- 11		
2	Herb Fox (SBN 126747) LAW OFFICE OF HERB FOX 15 W. Carrillo Street, Suite 211 Santa Barbara, CA 93101 Telephone (805) 899-4777 Facsimile (805) 899-2121	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
5	Peter Bezek (SBN 102310) FOLEY & BEZEK 15 West Carrillo Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101 Telephone (805) 962-9495	GARY M. BLAIR, Executive Officer  CARRIE L. WAGNER, Deputy Clerk
7		
8	Attorneys for Raymond Chandler	lellelo5 court  STATE OF CALLEDRNIA Order
9		Ollolos Court
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
11	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA	
12	COOK DI	VISION FILED (INDED CEAL
13		FILED UNDER SEAL
14	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )	mitacts con
15	Plaintiff,	VERIFIED OBJECTIONS BY NON PARTY
16	vs.	RAYMOND CHANDLER TO DEFENDANT'S SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM
17	MICHAEL JACKSON,	
18	Defendant,	[Agrigued for All Dymosos to the Hamerchie
19	mifacts.com	[Assigned for All Purposes to the Honorable Rodney S. Melville]
20		Hearing Date November 4, 2004 Time: 8:30 AM
21	{	Dept.: SM-2
22	,	
23	REQUEST NO. 1:	
24	All DOCUMENTS constituting, evidencing	g, concerning, discussing or mentioning Jordan
25	Chandler's relationship with Michael Jackson since Ja	nuary 1, 1992.
26	RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 1:	om mjfacts.com
27	Raymond Chandler objects to producing these documents on the grounds that: (a) the request is	
28	overbroad and burdensome in that the majority of these documents - numbering in the hundreds of	
	1	

pages – are newspaper and magazine articles and court pleadings; (b) these documents are public documents readily available to the defendant; (c) to the extent that any of these documents are unpublished they are protected from compelled production by the journalists shield law.

To the extent that these documents are not newspaper or magazine articles or court pleadings readily available to the defendant, and are not protected from compelled production by the journalists shield law, production will be allowed subject to this Court's ruling on the Motion to Quash filed concurrently with these Objections and this Court's in camera review of the documents.

# REQUEST NO. 2:

All DOCUMENTS constituting, evidencing, concerning, discussing or mentioning any contract, consulting agreement, joint venture agreement, employment relationship, or services arrangement between you and Tellem Worldwide.

# **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 2:**

Raymond Chandler objects to producing these documents on the grounds that the documents requested are irrelevant to the issues in this case.

Notwithstanding said objections, Raymond Chandler is unable to comply with Request No. 2 because no such documents have ever existed. A diligent search and reasonable inquiry has been made in an effort to comply with this demand.

## REQUEST NO. 3:

All DOCUMENTS constituting, evidencing, concerning, discussing or mentioning any communications, correspondence, notes, letters, memoranda, or discussion between you and Tellem Worldwide since January 1, 1992, or any of their REPRESENTATIVES.

# **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 3:**

Raymond Chandler objects to producing these documents on the grounds that (a) the documents requested are irrelevant to the issues in this case and (b) will not reasonably lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Notwithstanding said objections, Raymond Chandler is unable to comply with Request No. 3 because no such documents have ever existed. A diligent search and reasonable inquiry has been made in an effort to comply with this demand.

#### **REQUEST NO. 4:**

All DOCUMENTS constituting, evidencing, concerning, discussing or mentioning any communication, correspondence, notes, letters, or memoranda, or discussion between you and any person, business, or other entity since January 1, 1992, where Michael Jackson has been mentioned or discussed.

#### **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 4:**

Raymond Chandler objects to producing these documents on the grounds that: (a) the request is overbroad and burdensome; (b) are an invasion of privacy; (c) to the extent that any of these documents are unpublished they are protected from compelled production by the journalists shield law; and (d) will not reasonably lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

#### REQUEST NO. 5:

All DOCUMENTS constituting, evidencing, concerning, discussing or mentioning any communication, correspondence, notes, letters, or memoranda, or discussion between you and any law enforcement agency, governmental entity, police personnel, sheriff's personnel, child protective services personnel, or any of their REPRESENTATIVES, whether federal, state, or local, since January 1, 1992, where Michael Jackson or Jordan Chandler has been mentioned or discussed.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 5:

Raymond Chandler objects to producing these documents on the grounds that they are not relevant to the subject matter at hand in that none of these documents contain any information regarding any claims of child molestation or defenses to such claims.

