CASE NO. CR	IM 24552
SUPREME COURT OF THE	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE) OF CALIFORNIA,)	
)	
PLAINTIFF,)	SUPERIOR COURT
-vs-	NO. CR-71787 MOTIONS
KEVIN COOPER,	MO11042
DEFENDANT,)	
APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR	COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNT
HONORABLE RICHARD C. G.	ARNER, JUDGE PRESIDING
	CC0.107 AV 400541
REPORTERS' TRAN	SCRIPT ON APPEAL
APPEARANCES:	
FOR PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT:	HON. JOHN D. VAN DE KA
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
	110 WEST "A" STREET SUITE 600
	SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT:	IN PROPRIA PERSONA
REPORTED BY:	LEONARD D. GUNN
	C.S.R. NO. 1109 AND
	JUDITH L. MORRIS
	C.S.R. NO. 2400 OFFICIAL REPORTERS
	VILLUIAL REPORTERS
VOLUME 34	
/	
PAGES 2069 THROUGH 2198	

i						
1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO					
3						
4	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE					
5	OF CALIFORNIA,					
6	Plaintiff,)					
7	vs.) NO. OCR-9319 (R-71787					
8	KEVIN COOPER,) VOLUME NO. 24					
9	Defendant.) Pgs. 2069 thru 2198, Incl.					
10						
11	REPORTERS' DAILY TRANSCRIPT					
12	BEFORE HONORABLE RICHARD C. GARNER, JUDGE					
13	DEPARTMENT 10 - SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA					
14	Thursday, May 17, 1984					
15						
	APPEARANCES: DENNIS E. KOTTMEIER					
16	For the People: DENNIS E. KOTTMETER District Attorney					
17	DENNIS E. KOTTMEIER					
18	District Attorney By: JOHN P. KOCHIS					
19	Deputy District Attorney					
20	For the Defendant: DAVID MC KENNA Public Defender					
21	BY: DAVID NEGUS Deputy Public Defender					
22						
23	Reported By: LEONARD D. GUNN Official Reporter					
24	C.S.R. No. 1109					
25	JUDITH L. MORRIS Official Reporter					
26	C.S.R. No. 2400					

1	T	N D E X
2	DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES	PAGE
3	CRAIG JACKSON	
4	Direct	
5	Cross	
6	HECTOR O'CAMPO	2074
7	Cross (Resumed)	2092
8	Recross	
9	MARY RISI	
10	Direct	
11	LINDA HEADLEY	
12	Direct	2120
13	Direct (Resumed)	2140
14	Cross	2165
15	JERRY HOYLE	
	Direct	
16	Cross	
17		
18	ЕХН	HIBITS
19	DEFENDANT'S FOR IDE	ENTIFICATION INTO EVIDENCE
20	H-189 - Interview with Joshua Ryen	2081 2086
21		2128 *
22	H-1-C - Document	2130 *
23	H-17 - Diagram	
24	H-2 - Copy of Dr. Hoyle's Notes	2171 2178
25		
26		
		' -

```
SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1984; 9:43 A.M.
                                         HON. RICHARD C. GARNER, JUDGE
2
    DEPARTMENT NO. 10
3
    APPEARANCES:
              The Defendant with his Counsel, DAVID NEGUS,
              Deputy Public Defender of San Bernardino
5
              County; DENNIS KOTTMEIER, District Atrorney
6
              of San Bernardino County, and JOHN P. KOCHIS,
7
              Deputy District Attorney of San Bernardino
8
              County, representing the People of the State
9
10
              of California.
              (Leonard D. Gunn, C.S.R., Official Reporter, C-1109,
11
              Judith L. Morris, C.S.R., Official Reporter, C-2400.)
12
13
              THE COURT: Good morning.
14
              MR. KOCHIS: Good morning.
15
16
              MR. NEGUS: Craig Jackson.
                            We're now calling a witness out of order,
17
              THE COURT:
    as I recall.
18
19
              MR. NEGUS:
              THE BAILIFF: Please face the clerk and raise your
20
21
    right hand.
22
    \underline{C} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{A} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{G} \ \underline{J} \ \underline{A} \ \underline{C} \ \underline{K} \ \underline{S} \ \underline{O} \ \underline{N}, called as a witness by and on
23
         behalf of the People, was sworn and testified as follows:
24
25
     1111
26
     1111
```

THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear that 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: Craig R. Jackson, J-a-c-k-s-o-n.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. NEGUS:

1

6

7

8

9

- 12 Q Mr. Jackson, what's your occupation?
- 13 A I'm a clinical social worker.
- 14 Q And in June of 1983 for whom were you employed?
- 15 A. I was employed with Loma Linda University Medical Center.
- 16 Q Did you have a particular unit that you were assigned to?
- 18 A Yes. I was assigned to basic pediatrics, what is known as 5100 and 5300.
- 20 Q Did you have a patient in June of 1983 named Josh Ryen?
- 21 A Yes, I did.
- 22 On June 14th, 1983, did you and a Dr. Jerry Hoyle have
- 23 a brief conference with Josh in the morning?
- 24 A. Yes, we did.
- 25 Q During that conference were you attempting to elicit
 26 information from Josh about the crime that he'd been a

```
victim of?
```

- A. No, we did not.
- 3 Q Did Josh spontaneously give you some information about that crime?
- 5 A. Yes.

- 6 Q What information did Josh spontaneously give you?
- As near as I can remember, he began to talk about it was late at night, he heard screams, went into his parents' room, and then that was all that he remembered.
- 10 Q Did he ever describe anybody, any assailant or assailants
 11 being in the house?
- 12 A. To my recollection, no.
- 13 Q That same day was Josh informed that he would not be in the custody of his grandmother?
- 15 A. It may have been either on that same day or within two

 16 days. I've been unclear as to exactly when that occurred.
 - Q Do you have records of that?
- 18 A. I have some notes from that, but I was not a part of
 19 the conversation with regard to telling him he would not
 20 live with his parents -- with his grandmother. I'm
 21 sorry.
- 22 Q When Josh was giving the information about the crime,
 23 he just spoke in a narrative and you or Dr. Hoyle did
 24 not ask him any questions or give him any suggestions;
 25 is that correct?
- 26 A That is correct.

MR. NEGUS: Thank you. I have nothing further. THE COURT: Mr. Kochis. 2 3 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. KOCHIS: Mr. Jackson, the date again that this took place on was 6 what date? The conversation with Josh? 8 Right. 9 June 14th. 10 And is it true that there was no law enforcement person 11

13 A That is correct.

12

14 Q And what room did it take place in, if you recall?

present when this conversation took place?

15 A. It was in the play room on 5300.

16 Q Do you know if that was before or after Detective
17 O'Campo would later talk to Josh Ryen?

18 A That was before.

19 Q And was it your intention at that point not to question
20 Josh about what he recalled?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q Was that due to your concern about his mental condition at the time?

A. Well, that had been an on-going concern of ours. The
purpose of that meeting with Josh was to let him know
that a detective would be questioning him and our primary

```
intent was to prepare him for that.
        And did he more or less spring this information on you
2
3
        at that point?
        Yes, he did.
        And I assume neither you nor Dr. Hoyle reached up and
5
        tried to stop him from talking at that time?
7
        No, we did not.
        But you didn't encourage him to talk at all?
        That's correct.
        You didn't probe into his memory at all?
10
11
        No.
                         I have nothing further.
12
            MR. KOCHIS:
            MR. NEGUS: Nothing further.
13
                        Thank you, Mr. Jackson.
            THE COURT:
14
                        I'm ready to return to Mr. O'Campo.
15
            MR. NEGUS:
16
    let him go till ten.
                        Is he outside?
17
            THE COURT:
18
                    O' C A M P O, having been previously duly
19
    HECTOR L.
        sworn, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:
20
            THE COURT: You're still under oath, Mr. O'Campo.
21
    Just have a seat and state your name for the record again,
22
23
    please.
                          Hector L. O'Campo.
24
            THE WITNESS:
                        Mr. Negus.
25
            THE COURT:
                        I think Mr. Kochis.
            MR. NEGUS:
26
```

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Mr. Kochis.

MR. KOCHIS: -- he's on my cross.

THE COURT: All right.

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

2

3

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed)

BY MR. KOCHIS:

- Q Detective O'Campo, directing your attention back to the area that we were discussing yesterday at four o'clock when we recessed, specifically your June the 14th, 1983, interview with Joshua Ryen, do you have that general area in mind at this point?
- 13 A Yes, sir.
- During your interview with Joshua Ryen, did he tell you that he woke up at some point because he heard his mother screaming?
- 17 A Yes, sir.
- 18 Q And did he tell you that he woke Chris Hughes up after
 19 he heard his mother screaming?
- 20 A That's correct.
- 21 Q Did you place both those pieces of information in your
 22 typewritten report which was in front of you on the
 23 witness stand yesterday?
- 24 A Yes, sir.
- 25 Q Did he tell you what he did after he woke Chris Hughes up?
- 26 A Yes, he did.

```
Q Did he tell you that both he and Chris Hughes went
toward his mother's bedroom?
```

- A. That's correct.
- 4 Q And did you place that in your report?
- 5 A. I did.

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Did he tell you if he observed any member of his family on the way to his mother's bedroom in the hall?

MR. NEGUS: Objection. I believe this was asked and answered yesterday.

THE COURT: Yes, it was.

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I neglected one area in my cross, and I think it's necessary for me to orient Detective O'Campo to get to that area.

THE COURT: Counsel, I --

MR. KOCHIS: I can speed it up if the Court's concerned.

THE COURT: No, I'm not particularly concerned.

It's not going to take long. What I was hesitating about was your use of the word cross. It's not an issue, so go ahead. Proceed.

- Q (BY MR. KOCHIS:) Did he describe the location of the various members of his family when he got to his parents' room the first time?
- A Yes, he did.
- Q Did you place that information in your report?
- 26 A Yes, sir.

- 1 Ω Did he describe seeing his mother when he first went to
- 2 his parents' bedroom?
- 3 A. No, he didn't.
- 4 Q Did he tell you whether or not he went anywhere after
- 5 he saw his sister and his father?
- 6 A Yes, sir.
- 7 Q What room of the house did he go to?
- 8 A. The laundry room.
- 9 Q Did he tell you that he went to the laundry room to hide?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q And he heard some sounds from the laundry room?
- 12 A Yes, sir.
- 13 Q And those were sounds that he attributed to Chris Hughes?
- 14 A Yes, sir.
- 15 Q You placed those in your report as well?
- 16 A. I did.
- 17 Q Basically he heard Chris running in the house?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q And calling out his name Josh?
- 20 A That's correct.
- 21 Q Did he tell you that there came a time when he did not
- 22 hear Chris Hughes any more?
- 23 | A I believe he did, yes.
- 24 Q. Did he tell you that he then exited the laundry room
- 25 and returned again to his parents' bedroom?
- 26 A That's correct.

```
1 Q Did he tell you that when he came to his parents' bedroom
2 at that point he saw his mother in the bedroom?
```

- 3 A Yes, sir.
- And did he describe her approximate location in the room
 when he returned the second time?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q Did you at that point then bring him back to the first time he came into his mother's bedroom?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q And do you recall how you did that?
- 11 A. I believe I told him I wanted to stop and I wanted him
 12 to think back to the first time that he went to the
 13 bedroom when Chris was with him.
- Directing your attention again, Detective O'Campo, 14 to Exhibit H-198, and specifically to Page 4 of that 15 exhibit, your interview with Joshua Ryen, and the last 16 full paragraph that appears on that particular page, 17 specifically the last sentence of that paragraph, did 18 you ask him when he went to the bedroom the first time 19 if he saw anyone in the bedroom or could hear anyone 20 or could smell anyone? 21
- 22 A That's correct.
- 23 Q What did Joshua tell you?
- 24 A He told me no.
- Q Did you then allow him to continue with his observations
 as to what he may have seen or heard the second time

```
he returned to his parents' bedroom?
```

- 2 A Yes, sir.
- 3 Q Did he tell you if he entered his parents' bedroom on
- 4 that second occasion?
- 5 A Yes, sir.
- 6 Q And did he tell you that Jessica was in the same
- 7 position in the hallway that she was the first time he
- 8 had gone to his parents' bedroom?
- 9 A That's correct.
- 10 Q Did you include that in your report as well?
- 11 A Yes, sir.
- 12 Q And did he tell you that his father was essentially in
- the same position that he had seen his father in the
- 14 first time he went into the bedroom?
- 15 A Yes, sir.
- 16 Q Did he tell you that he saw Chris Hughes when he
- 17 entered his parents' master bedroom the second time?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Did he tell you where Chris Hughes was when he entered
- 20 the master bedroom the second time?
- 21 A Yes, he did.
- 22 Q Where according to Josh Ryen was Chris Hughes?
- 23 A He was lying by the ironing board.
- 24 Q Did Joshua tell you if he heard anything inside that
- 25 master bedroom?
- 26 A Yes.

- 1 Q Did he in fact hear a sound coming from Chris Hughes?
- 2 A Yes, he did.
- 3 | Q Did he tell you where he was in the bedroom when he heard
- 4 that sound?
- 5 A Yes, sir.
- 6 Q Where was he?
- 7 A. He was standing by Chris.
- 8 Q Did you ask him at that point if he saw or heard anyone
- 9 else?
- 10 A Yes, sir.
- 11 Q And did he tell you that he did not see anyone else but
- 12 he heard Chris make a gurgling sound?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q Did he attempt to imitate that sound for you?
- 15 A. He did.
- 16 Q Was Dr. Hoyle to your knowledge still in the room when
- Josh Ryen attempted to imitate that sound?
- 18 A I didn't hear him leave, and he was there when I finished,
- 19 so I assumed he was still in the room.
- 20 0 Somewhere behind you in the room?
- 21 A Yes, sir.
- 22 Q Did Joshua Ryen tell you what he recalls happening to
- 23 himself as he stood there in his parents' master bedroom
- 24 hearing Chris Hughes making the gurgling sounds?
- 25 A Yes, sir.
- 26 a What did he tell you he remembered?

```
He remembered getting hit on the head.
1
2
        Did he tell you he saw the person who hit him on the
    a
3
        head?
        No, he didn't.
    A.
        Did he tell you he heard the person who hit him on the
    Q
        head approach him?
7
        No, he didn't.
        Did he tell you that sometime after he was hit on the
8
        head he remembered waking up?
9
10
        Yes, sir.
        Did he tell you whether it was light or dark outside
11
12
        when he recalled being conscience again?
13
        I believe he said it was light.
        Did you then question him about what he recalled taking
14
        place from the time he awoke after being struck on the
15
        head and the time he was taken to the hospital?
16
17
        Yes, sir.
        And did his recollection include seeing Bill Hughes,
18
        Chris's father, outside the sliding glass door?
19
20
        Yes, sir.
        Did it include his recollection of paramedics being at
21
22
        the scene?
        He remembered specifically people helping him.
23
```

recall him using the word paramedics.

(No omissions.)

26

24

```
Q And did he recall that that was after Bill Hughes somehow got into the house?
```

A Yes, sir.

