

# SUPREME COURT COPY

# COPY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff/Respondent,

v.

JAMES MICHAEL FAYED,

Defendant/Appellant.

) SUPREME COURT CASE  
) NUMBER.: S198132

) TRIAL CASE NO.:  
) BA346352

SUPREME COURT  
FILED

OCT 30 2015

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 REPLY BRIEF

Mark J. Werksman, Esq. (SBN120767)  
Kelly C. Quinn, Esq. (SBN 197697)  
LAW OFFICES OF MARK J. WERKSMAN  
888 West Sixth Street, Fourth Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: (213) 688-0460  
Facsimile: (213) 624-1942  
Attorneys for Appellant

JAMES MICHAEL FAYED

# DEATH PENALTY

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
A.    ADMISSION OF THE RECORDED STATEMENT VIOLATED APPELLANT’S FOURTH, FIFTH, SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS .....	2
1.    THE STATEMENT WAS OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO COUNSEL .....	3
a.    SHAWN SMITH WAS AN AGENT OF THE GOVERNMENT .....	4
i.    RESPONDENT MAY NOT ARGUE A NEW THEORY ON APPEAL .....	4
ii.   EVEN IF THE GOVERNMENT IS PERMITTED TO PROFFER A NEW THEORY ON APPEAL, THERE WAS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE THAT SMITH WAS AN AGENT OF THE GOVERNMENT .....	6
b.    THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL HAD ATTACHED ON THE STATE MURDER CASE WHEN THE GOVERNMENT AGENT QUESTIONED APPELLANT .....	7
i.    RELEVANT LAW ON WHEN THE SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO COUNSEL ATTACHES .....	8
ii.   FACTS OF THE INSTANT CASE .....	12

c.	APPELLANT’S RIGHT TO COUNSEL HAD ATTACHED ON THE FEDERAL CASE, PRECLUDING QUESTIONING CONCERNING THE MURDER ALLEGATIONS .....	15
i.	APPELLANT’S SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS HAD ATTACHED ON THE FEDERAL CASE .....	16
ii.	THE FEDERAL ARREST AND DETENTION WAS A SHAM PROSECUTION .....	20
aa.	PRIOR TO APPELLANT’S ARREST, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WAS NOT PURSUING AN ACTUAL CASE AGAINST APPELLANT .....	22
bb.	ARRESTING AND DETAINING APPELLANT ON THE FEDERAL WHITE COLLAR CASE WAS A RUSE TO HOLD APPELLANT FOR MURDER .....	23
d.	DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS PROHIBIT ADMISSION OF APPELLANT’S STATEMENT .....	25
2.	THE STATEMENT WAS OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS .....	27
3.	THE STATEMENT WAS OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT’S FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS .....	29
a.	APPELLANT WAS UNLAWFULLY HELD IN FEDERAL CUSTODY WITHOUT BAIL .....	29

	PAGE(S)
i.    REQUIREMENTS FOR DETENTION WITHOUT BAIL IN FEDERAL PROCEEDINGS .....	30
ii.   REQUIREMENT FOR SERIOUS RISK OF FLIGHT .....	32
iii.  NO EVIDENCE SUPPORTED HOLDING APPELLANT WITHOUT BAIL .....	34
b.    UNLAWFULLY HOLDING A DEFENDANT IN CUSTODY VIOLATES THE FOURTH AMENDMENT .....	36
c.    ATTENUATION DOES NOT DISSIPATE THE ILLEGALITY .....	39
4.    APPELLANT’S STATEMENT WAS ADMITTED IN VIOLATION OF HIS SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO CONFRONTATION .....	40
a.    SMITH’S STATEMENTS WERE TESTIMONIAL .....	41
b.    SMITH’S STATEMENTS WERE ADMITTED FOR THEIR TRUTH .....	42
5.    ADMISSION OF THE UNREDACTED STATEMENT WAS ERROR .....	45
6.    ADMISSION OF THE TAPE WAS PREJUDICIAL .....	46
B.    JURY MISCONDUCT REQUIRES REVERSAL .....	48

1.	THE LOWER COURT DID NOT CONDUCT SUFFICIENT INQUIRIES INTO THE MISCONDUCT .....	49
a.	THE LOWER COURT WAS DISINCLINED TO BELIEVE THAT JURORS WERE COMMITTING MISCONDUCT .....	49
b.	THE INVESTIGATION WAS INCOMPLETE .....	51
i.	FACTS CONCERNING THE LOWER COURT'S INVESTIGATIONS .....	51
ii.	RESPONDENT'S ARGUMENT THAT THE LOWER COURT CONDUCTED A SUFFICIENT INQUIRY IS UNFOUNDED .....	53
2.	THERE WAS GOOD CAUSE TO BELIEVE THERE WAS JUROR MISCONDUCT .....	55
3.	THE DENIAL OF THE NEW TRIAL MOTION WAS IN ERROR .....	57
C.	THE ERROR IN JURY INSTRUCTIONS REQUIRES REVERSAL .....	59
1.	THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN REFUSING TO GIVE A THIRD-PARTY CULPABILITY INSTRUCTION .....	60
a.	ARGUMENTS IN THE TRIAL COURT .....	60
b.	RESPONDENT'S POSITION ON APPEAL .....	62
c.	APPELLANT WAS ENTITLED TO AN INSTRUCTION ON THE THIRD-PARTY CULPABILITY EVIDENCE .....	63

