

<p><b>SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA</b></p> <p>STREET ADDRESS: 312-C East Cook Street  MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. Box 5369  CITY AND ZIP CODE: Santa Maria, CA 93456-5369  BRANCH NAME: Cook Division</p>	<p>FOR COURT USE ONLY  SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA</p> <p>OCT 19 2004</p> <p>GARY M. BLAIR, Executive Officer  <i>Carrie L. Wagner</i>  CARRIE L. WAGNER</p>
<p>People of the State of California v. Michael Joe Jackson</p>	
<p><b>FINDINGS AND ORDER RE SEALING DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO TRAVERSE ETC.; DA'S REPLY THERETO; AND DEFENDANT'S REPLY TO DA'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENSE MOTION TO SUPPRESS</b></p>	<p>CASE NUMBER: 1133603</p>

On September 13, 2004, Mr. Jackson filed a Supplemental Brief to Traverse Affidavits, etc. under conditional seal. A redacted version was released on September 13, 2004. On September 10, 2004, the DA filed a Reply to Defendant's Supplemental Brief etc. On September 21, 2004, a redacted version of that document was released. On September 13, 2004, Mr. Jackson filed a Reply to the DA's Supplemental Response in Opposition to Defense Motion to Suppress under conditional seal. A redacted version was released on September 13, 2004. On October 14, 2004, the court granted the motions to seal the documents.

The Court makes the following findings:

The documents address whether certain items of evidence should be suppressed by the court. Those items were described by number and, in certain instances, by particularized description. The descriptions were redacted, where necessary.

In this case, protection of the Defendant's right to a fair trial and protection of the identity of the minor complaining witness and his family overcomes the right of public access to the record. A substantial probability exists that those interests will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed as requested. The intensity of the media coverage in this case is unprecedented. Each court hearing is thoroughly reported and exhaustively analyzed by the media. It is substantially probable that if the evidence expected to be given at trial were to be released pretrial, it would be similarly reported and analyzed. The sealing order is necessary to maintain the integrity of the available jury pool by limiting its exposure to the expected evidence and testimony pretrial and to prevent exposure to inadmissible items of evidence. The Court has consistently held that because of the pervasive media coverage in this case, the Defendant's right to a fair trial outweighs public access. Those findings are relevant here and incorporated by reference. [See Findings and Order re: Motion for Protective Order, filed January 23, 2004 and Findings and Order re: Sealing of Search Warrant Materials, filed January 23, 2004]

There are no less restrictive means to protect those interests. The extraordinary circumstances present in this case overcome the presumption that cautionary admonitions and instructions to the jury pool would have a curative effect. It is far more desirable to avoid the prejudice in the first instance than to hope to identify unaffected jurors later.

The Court acknowledges that its order must be narrowly tailored to accommodate the maximum public disclosure. Redacted versions of these documents were released, as noted above.

Dated:           OCT 19 2004          

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

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 OCTOBER 19, 20 04, I served a copy of the attached FINDINGS AND ORDER RE SEALING DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO TRAVERSE ETC.; DA'S REPLY THERETO; AND DEFENDANT'S REPLY TO DA'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENSE MOTION TO SUPPRESS 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's Office); (310) 861-1007 (Thomas 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 the person having charge thereof or by hand delivery to the above mentioned parties.

\_\_\_ 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 19<sup>TH</sup> day of OCTOBER, 20 04, at Santa Maria, California.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CARRIE L. WAGNER