2

• 3

15

- Q Now, did you then ask him, ask Josh Ryen if he had any idea who might have done this to him and to his family?
- 7 A Yes, sir.
- Q Now, up until the time you asked that question -perhaps I should stop for a moment. The exhibit which
 is in front of you, H-186, the 7-page typed report of
 your interview with Josh Ryen, when you dictated your
 report, did you make an attempt to include the information
 in chronological order to match that which Josh gave
 you?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q For example, when you started your interview with
 Josh, did you start with Saturday or did you start with
 the preceding day, on Friday?
 - A I started with Friday.
- Q Did you run through all of the events Josh remembered on Friday first?
- 22 A Yes, sir.
- Q And is that reflected in your typewritten report, Exhibit H-186?
- 25 A 189, yes.
- 26 | Q Excuse me. Did you then start with what he recalled

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

25

26

from the time he woke up Saturday morning until the time he went to bed Saturday night?

- A Yes, sir.
- Q Is that chronological sequence likewise reflected in your typewritten report?
- A Yes, it is.
- Q Then from there did you put in what he remembered from the time his mother screamed, cause him to wake up, until the time he was hit on the head?
- 10 A Yes.
 - Q Did you put in the events he recalled happening from the time he woke up until the time he took the helicopter ride to the hospital?
- 14 A Yes, sir.
 - Q Then you asked him if he had any idea who had done this to either him or his family, is that correct?
- 17 A That's correct.
 - Q Now, up until the time you asked that question, did

 Joshua Ryen ever tell you that he saw the three white

 men in the house attack any member of his family?
- 21 | A No, sir.
- Q Did he ever tell you that he saw three while males attack him?
- 24 A No.
 - Q Did he ever tell you up until that point in the interview that he ever saw three Mexican American male adults

- attack any members of his family?
- 2 A No. sir.

5

12

13

16

17

18

23

24

- Q Did he ever tell you that he saw white male adults attack any member of his family or himself?
 - A No, sir.
- Q Up until that time did Joshua Ryen tell you that he had seen anyone in the house other than Chris Hughes and the members of his family?
- 9 A No. sir.
- Q What did Joshua tell you, if anything, when you asked him if he had any idea who did this to he and his family?
 - A He said he thought it was the three Mexicans that did it.
 - Q Did you then ask him questions about three Mexicans?
- A I asked him which Mexicans, which three Mexicans he was talking about.
 - Q Did he then describe an incident which took place as he and his family were leaving for the barbecue at the Blade's house?
- 19 A Yes, sir.
- Q And did he describe a car in which these three people arrived at the house?
- 22 A Yes. A little blue pickup.
 - Q And again, was all this information obtained after Joshua had completed with you his chronological sequence of what he recalled taking place in the house?
- 26 A Yes, sir.

- Q So in essence did you at that point in your discussion return to a point in time prior to when he and his family left their home to go to the Blade's for the barbecue?
- 5 A Yes.
- Q Did he likewise give you a description of each of those three male Mexican people?
- 8 A Yes, he did.
- 9 Q Did that description include their approximate age, for example?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 | Q Their approximate height?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 | Q Their approximate build?
- 15 A That's correct.
- 16 Q And did you include all that information in your type-17 written report?
- 18 A Yes, sir.
- 19 Q Did he explain to you an activity which took place 20 between his father and any of these people?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 | Q Was that essentially some type of short conversation?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- Q After Joshua related this incident to you, did you ask him again if it was his opinion that these were the people who returned to the house?

```
A Yes, I did.
```

- 2 Q And that these were the people who caused him some harm?
- 3 A Yes, sir.

- Q And did he tell you that that is what he believed?
- 5 A Yes, sir.
- Q Did he at that time, however, tell you that he ever saw any of these three people inside his house?
- 8 A No.
- Q Did he tell you that he saw, ever saw any of these
 three people attacking himself or any member of the
 family?
- 12 A No.
- Q Now, this opinion Joshua Ryen expressed to you twice during the interview, was that consistent or was that inconsistent with your belief on the 14th that Kevin Cooper was responsible for the Ryen-Hughes homicides?
- 17 A It would be inconsistent with my belief.
- Q Well, if it was inconsistent with your belief, why
 did you put it in such detail in your 7-page typed
 interview?
- 21 A Because he said it.
- Q Well, wouldn't it have been better for you to have left that out of your interview with Josh Ryen?
- 24 A Wouldn't it have been better if I would have left it out?
- 25 Q In terms of supporting your belief.
- 26 A Oh, definitely.

Q Now, when you dictated this 7-page typewritten report, were you trying to frame Kevin Cooper?

A No, sir.

Q When you were asking Josh Ryen questions in the hospital and taking notes, were you trying to frame Kevin Cooper?

A No, sir.

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, at this point I'm going to move to another area. Before I do that, I would like to offer into evidence Exhibit H-189. My reason for offering it at this point, if there is going to be an objection, I'm prepared to take the officer line by line, question and answer through the entire document.

THE COURT: Is there an objection?

MR. NEGUS: No.

THE COURT: It will be received.

Q (BY MR. KOCHIS:) Mr. O'Campo, directing your attention to a point in time of June 5, 1983, the day that you were called to the Ryen residence. Do you have that date in mind?

A Yes, sir.

Q During the period of time that you were outside the Ryen home on that Sunday afternoon, did you observe a piece of evidence which you later pointed out to a technician from the Identification Bureau?

A Yes, sir.

Q Was that piece of evidence a shoe print impression on

```
the top of a Jacuzzi spa?
```

A Yes, sir.

- 3 Q Was that person Mr. Duffy?
- 4 A Yes. it was.
- Q After you directed his attention to that, did you see Mr. Duffy photograph that impression to preserve it?
- 7 A Yes, I did.
- 8 Q Now, were you the detective that was assigned that 9 crime scene?
- 10 A No, I was not.
- 11 Q Was Mike Hall one of those people?
- 12 A Yes, sir.
- Q And was there another person, another detective from your Bureau who was later assigned with Mike Hall
- to that crime scene?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 | Q Would that have been John Clifford?
- 18 A Yes, sir.
- 19 Q Would that assignment have taken place sometime in
- 20 the evening or early morning hours on either the evening
- of Sunday, June the 5th, or Monday morning, June the 6th?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q Were you one of the detectives that assisted Detective
- 24 Hall with the crime scene?
- 25 A Yes, sir.
- 26 Q Was it Detective Hall's responsibility to record the

```
measurements of objects, certain objects in the crime
scene?
```

A Yes, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

15

16

24

25

- Q And did you in fact observe him during the evening using a tape measure to record the location, for example, of various victims that were deceased that were still in the Ryen home?
- 8 A Yes, sir.
 - Q Prior to the time you entered the Ryen home, did you observe Detective Duffy inside the house, inside the Ryen master bedroom with a camera?
 - A Prior to my entering?
- 13 Q Yes.
- 14 A I don't specifically remember. I seem to think I did.
 - Q Well, on that Sunday did you see Detective Duffy inside the Ryen master bedroom taking a number of photographs?
- 17 A Yes, sir.
- Q And at that time was he assigned to the Identification
 Bureau?
- 20 A That's correct.
- 21 Q And is that one of the Bureaus that arrives at a crime scene to process the crime scene?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
 - Q On that particular crime scene, did members from the crime lab arrive as well?
 - A Yes, sir.

- Q And at that crime scene is Identification the division that does the photographing, for example?
 - A Pardon me. Can you repeat that?
- Q Sure. At the crime scene was Detective Duffy and
 Detective Roper there to photograph the crime scene?
- 6 A Yes, sir.

- Q For example, Homicide assisted and did not photograph
 the crime scene?
- 9 A That's correct.
- 10 Q Is I.D. there also to lift latent fingerprints?
- 11 A Yes.
- Q Is it fair to say that Homicide did not lift any latent prints, it was the I.D. Bureau?
- 14 A I would agree.
- 15 Q You weren't involved in lifting any prints?
- 16 A No. sir.
- Q Was the crime lab at that particular crime scene involved
 when you saw them from time to time in picking up
 evidence at the scene?
- 20 A Yes. sir.
- Q Now, did you walk through the residence to conduct a visual search of the residence?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- Q Would one of your purposes for conducting a visual check of the residence be to look for signs of disturbance?
- 26 A That would be one of the reasons.

- Q Would you also check for the presence or absence of valuable items of property?
- 3 A Yes, sir.
 - Q Now, were you assigned after this day to interview person connected with the case?
- 6 A Yes, sir.

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q For example, you interviewed Joshua Ryen, is that true?
- A That's correct.
 - Q He was one of several people you interviewed in connection with this case?
- 11 A Yes, sir.
 - Q As a Homicide detective, in your experience, do you find any value in having some first-hand observations of a crime scene that will later assist you in interviews of persons connected with the case?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q Can a problem arise, for example, in interviewing a survivor of a crime scene, when you have no knowledge of what the crime scene looked like?
 - A That's correct.
 - When you assisted the officers in their measurements of items at the crime scene, every time you engaged in that type of activity, did it appear to you that the detective at the other end of the tape was making a record of the measurement you were helping take?
 - A Yes, sir.

```
Now, did you follow the individuals from the crime lab
1
         around that house the entire time they were there?
2
         I did not.
3
        Were you assigned to keep an eye on the crime lab, for
         example?
5
6
        No. sir.
    Α
        At that crime scene, did they, although they are part
7
         of a team, work independently of your department? Or is
8
         that a vague question?
9
        That's vague, I guess.
10
        By that I mean at that crime scene was a Homicide
11
         detective assigned to tag along with the crime lab and
12
13
        watch everything they did?
        No, sir.
14
        Likewise, were you assigned to follow the individuals
15
        from the I.D. Bureau around the crime lab and see where
16
         they stood when they took their photographs to preserve
17
         the crime scene?
18
19
        No, sir.
                            (No omissions.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

While you were at that crime scene, did you see any civilians inside the Ryen home other than the victims and the persons who assisted in removing the bodies of the deceased people from the house?

- 5 A. Dr. Root.
 - Q Dr. Root is a pathologist who works in coordination with this county on homicides; is that correct?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- g Q Did you see, for example, any members of the press inside the house at that time?
- 11 A. No.

6

7

MR. KOCHIS: Thank you. I have nothing else, Your

13 Honor.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

26

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEGUS:

- Mr. O'Campo, yesterday you described your note taking process as like you would put laundry room with an arrow and that would indicate to you that Joshua went into the laundry room. Is that basically the way you did most of your note taking?
- 21 A Are you referring to the arrow?
- 22 Q It is an abbreviated form where you abbreviate the
 23 verb and don't have a subject and just put that which
 24 you think is significant about the statement; that is,
 25 laundry room?
 - A. I would agree with you insofar as my note taking being

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

in an abbreviated method, yes.

- Q Do you normally put a subject in if there's not a proper name used?
- A I would think I'd have to.
- Do you always put he's and they's and you's and we's,
 or do you leave those out sometimes?

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I would object as not being relevant as to what he does in other scenes. What he did in this case would be relevant.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. NEGUS: I thought that was what I was asking about.

THE WITNESS: I would say yes.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) You tend to leave the pronouns out?
- 15 A. No, sir. I would use them.
- 16 Q For example, you said that there was a time that there
 17 was a description of Chris being chased; is that right?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q Do you remember if you wrote down whatever subject Josh
 20 used in your notes, "they chased," "Chris was chased"?
 21 Do you remember the form of the sentence?
- 22 A. No, I don't have independent recollection of that.
- 23 Q Possibly you abbreviated Chris chased or chased Chris?
- 24 A It's possible.
- 25 Q And that would be a practical way to abbreviate things; 26 is that correct?

- 1 A It could be done that way.
- 2 Q Do you do it that way?
- 3 A Well, like I said, I don't have independent recollection
- of how I did it.
- 5 Q Do you remember how many pages of notes you had?
- 6 A. No, I don't remember how many.
- 7 Q Were you taking notes in a spiral notebook?
- 8 A No. It was a steno note pad.
- 9 Q The same type of paper that Josh wrote his question on
- 10 for you back on June the 6th; is that right?
- 11 A Yes, sir.
- 12 Q When you took your notes, you basically wrote down
- Josh's answers rather than your questions?
- 14 A. That I don't remember.
- 15 Q Do you remember whether you were asking leading questions
- or open-ended questions?
- 17 A. I don't remember asking leading questions, and I don't
- recall asking open-ended questions. I do remember asking
- 19 questions that required an answer.
- 20 Q How would you define a question in between an open-ended
- 21 and a leading question? Give me an example.
- 22 A. If I were to ask you what color shirt you have on.
- 23 Q When you were going through the narrative, did you ask
- 24 like what happened next or where did you go next?
- 25 What kind of questions were you asking?
- 26 A. I would probably have said what happened next or what

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

did you do, did you hear anything, did you see anything,did you smell anything.

- Q So you were trying to focus his attention on certain subjects without necessarily suggesting an answer; is that fair?
- 6 A. Yes, sir, I agree with you.
 - Q Do you have any estimate as to whether -- were you writing the whole time or did you pause? How did that work? I mean, were you just taking notes constantly when something significant came up? How did you do that?
 - A. I believe I would make notes as I received a response and not make them until I thought I had what was sufficient notes and make them until I thought I had what was sufficient notes to cover the response and the question.
 - Q. So you would be taking some sort of note, even just a couple of words, as to each response that Josh made; is that correct?
- 19 A. I would hope that that's what I was doing. I don't have a specific recollection.
 - Do you recall Josh describing the attack on himself and
 his family using the pronoun they or them for his
 attackers at least on six different occasions?
- 24 A No, sir.
- 25 Q When Mr. Kochis asked you about why did you put in information about the Mexicans in your report, you didn't

write your report in any fashion that you attributed to

Josh any statement, factual statement, as to what

Josh perceived that would be inconsistent with your

theory of the case; is that true?

- A. I don't understand that.
 - As you wrote the description of what Josh told you about his observations, leaving aside the one sentence about Josh felt the three Mexicans came back, you didn't make an observation, just a feeling, but as to your description as to the way you wrote the rest of the interview, the whole thing was written in such a way which would be consistent with your theory of the case, true?

MR. KOCHIS: I'm going to object. That's argumentative.

THE COURT: Sustain the objection.

(BY MR. NEGUS:) When Mr. Kochis asked you why you put the statement about three Mexicans in the report, you said because Josh said it. When you put it in there, you didn't put it in in such a way that was inconsistent with your theory of the case, did you?

MR. KOCHIS: Objection, that likewise is argumentative MR. NEGUS: May I submit some Points and Authorities on argumentative questions?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. NEGUS: If I can find them.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. NEGUS: Your Honor, I don't believe that question falls within any of the three definitions of an argumentative question. Mr. Kochis asked this gentleman about why did he put inconsistent information into his police report. I think I'm entitled to examine him to bring out that he didn't.

THE COURT: Counsel, it calls for no new facts but merely asks a question to agree with the inferences that you may draw from the evidence thus far, which is one of the three categories.

MR. NEGUS: The new fact that it calls for is is there anything that was inconsistent.

THE COURT: I'm not quite sure that that was the way it came out.

MR. NEGUS: I'll rephrase it, then.

- (BY MR. NEGUS:) Is there anything, any fact, that you put into your police report other than the statement about what Josh's feelings were which was inconsistent with your theory of the case?
- A. When he told me of the three Mexicans, that was inconsistent with my opinion, not with my theory.
- Q Well, the facts that you put into the police report were that Josh had seen three Mexicans that he and his family left for a party. Was anything inconsistent in that with your opinion?

26 A No.

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Q.	So the	only	thing	that	was	incons	siste	ent '	that	you	put	in
	was Jo	sh fel	lt the	three	Mex	icans	had	ret	urned	l?		

MR. KOCHIS: Again, Your Honor, that's an argumentative form of the question.

THE COURT: I don't think so. Can you answer that one, sir?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. My answer would be I'll agree with you on that.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) And a description of Josh of his assailants as "they" would be inconsistent with your theory of the case; correct?
- A If he would have referred to any attackers as they or referred to an attacker at all, more than one attacker, I would agree with you as being inconsistent with my opinion.
- 16 Ω You indicated that the reason that you didn't dictate

 17 your report the night that you got through interviewing

 18 Josh was that Sergeant Arthur told you to go home?
- 19 A Yes, sir, I believe he did.
- 20 Q You talked to Josh on Tuesday, approximately nine days
 21 after the crime was discovered; is that correct?
- 22 A June 14th, yes.
- 23 Q That was a Tuesday?
- 24 A I don't recall the day of the week.
- 25 Q At that point in time had you gone without sleep for an extended period of time?

A.	•	That	I	don't	remember.	
			-			

- Do you remember being up all night the night before
 that?
- A. Not specifically.
- Monday, June the 13th, there wasn't anything specific going on with the investigation that you were involved in other than just liaison with Josh?
- A. I don't remember.
- Q Do you have notes of anything you did on June the 13th?
- A No, sir, I have no notes.

(No omissions.)

Q	Is your memory such that you can remember a lot more
	details about a conversation for the first hour or two
	but then after that it drops off significantly?

- A Is my memory such?
- Q Does your memory work by your being able to remember the details of something, a conversation, for example, best for an hour or two, but then after say two hours, your memory drops off of the small details quite a bit?
- A Are you referring to as a conversation is taking place or after the conversation has been concluded?
- Q The conversation ends at 7:00. Would you memory be such that you would be able to remember most of the details for say the first hour, dropping off more after two hours, and then after two hours being able to recall maybe 20 percent of the details, something like that?
- A No, I don't think I can agree with that.
- How much can you remember overnight after you have slept of the conversation? Can you remember everything that happened?

MR. KOCHIS: I'm going to object. It's vague as to what type of situation we are talking about. It's not relevant, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very general, Mr. Negus. Sustained

Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) How much did you remember the next morning when you were dictating your report after 12, 14 hours had expired after your interview with Josh?

Did you remember 80 percent of the details, 20 percent of the details? How would you relate your memory of the details?

- A It's difficult to answer. There would have to be a system of measuring how much information is retained after that amount of time. I have never subjected myself to such a test.
- Q You have no way of knowing, then?
- A I wouldn't even want to guess.
- Q Do you think that your particular memory is significantly greater than the average persons?

MR. KOCHIS: Objection. That calls for speculation on his part. It's not relevant.

THE COURT: It's speculative. Sustained.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Do you have a good memory?
- A I like to think I do.
- Q Is it outstanding so that you can amaze your friends by being able to remember more than they do about the same thing?

MR. KOCHIS: Objection, your Honor. Argumentative. Vague. It's not relevant.

MR. NEGUS: Your Honor, I think that it's known by psychologists how much people can remember on the average, and I'm just trying to --

THE COURT: The question of relevancy, counsel, I'm trying to weigh that relevancy to see how slight or heavy

it is. You are asking his opinion as to the strength of his memory powers.

MR. NEGUS: I think most of us have an opinion as to where we are.

THE COURT: Are you about to conclude on that point?

MR. NEGUS: I'm about to conclude if I can get an answer.

THE COURT: All right. Let's permit it, if you recall it, sir. Do you?

THE WITNESS: No, sir, I don't.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Negus.

Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Would you say that your memory -- you took a conversation and say compared to other detectives in Homicide, would you be outstanding in your ability to remember or about the same as the others?

MR. KOCHIS: Objection. That calls for speculation absent foundation that he subjected himself and everyone else in Homicide to that test. It's also vague as to what he is talking about, whether a conversation with Mr. Negus in the hallway or --

THE COURT: He has to evaluate the memory powers of everybody who works around him as well as his own.

MR. NEGUS: Can I have the original question read back?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Whereupon the requested portion was read back

