

SUPREME COURT COPY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)	SUPREME COURT CASE
)	NUMBER: S198132
)	
Plaintiff/Respondent,)	
)	TRIAL CASE NUMBER:
vs.)	BA346352
)	
JAMES MICHAEL FAYED,)	SUPREME COURT
)	FILED
)	
Defendant/Appellant.)	JAN 22 2014
)	
)	

Frank A. McGuire Clerk

Deputy

AUTOMATIC APPEAL FROM THE JUDGMENT OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CLARA SHORTRIDGE FOLTZ CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER, THE HONORABLE KATHLEEN KENNEDY, DEPARTMENT 109

APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF

Mark J. Werksman, Esq. (State Bar No.: 120767)
Kelly C. Quinn, Esq. (State Bar No.: 197697)
LAW OFFICES OF MARK J. WERKSMAN
888 W. Sixth Street, Fourth Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Tel: (213) 688-0460 / Fax: (213) 624-1942

Attorneys for Appellant
JAMES MICHAEL FAYED

DEATH PENALTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE(S)
I. STATEMENT OF APPEALABILITY	1
II. INTRODUCTION	1
III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS	7
A. FACTS FROM PRETRIAL MOTIONS AND HEARINGS	7
1. FACTS RELEVANT TO APPELLANT’S STATEMENT.....	7
a. FACTS CONCERNING APPELLANT’S FEDERAL CASE.....	9
b. FACTS CONCERNING THE MURDER INVESTIGATION AND APPELLANT’S INVOCATION OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS	9
c. FACTS CONCERNING THE FEDERAL DETENTION BASED ON STATE CHARGES.....	11
d. FACTS CONCERNING THE STATEMENT ELICITED FROM APPELLANT	12
e. HEARINGS ON THE MOTIONS CONCERNING APPELLANT’S STATEMENT	14
2. RELEVANT FACTS FROM THE MOTION TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE DERIVING FROM THE SEARCH AND SEIZURE OF APPELLANT’S CELL PHONE.....	17

3.	RELEVANT FACTS FROM THE MOTION TO QUASH WARRANT	19
4.	RELEVANT FACTS FROM THE MOTION TO TRAVERSE AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF SEARCH WARRANT	20
5.	RELEVANT FACTS FROM THE MOTION IN LIMINE TO EXCLUDE FEDERAL INDICTMENT	21
6.	RELEVANT FACTS CONCERNING TESTIMONY OF PHYSICIANS WHO PRESCRIBED PAIN MEDICATIONS TO APPELLANT IN THE MONTHS LEADING TO THE DEATH OF PAMELA FAYED.....	22
B.	FACTS FROM THE GUILT PHASE	23
1.	THE GOVERNMENT’S CASE.....	23
a.	TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE BACKGROUND OF APPELLANT AND PAMELA FAYED	23
i.	TESTIMONY OF DESIREE GOUDIE	23
ii.	TESTIMONY OF DELILAH URREA.....	24
iii.	TESTIMONY OF CAROL NEVE.....	25
iv.	TESTIMONY OF MARTY MCCOY	26
b.	TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS.....	26
c.	TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE FEDERAL INVESTIGATION INTO GOLDFINGER.....	28

i.	TESTIMONY OF MARK AVEIS	28
ii.	TESTIMONY OF DAVID WILLINGHAM.....	30
iii.	TESTIMONY OF JEAN NELSON	33
d.	TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE DEATH OF PAMELA FAYED	34
i.	TESTIMONY OF MATTHEW GRODE	34
ii.	TESTIMONY OF EDWIN RIVERA	35
iii.	TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN SCHOLTZ	36
e.	TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE INVESTIGATION INTO THE DEATH OF PAMELA FAYED	37
i.	TESTIMONY OF ERIC SPEAR	37
ii.	TESTIMONY OF MARK NEWHOUSE.....	39
iii.	TESTIMONY OF STEVE EIDSON....	39
iv.	TESTIMONY OF MIGUEL SANCHEZ.....	40
v.	TESTIMONY OF ALEJANDRO SAMAYOA.....	42
vi.	TESTIMONY OF TENILLE CHACON	42
vii.	STIPULATIONS ENTERED AT TRIAL	43

viii.	TESTIMONY CONCERNING PHONE RECORDS	44
aa.	TESTIMONY OF EDWARD DIXON	44
bb.	TESTIMONY OF DAN JENSEN.....	47
cc.	TESTIMONY OF SALAAM ABDUL	48
ix.	ADMISSION OF THE RECORDED STATEMENT AT TRIAL	50
x.	STATEMENTS FROM THE TAPE....	51
2.	DEFENSE WITNESSES.....	57
3.	GOVERNMENT’S REBUTTAL EVIDENCE.....	60
D.	PENALTY PHASE EVIDENCE	60
1.	PROSECUTION EVIDENCE.....	60
2.	DEFENSE EVIDENCE.....	62
a.	TESTIMONY OF JAMES SADLER AND JAMES TYLER.....	62
b.	TESTIMONY OF MELANIE JACKMAN ...	63
E.	FACTS CONCERNING THE JURY MISCONDUCT	64
V.	ARGUMENT	64
A.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY ADMITTED A RECORDED STATEMENT IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S FOURTH, FIFTH, SIXTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS.....	64
1.	STANDARD OF REVIEW.....	66

