SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

CR 72787

Supreme Court No. Crim 24552

KEVIN COOPER,

Defendant-Appellant.

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY

HONORABLE RICHARD C. GARNER, JUDGE PRESIDING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff-Respondent:

HON. JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP

State Attorney General Department of Justice

110 West "A" Street, Suite 700

San Diego, California 92101

For Defendant-Appellant:

IN PROPRIA PERSONA

Pages 176 to 223, incl.

JILL D. MC KIMMEY, C.S.R., C-2314 Official Reporter

```
1
              SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2
                    FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
3
     THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE
 4
     OF CALIFORNIA,
5
                     Plaintiff,
6
                                            NO. 00R-9319
          YS.
7
     KEVIN COOPER,
8
                                             VOLUME 3
                      Defendant.
9
10
                REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL PROCEEDINGS
11
                BEFORE HONORABLE RICHARD C. GARNER, JUDGE
12
                   DEPARTMENT 3 - ONTARIO, CALIFORNIA
13
                          March 2 and 5, 1984
14
     APPEARANCES:
15
                                      DENNIS E. KOTTMEIER
     For the People:
                                      District Attorney
16
                                      (3-5-84)
                                              and
17
                                      JOHN P. KOCHIS
Deputy District Attorney
18
                                       (3-2-84 \text{ and } 3-5-84)
19
                                      DAVID MCKENNA
     For the Defendant:
                                      Public Defender
20
                                      By: DAVID NEGUS
                                      Deputy Public Defender
21
                                      (3-2-34 \text{ and } 3-5-84)
22
23
24
25
                                      JILL D. MCKIMMEY
     Reported by:
                                      Official Reporter
26
                                      C.S.R. No. 2314
```

ONTARIO, CALIFORNIA; FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1934; 3:20 P.M.

--030--

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in chambers:)

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. NEGUS: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Mr. David Negus, Mr. John Kochis in chambers.

T received a note from my clerk. It says:
"Mr. Negus has been ill for two days and will not be
ready to proceed on March 5. He and Mr. Kochis would
like to see you Friday afternoon at your convenience.
Mr. Negus indicated that you would not need to move
over to Department 2 for Monday's hearing. He also
indicated he would be ready to proceed on everything
on March 12. Linda."

MR. NEGUS: Let me just clarify a little bit.

We -- the only thing I'm not ready on is the taking of evidence and arguing in court. We are prepared at least to start submitting stuff to you to read and to consider all next week, but we just don't need to do it in court, because most of the stuff is -- is -- is newspaper articles, television stuff, all that kind of stuff.

THE COURT: We may need to make a record as to what's going to be submitted. Am I going to have time to try another case?

MR. NEGUS: No.

• 13

MR. KOCHIS: No.

THE COURT: Oh, because I was about ready to have them call up Peters versus Peters and try and conclude a matter that we haven't been able to finally finish.

MR. NEGUS: Well, we feel we need -- we need your time. It's just we don't need to have it in open court, and I didn't want to bring over the defendant and have you go to all the trouble of switching courtrooms if we didn't need to do that, so that was really --

THE COURT: I don't think a brief appearance over in Department 3 necessitates a change of courtrooms.

MR. NEGUS: Well, I was just going to ask you not bring the defendant over till March 12.

THE COURT: You don't want him even over on the 5tm?

MR. NEGUS: Right. I have talked to him. It's agreeable to Mr. Cooper.

THE COURT: We are going to meet on the 5th.
You have filed formally your motion for change of venue.

MR. NEGUS: I filed my motion. I have submitted to the clerk all the newspaper clipping exhibits that were received in response to the subpoena duces tecum. The television exhibits are coming in somewhat slowly. I will have all the radio exhibits ready for you to look at on Monday.

THE COURT: Scripts?

MR. NEGUS: Scripts, yes, and they include a substantial number of scripts that were — that were presented at the 858 motion, but there's also some additional ones.

THE COURT: Linda, would you check to make sure
I filed -- everything's all right back there?

MR. NEGUS: And we're going to need time to go --sort of need time with the clerk to mark the exhibits.

THE COURT: I'm normally engaged in other matters for the first hour.

MR. NEGUS: Well, I understand, but we need -I need her undivided attention. It's reasonably
complicated. I have to go over it with Mr. Kochis.
Then we just have stuff for you to read all week, I think,
and when we run out of stuff, we have the transcript to
start on, because we're going to have -- you're going to
have to read that, and that's --

THE COURT: Well, the transcripts of what?

MR. NEGUS: The preliminary hearing.

THE COURT: For purposes of venue motion?

MR. NEGUS: For purposes of the 395 motion,

basically, you're going to have to read it. If we run out of time -- I don't think you will. I mean, I think we have enough --

THE COURT: Before I read the transcript on the

995 motion, I want to formally see your motions. You haven't filed that yet?

MR. NEGUS: That's right. I'm still working.

That's coming. Okay. I mean that's -- it's going to

take you at least a week. I mean, I don't know how fast
you read, but there's --

THE COURT: I'm not resistive, Mr. Negus. I'm simply trying to clarify what we're going to all be doing.

ME. KOCHIS: Judge, we didn't want to wait till Monday morning to show up to tell you on Monday that we weren't going to call witnesses until the 12th and have you in another courtroom and throw Judge Ziebarth into another courtroom. We wanted to tell you today.

THE COURT: The witnesses on the 12th are going to be in reference to what?

MR. HEGUS: Change of venue.

THE COURT: How long will you expect the evidentiary portion to take?

MR. NEGUS: Probably an nour, but it could -- it could extend forever. I mean, it could extend longer, depending --

MR. HOCHIS: Between one hour and one day.

MR. NEGUS: We would then be ready -- after we got through with the change of venue on Monday, I will have, hopefully, my formal motion to suppress filed early next week. I believe that it's not going to be

1 2

/19

any surprise to Mr. Kochis, and we'd be ready to start presenting evidence on the motion to suppress after we get like to the 13th.

THE COURT: Let me run through that again. I was thinking of something else. We're going to perhaps then on the 12th -- at some time on the 12th we'll finish phase one of the motion for venue change?

MR. NEGUS: That's the hope.

THE COURT: And then you will start on the 13th on the 995 or suppression?

