

# SUPREME COURT COPY

## THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, )

Plaintiff and Respondent, )

vs. )

MICHAEL LEON BELL, )

Defendant and Appellant. )

) No. S080056

) Stanislaus Co.

) No. 133269

SUPREME COURT  
**FILED**

MAR - 9 2015

**APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF**

Frank A. McGuire Clerk

Deputy

**APPEAL FROM A JUDGMENT OF DEATH  
FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF STANISLAUS COUNTY  
THE HONORABLE DAVID G. VANDER WALL, JUDGE PRESIDING**

Melissa Hill  
State Bar No. 71218  
PO Box 2758  
Corrales, NM 87048  
Phone: (505) 898-2977  
Email: [mhcorrals@me.com](mailto:mhcorrals@me.com)

Attorney for Appellant  
Michael Leon Bell

**DEATH PENALTY**



**TOPICAL INDEX**  
**People v. Bell (S080056)**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....X

APPELLANT’S REPLY BRIEF.....1

CORRECTIONS TO RESPONDENT’S STATEMENT OF FACTS.....1

ARGUMENT SECTION 1.....3

INTERRELATED ARGUMENTS REGARDING THE IMPARTIALITY OF, AND SELECTION OF THE JURY THAT DECIDED GUILT AND PENALTY.....3

I. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S ASSERTION, THE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED BELL’S FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO TRIAL BY AN IMPARTIAL TRIBUNAL IN VIOLATION OF THE SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS AND THEIR CALIFORNIA COUNTERPARTS, BY APPLYING AN INCORRECT STANDARD TO FIND STRONGLY PRO-DEATH PENALTY PANELISTS SUBSTANTIALLY UNIMPAIRED PURSUANT TO *WAINWRIGHT V. WITT* (1985) 469 U.S. 412 [83 L.ED.2D 841, 105 S.CT 844] BASED SOLELY ON JURORS’ “APPROPRIATE” ANSWERS TO THE JUDGE’S LEADING QUESTIONS THAT THE COURT DEEMED AUTOMATICALLY QUALIFYING ACCORDING TO *WITT*, AND BY EMPLOYING THREATS TO CHILL DEFENSE COUNSEL’S ABILITY TO MEANINGFULLY SCREEN PROSPECTIVE JURORS FOR ACTUAL OR IMPLIED BIAS.....3

    A. Respondent Falsely Suggests Appellant Does Not Challenge The Impartiality Of The Jury.....3

    B. Appellant’s Failure To Argue That The Court Erred By Granting The Prosecutor’s Challenge’s For Cause Is Irrelevant.....4

    C. Respondent’s Forfeiture Argument Should Be Rejected And The Issues Addressed On The Merits.....5

    D. The Trial Court’s Threats Were Improper; Counsel Was Not Putting Words In Panelists’ Mouths, But Engaging In Proper *Witt* Voir Dire.....17

E. The Trial Court’s Improper Rehabilitation Of Biased Jurors And Threats To Trial Counsel Resulted In Prejudice to Appellant.....22

F. The Trial Court Misapplied The Law And Erred In Finding Challenged Panelists Qualified.....28

II. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S ASSERTION, BELL WAS DENIED DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, EQUAL PROTECTION AND A RELIABLE DETERMINATION OF PENALTY BY THE TRIAL COURT’S UNREASONABLE REFUSAL TO ALLOW SECTION 987.9 FUNDS TO BE SPENT ON AN INVESTIGATOR WHO WAS ALSO A JURY SELECTION CONSULTANT, RATHER THAN ON AN INVESTIGATOR WITHOUT ANY JURY SELECTION EXPERTISE OR A SECOND ATTORNEY.....32

A. The Record:.....32

B. Discussion:.....34

ARGUMENT SECTION 2.....45

INTERRELATED ARGUMENTS STEMMING FROM THE TRIAL COURT’S DENIAL OF BELL’S MOTION FOR DISCOVERY OF TORY’S STATEMENTS MADE TO DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY CASSIDY WHILE CASSIDY WAS TRAVIS’ DEFENSE ATTORNEY, AND MOTION TO RECUSE THE STANISLAUS COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY’S OFFICE OR, ALTERNATIVELY, PRECLUDE TORY FROM TESTIFYING AGAINST BELL AT HIS TRIAL.....45

III. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S ARGUMENT, BELL’S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS AND CONFRONTATION AND COMPULSORY PROCESS WERE VIOLATED BY THE TRIAL COURT’S DENIAL OF BELL’S MOTION FOR DISCOVERY OF TORY’S STATEMENTS TO DEFENSE COUNSEL AT A TIME WHEN COUNSEL WAS IN THE PROCESS OF APPLYING FOR, OR HAD ALREADY ACCEPTED A JOB IN THE OFFICE OF THE STANISLAUS COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, AND WAS AT THE SAME TIME NEGOTIATING A PLEA BARGAIN WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY NOTWITHSTANDING THAT THE STATEMENTS WERE PROTECTED BY ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE.....45

