SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

Vs.

KEVIN COOPER,

Defendant-Appellant.

CR 72787

Supreme Court
No. Orim 24557

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY
HONORABLE RICHARD C. GARNER, JUDGE PRESIDING
REPORTERS' 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

1/dl 12

For Defendant-Appellant:

IN PROPRIA PERSONA

VOLUME volumes
Pages 224 to 276, incl.

JILL D. MC KIMMEY, C.S.R., C-2314 and NOEMI LUCCHESI, C.S.R., C-3136 Official Reporters

	SHORDIAD COURT OF TH	E STATE OF CALLFORNIA		
1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN PERNARDING Robert O. Zumwelt. Clark			
3	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	FEB 26 1985		
5	Plaintiff,)))		
6	vs.)		
7	KEVIN COOPER,)		
8	Defendant.) VOLUME 4		
9				
10	REFORTERS! DAILY TRANSCRIPT			
11	BEFORE HONORABLE RICHARD C. GARNER, JUDGE			
12	DEPARTMENT 3 - ONTABIO, CALIFORNIA			
13	March 12, 1984			
	a odka rantes:			
14		DENNIS KOTTMEIER		
15	Por the People:	District Attorney		
16		DENNIS KOTTMEIER		
17		District Attorney By: JOHN F. KOCHIS		
18		Deputy District Attorney		
19	For the Defendant	DAVID ComminA Public Defender		
20		By: DAVID NEGUS Debuty Fublic Defender		
21		perdog ruelle berender		
;				
22		JILL D. MCKIMMEY		
23	Reported by:	Official Reporter C.C.R. No. 2314		
24		and NORM LUCCHENI		
25	·	Official Reporter		
26		c.s.R. No. 3136		
	•	<u> </u>		

4	
1	<u> 1 M D E X</u>
2	<u>volumm</u> <u>4</u>
3	
4	DEFT'S WITNESSES PAGE
5	BACON, Richard
6	Direct Examination by Mr. Negus
7	Cross-Examination by Mr. Kochls
8	BLANCO, Luis
9	Direct Examination by Mr. Negus
10	TATRO, Brenda
11	Direct Examination by Mr. Negus
12	
13	ARTHUR, Bill
14	Direct Examination by Mr. Hegus
15	
16	
17	
18	<u>ev n i b i T S</u>
19	POR I.D. IN EVIDENCE
20	245
21	V=40 thru 43 = Photographs = 245 V=44 = Literature = 245
22	
23	000
24	
25	
26	

```
ONTARIO, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1984; 9:45 A.M.

DEPARTMENT NO. 3 HON. RICHARD C. GARNER, JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

The Defendant with his Counsel, DAVID NEGUS,
```

The Defendant with his Counsel, DAVID NAMES, Deputy Public Defender of San Fernardino County; DENNIS KOTTMEIER, District Attorney of San Bernardine County, JOHN P. KOCHIS, Deputy District Attorney of San Bernardino County, representing the People of the State of California.

(Jill D. McKimmey, C.S.R., Official Reporter, C-2314, Hoemi Lucchesi, C.S.R., Official Reporter, C-3136)

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

THE COURT: All right. For the record, it's now no minutes till 10:00. All three attorneys are in chambers with Mr. Cooper.

What's to occur here, gentlemen?

MR. NEGUS: I have a couple of requests first.

I'd be requesting court orders that a tarber paid for by

Mr. Cooper be allowed to go into the jail for the purpose

of giving him a halrout. The reason for this is that If

it's done by the jail, they have trustees do it. In

Mr. Cooper's case I don't think that we can trust the

trustees. We have obtained a licensel barber who's

willing to -- who's willing to do that. I have a call in.

Mr. Cooper was originally advised to get a court order to do that by a Sergeant Ingram.

ß

R

q

THE COURT: I have no objection to it. Is there any problem with that?

MR. MESUS: I have a call in to Lieutenant Gilmore, who's watch commander of the Jail. He just started that duty. He's checking, but I don't think there's any problem, but he'll let me know if there's any problem.

MR. KOCHIS: No objection from the People.

THE COURT: Unless there's some security problem with the jail in some way, why, I have no objection, and I will be naply to make an order, if you desire.

MR. HEGUS: As far as I hear back from Lieutenant Gilmore, I will draft an order and get It to you.

THE COURT: That's number one.

MR. ME HUT: The second request is that Mr. Cooper had -- needs places. He had classes when he was arrested in Los Angeles, but they were lost during the course of the arrest by the Los Angeles Police Department. On his medical records at CIM is a notation he needs glasses.

He's having more and more difficulties as he goes along, because he gets headaches. He can't over He gets dizzy.

We would rejuest that the fourt order a doctor from the California Institution for Men who does that sort of thing to come up and do a prescription and have the CIE people prepare the classes.

Sergeant Gilmore's also checking to see whether that would cause any security problems. He didn't think it would.

THE COURT: Well, it's one thing for me to sign an order to permit such an expert access to the defendant in the County Jail, and I have no problem with that. It's quite another for me to order them to do so. He doesn't have a prescription already filled -- prepared for his old glasses that he can simply supply to CIM people to prepare new glasses?

MR. MEGHS: The last prescription he -- he got was filled I think in 1979, or something like that, at Huntington Prison in Lennsylvania. I don't think we have it, or it's available -- it's out of date, anyway.

MR. KOCHIC: Your Honor, I'm not sure what CIM's position is soing to be, because at this joint he's not in their custody.

THE COURT: Mr. Negus, I'd like to have you do some more checking. Ferhaps, you know, that testing would have to be done down at CICL. Ferhaps It could be done -- he could be taken down at a Thursday night, and it could be done on Friday. Saturday or Junday Lefore he's brought back here, we could perhaps house him down there one weekend. I'd like you to do some more encoking on that. Find out more what CIE's position is, what facilities are needed. I don't think that a doctor can simply go into

County Jail and do an adequate job.

1,

I have a pair of magnifying glasses that comebody -that I came across. If he wants to use those as an
emergency, why, I'd be happy to let him have those.

MR. NEGUS: I'm not sure that that's the problem with his eyes. I think there's an astigmatism problem or something.

THE COURT: That's not a good thing to do. I appreciate that. So could you do some more checking, and we'll follow up on it. Right now, I'd be hesitant to make any order.

making a motion to exclude witherses from the -- all the motions that we have, and I'd be making that motion to exclude all witnesses who may be called at trial by -- by either side, with the exception of the two investigating officers, Mr. Arthur and Mr. Forbush, and the reason for that is that a lot of the testimony at the various motions will overlap the testimony at trial, and I believe it is necessary, in order to make sure that the witnesses' testimony is their own, to keep them out of court. I have five witnesses today, none of whom I expect to call at trial, and I have no objection to them -- the people remaining today. I just didn't want to waive it by not making It at the earliest possible opportunity.

