	back?
	2 my knees. A. I don't know. I think on
	3 Q. Your knees?
***	4 yeah. I think so,
	Q. Okay, and then did he come over at you and spit right
	in your face or did he have to bend down to spit in your face?
	face?
	A. I don't know exactly. I know he spit in my face.
	Q. Spit in your face?
10	The Man was a second
11	, ph
12	A. Yesh.
13	Q. And what did he call your father?
14	A Call bad words in Assyrian.
15	Q. What did he say?
16	
17	Q. Well, you are going to have to say it. What did he
18	say? What did he
19	MR. PESTARINO: Well, if Your Honor please
20	THE WITNESS: I don't want to say these words
21	egain. I just don't want to say it. If you want me I could
22	write it for you but I don't want to say it.
23	MR. ROBINSON: That is not acceptable.
24	THE COURT: Pardon
25	THE COURT: Pardon me, may I intervene? Why don't you want to say it?
26	THE WITNESS: It's very bad word, and it was for

my father, so I don't want to mention again these words. I could write it but I don't want to say it by myself. He should say it that's all right, but I don't want to say it.

THE COURT: The reason you don't want to say it is because you don't want to say words against your father or because --

THE WITNESS: Yeah, because it was against my father. I hear these words against my father, so I don't want to say it.

THE COURT: In other words, you don't went to say the same words against your father?

THE WITNESS: That's right.

THE COURT: Okey. All right.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, he is not saying it, Your Honor, according to him it is the Patriarch saying it.

THE COURT: That is why -- if you will give me a chance -- what the lawyer is asking you is to tell everybody what the Patriarch said, see? So even if you repeat what the Patriarch said you are not saying it of your own words. You are telling us what he said. You understand?

THE WITNESS: I understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So why can't you say the words?

THE WITNESS: Well --

THE COURT: You will not offend the jury or any of us by use of the words whatever they are.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Well, after he spit in my face said two bad words to my father, which says, "Rezel brone drazel kope brone dkope."

THE REFORTER: Could be spell it now?

THE COURT: Well, did you get it phonetically at all?

THE REPORTER: Would you say it once more?
THE WITNESS: No. I don't.

MR. PESTARINO: We'll have him write it out.

THE COURT: Could you write it out?

MR. PESTARINO: I'll have him do that.

THE COURT: Can you write it in English?

THE WITNESS: I can write it. I don't know makes sense or not.

THE COURT: Write it first in Assyrian. Can you write that? And then can you write that in English, the best you can.

THE WITNESS: (Writing.)

THE COURT: And we will mark this as an exhibit for the prosecution. Be number 32. Thank you.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document, being a writing by the witness, was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 32 for identification and entered into evidence.)

THE COURT: Could you perhaps translate those, also?

o.c

26

25

11.

3

MR. PESTARINO : Excuse me --

THE WITNESS: No, it is hard for me to translate.

THE COURT: He has written, for the record, in

Aramaic or -- what's the language?

THE WITNESS: Assyrian.

THE COURT: Then the translation or the phonetic spelling is, "Razel brona drazel kopa brona dkopa," is that right?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

- Q. (By Mr. Robinson) Okay. And you remember that is what the Patrierch said?

 A. Yeah.
- Q. No doubt in your mind? A. No.
- Q. So your memory is good up to that point?
- A. Yeah.
- Q. What happened next? A. I don't know.
- anything after that point?

 A. Well, what do you want me to say? I'll say it. Just tell me what you want me to say, I'll say it. But I don't remember what happened exactly. When I heard these words I don't know what happened. You want me to say something, just tell me, I will.
- Q. Well, sir, I don't want you to say anything. I just want to get to the truth of this matter. You understand I have a client to represent in the proceeding, too, don't you?

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

MR. PESTARINO: I don't think we ought to argue.

I think the witness ought to be instructed to answer the questions and counsel ask the question.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ismail, if Mr.

Robinson is going too fast or if you don't understand what he

is asking, just say so. He does not want you to say anything

that isn't true. He wants you to tell what you remember in

the way he is asking the questions. Then your attorney will

5

6

7

8

10

11

19

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Excuse me. I think there may be a lack

THE WITNESS: Okay.

have a chance to ask other questions.

- Q. (By Mr. Robinson) After he said these words about your father you don't remember anything that happened?
- A. No.
- Q. Okay. And the next time you remember something is in the pizza parlor?

