SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COURTY OF LOS ABGELES

In the Matter of

No. A 233421

SIRHAN BISHARA SIRHAN.

7 8

1

2

3

5

6

9

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

Meeting held in the Chambers of Assistant Presiding Judge Charles . Lering, on Friday, May 16, 1969, at 1:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Judge Charles A. Loring.
Assistant Presiding Judge

Judge Herbert V. Walker

Robert A. Houghton, Deputy Chief, Los Angeles Police Department

David Fitts, Deputy District Attorney

Emery Hatcher, Chief Deputy, County Clerk's Office

Peter Talmachoff, Division Chief, Criminal Division, County Clerk's Office

Mrs. Alice Mishikawa, Clerk, Department 107

VOSTA MINNICK, Official Reporter www

handen.

.

no don't pun!

LOS AMGELES, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, MAY 16, 1969, 1:30 P.M.

JUDGE WALKER: First perhaps we better take up

MR. PITTS: There are somewhere in the neighborhood of 130. I wasn't present at the precise moment they were introduced but my understanding is that they were offered in evidence with the stipulation that they were not to be viewed by the jury.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, I had Alice check.

THE CLERK: They were only marked for identifica-

JUDGE WALKER: Because the Defense objected and that is why they were put in just for identification only.

Now I have come to this conclusion. As far as they are concerned, I am willing to seal those subject to order of Court, and I think I can put it on some kind of ground. I am going to look at it and find myself some ground and do it. If the Appellate Court wants to upset us, that is fine.

MR. FITTS: Well, I don't think there is going to be too much demand to see these. The only people that could do anything are going to be cranks in the first place.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, those are the people I am

7

9 10

8

11 12

13

18 19

16

17

20 21

22 23

26

24 25 worried about.

MR. FITTS: Well, I sort of thought these people would be the cranks and they want to see them so they can start cranking.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: I will agree with that. MR. FITTS: So these folders were for identification?

THE CLERK: They were for identification only. There were two groups, one consisting of 166 and the other 127 photos.

MR. FITTS: I never counted them.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: There were two sets. was a set of photographs of the autopsy which Moguchi's people took and then there was about half a dozen, it seems to me, of photographs taken by the Los Angeles police officers over there at the Good Samaritan Hospital and you remember those. They were taken prior to any surgery or cutting on the wound, on the head wound, and I think they ought to be categorized in the same group. I don't know if you used them in evidence.

MR. FITTS: Would you give me the exhibit numbers of those.

THE CLERK: 81 and 82.

JUDGE WALKER: And 81 consists of --

THE CLERK: 166 photos, and what they are I really don't recall offhand, and then 82 is as envelope

containing 123 photos.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHYON: Well, the photos I am talking about were not introduced in evidence. We can talk about those in a separate category.

THE CLERK: They were only for identification.

JUDGE WALKER: Anything that went in evidence. I

don't think we can take a chance on sealing.

DEPUNY CHIEF HOUGHTON: Well, I agree.

JUDGE WALKER: Those that weren't in evidence, I think I am on a lot better ground.

MR. FITTS: We used a very minimal of photos because, after all, it wasn't an issue anyway, no controversy.

JUDGE WALKER: I know Alice has kept track of it.

It is not going to be any problem to figure it out.

Then we come to the second problem as I see it.

These exhibits were extremely valuable and they are

going to go up on appeal and to have them mutilated or

even some of them, it is going to be very bad, and I

think particularly if they are not in packages.

MR. FITTS: Yes, and in particular you have mentioned 31 and 82. Do you have those in the minutes, just a minute order?

JUDGE WALKER: Well, I think I better write an order in some particularity and put it in the file.

MR. FIFTS: Wall, there could still be a minute order.

minute order hell a think there should also be an actual signed order. I thought.

MR. TALMACHOFF: I would like to recommend you do this. We had this at the very beginning of the case and it is quite helpful to us to be able to show a copy of the Court order with the Judge's signature on it.

JUDGE WALFER: Well, we can write up an order covering it in particularity.

show getting back to our second problem, we have got these bullets, we have got the gun, and I have even had a request from some woman that got hit with one of those bullets. She wanted it for a souvenir. I have already told her where she can get it.