THE COURT: I don't understand now. The five

witnesses that you've got --

MR. NEGUR: Today are the witnesses -- The witnesses on the change of venue motion are not witnesses that will ever testify at trial. They are just going to testify about community centers, with the exception of Sergeant Arthur, and he would be excluded from the order, anyway.

THE COURT: Do you have witnesses, Mr. Kochis or Mr. Kottmeler?

MR. KOCHIS: Not today, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's kind of a moot question today, apparently.

MR. NEGRO: I just wanted to make the Court aware of that motion, and not to walve it tomorrow by not -- by not making it today.

THE MOURT: All right. You have made it. The record will reflect it.

MR. MEGUS: Finally, I just want to let the Court know what the logistical problems we have are at the moment. We have two television tapes that have not yet been received and --

THE COUPT: Where is it from?

MR. MEGUE: Channel 4 and Channel 2. Channel 4 is supposed to call me this morning. The tage is supposed to be ready for pickup, hopefully, at noon, and I am prepared to send Mr. Forbush down to jick it up and ret it back here so we can watch it this afternoon.

I have another tape from Channel II that I'd like to have us watch this afternoon. I would suggest that seeing as how we didn't have any of these tapes copied, that all three of us, prosecutor, myself and --

THE COURT: I'm agreeable. I'm agreeable.

MR. MEGUS: There's one possible tape. Channel 2, it's prepared. The Channel 2 people indicated they wanted to be paid before they delivered the tapes. I indicated that I didn't have several hundred dollars to pay them. I didn't think that the law required me to do so. I would submit their bill, as I have done with all the other bills, to the Court, and you can do with it as you wish. They have not yet — they were supposed to call me Friday afternoon and let me know what they decided about that. They naven't done so, so I am prepared to send a subpoena ducer tecum, if they don't show up today with the tape, deliverable tomorrow morning, so we may have to watch the CBS tape temorrow morning.

have a written response to Mr. Mochis' points and authorities, which I'd like the Tourt to consider before ruling on the motion, that is -- we -- the typists in our office are overworked, so we are farming the typing out, and I am informed that that won't -- that that probably won't be ready before tomorrow morning, so I'll need to be submitting the final papers on the points and authorities

on the change of venue tomorrow morning, so we won't be finished with the change of venue until tomorrow.

THE COURT: If possible, see if you can't get it in by 5:00 o'clock today.

MR. NEGUS: I can't. I asked them to do it.

They are going to make every effort, but apparently that's unlikely. I applorize, but I just -- you know, we're down a secretary, plus we're having to farm it out, so we're sort of in a bind.

THE COURT: All right. Shall we go outside and put on the witnesses then?

MR. KOCHIS: Yes.

served me Friday afternoon with a series of motions. I have responded to one of those in writing and filed the response this morning. By response to his 1538 will be filed in two parts. The typist is working on the first part. It will be filed this afternoon. The second part I don't anticipate completing until Wednesday or Thursday, and I am confident we will not be done with the testimony on those issues by that time, just to let the Court know where my responses are.

THE COURT: At the very latest, it would appear that we are going to have all the testimony on the change of venue motion in phase one, so to speak, by tomorrow noon?

MR. NEGUS: I hope so.

THE COURT: Then what would be our next step?

MR. NEGUS: Then the next step would be either to -well, the next step I would want to do would be to consider
the motion to release evidence, which Mr. Kochis has
already responded to. That shouldn't take very long.

THE COURT: I have read both of those. That should not take very long.

MR. MEGUS: And then, to begin taking testimony on the motion to suppress. I don't think we need to, as Mr. Kochis indicates, wait for all of his points and authorities before we begin taking the evidence.

THE COURT: No.

MR. KOSHIS: I think Mr. Negus overlooked one thing. I think he anticipates our arguing and receiving a ruling from the Court on the change of venue motion, unless I'm mistaken, prior to the time we start the 1538, or am I mistaken?

MR. MEGUE: That would be my hope, I would think.

THE COURT: I would expect, shortly after receiving the last evidence and hearing your argument, to be able to rule immediately.

Ckay. Wait a minute. What I did all last week, I went through every item and every film.

MR. NEGUS: I'm not upset by what you're saying.
THE COUPT: Maybe we'll get some decision on that,

and be prepared to go the next step. Maybe you'll want witnesses then tomorrow afternoon.

MR. KOCHIS: We have witnesses subpoensed for tomorrow.

THE COURT: These motions could overlap, if there's any delay. I mean we could proceed on.

MR. MEGUS: We are suggesting that Mr. Clifford, who will be the first witness on the motion to suppress, would begin testimony at 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

THE COURT: With reference to your motion to suppress, is there any shortening of such that I can save by reading the transcript?

MR. MOCHIS: Mr. Megus and I were going to consider possible stipulations to some of the testimony of some of the civilian witnesses. We haven't worked that out yet.

THE COURT: Save us whatever you can. You tell me, though.

Anything else?

MR. NEGUE: Not that I can think of.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's go outside.

MR. METWO: I need to get my first witnesses.

(No omissions.)

.

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

THE COURT: Good morning.

with Counsel in chambers, we discussed to some extent the business for the day. It occurs to me that first all of the items previously marked as exhibits, the newspaper clippings, the television tapes, radio tapes, all the other matters marked as exhibits relevant on the change of venue motion have been offered, as an offer of proof, and marked as exhibits but not yet formally received.

In the presence of Mr. Cooper and his Counsel this morning, are you both prepared for some sort of stipulation in that regard?

MR. KOCHIS: Yes.

MR. NEGUS: Yes, Your Honor. There are still a few exhibits that have not yet come in. We can finish that, but with respect to all exhibits received by both Prosecution and Defense, I would move that they be introduced into evidence at the change of venue motion and be made part of the record of that motion.

MR. KOCHIS: I have no objection.

THE COURT: There have been some offered by you as well, Mr. Kochis.

MR. KOCHIS: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So all of them previously offered will be received without objection by the same numbers.

```
MR. NEGUS: Also, we're requesting that we formally
1
2
    make the stipulation that the Court can consider the pages
3
    of testimony from the 868 Motion that I referred to in my
            I believe that was pages -- it was -- the date was
4
    brief.
5
    9/23/83, and believe the pages were 40 thru 72.
            MR. KOCHIS: I likewise have no objection to that.
6
            THE COURT: Pages 40 to 72? I have not yet read
7
    that. I'll have to do that. All right. The stipulation
8
9
    is accepted.
            MR. NEGUS: My first witness I believe is on his way.
10
            THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.
11
            THE COURT: Proceed.
12
            MR. NEGUS: When he gets here, it will be Mr.
13
14
    Richard Bacon.
            THE COURT: Isn't there somebody else you can call
15
16
    out of order?
            MR. NEGUS: The other witnesses will take considerably
17
    longer, and he's on his way. He should be here in just a
18
19
    second.
            THE COURT: Call me when he's here.
20
            THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir.
21
            (Short break in the proceedings.)
22
            THE COURT: Proceed.
23
24
    1111
25
    1111
26
    1111
```

RICHARD BACON,

called as a witness by and on behalf of the Defense, was sworn and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give in the action now pending before this Court shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God?

