

10145

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
2 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA  
3 SANTA MARIA BRANCH; COOK STREET DIVISION  
4 DEPARTMENT SM-2 HON. RODNEY S. MELVILLE, JUDGE

5

6

7 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF )

8 CALIFORNIA, )

9 Plaintiff, )

10 -vs- ) No. 1133603

11 MICHAEL JOE JACKSON, )

12 Defendant. )

13

14

15

16

17 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

18

19 FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2005

20

21 8:30 A.M.

22

23 (PAGES 10145 THROUGH 10188)

24

25

26

27 REPORTED MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304

28 BY: Official Court Reporter 10145

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

2

3 For Plaintiff: THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR.,

4 District Attorney -and-

5 RONALD J. ZONEN, Sr. Deputy District Attorney

6 -and- GORDON AUCHINCLOSS,

7 Sr. Deputy District Attorney 1112 Santa Barbara Street

8 Santa Barbara, California 93101

9

10

11 For Defendant: COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU BY: THOMAS A.  
MESEREAU, JR., ESQ.

12 -and- SUSAN C. YU, ESQ.

13 1875 Century Park East, Suite 700 Los Angeles, California 90067

14 -and-

15 SANGER & SWYSEN

16 BY: ROBERT M. SANGER, ESQ. 233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C

17 Santa Barbara, California 93101

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 10146

1 I N D E X

2

3 Note: Mr. Sneddon is listed as "SN" on index.

4 Mr. Zonen is listed as "Z" on index. Mr. Auchincloss is listed as "A"  
on index.

5 Mr. Mesereau is listed as "M" on index. Ms. Yu is listed as "Y" on  
index.

6 Mr. Sanger is listed as "SA" on index.

7

8

9 DEFENDANT'S

10 WITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS

11 LEGRAND, David G. 10150-A

12 (Contd.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 10147

1 E X H I B I T S

2 FOR IN PLAINTIFF'S NO. DESCRIPTION I.D. EVID.

3

4 263 MJJ Productions office records 10184 10185

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 10148



1 Santa Maria, California

2 Friday, May 13, 2005

3 8:30 a.m.

4

5 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone.

6 COUNSEL AT COUNSEL TABLE: (In unison)

7 Good morning, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: (To the jury) How was it?

9 A JUROR: What?

10 THE COURT: The breakfast.

11 THE JURY: (In unison) We didn't have a

12 breakfast.

13 JUROR NO. 7: It's lunch.

14 THE COURT: Oh, you're getting lunch? That's

15 what they promised.

16 JUROR NO. 4: My cereal was okay.

17 THE COURT: I had information that you were

18 going to get breakfast. So you're getting lunch.

19 A JUROR: We got presents. We got cups.

20 THE COURT: All right. Let me just say

21 don't eat too much at lunch.

22 Okay. Counsel, are you ready to proceed?

23 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I am, Your Honor. But,

24 I'm sorry, with the Court's permission, I'd like to

25 have a brief sidebar to discuss a matter that I

26 don't want to go into without your permission.

27 THE COURT: All right.

28 (Discussion held off the record at sidebar.) 10149

1 THE COURT: All right.

2 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Thank you, Your Honor.

3

4 DAVID G. LEGRAND

5 Having been previously sworn, resumed the

6 stand and testified further as follows:

7

8 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

9 BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS:

10 Q. Good morning, Mr. LeGrand.

11 A. Good morning.

12 Q. Yesterday we talked about the LLC Fire

13 Mountain, and you indicated that that LLC, that

14 limited liability corporation, was formed to act as

15 the corporation under which the proceeds from the

16 FOX special, "The Footage You Were Never Meant To

17 See" or what we've been calling the "Take 2" video,

18 to basically funnel those assets or those -- the

19 cash that was produced from that program and then

20 disburse to various parties. Is that correct?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Okay. And I asked you -- I'm not sure if we

23 ever got the answer, but I asked you, and I'm asking

24 you now, was that corporation formed to conceal

25 assets from Mr. Jackson's creditors?

26 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;

27 relevance.

28 THE COURT: Overruled. 10150

1 You may answer.

2 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: In any way.

3 A. There were multiple concerns with regard to  
4 the "Take 2" video at the inception of the process.  
5 There was a letter from Granada basically demanding  
6 that no footage of Martin Bashir be utilized without  
7 Granada's permission, so we had significant concerns  
8 about potential liabilities associated with Fire  
9 Mountain.

10 There were also concerns, not so much about  
11 trade creditors in general, but, rather, that the  
12 mounting financial demands of the lawyers, the  
13 accountants, the production people be met, and we  
14 had not yet -- there was -- we had not yet  
15 accomplished a complete transition of money  
16 management affairs and open --

17 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'm going to object at this  
18 time as nonresponsive.

19 THE WITNESS: Okay.

20 THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

21 I'll allow him to complete his answer.

22 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right.

23 THE WITNESS: I opened a dialogue with Bank  
24 of America and discussed with the bank  
25 representatives the relationship of Fire Mountain  
26 with FOX, and to my knowledge, there was never a  
27 demand of default made by Bank of America with

28 respect to any of their credit protection 10151

1 provisions.

2 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: My question was, was  
3 that Fire Mountain, Limited Liability Corporation,  
4 formed in any way to conceal assets from Mr.  
5 Jackson's creditors? And my question goes beyond  
6 the Bank of America.

7 MR. MESEREAU: Same objection.

8 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: And do you understand  
9 the question?

10 A. Yeah. It was not my intent to conceal. It  
11 was my intent to protect the cash flows being  
12 received in order to address the financial needs of  
13 my client, Mr. Jackson.

14 Q. All right. Well, you testified that Mr.  
15 Jackson had creditors with outstanding bills in  
16 excess of ten million dollars, true? Yes?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And some of those creditors had initiated  
19 lawsuits; isn't that true?

20 A. I don't know that creditors had initiated  
21 lawsuits. The two primary lawsuits that were  
22 pending that I had knowledge of early on were the  
23 Avram case and the Myung Ho Lee case.

24 Q. All right.

25 A. I don't know that those gentlemen were  
26 creditors at that time, because I don't remember  
27 seeing them listed in the payables listings. There

28 was a subsequent lawsuit -- I mean, there was a 10152



1 lawsuit filed somewhere, hmm, I'm not sure if it was  
2 late February or early March, filed by an auction  
3 house in New York with respect to a painting.

4 Q. Would that be Sotheby's?

5 A. Yes. Yes, that was Sotheby's.

6 Q. And that dealt with a painting Mr. Jackson  
7 purchased but never paid for; is that correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; relevance.

10 THE COURT: Sustained.

11 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right. But in  
12 effect, the Fire Mountain corporation would prevent  
13 any of these creditors from getting their hands on  
14 the money, the proceedings from the FOX production;  
15 true? I'd like a "yes" or "no" question -- answer  
16 to that question.

17 A. I don't know --

18 Q. If you know.

19 A. I don't know how it would prevent creditors  
20 from getting to it. I mean, if a creditor took a  
21 judgment debtor exam of someone and found that this  
22 subsidiary of MJJ had these funds, the question is  
23 creditor of whom, I guess? I mean, the goal of Fire  
24 Mountain was to serve as a subsidiary to MJJ  
25 Productions.

26 Q. Who is Marcel Avram? You just mentioned  
27 that. Who is that?

28 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; relevance. 10153

1 THE COURT: Overruled.

2 You may answer.

3 THE WITNESS: What I've read is that he was  
4 a promoter who had entered into some agreements  
5 with -- and I'm not sure who with, but with Mr.  
6 Jackson or entities affiliated with Mr. Jackson.  
7 I'm not even sure who the parties were in that  
8 litigation.

9 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: And that was a  
10 multimillion-dollar lawsuit?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And that was here in Santa Maria?

13 A. I don't know where it was.

14 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; relevance.

15 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: My question -- I'm sorry.

16 THE COURT: Next question. Overruled.

17 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: And that lawsuit was  
18 going on during February of 2003?

19 A. I think so, yes.

20 Q. And --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. If that lawsuit went bad, wasn't it your  
23 opinion that bankruptcy was assured for Mr. Jackson?

24 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;  
25 misstates the evidence.

26 THE COURT: Foundation sustained.

27 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Did you ever send an

28 e-mail to the effect that bankruptcy was assured if 10154

1 the Marcel Avram lawsuit went bad for Mr. Jackson?

2 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;

3 leading; relevance.

4 THE COURT: Overruled.

5 You may answer.

6 THE WITNESS: I don't recall such a specific

7 e-mail. It's possible. But I don't recall.

8 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: If I could have a moment,

9 Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: You may.

11 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Let me just ask a

12 follow-up question. Was that your opinion?

13 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Relevance;

14 foundation.

15 THE COURT: Sustained.

16 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'll come back to that.

17 Q. Mr. LeGrand, did you talk to anybody after

18 you left the stand here today (sic) about your

19 testimony in this case?

20 A. I did not speak about my testimony in this

21 case. I did speak to several people last night.

22 Q. Who did you talk to?

23 A. Talked to my wife.

24 Q. Did you talk to anybody that was involved in

25 this case in any fashion?

26 A. I don't know whether "involved" or not. I

27 did call Al Malnik.

28 Q. Why did you call Mr. Malnik? 10155

1 A. He's -- his wife is expecting a child. It's  
2 been any day for the last couple of weeks. And I  
3 called to inquire as to his wife's health and the  
4 prospect of delivery.

5 Q. Do you work for Mr. Malnik?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Have you been employed with Mr. -- by Mr.  
8 Malnik in the past?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Mr. Malnik has never paid you for any  
11 services --

12 A. No.

13 Q. -- is that your testimony?

14 A. That's my testimony.

15 Q. Have you ever taken any directives from Mr.  
16 Malnik concerning legal matters regarding Mr.  
17 Jackson?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Why did you take directives from Mr. Malnik  
20 concerning Mr. Jackson's affairs?

21 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; relevance.

22 THE COURT: Overruled.

23 You may answer.

24 THE WITNESS: I was instructed by Mr.  
25 Jackson to do so.

26 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: And did Mr. Malnik work  
27 for Mr. Jackson, as far as you knew?

28 A. As far as I knew. 10156



1 Q. What was his relationship with Mr. Jackson?

2 A. I believe he was a friend and I believe he  
3 was an attorney.

4 Q. Do you know if Mr. Malnik was retained by  
5 Mr. Jackson as an attorney?

6 A. I did not see an engagement letter. I was  
7 instructed by Mr. Jackson to submit all documents  
8 that were to be signed by Mr. Jackson, they were to  
9 be reviewed by Mr. Malnik before presentation to Mr.  
10 Jackson. That instruction was given to Ronald  
11 Konitzer and Dieter Weizner as well.

12 Q. Have you attended meetings with Mr. Malnik  
13 and Mr. Jackson?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. On how many occasions?

16 A. Once for sure. There may have been a second  
17 meeting during that same weekend, but I'm not sure.  
18 But I know of one in particular. It was mid to late  
19 March. Mr. Fishman and I flew to Florida. I think  
20 that's when. I'm not sure of the dates, though.

21 Q. And did Mr. Konitzer attend that meeting?

22 A. There were several meetings and Mr. -- there  
23 were several meetings with myself and Mr. Malnik and  
24 Mr. Konitzer attended one of those meetings.

25 Q. Was Mr. Jackson present?

26 A. I think so.

27 Q. Was Mr. Weizner present?

28 A. You know, I think Dieter was there, but I'm 10157

1 honestly not sure today.

2 Q. Do you know what time in March that was?

3 A. Well, it was before the 28th. I think it  
4 was a week to ten days before the 28th of March, but  
5 I'm not sure exactly.

6 Q. Was it before your services were terminated  
7 as Mr. Jackson's attorney?

8 A. Yes. That's why I know it's before the  
9 28th.

10 Q. And the purpose of that meeting was what?

11 A. To discuss the overall positions, to discuss  
12 the -- to discuss how or whether we would continue  
13 the various relationships, because Ronald was upset  
14 with me for having pointed the finger at him with  
15 respect to the \$965,000.

16 We were attempting in that meeting to  
17 construct a framework under which we would -- you  
18 know, Ronald and Dieter would remain involved in --  
19 as, you know, consultants, advisors to Mr. Jackson.  
20 But Mr. Malnik essentially emerged, in my opinion,  
21 as the primary person with Michael Jackson's trust  
22 and confidence for business decisions.

23 Q. Mr. Malnik was one of the people you had  
24 investigated?

25 A. Yes, he is.

26 Q. So you were suspicious of him, too?

27 A. Yes.

28 Q. And you voiced those suspicions to Mr. 10158

1 Jackson, didn't you?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. You voiced those suspicions to Mr. Jackson

4 about Mr. Konitzer?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And Mr. Weizner?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And you were suspicious about Mr. Jackson's

9 personal assistant, Evvy?

10 A. Yes. Primarily because Mr. Konitzer --

11 Q. There's no question pending.

12 A. Oh. Sorry.

13 Q. And you were suspicious about Mr. Geragos?

14 A. Yes, I was.

15 Q. And you were suspicious about Mr. Jackson's

16 attorney, Mr. Cochran's associate, Zia Modabber?

17 A. Less so, but yes.

18 Q. Well, you had him investigated?

19 A. Less so, but yes.

20 Q. And you were suspicious about Mr. Gross, who

21 worked for Fred Haber, the foreign rights people,

22 Edgar Gross? Maybe I'm misstating that. Did you

23 have Edgar Gross investigated?

24 A. I don't remember that name. Was it -- do

25 you mean -- I'm sorry, I don't recall.

26 Q. You were suspicious about a Dr. Armen

27 Kazanchian?

28 A. Yes, I was. 10159

1 Q. You were suspicious about Mr. Jackson's  
2 long-standing business manager, Trudi Green?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. These people had really very little  
5 connection with one another, did they? I mean, you  
6 tell me. Did they have connection with one another?

7 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; foundation.

8 THE COURT: Sustained.

9 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: In effect, you had  
10 investigated everybody who was within Michael  
11 Jackson's inner circle; isn't that true?

12 A. I don't know, because I don't know your  
13 definition of "inner circle." I investigated  
14 people that I viewed as being close to Michael or  
15 having the potential to do harm to Michael as I saw  
16 it at the time.

17 Q. And you were suspicious of them all,  
18 correct?

19 A. Um, I was -- I was cautious. I was becoming  
20 more cautious as time went on.

21 Q. Well, didn't you testify that you had  
22 everybody investigated that you found suspicious?

23 A. I'm not sure those were my exact words, sir.

24 Q. Well, was that true or not?

25 A. No. I did not have everybody investigated  
26 whom I found suspicious. There were certainly  
27 people who I had concerns about, but who did not

28 have a position such that I was overly -- 10160



1 sufficiently concerned to spend money.

2 Q. But you had concerns about all these people.

3 Will you go that far?

4 A. Concerns about a lot of people.

5 Q. Okay. And as far as this \$900,000, you

6 don't know what that money was for, do you?

7 A. No.

8 Q. You don't know if that money was owed to

9 Dieter and Ronald, do you?

10 A. No, I don't. I never saw -- I never saw

11 evidence it was.

12 Q. Right. But you never saw any evidence

13 whatsoever about what that \$900,000 was for, did

14 you?

15 A. No, I never saw evidence of it.

16 Q. You don't know if Mr. Jackson knew about

17 that at the time or didn't know about it at the

18 time, do you, at the time it was disbursed?

19 A. No, I didn't.

20 Q. So you just pointed the finger with

21 virtually no evidence against these people because

22 of your suspicions; isn't that fair to say?

23 A. I discussed the matter with Mr. Malnik, and

24 at his direction prepared the letter. He reviewed

25 the letter. So this was not my independent action.

26 Q. Well, if this was an embezzlement, wouldn't

27 it be an incredibly lame attempt to embezzle money

28 from a trust account of an attorney with a paper 10161

1 trail one inch long leading directly to the  
2 embezzlers?

3 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; argumentative.

4 THE COURT: Sustained.

5 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Would you agree with me  
6 that it would be a very poor plan to embezzle money?

7 MR. MESEREAU: Objection.

8 THE COURT: Sustained.

9 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Would you agree with me  
10 that there was never any attempt to conceal that  
11 that money went from the trust account to Mr.  
12 Weizner and Mr. Konitzer?

13 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Misstates the  
14 evidence and foundation.

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 You may answer. Do you want that question  
17 read back?

18 THE WITNESS: I believe that --

19 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'm going to --

20 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. He's cutting off  
21 the witness, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Sustained. Let the witness  
23 answer the question.

24 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right.

25 THE WITNESS: I believe that Mr. Konitzer  
26 was unhappy that Mr. Finkelstein gave me that  
27 accounting.

28 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Would you agree that 10162

1 there was never any attempt to conceal that those  
2 moneys went from that trust account to Mr. Weizner  
3 and Mr. Konitzer; yes or no?

4 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation and  
5 misstates the evidence.

6 THE COURT: Overruled.

7 You may answer.

8 THE WITNESS: I do not know -- I do not have  
9 actual knowledge of an attempt to conceal those  
10 disbursements.

11 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Michael Jackson  
12 Universe, MJ Universe, that was the plan that Ronald  
13 and Dieter were working on with Mr. Jackson to  
14 remake his image and career, correct?

15 A. I'm -- I'm not sure I agree with the  
16 characterization, "remake his image and career." It  
17 was the business plan that Ronald and Dieter had put  
18 forth.

19 Q. It was a promotional plan for Michael  
20 Jackson, correct?

21 A. It involved elements of using Michael  
22 Jackson's trademarks, image and likeness to gain  
23 revenue.

24 Q. Wouldn't that be a promotional plan?

25 A. I'm not trying to be difficult. I just  
26 don't know what you mean by "a promotional plan." I  
27 mean, that's all.

28 Q. What I mean by "promotional plan" is a plan 10163

1 that promotes Mr. Jackson. Was it designed to  
2 promote Mr. Jackson's image and likeness, his name,  
3 to sell products to make profit?

4 A. I certainly agree it was part of the plan to  
5 use his image and likeness to sell products and make  
6 profit.

7 Q. Was it also the idea of this plan, this new  
8 enterprise, MJ Universe, to save Mr. Jackson from  
9 impending financial ruin? Yes or no.

10 A. When the plan was first -- the first  
11 development of the plan, none of us had knowledge of  
12 Mr. Jackson's financial affairs. So the plan was  
13 developed in a context where we, that is, Mr.  
14 Konitzer, and he expressed to me his belief that Mr.  
15 Jackson had significant financial resources to call  
16 upon. So the original plan was not about financial  
17 ruin. It was developed before any of us knew of the  
18 financial circumstances that ultimately were  
19 disclosed to me in February of 2003.

20 Q. Is it true that the plan was designed to  
21 make everyone, including Michael Jackson and  
22 yourself, a lot of money?

23 A. The intent of the plan was to make money,  
24 yes.

25 Q. One of the mechanisms for this plan was to  
26 use the Internet as a platform; is that true?

27 A. Yes. There was a portion of the plan

28 devoted to Internet. 10164



1 Q. You testified yesterday that it seemed like  
2 everybody around Michael Jackson was interested in  
3 profiting; is that accurate? That was your opinion?

4 A. Many people, yes.

5 Q. Did you see something wrong with that, with  
6 people profiting who worked for Michael Jackson?

7 A. I see nothing wrong with people earning  
8 appropriate income from providing services.

9 Q. And Michael Jackson Universe --

10 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. I don't think the  
11 witness has completed his response, Your Honor.

12 THE WITNESS: I got concerned about where it  
13 appeared people wanted to have excessive amounts of  
14 money in relation to their contribution.

15 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Okay. And this is  
16 where some of your suspicions took off?

17 A. That's where they were derived, yes.

18 Q. But as it turned out, you really didn't know  
19 where those funds were going, you've testified,  
20 correct?

21 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation and  
22 misstates the evidence.

23 THE COURT: Vague; sustained.

24 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: As far as this plan,  
25 the idea or hope was to make hundreds of millions of  
26 dollars, true?

27 A. That was the hope.

28 Q. And that was a hope that Mr. Jackson had, or 10165

1 shared with Mr. Konitzer, true?

2 A. Yes.

3 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; foundation.

4 THE WITNESS: Whoops.

5 THE COURT: Overruled. The answer was,

6 "Yes."

7 THE WITNESS: Yes.

8 THE COURT: Next question.

9 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: And Mr. Konitzer, from

10 your point of view, had a genuine interest in the

11 success of Michael Jackson, both for his own benefit

12 and for the benefit of Mr. Jackson; isn't that fair

13 to say?

14 A. Yes. That's -- I mean, that's true. Mr.

15 Konitzer, I believe, was quite sincere in many

16 respects and there was no question that he saw the

17 opportunity for significant financial gain and that

18 that gain would -- the largest gain would come if

19 Mr. Jackson also realized a significant financial

20 benefit.

21 Q. If this plan took off, Mr. Konitzer had a

22 very legitimate hope of earning millions and

23 millions of dollars, true?

24 A. Yes. But I'll also tell you that both Mr.

25 Malnik and I were very skeptical about Mr.

26 Konitzer's plan.

27 Q. I understand that, but that's not a question

28 I asked you. 10166

1 But that was the hope. That was the idea  
2 between you, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Konitzer, that was the  
3 reason for Michael Jackson Universe, correct?

4 A. The reason was to create profit, yes.

5 Q. So would you agree it doesn't make much  
6 sense for Mr. Konitzer to attempt to steal a few  
7 hundred thousand dollars at the very beginning of  
8 his relationship with Mr. Jackson?

9 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Argumentative;  
10 foundation.

11 THE COURT: Sustained.

12 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right.

13 Q. Your investigation of these various people  
14 was designed to clean house again, wasn't it? Do  
15 you understand that question? Maybe I should start  
16 over again.

17 You're aware that Mr. Jackson had just  
18 cleaned house, he just fired all the people he had  
19 been working with for years, including some he  
20 hadn't worked with for very long?

21 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation and  
22 misstates the evidence.

23 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'll simplify the  
24 question.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

26 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: You're aware Mr.  
27 Jackson had just cleaned house by firing a number of

28 his associates and close employees, correct, you've 10167

1 testified to that?

2 A. No, I don't think I did. What employees  
3 were terminated?

4 Q. Well, people that worked for Mr. Jackson. I  
5 don't mean to quibble about semantics.

6 Mr. Branca was fired, correct?

7 A. I'm not aware he was ever an employee of Mr.  
8 Jackson. I believe he's an attorney who was  
9 providing services to Mr. Jackson. Yes, his  
10 services were terminated during this process.

11 Q. Are you saying that Mr. Branca was never  
12 employed by Mr. Jackson in any fashion?

13 A. No, I'm saying he was not a W-2 statutory  
14 employee, which is the sense in which I'm used to  
15 using the term. I don't mean to be difficult, but,  
16 you know, this is -- my background is corporate law,  
17 and "employee" means something very specific to me.

18 Q. Okay. When I'm asking questions, just so  
19 you know, I'll be asking them in the common lay  
20 term, not in any technical sense. When I say  
21 "employee," I mean he worked for him, he was paid by  
22 him.

23 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Argumentative and  
24 vague. Object to the colloquy.

25 THE COURT: Counsel, I don't think you can  
26 ask this person to accept your definitions. You  
27 need to know how he defines various corporate terms.

28 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: And I appreciate that. 10168



1 I'm just trying to clarify it.

2 THE COURT: And that be helpful to the jury,

3 I'm sure, if they knew that too. But you -- just as

4 an instruction from me --

5 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Sure.

6 THE COURT: -- you need to find out how he

7 defines them, not tell him how to define them.

8 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Okay.

9 Q. All right. So you would agree with me that

10 Mr. Branca worked for Mr. Jackson, was paid for by

11 Mr. Jackson, correct? He received money from Mr.

12 Jackson for services, true?

13 A. I believe the Ziffren law firm received

14 compensation from Mr. Jackson for legal services,

15 yes.

16 Q. Do you think Mr. Branca ever received any of

17 those moneys for work that he performed?

18 A. I believe Mr. Branca was paid by his firm,

19 yes.

20 Q. All right. And Mr. Jackson (sic) was one of

21 the people he fired when he was cleaning house,

22 true?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. As was Trudi Green?

25 A. Yes.

26 Q. Okay. So we went through the list. I don't

27 need to go through it again.

28 But wasn't it your desire, in preparing this 10169

1 investigative report or ordering this investigative  
2 report on Mr. Jackson's inner circle, to become a  
3 trusted associate of Mr. Jackson to the exclusion of  
4 the people that you were having investigated?

5 A. I don't believe that was my intent. It was  
6 my intent to gain knowledge about the people who  
7 were involved. For example, with respect to Mr.  
8 Malnik, I had no intent to eliminate him from Mr.  
9 Jackson's circle.

10 I had much greater concerns about Mr.  
11 Konitzer and Mr. Weizner than, say, for example, Mr.  
12 Malnik. But at the same time, I felt it  
13 appropriate, granted the history, to have greater  
14 knowledge about these people. You know, there's an  
15 aphorism, knowledge is power. And I felt it  
16 appropriate, and my colleagues, Mr. Joss, my  
17 partner, Mr. Gibson, concurred in those iterations.

18 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; nonresponsive.

19 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. He cut off the  
20 witness.

21 THE COURT: Sustained. I'll allow him to  
22 complete the answer.

23 Do you want part of your answer read back,  
24 so you know where you were, or --

25 THE WITNESS: Well, I'd just like to say  
26 that I and my partner called for those  
27 investigations. It was not simply my intent that

28 was ruling. I was consistently, daily communicating 10170

1 with a number of lawyers who, as a group, were  
2 providing services to Mr. Jackson. And the decision  
3 to have those investigations done was not my  
4 unilateral decision.

5 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: You said, "knowledge is  
6 power." Wasn't this an effort to obtain more power?

7 A. Absolutely, for Mr. Jackson to be empowered.

8 Q. Okay. Let's -- let me ask you a couple of  
9 questions, a couple of background questions. I  
10 don't think I finished inquiring about people you  
11 may have talked to last night.

12 Did you talk to Mr. Mesereau at all between  
13 the time that you took the stand today and the time  
14 that you left the stand yesterday?

15 A. I'm not sure if -- he might have come in the  
16 room and left, you know, 30 seconds. I'm -- I'm  
17 sorry, I was upstairs in the room for a little bit.  
18 I don't remember. I don't have -- I didn't have any  
19 substantive conversations if I did see him at that  
20 time.

21 Q. Have you met Mr. Mesereau before?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. On how many occasions?

24 A. Three, I think. Maybe four.

25 Q. Did you talk to him about your testimony in  
26 this case?

27 A. We did not discuss my testimony in this

28 case. 10171

1 Q. Did you talk to him about the facts of this  
2 case?

3 A. I met with Mr. Mesereau, Mr. Cochran, a  
4 number of lawyers when I was delivering files and  
5 reviewed with them some of the contents of the boxes  
6 of files.

7 Q. When did you deliver those files?

8 A. I'm sorry, I don't know.

9 Q. Can you tell me --

10 A. It was 2004.

11 Q. Okay. 2004. Can you tell me if it was in  
12 the beginning or towards the end of 2004?

13 A. It was by -- I know it was by mid-September,  
14 by Labor Day weekend, that I had delivered the bulk  
15 of the files. There's been some bits and pieces  
16 that have just -- you know, either were delivered to  
17 me or were found, you know, in another file, because  
18 I had people in Reno working that were delivered  
19 later. But I'm pretty sure 90 percent of it was  
20 delivered by Labor Day of 2004.

21 Q. Did you go through these files with Mr.  
22 Mesereau and Mr. Cochran in any fashion?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Was an investigator present?

25 A. I think so.

26 Q. Do you know Scott Ross?

27 A. Yes.

28 Q. Was he present? 10172



1 A. I don't think so. But I'm really not sure.

2 There was an investigator, but I thought it was  
3 somebody different. I don't know that I met Scott  
4 before arriving here.

5 Q. Mr. Mason, perhaps?

6 A. Mason. That name's familiar. I honestly  
7 didn't pay a lot of attention to the investigator.

8 Q. Okay. But there was an investigator there?

9 A. Yeah.

10 Q. And have you talked to any investigators  
11 between the time you left the stand and the time you  
12 took the stand this morning?

13 A. Yeah. Scott Ross took me back to my hotel  
14 last night, and then took me to drop me off at the  
15 mall so I could go get something to eat.