	PAGE(S)
d. APPELLANT WAS PREJUDICED BY THE REFUSAL TO INSTRUCT ON THE THIRD-PARTY CULPABILITY DEFENSE .....	65
2. THE LOWER COURT ERRONEOUSLY USED CALJIC .....	66
a. APPELLANT DID NOT FORFEIT THE ARGUMENT .....	66
b. USE OF THE CALJIC INSTRUCTION FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM AIDING AND ABETTING WAS ERROR .....	69
3. THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY INTERMINGLED CALJIC AND CALCRIM .....	71
4. THE JURY WAS NOT PROPERLY INSTRUCTED CONCERNING WITHDRAWAL FROM CONSPIRACY .....	73
5. THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN REFUSING TO GIVE CALJIC NO. 2.23 .....	74
6. THE INSTRUCTIONAL ERROR INDIVIDUALLY, AND TAKEN TOGETHER, WARRANT REVERSAL .....	75
D. THE LOWER COURT ERRED BY ADMITTING EVIDENCE IN VIOLATION OF APPELLANT'S FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS .....	76
1. EVIDENCE FROM APPELLANT'S PHONE WAS UNLAWFULLY ADMITTED .....	77
a. IF APPELLANT WAS DETAINED, AS STATED IN THE POLICE REPORTS, THEN THE PHONE'S SEIZURE WAS UNLAWFUL .....	77

	PAGE(S)
b. IF APPELLANT WAS ARRESTED, THE SEIZURE AND SUBSEQUENT SEARCH OF HIS PHONE WAS UNLAWFUL .....	79
c. THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN FINDING INEVITABLE DISCOVERY .....	81
2. THE LOWER COURT ERRONEOUSLY ADMITTED EVIDENCE OBTAINED BY THE UNLAWFUL RECORDING OF APPELLANT'S INVESTIGATOR .....	82
a. THE RECORDING OF APPELLANT'S INVESTIGATOR WAS AN UNLAWFUL INTRUSION INTO THE DEFENSE CAMP .....	83
b. THE TRIAL COURT IMPROPERLY DENIED THE MOTION TO TRAVERSE .....	84
c. THE TRIAL COURT IMPROPERLY DENIED THE MOTION TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF MINIMIZATION REQUIREMENTS .....	85
d. THE TRIAL COURT IMPROPERLY DENIED THE MOTION TO DISMISS BECAUSE THE RECORDING OF APPELLANT'S INVESTIGATOR CONSTITUTED A DUE PROCESS VIOLATION .....	86
e. REVERSAL IS APPROPRIATE BECAUSE ADMISSION OF THE EVIDENCE WAS PREJUDICIAL .....	87
3. LOWER COURT ERRED IN DENYING APPELLANT'S MOTION TO QUASH THE JULY 31 SEARCH WARRANT .....	88

	PAGE(S)
a.	THE JULY 31 WARRANT WAS NOT SUPPORTED BY PROBABLE CAUSE ..... 88
i.	THE AMENDMENT DID NOT SET OUT NEW FACTS SUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH PROBABLE CAUSE ..... 89
ii.	THE INCORPORATED AFFIDAVIT LACKS PROBABLE CAUSE BECAUSE IT WAS BASED ON INFORMATION THAT WAS BOTH MOOT AND STALE ..... 90
b.	THE JULY 31 WARRANT WAS OVERLY BROAD ON ITS FACE ..... 91
c.	ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE SEIZED UNDER THE JULY 31 WARRANT CONSTITUTES PREJUDICIAL ERROR ..... 92
d.	THE REASONABLE RELIANCE TEST DOES NOT JUSTIFY UPHOLDING THE JULY 31 WARRANT ..... 93
E.	THE LOWER COURT ERRONEOUSLY ADMITTED STATE EVIDENCE AND EXCLUDED DEFENSE EVIDENCE ..... 93
1.	THE LOWER COURT ERRONEOUSLY ADMITTED EVIDENCE THE GOVERNMENT HAD FAILED TO DISCLOSE TO THE DEFENSE ..... 94
a.	RESPONDENT’S ATTEMPTS TO CHARACTERIZE THE WITHHELD EVIDENCE AS “IMPEACHMENT” IS IMMATERIAL ..... 95



