MAR 1 3 2005

GARY M. BLAIR, Executive Officer 4 Carried Wagner CARRIE & Walter Debuty Clark

## 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) 568-2300 FAX: (805) 568-2398

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

SANTA MARIA DIVISION

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, No. 1133603 PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF Plaintiff. MOTION AND MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING OF DEFENDANT'S MOTION RE: ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE v. RELATED TO GEORGE LOPEZ (Evid. Code, § 402) MICHAEL JOE JACKSON. DATE: March 17, 2005 Defendant. TIME: 8:30 a.m. DEPT: SM 2 (Melville)

TO: THE CLERK OF THE COURT, AND TO DEFENDANT MICHAEL JOE JACKSON, AND TO THOMAS MESEREAU, JR, ROBERT SANGER AND R. BRIAN OXMAN, HIS COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on March 17, 2005, Plaintiff will request that the Court continue the hearing of Defendant's "Motion Re: Admissibility Of Evidence Related To George Lopez." currently calendared for that date (notice of which was filed and served on March 14th) pending receipt by Court and Counsel of Mr. Lopez's written statement pursuant to the Court's earlier direction in a recent conference call with Mr. Lopez's counsel.

This motion is made on the ground that Mr. Lopez's statement will be necessary to an informed ruling on the pending motion. It will be based on this Notice and the accompanying Declaration of Gerald McC. Franklin. DATED: March 16, 2005 Respectfully submitted, THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR. District Attorney S Gerald McC. Franklin, Senior Deputy 

- 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. Defendant's "Motion Re: Admissibility of Evidence Related to George Lopez" was filed and served Tuesday, March 14, 2005. The notice of that Motion proposed that it be heard on March 17th.
- 3. I am informed, and thereon allege, that a conference call involving the Court, counsel for both Plaintiff and Defendant and counsel for one George Lopez was had very recently, concerning Mr. Lopez's proposed evidence, and that the Court directed Mr. Lopez's counsel to file and serve the written statement of his client before the Court took further action on Defendant's request for the admission of certain evidence concerning Mr. Lopez.
- 4. To my knowledge, no such statement has yet been dispatched by Mr. Lopez or his counsel, or received by the Court or counsel for the parties to this lawsuit.
- 5. I am informed by my co-counsel, who know more about the evidence in this matter than do I, and believe that the "facts" which Attorney Sanger alleged in his declaration supporting the pending motion and by Attorney Mesereau in his opening statement to the jury may not be correctly or fully stated. I am informed and believe that Mr. Lopez's statement likely will provide additional light and perspective on defense counsel's present view of matters.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true, except as to matters stated upon my information and belief, and as to such matters I belief it to be true. I execute this Declaration at Santa Barbara, California on March 16, 2005.

RJohn (for G. Mc F.)
GERALD McC. FRANKLIN

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

With certain exceptions that may or may not be pertinent here, all relevant evidence is admissible in a California criminal trial. (Cal. Const., art. 1, § 28, subd. (d).)

Surely, there can be no argument with the proposition that the Court ought to know as much as possible about the foundation of the evidence a party seeks to introduce before it is introduced: that is why Evidence Code section 402 exists.

The preliminary showing made by Defendant in support of his pending motion appears to be contradicted in pertinent part by the police reports attached as factual support for the admission of the proposed evidence. There is no evidence that Mr. Lopez himself has been interviewed. There is reason to believe that Mr. Lopez's information, when it becomes available, may weaken rather than strengthen the supposed relevance of his testimony to the defense position in this lawsuit.

Be that as it may, a summary of Mr. Lopez's information, provided by Mr. Lopez himself, will surely be useful and may be critical to the Court's assessment of the relevance of his proposed testimony in this case.

For that reason, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the hearing of Defendant's pending motion be continued to a date convenient to the calendars of all concerned following receipt of the anticipated written statement from Mr. Lopez.

DATED: March 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR. District Attorney

By:

Gerald McC. Franklin, Senior Deputy

## PROOF OF SERVICE

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

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 March 16, 2005, I served the within PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING OF DEFENDANT'S MOTION RE: ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE RELATING TO GEORGE LOPEZ on Defendant, by THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ROBERT SANGER, and BRIAN OXMAN by personally delivering a true copy thereof to Mr. Sanger's office in Santa Barbara and by transmitting a facsimile copy thereof to Attorney Mesereau at his Santa Maria fax number.

> I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Santa Barbara, California on this 16th day of March, 2005.

rald McC. Franklin



PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE OF HEARING RE "GEORGE LOPEZ" § 402 EVIDENCE