16 Q. And did you talk to Mr. Ross about anything  
17 to do with this case?

18 A. We really didn't discuss the case. We were  
19 quite conscious that we -- or I was conscious that I  
20 didn't feel that was really appropriate.

21 Q. Okay. So that's a "no," you did not talk to  
22 Scott Ross about anything about this case?

23 A. We didn't talk about this case.

24 Q. All right. How about Mr. Castillo, did you  
25 talk to him about this case at all?

26 A. Who?

27 Q. Jesus Castillo?

28 A. I don't know who that is. 10173

1 Q. Well, all right. Now, you mentioned  
2 yesterday that you were aware of the "Home Movies"  
3 production, the "Michael Jackson Home Movies"  
4 production. True?

5 A. Is that the program that involved Chris  
6 Tucker that was produced with FOX?

7 Q. I can't answer questions.

8 A. I'm sorry, I'm not sure what --

9 Q. Weren't there -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

10 A. I'm not sure what you mean by "Home Videos"  
11 productions.

12 Q. Well, weren't there documents in your files  
13 regarding the "Home Movies" production involving  
14 Michael Jackson?

15 A. I think so, yes. We had started -- we had  
16 started a negotiation with FOX for some additional  
17 production.

18 Q. And that production was also going to be run  
19 through Fire Mountain; that was the plan, correct?

20 A. Yes, I think so.

21 Q. And was Mr. Schaffel going to work on that  
22 one as well; do you know?

23 A. It was my goal to minimize the involvement  
24 of Mr. Schaffel as much as possible. And I do not  
25 know what I was -- I was terminated before that  
26 really got rolling. That's my recollection.

27 Q. Was your concern about Mr. Schaffel related

28 to his connections in the adult sex videos industry? 10174

1 A. That was certainly part of the concern, yes.

2 Q. Did you ever express a concern to Mr.

3 Jackson about Mr. Schaffel being associated with the  
4 rebuttal video or the "Take 2" video because of his  
5 background?

6 A. I'm not sure that I had a direct  
7 conversation with Mr. Jackson about that or not. I  
8 don't know.

9 Q. And he was also one of the people that you  
10 had investigated, true?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Now, as far as money goes, profiting  
13 involving Mr. Jackson, isn't it fair to say that  
14 that was one of your goals here too, to make money  
15 by being associated with Mr. Jackson?

16 A. My goal was to get paid for providing legal  
17 services.

18 Q. Weren't you very excited about becoming  
19 Michael Jackson's attorney?

20 A. It was exciting.

21 Q. You perceived it to be a means to make a  
22 great deal of money, didn't you, Mr. LeGrand?

23 A. Actually, I really didn't know what it was  
24 going to involve.

25 Q. But you had hopes that it would result in  
26 something very good for David LeGrand, true?

27 A. I saw it as an opportunity to work in a

28 unique and different environment that was 10175

1 interesting, that had great potential. It was -- it  
2 was exciting.

3 Q. Potential for wealth, true?

4 A. I don't know about wealth. But certainly  
5 gain.

6 Q. You won't admit that it's -- that there was  
7 financial gain, that was one of your motives in  
8 becoming Michael Jackson's attorney? You disagree  
9 with that?

10 A. All I wanted was to be paid for my hourly  
11 work.

12 Q. And you wanted to do a lot of hourly work  
13 for Michael Jackson, didn't you?

14 A. As it turned out, I didn't have much choice.  
15 At least for a while.

16 Q. Would you answer my last question?

17 A. The hours ended up being considerable.

18 Q. And you wanted to do a lot of hourly  
19 business with Michael Jackson, true? Can you answer  
20 that "yes" or "no" for me, sir?

21 A. It's very hard to answer "yes" or "no,"  
22 because it really wasn't formulated in my mind that  
23 way.

24 Q. Mr. LeGrand, didn't you communicate to Mr.  
25 Konitzer that you were worried about getting paid  
26 for your services and being first in line for money?

27 A. I was concerned about that, yes.

28 Q. And as early as February 11th, you had 10176



1 expressed that concern to Mr. Konitzer that you  
2 wanted to be paid?

3 A. Yes. And when we say "I," my firm.

4 Q. Your firm.

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. That's fair. And Mr. Konitzer asked you to  
7 calm down about that, didn't he?

8 A. Yes, he did.

9 Q. And he said, "Don't worry, you'll be first  
10 in line," true?

11 A. Yes, he did.

12 Q. And he did that through e-mail, correct?

13 A. He also said it to me.

14 Q. And you did a considerable amount of  
15 communication with Mr. Konitzer through e-mail,  
16 e-mails, true?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And if your file is complete, then all of  
19 those e-mails should be in it, shouldn't they?

20 A. If you mean that a file comprising the  
21 totality of my work involving Mr. Jackson would  
22 include the e-mails to Ronald Konitzer, the answer  
23 is yes.

24 Q. And my last question was, if your file that  
25 you turned over did not include e-mails such as  
26 that, it would not be complete, true?

27 A. I -- I think that follows logically.

28 Q. All right. Did you remove any e-mails from 10177

1 your file prior to turning it over to Mr. Mesereau  
2 and Mr. Cochran?

3 A. I don't remember removing any e-mails. I  
4 don't remember removing any documents from the  
5 files.

6 Q. You can conceive of it, though?

7 A. No, I really didn't even personally prepare  
8 the files. Staff did. I -- I really wasn't  
9 directly involved in the file production process.

10 Q. Is (702) 222-2520 the direct line to your  
11 office at Hale Lane?

12 A. Yes, it was.

13 Q. Did you have a cell phone at that time?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And what was that number?

16 A. (702) 218-6736.

17 Q. At some point in time, Mr. Geragos came into  
18 the picture. Do you remember when that was?

19 A. First week of February 2003.

20 Q. Is that when you first met Mark Geragos?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And Mr. Geragos is a criminal attorney?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And who introduced you to Mr. Geragos?

25 A. I believe it was Ronald Konitzer who  
26 selected Mr. Geragos to be interviewed.

27 Q. Was there an interviewing process going on

28 to find a criminal attorney at that time? 10178

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And can you explain why -- well, let me back  
3 up.

4 Was it perceived that some criminal conduct  
5 might be alleged against Michael Jackson at that  
6 time, and therefore a criminal attorney should be  
7 retained?

8 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;  
9 relevance.

10 THE COURT: Overruled.

11 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, what was the  
12 question?

13 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'll ask to have it read  
14 back.

15 THE COURT: I'll have the court reporter  
16 read it.

17 (Record read.)

18 THE WITNESS: The press outcry was such  
19 that -- and the calls for investigation, calls for  
20 removal of his children were such that I and the  
21 other lawyers agreed it was appropriate to have a  
22 criminal attorney in California to address any  
23 possibilities of that kind.

24 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Okay. So the answer to  
25 that question would be "yes"?

26 A. I think I've answered it.

27 Q. My question is, so the answer to that

28 question would be "yes"? 10179

1 A. Yes, we were concerned about possible  
2 criminal investigation resulting from the video, the  
3 Bashir video. There were people, you know, calling  
4 for investigation.

5 Q. Who -- well, let me phrase that differently.

6 Who was in charge in terms of the legal  
7 advice provided to Mr. Jackson at that time? We're  
8 talking about the beginning of February. You?  
9 Mr. Geragos? Who was running the show there?

10 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; foundation.

11 THE COURT: Sustained.

12 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Okay.

13 Q. What exactly was Mr. Geragos -- do you know  
14 what Mr. Geragos was tasked with at the time he was  
15 retained, what he was asked to do?

16 A. I know that we asked him to attempt to  
17 ascertain if any criminal investigation had been  
18 commenced, and if there was any child custody  
19 removal efforts being commenced.

20 Q. That would be a family law matter, wouldn't  
21 it?

22 A. I guess it's more family than criminal, yes.

23 Q. Do you know who Brad Miller is?

24 A. I believe he's an investigator that works or  
25 worked -- was engaged by Mr. Geragos's firm.

26 Q. Did you ever meet Brad Miller?

27 A. You know, I don't know. I might have.

28 Q. Where might you have met Brad Miller? 10180



1 A. Mr. Geragos's office.

2 Q. Did you meet with Mr. Geragos in his office?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. More than once?

5 A. I think so, yes.

6 Q. How many times did you meet with Mr.

7 Geragos, either in his office or elsewhere?

8 A. Maybe four or five times.

9 Q. Four or five times?

10 A. I think so.

11 Q. Did you ever communicate with Mr. Geragos by

12 e-mail?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Do you know where those e-mails are?

15 A. Not specifically, no.

16 Q. Did you give those e-mails to Mr. Mesereau

17 and Mr. Cochran?

18 A. I think so.

19 Q. Did you ever talk to Brad Miller on the

20 phone?

21 A. I don't know. It's possible.

22 Q. Do you know what Brad Miller was retained by

23 Mr. Geragos to do?

24 A. Not really. I know that it had to do with

25 the Arvizos, but I really don't know in detail what

26 Brad Miller was asked to do.

27 Q. Do you know who Asaf Vilchic is?

28 A. Who? 10181

1 Q. Asaf Vilchic?

2 A. I don't think I've heard that name before.

3 Q. I'm going to have trouble with this next  
4 one. Can you tell me if you've heard of the name  
5 Johnny Majetich, something of that nature?

6 A. That name does not ring any bells, sir.

7 Q. Have you ever heard of a private  
8 investigator referred to as "Johnny in the Sky"?

9 A. No, sir. I don't think so. It's the sort  
10 of thing one might remember, but I don't have a  
11 recollection of that one.

12 Q. Okay. Now, I want to come back to this  
13 rebuttal film or the "Take 2" video.  
14 You participated in getting or I should say  
15 preparing releases for the entire Arvizo family,  
16 correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And who asked you to do that? Maybe I'm  
19 making an assumption there. Did you do that on your  
20 own or did somebody else ask you to do it?

21 A. I don't really know. I know it needed to be  
22 done, but I'm not sure whether it was, you know,  
23 Lachman Productions, Marc Schaffel, or who it was.  
24 The consents and releases started with Debbie Rowe,  
25 and then we just started thinking, "Oh, well, we  
26 need releases for everybody that might be in this  
27 video." I prepared a release for Hamid as well.

28 Q. All right. The one for Hamid, was that 10182

1 under a Brad Lachman letterhead; do you know?

2 A. I don't know.

3 Q. Okay. But you knew that the plan was to  
4 have the Arvizo family filmed for the "Take 2"  
5 video, correct?

6 A. I knew there was a desire to have some  
7 footage of the Arvizo family for possible inclusion  
8 in the "Take 2" video, yes.

9 Q. And that was the reason why these consent  
10 forms were prepared?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And you sent those consent forms to Ann  
13 Gabriel, true?

14 A. I don't know. I might have.

15 Q. Did you send a consent form to Ann Gabriel  
16 and ask her to put "Gabriel Media" on the top of it?

17 A. I don't -- I don't remember. It's possible,  
18 but I don't remember that.

19 Q. If it's possible, can you tell me why that  
20 would have happened?

21 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; unintelligible.

22 THE COURT: Sustained.

23 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Well, you admit it's  
24 possible.

25 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; calls for  
26 speculation.

27 THE COURT: Overruled.

28 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Yes? 10183

1 A. I really can't say. I don't know.

2 Q. Okay. Can you tell me if you can envision a  
3 reason why you would send a consent form to Ann  
4 Gabriel and ask her to put "Gabriel Media" on the  
5 top of it?

6 A. I really don't know today. We were moving  
7 quick on a lot of things, and it, you know, if it  
8 happened, may have seemed like a good idea at the  
9 time, but I really don't know why in retrospect. It  
10 could have been that I was trying to give Ann, you  
11 know, a bit of a role. It --

12 Q. Did you send consent forms to Neverland  
13 Valley Ranch by way of fax for the Arvizo family?

14 A. I think so, yes.

15 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: If I may approach, Your  
16 Honor.

17 Q. Mr. LeGrand, I show you People's Exhibit No.  
18 263. It appears to be one, two, three -- five, six,  
19 seven, eight -- nine separate pages. Would you look  
20 at that for me, please, and identify it if you can.

21 A. This appears to be a fax from Hale Lane to  
22 Joe Marcus at Neverland Valley Ranch containing  
23 appearance consents and releases for various members  
24 of the Arvizo family.

25 Q. Did you prepare those consent and release  
26 forms?

27 A. I think my associate, Ann-Marie Levy, did.

28 Q. At your direction? 10184



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Is that the consent and release form that  
3 you wrote or prepared?

4 A. Well, I directed the preparation. It  
5 appears -- the language looks familiar.

6 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Your Honor, at this time  
7 I'd move into evidence People's Exhibit 263. I'll  
8 show it to counsel.

9 MR. MESEREAU: No objection.

10 THE COURT: It's admitted.

11 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Mr. LeGrand, at the top  
12 of those consent and release forms is the logo for  
13 MJJ Productions, correct?

14 A. On some of them, yes.

15 Q. Did you place that logo there? Did you  
16 direct, I should say, the placement of that logo at  
17 the top of those appearance consent and release  
18 forms?

19 A. I don't believe I did. I have no  
20 recollection of so instructing.

21 Q. And then at the back, a couple of pages,  
22 that logo appears to have been removed. Did you  
23 direct that appearance consent and release forms for  
24 the Arvizos be provided without the MJJ Productions  
25 logo?

26 A. I don't recall instructing that they be  
27 presented in one form or the other.

28 Q. If your file was complete, Mr. LeGrand, then 10185

1 it should have had that fax and those releases in  
2 it, true?

3 A. If the files of my firm were complete, it  
4 should be in there.

5 Q. And if it wasn't in your file, can you  
6 explain that?

7 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation; calls  
8 for speculation.

9 THE COURT: Overruled.

10 You may answer.

11 THE WITNESS: No, I can't explain it. That  
12 portion of the file was kept by Ann-Marie Levy. She  
13 was subsequently -- her services at my firm were  
14 later terminated.

15 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Is there any reason why  
16 Ann-Marie Levy would go through the files and remove  
17 those documents, as far as you know?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Did you also send the same consent forms to  
20 Hamid Moslehi?

21 A. I don't know. I'm pretty sure that my firm  
22 sent appearance and consent forms to Hamid Moslehi,  
23 but I don't know exactly when or if they were  
24 absolutely identical. But -- because I'm not sure  
25 we knew where the Arvizos were in order to get the  
26 documents executed, and since Hamid was supposed to  
27 do the videography, it would not surprise me that we

28 sent them to Hamid. 10186

1 Q. Well, that's a good point. They were  
2 different, weren't they? They weren't the same as  
3 the ones you sent to Neverland, correct?

4 A. I don't know.

5 Q. But you agree that your associate sent those  
6 to Hamid at your direction?

7 A. I don't recall making that instruction  
8 today.

9 Q. Would you agree that your associate would  
10 not send those to Hamid on her own without some  
11 direction from you?

12 A. I -- it's certainly possible that she would  
13 have. I mean, she can have been instructed by Mr.  
14 Konitzer directly to do so. It's possible she would  
15 have sent them or that she would have interpreted my  
16 instruction to prepare and get the consents out as,  
17 you know, a broad mandate.

18 THE COURT: Let's take a break.

19 (Recess taken.)

20 --o0o--

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 10187

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3

4 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE )

5 OF CALIFORNIA, )

6 Plaintiff, )

7 -vs- ) No. 1133603

8 MICHAEL JOE JACKSON, )

9 Defendant. )

10

11

12 I, MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR,

13 CSR #3304, Official Court Reporter, do hereby

14 certify:

15 That the foregoing pages 10149 through 10187

16 contain a true and correct transcript of the

17 proceedings had in the within and above-entitled

18 matter as by me taken down in shorthand writing at

19 said proceedings on May 13, 2005, and thereafter

20 reduced to typewriting by computer-aided

21 transcription under my direction.

22 DATED: Santa Maria, California,

23 May 13, 2005.

24

25

26

27 MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304

28 10188



1 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
2 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA  
3 SANTA MARIA BRANCH; COOK STREET DIVISION  
4 DEPARTMENT SM-2 HON. RODNEY S. MELVILLE, JUDGE

5

6

7 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF )

8 CALIFORNIA, )

9 Plaintiff, )

10 -vs- ) No. 1133603

11 MICHAEL JOE JACKSON, )

12 Defendant. )

13

14

15

16

17 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

18

19 FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2005

20

21 8:30 A.M.

22

23 (PAGES 10189 THROUGH 10362)

24

25

26

27 REPORTED MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304

28 BY: Official Court Reporter 10189

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

2

3 For Plaintiff: THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR.,

4 District Attorney -and-

5 RONALD J. ZONEN, Sr. Deputy District Attorney

6 -and- GORDON AUCHINCLOSS,

7 Sr. Deputy District Attorney 1112 Santa Barbara Street

8 Santa Barbara, California 93101

9

10

11 For Defendant: COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU BY: THOMAS A.  
MESEREAU, JR., ESQ.

12 -and- SUSAN C. YU, ESQ.

13 1875 Century Park East, Suite 700 Los Angeles, California 90067

14 -and-

15 SANGER & SWYSEN

16 BY: ROBERT M. SANGER, ESQ. 233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C

17 Santa Barbara, California 93101

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 10190

1 I N D E X

2

3 Note: Mr. Sneddon is listed as "SN" on index.

4 Mr. Zonen is listed as "Z" on index. Mr. Auchincloss is listed as "A"  
on index.

5 Mr. Mesereau is listed as "M" on index. Ms. Yu is listed as "Y" on  
index.

6 Mr. Sanger is listed as "SA" on index.

7

8

9 DEFENDANT'S

10 WITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS

11 LEGRAND, David G. 10207-M 10232-A

12

13 10240-M 10241-A (Further) (Further)

14

15 10242-M (Further)

16

17 GERAGOS, Mark 10248-M 10288-Z

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 10191

1 E X H I B I T S

2 FOR IN PLAINTIFF'S NO. DESCRIPTION I.D. EVID.

3

4 899 Letter from David LeGrand to Barry Siegel 10193 10194

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Thank you, Your Honor.

28 Q. I'd like to show you a few documents. We're 10192



1 in the home stretch here, so I'll be finished in a  
2 short period.

3 If I may approach, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: You may.

5 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right. First of  
6 all, Mr. LeGrand, I show you People's Exhibit No.  
7 899. Can you identify that for me, please?

8 A. Yes. This is a letter I prepared for Mr.  
9 Jackson's signature directed to Barry Siegel.

10 Q. Okay. And that was a letter turning over  
11 the financial reins to you for Mr. Jackson's  
12 concerns involving Provident Financial Management;  
13 is that correct?

14 A. I believe the document speaks for itself.  
15 It states in one relevant paragraph that, "Mr.  
16 LeGrand is engaging a new management company to  
17 serve my interests, and you are specifically  
18 authorized and instructed to transfer any available  
19 funds you are holding on my behalf or for any of my  
20 businesses to such management company or Mr.  
21 LeGrand's trust account pursuant to Mr. LeGrand and  
22 Miss Brandt's instructions."

23 Q. Okay. Is that Michael Jackson's signature  
24 at the bottom of that document?

25 A. Yes, it is.

26 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Move to admit People's  
27 Exhibit No. 899 into evidence.

28 MR. MESEREAU: No objection. 10193

1 THE COURT: It's admitted.

2 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right. Showing you  
3 the People's Exhibit -- the 400 series. Didn't mean  
4 to scare you.

5 Okay. Beginning with Exhibit No. 406, it  
6 appears to be a Hale Lane fax transmittal sheet on  
7 the front page. Can you identify that document for  
8 me, please?

9 A. This appears to be the transmittal between  
10 myself and Marisa Fermin of the final agreement for  
11 the "Take 2."

12 Q. And that agreement calls for Fire Mountain  
13 to receive three million dollars on behalf of Mr.  
14 Jackson; is that correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And did you send that document to Miss  
17 Fermin at FOX?

18 A. Yes.

19 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right. Move to admit  
20 People's Exhibit 406 into evidence at this time.

21 MR. MESEREAU: No objection.

22 THE COURT: It's admitted.

23 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Showing you People's  
24 Exhibit 412, can you identify that for me, please?

25 A. This appears to be a transmittal from Hale  
26 Lane to Hamid Moslehi containing some appearance  
27 consents and a -- yeah. Containing appearance

28 consents and an additional consent for MJJ 10194

1 Productions for the Michael Jackson special.

2 Q. Did you send that fax transmittal with  
3 accompanying documents to Hamid at (818) 224-4664  
4 on -- I'm sorry -- February 10th, 2003?

5 A. Based on these documents, yes.

6 Q. And the first document that appears in that  
7 group after the fax sheet is entitled "Gabriel  
8 Media, Incorporated. Appearance Consent and  
9 Release." Did you send that document to Hamid  
10 Moslehi?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Can you explain to me why the document is  
13 entitled "Gabriel Media, Incorporated"?

14 A. Not today, no. I don't remember.

15 And the second document has that whited out,  
16 and it has a --

17 Q. There's no question pending.

18 A. Oh. Sorry.

19 Q. I'm just asking about the first document.

20 A. No. I don't know why.

21 Q. But you admit that you did send that to  
22 Mr. Moslehi?

23 A. Yes, I did.

24 Q. And Gabriel Media had nothing to do with  
25 this production, did they?

26 A. I'm not sure I can say "nothing" to do with  
27 this production. At the time, I believe Miss

28 Gabriel was still a consultant on PR-related 10195

1 matters.

2 Q. But can you -- go ahead.

3 A. I really don't remember today why this

4 document had her company's title on it.

5 Q. There's no reason for that, is there?

6 A. I -- I don't know of the reason for it. I

7 don't remember. I'm sure there was at the time, but

8 I don't remember it today.

9 Q. Was the reason "Gabriel Media, Incorporated"

10 appears on that appearance consent and release form

11 intended to distance you and Michael Jackson from

12 these consent and release forms?

13 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Argumentative; no

14 foundation.

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 You may answer.

17 THE WITNESS: I don't remember what the

18 intent was.

19 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right. Let's move on.

20 THE COURT: I want to ask a question.

21 The Exhibit 406, previously I admitted a

22 portion and not admitted a portion, and then he

23 offered it a minute ago and there was no objection.

24 But I just wanted to bring your attention to my

25 previous ruling.

26 MR. SANGER: Can we have just a moment?

27 THE COURT: Yes.

28 (Off-the-record discussion held at counsel 10196



1 table.)

2 MR. MESEREAU: Your Honor, I thought they  
3 were complete documents, the ones I saw. Could we  
4 hold off a ruling and discuss them?

5 THE COURT: All right.

6 MR. MESEREAU: Thank you.

7 THE COURT: All right. I'll hold off on  
8 that.

9 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Showing you page seven  
10 of Exhibit No. 413, it also appears to be a Hale  
11 Lane facsimile transmittal sheet. Can you identify  
12 that for me, please?

13 MR. SANGER: Your Honor, I'm sorry, could we  
14 just have that back? Page seven of what exhibit?

15 THE COURT: 4-1-3.

16 MR. SANGER: Thank you.

17 THE WITNESS: This is a fax from Hale Lane  
18 to Vincent at MJJ Productions of some model releases  
19 for the Arvizos; for Gavin, Star, and Janet.

20 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Did you send a fax  
21 transmittal to -- and we should say, for the record,  
22 that you're looking through -- you've removed the  
23 document from its sleeve and there appears to be  
24 several appearance and consent release forms that  
25 are paper-clipped together.

26 A. I'm sorry, these are different documents  
27 with different dates. The paper-clipped transmittal

28 of February 17th appears to be substantially the 10197

1 same as the fax transmittal that we identified  
2 earlier to Neverland.

3 Q. Okay.

4 A. Whereas these documents that are attached --  
5 that are in this folder that I just referenced are  
6 dated February 21. And I don't know when they were  
7 sent or how.

8 Q. Okay. Let's talk about that. And why don't  
9 we keep this out for a moment.

10 A. Oh. Sure.

11 Q. The first document is dated February 17th,  
12 2003, correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And it indicates a number of pages with  
15 cover of nine; is that true?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. But there's only one, two, three, four,  
18 five -- six pages paper-clipped together with this.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. All right. Now, did you direct that this  
21 document, either with or without nine pages, was to  
22 be sent to Vincent at MJJ Productions at (818)  
23 224-4664 on February 17th, 2003?

24 A. Yes, I did so direct.

25 Q. Who is Vincent?

26 A. I think his name is Vincent Amen.

27 Q. Have you ever talked to him?

28 A. I think so, but I don't have a specific 10198

1 recollection of talking to him.

2 Q. Have you ever met Mr. Amen?

3 A. I don't recall.

4 Q. And was your intent to send those forms to  
5 Mr. Amen at that number so that he could get the  
6 Arvizos to sign consent and release forms for the  
7 "Take 2" video?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Now, moving on to the next form, page, I  
10 guess what we would consider page eight of that same  
11 exhibit number, 403. Let me double-check that.  
12 413, I'm sorry.

13 Calling your attention to page eight, is the  
14 language of that model release language that you  
15 cleared for use in that consent form?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Did you have a discussion with Vincent Amen  
18 at 12 -- looks like 12:57 a.m. in the early morning  
19 hours of February 21, '03?

20 A. I think so. I just don't remember if it was  
21 Vincent Amen. But I had -- I think I mentioned in  
22 my testimony yesterday that I had one evening a --  
23 late in the evening I had a conversation about the  
24 Arvizo releases.

25 Q. Okay. I'll come back to that in a moment.  
26 I'm showing you People's Exhibit 807. Have  
27 you ever seen that exhibit before?

28 A. Yes. 10199

1 Q. What is it, please?

2 A. This is a document authorizing Theodore  
3 Goddard to file, it says, "...this complaint on  
4 behalf of my son Gavin Arvizo."

5 Q. Was that a document that you had in your  
6 file at Hale Lane for Michael Jackson?

7 A. I don't know.

8 Q. Where have you seen that document before?

9 A. It was filed with the -- well, I don't know.

10 I'm sorry, let me back up.

11 It was submitted to the law firm in the UK  
12 of Theodore Goddard as support for their  
13 authorization to file the complaint I referenced  
14 with the British Broadcasting Standards Board.

15 Q. Based on your training and experience, does  
16 that document look like it was prepared by an  
17 attorney?

18 A. Well, it looks like it was prepared by  
19 somebody who had legal knowledge.

20 Q. Is that the type of document you would  
21 prepare for a release of that nature?

22 A. I don't know if I prepared this or not. I  
23 remember discussing this matter, and I remember  
24 talking to, I believe it's Ronald Konitzer, who was  
25 in Florida at the time, regarding the need to have  
26 the authorization for the Broadcasting Standards  
27 Board complaint.

28 Q. Are you aware that Janet Arvizo's attorney 10200



1 complained that that document was forged around her  
2 signature?

3 A. Yes, I am aware that Mr. Dickerman made that  
4 statement.

5 Q. And were you present when this document was  
6 signed?

7 A. I don't believe so, no.

8 Q. And where did you get this document from, or  
9 a copy of it from?

10 A. I'm not sure. I believe Mr. Konitzer  
11 delivered this document to me. But I -- but I'm not  
12 sure.

13 Q. I'm showing you People's Exhibit 811. It  
14 appears to be four pages, if you'd leaf through it.  
15 Have you ever seen Exhibit 811 before?

16 A. Well, Exhibit 811 is a signed version of  
17 these other documents that are -- have the February  
18 21, '03, date on them that were faxed under the --  
19 well, I'm not sure they were faxed or not under  
20 that. But anyway, yes, I've seen these before, but  
21 I don't remember particularly seeing the signed  
22 ones.

23 Q. Okay. Did you have copies of these signed  
24 model releases in your file for Michael Jackson?

25 A. I don't know if I did or didn't. I  
26 really -- Ann-Marie was responsible for the release  
27 forms.

28 Q. All right. Going back to the consent forms 10201

1 that were signed ultimately by the Arvizos, the  
2 first consent forms were sent by you to Neverland  
3 Valley Ranch to have the Arvizos sign them, correct?

4 That was the first time that you attempted  
5 to get consent forms signed by the Arvizos, true?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And they didn't sign them, did they?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Were you informed of why the Arvizos did not  
10 sign those consent forms to be sent to Neverland  
11 Valley Ranch?

12 A. The conversation I had, which -- based on  
13 what you've presented, I believe --

14 Q. I'm sorry. That's a "yes" or "no" question  
15 first.

16 A. I'm sorry, what was the question?

17 Q. I just want to know if you were informed of  
18 why those consent forms were not signed.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Who did you receive that information from?