 A. I don't know was in
- pizza parlor or someplace else, my hands on the wall .
- Q. And at the time that the Patriarch, according to your testimony, uttered these words against your father, this was after he spit in your face?

 A. Yesh.
- Q. And at this time were you still down on the ground?
- A. I don't -- I don't remember exactly I went down the ground or not. I can't clear that.
- Now, you don't remember if you went down on the ground or not?

 A. Not clearly.

house that Thursday night with the gun with the intention to kill the Patriarch? What's a fact? Isn't that what happened? You mean I went there for kill him? Q. Yes, sir. A. No. 6 Isn't it a fact, sir, that the minute he opened the 7 door you had that gun there, you pointed it at him, he 8 screamed for his wife, two times, "Emama, Emama, " and you shot him? No. 10 That didn't happen? No. sir. 11 MR. ROBINSON: I have no further questions. 12 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. PESTARINO: 14 Let me ask you this, Mr. Ismail, a little while ago you testified that you felt ashamed ? 15 A. 16 Yeah. 17 Do you want to explain that a little bit more? I can't remember very clearly, but I remember just I 18 19 want to get out of, feel very ashamed. I don't want, maybe somebody in the house could have seen him, you know, slap 20 me, and I wasn't thinking that he was do that for me, I was 21 thinking just as a member of the family, not a stranger from 22 23 So I was thinking, think, I was very ashamed, I should get out early, his wife come in or somebody else there. 24 Q. When you went into the house or went up to the house 25 did you feel nervous, upset, kind of frightened? 26

1	Q. And did your father do a lot of things for you, too?
2	A. Yes, he did.
3	Q. Were some of these things going through your mind when
4	the Fatriarch said these words about your father?
. 5	MR. ROBINSON: Objection, leading question.
6	The proper question is, 'What was going through your mind."
7	THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
8	THE WITNESS: Well, when he said these
9	Q. (By Mr. Pestarino) What was going through your mind?
10	A. I don't know exactly what was going my mind, but when
11	I heard these and I know how my father be, he was close to
12	him, and I know what he did for him for years and years and
13	years, and I was just, I don't know, I don't know what to say
14	I don't know what to do at that time. I just
15	Q. Let me ask you this, to spit in someone's face even,
16	you work with people that are not Assyriens?
17	A. Um-hum.
18	Q. Huh? A. Yeah.
19	Q. Did you ever see anybody spit in somebody's face
20	before? A. Well, it is very bad.
21	It look very bed, Assyrian, if somebody spit in another
22	person's face.
2 3	MR. ROBINSON: I'm going to make a motion to
24	strike as nonresponsive. The question was, "Did you ever
2 5	see anybody spit in anybody's face?"
26	MR. PESTARINO: I egree.

conversation. I am asking him if he heard him scream.

5

THE COURT: Did you understand that? Were you ever present when the Pariarch screamed or yelled at somebody?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. PESTARINO: All right. Fine.

Q. (By Mr. Pestarino) You indicated that you had, or the District Attorney indicated that you had made a conscious decision --

MR. ROBINSON: I'm going to object. I didn't indicate that. I asked him the question and he agreed.

MR. PESTARINO: I think if you can go back to the record the District Attorney paraphrased his words by saying that you made a conscious

MR. ROBINSON: That was my question.

THE COURT: What is your question?

MR. PESTARINO: Well, this is just preliminary.

THE COURT: Well, I can't make any ruling until the question is asked.

MR. PESTARINO: All I'm asking is that the District Attorney indicated to you that you had made a conscious decision to go to see the Patriarch.

THE COURT: All right. The objection is overruled to this point. Now, let's hear the rest of the question.

MR. PESTARINO: It's preliminary.

Q. (By Mr. Pestarino) Now, you indicated too, that you had been, you made that decision when you went outside the

If

```
1
     the pizza parlor or outside the pizza parlor?
           I don't know exactly. I have that pizza, I went out-
     side for fresh air, and I think I was feeling okay, and I
 4
     just walked there or taxi, or I don't know, I think I walked
5
     there, I guess, and decide, I don't remember why or how I
    made that decision, but I was thinking Friday, Saturday, go.
7
           Let me ask you this, you were thinking, did the
    Q.
    alcohol have any effect on you at that time?
9
           Well, I don't know. Probably.
    A.
10
    Q.
           You don't know?
                                                    I don't know.
11
           You indicated yesterday how much you had had to drink?
    Q.
12
    A.
          Yes, sir.
13
    Q.
           Yes?
                                        A.
                                               Yes.
          And did you feel any of the effects, any effects of
14
    Q.
15
    what you drank?
                                             I don't know exactly.
          Let me ask you this, did five or six drinks, or four
16
    or five drinks within the period that you testified to --
17
    A.
18
          Um-hum.
          -- didn't you feel those drinks at all?
19
          I could feel them myself, I was haby (heavy), but --
20
    A.
          Huh?
    Q.
21
                                          I was feeling myself I
    was a little haby (heavy).
22
    Q.
23
          A little happy?
                                            A.
                                                    Haby (heavy).
    you know, like a little drunk.
24
          Sorry, I didn't hear that. A little heavy?
    Q.
25
    A.
          Um-hum.
26
```