	PAGE(S)
i. RESPONDENT’S “CHARACTER” OR “USE” TEST CONTRAVENES THE DISCOVERY STATUTE .....	95
ii. RESPONDENT’S “CHARACTER” OR “USE” TEST IS UNWORKABLE .....	97
b. RESPONDENT’S CLAIM ON APPEAL THAT THE TAPE WAS NOT MADE DURING THE INVESTIGATION OF PAMELA FAYED’S MURDER IS PLAINLY CONTRADICTED BY THE RECORD .....	98
c. THE ERRONEOUS ADMISSION OF PREVIOUSLY UNDISCLOSED EVIDENCE PREJUDICED APPELLANT .....	100
2. THE TRIAL COURT ERRED BY ADMITTING EVIDENCE OF THE FEDERAL INDICTMENT AND INVESTIGATION .....	101
a. EVIDENCE CONCERNING THE FEDERAL INDICTMENT WAS INADMISSIBLE CHARACTER EVIDENCE .....	102
b. EVIDENCE FROM THE FEDERAL CASE SHOULD HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED UNDER EVIDENCE CODE SECTION 352 .....	103
c. THE ERROR WAS NOT HARMLESS .....	103
3. THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN ADMITTING HEARSAY TESTIMONY FROM CAROL NEVE .....	104
4. THE LOWER COURT ERRONEOUSLY ADMITTED PREJUDICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS DURING THE GUILT PHASE .....	105

	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. PHOTOGRAPHS OF BLOODIED ITEMS SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN ADMITTED AT TRIAL .....</li> </ul>	106
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. SENTIMENTAL AND EMOTIONAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF PAMELA FAYED WERE IMPROPERLY ADMITTED .....</li> </ul>	107
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. THE TRIAL COURT IMPROPERLY HINDERED APPELLANT’S CROSS-EXAMINATION RIGHTS .....</li> </ul>	108
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. THE ARGUMENT WAS NOT FORFEITED .....</li> </ul>	109
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. THE CROSS-EXAMINATION OF AUSA MARK AVEIS WAS IMPROPERLY LIMITED .....</li> </ul>	110
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED DEFENSE EVIDENCE DEPRIVING HIM OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO MOUNT A DEFENSE .....</li> </ul>	111
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO APPELLANT’S STATE OF MIND .....</li> </ul>	112
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED TESTIMONY CRITICAL TO APPELLANT’S THIRD-PARTY CULPABILITY DEFENSE .....</li> </ul>	113
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED RELEVANT PORTIONS OF TABOGA’S TESTIMONY .....</li> </ul>	113

	PAGE(S)
ii. THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN EXCLUDING QUESTIONS TO TABOGA REGARDING APPELLANT’S LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF MERCEDES’ PRIOR SOLICITATION .....	114
iii. THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY EXCLUDED TABOGA’S PRIOR CONSISTENT STATEMENT .....	115
7. APPELLANT WAS PREJUDICED BY THESE EVIDENTIARY ERRORS .....	117
F. THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES .....	118
1. THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF FINANCIAL GAIN .....	118
a. RESPONDENT’S POSITION IN THE TRIAL COURT .....	119
b. THE FINANCIAL GAIN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE APPLIES TO AIDERS AND ABETTORS WHERE THERE IS EVIDENCE <i>THE KILLER</i> FINANCIALLY BENEFITTED .....	120
c. THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE THAT APPELLANT ACTED FOR HIS OWN FINANCIAL GAIN .....	123
d. EVEN IF RESPONDENT’S NEW “MAIN” THEORY THAT APPELLANT PERSONALLY BENEFITTED IS CORRECT, REVERSAL IS STILL WARRANTED .....	124

	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
2. THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF LYING IN WAIT .....	125
a. THERE WAS NO EVIDENCE OF APPELLANT "LYING IN WAIT" .....	126
b. THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE THAT APPELLANT AIDED AND ABETTED CO-DEFENDANTS "LYING IN WAIT" .....	127
G. THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTED NUMEROUS INSTANCES OF MISCONDUCT IN THE GUILT PHASE DEPRIVING APPELLANT OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL .....	128
1. THE GOVERNMENT'S INFLAMMATORY STATEMENTS ABOUT PAMELA'S SUFFERING PREJUDICED APPELLANT .....	129
a. THE STATEMENTS WERE IMPROPER .....	130
b. THE MISCONDUCT WAS PREJUDICIAL .....	131
2. THE GOVERNMENT MISSTATED KEY ELEMENTS OF LAW .....	133
a. THE GOVERNMENT MADE MISSTATEMENTS OF THE LAW CONCERNING WITHDRAWAL .....	133
i. THE GOVERNMENT MISSTATED THE BURDEN OF PROOF .....	134
aa. THE GOVERNMENT INCORRECTLY TOLD THE JURY THAT THE DEFENSE HAD TO PRODUCE EVIDENCE TO PROVE WITHDRAWAL .....	134

