

	IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF SALINAS JUDICIAL DISTRICT
	COUNTY OF MONTEREY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
	HONORABLE WILLIAM F. MORENO, Judge
	000
	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF) CALIFORNIA,
•)
	Plaintiff, No. 81371
٠	vs. ,
:	STANFORD NORMAN NATHAN,
	Defendant.
	<u></u>
	PRETRIAL HEARING
	Courthouse, Salinas, California
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Tuesday, November 8, 1977
. 1	Appearances:
T	For the People: For the Defendant:
V	Villiam D. Curtis, Esq., JOHN T. McTERNAN, Esq.
	PHILLIP M. WATTS, Esq., Deputy District Attorney
100	海ひがじん つてゅ にてていた がただのたけなん
ľ	

		l .
1	TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1977	
2	8:30 o'clock a.m.	ı
3	THE COURT: The People versus Stanford Nathan.	
4	MR. McTERNAN: I am John T. McTernan from Los	
5	Angeles.	
6	THE COURT: I would like to see this matter dis-	
7	missed with a stipulation that there would be no lawsuit	
8	going on here, that that would be the case.	
9	MR. McTERNAN: May I inquire if that is the People's	
10	position, Your Honor?	
11	THE COURT: I don't know. I'm not trying to put	
12	pressure on Mr. Watts. I think that there was basically	
13	a misunderstanding on something that happened over in	
14	the jail, and I really feel that there are times when	
15	we should forgive and forget. This is one of them.	
16	MR. McTERNAN: By both sides.	
17	MR. WATTS: This was filed by Assistant District	
18	Attorney Dean Flippo.	
19	THE COURT: Well, if there was a resolution of a	
20	dismissal, I would be amenable to it, at least, based	
21	upon the comments, and a stipulation for probable cause,	
22	that is short of a flat out dismissal.	
23	In the first place, there was a misunderstanding	3
24	MR. McTERNAN: That is correct.	
25	THE COURT: And in that regard, there were arrests	
6	earlier in the day and when Mr. Nathan came down there	

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

the jailer didn't -- well, the one that came on, came on in the afternoon. He didn't realize that there were three guys that had been arrested in the morning and that the guys that were in there in the afternoon were just being booked. Mr. Nathan thought he was being given the runaround because he thought that they were preventing him from seeing the clients that were being booked, and so there was a misunderstanding. Also, he was given bad information. The jailer told me that he told him that when he wanted to go in there that he couldn't go in there until he got appointed by the court. That is, you know, if I were a lawyer out there and I was thinking I was getting ripped off, I would probably get a little bit vocal, too, and I suppose that there is no lawyer worth his salt that isn't going to get upset at one time or another when he thinks he's getting the runaround.

As far as I'm concerned, he was incarcerated.

Me was in there. He got his shirt ripped. As far as

I'm concerned, you know, there was a certain amount of

punishment. He hasn't gone scot free, and I think that

there are times when it is the time to cool it and I

think this is the time. He's not going without punishment, and if you don't think that it is humanly degrading

to sit in one of those cells, it was humanly degrading.

He spent a day, and the way I feel about it, you gentlemen

have a duty of keeping law and order in this area, but my own personal feeling on the subject, this is also the time to take into consideration that we are dealing with a fellow lawyer, and take into consideration what was going down, and I think that this thing, it would go against you, but that is my feeling.

MR. WATTS: I appreciate that. From my investigation of the matter, I think that this is a situation where there was possibly a misunderstanding on both sides.

We would be amenable to this resolution. I would only ask that Mr. Nathan approach the deputy and clear the air in terms of an apology, as far as this incident, because I think it is questionable.

