

APR 20 2005

GARY M. BLAIR, Executive Officer
By *Carrie L. Wagner*
CARRIE L. WAGNER, Deputy Clerk

1 **COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU**
2 Thomas A. Mesereau, Jr., State Bar Number 091182
3 Susan C. Yu, State Bar Number 195640
4 1875 Century Park East, 7th Floor
5 Los Angeles, CA 90067
6 Tel.: (310) 284-3120, Fax: (310) 284-3133

7 **SANGER & SWYSEN**
8 Robert M. Sanger, State Bar Number 058214
9 233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C
10 Santa Barbara, CA 93101
11 Tel.: (805) 962-4887, Fax: (805) 963-7311

12 **OXMAN & JAROSCAK**
13 Brian Oxman, State Bar Number 072172
14 14126 East Rosecrans
15 Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
16 Tel.: (562) 921-5058, Fax: (562) 921-2298

17 Attorneys for Defendant
18 **MICHAEL JOSEPH JACKSON**

19
20 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
21 FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, COOK DIVISION
22
23

24 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF)
25 CALIFORNIA,)

26 Plaintiffs,)

27 vs.)

28 MICHAEL JOSEPH JACKSON,)

Defendant.)

Case No. 1133603

MR. JACKSON'S RESPONSE TO DISTRICT
ATTORNEY'S MEMORANDUM RE: THE
ADMISSIBILITY OF CERTAIN
TESTIMONY OF SEVERAL OF
DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED WITNESSES

DATE: TBA
TIME: TBA
DEPT: SM-8

1 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

2 ARGUMENT

3 I.

4 MR. JACKSON IS ENTITLED TO REBUT ALLEGED PRIOR OFFENSE EVIDENCE
5 WITH THE TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES WHO HAVE OBSERVED MR. JACKSON
6 INTERACT WITH CHILDREN AND NEVER SEEN ANY IMPROPER BEHAVIOR

7 The government's argument that defense counsel should not be allowed to ask certain
8 defense witnesses about the fact that they never witnessed Mr. Jackson behave improperly with
9 children is without merit. As demonstrated below, the case law in California is clear that a
10 defendant may introduce testimony of witnesses, who have personally observed the defendant
11 interact with children for the purpose of showing that the defendant is not given to lewd acts with
12 children.

13 The prosecution has special leave of court to offer propensity evidence under Evidence
14 Code Section 1108. The Court certainly did not expect that Mr. Jackson would be barred from
15 offering evidence to oppose such evidence. Evidence Code Section 1108 evidence already has a
16 potential for unfairness. To disallow a defense to it would make such evidence not only unfair
17 but invincible.

18 The testimony of lay witnesses that a defendant charged with lewd conduct is not a
19 "sexual deviant," based on witnesses' observations of the defendant's conduct with children, is
20 the proper subject of lay opinion testimony and is relevant to the charge of child molestation.
21 (*People v. McAlpin* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 1289, 1309-1310.) A defendant may introduce evidence of
22 specific instances of his good conduct under similar circumstances, as well as opinion evidence
23 and reputation evidence, to rebut the government's evidence, when government introduces
24 evidence of defendant's commission of another sexual offense. (*People v. Callahan* (1999) 74
25 Cal.App.4th 356.)

26 The government's "negative evidence" argument, regarding the testimony of witnesses
27 that they did not see molestation, has been distinguished from this type of case by the California
28

1 Supreme Court. The Court in *McAlpin* and stated that:

2 The proffered testimony is thus distinguishable from the hypothetical suggested
3 by the trial court, viz., "it's like saying, well, this defendant is charged with
4 robbing a bank and I have a witness who saw him walk past a bank a week before
5 without robbing it."

6 (*People v. McAlpin* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 1289, 1309 Fn. 14.)

7 The government concedes that the witnesses are present and former employees, as well as
8 people who do work at Neverland "on a regular basis." (Memorandum, page 1.) The witnesses
9 are not people who happened to observe Mr. Jackson on a few isolated occasions. These are
10 precisely the types of witnesses who are in a position to testify to personal observations regarding
11 Mr. Jackson's interaction with children.

12 II.

13 CONCLUSION

14 The case law allows this type of testimony and it should be admitted to ensure that Mr.
15 Jackson is not deprived of his Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendment rights to due process and a
16 fair trial.


17 Dated: April 20, 2005

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

21 SANGER & SWYSEN
22 Robert M. Sanger

23 OXMAN & JAROSCAK
24 Brian Oxman

25 For By:

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