```
by the reporter.)
```

MR. KOCHIS: I interpose an objection to that question.

It's my understanding it was sustained and then there was another question that Mr. Negus asked.

THE COURT: Let's save time, Mr. Kochis. Overruled. Can you answer that?

THE WITNESS: About the only answer I could provide for that question would be that my opinion, as far as my opinion about my memory, my opinion is that I feel there is possibly a substantial difference between my ability to recall things and other peoples.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Greater or lesser?
- A It would depend, I'm sure, on the subject matter.
- Q Sometimes less, sometimes more?
 - A More than likely.

THE COURT: Let's don't pursue it.

MR. NEGUS: I'm not going to.

Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) In answering a question yesterday at page 1955, line 3, you spoke and you said, "You," meaning myself, provided you with the transcript of the preliminary hearing. Was that a misstatement? In fact, did Mr. Kochis give you the transcript of the preliminary hearing?

MR. KOCHIS: If I could have the page again, your Honor.

MR. NEGUS: 1955, line 3.

Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Is that correct?

THE COURT: If I could show the witness the statement.

And it's not the way I recall the answer, but --

MR. NEGUS: I wasn't sure.

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I'm prepared to stipulate that Mr. Negus did not give him a copy of his transcript.

MR. NEGUS: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. I will accept the stipulation

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) When you were listening to Josh, did he talk about a chase in a circle?
- A I believe he said he could hear cries running in circles, something to that effect.
- Q From your knowledge of going around the Ryen house, is it possible to be chased in a circle around the halls so that you are going in a circle through the halls?
- A Yes, sir.

- Q It's sort of a circular arrangement? There are halls circling around the trophy room in a circular fashion?
- A Yes, sir.
- Yesterday Mr. Kochis asked you if Joshua's statement that the first time he went into the bedroom he reached down and touched Jessica and looked into the master bedroom and was not able to see his mother, and then he asked you, "And that was not consistent with what you saw at the crime scene?" And you answered, "You are correct." Do you remember that?
- A Yes, sir.

- Q What was inconsistent about Joshua's statement with what you saw at the crime scene?
 - A Standing in the area that Josh described to me he was at, when I was there I could see Josh's mother.
 - Q All right. And that's what Josh told you he saw the second time he was there, correct?
- A Yes, sir.
 - Q Is there anything inconsistent with Josh's statement and your observations if you don't assume that his mother was dead the first time he went into the house?
- A Could you rephrase that, possibly?
 - Is your observations at the crime scene inconsistent with Josh's description of the events if you don't assume that his mother was dead the first time he went into the bedroom? I'll try to do it again another way. If you assume that his mother is alive and someplace other than where she was lying when she was dead, when Josh first went into the bedroom, is there anything inconsistent with Josh's statement to you and your observations?

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I have an objection. It assumes a fact not in evidence. It's not relevant. Under 352, any relevance that it has --

THE COURT: If I may be permitted, if she was still able to move between the two observations, they could be reconciled, your observations and his, could they not?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Why did you say Mr. Kochis was correct in saying that was inconsistent?

MR. KOCHIS: Objection, your Honor. That's a misstatement of his testimony. He said it was inconsistent with what he say, not with Mr. Negus' proposed hypothetical.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: If I remember correctly, at the time

Mr. Kochis was questioning in that area, he was, I believe,

trying to point out that from the position Josh was at when

he was next to Jessica, if the mother had been in the position

I had observed her in, then Joshua would have seen her then

also.

Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Isn't the reason for your answer,
"You are correct" because Mr. Kochis asked you a leading
question and you answered it in the way the question
suggested?

MR. KOCHIS: Objection. That's argumentative.

THE COURT: Overruled. But it hardly seems worthwhile. Try and conclude this point, Mr. Negus.

Can you answer the last question?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: I answered correct because I agreed with what he said.

THE COURT: Let's try and conclude with the witness.

I'm trying to. I think I'm just about MR. NEGUS: 2 done. 3 (BY MR. NEGUS:) At a homicide scene, when you have various divisions, crime lab, I.D., Homicide, patrol, Bureau of Administration, you name it, who is responsible 5 for the crime scene? 6 7 The Homicide Detail when it arrives. 8 It's Homicide's duty to make sure everybody else does Q 9 their job correct, is that correct? 10 I would have to say the ultimate responsibility is 11 Homicide's, yes, sir. Did. Josh mention the three Mexicans when you first took 12 13 him through the events of Saturday evening on? 14 No, sir. 15 (No omissions.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

54.4

Q In response to what question by yourself did Josh first
mention three Mexicans?

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, could I give Mr. O'Campo the exhibit so he's referring to the exhibit rather than another copy to orient the Court?

THE COURT: Certainly. Is that 189?

MR. KOCHIS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. The question would have been something to the effect of do you know who did this to you or do you have any idea or who do you think, something to that effect.

MR. NEGUS: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Mr. Kochis.

MR. KOCHIS: Yes, Your Honor.

BY MR. KOCHIS:

Mr. O'Campo, now that you have 189 in front of you,
H-189, directing your attention to, for example, Page 2,
the first full paragraph, does that sentence contain
some of the pronouns that Josh used when he communicated
to you his observations of the scene, the observations
of his -- his recollections of his activities?

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

- A Yes, sir. He would have said "we," and I would have written "they."
- Q And does in fact in your report the word "they" appear

	ı	
1		several times in this seven-page document?
2	A.	Yes, sir.
3	Q	Likewise, does Page 2, specifically the first and
4		second paragraphs, contain examples of the questions
5		that you asked Joshua during the interview?
6	A.	Yes, sir.
7	Q	Does Page 4 of your typewritten interview, specifically
8		the fifth paragraph, contain Joshua's recollection of
9		what he heard from the laundry room?
10	A.	Yes, sir.
11	Q	And does it include Joshua's recollection of hearing
12		Chris running in circles?
13	A.	Yes, sir.
14		MR. KOCHIS: I don't have anything else.
15		
16		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY	MR. NEGUS:
18	Q.	Your typewritten report does not purport to be a
19		verbatim account of what Josh said; is that correct?
20	A.	That's correct.
21	Q.	And even with the substitution from the first person to
22		the third person, it doesn't purport to be verbatim;
23		correct? Even changing I to he or we to they doesn't
24		purport to be word for word what Josh said; correct?
5	Α	That's correct.

And isn't it true that when you were dictating it you

```
couldn't even remember for sure, you know, the order
1
       of Josh's words in the sentence but just the general
2
        idea of what he communicated?
3
       No, I won't agree with that.
       You can remember word for word what he said?
5
       No, I don't remember. I'm sure I can't remember or didn't
6
        remember word for word what he said.
7
       But you remember the order of the words in the sentence?
8
            MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I'm going to interpose an
9
   objection to that question. It's beyond the scope of my
10
   examination. It's not relevant. It's a 352 issue.
11
            THE COURT: I don't believe it's beyond the scope.
12
   Counsel, you're both belaboring this point. I can't believe
13
   the extent to which you're continuing this examination.
   But your objection is overruled. Anything further?
15
           MR. NEGUS: I haven't gotten an answer to the
16
   question yet.
17
                          I did not write down word for word
            THE WITNESS:
18
   Josh's response. I did make notes on his responses.
19
        (BY MR. NEGUS:) As previously described?
20
       As I've described, yes.
21
           MR. NEGUS: Nothing further.
22
            THE COURT: We'll take the morning recess.
23
            MR. NEGUS: Before we resume, I'd like to have a
24
   brief in-chambers statement.
25
            THE COURT: All right.
```

(Recess.)

(The following proceedings were held in chambers.)

THE COURT: For the record, Mr. Cooper and both Counsel are in chambers.

MR. NEGUS: One of the requests I had was moot, because the television folks have left. The other request is that the next witness, we'd request that her name not be given in open court. She is Mary Risi, R-i-s-i, and she requests for her own privacy reasons not to have her name revealed so it will not be in the paper.

MR. KOCHIS: I have no problem with that.

THE COURT: You know the media's going to try and get her name.

MR. NEGUS: I know. She's not really a pivotal witness. I think all my witnesses are important for one reason or another, but I doubt seriously if the case will turn on her testimony.

THE COURT: Is it going to be extensive?

MR. NEGUS: No.

THE COURT: Let's have her back here and examine her here.

MR. NEGUS: Okay. That's okay with me.

THE COURT: Go ahead and bring her back. Don't call her name out there. Maybe Mr. Forbush can get her.

MR. KOCHIS: If we're going to conduct the entire

examination, I have to get some materials.

MR. NEGUS: I have to get some stuff, too. It's going to be 15 or 20 minutes.

THE COURT: Oh, is it going to take that long? Are we being too concerned with her desires? What's the point of it?

MR. NEGUS: I think that she just doesn't want to have to be -- I can relate to that. I'm starting to get phone calls myself in the middle of the night and I can understand that she doesn't want to receive phone calls. For some reason this particular area arouses the phone call makers. I mean, I noticed that when we did this, when we went into this area at the prelim, all of a sudden we get a rash of phone calls.

I think that the lady has a point and her name is not really a big issue. What's important is her testimony.

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I would have no problem with swearing her, taking her name in here, going into open court, and I can --

THE COURT: Why don't you come over here, please.

MR. KOCHIS: Neither Mr. Negus nor I have to refer to her in examination. We can just start with the questions.

THE COURT: Would you stand and raise your right hand and be sworn.

1///

 \underline{M} \underline{A} \underline{R} \underline{Y} \underline{R} \underline{I} \underline{S} \underline{I} , 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.

THE CLERK: Please be seated.

THE COURT: State your name for the record, please.

THE WITNESS: Mary Catherine Risi.

THE COURT: Spell your last name.

THE WITNESS: My last name? R-i-s-i.

THE COURT: Is it Miss or Mrs.?

THE WITNESS: Mrs.

THE COURT: Mrs. Risi, we were just discussing your desires to keep your name confidential. That's why we brought you back to chambers. That causes a little bit of a problem, because I do know the media people are sitting outside so they're going to asking you and asking Counsel. I will instruct my clerk not to reveal her name to the media nor let them see the minutes, that portion of the minutes reflecting her name, and the court reporter as well.

Counsel, I trust you will try and keep it as well confidential. The media can sometimes be persistent.

With that, we'll take her outside in open court.

We're trying to accommodate, but we've got a problem. You

```
can show her the way back outside and we'll examine her
    in open court, then, in a few minutes.
            MR. NEGUS: The record should also reflect that the
3
    television people are now leaving. They're gone. They won't
             I take it there's no problem, is there, ma'am,
    with revealing the place that you were employed back in
    June of 1983?
            THE COURT: She worked at the Country Corral?
            MR. NEGUS: Different bar.
            THE WITNESS: No.
10
            THE COURT: Oh, it's the other one.
11
            THE WITNESS: I really don't want it to be, because
12
    I'm a very private person.
13
            MR. NEGUS: I can't really stop the other -- you're
14
   not working there any more?
15
            THE WITNESS: Yes, I am working there.
16
            MR. NEGUS: Could we put that on the record here as
17
18
   well?
            THE COURT: You're going to be asking her about
19
    the events of the night, aren't you?
20
           MR. NEGUS: Yes.
21
            THE COURT: I don't see how they can avoid finding
22
   out where those events occurred. There's only so much we
23
   can do. This is a serious murder case. We'd like to
24
   oblige, but there's only so much we can do.
25
```

Take her outside and we'll commence with examination

there. Counsel, I have one other thing before we go back 2 Mr. White apparently from the Press Enterprise, 3 Riverside --MR. NEGUS: Smith. THE COURT: -- has requested -- is that the name 6 of the paper there? 7 MR. NEGUS: Press Enterprise, but it's a Mr. Ron 8 9 Smith. THE COURT: Smith, yes. He requested from my 10 bailiff a copy of Exhibit H-189, and I said not from the 11 Court you can't have it. I would suggest that neither of 12 you furnish it to him as well, because this is a sort of 13 emotional thing. If he prints that verbatim, it's just 14 going to inflame the passions of people that read it. 15 MR. NEGUS: He's already asked both of us and been 16 17 denied. THE COURT: Good. Okay. Then we can go outside. 18 (The following proceedings were held in 19 20 open court.) THE COURT: We started with a witness in chambers. 21 We're now back in open court. Defendant and Counsel are 22 23 present. If you'd show that witness to the stand, we'll begin 24

her examination. Did she leave?

THE BAILIFF: I didn't know who she was. I didn't

25