21 A. Based on what you've just reviewed with me,  
22 I think it was Vincent Amen.

23 Q. All right. And what did Vincent Amen tell  
24 you about that?

25 Well, let me back up. Did Vincent Amen tell  
26 you that the Arvizos did not want to sign those  
27 forms?

28 A. Yes. 10202

1 Q. The next forms you sent were to Hamid  
2 Moslehi, identical forms, except for some minor  
3 changes. I think the "MJJ Productions" is removed.  
4 Is that fair to say?

5 A. The body of the consents are the same. I'm  
6 not sure -- we've looked at a number of these now.  
7 I'm not sure -- did we send -- I'm not sure whether  
8 the ones that went to Hamid were particularly for  
9 the Arvizos or whether they were general forms.

10 Q. Would you like to see them again?

11 A. Yeah, if I could. I'm getting a little  
12 confused.

13 Q. Again, I'm just showing you People's Exhibit  
14 412.

15 A. Yeah, these do not have the names of  
16 individual people typed in to the body of the  
17 document, so they are similar in form and substance,  
18 but they are different.

19 Q. Okay. And was it your intent to have Hamid  
20 obtain signatures from the Arvizo family on those  
21 forms?

22 A. I don't recall that I had any specific  
23 intent with respect to the Arvizos in transmitting  
24 those to Hamid. It was certainly my intent to have  
25 Hamid further assure that we had consents from  
26 anybody appearing in the video.

27 Q. All right. And then is the exhibit that I

28 showed you marked as -- let me check one more thing. 10203

1 I'm sorry.

2 A. I'm sorry, I have not been well.

3 Q. This is the exhibit that was removed from

4 the sleeve. I'll put it back in. That will

5 necessitate me finding the missing sleeve.

6 Okay. Here it is. Well, I'll ask my friend

7 Mr. Zonen to find the sleeve for that.

8 Q. The exhibit that was to Vincent at MJJ

9 Productions dated February 17th, 2003, that one was

10 specifically sent to have the Arvizos sign, correct?

11 A. Yes. The body of the document included

12 names of the individual members of the Arvizo

13 family.

14 Q. And the Arvizos did not sign those forms

15 either, did they?

16 A. No.

17 Q. And in the early morning hours, you received

18 a phone call several days later that the Arvizos

19 were still refusing to sign these consent forms, did

20 you not?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. From whom?

23 A. Again, based on what you've presented, I

24 believe it was Vincent Amen.

25 Q. And you revised the release form to the

26 state that we find in People's Exhibit 811, which

27 has signatures on it; is that correct?

28 A. Yes. 10204



1 Q. Mr. LeGrand, did you conceal any documents  
2 from your files on Michael Jackson?

3 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;  
4 relevance.

5 THE COURT: Overruled.

6 You may answer.

7 THE WITNESS: I don't think so.

8 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Can you tell me where  
9 the e-mails are for that file?

10 A. As far as I know, they're in the Hale Lane  
11 computer system. And to the best of my  
12 recollection, there was a CD-rom prepared and  
13 delivered to the Katten Muchin law firm.

14 Q. Can you tell me where your personal notes  
15 are regarding your communications with Michael  
16 Jackson regarding that period of time of  
17 representation for Mr. Jackson that should be in  
18 that file?

19 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Argumentative;  
20 misstates the evidence.

21 THE COURT: Sustained.

22 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Can you tell me where  
23 your personal notes of Michael Jackson -- involving  
24 communications with Michael Jackson during this  
25 period of time, early part of 2003, can you tell me  
26 where those are?

27 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;

28 misstates the evidence. 10205

1 THE COURT: Overruled.

2 You may answer.

3 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure today.

4 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: You stated that you  
5 thought the Martin Bashir film was a hatchet job.

6 Did you ever say in an e-mail that, "Ronald  
7 had nothing to do with this. The man did the  
8 interview himself. Not good"? Did you ever say  
9 that?

10 A. I don't remember that. It's certainly  
11 possible.

12 Q. If I show you a copy of that e-mail, would  
13 that refresh your recollection?

14 A. It might.

15 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: May I approach?

16 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I did say that.

17 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Mr. LeGrand, concerning  
18 your files in this case, did you ever indicate that  
19 you would, "Walk away as soon as I plug a few  
20 document holes"?

21 A. I may have. There were some corporate  
22 paperwork pieces that needed to get finished that I  
23 had -- you know, that I had the knowledge of that we  
24 just hadn't had time to finish everything that  
25 needed -- that should have been done, in my opinion,  
26 so I wanted to complete some of that paperwork.

27 Q. Did you ever say, "I am cleaning up

28 documents over the next few days which should help 10206

1 build a strong position for defending our actions if  
2 they ever need to be defended”?

3 A. Could be. Again, there were resolutions,  
4 there was some corporate paperwork that was no way a  
5 fabrication that would reflect the events as they  
6 occurred that, you know, should have been done.

7 Q. Did “cleaning up the documents” in this case  
8 include destruction of documents, Mr. LeGrand?

9 A. No.

10 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I have no further  
11 questions.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Mesereau?

13

14 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. MESEREAU:

16 Q. Mr. LeGrand, do you have the exhibit book in  
17 front of you that you had yesterday?

18 A. No, sir.

19 MR. MESEREAU: May I approach, Your Honor,  
20 and --

21 THE COURT: Yes.

22 MR. MESEREAU: Oh. Thank you.

23 Q. Mr. LeGrand, isn't it true the District  
24 Attorney's Office never subpoenaed documents from  
25 you?

26 A. That's correct.

27 Q. Isn't it true that Prosecutor Auchincloss

28 never once called you and asked you to give him any 10207

1 documents in your files?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. Isn't it true that Prosecutor Sneddon never  
4 called you at any time and said, "Could we please  
5 have your files?"

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. Isn't it true Prosecutor Zonen never called  
8 you at any time and said, "Mr. LeGrand, could we  
9 just take a look at your files?"

10 A. That's correct.

11 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; leading.

12 THE COURT: Overruled.

13 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Isn't it true that no  
14 representative of the Santa Barbara sheriffs ever  
15 called your office and said, "Mr. LeGrand, please  
16 give us your e-mails"?

17 A. That is correct.

18 Q. Nobody associated with the prosecution has  
19 ever called you or your firm and said, "Please let  
20 us see your files," right?

21 A. That's true.

22 Q. Now, Mr. LeGrand, the prosecutor asked you  
23 some questions about you and your partners' efforts  
24 to investigate people who were around Michael  
25 Jackson, right?

26 A. Yes.

27 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; leading.

28 THE COURT: Overruled. 10208



1 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And he specifically asked  
2 you questions about an attorney named John Branca,  
3 right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. At the time you began an investigation into  
6 some of the people around Mr. Jackson that you were  
7 concerned about, one of the people you investigated  
8 was Mr. Branca, correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; leading.

11 THE COURT: Overruled.

12 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And to your knowledge at  
13 the time, Mr. Branca had been an attorney in Los  
14 Angeles doing music work for Mr. Jackson, right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. You yourself, as you've indicated yesterday,  
17 were not a specialist in music law, right?

18 A. That's right.

19 Q. Mr. Branca purportedly was, right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Now, you answered some questions yesterday  
22 about the Sony/ATV catalog. Remember that?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And the Sony/ATV catalog was owned 50/50 by  
25 Sony and Michael Jackson, correct?

26 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; leading.

27 THE COURT: Overruled.

28 THE WITNESS: Yes. 10209

1 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And at times Mr. Jackson  
2 and Sony would have business discussions about their  
3 respective ownership interests in the catalog,  
4 right?

5 A. I was never privy to those discussions. It  
6 would certainly seem that they would occur, but I  
7 don't have actual knowledge of that.

8 Q. But you were aware that negotiations went on  
9 from time to time between representatives of Michael  
10 Jackson and representatives of Sony about their  
11 respective interests in that music catalog, right?

12 A. Well, absolutely, yes, because I obtained  
13 files from the Ziffren law firm evidencing the  
14 Ziffren law firm and Mr. Branca's representing Mr.  
15 Jackson in just such discussions over a period of  
16 time.

17 Q. And just to clarify, Mr. Branca was a  
18 partner at the Ziffren law firm in Los Angeles,  
19 correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. That firm also represented Sony, correct?

22 A. I believe the answer is correct. Yes.

23 Q. And you were concerned that Mr. Branca and  
24 that law firm might not be representing Mr.  
25 Jackson's interests properly because of their  
26 connection to Sony, correct?

27 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; leading.

28 THE COURT: Sustained. 10210

1 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Didn't you investigate Mr.

2 Branca because you were concerned that he and Sony

3 had set up an offshore account to funnel money to so

4 they could defraud Michael Jackson?

5 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Same objection.

6 THE COURT: Sustained.

7 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Why did you investigate

8 Mr. Branca?

9 A. I requested -- well, let me back up.

10 After consultation with my partner, Mr.

11 Gibson, and discussion with I believe Mr. Joss at

12 Paul Hastings, Mr. Gibson and I instructed the firm

13 Interfor to investigate Mr. Branca, because Mr.

14 Konitzer had indicated in several conversations that

15 he was very concerned about Mr. Branca and that Mr.

16 Jackson had expressed concern about Mr. Branca's

17 loyalty.

18 Also, there was -- Mr. Schaffel related

19 information that also was negative of Mr. Branca.

20 So we made collectively the decision to ask Interfor

21 to further the background investigation, to conduct

22 investigation into Mr. Branca.

23 Q. But at the time, Konitzer didn't know that

24 you were also investigating him, right?

25 A. That's correct.

26 Q. At the time, Schaffel didn't know you were

27 also investigating Schaffel, right?

28 A. That's correct. 10211

1 Q. At the time, Weizner didn't know you were  
2 also investigating Weizner, right?

3 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Leading;  
4 foundation.

5 THE COURT: Overruled.

6 THE WITNESS: That's correct. We did not  
7 inform them of the scope of -- the full scope of  
8 Interfor's actions at our request.

9 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And you also investigated  
10 somebody named Tommy Motolla, correct?

11 A. I'm not sure that's correct.

12 Q. Do you recall asking Interfor to do some  
13 investigation into an offshore bank account?

14 A. It's kind of the other way around. We asked  
15 Interfor to investigate Mr. Branca. They indicated  
16 to us that --

17 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'm going to object based  
18 on hearsay.

19 MR. MESEREAU: State of mind, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Sustained.

21 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: What was your state of  
22 mind when you investigated the possibility that an  
23 offshore account had been formed by various people  
24 to defraud Michael Jackson?

25 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'm going to object as  
26 leading.

27 THE COURT: Sustained.

28 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: What was your state of 10212



1 mind when you investigated the formation of an  
2 offshore bank account?

3 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; assumes facts.

4 THE COURT: Sustained.

5 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you investigate the  
6 existence of an offshore bank account?

7 A. We requested Interfor to look into that  
8 possibility, yes.

9 Q. Why?

10 A. Because there was a --

11 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'll object based on  
12 hearsay.

13 MR. MESEREAU: State of mind.

14 THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

15 You may complete your answer.

16 THE WITNESS: Because we had -- we, the  
17 lawyers, had been given information from a source  
18 that appeared to have some credibility that such an  
19 account existed.

20 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And why did you want to  
21 investigate that account?

22 A. Be -- well, to me, that's kind of obvious.

23 But if, in fact, there was an offshore account in  
24 which money was being deposited for the benefit of  
25 Mr. Branca or others, that would indicate very  
26 serious violations of Mr. Branca's responsibilities  
27 to Mr. Jackson.

28 Q. Did you think at one point that Sony was 10213

1 paying Mr. Branca money to sell out Mr. Jackson?

2 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Improper

3 opinion; leading.

4 THE COURT: Sustained.

5 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did your investigation

6 involve anyone you thought was involved in

7 transferring money to that bank account?

8 A. The best way I can answer that is to say we

9 asked the investigators to do as complete a job as

10 they could with the financial resources we had

11 available for them. And I didn't delineate who they

12 should or shouldn't look into with respect to such

13 an account.

14 Q. But at your direction, they looked into the

15 existence of that account, correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And it was your direction that they look

18 into that account because you were concerned that

19 Michael Jackson's attorney and Sony were putting

20 money in that account so Mr. Jackson's lawyer would

21 essentially sell him out, right?

22 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Leading;

23 argumentative.

24 THE COURT: Sustained; foundation.

25 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Where was the offshore

26 account, if you know?

27 A. I'm sorry, I don't recall. I believe it was

28 in the Caribbean. 10214

1 Q. Okay. And did your investigation get far  
2 enough to establish that, in fact, this lawyer was a  
3 signatory on that account?

4 A. I don't believe so, no.

5 Q. But the investigation did indicate he was  
6 somehow involved in the account, correct?

7 A. The investigator's report so indicated.

8 Q. And the investigator's report indicated it  
9 appeared that Sony was involved in that account,  
10 right?

11 A. The investigator's report indicated that  
12 Sony had transferred money to the account.

13 Q. Sony had transferred money to that account  
14 for the benefit of Mr. Jackson's lawyer, right?

15 A. That's what was indicated in the report.

16 It -- I need to be very clear here that that  
17 was not verified, with a reasonable degree of  
18 certainty, that I would have acted upon that  
19 information. And Mr. Branca's a fine lawyer. And,  
20 you know, there is no -- I have no proof of these  
21 statements.

22 Q. You investigated Mr. Branca because, in your  
23 words, you thought he was involved in self-dealing,  
24 right?

25 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Improper  
26 opinion; no foundation; leading.

27 THE COURT: Overruled.

28 THE WITNESS: Again, you know, I want to be 10215

1 clear. I consulted with my partner and, you know,  
2 other lawyers, and we collectively made a decision  
3 to -- that it was prudent to have our investigator  
4 look into the possibility of such actions being  
5 taken by Mr. Branca.

6 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You were concerned that  
7 all of the individuals you investigated were  
8 involved in self-dealing, right?

9 A. No. That's not right. For example, I did  
10 not suspect Mr. Malnik of self, right?

28 improper opinion; leading. 10216



1 THE COURT: Sustained.

2 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Do you know whether or not  
3 Mr. Malnik has ever had a position with the Sony  
4 corporation?

5 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Same  
6 objection. Add relevancy.

7 THE COURT: Relevancy, sustained.

8 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: When you did your  
9 investigation, you and your partner, both former  
10 prosecutors, were you concerned about Mr. Malnik's  
11 relationship with Sony?

12 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Same objection.

13 THE COURT: Overruled.

14 THE WITNESS: I really don't recall that we  
15 had any concern over Mr. Malnik's relationship with  
16 Sony. In fact, I'm not aware that he had a  
17 significant relationship with Sony.

18 Our concern about Mr. Malnik was simply  
19 based upon the, you know, public records indicating  
20 these, you know, vague relationships to criminal  
21 figures. And those -- you know, those are all long  
22 in the past, but still, you know, in the public  
23 domain.

24 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And you were concerned  
25 that all of these characters were trying to steal  
26 money and take advantage of Michael Jackson, right?

27 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Leading;

28 argumentative. 10217

1 THE COURT: Sustained.

2 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Have you and Prosecutor  
3 Auchincloss ever had a discussion about this  
4 investigation that you and your partner began?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Has Mr. Auchincloss ever tried to approach  
7 you to find out why you were investigating all of  
8 these people while you were Mr. Jackson's lawyer?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Isn't it true that you were trying to  
11 investigate offshore accounts owned by Branca and  
12 someone named Tommy Motolla?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Who was Tommy Motolla?

15 A. He was a very powerful figure in the record  
16 industry at one time. I believe he was the  
17 president of the Sony Entertainment Division in the  
18 U.S. I'm not sure of his exact title or position.

19 Q. Were you concerned that Tommy Motolla and  
20 Mr. Jackson's lawyer, John Branca, were working  
21 together to defraud Michael Jackson?

22 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Relevancy;  
23 assumes facts; leading.

24 THE COURT: You may answer.

25 THE WITNESS: Based on the suspicions that  
26 were expressed to me and my partner, we asked  
27 Interfor to look into these rumors.

28 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, you had known 10218

1 Konitzer for how many years at that point?

2 A. I'm not sure. Six, seven, eight maybe.

3 Q. But you had never investigated Konitzer

4 before you started this investigation, right?

5 A. Right.

6 Q. Even though you knew Konitzer all those

7 years, you had never hired an investigative firm to

8 check out his background, correct?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. You were concerned that Konitzer was engaged

11 in self-dealing at the expense of Michael Jackson,

12 true?

13 A. Yes.

14 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Relevancy;

15 improper opinion.

16 MR. MESEREAU: I think the prosecutor's gone

17 through all this, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

19 THE WITNESS: My answer is yes, I was

20 concerned.

21 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You were also concerned

22 that Dieter Weizner was engaging in self-dealing at

23 the expense of Michael Jackson, correct?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. You were -- you asked for an investigation

26 into Konitzer's background in Canada, right?

27 A. Canada and Germany, yes.

28 Q. And you also asked for an investigation into 10219

1 Weizner's background in Germany, right?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Have you ever met Tommy Motolla?

4 A. No.

5 Q. Ever spoken to him?

6 A. No.

7 Q. To your knowledge, did Al Malnik have any

8 relationship with Tommy Motolla?

9 A. Not to my knowledge.

10 Q. Did you ever talk to him about that?

11 A. I don't believe I ever talked to Al about

12 whether or not he knew or had met Tommy Motolla.

13 Q. Was it your belief when you started this

14 investigation that Al Malnik, Tommy Motolla, John

15 Branca and people at Sony were trying to find a way

16 to get Mr. Jackson's interest in that music catalog?

17 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Argumentative;

18 leading; relevancy.

19 THE COURT: Overruled.

20 You may answer.

21 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure that I would

22 include Al Malnik in that group, but I certainly was

23 concerned that Branca and Motolla, in particular,

24 had set the stage, so to speak, for Sony to be able

25 to obtain Michael's interest in the Sony/ATV joint

26 venture.

27 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And as a former prosecutor

28 and as Michael Jackson's attorney, you thought the 10220



1 ethical and professional thing for you and your law  
2 firm to do was to investigate these people to  
3 protect Mr. Jackson as best you could, right?

4 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'm going to object to the  
5 prefatory remarks as argumentative.

6 THE COURT: Overruled.

7 You may answer.

8 THE WITNESS: The investigation was one of  
9 the tools we employed to try to be effective in  
10 representing our client's interest.

11 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: In response to Prosecutor  
12 Auchincloss's questions, you said you wanted --  
13 excuse me, let me rephrase that.

14 In response to Prosecutor Auchincloss's  
15 questions about why you started this investigation,  
16 you said you wanted Michael Jackson to be empowered.  
17 Do you remember that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And what did you mean by the word  
20 "empowered"?

21 A. I wanted him to have a higher degree of  
22 detail and knowledge about the people who were  
23 becoming influential in his business and financial  
24 affairs, so that, having that knowledge, he could  
25 then make better decisions about those people and  
26 the positions they would occupy in his life.

27 Q. Did you feel that Michael Jackson had made

28 poor decisions in trusting certain people in his 10221

1 life?

2 A. No disrespect intended to Mr. Jackson, but  
3 it's -- it was apparent from any review of the  
4 lawsuits against him and some of his well-publicized  
5 history that he's been taken -- you know, that  
6 people have attempted to gain significantly from  
7 being associated with him.

8 Q. And you felt, looking at his history, that  
9 he'd been taken advantage of repeatedly, right?

10 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Leading;  
11 argumentative.

12 THE COURT: Sustained.

13 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you make a  
14 determination whether or not Mr. Jackson had been  
15 taken advantage of?

16 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; improper  
17 opinion.

18 THE COURT: Relevancy; sustained.

19 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you feel that one of  
20 your responsibilities as Mr. Jackson's new attorney  
21 was to try and stop people from taking advantage of  
22 him?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Did you have concerns that all of the people  
25 that you were investigating were taking advantage of  
26 Michael Jackson?

27 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Leading;

28 relevance. 10222

1 THE COURT: Asked and answered.

2 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Asked and answered.

3 THE COURT: Sustained.

4 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you know that Mark  
5 Geragos was investigating the Arvizos?

6 A. I don't know. I don't remember -- as I sit  
7 here today, I don't remember specifically that I  
8 knew he was investigating them. I'm just not sure  
9 about that. I'm sorry.

10 Q. I'm sorry. Did I stop you?

11 A. No. I just -- I don't remember.

12 Q. Well, Prosecutor Auchincloss asked you if  
13 you had ever talked to an investigator named Brad  
14 Miller, right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And I believe you thought you might have,  
17 but you weren't sure; is that right?

18 A. That's right.

19 Q. At some point, you were one of the lawyers  
20 responsible for hiring Mark Geragos, right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Do you recall ever discussing with Mark  
23 Geragos his decision to investigate the Arvizos'  
24 background in extortion and fraud?

25 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Argumentative;  
26 assumes facts; hearsay.

27 THE COURT: Sustained.

28 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you ever talk with 10223

1 Mark Geragos about what he learned about the J.C.

2 Penney suit filed by the Arvizos?

3 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Hearsay;

4 exceeds the scope.

5 THE COURT: Sustained.

6 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: When you were

7 communicating with Mr. Geragos, did you ever

8 discuss, you and he, a J.C. Penney suit, that you

9 recall?

10 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; hearsay.

11 THE COURT: Sustained.

12 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Now, Prosecutor

13 Auchincloss asked you some questions yesterday about

14 Janet Arvizo turning down an offer of \$25,000 from

15 you. Do you remember that?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And at the point in time when you offered

18 \$25,000 to Janet Arvizo, Janet Arvizo was being

19 represented in England by the same law firm that

20 represented Michael Jackson, right?

21 A. With respect to the British broadcasting

22 administrative complaint process, yes.

23 Q. If you know, who was paying Janet Arvizo's

24 legal fees in that action?

25 A. Ultimately Mr. Jackson. I'm not sure which

26 exactly the source of funds was. But ultimately Mr.

27 Jackson.

28 Q. Do you have any idea how much money Mr. 10224



1 Jackson spent paying Janet Arvizo's legal fees in  
2 England?

3 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; relevancy.

4 THE COURT: Sustained.

5 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: When you discussed the  
6 possibility of giving Janet Arvizo \$25,000, you were  
7 talking to her new lawyer named Bill Dickerman,  
8 right?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. When you spoke to Bill Dickerman, did you  
11 know that he had a profit-sharing arrangement with  
12 an attorney named Larry Feldman?

13 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Relevancy;  
14 hearsay.

15 THE COURT: Sustained.

16 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: If Janet Arvizo was going  
17 to file a lawsuit against Michael Jackson with  
18 Attorneys Larry Feldman and Bill Dickerman, it  
19 wouldn't make sense to be joined with him in a suit  
20 in England, would it?

21 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; argumentative.

22 THE COURT: Sustained.

23 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Approximately when did you  
24 talk to Attorney Bill Dickerman about your offer of  
25 \$25,000 to Janet Arvizo?

26 A. As I think I said yesterday, it was I think  
27 spring of '04. And whether that was March, April,

28 May or June, I'm not sure. Mr. Dickerman and I 10225

1 corresponded over a period of, I'm not sure whether  
2 it was two weeks or six weeks. But there was a  
3 little period of time. And I'm pretty sure it was  
4 late spring of '04.

5 Q. Did the name Attorney Larry Feldman ever pop  
6 up in your discussions with Bill Dickerman?

7 A. No.

8 Q. How about Jamie Masada?

9 A. No.

10 Q. How about Stan Katz?

11 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Beyond the  
12 scope; relevancy.

13 MR. MESEREAU: I believe counsel explored  
14 this issue, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

16 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Attorney Dickerman  
17 communicated to you his desire that Mrs. Arvizo not  
18 be represented by any of Michael Jackson's  
19 attorneys, right?

20 A. Not exactly. What he communicated was that  
21 he wanted the -- the representation with respect to  
22 the British Standards Board complaint to be  
23 terminated and he wanted the complaint withdrawn.

24 Q. And that was a complaint that Mr. Jackson  
25 and Mrs. Arvizo had filed complaining about Mr.  
26 Bashir's actions and tactics, right?

27 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; assumes facts

28 not in evidence. 10226

1 THE COURT: Overruled.

2 THE WITNESS: Originally, as I said  
3 yesterday, there was one complaint filed on behalf  
4 of the Jacksons and the Arvizos. The Standards  
5 Board subsequently instructed the lawyers in the UK  
6 that the Arvizo complaint was a separate and  
7 distinct matter and needed to be the subject of its  
8 own complaint.

9 So that's -- I mean, so there were two  
10 separate complaints. Ultimately one for the Arvizos  
11 and one for Mr. Jackson. And those complaints  
12 alleged that Granada and Martin Bashir, as Granada's  
13 agent, had violated various aspects of the British  
14 broadcasting standards with respect to their actions  
15 in the video presented and produced by Granada.

16 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: At any point, did you feel  
17 that you were a lawyer for Janet Arvizo?

18 A. No.

19 Q. At any point, did you feel you were giving  
20 any legal advice to Janet Arvizo?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Now, Prosecutor Auchincloss showed you a  
23 couple of model release forms that you had prepared,  
24 right?

25 A. Yes.

26 Q. And when you prepared those release forms,  
27 it was your understanding that Ms. Arvizo and her

28 family would sign them authorizing the family to be 10227

1 filmed in the "Take 2" production, right?

2 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Leading;

3 assumes facts not in evidence.

4 THE COURT: Sustained.

5 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Why did you prepare model

6 releases to be signed by the Arvizos?

7 A. Because we -- because there could not be a

8 broadcast use of any video containing their images

9 without a release.

10 Q. And at some point, did you learn that Janet

11 Arvizo was bargaining for better terms in those

12 releases?

13 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Hearsay;

14 assumes facts not in evidence; and leading.

15 THE COURT: Sustained.

16 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You indicated in response

17 to Prosecutor Auchincloss's questions that there was

18 a point in time where Janet Arvizo didn't want to

19 sign the release you had drafted, correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And I believe you said that that refusal to

22 sign was communicated to you by Vincent Amen,

23 correct?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And I believe you said that you then

26 redrafted a release for Janet Arvizo to sign,

27 correct?

28 A. Yes. 10228



1 Q. Why did you redraft that release for Janet  
2 Arvizo to sign?

3 A. Because I needed -- because it had to be in  
4 a simpler, more readable, user-friendly,  
5 plain-English format, based on what had been  
6 presented to me as the concerns and reservations  
7 about executing the more formal release that I think  
8 is two big paragraphs of like, you know, one  
9 sentence per paragraph. It's very legalese, so to  
10 speak, and my understanding was that the Arvizos  
11 would sign releases if they were drafted in a  
12 fashion that were understandable by them.

13 Q. And was it your understanding that that was  
14 Janet Arvizo's request?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Who communicated that request to you?

17 A. I think it was Vincent Amen.

18 Q. How many drafts did that release go through  
19 before you learned that Janet had signed it?

20 A. I think it was just the one revision  
21 process. We went from the more complex document  
22 that I described that we looked at in the exhibits  
23 earlier to a more simpler document I think titled  
24 "Model Release," and it's much simpler, less  
25 elegant.

26 Q. And did you ever learn whether or not the  
27 Arvizos had even appeared in the "Take 2"

28 documentary? 10229

1 A. I'm not sure that they did, to tell you the  
2 truth. I mean, I did watch it once, but that was  
3 two years ago, and I don't remember whether they're  
4 in it or not.

5 Q. Isn't it true, Mr. LeGrand, that documentary  
6 appeared on television, was a great success, and  
7 they weren't even in it?

8 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; argumentative.

9 THE COURT: Sustained.

10 Counsel? I have this picture of this lawyer  
11 upstairs walking back and forth, pulling his hairs  
12 out of his head, wondering why the heck I ordered  
13 him up here today under threat of warrant while Mr.  
14 Mesereau goes on and on. What's wrong with that  
15 picture?

16 MR. MESEREAU: It's pretty accurate, I  
17 think, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Can we get on with it?

19 MR. MESEREAU: Yes. Yes, I will. Okay.

20 (Laughter.)

21 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: All right. Prosecutor --

22 Prosecutor Auchincloss --

23 THE COURT: Thank you for laughing. That

24 relieves some tension here.

25 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Prosecutor Auchincloss

26 asked you a question yesterday about Mr. Jackson's

27 music career. Do you remember that?