MR. NEGUS: 1536.5, because that's easier to write that. I mean, it's basically that's evidentiary, not written. The 995 I'm still working -- I mean I haven't even started it, but there's lots to write on that, so I have to write a lot, and I haven't done that yet. I'm sort of trying to do this as fast as I can, but, you know, I'm doing five things at once.

THE COURT: I naven't heard from my presiding judge or supervising judge about any changing of the court, so until I am notified otherwise, we will stay here in Ontario. I may well when we get to the evidentiary portion, apart from the venue change, discontinue extended coverage.

What are we going to do about all the media appearing tomorrow?

MR. ROUHIS: Tomorrow is Caturday. There will be

1 no one here. 2 THE COURT: Monday. 3 MR. NEGUS: The Fiverside Press Enterprise, 4 Channel 2, Daily Report have all been notified that 5 nothing's going to happen. 6 THE COURT: Is that man still back there? 7 THE CLERK: (Nodding affirmatively.) 8 THE COURT: Press Enterprise wanted to look at 9 the Gooper file. It is a public record, as far as I can 10 tell. They are going to pick up all of his declarations, 11 wherein he says that you're all bad and he's all good. 12 MR. KOCHIS: I'm trying to think what's in the 13 file. I'm not eager to have them look at the file. 14 THE COURT: Well, I'm not, either, but I don't 15 know how I can stop it. 16 MR. MOCHIS: Well, I think we could agree that 17 at this point pending the Court's ruling on a change of 18 venue motion, it wouldn't be appropriate. 19 THE COURT: They have already looked at it. 20 They have been back there for an hour. 21 MR. NEGUS: I don't see how you can grant 22 extended coverage -- well, I take it back. I have no

23

24

25

26

comment.

MR. KOCHIS: I assume the confidential portion of the file has been removed.

THE COURT: What confidential portion? On fees?

 MR. KOCHIS: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, that's not even maintained here, I hope. There's nothing confidential in our files, is there?

THE CLERK: I don't think so.

THE COURT: I assume Judge Kayashima has that.

THE CLERK: The only thing I know that's in there is the invoices on some of the billings that Mr. Negus has received.

THE COURT: Are any other papers playing this up? I was out of town till last night, and I saw the day after our last Friday's hearing, I guess it was last Saturday, The Daily Report had a splash. I looked at The Times for the same day, and I did not see anything in The Times.

MR. NEGUS: The L.A. Times is not at the present time sending anybody out. They are keeping in touch so that they know -- they are going to make a decision to come back at some point in time, but they are not sending anybody out right at the moment.

THE COURT: How about the Sun Telegram?

MR. NEGUS: The Sun Telegram has published an article last time. So did the Riverside Press Enterprise, and I don't subscribe to any other newspapers, so I don't know what -- I assume that the Herald and the Register

are carrying smaller articles. I know it went out on

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

-

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

AP and UPI, and there was television coverage last week too.

THE COURT: Well, something could go out on United Press or one of the wire services and never be picked up by the media.

MR. NEGUS: Conceivably, but that's not the way it's worked. You'll see in the radio scripts that basically the radio stations pick up the stuff, while the AP gives short blurbs of it.

The newspapers in the area have submitted declarations that they don't keep track of which -- that is, newspapers outside of the main ones here that have sent their own reporters don't keep track of what AP stuff that they publish, but they have estimated on the average that they have published half the AF stories and then usually half the story, so like one quarter of the stuff that moves on the AP wire gets published and gets published in most newspapers. You can see from the coverage that in fact, you -- well, let's see. The Daily Report has had, I believe -- I have to supplement the subpoensed stuff with additional stuff that I clip from the newspapers that I get, but The Daily Report has had, I think, six stories on the case in the month of February; Press Enterprise maybe 70, something like that. It's somewhere in that same level of coverage that they've had all along.

THE COURT: I assume that you are going to maintain your consistency, Mr. Nogus, and the suppression motion will be completely de novo.

MR. NEGUS: Judge, the issue in the suppression motion is credibility. If you can tell me some way to get credibility other than doing it de novo, I am willing to listen, but I don't see any way we can do it, and I don't think John does, either.

MR. KOCHIS: I agree, Judge.

I have served Mr. Negus with statements in aggravation and a notice of 1101 motion, and I have not filed the originals with the Court, nor do I intend to do so if someone from the press is looking through the file, because it deals with a matter that a jury may never hear, and perhaps sometime next week we can work out something to put them in a confidential portion of the Court's file.

THE COURT: I will be happy to maintain a confidential file, and we can set up a separate file kept by the clerk nere of confidential material, and we will review anything of any particular sensitivity from either one of you that should go into that file. I can see reasons definitely why some things should not be open to the public, and that would apply to you as well, Mr. Negus. I don't want to try this in the newspapers.

MR. NEGUS: It's a little late.

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

THE COURT: You're objecting to extended coverage, which is television, picture-taking, sound recording, but you never asked me to close the court.

MR. NEGUS: I can't.

THE COURT: All we are doing by extended coverage - it's a little late as far as Municipal Court is concerned, you mean?

MR. NEGUS: Yeah.

THE COURT: I see, because this case is going to be reported whether we have extended coverage or not.

MR. NEGUS: At the Municipal Court, Your Honor,
I asked to have the preliminary hearing closed, everybody
excluded. The prosecution did not take a position one
way or the other, and Judge Merriam denied the motion,
so I --

THE COURT: You ought to make him try it.

MR. NEGUS: I take it that Judge Merriam wasn't worried about change of venue motions at that point in time. He certainly --

MR. MOCHIS: He's a Municipal Court judge.

MR. NEGUS: -- seemed to not be too worried about it, and the prosecution elected not to join me in the request, which I think made it harder to do.

THE COURT: Mr. Negus, just informally at this time, if you get over the hurdle of getting it moved out of this county, and just anticipating down the road, is

it possible that you might be agreeable to keeping it closer as opposed to further? Is there anyplace in Southern California, for instance, Vista, Oceanside, San Diego, getting away from the L.A. media, perhaps, that might be agreeable to you?

MR. NEGUS: I told Mr. Kottmeier that I would stipulate to trying the case Central Los Angeles District.

THE COURT: In where?