A. The Record:.....	45
B. Discussion:.....	46
IV. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S CONTENTION, THE TRIAL COURT ERRONEOUSLY REFUSED TO RECUSE THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY, AND/OR ALTERNATIVELY, TO PRECLUDE TESTIMONY BY TORY, ON THE GROUND THAT DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY CASSIDY, PRIOR TO JOINING THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY’S OFFICE, WAS THE DEFENSE ATTORNEY FOR TORY AND HELPED NEGOTIATE A PLEA BARGAIN FOR A LENIENT SENTENCE IN EXCHANGE FOR TESTIMONY AGAINST BELL.....	54
ARGUMENT SECTION 3.....	61
ERRORS IN THE ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE DURING THE GUILT PHASE, OR GUILT AND PENALTY PHASES.....	61
V. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S ASSERTION, THE TRIAL COURT PREJUDICIALLY ERRED AND VIOLATED BELL’S RIGHTS GUARANTEED BY THE STATE AND FEDERAL CONFRONTATION CLAUSE BY ADMITTING THE TESTIMONY OF DETECTIVE OLSON REGARDING THE STATEMENTS OF DECEASED CODEFENDANT ROSEADA TRAVIS.....	61
A. The Record:.....	61
B. Discussion.....	61
1. Forfeiture:.....	61
2. The Merits:.....	64
3. Prejudice:.....	66
VI. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S ASSERTION, THE TRIAL COURT PREJUDICIALLY ERRED AND VIOLATED BELL’S STATE AND FEDERAL CONFRONTATION RIGHTS BY ADMITTING DETECTIVE OLSON’S TESTIMONY ABOUT HIS DISCUSSIONS WITH PROBATION OFFICER MICHAEL MOORE, FROM WHICH THE JURY WOULD NECESSARILY HAVE INFERRED THAT	

MOORE IDENTIFIED BELL AS THE ROBBER AND MURDERER FROM THE VIDEOTAPE OF THE INCIDENT.....68

A. The Record:.....68

B. Discussion:.....68

VII. CONTRARY TO WHAT RESPONDENT ARGUES, BELL’S SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO EFFECTIVE CROSS-EXAMINATION WAS VIOLATED BY ALLOWING DEBRA OCHOA TO TESTIFY, THEN INVOKE THE FIFTH AMENDMENT PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION AS A BAR TO CROSS-EXAMINATION ABOUT HER DISPOSITION OF THE GUN.....73

A. The Record:.....73

B. Discussion:.....73

VIII. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S ARGUMENT, ALLOWING THE REPEATED PLAYING OF A VIDEOTAPE AND AUDIOTAPE OF THE ROBBERY, INCLUDING BONE-CHILLING AUDIO OF THE VICTIM DYING, WAS AN ABUSE OF JUDICIAL DISCRETION, EVISCERATED BELL’S RIGHT TO FUNDAMENTALLY FAIR GUILT AND PENALTY PHASE TRIALS, AND VIOLATED THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT’S GUARANTEE OF RELIABILITY AND ACCURACY IN CAPITAL SENTENCING.....78

A. The Record:.....78

B. Discussion:.....78

1. Forfeiture:.....78

2. The Merits:.....80

a. Guilt phase error:.....80

b. Penalty phase error:.....83

IX. CONTRARY TO WHAT RESPONDENT ASSERTS, BELL SUFFERED PREJUDICE AS A RESULT OF THE TRIAL COURT’S ERROR ADMITTING THE TESTIMONY OF REGINA FAY ALSIP REGARDING HER OPINION OF KENNETH ALSIP’S

TRUTHFULNESS, AND HIS REPUTATION IN THE COMMUNITY FOR UNTRUTHFULNESS.....	88
A. The Record:.....	88
B. Discussion:.....	88
ARGUMENT SECTION 4.....	94
ERRORS IN INSTRUCTION DURING THE GUILT PHASE.....	94
X. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S ASSERTION, THE TRIAL COURT COMMITTED PREJUDICIAL ERROR, AND VIOLATED BELL’S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND A RELIABLE ADJUDICATION OF GUILT AND PENALTY, BY REFUSING A DEFENSE INSTRUCTION ON THE CREDIBILITY OF A DRUG ADDICT AS A WITNESS.....	94
A. The Record:.....	94
B. Discussion:.....	94
XI. THE TRIAL COURT’S VIOLATION OF ITS SUA SPONTE DUTY TO GIVE AN INSTRUCTION ON THE OFFENSE OF DISCHARGING A FIREARM IN A GROSSLY NEGLIGENT MANNER, AS A LESSER-INCLUDED OFFENSE OF DISCHARGING A FIREARM AT AN OCCUPIED VEHICLE WAS PREJUDICIAL ERROR, AND VIOLATED BELL’S RIGHT TO A RELIABLE DETERMINATION OF PENALTY.....	98
ARGUMENT SECTION 5.....	101
PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT IN THE GUILT PHASE.....	101
XII. THE PROSECUTOR COMMITTED MISCONDUCT AND VIOLATED BELL’S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND A RELIABLE DETERMINATION OF THE PENALTY BY TRIVIALIZING THE REASONABLE DOUBT STANDARD DURING CLOSING ARGUMENT.....	101
A. The Record:.....	101
B. Discussion:.....	101

