



1 Battered Women's Syndrome (BWS). The prosecution has failed to establish the relevance of  
2 BWS expert testimony to this case. The District Attorney presents an argument, in summary  
3 form, that Janet Arvizo was the victim of a violent spouse. This does not provide the Court with  
4 adequate information to make a determination as to whether or not Janet Arvizo was ever  
5 actually abused, let alone, that she suffered from a pattern of abuse that would produce BWS.

6 The admission of such testimony threatens to deprive Mr. Jackson of his federal and state  
7 constitutional rights to a fair trial, due process of law, and right to a reliable verdict and sentence  
8 pursuant to the Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States  
9 Constitution and Article 1, Sections 7, 15, 17 and 24 of the California Constitution.

10 **ARGUMENT**

11 **I.**

12 **IT IS PREMATURE TO RULE ON THIS MOTION BECAUSE THE PROSECUTION**  
13 **HAS FAILED TO PRESENT FACTS TO THE COURT THAT WOULD JUSTIFY THE**  
14 **INTRODUCTION OF BATTERED WOMEN'S SYNDROME TESTIMONY**

15 It is premature for the Court to be deciding these issues. It is not possible for the defense  
16 to adequately oppose this motion, because the prosecution has not provided the statements of the  
17 proposed witnesses, except in summary fashion, by way of argument. Defense counsel does not  
18 know the name of the prosecution's expert. Defense counsel does not know what the  
19 prosecution's experts will say.

20 The prosecution have not presented evidence that would lay a foundation for the  
21 admission for this type of testimony. They have not adequately shown that Janet Arvizo was a  
22 battered woman or behaving in any way that was consistent with a battered woman. The  
23 prosecution's motion explains how BWS testimony would bolster the testimony of Janet Arvizo,  
24 but they have not established that her behavior was consistent with being a battered woman.

25 Evidence Code Section 1107 (b) states the requirements for the introduction of BWS  
26 testimony: "The foundation shall be sufficient for admission of this expert testimony if the  
27

1 proponent of the evidence establishes its relevancy and the proper qualifications of the expert  
2 witness.” Here, the prosecution has not yet named its expert, let alone demonstrated to the Court  
3 that the expert is qualified. The prosecution has also failed to lay the necessary foundation to  
4 establish the relevancy of this type of testimony in a conspiracy/child molestation case.

5 Instead of acknowledging that Janet Arvizo is not a credible witness and dismissing the  
6 case, the prosecution seeks to bring in “experts” and distractions with the hope that the jury will  
7 believe Mr. Jackson to be guilty in the absence of actual proof.

8 **II.**

9 **CONCLUSION**

10 For the above stated reasons, Mr. Jackson objects to the introduction of BWS testimony  
11 by a yet to be named expert.


12 Dated: January 21, 2005

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

16 SANGER & SWYSEN  
17 Robert M. Sanger

18 OXMAN & JAROSCAK  
19 Brian Oxman

20 By:

21   
22 Robert M. Sanger  
23 Attorneys for Defendant  
24 MICHAEL JOSEPH JACKSON  
25  
26  
27

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned declare:

I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. I am employed in the County of Santa Barbara. My business address is 233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C, Santa Barbara, California, 93101.

On January 21, 2005, I served the foregoing documents on the interested parties in this action by depositing a true copy thereof as follows: EXPARTE APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER THAT NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ORDER THAT OPPOSITION TO DA MOTION RE ADMISSION OF EXPERT TESTIMONY ON BATTERED WOMENS SYNDROME and OPPOSITION TO DA MOTION RE ADMISSION OF EXPERT TESTIMONY ON BATTERED WOMENS SYNDROME and REDACTED VERSION on the interested parties in this action by depositing a true copy thereof as follows:

Tom Sneddon  
Gerald Franklin  
Ron Zonen  
Gordon Auchincloss  
District Attorney  
1112 Santa Barbara Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
805-568-2398

       **BY U.S. MAIL** - I am readily familiar with the firm's practice for collection of mail and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. Such correspondence is deposited daily with the United States Postal Service in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid and deposited during the ordinary course of business. Service made pursuant to this paragraph, upon motion of a party, shall be presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date or postage meter date on the envelope is more than one day after the date of deposit.

  X   **BY FACSIMILE** - I caused the above-referenced document(s) to be transmitted via facsimile to the interested parties

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

Executed January <sup>21, 2005</sup> ~~18~~, 2005, at Santa Barbara, California.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bobette J. Tryon