What I am trying to do is to set up something like this, that the actual exhibits are not exhibited to these people in some manner, so they are not mutilated or lost or anything else, because it is easy for these exhibits to get lost in your office and everybody is in a mess. I understand that maybe you could have copies that the public could see.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: I was going to wait until you got through with those exhibits and then we can talk

about this other. We have done a lot of investigating of cases which were not subject to testimony and I think you put in Owens?

JUNEA WALKER: Some 38 or 40 witnessee.

MR. FITTS: Now many were there? Most of that stuff was ordered delivered on discovery and, in one way or another, they had a lot of specific names so they got that stuff and let me assure you here and now that which was delivered on discovery and that which was filed with the Court was scaled to this extent. They asked for interviews and interviews they got, but when it came down to embodying conclusions of investigative personnel you know and we believed, after examining this, that and the other, that even this Owens is a self-seeking som-of-a-bitch — Let it stay in the record. Material of that kind I abstracted from the file.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOWEYOM: In other words, what you did, you must have done it earlier to block it out or to copy, because some of that was built into some of those interviews.

MR. FITTS: No, it wasn't built into the Q and A, and I gave you that which purports to be questions and answers.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: We got a lot of actually what was summary of interviews, not gs and Ms.

MR. FITTS: Yes.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: And someone had made an evaluation of it as to the veracity of those fellows.

MR. FITTS: Where possible the stuff was not made a matter of record.

JUDGE WALKOR: It was not swem put in for identification.

MR. FITTS: Mostly it was in as just interviews without editorial comments.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUSETON: Are you finished -- Go ahead.

MR. FITTS: That finishes my thought.

all of you will know, with Buck Compton and John and Dave and my staff in which the District Attorney requested that we were to use his material given to him, our investigating files and copies thereof, which constituted, in his terms, red herrings in the case. Now, there were about fifteen or sixteen such categories and five of those received some publicity. There was the Cuban Duarte who you are not familiar with, but he got in and he even went on TV and Jerry Owens, the self-styled preacher.

John Faley, and I think he got some publicity, and most of them did because these witnesses went out and got the publicity, so we have got all of those plus some others that we consider to be in that category of red herrings

some significance, not materially significant, other than those that they asked for on discovery and they called Walter Crow.

MR. FITTS: They got it.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: They got that and I think one or two others, and they might have Virginia Teresa and that might have been marked.

MR. PITTS: I don't think so.

prepary CHIEF HOUGHTON: Some of it had not reached the press that our investigation bad uncovered and so that is the way it came back, but nebody knew it except us, the District Attorney and the FBI. There is that category that anybody in that group that was introduced and marked for identification and, I am not sure, you will have to go back and look and them I will have to tell you.

MR. FITTS: I don't know why it all falls to me.

I am in the business of compiling scalething which will

probably have to be reveneed, I don't know how many

times, but it will be a District Attorney news release

with respect to this Sixhan investigation, an appendix,

and we have a list here of all the witnesses that the

People called as a part of their case in chief. We

weren't asked to mention these called by the Defense

and we didn't.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOMETON: Called or subpoenced.

 MR. FITTS: As to those files that we put in.

Now, correct me if I am wrong, but they were put
in evidence, not to be seen by the jury, and you will
remember there were a number of them that were submitted
and this is just after we closed.

THE CLERK: They were only marked for identification.

JUDGE WALKER: The only thing that was admitted in evidence and not to be shown to the juzy were the statements taken by Dr. Pollock of his interview with Sirhan.

How about the search warrant?

THE CLERK: That is only for identification.

JUDGE WALKER: Okay, fine.

DEPUTY CRIEF HOUGHTON: Which search warrant?

JUDGE WALKER: Well, the one somebody had.

DEPUTY CRIEF HOUGHTON: For the car? We had two.

JUDGE WALKER: I have forgotten.

MR. FITTS: The first search warrant was never material. It was the wrong car. That was a Chrysler.

JUDGE WALFER: There was one I didn't want to put in evidence because of the affidavits attached to it.

DEPUTY CRIEF HOUGHTON: I don't know which one you are talking about.

MR. FITTS: There was the search of the DeSoco.

THE CLERK: He never asked it to go into evidence.

-

 DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: It never came in issue?

MR. FITTS: It never came up so we never put the search warrant in evidence.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: There was one other thing that we applied for and got and I want to be sure I understand what the Judge is talking about. In the Duarte investigation and Duarte is an anti-Castro Cuban, he alleged a fight with Sirhan at a meeting of the far-left people over in Hollywood.