APPELLANT’S ARGUMENT SECTION 6.....104

PENALTY PHASE ERRORS STEMMING FROM DEPUTIES’  
SCUFFLE WITH BELL WITHIN THE EARSHOT OF THE JURY  
DURING THE PENALTY PHASE OF THE TRIAL.....104

    Introduction.....104

XIII. CONTRARY TO WHAT RESPONDENT ARGUES, THE ENTIRE  
JUDGMENT MUST BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT  
WILFULLY VIOLATED BELL’S STATUTORY, AND STATE AND  
FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO BE PERSONALLY  
PRESENT AT ALL CRITICAL PHASES OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN A  
PROSECUTION FOR A CAPITAL OFFENSE; BELL DID NOT  
VOLUNTARILY WAIVE HIS RIGHT TO BE PRESENT.....105

    A. The Record:.....105

    B. Discussion:.....105

XIV. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S CONTENTION, BELL WAS  
DENIED THE RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, THE RIGHT  
TO CONFRONT AND CROSS-EXAMINE THE WITNESSES AGAINST  
HIM, AND A RELIABLE ADJUDICATION OF PENALTY BY THE  
TRIAL COURT’S DENIAL OF THE MOTION FOR MISTRIAL; THE  
TRIAL COURT ABUSED ITS DISCRETION IN DENYING THE  
MOTION FOR MISTRIAL.....115

    A. The Record:.....115

    B. Discussion:.....115

XV. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S ASSERTION, THE COURT’S  
FAILURE TO CONDUCT ADEQUATE QUESTIONING OF THE JURY  
TO RULE OUT PREJUDICIAL EFFECTS OF THE INCIDENT IN THE  
COURTROOM VIOLATED BELL’S RIGHT TO AN IMPARTIAL  
JURY, AND A RELIABLE DETERMINATION OF THE DEATH  
PENALTY BASED SOLELY ON EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT;  
THE ISSUE WAS NOT FORFEITED.....120

    A. Forfeiture:.....120



B. The Merits:.....	121
XVI. CONTRARY TO WHAT RESPONDENT ARGUES, THE LACK OF A CLEAR ADMONITION OR INSTRUCTION DIRECTING JURORS NOT TO CONSIDER THEIR PERSONAL EXPERIENCES OF THE INCIDENT IN THE COURTROOM IN ADJUDICATING WHETHER BELL COMMITTED VIOLENT CRIMINAL CONDUCT USABLE AS AGGRAVATING EVIDENCE VIOLATED BELL'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, TO CONFRONTATION, AND A RELIABLE DEATH PENALTY DETERMINATION; THIS COURT SHOULD NOT INVOKE FORFEITURE.....	127
A. Forfeiture:.....	127
B. The Merits:.....	129
XVII. THE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED BELL'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND A RELIABLE DETERMINATION OF THE DEATH PENALTY, AND INTERFERED WITH BELL'S RIGHT TO THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, BY DEFERRING TO COURTROOM SECURITY PERSONNEL THE DECISION TO USE CHAINS AND A STUN BELT TO RESTRAIN BELL DURING THE PENALTY TRIAL, AND BY FAILING TO INSTRUCT JURORS NOT TO CONSIDER BELL'S PHYSICAL RESTRAINTS FOR ANY PURPOSE; THE ISSUE WAS NOT FORFEITED.....	132
A. The Record:.....	132
B. Discussion:.....	132
1. Delegation of Decisionmaking and Decision re Types of Restraints:.....	132
a. Forfeiture:.....	132
b. The Merits:.....	134
2. Failure to Instruct:.....	138
a. Forfeiture:.....	138
b. The Merits:.....	140

XVIII. BELL WAS DENIED THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL BY HIS ATTORNEY’S HANDLING OF ISSUES ARISING CONSEQUENT TO THE OUTBURST IN THE COURTROOM.....145

ARGUMENT SECTION 7.....150

ERRORS RELATING TO THE ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE DURING THE PENALTY PHASE.....150

XIX. CONTRARY TO RESPONDENT’S ASSERTION, THE TRIAL COURT ABUSED ITS DISCRETION AND EVISCERATED BELL’S RIGHT TO A FAIR PENALTY TRIAL AND A RELIABLE DEATH DETERMINATION BY ALLOWING THE PROSECUTOR TO PLAY A VIDEOTAPE OF THE VICTIM’S WEDDING CEREMONY AND CELEBRATION.....150

A. The Record:.....150

B. Discussion:.....150

XX. THE TRIAL COURT ABUSED ITS DISCRETION PURSUANT TO EVIDENCE CODE SECTION 352, AND VIOLATED BELL’S STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO A FAIR TRIAL AND RELIABLE DEATH DETERMINATION BY ADMITTING EVIDENCE THAT BELL REQUESTED THE PLAYING OF “GANGSTA RAP” MUSIC DURING THE BEATING OF PATRICK CARVER.....153