THE WITNESS: I do.

THE CLERK: Please be seated. State your name, please, for the record, and spell your last name.

THE WITNESS: Richard Bacon, B-a-c-o-n.

12

13

15

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

DIRECT EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. NEGUS:

- Q Mr. Bacon, what is your occupation?
- 16 | A. Deputy sheriff.
- 17 Q And are you assigned to the West End Substation Jail
 18 as one of your most frequent assignments?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q Were you so assigned back in November of 1983?
- 21 A. Yes, sir-
- 22 Q On November 24th, 1983, were you aware that Kevin Cooper
- was attending a Preliminary Hearing in Department A of
- 24 the Municipal Court?
- 25 A. I'm not sure if that was the date, but I was aware he

26 was going to a Preliminary.

```
And during the course of that Preliminary Hearing, at least at the beginning, Mr. Cooper had two different suits that were available for him to wear to court; is that correct?
```

A Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q And basically I would come over and pick up one, take it to be cleaned and then substitute another? We kept switching them back and forth at the beginning of the Preliminary Hearing?
- A Yes, sir.
- 11 Q Where was the suit kept that was being used while Mr.
 12 Cooper was not in court?
 - A There's a small area in the front part of the booking section of the West End Jail that they were locked in.
 - Q Now, on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, which I believe was the 23rd of November, were you on duty at the time that Mr. Cooper got finished with court that afternoon and went back to the main jail?
- 19 A. Was this on Wednesday afternoon?
- 20 Q Yes.
- 21 A. No, sir.
- Q When you arrived at work on Monday morning, at some point in time did you go into that closet to get Mr.
 Cooper's suit?
- 25 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q And what -- approximately what time was that?

2

3

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

- A I would say between 8:00 and 8:30.
- Q When you went into that closet, was it locked?
- A Yes, sir.
- 4 Q Showing you Exhibit 63, is that the suit that was in the closet?
- 6 A That looks like it, yes, sir.
 - And asking you to look at the front of the suit, there's a substance on that suit. Was that substance there on the -- on the morning of the 28th?
- 10 A. Looks about the same, yes.
- 11 Q And the tie has a burn mark. Was that burn mark there

 12 on the --
- 13 A I didn't notice the tie.
 - And did you notice the crotch area of the pants, whether there was any burn mark in the crotch area of the pants?
 - A If the location is on the left leg towards the crotch, yes, sir.
- 18 Q Showing you, if I can, the crotch area in the left leg.

 19 There seems to be two burns in that.
- 20 A I wasn't aware of this one. I was aware of this one.
- 21 Q You weren't aware of the one on the crotch, but you were aware of the one on the left leg?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q The last time you had seen this suit on Mr. Cooper before that, had it been in this condition?
- 26 A No, sir.

```
Are -- are inmates of the jail supposed to have access
2
         to that closet?
3
        No, sir.
    A.
        Who was supposed to have access to it?
 4
        The deputy who was working.
5
6
        Thank you.
             I have nothing further.
7
8
                           CROSS-EXAMINATION
9
    BY MR. KOCHIS:
10
        Mr. Bacon, the room in which that particular suit is
11
        kept, does it have a cage area on the front?
12
        Yes, sir.
13
    A.
        Does it also have a counter?
14
        Yes, sir.
15
    À.
        And is the cage area made of some metal screen or mesh?
    Q.
16
        Yes, sir.
17
    A
        Is there in fact a space of about two feet that
    Ç.
18
        separates the counter from the metal screen?
19
        Not quite that high, but there is a large area.
    A.
20
        And does it run across the counter several feet, three
    Q
21
        or four feet?
22
        Yes, sir.
    A.
23
        And is that space large enough for someone to crawl
24
        through, even when the room itself is locked?
25
        I imagine so, yes, sir
    A.
26
```

	1	
1	Q	Who has the responsibility of hanging clothes up for
2		the inmates, the deputies or the trustees?
3	A.	The deputies.
4	Q	Do trustees also have access to that particular room?
5	A.	Yes, sir.
6	Q	And are trustees people who are not deputy sheriffs?
7	A.	Yes, sir.
8	Q	Are they people who have been convicted of some crime,
9		and they're serving their time in the county jail?
10	A.	Yes, sir.
11	Q	And those people have access to the room as well?
12	A.	Yes, sir.
13	Q	During the day is the door to that particular room
14		often kept unlocked?
15	A.	In the morning. After that it's locked.
16	ی	And in the morning when it is unlocked, are there
17		trustees working in that portion of the facility?
18	A.	Yes, sir.
19		MR. KOCHIS: I have nothing else.
20		
21		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. NEGUS:	
23	Q.	When there was no court, would that room be unlocked
24		in the morning?
25	A.	Beg your pardon?
26	Q	When there was no court, when there was no inmates being
- 1		

```
brought from the jail to go to court, that closet wouldn't
2
         be unlocked?
3
         Yes, sir.
4
        Is that correct?
5
         In the morning, yes, sir.
    A.
6
        It would not be unlocked?
7
        It would be unlocked.
        Even if they were on a holiday or --
8
9
    A.
        Yes, sir.
        Do you know what that substance is on the front of the
10
11
        coat?
        The dark spot?
12
    à.
13
    Q.
        Yes.
14
    A
        No, sir.
        Does it appear to be -- to be consistent with fingerprint
15
16
        ink?
        It could be, yes, sir.
17
    A.
        Is there fingerprint ink in the West End Substation?
18
        Yes, sir.
19
    A.
        Thank you.
    Q.
20
            Nothing further.
21
            MR. KOCHIS: No further cross.
22
            THE COURT: Thank you very much.
23
            MR. NEGUS: Call Luis Blanco.
24
             I would move Exhibit 63 into evidence, Your Honor.
25
            MR. KOCHIS: I would object on relevancy grounds.
26
```

THE COURT: Counsel, I have seen it. I don't think we need to put it into evidence. Denied.

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

2

 $\underline{L}\ \underline{U}\ \underline{I}\ \underline{S}\ \underline{B}\ \underline{L}\ \underline{A}\ \underline{N}\ \underline{C}\ \underline{O}$, called as a witness by and on behalf of the Defense, was sworn and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear the testimony
you are about to give in the action 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.

THE CLERK: Please be seated. State your name, please, for the record, and spell your last name.

THE WITNESS: Luis Blanco, B-l-a-n-c-o.

14

15

16

17

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEGUS:

- Q Mr. Blanco, what is your occupation?
- 18 A. I'm an investigator with the Public Defender's Office.
- 19 \ Were you so employed on November the 9th, 1983?
- 20 A. Yes, I was.
- 21 Q On that date were you assigned by myself to go out
- 22 and view a demonstration taking place on Sixth Street
- in front of the courthouse?
- 24 A. Yes, I was.
- 25 Q Can you describe that demonstration?
- 26 A. Sure. There were several men dressed in uniforms with

Nazi emblems, and they were -- they had signs, racist signs. They were shouting racist slogans. They had -- one sign in particular, it was up on a pole, had a monkey hanging on it, making reference to hanging Kevin Cooper.

