FILED
SUPPHION COUNT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

MAY - 8 2005

	ARY M. BL.				
ву	Carry	1 8	Wa	gne	,
-	CARRIE L.V	WAGN	IER, Dé	buly Cleri	K

DEPT: TBA (Melville)

THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY
County of Santa Barbara
By: RONALD J. ZONEN (State Bar No. 85094)
Senior Deputy District Attorney
J. 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.

Plaintiff,

PLAINTIFF'S TRIAL BRIEF RE:
ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE OF
DEFENDANT'S RELEVANT
CHARACTER TRAIT: CROSSEXAMINATION OF CHARACTER
WITNESSES AND REBUTTAL
EVIDENCE ON THE ISSUE OF
DEFENDANT'S CHARACTER

Defendant.

Defendant.

Defendant.

DATE: TBA
TIME: 8:30 a.m.

## A. Discussion

Defendant may offer character evidence in the form of witness testimony concerning his good *character* by the witness's knowledge of the defendant's

-- reputation for the good character trait (here, doesn't molest boys) in the community where he lives or works (Evid. Code § 1324);

-- opinion of the witness (Evid. Code, § 800) concerning defendant's good character for the trait in question, based on personal knowledge (Evid. Code, § 702); see *People v*.

McAlpine (1991) 53 Cal.3d 1289, 1309-1310 [opinion of witnesses that defendant not a person given to lewd conduct with children, based on their observation of his conduct with their

1

daughters, properly the subject of opinion evidence and relevant to charge of molesting young girls]. And see *People v. Callahan*, *supra*, 74 Cal.App.4th 356, 374-375 [error to exclude testimony of defendant's 18-year-old niece that defendant never touched her in an inappropriate manner when he baby-sat her as a child, because evidence was relevant to his propensity to molest young girls, other evidence of which had been offered by the prosecution pursuant to Evidence Code section 1108].

It is . . . relevant to keep in mind that a defendant's introduction of good character evidence is by no means a risk-free proposition. "Two grave risks face the criminal defendant who chooses to . . . offer [] evidence of her good character. The first and most serious risk . . . arises when the prosecutor cross-examines the defendant's character witnesses. . . . [W]hen cross-examining either a reputation or opinion witness, the prosecutor can inquire about specific acts in the defendant's past to assess the value of the reputation or opinion testimony . . . [Although in] theory, the trier of fact cannot use the prosecutor's questions about specific acts as evidence that the acts occurred . . . [and] upon request, the defendant is entitled to a limiting jury instruction[,] . . . [it is well recognized] that jurors probably cannot follow a judge's instruction not to use the question and responses about specific acts as evidence that the acts did occur . . . . The second risk is [that] . . . the prosecutor can call rebuttal witnesses to testify that the defendant's character is bad.

(People v. McAlpin. supra, 53 Cal.3d 1289, 1315 (conc. & dis. opn. of Broussard, J.).)

"The probative value of personal opinion or reputation evidence of a defendant's good character traits to prove that he did *not* commit a charged crime or to support his credibility as a witness is slight at best." (*People v. Pic'l* (1981) 114 Cal.App.3d 824, 892, reversed on other grounds in *People v. Kimble* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 480, 498.)

3 4

1

2

5

7 8

6

10 11

9

12 13 14

1.5 16

18

19

17

20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

The "reputation for good character" witness can be asked on cross-examination whether, that witness had heard of some specific act inconsistent with a good reputation for the trait in question. (See People v. Marsh (1962) 58 Cal.2d 732, 745; People v. Wagner (1975) 13 Cal.3d 612, 619; *People v. Hurd* (1970) 5 Cal.App.3d 865, 879-880;

The People may use the testimony of other persons regarding defendant's reputation to rebut that evidence.

## C. Cross-examination of the "opinion" witness:

The "I-have-an-opinion,-based-on-personal-observation,-that-defendant-has-a-goodcharacter-for-behaving-himself-with-young-boys" opinion character witness can be asked whether that witness is aware of certain conduct inconsistent with the character trait in question (if so, what effect does that have on the witness's opinion; if not, and if what was suggest was true, is the witness's opinion now different). "Have you heard" questions on cross-examination of the "opinion" witness are also proper (People v. Hurd, supra. 5 Cal.App.3d 865 at p. 880; *People v. Hempstead* (1983) 148 Cal.App.3d 949, 953-954.) Topics for impeachment of character witnesses include the following:

- -- All details of Jordie Chandler allegations as depicted in his interview w/ LAPD and LADA and in the affidavit of the s/w:
- -- All 1108 witnesses, including Jonathan Spence and Jimmy Safechuck. Events as outlined in the statement of Marc Quindoy as given to law enforcement witnessing acts of molestation. Statement of Norma Stokos, and Miko Brando about not leaving their kids alone with Michael Jackson;
- -- Statement of Latova Jackson, defendant's sister, said on national television that she saw a payment of \$1m check to Jimmy Safechuck's family for purposes of buying silence;
- -- Evidence that Defendant has taken numerous children into his room and bed while heavily addicted to Demerol and other controlled substances.
- -- Evidence that Defendant has given alcohol to children;

## PROOF OF SERVICE

SS (

1 2 3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA 4 5 6 7 8 California 93101. 9 On May 4, 2005, I served the within PLAINTIFF'S TRIAL BRIEF RE: 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17

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 Attornev's Office; Courthouse; 1112 Santa Barbara Street, Santa Barbara,

ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE OF DEFENDANT'S RELEVANT CHARACTER TRAIT; CROSS-EXAMINATION OF CHARACTER WITNESSES ON THE ISSUE OF DEFENDANT'S CHARGER on Defendant, by THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR. and ROBERT SANGER, by personally delivering a true copy of it to them in open court.

> I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Santa Maria, California on this 4th day of May, 2005.

Ron Zonen



27

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

l 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 

7 · q