A. The Record:.....153

B. Discussion:.....153

ARGUMENT SECTION 8.....159

ARGUMENTS RELATING TO THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF CALIFORNIA’S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, AS INTERPRETED BY THIS COURT AND APPLIED AT APPELLANT’S TRIAL.....159

XXI. APPELLANT’S DEATH PENALTY IS INVALID BECAUSE PENAL CODE § 190.2 IS IMPERMISSIBLY BROAD.....159

XXII. BELL’S DEATH PENALTY IS INVALID BECAUSE PENAL CODE § 190.3(A) AS APPLIED ALLOWS ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS IMPOSITION OF DEATH IN VIOLATION OF THE

FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.....164

XXIII. CALIFORNIA’S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE CONTAINS NO SAFEGUARDS TO AVOID ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS SENTENCING AND DEPRIVES DEFENDANTS OF THE RIGHT TO A JURY DETERMINATION OF EACH FACTUAL PREREQUISITE TO A SENTENCE OF DEATH; IT THEREFORE VIOLATES THE SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.....164

XXIV. THE CALIFORNIA SENTENCING SCHEME VIOLATES THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION BY DENYING PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS TO CAPITAL DEFENDANTS WHICH ARE AFFORDED TO NON-CAPITAL DEFENDANTS.....166

XXV. CALIFORNIA’S USE OF THE DEATH PENALTY AS A REGULAR FORM OF PUNISHMENT FALLS SHORT OF INTERNATIONAL NORMS OF HUMANITY AND DECENCY AND VIOLATES THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS; IMPOSITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY NOW VIOLATES THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.....166

XXVI. THE CUMULATIVE PREJUDICIAL EFFECT OF THE ERRORS DEPRIVED THE GUILT AND PENALTY PHASE JUDGMENTS OF FAIRNESS OR RELIABILITY.....167

CONCLUSION.....168

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### People v. Bell (S080056)

#### CASES

<i>Ake v. Oklahoma</i> (1985) 479 U.S. 68.....	39, 43
<i>Aldridge v. United States</i> (1931) 283 U.S. 308.....	43
<i>Arizona v. Fulminante</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 279.....	113
<i>Bayside Timber Co. v. Board of Supervisors</i> (1971) 20 Cal.App.3d 1.....	57
<i>Blackwell v. Brewer</i> (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1977) 562 F.2d 596.....	113, 114, 147
<i>Booth v. Maryland</i> (1987) 482 U.S. 496.....	84
<i>Brady v. Maryland</i> (1963) 373 U.S. 83.....	52
<i>Bruton v. United States</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 123.....	62, 66
<i>Caldwell v. Mississippi</i> (1985) 472 U.S. 320.....	87
<i>California v. Ramos</i> (1983) 463 U.S. 992.....	39, 43
<i>Chambers v. Mississippi</i> (1973) 410 U.S. 284.....	48
<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18.....	70, 76, 113, 143
<i>City and County of San Francisco v. Cobra Solutions, Inc.</i> , (2006) 38 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 839.....	58
<i>Com. v. Chmiel</i> (1999) 558 Pa. 478.....	50
<i>Commonwealth v. Kane</i> (Mass. App. 1984) 472 N.E.2d 1343.....	113
<i>Corenevsky v. Superior Court</i> (1984) 36 Cal.3d 307.....	38
<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> (2004) 541 U.S. 36.....	62, 63, 64, 69, 70, 74
<i>Davis v. Washington</i> (2006) 547 U.S. 813.....	63, 75
<i>Dawson v. Delaware</i> (1992) 503 U.S. 159.....	153, 154, 155, 158
<i>Deck v. Missouri</i> (2005) 544 U.S. 622.....	127, 131, 141, 142, 143
<i>Delaware v. Van Arsdall</i> (1986) 475 U.S. 673.....	52
<i>D.M. v. Department of Justice</i> (2012) 209 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 1439.....	57
<i>Doe v. Superior Court</i> (1995) 39 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 538.....	43
<i>Dyer v. Calderon</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998) 151 F.3d 970.....	119