2.	THE STATEMENT WAS OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO COUNSEL	67
a.	THE INFORMANT WAS A GOVERNMENT AGENT	68
b.	THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL HAD ALREADY ATTACHED WHEN THE GOVERNMENT AGENT QUESTIONED APPELLANT	69
i.	APPELLANT’S RIGHT TO COUNSEL HAD ATTACHED ON THE STATE CASE.....	70
ii.	APPELLANT’S RIGHT TO COUNSEL HAD ATTACHED ON THE FEDERAL CASE, PRECLUDING QUESTIONING ON THE INSTANT CASE	72
aa.	THE FEDERAL AND STATE CASES WERE INEXTRICABLY INTERTWINED	73
bb.	THE FEDERAL ARREST AND DETENTION WAS A SHAM PROSECUTION.....	74
iii.	DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS PROHIBIT ADMISSION OF APPELLANT’S STATEMENT	76
3.	THE STATEMENT WAS OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS.....	78
a.	APPELLANT’S FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO COUNSEL WAS VIOLATED....	78

b.	APPELLANT’S FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT WAS VIOLATED	79
4.	THE STATEMENT WAS OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS	82
a.	DETENTION OF APPELLANT WITHOUT BAIL VIOLATED THE BAIL REFORM ACT	83
5.	ADMISSION OF APPELLANT’S STATEMENT WAS PREJUDICIAL	87
6.	APPELLANT’S STATEMENT WAS ADMITTED IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO CONFRONTATION...	88
a.	STANDARD OF REVIEW	89
b.	THE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED APPELLANT’S SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS BY ADMITTING SMITH’S STATEMENT	89
c.	THE <i>CRAWFORD</i> VIOLATION PREJUDICED APPELLANT	93
7.	ADMISSION OF THE UNREDACTED STATEMENT VIOLATED APPELLANT’S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS	93
a.	THE PORTIONS OF THE STATEMENT CONCERNING APPELLANT’S PURPORTED THREAT AGAINST CO-DEFENDANT MOYA SHOULD HAVE BEEN REDACTED	95

i.	REGARDLESS OF ANY PROFFERED THEORY OF ADMISSIBILITY, ANY STATEMENT CONCERNING MOYA SHOULD HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED UNDER EVIDENCE CODE SECTION 352	96
aa.	THE EVIDENCE HAD LIMITED PROBATIVE VALUE	96
bb.	THE UNCHARGED CONDUCT WAS HIGHLY PREJUDICIAL.....	102
ii.	SHAWN SMITH'S INFLAMMATORY STATEMENTS CONCERNING EXTRANEOUS MATTERS SHOULD HAVE BEEN REDACTED.....	105
iii.	APPELLANT'S STATEMENTS CONCERNING EXTRANEOUS MATTERS SHOULD HAVE BEEN REDACTED	106
b.	THE INTRODUCTION OF EXTRANEOUS MATTERS WAS PREJUDICIAL	108
B.	THE JURY MISCONDUCT IN THE INSTANT CASE WARRANTS REVERSAL	109
1.	FACTS CONCERNING THE JURY MISCONDUCT.....	110
2.	STANDARD OF REVIEW.....	120
3.	JURY MISCONDUCT OCCURRED IN THE INSTANT CASE.....	120

4.	THE LOWER COURT FAILED TO PROPERLY INVESTIGATE THE MISCONDUCT.....	123
5.	THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN NOT GRANTING THE NEW TRIAL MOTION BASED ON THE JURY MISCONDUCT	125
C.	THE TRIAL COURT COMMITTED NUMEROUS ERRORS IN INSTRUCTING THE JURY IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL.....	129
1.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY REFUSED TO INSTRUCT ON APPELLANT’S THIRD-PARTY CULPABILITY DEFENSE.....	130
2.	THE LOWER COURT ERRONEOUSLY USED CALJIC.....	135
a.	THE LOWER COURT ERRONEOUSLY USED THE CALJIC INSTRUCTION FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM AIDING AND ABETTING.....	136
i.	CALJIC 3.03 DOES NOT ACCURATELY STATE THE LAW OF WITHDRAWAL	137
3.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY INTERMINGLED CALJIC AND CALCRIM	139
4.	THE JURY WAS NOT PROPERLY INSTRUCTED CONCERNING WITHDRAWAL FROM CONSPIRACY.....	140
5.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY REFUSED TO GIVE CALJIC No. 2.23	142
6.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY GAVE CALJIC No. 2.06.....	144