1	Q. A little, in other words, thick?
2	A. Yeah, you know, but I wasn't think there was, I was
3	drunk.
4	Q. Okay. A. I don't think so.
5	Q. Was it at that time that you were feeling a little
6	heavy? A. Um-hum.
7	Q. That you decided to visit the Patriarch?
8	A. I guess so.
9	Q. And was that after you ate the pizza?
10	A. Yeah.
11	Q. Was that after you felt sick? A. Yes.
12	THE COURT: Counsel, let's take our morning
13	recess at this time. We will take our fifteen minute break,
14	ladies and gentlemen. You will keep in mind the admonition
15	I have previously given to you. We will resume at 11:10.
16	And you can step down, also, Mr. Ismail. You are ordered to
17	return at that time.
18	(Short recess taken.)
19	(Whereupon, the following proceedings took place
20	in Chambers out of the presence of the jury:)
21	THE COURT: During the recess the bailiff told me
22	that he had been approached by three members of the jury.
23	THE BAILIFF: Three of the male members, the men.
24	THE COURT: Would you explain to counsel what
25	they stated.
26	THE RATITER: They stated they are minutaine and

3

5

they know how hard it is to testify in another language, and they would request, if possible, to have the defendant testify in his language with an interpreter to explain what he is trying to say since they know how hard it is to testify in another language when you are not familiar with it.

MR. PESTARINO: Well --

THE COURT: My feeling is that inasmuch as he seems to comprehend and understand basic English, and that it has been only a few times where his accent was the problem, that he is perfectly capable of comprehending and testifying. On the other hand, if there are things that he cannot completely explain in response to questions posed in English, I would have no objection to an interpreter if one is available and suitable to both sides.

MR. PESTARINO: We are faced with this situation, we are practically both through with the examination of the witness, and I think we ought to consider that.

THE COURT: Would you have any objection?

MR. PESTARINO: I was just going to suggest that
you talk to David Ismail yourself and see what his feelings
are because he has expressed, sometimes he says, "I don't
understand what you mean." And like during the recess he
says, "I really don't understand what you mean," when I
asked him a question about how did he feel and he says
heavy.

25.26.

THE COURT: All right. Let's ask Mr. Ismail if he would like an interpreter for the remaining portion or to go over any portion of further examination. And in the event that he wouldn't want one or is satisfied, then I thought that I would explain to the jury that he was willing to testify in English and seemed to be at this point able to communicate with his attorney, and an interpreter was available or is available to him.

MR. FESTARINO: Well, I'm going to have one of the doctors testify that his language is a barrier as far as some examination is concerned because, something to the effect that there is not precise language for some examinations.

Now, I don't know what bearing that will have with these jurors, but that is probably what the doctor will testify to.

THE COURT: I was going to explain to them because we have run into this in other cases where we have had interpreters, where the interpreter would say, "There is no precise English word for this, and, therefore, the nearest is such and such." How do you feel about it?

MR. ROBINSON: I agree with Your Honor's explanation to the jury that Mr. Pestarino obviously felt that this man was able to communicate and understand English, that the police officer who interviewed Mr. Ismail felt that same way. There has been nobody that has testified in this whole proceeding that Mr. Ismail doesn't understand

. 9

5

English. He has been in Canada where he speaks English since 1960, '68 or '60, he appears to be able to communicate on the witness stand.

MR. PESTARINO: I can shortcut the whole thing. Why don't you have him come in here, I think he will tell you that. Maybe that will resolve the whole problem. I don't want another fiery cross-examination.

MR. ROBINSON: I'm not going to ask any questions.
THE COURT: I'll do the examining of Mr. Ismail.

(Whereupon, the defendant, David Malek Ismail, was brought into Chambers and the following proceedings took place in his presence:)

THE COURT: Please sit down, Mr. Ismail.

