SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

CR 72787

vs.

KEVIN COOPER,

Supreme Court No. CE119

24532

Defendant-Appellant.

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY HONOPABLE 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

For Defendant-Appellant:

IN PROPRIA PERSONA

volumes. Pages 1410 to 1448, incl. JILL D. MC KIMMEY, C.S.R., C-2314 BRIAN V. RATEKIN, C.S.R., C-3715 Official Reporters

Derivating.

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	vs.) NO. OCR-9319
7	KEVIN COOPER,
8	Defendant.) VOLUME 17) Pgs. 1410 thru 1448, incl.
9	
10	REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT
11	BEFORE HONORABLE RICHARD C. GARNER, JUDGE
12	DEPARTMENT 3 - ONTARIO, CALIFORNIA
13	Thursday, April 26, 1984
14	APPEARANCES:
15	For the People: DENNIS KOTTMEIER District Attorney
16	DENNIS KOTTMEIER
17	District Attorney By: JOHN P. KOCHIS
18	Deputy District Attorney
19	For the Defendant: DAVID McKENNA Public Defender
20	By: DAVID NEGUS Deputy Public Defender
21	
22	TTY D MANTHURY
23	Reported by: JILL D. McKIMMEY Official Reporter
24	C.S.R. No. 2314 and
25	BRIAN RATEKIN Official Reporter
26	C.S.R. No. 3715

$\overline{\mathbf{I}}$ $\overline{\mathbf{N}}$ $\overline{\mathbf{D}}$ $\overline{\mathbf{E}}$ $\overline{\mathbf{X}}$. PEOPLE'S WITNESS PAGE GREGONIS, Daniel John Redirect Examination by Mr. Kochis Recross-Examination by Mr. Negus Cross-Examination Reopened by Mr. Negus 1417

the l

Thursday, April 26, 1984

		SUBJECT INDEX	•	·
•	GREGONIS		1421 - E	lectrophoresis
				Reliability if known standards
	REDIRECT	(by Mr. Kochis)		are ignored
	1411 - E1	ectrophoresis: detecting		Reliability if the standards
		potential problems with it		don't come out
		Controls: used to detect		Problems that cannot be identi;
		potential problems		fied through standards
		In improper chemical mixtures		Degradation, spot problem on
		In heating during long runs		the plate
		In voltage problems	1422 - D	egradation
	1412 -	Signposts for potential problems:		Question re intermediate stage
	- 122	the Saferstein chapter		of degradation affecting
		His use of them		reliability
		One stain contaminated from	Δ	nalyst interpretation
		possibly two sources - will		Problem of inexperienced
		it manifest		analysts
	1413 -	Deamination	1423 -	Willingness not to type if the
	1113	Signposts on electrophoresis	1425	sample is too weak: a crucia
		plate		factor in interpretation
		His use of them		reliability
		Dry and wet stain changes - pro-	1423 -	Signposts for potential
		tein or enzyme degradation	1425 -	problems: Sensabaugh book
	1414 -			
	1414 -	Results in loss of enzyme activity		His familiarity with them
		leading to nonreadability, not	1425 0	in June ne stain contaminated from two
	K-1	misreading `	1425 - 0	
	1(-,	Reasons for using the stains lifted		sources Question re AK 1 and 2
	1415 - Dr	y and wet stain changes	ъ	rotein degradations
	1415 - DI	Procedures to arrest them	1.	Different causes
	Acti	id phosphatase test for semen		Oxidation, protease action
	nc.	Controls to determine its accuracy		The different rates they
		Microscopy		proceed
	1416 - Abo	sorption—elution test on saliva	1426 - A	BO testing on bloodstains
	1410 - AM	and semen	1420 - A	His use of negative controls
		Controls used		Necessity of negative contro
	K-1			- not absolutely necessary
		Use of starch gel in electrophoresis	1427 -	Plant and animal substances
		Acceptance in the community for	12,	that cause similar ABO anti-
		determining EAP, ADA, AK		gen reactions - reason for
		Use of agarose gel		the Lattes test
		Its acceptance in determining	1428 -	Reliability of only using the
		Tf and Gc	1420 -	absorption-elution test for
	1417 -	PEP A and CA II		ABO
		Use of gradient acrylamide gel		Reliability if microbe con-
		For Hp		tamination is present
ī	RECTROSS (h	y Mr. Negus)	CROSS REY	OPENED (by Mr. Negus)
-		ological procedures		he type of antisera used
		Question on whether its inter-		Affecting ABO typing reliabilit
		pretation is dependent on		Affecting Tf and Gc
		analyst skill		Acceptability of his antisera
		Comparison to the gas		in the community
		chromatograph	1430 -	His independent testing of his
1	1419 -	Analyst skill in reading plates		antisera
-	. = =	Analyst skill in recognizing		Question on problems with anti
		problems		A sera
		Frequency of problems in blood-	•	
		stains in crime scenes		
		Constant of the society		

SUBJECT INDEX (CONTINUED)

