranch during the year 1968?
  - A. Yes, I did.
  - Q Did you go out to Spahn Ranch during the year 1969?
  - A. Yes, I did.
- Now, directing your attention to the defendant in this case, Mr. Charles Manson, do you know him?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q Now, do you recall when it was that you first met Mr. Manson?

MR. KANAREK: That's irrelevant and immaterial, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: It was approximately in the early Spring.

- Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Of 19--
- A I am unable to say the date or the month, exactly.
- And was it -- was the year 1969?

1	MR. KANAREK: Leading and suggestive, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer.
3	THE WITNESS: Yes.
4.	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And whore was Mr. Manson when you
5	met him?
6	A. At the Spahn Ranch.
7	And were there other people there with Mr. Manson?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q Now, directing your attention to the date of June
10	30th of 1969, do you recall that date?
11	MR. KANAREK: That's leading and suggestive, your Honor.
12	THE WITNESS: Yes.
13	THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
14	The answer may remain.
15	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And how do you remember that
16	date?
17	MR. KANAREK: That's irrelevant and immaterial, your
18	Honor, as to how he happens to remember it.
19	THE COURT: Oyerruled.
20	THE WITNESS: That's the date when I went to the escrow
21	with Mrs. Kelly.
22	Q BY MR. MANZELLA; All right. Mrs. Kelly was the
23	person from whom you purchased the property adjoining Spahn
24	Ranch?
25	A. That's correct.
26	Q And was that the date that you went into escrow?
27	A That's right, yes.
28	Q Now, were you and Mrs. Kelly on that property that

1	you eventually purchased on June 30th, 1969?
2	A. Yes.
. 3	Q And what were you doing there on that date?
4	MR. KANAREK: That's irrelevant and immaterial, and it
5	doesn't go to reach any issue in the Indictment, your
6	Honor.
7	THE COURT: Sustained.
8	You need not answer that.
9	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you see Mr. Kelly on the
10	Mr. Manson on the Kelly property on June 30th, 1969?
11	MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant
12	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.
13	MR. RAWAREK: and immaterial, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
15	The answer may remain.
16	THÉ WITNESS: Yes, I did.
17	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And where was Mr. Manson when you
18	saw him?
19	A He was in the farmhouse.
20	Q And is the farmhouse strike that.
21	Is the farmhouse on the Kelly property?
22	A Yes, correct.
23	Q And how strike that,
24	Where is the farmhouse in relation to Spahn Ranch?
25	A Almost on the border.
26	Q Between what was the Kelly property and the Spahn
27	Ranch?
28	A That's correct.

Q. Now, was Mr. Manson alone in the farmhouse, or was he with other people? MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant and immaterial; prejudicial value outweighs any probative value. . MR. MANZELLA: It goes to motive, your Honor. THE COURT: Counsel's remarks -- Mr. Manzella's remarks are stricken, but the objection is overruled. You may answer the question. THE WITHESS: When I opened the door, it was about 20 people in, all lying on the floor, and --BY MR. MANZELLA: And Mr. Manson was one of these people? Yes. 

25

26

27

28

Q Now, did you say something to Mr. Manson and these people when you came upon them?

MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant, immaterial, hearsay, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, the prejudicial value outweighs any probative value.

THE COURT: The answer as it is may remain.

The objection is overruled.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And what did you say to them?

MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant, immaterial, hearsay; prejudicial value outweighs any probative value, your Honor.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

MR. MANZELLA: May we approach the bench for an offer of proof, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

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

THE COURT: You are offering this for what purpose?

To show his --

MR. MANZELLA: Motive.

THE COURT: -- to show his intentions, show Mr. --

MR. MANZELLA: To show motive.

THE COURT: On the part of --

MR. MANZELLA: Yes. My offer of proof is that Mr. Retz told Manson to get out, to get off his property; and that Manson said he had no right to tell him to leave.

It goes to motive, the same situation as if

8e-2

y.

somebody said, "I want you out of my house," to a person who later came back and shot the person for throwing him out of the house.

It's the same thing. It goes to motive.

THE COURT: Well, do you contend that Retz later on did hire Shorty Shea?

MR. MANZELLA: We contend that Shea was killed before he was hired, but that -- but that the negotiations -- or, the conversation with George Spahn, in which Retz told Spahn that he wanted to hire Shea, and to tell Shea about it, occurred after the August 16th raid; and that Shea was dead by September 1st of 1969.

So in other words, we are not talking about a remote situation. We are talking about a situation in which -- of August 16th, 1969.

But what I am attempting to show right now is that Rets --

THE COURT: Retz didn't want Manson --

MR. MANZELLA: That Retz told Manson several times to get off his property; not to come on his property; and that for that purpose, he was hiring Shea. And that this motive - it's not a situation in which -- we are not claiming it's a situation in which Retz told Mr. Manson to get off his property just once. It's a situation in which he continually told Manson to get off his property.

THE COURT: Are you stating that Retz told Manson that he was hiring Shea?

MR. MANZELLA: No, not at this point. He never told

8a-3

٠

્

1

2

\_

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14,

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

**2**2

څ

23 24

25 26

27

28,

Manson that he was hiring Shea.

But we are showing that Retz threw Manson off his property and told him to get off his property, several times.

THE COURT: Then how ---

MR. MANZELLA: And we will show that --

THE COURT: How is the motive -- how did you intend to show that? That Manson knew that Shea was in any way involved with Retz' order that he, Manson, vacate the property?

MR. MANZELLA: By Manson's own statements, that this is one of the reasons Shea was killed.

MR. KANAREK: Well, you can't use that. You can't have -you can't prove the corpus, your Honor, with the statements of
the defendant.

MR. MANZELLA: I am not trying to prove the corpus.

THE COURT: But he is not showing the corpus.

MR. KANAREK: Evidently, that's part of his corpus, because he is trying to prove these as -- as some kind of basis to show that Shorty Shea is dead. He is now --

MR. MANZELLA: No, that's not true.

MR. KANAREK: He is now offering evidence -THE COURT: No.

Well, go ahead.

MR. KANAREK: He is now offering evidence that -certainly, it -- these -- these statements cannot be admissions, because even from the prosecution viewpoint, looking
at the indictment, these are matters that occurred before
Mr. Shea died.

So they couldn't possibly be admissions. They

have to be something to prove the case in chief. 8a-4 And it's irrelevant, it's immaterial, and it's 9 fls. prejudicial, and it cannot be used. . 14 22; -3 3. 1 × 110 1 115 

3

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

16

17

.

18

19

20

21.

22-

24

25

26

27

28

MR. MANZULLA: We are not offering this testimony on the corpus. We are offering it on the connection of Mr. Manson to the death -- we're offering the testimony as part of the motive of Mr. Manson to kill Shea.

MR. KANAREK: That is double-talk, your Honor. That last statement of counsel has to be, because you can't have it both ways. Either it is relevant or material or it isn't. It just can't be used. It has to come in on some legal question.

THE COURT: I think it is.

MR. MANZELLA: Because --

THE COURT: I think it is relevant concerning the People's theory.

MR. KANAREK: How is it going to -- the fact that this man THE COURT: It shows Mr. Manson's knowledge of Mr. Retz's inclination to keep him off of his property and ties in with the statement that the People expect to elicit that Mr. Manson knew that Mr. Shea was employed by Retz to accomplish this on behalf of Retz.

Is that what you are saying?

MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: But, your Honor, the only way Mr. Manson's statement later on can be used is as an admission.

MR. MANZELLA: That's correct.

THE COURT: That's --

MR. KANAREK: All right, now, you can't. That stands on its own two feet as an admission. You can't -- you can't use this irrelevant and immaterial evidence to prove that right now -- right now they are proving the corpus of Mr. Shorty Shea.

They can't use that irrelevant, immaterial, prejudicial evidence to prove that Shorty Shea is dead. If they want to use an 3 6 7. 10 11 told it to Mr. Manson. 12 13 MR. MANZELLA: Correct. 15 16 in connection with it? 17 MR. MANZELLA: No. 18 19 20 of those instances. 21 MR. MANZDILA: Right. 22 THE COURT: Ask him whether or not --

admission of Mr. Manson by some witness, that's a different matter, but this is -- this is absolutely irrelevant and immaterial. Because by counsel's own statement. Mr. Retz is not going to testify that Mr. Shea -- that he ever told Mr. Manson he's hiring Mr. Shea. Maybe he can do that with some other witness, but that is -- this testimony here, the fact that he was going to hire Shorty Shea has to be saddled somehow on Mr. Manson and you can't do it if the man never THE COURT: Mr. Retz is simply going to testify that he ordered Mr. Manson to leave the place?

THE COURT: And he's not going to go into any details

THE COURT: The Court thinks that you can ask him that without going into any of the other instances or the details

MR. MANZELLA: Here is what I intend to ask him.

One, about this incident;

Two, about the August 24th incident that Deputy Wachsmuth testified to; and

Thirdly, did he ever at any time find Mr. Manson on his property and did he tell Mr. Manson to leave.