MR. FITTS: I know what you are talking about.

That was in the search warrant. The most that ever occurred, so far as he was concerned, was that we scared him with a Grand Jury subpoens.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: I will check it out.

MR. FITTS: It is in the roster.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: That is right.

MR. FITTS: Okay.

DEPUTY CRIEF. HOUGHTON: I told them to either get a search warrant --

MR. FITTS: We discussed the matter and the Grand Jury subpocna and that wasn't worth the paper it was written on.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: I remember we discussed the search warrant.

JUDGE WALKER: I may be mistaken, but I remember specifically the search warrant that was there was not

. 7 . 8

 going to the jury, and which search warrant it was. I don't know.

In any event, let's go on to the rest of it.

The big problem --

MR. FIFTS: May I just for clarification, because I want to know who is going to do what, and with respect to the restrictive order now as to those autopsy photos. Exhibits 81 and 82, do you want as affidavit or an order prepared by someone?

JUDGE WALKER: Well, you can make up an affidavit or an order for my signature.

MR. FITTS: Well, I was hoping you would do it.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, I can't very well make an

affidavit. I think that is up to your office. I don't

know whether we need an affidavit. Couldn't you just

simply prepare an order? I think there should be some
thing in the record that supports my order, and now

whether it is a good legal support or not is another

question.

JUDGE LORING: Couldn't you regits an examination of the photographs, discovery material of such a nature and so forth, otherwise it would serve no useful purpose.

MR. PITTS: That is what I had in mind.

JUDGE WALKER: I will do it that way but you will have to help me. We will have to bring them up and examine them so I can get some idea.

Getting back to all of this thing that is supposed to be exhibited or could be exhibited, how are we going to handle this and keep them from having the originals?

MR. HATCHER: Our office could duplicate every single exhibit that could be duplicated and only those that could be duplicated.

JUNGE WATKER: Well, that is all right with respect to physical exhibits like papers and all things like that, but we have got the coat, we have bullets, we have got expended shells, unexpended, and so forth, which are physical.

JUDGE LORING: Well, I think they could be put in some kind of a plastic or cellophane container that can be seen through without being able to touch them.

MR. FITTS: To be realistic about it, there aren't going to be many people who want to look at these bullets anyway. What can they do with it?

problem, and I am just guessing as to what is bothering the Judge so much. I don't think they would have to handle the bullets. I think you could store the bullets however you want to store them or for how long, and I think that there could be photographs taken, if somebody wants to see the bullets, and I think photographs could be taken of a scale model and just lay it out clear and this is what they look like. Then you could say that

 they are in permanent storage, whatever you want to cay.

Now, as to the coat, I agree with Judge Loring, that if for some reason somebody might want to see the coat and they might want to look at the clothing just to verify the fact that there was a bullet hole as we said there was, and that sort of thing. I think you might be able to put that in a bay so that they could see that there were bullet holes in the shoulder of the coat and the armpit and that sort of thing.

JUDGE LOKING: You would probably want to preserve that in some kind of a container in any event.

of all of the other exhibits?

MR. TALMACHOFF: All documents you mean?
MR. HATCHER: That is no problem at all.

JUDGE WALKER: How about the bullets, guns and other physical things?

MR. MATCHER: We could have them photographed if you would like. We could arrange to have it done. There would be no problem.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, we don't want any of the originals available except to attorneys of record.

body comes in with a valid reason as to why they should see it, and they are responsible people, them we could order it.

JUDGE WALKER: I won't be here so I am not concerned.

JUDGE LORING: Well, whoever does it.

MR. FIFTS: Judge Loring, that is something that I wanted to mention and it appears to me that with respect to the precautions that should be regarded in connection with all of this stuff, that rather than having anybody willy-nilly walking in off the street and coming up and pestering the Clerk, it would be nice somehow if they obtained a kind of clearance through the Court. I know I am posing a sort of omerous burden.

JUDGE WALKER: You mean to see anything at all?

MR. FITTS: No.

JUDGE WALKER: Oh, no.

only with copies such as photographs of the original documents, what risk is there? Why shouldn't they see copies?

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: If you think of the volumes and volumes, there will probably be a sudden surge and I am saying immediately, as soon as it is known that they are going to be available, there will be maybe thirty people or maybe a hundred.

JUDGE WALKER: As I understand it, it is going to be made known they are going to be available in a news release.