Improper dilution

How it affects AEO typing readability vs. reliability
Absorption-inhibition test

Sample overloading

How it affects electrophoretic runs

readabilty vs. reliability

1431 - Causing streaking

Skill involved in and whether to

call a streaked plate

Chloroform in cleaning up Hp streaking

What it does and doesn't clean

1432 - Dura-Print

Question on its affect on a bloodstain

before ABO typing

1433 - Question re literature on it

His proficiency testing

Number of times he has been tested on

PEP a 2-1, Tf CD, Hp 2-1M

1434 - Defense request re running Exhibit J-J

for Group I

1435 - for his proficiency testing documents

Discussion between Court and counsel re 1101b

1438 - Chambers discussion

ONTARIO, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1984; 9:37 A.M. DEPARTMENT NO. 3 HON. RICHARD C. GARNER, JUDGE APPEARANCES: 3 The Defendant with his Counsel, DAVID NEGUS, Deputy Public Defender of San 5 Bernardino County; DENNIS KOTTMEIER, 6 District Attorney of San Bernardino 7 County, and JOHN P. KOCHIS, Deputy 8 District Attorney of San Bernardino 9 County, representing the People of the 10 State of California. 11 (Jill D. McKimmey, C.S.R., Official Reporter, C-2314, 12 Brian Ratekin, C.S.R., Official Reporter, C-3715) 13 14 THE COURT: Good morning, everybody. 15 Mr. Cooper's present, all counsel. 16 17 $\underline{D} \ \underline{A} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{L} \ \underline{J} \ \underline{O} \ \underline{H} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{G} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{G} \ \underline{O} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{S}, \ \text{called as a witness}$ 18 by the People, having been previously duly sworn, was 19 examined and testified further as follows: 20 THE COURT: Mr. Gregonis, welcome again. 21 State your name for the record, and I remind you 22 you are still under oath. 23 THE WITNESS: Daniel J. Gregonis. 24 THE COURT: You are now on direct, Mr. Kochis. 25 MR. KOCHIS: Thank you, Your Honor. 26

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KOCHIS:

1

2

- Mr. Gregonis, directing your attention back to the cross-examination that took place on Monday and again on Tuesday afternoon that involved potential problems that may arise with the stain in electrophoresis or the electrophoretic run itself, will the standard that you use in the plate operate as a control to allow you to detect potential problems?
 - A. Yes, it will.
- 11 Q For example, if there's an improper chemical mixture

 12 when you make your buffer, would you expect for that

 13 to manifest itself in the standard?
- 14 A. Yes, it would.
- 15 Q Likewise, if there are heat problems that may have
 arisen, for example, on a long run, for example, the
 16 l6-hour Group II run, will those problems manifest
 themselves on the standard?
- 19 A. Yes, it would.
- 20 Q If there's voltage problems in the electrical
 21 apparatus of the machine itself, will that manifest
 22 itself in the standard?
- 23 A. Yes, it will.
- 24 Q And do you take these signposts into consideration 25 when you read a plate?
- 26 | A. Yes, I do.

- Now, are you familiar with some of the writings of · Q. Dr. George Sensabaugh? 2 Yes, I am. A. 3 And in fact, do you have Mr. Saferstein's handbook in a your crime lab? 5 Yes, I do. A. One of the chapters of that handbook, Chapter 8, I believe, is written by Dr. Saferstein? 8 Yes, it is. A. 9 You've read the chapter? 10 A. Yes, I have. 11 And does it point out potential problems that may Q. 12 exist or may occur in an electrophoretic run? 13 A. Yes, it does. 14 And does it discuss the various signposts that a a 15 serologist such as yourself should look for when you 16 analyze a particular plate? 17 To some extent, yes, it does. A. 18 And do you keep those signposts in mind when you read 19
- A. Most definitely, yes.

any plate?

20

22 0 In a situation where a stain may be contaminated in
23 that it may contain blood from two sources, two people,
24 will that manifest itself in an electrophoretic run
25 when you run as many systems, for example, as Groups I
26 through IV?

	7
	9
	7
•	

1 A Yes, it would. The only case where it would not is if
2 all the enzymes in the ABO that I tested for were
3 identical.

- Q In both persons?
- 5 A. In both persons.
 - Q So in a case where there may be blood from two sources in a -- contained in a single stain from people with different genetic profiles, that would manifest itself as you go through the different electrophoretic group runs?
 - A Yes, it would.

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

- Q. The problem of deamination that Mr. Negus discussed during his cross-examination, that is also something that is somewhat predictable?
- A. Yes, it is.
- 0. And when you read a plate in an electrophoretic run, are there certain signs that manifest themselves if deamination has taken place?
- A. Yes, there is.
- 20 And do you take those into consideration when you read
 a plate before you call the plate?
 - A. Yes, I do.
 - Q Likewise, with some of the other dry and wet stain possible changes, for example, protein degradation or enzyme degradation, does that usually result in a loss of enzyme activity?

A.	Yes.	it	will.
£34	1001		***

- And does that in turn usually result in an inability for you to read the plate to make a call whatsoever, or
- can it?