<i>Eddings v. Oklahoma</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 104.....	86
<i>Elledge v. Dugger</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987) 823 F.2d 1439.....	127
<i>Favre v. Henderson</i> (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1972) 464 F.2d 359.....	70
<i>Ford v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 399.....	72, 77, 93, 114
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 238.....	160, 162, 164
<i>Gardner v. Florida</i> (1977) 430 U.S. 349.....	72, 77, 86, 93
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153.....	43, 72, 77, 93, 164
<i>Griffin v. Illinois</i> (1956) 351 U.S. 12.....	38
<i>Hale v. Morgan</i> (1978) 22 Cal.3d 388.....	57
<i>Hambarian v. Superior Court</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 826.....	54
<i>Haraguchi v. Superior Court</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 706.....	54
<i>Harmelin v. Michigan</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 957.....	72, 77, 93
<i>Harris v. McRae</i> (1980) 448 U.S. 297.....	40
<i>Henriksen v. Great American Savings &amp; Loan</i> (1992) 11 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 109.....	55
<i>Hewett v. Helms</i> (1983) 459 U.S. 460.....	114
<i>Hicks v. Oklahoma</i> (1980) 455 U.S. 343.....	72, 92, 114
<i>Hollywood v. Superior Court</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 721.....	72, 77, 86, 93
<i>Holmes v. State</i> (Nev. 2013) 306 P.3d 415.....	157
<i>Hovey v. Superior Court</i> (1980) 28 Cal.3d 1.....	9, 21, 34
<i>Hutchins v. Wainwright</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983) 715 F.2d 512.....	70
<i>Idaho v. Wright</i> (1990) 497 U.S. 805.....	69
<i>In re Jones</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 552.....	167, 168
<i>In re Khonsavanh</i> (1998) 67 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 532.....	8
<i>In re Marriage Cases</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 757.....	39, 40
<i>In re Sheena K.</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 875.....	7, 121
<i>Irvin v. Dowd</i> (1961) 366 U.S. 717.....	126
<i>Johnny S. v. Superior Court</i> (1979) 90 Cal.App.3d 826.....	37
<i>Kelly v. California and Zamudio v. California</i> (2008) 555 U.S. 1020.....	151

<i>Killian v. Poole</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002) 282 F.3d 1204.....	167
<i>Kentucky v. Stincer</i> (1987) 482 U.S. 730.....	51
<i>Mak v. Blodgett</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992) 970 F.2d 614.....	167
<i>Mathews v. Eldridge</i> (1976) 424 U.S. 319.....	36
<i>McDonough Power Equipment, Inc., v. Greenwood</i> (1984) 464 U.S. 458.....	43
<i>Miller v. Webb</i> (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004) 385 F.3d 666.....	25, 26, 27
<i>Morales v. Portuondo</i> (S.D.N.Y. 2001) 164 F.Supp.2d 706.....	47, 52
<i>Morgan v. Illinois</i> (1992) 504 U.S. 719.....	20, 21
<i>Ocampo v. Vail</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 649 F.3d 1098.....	70
<i>Payne v. Tennessee</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 808.....	82, 83, 84, 85, 152
<i>People v. Albarran</i> (2007) 149 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 214.....	158
<i>People v. Alonzo</i> (1993) 13 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 535.....	98
<i>People v. Alexander</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 846.....	57
<i>People v. Alfaro</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1277.....	21
<i>People v. Allen</i> (1974) 41 Cal.App.3d 196.....	57
<i>People v. Anderson</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 543.....	133, 154
<i>People v. Aranda</i> (1965) 63 Cal.2d 518.....	62, 63
<i>People v. Arias</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 92.....	161, 163
<i>People v. Avila</i> (2004) 117 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 771.....	147
<i>People v. Avitia</i> (2005) 127 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 185.....	158
<i>People v. Bacigalupo</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 457.....	161
<i>People v. Barthel</i> (1965) 231 Cal.App.2d 827.....	75
<i>People v. Beames</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 907.....	163
<i>People v. Blair</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 686.....	38
<i>People v. Bolden</i> (1996) 44 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 707.....	99
<i>People v. Bonilla</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 313.....	154
<i>People v. Bouzas</i> (1991) 53 Cal.3d 467.....	70, 75, 102, 112, 149
<i>People v. Box</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1153.....	34, 36

<i>People v. Boyette</i> (2002) 29 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 381.....	63
<i>People v. Brady</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 547.....	85
<i>People v. Breverman</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 142.....	99, 100
<i>People v. Brown</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 518.....	101, 102
<i>People v. Bryant, Smith and Wheeler</i> (2014) 60 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 335.....	76
<i>People v. Burgener</i> (1986) 41 Cal.3d 505.....	123
<i>People v. Burnett</i> (1999) 71 Cal.App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 151.....	80
<i>People v. Cage</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 965.....	64, 65, 68
<i>People v. Capistrano</i> (2014) 59 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 830.....	62
<i>People v. Carpenter</i> (1999) 21 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1016.....	129
<i>People v. Carter</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1166.....	130
<i>People v. Castillo</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 145.....	15
<i>People v. Clark</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 856.....	24, 128
<i>People v. Cobb</i> (1955) 45 Cal.2d 158.....	89, 90
<i>People v. Combs</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 821.....	136
<i>People v. Connor</i> (1983) 34 Cal.3d 141.....	54, 56
<i>People v. Cowan</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 401.....	66, 120, 121, 124
<i>People v. Doolin</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 390.....	24
<i>People v. Duran</i> (1976) 16 Cal.3d 282.....	127, 137, 139, 140, 145
<i>People v. Easley</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 712.....	22
<i>People v. Edwards</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 787.....	86
<i>People v. Elliot</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 535.....	116, 161
<i>People v. Eubanks</i> (1996) 14 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 580.....	54, 56, 59
<i>People v. Farnam</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 107.....	125
<i>People v. Frye</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 894.....	109
<i>People v. Gamache</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 347.....	58
<i>People v. Graham</i> (1969) 71 Cal.2d 303.....	140
<i>People v. Green</i> (1980) 27 Cal.3d 1.....	159