MR. NEGUS: Downtown Los Angeles. We wanted to avoid all the hassle. I would stipulate to Central Los Angeles. Mr. Kottmeier refuses to do that. I then said that if Mr. Kottmeier refuses to do it, I am going to litigate for where I think is best, which is what the statute says, so, basically, we cannot agree.

THE COURT: You know --

MR. NEGUS: I've tried.

and I generally say what I feel, and I'm just as confident as I am sitting here that this case can't be tried fairly in Ontario. I don't know about the rest of the county, because I no longer subscribe to The Sun. I have from time to time periodically over the years, and The Sun's a big newspaper in Los Angeles and Barstow, which are the only two other possibilities in this county, but if it can't be tried here, I would hate to move it all the way to San Francisco or semeplace far up north, considering

the many, many witnesses, the time and expense. This case is going to be expensive enough as it is. That's not, you know, — considering fair trial, that's not of a paramount concern, but I have to consider that, and the inconvenience to all those people that you are going to have to bring up there.

MR. MEGUS: That was what I told Mr. Kottmeier.

THE COURT: Yes, so --

MR. NEGUS: Mr. Kottmeier doesn't wish to --

THE COURT: I am surprised at your statement,

though.

MR. NEGUS: Maybe I'm speaking out of turn.

Mr. Kochis can speak for Mr. Kottmeier probably better

than I can, but my understanding is --

THE COURT: Let me just start you thinking. You don't want me to --

MR. NEGUS: If you're going to talk — the only -I believe that Mr. Cooper cannot get a fair trial anywhere

THE COURT: It may be that he cannot.

MR. NEGUS: — in Couthern California, with the possible exception of Downtown Los Angeles, and I have, I believe, substantial evidence that, for example, Vista, Oceanside — well, there's no Superior Court in Oceanside, but Vista, San Diego County is just as bad as here, and we have the — when we get to that stage, I can bring in that kind of stuff.

1 THE COURT: Vell, okay.

> MR. NECUS: And Santa Barbara, Ventura are just as bad as well.

THE COURT: The TV coverage is not the same in San Diego County as it is in Los Angeles and here.

MR. NEGUS: Right. We have the tapes, though.

THE COURT: Ckay. Well, they do get some L.A. stations, but not as much.

MR. NEGUS: I have the San Diego stations.

THE COURT: Yes, and they have primarily their newspaper, although the L.A. Times is circulated down there too.

MR. NEGUS: L.A. Times is one of the larger circulation newspapers in San Diego County.

THE COURT: I know.

MR. NEGUS: The Union, it's about that thick (indicating).

THE COURT: Okay. I can't shorten it at all. I would like to reach some accommodations.

MR. NEGUS: I would too.

MR. KOCHIS: Judge, while we are talking in the abstract, I was wondering at what point we may come to an understanding of a trial date. I realize we are set for the 19th.

THE COURT: That's worrying me.

MR. KOCHIS: We are not going to be done, if I

25

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

understand Mr. Negus. In my estimation of the motions, we won't be done with the 995 by the 19th.

MR. NEGUS: Right.

MR. KOCHIS: And I was wondering if there's going to be a period in time whether we're going to set the trial for the 26th, April the 2nd, April the 9th.

THE COURT: Well, you know, if we start hearing on the 12th, it may -- oh, you can't. We've got to have a break in it, even if it stayed here, I suppose, to some extent. I was going to say we'd be just full time right throughout trial, but if we move it someplace, that won't be possible. You will have to have at least some time to arrange.

FR. NEGUS: Well, that's one of the reasons why
I want to do the change of venue motion first, and then
give you a chance to find out what the -- what the
situation is from the Judicial Council and that sort of
thing.

MR. KOCHIS: If that becomes necessary.

MR. NEGUS: And, quite frankly, my position on trial time may vary with the ruling on the change of venue motion. There have been 97, if I remember correctly—correct me if I'm wrong — articles on Mr. Cooper in the Sun Telegram over the last six months.

THE COURT: Have you counted lately?

MR. NEGUS: Yep. That's not counting the ones in

the last three weeks.

MR. KOCHIS: But the vast majority either discuss what a good job Mr. Negus is doing or how weak the prosecution case is.

MR. HEGUS: I don't recall any saying that -- would you point that out?

THE COURT: They all, however, wind up with a paragraph and say he's charged with this dastardly mass murder.

MR. NEGUS: And escaped mental patient and rape charges in one place or another.

THE COURT: At least almost all the articles that I have seen so far wind up at least in the bottom paragraph with a succinct recap of the allegations.

MR. KOCHIS: They mention the victims' names and ages.

MR. NEGUS: Yes, the ages, and the slashed throat, usually.

MR. KOCHIS: So we're no closer to a trial date or anything else.

THE COURT: What are we going to do about it?

Let's don't leave the subject.

MR. NEGUS: My position on the trial depends upon the outcome of the change of venue motion. I have told Mr. Kochis, and I think I've told some Judges -- probably not yourself -- that my position on the trial date is

My current position is that I'd like to get it to trial as soon as possible. I don't imagine -- it depends on how we handle -- I don't imagine that we will be through with the -- what I consider to be pretrial motions much before the first or second week in April, and then I'm sure that we have innumerable motions after that. We may -- the original estimate of two months, that may extend to twice that, depending upon what Mr. Kottmeier's position is on a certain witness.

MR. KOCHIS: Judge, the one thing we wanted to —

I think we wanted to touch base on were, depending on
what the propositions were, is there's a number of motions
that will be heard out of the jury's presence that are
402, 405 motions that Mr. Negus would want to have some
stipulation that jeopardy will have attached. I don't
think that's going to be a problem. My only thought is
assuming for the sake of argument that — let's assume for
the sake of argument only that a month from now we're
in some faraway place, Sacramento, I don't care where.
It would seem to me that the motions that are going to
be outside the jury's presence could be litigated in our
own backyard, as opposed to being in Northern California,
with 20 to 30 witnesses litigating those issues.

MR. NEGUS: I am not opposed to that, assuming that we get the stipulation that jeopardy is attached.

THE COURT: Jeopardy attaches how?

MR. NEGUS: Well, normally what you would do is you choose a jury and you swear the jury; right? And then you have 402 motions about the admissibility of evidence ---

MR. KOCHIS: Hitch.