33

23

24

25

26

27

28

3

THE COURT: All right, I am in accord with you, Mr. Kanarek, and agree with you that without a corpus, an admission cannot be utilized or considered.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, at some point we're going to have to get to the point -- what I am offering, I am offering this witness' testimony not on the issue of corpus, I am offering it on the issue of guilt.

THE COURT: The Court understands why you are offering it. The Court understands that Mr. Manson at some time later on made some statement which would be an admission.

MR. MANZELLA: Confession. And --

THE COURT: Confession.

MR. MANZELLA: A confession, and as part of that confession he said that Retz was going to hire Shea and that Squeaky told him that Retz had hired Shea to get rid of the Family.

THE COURT: I had assumed it was an admission from what you said.

MR. MANZELLA: Not from Retz. That testimony is not coming from Retz.

THE COURT: I understand.

What you intend to offer would be -- I didn't know that it was a part of the alleged confession.

MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: But I think that in order to show motive, that the People can, if the Court permits it to come in out of order. The Court will do it.

MR. MANZELLA: All right. Thank you.

MR. KANAREK: Oh, your Honor, may we take a recess at

ŝ

this time?

THE COURT: All right.

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

THE COURT: We'll take a short recess, ladies and gentlemen.

Remember the admonition, you are not to converse amongst yourselves, nor with anyone else, nor 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.

About ten minutes, if you would, please.

You may step down and come back in ten minutes.

(Short recess.)

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: The record will show the defendant to be present with his counsel. The jurors and alternates are present.

You may proceed.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, there is a motion pending before the Court.

THE COURT: Would you approach the bench?
MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor.

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

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I forgot about the motion.

Mr. Kanarek made a motion to sequester the jury before the

Last recess.

THE COURT: That's correct. Let's handle it after we conclude tonight.

Is that all?

MR. MANZELLA: That's all, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

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

MR. MANZELLA: Mr. Retz, would you take the witness stand, please.

## FRANK RETZ,

resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

9a-2	ı	DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)
	Ž	BY MR. MANZELLA:
_	3	Q Now, Mr. Retz, directing your attention to the
	4	date of June 30, 1969, when you came upon Mr. Manson and
	5	others in the family house on the Kelly property.
£	6	Did you say anything to Mr. Manson?
·	7	A Yes.
3	8 ,	MR. KANAREK: Hearsay, irrelevant and immaterial.
	9	THE COURT: Overruled.
	10	A Yes, I did.
	11	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And what did you say to Mr.
	12.	Manaon?
	13	MR. KANAREK: Hearsay, irrelevant and immaterial, your
<b>.</b>	14	Honor.
	15	THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer.
<b>€</b>	16	A To get out of my property.
	17	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Now, did Mr. Manson say
	18.	anything to you when you told him to get out?
	19	MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant, immaterial, the prejudicial
	20	value outweighs the probative value. No foundation, your
	21	Honor. Hearsay.
	22	THE COURT: Sustained.
3	23	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you call
₽	24	THE COURT: Well very well, I'll sustain it. Go
	25	ahead.
	26	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you call the Los Angeles
<u>`</u>	27	County Sheriff's Office?
	28	MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant immaterial conclusion.

9 <b>a-</b> 3	1	THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
	2	A Yes, sir, I did.
	3,	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And did the sheriffs arrive?
	4	A Yes, they did.
•	5	Q On did you speak to them?
	6	A Yes.
	7	Q And at sometime thereafter did Mr. Manson and
,3	.8	this other group of people leave the Kelly property?
	9	A Not right away.
	10	Q I'm not
	11	A No.
	12	Q Mr. Retz, just listen to my question.
	13	Sometime after that did Mr. Manson and the rest
	14	of the people that were with him leave the Kelly property?
•	15	A That day or sometime after, another day, I didn't
•	16	Q Well, I'm talking about that same day.
2 1	17	A The same day?
	18	Q Yes, did Mr. Manson and the rest of the people
	19	you saw in the farmhouse with Mr. Manson, did they eventually
	20	leave the property that day!
	21	A No, they didn't.
•	22	Q All right. Now, did you go to the Kelly property
*	23	once or more than once during the time that you were consider-
<b>.</b>	24	ing buying the property?
	25	MR. KANAREK: That's irrelevant and immaterial, your
	26	Honor.
·	27	THE COURT: Sustained.
7	28	Q BY :MR. MANZELLA: Mr. Retz, after June 30, of 1969

did you -- strike that. 1 After June 30, 1969, did you spend time on the 2 property which you had purchased from Mrs. Kelly? 3 MR. KANAREK: That's irrelevant and immaterial. THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer. 5 A Yes, I did. 6 BY MR. MANZELLA: And how much time did you spend Q 7 on the property? 8 Ă At least 50 percent of my time. 9 Were you out on the property every day? ð 10 A Almost every day. 11 Q Now, after June 30th, 1969, when you were out on 12 the property almost every day, did you see Mr. Manson there? 13 A Yes, I did. 14 On one occasion or more than one occasion? Q 15 A More. 16 And can you tell us approximately how many Q 17 occasions? 18 It is hard to say. More occasions. A 19 And was Mr. Manson alone on these occasions or Q. 20 was he with other people? 21 A With other people. 22 Now, on these occasions did you ever talk to Mr. Q 23 Manson? 24 Ă Yes, I did. 25 What did you tell him on these occasions? Q 26 MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant, immaterial, hearsey, 27 conclusion, your Honor. The prejudicial value outweighs any 28

92-4

9 <b>4-5</b>	1	probative value.
	2	THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
	3.	9 BY MR. MANZELLA: What did you tell him on these
	4	occasions?
b fls.	5	A Tell him to leave my property.
, <b>3</b>	6	
	7	
*	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	The second state of the second
	12	
•	13	
	14	
•	15	
÷	16	
3	17	
	18 19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
*	24	
	25	
•	26	,
•	27	
	28	
`	*	

n> 4		a three notions times 20th no 1000 and was have any
9b-1	1	Q Now, after June 30th of 1969, did you have any
	2	conversations with George Spahn?
	3	A. Yes, I did.
•	4	Q Where did you have those conversations with George
	5	Spahn?
	6	A. Most on Spahn.
ei • `	' <b>7</b>	Q. On the Spahn Ranch?
, &	8 .	A. Yes
	9	Q And on those strike that.
	10	During those conversations did you talk to
	11	Mr. Spahn about buying Spahn Ranch?
	12	MR. KANAREK: Object on the grounds of hearsay, no
	13	foundation, irrelevant and immaterial.
	14	THE COURT: Sustained.
*	15	MR. MANZELLA: May we approach the bench for an offer of
`	16	proof?
*	17	THE COURT: No, you may not.
	18	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you talk to Mr. Spahn about
	19	the presence of Mr. Manson and other people on your property
	20	which you had purchased from Mrs. Kelly?
	21	A, No.
	22	MR. KAWAREK: Object, no foundation, hearsay, irrelevant
•	23	and immaterial, leading and suggestive.
ક	24	THE COURT: The objection is sustained as to form.
	25	MR. MANZELLA: All right.
	26	
	27	The persons that you saw with Mr. Manson on your
	28	property on June 30, 1969, had you seen those persons on

1	Spahn Ranch?
2	A. Yes, I did.
3	Q And did you know those persons by one name or one
4	term?
5	MR. KANAREK: Objection, your Honor, that's conclusion
6	and hearsay.
7	THE COURT: Sustained.
8	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Now, when you had the conversation
9	with Mr strike that.
10	When you had the conversations with Mr. Spahn after
11	June 30, 1969, was anyone else present other than you and
12	Mr. Spahn?
13	A. Sometime, yes.
14	Q And who was present?
15.	A. The girl that was most with him, was Linda, Squeaky.
16	Q Squeaky?
17	A. Yes.
18	And was Squeaky present on some occasions or on all
19	occasions that you talked to Mr. Spahn?
20	A Not on all of them. If she was here, then she was
21 22	present.
23	Q You mean if she was on the ranch, she was present?
24	A That's right.
25	, MR. KANAREK: Well, that's a conclusion. I ask it be
26	stricken. That he couldn't possibly know.
27	THE COURT: The answer "not on all of them," may remain.
28	The other portion of it is stricken, ladies and gentlemen.
	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Was she there? Was Squeaky

present at the conversations on most of the occasions to which 1 you spoke to Mr. Spahn? MR. KANAREK: That's ambiguous, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Overruled. THE WITHESS: Most. 5 BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Directing your attention to the photograph which has been marked People's 52 7 for identification, do you recognize the person who is shown 8 in this photograph? 9 Yes, I do. À, 10 And by what name do you know that person? Q. 11 Linda or Squeaky, 12 A 13 Squeaky? 14 Uh-huh. 15 . 16 i7. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 28

2

.3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

. 25

26.

27 28 Now, Mr. Retz, at any time did you tell Mr. Manson to get off Mr. Spahn's property?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I --

THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.

MR. KANAREK: That calls for a conclusion, your Honor, as to his knowledge of where the property line is.

THE COURT: Sustained. The answer may be stricken.

MR. MANZELLA: On that ground, your Honor? That he didn't know where the property line was?

I'm sorry. I'll withdraw the question.