28 A. Not precisely, no, sir. 10230

1 Q. Well, didn't he say something about you were  
2 all working on a "Take 2" documentary because you  
3 were trying to shore up a falling music career for  
4 Michael Jackson?

5 A. I think there was a question that had that  
6 implicit in it. But I can't recall the details of  
7 the question. It's been quite a few questions in  
8 the last day.

9 Q. In the Bashir documentary, do you remember  
10 Mr. Jackson received a BAMBI award?

11 A. Yes.

12 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; relevancy.

13 THE COURT: Sustained.

14 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: In fact, in that  
15 documentary Bashir talks about Michael Jackson as  
16 the greatest musical artist of all time, right?

17 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; relevancy.

18 THE COURT: Sustained.

19 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: You indicated you spoke to  
20 representatives of the Bank of America about the  
21 Fire Mountain LLC, right?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And it was your understanding they had no  
24 objection to money from the "Take 2" documentary  
25 being placed in the Fire Mountain account, correct?

26 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Hearsay;

27 leading.

28 THE COURT: Overruled. 10231

1 You may answer.

2 THE WITNESS: I had a conversation, I'm not  
3 sure which individual at Bank of America. There  
4 were two or three that I spoke with. And after  
5 discussing with them the overall circumstances, the  
6 uses in paying the attorneys and funding the  
7 litigation in the UK and such, they indicated that  
8 they would not view that as a default under the  
9 loan, and to the best of my knowledge, they  
10 subsequently extended the loan in negotiations with  
11 Mr. Malnik.

12 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And certainly Mr. Jackson  
13 was not working with you in any effort to defraud  
14 Bank of America, right?

15 A. That's right.

16 MR. MESEREAU: I have no further questions,  
17 Your Honor.

18 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Just a few. I'll be  
19 brief.

20

21 RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS:

23 Q. Mr. LeGrand, you spoke to Attorney  
24 Finkelstein at least two times. You testified to  
25 that yesterday, correct?

26 A. I think that's right.

27 Q. And Mr. Finkelstein was an attorney for Mr.

28 Jackson, true? 10232



1 A. Today I'm not sure who he was acting for.

2 Q. That was your understanding, that he was an  
3 attorney for Mr. Jackson, correct?

4 A. It was my understanding he was being engaged  
5 to handle the funds with respect to Fire Mountain,  
6 which was --

7 Q. My question is, he was an attorney for  
8 Michael Jackson; true or false?

9 A. I don't know that.

10 Q. Was that your understanding?

11 A. I am not aware that Mr. Finkelstein believed  
12 he was representing Mr. Jackson as an individual.

13 Q. Who was he representing?

14 A. I thought he was acting for Fire Mountain.

15 Q. And Fire Mountain is completely owned by MJJ  
16 Productions?

17 A. Yes, a corporation.

18 Q. Which is completely owned by Michael  
19 Jackson?

20 A. Yes. That was my understanding.

21 Q. So he would be answering to Michael Jackson,  
22 true?

23 A. Ultimately, yes.

24 Q. Okay. Mr. Finkelstein is a specialist in  
25 offshore money, isn't he?

26 A. I don't know what he specializes in.

27 Q. Well, isn't it true that you transferred two

28 million dollars to Mr. Finkelstein on Michael 10233

1 Jackson's behalf so that Michael Jackson could  
2 establish offshore bank accounts, true, or for  
3 deposit in offshore bank accounts for Mr. Jackson?

4 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Relevancy;  
5 foundation.

6 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: True?

7 THE COURT: Overruled.

8 THE WITNESS: I have, and had, no knowledge  
9 of establishment of offshore accounts for the  
10 benefit of Mr. Jackson at that time.

11 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Well, you were  
12 entrusted with this two million dollars, correct?

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 Q. And you were entrusted with that two million  
15 dollars to act in Michael Jackson's interests,  
16 correct?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. And when you transferred that two million  
19 dollars to Mr. Finkelstein, Mr. Jackson's interests  
20 were what you were serving when you did that,  
21 correct?

22 A. That was my intent, yes, sir.

23 Q. And are you telling us you had no idea where  
24 that two million dollars was going?

25 A. I thought it was going to be used to pay the  
26 expenses that were being incurred on Mr. Jackson's  
27 behalf in terms of the Granada litigation, to pay

28 bills, and would be delivered to the money manager 10234

1 once we got the new money manager firmly  
2 established. That's what I believed.

3 Q. But it wasn't, was it?

4 A. Actually, I believe a significant portion of  
5 the funds ultimately were delivered to Allan  
6 Whitman.

7 Q. Do you know that?

8 A. I'm not sure today, but I thought -- I  
9 certainly thought that the residual of the money  
10 after that \$965,000 was disbursed, I thought that  
11 was delivered to Mr. Whitman. But I could be wrong  
12 about that.

13 Q. As far as the John Branca and Tommy Motolla  
14 investigation by Interfor, Interfor never found any  
15 evidence that Mr. Motolla or Mr. Branca were engaged  
16 in any fraud with Mr. Jackson, did they?

17 A. That's correct. I had no evidence delivered  
18 with that report to substantiate those claims.

19 Q. And in fact, that report only indicate that  
20 Sony was depositing money in some offshore account,  
21 apparently for Mr. -- on Mr. Jackson's behalf, true?

22 A. I'm not sure about the "Mr. Jackson's  
23 behalf." I would need to see the report.

24 Q. Okay. But you have no reason to believe  
25 that any funds transferred to an offshore account by  
26 Sony, you have no reason to believe that those funds  
27 were somehow defrauding Mr. Jackson?

28 A. I was given no credible evidence to support 10235

1 those charges. I would be doing Mr. Branca and Mr.

2 Motolla a great wrong if I said otherwise.

3 Q. Did you consult with Mr. Jackson before you

4 took two million dollars of his money and sent it to

5 Mr. Finkelstein?

6 A. I don't think so.

7 Q. Did you ever talk to him about that, ever?

8 A. I believe we talked about it when we were at

9 Al Malnik's house in Florida later.

10 Q. And Mr. Finkelstein -- or Mr. Jackson had

11 knowledge of that two million dollars being

12 transferred to Mr. Finkelstein, didn't he?

13 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; foundation.

14 THE COURT: Sustained.

15 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: He never indicated that

16 he didn't know that you had transferred two million

17 dollars of his money to Mr. Finkelstein without his

18 permission or without his agreement, did he?

19 A. He never indicated to me that he was

20 dissatisfied with what -- with those transfers.

21 Q. As far as this litigation or complaint, or

22 whatever was going on in England regarding the

23 airing of the Bashir special, Janet Arvizo never

24 authorized her joinder in that action, did she, as

25 far as you know?

26 A. The only evidence I saw of her authorization

27 for that action was the page you showed me earlier

28 that Mr. Dickerman subsequently stated was a 10236



1 forgery.

2 Q. And as far as you know, Janet Arvizo has  
3 never authorized any law firm in England to  
4 represent her, as far as you know today, based on  
5 everything?

6 A. Yeah, that's true.

7 Q. And Janet Arvizo was reluctant to sign those  
8 consent forms because she felt that she was burned  
9 in the Martin Bashir special; that her family was  
10 hurt because Gavin appeared in that special without  
11 anybody's consent. Isn't that one of the reasons  
12 why she was reluctant to sign those consent forms?

13 A. I don't know what was in Janet Arvizo's  
14 mind.

15 Q. No one ever communicated to you that that  
16 was part of her reluctance in signing those forms?

17 A. I don't remember that. I think Mr.  
18 Dickerman said words to that effect in 2004. But I  
19 don't remember anybody at the time, the week or ten  
20 days or so that we were engaged in getting  
21 appearance consents and releases from various  
22 people, I don't believe I heard that kind of  
23 statement at that time.

24 Q. As far as the allegations of double-dealing,  
25 self-interest involving the Interfor investigation,  
26 Interfor never came up with anything substantial,  
27 substantive, about Mr. Konitzer, did they?

28 A. I'm not sure what you mean by "substantive." 10237

1 Q. Well, in terms of his double-dealing with  
2 Michael Jackson, was there ever any indication that  
3 he was double-dealing with Michael Jackson based  
4 upon that report?

5 A. No, but that wasn't -- the report wasn't  
6 about that.

7 Q. Was there ever any indication that he was  
8 double-dealing -- that Dieter Weizner was  
9 double-dealing with Michael Jackson in any way,  
10 shape or form?

11 A. Not in that report.

12 Q. That report was basically full of rumors and  
13 unsubstantiated allegations, true, because it was  
14 incomplete?

15 A. Ultimately that was my view.

16 Q. And if Bank of America knew that you were  
17 sending two million dollars to Mr. Finkelstein, do  
18 you think they would have gone ahead and authorized  
19 the handling of these funds through the Fire  
20 Mountain account?

21 A. I don't know.

22 Q. Well, didn't you know that they were  
23 concerned about paying bills and not putting money  
24 offshore?

25 A. I don't know. I can't speak for Bank of  
26 America, I'm sorry, sir.

27 Q. Janet Arvizo, based upon everything you

28 knew, was going to get nothing for this film, video, 10238

1 of her and her family that was taken at Mr.

2 Moslehi's house, true?

3 A. I don't know.

4 Q. Well, you didn't disburse any funds to her

5 from the account that you pulled in three million

6 dollars from FOX on, correct?

7 A. That's true.

8 Q. And she didn't get a dime of that, did she?

9 A. Not to my knowledge.

10 Q. And you knew she was a poor individual,

11 indigent, her family did not have money?

12 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;

13 misstates the evidence.

14 THE COURT: Sustained.

15 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Did it ever occur to

16 you that you were engaging in an exploitation of

17 Janet Arvizo along with Michael Jackson?

18 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;

19 leading; misstates the evidence.

20 THE COURT: Sustained.

21 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Mr. LeGrand, as far as

22 any requests from the People regarding files or any

23 requests from law enforcement regarding files, the

24 reason why no requests were made is because that

25 would have been futile, because there's an

26 attorney-client privilege that protects those files;

27 isn't that accurate?

28 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Misstates the 10239

1 evidence; foundation.

2 THE COURT: Overruled.

3 You may answer.

4 THE WITNESS: I'm not an expert in that area  
5 of law, but I think generally you're correct, that  
6 the prosecution in this case could not have  
7 compelled me to produce those files without Mr.  
8 Jackson's consent.

9 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: And in fact, you were  
10 contacted by the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Office and  
11 asked to be interviewed, and you refused; isn't that  
12 true?

13 A. I informed your -- I'm not sure what his  
14 title was, but I informed the investigator who  
15 called from the office that I would only be able to  
16 be interviewed if they obtained Mr. Jackson's  
17 consent.

18 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: No further questions.

19

20 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. MESEREAU:

22 Q. Mr. LeGrand, do you know whether or not Mr.  
23 Jackson has waived the attorney-client privilege as  
24 far as you're concerned?

25 A. Yes. I received documents signed by Mr.  
26 Jackson waiving privilege so that I could appear  
27 here today and yesterday.

28 Q. In fact, you were informed quite a while ago 10240



1 that Mr. Jackson had waived the attorney-client  
2 privilege, correct?

3 A. Well, I was informed that he was prepared to  
4 waive it with respect to my testimony, yes.

5 Q. Nobody from law enforcement has ever asked  
6 you if there was any waiver of the attorney-client  
7 privilege, right?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. Nobody from the prosecution has ever asked  
10 you if there was any waiver of the attorney-client  
11 privilege?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. Mr. Jackson doesn't even know who Mr.  
14 Finkelstein is, right?

15 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection. Assumes facts;  
16 foundation; argumentative.

17 THE COURT: Sustained.

18 MR. MESEREAU: No further questions.

19

20 FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS:

22 Q. As far as this waiver goes, when did you  
23 ultimately obtain a waiver from Mr. Jackson on the  
24 attorney-client privilege?

25 A. I believe it was Wednesday morning, this  
26 week.

27 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: No further questions.

28 10241

1 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. MESEREAU:

3 Q. Mr. LeGrand, do you remember learning that  
4 we had turned over your files to the prosecution  
5 last December?

6 A. Yes.

7 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; assumes facts.

8 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did they ever ask you to  
9 follow up, give them some more documents after they  
10 got your files last December?

11 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; argumentative.

12 THE COURT: Overruled.

13 You may answer.

14 THE WITNESS: I had no contact from the  
15 prosecutor's office other than that one phone call  
16 from the sheriffs a long -- or investigator a long  
17 time ago. But since December, no.

18 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And were you aware that  
19 Mr. Auchincloss had your files as of last December?

20 A. I didn't even know who Mr. Auchincloss was  
21 before yesterday, but I had been informed by you  
22 that my files had been delivered to the office  
23 headed by Mr. Sneddon.

24 MR. MESEREAU: Thank you.

25 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I have no further  
26 questions, Your Honor. But there is one  
27 housekeeping matter that I don't think is

28 appropriate for me to mention in front of the jury. 10242

1 THE COURT: All right. Then I'll excuse the  
2 jury for lunch. We'll take our break now, and I'll  
3 remain for a moment.

4 (To the witness) Just a moment. I'm not  
5 sure if this involves you or not.

6 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Thank you.

7

8 (The following proceedings were held in  
9 open court outside the presence and hearing of the  
10 jury:)

11

12 THE COURT: Go ahead.

13 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Your Honor, this witness  
14 has indicated that he turned over five boxes of  
15 documents to the defense. He has indicated that  
16 there should have been e-mails in that -- in those  
17 files, as well as his personal notes regarding  
18 communications with his client.  
19 I would like to state for the record, we  
20 have none of those items. We have what I would say  
21 would probably be one banker's box of materials.  
22 And I would like this witness ordered back. I would  
23 like him ordered to produce the entire file  
24 regarding Mr. Jackson. And I would like an  
25 opportunity to review those documents and, if  
26 necessary, have him brought back on  
27 cross-examination concerning those documents.

28 THE COURT: As I understood his testimony, 10243

1 he's turned over everything that he had to somebody  
2 else. I mean, he doesn't claim that he has any of  
3 the documents.

4 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: And if that is the state  
5 of the record, then I'd ask that the Court order the  
6 defense to produce the documents that I've  
7 mentioned.

8 THE COURT: Is that your position, that  
9 you've already turned over everything you have on  
10 this case to someone else?

11 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, with respect -- I  
12 am no longer associated with the firm of Hale Lane.

13 THE BAILIFF: No one can hear you, sir.

14 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.

15 I am no longer associated with the law firm  
16 of Hale Lane. And I have no control over any of the  
17 files that remain at Hale Lane. I have no access to  
18 any of those materials.

19 I did, when I left Hale Lane, have a few  
20 legal pads of notes. I don't know whether those  
21 notes include any references to Mr. Jackson or not.  
22 And I will be pleased to, you know, look through  
23 those and see if there are. But I have no access or  
24 control.

25 THE COURT: Other than that, is it your  
26 belief that all the file was turned over, or do you  
27 have any way of knowing that?

28 THE WITNESS: I really have no way of 10244



1 knowing that. I mean, I -- when my representation  
2 was terminated originally back in March of 2003, I  
3 prepared copies of all the files at that time and  
4 delivered them, I believe to Mr. Malnik in Florida,  
5 who at the time I understood to be the primary  
6 attorney serving Mr. Jackson.

7 Subsequently, I was re-engaged for the  
8 limited purpose of continuing to manage the Granada  
9 litigation in the United Kingdom, and continued in  
10 that role until -- for quite a while, until the  
11 charges were brought against Mr. Jackson in this  
12 case, at which time the litigation in the UK was put  
13 on hold.

14 Shortly thereafter, I communicated with Mr.  
15 Malnik, asked him what I should do. And I  
16 corresponded with, I think it was Steve Cochran, Zia  
17 Modabber, whom I knew from the dealings with Mr.  
18 Jackson, and indicated that I felt it appropriate to  
19 turn over my records to the Katten Muchin law firm,  
20 which at the time seemed to have a continuing  
21 representation of Mr. Jackson.

22 I instructed my staff to prepare, you know,  
23 copies of files. I -- this discussion of  
24 completeness is somewhat baffling to me. Nobody  
25 ever requested that I turn over every single piece  
26 of paper, e-mail or document, that we make, you  
27 know, a thorough search of every crevice and cranny

28 of our firm. We simply did our best to, you know, 10245

1 compile the files and deliver them. A lot of --

2 THE COURT: Have you turned over everything  
3 that you have control of at this point to somebody,  
4 other than --

5 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think so.

6 THE COURT: Okay.

7 THE WITNESS: It's possible I have some  
8 boxes that may contain some notes.

9 THE COURT: I'll ask you to look through  
10 whatever records you have, and if you find that you  
11 have some, prepare -- notify both sides and give  
12 both sides access to those documents.

13 THE WITNESS: Very good, sir.

14 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: There was one other thing.  
15 He mentioned that he delivered a CD of  
16 e-mails to the defense, which we have not received.

17 THE COURT: Well, my recollection of the  
18 testimony was that he thought he did.  
19 Did you --

20 MS. YU: Your Honor, I believe everything  
21 was produced. We printed everything from a CD  
22 that, it is correct, that Mr. LeGrand -- and we  
23 printed it out and we produced them.

24 THE COURT: All right.

25 MS. YU: Every page.

26 THE COURT: So you should have those.

27 So the Court will -- you may step down.

28 Thank you. 10246

1 The Court will go in recess.

2 THE WITNESS: There's still a binder here.

3 Somebody -- I'm not sure whose it is.

4 (Recess taken.)

5

6 (The following proceedings were held in

7 open court in the presence and hearing of the

8 jury:)

9

10 THE COURT: Call your next witness.

11 MR. MESEREAU: Yes. The defense will call

12 Mr. Mark Geragos.

13 THE COURT: Come forward, please. When you

14 get to the witness stand, remain standing.

15 Face the clerk and raise your right hand.

16

17 MARK GERAGOS

18 Having been sworn, testified as follows:

19

20 THE WITNESS: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Please be seated.

22 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

23 THE CLERK: State and spell your name for the

24 record.

25 THE WITNESS: Mark Geragos. G-e-r-a-g-o-s.

26 THE CLERK: Thank you.

27 DIRECT EXAMINATION

28 BY MR. MESEREAU: 10247

1 Q. Good morning, Mark.

2 A. Good morning, Tom.

3 Q. Would you please give a little summary of  
4 your education?

5 A. I went to college, I went to law school, I  
6 passed the bar.

7 Q. Okay.

8 (Laughter.)

9 Q. That was kind of long-winded, wasn't it?

10 A. It was not a very distinguished  
11 undergraduate or graduate career, so....

12 Q. And you are a lawyer in Los Angeles,  
13 correct?

14 A. I am. I've got a firm in Los Angeles, which  
15 I share with my father and my brother, named  
16 Geragos & Geragos. We stayed up all night thinking  
17 it up.

18 Q. All right. Do you know the fellow seated at  
19 counsel table to my right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And who is he?

22 A. Michael Jackson, who was a client of mine  
23 for about 16 months.

24 Q. And when did you first meet Mr. Jackson?

25 A. It would have been probably about  
26 February -- the first week of February of 2003, I  
27 believe.

28 Q. And at some point, you were retained to 10248



1 represent Mr. Jackson, right?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. And how did that come about?

4 THE WITNESS: Although I know you've told me  
5 out of court that there is a waiver, Your Honor, I  
6 have not seen nor heard it on the record, and I'm  
7 more comfortable if I have that first.

8 THE COURT: Certainly.

9 MR. MESEREAU: I can represent to the Court  
10 there is a waiver of the attorney-client privilege  
11 so Mr. Geragos can testify.

12 THE COURT: You have a written waiver you'll  
13 provide him with after court today?

14 MR. MESEREAU: We will do that, Your Honor,  
15 sure.

16 THE COURT: Is that satisfactory?

17 THE WITNESS: That is, Your Honor. Thank  
18 you.

19 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: When were you first  
20 retained to represent Mr. Jackson?

21 A. It would have been sometime shortly before I  
22 met him the first time. The first time I met  
23 Michael was at Neverland, and I was contacted by  
24 somebody from, I think, Paul Hastings. And then was  
25 sent -- or there was a series of transactions, I  
26 guess, or faxes back and forth, and ultimately I was  
27 retained and then went up to Neverland and met

28 Michael for the first time. 10249

1 Q. And why were you retained?

2 A. At that point, there were allegations that  
3 were being made in the media and there was also, as  
4 I remember, complaints that were being made to Child  
5 Services about him, his fitness as a parent, as  
6 well.

7 Q. And did you represent Mr. Jackson in those  
8 two areas?

9 A. I did. I was given the role, so to speak,  
10 among a cast of thousands, to kind of coordinate and  
11 be a person who would look out for his interests in  
12 those areas.

13 Q. And when you began to represent Mr. Jackson,  
14 were you reporting to anyone in particular?

15 A. Well, when I first came on board, there was  
16 a gentleman, who I saw in the hallway just a minute  
17 ago, David LeGrand, who was there, who was a lawyer  
18 who was coordinating a lot of the stuff.

19 There was a gentleman who he introduced me  
20 to named Ronald Konitzer. And there was a gentleman  
21 over at Paul Hastings. And I feel awful, I can't  
22 remember his name, because he's the person who  
23 referred me over there in the first place. But  
24 there was another lawyer there.

25 But generally what would happen is, it  
26 wasn't so much reporting as we would have these  
27 interminably long conference calls.

28 Q. And generally who was involved in those 10250

1 calls?

2 A. It seemed like everyone. There were all  
3 kinds of people on the conference calls. There were  
4 PR people. Paul Hastings lawyers. David LeGrand  
5 would be on the conference call. I would plug into  
6 the conference call. Ronald Konitzer would be on  
7 the conference call, among others. Those are the  
8 ones that come to mind.

9 Q. And were these conference calls occurring on  
10 a daily basis?

11 A. It seemed like it.

12 Q. Typically who would initiate the conference  
13 call?

14 A. I think David's office would be my --  
15 would -- but that would be a guess. I really don't  
16 know.

17 Q. Was Michael Jackson usually involved in  
18 these conference calls?

19 A. Usually not.

20 Q. Was he involved in any of them?

21 A. He -- there were a couple of calls. You're  
22 talking about February of '03.

23 Q. Sure.

24 A. There were a couple of calls where Michael  
25 would get on the phone for brief periods of time,  
26 but generally were not the same as what I'm talking  
27 about with these conference calls. Those would be a

28 call where maybe Ronald would put him on the phone, 10251

1 there would a brief discussion. It wouldn't be more  
2 than, I don't know, 45 seconds or a minute, usually,  
3 it seemed like. It was very quick.

4 Q. And I believe said your work involved  
5 response to the Bashir documentary?

6 A. Well, the lawyers who were responding to the  
7 Bashir documentary, as I understood it, was there  
8 was -- I think it was Paul Hastings English  
9 barristers who were dealing with the documentary  
10 there and dealing with some issue that they kept  
11 talking about, some board that was involved that  
12 they were making complaints about.

13 And then here, my role was to see if there  
14 was any kind of -- anything that needed to be done  
15 to protect him in terms of his parental rights or  
16 anything else from the accusations that were being  
17 made against him.

18 Q. Was your firm exclusively involved in the  
19 area of child custody, parental rights?

20 A. No. There was -- he had a -- I don't know  
21 if he still has, but there was a lawyer by the name  
22 of -- I think his name was Lance Spiegel, from a  
23 firm on the west side of Los Angeles, and he was  
24 clearly primarily with the custody issues.

25 My role was if there was any DCFS  
26 involvement, if there was anybody who was trying to  
27 do anything else. Basically to see if there was

28 anything else that he needed protection against. 10252



1 Q. Was a potential DCFS investigation the only  
2 investigation you were concerned about at the time?

3 A. No, no, I was concerned about -- obviously  
4 at the same time that the documentary came out, at  
5 the time, there were people making all kinds of  
6 accusations about Michael, and specifically with one  
7 young man who was involved in that documentary, and  
8 I was supposed to look into that as well.

9 Q. And was his name "Gavin Arvizo"?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Okay. At some point, did you ever hear the  
12 name "Janet Arvizo"?

13 A. At the very -- probably before I heard the  
14 name "Gavin."

15 Q. And how did you hear her name?

16 A. Initially there was a rundown of exactly  
17 what the situation was. And I couldn't tell you  
18 exactly if it was Paul Hastings or if it was the  
19 English counterpart or the American counterpart or  
20 if it was David, but there was a rundown of the  
21 situation. I was told about the Arvizos.  
22 I was also told and the first thing that was  
23 done that had any urgency is there was a 60 Minutes  
24 taping that was scheduled, and they wanted me to be  
25 up there to make sure that Michael didn't make any  
26 statements or questions weren't asked that were  
27 inappropriate.

28 Q. And was this at Neverland? 10253

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Did you see Janet Arvizo at Neverland on  
3 that day?

4 A. I remember seeing Gavin at Neverland that  
5 day. And then we were there for, I don't know,  
6 maybe 12 hours or so. And during that time there, I  
7 was getting downloaded with information as well from  
8 a number of people at the ranch itself.

9 Q. And what was your role as far as your  
10 representation of Mr. Jackson went on that occasion?

11 A. Well, that was really -- they just wanted  
12 me, I guess, as a backstop on the interview.  
13 And ultimately, after sitting there for  
14 about 12 hours, it was my decision, or I told them  
15 that, look, if I was going to be involved, I didn't  
16 want him doing the interview, and I pulled the plug  
17 on it.

18 Q. So ultimately that interview with 60 Minutes  
19 did not take place, correct?

20 A. On that occasion in February of 2003, it did  
21 not. I -- I said that it was not going to happen,  
22 and asked that they -- politely asked Mr. Bradley,  
23 and there was another producer, whose name I think  
24 was Radotsky, Michael Radotsky, who was there, told  
25 them that this was not going to happen.

26 Q. And you say you were at Neverland  
27 approximately 12 hours that day?

28 A. It seemed like it, yeah. 10254

1 Q. And did you see Ms. Janet Arvizo there the  
2 whole time?

3 A. Well, portions, is my memory. I remember --  
4 I have vivid memories about Gavin Arvizo talking  
5 with Ed Bradley and Gavin Arvizo talking with  
6 Radotsky, which I think is his name, the producer,  
7 and then seeing what was going on there. And also  
8 hearing these stories that people were telling me,  
9 and trying to just take it in and sort out whatever  
10 it was.

11 Q. And was it your understanding that the  
12 Arvizos wanted to have a role in that 60 Minutes  
13 documentary?

14 A. I watched as --

15 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as to  
16 speculative.

17 THE COURT: Sustained.

18 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Referring only to your  
19 state of mind at the time, Mr. Geragos, did you have  
20 any knowledge one way or the other whether or not  
21 the Arvizos were supposed to be involved in the  
22 documentary?

23 MR. ZONEN: I object as irrelevant to this  
24 question.

25 THE COURT: You have to let him finish the  
26 question so I know what you're objecting to.

27 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Mr. Geragos, just

28 directing my question to your state of mind at the 10255

1 time, did you have any understanding one way or the  
2 other whether or not Janet Arvizo and the children  
3 were supposed to appear in a 60 Minutes documentary?

4 MR. ZONEN: Objection to his state of mind  
5 as being irrelevant to this proceeding.

6 THE COURT: Sustained.

7 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: In your capacity as Mr.  
8 Jackson's attorney on that day, did you have any  
9 understanding as to why the Arvizos were at  
10 Neverland?

11 A. The -- I saw an interaction between Gavin  
12 Arvizo --

13 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object to any  
14 vision of interaction as being irrelevant to this  
15 proceeding, and the question is irrelevant and  
16 lacking in foundation.

17 MR. MESEREAU: He's cutting off the witness,  
18 Your Honor, I object.

19 THE COURT: I think that question can be  
20 answered "yes" or "no," and we can go from there.  
21 Do you want the question read back?

22 THE WITNESS: God, I hate to say "no."

23 Did I see -- did I see an interaction? Yes.

24 THE COURT: I'll have the question read back  
25 so you understand it.

26 (Record read.)

27 THE WITNESS: Yes.

28 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: What was your 10256



1 understanding?

2 MR. ZONEN: Objection; lack of foundation.

3 THE COURT: Sustained.

4 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: As Mr. Jackson's attorney,  
5 were you under any instructions to do anything with  
6 the Arvizos at Neverland on that particular day?

7 MR. ZONEN: Objection; vague. Instruction  
8 from whom?

9 THE COURT: Sustained.

10 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you talk to Janet  
11 Arvizo that day?