bb.	RESPONDENT’S ARGUMENT THAT IT CORRECTLY TOLD THE JURY THE BURDEN OF PROOF FOR WITHDRAWAL IS CONTRADICTED BY THE RECORD .....	136
ii.	RESPONDENT AFFIRMATIVELY TOLD THE JURY THAT APPELLANT HAD TO CONTACT THE POLICE IN ORDER TO WITHDRAW .....	138
b.	THE GOVERNMENT MADE MISSTATEMENTS OF THE LAW CONCERNING AIDING AND ABETTING .....	139
3.	THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTED MISCONDUCT BY REFERENCING FACTS OUTSIDE OF THE RECORD AND/OR MISSTATING THE EVIDENCE IN CLOSING ARGUMENTS .....	141
a.	THE ARGUMENT WAS NOT FORFEITED .....	141
b.	INFERENCES BASED ON THE FEDERAL SUBPOENA WERE UNREASONABLE .....	143
c.	INFERENCES BASED ON THE FEDERAL CASE WERE UNREASONABLE .....	144
d.	INFERENCE ABOUT NEVE’S TESTIMONY WERE UNREASONABLE .....	146
e.	THE GOVERNMENT MISCONDUCT REQUIRES REVERSAL .....	147

	PAGE(S)
H. APPELLANT WAS DENIED DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL BY THE ADMISSION OF IMPROPER EVIDENCE AT THE PENALTY PHASE .....	148
1. THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY ADMITTED A LETTER WRITTEN BY PAMELA FAYED .....	148
2. THE LOWER COURT IMPROPERLY ADMITTED PHOTOS OF THE GRAVE SITE .....	149
I. THE LOWER COURT VIOLATED APPELLANT'S EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS BY EXCLUDING MITIGATING EVIDENCE IN THE PENALTY PHASE .....	151
1. THE ERROR WAS NOT HARMLESS .....	152
J. THE GOVERNMENT VIOLATED APPELLANT'S EIGHTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL BY IMPROPERLY APPEALING TO THE PASSION AND PREJUDICE OF THE JURY DURING PENALTY PHASE CLOSING ARGUMENTS .....	153
K. THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTED MISCONDUCT BY ARGUING FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE IN THE PENALTY PHASE DEPRIVING APPELLANT OF HIS RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL .....	155
1. THE GOVERNMENT MADE ARGUMENTS CONCERNING JANETTE BASED ON FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE .....	155
2. THE GOVERNMENT MADE OTHER ARGUMENTS BASED ON FACTS NOT IN EVIDENCE .....	156
L. CUMULATIVE ERROR REQUIRES REVERSAL .....	157

	PAGE(S)
M. THE SUBSTANTIVE PROVISIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, AS INTERPRETED AND APPLIED, CONSTITUTE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT .....	159
1. CALIFORNIA'S CURRENT DEATH PENALTY SCHEME IS ARBITRARY .....	159
a. CALIFORNIA'S DEATH PENALTY SCHEME IS ARBITRARY BECAUSE IT DOES NOT SUFFICIENTLY NARROW THE CLASS OF DEATH-ELIGIBLE DEFENDANTS AND DEATH IS RARELY IMPOSED .....	161
b. THE DEATH PENALTY IS STILL IMPOSED ARBITRARILY .....	163
2. THE PUNISHMENT OF DEATH IS UNUSUALLY SEVERE .....	166
3. THE DEATH PENALTY HAS BEEN REJECTED BY CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY .....	169
4. THE DEATH PENALTY DOES NOT SERVE PENAL PURPOSES MORE EFFECTIVELY THAN LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE .....	171
N. THE PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, ALONE OR CUMULATIVELY, CONSTITUTE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT .....	173
CONCLUSION .....	174
CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL .....	175

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**PAGE(S)**

**FEDERAL CASES**

*Albright v. Oliver*  
510 U.S. 266 ..... 36, 37

*Apprendi v. New Jersey*  
530 U.S. 466 ..... 42

*Arizona v. Fulminante*  
499 U.S. 279 ..... 28

*Atkins v. Virginia*  
536 U.S. 304 ..... 169

*Baze v. Rees*  
553 U.S. 35 ..... 167

*Boyde v. California*  
494 U.S. 370. .... 147

*Brewer v. Williams*  
430 U.S. 387 ..... 3, 17

*Bullcoming v. New Mexico*  
\_\_ U.S. \_\_ [131 S.Ct. 2705, 1 L.Ed.2d 610] ..... 41

