TIIOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY 1 County of Santa Barbara 2 By: RONALD J. ZONEN (State Bar No. 85094) APR - 5 2005 Senior Deputy District Attorney J. GORDON AUCHINCLOS\$ (State Bar No. 150251) 3 GARY M. BLAIR, Executive Officer Senior Deputy District Attorney
GERALD McC. FRANKLIN (State Bar No. 40171) Carried Wagner 4 CARRIEL WAGNER, Debuty Clerk Senior Deputy District Attorney 5 1112 Santa Barbara Street 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 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, No. 1133603 12 Plaintiff. PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO 13 DEFENDANT'S OBJECTION TO ADMISSION OF "1108-AND 14 1101 EVIDENCE" 15 MICHAEL JOE JACKSON 16 Defendant. DATE: TBA TIME: TBA. 17 DEPT: SM-2 (Melville): 18 19 20 Defendant objects to the admission of third party witnesses (whatever he means by 21 that) under Evidence Code sections 1108 and 1101 regarding his prior sexual offenses "when 22 the alleged victims will not be testifying," on the grounds that "he could not address | 108 or 23 1101 evidence in opening statement," and that such evidence violates his right to "confront 24 witnesses." 25 Nonsense. It was defendant who objected (vigorously, if we recall correctly) to any 26 reference by plaintiff's counsel to such evidence in his opening statement, because the 27 admissibility of that evidence had not been determined. He is not well positioned to complain 28 about his own inability to address that evidence in his opening statement.

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S OBJECTION TO ADMISSION OF "1108 AND 1101 EVIDENCE"

Defendant has not yet been denied the opportunity confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him, nor will he be. His Sixth Amendment right to confront and cross-examine witnesses is limited to those witnesses who give evidence from the witness stand. "The right of the accused to be confronted with witnesses is the right to have the witnesses testify in his presence and the right of the accused to cross-examine them; it is not required that all witnesses or persons who may have knowledge of the crime be produced in court or called to testify." (People v. Taylor (1958) 159 Cal.App.2d 752, 756.) Defendant's objection is not well taken. It should be overruled. DATED: April 5, 2005 THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR. District Attorney McC. Franklin Senior Deputy District Attorney 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 April 5, 2005, I served the within PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S OBJECTION TO ADMISSION OF "1108 AND 1101 EVIDENCE" 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 transmitting a copy by facscimile to Mr. Mesereau at the confidential FAX number of their temporary office in Santa Maria. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Santa Maria, California on this 5th day of April, 2005. 

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S OBJECTION TO ADMISSION OF "1108 AND 1141 EVIDENCE"

SERVICE LIST THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR. Collins, Mesereau, Reddock & Yu, LLP 1875 Century Park East, No. 700 Los Angeles, CA 90067 FAX: [CONFIDENTIAL] Attorney for Defendant Michael Jackson ROBERT SANGER, ESQ. Sanger & Swysen, Lawyers 233 E. Carrillo Street, Suite C Santa Barbara, CA 93001 FAX: (805) 963-7311 Co-counsel for Defendant BRIAN OXMAN, ESQ. Oxman & Jaroscak, Lawyers 14126 E. Rosecrans Blvd., Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670 Co-counsel for Defendant mjfacts.com mifacts.com 

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S OBJECTION TO ADMISSION OF "1108 AND 1101 EVIDENCE"