THE COURT: Very well.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Mr. Retz, did you have a conversation with Mr. Spahn sometime after June 30th, 1969, about the presence of Mr. Manson and the people with him on Spahn Ranch?

MR. KANAREK: Leading and suggestive; no foundation; hearsay; it's irrelevant and immaterial, and the prejudicial value outweighs the probative value, your Honor.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And was that after June 30th of 1969?

A Yes

Q' And during that conversation, did you ask anything of Mr. Spahn?

MR. KANAREK: That's calling for a conclusion. It's also hearsay. There's no foundation. Your Honor, it's

irrelevant; it's immaterial. 1 THE COURT: The objection is sustained. 2 BY MR. MANZELLA: Who was present during that Q 3 conversation? Strike that. I'll withdraw that question. Was Squeaky present during that conversation with 6 Mr. Spahn? 7 It depends on which conversation. 8 MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, may we approach the bench? 9 THE COURT: No, you may not. Continue with your 10 questioning. 11 MR. MANZELIA: All right. 12 13 After June 30th of 1969, during one of the occasions when you saw Manson and Mr. -- Mr. Manson and the 14 15 people with him on Spahn Ranch, did you have conversations with Mr. Manson, or did you talk to Mr. Manson? 16 17 À. Oh, yes, I did. 18 And was that on one occasion or on more than one 19 occasion? 20 A. More. 21 And this is on George Spahn's Ranch; is that correct? Q. 22 That's correct. A. 23 And what did you say to Mr. Manson on those Q. 24 occasions? 25 MR. KANAREK: Hearsay, your Honor; foundation; 26 irrelevant and immaterial. 27 THE COURT: Overruled. 28 MR. KANAREK: And the prejudicial value outweighs the

E

probative value. 1 THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer. THE WITNESS: I told him to leave the ranch, because 3 George Spahn asked me to clean the ranch up of the Manson Family, and he gave me even power of attorney. BY MR. MANZELLA: To do that? His attorney called me up, and I tried to do it. A. 7 Now ---O. MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may that last portion be 9 stricken, about the --10 Was that part of what you said to Mr. Manson? 11 THE COURT: 12 THE WITNESS: That's right. THE COURT: The motion to strike is denied. 13 14 BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Prior to that time, Q 15 had you had a conversation with Mr. Spahn about the presence 16 of the Manson Family on Spahn Ranch? 17 MR. KANARIK: That's hearsay, --18 THE WITNESS: Correct. 19 MR. KANAREK: -- your Honor, conclusion, irrelevant and 20 immaterial; no foundation. 1 21 THE COURT: The objection is overruled. 22 The answer may remain. 23 BY MR. MANZELLA: And was Squeaky present during 24 that conversation? 25 Yes, she was. 26 Now, Mr. Retz, when did you take possession of the 27 property adjoining the Spahn Ranch? 28 Possession? A.

<u> </u>		1	Q. Yes.
		2	A I had an option on the Spahn Ranch
		3	Q No. No, let me interrupt you.
		4.	When did you take possession of the property which
		5	was next to the Spahn Ranch, which was the Kelly property?
	Ť	6	A In May, '69.
	₹	7	Q Now, directing your attention to the date of
		8	August 16 of 1969, do you recall that date?
		9	A. I don't remember dates.
		10	Q All right. Do you recall or, did you become
		11	aware of a raid or series of arrests which were made at
		12	Spahn Ranch on August 16th of 1969?
		13	A I knew that, but I don't know exactly the date.
		14	Q All right. But you did become aware of the raid
•		15 16	on Spahn Ranch by Sheriff's deputies; is that correct?
		17	A, Yes.
10a³	;	18	
	₹.	19	
•		20	
		21	
		22	
	23		
<b>24</b>		24	
*		25	
		26	
		27	•
		28	

All right. Now, after that raid, did you have a 10x-1 1 conversation with George Spahn on Spahn Ranch? Yes, the very next morning. A 3 The morning after the raid? Q That's correct. A 5 And who was present at that conversation? 6 A It was nobody -- myself and George. 7 Was Squeaky present at that conversation? Q. A No. 9 Now, would you tell us what you said to Mr. Spahn? Q 10 MR. KANAREK: Hearsay, your Honor; no foundation; 11 irrelevant, immaterial; prejudicial value outweighs the 12 probative value. 13 THE COURT: The objection's overruled. You may enswer. 14 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor --15 I told Mr. Spahn, "There is no other way 16 THE WITNESS: 17 to clean that thing out, then to hire a guard, and I going to 18 hire one." 19 BY MR. MANZELLA: You were going to hire a Q. 20 guard? 21 I promised Mr. Spahn. 22 Yes. 3 23 THE COURT: 24 25 The jury is admonished to disregard that. 26

27

28

The Court will strike the response, "There is no other way to clean the thing up." That is stricken. BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you tell --MR. KANAREK: It's our motion to strike the entire answer, your Honor.

10a-2

خ

1 2

-

THE COURT: The other portion of it may remain, including the defendant's last answer, in response to Mr. Manzella's --

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor said "defendant."

THE COURT: Strike that. The witness answer may remain to the last question; and the last portion of his answer, other than the words stricken in the previous answer, may remain.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Did you tell Mr. Spahn that you wanted to hire a guard?

A I did.

MR. KANAREK: That's leading and suggestive, your Honor, besides being hearsay and conclusion; and irrelevant and immaterial.

THE COURT: Well, it's asked and answered, but the answer may remain in.

The objection is overruled.

Q BY MR: MANZELLA: During that conversation with George Spahn, the day after the Spahn Ranch raid, did the name of any person come up with regard to what you had said to George about hiring a guard?

MR. KANAREK: Object on the grounds of hearsay, conclusion, your Honor. It's irrelevant and immaterial; improper foundation.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Mr. Retz, did you tell Mr. Spahn that you were going to hire any particular person as a guard?

10a-3

2

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

IJ

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

10b fla.

MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant, immaterial, your Honor. No foundation; hearsay.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

You may answer the question.

THE WITNESS: I didn't tell Mr. Spahn for a particular person, but Mr. Spahn offered me, and he says he got a person for me.

MR. KANAREK: I ask that that be stricken, your Honor, on --

THE COURT: The answer is stricken.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right.

Mr. Retz, after -- strike that.

During the conversation you had with Mr. Spahn about hiring a guard, did you eventually tell him -- did you eventually tell him that you were going to hire a person whose name he had suggested?

MR. KANAREK: Object, your Honor. There are a multitude of reasons that that --

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right.

Now, Mr. Retz, during the conversation you had with Mr. Spahn, was Squesky present?

A (No response.)

Q Did you hear the question?

A Yes, I heard, but when we had that day, or the day after, conversation Squeaky was not present. It was probably eight days later when we really came into the deal, that I going to hire a guard.

MR. MANZELLA: All right.

3

5

6

7 8

Q

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

3

ð

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

MR. KANAREK: Well, I ask that that last statement be stricken, your Honor. It's not even responsive to the question. It's a gratuitous --

MR. MANZELLA: I have no objection to striking the statement.

THE COURT: It may be stricken. It is stricken.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. During the period after the Spahn Ranch raid, did you have more than one discussion with Mr. Spahn with regard to the hiring of a guard?

A Yes.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, I object on the grounds of hearsay and conclusion; improper foundation. We are entitled to know who is present.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. The answer may remain in.

- Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And during any of those conversations, was Squeaky present?
  - A. Yes.
- Q Was she present on one occasion or more than one occasion, when you had those conversations with George Spahn?
  - A. On more.
  - a On more than one?
  - A. Yes.
- Q All right. Now, during the conversations at which time Squeaky was present, after the Spahn Ranch raid, did you talk about hiring a particular person as a guard?

MR. KANAREK: Leading and suggestive.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. KANAREK: Hearsay, your Honor; irrelevant and 1 immaterial; no foundation for it. Calling for a conclusion. THE COURT: The objection is overruled. 3 You may answer that. THE WITNESS: Yes. BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. And what did you tell Mr. Spahn about hiring a guard in Squeaky's presence? 8 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, we -- we object on the 9 grounds of foundation and hearsay; conclusion. 10 THE COURT: I'll sustain it. 11 BY MR. MANZELLA: Did these conversations that took 12 place after the Spahn Ranch raid occur before, say, the first 13 week in September, 1969? 14 MR. KANAREK: Leading and suggestive --15 Q BY MR. MANZELLA: In other words, during the last 16 half of August of 1969? 17 MR. KANAREK: Leading and suggestive, your Honor; no 18 foundation; hearsay, conclusion. 19 THE COURT: The objection is overruled. 20 You may answer it. 21 THE WITNESS: I don't remember exactly the date, but it --22 Q BY MR. MANZELLA; All right. I am not asking you 23 for the date. 24 A Yeah. 25 0. Let me ask it this way: 26 During what period of time during the -- after the 27 Spahn Ranch raid did these conversations occur? 28 MR. KANAREK: That's assuming facts not in evidence, your

1 Honor. 2 THE WITNESS: Eight days. 14 days. 3 THE COURT: Overruled. Three weeks. I'm not sure. THE WITNESS: 5 BY MR. MANZELLA: It was within a week to two weeks after the Spahn Ranch raid? A. Something like that. 8 MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, that's assuming facts not in 9 evidence. That's leading and suggestive by Mr. Manzella. 10 THE COURT: The objection is overruled, and the answer 11 may remain. 12 BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Would you tell us 13 what you told Mr. Spahn with regard to hiring a guard, in the 14 presence of Squeaky? 15 MR. KANAREK: Object, your Honor. Hearsay; no foundation; 16 calling for a conclusion; it's irrelevant and immaterial, and 17 the prejudicial value outweighs the probative value. 18 THE COURT: The objection is sustained as to foundation. 19 BY MR. MANZELLA: Where were the conversations held. Q 20 Mr. Retz? 21 Spahn's home. 22 All of these conversations were held at Mr. Spahn's 23 home; is that correct? 24 A. Yes. 25 . Mr. Spahn at that time was an elderly man; is that Q. 26 right? 27 That's correct. A. 28 And was he blind at that time? Q.