*Cahill v. Rushen*  
501 F.Supp. 1219 ..... 3, 10, 11

*California v. Ramos*  
463 U.S. 992. .... 117

*California v. Trombetta*  
467 U.S. 479 ..... 86

*Carter v. Kentucky*  
450 U.S. 288 ..... 75



	PAGE(S)
<i>Chapman v. California</i> 386 U.S. 18 .....	passim
<i>County of Riverside v. McLaughlin</i> 500 U.S. 44 .....	38
<i>Crane v. Kentucky</i> 476 U.S. 683 .....	117
<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> 541 U.S. 36 .....	41, 42
<i>Darden v. Wainwright</i> 477 U.S. 168 .....	128, 131, 147, 154
<i>Davis v. Washington</i> 547 U.S. 813 .....	41
<i>DeRosa v. Workman</i> 696 F.3d 1302 .....	2
<i>Dickerson v. United States</i> 530 U.S. 428 .....	27
<i>Escobedo v. State of Ill.</i> 378 U.S. 478 .....	10
<i>Estelle v. McGuire</i> 502 U.S. 62 .....	100
<i>Ford v. Wainwright</i> 477 U.S. 399 .....	93
<i>Foucha v. Louisiana</i> 504 U.S. 71 .....	25
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> 408 U.S. 238 .....	passim

	PAGE(S)
<i>Giles v. California</i> 554 U.S. 353 .....	41
<i>Glossip v. Gross</i> ___ U.S. ___ [135 S.Ct. 2726, 192 L.Ed.2d 761] .....	passim
<i>Godfrey v. Georgia</i> 446 U.S. 420 .....	160
<i>Graham v. Florida</i> 560 U.S. 48 .....	171
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> 428 U.S. 153 .....	75, 158, 159, 160, 163, 171
<i>Griffin v. United States</i> 502 U.S. 46 .....	124
<i>Hamdi v. Rumsfeld</i> 542 U.S. 507 .....	25
<i>Hayes v. Florida</i> 470 U.S. 811 .....	78
<i>Hickman v. Taylor</i> 329 U.S. 495 .....	83
<i>Hicks v. Oklahoma</i> 447 U.S. 343 .....	75
<i>Illinois v. Gates</i> 462 U.S. 213 .....	89, 90
<i>In re Medley</i> 134 U.S. 160 .....	168
<i>In re Winship</i> 397 U.S. 358 .....	86

	PAGE(S)
<i>Kansas v. Marsh</i> 548 U.S. 163 .....	164
<i>Kennedy v. Louisiana</i> 554 U.S. 407 .....	171
<i>Kirby v. Illinois</i> 406 U.S. 682 .....	11
<i>Lincoln v. Sunn</i> 807 F.2d 805 .....	157
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> 438 U.S. 586 .....	150
<i>Maine v. Moulton</i> 474 U.S. 159 .....	26
<i>Mapp v. Ohio</i> 367 U.S. 643 .....	1, 39
<i>Massiah v. United States</i> 377 U.S. 201 .....	5, 8, 10, 11
<i>Mathis v. United States</i> 391 U.S. 1 .....	27
<i>McDowell v. Calderon</i> 130 F.3d 833 .....	65, 155
<i>McNeil v. Wisconsin</i> 501 U.S. 171 .....	11
<i>Milton v. Wainright</i> 407 U.S. 371 .....	46
<i>Minnesota v. Dickerson</i> 508 U.S. 366 .....	78

	PAGE(S)
<i>Miranda v. Arizona</i> 384 U.S. 436 .....	27
<i>Moran v. Burbine</i> 475 U.S. 412 .....	9, 11
<i>Parle v. Runnels</i> 505 F.3d 922 .....	157
<i>Payne v. Tennessee</i> 501 U.S. 808 .....	149
<i>Penry v. Lynaugh</i> 492 U.S. 302 .....	153
<i>Kennedy v. Louisiana</i> 554 U.S. 434 .....	171
<i>Coker v. Georgia</i> 433 U.S. 584 .....	18, 21, 171
<i>Rhode Island v. Innis</i> 446 U.S. 291 .....	28
<i>Riley v. California</i> __ U.S. __ [134 S.Ct. 2473, 192 L.Ed.2d 416] .....	80
<i>Riley v. Dorton</i> 115 F.3d 1159 .....	38
<i>Robinson v. California</i> 370 U.S. 660 .....	171
<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> 543 U.S. 551 .....	169
<i>Rothgery v. Gillespie County, Tex.</i> 554 U.S. 191 .....	8, 9, 10

	PAGE(S)
<i>Spencer v. Texas</i> 385 U.S. 554 .....	100
<i>Stack v. Boyle</i> 342 U.S. 1 .....	29
<i>Stansbury v. California</i> 511 U.S. 318 .....	130, 132
<i>Strickland v. Washington</i> 466 U.S. 668 .....	157
<i>Sullivan v. Louisiana</i> 508 U.S. 275 .....	147
<i>Terry v. Ohio</i> 392 U.S. 1 .....	77
<i>Texas v. Cobb</i> 532 U.S. 162 .....	16, 17
<i>Torres v. McLaughlin</i> 163 F.3d 169 .....	37
<i>United States v. Abrahams</i> 575 F.2d 3 .....	32
<i>United States v. Abuhamra</i> 389 F.3d 309 .....	37
<i>United States v. Acevedo-Ramos</i> 755 F.2d 203 .....	32
<i>United States v. Ali</i> 793 F.Supp.2d 386 .....	30
<i>United States v. Alvarado</i> 440 F.3d 191 .....	18

