

FILED
SEP 10 2004
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

SEP 08 2004

GARY M. DEAR, Executive Officer
By: *[Signature]*
CARRIE L. MACNEIL, Deputy Clerk

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

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL JACKSON,

Defendant.

Case No.: 1133603

Order for Release of Redacted Documents

[Motion to Compel Discovery]

The redacted form of the Defendant's Motion to Compel Discovery attached to this order shall be released and placed in the public file. The unredacted originals shall be maintained conditionally under seal pending the hearing on September 16, 2004. Defense counsel is reminded of their obligation to provide proposed redacted copies of the documents they seek to file under seal and directed to comply with that obligation.

DATED: September 8, 2004

[Signature: Rodney S. Melville]
RODNEY S. MELVILLE
Judge of the Superior Court

1 Thomas A. Mesereau, Jr. (SBN 91182)
 Susan C. Yu (SBN 195640)
 2 COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU
 1875 Century Park East, 7th Floor
 3 Los Angeles, CA 90067
 Telephone: 310-284-3120
 4 Facsimile: 310-284-3133

5 Steve Cochran (SBN 105541)
 Stacey McKee Knight (SBN 181027)
 6 KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
 2029 Century Park East, Suite 2600
 7 Los Angeles, California 90067
 Telephone: (310) 788-4400
 8 Facsimile: (310) 712-8455

9 Robert M. Sanger (SBN 58214)
 SANGER & SWYSEN
 10 233 E. Carrillo Street, Suite C
 Santa Barbara, California 93101
 11 Telephone: 805-962-4887
 Facsimile: 805-963-7311

12 Brian Oxman (SBN 072172)
 13 OXMAN & JAROSCAK
 14 14126 East Rosecrans
 Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
 Telephone: 562-921-5058
 15 Facsimile: 562-921-2298

16 Attorneys for Defendant
 17 MICHAEL J. JACKSON

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

21 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
 22 CALIFORNIA,

23 Plaintiff,

24 vs.

25 MICHAEL J. JACKSON

26 Defendant.

CASE NO. 1133603

NOTICE OF MOTION AND
 MOTION TO COMPEL
 DISCOVERY; MEMORANDUM
 OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
 DECLARATION OF STEVE
 COCHRAN; EXHIBITS

Hearing: September 16, 2004
 Time: 8:30 a.m.
 Place: Dept. 9

~~FILED UNDER SEAL~~

1 TO PLAINTIFF, PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND THEIR
2 COUNSEL OF RECORD:

3 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on September 16, 2004 at 8:30 a.m., or as soon
4 thereafter as the matter may be heard, before the Honorable Rodney S. Melville,
5 defendant Michael J. Jackson ("Mr. Jackson") through his counsel, will and hereby
6 does move for an order compelling discovery. Specifically, Mr. Jackson requests an
7 order requiring the prosecution to produce information and materials gathered during
8 the 1993-1994 investigation conducted by police and prosecutors in Los Angeles and
9 Santa Barbara counties. Additionally, the results of forensic tests done by the
10 prosecution must be produced.

11 This motion is brought pursuant to Penal Code § 1054.1. The discovery
12 requested is relevant. The prosecution relies on information from the prior
13 investigation in these proceedings, including the affidavit to justify searches in this
14 case. That material also contains, or is likely to lead to, exculpatory evidence.

15 The results of forensic testing by the prosecution are long overdue. The
16 production of that information should now be compelled.

17 The parties have met and conferred to impasse. The prosecution declines to
18 produce this discovery.

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

This motion is based upon this notice, the attached memorandum of points and authorities, declaration of Steve Cochran, exhibits, the file and record and any other information presented prior to a ruling hereon.