12 A. Briefly, I believe. But -- I know that I  
13 didn't talk to her. I watched her interact or  
14 converse with Mr. Radotsky, who was the producer.  
15 I believe Mr. Bradley.

16 Q. Did you see Ms. Arvizo talking to Mr.  
17 Radotsky for any length of time that day?

18 A. I don't know if I would say a length of  
19 time. I saw at least on two occasions, I think.

20 Q. And why were you at Neverland that day?

21 A. I was asked to come up by Mr. LeGrand  
22 specifically to, I guess, monitor the interview.

23 Q. And were you under the impression, as you  
24 arrived, that the Arvizos were going to be there?

25 A. Yes.

26 Q. Why?

27 A. It's what I was told.

28 Q. Is that by Mr. LeGrand? 10257

1 A. I believe it was.

2 Q. And were you told why they were going to be  
3 there?

4 A. I believe Mr. LeGrand told me that --

5 MR. ZONEN: That would be "yes" or "no,"

6 Your Honor. I object to any answer beyond that.

7 THE COURT: Sustained.

8 "Yes" or "no."

9 THE WITNESS: Yes.

10 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And what was your  
11 understanding as to why they were going to be there?

12 MR. ZONEN: Objection. Hearsay; lack of  
13 foundation.

14 THE COURT: Sustained.

15 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you give any advice to  
16 the Arvizos on that particular day?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Did you talk to Gavin Arvizo on that  
19 particular day?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Who else do you recall being at Neverland on  
22 that particular day, other than the people you've  
23 identified?

24 A. Dieter Weizner was there. I think a  
25 gentleman by the name of Jack Sussman from CBS was  
26 there. There was a woman which -- also with CBS  
27 with the last name of Simon, I think was there.

28 There was another lawyer from my office with me. I 10258

1 can't remember which lawyer it was. And there was  
2 a -- I don't know, a cast of probably 30 or 40  
3 people, production people, who were there as well.

4 Q. And what time did you arrive there that day?

5 A. I couldn't tell you. It was light outside.

6 But I don't -- I would imagine late morning, early  
7 afternoon, but that's just a guess.

8 Q. What time do you think you left?

9 A. Whatever, eight, ten, twelve hours after I  
10 arrived.

11 Q. When you left, do you know whether or not  
12 Janet Arvizo was still there?

13 A. I do not.

14 Q. Do you know whether or not Gavin Arvizo was  
15 still there?

16 A. I do not. Not as I sit here today.

17 Q. Did you hear Janet Arvizo say anything to  
18 Mr. Radotsky?

19 A. Not that I can remember as I sit here.

20 Q. Did you see Janet Arvizo talk to Ed Bradley  
21 of 60 Minutes?

22 A. I believe that I did.

23 Q. Did you hear what she said?

24 A. Not that I can remember.

25 Q. Okay. Did you see either Mr. Bradley or Mr.  
26 Radotsky talking to Gavin Arvizo?

27 A. Yes. I think Radotsky, with Mr. Bradley. I

28 don't know that he was actively participating, but I 10259

1 do believe Radotsky was talking.

2 Q. And approximately what date was this, Mr.

3 Geragos?

4 A. I want to say February 7th, and I just -- I

5 don't know if that was a Saturday. I don't believe

6 it was a court day. So it was either a Saturday or

7 a Sunday, but I'd just be guessing again.

8 Q. Have you seen the Bashir documentary at this

9 point?

10 A. I have seen it. But not recently.

11 Q. No, had you seen it at this particular point

12 in time?

13 A. No, I had not.

14 Q. Did you ever see Janet Arvizo again?

15 A. No, I don't believe that I have.

16 Q. Have you ever spoken to her on the phone?

17 A. No, I don't believe that I have.

18 Q. Okay. Following that visit to Neverland,

19 you continued to represent Mr. Jackson, right?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. And what were the things you were doing as a

22 lawyer for Mr. Jackson?

23 A. Well, one of the first things that I did

24 after that was to get ahold of the -- a copy of the

25 documentary by Mr. Bashir. I watched it. We

26 were -- on these conference calls, they would talk

27 about what the various allegations were against

28 Michael. 10260



1 One of the first things I did is involve a  
2 private investigator. And I involved a private  
3 investigator and I had some associates in the firm  
4 do some database searching on various players  
5 involved.

6 Q. Now, was it your understanding at that point  
7 that Mr. Sneddon had started any investigation?

8 A. No. It was not my understanding that he  
9 had.

10 Q. Had you heard of any statements Mr. Sneddon  
11 had made anywhere about an investigation into  
12 Michael Jackson at that point?

13 A. In early February, no. The only thing  
14 that -- as I remember, in early February, that  
15 sticks out in my mind now as I sit here, was  
16 something about somebody complaining to DCFS.

17 Q. Now, you said you started your own  
18 investigation, right?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. And why did you do that?

21 A. I was -- the things that I was hearing about  
22 the Arvizos gave me great pause.

23 Q. What were you hearing?

24 MR. ZONEN: I'll object as hearsay and  
25 irrelevance and lack of foundation and vague as to  
26 time.

27 THE COURT: I'm going to overrule the

28 objection and I'm going to allow the witness to 10261

1 answer, but I'll caution the jury that at this  
2 point, what he states that he heard about the family  
3 is not offered for the truth of the matter asserted.  
4 But it's offered to explain why he did certain  
5 things thereafter.

6 Go ahead.

7 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

8 I had -- when I was up there, sitting up  
9 there that day, somebody had told me a story about  
10 Gavin being told to refer to Michael as "Daddy," and  
11 that -- that Michael was uncomfortable with that;  
12 that the person that was telling me was probably one  
13 of the people who were -- it was either Weizner or  
14 Konitzer or somebody, somebody who was up there, and  
15 that that concerned him greatly.

16 That obviously gave me pause, and so in  
17 response to that, I decided to run some database  
18 searches on the Arvizos.

19 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you run those database  
20 searches on the Arvizos?

21 A. I did.

22 Q. And what did you find?

23 A. The -- a lawsuit against J.C. Penney's  
24 and -- a lawsuit against J.C. Penney's and then a  
25 purported -- and then I had somebody, and I don't  
26 know if it was in-office or not, take a look at the  
27 file or do a little bit more due diligence on it.

28 Q. That was look at the J.C. Penney file? 10262

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Okay. And why did you do that?

3 A. Well, I had a concern at that point that  
4 given what was going on, that somebody might use the  
5 situation to manipulate my client.

6 Q. And when you say "manipulate" your client,  
7 what do you mean?

8 A. It was not unknown to me that my client is  
9 frequently the target of litigation, so I -- and  
10 you've got a whirlwind of activity going around and  
11 you've got people making accusations. It occurs to  
12 me that I want to know if some of the players that  
13 are involved have a litigious history, so that's why  
14 I ran the database search.

15 Q. Now, did you do the database search yourself  
16 or did you have an investigator do it?

17 A. That's what I said before. I don't know if  
18 it was inhouse or out. I can't tell you, as I sit  
19 here, for sure, whether I had Brad do it, whether I  
20 had somebody just run it on either Lexis or West Law  
21 in the office, but somebody did it and came up with  
22 it.

23 Q. Who is Brad?

24 A. Brad Miller is the investigator who I hired  
25 to start to do an investigation on the Arvizos.

26 Q. And approximately when did you start your  
27 investigation into the Arvizos?

28 A. It would have been very shortly after 10263

1 leaving Neverland. So if that was the 7th or the  
2 8th, it would have been within a couple of days.

3 Q. And when do you think you learned about the  
4 J.C. Penney lawsuit that had been filed by the  
5 Arvizos?

6 A. Within a couple of days.

7 Q. Okay. And what was your reaction to what  
8 you learned about that suit?

9 A. I was gravely concerned.

10 Q. Why?

11 A. I thought that given the situation, and I  
12 was also given information that they were attempting  
13 or that there were rumors that the family was  
14 attempting --

15 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object to any  
16 reference to "rumors" or any information from an  
17 unnamed source as lacking in foundation,  
18 speculative.

19 THE COURT: Sustained.

20 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Was the investigation you  
21 did into the J.C. Penney lawsuit the first part of  
22 your investigation into the Arvizos?

23 A. Probably. I mean, to that extent that you  
24 run some kind of a database search, I suppose that  
25 was -- if it wasn't the first, it was in the top  
26 five.

27 Q. And was Mr. Miller involved in that search

28 into the J.C. Penney lawsuit, to your knowledge? 10264



1 A. I would imagine that after I -- if he didn't  
2 find it, that I quickly brought it to his attention  
3 and he did do -- he probably would have -- he  
4 probably would have been the guy that I assigned to  
5 follow up on it. But I -- I don't know as I sit  
6 here.

7 Q. Is Mr. Miller a licensed private  
8 investigator in California?

9 A. He is.

10 Q. And had you worked with him before?

11 A. I had, on, I think, probably three or four  
12 occasions.

13 Q. Okay. And where was his office at the time?

14 A. You know, I believe at the time it was in  
15 Beverly Hills. But I can't -- that's only because I  
16 know it was in Beverly Hills at one time and it's no  
17 longer in Beverly Hills. I don't know in February  
18 of '03 if it still was in Beverly Hills. I couldn't  
19 tell you.

20 Q. Did the investigation into the Arvizos that  
21 you started continue?

22 A. Yes. I had him -- or I asked him to please  
23 find out where they were, and to document what they  
24 were doing, who they were meeting with, and whether  
25 or not they were either trying to sell a story to  
26 the tabloids, or meeting with lawyers, or anything  
27 even more grave than that, at least from my client's

28 standpoint. 10265

1 Q. When you say "more grave than that," what  
2 are you talking about?

3 A. Well, I -- I thought at that time that it  
4 was a problem that somebody could manipulate the  
5 situation. I don't know -- I don't want to run  
6 through a parade of horrors in my mind, but I  
7 thought that, given what the situation was, somebody  
8 could take advantage of it, and I was worried about  
9 that. And I -- so I decided I wanted to know, and I  
10 told Brad, "Tell me where they are, tell me what  
11 they're doing, and tell me who they're meeting  
12 with."

13 Q. Were you concerned that the Arvizos might be  
14 planning to extort Michael Jackson?

15 MR. ZONEN: Objection; leading.

16 THE COURT: Sustained.

17 THE WITNESS: I was; I was concerned.

18 MR. ZONEN: There's an objection.

19 THE COURT: Just a moment.

20 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.

21 THE COURT: Next question.

22 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: What else did you do to  
23 investigate the problem of the Arvizos possibly  
24 manipulating Michael Jackson?

25 A. Well, I -- besides have Brad do that, we  
26 investigate -- they were not the only -- they  
27 weren't the sole focus, but for your -- to answer

28 your question, I also told Brad I wanted him to go 10266

1 and take a statement and get a statement from them.

2 Q. And why did you want Brad Miller to get a  
3 statement from the Arvizos?

4 A. Because I found that -- in the past, at  
5 least, with other cases, that if somebody gives a  
6 statement right at the time, that it's much more  
7 difficult later for them to make up something and  
8 change the story, because you're locked into it.  
9 That's what the truth was, and that's why I wanted a  
10 statement.

11 Q. And in your experience, it's pretty typical  
12 for an investigator to try and get statements,  
13 correct?

14 MR. ZONEN: Objection; leading.

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 You may answer.

17 THE WITNESS: It's what investigators do.

18 The reason you have the investigator take the  
19 statement and not the lawyer is so that the lawyer  
20 doesn't end up being like I am up here, on the  
21 witness stand.

22 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And to your knowledge, did  
23 Mr. Miller take a statement from the Arvizos?

24 A. Yes, Mr. Miller took a statement. I told  
25 him to identify himself. I told him to tell them  
26 that he was taking it for me, and I told him that I  
27 wanted him to ask questions.

28 Q. Okay. And did you ever actually see that 10267

1 statement?

2 A. Later I saw a transcript of it. But I don't  
3 know that I saw -- I think he downloaded it to me in  
4 essence saying, "This is what they said, this is  
5 what they said, this is what they said," in a  
6 telephone call is probably what he did.

7 Q. Was it your understanding, Mr. Geragos, that  
8 statement would be recorded?

9 A. I wanted a tape-recorded statement of them,  
10 detailing all of -- or as extensively as possible,  
11 and I wanted it done -- I probably told Brad  
12 something to the effect, "I want it done yesterday.  
13 I don't want to wait. Get it done."

14 Q. Did anything else go on in the investigation  
15 of the Arvizos?

16 A. Well, at the same time that that was  
17 happening, the -- there was a rebuttal video being  
18 made by a gentleman named Schaffel, who seemed to be  
19 running that end of things, and that rebuttal video  
20 involved the Arvizos as well.

21 So at one point I instructed Brad, "Go watch  
22 when that gets made and sit there, and don't leave  
23 until you get a copy of that videotape. Because I  
24 want a copy of the videotape. I don't want it to  
25 disappear into the ether."

26 Q. To your knowledge, did he do that?

27 A. I know that he went there. I don't know

28 that we ever got a copy of the videotape. 10268



1 Q. Is there anything else you had Mr. Miller do  
2 to investigate the Arvizos?

3 A. I don't know. Off the top of my head, the  
4 things that I described is what I remember, as I sit  
5 here.

6 Q. Did you ever arrange to have the Arvizos put  
7 under surveillance?

8 A. I told him at one point I wanted to know  
9 where they were, what they were doing, who they were  
10 meeting with, and to report back to me.

11 Q. And as far as you know, putting people under  
12 surveillance is part of an investigation, and it's  
13 perfectly lawful, correct?

14 A. I have done it on more than one occasion. I  
15 know most lawyers do it with great frequency. I  
16 know D.A.s do it. And law enforcement does it.

17 Q. Okay. And do you know whether or not the  
18 Arvizos were actually put under surveillance at some  
19 point?

20 A. I do now, and I did then.

21 Q. Okay. To your knowledge, was anyone working  
22 with Mr. Miller in your investigation of the  
23 Arvizos?

24 A. I know now that they were. He may have told  
25 me that a gentleman by the same of Asaf did  
26 something for him on one occasion. I know now that  
27 he had somebody named Johnny working for him. And I

28 didn't know that at the time. 10269

1 Q. Okay. And how long did your investigation  
2 of the Arvizos last, if you know?

3 A. If he started sometime after February 7th,  
4 it would have gone through probably the middle or  
5 end of March would be my guess.

6 Q. Okay. Now, you mentioned someone named  
7 Schaffel. Did you meet Marc Schaffel at some point?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Did you ever speak to him?

10 A. I've spoken to him on the phone.

11 Q. How often do you think you've spoken to him  
12 on the phone?

13 A. I couldn't tell you. Anytime that anything  
14 came up about this video that was being made, I was  
15 always told to talk to Schaffel.

16 Q. How many conversations do you think you had  
17 with Schaffel about the making of the video?

18 A. It would just be a guess. I have no idea.

19 Q. Okay.

20 A. I would say five to ten, probably. Maybe  
21 more.

22 Q. Now, was Schaffel typically involved in the  
23 conference calls you have described before?

24 A. Actually, no. He was not typically involved  
25 in the conference calls. In fact, at one point,  
26 David LeGrand and I had discussed excising Schaffel  
27 from the whole situation --

28 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object to that 10270

1 portion as being nonresponsive to the question and  
2 hearsay.

3 THE COURT: Sustained.

4 MR. ZONEN: Motion to strike.

5 THE COURT: Strike it after, "Actually, no."

6 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you and Mr. LeGrand  
7 have any discussions about Marc Schaffel?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. How many do you think you had?

10 A. At least three.

11 Q. Okay. Did you have more discussions with  
12 Konitzer than you did Schaffel?

13 A. Clearly. Clearly.

14 Q. And why do you say that?

15 A. Ronald Konitzer was, from my perception, the  
16 person who was kind of the backstop or the person  
17 who was running things.

18 Q. And did you meet with him personally?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. On how many occasions, do you think?

21 A. Probably at least three.

22 Q. Okay. Did you ever talk to a guy named  
23 Dieter Weizner?

24 A. During the time period of February and March  
25 of '03, only the time that I was at Neverland did I  
26 speak to Dieter, and it was for just a very brief  
27 period of time.

28 Q. Okay. 10271

1 A. I later -- in terms of time, I later talked  
2 to Dieter maybe a year after that more extensively.  
3 But February and March, no, I had very little  
4 contact with Dieter.

5 Q. Now, as part of your investigation into the  
6 Arvizos, you described the statement that Mr. Miller  
7 obtained, his attendance at the rebuttal video, and  
8 you say you learned about some surveillance that  
9 went on. Is there anything else that was part of  
10 that investigation that you remember?

11 A. Well, I remember a series of letters with a  
12 gentleman named Dickerman. And storage of Janet  
13 Arvizo's things in a storage unit. And I remember  
14 going back and forth with Mr. Dickerman as to where  
15 he wanted those items and the things that he was  
16 claiming.

17 Q. You mentioned Janet Arvizo's possessions  
18 being in a storage unit. How did that happen?

19 A. I -- I don't know, because I wasn't there.  
20 Everything I know was later related to me. If  
21 that's okay, I'll get into that. You don't have --  
22 there's no objection.

23 Okay. It was later related to me by Brad  
24 that she was moving in with her boyfriend who was --

25 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as to  
26 hearsay. Nonresponsive to the question.

27 THE COURT: Okay. Sustained.

28 MR. ZONEN: Was that one sustained, Your 10272



1 Honor?

2 THE COURT: Yes.

3 MR. ZONEN: Thank you.

4 THE COURT: He gave you the opening line, but  
5 you were talking to counsel.

6 THE WITNESS: I tried to prompt you, Mr.  
7 Zonen.

8 THE COURT: He was prompting you. Go ahead.

9 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you have anything to  
10 do with the storage of Janet Arvizo's possessions?

11 A. I told Brad at one point, "If you're going  
12 to do this, film it, so that you don't later get  
13 accused of taking something."

14 Q. And did you have any understanding as to why  
15 Brad was going to store that material?

16 A. I believe --

17 MR. ZONEN: I'll object as hearsay.

18 THE COURT: Overruled.

19 You may answer.

20 THE WITNESS: I believe it was because he  
21 was trying to remain in the good graces to get  
22 whatever information he could as to what they were  
23 up to.

24 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as  
25 speculative, move to strike.

26 THE COURT: I'll strike that.

27 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Was it your understanding

28 that Janet wanted Brad to store her possessions? 10273

1 MR. ZONEN: Objection. Leading and  
2 speculative.

3 THE COURT: Sustained.

4 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Do you know why those  
5 possessions were stored?

6 MR. ZONEN: Objection; lack of foundation.

7 THE COURT: Foundation; sustained.

8 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you ever at any point  
9 have any knowledge as to why those possessions were  
10 stored by Mr. Miller?

11 MR. ZONEN: I'll object beyond "yes" or  
12 "no."

13 THE WITNESS: Yes.

14 I'm sorry, I may have jumped the gun.

15 THE COURT: That's fine.

16 Go ahead. Next question.

17 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Why were they stored?

18 MR. ZONEN: Objection. Lack of foundation;  
19 hearsay.

20 THE COURT: Foundation; sustained.

21 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Do you know why they were  
22 stored?

23 A. I believe they were stored --

24 MR. ZONEN: I'll object to anything beyond  
25 "yes" or "no."

26 THE WITNESS: Yes.

27 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: How did you obtain your

28 knowledge of how they were stored? 10274

1 A. Talking with Mr. Miller.

2 Q. Did he tell you why they were stored?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Did you give any instructions to him about  
5 storing that material?

6 A. I told him when he did the move --

7 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as hearsay.

8 THE COURT: Sustained.

9 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Were those possessions  
10 stored at your request?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Were they stored because Mr. Miller wanted  
13 to store them?

14 MR. ZONEN: Objection. Lack of foundation;  
15 hearsay.

16 THE COURT: Sustained.

17 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you ever see those  
18 possessions at any time?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Did you ever go to storage to see those  
21 possessions?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Now, you had some correspondence with  
24 Attorney Bill Dickerman about those possessions,  
25 right?

26 A. Yes.

27 Q. And what can you tell us about that?

28 A. That every time I'd get a letter it didn't 10275

1 seem to represent the phone conversation that we  
2 had.

3 Q. And did he start writing to you about  
4 wanting those possessions returned?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And do you know approximately when that  
7 happened?

8 A. I do not. It was sometime after -- it was  
9 sometime after February.

10 Q. And you were still representing Michael  
11 Jackson at the time, correct?

12 A. I represented Michael all the way through, I  
13 don't know, whatever -- February to whenever,  
14 December, I guess.

15 Q. Now, at some point, did you try to return  
16 those possessions to Mr. Dickerman?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And please explain what you did.

19 A. I directed -- when I first got the letter  
20 from Mr. Dickerman, I told somebody to fax it over  
21 to Brad, somebody in my office to fax it over to  
22 Brad. And at some point, then received another  
23 letter, and letters kept coming back and forth. And  
24 there would be phone calls. And I kept trying to  
25 get this stuff over there, suggesting that either  
26 they take over the storage unit, that they pay for  
27 the storage unit, that they do anything to get it

28 out, so that we could get out of the situation. 10276



1 Q. Did you say that it was at your direction  
2 that the move was videotaped?

3 A. I believe I'm the one who told Brad, "If  
4 you're going to do this, you better videotape the  
5 move." I believe that's what I told him. It was  
6 almost those exact words.

7 Q. And did he ever tell you that Janet wanted  
8 him to move that stuff?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. When did he tell you that Janet wanted him  
11 to move that stuff?

12 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as hearsay.

13 Move to strike.

14 THE COURT: Overruled. The question, though,  
15 now, is, "When did she tell you" -- no. "When did  
16 he tell you that Janet wanted him to move the  
17 stuff?"

18 THE WITNESS: Probably in the same  
19 conversation I said, "If you're going to do it, you  
20 should videotape it."

21 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And to your knowledge, was  
22 that material ever returned to Mr. Dickerman?

23 A. You know, I assume so. But I know that  
24 there was one instance where I got so fed up with  
25 what was going on, that I actually told --

26 MR. ZONEN: I'll object as nonresponsive.

27 THE COURT: Sustained.

28 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Do you know if that 10277

1 material was ever returned to Mr. Dickerman?

2 A. I know at one time I directed that it just  
3 be dumped into his law office so that he would take  
4 it, and the building wouldn't accept it.

5 Q. That was done at your request?

6 A. To return it? Yes. At all times I said,  
7 "Return the stuff."

8 Q. Okay. Do you know someone named Frank  
9 Tyson?

10 A. I've met Frank Tyson.

11 Q. And when did you first meet him?

12 A. Probably it would have been mid-February of  
13 2003, would be a guess.

14 Q. Do you know approximately where you met him?

15 A. No. I can't tell you where I met him. I  
16 think he came to my office once with another guy  
17 whose name I can't remember. But I -- but I don't  
18 know if that was the first time I met him or not.

19 Q. Did you have much communication with Frank  
20 Tyson?

21 A. I talked to Frank occasionally.

22 Q. Would he typically call you?

23 A. Most always. I wasn't calling him.

24 Q. How many conversations do you think you had  
25 with him?

26 A. Well, if he would call me, I might call him  
27 back. But I don't know how many conversations. I

28 don't know that it was a time. I think he was in 10278

1 communication with Brad more than he was with me.

2 Q. Okay. Now, at some point did your  
3 investigation into the Arvizos terminate?

4 A. Yeah. I would say probably -- probably  
5 about five or six weeks after it started.

6 Q. And did you reach any conclusions about the  
7 Arvizos, based upon your investigation?

8 A. Yeah. They -- that Michael could have  
9 nothing to do with them.

10 Q. Why is that?

11 A. I just felt like it was a pending disaster.

12 Q. And what do you mean by "pending disaster"?

13 A. I just was not comfortable with what I was  
14 finding out, what I was hearing. I just wasn't  
15 comfortable with that.

16 Q. What were you finding out?

17 A. Well, I --

18 MR. ZONEN: Objection; hearsay.

19 THE COURT: Sustained.

20 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Were you ever concerned  
21 that the Arvizos were going to try to extort Michael  
22 Jackson?

23 MR. ZONEN: Objection; leading.

24 THE COURT: Sustained.

25 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Were the results of your  
26 investigation negative or positive when it came to  
27 the Arvizos?

28 A. Negative. 10279

1 MR. ZONEN: Objection; vague.

2 THE COURT: Sustained.

3 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: What did you conclude?

4 A. I concluded that they -- that they should --

5 MR. ZONEN: Objection; calls for a

6 conclusion.

7 THE COURT: You should have said "asked and

8 answered."

9 He's already discussed that. Move on.

10 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Okay. As Mr. Jackson's

11 lawyer at that point in time, did you think it was

12 in his interest to be involved with the Arvizos?

13 A. I --

14 MR. ZONEN: Objection; asked and answered.

15 MR. MESEREAU: No, it wasn't.

16 THE COURT: It is. Next question.

17 MR. MESEREAU: Okay.

18 THE COURT: Sustained.

19 MR. MESEREAU: All right.

20 Q. Did you ever hear anything about the Arvizos

21 taking a trip to Brazil?

22 MR. ZONEN: Your Honor, I'm going to object

23 as to hearsay. And vague, "hear anything about."

24 BAILIFF CORTEZ: Your microphone's off

25 again, sir.

26 THE COURT: Sustained.

27 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you ever learn whether

28 or not the Arvizos were planning to take a trip to 10280



1 Brazil?

2 A. I learned later that there were --

3 MR. ZONEN: I will object to anything beyond

4 "yes" or "no" as nonresponsive.

5 THE WITNESS: Yes.

6 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: What did you learn?

7 MR. ZONEN: Objection; hearsay.

8 THE COURT: Sustained.

9 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you have anything to  
10 do with any planned trip to Brazil involving the  
11 Arvizos?

12 A. No.

13 Q. Did you ever learn if anyone did?

14 A. I learned that someone --

15 MR. ZONEN: Objection beyond "yes" or "no."

16 THE WITNESS: Yes.

17 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: What did you learn?

18 MR. ZONEN: Objection; hearsay.

19 THE COURT: Sustained.

20 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you ever learn that  
21 the Arvizos were traveling to any federal buildings  
22 to obtain passports or visas for a trip to Brazil?

23 MR. ZONEN: Objection; beyond the scope.

24 Objection; lack of foundation and leading.

25 THE COURT: Sustained on leading.

26 Sustained.

27 MR. MESEREAU: Okay.

28 Q. During the time you represented Michael 10281

1 Jackson, did you ever do anything involving a  
2 potential trip to Brazil with the Arvizos?

3 A. I didn't do anything involving a potential  
4 trip to Brazil with the Arvizos.

5 Q. Did you ever learn anything about such a  
6 trip?

7 A. I did, yes.

8 Q. When did you learn that?

9 A. Sometime after Michael was arrested.

10 Q. Okay. And at some point, did you ever have  
11 possession of passports of the Arvizos?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And could you explain that?

14 A. The passport -- when I was going through all  
15 of the materials that we had in our office in order  
16 to itemize them for you, in turning over all the  
17 files, the passports were located in a locked file  
18 cabinet where we kept a lot of Michael's files.

19 I then directed one of the lawyers in my  
20 office to file the passports with the Court so that  
21 I did not give them to you, so that you wouldn't be  
22 in a position where you would have to testify as to  
23 them.

24 Q. And did you, in fact, turn them in to this  
25 Court?

26 A. I directed one of the lawyers in my office  
27 to bring them to the Court and file them with the

28 Court as a court's exhibit. 10282

1 Q. Okay. Is that the last you saw of them?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Okay. Were you involved in any business  
4 matters related to Mr. Jackson during the first  
5 three months of 2003?

6 A. There probably were times when Mr. Konitzer  
7 would ask about certain projects. And then if it  
8 was something somebody in the office, one of the  
9 other lawyers, could deal with, I would refer him to  
10 one of the other lawyers. So, yes, I would say that  
11 there were some occasions.

12 Q. And what kind of projects are you referring  
13 to?

14 A. My understanding of what Mr. Konitzer's  
15 relationship was with Mr. Jackson was that he was  
16 helping to promote, I don't know, technological  
17 applications of various things. And it was usually  
18 surrounding those kind of items and usually it was  
19 beyond our expertise. So usually I would tell  
20 him -- refer him over to somebody else or to some  
21 other lawyer. But he would come and seek advice on  
22 those things.