Mr. Ismail, you have been answering questions which have been asked of you in English, and you have been answering in English although sometimes you have had a little difficulty understanding; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right. Now, in order to be absolutely fair to you we would like to know whether or not you would want an interpreter so that you could speak in Assyrian and have the interpreter translate what you want to say into English for the benefit of the jury? Or whether you feel that you are getting along well enough with your attorney and with the people who are helping him so that you don't need an interpreter? How do you feel about that?

0

5

A. I be glad if anybody, anybody else could speak English and Assyrian.

THE COURT: The question is this, Mr. Ismail, I feel that you have been able to express and state, you know, what has happened, and what you did, what conversation you had, but if there is something that you feel you cannot express yourself in English --

THE IEFENDANT: What's 'express"?

THE COURT: Well, talk or explain, like, for example, the statement about your father that you did not want to say in English. Now, I don't know whether that was because of a personal feeling of yourself or because of the fact that there was no English translation of that.

THE DEFENDANT: I don't know if there is an English translate but it is personal feeling.

THE COURT: Personal. All right. Mr. Robinson has indicated that -- both he and Mr. Pestarino have indicated that, both of them are almost through with the questioning of you.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: Do you feel that you would be happier if there was somebody that you could answer questions in Assyrian and, in other words, if they could be put to you in Assyrian and you could answer them in Assyrian?

THE DEFENDANT: Be better. Be better for me.
THE COURT: It would be?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. I could explain more. MR. PESTARINO: Could I say something? You're 3 finished; I'm finished. Do you have any recross? 4 MR. ROBINSON: No. 5 THE COURT: Could I ask you what areas, Mr. Ismail, 6 what parts of your testimony you would like to have explained 7 in Assyrian? THE DEFENDANT: Well, if they have more questions? THE COURT: No, they have no more, apparently. 10 THE DEFENDANT: Well --11 THE COURT: Then you are satisfied? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yesh. 13 THE COURT: All right. Okay. Are you both through then? 14 MR. PESTARINO: I'm through. You're through? 15 16 MR. ROBINSON: Yeah. 17 THE COURT: Also with regard to what other people say, other witnesses who have testified, have you 18 been able to understand what they have said or has Mr. 19 Pestarino and his investigator explained to you what other 20 people have said on the witness stand? 21 THE DEFENDANT: You mean? 22 THE COURT: Other witnesses. 23 THE DEFENDANT: Other witnesses, last week, week 24 before? 25 THE COURT: Yes. 26

26

THE DEFENDANT: I think I understand them. THE COURT: That is the main thing I want to 3 make sure, that you do understand what other people have 4 testified. THE DEFENDANT: I understand that. THE COURT: Thank you. Then I see no need for a translator or interpreter. I was just going to say, with 7 regard to the statement which he has written, it would not be of any meaning to the jury unless it was translated. So, perhaps, you could have someone --10 11 MR. PESTARINO: I intend to have, hope to have a translator, if we can get copies of those letters. 12 THE CLERK: I gave them to your investigator yesterday. 14 THE COURT: Also the statement that he wrote in 15 his own handwriting. 16 MR. FESTARINO: Can you make a copy of that? 17 THE COURT: Sure. We can make a Xerox. 18 MR. PESTARINO: We will try to qualify an 19 interpreter. 20 THE COURT: Well, maybe you can stipulate. 21 MR. MESTARINO: I'll bring the interpreter in and 22 ask him. 23 MR. ROBINSON: I think perhaps we should, abo, 24

give the benefit of our collective thinking back to the

jury and indicate to them that Mr. Ismail feels, and along

3

 with counsel, myself, and the Court, that he understands everything, that he is able to answer the questions.

THE COURT: We will do that.

MR. PESTARINO: Can you give us a few more minutes now? I had to spend this in conference.

THE COURT: We will start about 11:30.

MR. PESTARINO: I only have one witness. I am going to run out of witnesses for this morning.

THE COURT: Is your witness here? (Off the record discussion.)