```
see her. There's no one out there.
            THE COURT: Mr. Forbush isn't here either? There
2
    she is.
3
            You were previously sworn. Just resume the stand.
            Mr. Negus, you may continue.
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
7
    BY MR. NEGUS:
8
        Ma'am, on the night of Saturday, June the 4th, 1983,
        where were you employed?
10
        La Vida Hot Springs, La Vida Cafe.
11
        Is that on Carbon Canyon in Orange County?
12
13
        Yes.
    A.
        How far approximately -- are you familiar with a bar
14
        called the Canyon Corral Bar?
15
16
        Yes, I am.
        Approximately how far is La Vida from the Canyon Corral?
17
        Probably about three, three miles.
18
        La Vida would be closer to the Orange County end of
19
    Q.
20
        the canyon?
21
        Yes, it is.
        And the Canyon Corral is at the Chino area end of the
22
23
        canyon?
24
        Yes.
        On June the 4th, 1983, that's Saturday night, did three
25
        unusual men come into La Vida?
26
```

- 1 A. Three men came in.
- 2 Q Can you describe them?
- 3 A. Two Mexicans and one black man.
- 4 Q Do you remember anything more about them than that?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q Was the black man in his thirties?
- 7 A. Yes. I would say he was close to his thirties.
- 8 0 Did he have short hair?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q And it was not -- was it Mr. Cooper?
- 11 A. No, it does not look like him, that I recall.
- 12 Q How long were these men in the bar?
- 13 A. Approximately an hour and a half to two hours.
- 14 Q After June the 4th, did some officers come to the bar
- 15 to talk to you?
- 16 A. They came up and they asked some questions, yes.
- 17 0. When they first came up, whom did you see them asking
- 18 questions of?
- 19 A. They just asked about one of the employees and one of
- 20 the girls that said, well, Mary worked that night. She
- 21 was the only one. And I overheard my name being
- mentioned, so I walked out and I asked the officers what
- they needed.
- 24 Q Can you describe those officers?
- 25 A. No, I could not.
- 26 Q Were they both male?

```
1 A. Yes.
```

7

- 2 Q Were they both white?
- 3 A. I can't recall.
 - Q Where they both in plain clothes?
- 5 A. Yes. They were wearing suits.
 - Q Did you give them a description of these men that you've previously described?
- 8 A. I gave them a description of them saying two Mexicans
 9 and a black and they had been wearing jeans and T-shirts.
 10 That's the only description -- and they had short hair,
 11 all of them had short hair.
- 12 Q Did one of the Mexicans have on a red shirt?
- 13 A I can't recall.
- Did you talk to Mr. Forbush sometime, I believe, around the beginning of February; Mr. Forbush being the gentleman with the grey hair seated at the counsel table?
 - A. Yes.

18

19

20

- Q At that point in time was your memory of these people better than it is now?
- 21 A. I would say so.
- 22 Q When the detectives were talking -- the interview with you at your place of employment, did you ever describe three white males to them?
- 25 A. No, I did not.
 - Q Did Mr. Forbush show you before he interviewed you a

police report that had been prepared of the interview of those officers with you?

- A. I can't recall right now. Oh, wait a minute. I do recall him showing me something, a piece of paper that said something that I had stated.
- And did you point out to them that the people were not white but they were the two Mexicans and a black?
- A. Yes.

MR. NEGUS: Thank you. I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR. KOCHIS: No.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. You may step down.

Who is the next witness?

MR. NEGUS: Linda Headley.

THE COURT: You'll have to come to the other door.

(No omissions.)

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

24

25

26

<u>L I N D A</u> <u>H E A D L E Y</u>, called as a witness by and on behalf of the Defendant, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please state your full name and spell your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Linda Headley, H-e-a-d-l-e-y.

THE COURT: Counsel, if I might interrupt, I know that there are members of the media present. The last witness, gentlemen, had expressed to counsel a desire that her name not be mentioned. She was obviously very nervour and indicated she was a private person. She revealed her name, but I see no need in volunteering it. We are trying to comply with her request. If that explains to you. Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEGUS:

- Q Mrs. Headley, what is your occupation?
- 18 A I'm a nurse.
- 19 Q With whom are you employed?
- 20 A Loma Linda University Medical Center.
- 21 | Q Were you so employed in June of 1983?
- 22 A Yes.
 - Q What was your particular assignment within the hospital on that date?
 - A I was the nurse for Joshua Ryen, I guess, on the date you are talking about.

THE COURT: Could I get you to get a little closer to the microphone, please?

THE WITNESS: Okay.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Was that on Monday, June the 6th, and Tuesday, June the 7th?
- A I would have to look at things to confirm dates. I don't have the dates clearly in my mind.
- Q In the hospital, do you as part of your duties, take records of the patients on both a flow chart and on a narrative nursing note form?
- 11 A That's correct.

MR. NEGUS: I have some documents, your Honor, that I would like to have marked as a group H-1-D.

THE COURT: All right. They may be stapled together.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Asking you to look at that packet of documents that has been marked as H-1-D, does this appear to be the narrative progress notes that you take, that people take as nurses in Loma Linda Hospital?
- A Yes, it is.
- Q And then also included in the same batch of records would be intensive care records which you people in intensive care likewise keep in the hospital, is that correct?
- A That's correct.
- Q Now, showing you on page 2 of the intensive care records, do you, when you are taking care of a patient, sign in on the intensive care records?

- 1 A Yes, we do.
- 2 Q And did you sign in for June 6, 1983?
- 3 A Yes, I did.
- 4 | Q And did you likewise sign in on June 7, 1983?
- 5 A Yes, I did.
- 6 Q But on June 8, 1983, you did not?
- 7 A That's correct.
- 8 Q So the two dates that you dealt with Joshua Ryen would 9 have been June 6th and June 7th, is that correct?
- 10 A That's correct.
- 11 Q Now, what time was it that you first had contact with
 12 Josh on June 6th?
- A I came on duty at 6:00 in the morning, but it was probably
 more like 6:30 that I actually had contact with him.
- 15 Q I would like you to look at page 2, the front part of
 16 the intensive record, and there is a part of it that
 17 says, "Neuro signs." Do you see that?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q What does that mean?
- 20 A That means the patient's level of consciousness, whether
 21 they answer questions appropriately, whether they are
 22 oriented to time, place and person, and pupil responses.
- Q When did you start making records of that information with respect to Josh Ryen?
- 25 A At 7:00.
- 26 | Q You are a registered nurse, is that correct?

That's correct. Α

- What is the background and training you have had in 2 order to be a registered nurse? 3
- My schooling?
- Yes. Q 5

1

- I went to Valley College Nursing School, two-year 6 nursing school. 7
- And you were licensed by the State of California? 8
- 9
- And how long have you been a registered nurse? Q 10
- Since 1978. 11
- And your assignment in intensive care, how long has Q 12 that been? 13
- Six years. 14
- Now, with Joshua on the morning of June the 6th, did 15 you do this neurological check on him at 7:00, 8:00, 16 noon, and then again -- excuse me. Yes, seven, eight 17 and noon?
- Yes, that's correct. 19
- And during that period of time, what -- you have an 20 entry for level of consciousness and a quote DO? 21
- Right. 22

- What is that? 23
- That means drowsy but oriented to time, place and person. 24
- How do you determine that? 25 Q
- How do I determine that? 26

Q Right.

A It's a judgment. It is, you know, just a judgment value. If the patient is fully alert like you and I, talking very clear of thought, then you would put "A" for alert. And he was drowsy, you know, sleepy. He was under medication at the time and -- does that answer?

- Q So he was not as alert as if he hadn't been in the particular physical condition that he was in?
- 10 A That's correct.
- 11 Q Does that mean that he is hallucinating? How do you tell he is oriented?
 - A You ask a patient just if they can say their name and if they know the date or the approximate date, as long as they don't think it's, you know, several years different, you know they are pretty well oriented.
 - Q Was Josh able to speak?
 - A He mouthed words very plainly. He was not able to use his voice.
 - Q But you had no difficulty understanding him when he mouthed words?
- 22 A None.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 23 Q Was he able to make sentences?
- A He gave mainly just, you know, one or two word answers, but he did make short sentences.
 - Q There is a response section and there are different

numbers which reveal different things. The No. 1 you didn't put anything in that because he wasn't able to speak?

- A That's correct.
- Q That's basically what it is?
 - A Verbally. The code up here says "responds verbally," and, no, he could not respond verbally.
 - Q Obviously in his particular condition, that wasn't necessarily a sign of any lack of consciousness on his part?
- A No.

MR. KOCHIS: Excuse me. I interpose an objection.

It's his witness and they are leading and suggestive questions.

I would ask that that answer be stricken.

THE COURT: That may remain. Hereafter.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) You then have a series of assessments of handgrip and leg movements. Were his responses consistent at all times?
- A Yes. They were always strong.
- Q What does that indicate?
- A It means to commands, if we asked him to move his legs, he would move them strongly to command, or squeeze our hands, he would grip them strongly.
- Q Then you have some measurements as to pupil reaction and size. Could you explain? They seem to vary somewhat The first one says four over three is the size and

1 What does that mean? 2 It means that his pupil would contract from four milli-3 meters to three, and that "N" is normal reaction. So he had a normal reaction? Did he have a normal 4 Q 5 reaction? 6 He had a normal pupilary reaction. Α Now, you said that he was on medication. Did you 7 Q 8 yourself give him any medication? I would have to look at the medication record. 9 Α 10 Do you have that there? Is that part of the --Q 11 It's a different sheet than the narrative notes or the Α 12 flow sheet. Let me just ask you to look at the back of this flow 13 chart. Like in the morning there is an indication of 14 a half grain of Codeine being given? 15 That was given just before I came on duty. 16 Would you have put any pain=killers that you gave him 17 18 in that comment section? Not necessarily. We have a separate record for that. 19 Α What is that record entitled? 20 Q Medication administration. 21 Α Are those charts always, medication administration 22 23 charts always kept?

Are those turned into the Loma Linda University Medical -

while I check my records, could you look through this

26

24

25

Α

Yes.

```
0000074
```

packet of materials here and see if you see it?
Yes.

(No omissions.)

```
Find it?
2
        Yes.
            MR. NEGUS: Perhaps we could have this separately
3
    marked when we get a chance.
            THE CLERK: Counsel, that will H-1-C.
5
            MR. NEGUS: H-1-C? Okay.
6
        (BY MR. NEGUS:) And could you look at that document
7
       which we will have marked as H-1-C and indicate whether
8
       or not while you were on shift he was given any pain
9
10
        pills?
       No. But he received -- he received some at 6:20 in
11
        the morning just ten minutes before I was in the room.
12
        And that was a half a grain of codeine?
13
14
        That's correct.
        Is that a particularly large amount of pain killer?
15
16
        That's a normal dose.
        A normal dose?
17
18
        Yes.
       Would that amount of pain -- you're generally familiar
19
       with the effects of the drugs that are commonly
20
        administered to people as part of your medical training?
21
22
        Right.
        Would that amount of codeine make -- what effect would
23
        that have on consciousness of the person?
24
        It can decrease the consciousness. Everybody reacts
25
        differently to pain medication and some people react
26
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

19

more severely than others. And that's why when we give pain medication we have to observe very closely to see how a patient responds to medication.

Also, Josh had been under anesthesia the previous evening and the effects are sometimes lasting and, you know, cumulative also.

- Q. As far as you could tell in examining Josh, what effects was it having on his consciousness?
- A. It helped relieve his pain and made him somewhat drowsy.
- Q As you previously described?
- 11 A. Right.
- 12 Q As part of your duty as a nurse, do you also record
 13 the contacts of outside people with Joshua?
- 14 A. We're supposed to.
- 15 Q Did you?
- 16 A. Part of the time. I can't say I may have wrote every
 17 single time someone came in and out of the door, but
 18 hopefully --
 - Q If anybody was there for a visit, you would know that?
- 20 A. Right. And I hopefully put it all in.
- 21 Q For example, did you put that at eleven o'clock the 22 6th that Josh's grandmother and his uncle came in?
- 23 A. At what time? Six in the morning?
- 24 Q No, eleven o'clock, looking at your chart there.
- 25 A. See, this is actually the other front side of this and it comes out like this.

- 1 Q If you place it together as I'm doing here, does that
 2 give you an approximate time for the area of the comments?
- 3 A Eleven o'clock.
- And then did you also note a time that a detective
 was questioning Josh on the 6th?
- 6 A Yes, at one o'clock.
- 7 Q And were you in the room when the detective was 8 questioning Josh?
- 9 A Yes, I was.
- 10 Q Looking at Exhibit H-17 on the board behind you there,
- does that appear to be a schematic drawn of Joshua's
- 12 room?
- 13 A. Fair.
- 14 Q You have B for beds, and the two bracketed lines would
 15 indicate the doorway and a T.V. Is that basically --
- 16 A That's correct.
- 17 Q And the B with the J under it, is that the bed that

 18 Josh was in?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q When the detective was questioning Josh, was he
 21 approximately at the spot marked X?
- 22 A Approximately.
- 23 Q Was he standing, seated, how was he?
- 24 A Standing.
- 25 Q Where were you during this particular point in time?
- 26 A I was doing all kinds of things in the room, so I was

2

3

5

6

25

26

probably walking around, not just sitting in one -- we had this bed kind of pushed to the side and I had my desk, a table where I was charting over from his bedside where it probably was where that bed is.

- Q Could you in red sort of rearrange the room as you had it and then put also the D for desk in there?
- 7 A Okay. We just moved this bed over about right here and
 8 then we had the desk set up here, actually about like
 9 that, facing Josh with a chair so that we weren't just
 10 hovering over him that we could observe him.
- 11 Q Could you scratch out the incorrect orientation of the
 12 desk there and just leave the --
- 13 A. I don't know how to do it. How about if I just fill it in?
- 15 Q All right. Next to that could you put D for desk?
- 16 A (The witness complies.)
- 17 Q B for bed at the spot that you moved the bed.
- 18 A (The witness complies.)
- Now, during the time that you were attending Josh there
 when the detective came in, was this the first time
 the detective had come in that you knew of?
- 22 A My memory is really faulty. It was a long time ago.
 23 And if I'm, you know, to believe my charting, that's
 24 what I would say. But I really cannot remember correctly.
 - Q As the detective was talking to Josh, were you in fact making any effort as to not sort of pay attention to what

was being said?

2 A. Yes, I was.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

Q And why was that?

A Just personal conviction on my -- I didn't feel that the legal end was my job. I felt that my job was taking care of Josh. I was observing Josh very closely and hawkishly to make sure that he was not upset or badgered in any way.

Q Did the detective that was communicating with Josh, did he seem to Josh well and establish a good rapport with him?

- A. That's mainly what he was doing was establishing a rapport with Josh, and he was just very kind and gentle with him.
- Q During the time that you were taking care of Josh, did you in fact observe Josh to communicate to the detective any information which you did pick up?
- A. Yes.

