

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, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
3 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Telephone: (310) 284-3120  
4 Facsimile: (310) 284-3133

5 **KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN**  
Steve Cochran, State Bar Number 105541  
6 Stacy McKee Knight, State Bar Number 181027  
2029 Century Park East  
7 Suite 2600  
Los Angeles, California 90067-3012  
8 Telephone: (310) 788-4455  
Facsimile: (310) 712-8455

9 **SANGER & SWYSEN**  
Attorneys at Law  
10 Robert M. Sanger, State Bar No. 058214  
233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C  
11 Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
Telephone: (805) 962-4887  
12 Facsimile: (805) 963-7311

13 Attorneys for Defendant MICHAEL JOSEPH JACKSON  
14

15 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
16 FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, COOK DIVISION  
17

18 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 vs.

21 MICHAEL JOSEPH JACKSON,

22 Defendant.  
23  
24

) Case No. 1133603

) TABLE OF CONTENTS AND TABLE OF  
) AUTHORITIES TO THE NOTICE OF  
) MOTION AND MOTION TO SET ASIDE  
) THE INDICTMENT (Penal Code § 995);  
) MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
) AUTHORITIES

) ~~FILED UNDER SEAL~~

) Honorable Rodney S. Melville

) Date: July 9, 2004

) Time: 8:30 am.

) Dept: SM 2  
25  
26  
27

28 TABLE OF CONTENTS AND TABLE OF AUTHORITIES TO THE NOTICE OF MOTION  
AND MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE INDICTMENT  
(Penal Code § 995)

**FILED**  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

JUL 01 2004

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

*Unsealed per  
6/16/05 court  
order*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

INTRODUCTION ..... 4

PROCEDURAL SUMMARY ..... 6

THE SO-CALLED FACTS PRESENTED TO THE GRAND JURY ..... 6

    A. BACKGROUND ..... 6

    B. THE FIRST VISIT TO NEVERLAND ..... 9

    C. THE BASHIR TAPING, BROADCAST AND THE TRIP TO MIAMI, FLORIDA ..... 13

    D. ALLEGED THREATS, "ESCAPES" FROM NEVERLAND, THE REBUTTAL INTERVIEW AND THE PASSPORTS FOR TRAVEL TO BRAZIL ..... 25

    E. THE ALLEGED INCIDENTS OF LEWD CONDUCT ..... 43

    F. THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED BY LOS ANGELES COUNTY ..... 52

    G. THE ARVIZO'S MEET WITH WILLIAM DICKERMAN ..... 62

    H. THE ARVIZOS LEAVE NEVERLAND ..... 65

    I. LARRY FELDMAN'S REFERRAL TO DR. STAN KATZ AND ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT ..... 72

    J. MR. JACKSON'S SUPPOSED TIES TO AN ALLEGED CONSPIRACY ..... 77

    K. INVESTIGATION BY SANTA BARBARA COUNTY ..... 82

    L. THE PERFUNCTORY PRESENTATION OF DEFENSE MATERIAL PROVIDED TO THE PROSECUTION ..... 87

ARGUMENT ..... 88

    I. THE GRAND JURY PROCESS IS DESIGNED TO PROTECT THE ACCUSED FROM UNWARRANTED PROSECUTION ..... 88

    II. THE TRIAL COURT THAT MUST DETERMINE UNDER PENAL CODE SECTION 995 WHETHER OR NOT THE GRAND JURY ABUSED ITS POWER IN RETURNING THE INDICTMENT ..... 89

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

III. THE ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE IS INSUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH A STRONG SUSPICION OF THE ELEMENTS NECESSARY TO SHOW MR. JACKSON WAS PART OF A CONSPIRACY ..... 91

A. Proof of Intent to Agree or Conspire ..... 92

B. Proof of Specific Intent to Commit Specific Crimes ..... 92

IV. MERE ASSOCIATION WITH THE PERPETRATOR OF A CRIME IS NOT SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO ESTABLISH PARTICIPATION IN A CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY ..... 94

V. THE EVIDENCE THAT ALLEGEDLY TIES MR. JACKSON TO A CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY IS INADMISSIBLE OVER OBJECTION AT TRIAL ..... 95

A. "An Indictment Based Solely On Hearsay Or Otherwise Incompetent Evidence Is Unauthorized And Must Be Set Aside On A Motion Under Penal Code Section 995." (*People v. Backus* (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 360, 387.) ..... 95

B. The Overt Acts, Listed In The Indictment, Are Not Supported By The Admissible Evidence. .... 97

C. Once The Inadmissible Evidence Is Properly Excised, There Is Nothing That Connects Mr. Jackson To The Overt Acts Or To The Conspiracy Itself. 100

VI. MANY OF THE OVERT ACTS THAT MR. JACKSON IS ALLEGED TO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN PERSONALLY DO NOT HAVE ANY RATIONAL CONNECTION TO A CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT CHILD ABDUCTION, FALSE IMPRISONMENT AND EXTORTION ..... 101

VII. THE INDICTMENT MUST BE SET ASIDE BECAUSE THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY PRESENTED THE GRAND JURY WITH SO MUCH INCOMPETENT AND IRRELEVANT EVIDENCE THAT IT WOULD BE UNREASONABLE TO EXPECT THAT THE GRAND JURY COULD LIMIT ITS CONSIDERATION TO THE ADMISSIBLE, RELEVANT EVIDENCE ..... 102