DATED: September 3, 2004 Respectfully submitted,

Thomas A. Mesereau, Jr.
Susan C. Yu
COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU

Steve Cochran
Stacey McKee Knight
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN

Robert M. Sanger
SANGER & SWYSEN

Brian Oxman
OXMAN & JAROSCAK

By: Steve Cochran
Steve Cochran
Attorneys for Defendant
MICHAEL J. JACKSON

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. SUMMARY**

3 During 1993 and 1994, Mr. Jackson was the subject of an investigation
4 concerning alleged improprieties with a minor. The investigation was a coordinated
5 effort among the Santa Barbara County District Attorney's Office, the Sheriff's
6 Department of this county, the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office and the Los
7 Angeles Police Department. Criminal charges were not brought against Mr. Jackson
8 as a result of that investigation.

9 A large amount of information was developed during the '93-'94 inquiry.
10 Searches occurred pursuant to warrant. Dozens of witnesses testified before grand
11 juries convened in both counties. Scores of people were interviewed by law
12 enforcement and boxes of documents were gathered.

13 The prosecution has relied on information from the prior investigation in this
14 case. Moreover, in view of the scope and result of the prior investigation, materials
15 in the possession of law enforcement likely contain or will lead to exculpatory
16 evidence.

17 The prosecution refuses to produce reports, transcripts, witness statements and
18 other materials from the prior investigation. This information is relevant and
19 necessary to preserve Mr. Jackson's right to a fair trial. Therefore, the prosecution
20 should be compelled to produce discovery from the '93-'94 investigation.

21 The prosecution has been investigating this matter for over a year. The seized
22 items have been in the prosecution's possession for almost ten months. Defense
23 counsel have informally requested, but have not yet received, the results of forensic
24 tests. Therefore, the production of this discovery should be compelled.

25 **II. THE PERTINENT FACTS**

26 **A. THE PRIOR INVESTIGATION**

27 Between approximately August of 1993 and June of 1994, police and
28 prosecutors from Los Angeles and Santa Barbara Counties coordinated efforts

1 investigating Mr. Jackson. The investigation involved allegations of sexual
2 misconduct with a minor. Criminal charges were never filed.

3 Immense resources were devoted to that matter. Among other things, search
4 warrants were sought and obtained for Mr. Jackson's ranch at Los Olivos and
5 elsewhere. Grand juries were convened in both counties. Numerous witnesses were
6 subpoenaed to testify.

7 According to news reports, police and prosecutors interviewed well over one
8 hundred witnesses. Reports, witness statements and many other documents were
9 generated during the course of the investigation. See Declaration of Steve Cochran.

10 B. THE PROSECUTION'S RELIANCE ON INFORMATION FROM
11 THE PRIOR INVESTIGATION

12 The investigation that led to the charges in this case commenced sometime in
13 2003. Arrest and search warrants were sought and obtained in mid-November.

14 The affidavit that has been used in support of the dozens of searches in this
15 case refers to information developed during the prior investigation. The affidavit
16 quotes material used to search Mr. Jackson's ranch in the prior investigation and
17 summarizes the district attorney's explanation about how that investigation became
18 inactive without criminal charges.

19 Recent hearings in this case have involved whether police acted in excess of a
20 search warrant for certain parts of Mr. Jackson's ranch. The prosecution has sought
21 to justify the breadth of the search by presenting witness testimony about information
22 gathered during the prior investigation. See Declaration of Steve Cochran.

23 C. THE MEET-AND-CONFER ON THIS ISSUE

24 Defense counsel have informally requested the materials from the prior
25 investigation. Correspondence containing this request is attached hereto as Exhibit

26 A. The prosecution has not responded in writing to this request. The prosecution has
27 stated in court, however, that discovery from the prior investigation is irrelevant. See
28 Declaration of Steve Cochran.

1 D. THE RESULTS OF FORENSIC TESTS HAVE NOT BEEN
2 PRODUCED.

3 Police reports produced thus far indicate that the prosecution has
4 commissioned forensic examinations of all kinds. Among other things, analyses of
5 computer data, DNA and fingerprints have been done by the California Dept. of
6 Justice and/or the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

7 The defense informally requested the results of such tests long ago. A copy of
8 that correspondence is attached hereto as Exhibit B. To date, virtually no reports of
9 the results of forensic tests have been produced. See Declaration of Steve Cochran.