(Whereupon, pursuant to the recess, Court convened in the presence of the jury and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Please be seated. I am sorry for the long delay, ladies and gentlemen, but for the record a few of the jurors had indicated to the bailiff some concern over the fact that Mr. Ismail was not able to express himself fluently in English and perhaps an interpreter should be used. We had Mr. Ismail in chambers with counsel. and we asked him those questions as to whether or not he felt an interpreter was necessary. It was brought out that Mr. Ismail had lived in Canada for a number of years where he spoke English, and that, as you heard from the stand here, he apparently communicated well in English, and although he had some difficulty with some words and an accent, he indicated that he comprehended what other witnesses had

5

0

3

testified to. Also, Mr. Pestarino, his attorney, stated that he had the services of an interpreter available during the pretrial and trial period. And possibly an interpreter would be here to read the letters which were written in Assyrian and the item which was written by Mr. Ismail this morning. So Mr. Ismail felt as long as there was to be no more questions, and that is what counsel had indicated of him that he didn't require an interpreter. So I just want you to know that.

MR. ROBINSON: Might the record indicate that His Honor, along with Mr. Pestarino and myself, agree that Mr. Ismail understands the questions that were asked him and responded understanding those questions? That is an agreement?

MR. PESTARINO: As Your Honor indicated, the trouble with lawyers is they always talk. As Your Honor indicated, there are certain words that he doesn't understand. I think the jury gets the import of that as well as we do because when he doesn't understand a word he says, "What does that mean? What do you mean?" I am satisfied that he understands.

THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Pestarino just has indicated he is satisfied; and Mr. Ismail is satisfied that he understood the things that were not clear, he would ask about, and we would rephrase or restate, and he comprehends all that is going on. He is through as a witness and,

1 therefore, there is no need for an interpreter unless 2 something else develops. But one is available. You may proceed. MR. FESTARINO: I have no further questions of 5 Mr. Ismail. 6 THE COURT: All right. 7 MR. ROBINSON: I have no further questions. 8 (Witness excused.) 9 MR. PESTARINO: I would like to call Robert Vola. 10 V-0-1-a. THE COURT: You want to come forward, sir, and 11 12 raise your right hand. 13 ROBERT VOLA. called as a witness on behalf of the defendant, being first 14 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 15 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. PESTARINO: 17 Mr. Vola, would you be good enough to state your name, 18 give your address and your occupation? 19 A. My name is Robert Vola, address is 1951 Emerald Street 20 in Concord, and I am employed by Union Oil Company as 21 resident manager in our San Jose sales office. 22 At one time did you work for Union Oil? Q. 23 A. I still do. 24 Q. You still do? Yes. I am the 25 resident manager with Union Oil here in San Jose. 26

I wasn't paying attention. That's the problem. Q. speaks well enough. 3 You don't need an interpreter, do you? 4 A. I hope not. Did you know a person by the name of Lazar? Q. A. Yes. I did. Q. Do you know a person by the name of Meyers? 8 A. Yes. Did you know of a service station in Oakland on Mac 10 Arthur Boulevard that belonged to Union Oil? 11 Yes. 12 Were you a representative of that at that time dealing 0. with individual sales or leases for Union Oil? 13 14 A. Yes. I was what they call a retail representative at the time, and my area covered from Broadway and MacArthur in 15 Oakland to Cutting Boulevard in Richmond. 16 Now, you do commercial work? A. Q. Yes. sir. 18 Q. Now, did you handle a sale that involved these two people? Yes. I did. A. 19 Tell me a little bit about what your capacity was in 20 arranging a sale? You were a representative? What did you 21 have to do with sales? Well, at the time I was the representative of the company. It was my 23 responsibility to maintain a number of units, that particlar 24 time I believe it was twenty-three units in the field, and 25 as a representative you are responsible for the entire 26

operation of the units and any dealer changes. If you lose 1 a dealer you go out and recruit to try and find another 3 dealer to replace the lost one, and you just handle everything that has to do with those twenty-three units. All right. Now, let me show you some of these exhibits 5 Q. maybe to refresh your recollection. You have no records --A. No. 7 -- on this sale, do you? A. No. And the records are where? Well, they A. could be in any of four different places because we have had 10 some reorganization in the company since the time of this 11 transaction, which was back in 1970, and our records have 12 been transferred, I mean, so I actually don't know exactly 13 where they are at. 14 Q. So what you are doing now is testifying from memory as 15 best you can? That is correct. 16 All right. Let me show you Defendant's Exhibit No. D-4 17 and I have here D-5 and D-6, and ask you to look at those for 18 just a moment and see if that will help you. 19 Can I ask you a question, first, did Union Oil 20 sell this station to a person by the name of Yule lazar? 21 We don't sell a service station in that manner. We A. . 22 lease a service station. The property and buildings remain 23 the property of the company, and we work a lease where we 24 lease the business and the individual becomes a private 25

