THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY 1 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA County of Santa Barbara 2 By: RONALD J. ZONEN (State Bar No. 85094) JAN 2 4 2005 Senior Deputy District Attorney 3. J. GORDON AUCHINCLOSS (State Bar No. 150251) GARY M. BLAIR, Exocutive Officor Senior Deputy District Attorney Ay, Carlie & Wigner 4 GERALD McC. FRANKLIN (State Bar No. 40171) CARRIE L. WAGNER, Debuty Clork Senior Deputy District Attorney 5 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101 Telephone: (805) 568-2300 б FAX: (805) 568-2398 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA 10 SANTA MARIA DIVISION 11 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. 12 No. 1133603 13 PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF Plaintiff. MOTION AND MOTION FOR 14 COURT'S REVIEW OF PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO 15 V. MOTION IN LIMINE TO LIMIT UNCHARGED CONSPIRATOR 16 HEARSAY WHETHER SEALING MICHAEL JOE JACKSON. IS APPROPRIATE; DECLARATION 17 OF GERALD McC. FRANKLIN; Defendant MEMORANDUM OF POINTS 18 AND AUTHORITIES 19 20 DATE: January 28, 2005 TIME:98:30 a.m. 2: DEPT: TBA (Melville) TU: MICHAEL JOE JACKSON, AND TO THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., 22 ROBERT SANGER AND BRIAN OXMAN, HIS ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, AND TO 23 THEODORE J. BOUTROUS, JR., ESO., GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP: 24 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on January 28, 2005, at \$30 a.m. or as soon 25 thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the Department to be assigned, Plaintiff will, and 26 hereby does, request the Court to review Plaintiff's Response to Motion in Limine to Limit 27 Uncharged Conspirator Hearsay, filed contemporaneously with this Motion, to determine for 28

itself whether an order directing that the Response is an appropriate document for sealing., and that the Response 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 Plaintiff's Response to Motion in Limine to Limit Uncharged Conspirator Hearsay, as established by the accompanying declaration of Gerald McC. Franklin, may not be sufficient to justify sealing 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 24, 2005

W. SNEDDON, JR. District Attorney

Attorneys for Plaintiff

I, Gerald McC. Franklin, say:

- 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.
- 2. This motion to conditionally seal the contemporaneously-filed Plaintiff's Response to Motion in Limine to Limit Uncharged Conspirator Hearsay, and requesting that the Court determine for itself whether the Response is appropriate for sealing, is made on the ground that the Response does not, in the undersigned's opinion, itself reveal any information that would warrant sealing. For that reason I have not prepared a proposed redacted version of the Response.
- 3. I believe that the interest of each party to a fair trial dictates that Plaintiff's Response to Motion in Limine to Limit Uncharged Conspirator Hearsay should remain under conditional scal until the ppropriateness of sealing the document and, if sealing is ordered, of the release of a redacted version of the Motion 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 24, 2005.

Gerald McC. Franklin

mjfacts.com

mjfacts.com

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

1

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1111

1111

The procedure for scaling records under California Rules of Court, rule 243.1 et seq. 2 applies only to records that are deemed public. (Id., rule 243.1(a)(2).) Motions and responsive 3 pleadings in criminal cases are, ordinarily, "public" records of the court. 4 5 Rule 243.1(d) provides that The court may order that a record be filed under seal only if it 6 expressly finds facts that establish: 7 (1) There exists an overriding interest that overcomes the right of 8 public access to the record: 9 (2) The overriding interest supports sealing the record; 10 (3) A substantial probability exists that the overriding interest will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed; 12 (4) The proposed sealing is narrowly tailored; and 14 (5) No less restrictive means exist to achieve the overriding interest. Rule 243.1(e) provides, in pertinent part: (1) An order scaling the record must (i) specifically set forth the facts findings that support the lindings 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 seal. 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." ////ifacts.com 1111 1111

DATED: January 24, 2005 Respectfully submitted, THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY

County of Santa Barbara Gerald McC. Franklin, Senior Deputy Attorneys for Plaintiff

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SS COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

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, California 93101.

On January 24, 2005, I served the within PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION FOR COURT'S REVIEW OF 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 ROBER'I SANGER, by personally delivering a true copy to Mr. Sanger's Office and then transmitting a true copy thereof to Mr. Mesereau at his confidential FAX number in Santa Maria and to Mr. Boutrous at (213) 229-6758.

> I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Santa Barbara, California on this 24th day of January, 2005.