څ

Ì

1	A. Yes.
2	o. And he didn't move away from his home too much; is
3	that correct?
, ,4.	A NO.
*	Q. That is
6	That is correct. That is correct.
7	And during the conversations you had with Mr. Retz -
· <b>8</b>	strike that
9	(Continuing) that you had with Mr. Spahn, during
10	this period of time when Squeaky was present, was anybody else
11	other than you and George Spahn present?
12	A. Sometimes. Sometimes not.
13	Q And when someone else was present, who was that
14	person?
15	A Some girls, who or boys was around in the
16	home.
17	And do you know their names?
18	A Some of them. Some of them I don't. They came and
19	go.
20	
2]	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27 28	
28	

1,0c

10c-1

3

2

1

3

5

8

9 10

11

13 14

15

16

17 .

18

<u>i</u>9 -

20

21

.22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Were these people that lived with Mr. Manson at Q. Spahn Ranch?

Yeah.

MR. KANAREK: Object. Leading and suggestive, your Honor, and also calling for a conclusion.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

The answer may remain on the record.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA; All right. Would you tell us what you said to Mr. Spahn in the conversation with regard to hiring a guard, when Squeaky was present?

MR. KANAREK: Object on the grounds of calling for a conclusion; improper foundation; hearsay; it's irrelevant and immaterial; and the prejudicial value far outweighs the probative value.

There were purportedly several conversations, and he s lumping it all together in -- in a question which asks this witness to synopsize a series of events, a series of conversations. . . .

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection on the last ground.

BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Mr. Retz, how many conversations did you have with Mr. Spahn after the Spahn Ranch raid, with regard to hiring a guard? Approximately how many did you have?

A Four, five.

Q. All right. Now, Squeaky was not present at each of those; is that correct?

A. No.

1	Q That is correct, she was not present?	
2	A. That's correct.	
3	On about how many occasions was Squeaky present?	;
4	During how many of those four or five total conversations was	1
5	Squeaky present?	I
6	A. She was on two occasions present, when Mr. Spahn	
7	told me that he had the man for me.	
8	Q All right.	
9	MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, may that last portion be stricke	n?
10	THE COURT: After "She was on two occasions present,"	
11	the balance of the statement may be stricken.	
12	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. On those two	
13	occasions, would you tell us what the conversation was with	
14	regard to hiring a guard?	
15	MR. KANAREK: I'll object on the grounds of foundation,	
16	your Honor; hearsay; conclusion; it's irrelevant and immaterial	
17	and the prejudicial value outweighs the probative value,	
18	There are two two separate conversations, and	
19	this manner of questioning asks the witness to lump them	
20	together.	
21	THE COURT: The objection is sustained on that latter	
22	ground.	
28	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Do you recall the	
24	conversation you had the first time that Squeaky was present?	
25	A. Yes.	
26	Q All right. Would you tell us what the conversation	
27 28	was?  * MR. KANAREK: Object on the grounds of hearsay, your	

28

Honor; conclusion; irrelevant and immaterial; and the prejudicial value outweighs the probative value.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: First, the conversation was: Mr. Spahn told me that he have a -- that he have Shorty as a man for the right job.

- And was Shorty a man you knew otherwise as Donald Shea?
  - A That's correct.
- And did you say anything more about hiring a guard or about hiring Shorty on that occasion, the first occasion?
- A. I agreed with Mr. Spahn and told him to send him to me.
- Now, on the second occasion, what was said about
  hiring a quard, or about Shorty?

MR. KANAREK: Leading and suggestive, your Honor; hearsay; conclusion; irrelevant and immaterial, and the prejudicial value outweighs the probative value.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

You may answer.

THE WITNESS: I came out, and I said, "How come Shorty didn't show up?"

And he said, "I don't see him around."

So he -- "As soon as he comes, I am going to send him to you."

MR. KANAREK: I ask that all of that statement be stricken, your Honor, and I would like to approach the bench.

1	THE COURT: Sustained. The Court strikes the last
2	remarks the last answer.
3	MR. KANAREK: May I approach the bench, your Honor?
4	THE COURT: The Court has previously admonished the jury
<b>5</b> ,	that the jury is to disregard anything that it has ordered
6	stricken.
7	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Now, during the first conversation
<b>.</b>	at which Squeaky was present, would you tell us what you told
9	George Spahn?
10	MR. KAWAREK: Asked and answered, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Overruled.
12	MR. KANAREK: And also the other objections I have
13	enunciated.
14	THE COURT: You may answer.
15	THE WITNESS: I guess I answered that already.
16	MR. MANZELLA: All right. Strike that.
. 17	Q Would you tell us what was said during that
18	conversation?
19	MR, KANAREK: That's assuming facts not in evidence,
20	and asked and answered.
21	THE COURT: Sustained.
22	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Was something else said by you
23	with regard to hiring Donald Shea, or Shorty, during that
24 25	first conversation?
25 26	MR. KANAREK: Asked and answered, your Honor. The man
27	has stated that.
28	THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
20	You may answer.

L1,				1
				2
				3
				4
				5
	٥			6
				7
	•	7	ŧ	8
			•	9'
			, -	10
				11
				12
				13
_				14
$\overline{}$				

The rear house on your property? Q.

Yes.

And did you tell George Spahn what you wanted Shea to do, what you wanted Shorty to do?

MR. KANAREK: Object, your Honor.

May I have a continuing objection on hearsay, conclusion and foundation? It is irrelevant and it is 'immaterial.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. MANZELLA: May we approach the bench, your Honor? I would appreciate the opportunity to approach the bench.

THE COURT: All right, the Court will hear from you.

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

MR. MANZELLA: The purpose of this whole line of questioning was to show that Shea was going to be hired to remove Manson and the Family from Retz's property, from Spahn's Ranch.

THE COURT: And Mr. Manson knew about it?

MR. MANZELLA: Now, we're going to show, through another witness, that Mr. Manson did have knowledge through Squeaky that Shea was hired for that purpose. Since Squeaky was present in this conversation, it is obviously our theory that Squeaky learned of this conversation about the hiring of Shea to get rid of Manson and the Family and that she told Manson about it.

THE COURT: I understand that. from --

27

28

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

ľ

2

3

5

б

7

8

è

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

41

\_ ..

24

25

26

27

28

MR. MANZELLA: And that's why I am asking him if he told or said during this conversation what -- why he wanted to hire Shea.

THE COURT: It is not offered, in other words, to show the truth of the matter as stated; is that correct? It is simply offered to --

MR. MANZELLA: Well, it is a -- it really doesn't say anything. Shea was never hired. It is our contention he was killed.

THE COURT: It is merely to show Manson's possible motive.

MR. MANZELLA: Right. It is to show that, in fact, Shea was going to be hired and that this man did intend to hire Shea to get rid of Manson and the Family, and that Squeaky was present during that conversation and Manson did learn of that through Squeaky.

THE COURT: It is merely to show the state of mind of Manson during this time?

MR. MANZELLA: To show that and the person relayed this information to Manson was present during the statements made by this witness, that he intended to hire Donald Shea to remove Manson and the Family from the ranch.

MR. KANAREK: You can't do that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why can't you?

MR. KANAREK: WeII, you have to snow that Mr. Manson — that Mr. Manson was privy to this conversation. You have to show that Mr. Manson was there.

THE COURT: Don't you think that it is a possible -- one

ć

of the possible inferences that a member of the Family, namely Squeaky, conveyed that to Mr. Manson?

MR. KANAREK: That's one of the vices of this prosecution and the District Attorney's whole approach. There is no -- there are many, many --

THE COURT: All right, speaking of this specific question and problem of evidence here.

MR. KANAREK: There is not -- there is no law -- there is no rule of evidence that allows the state of mind to be one or two steps removed. And to show a state of mind, you have to show that person was privy to the conversation. The law does not contemplate --

THE COURT: Well, they intend to show -- Go ahead.

MR. KANAREK: The law does not contemplate some kind of one removed-type of state of mind exception that counsel is trying to infer here.

THE COURT: Now, you have -- Mr. Manzella, you have already gone into the conversation?

MR. MANZELLA: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: It has been related to the jury that he and Spahn were discussing Mr. Sheats duties as a guard to keep Mr. Manson off --

MR. MANZELLA: He hasn't testified to that.

