SUPERIOR COURT of CALIFORNIA COUNTY of SANTA BARBARA

APR 2 2 2005

GARY M. BLAIR, Executive Officer

BY CANNEL WAGNER, Debuty Clerk

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA SANTA MARIA DIVISION

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Plaintiff.

VS.

MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,

16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

INTROI

Defendant.

No. 1133603

PEOPLE'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RE: THE TESTIMONY OF CYNTHIA MONTGOMERY; DECLARATION IN SUPPORT THEREOF; AND REQUEST FOR USE IMMUNITY (P.C. 1324)

DATE: TBA TIME: TBA

DEPT.: SM2 (Melville)

INTRODUCTION

On April 21, 2005, this court issued an order precluding the testimony of witness Cynthia Montgomery on the grounds that she would assert her 5th Amendment privilege on certain areas of inquiry. The People informed the court that Ms. Montgomery would testify, generally, about flights she coordinated during late 2002 and through September of 2003 for the Defendant. Additionally, she would testify as to the plans made to send the Arvizo family

PEOPLE'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RE: THE TESTIMONY OF CYNTHIA MONTGOMERY

19

24 25

27

28

26

to Brazil shortly after the taping of the "Rebuttal Video." Cynthia Montgomery is a material witness due to her personal knowledge of certain events which are probative regarding the conspiracy alleged in Count 1 of the Information and the interaction of the various unindicted co-conspirators during the relevant time frames. She can explain to the jury how travel arrangements were made for the defendant, who flew with him on those flights, and who she received instructions from within the defendant's camp. Additionally and with specificity, she will testify that during the performance of the duties above described, she was instructed by Mark Scaffel to purchase one-way tickets for the Arvizo's to Brazil on or about February 25. 2003; and, that Lauren Wallace told her that she poured wine into soda cans for the defendant because she was instructed to do so by the defendant, (a statement which is inconsistent with Lauren Wallace's trial testimony).

Due to the "eleventh-hour" notice to the prosecution that she intended to invoke with respect to Defendant Jackson's "surrender flight," we were unable to have meaningful discussions with her attorney or the federal prosecutors investigating the incident prior to the hearing of April 21. Now we have. Since Ms. Montgomery's testimony is highly probative due to her close association with members of Defendant Jackson's 'inner circle' through her role as travel coordinator, we have noticed both the United States Attorney and Ms. Montgomery's attorney of our intent to request she be compelled to testify under a grant of use immunity.

COMPELLING A WITNESS TO TESTIFY UNDER A GRANT OF "USE" IMMUNITY IN STATE COURT BARS ANY USE OR DERIVATIVE USE OF SUCH TESTIMONY IN FEDERAL COURT

Penal Code section 1324 provides that a prosecutor may request an order granting "use" immunity in order to compel the testimony of a witness who would otherwise assert the constitutional protections of the Fifth Amendment. In Murphy v. Waterfront Comm'n of New York Harbor (1964) 378 U.S. 52, the Supreme Court overturned previous precedents which had held that testimony which had been compelled in a state court could be used against a

defendant in federal court.

"... we hold the constitutional rule to be that a state witness may not be compelled to give testimony which may be incriminating under federal law unless the compelled testimony and its fruits cannot be used in any manner by federal officials in connection with a criminal prosecution against him. We conclude, moreover, [*892] that in order to implement this constitutional rule and accommodate the interests of the State and Federal Governments in investigating and prosecuting crime, the Federal Government must be prohibited from making any such use of compelled testimony and its fruits. This exclusionary rule, while permitting the States to secure information necessary for effective law enforcement, leaves the witness and the Federal Government in substantially the same position as if the witness had claimed his privilege in the absence of a state grant of immunity." (pg 79)

In Nelson v. Municipal Court, (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 889, 893, the court applied the Murphy rule to a witness who was afraid that her state-compelled testimony would subject her to federal prosecution, ". . . we conclude that the Murphy holding that the testimony in question could be compelled, since the federal government would be barred from using any of the testimony, or its fruits, in a subsequent federal prosecution, governs the disposition of this proceeding, and that petitioners, having been granted immunity pursuant to Penal Code section 1324, may be compelled to testify. (See: Kastigar v. United States, (1972) 406 U.S. 441, 92 S.Ct. 1653).

Therefore, we respectfully request this court issue an order granting use immunity to the witness Cynthia Montgomery.

DATED: April 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY

By:

Mag M. Nicola, Senior Deputy District Attorney

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

I

ss

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 22, 2005, I served the within PEOPLE'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RE: THE TESTIMONY OF CYNTHIA MONTGOMERY; DECLARATION IN SUPPORT THEREOF; AND REQUEST FOR USE IMMUNITY on Defendant, by THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ROBERT SANGER, and BRIAN

OXMAN, by transmitting a facsimile copy thereof to Attorney Sanger.

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

Executed at Santa Barbara, California on this 22nd day of April, 2005.

Sandra Castro

ifacts.com

die:

27 | 28 |

Landre Casto

1	SERVICE LIST
2	THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ESQ.
3 4	THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ESQ. Collins, Mesereau, Reddock & Yu, LLP 1875 Century Park East, No. 700 Los Angeles, CA 90067 FAX: [Confidential]
5	Attorney for Defendant Michael Jackson
6	ROBERT SANGER, ESQ.
7	ROBERT SANGER, ESQ. Sanger & Swysen, Lawyers 233 E. Carrillo Street, Suite C Santa Barbara, CA 93001 FAX: (805) 963-7311
9	Co-counsel for Defendant
10	BRIAN OXMAN, ESQ.
11	BRIAN OXMAN, ESQ. Oxman & Jaroscak, Lawyers 14126 E. Rosecrans Blvd.
12	Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
13	Co-counsel for Defendant
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	mjfacts.com mjfacts.com
19	
21	
22	
23	
24	Gia.
25	jfacts.com mjfacts.com mjfacts.com
26	
27	
28	od a ·
	5
1	

PEOPLE'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RE: THE TESTIMONY OF CYNTHIA MONTGOMERY

DECLARATION OF MAG M. NICOLA

I, MAG NICOLA, 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 for reconsideration and request for an order granting use immunity to Cynthia Montgomery was filed on April 22, 2005.
- 3. I informed both the Office of The United States Attorney and counsel for Ms. Montgomery that we would seek to compel the testimony of the witness under the provision of P.C. 1324 on April 21, 2005.
- 4. I believe the information offered by Ms. Montgomery cannot be supplied by other witnesses due to the nature of her first-hand knowledge.
- 5. I believe there is an absence of any compelling and contrary public interest such that this court should not order said witness to appear and answer questions under oath in this matter.

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 Maria, California on April 22, 2005.

MAG M. NICOLA

mjracts.com