

1 THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY
County of Santa Barbara
2 By: RONALD J. ZONEN (State Bar No. 85094)
Senior Deputy District Attorney
3 J. GORDON AUCHINCLOSS (State Bar No. 150251)
Senior Deputy District Attorney
4 GERALD McC. FRANKLIN (State Bar No. 40171)
Senior Deputy District Attorney
5 1105 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
6 Telephone: (805) 568-2300
FAX: (805) 568-2398
7

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
SEP 16 2004
CLERK OF COURT
COURT HOUSE
SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
10 SANTA MARIA DIVISION

11
12 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,) No. 1133603
13 Plaintiff,)
14 v.)
15 MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,)
16 Defendant.)
17)
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

DATE: Sept. 16, 2004
TIME: 8:30 a.m.
DEPT: SM 2 (Melville)

24 TO: MICHAEL JOE JACKSON, AND TO THOMAS A. MESEREAU, STEVE
25 COCHRAN, and ROBERT SANGER, HIS ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, AND TO
26 THEODORE J. BOUTROUS, JR., ESQ., GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on September 16, 2004, at 8:30 a.m. or as soon

1 thereafter as the matter may be heard, in Department SM 2, Plaintiff will, and hereby does,
2 move for an order directing that the following records be maintained under conditional seal
3 until further order of court, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 243.1 et seq:

4 Warrant No. **SW 5128** for the search of the records of **CELLCO**
5 **PARTNERSHIP DBA: VERIZON WIRELESS**


6 which warrant was issued on August 20, 2004, together with its supporting affidavit and the
7 return, if any, on said warrant.

8 The motion will be made on the ground that the facts, as established by the
9 accompanying declaration of Gerald McC. Franklin, are sufficient to justify sealing the
10 specified records pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 243.1 et seq.

11 The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration of Gerald
12 McC. Franklin and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the
13 records and the file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the
14 motion.

15 DATED: August 27, 2004

16 THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR.
17 District Attorney


18 By: 
19 Gerald McC. Franklin, Senior Deputy

20 Attorneys for Plaintiff
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 investigation has been concluded.

2 6. I believe an order maintaining those records under seal in the interim would avert
3 the probability of prejudice, and that no more narrowly tailored order with respect to those
4 records could be drafted to achieve the overriding interest in a fair trial.

5 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the foregoing is
6 true and correct, except as to matters stated upon my information and belief, and as to such
7 matters I believe it to be true. I execute this declaration at Santa Barbara, California on August
8 27, 2004.

9 
10 Gerald McC. Franklin

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

1
2 Penal Code section 1534, subdivision (a) provides:

3 (a) A search warrant shall be executed and returned within 10 days
4 after date of issuance. A warrant executed within the 10-day period
5 shall be deemed to have been timely executed and no further
6 showing of timeliness need be made. After the expiration of 10
7 days, the warrant, unless executed, is void. The documents and
8 records of the court relating to the warrant need not be open to the
9 public until the execution and return of the warrant or the expiration
10 of the 10-day period after issuance. Thereafter, if the warrant has
11 been executed, the documents and records shall be open to the public
12 as a judicial record.

13 In *PSC Geothermal Services Co. v. Superior Court* (1994) 25 Cal.4th 1697, our
14 Supreme Court noted:

15 “Section 1534 provides that the documents associated with the
16 warrant are public documents 10 days after its execution. Typically
17 after the search, arrests are made. There is no exception in the
18 statute for instances, such as that here, where the search is used to
19 further an ongoing investigation. Such information, however, may
20 be privileged as official information under Evidence Code sections
21 1040, subdivision (a) and 1042, subdivision (b).” (*Id.*, at p. 1714.)

22 Evidence Code section 1040, subdivision (a) provides: “As used in this section,
23 ‘official information’ means information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the
24 course of his or her duty and not open, or officially disclosed, to the public prior to the time the
25 claim of privilege is made.”

26 Evidence Code section 1042, subdivision (b) provides: “Notwithstanding
27 subdivision (a) [requiring a court to make adverse findings adverse to the public entity upon
28 any issue in a court proceeding to which privileged information is material], where a search is
made pursuant to a warrant valid on its face, the public entity bringing a criminal proceeding is
not required to reveal to the defendant *official information* or the identity of an informer in

1 order to establish the legality of the search or the admissibility of any evidence obtained as a
2 result of it.” (Emphasis added.)

3 The procedure for sealing records under California Rules of Court, rule 243.1 et seq.
4 applies only to records that are deemed public. (*Id.*, rule 243.1(a)(2).) Search warrants, their
5 supporting affidavits and the returns thereto are open to the public within 10 days of issuance
6 or until the warrant is executed and returned, whichever is earlier. (Pen. Code, § 1534, subd.
7 (a).)

8 Rule 243.1(d) provides that

9 The court may order that a record be filed under seal only if it
10 expressly finds facts that establish:

11 (1) There exists an overriding interest that overcomes the right of
12 public access to the record;

13 (2) The overriding interest supports sealing the record;

14 (3) A substantial probability exists that the overriding interest will
15 be prejudiced if the record is not sealed;

16 (4) The proposed sealing is narrowly tailored; and

17 (5) No less restrictive means exist to achieve the overriding interest.

18 Rule 243.1(e) provides, in pertinent part:

19 (1) An order sealing the record must (i) specifically set forth the
20 facts findings that support the findings and (ii) direct the sealing of
21 only those documents and pages, or, if reasonably practicable,
22 portions of those documents and pages, that contain the material that
23 needs to be placed under seal. All other portions of each documents
or page must be included in the public file.

24 Rule 243.2(b) provides, in pertinent part, that “Pending the determination of the
25 motion [of a party to file a record under seal], the lodged record will be conditionally under
26 seal.”


27 ////

28 ////

1 DATED: August 27, 2004

2 Respectfully submitted.

3 THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR., DISTRICT ATTORNEY
4 County of Santa Barbara

5 By: 
6 Gerald McC. Franklin, Senior Deputy

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

SERVICE LIST

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP
Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr., Esq.
William E. Thomson, Esq.
Julian Poon, Esq.
333 S. Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
Attorneys for (collectively) "Media"

THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR.
Collins, Mesereau, Reddock & Yu, LLP
1875 Century Park East, No. 700
Los Angeles, CA 90067
FAX: [CONFIDENTIAL]
Attorney for Defendant Michael Jackson

STEVE COCHRAN, ESQ.
Katten, Muchin, Zavis & Rosenman, Lawyers
2029 Century Park East, Suite 2600
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3012
FAX: (310) 712-8455
Co-counsel for Defendant

ROBERT SANGER, ESQ.
Sanger & Swysen, Lawyers
233 E. Carrillo Street, Suite C
Santa Barbara, CA 93001
FAX: (805) 963-7311
Co-counsel for Defendant