<i>People v. Gutierrez</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 789.....	63
<i>People v. Hamilton</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 863.....	152
<i>People v. Harris</i> (2013) 57 Cal.4th 804.....	62
<i>People v. Harris</i> (1989) 47 Cal.3d 1047.....	75
<i>People v. Harris</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1269.....	63
<i>People v. Haskett</i> (1982) 30 Cal.3d 841.....	86
<i>People v. Hathcock</i> (1973) 8 Cal.3d 599.....	75
<i>People v. Hendricks</i> (1988) 44 Cal.3d 635.....	117
<i>People v. Hill</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 800.....	passim
<i>People v. Holloway</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 96.....	120, 121
<i>People v. Jablonski</i> (2006) 37 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 774.....	154, 155
<i>People v. Jackson</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1164.....	113, 147
<i>People v. Jackson</i> (1993) 14 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 1818.....	137
<i>People v. Jackson</i> (2010) 45 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 662.....	82
<i>People v. Jacla</i> (1978) 77 Cal.App.3d 878.....	127, 137
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (1989) 47 Cal.3d 1194.....	46
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (2004) 115 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 1169.....	102
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d 106.....	4
<i>People v. Katzenberger</i> (2009) 178 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 1260.....	102
<i>People v. Kelly</i> (2007) 42 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 763.....	151
<i>People v. Kurland</i> (1980) 28 Cal.3d 376.....	95
<i>People v. Lawley</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 102.....	129
<i>People v. Ledesma</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 641.....	50, 128
<i>People v. Lewis</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 415.....	115
<i>People v. Livingston</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1145.....	61, 68
<i>People v. Lopez</i> (2013) 56 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1028.....	141
<i>People v. Love</i> (1960) 53 Cal.2d 843.....	82, 84, 85
<i>People v. Loy</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 46.....	70
<i>People v. Manibusan</i> (2013) 58 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 40.....	16, 17



<i>People v. Mar</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1201.....	133, 137
<i>People v. Marshall</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 799.....	101
<i>People v. Mata</i> (2013) 57 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 178.....	7
<i>People v. Mattson</i> (1990) 50 Cal.3d 826.....	34, 36
<i>People v. Maury</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 342.....	122, 123
<i>People v. McAlpin</i> (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1289.....	88, 89
<i>People v. McGowan</i> (1922) 56 Cal.App.587.....	75
<i>People v. McKinnon</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 610.....	4, 140
<i>People v. Medina</i> (1995) 11 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 694.....	135, 136
<i>People v. Medina</i> (1990) 51 Cal.3d 870.....	141
<i>People v. Memory</i> (2010) 182 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 835.....	158
<i>People v. Mendoza</i> (2007) 42 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 686.....	102
<i>People v. Montes</i> (2014) 58 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 809.....	151
<i>People v. Montiel</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 877.....	66
<i>People v. Moon</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1.....	110
<i>People v. Nesler</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 561.....	118, 119
<i>People v. Norwood</i> (1972) 26 Cal.App.3d 148.....	57
<i>People v. Nguyen</i> (1995) 40 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 28.....	102
<i>People v. Osband</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 622.....	102
<i>People v. Paisley</i> (1963) 214 Cal.App.2d 225.....	91
<i>People v. Panah</i> (20505) 35 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 395.....	80
<i>People v. Partida</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 428.....	62
<i>People v. Pope</i> (1979) 23 Cal.3d 412.....	26
<i>People v. Price</i> (1991) 1 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 324.....	110
<i>People v. Pride</i> (1992) 3 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 195.....	117
<i>People v. Prince</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1179.....	151
<i>People v. Rajanayagam</i> (2012) 211 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 42.....	57, 58
<i>People v. Ramirez</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 980.....	98
<i>People v. Ramkeesoon</i> (1985) 39 Cal.3d 346.....	100

<i>People v. Ramos</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1133.....	27
<i>People v. Ramos</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 494.....	59
<i>People v. Reyes</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 743.....	123
<i>People v. Robinson</i> (1961) 196 Cal.App.2d 384.....	75
<i>People v. Romero</i> (2008) 44 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 386.....	109, 110
<i>People v. Rundle</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 76.....	24
<i>People v. Russell</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1228.....	85
<i>People v. Sanchez</i> (1995) 12 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1.....	85, 163
<i>People v. Sanders</i> (1990) 51 Cal.3d 471.....	160
<i>People v. Sanders</i> (2010) 189 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 543.....	75
<i>People v. Sandoval</i> (2001) 87 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 1425.....	71
<i>People v. Saunders</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 580.....	6, 15
<i>People v. Schmeck</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 240.....	165, 166
<i>People v. Scott</i> (1978) 21 Cal.3d 284.....	133
<i>People v. Seden</i> (1974) 10 Cal.3d 703.....	99, 100
<i>People v. Sergill</i> (1982) 138 Cal.App.3d 34.....	89
<i>People v. Stanley</i> (1995) 10 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 764.....	161
<i>People v. Stevens</i> (2009) 47 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 625.....	136, 137
<i>People v. Superior Court (Engert)</i> (1982) 31 Cal.3d 797.....	160
<i>People v. Superior Court (Greer)</i> (1977) 19 Cal.3d 255.....	58
<i>People v. Tate</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 635.....	31
<i>People v. Taylor</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1155.....	85
<i>People v. Taylor</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 574.....	120, 121
<i>People v. Thompson</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 79.....	4
<i>People v. Tuggles</i> (2009) 179 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 339.....	8, 11, 14
<i>People v. Turner</i> (1990) 50 Cal.3d 668.....	133
<i>People v. Valdez</i> (2004) 32 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 73.....	99
<i>People v. Valencia</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 268.....	131
<i>People v. Vance</i> (2010) 188 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 1182.....	86