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

24

- A. Yes, it will.
- 6 Ω For example, if the enzyme completely degrades, what
 7 you would expect to happen would be a situation where
 8 there's simply not enough for you to read and make a
 9 call one way or the other?
 - A. There's nothing there to read if it completely degrades.
 - Q So in degradation, what most probably would result would be an inability to make a reading as opposed to a situation where you may misread one type as another?
 - A. That is true, yes.
- Directing your attention for a moment again to the chart which has been marked for this hearing, I believe, as Exhibit --
- 19 A. K-1.
- 20 Q -- K-1, is there a reason that you use the particular
 21 stains that appear on that chart when you read the
 22 plates for the various enzymes?
- 23 A. Yes, there is.
 - Q What is that reason?
- 25 A. The reason is that each of those stains are designed
 26 in such a way that react with the enzyme that I'm

1a

looking for specifically. Not any of the other enzymes that would be in the same area on the plate would react with that stain.

- Q With the dry and wet changes, the potential changes that Mr. Negus discussed with you Monday and Tuesday during cross-examination, are there procedures that you employ to arrest those changes?
- A. Yes, there are.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

- Q And would that procedure include first making sure the particular bloodstain is allowed to dry?
- 11 A. Yes, it would.
- 12 Q And then taking the bloodstain and freezing it?
- 13 A. Yes, it would.
- Directing your attention to the acid phosphatase test
 that you performed on the stain on the blanket to
 determine whether or not it was semen, are there other
 tests that can be performed on a blanket as a control
 to more or less check the accuracy of the acid
 phosphatase test?
- 20 A. Yes, there are.
- Q Would a microscopic examination to detect the presence of sperm be one of those tests?
- 23 A. Yes, it would.
- 24 \ And, for example, did you do that in this case?
- 25 A. Yes, I did.
- 26 And what information would a microscopic test reveal

and Gc serum protein types?

A. Yes, it is.

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Q. Within your community, is the use of electrophoresis
using an agarose gel medium accepted as a valid and
reliable means for determining the various peptidase A
and CA II enzyme types of both bloodstains and whole
blood?

- A. Yes, it is.
- And within your community, is the use of an electrophoresis where you use a gradient acrylamide gel accepted as a valid and reliable means of determining the haptoglobin type of whole blood as well as bloodstains?
- A. Yes, it is.

MR. KOCHIS: Thank you.

I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Negus.

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEGUS:

- Are the particular procedures, serological procedures, that you used in this particular case independent of the skill of the analyst?
- A. I don't understand your question.
- As an example, if you were to run a blood sample to
 see whether it had any ethanol in it using the gas
 chromatograph, basically, if you stick it in correctly,

the machine basically does the rest and prints out on a computer printout a result; is that right? In a very simplified manner, yes. And all you have to do is be able to read English in order to know what the result is; is that correct? Not totally, but, again, in a very simplified manner, A. yes. (No omissions.)

Maria Santa Barilary

26

1	Q	You bring in that little computer printout to court and
2		show it to the jury, and it says "point two percent" or
3		whatever it is, and they can see that that is a point two
4		one percent?
5	A.	If they're shown the proper area of the computer readout,
6		yes.
7	2	That is not very hard to find, is it?
8	A.	I would imagine to a layman it probably would be who
9		knew nothing about the computer printout.
10	Q	How long does it take somebody to learn that?
11		MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I would object as irrelevant.
12	I th	nink there's a much more direct way to get at what he
13	want	ts to ask.
14		MR. NEGUS: I don't want to go into blood alcohol too
15	much	ı.
16	Q	(BY MR. NEGUS:) Taking blood alcohol as one as one
17		as one pole of what one can do, is more analyst skill
18		required in order to get reliable results using techniques
19		that you use than to determine ethanol?
20	A.	I would say yes.
21	Q.	If there are no problems with a run, a somewhat higher
22		level of analyst skill a person of somewhat higher leve
23		of analyst skill can recognize paradigms once they have
24		a little chart and have them pointed out; is that correct?

I don't understand what "paradigm" means.

Recognize the patterns of the -- of the various enzymes

2

4

5

6

7

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

on a plate, as you can -- you can bring in pictures or diagrams and show that to the Court fairly --

- 3 A. Yes, they can.
 - And it takes somewhat more analyst skill than reading
 the two one on the -- on the computer printout but it's
 still something that is well within the realm of most
 folks; is that correct?
- 8 A. Yes, it is.
- 9 Q Does that same relatively low level of analyst skill carry over to recognizing problems?
- 11 A. I would say you have to have an analyst with more skill 12 and training to recognize the problems.
- 13 Q In order to recognize the problems, does that require a
 14 fairly good knowledge of biochemistry?
- 15 A. You could probably train somebody just to recognize the

 16 problem on the plate by running plates and showing him

 17 various problems that you have rather than actually

 18 knowing the exact biochemistry. Biochemistry will help.
 - Q Well, are the -- can you get reliable results if you have an analyst that doesn't know how to recognize the problems?
 - A. I would say if the problems exist there and the analyst is not trained in recognizing the problems, no, you would not. Not in all -- all cases.
 - Q. Well, in -- in -- in bloodstains from crime scenes, problems exist with a fairly good degree of frequency; isn't that correct? It's not unusual to get degraded

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

samples?