19 Q What was that information?

MR. KOCHIS: I would object, vague as to time. Just the day. I can't tell from the question where we are.

THE COURT: Pin it down. I thought we had that established.

(BY MR. NEGUS:) Essentially the only time that you were taking care of Josh was June 6th and June 7th; is that correct?

22

23

24 25

A That's correct.

Now, on June 6th or on June 7th, do you know when you picked up this information from the detective talking to Josh?

5 A. Truthfully I can't really remember which day. It would have been one of those days.

Q One of those two days? Okay. And you worked the swing shift both times?

9 A That's correct.

Q So it would have been between six in the morning and two in the afternoon on one of those two days?

12 A. Well, I worked from six in the morning until four-thirty
13 in the afternoon.

a Excuse me. So six to four-thirty?

A That's correct.

What information did you observe Josh to communicate to
 the detective?

Mainly what I overheard would be what the detective would have repeated out loud, you know. I couldn't really tell, you know, Josh could not speak out loud. So I could not hear him speaking. And I was really not —
I was trying to avoid, you know, paying that much attention to the legal end. But I overheard something about —

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, at this point I'd interpose an objection of no foundation, if she's not paying attention

to the patient. I was paying attention to the patient. THE WITNESS: 2 THE COURT: Overruled, Counsel. But I wasn't necessarily reading his THE WITNESS: lips at all times. 5 What did you hear being discussed from (BY MR. NEGUS:) 6 the detective? I heard something about -- I know I naturally heard 8 the questions that he asked and I'm not sure what you're 9 getting at. 10 Did the detective ask any questions about suspects? 11 Yes, he did. 12 And in his follow-up questions, did he indicate something 13 about -- did he confirm a description that Josh had 14 given of a suspect? 15 Confirm I cannot say. Josh was acting very puzzled 16 and he was shrugging his shoulders and seemed bewildered, 17 so I don't know -- I heard a description of one person, 18 a Mexican in a red shirt. 19 And did that come from the detective pertaining to Josh? 20 21 Yes. Did you hear Josh or any questions about the crime itself; 22 that is, the violence that had been done to Josh's 23 family? 24 25 Do you recall a question about Josh's mother screaming?

```
I recall that -- I believe that at the time Josh's
1
        grandmother was in the room and that she was asking him
2
        some questions about what happened and he said that
3
        he was -- he woke up, he was asleep and he woke up
        hearing his mother screaming.
        Did you talk to Mr. Forbush back in October?
        Yes, I did.
7
        In October was your memory better than it is now?
        I don't know.
        Do you know?
10
        I was very upset when I was talking to Mr. Forbush.
11
        Do you remember telling Mr. Forbush that the statements
12
        about Josh hearing his mother screaming and Josh
13
        attacking somebody with his fists were made to the
14
        detective?
15
            MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I would object.
16
    leading and suggestive.
17
            MR. NEGUS: Prior inconsistent statement.
18
            MR. KOCHIS: Again, there's no showing that she's
19
    being evasive. She simply can't recall.
20
            THE COURT: Not as a prior inconsistent -- are you
21
    attempting to refresh her memory or impeach her?
22
                        Impeach her.
            MR. NEGUS:
23
            THE COURT: All right. That's permitted. Overruled.
24
        (BY MR. NEGUS:) Did you say that to Mr. Forbush?
25
```

Did I say something about Josh's using his fists?

- Q Did you tell Mr. Forbush that Josh told the detective about his mother screaming?
- A I don't remember whether I told him he told the detective.
- Q Did you tell Mr. Forbush that Josh told the detective about hitting the assailants?
- A. The only --

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I'm going to object. That question is vague as to time. My offer of proof would be that may relate to a conversation that took place much later in time. I'm aware at least through an interview of at least possibly two different periods of time. I'm not sure she's talking about the 6th or a later period of time when there was a television set involved.

THE COURT: She's describing what occurred at one conversation. We don't know whether it was the 6th or 7th, as I understand it. But we're not talking about some later period subsequent to those dates.

Is that correct, ma'am?

THE WITNESS: Well, Josh did -- one time I went down to visit him at --

THE COURT: Okay. There was another time after the 7th of June that you also talked with Josh?

THE WITNESS: Right.

THE COURT: Is it possible that some of these statements that are coming out now may have occurred on that occasion?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) The time that you're talking about after Joshua had left your unit was when Josh was watching television with his grandmother; is that correct?

- A That's correct, and he was on the pediatric unit.
- Q So he was down on the fifth floor rather than up on the eighth floor?
- 9 A. Right.

- 10 Q At that time Detective O'Campo was not there; is that
 11 correct?
- 12 A I don't believe he was.
 - Q I'm getting back then to the conversation with Detective O'Campo that you overheard and I'm now also talking to you about what you observed about Mr. Forbush in October about that conversation. Did you tell Mr. Forbush in October that Josh had told O'Campo that he had attacked, Josh attacked his attackers with his fists?
 - A. I don't recall that.

(No omissions.)

THE COURT: Excuse me. If I might interrupt, I'm not trying to hasten your examination, but I remind you I cannot go beyond 12:00 today.

MR. NEGUS: I'm sure we will have to bring her back.

THE COURT: I have a medical appointment myself at noon. I simply can't go beyond 12:00.

MR. NEGUS: Let me ask one more question on this line and then we can break.

THE COURT: I'm not trying to break early. I just want you to know that. She may have had a tight schedule this afternoon. I don't know.

MR. NEGUS: I warned her.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Did you tell Mr. Forbush in October that in relating this, you thought that Josh had confused two separate instances, one where he saw some Mexicans and one where he was talking about his mother.
- A I remember telling him I thought he confused some incidences, but those two things were not the ones that I was talking about. I just felt that he really was not recalling appropriately what had happened.
- Q By the way, did Mr. Forbush tape record your conversation?
- A Yes, he did.

MR. NEGUS: We can break now and I will come back to this afterwards.

THE COURT: You want to break right now?

MR. NEGUS: Sure.

THE COURT: I regret having to have you come back.

THE WITNESS: That's okay.

THE COURT: It's a particularly long period. I indicated to counsel earlier I would have to break until 2:00. We will recess for noon until the hour of 2:00 p.m.

MR. KOCHIS: Before you leave the bench, I would at this time be alerting the Court that I would be moving at 1:30 or move at this point for discovery of the transcript Mr. Negus has of his interview of Mr. Forbush of Linda Headley. He put the witness on the stand. He is going to examine her, and I feel to adequately cross-examine her, I'm entitled to it.

THE COURT: All right. I will take it up this afternoon, Mr. Negus.

MR. NEGUS: I think that that's unconstitutional.

THE COURT: Well, now, there is a particular provision.

MR. KOCHIS: I will have that at 1:30.

THE COURT: There is particular authority for some discovery.

MR. NEGUS: That's in the Supreme Court right now.
(Noon recess.)

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1984; 2:00 P.M.

DEPARTMENT NO. 10 HON. RICHARD C. GARNDER, JUDGE

(Appearances as heretofore noted.)

THE COURT: All right. Everybody is again assembled.

Just for the record, state your name once again.

THE WITNESS: Linda Headley.

THE COURT: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (RESUMED)

BY MR. NEGUS:

- Q Mrs. Headley, the detective that was visiting Josh and establishing a rapport with him was Detective Hector O'Campo, is that correct?
- A That's correct.
- Q Did Mr. Forbush, when he spoke to you in October, ask you, "Taking into consideration that we do not know -- that you do not know what was said on the first or second day, but generally what might have been said or what was said during those times, can you recall some of those things?" And did you answer him. "Yes. Well, Josh, I think, was real confused about what happened. He, I think, might have been relating two different incidences together. He remembered he was in his room asleep and he remembered his mother screaming and he ran in, into where his mother was

screaming, and he said it was dark and he couldn't really see, and he said he was -- that he ran up and was trying to beat somebody with his fists because his mother was screaming, and he said that he thought maybe it was three men and it was dark and he couldn't see."

- A No, I did not say that altogether like that. I said
 those things, but not altogether like that. In different
 relating two different things that he said at different
 times.
- Q Did you say that in answer, just in this straight narrative form the way I asked the question to you, in answer to one question by Mr. Forbush?
- A I don't remember.

- Q Did Mr. Forbush ask you, "Can you recall if he made any particular reference to race or nationality of the men?" And you answered, "He said that he couldn't see well enough and he thought that maybe one of them might have been Mexican."
- A I don't believe I stated it just like that. I said that one time during the questioning that he had mentioned a man in a red shirt and he said that he was a Mexican.
- Q Did Mr. Forbush ask you, "Now, you said earlier that, in prefacing what you have just stated, that you felt he had perhaps two incidences confused?" And did you

answer, "Uh-huh." And then did Mr. Forbush then ask you, "With each other. And can you explain what you meant by that?" And did you answer, "Well, he said that well, I don't know that he had them confused or he was just putting them together. He said that earlier that evening before this, the incident happened, that him and his family were driving back from somewhere and somebody stopped them at the side of the road and asked them questions, and he said he didn't know what it was about. He said his dad went and talked to these, he thought it was three boys."

MR. KOCHIS: Objection. Compound.

THE COURT: He purports it to be one answer to one question thus tied together.

MR. KOCHIS: I believe that was the case with the previous sequence, but what he just read to this witness was a series, if my memory serves me correctly, of questions and answers.

THE COURT: Is that the case?

MR. NEGUS: There was one question with "uh-huh" in the middle of it and then that answer that I read was one answer.

THE COURT: What is your question to her, did you so answer, in effect?

Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Is that what you said?

THE COURT: Is that what you said?

THE WITNESS: I can't even remember now what all you said. I'm sorry. But if I had a copy of what I said, you know, since it was tape recorded, could I have a wordfor-word copy of what I said.

THE COURT: We don't want you to assume that you said anything. He is simply trying to ask you do you know remember saying that.

THE WITNESS: It was a long time ago.

THE COURT: All right.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Then is the answer that you don't remember if you said that or not?
- A I remember saying something about that.
- Do you remember Mr. Forbush asking you, "And were they Mexican guys or were they described in some particular way?" And you answering, "Yeah. I know it. I know he said at least one of them was Mexican and I don't remember if he said that he knew what the other two were. And, anyway, he said that he thought maybe it was them, you know, that had been there and done, you know, what happened."
- 21 A I never said that, no.
 - Q Were you happy about talking to Mr. Forbush?
- 23 A No. I felt tricked into it.
 - Q Why were you tricked?
 - A I'm loyal to where I work. I have worked there a long time. But hospital administration called me down into

one of those offices which I've never been called by a hospital administration before, and told me that I needed to answer some routine questions about the investigation into this case. I felt, No. 1, I was being paid -- this was on hospital time. I was called by hospital administration, in, you know, and I never was talked to by anyone from the hospital. They told me -- except for the secretary. She said, "You are to be in such and such room." So I knew nothing about what was going on, who was doing the questioning until I got there, and at that time I was under the impression that I had to talk to him.

- Q Did Mr. Forbush tell you you had to talk to him?
- A No, he did not.

Q Mr. Forbush had scheduled interviews with probably 20 or 30 different people, is that correct?

MR. KOCHIS: Objection. No foundation. Calls for speculation.

THE COURT: If you know, you may answer. Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I know that there were several people from the hospital that was scheduled to talk to him. I don't know how many.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Some of them talked to him and some of them didn't, is that true?
- A I have no idea.
- Q On December 29, did Mr. Arthur, sitting here at counsel

1	table, come out to the hospital and talk to you?
2	A I couldn't say the date for sure but on one occasion he
3	did, yes.
4	Q Did he tape record your conversation?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Did he tell you why he wanted to talk to you?
7	MR. KOCHIS: Objection. Irrelevant. It calls for
8	hearsay.
9	THE COURT: We are in an area of credibility and
10	to some extent the foundation is important. Overruled.
11	THE WITNESS: I believe he did and I can't remember
12	his exact words.
13	Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) What was the general sense?
14	A Just also investigation into, you know, what happpened.
15	Q Did you feel any reluctance to talk to Sergeant Arthur?
16	A A little.
17	Q Did you nonetheless do it?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Were you ordered to by the hospital administration?
20	A Not at all.
21	(No omissions.)
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
Was it on hospital time?
       Yes, it was.
       Was it essentially the same room as you talked to Mr.
3
        Forbush?
5
        No, it was not.
       Did Sergeant Arthur explain to you that the Prosecution
       was not entitled to interviews done by the Defense?
7
            MR. KOCHIS: Objection. It's leading and suggestive,
8
        it's not relevant, calls for hearsay.
9
10
            THE COURT: Sustained.
        (BY MR. NEGUS:) Did Sergeant Arthur tell you anything
11
        about the discovery of the tape that you'd given to
12
13
        Mr. Forbush?
            MR. KOCHIS: Again, I would object. It's not
14
    relevant and it calls for hearsay.
15
            THE COURT: No. Overruled.
16
                                           I don't know.
            THE WITNESS: Am I to answer?
17
                             I'm sorry.
18
            MR. NEGUS: Yes.
19
            THE COURT: You may.
            THE WITNESS: I told him that I had been recorded
20
21
    previously.
        (BY MR. NEGUS:) Did he tell you anything about whether
22
        he had access to that tape?
23
            He didn't have access to it as far as I know.
24
        Is that what he told you?
25
26
        I believe so.
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

26

Q Did he ask you a series of questions about what you had told Mr. Forbush?

MR. KOCHIS: Again, I would object as not being relevant.

THE COURT: It is relevant, sir. Overruled. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question?

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Did Sergeant Arthur ask you a series of questions about what you told Mr. Forbush?
- A Well, I believe so.
- 11 Q Did he ask you questions about your attitude toward Mr.

 12 Forbush?
 - A I volunteered that information. It wasn't -- it's not my attitudes towards Mr. Forbush. He was very nice during the interview. It was my attitude mainly towards the hospital. I didn't feel that he particularly tricked me. I felt that it was the hospital.
 - Q Do you read the Sun Telegram?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q The day that Sergeant Arthur talked to you, had you seen the story that morning about this case?
- 22 A. No, I had not. I don't get the Sun Telegram personally,
 23 and I read it like when I go to my mother's house or -24 I don't get any newspaper.
 - Q You had not read the story about Josh Ryen that appeared in the Sun Telegram that particular morning?

```
No, I had not. I'd been at work all day.
        Did Sergeant Arthur tell you that your name had come up
2
        in the course of the Preliminary Hearing?
        Yes, he did.
        Did he tell you that statements attributed to you
5
        contradicted the testimony of Mr. O'Campo?
        No, he did not.
        Did he indicate to you anything about the testimony
        of Mr. O'Campo?
        No, he did not.
10
        Was Dr. Mary Howell present in the room when Detective
11
        O'Campo was talking to Josh on June the 6th?
12
        I don't remember.
13
        In your chart -- do you still have your chart before
14
        you? At eleven o'clock you have Dr. Howell check in;
15
        is that correct?
16
            MR. KOCHIS: Objection, it's leading and suggestive
17
            It's his witness.
18
    again.
            THE COURT: That's foundational, however. You may
19
20
    answer.
            THE WITNESS: I have what?
21
        (BY MR. NEGUS:) On the chart at eleven o'clock you have
22
        Dr. Howell and Mr. Ryen, grandmother and uncle?
23
        On the 7th?
24
        On the 6th, June 6th.
25
```

Oh, I do. It's hard to see this from back to --

- 1 Q I realize that, but that's the way they gave it to us.
- 2 A. No. Where is eleven o'clock?
- 3 Q Comes in blocks of four, right?
- A. Right. So four up from the bottom, one, two, three, four.
- 6 0. Would be eleven o'clock?
- 7 A. Oh, I see. It's this direction. Okay. Yes, I have the grandmother and uncle were in the room.
- 9 Q There's no sign that they left the room on those four lines on that page; is that right?
- 11 A. That's correct. But that doesn't mean they did not leave.
- 13 Q Let's just go on looking over at the next page, which
 14 is still June 6th. At the end of your shift there's
 15 an indication that the grandmother is still at the
 16 bedside; is that correct?
- 17 A. There's an indication that the grandmother is at the
 18 bedside, and I would interpret that she was at the
 19 bedside again.
- 20 Q Well, that's not made by yourself, is it?
- 21 A. What's not made by myself?
- 22 Q The indication that grandmother is at the bedside.
- 23 That's made by a Shirley Barnett; is that correct?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 Q And there's no indication in your notes above that that the grandmother entered the room; is that correct?

