

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

SEP 21 2004

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL JACKSON, et al.

Defendant.

) Case No.: 1133603

) Order for Release of Redacted Documents

) [Plaintiff's Reply to Defendant's  
) Supplemental Brief to Traverse Affidavits,  
) Quash Warrants and Suppress Evidence]

The redacted form of the Plaintiff's Reply to Defendant's Supplemental Brief to Traverse Affidavits, Quash Warrants and Suppress Evidence prepared by the court and attached to this order shall be released and placed in the public file. The unredacted original shall be maintained conditionally under seal pending the hearing on October 14, 2004. The document was filed prior to the court's indication to the parties that the failure to provide proposed redacted versions will result in monetary sanctions. Thus, no sanctions are ordered.

DATED: September 21, 2004

*Rodney S. Melville*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RODNEY S. MELVILLE  
Judge of the Superior Court

COPY

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 GORDON AUCHINCLOSS (State Bar No. 150251)  
Senior Deputy District Attorney  
4 GERALD McC. FRANKLIN (State Bar No. 40171)  
Senior Deputy District Attorney  
5 1112 Santa Barbara Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
6 Telephone: (805) 568-2300  
7 FAX: (805) 568-2398

FILED  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

SEP 16 2004

GARY M. ELAID, Executive Officer  
BY Carmel L. Wagner  
CARMEL L. WAGNER, Legal Clerk

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,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15  
16 MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,

17 Defendant.

No. 1133603

PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO  
DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL  
BRIEF TO TRAVERSE  
AFFIDAVITS, QUASH  
WARRANTS AND SUPPRESS  
EVIDENCE

DATE: September 17, 2004  
TIME: 8:30 a.m.  
DEPT: SM 2 (Melville)

FILED UNDER SEAL

18  
19  
20 I

21 INTRODUCTION

22 With respect to the law governing application of the "plain view doctrine,"  
23 defendant asserts in his "Supplemental Brief In Support of Motion to Traverse," etc. ["Supp.  
24 Br."], "the burden is on the prosecution to show that the plain view doctrine is applicable to  
25 each particular seizure. (*People v. Murray* (1978) 77 Cal.App.3d 305.) In addition to the item  
26 being in plain view, the officer must have probable cause to believe that the item is subject to  
27 seizure, rather than mere suspicion. (*Arizona v. Hicks* (1987) 480 U.S. [321].) (Supp. Br. 2:22  
28 26.)

1 With respect to the seized items, defendant argues that a given item either is  
2 "wholly irrelevant," or "outside the scope of the warrant," and/or "is not contraband or  
3 evidence of a crime." (See, e.g., Supp. Br. 2:27 - 3:3.)

4 A. There Is A Stipulation That The Evidence In Question  
5 Was In The "Plain View" Of Officers Who The Court  
6 Determines Were Properly In The Place Being Searched

7 Early in the afternoon of the proceedings on August 20th, defense counsel entered  
8 into a written stipulation with respect to certain listed property, pursuant to which (as Mr.  
9 Sanger explained) it was agreed that the listed items were "all seized and to the extent they  
10 were not described in the search warrant, we will concede the issue, the first part of the plain  
11 view issue, that is that the officers were lawfully in a place to seize them, and could see them,  
12 and then it will be up to the People, as I think I said, to establish whether or not they could be  
13 properly seized outside the warrant." (Uncertified RT 83:28 - 84:8.)

14 In the circumstances, the only burden on the People to show that "the plain view  
15 doctrine is applicable to each particular seizure" in this case is to satisfy the Court, from its  
16 own review of the description and photograph of a given item, that the relevance of that item  
17 to further the investigation then under way would have been "immediately apparent" to a  
18 reasonable officer, given the information furnished the officers in this case prior to the  
19 execution of the warrant.

20 B. The Incriminating Nature Of Evidence  
21 Seizable Under The "Plain View Doctrine"

22 With respect to Items 312, 318, 322, 328, 331, 332, 333-A, 341, 334-A, 348, 349,  
23 352, 362, 368 and 369, defendant recites, as to each, that the item is "not evidence of a crime  
24 and is not contraband" (or a variation of that phrase) as though that observation obviated the  
25 need for further analysis. (See Supp. Br. 2:27 through 4:20.)