10 **III. THIS DISCOVERY SHOULD BE COMPELLED BECAUSE THE**
11 **PROSECUTION HAS RELIED ON INFORMATION FROM THE**
12 **PRIOR INVESTIGATION AND THAT MATERIAL IS LIKELY TO**
13 **CONTAIN OR LEAD TO EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE.**

14 Materials from the investigation of 1993-1994 are within the purview of
15 discovery in this case. The prosecution has already utilized information developed
16 during that investigation and innuendo from the settlement of civil proceedings
17 initiated by the complainant in that matter. The prosecution relies on so-called
18 information from the prior investigation to justify the scope of the November 2003
19 search of Mr. Jackson's ranch. Resort to that information as part of this case obliges
20 the prosecution to provide discovery.

21 Mr. Jackson's right to receive exculpatory information from the prosecution
22 also requires production of materials from the prior investigation. Law enforcement
23 unquestionably developed information rebutting allegations of misconduct from the
24 many people who testified before the grand juries or submitted to informal interview.

25 The volume of material generated during the prior investigation appears to be
26 large. Ample time is necessary for the defense to review and follow up on that
27 information. The prosecution has already waited too long to provide this discovery.

28 ///

1 IV. THE PROSECUTION SHOULD BE COMPELLED TO PRODUCE THE
2 RESULTS OF FORENSIC TESTS.

3 The prosecution has not yet produced the results of forensic examination going
4 on for weeks, if not months. The forensic work covers a wide array of areas from
5 fingerprints to computers to DNA.

6 Ample time is needed to review results obtained by the prosecution and
7 conduct independent analyses. Accordingly, the prosecution should be ordered to
8 produce promptly the results of all forensic examinations of any kind.

9 V. CONCLUSION

10 The materials gathered during the prior investigation are relevant and
11 exculpatory, as are the results of forensic tests. Accordingly, Mr. Jackson
12 respectfully requests an order compelling the prosecution to provide discovery.

13 DATED: September 3, 2004 Respectfully submitted,

14 Thomas A. Mescreau, Jr.
15 Susan C. Yu
16 COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU

17 Steve Cochran
18 Stacey McKee Knight
19 KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN

20 Robert M. Sanger
21 SANGER & SWYSEN

22 Brian Oxman
23 OXMAN & JAROSCAK

24 By: Steve Cochran
25 Steve Cochran
26 Attorneys for Defendant
27 MICHAEL J. JACKSON
28

1 DECLARATION OF STEVE COCHRAN

2 I, Steve Cochran, declare and say:

3 1. I am an attorney duly authorized to practice before all courts of the State
4 of California and am a partner of the law firm of Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman,
5 counsel for defendant Michael Jackson in the above-entitled case. I submit this
6 declaration in support of a defense motion to compel discovery.

7 2. Between approximately August of 1993 and June of 1994, police and
8 prosecutors from Los Angeles and Santa Barbara Counties coordinated efforts
9 investigating Mr. Jackson. The investigation involved allegations of sexual
10 misconduct with a minor. Criminal charges were never filed.

11 3. Immense resources were devoted to that matter. Among other things,
12 search warrants were sought and obtained for Mr. Jackson's ranch at Los Olivos and
13 elsewhere. Grand juries were convened in both counties. Numerous witnesses were
14 subpoenaed to testify.

15 4. According to news reports, police and prosecutors interviewed well over
16 one hundred witnesses. Reports, witness statements and many other documents were
17 generated during the course of the investigation.

18 5. The investigation that led to the charges in this case commenced
19 sometime in 2003. Arrest and search warrants were sought and obtained in mid-
20 November.

21 6. The affidavit that has been used in support of the dozens of searches in
22 this case refers to information developed during the prior investigation. The affidavit
23 quotes material used to search Mr. Jackson's ranch in the prior investigation and
24 summarizes the district attorney's explanation about how that investigation became
25 inactive without criminal charges.