MR. NEGUS: — outside the presence of the jury, you know. During the presentation of evidence, normally — ofttimes in cases one as a convenience decides those before the jury is picked. Most cases it doesn't matter much how you — which order you do it in. Technically, the motions should be made after the jury is picked, I believe.

MR. KOCHIS: That's another issue we don't know.

THE COURT: Mr. Kochis?

MR. MOCHIS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This probably can be solved by an artfully drafted stipulation with reference to when jeopardy attaches and how we might consider those in limins type motions.

MR. KOCHIS: The only thing I wanted to alert the Court to is I wanted to make sure the Court didn't have any objection to handling it that way.

THE COURT: Rey, I'd much prefer it. That's the way we should do it. If we go away from this county, we should save that just for jury trial as much as possible, handling everything else before we ever get there.

MR. NEGUS: I agree with that, as long as we stipulate that jeopardy attaches.

THE COURT: That can be drafted. Either one of you can draft a proposal for that, and that sounds fair to me.

MR. NEGUS: Okay.

MR. KOCHIS: We will either litigate it or stipulate to it, but we will resolve it one way or the other.

That's it. I don't think we have anything else to bore the court reporter with.

THE COURT: One other thing. You do not want Mr. Cooper here on Monday?

MR. NEGUS: Right.

THE COURT: And on Monday, however, you are going to make certain offers of exhibits and things of that nature, and are you going to make argument?

MR. NEGUS: No.

MR. KOCHIS: No.

MR. NEGUS: What we are going to do next week is Mr. Kochis is going to give me some points and authorities and you some points and authorities sometime next week.

MR. KOCHIS: No, Monday.

MR. NEGUS: Monday.

I'm giving you a whole bunch of exhibits to read.

When he -- when he gets -- when he files his thing, I have

an additional declaration and points and authorities I am going to have to put in. He's probably going to respond to that, so we are going to be papering you back and forth all week.

Well, also -- after you have done two or three days' worth of reading, you will have about 15 hours'

THE COURT: Are you going to be with me when I watch that?

worth of television to watch, and we are, hopefully --

MR. NEGUS: Well, I don't see any reason to, I mean, unless you want us there.

THE COURT: Arrange to have an operator. I don't want to have to worry about the operation.

MR. NEGUS: Okay. Well, we're trying --

MR. KOCHIS: We're trying to get the machine first, Judge.

THE COURT: Get the machine, and I can assign my bailiff to it, something like that.

MR. KOCHIS: Yes.

MR. NEGUS: If you want us to be there, we can be there. I mean --

THE COURT: No. I don't think that's necessary, if you've seen it all.

MR. NEGUS: It's always nice to watch John again.

THE COURT: I suspect there's going to be quite a lot of repetition in my life for a while.

T2

MR. NEGUS: Yes.

THE COURT: Saying the same thing over and over again or reading the same thing over and over again.

MR. NEGUS: Right. That's true, but we are going to have to work out ways to explain to you what you are seeing, because it comes in piecemeal. The television people have not yet complied completely with the subpoenas. They have been slow in getting the stuff in, so I still nave several people that haven't come in with -- CBS is not going to have all their stuff until the end of next week, so the television stuff is going to sort of be trickling in. We can start you on it, if it's not all here, but it may be trickling in, but we will have plenty for you to read back and forth, and we just need to -- I think it's easier to do it that way. Mr. Cooper is not anxious to come here because whenever he moves, there's security problems involved.

THE COURT: It's all right with me. Then let's -MR. NEGUS: Can I just call Lieutenant Carpenter
from your phone here now in case he needs an order not to
bring him?

THE COURT: Sure, or we can make a minute order and the clerk can --

THE CLERK: I was going to call Sergeant Reynosa, because I thought he was the one in charge of it.

MR. NEGUS: Okay.

THE COURT: Why don't you do that right now then.

Tell him not to bring him Monday until we next call for him.

MR. NEGUS: How about March 12?

THE COURT: All right, not till the 12th, at 9:30 on the 12th. At that time in his presence I may set a trial date, tentative though it may be.

MR. NEGUS: Well, I'd like to just keep the 19th until there's some other reason. Obviously, if we are still in motions, then you can't start picking a jury when we're still in motions, and as I've said before, we are going to be — if it's — assuming a change of venue is granted and there's a problem of getting — getting us to wherever we are going to go, we are easy about that. We are also easy about stipulating, with jeopardy attaching, to doing all the motions down here, but once the motions start, the trial's started, so there's not really a problem, I don't think, of the trial date.

We're not going to mess around with you on the 60-day rule, but —

THE COURT: I'd like for you to put in -- I'm yours, you know. I'll devote whatever time continuously, however, to the Cooper trial, but I'd like to put in there somewhere that if a move is effected, that the defendant and counsel perhaps will not object to a week or two hiatus between times, so that arrangements can be

made. We all have personal arrangements. We have formal arrangements to make in courts and housing arrangements, perhaps, any number of things, staff arrangements. My staff is not going to go with me if I go away, a number of things.

MR. NEGUS: There's no problem.

MR. KOCHIS: Wait a minute, Judge. If we go, the staff's going to go.

THE COURT: I know another reporter that might want to go, however. Maybe I can put her on the payroll.

when are we going to have all of this to me to where I am going to start hearing argument on venue?

MR. NEGUS: March 12.

MR. KOCHIS: Assuming we get the evidence done in the morning, we will be arguing in the afternoon. If it takes us all day to put the evidence on, we'll do the argument on the 13th. Then you may be reflecting and — I imagine you'll have a decision by March the 14th, or thereabouts.

THE COURT: I suspect.

MR. NEGUS: The reason why it might take a long time --

THE COURT: By the time I've gone through all of that, and by the time you make your last argument, I will be ready to make my decision.

MR. KOCHIS: I imagine that's true.

THE COURT: That's the way it generally works.

MR. NEGUS: The reason you may have problems on the 12th is, quite frankly, that I probably will subpoena some legislators. They probably will have to quash the subpoenas, so that will probably take some time.

THE COURT: You are a troublemaker.

MR. NEGUS: No, sir. I --

THE COURT: There's a special code section to excuse legislators. I don't know what it cays, but there's some special provision for it if they are in session.