MR. PITTS: Here is the point of the release.

The District Attorney wants to have something in the release with respect to the accessibility of those things which we have marked in evidence in some fashion or other like all of these interviews and the rest of it. He wants to make it known that they are available for those people who have got some legitimate interest in looking at the stuff and include some kind of explanation of the mechanics by which this material can be viewed, and that is what I was hoping we might be able to determine, determine today, so I could report to him and discuss what is to be written in those releases which I have to write.

JUNCE WALKER: Well, I think that we could have duplicates in the County Clerk's Office and those that we have decided to seal would have to be obtained by Court order.

MR. MATCHER: There would have to be another provision. If the person insists on socing the original, it would have to be on order of Court.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, that could be done.

JUDGE LORING: And good cause being shown.

MR. EATCHER: I anticipate we will be getting a number of orders for copies. They can purchase copies of public records.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, I have got a request up

there now for the oxiginal working papers of the psychiatrists and stuff like that, and that is from the Psychiatric Association. One of them wants all the

THE CLERK: May I bring up a point? Here we have this 114, the psychiatric interview of Dr. Pollack with the defendant. I imagine lots of these psychiatrists would be interested in this particular interview too. How are you going to handle that?

MR. FTTTS: Well, the problem has arisen along that line.

THE CLERK: They were admitted in evidence but were not to go before the jury.

WR. FIFTS: That is true, and Dr. Pollack himself was terribly exercised, for whatever it may be worth, when those statements, you know, were made available to the press. It was not me though that did it. I don't think it was a very good idea to do it. As far as Dr. Pollack was concerned, at that time these particular interviews were privileged until such time as they perhaps became an issue in the lawsuit and then, of course, no privilege would apply, but nobody asked for that stuff in the courtroom and yet it was released and we know that copies of that stuff had been made available and will at some time be used. Dr. Pollack has gotten a letter from us saying that he has in no way, shape or

psychiatric testimony.

form consented to the release of this material to anybody and that was done without prior knowledge on his
part. That is just to protect him so far as his professional standing is concerned, so whether that material
should be released, I have some misgivings because it
was not in evidence.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, when it was not in evidence I don't understand why they were released.

THE CLERK: Now it is in evidence but not to go to the jury. There was that condition.

MR. FIFTS: Okay, the statements are in evidence but the contents thereof were never placed in evidence.

THE CLERK: That is right.

MR. FITTS: There is one thing to have the scale in evidence and that doesn't have any value whatsoever except for the words that would be contained on it, and this was not placed in evidence and you know, it seems to me there is a distinction.

JUDGE WALKER: Was there a written copy of the interview?

MR. FITTS: Not necessarily.

JUDGE WALKER: Anything not in evidence I don't see why we have to make it available.

MR. FITTS: Well, as Alice just said, the statements are in evidence but the contents however were never placed in evidence.

2 3

4

5

.7

6

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

JUDGE WALKER: We just got the basis. MR. FINTS: We got the basis and the plasticmaterial, if it ever got close enough to a magnet, we don't even have the words.

MR. MATCHER: Maybe that isn't the answer.

THE COURT; Is there anything further? I don't want to take too much of Judge Loring's time.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: I have something and it is only to eighten our position in this connection. What data you have been talking about is not over 5 percent or less of the total investigation files, probably maybe 2 percent. The total investigation files are in great detail and there is a whole gamut of miscellaneous nonrelevant material because this inventigation started out and wound up to be as thorough an investigation as it was possible to make. Every lead that was a possible inference of conspiracy, no matter how remote or how inane it might have sounded initially, was followed. From some of this information, obviously, we interviewed a lot of people and you never knew who they were going to talk to. I am sure some of it will leak out. The majority of it has not. Much of it has. How, the posture of the Los Angeles Police Department is that we think that nothing in this case should be withheld from the public.

JUDGE WALKERS That is right.

not nove in

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: We think to put secrecy around this phase of it is just going to open up speculation that is going on with the John Kennedy assassination since we did do in my opinion as professional a job of investigation as could have been done anywhere and I feel that this information should be made available. Now, we have not decided whether we will make the files available yet. We will decide this.

JUDGE LORING: This is all in written form?

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: It is all in written form, about 50,000 pieces of paper, and the final report to the Chief consists of nine volumes, and I believe that everything went down on it.