D.	THE LOWER COURT ERRED BY ADMITTING EVIDENCE OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM UNLAWFUL SEARCH AND SEIZURE	146
1.	STANDARD OF REVIEW	146
2.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY ALLOWED IN EVIDENCE AT TRIAL OBTAINED THROUGH AN IMPERMISSIBLE SEARCH OF APPELLANT’S PHONE.....	147
a.	IF APPELLANT WAS DETAINED, AS STATED IN THE POLICE REPORTS, THEN THE SEIZURE OF HIS PHONE WAS UNLAWFUL	148
i.	APPELLANT’S DETENTION WAS UNLAWFUL	148
ii.	THE PAT-DOWN OF APPELLANT WAS UNJUSTIFIED	150
iii.	EVEN IF OFFICERS COULD HAVE CONDUCTED A PAT-DOWN OF APPELLANT, THEY FAR EXCEEDED THE SCOPE OF THE PAT-DOWN WHEN THEY SEIZED THE CELL PHONE.....	151
b.	IF APPELLANT WAS ARRESTED, THE ARREST WAS UNLAWFUL	152
c.	EVEN IF APPELLANT WAS LAWFULLY ARRESTED, THE SUBSEQUENT SEARCH OF HIS CELL PHONE WAS UNLAWFUL.....	154

	i.	EVEN IF <i>DIAZ</i> IS APPLICABLE, THIS COURT SHOULD RECONSIDER THAT OPINION IN LIGHT OF SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT	155
	d.	THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN FINDING INEVITABLE DISCOVERY	159
3.		THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING IN EVIDENCE DERIVED FROM THE UNLAWFUL RECORDING OF APPELLANT’S INVESTIGATOR QUESTIONING A WITNESS ..	162
	a.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY DENIED THE MOTION TO TRAVERSE ..	164
	b.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY DENIED THE MOTION TO SUPPRESS FOR FAILURE TO COMPORT WITH MINIMIZATION REQUIREMENTS	167
	c.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY DENIED APPELLANT’S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS	168
	d.	THE ADMISSION OF THE EVIDENCE WAS PREJUDICIAL	170
4.		THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN DENYING APPELLANT’S MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT	171
	a.	THERE WAS NO PROBABLE CAUSE TO ISSUE THE JULY 31, 2008 SEARCH WARRANT	172
	i.	THE INFORMATION IN THE AMENDMENT WAS INSUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH PROBABLE CAUSE	173

ii.	THE INFORMATION FROM THE INITIAL AFFIDAVIT WAS STALE AND MOOT	174
aa.	THE NEED TO SEARCH APPELLANT’S PROPERTY FOR THE VEHICLE WAS MOOT	175
bb.	THE INFORMATION IN THE INITIAL AFFIDAVIT BECAME STALE AFTER THE FIRST SEARCH	176
b.	THE WARRANT WAS OVERLY BROAD	179
c.	ADMISSION OF THE EVIDENCE CONSTITUTES PREJUDICIAL ERROR ...	180
E.	THE LOWER COURT’S RULINGS PERTAINING TO SEVERAL PIECES OF EVIDENCE VIOLATED APPELLANT’S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL.....	181
1.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY ADMITTED GOVERNMENT EVIDENCE	181
a.	THE LOWER COURT ERRONEOUSLY ADMITTED PREVIOUSLY UNDISCLOSED EVIDENCE IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S RIGHT TO COUNSEL AND RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL	184
i.	STANDARD OF REVIEW.....	184
ii.	RELEVANT LAW CONCERNING THE GOVERNMENT’S BURDEN TO DISCLOSE EVIDENCE.....	184

b.	THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN ADMITTING EVIDENCE CONCERNING THE FEDERAL INDICTMENT	188
i.	STANDARD OF REVIEW	191
ii.	THE UNCHARGED CONDUCT WAS INADMISSIBLE CHARACTER EVIDENCE.....	191
aa.	THE UNCHARGED CONDUCT DID NOT SHOW MOTIVE	192
iii.	THE EVIDENCE SHOULD HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED UNDER EVIDENCE CODE SECTION 352 ...	194
iv.	APPELLANT WAS PREJUDICED BY ADMISSION OF THE FACTS FROM THE FEDERAL CASE.....	196
c.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY ALLOWED THE GOVERNMENT TO PRESENT HEARSAY TESTIMONY IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S RIGHT TO CONFRONT WITNESSES	197
d.	THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING THE GOVERNMENT TO ADMIT PREJUDICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE GUILT PHASE	199
i.	PHOTOGRAPHS OF BLOODIED ITEMS FOUND AT THE MURDER SCENE SHOULD HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED.....	200