<i>People v. Vasquez</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 47.....	54, 58
<i>People v. Victor</i> (1965) 62 Cal.2d 280.....	94, 95
<i>People v. Vierra</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 264.....	28
<i>People v. Vines</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 830.....	151
<i>People v. Virgil</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1210.....	127, 137, 38, 156
<i>People v. Watts</i> (1999) 76 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 1250.....	106
<i>People v. Weaver</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 876.....	111, 112
<i>People v. Whalen</i> (2013) 56 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1.....	16, 17
<i>People v. Wilcox</i> (1960) 53 Cal.2d 651.....	147
<i>People v. Wilds</i> (N.Y. App. Div. 1988) 141 A.D.2d 395.....	102
<i>People v. Williams</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 148.....	121
<i>People v. Williams</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 584.....	73, 74
<i>People v. Williams</i> (1988) 44 Cal.3d 1127.....	116
<i>People v. Wilson</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 309.....	74
<i>People v. Wilson</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1.....	99
<i>People v. Workman</i> (1955) 136 Cal.App.2d 898.....	90
<i>People v. Young</i> (2005) 34 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1149.....	106
<i>Powell v. Alabama</i> (1932) 287 U.S. 45.....	39
<i>Priest v. Hennessy</i> (1980) 51 N.Y.2d 62.....	48
<i>Pulley v. Harris</i> (1984) 465 U.S. 37.....	161, 162
<i>Riggins v. Nevada</i> (1992) 504 U.S. 127.....	112, 114
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 584.....	72, 77, 93
<i>Ryan v. Miller</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir. 2002) 303 F.3d 231.....	70
<i>Saffle v. Parks</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 484.....	119
<i>Satterwhite v. Texas</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 249.....	39, 72, 77, 96
<i>Shahinian v. McCormick</i> (1963) 59 Cal.2d 554.....	108
<i>Silverthorne v. United States</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1968) 400 F.2d 627.....	123
<i>Simmons v. United States</i> (1968) 390 U.S. 377.....	109
<i>Skinner v. Oklahoma</i> (1942) 316 U.S. 535.....	39

<i>Spain v. Rushen</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989) 883 F.2d 712.....	145
<i>State v. Garcia-Contreras</i> (Ariz. 1998) 953 P.2d 536.....	108, 113, 147
<i>Swidler &amp; Berlin v. United States</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 399.....	46, 47, 51, 53
<i>Taylor v. Cain</i> (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008) 545 F.3d 327.....	70
<i>Taylor v. United States</i> (1973) 414 U.S. 17.....	111
<i>Thompson v. Calderon</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) 109 F.3d 1358.....	106
<i>Thompson v. Oklahoma</i> (1988) 487 U.S. 815.....	39
<i>Tucker v. Fischbein</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 2001) 237 F.3d 275.....	157
<i>Tuilaepa v. California</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 967.....	161, 162, 163, 164
<i>Turner v. Louisiana</i> (1965) 379 U.S. 466.....	119
<i>Turner v. Murray</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 28.....	20
<i>Ungar v. Sarafite</i> (1964) 376 U.S. 575.....	112
<i>United States v. Bagley</i> (1985) 473 U.S. 667.....	52
<i>United States v. Brooks</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014) 772 F.3d 1161.....	70
<i>United States v. Cardillo</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1963) 316 F.2d 606.....	75
<i>United States v. Collins</i> (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1972) 472 F.2d 1017.....	95
<i>United States v. Figueroa-Cartagena</i> (1st Cir. 2010) 612 F.3d 69.....	63
<i>United States v. Kinnard</i> (D.C. Cir. 1972) 465 F.2d 566.....	95, 96
<i>United States v. Martinez-Salazar</i> (2000) 528 U.S. 304.....	27
<i>United States v. Novaton</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001) 271 F.3d 968.....	112
<i>United States v. Nguyen</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009) 565 F.3d 668.....	64, 71, 76
<i>United States v. Shakur</i> (S.D.N.Y. 1988) 723 Supp. 925.....	20
<i>United States v. Silva</i> (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004) 380 F.3d 1018.....	70
<i>United States v. Thompson</i> (10 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990) 908 F.2d 648.....	123
<i>United States v. Williams</i> (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1978) 568 F.2d 464.....	123
<i>United States v. Wilmore</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004) 381 F.3d 868.....	75, 76
<i>Wainwright v. Witt</i> (1985) 469 U.S. 412.....	passim
<i>Wheeler v. State</i> (Del. 2012) 36 A.3d 310.....	70
<i>Williams v. Griswald</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984) 743 F.2d 1533.....	123