There were, I'd say, in the 30 or so minutes I was out there, about 50 people, 50 spectators coming and going. I believe there were a couple of police out there, and there was some arguing. People would walk by and argue, and...

(No omissions.)

```
pid you photograph that demonstration?

A. Yes, I did.
```

- that a print of one of the photographs that you took of the demonstration?
- A. Yes, it is.

5

9

14

17

23

24

25

- 6. And does that accurately depict one of the signs and some of the participants in the demonstration?
- A. Yes, it does.
- 10 . Showing you Exhibit V-41, did you take that photograph?
- 11 A. Yes, I did.
- 12 And does that agair, accurately depict another of the signs and some of the participants in the demonstration?
 - A Yes, it does.
- 15 % Chowing you Exhibit V=43, does that depict the mankey that you described earlier?
 - A. Yes, it does.
- G. Does that also depict accurately the signs that were attached to the monkey?
- 20 A. Yes, it does.
- 21 G. Were the -- were the carticipants in the demonstration 22 handing out leaflets?
 - A: Yes, they were.
 - demonstrators handing out some leaflets?
 - A. Yes, it does.

pid you get copies of some of the leaflets that werebeing handed out by the demonstrators?

3 A Yes, I did.

4 . And did you take them in and hand them to me in my office later that day?

4 Yes, I did.

Have you seen those -- have you seen those pamphlets since?

9 A Yes.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

showing you Exhibit V-44, a folder which contains a series of pamphlets, are those the pamphlets that you were handed by the demonstrators on November the 9th?

E Yes, they are.

MR. MENUS: Thank you.

I have nothing further.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KOCHIS:

The Blanco, the persons present at the demonstration, the 50 people, some of those persons included lawyers from your office; isn't that true --

. Tes.

-- that were spectators and, in fact, a large number of the persons present at the demonstration were media personnel, a reporter from The Daily Report, from The Press Enterprise in Riverside, and various TV

* ******

```
0006657
```

```
newscasters; isn't that true?
 1
         The only media people I -- I could recognize were
2
         the gentlemen with the cameras.
3
         Well, do you know what Richard Gray looks like?
         No, I don't.
     à.
5
         You don't know what Mr. Smith looks like?
6
     A.
         ::o.
7
         So you don't recognize them in the pictures that you
     0
8
         took?
9
         llo.
     A.
10
         Did you talk to the people who were carrying the signs?
11
     j.
         ∷o.
12
         Do you know where their office in Los Angeles County
13
         is?
14
         Mo, I don't.
     į.
15
         Do you know what county they were from?
16
         ∷c.
17
             MR. MOCHIS: I have nothing else.
18
             MR. MEGUS: Nothing further.
19
             THE COURT: Thank you.
20
             MR. NEGVS: Move into evidence Exhibits V-40 through
21
     7-44.
22
             MR. KOCHIS: I have no objection.
23
             THE COURT: They will be received.
24
             MR. MEGUS: Call Brenda Tatro.
25
26
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

26

ck.

 $\underline{B} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{D} \ \underline{A} \ \underline{T} \ \underline{A} \ \underline{T} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{O}$, called as a witness by the defendant, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: You do notemnly swear the testimony you are about to give in the action now pending before this Court shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

THE WITHERS: I do.

THE CLERK: Please be seated.

State your name, please, for the record, and smell your last name.

THE WITHESS: My name is Brenda Tatro. That's spelled Teas in Tor-a-t-as in Tom-reo.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEGUS:

- Q Mrs. Tatre, in what community do you live?
- A I live in Thino.
- 4 And have you been living there since June of 1983?
- A Yes, I have.
- 20 G Do you relong to any community groups connected with prisons in Chino?
 - A Yes. I am president of a citizent' organization called tro-fal, and I was -- 1 sat on an advisory committee at california Institution for Men, which I no longer do.
 - Q Could you describe the advisory committee?

```
A. At CIM?
```

Right.

<u>_</u>

A. It was made up of citizens and both prison officials.

d And what was its purpose?

A The purpose of it was it was set up, as far as I know, by Superintendent Midge Carroll at a forum at the Glenmeade School. She asked if anyone would be interested in sitting on an advisory council at the prison, and to give her your name; so I believe from there, she called people to be on this advisory committee. In that, we discussed prison escapes, security of the prison.

- Was there any particular event which -- which caused the formation of this particular committee and this particular community interest?
- A Of course, I can't speak for Midge Carroll. It was formed -- like I said, it was developed at the Glenmeade School because of the tragedy in Chino Hills.
- That would be the homicides in which members of the Ryen family were killed and Christopher Hughes were killed?
- 22 A That's correct.
- 23 G How long have you lived in Chino?
- 24 A It will be eight years in May.

A Describe it?

4 Yes.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

A. Hostile.

MR. MOCHIS: Well, Your Honor, I think I am going to object as calling for an opinion that she's not qualified to give.

MR. MEGUT: Maine versus Eurerior doubt indicates that one of the minds of evidence that comes in in a change of venue is opinion evidence about the nature of the community.

THE COURT: Without going into the details, I think she can adequately describe mood, expressions, general feelings, consensus of opinion. Overruled.

- G. BY MR. MEGUD: You can answer.
- A I can answer? in my opinion --
- Q Yes.
- A -- it was hostile. It was fearful. Teaple were ... fearful, upset; very hard to describe, in my opinion.
- Was that hostility directed against any particular person?
- A Could you repeat that? I'm sorry.
- Q Was the hostility that was expressed at that meeting, in your opinion, directed against any particular person?
- A I cannot answer for anyone else except for myself.

 At that point T was upset because of the tragedies in

2

3

```
Chino Hills, and that CIM did not have the security if there was the possibility of an inmate getting out, but for me, it was -- I was very upset because of the deaths.
```

- G You were upset primarily at CIM?
- A No. I was upset about the deaths in Chino Hills, and also about possibly an inmate getting out of CIM, that there wasn't enough security.
- g L Of what were you afraid?
- 10 A I was afraid of an inmate getting out of CIM and possibly the same thing happening or supposedly happening to harm my family.
- Did you hear from other persons any expressions of hostility towards Revir. Cooper at that meeting?
- 15 4 Other people talked to me, yes. They expressed their opinion about Kevin Cooper.
- 17 . And was that hostile?
- 18 A. Yes, it was.

- 20 While you were on the Citizens Advisory Committee,
 20 there were meetings held between members of the
 21 prison administration, like Mr. Pales, Miss Carroll
 22 and Miss Stephens and members of the community?
- 23 A. Did you say while I'm on the committee? I've been removed.
- 25 4 Yes, while you were on the committee. Excuse me.
 - A Yes. We discussed issues that happened.