ii.	THE LOWER COURT ERRED WHEN IT ADMITTED OVERLY SENTIMENTAL AND EMOTIONAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF PAMELA FAYED WHEN SHE WAS ALIVE	203
2.	THE TRIAL COURT IMPROPERLY HINDERED APPELLANT’S CROSS-EXAMINATION RIGHTS	204
a.	STANDARD OF REVIEW	205
b.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY LIMITED THE CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WITNESS MARK AVEIS	205
3.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED DEFENSE EVIDENCE	207
a.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO APPELLANT’S STATE OF MIND DEPRIVING HIM OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO MOUNT A DEFENSE	208
b.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED TESTIMONY CRITICAL TO APPELLANT’S THIRD PARTY CULPABILITY DEFENSE DEPRIVING HIM OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO MOUNT A DEFENSE.....	209
i.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED RELEVANT PORTIONS OF TABOGA’S TESTIMONY	210

	ii.	THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN EXCLUDING QUESTIONS TO TABOGA CONCERNING APPELLANT'S LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF MERCEDES' PRIOR SOLICITATION	211
	iii.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED TABOGA'S PRIOR CONSISTENT STATEMENT	212
	c.	THE LOWER COURT ERRED WHEN IT EXCLUDED EVIDENCE OF APPELLANT'S PHYSICAL INABILITY TO COMMIT THE CRIME	214
F.		THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.....	214
	a.	THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF FINANCIAL GAIN.....	215
	b.	THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF LYING IN WAIT	218
	i.	THE GOVERNMENT DID NOT SHOW THAT APPELLANT WAS LYING IN WAIT	218
	ii.	ALLOWING A DEATH SENTENCE FOR A DEFENDANT WITH NO MENS REA OR ACTUS REUS REQUIREMENT VIOLATES DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS	222
G.		THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTED NUMEROUS INSTANCES OF MISCONDUCT IN THE GUILT PHASE DEPRIVING APPELLANT OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL	225

1.	THE GOVERNMENT’S INFLAMMATORY STATEMENTS IN CLOSING ARGUMENT OF THE GUILT PHASE WERE MISCONDUCT	226
2.	THE GOVERNMENT MISSTATED KEY ELEMENTS OF LAW	228
a.	THE GOVERNMENT MADE MISSTATEMENTS OF THE LAW CONCERNING WITHDRAWAL	229
b.	THE GOVERNMENT MADE MISSTATEMENTS OF THE LAW CONCERNING AIDING AND ABETTING	231
c.	THE GOVERNMENT MADE MISSTATEMENT OF THE LAW CONCERNING LYING IN WAIT	232
3.	THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTED MISCONDUCT BY REFERENCING FACTS OUTSIDE OF THE RECORD AND/OR MISSTATING THE EVIDENCE IN CLOSING ARGUMENTS	233
a.	THE GOVERNMENT MADE STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE FEDERAL SUBPOENA BASED ON FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE AND/OR MISSTATED THE RECORD	234
b.	THE GOVERNMENT MADE STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE FEDERAL CASE BASED ON FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE AND/OR MISSTATED THE RECORD	236

c.	THE GOVERNMENT MADE STATEMENTS ABOUT APPELLANT'S MENTAL STATE BASED ON FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE AND/OR MISSTATED THE RECORD.....	238
d.	THE GOVERNMENT MADE STATEMENTS ABOUT CAROL NEVE BASED ON FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE AND/OR MISSTATED THE RECORD	240
e.	THE GOVERNMENT MADE OTHER STATEMENTS TO THE JURY BASED ON FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE AND/OR MISSTATED THE RECORD	241
f.	THE GOVERNMENT MISCONDUCT REQUIRES REVERSAL	242
H.	APPELLANT WAS DENIED DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL BY THE ADMISSION OF IMPROPER EVIDENCE AT THE PENALTY PHASE	243
1.	THE STANDARD OF REVIEW	246
2.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY ADMITTED A LETTER WRITTEN BY PAMELA FAYED	246
3.	THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY ADMITTED PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE GRAVE SITE	249
I.	THE LOWER COURT VIOLATED APPELLANT'S EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS BY EXCLUDING MITIGATING EVIDENCE IN THE PENALTY PHASE	250