I would say it's not unusual, but I wouldn't say that it happens in the majority of the times. Degraded samples would include the -- just deactivation of the enzymes, where I'm not picking them up, period, rather than having a what you might term a problem sample. If one does electrophoresis ignoring one's known standards is it still reliable? To some degree, no -- yes, but I would say it's not totally reliable, no. If one does electrophoresis ignoring the fact that one's standards don't come out, you get nothing when you run your standards, is that reliable? I would say no. Can you identify all of the things that can go wrong with an electrophoretic run through the use of standards? Not every single one, no. What are those that you cannot identify? You may have problems with each individual sample, for instance, your previous discussion of the degradation of

25 26

Anything else besides the -- just the basic degradation

when I have had a spot problem on the plate.

the sample. Also it's a possibility, although the ones

I have seen manifested themselves in other areas, is a

spot problem on the plate. You can usually pick that up,

or, I have, to my knowledge, I have always picked it up

and the spot problems that you -- that you cannot pick up through the use -- proper use of known samples?

Not that I can think of at the present, no.

When you told Mr. Kochis about sample degradation, what -eliminating a sample so you get no reading whatsoever,
there's also an intermediate stage, is there not, when
the sample is partially degraded? You can still see
something, but reliability may be affected?

· 7

A. I would say readability may be affected.

Rely -- I should have -- I misspoke, the reliability of a reading may be -- may be affected?

The fact as whether you may be able to read it or not may be affected. As to whether the reading is reliable or not, again, I'm looking at the readability rather than reliability.

Well, different analysts will, for example, not read a

set of bands -- well, erase that.

analysts will read or not read different bands differently. That is, not everybody always comes out with the same results as to whether something is readable or not?

I'd say if you put ten different analysts in a -- in an extremely weak stain or something like that, one may come up with a reading and -- or, some may come up with a reading, some may not. However, those that come up with a reading will come up with the proper reading, as long

Is it true that different -- that -- that different

1		as those people are properly trained.
2	Q.	Well, isn't one of the biggest problems in analyst
3		interpretation inexperienced people reading where they
4		shouldn't?
5	A.	That can be, yes.
6	Q	Isn't that one of the hardest things to learn not to do?
7	A.	No, sir, I don't believe so. It depends on the person's
8		training and the person's personality.
9	Q	The analyst's willingness to not type a crucial bit of
10		evidence if in fact it's really too weak to call can be
11		one of the most critical factors in the reliability of
12		·interpretations; is that correct?
13	A.	As far as if he's just making a guess if it's not
14		readable? Is that what you're getting at?
15	Q.	Looks like it but it doesn't, it's
16	A.	Something that could be, that I would determine an
17 -		inconclusive, I would hope that the person would call
18		it inconclusive.
19	Q.	Wouldn't knowing how to draw that line, though, be one of
20		the most critical factors as far as an analyst's reliability
21		is concerned?
22	A.	It can be, depending on that person's experience.
23	Q.	To what extent were you familiar with the different
24		problems elucidated by Dr. Sensabaugh back in June when
25		you were doing the bulk of the testing in this particular

case?

1	A.	I would say pretty much an equal amount as to what I have
2		testified to in court to today or, over the past few
3		days.
4	Q	So if you were confused as to the effect of the deamidation
5		on samples over the past few days, you would have been
6		confused back in June?
7	A.	If that's the case, probably, yes.
8		(No omissions.)
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		•
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
	1	

	7
	J
	71
į	
Ĺ	j

1		With contoniustion which involves a minture of their
	Ď	With contamination which involves a mixture of stains
2		that you spoke to Mr. Kochis about, if blood from a
3		person who was an AK l was mixed with blood from a
4		person who was an AK 2, would you get on your plate
5		something that was readable as a mixture of AK 1 and 2
6		or would you get something on your plate that looked
7		like an AK 2-1?
8	A.	You probably would get something that would be readable
9		or look like a mixture of an AK 1 and 2.
10	U	Why is that?
11	A.	The only circumstance where you would not is if you
12		were going to take it in a laboratory and know the
13		activities of the AK l and the AK 2 and put exactly
14		equal amounts together so that you get the equal
15		intensities of the bands.
16	Q.	Well, do you only read AK 2-1's when you have equal
17		intensities?
18	A.	Yes, essentially.
19	Q	You spoke, again, of a protein degradation. Are all
20		protein degradations the same, that is, they all come
21		from the same cause?
22	A.	I didn't catch your last
23	Q.	Do they all come from the same cause?
24	A.	No.
25	Q	Do well, one one reason for loss of of
26	_	protein activity can be oxidation; correct?
		·

3a

A.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Q.

What do you mean?

system or the antibody system.

Yes.

Proteases, yes. A. Do those reactions proceed in the same way and at the Q same rate? I'd say they probably do not. I know they do not proceed in the same way, and they probably do not proceed in the same rate. Do the proteases differentiate between different alleles at the speed at which they eat up the protein? No, sir. A. When you do your ABO testing on suspected bloodstains, in addition to your samples of known blood, do you also use negative controls, that is, controls taken from the area and the same material as the bloodstain, but which presumably don't contain the bloodstain? When available, yes. Are those negative controls necessary in order to have Q. reliability? Not absolutely, no.