MR. NEGUS: We litigated that last time. It's got to do with civil process, not criminal, and they will move to quash whatever, but I am perfectly willing to stipulate to Downtown Los Angeles and save us all this problem.

THE COURT: Would you stipulate, Mr. Kochis,
perhaps, that if counsel will draft a set of interrogatories
to those legislators and if they answer them under oath,
that that may be received by the Court and considered in
evidence? And perhaps you can also add some questions
to it. Let's do it an easy way, if we can.

MR. KOCHIS: I had no problem with that last time.

MR. NEGUS: Neither did I. It was the legislative council that had problems.

MR. KOCHIS: They didn't want to spend their time answering interrogatories.

MR. NEGUS: Well, that's not true. What happened is the legislative -- Mr. Bader was willing. In fact, he was anxious to come in, I think.

THE COURT: Sure. They get publicity.

MR. NEGUS: But their council had -- they had -- last time I subpoensed their mail as well as the legislature, so that was their real hangup. Who knows what's going to happen? I'm going to do it somewhat differently, I think.

THE COURT: Well, try and -- I don't want to repeat my speech that I made with reference to Mr. McCombs, but try and avoid these confrontations with other branches of our government.

MR. NEGUS: I can't. I can't. Like with
Mr. McCombs, Mr. McCombs, according to the Riverside
Press Enterprise, was perfectly —

THE COURT: What? I saw the article.

MR. NEGUS: All right.

THE COURT: The little paper won. I didn't make it come out that way.

MR. NEGUS: But the -- but the key to it was that Mr. McCombs -- if you hadn't have put me in a box, Mr. McCombs --

