

1 COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU
Thomas A. Mesereau, Jr., State Bar Number 091182
2 Susan C. Yu, State Bar Number 195640
1875 Century Park East, 7th Floor
3 Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel.: (310) 284-3120, Fax: (310) 284-3133

4 SANGER & SWYSEN
5 Robert M. Sanger, State Bar Number 058214
233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C
6 Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Tel.: (805) 962-4887, Fax: (805) 963-7311

7 OXMAN & JAROSCAK
8 Brian Oxman, State Bar Number 072172
14126 East Rosecrans
9 Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
Tel.: (562) 921-5058, Fax: (562) 921-2298

10 Attorneys for Defendant
11 MICHAEL JOSEPH JACKSON

12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
13 FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, COOK DIVISION
14

15 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF)
16 CALIFORNIA,)

17 Plaintiffs,)

18 vs.)

19 MICHAEL JOSEPH JACKSON,)
20)

21 Defendant.)
22)
23)

) Case No. 1133603
)
) MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
) AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
) FOR A MISTRIAL
)
) Honorable Rodney S. Melville
) Date: March 18, 2005
) Time: 8:30 am
) Dept: SM 8

24
25
26
27
28 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR A
MISTRIAL

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

MAR 18 2005

GARY M. BLAIR, Executive Officer
Carrillo & Wagner
CARRIE L. WAGNER, Deputy Clerk

1 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR

2 MISTRIAL

3 I.

4 THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY SPECIFICALLY VIOLATED THE COURT'S ORDER
5 THAT HE NOT MAKE ANY REFERENCE TO THE 1993 MATTERS UNLESS AND
6 UNTIL THE COURT RULES ON THE 1108 MOTION, AFTER HOLDING A 402
7 HEARING

8 Mr. Auchincloss specifically elicited the heart of their 1108 evidence. Mr. Auchincloss
9 himself, by leading questions, named the very people that the prosecution claims to be victims of
10 prior offenses. Furthermore, he attempted to elicit the very theory of the 1108 motion. Mr.
11 Auchincloss specifically asked Kiki Fournier about Mr. Jackson's relationships with MacCauley
12 Culkin, Brett Barnes, Jimmy Safechuck, Wade Robson, and Jordan Chandler. He then used
13 leading questions to imply that those relationships were improper.

14 Remember that it was Mr. Auchincloss who asked the witness leading questions with the
15 names of Jordan Chandler and Jimmy Safechuck. He cannot claim that he did not know that the
16 witness would give an unexpected answer. She did not give those names, he did.

17 This is exactly the same evidence that the prosecution is seeking to introduce via the still
18 pending Section 1108 motion. (1108 Motion, page 2.)

19 Mr. Mesereau made an objection, pursuant to the Court's ruling on the Section 1108
20 motion when Mr. Auchincloss mentioned Mr. Safechuck and Mr. Chandler. (RT: 2539:19-20.)
21 The Court sustained the objection. Mr. Auchincloss continued his improper line of questioning,
22 despite the sustained objection. Mr. Auchincloss asked Ms. Fournier what Mr. Safechuck's age
23 was at the time of the "special relationship."¹ Mr. Mesereau again objected and the Court
24 overruled the objection. (2541:3-9.) Mr. Auchincloss asked about Wade Robson (RT 2640:3)

25
26 ¹ The phrases "special relationship" and "special friends" were introduced to the jury by
27 Mr. Auchincloss, not the witness. The record demonstrates that Ms. Fournier did not use either
28 phrase during her testimony.

1 and Mr. Mesereau objected. (RT 2640:4.) This time the Court sustained the objection. (RT
2 2640:5.)

3 This is precisely the type of willful misconduct which necessitates the granting of a
4 mistrial. It is true that there has been a substantial investment of time and money by the Court
5 and by the defense.² However, it is not tolerable to allow the prosecution to benefit from its own
6 willful misconduct on the grounds of economy. This was a calculated move. Mr. Auchincloss
7 not only knew what was coming but actually was the one who asked about the individuals by
8 name. If he jeopardized the substantial investment of the court and others, he did so with his
9 eyes wide open.

10 In light of this blatant misconduct the only remedy is to grant a mistrial.

11 II.

12 THE COURT SHOULD NOT REWARD INTENTIONAL MISCONDUCT BY MR.
13 AUCHINCLOSS

14 It may also be that the prosecution seeks to force the Court into granting the 1108 motion
15 so that they can claim that there was no harm, therefore, a mistrial is not granted. It appears that
16 the prosecution has intentionally put the Court in the position of having to either grant a mistrial
17 or grant the prosecution's Section 1108 motion. This type of calculated behavior through the use
18 of leading questions should not be rewarded.

19 However, in the event that the motion for mistrial is not granted, we respectfully request
20 that the Court summarily deny the 1108 motion as a sanction. Although we maintain that the
21 motion should be denied on the merits, it is an appropriate to deny it as a sanction for the willful
22 disregard of the Court's order and taking whatever other remedy the court may deem just and
23 proper.

24
25
26 ² It is possible that Mr. Auchincloss was counting on the Court to be reluctant to grant a
27 mistrial when he took a calculated risk to directly violate an order of this Court.

28 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR A
MISTRIAL

1 III.

2 WE RESERVE THE RIGHT TO ARGUE THAT A RE-TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE
3 PERMITTED

4 The government's case is weak and their own witnesses have not met the promises of the
5 government's opening statement. It appears that the government is deliberately trying to provoke
6 a mistrial so that they can start again. Nevertheless, under the circumstances, the defense has no
7 choice but to move for a mistrial because the prejudice to continuing in light of the misconduct
8 by the prosecution is too great. Notwithstanding the defense request for a mistrial, this type of
9 willful misconduct in order to gain another otherwise jeopardy barred bite at the apple should not
10 result in the government getting that bite. When the prosecution acts in bad faith in an attempt to
11 goad the defense into requesting a mistrial, then principles of former jeopardy may preclude any
12 retrial of defendant. (See *Oregon v. Kennedy* (1982) 456 U.S. 667; *People v. Batts* (2003) 30
13 Cal.4th 660, 695-696.)

14 However, the Court must decide the motion for mistrial on the merits. The legal
15 consequences will fall where they may.

16 IV.

17 CONCLUSION

18 Therefore, the Court should grant a mistrial.

19 Dated: March 18, 2005

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

21 SANGER & SWYSEN
Robert M. Sanger

22 OXMAN & JAROSCAK
23 Brian Oxman

24
25 By: 

26 Robert M. Sanger
Attorneys for Defendant
27 MICHAEL JOSEPH JACKSON

28 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR A
MISTRIAL