J.	THE GOVERNMENT VIOLATED APPELLANT’S EIGHTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND HIS RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS AND RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL BY IMPROPERLY APPEALING TO THE PASSION AND PREJUDICE OF THE JURY DURING THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS OF THE PENALTY PHASE ..	253
K.	THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTED MISCONDUCT BY ARGUING FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE IN THE PENALTY PHASE DEPRIVING APPELLANT OF HIS RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL	255
	a. THE GOVERNMENT MADE ARGUMENTS CONCERNING JANETTE BASED ON FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE	256
	b. THE GOVERNMENT MADE OTHER ARGUMENTS BASED ON FACTS NOT EVIDENCE	257
L.	CUMULATIVE ERROR REQUIRES REVERSAL	258
M.	THE SUBSTANTIVE PROVISIONS OF CALIFORNIA’S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, AS INTERPRETED AND APPLIED, CONSTITUTE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT	260
	a. CALIFORNIA’S DEATH PENALTY SCHEME, AS WRITTEN AND APPLIED, IS ARBITRARY	262
	i. CALIFORNIA’S DEATH PENALTY SCHEME DOES NOT SUFFICIENTLY NARROW THE CLASS OF DEFENDANTS ELIGIBLE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY	262
	aa. THE LYING-IN-WAIT SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE IS OVERLY BROAD	265

bb.	THE FELONY-MURDER SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE IS OVERLY BROAD	270
ii.	THE DEATH PENALTY IS ARBITRARY BECAUSE IT IS USED DISPROPORTIONATELY COMPARED TO THE POOL OF DEATH ELIGIBLE-CASES	273
b.	THE PUNISHMENT OF DEATH IS UNUSUALLY SEVERE.....	279
c.	CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY DISFAVORS CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.....	284
d.	THE DEATH PENALTY IS NOT MORE EFFECTIVE THAN LIFE IMPRISONMENT	288
i.	THE DEATH PENALTY IS NOT A BETTER DETERRANT THAN A SENTENCE OF LIFE IN PRISON.....	289
ii.	THE DEATH PENALTY DOES NOT FURTHER THE GOAL OF RETRIBUTION BETTER THAN A SENTENCE OF LIFE IN PRISON.....	292
N.	THE PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, ALONE OR CUMULATIVELY, CONSTITUTE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT.....	294
1.	PENAL CODE SECTION 190.3, SUBDIVISION (a), IS OVERLY BROAD, ALLOWING FOR THE ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS IMPOSITION OF DEATH.....	295
2.	THE DEATH PENALTY STATUTE AND ACCOMPANYING JURY INSTRUCTIONS FAIL TO SET FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BURDEN OF PROOF.....	299

a.	THE CALIFORNIA DEATH PENALTY STATUTE IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN THE WAKE OF <i>APPRENDI</i> , <i>RING</i> , <i>BLAKELY</i> , AND <i>CUNNINGHAM</i>	300
i.	THE DEATH PENALTY FAILS TO REQUIRE THE EXISTENCE OF AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT	302
aa.	DEATH IS NOT THE MAXIMUM PENALTY FOR A DEFENDANT CONVICTED OF FIRST-DEGREE MURDER	304
bb.	CALIFORNIA’S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE REQUIRES FINDINGS OF AGGRAVATING FACTORS TO IMPOSE DEATH.....	306
ii.	THE DEATH PENALTY IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT FAILS TO REQUIRE FINDINGS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT	309
aa.	IF NO BURDEN OF PROOF IS REQUIRED, THE JURY SHOULD HAVE BEEN INSTRUCTED ON THE LACK OF A BURDEN.....	312
bb.	THE JURY SHOULD HAVE BEEN INSTRUCTED THAT THERE IS A PRESUMPTION OF LIFE	313
3.	CALIFORNIA’S DEATH PENALTY REQUIREMENTS ARE CONSTITUTIONALLY INFIRM BECAUSE THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT FOR WRITTEN FINDINGS BY THE JURY.....	314

4.	THE LOWER COURT FAILED TO INSTRUCT THE JURY THAT THE ABSENCE OF STATUTORY MITIGATING FACTORS IS NOT AN AGGRAVATING FACTOR	319
5.	THE DEATH PENALTY STATUTE FAILS TO REQUIRE UNANIMITY REGARDING AGGRAVATING FACTORS	322
6.	PENAL CODE SECTION 190.3, SUBDIVISION (a) IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT FAILS TO REQUIRE INTER-CASE PROPORTIONALITY	324
7.	THE USE OF ADJECTIVES “EXTREME” AND “SUBSTANTIAL” IN SECTION 190.3, SUBDIVISIONS (d) AND (g), IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL	325
8.	THE DEATH PENALTY SCHEME IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT ALLOWS RELIANCE BY THE GOVERNMENT ON UNADJUDICATED CRIMINAL ACTIVITY	325
9.	THE CALIFORNIA SENTENCING SCHEME VIOLATES THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION	326
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	327
	CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL.....	328

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

PAGE(S)