23 Q. Was any of this business-related legal work  
24 done in your office?

25 A. Some could have been. I mean, there could  
26 have been -- I could have sent -- probably my  
27 brother Matthew would have done some work in

28 connection with various things that they were asking 10283

1 about. Loan refinancing, things of that nature.

2 There was also a marketing idea that they were doing

3 or they wanted to pursue.

4 Q. And were you having discussions with Mr.

5 LeGrand about Mr. Jackson's business matters?

6 A. Mr. LeGrand would bring up those issues, but

7 it was really -- that was really Mr. LeGrand's area

8 of -- I guess his purview, so to speak. That was

9 really what his niche was. He's what's called a

10 transactional lawyer who deals with corporate

11 matters, and that was really his expertise.

12 Q. In the discussions you had with Konitzer and

13 Weizner about Mr. Jackson's business affairs, do you

14 recall Mr. Jackson ever participating?

15 MR. ZONEN: Objection. Lack of foundation;

16 assumes facts not in evidence as to those

17 conversations.

18 THE COURT: Overruled.

19 You may answer.

20 THE WITNESS: It was my understanding that

21 there was -- in fact, it was more than an

22 understanding because I believe that my retainer

23 initially was signed on a power of attorney that --

24 MR. ZONEN: I'll object as nonresponsive to

25 the question.

26 THE COURT: Sustained.

27 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you have any

28 discussions with Mr. Konitzer about Mr. Jackson's 10284



1 business affairs?

2 A. To the extent that Mr. Konitzer represented  
3 to me that he was running the business affairs.

4 Q. Is that what he told you?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Did you have any discussions with Mr.  
7 Weizner about Mr. Jackson's business affairs?

8 A. Not in 2003, in February or March. Like I  
9 said, the only contact I really had with Dieter was  
10 that first time I saw him briefly, discussed it  
11 briefly. But I didn't really have that much contact  
12 with him. I really talked mostly with Ronald.

13 Q. And when you were retained, you had a  
14 retainer agreement signed, correct?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. And that's your normal practice as a lawyer,  
17 right?

18 A. And the State Bar rules generally encourage  
19 that, if not require anything that's going to  
20 involve a certain amount of money.

21 Q. And a retainer agreement basically sets out  
22 the terms and conditions under which you'll  
23 represent a client as a lawyer, right?

24 A. Right.

25 Q. Who signed your retainer agreement?

26 A. I believe that it was signed by Konitzer and  
27 Weizner on a power of attorney, which I also was

28 provided, that was signed by Mr. Jackson. 10285

1 Q. Okay. Did you ever see Konitzer sign any  
2 other documents on behalf of Mr. Jackson while you  
3 were representing Mr. Jackson?

4 A. Not that I can pinpoint. I mean, I -- no,  
5 not that I can think of right now.

6 Q. And did the power of attorney that you saw  
7 appear to give Mr. Konitzer the ability to sign  
8 documents for Mr. Jackson?

9 A. It did -- my understanding of it was that it  
10 did.

11 Q. And do you recall at any point in time when  
12 that power of attorney was revoked?

13 MR. ZONEN: I'll object to lack of  
14 foundation.

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 You may answer.

17 THE WITNESS: I believe the power of attorney  
18 was revoked about the time that David LeGrand got  
19 fired. But that's just my memory as I'm sitting  
20 here. I don't have anything to pin that on.

21 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: And I believe you said,  
22 Mr. Geragos, that you were under the impression that  
23 Konitzer was trying to take over Mr. Jackson's  
24 business affairs?

25 A. It was my perception of Mr. Konitzer that he  
26 was the one who was running the business affairs in  
27 terms of hands on, and that Mr. LeGrand was the

28 lawyer that was doing the corporate transactional 10286

1 work.

2 Q. And based on your involvement in discussions  
3 about Mr. Jackson's business, did it appear to you  
4 that Mr. Jackson wasn't involved much at all?

5 MR. ZONEN: Objection; leading.

6 THE COURT: Sustained.

7 MR. ZONEN: Objection; speculative as well.

8 THE COURT: Leading; sustained.

9 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Did you ever meet Mr.

10 LeGrand in Las Vegas?

11 A. I met Mr. LeGrand at Neverland. And I met  
12 Mr. LeGrand at another -- at Paul Hastings, I  
13 believe, downtown L.A. As I sit here, I don't  
14 remember Las Vegas. If you've got something to  
15 refresh my memory, maybe, but I don't recall that as  
16 I sit here.

17 Q. Now, obviously, having represented Mr.

18 Jackson, you're aware of what the charges are in  
19 this case, right?

20 A. I am.

21 Q. And you're aware that the prosecutors are  
22 claiming there was a conspiracy to commit various  
23 crimes on the Arvizos, right?

24 MR. ZONEN: Objection; leading.

25 THE COURT: Overruled.

26 THE WITNESS: I am aware of that.

27 Q. BY MR. MESEREAU: Were you ever part of any

28 conspiracy to abduct the Arvizo children? 10287

1 A. No.

2 Q. Were you part of any conspiracy to extort  
3 anything from the Arvizos?

4 A. Absolutely not.

5 Q. Were you ever part of any conspiracy to  
6 commit any crime against the Arvizos?

7 A. Absolutely not. I was trying to prevent a  
8 crime against my client.

9 Q. And what crime was that?

10 A. I thought that they were going to shake him  
11 down.

12 MR. MESEREAU: I have no further questions.

13 THE COURT: Cross-examine?

14

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. ZONEN:

17 Q. Mr. Geragos, good afternoon.

18 A. Good afternoon, Mr. Zonen.

19 Q. Now, you were retained to represent Mr.

20 Jackson in the early part of February; is that  
21 correct?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. Could that have been the latter part of  
24 January?

25 A. I don't think so. But, I mean, if -- I  
26 don't want to quibble with you for a couple of days.

27 I've always thought it was -- I've always thought it

28 was February 4th and that I went to Neverland on the 10288



1 7th. I don't know why, that just sticks in my head.

2 Q. Now, prior to your being retained, were you  
3 familiar or did you know about the documentary  
4 "Living with Michael Jackson"?

5 A. I don't -- I don't know.

6 Q. At the time that you were retained, did you  
7 know about the documentary "Living with Michael  
8 Jackson"?

9 A. At the time that the retainer agreement was  
10 signed, yes.

11 Q. At the time that you were first contacted by  
12 somebody --

13 A. I was going to say --

14 Q. -- for Michael Jackson's organization about  
15 your representing Mr. Jackson, did you know about  
16 the documentary "Living with Michael Jackson"?

17 A. Probably not.

18 Q. Who was the first person to call you about  
19 your representing Mr. Jackson?

20 A. I think it was a lawyer from Paul Hastings,  
21 the same guy I said I've got a mental block on the  
22 name, who said that one of his partners was an  
23 ex-U.S. Attorney who had a case with me and wanted  
24 to know if I was interested in it.

25 Q. All right.

26 A. I just don't remember. I just don't  
27 remember the name. And it was -- it could have

28 been -- could he have called me in late January? I 10289

1 suppose he could have. I just don't remember.

2 Q. Do you know if that was before the screening  
3 of the documentary "Living with Michael Jackson"?

4 A. I have no idea.

5 Q. Do you know when "Living with Michael  
6 Jackson" was screened?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Either in the United States or in England?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Do you know -- did you know the content of  
11 the documentary "Living with Michael Jackson"?

12 A. At what time?

13 Q. At the time that it was aired in the United  
14 States.

15 A. Well, you'd have to tell me when it was  
16 aired and then I'd tell you.

17 Q. I guess you didn't see it, then; is that  
18 correct?

19 A. Well, no, I saw it. But I didn't watch it  
20 when it was aired. I --

21 Q. All right. When you were contacted by  
22 somebody --

23 MR. MESEREAU: Objection, Your Honor. He's  
24 cutting off the witness.

25 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Was your answer completed?

26 A. All I was going to say is, I remember  
27 watching it for the first time when somebody sent

28 it -- I asked that they send me a copy of the 10290

1 videotape. I was aware of it before I watched it  
2 the first time because it was probably a subject of  
3 one of these conference calls.

4 Q. And -- all right. Now, when is the first  
5 time you spoke with your client, Mr. Jackson?

6 A. Would have been probably that day at  
7 Neverland.

8 Q. There's no question that your client was  
9 Michael Jackson; is that right?

10 A. My client was Michael Jackson.

11 Q. It was not Ronald Konitzer?

12 A. No.

13 Q. It was not Dieter Weizner?

14 A. Right.

15 Q. It was not Marc Schaffel?

16 A. That's correct.

17 Q. Nor was it Vinnie or Frank?

18 A. Clearly it was not.

19 Q. And at all times you understood that you  
20 represented Michael Jackson alone?

21 A. I did.

22 Q. You did not represent the enterprise  
23 Neverland Valley Entertainment?

24 A. I did not.

25 Q. Did not represent any of Michael Jackson's  
26 corporate interests?

27 A. I did not.

28 Q. And you represented Michael Jackson for 10291

1 purposes of assuring that he avoided criminal  
2 liability and liability with regards to custody of  
3 his children; is that correct?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. Your concern was that his children might be  
6 taken away from him?

7 A. That was one of my concerns.

8 Q. Your concern was that he might be prosecuted  
9 for some criminal matter?

10 A. I think initially my concern was -- were the  
11 children and any allegation of the fitness of him as  
12 a parent, because that was a subject of a lot of the  
13 media firestorm surrounding him at that point.

14 Q. Was that because of his allegedly dangling  
15 his youngest child over a second-story balcony in a  
16 hotel in Germany?

17 A. I think that that's what started some of  
18 that, but then the -- there was -- with the  
19 documentary, there was the same usual suspects  
20 hurling allegations at him about his fitness once  
21 the documentary came out.

22 Q. All right. But are we talking about simply  
23 neglect of his own children, or are we talking about  
24 his relationship with other children?

25 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Misstates the  
26 evidence; lack of foundation; leading.

27 THE COURT: Overruled.

28 THE WITNESS: I was concerned about his 10292



1 children and his maintaining his relationship with  
2 his children.

3 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: But the issues that you were  
4 dealing with as a consequence of that documentary,  
5 "Living with Michael Jackson," had to do with how he  
6 interacted with his own children, correct?

7 A. The issues dealt with the fact that there  
8 were people who were calling for DCFS to take the  
9 children out of the house --

10 Q. All right.

11 A. -- and to conduct an investigation. That  
12 was what -- that was what was the overriding concern  
13 initially.

14 Q. At some point in time, you had an  
15 opportunity to either read the transcript of that  
16 documentary, "Living with Michael Jackson," or view  
17 it; is that correct?

18 A. I viewed it. I didn't read the transcript.

19 Q. Did you view it before you arrived at  
20 Neverland?

21 A. I couldn't tell you, as I sit here, whether  
22 I did it before or after. It was sometime within a  
23 very close period of time.

24 Q. At the time that you were at Neverland, you  
25 saw Ed Bradley there; is that right?

26 A. That's right.

27 Q. Ed Bradley is somebody you recognized as

28 being one of the commentators from 60 Minutes; is 10293

1 that right?

2 A. That's right.

3 Q. You also saw an entire film crew from 60

4 Minutes?

5 A. That's right.

6 Q. 60 Minutes you were familiar with. You had

7 seen it in the past; is that right?

8 A. That's right.

9 Q. You were a little concerned about Michael

10 Jackson appearing on 60 Minutes; is that right?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Had you had a conversation with Michael

13 Jackson prior to your arrival at Neverland on that

14 date?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Do you know if that date was the 7th of

17 February?

18 A. I think I stated before that that date

19 sticks in my mind. If that is a Saturday, that

20 would be my guess. My best guess.

21 I believe that when you executed the -- or

22 the officers executed the search warrant, they took

23 some gate logs also. I don't know if the gate logs

24 are accurate, but I later saw where I signed it on

25 the day that I got there.

26 Q. Did you have a conversation with Mr. Jackson

27 on the 7th?

28 A. Yes. 10294

1 Q. All right. Did you have a sense of the  
2 content of the documentary "Living with Michael  
3 Jackson"?

4 A. At that point, I was more concerned with  
5 what -- the fact that he was going to sit down with  
6 60 Minutes and what the content of that was going to  
7 be.

8 I spent most of my time talking with and  
9 trying to weasel out the information from the  
10 producers as to what was going to be the ground  
11 rules, which they said there were none. But the  
12 content, where they were headed, what they were  
13 trying to do, that was my concern.

14 Q. Did you ask any questions of Michael Jackson  
15 about whether he had been sleeping with boys during  
16 your conversation with him on the 7th of February at  
17 Neverland?

18 A. No, I did --

19 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Leading; lack of  
20 foundation.

21 THE COURT: Overruled.

22 THE WITNESS: No, I did not start  
23 questioning him about whether he was sleeping with  
24 boys when I was up there.

25 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did you know, at the time  
26 that you were at Neverland on the 7th of February,  
27 assuming that is the date, that the issue of him

28 sleeping with boys was, in fact, an issue that had 10295

1 been raised in this documentary?

2 A. I think that I did know that. I don't know  
3 whether it was through the documentary or whether it  
4 was from the download of information. I think I  
5 probably had that information.

6 Q. Did you understand, at the time that you  
7 were at Neverland on the 7th of February, that Gavin  
8 Arvizo was one of the children it was believed that  
9 Mr. Jackson was sleeping with?

10 A. I don't know that -- when you say one of the  
11 children that he was sleeping with, I'm not clear on  
12 what you're -- what you're implying there.

13 I knew that Gavin Arvizo, when I was up  
14 there, was somebody who was reputed to be in the  
15 documentary. But I don't know that anybody said,  
16 "Hey, Michael Jackson is sleeping with Gavin  
17 Arvizo." I don't think that that happened.

18 And I certainly -- as I sit here today, I  
19 don't know if Gavin Arvizo says in the documentary,  
20 "Yeah, I was sleeping with Michael Jackson."

21 MR. ZONEN: I'll object as nonresponsive as  
22 to what he knows today. The question dealt with on  
23 the 7th of February. And move to strike.

24 THE COURT: All right. I'll strike from --  
25 well, actually, I won't. He actually says as he  
26 sits here today, he can't remember what he knew  
27 then, so the objection is overruled.

28 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: All right. But on the 7th of 10296



1 February of 2003, you were aware that one of the  
2 issues that you were dealing with, as his lawyer,  
3 was the issue of whether or not he had been sleeping  
4 with a succession of different boys over the last  
5 number of years?

6 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. No foundation  
7 and misstates the evidence.

8 THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.

9 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did you understand that Mr.  
10 Jackson, in the interview with Mr. Bashir, said, "I  
11 slept with all of them," in reference to a number or  
12 succession of boys?

13 A. On February --

14 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;  
15 argumentative.

16 THE COURT: Overruled.

17 You may answer.

18 THE WITNESS: On February 7th, I don't  
19 believe -- I know you asked this. I just don't  
20 believe that I can tell you whether I had seen the  
21 documentary. I probably had not until after I got  
22 back from Neverland is my best guess. So, no, my  
23 guess is, as I sit here, but I'm not 100 percent  
24 sure of that.

25 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did you have a conversation  
26 with Michael Jackson about Michael Jackson doing a  
27 press conference in Florida?

28 A. No. 10297

1 Q. Did you know that Michael Jackson had been  
2 scheduled to do a press conference in Florida?

3 A. On what date?

4 Q. The 7th of February.

5 A. On the 7th of February. No, I did not know  
6 that.

7 Q. Did you know that Michael Jackson had  
8 brought the Arvizo family to Florida to do a press  
9 conference?

10 A. On February 7th, I did not know that.

11 Q. Did you know, on the 7th of February, that  
12 Janet Arvizo had never had a conversation with  
13 Michael Jackson other than a brief conversation back  
14 in the year 2000?

15 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Misstates the  
16 evidence; foundation.

17 THE COURT: Overruled.

18 You may answer.

19 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Go ahead.

20 A. On February 7th, I can't tell you what Janet  
21 Arvizo did with Michael Jackson. The only thing  
22 that I can tell you is I saw the Arvizos interacting  
23 with --

24 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: My question was whether you  
25 knew about any conversations between --

26 A. No.

27 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. He cut off the

28 witness again, Your Honor. 10298

1 MR. ZONEN: It's nonresponsive, I'll object.

2 MR. MESEREAU: Move to admonish counsel not  
3 to cut off the witness.

4 THE COURT: I'll strike after the sentence,  
5 "The only thing that I can tell you...." From there  
6 on, I'll strike that. Next question.

7 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Mr. Geragos, did you have a  
8 conversation with any employee of Michael Jackson or  
9 representative of Michael Jackson directing them to  
10 have the Arvizos brought to Florida?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Did you have a conversation with Michael  
13 Jackson or any representative of Michael Jackson  
14 directing that the Arvizos be brought from Florida  
15 to Neverland?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Did you know that they were being brought  
18 from Florida to Neverland?

19 A. On February 7th? No.

20 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. That misstates  
21 the evidence. Foundation. They weren't being  
22 brought anywhere.

23 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the  
24 objection as vague.

25 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Were you aware that the  
26 Arvizo family was flown from Florida to Santa  
27 Barbara County and then driven to Neverland?

28 A. On February 7th? 10299

1 Q. Prior to, just prior to February 7th.

2 A. I'm asking you. Do you mean did I know that

3 on February 7th?

4 Q. On February 7th did you know that?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Did you make any inquiry as to what that

7 family was doing there?

8 A. Later.

9 Q. When later?

10 A. Probably middle February.

11 Q. Two weeks later? A week later?

12 A. No, by middle February would have been about

13 a week later.

14 Q. On the 7th of February, did you recommend to

15 your client, Mr. Jackson, that the family, the

16 Arvizo family, be taken home immediately?

17 A. No.

18 Q. A week later, did you tell Mr. Jackson that

19 the Arvizo family should be taken home immediately?

20 A. No.

21 Q. At any time during the month of February,

22 did you tell Mr. Jackson that the Arvizo family

23 should be taken home immediately?

24 A. No, I did not.

25 Q. Did you have any conversation with Mr.

26 Jackson at any time on the 7th of February about the

27 Arvizo family being there on his property?

28 A. To the extent that this, "He's calling me 10300



1 daddy," or, "Janet's encouraging him to call me  
2 'daddy'" story was told to me.

3 Q. Did you talk with Mr. Jackson at any time on  
4 the 7th of February about the Arvizo family leaving  
5 Neverland?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Did you talk with Mr. Jackson at any time on  
8 the 7th of February about whether or not Gavin was  
9 staying in his bedroom?

10 A. No. Not on the 7th.

11 Q. Did you know on the 7th of February that  
12 there was an issue dealing with boys staying in his  
13 bedroom --

14 MR. MESEREAU: Objection.

15 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: -- that had become quite  
16 public?

17 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Misstates the  
18 evidence; argumentative.

19 THE COURT: Overruled.

20 MR. MESEREAU: And foundation.

21 THE COURT: Overruled.

22 You may answer.

23 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Go ahead.

24 THE COURT: Do you want the question read  
25 back?

26 THE WITNESS: No.

27 I just don't know what you mean by "an

28 issue." That it was in the public domain? Yes. I 10301

1 knew it was in the public domain.

2 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: And did you discuss it with  
3 Mr. Jackson?

4 A. No.

5 Q. As his attorney and hopeful of avoiding any  
6 criminal liability on his behalf, did you tell Mr.  
7 Jackson on the 7th of February that he ought to  
8 refrain from having young boys come into his  
9 bedroom?

10 A. No. I didn't give him, as I told you, any  
11 advice right then and there. I was -- the first  
12 time I met him, I was trying to do an investigation.  
13 I was also trying to stop the 60 Minutes interview,  
14 once I got a sense that it was not going to be a  
15 warm and fuzzy piece.

16 Q. All right. You've seen 60 Minutes before,  
17 haven't you?

18 A. If it's Morley Safer, you tend to get a  
19 different piece than if it's Ed Bradley or Mike  
20 Wallace.

21 Q. So even without knowing the issues, as soon  
22 as you saw it was Ed Bradley, you assumed it  
23 wouldn't be warm or fuzzy, right?

24 A. I've watched Ed Bradley do some pieces that  
25 weren't exactly hard-hitting.

26 Q. Now, at any time within the next seven days  
27 after the 7th, the next week after the 7th, did you

28 ever tell Mr. Jackson that he would be well-served 10302

1 by keeping young boys out of his bedroom?

2 A. I don't know that I talked directly to him  
3 that following week. The only conversations that I  
4 had for the next six weeks were usually over the  
5 phone and fairly brief.

6 Q. With Mr. Jackson?

7 A. If he was on the phone, briefly. But they  
8 weren't extensive.

9 Q. All right. Do you know if you had any  
10 conversations with Mr. Jackson over the next seven  
11 days over the telephone?

12 A. I couldn't tell you. I don't think so.

13 Q. Do you know if you had any conversations  
14 with Mr. Jackson over the next 14 days?

15 A. Probably one.

16 Q. Just one conversation?

17 A. Probably one.

18 Q. Can I assume that that conversation did  
19 address the issue of whether or not boys were still  
20 sleeping in his bedroom?

21 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;  
22 argumentative.

23 THE COURT: Overruled.

24 You may answer.

25 THE WITNESS: No, I don't think that the  
26 discussion revolved around whether boys sleep in his  
27 bedroom.

28 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Can I assume within the next 10303

1 14 days after the 7th, in other words, up to the  
2 21st of February, that you had by this point seen,  
3 personally viewed, the documentary "Living with  
4 Michael Jackson," the Martin Bashir documentary?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And you had seen at that point Mr. Jackson's  
7 admission to sleeping with boys; is that right?

8 A. Well, when you say "admission to sleeping  
9 with boys," what are you saying? The statement that  
10 boys will stay in his room?

11 Q. Yes.

12 A. Okay. Are you implying that's necessarily  
13 something sexual?

14 Q. I don't believe it's appropriate for me to  
15 be answering questions, Mr. Geragos. Let's go back  
16 to the question again.

17 A. I'm confused as to when you say "sleeping,"  
18 "boys sleeping in his room," I didn't -- I didn't  
19 think -- my concern was, Mr. Zonen --

20 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as  
21 nonresponsive.

22 THE WITNESS: I was trying to answer it.

23 MR. MESEREAU: Cutting off the witness, Your  
24 Honor. Objection.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Everyone, we're going to  
26 have a time-out.

27 MR. ZONEN: Next question?

28 THE COURT: No. I want you to drop down 10304



1 about two degrees and.... I ride horses, and we

2 wait for the head to relax.

3 Go ahead. Relax a minute.

4 All right.

5 MR. ZONEN: Thank you.

6 Q. Mr. Geragos, when you watched that film, you

7 did see the portion where Mr. Jackson refers to

8 sleeping with boys; is that right?

9 A. Mr. Zonen, as I sit here today, I don't

10 remember seeing in that documentary - I'll take your

11 word for it - that he said, "sleeping with boys."

12 The one thing that I drew from seeing

13 Michael Jackson on February 7th and seeing the kids

14 there was a gentleman who, to my mind, was almost

15 childlike in his love for kids. I didn't see

16 anything nefarious. I didn't see anything that

17 struck me as potentially criminal. But I did see

18 somebody who appeared to me to be ripe as a target.

19 And so I took action that I thought was to protect

20 him.

21 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as

22 nonresponsive.

23 THE COURT: Sustained.

24 MR. ZONEN: Move to strike the last part of

25 the answer.

26 THE COURT: I'll strike after, "I don't

27 remember seeing in that documentary...."

28 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Mr. Geragos, do you recall 10305

1 the documentary where he said he slept with Macaulay  
2 Culkin?

3 A. No. As I sit here, I don't remember him --  
4 I wasn't fixated on whether or not he slept with  
5 Macaulay Culkin. I really -- that was not a concern  
6 of mine.

7 Q. Do you recall him saying he shared a bed  
8 with boys?

9 A. I know that he has said that since then. I  
10 know -- I've sat next to him, or in the same room  
11 when he said that, so I know that; that I know that  
12 he said that.

13 Q. Do you recall seeing the portion of the  
14 documentary where he's sitting next to Gavin Arvizo?

15 A. That I have a vivid memory of.

16 Q. And in that portion of that documentary,  
17 he's holding Gavin Arvizo's hand?

18 A. I have a vivid memory of that.

19 Q. And Gavin Arvizo is resting his head on Mr.  
20 Jackson's shoulder?

21 A. Right.

22 Q. Gavin Arvizo shared a room with Mr. Jackson;  
23 is that correct?

24 A. I -- you're telling me --

25 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; argumentative.

26 THE COURT: Overruled.

27 You may answer. Do you want the question

28 read back? 10306

1 THE WITNESS: No.

2 If what you're telling is Gavin Arvizo spent  
3 the night in his room --

4 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Were you aware of that?

5 A. I know that that's one of the things that's  
6 been claimed, yes.

7 Q. Did you ever ask Mr. Jackson if that was  
8 true, that Gavin Arvizo shared his bed or spent the  
9 night in his room?

10 A. I think we discussed that.

11 Q. What did he tell you?

12 A. That nothing happened.

13 Q. No, I didn't ask you that. What did he tell  
14 you about whether or not he shared his room or his  
15 bed?

16 A. What he has consistently said the entire  
17 time that I represented him, which is that he didn't  
18 do anything; that there was nothing untoward; that  
19 there was nothing sexual; and that if somebody  
20 spends the night in his room, that that was just an  
21 act of unconditional love. That it wasn't anything  
22 that you're getting in here and --

23 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to move to strike as  
24 nonresponsive.

25 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. He cut off the  
26 witness.

27 THE COURT: You did cut him off. Your

28 question called for the answer he's giving, so -- 10307

1 MR. MESEREAU: May he continue to give his  
2 answer, Your Honor?

3 THE COURT: Yes, he may.

4 THE WITNESS: The problem was, Mr. Zonen,  
5 as I saw it, when people say he's sleeping with  
6 somebody in his room, the jump is, with a lot of  
7 people, that that is something that is awful, that  
8 is something that is really, really bad because it  
9 must be sexual.

10 THE COURT: Just a minute. You're lecturing  
11 the jury. Let's back up. I'll strike that. Do you  
12 want to go back to the question again?

13 MR. ZONEN: I'd like to ask a new one.

14 Q. Mr. Geragos, did you ask Mr. Jackson  
15 specifically if Gavin Arvizo had ever spent the  
16 night in his room?

17 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Beyond the scope  
18 and foundation.

19 THE COURT: Overruled.

20 THE WITNESS: Yes. And he said nothing ever  
21 happened.

22 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did he tell you that Gavin  
23 Arvizo had spent the night in his room?

24 A. He said he may have spent the night in the  
25 room, like a lot of the other boys did, and nothing  
26 happened.

27 Q. Did he tell you how many nights Gavin Arvizo

28 spent in his room while he was there? 10308



1 A. No. I didn't ask him.

2 Q. Did he tell you whether or not Gavin Arvizo  
3 specifically shared a bed with him?

4 A. I didn't ask him about sharing a bed. I  
5 asked him in the room, I asked him if anything  
6 happened. His answer was, "No."

7 Based on my observations --

8 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as  
9 nonresponsive.

10 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. He cut off the  
11 witness.

12 MR. ZONEN: Maybe we better resolve this, I  
13 think.

14 THE COURT: Just a moment.

15 The ruling is that, "Based on my  
16 observations..., " that will be stricken. Next  
17 question.

18 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Now, you never asked him at  
19 any time whether or not he shared a bed with Gavin  
20 Arvizo?

21 A. I may have later on, after the arrest. I  
22 assumed we were still talking sometime in  
23 February --

24 Q. Yes.

25 A. -- of '03.

26 Q. Yes.

27 A. February of '03, no. After the arrest, yes.

28 Q. All right. Now, during the next two weeks, 10309

1 did you have any other conversations with Michael  
2 Jackson about Gavin Arvizo?

3 A. Other than the ones we've talked about, no.  
4 Probably not.

5 Q. Did you ever tell Michael Jackson that the  
6 Arvizo family should be taken home as soon as  
7 possible?

8 A. In February of '03, no.

9 Q. Did you come to learn that the Arvizo family  
10 was spending a great deal of time at Neverland  
11 during the month of February?

12 A. No, I came to learn that Janet Arvizo was  
13 making accusations about Dieter.

14 MR. ZONEN: I'll object as nonresponsive.

15 THE COURT: Sustained. Stricken.

16 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Mr. Geragos, did you come to  
17 learn that the Arvizo family was spending a great  
18 deal of time at Neverland during the month of  
19 February?