JUDGE WALKER: You need a final final report.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: Well, it can be broken up very readably. This was done as I, and I realize everybody has been second-quessing, easily enough, but it was done for the simple reason of protecting the reputation of this department who felt what had happened in town was an extremely significant thing that would be reviewed for a number of years, but lots of those people -- We wanted to be sure that every loophole we could see or hear about was investigated and we have got some real weird things in the file, some way-out things, and we had to check them out, and we intend to answer any questions that anybody has. If anybody has some information

that they think is pertinent to either the conspiracy or anything, thy, we intend to answer it based upon our files.

respect and that is that Ramsey Clarke, when he was the Attorney General, I met with him out here and he expressed an interest in disposition of these investigative files. At that time he indicated that his thinking was running to having a duplicate set of these files placed in the archives in Washington. I discussed this with the Police Commission and they have no objection to this so long as there is a mutual agreement on procedure for release of information, in other words, that they don't run different systems of control, whatever they may wind up with.

However, since there has been a change in office and the new Attorney General, Bill Lynch, whom you know called me and they still have some interest in it, but I don't know to what degree or exactly how they are going to do it, so it is possible and I want you people to know it is possible that the files may be duplicated and placed in the National Archives for historical purposes. I don't know if that is of any concern to you but I think that since you are all in it, you should know it, and what happens as the posture of our Department.

JUDGE WALKER: It seems to me we shouldn't try or have any authority to exercise any control whatsoever

months.

of your files which have not gone into our case, and what do you think?

JUDGE LORING: That would be my view of it, that that material which the Police Department has, is a matter over which we have no jurisdiction.

MR. FITTS: In fact, I would like to have a little talk with you about this matter. We will arrange that.

The District Attorney wants to make reference to the fact that you have got all of this material and further reference to the fact that you have this policy about open disclosure with respect to it and you are going to have some ground rules, obviously, with respect to how this stuff is going to be accessible.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: The mechanics of it.

MR. FITTS: The mechanics of it and background rules, so far as we are concerned, can be determined by you but he would like to make some reference to the ground rules in the press release. Is that feasible?

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: I don't know yet. It
depends upon the timing, upon his release, because I am
waiting to get some kind of final decision from Washington
on the files because I don't know what their standard
procedures are back there and what controls they place
on their files, but I do have some ideas at this moment.
Our problem is one of mechanics.

MR. FITTS: Right.

7 my 1/2 hin?

 with. I know what they are. The files are all marked now and all the evidence we have in our system, I would say easily is 4,000 items.

have agreed to here is to issue an order covering the photographs and such other things we may determine should not be released except on order, and they can only be used by order of the Court or by showing proper cause. All other exhibits are to be duplicated and made available by our County Clerk to those people who want to get ahold of them, is that right?

MR. TALMACEOFF: Just as long as we understand that there are certain exhibits we can't duplicate.

There are books and I think we had a small library of Sixhan's in the case, and there is no sense of trying to duplicate those. You can't duplicate tapes very conveniently.

JUDGE WALKER: We don't want you to duplicate those tapes. The tapes are in evidence.

MR. TALMACHOFF: We would just as soon not tamper with those.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: I think Sizhan had a transcript and you know there is a tape, but I don't know if it was introduced.

THE CLERK: They were introduced.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: I think the tape between John Howard and Officer Murphy was introduced.

JUDGE WALKER: They are right in the transcript.

MR. FITTS: We played all of those tapes beginning with the first custodial interview through the last one.

The tapes were all marked in evidence and the jury was provided with transcripts so they could follow the tapes.

They are all in the daily. They are all there.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: But somebody may want to listen to the voice.

MR. FITTS: I don't know whether the Clerk's Office has copies of those transcripts. They were simply made available to the jury and to the reporter.

JUDGE LORING: Well, I think the answer to the people who want to hear the tape is to let them have access to the tapes. They cannot remove the tapes from the County Clerk's Office but they will have to supply their own electrical energy.

MR. FIFTS: That is what I was thinking with respect not to the real, and by real evidence I am talking of the physical things other than papers that can be duplicated, that they are viewed upon Court order for good cause shown, period.

JUBGE WALKER: You are talking about the coat and the shells again?

MR. FITTS: Right, every bit of it.

hora k

and kny

June 1

wont?

JUDGE WALKER: What you are talking about are the actual articles viewed on Court order.

MR. FITTS: Well, I am talking about viewing the real evidence. That is not talking about looking at pictures.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, there are going to be pictures of it anyway.

