1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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) Scnior Deputy District Attorney 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101 Tclephone: (805) 568-2300 FAX: (805) 568-2398 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA			
10	SANTA MARIA DIVISION			
11				
12	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, \ No. 1133603			
13	Plaintiff, PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF			
14) MOTION AND MOTION FOR v.) COURT'S REVIEW OF PEOPLE'S RESPONSE TO			
15) DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO			
16	MICHAEL JOE JACKSON, OCOMPEL DISCOVERY, TO DETERMINE WHETHER SEALING			
17	Defendant.) IS APPROPRIATE; DECLARATION OF GERALD McC. FRANKLIN;			
18) MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES			
19	UNDERSEAL			
20	DATE: September 16, 2004			
21	TIME: 8:30 a.m. DEPT: TBA (Melville)			
22	ع الله عن الله			
23	TO: MICHAEL JOE JACKSON, AND TO THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., STEVE			
24				
25	COCHRAN, ROBERT SANGER AND BRIAN OXMAN, HIS ATTORNEYS OF RECORD,			
26	AND TO THEODORE J. BOUTROUS, JR., ESQ., GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP:			
27	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on October 14, 2004, at 8:30 a.m. or as soon thereafter as			
- 1	the matter may be heard, in the Department to be assigned, Plaintiff will, and hereby does, request			
28	the Court to review Plaintiff's Response To Defendant's Motion To Compel Discovery, filed			
	mjfacts.com mjfacts.com			

PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST THAT COURT DETERMINE APPROPRIATENESS OF SEALING RESPONSE TO MOTION

contemporaneously with this Motion, to determine for itself whether an order directing that the Response To Defendant's Motion To Compel Discovery is an appropriate document for sealing., and that the Request be maintained under conditional seal until further order of court, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 243.1 et seq.

The motion will be made on the ground that the facts, as established by the accompanying declaration of Gerald McC. Franklin, may not be sufficient to justify sealing the specified motion pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 243.1 et seq.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration of Gerald McC. Franklin and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and the file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.

DATED: October 14, 2004

THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR.
District Attorney

By: Attorneys for Plaintiff

mifacts.com

mifacts.com

mifacts.com

mifacts.com

mifacts.com

mifacts.com

mifacts.com

1, 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,

- 2. This motion to conditionally seal the contemporaneously-filed Plaintiff's Response To Defendant's Motion To Compel Discovery, and requesting that the Court determine for itself whether the Response is suitable for sealing, is made on the ground that the Response does not, in the undersigned's opinion, itself reveal any information that would warrant scaling.
- 3. I believe that the interest of each party to a fair trial dictates that the Response should remain under conditional scal until the appropriateness of scaling the document and, if scaling is ordered, of the release of a redacted version of the opposition is determined by the court.

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 Barbara, California on October 8, 2004.

Gerald McC. Franklin

Octato Ivico, i imikili

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

The procedure for sealing records under California Rules of Court, rule 243.1 et seq. applies only to records that are deemed public. (Id., rule 243.1(a)(2).) Motions and responsive pleadings in criminal cases are, ordinarily, "public" records of the court.

Rule 243.1(d) provides that

The court may order that a record be filed under seal only if it expressly finds facts that establish:

- (1) There exists an overriding interest that overcomes the right of public access to the record;
 - (2) The overriding interest supports sealing the record;
- (3) A substantial probability exists that the overriding interest will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed;
 - (4) The proposed sealing is narrowly tailored; and
 - (5) No less restrictive means exist to achieve the overriding interest.

Rule 243.1(e) provides, in pertinent part:

(1) An order scaling the record must (i) specifically set forth the facts findings that support the findings and (ii) direct the scaling of only those documents and pages, or, if reasonably practicable, portions of those documents and pages, that contain the material that needs to be placed under seal. All other portions of each documents or page must be included in the public file.

Rule 243.2(b) provides, in pertinent part, that "Pending the determination of the motion."

[of a party to file a record under seal], the lodged record will be conditionally under seal."

njfacts.com

mjfacts.com

DATED: October 8, 2004 Respectfully submitted, THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY County of Santa Barbara Gerald McC. Franklin, Scnior Deputy Altorneys for Plaintiff

OF SERVICE

2	PROOF OF SERVICE			
,	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)			
	COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA SS			
5				
5	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:			
	Distinct Add and Office Constant and 1105 Conta Dark on Constant Dark of Contact Dark of Conta			

District Attorney's Office; Courthouse; 1105 Santa Barbara Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101. On October 8, 2004, I served the within PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION FOR COURT'S REVIEW OF PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY on THEODORE BOUTROUS, Media's counsel and on Defendant, by

THOMAS A, MESEREAU, JR., STEVE COCHRAN, ROBERT SANGER and BRIAN OXMAN, by causing a true copy thereof to be transmitted by facsimile to each counsel at the Fax number

shown on the attached Service List.

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

Executed at Santa Barbara, California on this 8th day of October, 2004.

,		SERVICE LIST	
2	mjfacts	.com mjfacts.com	mjfacts.com
3		GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP	
4	1	Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr., Esq. William E. Thomson, Esq.	
5	1	Julian Poon, Esq. 333 S. Grand Avenuc	
6		Los Angelcs, CA 90071-3197 FAX: (213 <mark>) 229-</mark> 6758	
7		Attorneys for (collectively) "Media"	
8		THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR.	
9	1	Collins, Mesereau, Roddock & Yu, LLP 1875 Century Park East, No. 700	
10		Los Angeles, CA 90067 FAX: [CONFIDENTIAL]	
11		Attomcy for Defendant Michael Jackson	
12		STEVE COCHRAN, ESQ.	
13	mjraci	Katten, Muchin, Zavis & Rosenman, Lawyers 2029 Century Park East, Suite 2600	
ł	1	Los Angeles, CA 90067-3012 FAX: (310) 712-8455	
15		Co-counsel for Defendant	
16		ROBERT SANGER, ESQ.	•
17		Sanger & Swysen, Lawyers 233 E. Carrillo Street, Suite C Santa Barbara, CA 93001 FAX: (805) 963-7311	
19	1	Co-counsel for Defendant	
20		BRIAN OXMAN, ESQ.	
21		Oxman & Jaroscak, Lawyers	
22		14126 E. Rosecrans Blvd., Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670	
23		g	
24	mjfact		
25			
26			
27			
28			
	11		