THE COURT: -- off the property.

Well, I think --

MR. MANZELLA: He answered that question non-responsively in answer to another question I asked and you struck the answer.

ؿ

It is not in evidence.

THE COURT: All right, I'll permit it.

MR. KANAREK: Well, but, your Honor, you can't -- just because two people have a conversation, say, on San Fernando Road, discussing Mr. Shea, doesn't mean Mr. Manson can be saddled with that. We can't lose our perspective just because it happens to be somebody Mr. Manson purportedly knows. You can't do that.

THE COURT: It shows Mr. Retz's intention to hire Mr. Shea on behalf of himself and apparently on behalf of Spahn and --

MR. KANAREK: There has to be a legal showing Mr. Manson knew that.

MR. MANZELLA: We are going to show that, your Honor.

MR. KANAREK: You can't do that by bringing in this

conversation in connection with someone other than Mr. Manson.

lla

11a-1

THE COURT: In view of the People's representation that they will show that Mr. Manson learned of the intention to hire Shee, I will permit it.

MR. KANAREK: Then, I ask for an offer of proof as to how he's going to show it, your Honor, so that we don't -THE COURT: He's already --

MR. KANAREK: I ask for an offer of proof as to who is going to testify that they heard Squeaky tell Charles Manson about these purported conversations between Mr. Retz and Mr. Spahn.

MR. MANZELLA: I don't think anyone is going to testify to that. You weren't listening to my offer of proof.

My offer of proof, is Mr. Menson's own statement through the testimony of Paul Watkins and through the testimony of Juan Flynn and through the testimony of, I believe, one other witness, will show that on certain occasions he made the statement as a part of a confession that Retz was going to hire Donald Shea to get rid of him. Shea was calling the police down on the ranch and that that's the reason he was killed.

Also, Johnny Swartz will testify that Manson told him when Swartz asked him -- asked Manson, "Where's Shea, I haven't seen him around?" That Manson said to Swartz, "I got Shorty a job with a friend of mine in San Francisco and it is a better job than the one Frank Retz offered him as a job." That's my offer of proof.

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor, then -- based on that offer of proof that no one is going to testify that Squaaky or

11a-2

9

.,

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17°

19

20

22

24

25

26 27

28

Lynne -- whatever the name of this girl is -- told Mr. Manson that, all of this has to be stricken. You can't -- there is no way --

THE COURT: The Court will permit it, but the Court will ask you to restrict your questions to Mr. Retz, to that line of inquiry that you are seeking.

Very well.

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

THE COURT: You may ask your next question.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: During that conversation when Squeaky was present, did you say anything about why you were going to hire Donald Shorty Shea?

MR. KANAREK: Your Honor --

A Yes.

MR. KANAREK: -- improper foundation, irrelevant and immaterial, and prejudicial. And the prejudicial value far outweighs any probative value.

THE COURT: Overruled. He has answered it. The enswer may remain.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: And what did he say in that regard?

MR. KANAREK: Object on the grounds of hearsay, conclusion, irrelevant and immaterial, no foundation, prejudicial value outweighs the probative value.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer,

A I said I have to clean that place out from debris

б

7

9

10

12

13. 14

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28 and people. People came in shooting around and hunting. Even we have some accidents on the property.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: All right, Mr. Retz, I just want to know what you told Mr. Spahn. Did you refer to Mr. Manson?

MR. KANAREK: Objection, your Honor, leading and suggestive, and also a conclusion and all the other objections we enunciated.

I hate -- I don't like to keep repeating them.

THE COURT: You needn't do so. I think you have made your objections clear, but the --

MR. KANAREK: But this is --

THE COURT: The Court will overrule the objection.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you refer to Mr. Manson?

A Yes,

Q All right. And what did you tell Mr. Spahn? MR. KANAREK: Objection, your Honor, on foundation.

A I told Mr. --

MR. KANAREK: And irrelevant and immaterial.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. You may answer.

A I told Mr. Spahn that I don't want now Mr. Manson-I like to clean the place up and not even -- everyone has to
stay off of the property.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: I'm sorry, what did you say with regard to Mr. Manson? I didn't understand that.

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, that's -- may the record be read as to what he said?

A I --

11a-4 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, I would request that the record be read. (Whereupon, the record was read by the reporter as follows: "A Told Mr. Spahn that I don't want now Mr. Manson -- I like to clean the place up and not even -- everyone has to stay off of the property.") THE COURT: The Court will permit you to answer. Give me again the question. lib fla. A 10  $\mathbf{n}$ 14 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 25 26 27 28

116-1	1	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: What did you
)	2	MR. KANAREK: May it be read, your Honor?
	3	THE COURT: The reporter will read it to you.
	4	(Whereupon, the record was read by the reporter
	5	as follows:
	6	"Q All right, and what did you tell Mr. Spahn?")
	7	A I told Mr. Spahn I would like to clean the place
3	8	up from debris and keep everyone out. That includes also
	9	Mr. Manson and everyone, because we had some accidents on
	10	the property.
	11	Q All right, thank you. I'm sorry to interrupt you.
	12	Now, was Squeaky present during the entire conver-
	13	sation that you have just told us about?
	14	A By that conversation, she was present.
	15	Now, directing your attention to the date of
•	16	August 24, 1969.
3	17	1. On that date were you present when Mr. Manson and
	18	a girl were arrested on your property?
	19	A I couldn't say exactly the date, but it was around,
	20	yes.
	21	Q This is after the Spahn Ranch raid?
	22	A Yes.
•	23	Q Now, did you go with the deputy sheriff to where
<b>\$</b>	24	Mr. Manson and the girl were?
	25	A That's correct.
	26	Q Where was Mr. Manson and the girl?
	27	A Again, in the house.
	28	Q The same farmhouse?

11b-2	1	A Yes.
	2	Q This is the one that's on the border near Spahn
	3	Ranch?
	4	A That's right.
	5	Q And were you present when strike that.
	6	Was the officer who arrived, the deputy sheriff?
\$	7	A Yed.
3	8	Q Were you present when he took Mr. Manson and the
	9	girl into custody?
	10	A Yes.
•	11	MR. MANZELLA: May I have a moment, your Honor?
	12	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
	13	(Pause.)
_	14	Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Now, Mr. Retz, did you ever talk
	15	to Shorty Shea about hiring him as a guard?
•	16	MR. KANAREK: Object, your Honor, irrelevent, immaterial,
	17	calls for hearsay. It is conclusion. The prejudicial value
	18	outweighs any probative value, and there's no foundation.
	19	MR. MANZELLA: I'll withdraw the question.
	20	THE COURT: The objection is sustained, and you may
	21	ask your next question.
`	22	MR. MANZELLA: Yes, thank you, your Honor.
	<b>23</b> <sup>-</sup>	May I have a moment?
•	24	Q Now, Mr. Retz, did you ever hire Donald Shorty
•	25	Shea as a guard?
	26	MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant, immaterial, no foundation,
	27	your Honor. The prejudicial value outweighs the probative
	28	value.

11b-3	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
<b>.</b>	6
·	7
3	8
	9
	10
	11:
	12
	13
	14
	15
•	16
. 3	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
j.	23
•	24
₹	25

27

28

THE COURTY Sustained.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you -- strike that.

Had you seen Shorty Shea at any time on the ranch or prior to the conversation you had with Mr. Spahn about hiring him as a guard?

A No

Q Had you ever met Shorty Shea personally?

A Oh, yes, yes.

Q Where did you meet him?

A At Spahn Ranch.

Q Now, did you see him after you spoke with Mr. Spahn about hiring him as a guard?

A No.

MR. KANAREK: That's prejudicial, your Honor. There are probably a million people that haven't seen Mr. Shea. The prejudicial value outweighs the probative value, clearly.

THE COURT: The answer may remain.

MR. KANAREK: Unless there is a showing --

THE COURT: The enswer may remain.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Did you see Mr. Shea at any time -- strike that.

Then, I take it you saw Mr. Shea -- when you saw him on Spahn Ranch, you saw him prior to the conversation you had with George Spahn?

A Yes, before.

Q Did you ever see Mr. Shea again?

A No.

MR. KANAREK: Object, the question has been asked and

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

Q Mr. Retz, did you ever talk to George Spahn after

11b-5 June 30, 1969, about buying Spahn Ranch? MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant and immaterial, asked and answered. THE COURT: Sustained. The Court can't see the 12 fls. 5 relevancy of that. Sustained. 

ļ

2

3

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

26

27

28

MR. MANZELLA: May I have a moment, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes, you may,

(Pause in the proceedings while a discussion off the record ensued at the counsel table between Mr. Manzella and Mr. Whiteley.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA; All right.

Mr. Retz, when you saw -- on those occasions when you saw Mr. Manson on the Kelly property -- and the dates I'm talking about are from the spring of 1969 to August of 1969 -- did you ever see Mr. Manson driving any vehicle on the Kelly property?

A Yes.

Q And did you ever see any other people driving any other -- any other members of the Manson Family driving vehicles on the Kelly property?

A Yes.