	PAGE(S)
<i>United States v. Ash</i> 413 U.S. 300 .....	8, 11
<i>United States v. Avants</i> 278 F.3d 510 .....	18
<i>United States v. Bird</i> 287 F.3d 709 .....	19, 20
<i>United States v. Butler</i> 165 F.R.D. 68 .....	31
<i>United States v. Ceccolini</i> 435 U.S. 268 .....	39
<i>United States v. Coker</i> 433 F.3d 39 .....	18, 21
<i>United States v. Cole</i> 715 F.Supp. 677 .....	33
<i>United States v. Cronic</i> 466 U.S. 648 .....	117
<i>United States v. Curcio</i> 608 F.Supp. 1346 .....	85
<i>United States v. Epstein</i> 155 F.Supp.2d 323 .....	33
<i>United States v. Friedman</i> 837 F.2d 48 .....	33, 35
<i>United States v. Giordano</i> 370 F.Supp.2d 1256 .....	32, 35
<i>United States v. Gouveia</i> 467 U.S. 180 .....	11

	PAGE(S)
<i>United States v. Guzman</i> 85 F.3d 823 .....	21
<i>United States v. Haischer</i> 780 F.3d 1277.....	65
<i>United States v. Himler</i> 797 F.2d 156 .....	33
<i>United States v. Hines</i> 963 F.2d 255 .....	16
<i>United States v. Jackson</i> 756 F.2d 703 .....	108
<i>United States v. Jones</i> __ U.S. __ [132 S.Ct. 945, 181 L.Ed.2d 911] .....	40
<i>United States v. Koenig</i> 912 F.2d 1190 .....	32
<i>United States v. Krueger</i> 415 F.3d 766 .....	19
<i>United States v. Leavis</i> 853 F.2d 215 .....	85
<i>United States v. Liddy</i> 542 F.2d 76 .....	21
<i>United States v. Mastroianna</i> 749 F.2d 900 .....	83
<i>United States v. Maull</i> 773 F.2d 1479 .....	33
<i>United States v. Mills</i> 412 F.3d 325 .....	19, 20

	PAGE(S)
<i>United States v. Shabani</i> 48 F.3d 401 .....	108
<i>United States v. United States Gypsum Co.</i> 438 U.S. 422 .....	70
<i>United States v. Vortis</i> 785 F.2d 327 .....	32
<i>United States v. Wade</i> 388 U.S. 218 .....	11
<i>United States v. York</i> 933 F.2d 1343 .....	6
<i>Washington v. Texas</i> 388 U.S. 14 .....	111
<i>Wilkins v. Gaddy</i> 559 U.S. 34 .....	38
<i>Wong Sun v. United States</i> 371 U.S. 471 .....	39
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> 428 U.S. 280 .....	149
<i>Youngberg v. Romeo</i> 457 U.S. 307 .....	25
<i>Zant v. Stephens</i> 462 U.S. 862 .....	161
 <b>STATE CASES</b>	
<i>Barber v. Municipal Court</i> 24 Cal.3d 742. ....	83



	PAGE(S)
<i>Cobb and People v. Stayton</i> 26 Cal.4th 1076 .....	16
<i>College Hospital Incorporated v. Superior Court</i> 8 Cal.4th 704 .....	104
<i>In re Carpenter</i> 9 Cal.4th 634. ....	56
<i>In re Hitchings</i> 6 Cal.4th 97 .....	54, 56
<i>In re Justin B.</i> 69 Cal.App.4th 879 .....	78, 79
<i>In re Lucas</i> 33 Cal.4th 682 .....	55,56
<i>In re Neely</i> 6 Cal.4th 901 .....	6
<i>In re Nordin</i> 143 Cal.App.3d 538 .....	29
<i>In re Thierry</i> 19 Cal.3d 727 .....	79
<i>Lorenzana v. Superior Court</i> 9 Cal.3d 626 .....	62
<i>Louis and Diederich, Incorporated v. Cambridge European Imports, Incorporated</i> 189 Cal.App.3d 1574 .....	59
<i>Panopulos v. Maderis</i> 47 Cal.2d 337 .....	5
<i>Peope v. Elliot</i> 53 Cal.4th 535 .....	160

	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
<i>People v. Anderson</i> 52 Cal.3d 453 .....	54
<i>People v. Arauz</i> 210 Cal.App.4th 1394 .....	41
<i>People v. Arias</i> 13 Cal.4th 92. ....	141
<i>People v. Avila</i> 58 Cal.App.4th 1069 .....	77
<i>People v. Ayala</i> 23 Cal.4th 225 .....	94, 95
<i>People v. Babbitt</i> 45 Cal.3d 660 .....	111
<i>People v. Balcom</i> 7 Cal.4th 414 .....	45, 46, 103
<i>People v. Barnard</i> 138 Cal.App.3d 400 .....	73
<i>People v. Barnett</i> 17 Cal.4th 1044 .....	54
<i>People v. Battle</i> 198 Cal.App.4th 50 .....	121, 122, 127
<i>People v. Beardslee</i> 53 Cal.3d 68 .....	73
<i>People v. Beeman</i> 35 Cal.3d 547 .....	139, 140
<i>People v. Bell</i> 49 Cal.3d 502 .....	142