A. The Prosecution Presented The Grand Jury With A Tremendous Amount Of Inadmissible And Irrelevant Evidence. .... 102

B. The Appearance Of Bias In And Of Itself, Requires That The Entire Indictment Be Set Aside. .... 121

C. The Individual Instances Of Misconduct Discussed Above Are Enough To Require That The Indictment Be Set Aside and, When Taken As A Whole, The Cumulative Effect is Overwhelming. .... 121

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

VIII. SHOULD THE COURT GRANT MR. JACKSON'S CONCURRENTLY FILED  
MOTION TO TRAVERSE, QUASH, AND SUPPRESS IS GRANTED, MR.  
JACKSON MUST RECEIVE A NEW DETERMINATION OF PROBABLE  
CAUSE WITH THE ILLEGALLY OBTAINED EVIDENCE EXCISED FROM THE  
EVIDENCE PRESENTED TO THE GRAND JURY ..... 122

IX. MR. JACKSON WAS DENIED HIS RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR  
GRAND JURY PROCEEDING DUE TO IMPROPRIETIES IN GRAND JURY  
PROCEDURE ..... 122

X. THE INDICTMENT MUST BE SET ASIDE BECAUSE THE PROSECUTOR  
MISSTATED THE LAW OF CONSPIRACY WHEN INSTRUCTING THE  
GRAND JURORS AND THE MISSTATEMENT OF LAW CAUSED THE  
GRAND JURY TO RETURN AN INDICTMENT ON LESS THAN  
REASONABLE OR PROBABLE CAUSE ..... 123

    A. The Prosecution Misstated The Law Regarding The Required Elements Of  
    Conspiracy. .... 124

    B. The Misstatement Of Law Was Prejudicial Because The Grand Jury Was Not  
    In A Position To Correct The District Attorney's Misstatement Of Law.  
    ..... 125

    C. The Trial Judge Cannot Correct Instructional Error By Attempting To Make  
    Its Own Determination Of Sufficiency Of The Evidence.  
    ..... 125

XI. CONCLUSION ..... 126

APPENDIX A ..... 127

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1

2 United States Supreme Court Cases

3 *Krulwitch v. United States* (1949) 336 U.S. 440 ..... 94

4 California Supreme Court Cases

5 *Cummiskey v. Superior Court* (1992) 3 Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 1018 ..... 88, 123

6 *Garabedian v. Superior Court* (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 124 ..... 90

7 *Greenberg v. Superior Court* (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 319 ..... 88

8 *In re Tyler* (1884) 64 Cal. 434 ..... 102

9 *Johnson v. Superior Court* (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 248 ..... 88, 90, 101, 122, 125

10 *People v. Aranda* (1965) 63 Cal.2d 518 ..... 103

11 *People v. Backus* (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 360 ..... 88, 92, 96, 102, 122

12 *People v. Eubanks* (1996) 14 Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 580 ..... 121

13 *People v. Hill* (1998) 17 Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 800 ..... 107

14 *People v. Horn* (1974) 12 Cal.3d 290 ..... 92, 124

15 *People v. Morante* (1999) Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 403 ..... 124

16 *People v. Morris* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 1 ..... 89, 90

17 *People v. Swain* (1996) 12 Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 593 ..... 124

18 *People v. Valenti* (1957) 49 Cal 2d 199 ..... 97

19 *Union Const. Co. V. Western Union Tel. Co.* (1912) 163 Cal. 298 ..... 98

20 *Williams v. Superior Court* (1969) 71 Cal.2d. 1144 ..... 123

21 California Appellate Courts

22 *Dong Haw v. Superior Court* (1947) 81 Cal.App.2d 153 ..... 94

23 *Birt v. Superior Court* (1973) 34 Cal.App. 3d 934 ..... 90, 101

24 *People v. Boehm* (1969) 270 Cal.App. 2d 13 ..... 89

25 *People v. Byars* (1961) Cal.App. 2d 794 ..... 97

26 *People v. Fisk* (1975) 50 Cal.App.3d 64 ..... 123

27 *People v. Gnass* (2002) 101 Cal.App. 4<sup>th</sup> 1271 ..... 123, 125, 126

1	<i>People v. Horace</i> (1954) 127 Cal.App. 2d 366 .....	98
2	<i>People v. Manson</i> (1976) 61 Cal.App. 3d 102 .....	94
3	<i>People v. Samarjian</i> (1966) 240 Cal.App.2d 13 .....	94
4	<i>People v. Sherwin</i> (2000) 82 Cal.App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 1404 .....	122
5	<i>People v. Superior Court (Mouchaourab)</i> (2000) 78 Cal.App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 403 .....	124
6	<i>People v. Villa</i> (1957) 156 Cal.App. 2d 128 .....	94
7	<u>California Statutes</u>	
8	California Evidence Code Section 1152 .....	72
9	California Evidence Code Section 1360 .....	105
10	CALJIC 6.10 .....	91
11	CALJIC 6.18 .....	94
12	CALJIC 9.70 .....	92
13	CALJIC 14.70 .....	93
14	CALJIC 16.135 .....	93
15	Penal Code Section 939.6 .....	89, 91, 97
16	Penal Code Section 995 .....	96
17	Penal Code Section 182 .....	6
18	Penal Code Section 222 .....	6
19	Penal Code Section 288 (a) .....	6
20	Penal Code Section 664 .....	6
21	Penal Code Section 939.8 .....	123
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

**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 July 1, 2004, I served the foregoing document TABLE OF CONTENTS AND TABLE OF AUTHORITIES TO THE MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE INDICTMENT (Penal Code § 995); MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES 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  
1105 Santa Barbara Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
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.

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

BY HAND - I caused the document to be hand delivered to the interested parties at the address above.

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

Executed July 1, 2004, at Santa Barbara, California.

  
Bobette J. Tryon