26 7. Recent hearings in this case have involved whether police acted in
27 excess of a search warrant for certain parts of Mr. Jackson's ranch. The prosecution
28 has sought to justify the breadth of the search by presenting witness testimony about

1 information gathered during the prior investigation.

2 8. Defense counsel have informally requested the materials from the prior
3 investigation. Correspondence containing this request is attached hereto as Exhibit
4 A.

5 9. The prosecution has not responded in writing to this request. The
6 prosecution has stated in court, however, that discovery from the prior investigation
7 is irrelevant.

8 10. Reports produced thus far indicate that the prosecution has
9 commissioned forensic examinations of all kinds. Among other things, analyses of
10 computer data, DNA and fingerprints have been done by the California Dept. of
11 Justice and/or the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

12 11. The defense informally requested the results of such tests long ago. A
13 copy of that correspondence is attached hereto as Exhibit B. To date, virtually no
14 reports of the results of forensic tests have been produced.

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

16 Executed this 3rd day of September, 2004 at Los Angeles, California.

17
18 
19 Steve Cochran

20
21
22
23
24
25
26 31214091-1



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com

EXHIBIT A



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com

CMRY

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1875 CENTURY PARK EAST, 7th FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067

TELEPHONE: (310) 284-3120 FACSIMILE: (310) 284-
WEBSITE: WWW.CMRYLAW.COM
EMAIL: MESEREAU@CMRYLAW.COM

THOMAS MESEREAU, JR.
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION
SPECIALIZING IN CRIMINAL DEFENSE

August 11, 2004

VIA FACSIMILE (805) 568-2398

Thomas Sneddon, Esq.
District Attorney's Office
1105 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93108

Re: People v. Jackson, SBSC Case No. 1133603

Dear Mr. Sneddon:

You have previously told the press that you are very familiar with the five boxes of documents gathered in the 1993 case. For instance, on December 3, 2003, the Santa Barbara News Press reported the following:

"Mr. Sneddon, who has been elected county district attorney six times, added that his decision to try the case himself came in part because he is so familiar with the five boxes of transcripts and evidence gathered in that first criminal investigation. The evidence includes photographs, statements from employees and items recovered by detectives in searches of Mr. Jackson's Neverland Valley Ranch and a home in Encino."

"None of that evidence was presented in court. The case fell apart — after months of investigation and testimony heard by criminal grand juries in Santa Barbara and Los Angeles — when the family of the 13-year-old alleged victim made a reported multimillion-dollar out-of-court settlement with the entertainer and declined to cooperate."

The 1993 case was also referenced and presented to the grand jury in this case at length. Request is hereby made that your office produce all documents relating to the 1993 case, including, but not limited to, all documents and items of evidence contained in the referenced five boxes, the entire grand jury transcripts, and any and all documents referencing, directly or indirectly, [REDACTED]

Thank you in advance for your professional cooperation in this regard.

Very truly yours,


Thomas A. Mesereau, Jr.



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com

EXHIBIT B



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com



mjfacts.com

KMZ Rosenman
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN

2000 Century Park East, Suite 2000
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2010
Tel: 310 788 4471 Fax: 310 788 4471

STEVE COCHRAN
steve.cochran@kmzr.com
310 718 4433 direct 310 712 8455 fax

January 30, 2004

By fax and mail

Gerald Franklin
Deputy District Attorney
1105 Santa Barbara St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Re: People v. Michael Joe Jackson
Case Number 1133603

Dear Mr. Franklin:

Please accept this informal discovery request pursuant to Penal Code § 1054.5(b). On behalf of Mr. Jackson, we request the following disclosures:

1. The names and current addresses and telephone numbers of all witnesses you intend to call to testify at trial and of all percipient witnesses and potential witnesses, whether or not the prosecution intends to call such witnesses to testify against Mr. Jackson at trial. Penal Code sections 1054.1(a), 1054.1(e); Brady v. Maryland (1963) 373 U.S. 93. See also, In re Littlefield (1993) 5 Cal.4th 122;