```
G Did Mr. Cooper's name come up during those meetings?
```

- 2 A. Yes, it did.
 - & How often?

9

10

11

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- A. In the beginning, very often.
- 5 | Did it ever stop coming up?
- A It came to the point where CIM officials said that we have gone over this territory enough; let's go to something else.
 - 2 So the dessation of talking about Mr. Cooper was at the instigation of the CIM people; is that right?
 - A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?
- 12 . That was a terrible question.
- 13 A Yeah.
 - The idea to stop talking about Mr. Cooper came from the SIM people rather than the community?
- 16 A. In my opinion, yes.
 - 2 Mr. Cooper was still a subject on the mind of the community people at that point in time and a subject of concern?

MR. MOCHIS: Well, Your Honor, I'm going to object to that.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- 2 BY MR. MEGUE: When did the CIM pupple ask you to stop talking about Mr. Cooper?
- A I'm sorry, but I can't remember exactly what meeting that occurred at. We attended twice a month, so it's

very difficult to come up with a date.

- Can you give me an approximation? Was it like in August or November, any general idea?
- A. I'm sorry. I couldn't answer that truthfully, because I really don't know. I'd have to go through the minutes to look at that and go over my own notes.
- When -- were you still on the committee in the middle of December when Fred Owen Hodges escaped from California Institution for Men?
- A Yes, I was.

- At that point in time, did Mr. Cooper's name come up again?
 - Hodges that came up, that how come the mutual aid -people felt that mutual aid was not put into force
 like it was decided on, and why did it take so long
 for prison officials to call the police department
 and the Sheriff's Department and the radio stations
 and the newspaper. It was why is this happening, why
 dign't you do what was agreed upon. That's the input
 I was getting or what I was asking.
 - Did you make any statements to the press in which you mentioned Mr. Cooper in connection with the Hodges case?
 - A I talked with the press after Hodges escaped out -- out in front of the prices when I went to pick up filers

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

د المحمد الم

agreed upon was not carried out. I was mainly upse	et
that the mutual aid and what was agreed upon was no	ot
carried out so that people could be notified that	
there was a prison escape, personally speaking.	

to hand them out about descriptions of hodges.

I don't recall. I talked to so many pecile, I

Was Mr. Cooper on your mind during that revied of

For myself, no. I was very upset that what was

Did you mention Mr. Cooper during those conversations?

- d How many community people were involved with the Citizens Advisory Committee, approximately:
- A i believe that the agreed upon was ten -- ten citizens, and there's going to be five CIE officials.
- Were the citizens connected with any larger group in the community?
- A. Some of them were before, yes.

really don't recall.

time?

- 4 Would that be the Concerned Citizens of the Chino Hills?
- A. Yes.
- Do you know about the Concerned Citizens of the Thine Hills?
- A. I was on the Concerned Citizens of Chino Hills, yes.
- Q Can you describe that particular organization?
- A. The citizens of Chino -- there was a forum -- who held

25 26

the forum at Glenmeade School that were in an uproar tecause of the deaths in Chino Hills. They arranged to have the forum. They got fliers out. They contacted people. They contacted the news and said we are having a forum at the Glenmeade School. A few people went to Sacramento to talk to legislators. We kept in contact with Senator Ayala, Assemblyman Bader, talked with a few people from the Department of Corrections to let them know -- we handed out a petition to say we do not want expansion of CIM. We do not want takeover of YTS, and sent this to Governor Deukmedian expressing how we felt about this.

- A la that group still in existence?
- A. As far as I know, no. I was some of the few that felt that prison issues were not just in our backward, that it was a statewide issue, so I formed a group sailed Fro-Cal, and have some on from there.
- St, tasically, Fro-Cal is designed to carry on the work of the Concerned Citizens, but on a wider scale?
- A That's incorrect.
- a What is the purpose of it:
- A. Instal is -- it stands for promote prison construction, and what it is -- why it was done was that -- like I had said, that it was not just CEE that had problems, but it was a statewide issue with all prisons, the condition of the prisons in the state of California.

We wanted to set up advisory groups where there are prisons, and where there might possibly be prisons, so that citizens could have communication with the prison in case there was an escape, so it really — it's not an extension of Concerned Titizens of Chino Hills.

- Que where there are prisons or where there might be?
- A. Yes.
- in the purpose of Pro-Cal to -- to organize citizens in the areas of prisons primarily? Would that be fair to say?
- A Organize them? We express our opinion. We have been to -- we have toured Folsom Frison. We have toured TRC, CIW, CIW. We have gone to beautout where there's the possibility of there being a prison. We put to them that if they happen to do get a prison in Beautout, that we'd be more than willing to come up and help them set up advisory committees, citizen advisory committees, so that there is communication; that we feel that the most important thing is to educate and communicate with the recopie.

(No unissions.)

Q Is it -- would it be fair to say that the primary membership of your organization, that most of the people involved in it, are people that live close to either existing prisons or proposed prison sites?

- A. That's correct.
- And the purpose of the organization then would be to aid those people who live close to prisons or proposed prison sites in their relationships with the institution?
- A. If they wish our help, we'd be more than willing to help them out.
- As you have -- have you toured the state to visit citizens in those various communities?
- A Yes. We have talked to citizens, yes.
- Q. Around the state in those communities which do have prisons, is there substantial opposition to those prisons?

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I'm going to object. Lack of foundation at this point, based on who she's talked to, the number of people in the community. If she goes to Sacramento and talks to five or six people, I don't think she's qualified to give an opinion.

THE COURT: Yes, sustained.

Counsel, bear in mind that I've reviewed numerous articles and exhibits with reference to prison communities, statewide, communities' opposition to it, problems in the legislature in the past. All of this I'm aware of. You

8

10

11

12

1

2

3

5

6

7

13

15 16

14

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

```
don't need to go into that much detail. The objection is sustained.
```

- Q BY MR. NEGUS: Just one last series of questions:

 During the eight years that you lived in Chino,

 were you ever involved in groups expressing opinions
 about prisons before June of 1983?
- A. No.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

25

- Q Is it -- is it fair to say that the catalyst for the formation of all of the groups that you belonged to is the Kevin Cooper case?
- A I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?
 - Q Is it fair to say that the catalyst, that is, the thing that brought them into being of all of the groups that you belonged to, is the Ryen killings and the Kevin Cooper case?
- 16 A. Possibly, yes.
- 17 \(\mathcal{U}\) Well, you weren't involved before. Do you know of any
 18 \(\text{of the other people in your groups --} \)
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q -- that were involved in opposition to prison --
- 21 A. Not that I know of. Like I say, I'm -- I was very upset
 22 about what happened in Chino Hills. My mind was more
 23 on that than Kevin Cooper. I mean, what had happened
 24 and what I've heard, that had a little bit to do with it.
 - Has your group even used Kevin Cooper as a symbol of opposition to prison construction?