	PAGE(S)
<i>People v. Beltran</i> 56 Cal.4th 935 .....	71, 72
<i>People v. Berryman</i> 6 Cal.4th 1048 .....	141
<i>People v. Bigelow</i> 37 Cal.3d 731 .....	121
<i>People v. Blacksher</i> 52 Cal.4th 769 .....	42
<i>People v. Bolton</i> 23 Cal.3d 208 .....	141
<i>People v. Brendlin</i> 45 Cal.4th 262 .....	39
<i>People v. Breverman</i> 19 Cal.4th 142. ....	63
<i>People v. Brooks</i> 88 Cal.App.3d 180 .....	45
<i>People v. Brown</i> 198 Cal.App.2d 253 .....	28
<i>People v. Brown</i> 31 Cal.4th 518 .....	69, 152
<i>People v. Burgener</i> 41 Cal.3d 505 .....	49, 54
<i>People v. Burnham</i> 176 Cal.App.3d 1134 .....	64
<i>People v. Cahill</i> 5 Cal.4th 478. ....	10

	PAGE(S)
<i>People v. Carpenter</i> 15 Cal.4th 312 .....	152
<i>People v. Carpenter</i> 21 Cal.4th 1016 .....	91, 92
<i>People v. Cash</i> 28 Cal.4th 703 .....	131
<i>People v. Cervantes</i> 118 Cal.App.4th 162 .....	42
<i>People v. Chiu</i> 59 Cal.4th 155 .....	127
<i>People v. Clark</i> 52 Cal.4th 856 .....	131
<i>People v. Cook</i> 39 Cal.4th 566 .....	131
<i>People v. Cooper</i> 53 Cal.3d 771. ....	55
<i>People v. Cromer</i> 24 Cal.4th 889 .....	95
<i>People v. Davis</i> 10 Cal.4th 463 .....	49, 53, 54, 57
<i>People v. DeSantis</i> 2 Cal.4th 1198 .....	107
<i>People v. Dorado</i> 62 Cal.2d 338 .....	10
<i>People v. Durham</i> 70 Cal.2d 171 .....	139, 140

	PAGE(S)
<i>People v. Edelbacher</i> 47 Cal.3d 983 .....	161
<i>People v. Edwards</i> 54 Cal.3d 787 .....	140, 153
<i>People v. Elmore</i> 59 Cal.4th 121 .....	64
<i>People v. Espinoza</i> 3 Cal.4th 806 .....	54
<i>People v. Ewoldt</i> 7 Cal.4th 380 .....	45, 103
<i>People v. Fields</i> 61 Cal.App.4th 1063 .....	151
<i>People v. Fiu</i> 165 Cal.App.4th 360 .....	133, 134, 135
<i>People v. Flannel</i> 25 Cal.3d 668 .....	64
<i>People v. Flores</i> 236 Cal.App.2d 807 .....	10
<i>People v. Freeman</i> 193 Cal.App.3d 337 .....	121
<i>People v. French</i> 53 Cal.4th 36 .....	67
<i>People v. Gamache</i> 48 Cal.4th 347 .....	153
<i>People v. Gerber</i> 196 Cal.App.4th 368 .....	69

	PAGE(S)
<i>People v. Green</i> 27 Cal.3d 1 .....	123, 124
<i>People v. Green</i> 34 Cal.App.4th 165 .....	73
<i>People v. Guerrero</i> 16 Cal.3d 719 .....	45
<i>People v. Guiton</i> 4 Cal.4th 1116 .....	124
<i>People v. Gurule</i> 28 Cal.4th 557 .....	106
<i>People v. Guzman</i> 66 Cal.App.3d 549. ....	54
<i>People v. Hall</i> 41 Cal.3d 826 .....	62, 63
<i>People v. Herring</i> 20 Cal.App.4th 1066 .....	142
<i>People v. Hill</i> 3 Cal.4th 959 .....	2
<i>People v. Hill</i> 17 Cal.4th 800 .....	68, 141, 142, 146
<i>People v. Howard</i> 44 Cal.3d 375 .....	22
<i>People v. Hoyos</i> 41 Cal.4th 872. ....	131
<i>People v. Ingle</i> 53 Cal.2d 407 .....	79