independent beingsman lessing those facilities from the

- 1 But there is no sale of the building or property company. involved. But you do sell the inventory? A. That is correct. 5 Q. And that includes gas and the underground tanks? Well, at that time the gasoline is on what we call a purchase and storage agreement, so there was actually no cash transaction involving the sale of the fuel because the dealer does not pay for this fuel until at such time it has been sold. 10 Okay. Now, you leased this piece of property on 11 MacArthur Boulevard to a Yule Lazar, did you not? 12 That is correct. A. 13 In relation to the papers you have then, can you kind 14 of give us some idea of what date this transaction took 15 place? Well, we leased this unit 16 to Mr. Lazar on October 17th, according to the papers in 17 front of me, and it was done through an escrow with Nor Cal 18 Escrow Company in which he purchased the unit through escrow, 19 the former dealer, Mr. Jules Moore. 20 Now, later on did YMle Lazar contact you and tell you Q. 21 he wanted to sell, or sell his interest, whatever it is or 22 what it was in the service station?
 - A. Um-hum, that is correct.

25

- Q. Can you give us some idea when he contacted you?
- Well, not by the exact day, but the normal procedure A.

1 when any service station dealer wishes to break his lease with the Union Oil Company he merely gives us a letter in 3 writing stating that he would like ninety days to be on notice, that ninety days from that point in time he wishes 5 to terminate his lease with Union Oil Company, and this is, 6° I believe, from memory what Mr. Lazar had done at that time. All right. Now, how did you first meet with Ron 8 Meyers? Do you remember? If you mean 9 the exact date --10 No, not the exact date. Approximately? 11 Well, at the time Mr. Lazar gave ninety days notice, 12 normally we ran an ad in the paper and we let other dealers 13 in the area know I am going to have a unit come up for 14 lease and that I am interested in finding a new prospect, and if my memory serves me correct I believe I received a phone 16 call, several phone calls, which one of them was Mr. Ron 17 Meyers. 18 Did you meet with Ron Meyers? Q. Yes. Yes, several times. 20 Q. Did you meet at his home? A. Yes. Q. 21 Did you meet with he and his wife? 22 A. Yes. And did you talk then about the service station? Q. 23 Um-hum, definitely. We go through the -- what I try 24 A. and what I did anyway at the time as a rep is that you try 25

to brief the individual thoroughly as possible because dealer

4

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

26

changes are expensive. They are not profitable to the company. They are not profitable to the independent businessman. You are trying to find someone that is gong to match that business, that is going to be able to grow, make a good living for himself, and so that you don't have to continue making dealer changes all of the time . And the only way to do this, you try and go through the complete operation of a unit with a dealer. If he is married you certainly try to involve his wife to let her know what he is going to be up against and it is time consuming, and what the demand is that is going to be placed upon their relationship involved in going into any business, in particular a service station. So is it true then that Ron Meyers contacted you? Q. To the best of my memory, let's put it that way, Most of my dealer prospects eventually call me because, like I said. I put the word out, put ads in the papers, and I would go to other people and ask them, and they in turn would either contact individuals or individuals would read the ad and they would phone in. And then we screen the applicant and pick which one we felt was the best to operate the unit.

Q. Did Mr. Meyers have any experience in running service stations at that time?

A. I don't believe he was ever a manager of a unit. I know he drove truck for Mobil Oil Company at the time. He had experience with oil companies. He had mentioned to me, if I am not mistaken,

1 that he had worked, you know, as a mechanic, or part-time in service stations. I don't believe he was ever a manager or had leased one before. All right. And so, is there a school that you have to 5 send people to before they take over one of these leases? 6 Yes, that is correct. The company requires, here again, A. as part of the training and background. In fact, we pay the individual to attend a four-week dealer training school. 8 And so Ron Meyers did attend a four-week training 10 school at your request? A. That is correct! And then did the sale take place or the transfer take 11 place? I keep calling it a sale, but the sale of an 12 inventory? 13 Yes. We get a little bit different situation here. Under the circumstances there 14 was no escrow. Back during those times there was two ways 15 that you could do a dealer change. You either put it in an 16 escrow through an escrow company or in a case where a dealer 17 gave you a ninety day notice in some instances we would take 18 19 what we call the till, which is a term in limited settlement, and we merely purchased back, Union Oil Company 20 purchased back the entire inventory of which this 21 documentation is in front of me. 22 Would you read the note on the back of it, Defendants 23 Exhibit what? This is number 61669, exchange number. D-4. 25 D-4. That is what I am talking about. Okay. Q. 26

