THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY 1 County of Santa Barbara By: RONALD J. ZONEN (State Bar No. 85094) 2 Senior Deputy District Attorney
J. GORDON AUCHINCLOSS (State Bar No. 150251) JAN 10 2005 3 Senior Deputy District Attorney
GERALD McC. FRANKLIN (State Bar No. 40171) GARY M. BLAIR, Executive Officer 4 Carried Wagner Schior Deputy District Attorney CARRIE L. WAGNER, Deputy Clerk 1112 Santa Barbara Street 5 Santa Barbara, CA 93101 Telephone: (805) 568-2300 6 FAX: (805) 568-2398 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA 9 SANTA MARIA DIVISION 10 11 No. 1133603 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. 12 PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF Plaintiff. 13 MOTION AND MOTION FOR COURT'S REVIEW OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION THAT 14 V. 15 THE HEARING OF PLAINTIFF'S "EVIDENCE CODE § 1108" 16 MOTION BE HELD IN CAMERA TO DETERMINE WHETHER 17 MICHAEL JOE JACKSON SEALING IS APPROPRIATE: DECLARATION OF GERALD 18 Defendant. McC. FRANKLIN: MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES 19

> DATE: January 10, 2005 TIME: 8:30 a.m. DEPT: TBA (Mclville)

TO: MICHAEL JOE JACKSON, AND TO THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ROBERT SANGER AND BRIAN OXMAN, HIS ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, AND TO THEODORE J. BOUTROUS, JR., ESQ., GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on January 12, 2005, at 8:30 a.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the Department to be assigned, Plaintiff will, and hereby does, request the Court to review Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion that

1

REQUEST THAT COURT DETERMINE APPROPRIATENESS OF SEALING OPPOSITION TO IN-CAMERA HEARING

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Hearing of Plaintiff's "Evidence Code § 1108" Motion Be Held In Camera, filed contemporaneously with this Motion, to determine for itself whether an order directing that the Opposition to In Camera Hearing is an appropriate document for sealing., and that the Motion be maintained under conditional seal until further order of court, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 243.1 et seq.

The motion will be made on the ground that the discussion of facts in the Opposition, as established by the accompanying declaration of Gerald McC. Franklin, may not be sufficient to justify scaling the specified motion pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 243.1 et seq.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration of Gerald McC. Franklin and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and the file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.

DATED: January 10, 2005

26

27

28

THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR.

District A

cC. Franklin, Schior Deputy

Attorneys for Plaintiff

2.1

 1. I am a lawyer admitted to practice in the State of California. I am a Senior Deputy of the District Attorney of Santa Barbara County. I am one of the lawyers of record for

the People, Plaintiff in this action.

I, Gerald McC. Franklin, say:

2. This motion to conditionally seal the contemporancously-filed Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion that Hearing of Plaintiff's "Evidence Code § 1108" Motion Be Held In Camera, and requesting that the Court determine for itself whether the Opposition is appropriate for sealing, is made on the ground that the Opposition to In-Camera Hearing does not, in the undersigned's opinion, itself reveal any information that would warrant sealing.

3. I believe that the interest of each party to a fair trial dictates that the Opposition to In-Camera Hearing should remain under conditional scal until the appropriateness of sealing the document and, if scaling is ordered, of the release of a redacted version of the opposition is determined by the court.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the foregoing is true and correct, except as to matters stated upon my information and belief, and as to such matters I believe it to be true. I execute this declaration at Santa Barbara, California on January 10, 2005.

Gerald McC. Franklin

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

The procedure for sealing records under California Rules of Court, rule 243.1 et seq. applies only to records that are deemed public. (*Id.*, rule 243.1(a)(2).) Motions and responsive pleadings in criminal cases are, ordinarily, "public" records of the court.

Rule 243.1(d) provides that

The court may order that a record be filed under scal only if it expressly finds facts that establish:

- (1) There exists an overriding interest that overcomes the right of public access to the record:
 - (2) The overriding interest supports sealing the record;
- (3) A substantial probability exists that the overriding interest will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed;
 - (4) The proposed sealing is narrowly tailored; and
 - (5) No less restrictive means exist to achieve the overriding interest.

Rule 243.1(c) provides, in pertinent part:

(1) An order scaling the record must (i) specifically set forth the facts findings that support the findings and (ii) direct the scaling of only those documents and pages, or, if reasonably practicable, portions of those documents and pages, that contain the material that needs to be placed under scal. All other portions of each documents or page must be included in the public file.

Rule 243.2(b) provides, in pertinent part, that "Pending the determination of the motion [of a party to file a record under seal], the lodged record will be conditionally under seal."

///<mark>/</mark>

nifacts.co

27 | | / / / / 28 | | / / /

I

2

3

4

5

6

7

S

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

REQUEST THAT COURT DETERMINE APPROPRIATENESS OF SEALING OPPOSITION TO IN-CAMERA HEARING

REQUEST THAT COURT DETERMINE APPROPRIATENESS OF SEALING OPPOSITION TO IN-CAMERA HEARING

PROOF OF SERVICE

SS

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

California 93101.

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

ς

24

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years and I am not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is: District Attorney's Office; Courthouse; 1112 Santa Barbara Street, Santa Barbara,

On January 10, 2005, I served the within PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION FOR COURT'S REVIEW OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION THAT THE HEARING OF PLAINTIFF'S "EVIDENCE CODE § 1108" MOTION BE HELD IN CAMERA TO DETERMINE WHETHER SEALING IS APPROPRIATE, ETC. and PROPOSED ORDER on THEODORE BOUTROUS, Media's counsel and on Defendant, by THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR. and ROBERT SANGER, by personally delivering a true copy to Mr. Sanger's Office and then transmitting a true copy thereof to Mr. Mesereau by facscimile, at (310) 284-3122.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Santa Barbara, California on this 10th day of January, 2005.

Gerald McC. Franklin

1 2 SERVICE LIST 3 4 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr., Esq. William E. Thomson, Esq. Julian Poon, Esq. 5 6 333 S. Grand Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197 7 FAX: (213) 229-6758 Attorneys for (collectively) "Media" 8 9 THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR. Collins, Mesercau, Reddock & Yu, LLP 10 1875 Century Park East, No. 700 Los Angeles, CA 90067 FAX: [CONFIDENTIAL] 11 12 Attorney for Defendant Michael Jackson 13 14 ROBERT SANGER, ESQ. Sanger & Swysen, Lawyers 233 E. Carrillo Street, Suite C Santa Barbara, CA 93001 15 16 FAX: (805) 963-7311 17 Co-counsel for Defendant 18 BRIAN OXMAN, ESQ. Oxman & Jaroscak, Lawyers 19 14126 E. Rosecrans Blvd., Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670 20 Co-counsel for Defendant 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER SEALING REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S § 1108 MOTION