	PAGE(S)
<i>People v. Jackson</i> 45 Cal.4th 662 .....	132
<i>People v. Jackson</i> 58 Cal.4th 724 .....	46, 87
<i>People v. Jennings</i> 50 Cal.4th 616 .....	166
<i>People v. Johnson</i> 3 Cal.4th 1183 .....	28
<i>People v. Kelley</i> 75 Cal.App.3d 672 .....	146
<i>People v. Kelly</i> 42 Cal.4th 763 .....	149, 150
<i>People v. Kovacich</i> 201 Cal.App.4th 863. ....	114
<i>People v. Lee</i> 51 Cal.4th 620 .....	160, 161
<i>People v. Lemus</i> 203 Cal.App.3d 470 .....	64
<i>People v. Leonard</i> 40 Cal.4th 1370 .....	130
<i>People v. Lewis</i> 25 Cal.4th 610 .....	105
<i>People v. Maestas</i> 204 Cal.App.3d 1208 .....	93
<i>People v. Majors</i> 18 Cal.4th 385 .....	57

	PAGE(S)
<i>People v. Marshall</i> 50 Cal.3d 907 .....	56, 73, 114
<i>People v. Marshall</i> 13 Cal.4th 799 .....	133, 170
<i>People v. Martinez</i> 47 Cal.4th 911 .....	161
<i>People v. McCoy</i> 25 Cal.4th 1111 .....	127
<i>People v. McDowell</i> 54 Cal.4th 395 .....	155
<i>People v. Mendoza</i> 37 Cal.App.3d 717 .....	131
<i>People v. Miller</i> 7 Cal.3d 219 .....	5
<i>People v. Morales</i> 48 Cal.3d 527 .....	126
<i>People v. Neal</i> 31 Cal.4th 63 .....	26
<i>People v. Nesler</i> 16 Cal.4th 561 .....	57
<i>People v. Norton</i> 161 Cal.App.2d 399 .....	69, 70
<i>People v. Padilla</i> 11 Cal.4th 891 .....	122
<i>People v. Partida</i> 37 Cal.4th 428 .....	66, 100, 141



	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
<i>People v. Payton</i> 3 Cal.4th 1050 .....	152
<i>People v. Pierce</i> 24 Cal.3d 199 .....	56
<i>People v. Quartermain</i> 16 Cal.4th 600 .....	147
<i>People v. Ramos</i> 30 Cal.3d 553 .....	117
<i>People v. Redd</i> 48 Cal.4th 691 .....	129
<i>People v. Redmond</i> 71 Cal.2d 745 .....	123
<i>People v. Richardson</i> 43 Cal.4th 959 .....	70
<i>People v. Robles</i> 23 Cal.4th 789 .....	81
<i>People v. Rodrigues</i> 8 Cal.4th 1060 .....	56
<i>People v. Russo</i> 25 Cal.4th 1124. ....	73
<i>People v. Sanchez</i> 24 Cal.App.3d 664 .....	91
<i>People v. Sanders</i> 5 Cal.4th 580 .....	67
<i>People v. Sanders</i> 11 Cal.4th 475 .....	154

	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
<i>People v. Sassounian</i> 182 Cal.App.3d 361 .....	56
<i>People v. Scheid</i> 16 Cal.4th 1 .....	105
<i>People v. Sedeno</i> 10 Cal.3d 703 .....	63
<i>People v. Sharer</i> 61 Cal.2d 869. ....	116
<i>People v. Shelmire</i> 130 Cal.App.4th 1044 .....	134
<i>People v. Sims</i> 5 Cal.4th 405 .....	87
<i>People v. Smith</i> 67 Cal.App.3d 638 .....	5, 62
<i>People v. Smith</i> 179 Cal.App.4th 986 .....	105
<i>People v. Smithey</i> 20 Cal.4th 936 .....	106
<i>People v. Snow</i> 44 Cal.3d 216 .....	151
<i>People v. Stankewitz</i> 51 Cal.3d 72 .....	141
<i>People v. Stansbury</i> 4 Cal.4th 1017 .....	130, 32
<i>People v. Stevens</i> 41 Cal.4th 182 .....	161

	PAGE(S)
<i>People v. Stowell</i> 31 Cal.4th 1107 .....	66
<i>People v. Superior Court (Tunch)</i> 80 Cal.App.3d 665 .....	81
<i>People v. Thompkins</i> 195 Cal.App.3d 244 .....	75
<i>People v. Thompson</i> 27 Cal.3d 303 .....	102, 123
<i>People v. Tuggle</i> 179 Cal.App.4th 339 .....	55
<i>People v. Valentine</i> 28 Cal.2d 121 .....	120
<i>People v. Vance</i> 188 Cal.App.4th 1182 .....	129, 130, 132
<i>People v. Vera</i> 15 Cal.4th 269 .....	67
<i>People v. Viray</i> 134 Cal.App.4th 1186 .....	8, 9, 11
<i>People v. Wader</i> 5 Cal.4th 610 .....	16
<i>People v. Walsh</i> 47 Cal.2d 36 .....	116
<i>People v. Watson</i> 46 Cal.2d 818 .....	101, 104, 152
<i>People v. Weaver</i> 52 Cal.4th 1056 .....	163