By John P. MacKenzie Washington Post Staff Writer

Denouncing charges of bias against U.S. District Court Judge John J. Sirica as speculative and "scurri-lous," Watergate Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski Prosecutor Leon Jaworski yesterday defended the judge's decision to preside at the Watergate cover-up trial.

Jaworski told the U.S. Court of Appeals that a motion to disqualify Judge Sirica was based on groundless accusations that the juristnationally famous for helping to break the Watergate case—had acquired a prosecutor's interest in convicting the seven conspiracy defendants.

The request to replace Sirica with another judge at the trial, scheduled for Sept. 9, has been made by lawyers for five of the defendants for five of the defendants— former Attorney General John N. Mitchell, former presidential campaign law-yer Kenneth W. Parkinson and former White House aides John D. Ehrlichman, Charles W. Colson and Gor-don Strachan don Strachan.

Their motion quoted extensively from last year's Watergate burglary trial and other public statements and appearances by the judge. Also cited was Sirica's off-the-bench remark that any Watergate defend-

ant can get a fair trial in Washington. The defendants are seeking a transfer of their trial on grounds of prejudicial publicity.

Jaworski denied that Judge Sirica had an excessive interest in vindicating his performance at the ear-lier trial. "If vindication were sought by the judge, he already has been vindi-cated" by grand jury pro-ceedings following up leads from the trial, the prosecutor said.

The prosecutor applied the "scurrilous" label to defense arguments that the judge had become "a na-tional hero" who would worry about his public image at the expense of impar-tiality on the bench.

Last month Jaworski suggested that Judge Sirica refer the defense motion to a U.S. District Court assignment panel, but Sirica re-fused. Yesterday's legal brief said the referral, though desirable, was "not legally required."

Jaworski's brief relied on

federal court decision that under existing law a judge has "a duty to sit" unless clearly disqualified from a case. The defense has argued that the "duty to sit" principle has been abolished by the U.S. Judicial Conference.

ence.
The Judicial Conference last year adopted the American Bar Association's new Code of Judicial Conduct, which calls for disqualification of a judge whenever his tion of a judge whenever his "impartiality might reasonably be questioned."