THE COURT: Had him in the box.

```
MR. NEGUS: -- was ready to give me what I asked
 1
 2
     for and --
              THE COURT: Well, that was a misunderstanding,
 3
 4
     Fr. Negus.
 5
              MR. NEGUS: But, you know --
              MR. KOCHIS: That's it. We're just chattering
 6
 7
     now.
 8
              MR. NEGUS: All right.
 9
              (Whereupon, the matter was adjourned
              until Monday, March 5, 1984.)
10
11
                                ---000---
12
13
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

ONTARIO, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1984; 10:15 A.M. 1 2 --000--3 (Whereupon, the following proceedings 4 were had in chambers:) THE COURT: In chambers out of the presence of 5 6 everybody, including the defendant. 7 I have Mr. Negus, Mr. Kottmeier and Mr. Kochis 8 here. 9 We had a hearing last week, the record would 10 reflect, wherein you kind of outlined what would be 11 expected to go on today, and you waived the appearance 12 of Mr. Cooper and, in fact, requested that we not bring

MR. NEGUS: That's true.

him over until the 12th of March.

THE COURT: What are we going to do back in chambers at this time?

MR. KOCHIS: To alert you to the fact that I think we have a VHS VCR for you. Some of the tapes will not fit that format. Most will.

MR. NEGUS: No. We can get everything on the VHS.

MR. KOCHIS: We've got the Sheriff to loan us the television.

We are ready to mark some of the exhibits, but not all of the exhibits, and I was going to make a request, and I understand Mr. Negus has no strong objection to my

19 20

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

23

24

25

request to deviate somewhat from the format you suggested; that Mr. Negus has submitted to the Court the United Press and Associated Press releases. We also have received material from --

THE COURT: I don't understand that. He submitted what?

MR. KOCHIS: The wire service releases, UPI and AP.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't know what he submitted. This is something that you're having marked outside?

MR. NEGUS: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So I don't know.

MR. KOCHIS: To get to the point, you have expressed a preference for considering just the publicity in this county first before you consider, if we get to the second stage, publicity in other counties. I am going to be asking the Court to consider some of the publicity the case has received in other counties to assist me in the argument I am going to be making to the Court next week as to why the case should stay here, and it is my understanding Mr. Hegus does not have a strong objection, if any objection, to my requesting the Court consider some of that publicity as well.

MR. NEGUS: The only --

THE COURT: Can you clue me in?

MR. KOCHIS: Vell, Judge --

24

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

THE COURT: Is your argument going to be, hey, publicity occurred everywhere, so you may as well keep it here?

MR. KOCHIS: That's it in a nutshell.

MR. NEGUS: That's going to --

THE COURT: That would open it up statewide, though, wouldn't it?

MR. KOCHIS: I would think so.

THE COURT: So it's not just a crack in the door that you're asking for. It's to go into --

MR. KOCHIS: Well, Your Honor, I was not going to submit radio coverage, TV coverage. I was just going to ask the Court to consider some of the media coverage, newspaper coverage from other counties. I can make part of the argument with the UPI/AP wire service, but I don't want to be precluded, if I stand up next week, from making that type of argument with Mr. Negus succinctly pointing out, well, those facts aren't before the Court, and how can Mr. Kochis make that argument.

THE COURT: You're probably not even prepared to put on all this stuff from around the state, are you?

MR. NEGUS: The stuff from around the state is unorganized sitting in my office -- or actually in a closet near my office.

THE COURT: How can we do it then to give him the opportunity to make the point without getting all

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

that in, I suppose?

MR. NEGUS: Well, I suppose we can't, because I don't think the point is well taken, because my argument is going to be that publicity around the state is not all equal, and I don't wish to concede that point, so if we are going to litigate it, I guess we will have to -it will take us time to get it all organized. purpose of the AP stuff and the UPI stuff is that the Victor Valley paper and some of the radio stations do not keep records of what stories they published in form -in -- which we are not -- they do not keep records of the stories that they publish generated from the wire services. What they -- all they can do is estimate that they -- for example, I believe the estimation of the Victor Valley Daily Press was that they printed half of the stories that came over the wire, and of those, they usually cut them down by half, so in order to give some substance to how much we are talking about, I introduced the wire service.

Some of the radio stations have the same problem.

THE COURT: Why is this going on back in chambers instead of out in open court?

MR. NEGUS: Well, because the reason we are doing all this in chambers is that, basically, this week we are just trying to organize the exhibits, and I don't think anything should happen in open court without Mr. Cooper

being here. What I would suggest is that we try and --

THE COURT: I don't understand that at all. Number one, you are concerned with extended coverage as far as the defendant's picture being taken and things of that nature, and then last week you told me that we were not going to have him here. At no time did you indicate that all of our hearings were going to be in chambers last week. At least I didn't understand that, and we have these people outside.

MR. NEGUS: The people -- anybody that called us was told that there weren't going to be anything happening this week. I told that to The Press Enterprise. Channel 2 called me up. I assumed that Channel 2 was going to tell the other channels. Apparently they didn't, because I notice Channel 2 is not here, but Channel 4 and 7 are, and they just didn't see fit to call and find out. Anybody that called was told nothing's going to happen, and I don't think we should be controlled in what we do by whether the television stations are fool enough to show up.

THE COURT: Nobody's controlling me in any way.

MR. NEGUS: I didn't mean to imply that.

THE COURT: I don't think there's anything wrong with, nowever, recognizing that there is a legitimate public interest here, and that extending a little courtesy to the people and letting them know. For instance,

24

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

they can conjure up all sorts of visions as to what's occurring back in chambers. This is perfectly legitimate pretrial discussions that we are having here, and I don't see any need to hide this from the people outside that are wondering about this case and what's going on in chambers. I don't like a lot of secrecy, if I can avoid it. This is going to give the appearance of it now if we try to have substantial hearings in chambers.

MR. NEGUS: What we are suggesting is we are not to have a substantial hearing today. We are not -- I don't think Mr. Kochis is asking you to rule on the request. All we are trying to do is tell you what the logistical problems are and how logistically we want to handle you working out reading the stuff during this week. What I was about to finish by saying was is that I believe we have enough in the county stuff to keep you busy for this -- for this -- for most, if not all, of this week. Not all of the television stuff has been turned in yet, so that will be coming -- hopefully, the rest of that will be coming in by the end of the week. It's been promised to me by the end of the week.

THE COURT: At some point today, Mr. Negus, wherever it may occur, you are going to physically offer in and ask the Court to accept as evidence on your venue motion certain things?

MR. NEGUS: No, I am not, no. What we have

23

1

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19.

20

21

22

24

suggested that we do is that we just give you the stuff to read. It's going to be all entered in by a stipulation when we actually get to a hearing, but the whole point of this whole week was not to have anything happen this week in open court, just to continue everything till March 12, because you had a lot of stuff to read and do, and we are not — I wasn't going to formally introduce anything into evidence. The reason why I didn't want the defendant here was we weren't going to do anything except this kind of stuff.

THE COURT: I am going to read things that are not formally into evidence and on which some day I am going to get a stipulation; is that what you are saying?

MR. NEGUS: Yes.

MR. KOCHIS: That's my understanding as well.

The things Mr. Negus and I are going to mark this
morning are things I have no objection to the Court
considering and, in fact, the Court must consider them.

THE COURT: Well, I just want it into evidence before I start to read it, and if you can waive foundation or stipulate that it come in in some way, but I want it into evidence before I start to read it. I want it marked as a —

MR. NEGUS: I don't think it's smart to do that without the defendant here. If you want to bring the defendant over for that limited purpose, I don't see --

I guess we can, but I don't want to be in a position of moving stuff into evidence or that kind of stuff until Mr. Cooper's actually here. The reason I didn't have him here this week was because I thought we had agreed that we'd handle it informally.

THE COURT: Mr. Negus, I don't see any reason to bend all the traditional rules of evidence and everything else. Here I am going to make a decision on this. I am going to read and consider certain things, and yet I don't follow the usual rules of evidence and have it admitted before me.