Negative controls, the ones I've run in the past, have

The -- when you type

shown very little interference with the ABO antigen

something, you're still picking up an antigen or --

Another could be the action of proteases eating them

•	1
	.
]

in the case of looking for the antigen, and that is. 1 showing me the positive test for that antigen, and 2 like I said, the negative controls in the past have 3 shown very little interference, in other words, having the same antigen that I'm picking up in the stain. 5 Are you saying that never happens that you get the 6 same antigen in the stain from your negative controls 7 or it just doesn't happen very often? 8 It doesn't happen very often. 9 But it does happen? 10 It can happen, and it does happen. 11 When you're doing your ABO testing, there are many 12 different things in the plant and animal kingdom that 13 can cause reactions similar to certain ABO antigens; 14 is that correct? 15 Yes, there is. 16 And if those things are present in proper quantity, 17 there's no way of distinguishing just by doing an ABO --18 for example, an ABO test for antigens as to whether or 19 not you have those microbes or whatever they are or 20 the ABO antigens; is that correct? 21 Not really, no. A. 22 Is that one of the reasons why you use the Lattes test Q. 23 as a -- in addition to the absorption-elution? 24 That is one of the reasons, yes. A. 25

The Lattes test will -- is to determine whether

26

Q.

	ACCUPANT OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	
		· ;
	7	
	5	
	5	
	3	
·	_	

antibodies are present?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. And most of the microbes or all of the microbes that
you're that are causing these antigen reactions
will not have blood cellular antibodies in them; is
that correct?
A. That is true, yes.
Q In a stain from an area of possible contamination by
microbes, is it reliable to do ABO typing solely
using the absorption-elution test without using
negative controls and without getting a result on
the Lattes test?
A. I would say it's reliable, but not as obviously
as reliable as if you were to use those other things.
Q. I'm not sure I understand the distinction between
"not as reliable." You can get false positives and
not know it; is that correct?
A. That's essentially correct, yes.
MR. NEGUS: I believe I'm finished with my
recross. I'd like to reopen my original cross for a little
bit.
THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
MR. NEGUS: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION (Reopened)
BY MR. NEGUS:

1	7
	1
	- j
	1

Ö	Can the brand of antisera that you use in doing your
	ABO typing affect the reliability of the test?

- A. It can, yes.
- Q Is that likewise true for the antiserum -- or antisera that you use to test for transferrin and Gc?
- A I would say in that case, it's more readability than reliability. Again, you're using standards on the plate. If you're picking up the standards properly, then that shows that your antisera is working properly.
- Where do you get the antisera that you use in doing your ABO testing?
- A. From a company called Accugenics.
- Q. Is that company's products accepted as reliable within the field of forensic science?
- A. Yes, they are.

(No omissions.)

1	Q	Do you do any independent testing of those antisera
2		before you use them in case work to make sure that what
3		you've got is reliable?

- A. Yes, I do.
- 5 Q How do you do that?
- A. I test them against standard bloodstains, standard ABO, saliva stains and semen stains, and I also test them
- 8 against the known red blood cells.
- 9 Q Does the anti-A serum -- sera cause you to the most
- problems?
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q Cause one the most problems?
- 13 A. The only thing with the Accugenics is that it's extremely
 14 strong, so I have to dilute it for the tests.
- 15 Q And improperly diluted antisera can make the whole test
- unreliable?
- A. Most likely make it unreadable rather than unreliable, or the sensitivies may be off also.
- 19 Q. What about the absorption-inhibition test? Can improperly
- 20 diluted antisera make that unreliable?
- 21 A. Again, it's unreadable rather than unreliable. And,
- again, it's a sensitivity problem.
- 23 Q Can overloading a sample cause reliability problems?
- 24 A. On what test?
- 25 Q On electrophoretic runs.
- 26 A. I'd say, again, it's a readable -- a readability problem

rather than a reliability problem. You would get, if
you have too much of the stain there, you'll end up with
streaking on the plate.

- Q If you have streaking on the plate, then you shouldn't call it?
- 6 A No. In some circumstances you can call it. If it's too 7 much, then I would not call it, yes.
- 8 Q How do you -- is that -- is that a problem of skill there, 9 to be able to draw that line?
- 10 A I would say that it's experience. Partly experience, yes.
- 11 Q You indicated a couple days ago that you do something
- to clean up the streaking in the haptoglobin before you
- test it. What -- in this particular case, what techniques
- did you clean to use up the haptoglobin?
- 15 A I wash it with chloroform.
- 16 Q And what does that do?
- 17 A Cleans up all the excess cellular debris and things that
- 18 I'm essentially not looking for, those things that cause
- 19 the streaking.
- 20 0 That's cellular debris?
- 21 A. Part of it, yes.
- 22 Q What else?
- 23 A I'm not totally sure of what everything else is in there
- 24 that would cause the streaking. It would be excess
- 25 hemoglobin, degradation products of the sample.
- 26 Q Well, doesn't the chloroform just make it easier to

precipitate out the hemoglobin? Isn't that all it does? 2 Into the clean up, yeah, sure does. I mean, doesn't clean up cellular debris or other stuff 3 like that, the chloroform does? I believe that's just what I stated. 5 Well, you said it -- you said that it doesn't clean up 6 cellular debris. That's not true, though, is it -- is it? 7 Well, the wash will get rid of the cellular debris in the 8 sample that I'm putting on the plate. 9 Do you centrifuge it? 10 Yes, I do. 11 Does putting a bloodstain in a substance called Dura-Print 12 prior to typing affect ABO typing? 13 MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I'm going to object. 14 certainly is not relevant to Kelly-Frye. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Negus? 16 (BY MR. NEGUS:) Affect the reliability of ABO typing? 17 MR. KOCHIS: Same objection. 18 THE COURT: Counsel, we're -- on credibility, as far 19 as the foundation of his expertise is concerned, I'll permit 20 it. Go ahead. 21 THE WITNESS: As far as previous reports from another 22 analyst, it does not seem to. Also, I have done some work 23 myself in that field and, again, it does not seem to affect 24 the reliability of the ABO or the enzymes. It may affect 25

the quantity that is available to type. And also I have to

```
1 say that I am continuing a study on the Dura-Print.
```