you. That D-4 represents what? D-4 represents a till, and it states right on the front of it, this was service station number 3538, dated 2-6-1970 from Yule Lazar. 411 West MacArthur, as the seller. The forms 5 were all prepared by me. They are all in my handwriting 6 except for the peoples' signatures, and it was sold to Union Oil Company, San Francisco. 8 By Yule Lazar? It was sold from Q. 9 Yule Lazar to Union Oil Company. 10 Q. And not to Ron Meyers? No. sir. 11 Then how did Ron Meyers get in the picture here? Q. 12 Well, the day this change was done, the three of us Α. 13 were together all day long, Mr. Lazar, Mr. Mayers, and myself, 14 and two separate inventories were taken, one transferring all 15 of this back to Union Oil Company, another one transferring it 16 from Union Oil Company back to Mr. Ron Meyers. 17 And is Ron Meyers' name on any of those documents? Q. 18 No. sir. Not these copies here. These was all Mr. 19 Lazar's copy. They are all signed and initialed by Mr. 20 Lazar, noting sale back to Union Oil Company of service 21 station inventory. 22 And your testimony is that Union Oil then sold the **2**3 That is correct. inventory to Ron Meyers? 24Well, now What dd he pay for it? 25 here I am going to go off my memory again. I believe at the 26 time Mr. Meyers was not financially able to purchase the

z

3

Q. Yeah.

entire amount of this inventory, which was \$4400, and we had two ways at this time of doing a change where the dealer did not have the entire amount in actual cash to take over the inventory. And I believe in this particular case we put the oil in what we call a thirty-day account, which was approximately \$179, and the remainder of the merchandise, which was what we classified as TBA, then that refers to tires, batteries, and accessory items and equipment was put on a note, and normal procedure on a note is that the incoming party pays twenty percent down plus the tax. And then the balance is put on a thirty-six month note, thirty-six equal monthly payments.

- Q. All right. So any note that would be made out for the inventory or anything regarding the service station would be done by you people, wouldn't it?
- A. Yes, that is correct.
- Q. And do you recall what kind of a down payment -
 first of all, what was the selling price, the total selling

 price was what?

 A. Now, here again I

 have Mr. Lazar's copy in front of me here, going from this,

 the total price was forty-four ten thirty. That included

 equipment, tires, batteries, lube oil and loose items.
- Q. And let me ask you this, to sell that inventory for \$600, what would that be in your mind?
- A. What? This inventory?
- A. You couldn't sell

this inventory for \$600. It is forty-four ten thirty. Okay. So you made out a promissory note for Ron Meyers or your company? Like I said, if my memory serves me company, yes. correctly, could have been done either that way or in a another manner. The TBA could have been put on what we call 7 the revolving account and within thirty days one third of 8 it would have been due. However, I doubt if we did it that way at the time because the question was money to start with! 10 As far as one third of \$4400, would have been a lot larger 11 than the twenty percent down payment plus the tex. then the thirty - six equal monthly payments. This gave him reserve 12 cash to operate that station rather than draining all of 13 his cash off, you know, and then not having cash flow for 14 the running of the unit. 15 Anyway, he made a substantial down payment? Q. 16 That is correct. 17 More than \$6002 18 Well, twenty percent of this particular inventory here plus the taxes 19 would have probably came close to about a thousand dollars. 20 Q. All right. Now you were the representative of Union 21 Oil that took the inventory? That is correct. 23 And you did that, first of all, with both people 24 present? Yes. 25 Q. And did you cover every item of inventory? 26

1 To my knowledge we inventoried the whole station. Ckay. There may have been a couple small items which was left to the dealers' option. I'm not, I just, this would have been the bulk of 5 it. Q. Let me ask you again, both parties were present when 7 you took the inventory? A. That is correct. 8 One signed off, did they? Um-bum. 9 The other one signed on? Right. 10 separate papers. 11 With you? That's right. 12 And was this deal fair? Absolutely. It was the same prices essentially that was originally 13 14 purchased from Mr. Moore by Mr. Lazar. We never try and sell 15 a station as far as the merchandise in it. We will sell it 16 at exact same price from each dealer because it, it would be 17 against fair trade practice. You can't make a profit on 18 inventory when you are merely selling out your inventory to an incoming dealer because he is going to take that 19 20 merchandise and resell it. Did Rom Meyers express any dissatisfaction at this time 21 with either you or Yule Lazar? Not to my 22 recollection, no. 23 And let me ask you another question, how long did Ron 24 Meyers have the service station? I believe A. 25 it was about. I'm going to guess because we are going back 26

Z

3

seven years, but it was a short time, around four months, I would say, four, maybe five.