MR. HATCHER: There are certain things that could not be copied photographically but there are other things that can be photographed and those photographs could be shown upon request. If they want to see the originals, then obtain a Court order. I think this would cover us pretty well.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: Could I make a comment here off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

JUDGE WALKER: Well, I think we have got it pretty well in mind now. It is up to me, along with the cooperation of the rest of you, to work out a proper order.

I am going to rely on you fellows there to do it, to be sure the details are right. Now, this doesn't have to be done before Wednesday, does it?

MR. FITTS: Well, let me tell you something. Did you see what we got served with, this memorandum of points and authorities in support of the motion?

JUDGE WALKER: I got a copy of it yesterday or the

Min altill

day before.

MR. FITTS: Well, I was up to 11:00 last night working on that and it looks like I am going to have to work on the weekend now. They had three weeks to prepare theirs. We have got four days including Saturday and Sunday, and I mean that is the Lind of pressure we are working under, Judge.

JUDGE MALKER: Cooper.

MR. FIFTS: Cooper submitted the points and authorities and somebody else submitted something, but I am not worriod about the ACLU little thing.

JUDGE WALKER: That is of no concern.

MR. FITTS: But you know all of that stuff they have put in there.

JUDGE MALICER: A lot of that is right in the transcript and the stuff is there, a complete transcript, and that is a great deal of what he has raised.

working on right now if you are interested. He picks from the transcript that which suits his purpose and omits from the points and authorities that which defeats his purpose, and somebody, if the thing is going to be prepared properly, has to sit down and include what he omitted. That is what I am doing. I am in the process.

JUDGE WALLER: I don't want you under that kind

of pressure because it is very important you have a proper answer in. Why don't you come in, say, Monday morning and ask for some more time?

MR. FIFTS: I don't want to. That is the last thing in the world I want to do, to ask for time.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, I don't want you to.

MR. FITTS: We will do the best we can, Judge, but I am not going to mak for time. If this motion is going to be denied and this guy sentenced. I would like to have it happen on the first available date. We have not been asking for time before and I don't want to ask now.

natter, when it goes up on appeal, wheever handles it on appeal, will have ample time to hit the whole transcript and put all of that stuff in so you would have what is left out. I have read through his briefs.

MR. FITTS: We are not going to turn in a too polished job because we can't under the time limitation, but it is going to look pretty therough.

JUDGE WALKER: I don't want you to short-circuit it and, while I don't care to put it over, I don't want to put you in the position, and if you come in Monday and ask for K days, that is what you are going to get, regardless of what the press or anyone else thinks about it.

MR. FITTS: Well, I would just as soon not work on

mi

 some of the details of this thing until we get that disposed of.

JUNCE WALKER: This can keep.

MR. FITES: The District Attorney is going to be on my back until I can give the District Attorney what we have thought out and what we have decided here today which should be sufficient. I don't say it would be. but it should. We have not got worked out the details and I don't think we can do it by Wednesday. As far as I am concerned, I would like to give this thing a little rest until after Wednesday.

chief, have you agreed in principle, that I know what you relayed to me, but you had some objection to the release of some of the stuff that was on file.

object to, the only thing I would point out is the precautionary things. I think it is up to the Judge but the FBI files themselves are maintained in confidence by the FBI and the fact that they have been introduced and marked in evidence, then I think they become something else. That is my personal opinion.

MR. FITTS: They understand that.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: Then I think those conclusions drawn by my investigators, which I asked them to draw and I wanted impressions from them, and sime of them are not put very tactfully as they call people liars and things

like that, and I would be just a little concerned about that.

Thon, let's see, there was one other area. I can't think of it.

Oh, yes, it is criminal records. Everybody we interviewed, we placed in their jacket if they had criminal records from the CII kick-back sheet. As far as I am concerned we are not going to release any of that. When we find someone has a criminal record, that is confidential information because I don't think we ought to disclose that. I don't know what you have.

JUDGE WALKER: I don't think so.

MR. FITTS: I am not too sure there might be a kick-back sheet on Jerry Owen.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: And Rabago and Delgado.

MR. FITTS: But Robert Cordero, there was no king
on him but a straight interview in those files.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOWERTON: Then there is one other thing, and this is where we didn't think far enough ahead. We also ran, on everybody we interviewed, them through our subversive files and of course some of them came up. Walter Crow, I don't know if you have our subversive confidential information.