- A. That's because she probably just entered at this time when Shirley made the notation.
- 3 Q It says grandmother at bedside, officer in room.
- 4 Does that mean the officer just entered the room as well?
- 5 A No. it does not.
- 6 Q Dr. Howell was at Josh's bedside during the day almost constantly; isn't that correct?
- 8 A No. She was in and out of the room.
- 9 Q When Dr. Howell was with Josh, where was she seated?
 10 Where was she?
- 11 A. Where was she? Well, she was at different places at
 12 different times, but mostly she was over nearest to me,
 13 this side.
- 14 Q Could you put a GM for grandmother?
- 15 A. Okay. That's only saying she was there at one time.

 16 She at other times may have been on this side or at the foot of the bed.
 - Q Just put the spot where she was most regularly.
 - A. (The witness complies.)

19

24

25

- 20 Q Do you recall Mr. O'Campo was talking to Josh at the
 21 time when you heard the information about the Mexicans
 22 that O'Campo asked Josh how many there were and that
 23 Josh put up three fingers?
 - At the time that he was talking about the one that he said was a Mexican in a red shirt, he held up three fingers.

- 1 Q And then Josh would go into -- then he went into what
 2 the people were wearing?
- 3 A. He said a red shirt. He said one was a red shirt.
- 4 Q You remember at least that much?
- 5 A Yes.
- There may have been more, but that's what you can remember?
- 8 A. That's what I remember.
- 9 Q And did they go into age, like high school age or
 10 O'Campo's age? Did he give him that sort of selections
 11 to make?
- 12 A He did, but I don't remember what he said.
- 13 Q And did O'Campo ask Josh about beards or moustaches on people?
- 15 | A. I believe he did.
- When Mr. Forbush was at the hospital in October, do you know if he and administration were attempting to coordinate so that there would be as little disruption of the hospital routine as possible?
- 20 A. That would be purely conjecture on my part. I mean,
 21 I don't understand what you mean.
 - When you were told to go down to see Mr. Forbush, did the hospital people indicate that they were trying to arrange things in such a way as to minimize the inconvenience to the running of the hospital in doing these interviews?

22

23

24

```
1 A. Nobody told me that. I mean, it would be purely
2 conjecture on my part.
```

- 3 Q On June the 7th, did Detective O'Campo take Joshua's fingerprints?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q Did somebody take Joshua's fingerprints?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 0 Who was that?
- 9 A I don't know.
- 10 Q Was the time that Joshua's fingerprints were taken,
- was that the same time as the interview about the
- suspects or a different time?
- 13 A That was a different time.
- 14 Q That would have been the next day?
- 15 A. Right.
- 16 Q So then the interview of the suspects would have been
 17 June the 6th?
- 18 A. It would have been a different time. I don't know whether it's the 6th or the 7th.
- 20 Q Do you have in your shift a Detective O'Campo logged in
 21 any other time except the time that you have him
 22 questioning Josh on June the 6th and the time that you
 23 have fingerprints being taken on June the 7th?
- 24 A This is so hard to follow.
- 25 Q It's your administration.
- 26 A. No. Our flow-sheet goes out this way so this is front

	7
ſ	
	1
	j
· · ·	

and back like this. It's not only front and back, it's 1 upside down on one side. So I'm getting confused. 2 3 I appreciate the problem. I can't even tell by this what day this is. I show you a Xerox, if Counsel has no objection. 5 MR. KOCHIS: I have no objection. 6 THE COURT: She may have found it herself. 7 Oh, okay. MR. NEGUS: THE WITNESS: What was the question? (BY MR. NEGUS:) The only two times that you have that 10 you logged in that detectives were there were on the 11 6th when you have Josh answering questions and mouthing 12 words and writing and on the 7th, at which time he's 13 being fingerprinted by detectives; is that correct? 14 That's correct. 15 And then in the afternoon on the 7th, right after the 16 fingerprinting, was the time that Dr. Howell and Dr. 17 Jorgenson informed Josh about the death of his parents; 18 is that right? 19 20 That's correct. So he would not have been interviewed that afternoon; 21 is that correct? 22 I don't know what happened after I left. 23 While you were there? 24

That wasn't the time that you heard the discussion about

While I was there, I believe.

26

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Mexicans was after Josh was informed about his parents; is that correct?

A That's correct.

MR. NEGUS: Thank you. I have nothing further.

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, pursuant to Penal Code
Section 1102.5, at this point I'm moving for discovery of
any statements that may have been reduced to writing that
were obtained by Mr. Forbush in October. And I'm also
moving for discovery of those on the further ground that
Mr. Negus attempted and didn't use those statements in court
to attempt to refresh this witness's recollection of the
past interview and to impeach her.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KOCHIS: I have a copy --

THE COURT: Are you resisting this motion, Mr.

Negus?

MR. NEGUS: Yes.

MR. KOCHIS: -- for the Court of this section.

THE COURT: I believe it applies to after direct examination and before he cross-examines the witness.

MR. NEGUS: That's a trial, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I beg your pardon?

MR. NEGUS: The section, if it's at all Constitutional

-- and its Constitutionality is before the California
Supreme Court in three cases -- only exists after the

26 Prosecution's rested, any 1118 motions have been adjudicated.

People vs. Collie --

THE COURT: It does speak to trial.

MR. KOCHIS: I have no problem with the first statement. The Code doesn't mention after 1118 motion, but as the Court recalls, we went in trial. We have entered into a stipulation that jeopardy has attached and that trial has begun, and Mr. Negus was very adamant about having that stipulation.

THE COURT: I would like to take a few minutes recess. Sorry to have to delay you, but I would like to study this a little more.

MR. NEGUS: <u>People v. Collie</u>, Cal. 3d. I believe it's 30 Cal. 3d. If not, plus or minus one volume. But I don't have the precise citation with me because I didn't realize we would have this problem.

THE COURT: I will see if I can find it. We will be in recess.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: Counsel, I suspect that -- I didn't check the time, but I probably didn't spend more than about ten minutes on this. I did not therefore, Shepardize Collie.

I found Collie. It's indeed cited in 30 Cal. 3d, 43. Collie is an October, 1981, decision by the Supreme Court, prior to the enactment of Penal Code Section 1102.5. It refers to many things and gives a history of prosecution and discovery, particularly analogizing to the erstwhile law we had relating to the discovery of alibi witnesses and the

20 R

 defendant's privilege against self-incrimination. That statute being enacted shortly thereafter I assume was designed to overcome the objections of the Supreme Court. I don't know that. And I do not have the legislative history in this chambers. So if you have any other authority, I would appreciate hearing it.

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I do not, and I'm obviously not going to have time, even if I receive the benefit of the Court's ruling, I would not have time to read it prior to conducting my cross-examination, so if the Court --

THE COURT: Will you yield, then?

MR. KOCHIS: Yes. What I would like to do is reserve further argument until I contact the other lawyers.

THE COURT: There may be other cases where it might come up and you might anticipate it for the next occasion.

Thank you, counsel. You may cross-examine.

MR. KOCHIS: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KOCHIS:

- Q Mrs. Headley, is it fair to say that in your own mind you were somewhat concerned about your memory of things that may have taken place over a year ago?
- A That's true.
- Q And as you sit here in this courtroom today under oath, are you skeptical of your ability to recall what took

place over a year ago.

THE COURT: counsel, how do you get over a year ago? 3 MR. KOCHIS: I'm sorry.

- (BY MR. KOCHIS:) Are you skeptical of your ability to recall events that took place in June of 1983?
- That's correct.
- 7 Is it fair to say that you are relying heavily on the few notes that you took in the hospital records? 8
 - A Yes.

2

4

5

6

9

- When Joshua Ryen stayed at your hospital in Loma Linda, 10 Q was he somewhat of a special patient? 11
- 12 Α Yes, he was.
- By that I mean did he attract some notoriety to the 13 Q hospital? 14
- Well, the case was in the papers and we tried to keep 15 his identity concealed. We had a private room for him 16 and there was, you know, a guard, an officer in the 17 room. 18
- 19 Q Perhaps what I'm getting at is did you discuss with other people employed at the hospital the fact that 20 you at one time attended to Joshua Ryen? 21
 - Α Yes.

- And were you aware of other people who likewise had 23 24 attended to Joshua Ryen at the hospital?
- Yes. I worked with several of them. 25
- Would you talk with the other employees at the hospital 26

	1	
1		about what you had observed Joshua's condition to be,
2		for example?
3	A	It's common when we get a report from one nurse to anothe
4		and also the way our unit is set up, our team leader,
5		we have to give a report on the physical conditon of the
6		patient.
7	Q	Would other hospital members from time to time talk
8		to you about contact that they had had with Joshua Ryen?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	When you first saw Joshua Ryen, did he appear to you
11		as a nurse to be in critical condition?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q	Did he appear to have severe wounds to certain portions
14		of his bedy?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Referring back to the records that are in front of
17		you, do you believe, to the best of your recollection,
18		that that was in June, on June the 6th?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	When you first saw Joshua, is it true that he was unable
21		to communicate verbally?
22	A	That's true.
23	Q	In fact, did he actually have a tube that entered his
24		body at the throat?
25	A	Yes, he did.
26	Q	When you first saw him on that first date, did he appear
İ		

to you to be in pain?

- A He had just been medicated just a few minutes before I came on. He was still having pain, but, you know, he was somewhat relieved of his pain.
- Q Did he appear to be in a state of shock?
- A Yes, he did.
 - Q Did he appear to be confused?
 - A He appeared very dazed.
 - Q Do you recall seeing Joshua's maternal grandmother,
 Mrs. Mary Howell, at the hospital during those first
 two days?
- 12 .A Yes.

2

3

· 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

- Q And on the 6th, was she in and out of Joshua's room?
- A Yes.
- Q Was she likewise in and out of Joshua's room on the 7th?
- A That's correct.
 - Q Mrs. Howell wasn't your patient on either of those days, was she?
- A No.
- Q Is it fair to say that you weren't keeping track of her in the hospital?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q Is it fair to say that you weren't keeping track of every time she entered Joshua's room and every time she exited?

1 A That's cor	cect	
----------------	------	--

- Q Now, do you recall Mrs. Howell from time to time attempting to communicate with Joshua?
- A Yes.

3

12

16

17

18

19

20

- 5 | Q Would she do that by talking to him?
- 6 A Yes
- 7 | Q Did you ever witness Joshua attempting to communicate 8 | back with her?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Would that have been in the fashion of attempting to
 11 mouth words?
 - A Yes. Also hand signals and the nodding of his head.
- 13 Q Now, when Detective O'Campo was at the hospital, did
 14 you meet him?
- 15 A Yes, I did.
 - Q Is there some confusion in your mind, looking back in time to June of 1983, as to who may have asked Josh Ryen a particular question, whether it was Dr. Mary Howell or whether it was Detective Hector O'Campo?
 - A Yes.
- Q Is there likewise some confusion in your mind as to who
 may have have obtained certain information from Josh
 Ryen, whether that was Dr. Mary Howell or whether that
 was Detective Hector O'Campo?
- 25 A Yes.
 - Q The hospital records that you have in front of you --

MR. KOCHIS: Excuse me, your Honor. If I could have a moment to orient myself with her copy.

THE COURT: Certainly. Take your time.

- Q (BY MR. KOCHIS:) You put in the record under "Comment" a brief note about patient answering questions of the detective. Do you see that on the chart?
- A Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

24

25

- Q And are you relying on that chart to recall, for example, if Dectective O'Campo talked to Joshua in your presence?
- A Yes.
 - Q Did you also indicate on the chart that Joshua responded by writing and mouthing words?
- A Yes, I did.
 - Q Is it fair to say that you didn't place any information anywhere on the hospital records as to what Detective O'Campo would have asked Joshua Ryen?
- 17 A That's correct.
- 18 Q And that's simply not part of your job, is it?
- 19 A That's right.
 - Q Is it also true to say that you didn't record in the hospital records any communication Josh Ryen may have had back towards Detective O'Campo?
- 23 A That's correct.
 - Q And according to your testimony this morning -- correct me if I'm wrong -- did Detective O'Campo, when you first saw him with Josh Ryen, spent most of his time trying

```
to establish some type of rapport with Josh?
```

A That's correct.

2

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

- Q I assume because Josh had a trach tube in his throat, that Detective O'Campo did all the talking?
- 5 A All the verbal talking.
- Q And then what you would have heard was Detective O'Campo trying to establish some type of rapport with Joshua Ryen?
- 9 A That's correct.
 - Q You also, I believe, in response to Mr. Negus' questions this morning, and correct me if I'm wrong, saw Joshua Ryen after he left your direct care in some other portion of the hospital, is that correct?
- 14 A That's correct.
 - Q And when you saw Joshua Ryen in another portion of the hospital, was Dr. Mary Howell in the room with him?
- 17 A Yes.
 - Q Do you recall whether or not she was talking with Joshua
 Ryen when you later saw him in another part of the
 hospital?
- 21 A Yes.
- Q Would that have been some period of time after the first two days that you had him in your custody?
- 24 A That's right.
- Q Is there perhaps, and correct me if I'm wrong, some confusion in your mind as to what may have been said or

what may have been communicated by Josh Ryen when his grandmother talked to him at a later time, as opposed to what he may have communicated during those first two days?

- A I'm sorry. I didn't follow that.
- Q When you saw Josh Ryen later in the hospital with Dr. Howell talking to him, did you take any notes of what they talked about?
- A No. I did not.
- Q Were you able to hear what they were talking about from time to time?
- 12 A Yes.

1

2

5

9

10

- Q Did Mrs. Howell appear to be asking Josh questions and
 Josh responding?
- 15 A Yes.
- Q Would you be able at this point to pinpoint what pieces
 of information came frm that interview, from that
 conversation as opposed to what pieces of information
 may have come from interviews on the first two days?
- 20 A Some of it, yes.
- 21 Q And some of it not?
- 22 A Possibly.
- Q Did you also talk to Detective O'Campo when he wasn't attempting to communicate with Josh Ryen?
- 25 A At the hospital?
- 26 Q Yes.

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Would that be, for example, when you would be perhaps
3		out of Joshua's immediate presence?
4	A	Well, sometime Josh would kind of doze off and
5.	Q	The two of you would talk?
6	A	Yes. Not particularly about Josh or anything about the
7		investigation, but more about just, you know, passing
8		time in the room.
9	Q	Is it fair to say that while you had care of Josh
10		Ryen during the first two days in June, that you had
11		responsibilities that would entail you not always being
12		at this bedside?
13	A	Not for very long at one time.
14	Q	For example, when Detective O'Campo was in the room
15		at the same time you were, would you be at times writing
16		notes in the chart, for example?
17	A	That's true.
18		(No omissions.)
19		
20		

```
1 Q I assume you had to look down when you did that?
```

2 A. That's true.

Q You wouldn't be looking at Josh Ryen at that time?