- 2 Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) So you don't know yet?
- 3 A Well, from what I've said before, the studies that I've
- seen, the analysts that I've talked to that has experience
- on it, plus the studies I have done before indicate that
- 6 it does not have an effect on the ABO typing or the
- 7 enzyme typing.
- 8 Q Are you aware of any published literature on that issue?
- 9 A Not at this current time, no.
- 10 Q In your proficiency testing that you have done, the 12
- 11 different matches, how many times have you been tested
- 12 on PEP A 2-1?
- 13 A. Believe it's about four times.
- 14 Q How many times have you been tested on --
- 15 A Excuse me. Specifically 2-1?
- 16 0. Yeah.
- 17 A. I would have to look at the results specifically for that.
- 18 I don't recall.
- 19 Q How many times have you -- Do you have the results with you?
- 20 A. No, I do not.
- 21 Q How many times have you been testified (sic) on transferring
- 22 CD?
- 23 A. Again, I do not recall the specific results on that.
- 24 Q And what about haptoglobin 2-1M?
- 25 A Again, I do not recall the specific results.
- MR. NEGUS: I have no further questions at this time.

```
I have a request for --
```

MR. KOCHIS: I have no re-recross -- re-redirect.

MR. NEGUS: I have a request. The request if Mr. -- as long as Mr. Gregonis is here, that at some point in time we may get beyond the <u>Kelly-Frye</u> issue to the issue of Mr. Gregonis' own ability to perform these tests.

THE COURT: We have been on that.

MR. NEGUS: I don't think so, not in this particular case. We haven't got into what he did in this particular case at all.

THE COURT: Oh, I see.

MR. NEGUS: And I would request that, prior to that, Mr. Gregonis take the cotton swab that he has frozen from laboratory Exhibit No. J-J and run that for the Group I.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Kochis?

MR. KOCHIS: I have to --

MR. NEGUS: That's Joshua Ryen's blood, taken from the hospital and delivered to Mr. Gregonis on June 14th.

MR. KOCHIS: I'll have to discuss that with him because he's in the academy now. He does that five days a week and he does his case work on Saturdays. And I'm not sure --

MR. NEGUS: His academy ends May the 4th. We're not going to get into that until June.

MR. KOCHIS: I'd still like to discuss it with Mr. Gregonis. And if I have an objection, I'll bring it to

morning so the Court can read those before we have the hearing

THE COURT: I think you're going to find the

the Court's attention on Monday.

THE COURT: All right.

2

25

are the say

Ì

.

_

authorities -- I haven't looked it up -- now are not all under the annotations of 1101b.

MR. KOCHIS: That's correct.

MR. NEGUS: Well, Your Honor --

THE COURT: But you're talking about almost a signature when you get around to similars. You're talking about MO's that are very closely, nearly the same, some of those things seem to me to be, just on initial look at them, perhaps. Of course, I don't know the details, but --

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I'm confident that I may be able to modify the list downward somewhat.

THE COURT: I would expect so.

MR. KOCHIS: And I think what Mr. Negus -- he's not asking for a specific offer of proof. What he wants is if there's any modification of the list, that it can be made now so that, when he goes to Judge Kayashima, where he's in a different posture --

MR. NEGUS: Basically I'm not asking the -- to decide the ultimate outcome on the eleven oh -- on that particular in limine motion at this point in time. Judge Kayashima just asked that if there was a rough screening -- I told him there was 24 acts -- if there was a rough screening that we could do as to something that's obviously not going to be relevant, then I won't have to investigate them. I don't want to have a final ruling on the 1101b motion until I have had a chance to investigate those which there's any dispute about. But it

```
1 looked like maybe it could have been proved out a bit. So
2 that's all I'm asking for at this point.
```

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, if the Court's available this afternoon for me to reappear at 2:30 or 3, I might be able to have some type of rough screening accomplished by then. And it's possible that I may have those pared down from the 24 factors to the 1101 even by then. And then the Court could decide on the remaining if you want to see reports.

THE COURT: I definitely will be available.

Mr. Negus, is it all right with you?

MR. NEGUS: I'm all right.

THE COURT: All right. When would you take him back, Detective Arthur?

SERGEANT ARTHUR: We're planning to take him back right after this hearing.

MR. NEGUS: Mr. Cooper, for that limited purpose, do you want to be here or --

THE DEFENDANT: Do I need to be here?

MR. NEGUS: No.

THE DEFENDANT: I don't want to be here.