MR. KANAREK: That's assuming facts not in evidence, about the Manson Family.

MR. MANZELLA: The witness referred to those people as the Manson Family.

MR. KANAREK: It's ambiguous.

THE COURT: Sustained. The objection will be sustained.

Q BY MR. MANZELLA: Mr. Retz, you used the term
Manson Family during one of your prior answers. To whom were
you referring when you referred to the Manson Family?

MR. KANAREK: Irrelevant and immaterial, your Honor.

THE COURT: The previous answer, the "Yes" that Mr. Retz uttered, is stricken, ladies and gentlemen.

12-2	1
	2
•	3
	4
	5
<u>.</u>	6
	7
₹	8
	9,
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
•	16
3	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
8	23
٠ ,	24
, <b>₹</b>	25
	26

27

28

The objection to this question is overruled. You may answer, Mr. Retz.

THE WITNESS: (No response.)

THE COURT: Do you wish to have the question read back to you?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Williams.

(Whereupon the record was read by the reporter as follows:

Ħά. Mr. Retz. you used the term Manson Family during one of your prior answers. To whom were you referring when you referred to the Manson Family?")

THE WITNESS: Other people who was on the Spalm Ranch, when they associated with Manson, I figure they are the Manson Family.

BY MR. MANZELLA: All right. Did you ever see any other members of the Manson Family riding vehicles or driving vehicles on your property, the Kelly property?

> A Yes.

Was that on one occasion or more than one occasion?

> A More.

Can you give us an approximation of how many Q occasions?

> A Many. Many.

I beg your pardon? Q

Ă Many occasions. 12-3

Q All right.

Mr. Retz, on August 24th of 1969, when you were present, when the deputy sheriff arrested Mr. Manson and the girl, did you and Mr. Manson exchange words during and after the arrest?

A Yes. I --

Q Don't say what they were.

A All right.

MR.MANZELLA: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions, your Honor.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KANAREK:

Q Mr. Retz -- Mr. Retz, did you know that Mr. Manson gave Mr. Spahn some \$6,000 to save the Spahn Ranch from income taxes or other taxes?

MR. MANZELLA: Objection, your Honor. That assumes a fact not in evidence.

MR. KANAREK: We are talking about negotiations, your Honor. He opened up the subject of negotiations for sale of the ranch, and we have a right to go into those conversations.

THE COURT: Just a minute. I didn't hear the ground for the objection.

MR. MANZELLA: The objection is that it assumes a fact which is not in evidence.

MR. KANAREK: I am asking him. This is cross-examination.
THE COURT: Excuse me. Will you let me rule?

10

9.

1

2

3

5

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

	<del>,</del>	6115
10 X		
12-4	1	MR. KANAREK: I'm sorry.
	2	THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
	3	Q BY MR. KANAREK: Well, did you and Mr. Spahn, in
	4	your conversation in your conversations; I'm sorry
	5	discuss monies that Mr. Manson had given Mr. Spahn?
•	6	A No.
	7	Q Did Mr. Spahn ever discuss with you any obliga-
ĝ	8	tions that he owed, due to his possession of the Spahn Ranch?
iza fils.	9	A Yes, we did.
	10	,
	11	
•	12	·
	13	
	14	
	15	
•	16	
•	17.	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22.	
<u>.</u>	23	
	24	
₹	25	
	26	
	27	n .
	28	

12a-1	,
	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
•	6
	, ,
ŧ	8
	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
•	16
₹	17
·	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
£	23
•	24
	47

THE WITNESS:

	6116
	Q And did and did Mr. Spahn tell you anything
	concerning the status of the taxes of the Spahn Ranch during
	your negotiations?
	A. No.,
	Q Well, was taxes one of the items that you that
	You discussed with Mr. Spahn?
•	A No.  Q You weren't concerned about the taxes when you were
	buying this property, Mr. Retz?
	MR. MANZELLA: Objection, your Honor.
	THE WITNESS: No.
•	MR. MANZELLA: It's argumentative.
	THE COURT: The answer may remain. The objection is
	overruled.
	Q BY MR. KANAREK: You say you had no did you
	cause the taxes I'll withdraw that.
	Did you do any research in the Hall of Records as
	to the status of the property, as far as taxes were concerned?
	A. Yes, we did.
	And how much taxes were owed at the time of the
	eacrow?
	MR. MANZELLA: Objection, your Honor. It calls for
	hearsay.
	THE WITNESS: I couldn't tell you, because
	THE COURT: Well, just a minute. There's no question
	pending. The objection is sustained.

I couldn't tell offhand.

THE COURT: The objection was sustained. You needn't

1	answer.
2.	THE WITNESS: Thank you. I'm sorry.
3	Q BY MR. KAMAREK: Mr. Retz, what was your financial
4	outlay to Mr. Spahn for the Spahn Ranch?
5	A I won't tell you that.
6	Q You defrauded Mr. Spahn, Mr. Retz, in connection
7	with this; is that a fair statement?
8	MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, that's argumentative. The
9	People
10	THE COURT: Sustained.
n	MR. MANZELLA: would object.
12	Q BY MR. KANAREK: You took
13	THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
14	Q BY MR. KANAREK: Mr. Retz, you knew that Mr. Spahn
15	was blind and infirm and incapable of negotiating, as far as
16	the sale of this property is concerned; is that right?
17	MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I object to the question on th
18	grounds that it's compound.
19 <sup>.</sup>	THE COURT: Sustained. The objection is sustained.
20	Q BY MR. KANAREK: Mr. Retz, directing your attention
21	to your state of mind and your thinking, would you say that
22	Mr. Spahn was something like 80 or 90 years old?
23	A. 82.
24	THE COURT: How would that affect his state of mind?
25	MR. KANAREK: Pardon?
26	THE COURT: The objection is the Court will make its
27	own objection to the question.
28	Q BY MR. KANAREK: Do you know of your own knowledge

```
how old Mr. Spahn was at the time that you had these
     negotiations with him, Mr. Retz?
3
                 (No response.)
          MR. KANARUK: May I have an answer, your Monor?
4
5
          THE COURT: You may answer that.
       . THE WITNESS: Yes, I did,
6
                 BY MR. KANAREK: How old?
          A.
                 82.
9
                 And Mr. Spahn hardly moved -- could hardly move, he
10
     was so infirm; is that right?
11
                 That's not so.
12
                 He moved very, very little from his -- from his
13
     home; is that right?
14
                 That's correct.
          Ä.
15
                 And in your dealings with Mr. Spahn, did he have a
          Q.
     lawyer?
               · Yes.
          Ä.
18
                 Who was his lawyer?
          Q.
          A
                 Donald Ruff,
                 Who's that?
                 Donald Ruff.
          A.
                 How do you spell that?
23
          A.
                 R--
24
                 Yes?
          Q.
          A.
                 R-u-f-f.
26
                 And during your negotiations with Mr. Spahn, did
27
     you speak to his lawyer?
28
                 Yes, I did.
```

	1	Q You were good friends with his lawyer; right?
	2	A That's correct.
	3	Q You and his lawyer are pretty tight; right?
	4	MR. MANZELLA: Objection, your Honor.
	5	THE WITNESS: (Laughing.)
	6	THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
å	7	MR. MANZELLA: Mr. Kanarek is harassing the witness.
÷	8	Q BY MR. KANAREK: You and Mr. Spahn's supposed
	9	lawyer are friends; right?
	10	MR. MANZELLA: Objection. The question has been asked
	11	and answered.
	12	THE COURT: The objection is sustained. It's immaterial.
	13	Q BY MR. KANAREK: Now, Mr. Retz, in connection with
	14	Mrs. Kelly, how old is Mrs. Kelly?
	15	MR. MANZELLA: Objection. It's not relevant.
*	16	THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
12b	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	•
	22	
<b>\$</b>	23	
	24	
÷	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	
	,	
	•	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1

The state of the s

.2b-1	1	Q You say you purchased land from Mrs. Kelly; right?
	2	A (No response.)
	3	Mr. Retz, do you hear me? Do you understand the
	4,	question?
	5	A. Yes.
	6	THE COURT: You may answer it.
	7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
đ	8	Q BY MR. KANAREK: You purchased land from Mrs. Kelly
	9.	A That's correct.
	10	Q And when was it that you purchased the land from
	11	Mrs. Kelly?
	12	A. May, '69.
	13	And it was about that time that you were also
	14	negotiating with Mr. Spahn, right?
<u> </u>	15	A That's correct.
**	16	Q And your state of mind was that you wanted Mr.
હ	17	Manson and these people off of the ranch, because you didn't
	18	want the good deal that you had spoiled; is that right,
•	19	Mr. Retz?
	20	MR. MANZELLA: Objection, your Honor. It's argumentative
	21	as to what a "good deal" was.
	22	THE COURT: Overruled.
	23 .	THE WITNESS: For your information, I paid a very high
3	24 * 1	price for that land, a very high price.
	25 26	Q * BY MR, KANAREK; Would you tell the ladies and
	20	gentlemen of the jury, and all of us, what you would you
	28	answer the question, please, Mr. Retz?
	20	A. Yes. A. Yes.
	1	

. MR. KANAREK: May the guestion be read, your Honor? ŀ THE COURT: Do you remember the question? THE WITNESS: Yes. 4 THE COURT: You may answer. I didn't pay enough; that's what -- what 5 THE WITNESS: 6 was the question. 7 MR. KANAREK: That wasn't the question. May the 8 question be read to him, your Honor? 9 THE COURY: Yes. 10 (Whereupon, the record was read by the 11 reporter as follows: 12 And your state of mind was that you 13 wanted Mr. Manson and these people off of the 14 ranch, because you didn't want the good deal that 15 you had spoiled; is that right, Mr. Retz?") 16 THE WITNESS: That's not. 17 BY MR. KANAREK: Pardon? Q 18. A. That's not. 19 That's not. Well, you say now that you paid a 20 good price for the property. Would you tell us what the 21 price was? 22 I wouldn't tell you this. Ä. 23 MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor, the witness has -- has 24 stated a -- has made a statement, an ambiguous statement. 25 We are entitled to know, so that the jury can determine whether 26 this is a good price or not. 27 THE COURT: The question is immaterial. 28 The Court will sustain its own objection.