```
A You mean what supposedly he did?
```

- 2 \ \text{\$\rho\$} \ \text{Have people with your group ever carried signs that} \ \ \text{say "Remember Kevin Cooper"?} \ \end{array}
- 4 A No, not in Pro-Cal. Pro-Cal has never carried a sign that says that.
- Q Were you ever with any organizations that said that?
- 7 A Yes, I demonstrated in front of Chaffey auditorium with Concerned Citizens of Chino.
- 9 Q Were such signs carried at that point in time?
- 10 A I did not carry a sign that had Mr. Cooper's name on it,
 11 no.
- 12 Q Did you see other people who did?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Ω Have you been present at other demonstrations against prisons throughout the state?
- 16 A Against prisons?
- 17 Q Yes, or to try and control prisons, to make them more responsive to the citizens?
- 19 A Like I said, I have been to Beaumont, I have talked to
 20 officials at Folsom, I have attended a testimony at
 21 CIM that the legislative -- Mr. Presley's committee held.
 - Q When you were in Beaumont, did Mr. Cooper's name come up?
- 23 A Yes, it did.

- 24 Q Were there signs about him at that point?
- 25 A They did carry signs, yes.
- 26 Q Thank you.

Nothing further. 2 CROSS-EXAMINATION 3 BY MR. KOCHIS: Mrs. Tatro --5 Tatro. 6 Tatro. The group you are presently president of, 7 Pro-Cal, is that opposed to prison construction or in 8 favor of prison construction? 9 We are very much in favor of prison construction. 10 Is the membership in that organization statewide? 11 We really can't call it membership. We are receiving 12 A. our nonprofit right now. We have a lot of supporters 13 statewide California, yes. 14 So the supporters of your group are not restricted to Q. 15 the Chino Hills area? 16 No, they are not. A. 17 They're not restricted to San Bernardino County? 18 No, they are not. 19 Not restricted to San Bernardino County? 20 No. A. 21 MR. KOCHIS: I have nothing else. 22 MR. NEGUS: Nothing further. 23 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 24 MR. NEGUS: The next witness, I'd like to have some 25

documents which I'd like to review before I call him. I

26

er tal Frank a.m.

think he was going to check. . .

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. NEGUS: Perhaps we could approach the bench briefly.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Cooper, do you wish to attend when we go to chambers, or will you waive your appearance?

THE DEFENDANT: I'll waive.

(The following proceedings were held in chambers:)

THE COURT: We're in chambers now. Defendant is not present.

What's this?

MR. NEGUS: Okay. Mr. -- the gentleman out there is Mr. Bob Bales. He's Associate Superintendent of CIM. He has with him some documents I asked to -- that he bring which are the minutes of the Citizens Advisory Committee meetings in Chino.

I originally subpoenaed Mrs. Carroll, but she's on vacation, and so the subpoena was passed from hand to hand till it got to Mr. Bales. He is reluctant to give them up. Basically I am just interested in the minutes themselves. I don't wish to force the man to give them up until he has a chance to talk to the AG.

If Mr. Kochis is willing to stipulate that once he talks to the AG and finds it's okay, that we can just make

copies and put them as part of the Court's record, that's an agreeable procedure with me.

MR. KOCHIS: I have no objection to that.

He just got in, apparently, Mr. Bales did, from Sacramento last night, found out this morning he was supposed to appear in court. He has not had time to contact anyone from the Attorney General's Office and receive a response as to what to do about the records. That's why he's reluctant to just turn them over without talking to his lawyer.

THE COURT: Should we perhaps order him back for this afternoon or tomorrow morning or something like that?

MR. NEGUS: Whatever your pleasure --

THE COURT: I think maybe we -- at 1:30. That should give him a chance to touch bases with the AG.

MR. KOCHIS: I would think so.

THE COURT: And we can hear the opposition, if any, at that point.

MR. NEGUS: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay?

MR. NEGUS: Then what I have is one witness, Mr. Arthur, who will not take too long. And then I have a tape we can start in on. I'll have to send Mr. Forbush up to try and fetch the NBC tape.

THE COURT: This is a tape from --

MR. NEGUS: Channel 11 I have available. Channel 4

```
we should have at 1:30, and I don't know what the status of
1
2
    Channel 2 is.
             THE COURT: This is going to be done privately?
3
            MR. NEGUS: Just you, Mr. Kochis and me -- or
    Mr. Kottmeier, if he wants to be present.
5
             THE COURT: Off the record?
7
            MR. NEGUS: Right.
            MR. KOCHIS: Judge, the only think I'm going to need
8
    is 10 minutes to see where the sheriff is with the training
    seminar and if I can get the equipment that we borrowed
10
    last week back.
11
            THE COURT: We can contemplate perhaps going over
12
    there where it doesn't have to be moved, and they can just
13
    let us have the use of it briefly.
14
            MR. KOCHIS: Fine. That's better.
15
            THE COURT: If it's like the others, no more than
16
    30 minutes.
17
            MR. NEGUS: Channel 11 shouldn't be too long.
18
    Channel 4 and 2 will be longer, if we get it.
19
            THE COURT: Okay.
20
             (The following proceedings were held in
21
            open court:)
22
            THE COURT: Is your name Mr. Bales?
23
            MR. BALES: Yes.
24
            THE COURT: Mr. Bales, we discussed the records
25
    briefly in chambers. We want to give you an opportunity to
26
```

check with the Attorney General. I will order you to return back here at 1:30 this afternoon with the documents that you have, and hopefully by then you will have an answer one way or another so we'll know how to respond. Okay?

MR. BALES: All right.

THE COURT: Be here by that time.

MR. NEGUS: Call Bill Arthur.

 $\underline{B} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{L} \ \underline{L} \ \underline{A} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{T} \ \underline{H} \ \underline{U} \ \underline{R}$, called as a witness by and on behalf of the Defense, was sworn and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear the testimony
you are about to give in the action now pending before this
Court shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but
the truth so help you God?

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am, I do.

THE CLERK: Please be seated. State your name, please, for the record, and spell your last name.

THE WITNESS: Bill Arthur, A-r-t-h-u-r.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEGUS:

- Q Mr. Arthur, you're a sergeant with the Homicide Department, San Bernardino Sheriff's Office; is that correct?
- A. Yes.

And you were the investigating officer who sat with the Prosecution during the Preliminary Hearing? A That's correct.

@ Are you familiar with a -- what was a proposed

Constitutional Amendment initiative entitled the Speedy

Trial Initiative?

A. Yes.

Q Were you engaged in trying to obtain signatures for that?

A. I was.

MR. KOCHIS: I would object as not being relevant to this motion.

THE COURT: For people in our business, Mr. Negus, one would expect us to be aware of that initiative. I'm aware of it. I think I can take judicial notice of the basic contents of the proposed initiative and the fact that it failed to garner sufficient signatures to get it on the ballot. What's the relevancy of all that?

MR. NEGUS: I believe that Mr. Arthur used this case as a means to try and get support for that initiative, and I think that that is another example of the use that the Prosecution has put of this case --

THE COURT: Without going too much into detail as to the nature of the initiative problem or the initiative here, you can go directly into his efforts.

MR. NEGUS: That's what I was doing, the best I can.
THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. NEGUS: Did you attempt to gather support for that initiative during the course of the Preliminary Hearing?