26 Correctly understood, the "plain view doctrine" does not limit an otherwise  
27 appropriate seizure merely to property that is "evidence of a crime" in the narrow sense of that  
28 phrase (e.g., to hold-up notes, weapons, etc.). In *Warden v. Hayden* (1967) 387 U.S. 294, 307,

1 the court noted the distinction between "mere evidence" from "contraband" or the "fruits [and]  
2 instrumentalities" of crime in holding that either kind of evidence may be seized if there is "a  
3 nexus – automatically provided in the case of fruits, instrumentalities or contraband – between  
4 the item to be seized and criminal behavior." "[I]n the case of 'mere evidence,' probable  
5 cause must be examined in terms of cause to believe that the evidence sought will aid in a  
6 particular apprehension or conviction. In doing so, consideration of police purposes will be  
7 required. [Citation.]" (398 U.S. 294, at p. 307.) In that case, the high court noted that "the  
8 clothes found in the washing machine matched the description of those worn by the robber and  
9 the police therefore could reasonably believe that the items would aid in the identification of  
10 the culprit." (*Ibid.*)

11 Most of the seized items in this case are "mere evidence," in that they are not  
12 contraband or self-evidently the fruits or instrumentalities of crime. In our "Supplemental  
13 Response In Opposition To Defense Motion To Suppress," filed September 3rd, we have  
14 attempted to describe all the items of property the seizure of which is contested and as to which  
15 the Court has not indicated its intention to deny suppression. We have provided a photograph  
16 of each, and have argued the investigatory value of each would have been apparent to the well-  
17 informed officer who seized it.

18 C. The Degree Of "Suspicion" That An Item  
19 In Plain View Would Further The Ongoing  
20 Investigation

21 Neither does it appear to be the case a searching officer who has lawfully intruded  
22 upon the privacy of a suspect by executing a search warrant for his residence needs "probable  
23 cause" to seize that which comes into his "plain view," as Defendant argues. In *People v.*  
24 *Bradford* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 1229, our Supreme Court noted,

25 The plain-view doctrine permits, in the course of a search  
26 authorized by a search warrant, the seizure of an item not listed in the  
27 warrant, if the police lawfully are in a position from which they view the  
28 item, if its incriminating character is immediately apparent, and if the  
officers have a lawful right of access to the object. (*Horton v.*  
*California* (1990) 496 U.S. 128, 135-137 [110 S.Ct. 2301, 2307-2308];

1 *Texas v. Brown* (1983) 460 U.S. 730, 739 [103 S.Ct. 1535, 1541-1542,  
 2 75 L.Ed.2d 502] (plur. opn.); see *Minnesota v. Dickerson* (1993) 508  
 3 U.S. 366, 374-375 [113 S.Ct. 2130, 2136-2137, 124 L.Ed.2d 334].) In  
 4 such circumstances, the warrantless seizure of evidence of crime in plain  
 5 view is not prohibited by the Fourth Amendment, even if the discovery  
 6 of the evidence is *not* inadvertent. (*Horton v. California, supra*, 496  
 7 U.S. 128, 130 [110 S.Ct. 2301, 2304].) Where an officer has a valid  
 8 warrant to search for one item but merely a suspicion, not amounting to  
 9 probable cause, concerning a second item, that second item is not  
 10 immunized from seizure if found during a lawful search for the first  
 11 item. (*Id.*, at pp. 138-139 [110 S.Ct. at pp. 2308-2309].) This rule was  
 12 stated by the high court in *Horton* in the context of a search conducted  
 13 pursuant to a warrant, notwithstanding the circumstance that in other  
 14 cases applying the plain view doctrine in various contexts, the  
 15 determination that the incriminating nature of an item was “immediately  
 16 apparent” was based upon whether the officers had probable cause to  
 17 believe that the item was either evidence of a crime or contraband.  
 18 (E.g., *Minnesota v. Dickerson, supra*, 508 U.S. 366, 375 [113 S.Ct.  
 19 2130, 2136-2137]; *Arizona v. Hicks, supra*, 480 U.S. 321, 326-327 [107  
 20 S.Ct. 1149, 1153-1154].)

21 In the present case, the testimony of the officers involved in the  
 22 search indicated their belief that they could search for items not listed in  
 23 the warrant. This testimony, read in context and considered in light of  
 24 the information in their possession concerning not only the Campbell  
 25 and Stewart matters but the other incidents, simply reflected their  
 26 entirely appropriate understanding that such items lawfully might be  
 27 seized if reasonably believed to be related to criminal activity.

28 (*People v. Bradford, supra*, 15 Cal.4th at pp. 1293-1294; emphasis the court’s.)