THE COURT: Oh, I think that Mr. Nathan knows by now that it is better to butter up those dudes over there because if they want to get in to see their clients, you know, I always did butter up the jailer because they alerted me now and then on things before the District Attorney found out about them, so I think that that is only smart when you're practicing law that you've got to be friendly with the jailer, and I don't think that the jailer was that upset. But you've got to look at the situation and keep that in the back of your mind at the time as to what all was going down. I talked to the jailer and it was his opinion, I was told by the jailer that there was a

deputy from the sheriff's office who was in the hospital who was injured, not very seriously, but of course, you know, that always has a tendency to get the blood flowing freely and, you know, you have to really look at what was going on in this case, and actually, if it was one of the private lawyers that had been punched in the shout by a defendant, you know, it is always difficult to be objective, and I think that your point is well taken. I think Mr. Nathan is a gentleman enough to go over there and, you know, apologize for his participation.

MR. WATTS: I think the appropriate thing would be with the stipulation for probable cause to dismiss.

MR. McTERNAN: May I have a moment to confer with counsel, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.

(At this time other cases were called by the Court.)

THE COURT: We will now take up the Nathan matter.

MR. WATTS: I have consulted with Mr. Phillips of the District Attorney's office and we are not prepared to move to dismiss the charge on People versus Nathan.

MR. McTERNAN: Your Honor, in a summary of the facts that you have made earlier, I think you showed a very good understanding of the entire situation. I think you have the facts in your mind and I would therefore move the Court for a dismissal of this matter in the

interest of justice.

THE COURT: Technically, I probably should disqualify myself in that I am probably going to be a witness.

MR. McTERNAN: That might be a matter at the time of trial, Your Honor. I don't think that it is a problem as far as sitting at this stage of the proceedings.

THE COURT: I can just see where this is going to go; acquittal and a lawsuit.

MR. McTERNAN: I am going to tell you, Your Honor, that if this case goes to trial, there will be a lawsuit.

THE COURT: I understand that. This is one of those matters that, you know, in the heat of the moment lots of things are said and done. It's like a husband and wife and, you know, we step in between husband and wife many times and there are a lot of misunderstandings that come out by excited people.

MR. McTERNAN: I think that Your Honor said a very wise thing this morning, that a lawyer is not worth his salt unless he fights for his client's rights.

THE COURT: I know. He's got a right to see his client, you know. I think that Mr. Nathan felt he was getting the runaround while the cops put him through their number. This gentleman decided not to be a part of that but decided that if he had to fight this thing

to see his clients; they were smart enough, in a way.

Mr. Nathan found a way of getting in with his clients

to find out what was going on, but they were smart

enough, at least, to separate them. It could have

happened that they would have been dumb enough to have

put him right in the cell with the guy that he was

trying to talk to, but no, they weren't that dumb.

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

MR. WATTS: I get the impression from listening to the Court that you know more about the case then I do.

THE COURT: Well, I was the guy that issued most of the orders. I got a phone call right in the middle of a good football game and was informed that there was some attorney using all kinds of obscenities and things down there and I said, "What's going on," and was informed that he couldn't go in there until he was appointed, but he is a private counsel and that there is not an appointment by the Court for that. Only the Public Defender needs to be appointed, and I learned that he was not a Public Defender but an attorney who wanted to see his client and when I found out that they were booking him I said, "While you're booking him, tell him he's got to wait, and then when you've finished booking him, as soon as you're finished booking him, then he's got a right to see his people, so let him see them, but you've got a right to book him first."

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Well, I went down there and the next thing I find out is that he told me, "I wanted to see some clients that were booked at 9:00 o'clock this morning who have been back in the jail all day long and it's just a game you're playing with me." The jailer chacked and, "There are three guys booked. I didn't know that. I just came on, Judge."

Now, what would you do if you were getting this jazz about you couldn't see your clients until they were booked and you knew they were booked at 9:00 o'clock and it's now 4:00, 4:30, or 5:00 o'clock. I really think that the jailer was as surprised as everybody else when he looked up in a few minutes and saw the Judge standing there. This is one Judge that believes in action, man. When someone calls for help from me, they'd better not ask me for something unless they would like to get it. I went right down there. I went down to the scene. We weren't talking about some deal over the phone. We were talking about somebody -- when I found out we had a lawyer in our jail that was arrested for disturbing the peace, I went down there to the jail. I think it was my duty to, so I went down there.