-

```
1 A. Yes.
```

- 2 Q How did you do that?
- 3 A Passed out petitions.
- 4 0. To whom?
- 5 A Anybody that would take them.
- 6 Q Pass out any petitions to Mary Ann Hughes?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q Was that during the Preliminary Hearing while you were in court?
- 10 A. Not in the courtroom, no.
- 11 Q Right outside the courtroom during a recess?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q During the time -- during the time that you were attempting
 14 to get support for this initiative, did you use this
 15 case as an argument in favor of signing?
- 16 A. Well, I certainly had this case in mind, but whether I
 17 actually argued to a person this case in order for him
 18 to sign, put his signature down, I don't believe I did
 19 that.
- 20 Q Well, when you -- for example, when you gave the petition
 21 to Mrs. Hughes, did you explain that if the petition
 22 were passed, the lengthy Preliminary Hearing which was
 23 held in this case would not have happened?
- 24 A. I don't believe so.
- 25 | Q Did you ever make that argument or that statement?
- 26 A. I may have.

On how many occasions?

MR. KOCHIS: Well, Your Honor, I would object as being irrelevant. The fact that a homicide detective gets frustrated over the length of a Preliminary Hearing, how does that affect whether or not the status of Mr. Cooper's reputation in the community is that he can't get a fair trial?

MR. NEGUS: Mr. Kottmeier has likewise made the same statements, Your Honor. They are quoted in the press. Mr. Arthur's activity I don't think was. That was the reason why I was asking Mr. Arthur about his activities.

THE COURT: I'm considering -- Mr. Arthur is not going to serve on the jury in this case. We can all stipulate to that. As far as any opinion of his, statement that he may have made as disclosing the temper of the community --

MR. NEGUS: I'm not asking --

THE COURT: Under Evidence Code Section 352, it's too remote.

MR. NEGUS: I'm not asking Mr. Arthur for his opinion about the nature of the community. There is an independent prong that can be considered in deciding whether a change of venue should be granted other than the nature and extent of publicity ab ut the case, and that is the use to which the case has taken in local politics. It's my position from the quotes that I had from Mr. Kottmeier, from

Mr. -- from Mr. Arthur, that prosecutorial officials have used this case to further certain political causes. I believe that that is something which is unique to this particular -- to this particular county, and although it's obviously not possible to document the precise effect it has on opinion, that's the kind of thing that the Appellate Courts have looked to in gauging whether a county is suitable for a fair trial or not.

THE COURT: What specifically are you asking, again?

MR. NEGUS: How many times did he use that argument.

The next and last question was to be to whom.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection. I'm recalling, however, that declaration that's in the file, and with reference to the points that you're making, I don't think it's necessary considering the time and the extraneous issue and the other factors of 352. Sustained.

MR. NEGUS: Thank you.

I have nothing further.

MR. KOCHIS: I have no questions.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. NEGUS: Having resolved the question of Mr. Bales, that he won't need to testify, but we'll just be submitting documents, I have no further testimony that I need to take.

THE COURT: Now, you have at least one other

television tape that perhaps we can listen to this morning if we can make the arrangements.

MR. NEGUS: I have somewhere Channel 11. I have to get Channel 4 and Channel 2, and there's documents from Channel 7.

THE COURT: Is there anything further we can do?

If you have no more witnesses, anything further we can do
at this time? Otherwise, we'll adjourn and see if we can
see the tape.

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I notice Lieutenant

McCormick in the courtroom. If I can have a moment to

check and see if we can once again impose on his equipment.

I think we can.

MR. NEGUS: The other thing, if Your Honor wishes, if you wish to use this time now, we can argue the -- we can intersperse the motion I had for the release of certain physical evidence, but if you want to be more -- I don't care.

THE COURT: I don't care either.

Mr. Kochis?

MR. KOCHIS: I have no objection to resolving that issue at this time.

(No omissions.)

THE COURT: All right. In that regard, you made a motion to have disclosed to you, or to your proposed expert, a Mr. Blake from Northern California, certain physical evidence in this case for purposes of taking serological tests, which motion is kind of opposed by the District Attorney, as I read his response.

MR. NEGUS: My understanding is they oppose it as to the items labeled number one, but don't as to items number two and three.

MR. KOCHIC: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me -- let me just find out. Item

MR. NEGUS: -- is what we referred to as the UU series of blood that was seized by criminalists on June 33, 1983.

THE COURT: Well, number one is made up of many cub carts, A through X, apparently.

MR. MEGUS: One through sixteen, yeah.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MR. NEMUS: It should be one through sixteen, I think.

THE COURT: Excuse me just a minute. All right.

I'm looking at his document filed on March 8, application
for order re releasing physical evidence, and number one
is on page 1 only, one through sixteen. I'm with you now.

MR. MEGUS: Okay.

THE COURT: And you have no objection to that; is that correct?

MR. ROCHIS: Excuse me, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You have no objection at all to the release of those items to Dr. Edward Blake?

MR. HEGUI: No. He objects to number one, doesn't object to two and three.

MR. MOCHIS: That's correct, Your Honor, as to
two and three. The procedure that I am going to suggest
be employed, because I have some trouble from Mr. Negus'
photographs, is one of the witnesses that Mr. Negus is
coing to call at the motion to suppress is Mr. Treconis.
He's going to bring the sheet and the comforter when ne
comes with him to count, and at Mr. Negus' ilrection, he's
going to cut out the sections that Mr. Negus requests,
and at that point we will turn the portion of the exhibit
directly over to either Mr. Forbush or another representative
of Mr. Negus' office so that he can arrange for the item
to go to Northern Malifornia.

MR. NEGTO: It's In the -- well, we can work out the details.

THE COURT: Are you talking not arout number two?

MR. MOCRIC: Yes, Your Honor, two and three.

THE COURT: So once we get on the record, then,

when Mr. Gregoris sets here, there would be no other objection to number two and three?

MR. KOCHIS:

MR. MOCHIS: That's correct.

THE COURT: All right. That will then be granted.

Going back then to number one, all right, bloodstains collected from the residence, item double U-1
through double U-16 --

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, for the record, they are MU-1 through MU-16. That's the way the crime lab refers to them.

THE COURT: All right. Those items, Er. Kochis, have they been previously analyzed?

MR. MOCHIS: No, Your Honor. The reason -- one of the reasons they have not been is because the samples themselves are extremely small; and mere the crime lab to analyze them at my direction, they would be expended, and I felt I would have another Hitch problem. We had a sample similar to these that was small in nature that, prior to the preliminary hearing, we instructed the crime las to stop the analysis. We informed Mr. Negus. He hired an expert who came down from Morthern California and was present when the remainder of that sample was tested and expended. We have not tested these because the testing will result in their destruction, and I feel it would be another appellate issue.