A. That's correct.

MR. KOCHIS: I have nothing else.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Negus.

7 8

3

5

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEGUS:

- 10 Q Mr. Kochis in his questioning suggested, and I believe 11 you agreed, that you might be confused about who said 12 what to Josh?
- 13 A. That's true.
- 14 Q Are you confused that it was Hector O'Campo -- are you
 15 confused as to whether it was Hector O'Campo who got the
 16 descriptions from Josh of the Mexican subjects?
- 17 A No.
- 18 Q That was O'Campo?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q And that's what you told to Mr. Forbush; is that right?
- 21 A I believe so.
- 22 | Q It's what you told to Sergeant Arthur?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q That's what you said consistently ever since?
- 25 A. I hope so. I'm feeling a little insecure about my
 26 memory at the moment.

Q.	But I take it that that particular thing is not the
	kind of thing that's easy to forget, at least O'Campo
	questioning Josh about suspects?

- A Right.
- Q. And you were never present at a later time when O*Campo and Dr. Jerry Hoyle from your hospital did a formal two-hour interview with Josh?
- A. Never.

MR. NEGUS: Thank you. I have nothing further.

MR. KOCHIS: I have no recross.

THE COURT: We thank you very much for your patience with us. You're free to leave. Any of your record that you brought with you you may take back. But not ours.

Counsel, did you want to go right on or would you like a recess?

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, there's a problem with the next witness. He apparently would like to be completed today, and I have no objection to us just starting.

MR. NEGUS: As long as I don't get killed by court personnel, I have no objection.

MR. KOCHIS: I forgot about that.

THE COURT: Let's just take about a five-minute recess just in case somebody wants to run away for just a little while.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: Next witness.

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

MR. NEGUS: Dr. Hoyle, Jerry Hoyle.

THE BAILIFF: Step up to the witness stand, raise your right hand to be sworn.

THE CLERK: Raise your right hand, please.

 $\underline{J} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{Y} \ \underline{H} \ \underline{O} \ \underline{Y} \ \underline{L} \ \underline{E}$, called as a witness by and on behalf of the Defense, was sworn and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear that 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.

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

THE WITNESS: Jerry Hoyle, H-o-y-l-e.

16

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEGUS:

- Q Dr. Hoyle, what's your occupation?
- 20 A I'm a clinical psychologist.
 - Q Are you connected with any particular medical facility?
 - A With the Loma Linda University Medical Center.
 - And in June of 1983, did you have a patient by the name of Josh Ryen?
- 25 A That's correct.
- 26 Q On the morning of June the 14th, 1983, did you have a

conference in which it was decided that Josh was well enough to undergo a formal interview with the sheriff's department?

- A. That's correct.
- Q Prior to making that decision, did you and Calvin Jackson have a brief conversation with Josh?
- A. Yes. That was a Craig Jackson, I believe, the social worker, and, yes, we had a talk with Josh.
- 9 Q During that talk did Josh spontaneously tell you information about the crime?
- 11 A About what? I'm sorry.
 - Q About the crime of which he'd been a victim.

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, at this point I'd object as not being relevant. If there's not a law enforcement officer present, how is it related to the <u>Hitch</u> issue? It calls for hearsay.

THE COURT: I don't wish to put words in Mr. Negus's mouth, but I believe his contention is that the officer in some way deliberately suppressed or concealed evidence in some way which he's attempting to establish by this witness. Do you want to modify it?

MR. NEGUS: No. I can tell you why I think the question is relevant.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. NEGUS: It is again, I believe -- what I believe the answer is going to be is that Dr. Hoyle did in fact have

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

24

25

26

that conversation with Josh, he did in fact spontaneously tell him things. Dr. Hoyle didn't take any notes of that conversation and Dr. Hoyle doesn't have any independent recollection of it. And the only thing that he has independent recollections of is the thing he took notes of.

Why I wanted to do it is because I believe he also would testify that he's not sure what Josh told him in the morning as opposed to what he told him --

THE COURT: Whatever Josh told him at whatever time, what's the relevancy of him --

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, hearing that offer of proof, I'm going to withdraw my objection. I'm sure if that offer of proof is anywhere accurate, I'm going to be going into the same area.

THE COURT: Proceed.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Do you now remember?
- 17 A. Repeat the question.
- 18 Q Do you remember what Josh told you about the crime on the morning of June the 14th when you talked to Craig Jackson?
- 21 A. No. I don't have any independent memory of that.
- 22 Q And you didn't take any notes of that?
- 23 A That's correct.
 - Q When Mr. O'Campo -- did Mr. O'Campo from the sheriff's department and yourself talk to Josh in the afternoon of June 14th?

- 1 A. That was in the afternoon of June 14th?
- 2 0 Yes.
- 3 A That's correct.
- 4 Q Where did that interview take place?
- 5 A It took place in the conference room, I believe, adjacent to Unit 5300 in the medical center.
- 7 Q During the course of that interview once the introductions
 8 had been -- once Josh had been as it were set up for
 9 the interview, did Mr. O'Campo do all the questioning?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q What was your role?
- 12 A. My role was simply there as one of emotional support as

 13 well as observer of Josh as he made his way through

 14 the interview for purposes of any kind of clinical

 15 follow-up that I would have to be involved in, let's

 16 say subsequent to his discussion of the incident.
- Were you particularly concerned to get the details of the crime down in your notes or anything like that?
- 19 A. That was not my intention.
- 20 Q Did you in fact take some notes of that interview?
- 21 A. Yes, I did.
- 22 | Q How long did that interview last?
- 23 A. I would only have a rough guess, but it could have been an hour and a half, it could have been an hour.
- 25 Q How many pages of notes did you take?
- 26 A. Two pages.

- 1 Q Showing you Exhibit H-2, is this a Xerox copy of the 2 original which you happen to have in front of you?
- 3 A Yes, that's correct.
- During the course of that interview, did Josh describe his being attacked?
- 6 A Yes. He made several references, I believe, to it.
- 7 1 In your notes have you indicated that he described his assailants either by the word they, them, or 'em at least six times?
- 10 A I haven't counted the number, but it could be something
 11 like that.
- 12 Q Included in that are some direct quotes, is that
 13 correct, from Josh?
- 14 & Fairly correct quotes, yes, a few of them.
- 15 Q For example --
- MR. NEGUS: Excuse me, Your Honor.
- 17 Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Did you quote Josh as saying they
 18 snuck up behind me and hit me?
- 19 1 That's correct.
- 20 And you have that in quotes as opposed to the rest of your notes?
- 22 L Yes, I do.

- Now, the first time that you have "they" in your notes
 is down at the bottom of the first page; is that correct?
- 25 L That's correct, I think.
 - And then after that you have in quotation marks "three

1 Mexicans"?

- 2 A. That's right.
- 3 Q Is that three Mexicans something that Josh said at the
 4 time that he was making that first statement, or is that
 5 something you added parenthetically later?
- 6 A. I don't remember.
- But the sentence is they, whatever, three Mexicans, parenthetically or not, chased us around the house.
 Is that what Josh said?
- 10 A. I don't recall whether or not he three Mexicans at that
 11 time.
- 12 Q So he either said "three Mexicans chased us around the house," or "they chased us around the house"?
- 14 A He could have said either one.
- On the second page you have an arrow with a statement leading to "saw MO," I take it meaning mother, "laying by desk"; is that correct?
- 18 A. That's right.
- 19 Q Does that mean that that statement "saw mother laying
 20 by desk" actually refers us to the statement from which
 21 the arrow emanates?
- 22 A Would you repeat that, please?
- 23 Q Well, are your notes basically in chronological order 24 of the way that Josh said them?
- 25 A. Basically, they are, yes.
- 26 Q Now, a lot of stuff that Josh said you didn't take notes

```
because it was of no clinical interest to you; is that
2
        right?
3
        Possibly, among other reasons.
        Whatever.
        Yeah.
5
        These two pages of notes that you took do not purport
6
        to be a complete record of what Josh said during that
7
        hour and a half or two hours' interview?
8
        No, I don't think so.
9
        Except for the sentence which is connected by an arrow
10
        and the possibility of the three Mexicans, are they in
11
        chronological order?
12
13
        Generally speaking, I think so.
            (No omissions.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
```

4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

At one point in time did Josh describe during that interview that he tried to fight them off, he tripped them up, they fell on their teeth, loosened them up?

- A That's correct.
- Q Was that of some clinical interest to you?
- A Not directly, no. Of course, I would have been interested in what initiative he might have taken to defend himself or something, yes.
- Q Did that statement in the context in which Josh made it sound like perhaps he was imagining that?

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I'm going to object. That calls for some speculation. The question itself, of course, is leading and suggestive. It's his witness.

THE COURT: I believe it does call for an expert opinion. I'm not sure you have laid the proper foundation.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Dr. Hoyle, how long have you been a clinical psychologist?
- A I have been licensed in California for approximately three years.
- Q And what background or training do you have in order to be a clinical psychologist?
- A Well, I have completed a Ph.D. with a two-year postdoctoral internship which requires taking licensing boards, oral and written boards in the State of California.
- Q Do you have a specialty within the field of clinical psychology, that is, you specialize in any particular

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

kind of patient?

- A Yes, I do.
- Q What is that?
- A I probably specialize in a number of areas. Stressrelated disorders. And I also spend a good share of my time in consult work with children in the hospital.

THE COURT: That's sufficient.

Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Did it appear to you during the interview that Josh was imagining in that particular description?

THE WITNESS: Well, your Honor, I'm a bit confused because I'm not clear whether or not I have been called today as an expert witness or as simply one who witnessed the facts of the interview.

THE COURT: Does the question itself in any way confuse you? For whatever role you are in, if you can answer the question, we will permit you to do so.

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, my initial objection would be that although he may be qualified as a psychologist, it would still call for speculation on his part as to whether or not that statement was a fantasy or some basis in fact.

THE COURT: There is a fine distinction between speculation and opinion which I'm unable to appreciate at the moment in this instance. The objection is still overruled. Doctor, if you can, will you try and answer the question.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

22 23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you recall it?

THE WITNESS: Would you repeat that.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Josh's description of trying to fight them off, how he tripped them up, how they fell on their teeth, that Josh bet that loosened them up, does that appear to you to be imagining?
- The fact that he attempted in some way perhaps to defend himself, that maybe he tripped someone up and they fell, those facts seem clear to me as factual. However, I do believe that he very likely inserted certain details into his account in order to make it complete because a child of nine years old, when asked a question by an adult, feels that he has to have some kind of an answer and I think he could have answered some questions filling in details that he may or may not have been clear about.

 Did Josh likewise describe to you a thought process that
- Q Did Josh likewise describe to you a thought process that Josh himself had gone through while he was hiding in the laundry room?
- A That's right.
- Q What was that?
- He stated that he ran to the laundry room to get something. He hid behind the door. He couldn't find anything in the laundry room. He didn't know, what if I would have killed him, or something, then I might get sued or get killed myself.
- Q In stating that, is that Josh telling his reasoning

there in the laundry room about whether to defend himself or not?

- A Yes, that's what it seems to me.
- Q Is there anything about that particular statement that might suggest in your expert opinion that Josh is trying to handle certain things psychologically rather than relating an actual thought process?
- A I'm not clear about that distinction you are making.
- Q Survivors of terrible crime, especially those in which their family has been killed, do they experience guilt?
- A That wouldn't be unusual. It's typical.
- Q Do people who experience guilt in that situation, especially if they are young impresionable eight or nine year olds, imagine in order to try to hide their guilt, they did things that in fact they did not do?

MR. KOCHIS: I object to that hypothetical because it assumes some facts that are not in evidence. There is no evidence as to those characteristics belonging to Josh Ryen.

THE COURT: Counsel, he has observed the subject here and I have permitted you to qualify him as an expert. He can give his opinion on what he observed and felt about the credibility, but to get off into generalization, I will sustain the objection to the present question.

Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Would Josh dealing with any feelings of guilt he might feel be consistent with him making up this thought process about worrying about being sued in

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

the	laundry	room or	bel	iev i ng	that	it wa	as t	rue	but	not
nece	essarily	having	gone	throug	gh tha	it on	the	nig	ht c	æ
the	crimes.									

- A I think what I have read here could have flashed through Josh's mind in a matter of seconds and only in retrospect is he verbalizing it as completely as he stated it to us. But I think it would be a normal kind of reaction for a child to have under the circumstance.
- At the end of the interview did Josh give a more, or give a complete, give a rather detailed description of the three Mexicans that he had met on Saturday evening?
- A That's right.

MR. NEGUS: At this point in time, your Honor, I would move to introduce Exhibit H-2, the doctor's notes, into evidence.

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I object. Hearsay.

THE COURT: Overruled. It will be received.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) On the beginning of November did you speak with me at that Loma Linda University facility in the company of Michael Gendler?
- 21 A Yes.
- Q Michael Gendler was or is, was and is the attorney for Dr. Mary Howell, is that correct?
- 24 A That's correct.
- Q At that point in time, did I ask for a copy of your notes?

A Yes.

Q

Q Did you give them to me?

MR. KOCHIS: Objection. How is that relevant?

THE COURT: It goes to bias and prejudice and interest.

Overruled. Did you, sir?

THE WITNESS: I provided you with the copy of two pages of my notes regarding the interview.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) You did? Didn't you in fact refuse to give me a copy of your notes?
- A I suppose we discussed it for a time, but I ended up giving you those notes, as I recall.
- Q Could you be mistaken?

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I'm having another problem with this area. This witness is not here with an attorney. There may be some patient-client privileges that may have existed at the time that may have affected his decision not to give something to Mr. Negus. He is the boy's therapist. There is a patient-therapist privilege.

THE COURT: Is so, sir, he can explain and you will get a chance to ask questions. Continue, please. The last question was could you be mistaken as to whether or not you gave him --

THE WITNESS: Yes, I could have been mistaken.

- (BY MR. NEGUS:) Didn't you read portions of the notes out loud to me?
- A That's correct.

Q And you felt that there were other portions of the notes that contained clinical impressions which the attorney -- excuse me -- the psychotherapist privilege -- let me start the whole question over.

Didn't you feel that there were clinical impressions on those notes that the psychotherapist-patient privilege prevented you from revealing to me?

- A That's correct.
- Q That was the reason for your procedure of reading parts of the notes but not letting me see or have copies of the actual pages?
- A That's the reason for reading them, and I remember that was discussed the issue of whether or not you could have copies and I do not recall whether or not we finally agreed to, but you presented me with a copy of them and I assumed that that was the way we resolved it.
- Q So because I handed you a copy of those notes today in court, that's why you assumed that I got them from you?
- A That's correct, because I don't recall the way we resolved that discussion.
- Q Do you remember that on December 29 Hector O'Campo, a deective from the San Bernardino Sheriff's office, came out and you handed him a copy of the notes?
- A That's correct.
- Q And then on February 1st a Detective Woods presented you with a release signed by Dr. Mary Howell and you again

preser	nted	him	with	a	сору	of	the	notes,	is	that	correct?
-											

- A I only recall one of those instances. I don't recall that there were two, but I do recall that at least one occasion I gave him a copy with a signed release.
- Q Did you also give a copy to the Sheriff's office without a signed release?
- A I don't recall that I did.
 - Q Do you have a copy of the signed release?
 - A I don't know that I have it with me. It could be a part of the complete clinical record which I didn't bring.