THE COURT: You waive and give up your right to be present? We'll do everything on the record with the reporter here, but you'll permit us to go ahead as to if you were here on that limited issue?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, if it's okay with my attorney.

```
MR. NEGUS: It's okay, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: Okay. Then it will be subject to your
2
   calling my clerk and getting together and coming over at
3
   any time. All right?
            MR. KOCHIS: Why don't we set it for 2:30 this
5
   afternoon?
            THE COURT: That's fine. 2:30 this afternoon.
                                                              Thank
7
   you.
8
            (Whereupon a recess was taken at 10:27 a.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

ONTARIO, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1984; 2:25 P.M.

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

.

--000--

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

THE COURT: On the record with reference to

People versus Kevin Cooper. Mr. Kochis and Mr. Negus

are here without the defendant, having waived his presence.

We were going to kind of have a preliminary rundown from you, I guess, Mr. Kochis, as to which ones you were willing to capitulate on perhaps now, and then later on, we may have a hearing as to other matters in controversy.

MR. KOCHIS: That's correct. Using the numbers as a reference point, taking first as a group Items 1 through 4 inclusive, it's not my intention to use those --

THE COURT: I'm just going to cross them out.

MR. KOCHIS: -- with the caveat I'm going to read into the record at the end. Item 5 is an area -- Item 5 on page 2 is an item we intend to introduce. Items 6 through 22 inclusive we do not intend to use.

THE COURT: Six through twenty-two?

MR. KOCHIS: Yes. Items 23 and 24 we do.

THE COURT: Just a second.

MR. KOCHIS: So that would leave only three. That would be Item 5 on page 2 and Items 23 and 24 on page 5,

with the following caveat: I would agree not to attempt to introduce evidence in the case in chief under Section 1101, but I do not want to preclude myself in the event, for example, during cross-examination, Mr. Negus elicits that type of evidence, for example, from Diana Williams about prior acts that may have occurred against her to indicate a bias against Mr. Cooper and then put myself in a position where I would not be able to bring other witnesses out to corroborate her. Likewise, if during the defense case, Mr. Negus introduces psychiatric testimony or the defendant takes the stand and makes statements, that I could impeach him with any of these prior acts. I do not want to be bound at this time in saying I would never use those on rebuttal, but as far as 1101 case in chief, there's only three I'm interested in.

THE COURT: Impeaching the defendant if and when he takes the stand by prior felony is not rebuttal. Are you saying that you would not impeach him with any of these so-called convictions?

MR. KOCHIS: Most of these are not convictions.

What I'm concerned about is, for example, the defendant taking the stand and saying, I always get accused of things I don't do. For example, I got accused of some things in Santa Barbara and they're totally without merit.

My not putting anything on rebuttal and then having

Mr. Negus argue, well, you know, my client has to be

 santa Barbara stuff, the D.A. would have put it on to show my client wasn't telling the truth. Likewise, if Mr. Negus were to put a psychiatric expert to say I've talked to my client and he doesn't have the intent to kill, he's got no prior history of any violence or anything, and I don't think he's capable of forming that intent, I don't want to be boxed in, but I'm not going to go through the litany of those arguments during my case in chief.

THE COURT: Okay. You've got only three?

MR. KOCHIS: Yes.

THE COURT: You've got five, twenty-three and twenty-four --

MR. KOCHIS: Yes.

THE COURT: -- that you intend to proceed on?

MR. KOCHIS: Yes.

THE COURT: Where is Lori Strahl at?

MR. KOCHIS: She's in Pittsburgh, and she is a witness that has been interviewed not only by the investigators in Pittsburgh, but by the investigators in San Bernardino. Copies of those interviews have been given to Mr. Negus. She's represented by an attorney, and I believe Mr. Negus has been in contact with her attorney or is going to contact her attorney and not contact her directly about that particular incident.

THE COURT: Is Diane Williams in Pennsylvania or is she out here?

MR. KOCHIS: She's in Pittsburgh.

THE COURT: All three of those are in Pittsburgh, so I don't think you'll have any trouble with Judge Kayashima or all of them are in Pennsylvania.

MR. NEGUS: Mr. Kochis solves the problem as far as the guilt phase is concerned, you know.

THE COURT: Okay. As far as the -- as far as the penalty phase, if we get there, there's another one of these in my file, is there?

MR. KOCHIS: In your sealed confidential file.

THE COURT: Are you now telling us only as far as the guilt phase is concerned?

MR. KOCHIS: Right. That's all Mr. Negus I believe asked me to do at this point. He said that the guilt phase -- the penalty phase (1) we might never get to (2) that we might be able to resolve at a later time.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. NEGUS: As far as my immediate needs are concerned, I have no problem with that. I will try and resolve it at such a time so it wouldn't require any extensive continuance to do it, but what I'm really concerned about is being ready for the guilt phase.

THE COURT: Sure. Well, I anticipated a lot more work on this motion, and you emasculated it, really.

5a

MR. NEGUS: I think that you will find that there's still with respect to number 5, at least, and number 13 -- or number 23, that there's at least still substantial things to argue about.

THE COURT: I don't even recall reading anything about number 5.

MR. KOCHIS: I concede we will have an argument and evidentiary hearing on that, but I certainly have pared the list down to satisfy Judge Kayashima.

MR. NEGUS: Fine. I have no problem. We'll get to the hearing later.