I also feel, however, because we have chosen not to create a Hitch problem, we have suggested some time in the past that they be tested jointly, that we should not

5a

be prevented from the results of those by a unilateral testing by the defense that would destroy the samples forever for the prosecution.

MR. NEGUE: Yes. Let me explain why. Basically, the testimony at the preliminary hearing was that these samples are only large enough so that you can do one out of eight possible tests on them. Some of them may be large enough for two, but, basically, they are only large enough for one. If a trained criminalist were to know which test was done, they would be able to know what I was looking for. If they were able to know what I was looking for, they would be able to figure out certain aspects of defense strategy.

THE COURT: There's nothing confidential about it in the way of communication. Where's the privileges

the issue. It's the right to do an independent analysis without reviewing the defense to the prosecution in advance. I would suggest that there is a way that the interests of both parties can be protected. Dr. place is probably the foremost gractitioner of the art of -- or defence of serology in the state, if not a much larger area. He takes excellent -- keeps excellent records and takes excellent photographs, so that other serologists can look over his work and judge whether he's right or

wrong.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

If these were released to the defense, the procedure which is used in other aspects of revealing defense information to the prosecution could be utilized, and that is that once the defendant has presented the -his case, we would be prepared to make full disclosure of the results of the test. That way, they would not be lost forever to the prosecution, but on the other hand, the prosecution would not be able to use the information they get from our testing technique as part of their burden of proof. That is a -- that's -- that would seem to me a standard procedure which, in fact, the statutes for witnesses and other things provide. I con't think that the prosecution would be harmed, and I wouldn't have to give up confidential information which -- which goes into the decision as to which test to do before the prosecution has finished their case.

THE COURT: Are these --

MR. MOCHIS: I would like to be heard in response.

THE COURT: -- all within one area of an exhibit

to where we could perhaps divide them up fairly, half to

one side and half to the other?

MR. MFOWS: I was hoping that we could, and with that Indmini, I asked that question essentially to Mr. Orino, the man who collected them at the preliminary hearing. He said no, Mr. Orino being, for the record, a

24 25

criminalist from the County of Man Bernardino Sheriff's Department.

THE COURT: Where are these exhibits from?

MR. MEGUS: They are from the Ryen house.

THE COUET: I understand, but various walls, all on one fabric, or where are they from?

ME. NFIUS: Three of them -- which I don't really care, but I don't know which one that they are -- I don't really want analyzed, but I don't know which they are until see them -- are fly specks, that is, from the little feets of flies that had gotten in there. I don't care about those. One of them is relatively close to a drop of blood which the procedution -- the prosecutor,

Mr. Mottmeier, indicated was his most crucial piece of evidence. A couple more of them are from smears on a door near that drop of blood. Others are from the master tataroom ans --

THE COURT: Well, you've given me enough of an idea already.

You started to say something?

in response, because the <u>Torres</u> case, on which Kr. Legue bases his argument, is distinguishable for two response: One, in <u>Torres</u> the testing did not -- would not result in exhausting any sample, and the court in <u>Torres</u> specifically pointed out that for the doctor to conjuct

.

he was going to have to communicate with the defendant, obtain a history from him which might be incriminating, when he'd used drugs, and that's not necessary in this case.

any meaningful examination of the defendant in that case,

Mr. Hegus' proposal to the Court as to how we would not be in a disadvantage is really not accurate, because, practically, this is what would happen if he's If the analyses are allowed to test it independently. inconsistent with his theory of the case, he, of course, would introduce those into court, and I would have a chance to scramile, have another expert look at the results and see if they are legitimate; however, if his analysis of those specks are consistent with the prosecution's theory of the case and not consistent with his theory of the case, he's going to have those results. Note hever going to introduce them, and I'm never going to be able to introduce them, either, because they are going to be lost to me, so his suggestion is not effective, and it's not fair.

MR. ME-MS: My suggestion would be not that they he lost to him forever, but that merely that they be not available to him until the close of the defendant's case; and whether they are "avorable to me or unfavorable, whether they help me or not, then I reveal them at that point in time, and then Mr. Archis, I'm sure, given the

3

2

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

length of projected testimony in this particular case, will have ample opportunity to use them.

THE COURT: Some of the points and authorities were filed on this matter only this morning. I'd like a chance to read the cases on it before I rule on this.

Let's set this over till later on today.

MR. MEGUS: Fine. Did you want to do it later on today? If that's the case --

THE COURT: Or we can do it perhaps tomorrow morning.

MR. HERVES: What I was going to suggest is if we are just going to watch television the rest of the day, that there's no need to keep Mr. Cooper here in the West Hind, and we can release him and then have a ruling on that tomorrow morning.

THE COURT: That will be fine.

We will resume tomorrow morning at 9:30 on the record then. Patisfactory?

MR. MEGUS: Fine.

MR. KOCHIS: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, and, Counsel, when would you

11ke --

MR. HEGUS: I need 10 or 15 minutes to find out what the status of the television tapes --

THE COMET: I think we ought to meet back here, say, at 1:30 this afternoon for Mr. Bales' response, to find

.

out about that. Get a walver from your client, if you would, on that, and then we can go from there. That will give me a chance to read the cases, and we can go from there, commence hearing the TV transcript this afternoon.

MR. NEGUS: Fine.

THE COURT: All right. We will be in adjournment till 1:30.

MR. MEGUS: Okay. That's satisfactory with In. Cooper.

THE COURT: Okay. Then we will meet this afternoon with reference to his documents without you, Er. Cooper. Okay?

THE COURT: All right. 1:30.

(Whereupon, at 11:06 a.m. the moon recess was taken.)

(Whereupon, no more proceedings were taken on the record.)

--000--

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
3	
4	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)
5	Plaintiff,) No. CR-72787
6	vs.) OCR-9319
7	KEVIN COOPER,) REPORTERS' Defendant.) CERTIFICATE
8	
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss
10	COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO)
11	We, JILL D. MC KIMMEY and NOEMI LUCCHESI, Official
12	Reporters of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify:
13	That we are certified shorthand reporters of the State
14	of California, duly licensed to practice; that we did report
15	in stenotype oral proceedings had upon hearing of the afore-
16	mentioned cause at the time and place hereinbefore set
17	forth; that the foregoing pages numbered 224 TO 276,
18	inclusive, constitute a full, true and correct transcription
19	from our said shorthand notes so taken.
20	Dated at Ontario, California, this day of July, 1985.
21	
22	\mathcal{V}
23	OFFICIAL REPORTER, C-3136
24	$\bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{C}_{i} \mathcal{C}_{$
25	OFFICIAL REPORTER, C-2314
6	$oldsymbol{\zeta}$