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT CASES

<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> (2000) 530 U.S. 466 [120 S.Ct. 2348, 147 L.Ed.2d 435].....	passim
<i>Beck v. Alabama</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 625 [100 S.Ct. 2382, 65 L.Ed.2d 392].....	255, 318
<i>Blakely v. Washington</i> (2004) 542 U.S. 296 [124 S.Ct. 2531, 159 L.Ed.2d 403].....	passim
<i>Boyde v. California</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 370 [110 S.Ct. 1190, 108 L.Ed.2d 316].....	242, 251
<i>Brady v. Maryland</i> (1963) 373 U.S. 83 [83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed.2d 215].....	186
<i>Bram v. United States</i> (1897) 168 U.S. 532 [18 S.Ct. 183, 42 L.Ed. 568].....	80
<i>Brewer v. Williams</i> (1977) 430 U.S. 387 [97 S.Ct. 1232, 51 L.Ed.2d 424].....	67, 68
<i>Brookhart v. Janis</i> (1966) 384 U.S. 1 [86 S.Ct. 1245, 7 Ohio Misc. 77].....	204
<i>Brown v. Illinois</i> (1975) 422 U.S. 590 [95 S.Ct. 2254, 45 L.Ed.2d 416].....	82, 152, 153, 161
<i>Brown v. Texas</i> (1979) 443 U.S. 47 [99 S.Ct. 2637, 61 L.Ed.2d 357].....	149
<i>Bruton v. United States</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 123 [88 S.Ct. 1620, 20 L.Ed.2d 476].....	204
<i>California v. Acevedo</i> (1991) 500 U.S. 565 [111 S.Ct. 1982, 114 L.Ed.2d 619].....	155
<i>California v. Brown</i> (1987) 479 U.S. 538 [107 S.Ct. 837, 93 L.Ed.2d 934].....	314

<i>California v. Trombetta</i> (1984) 467 U.S. 479 [104 S.Ct. 2528, 81 L.Ed.2d 413].....	168
<i>Carnley v. Cochran</i> (1962) 369 U.S. 506 [82 S.Ct. 884, 8 L.Ed.2d 70].....	67
<i>Chambers v. Mississippi</i> (1973) 410 U.S. 284 [93 S.Ct. 1038, 35 L.Ed.2d 297].....	168, 207, 208, 258
<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18 [87 S.Ct. 824, 17 L.Ed.2d 705].....	passim
<i>Chimel v. California</i> (1962) 395 U.S. 752 [985 S.Ct. 2034, 23 L.Ed.2d 685].....	158, 159, 178
<i>Coker v. Georgia</i> (1977) 433 U.S. 584 [97 S.Ct. 2861, 53 L.Ed.2d 982].....	282
<i>County of Riverside v. McLaughlin</i> (1991) 500 U.S. 44 [111 S.Ct. 1661, 114 L.Ed.2d 49].....	86
<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> (2004) 541 U.S. 36 [124 S.Ct. 1354, 158 L.Ed.2d 177].....	passim
<i>Cunningham v. California</i> (2007) 549 U.S. 270 [127 S.Ct. 856, 166 L.Ed.2d 856].....	passim
<i>Darden v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 168 [106 S.Ct. 2464, 91 L.Ed.2d 144].....	226, 255
<i>Davis v. United States</i> (2011) – U.S – [131 S.Ct. 2419, 180 L.Ed.2d 285].....	157, 158
<i>Delaware v. Van Arsdall</i> (1986) 475 U.S. 673 [106 S.Ct. 1431, 89 L.Ed.2d 674].....	89
<i>Delo v. Lashley</i> (1993) 507 U.S. 272 [113 S.Ct. 1222, 122 L.Ed.2d 620].....	313
<i>Enmund v. Florida</i> (1982) 458 U.S. 782 [102 S.Ct. 3368, 73 L.Ed.2d 1140].....	284

<i>Estelle v. McGuire</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 62 [112 S.Ct. 475, 116 L.Ed.2d 385]	88, 130
<i>Estelle v. Williams</i> (1976) 425 U.S. 501 [965 S.Ct. 1691, 48 L.Ed.2d 126]	313
<i>Franks v. Delaware</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 154 [99 S.Ct. 2674, 57 L.Ed.2d 667]	165, 172
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 238 [92 S.Ct. 2726, 33 L.Ed.2d 346]	passim
<i>Gardner v. Florida</i> (1977) 430 U.S. 349 [97 S.Ct. 1197, 51 L.Ed.2d 393]	129, 243, 326
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153 [96 S.Ct. 2909, 49 L.Ed.2d 859]	passim
<i>Godfrey v. Georgia</i> (1980) 446 U.S. 420 [100 S.Ct. 1759, 64 L.Ed.2d 398]	243, 253, 262, 299, 322
<i>Grunewald v. United States</i> (1957) 353 U.S. 391 [77 S.Ct. 963]	80
<i>Hampton v. United States</i> (1975) 425 U.S. 484 [96 S.Ct. 1646, 48 L.Ed.2d 113]	169
<i>Harris v. United States</i> (1947) 331 U.S. 145 [67 S.Ct. 1098, 91 L.Ed. 1399]	178
<i>Hicks v. Oklahoma</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 343 [100 S.Ct. 2227, 65 L.Ed.2d 175]	94, 130, 312, 321
<i>In re Winship</i> (1970) 397 U.S. 358 [90 S.Ct. 1068, 25 L.Ed.2d 368]	214
<i>Johnson v. Mississippi</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 578 [108 S.Ct. 1981, 100 L.Ed.2d 575]	243, 249, 325
<i>Kansas v. Marsh</i> (2006) 548 U.S. 163 [126 S.Ct. 2516, 165 L.Ed.2d 429]	295