MR. NEGUS: Nothing further.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KOCHIS:

- Q Dr. Hoyle, on the 14th, in the second interview with Joshua, the interview that took place with you and Detective O'Campo, do you recall the seating arrangement of the persons in that interview?
- 20 A I believe I can.
 - Q Was Detective O'Campo essentially seated on a bed next to Joshua?
 - A No. I believe the interview took place in an adjacent room, either a conference room or a children's play room adjacent to a patient room.
 - Q Were you seated behind Detective O'Campo and Josh Ryen

during the interview?

- 2 A No, I wasn't.
- Q Was Detective O'Campo seated closer to Joshua Ryen than you were?
- 5 A I think so.
- Q Is it fair to say that you were at the second interview,
 the interview with Josh Ryen and Detective O'Campo,
 solely for the purpose of supporting Joshua emotionally?
 - A That's true.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q And you were also there to be aware of his reaction to his attempting to recover some type of memory of what took place in the house?
- A That's correct.
 - Q Is it also true that your purpose for being there, at least in your own mind, was not to obtain accurate information about what happened in Josh Ryen's house?
- A That's correct.
 - I believe you testified on direct examination by
 Mr. Negus, and correct me if I'm wrong, that you
 cannot recall what information passed during the interview with Josh Ryen and Mr. Jackson and the information
 that passed during the second interview. Would that
 be fair to say?
- A Well, correct. If I understand your question correctly, it would be yes to the first part. I don't recall any comments nor did I make any notes about comments that

```
Joshua made of the incident during the first interview
         that I and Craig Jackson had with Josh.
2
                             (No omissions.)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
```

So is it fair to say that when you sat in the room with Detective O'Campo during the second interview you already had some information from Joshua as to what he recalled taking place in his parents' home?

A. I had some.

Is it possible that that information that you had prior to the time O'Campo started his interview affected the manner in which you tooks notes?

· 7

A. I don't think it would have had a large effect.

Is it true that during your interview with Josh Ryen
that was conducted by Detective O'Campo that Josh Ryen
never described actually seeing anybody inside the house

when this incident took place?

A. That's correct.

 Did you place an assessment that Joshua assumed that some people he would later describe were in the house and responsible for this event?

MR. NEGUS: Objection. I think that is something outside the doctor's expertise, because he particularly stated that he was not trying to evaluate the circumstances of the crime. So his assessment would be irrelevant.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer that, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay.

- Q (BY MR. KOCHIS:) Now the problem is do you have the question in mind?
- A. No. Would you repeat it, please.

and the second like

2

3

•5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Q Did it appear to you that Joshua assumed -- let me break that down.

In the interview did Joshua describe three male persons who came to the house prior to the time that his parents and he left for a barbecue?

- A. That's right.
- Q Did he describe them as people of Hispanic heritage or Mexican?
- 9 A. That's right.
 - Q In fact did you include portions of those descriptions in your notes?
- 12 A Yes, I did.
 - Q And did it appear to you in evaluating the interview that Joshua assumed that these persons were the ones responsible for what happened to him and his parents?

MR. NEGUS: Objection. Again, I think that calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Overruled. Did it?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I didn't catch what just happened.

THE COURT: Let's read it back, Mr. Kochis, because in repeating you've been coming up with different questions.

Perhaps --

MR. KOCHIS: Well, it's easier for me to reask it and I'll attempt to.

THE COURT: Every time you reask it I get another

22 23

24 25

Suit yourself. objection. (BY MR. KOCHIS:) Did it appear to you that Joshua 2 assumed those people were responsible for committing 3 those acts on his family? 4 I didn't understand the last two or three words that 5 6 you just said. MR. NEGUS: Before he asks the question, could I 7 object to it, because I know I'm going to object. 8 THE COURT: You didn't want to disappoint me, Mr. 9 10 Negus? I didn't want to disappoint you, Your 11 MR. NEGUS: Mr. Kochis has changed it. I'll object now. 12 Honor. MR. KOCHIS: I want to ask a question in another 13 14 area. (BY MR. KOCHIS:) Doctor, do you have a hearing problem 15 16 at all? Well, no, I don't. Your voice trailed off on those 17 last three words and I just didn't catch what you said. 18 Directing your attention back to the Mexican males 19 Joshua described sitting at his parents' house before 20 they left for the barbecue, do you have those three 21 22 people in mind? 23 Right. Did it appear to you during the interview that Joshua 24

assumed those three male Mexicans were the persons

responsible for committing these acts on his family?

25 26

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

MR. NEGUS: Objection.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes, it did appear that to me.

Q (BY MR. KOCHIS:) That assumes that you noted -- let me strike that and start over.

One of the reasons you took notes was to assist you in your clinical observations. Would that be fair to say?

- 9 A That's right.
- 10 0 You're not a stenographer?
- 11 A. That's right.
- 12 Q You weren't taking things down word for word?
- 13 A. No. I wasn't.
- 14 Q Would you take notes that would later help you recall,
 15 trigger your memory, as to things that were important
 16 in your clinical observations?
- 17 A. That's right.
- 18 Q Would those include, for example, assumptions Joshua
 19 was making?
- 20 A. Sure.
- 21 Q Could that have affected -- let me strike that and start
 22 over.

Would you have on your notes made some type of writing that would have allowed you later to recall that in your clinical observation, in your clinical asssessment, that Joshua was making an assumption?

24

23

- A I didn't make any such notes about assumptions on my paper.
- Could you have been putting Joshua's assumptions as opposed to what he actually said in your notes in your interview?
- A. I think my notes are largely based upon the information that he stated, and if there are one or two occasions in which I inserted something parenthetically, it would be an exception.
- When you talk about inserting parenthetically, in nuts and bolts terms what are you talking about?
- A Well, I'm talking about, for instance, my own observations of him behaviorally as he sat there and talked, my own questions, about the accuracy perhaps of some of the details perhaps that he was giving. And then it occurs to me that in this one case I may have inserted parenthetically quotes three Mexicans as a way of referring to who I think he meant when he used the word they. But I testified earlier that that sentence could have come out either way and I don't remember.
- Did you also in the interview, for example on Page 2 when you were referring to Joshua's recollection of the events, use a singular pronoun as opposed to a plural pronoun?
- A. I'm sorry. Did I ever notice that he did it that way or did I ever write it?

Q Did you ever write it down singularly?

2 A I'll have to review that.

Doctor, directing your attention to the exhibit Mr. Negus has marked Page 2, for example, on the second page approximately half way down the page on a line underneath the word that you wrote "sigh," did you indicate at that point?

A. Yes, I see that I said "if I'd killed him or something
I might get sued."

- Q This assailant or assailants that Joshua was assuming were in the house, would he refer to them both in the singular and the plural during the interview, or do you recall?
- A. Well, the only thing I can recall is what's on the note here, and in one case it appears that I've referred to him in the singular, which I just read, and in other cases in the plural.
- Q Do you recall when Detective O'Campo started the interview whether he started with Joshua's recollection of what happened when he woke up in response to his mother's screams, or if he started at some earlier point in time?
- A Well, he started out the interview actually Saturday.

 I think he even talked to him in general about lots of other things, about his routine at home. So we started out well in advance of the night of the incident.
- Q So in terms of chronology of the incidents, it's your

recollection that Detective O'Campo started discussing
what took place perhaps earlier on Saturday in the
morning?

- A Saturday morning.
- 5 Q And then progressed on through Saturday?
- 6 A That's right.

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Now, when the topic of the three Mexicans came up, was that after Detective O'Campo had interviewed Joshua about Joshua's recollection of the incidents he observed from the time his mother screamed until the time he got in the helicopter to go to Loma Linda?
- 12 A I'm not sure I understand.
- 13 Q Let me ask the question this way: Did Detective O'Campo

 14 in a question and answer format take Joshua through

 15 what Joshua recalled from the time his mother screamed,

 16 he woke up, and the time he was taken by a helicopter

 17 to the hospital?
 - A Yes, he did.
 - Q Do you recall after that sequence whether or not Detective O'Campo asked Joshua if Joshua had any idea who was responsible for these things?
 - A I believe that the notes that I made about that at the bottom of Page 2 contain some direct statements by Joshua, because there's all the detail there about what the men looked like. I may have inserted some other information parenthetically in that statement as well.

No, I can't recall those questions. 3 But as you indicated in your notes, Joshua apparently related that information and that those people came 5 Saturday as he and his family were leaving for the 6 7 party? Yes. 8 And is it true that after Joshua related that, he then 9 related a description of the people he saw outside his 10 house prior to the time his parents went to the party? 11 That's right. 12 Then was there a discussion between Joshua and Detective 13

O'Campo about what Johsua observed in terms of some

interaction between his father and those people?

Now, can you recall the question or questions that

triggered Joshua's response about the three Mexican men?

A. Yes.

14

15

16

21

22

23

24

25

- 17 | 0 You didn't make any notes on that?
- 18 A. I think -- I believe I noted that -- I think I noted

 19 somewhere that his father talked to them and he sent

 20 them away and didn't have any work for them.
 - And is that the extent of your recollection of the conversation between Josh and Detective O'Campo on that point?
 - A Well, I recall that he stated at some point that his father didn't like Mexicans and that he assumed these three men were angry because his father didn't give them

any work.

Did Joshua at any time during the interview describe actually seeing three white men inside the house attacking his family?

A. No.

Q Did Joshua at any time describe actually seeing three Mexican adults inside his house attacking his family?

A. No.

MR. KOCHIS: I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Redirect.

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEGUS:

- The first time that you used the word they or he or anything to describe the assailants was at the bottom of your first page; is that right?
- A. That's correct.
- And that's also the point in time that you have three Mexicans in parenthesis?
- A. That's right.
- Your notes seem to go down in a fairly even way down the page so that you're starting most of your lines about one-third of the way through the page with space for your assessment of Josh on the left; is that correct?
- A. That's right.
- Q And the statement "they, three Mexicans chased us around

screaming" on the line above; is that right?
That's true.

So it doesn't appear from the way that you took your notes that the three Mexicans would have been inserted, say, after, towards the end of the interview; is that correct?

the house," the day begins directly beneath the "mom

MR. KOCHIS: Well, objection. That's a leading and suggestive question.

THE COURT: Mr. Negus, sustained.

(BY MR. NEGUS:) Looking at your notes, was the phrase three Mexicans inserted after you had finished taking the rest of your notes?

A Well, what I'm allowing for is that as I was writing
I could have inserted parenthetically into the text
certain information even that he had told me earlier
which clarified what certain pronouns might have referred
to. And so what I'm telling you is that I don't remember
whether or not I inserted that parenthetically or not,
and there's two areas on the notes where I might have
included other details not given at the time of that
particular interview with Detective O'Campo.

- A. The bottom of the second page.
- Q Was that "probably could recognize them"?

What's the other place on the notes?

A. No, the last six lines.

2-1-0000

- Q The description of the three Mexicans?
 - A The descriptions were in fact quite verbatim. The first part, "thinks three Mexicans who came Saturday night before as they were leaving for the party came back later that night," that's kind of a general impression that I've gleaned from probably a number of conversations, more than just that interview that day. And he probably went over it again that day.
 - Q The only other time that you talked to Josh about the actual crime and what had occurred to him that night was when he brought it up with Mr. Jackson there that morning, is that correct, prior to this?
 - A. I couldn't tell you. I think it was probably not limited to that. I think there were other occasions before and after the interview that we're discussing here.
 - O Do you remember telling myself and Mr. Gindler that you only talked to Josh about the crime twice, once in the morning with Mr. Jackson and once with Mr. O'Campo?

MR. KOCHIS: Your Honor, I'm going to object as leading and suggestive, and I think there's a foundational impeachment problem that I don't know that Mr. Negus is going to be able to take the stand and attempt to impeach this witness.

MR. NEGUS: I can always have Mr. Gindler.

THE COURT: Counsel, when you ask him do you recall

9

2

3

5

6

7

8

11 12

13

1~

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

×....;†

and then state the matter to be recalled, it is leading and suggestive.

MR. NEGUS: But it's for the purpose of impeachment.

It's a prior inconsistent statement, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What's the nature of your objection, Mr. Kochis?

MR. KOCHIS: An offer of proof as to foundation as to how he's going to prove that a prior statement was made. It appears he didn't have an investigator present.

THE COURT: Good point. Are there any notes in some way? How could you --

MR. NEGUS: I am sure that Mr. Gindler was there.
Mr. Gindler has a record.

THE COURT: Mr. Who?

MR. NEGUS: Mr. Gindler. When I talked with Mr. Hoyles he was not alone. Mr. Gindler, who is an attorney from Irell and Manella law firm in Century City who was present.

THE COURT: If you persist, I think I perhaps have to examine the matter in camera in some manner.

MR. NEGUS: I don't understand. What's the problem? You're allowed to ask a witness didn't you make a statement without any foundation. I'm not aware of any foundation other than good faith.

THE COURT: You're not allowed to ask your own witness leading and suggestive questions. You get around

that by saying in effect I'm going to impeach my own witness and you can only impeach your witness with a prior inconsistent statement. You're going to have to give me some offer of proof as to that.

Now, you bring up the attorney's name, and I assume that you're in good faith and that if put to the test that you could show me the statement back in chambers or something like that.

Do you persist, Mr. Kochis?
(No omissions.)

MR. KOCHIS: Do I persist?

THE COURT: Do you want to continue your objection?

MR. KOCHIS: Well, your Honor, I made the objection.

I will abide by the Court's ruling. If the Court overrules

my objection, we will proceed.

THE COURT: I haven't overruled it. I'm going to go in camera for an offer of proof from counsel unless there is further objection. The reporter step in chambers, please.

MR. NEGUS: Can Mr. Cooper come, please?

THE COURT: Of course.

(Whereupon in camera proceedings in chambers are omitted from transcript.)

THE COURT: I will overrule the objection.

- Q (BY MR. NEGUS:) Didn't you tell me in the presence of Michael Gendler in November that you only talked to Josh about the crime twice, once with Mr. O'Campo and once with Mr. Jackson?
- If you have a record of that, then that's what I said.

 I think the thing that I'm differentiating about now is that we had two interviews in which the specific purpose of those interviews was to discuss details of the day before and the night of the incident. However, I had numerous conversations with Josh both by myself and with several other people in the room, and what my answer right now referred to was that there were incidental comments that were frequently made about the

1		crime and therefore I did talk with him or was involved
2		in conversations with him on more than those two times.
3	Q	Do you remember saying to me and Mr. Gendler that you
4		were confused in your mind between conversation with
5		Mr. Jackson and Mr. O'Campo and you didn't remember where
6		the information about the suspects came from, whether
7		it was the first conversation or the second conversation.
8		Do you remember stating it in those terms?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	So at that point in time you were stating as an alternati
11		between your conversation with Mr. Jackson in the morning

between your conversation with Mr. Jackson in or with Mr. O'Campo in the afternoon, is that correct?

Yes, I think so.

MR. NEGUS: Thank you. Nothing further.

MR. KOCHIS: No recross.

THE COURT: Doctor, thank you so much. If you will leave the exhibit but take your document, please.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Monday morning at 9:30. Today is Thursday, isn't it?

MR. NEGUS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Anything further today?

MR. KOCHIS: Not from the People.

THE COURT: See you Monday at 9:30. The case will be adjourned until then.

> (Whereupon the proceedings were concluded for the day.)

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25