<i>Williams v. Illinois</i> (2011) 132 S.Ct. 2221.....	66
<i>Wrinkles v. Buss</i> (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006) 537 F.3d 804.....	145, 146
<i>Yarborough v. Keane</i> (2nd Cir. 1996) 101 F.3d 894.....	113

## STATUTES

### California Business & Professions Code,

§ 6068, subd. (e)(2).....	50
---------------------------	----

### California Code of Civil Procedure,

§ 223.....	59
------------	----

### California Code of Regulations

§ 2 CCR 1022.1.....	41
§ 2 CCR 1023.1.....	41
§ 2 CCR 1025.1.....	40

### California Evidence Code,

§ 352.....	79
§ 353, subd. (a).....	62
§ 780.....	89
§ 958.....	50
§ 1101, subd. (a).....	155

### California Government Code

§ 11042.....	58
§ 15200.....	41
§ 15201.....	41
§ 15202.....	41
§ 15204.....	41

### California Penal Code

§ 190.2.....	159, 160, 162
§ 190.3, subd. (b).....	156, 131, 163, 165
§ 977, subd. (b)(2).....	105, 109

§ 987.9.....	32, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43
§ 1043.....	105, 106, 107
§ 1424.....	54, 58, 59, 60

## CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

### United States Constitution

Amendment I.....	153
Amendment V.....	14, 23, 73, 74, 85
Amendment VI.....	passim
Amendment VIII.....	passim
Amendment XIV.....	passim

### California Constitution

Art. I.....	119
Art. I, § 7.....	119
Art. I, § 14.....	119
Art. I, § 15.....	119
Art. I, § 17.....	60, 119

## LAW REVIEWS

John H. Blume, et al, <i>Probing “Life Qualification” Through Expanded Voir Dire</i> , 29 Hofstra L. Rev. 1209, 1232, n. 258 (2001).....	21
Samuel L. Gross, <i>ABA’s Proposed Moratorium: Lost Lives: Miscarriages of Justice in Capital Cases</i> , 61 Law & Contemp. Prob. 125, 147 (Fall, 1998).....	21
Louis M. Natali, Jr., <i>Should We Amend or Interpret the Attorney-Client Privilege to Allow for an Innocence Exception?</i> 37 Am. J. Trial Advoc. 93 (Summer 2013).....	48, 49, 50
Matthew Rubenstein, <i>Cover Story: Overview of the Colorado Method of Capital Voir Dire</i> , 34 Champion 18 (November 2010).....	18, 19

Ken Strutin, *Preserving Attorney-Client Confidentiality at the Cost of Another's Innocence: a Systemic Approach*, 17 Tex. Wesleyan L. Rev. 499, 523-528 (Symposium Edition 2011).....48

**NATIONAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES**

1989 *ABA Guidelines for the Appt. and Performance of Counsel in Death Penalty Cases*.....38, 39

*American Bar Association Guidelines for the Appointment and Performance of Defense Counsel in Death Penalty Cases* (February 2003).....18, 21

*National Legal Aid & Defender Association Performance Guidelines for Criminal Defense Representation* (1995 ed.).....38, 39

**REPORTS**

California Commission on the Fair Administration of Justice [CCFAJ], *Report and Recommendations on the Administration of the Death Penalty in California* (June 30, 2008).....40

**DICTIONARIES**

Black's Law Dict. (9<sup>th</sup> ed. 2009).....147

Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language (New Deluxe Ed. 1996).....111

**INTERNET RESOURCES**

Death Penalty Information Center, *The Innocence List: List of Those Freed From Death Row*.<http://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/innocence-list-those-freed-death-row?scid=6&did=110>.....48

Crime & Courts on NBCNEWS.com, *A killer's 26-year-old secret may set inmate free.* (April 12, 2008)  
[http://www.nbcnews.com/id/24083675/ns/us\\_news-](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/24083675/ns/us_news-)

crime\_and\_courts/t/killers--year-old-secret-may-set-inmate-free/#.VBG1OEiWSCc.....49

The New York Times, Week in Review When Law Prevents Righting a Wrong (May 4, 2008)  
http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/04/weekinreview/04liptak.html?pagewanted=2&fta=y&r=0.....49

American Bar Association’s Model Rules of Professional Conduct (Rule 1.6: Confidentiality of Information);  
http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\_responsibility/publications/model\_rules\_of\_professional\_conduct/rule\_1\_6\_confidentiality\_of\_information.html.....50

### MISCELLANEOUS RESOURCES

1978 Voter’s Pamphlet: Argument in Favor of Proposition 7.....159

State of California, Crime Victims Justice Reform Act, Initiative Measure Proposition 115, § 10 (approved June 5, 1990).....160