Defendant argues that there was “no probable cause for listening to the tape” (Item  
 367) located in a tape cassette player found in a locked safe in the master bathroom(!). “In  
 order to listen to the tape, the government was required to have probable cause to believe it  
 was contraband or evidence of a crime.” Because the cassette was labeled “Earth Song.”  
 “there was not probable cause to believe that the cassette tape contained anything other than a  
 song. While the fact that the cassette tape was located in a locked safe might be arguably .

1 suspicious in a different case, there is nothing unusual about a musician such as Mr. Jackson  
2 storing recorded music in a locked safe." (Supp. Br. 5:16 – 6:3.)

3 This particular musician's residence and ancillary buildings, situated within fenced  
4 and well-guarded grounds, were awash in audio and video tapes. The fact that defendant  
5 elected to safeguard a single audio tape and three vidcotapes (one labeled [REDACTED]  
6 [REDACTED] in a safe located in his bathroom indicated he attached particular importance to the  
7 items. "Privacy" is a relative concept. [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED]  
9 [REDACTED]  
10 [REDACTED]  
11 [REDACTED] Seizure of the tape  
12 cassette was reasonable. And because its significance, if any, lay in its contents, listening to  
13 the tape was no less reasonable.

14 D. The Other "Plain View" Items Were Properly Seized

15 The Court has had an opportunity to inspect Items 325, 326, 328, 502, 505, 508,  
16 509, 510 and 511. The People will rely on the Court's judgment whether the evidentiary  
17 significance of those items justified their seizure and inspection.

18 DATED: September 10, 2004

19 Respectfully submitted,

20 THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR.  
21 District Attorney

22 By:   
23 Gerald McC. Franklin, Senior Deputy

PROOF OF SERVICE


STATE OF CALIFORNIA }  
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA } SS

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years and I am not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is: District Attorney's Office; Courthouse; 1105 Santa Barbara Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101.

On September 10, 2004, I served the within PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF TO TRAVERSE AFFIDAVITS, QUASH WARRANTS AND SUPPRESS EVIDENCE on Defendant, by THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., STEVE COCHRAN, ROBERT SANGER, and BRIAN OXMAN by personally delivering a true copy thereof to Mr. Sanger's office in Santa Barbara, by transmitting a facsimile copy thereof to Attorneys Mesereau and Cochran, and by causing a true copy thereof to be mailed to each of them (Mr. Sanger excepted), first class postage prepaid, at the addresses shown on the attached Service List.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Santa Barbara, California on this 10th day of September, 2004.

  
Gerald McC. Franklin

SERVICE LIST

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

THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR.  
Collins, Mesereau, Reddock & Yu, LLP  
1875 Century Park East, No. 700  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
FAX: (310) 284-3122  
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

BRIAN OXMAN, ESQ.  
Oxman & Jaroscak, Lawyers  
14126 E. Rosecrans Blvd.  
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670  
Co-counsel for Defendant



PROOF OF SERVICE

1013A(1)(3), 1013(c) CCP

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA:

I am a citizen of the United States of America and a resident of the county aforesaid. I am employed by the County of Santa Barbara, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 312-H East Cook Street, Santa Maria, California.

On SEPTEMBER 21, 20 04, I served a copy of the attached ORDER FOR RELEASE OF REDACTED DOCUMENTS (PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF TO TRAVERSE AFFIDAVITS, QUASH WARRANTS AND SUPPRESS EVIDENCE) addressed as follows:

THOMAS W. SNEDDON, DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
1105 SANTA BARBARA STREET  
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93101

THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR.  
COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU, LLP  
1875 CENTURY PARK EAST, 7<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

X FAX

By faxing true copies thereof to the receiving fax numbers of: 805-568-2398 (DISTRICT ATTORNEY); 310-861-1007 (THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR). Said transmission was reported complete and without error. Pursuant to California Rules of Court 2005(i), a transmission report was properly issued by the transmitting facsimile machine and is attached hereto.

\_\_\_ MAIL

By placing true copies thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid, in the United States Postal Service mail box in the City of Santa Maria, County of Santa Barbara, addressed as above. That there is delivery service by the United States Postal Service at the place so addressed or that there is a regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and the place so addressed.


\_\_\_ PERSONAL SERVICE

By leaving a true copy thereof at their office with their clerk therein or the person having charge thereof.

\_\_\_ EXPRESS MAIL

By depositing such envelope in a post office, mailbox, sub-post office, substation, mail chute, or other like facility regularly maintained by the United States Postal Service for receipt of Express Mail, in a sealed envelope, with express mail postage paid.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 21<sup>ST</sup> day of SEPTEMBER, 20 04, at Santa Maria, California.

  
CARRIE L. WAGNER