MR. KOCHIS: But you are, Judge. He submitted ten days ago a 70-page motion for change of venue --

THE COURT: That many pages?

MR. KOCHIS: -- that contained numerous references to pieces of evidence, quotes that you have obviously read by now, and have partially considered, and, technically, it is not in evidence, and we are following the normal procedure that we always follow.

THE COURT: For the record, aggressive counsel are taking firm control of this trial and deciding how it's going to go without -- without any input from the Court.

MR. NEGUS: We consulted you last Friday, Judge, and that was the point of doing that.

THE COURT: You may have had one thing in mind.

I don't normally spend a week's work without the matter being formally submitted to me in evidence. I normally don't look at exhibits unless they are received.

MR. NEGUS: Well, technically, I suppose that the exhibits are all incorporated by reference into the declaration. All you are really required to do in support of the change of venue motion is to make a declaration of counsel, which I've done, and so those exhibits are already before you.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, I will take it as an offer of proof without objection from the prosecution, and this is all going to be ultimately moved into evidence; is that correct, Mr. Negus?

MR. NEGUS: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, all the -- are there going to be a lot of things submitted to the clerk for me to study this week?

MR. NEGUS: Yes.

THE COURT: And there's no dispute or objection as to any of those things?

MR. KOCHIS: No.

THE COURT: All right. Considering it then as part of the offer of evidence on which there is no objection, and subject to being formally received in evidence later on, I will proceed that way.

As far as your request, Mr. Kochis, on the scope --

MR. NEGUS: Could I make a suggestion?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. NEGUS: That Mr. Kochis and I proceed to organize this material this week, and that he formally make the motion for you to consider that as part of his argument next week, because I think that you will be busy with what we have so far, and then if you decide that that should be considered, then you can consider that next week before you rule on the motion.

THE COURT: Will we have Mr. Cooper tack on the 12th?

MR. NEGUS: Mr. Cooper will be here on the 12th.

MR. KOCHIS: That sounds like a reasonable suggestion.

THE COURT: All right. That's fine. Then we don't have anything going on in court today. Is that your --

MR. NEGUS: That was the whole plan.

THE COURT: Well, I am going to step out and recap this, at least in some manner. I've got to tell them what has occurred.

MR. NEGUS: Judge, I would object to doing anything out in court. I -- the people that are -- have been following the case most closely called me up and asked if anything was going to happen. I told them no, we're not going to do anything in court, based upon what

I understood was I think a fairly clear representation that we did in chambers. It's not fair to other stations for them not to show up on the basis of those kind of representations and then give coverage to the people that -- that are less --

THE COURT: I don't care if I do it.

MR. NEGUS: Well, I do. That's why I'm objecting

THE COURT: You want to step out and do it?

MR. NEGUS: No. I just don't think that --

THE COURT: You mean just keep them in the dark,

Mr. Negus?

MR. NEGUS: You can have the bailiff tell them nothing's going to happen in court. That's fine, but that's what -- that's what anybody who has asked has been told.

THE CGURT: All right. I will note your objection, but I am -- this is a public courtroom, and I am going outside and make a statement briefly synopsizing what's occurred here.

Anything further?

MR. NEGUS: I would object to doing that outside the presence of the defendant.

THE COURT: You may object. The record will reflect it.

Anything further?

And then you are going to go shead and mark your

exhibits.

It's not going to take me 30 seconds outside.

All right. Let's go back outside.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings
were had in open court:)

THE COURT: To those of you in the audience who are interested in the matter of People versus Kevin Cooper, counsel and I have been in chambers discussing the method of proceeding on the motion for change of venue. You were warned last week, I understand, at least some of the media representatives were warned, that nothing was going to occur in open court today, and indeed that's so, and we have had all the hearing we are going to have on the record in chambers. I will be spending time studying exhibits and reading documents, I assume, for the balance of this week, but there's nothing secretive about it. Nothing was said back there that in any way is startling or particularly newsworthy or anything else, but all we did discuss was the method of proceeding of getting the exhibits before the Court.

Mr. Cooper is not present, and we are not having any hearing. I simply wanted to explain to you a little bit what occurred in chambers.

Counsel are going to continue to work with the clerk on the marking of exhibits, and I will receive those when given to me by the clerk.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 2:15 p.m. the following proceedings were had in open court:)

THE COURT: All right. Back on Cooper. Both counsel — all three counsel are present without the defendant, and you have neatly arranged a lot of video cassettes, apparently.

MR. NEGUS: Pirst of all, I have a list of the exhibits that we have had marked in sort of order of their exhibit number, so you can have that to refer to when you are going through them. There are a few blanks that still haven't come in yet, but, basically, you have most of that material in front of you.

What I've done is separated them into radio scripts, newspaper clippings and television material. You have before you on the bench in little stacks the television material that was presented to Judge Merriam at the time of the 860 motion; so what you have is the television coverage in this case from all seven major. Los Angeles channels up to the middle of August. The materials from all seven major television channels since the middle of August are not yet complete, and so we were holding off on giving you those until they are complete, because there's some scripts and stuff that are supposed to come in to make sense out of it. If you look at the television things, they need a certain

The state of the s

amount of explanation.

Channel 2, there are — there is — the programs on Channel 2 are complete on the videotape, so you don't have to make reference to any scripts in order to understand that. In the declaration which is included in the documents, which is in the little file there, are the dates of the programs which they sent to us. There's a declaration of a Carol Nielsen, and she lists the dates of the programs that CBS sent us.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. NEGUS: Channel 4 is two tapes. It likewise is -- all the materials that we have received are complete on the tape. They have prepared a list for you of the times in which the various segments are broadcast. That's a handwritten list which is included in the -- in the file.

THE COURT: Do you know which exhibit that is, for instance?

When there should be a manila file folder right under — there's two tapes there. We are going in order. You went from two to four. There's a manila folder file — yeah. Then there should be a handwritten — a handwritten thing in V-2-C which says "Newscast Ratings, Subject: Kevin Cooper, Chino Murders," and lists all the different dates and ratings when they appeared.

THE COURT: Oh, I see.

MR. NEGUS: Unfortunately, Channel 4 did not list. if I recall correctly, on their tape what actual segment you're -- you're listening to; so the only way that I know of to -- if that becomes an issue, the only way that we can determine what segment is by reference to the material that's broadcast. I think you'll learn, as you go through the newspaper articles, that there's a certain pattern to when the stories appear; and after you've done it five or ten times, they sort of -- it becomes pretty clear what they are, but there is no other documentation, other than that handwritten thing, as to when an actual piece of thing on --

THE COURT: Have they excised out just the pertinent parts to the Cooper case?

MR. NEGUS: What you have is just the material that was broadcast on this case, yes. You are not going to have to watch the whole news program; so what you're going to see is just the coverage. I don't think that it's particularly significant at this stage which segment was broadcast on which date; as far as this particular motion.

THE COURT: Well, the dates --

MR. NEGUS: At least as far as the --

THE COURT: If I knew whether it went over 24 hours or 24 days, it would make a difference, I imagine.

23

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. NEGUS: Vell, you have listed on that handwritten thing the frequency of the coverage. The only problem you have is trying to -- is to be exactly sure, and if that becomes important, I can take the tapes and sit down and do it for you, but it wasn't -- we didn't even coordinate it for the 868 motion, and you have a list of when there was Cooper coverage on that handwritten thing, so that you can gauge the frequency.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. NEGUS: Channel 7 is more complicated, and that's in V -- excuse me. Channel 5 is next. With respect to Channel 5, now you have both scripts and tapes, and the way that I have found most successfully to do it is to sit when I'm watching the videotape with the script in front of me, and if you -- it's in the manila folder. The script's in the manila folder, V-3-C there right underneath Channel 5. Okay. If you look at the script, I can explain a little bit to you about that. There's -the scripts are those things in great big letters that -that -- that go down -- that are on several pages of xerox. In order to --

