1 2 3 4 5	THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY County of Santa Barbara By: RONALD J. ZONEN (State Bar No. 85094) Senior Deputy District Attorney GORDON AUCHINCLOSS (State Bar No. 150251) Senior Deputy District Attorney GERALD McC. FRANKLIN (State Bar No. 40171) Senior Deputy District Attorney 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101 Telephone: (805) 568-2398			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA			
10	SANTA MARIA DIVISION			
11	و الله الله الله الله الله الله الله الل			
12	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, \ No. 1133603			
13	Plaintiff, RESPONSE TO REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO			
15	DEFENDANT'S REQUEST THAT PLAINTIFF BE REQUIRED TO PRESENT THE HEARSAY PRESENT THE HEARSAY			
16	EVIDENCE OF DEFENDANT'S  RESPONSE TO "LIVING WITH  MICHAEL JACKSON" AS PART  OF ITS CASE IN CHIEF			
17				
18	Defendant.  Defendant.  Defendant.  DEPT: SM 2 (Melville)			
20	TILED UNDER SEAL			
21	A. Introduction:			
22	Plaintiff moved the Court to allow it to present Martin Bashir's documentary			
23	"Living with Michael Jackson" to the jury as part of its case in chief, as evidence of the			
24	catastrophic event that motivated Defendant and others to conspire to commit the crimes			
25	alleged in Count One of the indictment. The People moved to introduce the documentary			
26	"Living with Michael Jackson" as evidence of the event – the airing of that documentary			
27	around the world - that prompted the frenzied response alleged in Count One of the			
28	indictment.			

28 D

(Reply 2:17-22.)

At the hearing of Plaintiff's motion, Defendant's counsel urged the Court to require Plaintiff to "balance" the prejudicial effect of "Living with Michael Jackson" by presenting. immediately thereafter, "The Michael Jackson Interview: The Footage You Were Never Meant To See" film narrated by Maury Povich ("Footage"). Defendant argued that the Bashir documentary was edited to present facts in a misleading fashion and to deliberately show Michael Jackson in a false light. He urged that "Footage" reveals the true context of Mr. Jackson's several statements — a context suppressed by the editing of "Living with Michael Jackson" — and that his right to a fair trial obliged the People to present "Footage" as part of its case in chief.

Plaintiff opposed that request. We conceded that much of "Living with Michael Jackson" is "hearsay, but it is nevertheless admissible under the 'operative fact' doctrine. The Court has so ruled." (Opposition 3:1-2.) We noted: "If Defendant believes it would be prudent to introduce admissible evidence that offsets the prejudicial effect of 'Living with Michael Jackson,' he is free to do so as part of his case. The operative word is 'admissible.' Hearsay is inadmissible. 'Footage' is purest hearsay." (Opposition 3:11-14.)

In Defendant's "Reply to District Attorney's Opposition to Defendant's Request
That Plaintiff Be Required To Present The Hearsay Evidence Of Defendant's Response To
'Living With Michael Jackson' As Part Of Its Case In Chief," filed February 15, 2005,
Defendant asserts:

It appears from the Opposition of the District Attorney that the government does not oppose the playing of the Hamid Moslehi outtakes videos at the time of the playing of the Bashir production. In light of that, the defense will withdraw its request that the "Footage You Were Never Meant To See" be played immediately following the Bashir production. The defense reserves the right to offer said video at another time and will agree to advise the Court in advance to allow for an in limine ruling on the subject.

Defendant badly misreads our Opposition

B. Discussion:

Nothing in our Opposition remotely suggests that we do "not oppose the playing of the Hamid Moslehi outtakes videos at the time of the playing of the Bashir production." With the exception of certain admissions of Defendant, the "Footage" paean is hearsay, including those portions filmed by Mr. Moslehi while Mr. Bashir was filming "Living with Michael Jackson." Precisely because those outtakes are hearsay, they are inadmissible by either side. And because they are "outtakes" – i.e., footage that was never broadcast as part of the final version of "The Michael Jackson Interviews: The Footage You Were Never Meant To See" – they are irrelevant as part of the People's case in chief because they do not come within the exception that makes "Living With Michael Jackson" admissible: they are not "operative facts" evidence of the important event that prompted Defendant and others to conspire to commit the crimes alleged in Count One of the indictment.