I think that there were two things wrong.

One was that Mr. Nathan doesn't have to be appointed by a Court to see his client. He can see his client

25

26

at any times that are reasonable after booking; he doesn't have a right to before the booking, but when that is completed, and they were booked at 9:00 o'clock, and then for the jailer to say that you can't see somebody at 4:30 or so, that is strange. Now, what is strange is that the jailer didn't realize, somebody didn't advise him that these guys had already been booked, and so I know that the jailer didn't understand. What he was talking about was different. He did not see the whole shot that was going on all day long from San Ardo, and so I knew that there was a misunderstanding I said to the jailer, "He should be able to see somebody that has been here since 9:00 o'clock," and so I suggested that we go back and find out who he wanted to see and we found out that they were there and so they were brought back to the attorney interview room and things were set up there, and the last I saw things were calm and docile. It was just a misunderstanding. It was a bad situation and a misunderstanding and, you know, I don't know that your office wants to make a big federal case out of this, but I'm not going to deny you that pleasure. You can just go right ahead and do it. If you want to object to my dismissing it, be my guest.

MR. McTERNAN: On my motion, I haven't heard an objection from the People.

I made a speech. He's got a right to 1 reply to my speech. 2 Do you want to have a trial, sir? Is that 3 what you want? 4 MR. WATTS: Your Honor, at this time we are not 5 prepared to consent to the dismissal on the 148. 6 THE COURT: You do what you want. 7 Could I have a trial date? 8 MR. McTERNAN: Is the motion denied? 9 10 THE COURT: The motion is denied, sir. 11 that there comes a time -- you may think that I have done you harm. I don't think that I have. I think 12 13 that I may educate somebody here, because I see where 14 this case is going. I believe I've said all that I'm going to say on the subject, and as far as I'm concerned, 15 the District Attorney feels that this is a case where 16 17 the interest would be best served by prosecuting it. If they feel that way, all right. Fine. 18 So let her rip 19 THE CLERK: January 26th at 8:30. 20 THE COURT: Do you waive time? 21 MR. McTERNAN: Time waived. May I advise the Court 22 that we do, and it was my plan before I came here this 23 morning, I do feel that it is necessary to call Your 24 Honor as a witness in this trial. 25 THE COURT: I guess I'm getting to be a popular 26 witness these days, so I don't know. Maybe I should do

like a lot of the rest of the other Judges and stay on 1 the other side of the phone, but I would be surprised 2 on this if I wasn't called as a witness, and for your 3 information, his shirt was torn. 4 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. MCTERNAN: 5 THE COURT: I guess this is a case that has got to 6 be heard, and as a matter of fact, if either of you feel 7 that you want a further pretrial, or if you feel that 8 it would be helpful to have a pretrial before some Judge 9 who wasn't as involved. 10 MR. WATTS: I'd appreciate that, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Do you want one? 12 MR. McTERNAN: No, I don't think it is necessary. 13 THE COURT: All right. We have the jury trial date 14 of January 26th, and of course they will have to dis-15 qualify me as a Judge to hear it because I am a witness. 16 Thank you very much. 17 MR. MCTERNAN: Thank you, sir. 18 ---000---19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2	COUNTY OF MONTEREY)
3	
4	I, JOHN P. HINTZE, a Qualified Shorthand Reporter
5	in and for the State of California, do hereby certify that
6	I am the Reporter, duly appointed and sworn, who reported the
7	above and foregoing proceedings in the matter entitled THE
8	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Plaintiff, versus STANFORM
9	NORMAN NATHAN, Defendant, at the time and place first therein
10	mentioned; that I reported the said proceedings fully and
11	correctly, and that the foregoing pages, number 1 through
12	number 10, inclusive, are a fully, true, complete and correct
13	transcription of my stenotypy notes taken at said time and
14	place, prepared under my direction and supervision; and that
15	the said pages constitute a full, true, complete and correct
16	statement of the said proceedings then and there had.
17	Dated this day of, 19
18	
19	
20	
21	Qualified Shorthand Reporter
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
50	