MR. FITTS: We don't have it and we don't want it.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: We asked for discovery

on Walter Crow and we threw that out and I don't know

what harm that has done.

JUDGE LORIEG: Let me ask a question and this may not have any place but maybe this question should be asked. Suppose the Supreme Court should, through inadvertence, order a reversal here. Is there anything going to be investigated under these discovery orders or this program that will violate the original order that was issued by Judge Walker in this matter?

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: We don't think so. I don't know how the District Attorney feels.

JUDGE WALKER: No. I don't think that order covers this stage of the proceeding.

JUDGE LORING: But I had in mind the original order.

JUDGE WALKER: The idea behind the order was to preclude pretrial publicity and it had nothing to do with appellate publicity or anything since then, so I don't think it enters into it.

JUDGE LORING: But my point is if there is going to be press releases now of material that would have been prohibited under the original order and there is a reversal, is it not then the same as if there had been a relaxation of the initial order as to that second trial that would prevail?

JUDGE WALKER: It would be a question to this extent. If the Supreme Court does so, in all likelihood

. 9

. 9

 it would not be within at least two years and possibly three.

JUDGE LORING: The damage, if any, would have been done.

JUDGE WALKER: It would have been negligible.

JUDGE LORING: All right. You would just have to do the same thing with the jurous on the stuff that has been kept out and that didn't get into the trial, and that is all.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: Well, there is going to be, I know of at least four books and I know the tenor of all of them, but I know at least three of them are going to allege a major conspiracy in this matter and not what the truth is, so I think I can assure you that there is nothing in that file than is other than pure speculation, that is relevant to or material to the actual shooting of Robert Kennedy that was done by Sirhan. Our investigators will continue to comply with the orders of the Bureau and the District Attorney's Office at all points.

JUDGE LORING: I don't know enough of the details but I just did want to raise the question and ask if you had considered this if there should be a reversal and what effect this is going to have.

JUDGE WALKER: You would be at the same place we were at, at the start of the trial, with all the publicity.

. 9

We brought all of the jurors in chambers and went into all of these matters thoroughly so that we could protect the record. We would be in the same position then and you possibly couldn't get this thing up on appeal before two years. I am hopeful that the nature of the Court will change by then.

MR. FITTS: It is going to create a substantial problem. No matter how far it is into the future, if it is reversed, it is going to create a substantial problem and the Legislature is going to have to talk their heads off about it and I don't see anything we can do.

JUDGE WALKER: It is no different than the problem we had when we started the trial. It would just be augmented and it would be a very difficult problem.

MR. FITTS: This is something worth writing up if you would all like to listen to it. There should be some kind of security precautions enforced so far as the Clerk's Office is concerned. People who want to make copies of these things can make copies on facilities available in the presence of somebody that is watching what they are doing. Those who aren't satisfied with the facilities available can bring their own equipment.

MR. MATCHER: Oh, no, no.

MR. FITTS: No comment.

MR. HATCHER: With all of our precautions, they might destroy something so we duplicate everything.

Suprime!!

•

*****5

 Barlier in the trial there was something that was released by the press which indicated to members of the public that all they needed to do was to write in and they could get a copy of the Grand Jury transcript and we were getting requests like that, and we don't want anything going out to give the impression that all they need to do is to write in and they can get copies of everything.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUSIFION: What we are going to do, wall, the files of this investigation should be separated from all other files and they will be under lock and key and there will be minimum distribution of those keys.

At the moment there are three that have been released and one I will have until such time.

MR. FITTS: Nielson has one, and who has got the other?

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: Captain Brown.

we are going to isolate the files because they are not available to the average person.

MR. HATCHER; We advise them that they can procure a copy of a page and that our fee is fifty cents a page.

That will stop a lot of them.

MR. FITTS: Okay, does something like this sound reasonable? I am just talking off the top of my head.

DEPUTY CHIEF HOUGHTON: I would like to meet once with them or their commissioners so long as our problems

are similar.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, I don't want to take any more of Judge Loring's time on these details. I just wanted to get your opinion while we were going over the major aspects and I feel it is the Court's problem, otherwise I would have handled it myself.

JUDGE LORING: Absolutely.

JUDGE WALKER: Well, thanks a lot for your time.

I don't think I will have this written up at this time
for distribution.

(The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.)

•