THE COURT: Doesn't that come out in the video? MR. MEGUO: No. That's the reason why you have --THE COURT: You just have the picture without the sound?

MR. NEGUS: What they have done is that the stuff

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

on the script is what the anchorperson reads on the -on the television. They don't apparently keep tapes of their anchorpersons. All they keep tapes of is their remote coverage, so what you have there is the remote coverage is on the tape. When it says "V.O.," that means a particular segment is being broadcast on the screen as the anchorperson is reading what you -- what you see in front of you. There is also at the end of the script a listing of what was broadcast remote without a voiceover, and if you'll look at the script, it says at the end "-- 40 Tidwell", "--114 Wiesner", "--147 Mike". What that means is you've got 40 seconds into the tape, there's Sheriff Tidwell speaking, and then there's a tape that runs a total of a minute and forty-seven -- excuse me -two minutes and eleven seconds, and they give you a breakdown as to what comes on during what portion of the tape. That particular -- that particular tape was therefore broadcast without an anchorperson reading over it, but just with the sound that you see with the -- with the sound that you see on it; so you have to sit there with a script and watch the television and put it all -and put it all together.

This, apparently, is the way that our television people keep records.

Channel 7, they have for you both a list of all the different times that -- that the stories were

2

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

broadcast. They also have xerox -- what are called story slugs, which tells you when a particular thing on the videotape was -- was broadcast, and they also have the script; so you have to put in again -- in order to make sense of the whole thing, the -- what is on the videotape with what is in the script. Basically, again, for the purposes that we've been using this stuff before and which I would be willing -- which I am going to be proposing it, that which I am concerned about is not so much the exact continuity of the story, for the most part, but what was broadcast and how often; so I don't think it is as important to have an exact chronology. Once you see all the stuff on the tape, and once you read all the scripts, I think you can put it together and have an idea.

Let's see. Channel 9 is again scripts and tapes. On Channel 9 it can be confusing in trying to understand the dates of things, unless you know that they go all the way through their 1:30 news, and so you have a sequence of coverage on the scripts and tapes through the 1:30 news, and then the tape jumps back to the beginning again, and they show you all the way through June to August on the 10:00 o'clock news; so it looks like it's repeating itself, but what you have on the first — on the first series is all the 1:30 news, and on the second series all the 10:00 o'clock news, and they have a list for you when

they're broadcast, how often they broadcast it at 1:30 and at 10:00.

On the tapes from Channel 11 and Channel 13, this time around, they have the whole -- they have the whole -- they will have the whole news story on the tape, and so that's easier to look at.

The radio station coverage are basically scripts. Some of them are just -- some of them are just AP printouts with little notations from the people as to when they were -- as to when they were broadcast.

There's also — on the 24-hour news stations, it was impractical for them to go back and pick up exactly what they broadcast, so they made statements as to the sort of nature and extent of their coverage without trying to provide the actual content, but they made reference, by and large, to the wire services as to what they did.

You will also have in the newspapers the complete outline of the AP and UPI coverage out of the Los Angeles office on this case. That means anything that moved in AP from Pittsburg or from Santa Barbara didn't get subpoensed in, but I think you get a — get a basic understanding of what their coverage was from the — from the Los Angeles office. That repeats itself a lot. I am informed, and it's in the declaration, that generally when newspapers or — when newspapers run coverage off of

AP, they only take one story per day, not four or five, the four or five different versions of the same story that come over the wire.

MR. KOCHIS: The only procedural concern,
Your Honor, is the equipment you are going to be using
to view the video apparently has to be returned to the
Sheriff's Office later this week. They have a training
seminar, but it's going to be free for today and tomorrow,
and I can make arrangements to continue to have it
available for the Court on Wednesday, if the Court is
still looking at the video on Wednesday.

MR. NEGUS: The other problem is that the second series of television tapes we won't have completely available, at least from what I understand, that soon.

THE COURT: Is that Channel 2, 4, 5? We've got 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13.

MR. NEGUS: That's what you've got in front of you. That's all those channels up to August. We don't have -- we have five tapes that have come in on the post-August coverage. Three of those tapes -- there's three yet to come that are in transit, plus there's some scripts that are yet to come, so we are not --

THE COURT: Isn't there any room for reasonable latitude here? Is it possible at all that, for instance, Channel 2 might be representative of, basically, a similar context in Channels 4, 7, at least to where I wouldn't

No Catalana

have to look at all of them? I mean the three major networks, the basic quantity and quality would not be approximately the same? I mean you who have seen these tapes might be able to stipulate.

MR. NEGUS: They aren't basically the same.

Channel 2 I don't think has sent us all the stuff that they aired, but ---

THE COURT: There's no representative way that I can avoid going through each and every one?

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, the fashion in which the case was covered is depicted differently among the various news stations.

THE COURT: Sure. Significantly so?

MR. MOTTMEIER: I don't think, in my own feeling, it's that significantly different. You get nuances of story or comment here or comment there from the news-caster, but nothing that --

THE COUFT: No. I'm not trying to bend your arms, gentlemen, and I am perfectly villing to go through it, if you think it's important. I can just see myself, however, having gone through perhaps one or two of these stations, beginning to te able to recite by memory or rote.

MR. NEGUS: Certainly there's some statements by Mr. Kottmeier and Mr. Tidwell that get broadcast a lot of times, and you probably could say them by rote at the end.

THE COURT: We'll see how it goes. If I have any question, may I call you and get you in on another conference?

MR. KOCHIS: Yes, you may, Your Honor. We will be available on short notice.

MR. NEGUS: I am sure both Mr. Kochis and I will be here all week, with the possible exception of Friday, and we will be available. We will be bringing in additional materials when they do become available, and we will be filing additional papers during the week. I hadn't -- when I wrote my declaration, I hadn't had a chance to view the television materials, the most recent ones, and I am also sure that there will be something that Mr. Kochis will say that I'll feel the need to respond to.

THE COURT: All right. The plan is then that -and you both give me permission to view these materials
in your absence and in the absence of the defendant on
an informal basis as indicated; correct?

MR. NEGUS: Yes.

MR. KOCHIS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We shall start with the television first, so that we might free the machine at the earliest reasonable time, and my bailiff is going to be my chief engineer, and we are going to commence with the top of your list, I guess.

MR. NEGUS: I would suggest, perhaps, if you want, that probably Channel 4 and Channel 7 are the most complete coverage, and if you want to start with that, then you'll at least have a -- and they're also the best documentation of what they've done for you; so if you want to start with that, that might make it easier for you to understand some of the other stuff, but that's just a suggestion.

THE COURT: Is it going to be hard to understand?

MR. NEGUS: Not really, I don't think.

THE COURT: All right. Channel 4 starts off then with Exhibit V-27

MR. NEGUS: Channel 4 you don't have to go back and forth between -- between video and script, so it's easy. That's why I suggested it first.

(Whereupon, the matter was adjourned until Monday, March 12, 1984.)

--000---

J

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2 3

4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN BERHARDINO

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

I, JILL D. McKIMMEY, do hereby certify:

That I am an official reporter of the Superior Court of the State of California, for the County of San Bernardino;

That at the time and place herein stated I reported in stenotype the oral proceedings had with respect to the above-entitled cause and that the foregoing pages numbered 176 through 223, inclusive, constitute, to the best of my belief and ability a full, true and correct transcript of said proceedings as transcribed from my stenotype notes.

Dated this day of March, 1984, at Ontario, California.

C.S.R. No. 2314