20 A. Did I learn that in February?

21 Q. In February.

22 A. Probably, yes.

23 Q. All right. Did you immediately call Mr.  
24 Jackson and tell him that the Arvizo family should  
25 be taken back to their home in East Los Angeles?

26 A. No. I think I told him that in March, or  
27 told Ronald that in March; that they should -- they

28 should cut ties. 10310

1 Q. All right. Now, at some point in time, you  
2 directed that your investigator have an interview  
3 with the Arvizo family?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. And I think you said, "Do it yesterday,"  
6 right?

7 A. He said, "When do you want it done?" And I  
8 said, "Like yesterday."

9 Q. As quickly as he can possibly do it?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. This is Brad Miller?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Brad Miller has been your investigator for  
14 some number of years; is that correct?

15 A. I think at that time Brad Miller I had used  
16 on three or four other cases. I've used him on a  
17 number since.

18 Q. Did you tell Brad Miller to tape-record that  
19 interview?

20 A. I believe I told him to tape-record the  
21 interview, that I wanted a taped statement by the  
22 Arvizos.

23 Q. Did you tell him to turn off the  
24 tape-recorder and not to record certain pieces of  
25 information?

26 A. Absolutely not.

27 Q. Did you ever listen to that tape?

28 A. Yes. 10311

1 Q. All right. It is true, is it not, that when  
2 he asked the question about whether or not Gavin  
3 slept in the same bed with Michael Jackson, Gavin  
4 did not answer the question and Brad Miller then  
5 turned off the tape-recorder?

6 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Misstates the  
7 evidence; no foundation.

8 THE COURT: Overruled.

9 You may answer.

10 THE WITNESS: I'm not so sure that that's  
11 what happened.

12 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: What is your recollection of  
13 hearing that tape-recording?

14 A. It appears to me, in listening to that tape,  
15 that the tape was turned on, off, at least two or  
16 three times. And I can't tell you as I sit here  
17 what the question was before each one. But the tape  
18 is taped and is turned off and then turned on, so  
19 I'd agree with you as to that extent.

20 Q. Did you ask Brad Miller if he specifically  
21 turned off the tape-recorder about the time that he  
22 asked the question of whether or not Gavin was  
23 sleeping with Michael Jackson?

24 A. I -- you bet I did.

25 Q. You're aware that other children have  
26 accused Michael Jackson of molesting them. You're  
27 aware of that?

28 A. Yes. 10312



1 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;  
2 argumentative; Court ruling; move to admonish  
3 counsel.

4 THE COURT: Just a moment.

5 The objection is overruled. The answer is,  
6 "Yes."

7 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: All right. You're aware that  
8 back in 1993, there were -- there was one lawsuit  
9 that was filed against Michael Jackson that was  
10 settled on behalf of a child named Jordan Chandler?

11 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; beyond the scope.

12 THE COURT: Overruled.

13 You may answer.

14 THE WITNESS: Yes.

15 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: All right. You're aware that  
16 there was another incident of a resolution of a  
17 claim against Michael Jackson involving a child by  
18 the name of Jason Francia?

19 A. No. Not at -- if you're talking February  
20 and March of '03, no.

21 Q. You didn't learn that until some later time?

22 A. Right.

23 Q. All right. But at the time that you were  
24 meeting with Mr. Jackson on the 7th, you were aware  
25 of the incident involving Jordie Chandler; is that  
26 correct?

27 A. I knew --

28 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; asked and 10313

1 answered.

2 THE COURT: Sustained.

3 MR. ZONEN: I don't believe the last time I  
4 said in February. I may stand corrected if I'm  
5 wrong.

6 THE COURT: Well, that could be. I'll allow  
7 the question with that understanding.

8 MR. ZONEN: All right.

9 Q. Was that, in fact, something you knew about  
10 on the 7th of February?

11 A. I think so, yes.

12 Q. All right. Did you ask Mr. Jackson about  
13 that allegation?

14 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;  
15 beyond the scope.

16 THE COURT: Overruled.

17 THE WITNESS: No.

18 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Were you concerned when you  
19 saw Gavin Arvizo there, a child of the same age as  
20 Jordie Chandler?

21 A. I don't know that I knew that Gavin Arvizo  
22 was the same age as Jordie Chandler. I suppose,  
23 obviously, at one point they were the same age, but  
24 I don't know that that was something that ever went  
25 through my mind.

26 Q. Were you concerned about the presence of  
27 this child at Neverland?

28 A. Well, I was concerned about accusations that 10314

1 were being made, yes.

2 Q. Accusations by whom?

3 A. The -- at the time, in February of '03,  
4 there was a swirl of publicity, and there were  
5 accusations that were being made by numerous people  
6 that his children should be taken out of the home.

7 THE COURT: Just a moment.

8 Let's take a break.

9 (Recess taken.)

10 THE COURT: Counsel?

11 MR. ZONEN: Thank you.

12 Q. Mr. Geragos --

13 THE BAILIFF: Oh, your microphone.

14 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Mr. Geragos, did you keep  
15 copies of notes of conversations with Mr. Jackson?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Did you make any notes of your conversations  
18 with Mr. Jackson?

19 A. Probably not.

20 Q. You didn't make any notes at all of any of  
21 your --

22 A. Probably not. I generally don't do that  
23 with my clients. I generally just talk to them.

24 Q. Did you make notes of any of your  
25 conversations with any of the other individuals who  
26 were working for Mr. Jackson at the time?

27 A. I don't think so.

28 Q. You made no notes of any conversation with 10315

1 Dieter Weizner?

2 A. Dieter Weizner, as I explained before, I  
3 didn't really talk to in February or March, other  
4 than on that one occasion. Ronald I would talk to,  
5 but I'm not a big note-taker.

6 Q. No notes of conversations with Ronald  
7 Konitzer?

8 A. I wouldn't say "no," but none that I can  
9 remember taking.

10 Q. Do you think that your file might have notes  
11 of conversations with Ronald Konitzer?

12 A. To be honest, I'd have to look.

13 Q. Do you think that your file would have notes  
14 of conversations with Mark Schaffel?

15 A. No.

16 Q. How about Frank Cascio?

17 A. No.

18 Q. How about Vinnie Amen?

19 A. I don't know that I ever had -- unless he  
20 was standing with Frank when I talked with Frank, I  
21 don't know that I ever had a conversation directly  
22 with him. Maybe when he was with Frank, but, no, I  
23 wouldn't have notes.

24 Q. Did you have any e-mail communications with  
25 Michael Jackson?

26 A. No, I don't believe so.

27 Q. Did you have any e-mail communications with

28 any of the other named people, the people I just 10316



1 named?

2 A. Probably Ronald would be on -- e-mails that  
3 would come from David LeGrand would have Ronald's  
4 name on them as well.

5 Q. So you would have kept communications  
6 between yourself and David LeGrand through e-mail?

7 A. No, I wouldn't have kept them, but I would  
8 have had them at one point. I don't know that I  
9 would have kept them. Like I say, I would have had  
10 them if they had sent them to me, but probably would  
11 have deleted after I got whatever information I  
12 wanted.

13 Q. Is it your habit and custom to print out  
14 copies of your e-mails and keep them?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Is it your habit and custom to keep your  
17 e-mails electronically stored in your computer?

18 A. No. If it's something particularly  
19 important, I'll just click over and save it into  
20 Word Perfect and then save it in the file, but I  
21 generally do not keep the e-mails segregated with  
22 whatever else.

23 Q. Do you have a Word Perfect file on Michael  
24 Jackson?

25 A. I believe that I do.

26 Q. Does it contain e-mail communications?

27 A. I don't think I had any e-mails with him.

28 I'd have to double-check to be sure, but I don't 10317

1 think I did.

2 Q. Did you have e-mail communications with Brad  
3 Miller?

4 A. I think that I did.

5 Q. Did you save those e-mail communications?

6 A. I don't think that I did.

7 Q. You might have?

8 A. Maybe.

9 Q. Would it be your habit and custom to title  
10 those "E-mail communications" with your investigator  
11 and put them in your file as a Word Perfect  
12 document?

13 A. If I looked in Word Perfect, that's -- if it  
14 was something important and I saved it into Word  
15 Perfect, that would be the way to tell.

16 Q. Is it the case that you're the only lawyer  
17 remaining in Los Angeles County who still uses Word  
18 Perfect?

19 (Laughter.)

20 A. Probably so. But it's the 11 series, so --

21 Q. Mr. Geragos, I'd like to show you an  
22 exhibit.

23 Could I approach the witness?

24 THE COURT: Yes.

25 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Number 347, would you take a  
26 look at that, please?

27 A. Okay.

28 Q. That's an exhibit containing two notes; is 10318

1 that correct?

2 A. Yes. It's got two blue pieces of paper with  
3 handwriting on it.

4 Q. Do you recognize that as your former  
5 client's handwriting?

6 MR. MESEREAU: Excuse me, could I see what  
7 this is?

8 THE COURT: Yes.

9 MR. MESEREAU: May I approach, Your Honor?

10 THE COURT: Yes.

11 MR. ZONEN: It's admitted in evidence, Your  
12 Honor.

13 THE COURT: He just needs to see what it is.

14 MR. ZONEN: I understand. Thank you.

15 Q. Do you recognize that as Mr. Jackson's  
16 handwriting?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Were you familiar with Mr. Jackson's  
19 handwriting?

20 A. Familiar with his signature and familiar  
21 with some of the way he signs off. But not -- this  
22 does not appear -- there's nothing about it that I  
23 recognize.

24 Q. All right. Would you read those two notes,  
25 please, out loud?

26 A. "But you have to really be honest in your  
27 heart that I am your dad and will take care" --

28 "good care of you, Dad. I want you to have a great 10319

1 time in Florida. I'm very happy to be your daddy.

2 Blanket, Prince and Paris are your brothers and

3 sisters. Love, Dad."

4 Q. All right. Would you be surprised to learn

5 that that is, in fact, a note or two notes written

6 by Mr. Jackson to Gavin Arvizo?

7 A. I don't know. Would I be surprised? I

8 don't know. I probably would be surprised.

9 Q. All right. Mr. Geragos, if, in fact, those

10 are notes written by the defendant to Gavin Arvizo,

11 that would be inconsistent with what you tell us he

12 told you about not wanting to be called "Dad"; is

13 that right?

14 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Misstates the

15 evidence. He said someone else told him.

16 THE WITNESS: Yeah --

17 THE COURT: Just a moment.

18 And no speaking objections, Mr. Mesereau.

19 MR. MESEREAU: Yes, sir.

20 THE COURT: All right. You may answer. I'm

21 not sure you answered or you were responding to Mr.

22 Mesereau, so --

23 MR. ZONEN: Should the question be reread,

24 Your Honor?

25 THE COURT: Reread the question.

26 THE WITNESS: I believe that the -- that --

27 I don't know what dates these were written on, and I

28 don't know that it's his handwriting. 10320



1 Are you asking me to assume it's his  
2 handwriting? If I assume it's his handwriting, yes,  
3 that would be -- that would be surprising to me.

4 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Now, to your knowledge, the  
5 only trip that the Arvizos ever took to Florida with  
6 Mr. Jackson was the one that they took just prior to  
7 arriving in Neverland on the 7th; is that correct?

8 A. From the discovery, that's my understanding.

9 Q. You have no other information that the  
10 Arvizo family ever took any other trip to Florida  
11 with Mr. Jackson?

12 A. Right. I don't have any other information  
13 that they took any other trip.

14 Q. Do you have any information that the Arvizo  
15 family took a trip anywhere with Mr. Jackson other  
16 than Florida and Neverland?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Now, I asked you a number of questions about  
19 your giving counsel to your client about the Arvizo  
20 family leaving Neverland.

21 When did you finally tell your client that  
22 it's time for the Arvizo family to go home?

23 A. I think I told -- I don't know that it was  
24 Michael or Ronald, or maybe on the same phone call,  
25 but sometime in March that -- in March of '03.

26 Q. Now, were you aware in March of '03 that the  
27 Arvizo family was still at Neverland?

28 A. I think they had come and gone, was my 10321

1 understanding back then, in March of '03.

2 Q. At the time of the conversation with Mr.

3 Jackson -- let me strike that and reask that.

4 Did you finally have a conversation with

5 Michael Jackson about the fact that the Arvizos

6 should not be at Neverland?

7 A. I had a conversation -- my only hesitancy is

8 when you say was it with Michael Jackson. I don't

9 think it was with Michael. I think the conversation

10 was with either Ronald or Brad saying that, "This is

11 not a good situation." I don't think that the

12 conversation was with Michael.

13 Q. Well, Brad Miller was working for Michael

14 Jackson at the time?

15 A. Brad Miller was working for me.

16 Q. All right.

17 A. Brad Miller would be a liaison. If I were

18 in trial, I would have Brad communicate messages,

19 but Brad was not talking to Michael. Brad would

20 have been talking to one of the people that I

21 mentioned.

22 Q. All right. Is there a reason you didn't

23 call Michael Jackson directly, given that he is

24 your -- was your client --

25 A. Well --

26 Q. -- and tell him to send the Arvizo family

27 home? Is there a reason you didn't do that?

28 A. Because I don't believe, at the time when I 10322

1 had that conversation, that Michael was even at  
2 Neverland. I don't think Michael was there then.

3 Q. Did you make any effort to determine when  
4 Michael Jackson would be at Neverland?

5 A. Well, when you say, "make an effort to  
6 determine," I believe at one point he was out of  
7 state and -- in March, and I was informed of that,  
8 and so that's -- that was the basis for my opinion.

9 Q. Did you --

10 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. He's cutting off  
11 the witness.

12 THE COURT: Sustained.

13 MR. MESEREAU: May the witness complete his  
14 answer, Your Honor?

15 THE COURT: Had you completed your answer?

16 THE WITNESS: No, but I forgot what I was  
17 going to say.

18 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did you make an effort to  
19 contact Michael Jackson out of state?

20 A. No -- well, I think that I was told he was  
21 out of state. I think it was one of those brief  
22 conversations when he was on with somebody else. I  
23 was having a conversation with somebody else, he was  
24 either in the room or got on for a minute.

25 But, no, that was not -- I didn't consider  
26 that -- that I was dictating to him what he needed  
27 to do. I was there, I thought, to do an

28 investigation. I was there to make sure that 10323

1 nothing unfair happened to him and his kids. That  
2 was my role.

3 Q. At some point in time around the middle of  
4 the month of February, did you learn that the family  
5 had left Neverland?

6 A. This was what was objected to before. You  
7 want me to answer it now?

8 Q. I'd like to know if you learned at some time  
9 in the middle of February that the family had left  
10 Neverland. Yes or no?

11 A. Yes, I was told by somebody that the family  
12 had left Neverland.

13 Q. All right. Okay. Now, were you aware that  
14 there were telephone calls being made from Frank  
15 Cascio to Janet Arvizo asking her to return to  
16 Neverland?

17 A. I found that out later. I did not know it  
18 at the time.

19 Q. Are you aware that your investigator, Brad  
20 Miller, tape-recorded one or more of those  
21 conversations?

22 A. I'm aware of one. I found that out when the  
23 police searched Brad's office and got that tape, and  
24 later learned what that was.

25 Q. Did you direct Mr. Miller to tape-record  
26 those telephone calls?

27 A. I said I was aware of one.

28 Q. Did you direct Brad Miller -- 10324



1 A. And I did not direct him to tape a phone  
2 call surreptitiously. The only tape that I directed  
3 him to do that was an audiotape, was the one where I  
4 said, "I want you to sit down and interview them."  
5 And I also told him, "I want a log of where they  
6 are." I did not tell him to tape Frank Tyson or  
7 that one phone call.

8 Q. Did Mr. Miller tell you about the  
9 conversation that he tape-recorded between Frank  
10 Cascio or Frank Tyson and Janet Arvizo?

11 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Assumes facts not  
12 in evidence; no foundation; misstates the evidence  
13 as well.

14 THE COURT: Overruled.

15 You may answer.

16 THE WITNESS: Brad later told me, when we  
17 were -- you and I and Mr. Sneddon were litigating  
18 this issue, and I asked him about it, that the  
19 reason he did it is because Frank had led him to  
20 believe --

21 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object at this time  
22 to --

23 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. He's cutting off  
24 the witness.

25 MR. ZONEN: Well, I --

26 THE COURT: Overruled.

27 The question is simply whether or not he

28 told you about tape-recording the conversation. 10325

1 THE WITNESS: Do you want me to answer "yes"

2 or "no"? Yes.

3 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Now, when was the  
4 conversation that you had with Brad Miller where he  
5 acknowledged tape-recording that conversation? When  
6 was that?

7 A. It would have been substantially after the  
8 tape was seized from his office.

9 Q. All right. Back during the month of  
10 February, was Brad Miller informing you as to the  
11 content of his investigation?

12 A. He was -- he was pretty dil --

13 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Leading, Your  
14 Honor. Vague as to time.

15 MR. ZONEN: I said February.

16 MR. MESEREAU: Can I assume 2003?

17 THE COURT: Just a moment. Just a moment.

18 All right. I'll overrule the objection.

19 Do you want the question read back? I'll  
20 order it read back.

21 THE WITNESS: I remember. I was going to  
22 answer.

23 He was being fairly diligent about telling  
24 me. He did not tell me about that one particular  
25 call until after it was seized when I started to  
26 question him about it.

27 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did he tell you about any

28 conversations that took place between Frank Cascio 10326

1 and Janet Arvizo?

2 A. That conversation.

3 Q. Did he tell you that in the middle part of  
4 February, Frank Cascio was trying to get Janet  
5 Arvizo back to Neverland Ranch?

6 A. No. That's not what he told me. Do you  
7 want me to tell you what he told me?

8 Q. Did he tell you that anybody from Neverland  
9 Ranch was making efforts to get Janet Arvizo back?

10 A. No. He told me that he was --

11 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object as  
12 nonresponsive.

13 THE WITNESS: No.

14 THE COURT: Sustained.

15 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Mr. Geragos, did you have  
16 conversations with any employee of Michael Jackson  
17 on whether or not the Arvizo family should be  
18 tape -- videotaped and whether or not that videotape  
19 should be included in a commercial production to be  
20 aired on television?

21 A. I was told that they were going to be  
22 videotaped, and it would have been by David and/or  
23 Ronald. And I instructed Brad to go to the  
24 videotaping and to remain there until he got a copy  
25 of the videotape.

26 Q. Were you consulted at any time by any  
27 employee of Michael Jackson as to whether or not

28 waivers would be necessary for such a thing? 10327

1 A. No.

2 Q. Were you consulted by anybody employed by  
3 Michael Jackson on the question of whether or not  
4 any member of the Arvizo family should be  
5 compensated for their involvement in this tape?

6 A. I was told that they wanted to be  
7 compensated for the tape.

8 Q. All right. And did you tell -- who was that  
9 who told you that?

10 A. As I sit here, I would just be guessing. I  
11 know that I was told that they wanted to be  
12 compensated for the tape.

13 Q. And did you tell that person that that would  
14 be an appropriate thing to do, since it was a  
15 commercial interest?

16 A. No. I don't think I did -- had anything to  
17 do with it. In fact, I think that that was dealt  
18 with -- all of the licensing and everything having  
19 to do with the rebuttal was handled by, I think,  
20 David and Schaffel.

21 Q. At the time of the conversation with this  
22 person about them wanting to be compensated for this  
23 tape, did you ask that person if the Arvizo family  
24 was still staying at Neverland Ranch?

25 A. I don't remember if I did.

26 Q. Do you know if you told that person that it  
27 was not a good idea for these people to be

28 associating with Michael Jackson? 10328



1 A. Well, I know that I had that conversation.

2 Q. With whom?

3 A. I'm sure I've had it with Brad. I'm sure  
4 I've had it with Ronald. And I'm positive that at  
5 one point I had that conversation with David.

6 Q. With who?

7 A. David LeGrand.

8 Q. With David LeGrand.

9 Did any of them tell you that was difficult  
10 to do because Mr. Jackson enjoyed sleeping with  
11 Gavin Arvizo?

12 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Assumes facts not  
13 in evidence; argumentative.

14 THE COURT: Overruled.

15 You may answer.

16 THE WITNESS: No. Nobody told me that.

17 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: When did you first learn that  
18 there was, in fact, a succession of young boys that  
19 had been sleeping with Michael Jackson over the last  
20 15 years?

21 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Misstates the  
22 evidence; argumentative; no foundation; move to  
23 strike.

24 THE COURT: Argumentative; sustained.

25 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did you ever learn about  
26 Brett Barnes?

27 A. Doesn't ring a bell.

28 Q. Did you ever learn about Jordie Chandler? 10329

1 A. The same person you asked me about

2 earlier --

3 Q. Yes.

4 A. -- from '93, yes.

5 MR. MESEREAU: Asked and answered.

6 MR. ZONEN: All right.

7 THE COURT: Just a moment.

8 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: And in the process of

9 investigating --

10 THE COURT: Just a moment. I'm ruling on an

11 objection here.

12 MR. ZONEN: I'm sorry. I thought you had.

13 THE COURT: Sustained.

14 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did you ever determine

15 whether or not Jordie Chandler had spent many

16 consecutive nights in bed with Michael Jackson?

17 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Beyond the scope;

18 no foundation; argumentative.

19 THE COURT: Sustained.

20 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did you make any

21 investigation into any of the allegations against

22 Michael Jackson that occurred back in 1993 and prior

23 to '93?

24 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Beyond the scope;

25 no foundation; argumentative.

26 THE COURT: Overruled.

27 You may answer.

28 THE WITNESS: Over the break I was given the 10330

1 written waiver, and the written waiver was up  
2 through --

3 BAILIFF CORTEZ: Microphone, sir.

4 THE WITNESS: The written waiver was up  
5 through the time of arrest. To answer that, I would  
6 have to go beyond that.

7 THE COURT: I didn't understand that the  
8 waiver was limited.

9 MR. ZONEN: Nor did I.

10 MR. MESEREAU: Yes, Your Honor. If I didn't  
11 say that, I meant to. We were going to limit it  
12 until up to the time of Mr. Jackson's arrest.

13 THE COURT: That's not what you informed all  
14 of us. Take the jury out, please.

15

16 (The following proceedings were held in  
17 open court outside the presence and hearing of the  
18 jury:)

19

20 THE COURT: Counsel, you didn't inform Mr.  
21 Geragos, myself, or anyone else in the courtroom  
22 that there was anything other than a waiver of the  
23 attorney-client privilege. You didn't indicate  
24 there was any limitations on that waiver.

25 MR. MESEREAU: That's my mistake, Your  
26 Honor. I was thinking in terms of the period,  
27 relevant time period, not after the arrest, the time

28 he was involved with Mr. Konitzer, Dieter, people 10331

1 like that. That's -- that's my mistake, and I  
2 apologize. I didn't think anything was relevant  
3 after the arrest.

4 THE COURT: They can't hear you talking back  
5 there.

6 MR. MESEREAU: I didn't think anything was  
7 relevant after the arrest. And I should have been  
8 clear about that. That's my mistake.

9 THE COURT: Well, I consider you've made a  
10 total, complete waiver on the record. You know, I'm  
11 not going to allow you to give with one hand and  
12 take away with the other.

13 MR. MESEREAU: Can I inquire, Your Honor?  
14 With all due respect, what would be relevant after  
15 the arrest to the time period that's being litigated  
16 in court? I don't think there is anything. I  
17 believe the allegations --

18 THE COURT: The relevancy is one issue,  
19 granted. But that's not what we're talking about  
20 now. We're talking about the scope of the waiver  
21 that you represented that you were -- that existed.  
22 Mr. Geragos is on the witness stand. He's  
23 answering questions, and then you inform him during  
24 a break that there's some limitation. I think  
25 relevance has to be dealt with on a  
26 question-by-question basis. I'm not dealing with  
27 that. I'm dealing with the extent of the waiver

28 that you indicated to the Court and to Mr. Geragos 10332



1 that you have.

2 MR. MESEREAU: I guess I did do that. And  
3 unfortunately, I meant to cover the period involving  
4 this case, which I thought was before the arrest,  
5 and that was my mistake.

6 I didn't think it included, Your Honor, the  
7 period of time following the initial information.  
8 I didn't think that was relevant. I wasn't even  
9 considering that. I was thinking about the time  
10 period during which the prosecution has elicited  
11 testimony and he elicited testimony regarding these  
12 alleged events.

13 THE COURT: Well, what's your position?

14 MR. ZONEN: I think it may be appropriate to  
15 ask this witness questions about his conversations  
16 with the defendant and questions about his  
17 involvement in the case even after the arrest. It  
18 could have bearing certainly on his conduct here, or  
19 conduct that he took after the time of the arrest  
20 could have bearing on whether or not he did or  
21 didn't do certain things prior to the arrest. I  
22 just don't think that we should be restrained from  
23 having to limit our questions only up to the time of  
24 his arrest.

25 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, may I just  
26 interject one thing, since I'm going to be the one  
27 asked the questions?

28 If there's not a waiver from the client -- 10333

1 MR. ZONEN: I'm going to object.

2 THE WITNESS: If there's not a waiver --

3 THE COURT: No, he has my permission to  
4 speak.

5 THE WITNESS: If there's not a waiver by the  
6 client, I believe under State Bar rules, I am  
7 completely exposed. And I would inform the Court,  
8 without a written waiver, I am not going to answer,  
9 even under threat of contempt, any further questions  
10 that have to do with anything which is stated at  
11 least in the written waiver that I have, under -- or  
12 after December of 2003, because I can't put that  
13 genie back into the bottle at this point.  
14 Frankly, I think technically the arrest was  
15 in November of 2003, in the first place, but the  
16 letter states December of 2003. And I believe under  
17 State Bar rules, I'm not allowed to answer anything  
18 unless there's a written waiver that is fully  
19 informed by the client.

20 MR. ZONEN: Your Honor, we haven't been  
21 furnished with a copy of that waiver. We would like  
22 to see it, please.

23 THE COURT: Go ahead and --

24 MR. MESEREAU: We have another copy, Your  
25 Honor.

26 THE WITNESS: Do you want to make a copy or --

27 MR. ZONEN: That's okay.

28 THE COURT: The question that was asked was 10334

1 whether or not he'd made an investigation into the  
2 1993 allegations. And that was when he advised us  
3 that he had been given a limited waiver.

4 So I guess if the question was whether you'd  
5 made any investigation into the allegations about  
6 1993 back in February, that you would be able to  
7 answer that question.

8 THE WITNESS: That's correct, Your Honor.

9 In fact, if the question was limited to  
10 anything prior to, I believe it was November -- I  
11 want to say 18th or 19th of 2003, anything prior to  
12 that date I'm comfortable with and don't have a  
13 problem.

14 Anything after that date, I'm going to  
15 refuse or decline to answer. Respectfully, of  
16 course.

17 THE COURT: I'm not quite sure how to deal  
18 with it, but one way we can deal with it is that the  
19 relevancy of his testimony is based on what happened  
20 in February, March, and maybe up to the time of  
21 arrest. And then we could complete that testimony,  
22 and if you then thought you had some need to go into  
23 other areas, we could get some points and  
24 authorities on where we stand on the  
25 misrepresentation that Mr. Mesereau has made to the  
26 Court and to counsel.

27 That way, though, if we take evidence

28 limited in that respect today, we can free counsel 10335

1 up to get back to his trial. I know he's got a  
2 trial in Los Angeles that he needs to be at. And if  
3 we do it that way, then what I would do is hold you  
4 on call to me.

5 THE WITNESS: I kind of thought I already  
6 was.

7 THE COURT: Huh?

8 THE WITNESS: I kind of thought I already  
9 was.

10 THE COURT: Yeah, you are. But, you know, in  
11 the future, and --

12 MR. ZONEN: Judge, is the Court under the  
13 expectation that we're actually going to finish by  
14 2:30 today?

15 THE COURT: Uh-huh. Aren't you?

16 MR. ZONEN: Not optimistically, no. Not  
17 with redirect as well. I may finish cross. I don't  
18 know that we're going to finish redirect.

19 THE COURT: Well, let's see what we do.  
20 Sometimes -- anyway, I then will proceed in this  
21 fashion, reserving what remedies exist -- what  
22 should be done under the circumstances, but we don't  
23 waste the last hour, and perhaps we're able to free  
24 counsel and perhaps not.

