

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

13 **OXMAN & JAROSCAK**
14 Brian Oxman, State Bar No. 072172
15 14126 East Rosecrans
16 Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
17 Tel.: (562) 921-5058, Fax: (562) 921-2298

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

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

22 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
23 CALIFORNIA,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 vs.

26 MICHAEL JOSEPH JACKSON,

27 Defendant.

Case No. 1133603

MR. JACKSON'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE
REFERENCE TO MATERIALS AS
PORNOGRAPHIC AND ACCOMPANYING
DOCUMENTS

Honorable Rodney S. Melville

Date: January 28, 2005

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Dept: SM 2

~~FILED UNDER SEAL~~

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

JAN 26 2005

GARY M. BLAIR, Executive Officer

BY Carrie L. Wagner
CARRIE L. WAGNER, Deputy Clerk

*Unsealed pursuant
to 11/16/05 court order*

05 JAN 26 PM 2:20
RECEIVED

REPLY IN SUPP OF MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE REFERENCE TO MATLS AS PORNOGRAPHIC

1 **A. Introduction**

2 Mr. Michael Jackson submits this Reply in support of his Motion in Limine to Preclude Reference
3 to Materials as Obscene or Pornographic. Plaintiff states that “obscene matter” is defined by Penal Code
4 section 311(a), and that personal possession of “obscene” material in an individual’s home is not a crime.
5 (Plaintiff’s Memo, p. 2, lines 4-10). Yet, plaintiff wants to infer to the jury that these materials constitute
6 obscenity and pornography and has repeatedly in an effort to create a false impression to the world referred
7 to “Playboy Magazine,” “Gallery Magazine,” and photograph books by Robert Maxwell as obscene and
8 pornographic. The books and other materials involved in this case are neither obscene, pornographic, smut,
9 dirty, erotic, or any other pejorative phrase plaintiff has attempted to attach to them.

10 **B. The Court Should Instruct All Parties to Refer to the Materials as “Books,” “Magazines,”**
11 **“Photographs,” “Computer Images,” and if appropriate “Adult Material.”**

12 Plaintiff claims that some of the material seized comes within the definition of “obscene matter.”
13 (Plaintiff’s Memo, p. 2, lines 14-15). However, not only can plaintiff not prove this grandiose assertion,
14 but also no charge exists in this case regarding such a claim. While the Court could listen with great
15 interest at a section 402 preliminary fact hearing as plaintiff attempts to prove this bold notion, the plain
16 fact is these kinds of claims are neither relevant nor appropriate for this case. More important, the time to
17 do that was at this hearing, and plaintiff has not made any showing to the Court that would justify any such
18 conclusion.

19 Plaintiff states:

20 “Defendant does not suggest what other words might be used to refer to his collection
21 without incurring objection. We do not mean to be critical: the range of terms that accurately
22 describe the material and, at the same time, are not to pejorative is, given the focus of that
23 collection, quite limited. If ‘dirty books’ and ‘smut’ – the labels that immediately spring to mind –
24 seem rather more subjective than descriptive, ‘sexually explicit material’ and ‘erotica’ surely will
25 suffice.” (Plaintiff’s Memo, p. 2, lines 21-26).

26 However, it is the “legal conclusion” that plaintiff has attempted to place on completely innocent
27 materials that constitutes the offense here. Most of the books and photographs are neither erotic nor
28 sexually explicit. Legal conclusions have no place in this trial.

1 It appears that plaintiff is seeking some accommodation to Mr. Jackson's argument because it
2 recognizes it cannot attempt to label these material with legal conclusions in front of the jury. Mr. Jackson
3 requests the Court instruct all parties to refer to the materials as 'books,' 'magazines,' 'photographs,' and
4 "computer images." Where appropriate and relevant, the farthest the court should permit any party to travel
5 without creating a legal conclusion is that they refer to an appropriate item as "adult material."

6 Any other label sets forth an inference that has not and cannot be established in this case. The time
7 for plaintiff to bring forth justification for its legal conclusions was at this hearing, and plaintiff has not
8 done so. "Adult material" is the only appropriate phrase the Court should allow during the trial.

9 **E. Conclusion.**

10 For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Jackson requests his Motion in Limine to Exclude Reference to
11 "Obscenity" and "Pornography" be granted.

12 DATED: January 26, 2005

13 Respectfully submitted,

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

15 Robert M. Sanger
SANGER & SWYSEN

16 Brian Oxman
OXMAN & JAROSCAK

17
18
19 By: 

20 R. Brian Oxman
21 Attorneys for defendant
22 Mr. Michael Jackson