<i>Keeney v. Tamayo-Reyes</i> (1992) 504 U.S. 1 [112 S.Ct. 1715, 118 L.Ed.2d 318]	315
<i>Kennedy v. Louisiana</i> (2008) 554 U.S. 407 [128 S.Ct. 2641, 171 L.Ed.2d 585]	281
<i>Kentucky v. Whorton</i> (1979) 441 U.S. 786 [99 S.Ct. 2088, 60 L.Ed.2d 640]	129
<i>Lane v. Franks</i> (2014) 2013 WL 5675531	157
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 586 [98 S.Ct. 2954, 57 L.Ed.2d 973]	passim
<i>Massiah v. United States</i> (1964) 377 U.S. 201 [84 S.Ct. 1199, 12 L.Ed.2d 246]	70, 71, 87
<i>Maynard v. Cartwright</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 356 [108 S.Ct. 1853, 100 L.Ed.2d 372]	263, 299
<i>Mills v. Maryland</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 367 [108 S.Ct. 1860, 100 L.Ed.2d 384]	317
<i>Monge v. California</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 721 [118 S.Ct. 2246, 141 L.Ed.2d 615]	180, 255, 309, 319, 326
<i>Morrissey v. Brewer</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 471 [92 S.Ct. 2593, 33 L.Ed.2d 284]	77
<i>New York v. Belton</i> (1981) 453 U.S. 454 [101 S.Ct. 2860, 69 L.Ed.2d 768]	158, 159
<i>Nix v. Williams</i> (1984) 467 U.S. 431[104 S.Ct. 2501, 81 L.Ed.2d 377]	160
<i>Oregon v. Mathiason</i> (1977) 429 U.S. 492 [97 S.Ct. 711, 50 L.Ed.2d. 714]	80
<i>Pointer v. Texas</i> (1965) 380 U.S. 400 [85 S.Ct. 1065, 13 L.Ed.2d 923]	204

<i>Powell v. Alabama</i> (1932) 287 U.S. 45 [53 S.Ct. 55, 77 L.Ed. 158]	295
<i>Pulley v. Harris</i> (1984) 465 U.S. 37 [104 S.Ct. 871, 79 L.Ed.2d 29]	295
<i>Reid v. Georgia</i> (1980) 448 U.S. 438 [100 S.Ct. 2752, 65 L.Ed.2d 890]	149
<i>Remmer v. United States</i> (1954) 347 U.S. 227 [74 S.Ct. 450, 98 L.Ed. 654]	123
<i>Reynolds v. United States</i> (1878) 98 U.S. 145 [25 L.Ed. 244]	121
<i>Rhode Island v. Innis</i> (1980) 446 U.S. 291 [100 S.Ct. 1682, 64 L.Ed.2d 297]	81
<i>Riley v. California</i> (2014) 2013 WL 3938997	157
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 584 [122 S.Ct. 2428, 153 L.Ed.2d 556]	passim
<i>Rochin v. California</i> (1952) 342 U.S. 165 [72 S.Ct. 205, 96 L.Ed. 183]	169
<i>Rose v. Clark</i> (1986) 478 U.S. 570 [106 S.Ct. 3101, 92 L.Ed.2d 460]	196
<i>Rothgery v. Gillespie County, Texas</i> (2008) 554 U.S. 191 [128 S.Ct. 2578, 171 L.Ed.2d 366]	71
<i>Sandstrom v. Montana</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 510 [99 S.Ct. 2450, 61 L.Ed.2d 39]	137
<i>Scott v. United States</i> (1978) 436 U.S. 128 [98 S.Ct. 1717, 56 L.Ed.2d 168]	167
<i>Sgro v. United States</i> (1932) 287 U.S. 206 [53 S.Ct. 138, 77 L.Ed. 260]	176, 177