2. All statements or utterances by Mr. Jackson, oral or written, however recorded or preserved, whether or not signed or acknowledged by the defendant including, but not limited to, all audio and video tapes. Penal Code section 1054.1(b), 1054.1(e); Brady v. Maryland, supra;

3. The content of any statements made in Mr. Jackson's presence while being interrogated by law enforcement that were intended or might reasonably be expected to have the effect of encouraging Mr. Jackson to give a statement about the offense to the police. People v. Haydel (1974) 12 Cal.3d 190; Napue v. Illinois (1959) 360 U.S. 264;

mjfacts.com

mjfacts.com

mjfacts.com

KMZ Rosenman
KATHY MUCKIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN

Gerald Franklin
Deputy District Attorney

January 30, 2004

Page 2

4. All physical evidence obtained in the investigation of the case against Mr. Jackson. Penal Code section 1054.1(c), 1054.1(e);

5. Any record of criminal arrests or convictions of Mr. Jackson. Penal Code section 1054.1(d)-(e);

6. Any exculpatory evidence, information, documents, and other materials in the possession of, or that have come to the attention of, the District Attorney or of any police department involved in the investigation of the case against Mr. Jackson. Penal Code sections 1054.1(e), 1054(e). *Giglio v. U.S.* (1972) 405 U.S. 150, 92 S. Ct. 763; *Brady v. Maryland*, *supra*;

7. The identity and whereabouts of any material informants. Penal Code section 1054.1(c), 1054(e). *People v. Hobbs* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 978;

8. All written or recorded statements of witnesses who will testify at trial. Penal Code section 1054.1 (e)-(f);

9. All written or recorded statements of percipient witnesses, whether or not they will be called to testify. Penal Code section 1054.1 (e)-(f);

10. Any record of criminal arrests or convictions (whether felonies or misdemeanors) of any witness to be called to testify against Mr. Jackson. Penal Code section 1054.1 (e), 1054(e); *People v. Lang* (1989) 49 Cal3d 991; *People v. Harris* (1989) 47 Cal-3d 1047. See, *People v. Pinholster* (1992) 1 Cal.4th 865, 938, 939; *People v. Pensinger* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1210,1271;

11. All records concerning arrests of any alleged victims, complaints filed against any alleged victims, or information concerning incidents of specific acts of aggression by any alleged victims, as well as the names, addresses, and phone numbers of witnesses to such acts. Penal Code section 1054.1(e); *Engstrom v. Superior Court* (1971) 20 Cal.App.3d 240, 245;

mjfacts.com

mjfacts.com

mjfacts.com

mjfacts.com

KMZ Rosenman
KATIE MUGHIN LAVIS ROSENMAN

Gerald Franklin
Deputy District Attorney

January 30, 2004
Page 3

12. All notes and reports of police officers and investigators concerning offenses charged. This includes field notes, bench notes and reports concerning all aspects of the case, e.g. the alleged crime, Mr. Jackson's arrest, law enforcement activities and observations, and conversations with witnesses. Penal Code section 1054.1(e)-(f):

13. Any evidence to be used in rebuttal of the defense case. *Izazaga v. Superior Court* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 356; *People v. Bunyard* (1988) 45 Cal.3d 1189.

14. The content and timing of communications between Larry Feldman and anyone from the sheriff or district attorney's offices.

15. The content and timing of communications between Dr. Stan Katz and anyone from the sheriff or district attorney's offices.

16. The content and timing of any communications between Tom Sneddon and anyone from the complainant's family.

17. A copy of physical evidence amenable to duplication, e.g., videotapes, audiotapes, etc.

18. Notice of evidence offered under Evidence Code §§ 1101 and 1108.

19. The results of any forensic analysis.

20. The content and timing of any communications between [REDACTED] and anyone from the sheriff or district attorney's offices.