Charles in

Q BY MR. KANAREK: As a matter of fact, Mr. Retz.Mr. you dispossessed Mr. Spahn from the property; is that right?

A. No.

Q Mr. Spahn has a little shack --

THE COURT: Will counsel approach the bench? I'm sorry for interrupting you, Mr. Kanarek.

MR, KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

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

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, you objected when Mr. Manzella began to ask about negotiations between this witness and Mr. Spahn concerning the purchase of Mr. Spahn's property, and the Court sustained the objection, I think two or three times.

MR. KANAREK: No, the Court overruled --

THE COURT: Now, that may be the reason why Mr. Manzella has kept quiet, while you have, in the Court's opinion, explored an area which I believe to be immaterial.

I think that your questions were pertinent to show bias or prejudice against Mr. Manson, your last questions concerning his state of mind about the transaction.

That's certainly an area which you can explore.

But I don't wish you to pursue this. We are not going to try
a fraud case before this jury.

objection. I didn't want anything to go in concerning negotiations. Your Honor overruled my objection and allowed --

MR. KANAREK: -- and allowed him to discuss it.

THE COURT: No, the Court sustained your objection to the questions concerning the negotiations between Mr. Spahn and this witness for the purchase of Mr. Spahn's land, as I recall.

MR. KANAREK: No. As I recall --

12c-1 MR. MANZELLA: That's correct. MR. KANAREK: I -- I believe that --2 THE COURT: But in any event --3 MR. KANAREK: I believe your Honor allowed the escrow date and all of that to go in. 5 THE COURT: Well, that was concerning the Kelly land. 6 MR. KANAREK: Yes, but your Honor --MR. MANZELLA: The Kelly Lang. did you say? 8 MR. KANAREK: No, your Honor, I don't believe, heard 9 10 right. There are two parcels here, and your Honor allowed 11 into evidence matters concerning the Spahn Ranch. This man has purchased the Spahn Ranch. 13 THE COURT: Furportedly. MR. MANZELLA: That's right. He said he took possession 14 15 of the Spahn Ranch in January, 1971. 16 MR. KANAREK: That's correct. Your Honor allowed that 17 in. MR. MANZELLA: That one question. 19 THE COURT: Yes, I did allow that in. But is it --20 I've forgotten the lady from whom he purchased the --21 MR. KANAREK: Mrs. Kelly. 22 MR. MANZELIA: I thought you said Kelly Lang. 23 THE COURT: Kelly Lang? 24 MR. MANZELLA: Yes. She's a weather forecaster or 25 something on TV. **.**26 MR. KANAREK: KABC. 27 THE COURT: Never heard of her. Keep your mind on the 28 subject.

12c-2

1 2

3

4

explora?

**5**.

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

MR. KANAREK: She flies around in a helicopter, I think.

THE COURT: You did discuss the termination of the escrow and the entry into the escrow of the Kelly transaction.

MR. MANZELLA: Right.

THE COURT: But I think the exploration of this purchase and the terms of the purchase of the Spahn Ranch are -- should not be explored

MR. KANAREK: Well, your Honor --

THE COURT: You have touched upon --

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, --

THE COURT: -- possible bias or prejudice of this man toward Mr. Manson. But that can be done, if you wish to explore it any further, without going into it in more detail.

MR. KANAREK: Well, if we --

THE COURT: Into the question of whether or not there was a fraud.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I want the question enswered, of how much he paid for Spahn's property.

THE COURT: I assumed that you did.

MR. KANAREK: But --

THE COURT: Because you did keep quiet during all of this.

But nevertheless, the Court has to maintain some control of the --

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I think it's relevant, because Mr. Kanarek has -- what Mr. Kanarek has brought out, as the Court says, goes to his bias against Mr. Manson.

And I think the price that he paid for the ranch

1

2

4

5 6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

27

26

28

is also relevant along the same lines.

And I want to confer with the witness. He has already answered the question at the Grogan trial, and I don't know why he doesn't want to answer it here.

**新花园** 从外面是

And I think it's relevant along the same lines.

THE COURT: Did you wish to have me -- have him answer it?

MR. KANAREK: Well, yes, your Honor. What I am saying is that I'd like to be able to proceed and ask these questions.

MR. MANZELLA: You see, your Honor --

THE COURT: Well, what I'm directing your attention to is that I am not trying a fraud case, and I don't want the jury to determine a fraud case.

But you can explore the question of this man's bias.

MR. KANAREK: That's the point.

THE COURT: And it's obviously based upon his -his discomfort with Manson and Manson's associates on the
property, which he was about to acquire.

I don't think you need anything more than that. Let's go.

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

THE COURT: Mr. Williams, would you read the last question, please?

(Whereupon the record was read by the reporter as follows:

"Q As a matter of fact, Mr. Retz, Mr. -- you

12c-4	ı	"dispossessed Mr. Spahn from the property; is that
	2	right?
	3	"A No.
	4	"Q Mr. Spahn has a little shack")
	.5	THE REPORTER: And at that point, you interrupted,
3 f.s.	6	your Honor.
_	7	,
4	8	
	9	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
<b>.</b>	16	
ð	17	
	18	
	19 20	
	21	
	22	
*	23	
	24	
*	25	
	26	
	27	
<del>,</del>	28	
	4	

13-1 THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, you may continue. MR. KANAREK: Yes. Now, sir, directing your attention to this -- when Q 3 you say you caused Mr. Manson to be arrested when -- to be arrested, when you say you saw the girl in the farmhouse, 5 was that girl Stephanie Schram? б I don't know her name. You've spoken with the District Attorney and the Q Я police officer concerning this matter on several occasions, at least? .10 A Yeah. Did the name Stephanie Schram come up at all? 12 Q I don't remember. A You don't remember that? 14 Q 15 Á No. MR. KANAREK: Thank you, Mr. Retz. 16 17 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 18 19 BY MR. MANZELLA: 20 Mr. Retz, will you tell us how much per acre you paid for the Spahn Ranch? \$7,000. A 23 Q Per acre? Α Per acre. That's for 27-1/2 acres? Q, That's correct. Á MR. MANZELLA: Thank you, no further questions. THE WITNESS: And for the Kelly, we paid 10,000 --

13-2 THE COURT: No, there is no question pending. 1 THE WITNESS: I just wanted to say we paid 10,000. The last answer is stricken. THE COURT: 3 RECROSS - EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. KANAREK: б You intended to subdivide it and make a bundle 7 of money on it, didn't you, Mr. Retz? 8 A No, we can t. ij You purchased that property just as a keepsake? Q. 10 You don't intend to make money on it? 11 12 No. No. I don't intend to make money on it. THE DEFENDANT: You paid 400, and that's all. 13 MR. MANZELLA: Thank you. 15 BY MR. KANAREK: How much of the money did you Q. actually pay, Mr. Retz, that you have spoken of here. How 16 17 much have you actually laid out of your pocket? Not very 18 much, have you? Three or four hundred? 19 Oh, no, \$125,000. 20 Pardon? 21 30% we paid down. 2Ž Right. And some of this amount -- there were 23 27 acres times 7,000, a number of acres --24 THE DEFENDANT: All the crooks are in jail? All the 25 crooks are in jail? 26 THE COURT: Take Mr. Manson out. 27 THE DEFENDANT: All the criminals are in jail? That's 28 where your crooks are, right there.

. (Whereupon; the Defendant Manson made a motion 1 towards the witness.) 2 THE DEFENDANT: We tried to save that old man's property. (Whereupon, the Defendant Manson was escorted from the courtroom by the bailiff to the holding tank.) 7 THE WITNESS: May I say something? Ω THE COURT: You may not respond except to a question. a MR. MANZELLA: I have no further questions. 10 THE COURT: Any further questions? 11 MR. KANAREK: Thank you. Mr. Retz. 12 MR. MANZELLA: May Mr. Retz be excused now? 13 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Retz. 14 THE WITNESS: May I leave now? 15 THE COURT: Yes, you may leave now. Thank you, Mr. 16 Retz. 17 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 18 MR. KANAREK: He left rather hurriedly, may the record 19 reflect, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: The Court is envious of his energy. 21 sure all the jurors are, too. 22 All right, ladies and gentlemen, it is now 20 23 minutes of 5:00 and we'll recess today. MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor --25 THE COURT: Remember the obligation you have, ladies 26 and gentlemen, and that is not to converse amongst yourselves 27 or with anyone or permit anyone to confer with you or converse 28 with you on any subject connected with this case, nor are you

The state of the s

9:45.

to form or express any opinion on the matter until it has finally been submitted to you.