THE COURT: That's fine. When you're talking about "later", it's still going to be before we go wherever we're going to go?

MR. NEGUS: Right.

THE COURT: And you'll give each other notice or something, then give me notice, perhaps.

MR. NEGUS: I'm going to try and --

MR. KOCHIS: Mr. Negus has put me on notice. I intend to file, hopefully, something in writing in opposition and attach my position and possibly police reports as an offer of proof.

THE COURT: Put you on notice on what?

MR. KOCHIS: He's already put me on notice that he would object to my attempting to introduce this type of evidence during the guilt phase, and that we are going

to have a hearing on it, and I will try to reduce my position to writing.

MR. NEGUS: Well, basically, again, we anticipate starting up on whatever date it is you're coming back, May the 14th, with a fairly lengthy motion with respect to destruction of evidence, and we'll be having lots of different witnesses in for some period of time after that.

THE COURT: I'm just trying to anticipate when.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. Let's talk for a second. Monday is the 30th of April.

MR. NEGUS: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: We are going to conclude --

MR. NEGUS: On May 4.

THE COURT: We are not going to conclude on Monday the matter in which we are presently engaged?

MR. NEGUS: No.

MR. KOCHIS: No. The witness I'm calling on Monday Mr. Negus doesn't feel we will finish with on Monday, and we won't finish with him until sometime on Tuesday, hopefully by noon, so I can get him back to the airport; and then my last witness, Dr. Sparks, is not available to testify Wednesday. He's available to testify Thursday, and I'll put him on --

THE COURT: What are we going to do Wednesday?

MR. NEGUS: Well, I have a bunch of discovery
things I'm trying to get reduced to writing. Mr. Kochis

probably won't be surprised by them. Maybe we can do some of that.

THE COURT: Well, I mean can't we -- can we jump to the next issue like we have a little bit here with your cross-examination of one of the witnesses?

MR. NEGUS: There's a real problem --

THE COURT: There's nothing wrong with having a couple of these going at one time, provided you can handle it, that's all.

MR. NEGUS: With respect to the evidentiary motions, I won't be ready to do anything until -- I have been planning on your vacation, and I'm planning on having people subpoenaed for May 14 to start taking lots of testimony at that point in time.

THE COURT: When am I on vacation?

MR. NEGUS: I was under the impression that you were going to be gone from the 7th to the 11th of May, so that's basically what I'm planning on. I am planning on having a whole bunch of people subpoenaed on May 14, and that will probably take us three, maybe four weeks to finish with all the witnesses that we'll be doing there. In that interim period, I intend to try and have written—at least a—at a minimum, a list and for some of the motions, more formal motions, have the rest of the motions that I intend to raise before we start picking a jury, and you'll be getting that as I have a chance to work on it

5

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

during the period of time that we're taking motion (sic) on the Hitch motion; so by the time we get through with that three or four weeks of testimony taking, we should have a complete list, I hope, of all the rest of the work that we have to do.

THE COURT: Your logistics don't sound bad.

In your 995 motion and in the transcript, you -you spent considerable time with reference to failure to collect, preserve evidence, and I read points and authorities and things on that. Are we going to go through all of that again?

MR. NEGUS: Yep, and more. I mean it won't necessarily be the same, but there will be a lot of it.

THE COURT: Well, I haven't relooked at the authorities, but, you know, in Mr. Kochis' response to you, he cites cases to the effect that there's no duty on the prosecution to collect certain evidence and things of this nature, and a considerable part of your argument was with reference to their failure to collect evidence, not to preserve it.

MR. NEGUS: I would say that that was a minority of my argument.

I thought it was the majority of the transcript time. Maybe I'm wrong.

MR. NEGUS: I don't think so. They collected practically most of the evidence in that house.

5b

THE COURT: Well, the rugs and the walls that were put in the loft.

MR. NEGUS: They collected practically all the stuff. They didn't preserve very much, but they actually physically took it, and the things that they didn't preserve were, I would say, a minority of the blood that was in the house.

THE COURT: Mr. Negus, I fully think that you're competent to do things not -- you know, that you're not just wasting our time, but I just wanted -- I just wanted to tell you to -- if you find a way to shorten it or something like that, do so, or to incorporate by reference.

Let's don't just --

MR. NEGUS: I don't feel comfortable in this case, Your Honor, stipulating that we can do it on the basis of the transcript at the preliminary hearing for a wide variety of reasons; therefore, I want to have -- I wouldn't be willing to stipulate to do -- to the Court considering that; therefore, we're going to have to have testimony. If it comes down to you would rule some of the testimony is irrelevant, you do, but then I have a record that I can use to appeal from. I think the testimony I'm going to be bringing in is basically all relevant. I'm reasonably confident that I can have it in a fairly organized fashion so I can get it on as quickly as I can, but there's just lots and lots of witnesses.

```
THE COURT: Okay. So be it.
                                            I bow.
2
     you.
             MR. KOCHIS: Monday morning in San Bernardino,
3
     Department 10.
             THE COURT: 9:30 over there. We'll all find our
5
           Enjoy your weekend.
     way.
6
             (Whereupon, at 2:37 p.m. an adjournment
7
             was taken in this matter.)
8
                               --000--
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
```