<i>Sibron v. New York</i> (1968) 392 U.S. 40 [88 S.Ct. 1889, 20 L.Ed.2d 917]	151
<i>Solesbee v. Balkcom</i> (1950) 339 U.S. 9 [70 S.Ct. 457, 94 L.Ed. 604]	283
<i>Spano v. New York</i> (1959) 360 U.S. 315 [79 S.Ct. 1202, 3 L.Ed.2d 1265]	81
<i>Stansbury v. California</i> (1994) 511 U.S. 318 [114 S.Ct. 1526, 128 L.Ed.2d 293]	226, 227
<i>Stringer v. Black</i> (1992) 503 U.S. 222 [112 S.Ct. 1130, 117 L.Ed.2d 367]	131
<i>Sullivan v. Louisiana</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 275 [113 S.Ct. 2078, 124 L.Ed.2d 182]	88
<i>Taylor v. Alabama</i> (1982) 457 U.S. 687 [102 S.Ct. 2664, 73 L.Ed.2d 314]	82
<i>Terry v. Ohio</i> (1968) 392 U.S. 1 [88 S.Ct. 1868, 20 L.Ed.2d 889]	148, 150, 151, 161
<i>Townsend v. Sain</i> (1963) 372 U.S. 293 [83 S.Ct. 745, 9 L.Ed.2d 770]	314, 315
<i>Trop v. Dulles</i> (1958) 356 U.S. 86 [78 S.Ct. 590, 2 L.Ed.2d 630]	280, 282, 284
<i>Tuilaepa v. California</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 967 [114 S.Ct. 2630, 129 L.Ed.2d 750]	264, 296, 314
<i>Union Pac. R. Co. v. Botsford</i> (1891) 141 U.S. 250 [11 S.Ct. 1000, 35 L.Ed. 734]	148
<i>United States v. Booker</i> (2005) 543 U.S. 220 [125 S.Ct. 738, 160 L.Ed.2d 621]	302, 303
<i>United States v. Chadwick</i> (1977) 433 U.S. 1 [97 S.Ct. 2476, 53 L.Ed.2d 538]	155, 156

<i>United States v. Robinson</i> (1973) 414 U.S. 218 [94 S.Ct. 467, 38 L.Ed.2d 427]	155, 156, 158
<i>United States v. Salerno</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 739 [107 S.Ct. 2095, 95 L.Ed.2d 697]	83
<i>United States v. Wurie</i> (2014) 2013 WL 4402108	157
<i>Walton v. Arizona</i> (1990) 497 U.S. 639 [110 S.Ct. 3047, 111 L.Ed.2d 511]	307, 308
<i>Wilkerson v. Utah</i> (1879) 99 U.S. 130 [25 L.Ed. 345]	260
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 280 [96 S.Ct. 2978, 49 L.Ed.2d 944]	319
<i>Warden v. Hayden</i> (1967) 387 U.S. 294 [87 S.Ct. 1642, 18 L.Ed.2d 782]	178
<i>Zant v. Stephens</i> (1983) 462 U.S. 862 [103 S.Ct. 2733, 77 L.Ed.2d 235]	249, 262, 272, 319, 326

FEDERAL CASES

<i>Brooks v. Kemp</i> (11th Cir. 1985) 762 F.2d 1383	253
<i>Campbell v. Blodgett</i> (9th Cir. 1993) 997 F.2d 512	321
<i>Durham v. United States</i> (9th Cir. 1968) 403 F.2d 190	177
<i>Fetterly v. Paskett</i> (9th Cir. 1993) 997 F.2d 1295	321
<i>Hernandez v. Ylst</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 930 F.2d 714	130

<i>Jordan v. Havnani-Henry</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 199 F.3d 1332	187
<i>Myers v. Ylst</i> (9th Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 417	318
<i>United States v. Baptista-Rodriguez</i> (11th Cir. 1994) 17 F.3d 1354	74
<i>United States v. Bernhardt</i> (9th Cir. 1987) 831 F.2d 181	74
<i>United States v. Boatwright</i> (9th Cir. 1987) 822 F.2d 862	161
<i>United States v. Bobo</i> (4th Cir. 1973) 477 F.2d 974	167
<i>United States v. Byrd</i> (5th Cir. 1992) 969 F.2d 106	83, 85
<i>United States v. Certain Real Property and Premises Known as 38 Whalers Cove Drive, Babylon, New York</i> (2d Cir. 1992) 954 F.2d 29	74
<i>United States v. Coker</i> (1st Cir. 2005) 433 F.3d 39	75
<i>United States v. DiGiacomo</i> (D.Mass. 1990) 746 F. Supp. 1176	86
<i>United States v. Doward</i> (1st Cir. 1994) 41 F.3d 789	158, 159
<i>United States v. Dudden</i> (9th Cir. 1995) 65 F.3d 1461	205
<i>United States v. Escobar de Bright</i> (9th Cir. 1984) 742 F.2d 1196	135
<i>United States v. Friedman</i> (2d Cir. 1988) 837 F.2d 48	83