Remember that it is your solemn obligation and it is your duty to refrain from exposing yourself -- to do more than that, to take active steps to see that you are not exposed to any news media report concerning Mr. Manson, to any conversation concerning Mr. Manson.

The Court appreciates your efforts that you have made in that respect and the Court wishes for you to continue to take every step that you can reasonably take to keep from hearing anything, seeing anything concerning Mr. Manson.

. Thank you,

Good night, and I 11 see you tomorrow morning at

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, I have some witnesses I would like to have ordered back.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MANZELLA: They're next door, and they're being brought in now.

THE COURT: Good night, ladies and gentlemen, and leave your notes right on your chairs.

(Whereupon, the jury retired from the courtroom at 4:43 o'clock p.m., and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: All right, do you wish some witnesses ordered back?

13a fls.

28

26

27

13a-1

·2·

•

? .

MR. MANZELLA: Yes, your Honor, I just wanted to wait until they all got in here.

Yes, it is Mr. Sammy Launer, Delma Baker, and Mr. Jerry Binder, your Honor. Could they be asked to return tomorrow morning?

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen, you are ordered to return tomorrow morning at 9:45.

MR. MANZELLA: 9:45.

THE COURT: To this courtroom.

And, now, the Court did not rule previously on Mr. Kanarek's motion to sequester the jury. I'll hear your argument in regard to it, if you have anything further, Mr. Kanarek.

MR. KANAREK: The record, I think, speaks eloquently, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, the Court --

MR. KANAREK: Again, it is a Hobson's choice, but again that's our motion.

THE COURT: The Court does not believe that sequestering the jury is necessary. The Court believes that the record demonstrates, as a matter of fact, that the jury has managed to control the situation fairly well. The jury has, with the exception of the one juror, refrained from reading any newspaper reports. There has been thrust upon some of the jurors the television reports or partial television reports, partial radio reports, but the Court believes that those jurors who have heard those matters would not be affected, nor would their judgments be affected in this case.

28

The Court believes that the sequestration of the jurors is not called for at this time and, therefore, denies the motion.

THE DEFENDANT: (Calling out from inside the retaining tank) Your Honor, can I speak to you in regards to that lawyer and the telephone calls?

THE COURT: Mr. Kanarek, your client wants to speak to the Court. Do you wish to have him speak to me now in your presence and on the record?

MR. KANAREK: Yes. Yes.

THE COURT: I'll hear from him at the bench.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, may I have a moment? I have got some witness matters to take care of.

THE COURT: The Court would prefer that you romain here. It will only take a short time.

Would you come forward?

MR. MANZELLA: All right.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had at the bench among Court and counsel, with the defendant Manson present:)

THE DEFENDANT: The call, your Honor, the attorney, Mr. Beckler.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Beckler.

THE DEFENDANT: I called Mr. Beckler.

THE COURT: The same man you talked to before?

THE DEFENDANT: He seemed to be pretty busy. He's a pretty busy fellow in his world and I called the second time and asked him if he would come to the County Jail and visit

λ<u>.</u>8. 

13b

ž

---

me, and I had no response.

I was under the impression, if the Court would give me some phone calls, maybe in a couple of weeks, maybe I can latch on somebody and get them involved in this. It is hard to find someone, because the press has created so much confusion with it that it is almost impossible to find any reality in the whole thing.

THE COURT: Well, the Court wouldn't grant your request for phone calls to explore the legal field for a lawyer.

I will grant an additional phone call or two this week, if you wish.

THE DEFENDANT: Appreciate it.

THE COURT: So that you can contact Beckler himself.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I contacted him, himself.

THE COURT: Did he indicate to you that he was not interested in speaking to you?

THE DEFENDANT: He indicated that somebody had just come in and that he didn't have time right now and to have some more words with you.

THE COURT: That he wanted to speak to the Court again?
THE DEFENDANT: He didn't indicate any direction.

13 b

ŝ,

ĸ

. 12 

\$

 THE COURT: Do you wish -- are you under the same impression in respect to your representation with Mr. Kanarek?

THE DEFENDANT: I can't --

THE COURT: Are you asking that the Court select another lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: I can't seem to get any witnesses in to talk with. They've closed that off completely. I can't — there's nothing. They are sitting on me so heavy, you know, it is just impossible, through ventilators and things, you know.

THE COURT: Well, you didn't answer my question directly.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, if you are sitting on him, then
he's sitting on me, then. I can't --

THE COURT: The Court is in no way sitting on Mr. Kanarek.
THE DEFENDANT: Well, somebody is.

THE COURT: And will not do so.

MR. KANAREK: Well, I think I can indicate to the Court that just -- Mr. Manson's unhappiness, especially in view of these recent purported events, it -- the County -- and, of course, I guess it is -- I am the -- I am the foil, but the fact is because of recent events the Sheriff has made -- has made certain orders concerning certain people.

THE COURT: You mean you're more or less the focus of discontent, as you put it?

MR. KANAREK: Yes. It is like the attorney-client relationship is somewhat like the husband-wife relationship.

THE DEFENDANT: There is none.

MR. KANAREK: And from time to time --

THE DEFENDANT: There has been none.

MR. KANAREK: And the fact is, because of the recent events, the Sheriff has issued, has made certain orders concerning certain individuals and Mr. Manson has desires to speak with these individuals, and I would ask your Monor to allow Mr. Manson to speak with these people, to allow those people to come and visit with Mr. Manson at the convenience of the Sheriff and the convenience of Mr. Manson, and so that he can consult with these people.

THE DEFENDANT: This adds to the confusion. Let me state it as simply as humanly possible.

There has been no relationship between any attorney and myself because I have never been able to establish any line of truth with an attorney. It doesn't seem to be any truth there. I have labored under this. I can't get a piece of paper with my name written on it down through the attorney room, you know. I can't get a piece of paper out of the County Jail. I can't get a communication going to the outside world in any respect. That's one reason I mentioned phone calls.

б

14-1

2 3

1

4

5.

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

THE COURT: We will permit you again to call Mr. Beckler, who was -- has heretofore been appointed under 987(2) to examine that specific area that we once had spoken about, in connection with one of these counts of the indictment.

But --

MR. KANAREK: May I state this?

THE COURT: Could you be specific about --

MR. KANAREK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- what you are talking about in connection with the witnesses?

MR. KANAREK: Yes. And because I am following the Court's orders --

THE COURT: Not witnesses, but --

MR. KANAREK: Well, the paper -- in other words, I am following the Court's orders with respect to the transmission of the papers, documents; I -- I'm following that, and the Court's orders, and also following the Sheriff's Department's request --

THE COURT: Good.

MR. KANAREK: -- in connection with witnesses. But this has engendered, between Mr. Manson and myself, a little bit of differences of opinion, because I wish -- I wish to follow the Court's orders; and at the same time, I wish to -- I wish to do -- to do certain things on behalf of Mr. Manson.

And so I am right in the middle, because your Honor has made it very explicit that there is to be no transmission of information by way of documents or otherwise, and your Honor has made this point very clear.

·

ì

Č,

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

CieloDrive.com ARCHIVES

14-2

ÿ

2

1

4

5

3

6

7 3

10

9

11 12

13 14

15

16

18

19

20

21

24

25

\$

26 27

28

And in trying to -- trying to do the Court's -- to follow the Court's orders, Mr. Manson --

THE DEFENDANT: He has done that. He has done everything you tell him to do.

MR. MANZELLA: Can I interrupt for just a moment? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MANZELLA: Your Honor, if I don't make a phone call by 5:00 o'clock, I am going to have to drive three witnesses home.

THE COURT: I will excuse you.

MR. MANZELLA: Could you do that? Thank you.

(Whereupon Mr. Manzella left the area of the bench, and the following proceedings were had in his absence:)

THE COURT: Yes.

Mr. Kanarek is under some very strict orders by the Court, and I have made it clear that if he violates those orders, that I would consider it his breach of -- consider it a breach of duty as an officer of this court, and --

THE DEFENDANT: What does that do to me?

THE COURT: And likewise, he would be guilty of contempt.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, he does what you say, a lot more than he does what I say. So he's yours, isn't he?

THE COURT: Well, he's --

THE DEVENDANT: He's all yours.

THE COURT: He's obliged to carry out that order.

THE DEFENDANT: Seems to be all yours.

THE COURT: I'll see everybody tomorrow at -- 9:45 all

14-3 right? MR. KANAREK: Yes, sir. I'll see you then. THE COURT: (Whereupon, at 4:48 o'clock p.m., an adjournment was taken until 9:45 o'clock a.m. of the follow-ing day, Wednesday, September 8, 1971.)