25 Is that an agreeable way to proceed?

26 MR. ZONEN: It is.

27 And while the jury is out, let me also ask

28 that we be furnished at this time Mr. Geragos's 10336



1 file, at least the file that existed up to the date  
2 of the arrest, which would include all of his  
3 billing records, his notes, his e-mails, his  
4 handwritings, communications and reports. There is  
5 a waiver up till that time.

6 THE COURT: I'm not going to order that,  
7 Counsel. You can use the proper process for that.  
8 Now, is that an agreeable way to proceed,  
9 Mr. Mesereau, today?

10 MR. MESEREAU: Yes, Your Honor. And I  
11 apologize for the -- it was not intentional, what  
12 you've categorized as a misrepresentation. I  
13 apologize for that. It was not intentional. I was  
14 thinking of the period of the alleged conspiracy.

15 THE COURT: People can't hear you.

16 MR. MESEREAU: I was thinking of the period  
17 of the alleged conspiracy. I was not thinking  
18 beyond that, and that's my mistake. And I do  
19 apologize to the Court.

20 THE COURT: All right. We'll see where that  
21 gets us. I don't know where that gets us. Let's  
22 bring the jury in and see what we can achieve.

23

24 (The following proceedings were held in  
25 open court in the presence and hearing of the  
26 jury:)

27

28 THE COURT: Go ahead, Counsel. 10337

1 MR. ZONEN: All right.

2 Q. Mr. Geragos, the tape-recording of the  
3 telephone call that I had asked you about  
4 previously, the call between Frank Cascio and Janet  
5 Arvizo, you did tell us that you listened to that  
6 tape-recording; is that correct?

7 A. Yes, I -- well, we're right back to where we  
8 were before.

9 THE COURT: Excuse me. I was just -- let me  
10 just take care of something.

11 I'll just have the court reporter mark that.

12 Next question.

13 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Mr. Geragos, at some time  
14 after that interview that your investigator, Mr.  
15 Miller, had with the Arvizo family at your  
16 direction, you became aware of the fact that there  
17 was going to be a filming of the entire family; is  
18 that right?

19 A. I don't know if it was the whole family, but  
20 I was aware there was going to be a videotaping,  
21 yes.

22 Q. And were you aware at that time that that  
23 video was going to be used in a commercial  
24 production?

25 A. I knew that the videotaping was going to  
26 be -- they were trying to sell it. That's what they  
27 were going to do. So if you mean "commercial" that

28 way, yes, they were trying to sell it. I don't know 10338

1 if they had already cut a deal or not.

2 Q. Was it your understanding that the Arvizos'  
3 participation in that video would have commercial  
4 value to your client, Mr. Jackson?

5 A. I don't know if I'm qualified to answer  
6 that.

7 Q. Was that your belief at the time?

8 A. I don't know that I ever thought about it at  
9 the time.

10 Q. Did anybody ever talk to you about the  
11 commercial value of their involvement in this video?

12 A. Nobody was looking for my advice on  
13 commercial value of the rebuttal video.

14 Q. Did anybody ever consult with you at all  
15 about the propriety of using the Arvizo family in  
16 this video?

17 A. I don't know about -- well, I just said if  
18 some statements were going to be taped, I wanted a  
19 copy.

20 Q. Did you know that Gavin Arvizo was a cancer  
21 survivor?

22 A. I did not then, when that tape was made.

23 Q. Well, that tape was made, what, the 20th?

24 A. I think that tape was made the 20th. And I  
25 probably -- probably knew that either on that  
26 following day or the day after. But I think very  
27 close in time.

28 Q. Mr. Geragos, you had not watched the 10339

1 documentary "Living with Michael Jackson" prior to  
2 that?

3 A. I had, but I had -- I had not investigated  
4 records or anything like that. I later got records  
5 and confirmed what was being said.

6 Q. Isn't it true that the documentary "Living  
7 with Michael Jackson" has clearly stated that Gavin  
8 Arvizo is a cancer survivor?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And you did view that documentary prior to  
11 the taping on the 20th?

12 A. Right, but I wasn't buying anything until I  
13 had documentation.

14 Q. All right. But you had information, at  
15 least, that Gavin Arvizo was a cancer survivor; is  
16 that right?

17 A. That's what the claim was.

18 Q. Did you ever ask Michael Jackson if it was  
19 true that Gavin Arvizo was a cancer survivor?

20 A. Not in February of '03.

21 Q. Of any of the conversations that you had  
22 with David LeGrand or Ronald Konitzer, did you ask  
23 either one of them if it was true that Gavin Arvizo  
24 was a cancer survivor?

25 A. I think that the discussions were had  
26 sometime in February about that subject.

27 Q. You were aware, were you not, that the

28 filming and presentation and airing of the 10340



1 documentary "Living with Michael Jackson" caused  
2 Gavin Arvizo considerable problems in his life?

3 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; foundation.

4 THE COURT: Overruled.

5 You may answer.

6 THE WITNESS: I was aware that the claim was  
7 made that he was being taunted at school.

8 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: And you knew that prior to  
9 the 20th of February; is that right?

10 A. I don't think I knew it prior to the 20th.

11 I think I knew it closer to the end of the month or  
12 the beginning of March.

13 Q. When you viewed the documentary "Living with  
14 Michael Jackson," did you understand at the time  
15 that that documentary was going to cause Gavin  
16 Arvizo problems?

17 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; foundation.

18 THE WITNESS: My --

19 THE COURT: Overruled.

20 You may answer.

21 THE WITNESS: Gavin Arvizo wasn't my client.

22 Michael Jackson was my client.

23 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: I understand that.

24 A. I was not -- you know, I don't want to sound  
25 heartless, but I was worried about my client's  
26 problems.

27 Q. I understand you were worried about your

28 clients problems, but did you, in fact, understand 10341

1 that the airing of that documentary could cause  
2 Gavin Arvizo problems because of how he was depicted  
3 and portrayed?

4 A. I -- I suppose in retrospect, yes. At the  
5 time, I thought that it was -- it would have the  
6 opposite effect for him. He would be able to  
7 exploit that for money. That was my worry; that he  
8 was going to, or the family was going to go sell  
9 their story for a six-figure sum. I had that  
10 concern.

11 Q. Now, actually "sell the story," sell the  
12 story to whom?

13 A. One of the tabloids.

14 Q. Well, they would have a right to do that,  
15 wouldn't they?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. There's absolutely nothing illegal about  
18 selling your own story?

19 A. If it's false, then you have actions that  
20 you can take, and that's -- that's one of the  
21 reasons I wanted to have the tape, because I didn't  
22 want -- I wanted to have them locked into what the  
23 truth was and not later sell a false story, because  
24 my experience is that the tabloids are not always  
25 absolutely accurate.

26 Q. All right. Now, that's not necessarily the  
27 problem of the Arvizos, whether or not the tabloids

28 are accurate, right? 10342

1 A. I don't know that I would agree with that.

2 Q. All right. But the Arvizos certainly would  
3 have a right, in this country, to sell their story  
4 to anybody?

5 A. They would. And as I stated, I already had  
6 a concern about the Arvizos because of the J.C.  
7 Penney lawsuit, so I was not exactly looking at them  
8 as being pristine or pure at that point. I had --  
9 for lack of a better word, I had a rather jaded view  
10 at that point.

11 Q. In fact, Michael Jackson was marketing the  
12 Arvizo's story for profit; is that true?

13 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Foundation;  
14 assumes facts not in evidence.

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 You may answer.

17 THE WITNESS: They were trying to do, my  
18 understanding, what they called a rebuttal video.  
19 And the reason they were trying to do a rebuttal  
20 video, I suppose, was, as you indicated, for profit.  
21 It wasn't being done pro bono.

22 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: And your client believed that  
23 if the Arvizos were included and their story was  
24 included in this production, it would be more  
25 profitable to him; is that true?

26 A. Actually, I don't know.

27 MR. MESEREAU: Objection. Assumes facts not

28 in evidence; foundation. 10343

1 THE COURT: Overruled.

2 THE WITNESS: Actually, I don't know what my  
3 client believed. All I know is when I heard that  
4 they were going to be included, I wanted to have a  
5 copy of the statements, the videotaped statements.  
6 I did not specifically talk to Michael  
7 about, "Are you doing this for money?" "Is this  
8 something that you have a belief we're going to use  
9 them for marketing?" or anything of that nature.

10 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did you have a conversation  
11 with anybody at Hamid Moslehi's home -- easy for me  
12 to say.

13 A. Common spelling.

14 Q. -- (continuing) Hamid Moslehi's home on the  
15 19th of February of 2003?

16 A. I could have, if Brad was there. It would  
17 have made sense that Brad might have called me and  
18 said, "They're not giving me the videotape," because  
19 they didn't give me the videotape.

20 Q. Did you at any time during the evening of  
21 the 19th, into the early morning hours of the 20th,  
22 give any direction to any employee of Michael  
23 Jackson about what they should ask or what they  
24 shouldn't ask --

25 A. Absolutely --

26 Q. -- the Arvizo family?

27 A. Absolutely not.

28 Q. Did anybody consult with you about the 10344



1 script that would be used for the Arvizo family?

2 A. I didn't know that there was a script.

3 Q. Did anybody ask you whether or not the  
4 Arvizos should be specifically asked questions about  
5 whether Gavin was molested?

6 A. I specifically said, "I want copies of the  
7 videotape." I do not believe that I talked to  
8 Hamid. And I can't pronounce his last name.

9 Q. Moslehi.

10 A. Easy for you to say.

11 And I don't believe that I talked to anybody  
12 else that evening but Brad. I could be mistaken.  
13 But that -- my memory is that I would have talked to  
14 Brad; that Brad told me that they weren't giving up  
15 a videotape, or that it was getting late, or I told  
16 him, "I don't want to talk to you anymore. Don't  
17 call me anymore. It's late. I've got to go to  
18 bed."

19 Q. Did you talk to Mark Schaffel that night?

20 A. I don't think so. I think I might have  
21 talked to Schaffel the next day to find out why we  
22 didn't get a copy of the videotape.

23 Q. Did you talk to Christian Robinson?

24 A. I don't think I've ever talked to Christian  
25 Robinson. At least back in February or March of  
26 2003, I don't believe I've talked to Christian  
27 Robinson.

28 Q. Did you talk to Vicki Podberesky that night? 10345

1 A. I did not.

2 Q. Did you refer anybody to Vicki Podberesky?

3 A. I think Brad called and said that --

4 Q. Mr. Geragos, did you refer anybody to Vicki  
5 Podberesky?

6 A. I was trying to answer the question. Brad  
7 called and asked for a referral. I did not refer to  
8 Vicki Podberesky. I referred to Michael Nasatir.  
9 Vicki Podberesky is Michael's partner.

10 Q. All right. And you referred Brad Miller to  
11 Michael Nasatir; is that right?

12 A. Brad said that Janet wanted a lawyer. I  
13 said, "I can't represent Janet. My firm's not going  
14 to represent Janet. Call Mike Nasatir and see if  
15 it's something he can handle."

16 Q. All right. You were the one who then gave  
17 Brad Miller the name of Mike Nasatir's law firm; is  
18 that correct?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. You didn't say "Vicki Podberesky"?

21 A. I did not say "Vicki Podberesky." I said  
22 "Mike Nasatir."

23 Q. Did you have a conversation with Vicki  
24 Podberesky that night?

25 A. I don't believe it was that night. But if  
26 she says it was, I would defer to her. My memory is  
27 that I talked to Mike Nasatir.

28 Q. Did you talk to Mike Nasatir that night? 10346

1 A. Might have. Might have said, "I'm referring  
2 over a case," or "Brad's going to call you. Talk to  
3 him," you know, "Do whatever you have to do."

4 Q. Did you tell Mike Nasatir that you would be  
5 financially responsible for his bill?

6 A. Absolutely not.

7 Q. Did you tell him that Michael Jackson would  
8 be financially responsible?

9 A. Absolutely not.

10 Q. Did you know who was going to be responsible  
11 for his bill?

12 A. It wasn't my firm. It wasn't my business.

13 Q. Did it come up in the conversation with Brad  
14 Miller?

15 A. No. Why would it -- no.

16 Q. Now, at this point, you understood that  
17 Janet Arvizo did not have a lot of money?

18 A. I don't know that I understood that. I was  
19 aware of a J.C. Penney lawsuit. I was aware that  
20 she had a boyfriend who seemed to be making very  
21 good money. So, no, I'm not aware that she was  
22 completely limited in terms of her funding.

23 Q. Did you ever make any effort to determine  
24 whether or not she was going to have to pay a  
25 retainer to the law firm of Mr. Nasatir?

26 A. Absolutely not. It wasn't my business.

27 Q. You did have a conversation with Mr. Nasatir

28 either that night or the next morning? 10347

1 A. I believe it was the next morning, but I  
2 could be mistaken. It might have been that night.  
3 And I believe the conversation was that, "I referred  
4 somebody over, and this is the name and the number."  
5 And, you know, "Handle it however you want to handle  
6 it."

7 Q. Did you ask Mr. Nasatir to contact you after  
8 his interview with Janet Arvizo and tell you the  
9 content of that interview?

10 A. If -- if I talked to him that night, I  
11 probably would have said, "Let me know what  
12 happens," yes.

13 Q. Would you have asked him to tell you about  
14 the content of the conversation?

15 A. I would have wanted to know what was being  
16 said, yes.

17 Q. Would you have asked him to get an express  
18 waiver of attorney-client privilege from Janet  
19 Arvizo so that he could talk to you about the exact  
20 content of that conversation?

21 A. No. I wouldn't have advised him how to  
22 practice law. He's a -- I think a certified  
23 specialist in criminal law, and I would assume he  
24 would know that.

25 Q. Did you tell Brad Miller that you wanted  
26 Brad Miller to become informed of the conversation  
27 that Janet Arvizo was having with this attorney?

28 A. No, it was the opposite. Janet kept telling 10348



1 Brad she wanted him there.

2 Q. Did you have --

3 A. And Brad said he couldn't go, and that's why  
4 he volunteered Asaf instead.

5 Q. Did you have a conversation with Brad Miller  
6 wherein you specifically asked Brad Miller to get as  
7 much information as he could of the conversation  
8 between Janet Arvizo and the Nasatir lawyer?

9 A. No. In fact, I -- my understanding was, I  
10 told them, "I can't get in the middle of that.  
11 Refer it out." And she kept asking Brad to attend  
12 with her at that interview.

13 Q. Did Brad Miller tell you specifically that  
14 the interview they were referring to was a  
15 Department of Child Family Services interview?

16 A. I think he did, yes.

17 Q. Did you understand that that interview was  
18 existing, was taking place because of concerns about  
19 whether or not her children were being exposed to  
20 Michael Jackson?

21 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; misstates the  
22 evidence.

23 THE COURT: Overruled.

24 You may answer.

25 THE WITNESS: I -- I learned that after the  
26 fact, after the interview.

27 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Who is it who told you that

28 Janet Arvizo was going to have an interview with the 10349

1 Department of Child & Family Services

2 representatives?

3 A. I believe it was Brad.

4 Q. And he told you that that night?

5 A. I believe so. I believe that it was that

6 night that he said she was asking him to go with her

7 to the interview.

8 Q. Do you know why this interview was conducted

9 at two o'clock in the morning, hours before the

10 start of the interview with Janet Arvizo and the

11 Department of Child Family Services?

12 A. I have no idea --

13 MR. MESEREAU: Objection; misstates the

14 evidence.

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 You may answer.

17 THE WITNESS: I have no idea why it was 2:00

18 in the morning. I do have a memory of saying, "Stop

19 calling me, because I'm going to bed."

20 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did you tell Brad Miller at

21 any time that they should have that interview done

22 before the start of her interview with the

23 Department of Child Family Services?

24 A. Absolutely not. One, in my mind, had

25 nothing to do with the other.

26 Q. Did you tell Brad Miller to tape-record that

27 interview with the Department of Family Services?

28 A. Absolutely not. If I -- no, I absolutely 10350

1 did not.

2 Q. Did you tell Brad Miller that he should have  
3 somebody else tape-record that interview?

4 A. Absolutely not. I didn't know that he was  
5 going to have anybody there.

6 Q. Did you have Asaf there that day?

7 A. I did not have Asaf there that day.

8 Q. Did you know Asaf prior to that day?

9 A. I think I met Asaf on one prior  
10 investigation that I had hired Brad on.

11 Q. Is that Asaf Vilchic?

12 A. I think that's his last name.

13 Q. And did you understand him to be an  
14 employee, a part-time employee, of Brad Miller?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Is Brad Miller someone you had worked with  
17 for a period longer than five years prior to that  
18 day?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Did you feel that you knew Brad Miller  
21 fairly well?

22 A. I thought I knew him, yes. At that time, I  
23 don't know if I would say "fairly well," but I used  
24 him, as I indicated, probably on three or four  
25 different cases. I use a number of investigators.

26 Q. Was there any conversation between you and  
27 Brad Miller that night, on the evening of the 19th,

28 about whether or not the DCSF interview would be 10351

1 tape-recorded?

2 A. No, absolutely not.

3 Q. When did you first learn that that interview  
4 had been tape-recorded?

5 THE WITNESS: I can't answer that, Your  
6 Honor.

7 THE COURT: Mark that.

8 Next question, please.

9 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: When did you listen to the  
10 tape-recording for the first time?

11 A. I can't answer that.

12 Q. Did you have a conversation with Brad Miller  
13 within the next week about the -- about the meeting  
14 with the Department of Child Family Services?

15 A. I probably would have, yes. I don't have --  
16 as I sit here, I don't remember it, but it would not  
17 have been unlikely.

18 Q. Did Brad Miller brief you about the content  
19 of the Department of Child & Family Services  
20 meeting?

21 A. I think I was told that there wasn't any  
22 problem. And I don't -- and I don't know if I was  
23 told that within a week or within a day, but I think  
24 I was just told that there was no problem.

25 Q. Did you ask him, Brad Miller, if he was, in  
26 fact, present during the course of the meeting with  
27 the representatives from the Department of Child &

28 Family Services? 10352



1 A. I don't remember doing it, but it certainly  
2 would not have been unusual for me to have done it.  
3 As I sit here, I don't remember asking him that, but  
4 it's logical that I would have.

5 Q. Did Brad Miller tell you that he was  
6 personally present during that interview?

7 A. I don't remember the conversation, but I  
8 don't at any time remember Brad telling me that he  
9 was present during that interview.

10 Q. Did he ever tell you who was present during  
11 that interview?

12 A. That's another question I can't answer.

13 THE COURT: All right. Mark it.

14 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did Brad Miller ever tell you  
15 that Asaf was present during the beginning of the  
16 interview?

17 A. That's another question I can't answer.

18 THE COURT: Next question. Mark it.

19 Q. BY MR. ZONEN: Did Asaf ever tell you how  
20 that tape got in the hands of MS-NBC and Dan Abrams?

21 A. That's another question I can't answer.

22 THE COURT: All right. I think we'll take  
23 our recess early today. I don't think this is  
24 productive to proceed this way.

25 (To the jury) Any objection if you go home  
26 seven minutes early?

27 A JUROR: Oh, no.

28 THE COURT: See you Monday morning at 8:30. 10353

1 Remember the admonition.

2 Counsel remain a moment.

3 MR. ZONEN: Thank you.

4

5 (The following proceedings were held in  
6 open court outside the presence and hearing of the  
7 jury:)

8

9 MR. ZONEN: Mr. Geragos, do you still have  
10 that exhibit in front of you or did I take it back  
11 already?

12 THE WITNESS: Yes.

13 THE COURT: Mr. Geragos, you may step down,  
14 but remain within the bar. You have an interest, a  
15 stake here. I think you have counsel here.

16 MR. GERAGOS: Pat's sitting here, but I'll  
17 be one of those pro pers.

18 My biggest concern is I'm engaged in  
19 Department C35 in a jury trial that has been ongoing  
20 now for eight weeks in Santa Ana court before the  
21 Honorable Judge --

22 THE COURT: Could you come to the microphone?  
23 There's people that just can't hear you back there.

24 MR. ZONEN: I'll move out of your way.

25 MR. GERAGOS: I'm presently engaged in jury  
26 trial in Department C35, long-cause court, in Santa  
27 Ana. I've been there for eight weeks. We have 18

28 jurors in the box. I'm in the middle of 10354

1 cross-examination. This is a case that's estimated  
2 to last till August. The case is actually seven  
3 years old. It's been to the Supreme Court and back,  
4 and there is a published decision on it. The -- all  
5 the jurors are ordered back for Monday morning at  
6 nine o'clock. I am ordered back by Judge Fasel at  
7 8:45.

8 Obviously I do not want to incur the wrath  
9 of this Court, but I believe that if I'm ordered  
10 back for Monday, I'm going to be under competing  
11 Court orders, and somebody's going to find me in  
12 contempt.

13 THE COURT: Who do you want to do that?

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. GERAGOS: I think I'd rather -- I hate  
16 to say this, as much as I love Santa Maria, I'd  
17 rather spend my time in the OSC jail, so --

18 MR. SANGER: We have a nice jail here.

19 THE COURT: We can call that judge. I  
20 understand. In fact, that's why I ordered you up  
21 today, was when I heard that you were in a lengthy  
22 jury trial, my choice was not to disturb the jury  
23 trial on Monday, because I know how hard it is for  
24 any jury to have to deal with these kind of  
25 problems.

26 And I fully anticipated that we'd be able to  
27 get all of your testimony in today. You know, the

28 District Attorney had said that he only had a few 10355

1 more minutes with LeGrand, and that didn't happen,  
2 so you were kept upstairs for a period I didn't  
3 anticipate this morning.

4 But his courtroom is dark on Fridays?

5 MR. GERAGOS: He I think -- I believe has a  
6 law-and-motion calendar on Fridays, and that's why  
7 it's dark for jury trials.

8 The jury was ordered back at -- for nine  
9 o'clock. The next day off is the 20th. I've  
10 already inquired here. I guess you're not working,  
11 I guess this court is dark on the 20th. And then we  
12 do have, even though I'm supposed to be out of the  
13 country, we're dark on the 26th of May. I suppose I  
14 could always delay that trip to later in the day if  
15 I could get --

16 THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to put it  
17 off that long. What I could do is cancel our day  
18 off on the 20th. The 20th was going to be a day off  
19 because Mr. Sanger had made a commitment to  
20 appear --

21 MR. GERAGOS: If it's just Mr. Sanger, I've  
22 got no problems screwing up his day off.

23 THE COURT: So I'm trying to -- what I'm  
24 going to require here is some points and authorities  
25 from both sides. I'm not quite sure of what --  
26 where we are and what we should be doing. And so it  
27 wouldn't hurt if -- I mean, clearly everyone's going

28 to have their points and authorities to me Monday, 10356



1 but then we could take your testimony next Friday

2 and --

3 MR. GERAGOS: That's fine. And I'd

4 appreciate it. The case I had on Friday I was

5 hoping that you would say that. I had somebody go

6 out to San Bernardino this morning and continue a

7 prelim that was set for the 20th, so I have -- I can

8 move the other two things that I have, so it's not a

9 problem.

10 MR. SANGER: Your Honor, on Friday, from a

11 selfish standpoint, could we limit the day to Mr.

12 Geragos's testimony?

13 THE COURT: Yes.

14 MR. SANGER: So when we're through, then we

15 could go, because I could still make part of it.

16 THE COURT: Right. We can set Friday just

17 for Mr. Geragos's testimony.

18 MR. SANGER: Thank you.

19 THE COURT: How much more testimony -- how

20 much longer do you think you're -- I know. The

21 problem is if I give you a week, then it will -- to

22 think of questions, then....

23 MR. GERAGOS: Exactly.

24 MR. ZONEN: You're asking me how many more

25 minutes of cross-examination I have?

26 THE COURT: Estimate your time.

27 MR. ZONEN: Oh, gosh. A half hour at least.

28 THE COURT: Is that all? 10357

1 MR. ZONEN: Well, no.

2 (Laughter.)

3 THE COURT: Well, we have a serious problem  
4 to deal with, and I really don't have a -- I really  
5 am not -- all we can do is do some research.

6 MR. ZONEN: I'll try to accommodate the  
7 Court as best I can.

8 THE COURT: If I bring the jury in, I'm not  
9 going to bring them in just for a half hour of  
10 testimony on Friday, so we'll use the whole day.  
11 That would not be fair to the jury.

12 MR. SANGER: Whatever the Court decides.

13 THE COURT: I think that's what we've got to  
14 do.

15 MR. SANGER: If we quit early -- let me put  
16 it this way. If we quit early on Friday, it would  
17 be nice, but whatever the Court can do with that in  
18 mind.

19 THE COURT: All right.

20 MR. GERAGOS: May I be excused, with the  
21 promise that I will return at 8:30 on Friday the  
22 20th?

23 THE COURT: You're ordered to return on  
24 Friday --

25 MR. GERAGOS: And I promise I'll be here.

26 THE COURT: -- by 8:30.

27 MR. GERAGOS: Thank you.

28 THE COURT: I want points and authorities 10358

1 from Mr. Mesereau, and I want points and authorities

2 from Mr. Sneddon.

3 Are you interested in --

4 MR. GERAGOS: Yes, I had hoped that you

5 would invite me to, but I was going to -- I'll try

6 to keep it short, but I'll point to what I think are

7 the applicable code sections that are appropriate

8 and the Rules of Professional Conduct.

9 THE COURT: The issue -- here's -- the issue

10 I want addressed is not what the ethical rules are.

11 We know that. What I want to address is what

12 happens in the middle of testimony when the party

13 who's asserted that they have given you a waiver on

14 the record, a waiver of the attorney-client

15 privilege, suddenly reveals in the writing that you

16 don't have a complete waiver. And what are the

17 remedies? What should I do?

18 MR. GERAGOS: My belief is that under the --

19 THE COURT: Well --

20 MR. GERAGOS: I won't give it to you now.

21 THE COURT: Don't shoot from the hip. I

22 can't believe that this ever happened to you before,

23 did it?

24 MR. GERAGOS: No.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's do some

26 research on it.

27 MR. GERAGOS: I just think it's similar to

28 the conflict situation. If it's not done by the 10359

1 client on the record, then that's the problem.

2 THE COURT: Well, that's not the -- the  
3 client -- the attorney made the waiver. The client  
4 is sitting there, you know. There's all sorts of  
5 issues here that are different than that.

6 The question is what do we do now? So I  
7 would like all of you to weigh in on the issue at  
8 hand, which is what do we do now?

9 MR. GERAGOS: I'd be happy to. Thank you.

10 THE COURT: Now, will you fax your materials  
11 to my office? Do you still have that number?

12 MR. GERAGOS: I do. I saved that on my Word  
13 Perfect.

14 THE COURT: I'll authorize fax service on  
15 Mr. Mesereau and Mr. Zonen, Mr. Sneddon. And I want  
16 to have all of this by eight o'clock Monday morning.

17 MR. GERAGOS: That's fine.

18 THE COURT: And then would you call your  
19 judge and tell him that I have accommodated him and  
20 do understand the situation with him?

21 MR. GERAGOS: I will. Thank you very much,  
22 Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Anything else?

24 MR. SANGER: I'm still struggling with this  
25 matter that I have on Friday. Assuming we're  
26 through with Mr. Geragos by the 11:30 break, would  
27 you be willing to call the jury in -- in other

28 words, we would have witnesses -- if he's done in a 10360



1 half an hour, we would have witnesses to take us to  
2 the 11:30 break. Would that be all right?

3 THE COURT: All right.

4 MR. SANGER: Okay.

5 THE COURT: Would you have -- I would like to  
6 have the jury commissioner immediately leave a  
7 message for all the jurors right now that the day  
8 off on the 20th has been cancelled. We're going to  
9 use it so that any plans they have they can change,  
10 and prevent them from making plans in anticipation.

11 Anything else?

12 Okay.

13 (The proceedings adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)

14 --o0o--

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 10361

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3

4 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE )

5 OF CALIFORNIA, )

6 Plaintiff, )

7 -vs- ) No. 1133603

8 MICHAEL JOE JACKSON, )

9 Defendant. )

10

11

12 I, MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR,

13 CSR #3304, Official Court Reporter, do hereby

14 certify:

15 That the foregoing pages 10193 through 10361

16 contain a true and correct transcript of the

17 proceedings had in the within and above-entitled

18 matter as by me taken down in shorthand writing at

19 said proceedings on May 13, 2005, and thereafter

20 reduced to typewriting by computer-aided

21 transcription under my direction.

22 DATED: Santa Maria, California,

23 May 13, 2005.

24

25

26

27 MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304