In our Opposition we stated that the outtakes of Hamid Moslchi's "Footage" production do not disclose what the defense represented they would disclose. The outtakes do not show that Defendant's comments in the "Living with Michael Jackson" documentary about sleeping with children were taken out of context or were in any way misleading. Defendant's Reply never addressed the issue of what exactly is contained in the Moslehi outtakes that change the meaning of Defendant's comments. There has been no effort by the defense to identify the specific dialogue contained in the outtakes that might support their contention.

Mr. Moslehi was not present at Neverland when Defendant sat with John Doe and spoke of the joy he experienced in sharing his bed with young boys. No outtakes exist as to that conversation. Mr. Moslehi videotaped a conversation with Defendant in Florida. There are outtakes of that videotaped interview. The People contend their content adds nothing to the debate whether the Bashir documentary was factually accurate. The defense, for its part, is notably silent on that issue. Unless and until Defendant demonstrates the relevance and admissibility of any of those outtakes notwithstanding the hearsay rule, the People will object to the defense introduction of the Moslehi outtakes as part of its case. And just in case we have not made our position clear, we object to Defendant's request that Mr. Moslehi's

outtakes be played as part of the prosecution's case in chief. Defense counsel need to exercise rather more care in their reading of Plaintiff's submissions before they undertake a restatement of our position on a given issue. CONCLUSION Plaintiff is grateful for Defendant's withdrawal of his badly-premised request that "Footage You Were Never Meant To See" be played by the prosecution immediately following presentation of the Bashir production, Living With Michael Jackson." We oppose Defendant's suggestion that Moslehi's own outtakes should be played as part of Plaintiff's case in chief. DATED: February 17, 2005 Respectfully submitted, THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR. District Attorney 

PROOF OF SERVICE 1 2 3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA 4 5 I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over 6 the age of eighteen years and I am not a party to the within-entitled action. My business 7 address is: District Attorney's Office; Courthouse; 1112 Santa Burbara Street, Santa Barbara, 8 California 93101. 9 On February 17, 2005, I served the within PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO 10 DEFENDANT'S REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S REQUEST 11 THAT PLAINTIFF BE REQUIRED TO PRESENT THE HEARSAY EVIDENCE OF 12 DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO "LIVING WITH MICHAEL JACKSON" AS PART OF 13 ITS CASE IN CHIEF on Defendant, by THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ROBERT SANGER, 14 and BRIAN OXMAN by personally delivering a true copy thereof to Mr. Sanger's office in 15 Santa Barbara, and by transmitting a copy by facsimile to Mr. Mesereau's confidential Fax 16 number in Santa Maria. 17 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. 18 Executed at Santa Barbara, California on this 17th day of February, 2005. 19 20 21 22 23 24 mifacts.com 25 26

<

27

28

## SERVICE LIST

3			
2	njfacts.	MAS A MESEREALL TR	
3	Collin	MAS A. MESEREAU, JR. ns. Mesereau, Reddock & Yu, LLP Century Park East. No. 700 Angeles. CA 90067 (310) 284-3122	
4	Los /	Ingeles, CA 90067 (310) 284-3122	
5	Attor	ney for Defendant Michael Jackson	al a
6	ROB	er <mark>t sang</mark> er, esq.	
7	Sange 233 E	er & Swysen, Lawyers E. Carrillo Street, Suite C	mjfacts.com
8		Barbara, CA 93001 : (805) 963-7311	
9	Co-co	ounsel for Defendant	
10	BRIA	IN OXMAN, ESQ. an & Jaroscak, Lawyers 6 E. Rosecrans Blvd.	
11	14120	6 E. Rosecrans Blvd. 1 Fe Springs, CA 90670	
12		ounsel for Desendant	
13	mjfacts.co		
14			
15			
16		od a	
17			Geo.
18			
19			
20			
21			
23	<i>i i i</i> .		90 8
24			
25	mjfacts.co		
26	,		
27			
28			
		6	