21. The content and timing of any communications between [REDACTED] and anyone from the sheriff or district attorney's offices relating to Mr. Jackson, the complainant and/or any member of the complainant's family.

mjfacts.com

mjfacts.com

mjfacts.com

mjfacts.com

KMZ Rosenman
CATTED MACHIN PAVIS ROSENMAN

Gerald Franklin
Deputy District Attorney

January 30, 2004
Page 4

22. The content and timing of any communications between anyone from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and anyone from the sheriff or district attorney's offices.

23. All telephonic records obtained as part of the investigation into the offenses charged.

24. All search warrants and supporting affidavits for phone records sought relating to Mr. Jackson, the complainant, the complainant's family and/or the offenses charged.

Please allow this letter to serve as a reminder that the prosecution has a duty to disclose evidence favorable to the defendant pursuant to the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. (*United States v. Bagley* (1985) 473 U.S. 667, 674-78.) The prosecutor's duties of disclosure under the due process clause are wholly independent of any statutory scheme of reciprocal discovery. (*Izazaga v. Superior Court* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 356, 378.)

This is a request that continues through the completion of trial. Your cooperation and quick response to this request is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Steve Cochran
Steve Cochran

Benjamin Brafman
Benjamin Brafman

Mark J. Geragos
Mark J. Geragos

Robert M. Sanger
Robert M. Sanger

mjfacts.com

mjfacts.com

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I
3 am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within action, and my business
4 address is Karen Muchin Zavis Rosenman (the "business"), 2029 Century Park
5 East, Suite 2600, Los Angeles, California 90067.

6 On September 3, 2004, I served the foregoing documents described as
7 **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY;**
8 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES; DECLARATION OF**
9 **STEVE COCHRAN; EXHIBITS** on the interested parties in this action as
10 follows:

11 () I am readily familiar with the business's practice for collection and
12 processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal
13 Service; such correspondence would be deposited with the United States
14 Postal Service the same day of deposit in the ordinary course of business.

15 (X) By Facsimile Machine, I caused the above-referenced document(s) to be
16 transmitted to the persons listed below:

17 Thomas W. Sneddon, Jr.
18 District Attorney of Santa Barbara
19 1105 Santa Barbara Street
20 Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Fax: 805-568-2398

21 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
22 that the foregoing is true and correct

23 Executed on September 3, 2004 at Los Angeles, California.

24 
25 DANA M. THOMPSON

26 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

PROOF OF SERVICE

1013A(1)(3), 1013(c) CCP

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA:

I am a citizen of the United States of America and a resident of the county aforesaid. I am employed by the County of Santa Barbara, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 312-H East Cook Street, Santa Maria, California.

On SEPTEMBER 10, 20 04, I served a copy of the attached ORDER FOR RELEASE OF REDACTED DOCUMENTS (MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY) addressed as follows:

THOMAS W. SNEDDON, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
1105 SANTA BARBARA STREET
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93101

THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR.
COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU, LLP
1875 CENTURY PARK EAST, 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

X FAX

By faxing true copies thereof to the receiving fax numbers of: 805-568-2398 (DISTRICT ATTORNEY); 310-861-1007 (THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR.). Said transmission was reported complete and without error. Pursuant to California Rules of Court 2005(i), a transmission report was properly issued by the transmitting facsimile machine and is attached hereto.

___ MAIL

By placing true copies thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid, in the United States Postal Service mail box in the City of Santa Maria, County of Santa Barbara, addressed as above. That there is delivery service by the United States Postal Service at the place so addressed or that there is a regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and the place so addressed.

___ PERSONAL SERVICE

By leaving a true copy thereof at their office with their clerk therein or the person having charge thereof.

___ EXPRESS MAIL

By depositing such envelope in a post office, mailbox, subpost office, substation, mail chute, or other like facility regularly maintained by the United States Postal Service for receipt of Express Mail, in a sealed envelope, with express mail postage paid.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 10TH day of SEPTEMBER, 20 04, at Santa Maria, California.


CARRIE L. WAGNER