# **REQUEST NO. 6:**

All DOCUMENTS constituting, evidencing, concerning discussing or mentioning any compensation, payment, expense reimbursement, cancelled checks or other evidence of payment, for any speech, writing, manuscript, book, performance, consultation service, work, labor, or other assistance you have provided to any person where the subject matter of Michael Jackson or Jordan Chandler was discussed, mentioned, or involved.

///

///

## **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 6:**

Raymond Chandler objects to producing these documents on the grounds that: (a) the request is overbroad and burdensome; (b) are an invasion of privacy; (c) are irrelevant to the issues in this case; and (d) will not reasonably lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Raymond Chandler is unable to comply with Request No. 6 because no such documents have ever existed. A diligent search and reasonable inquiry has been made in an effort to comply with this demand.

mjfacts.com

# REQUEST NO. 7:

All DOCUMENTS constituting, evidencing, concerning, discussing or mentioning any discussions, letters, notes, communications, contracts, agreements, or correspondence between you and Jordan Chandler, or any of his REPRESENTATIVES, where the subject of Michael Jackson was discussed or mentioned since January 1, 1992.

# RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 7:

Raymond Chandler objects to producing these documents on the grounds that: (a) the request is overbroad and burdensome; (b) are an invasion of privacy; (c) to the extent that any of these documents are unpublished they are protected from compelled production by the journalists shield law; and (d) will not reasonably lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Raymond Chandler is unable to comply with Request No. 2 because no such documents have ever existed. A diligent search and reasonable inquiry has been made in an effort to comply with this demand.

#### **REQUEST NO. 8:**

All DOCUMENTS constituting, evidencing, concerning discussing or mentioning any discussions, letters, notes, communications, contracts, agreements, or correspondence between you and Evan Chandler, or any of his REPRESENTATIVES, where the subject of Michael Jackson or Jordan Chandler was discussed or mentioned since January 1, 1992.

#### **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 8:**

Raymond Chandler objects to producing these documents on the grounds that: (a) the request is overbroad and burdensome; (b) are an invasion of privacy; (c) to the extent that any of these documents

27

28

are unpublished they are protected from compelled production by the journalists shield law; and (d) will not reasonably lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

# REQUEST NO. 9:

All DOCUMENTS constituting, evidencing, concerning, discussing or mentioning manuscripts, manuscript, drafts, research notes, interview notes, interview audio and video recordings, correspondence with witnesses, and discussions with witnesses concerning or relating to the book "All that Glitters: The Crime and the Cover Up" by Raymond Chandler.

## RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 9:

Raymond Chandler objects to producing these documents on the grounds that: (a) the request is overbroad and burdensome; (b) are an invasion of privacy; (c) to the extent that any of these documents are unpublished they are protected from compelled production by the journalists shield law; and (d) will not reasonably lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

mifacts.com

## REQUEST NO. 10:

All DOCUMENTS constituting, evidencing, concerning, discussing or mentioning any contract, agreement, or arrangement for the printing, distribution, promotion, or sale of the book "All that Glitters: The Crime and the Cover Up" by Raymond Chandler.

## **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 10:**

Raymond Chandler objects to producing these documents on the grounds that: (a) they are not relevant to the subject matter at hand in that none of these documents contain any information regarding any claims or defenses to the action; (b) production of these documents is an invasion of privacy in that they reveal personal financial information.

Dated: 0 2 , 2004

LAW OFFICE OF HERB FOX

Herb Fox, Attorney for Non-Party

Raymond Chandler

# COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

I, the undersigned, having read the foregoing OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT'S SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM, say that I am a non-party to this action. I have read the above document and know its contents. The matters stated in it are true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

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

Executed on this 2 I day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2004, at Santa Barbara, California.

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

# STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

I am employed in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years of age and not a party to the within action; my business address is 5 West Carrillo Street, Suite 211, Santa Barbara, California 93101.

On Oct. 25, 2004, I served the foregoing document described as Application To File Under Seal And Without Notice To The People; Objections to Subpoena Duces Tecum; Proposed Order on the interested parties in this action as follows:

Brian Oxman 14126 E. Rosecrans Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670 Telephone (562) 921-5058

BY UNITED STATES MAIL: ((a) for nice Overnight)

[X] I deposited such envelope in the mail at Santa Barbara, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

[ ] As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Santa Barbara, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

[ ] BY PERSONALLY DELIVERY: I personally delivered said envelope to the name and address indicated above.

[ ] BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION: The transmission of this document was reported as complete and without error. A true and correct copy of the transmission reports are attached hereto. This transmission report was property issued by the transmitting facs mile machine on this date.

Executed on Oct - 25, 2004 at Santa Barbara, California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Kristyne Alian