- Q. Did you get the service station back?
- A. Yes, sir. It was a little unusual circumstances. One of my dealers phoned me up and told me that the unit was closed one day, and I went down and I couldn't find Mr. Meyers and we have what we call an abandonment clause, if a unit is left abandoned for forty-eight hours the company can regain the unit back. And the unit was definitely left unattended, locked up for a period of two days or more, and eventually I was finally able to reach Mr. Meyers, and we did eventually sign a mutual cancellation agreement. But at the time I had taken steps to get the unit back on an abandonment clause because it had been left closed for longer than forty-eight hours.
- Q. Now, to your knowledge had that service station been burglarized during the time that Ron Meyers had it?
- A. It is possible because the unit had been burglarized, breaking and entering, that I can remember, I don't remember, I don't remember, I can't remember how many times, but it had been broken and entered into more than once. And it is very possible that, well, I'm almost positive that it had been broken into. In fact, when both gentlemen had operated it, it had been broken into at least once under both operators.
- Q. You are pretty familiar with the Oakland area, are you not?

 A. Well, yes sir, I was

. 3

```
1969.
           Okay. And I take it that Mr. Lazar was screened by
    your people to see if he could run a service station?
 4
           Well, that is correct, by me.
           Okay. And Mr. Lazar was also given this four weeks of
     Q.
     training?
                                              That is correct.
 7
     Q.
           Okay. And Mr. Lazar then gave you ninety days notice?
 8
     A.
           That is correct.
           Okay. When did he sell the station?
     Q.
10
     A.
           February 6th.
11
           Of 19 --
     Q.
                                                        70
12
     Q.
           Okay. So how long was Mr. Lazar in the station?
13
           Let's see, November, December, four months.
     A.
14
           Same amount of time as Mr. Meyers?
     Q.
15
     A.
           That is correct.
     Q.
          Now, did Mr. Lazar lose a lot of money selling this
17
    station?
                                            No. he didn't.
18
    Ų.
           Okey.
                                     A
                                            To my knowledge.
19
           Okey. What about things like, do the attendants in
    the Union 76 station, do they wear uniforms?
21
           Yes, sir.
22
          Who pays for those?
    Q.
                                             A.
                                                    Well, the
23
    dealer.
24
    Q.
          The dealer?
                                              Unless the dealer
25
    has -- each dealer has a different option on that. Some of
    the dealers charge the employees, some of the dealers pick
26
```

up half of it, some of the dealers pick up all of it. It is up to the individual dealer? A. Right. And that individual dealer contracts out, I take it, with various cleaning services to clean the uniforms? 6 A. That is correct . You don't have anything to do with that? Q. 8 A. No. What about things like, oh, say coke machines, vending machines in the service station area, is that up to the 10 individual dealer, also? 11 Here again that depends. In most cases they are leased by the dealer 12 from the particular coke company, whatever it may be. And in 13 some cases the coke machine is owned by a dealer in which 14 case he might keep it or he might sell it as part of the 15 inventory. 16 Okay. Sell it to the person who is buying his station? 17 Q. 18 A. That's right. I just want to get one thing char in my mind. Ckay. 19 This service station that we are talking about is located 20 at 411 MacArthur Boulevard? 21 A. Yes, that's right. West MacArthur. And Siegle's Sportsman Supply is it 508 West 23 MecArthur Boulevard? I'm not sure of 24 the exact address. I know it is on the corner, just off the 25 corner of Cutting and San Pablo -- excuse me, MacArthur 26

1 Boulevard and San Pablo. Okay. And if the owner of Siegle's were to testify that it was at 508 West MacArthur, would you believe that? A. Certainly. 5 Q. Okay. MR. ROBINSON: Thank you. I have nothing 7 further. ጸ REDIRECT EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. PESTARINO 10 Q. Is 508 right next to the service station? Α. 11 No. Still a mile away? I would say yes! 12 A. Let me ask you this, you took the inventory of that 13 service station, was there a coke machine there at that time? 14 May I look at the --15 Of course you can. 16 There was a coke machine at the service station, but I don't see it 17 on this inventory list. 18 What does that mean, you don't see it? 19 Well, that could be that the machine is owned by the 20 particular company, Coca Cola Company, and I am not sure that, 21 I cannot remember. May I check this other list to see if it 22 was on there? 23 It isn't listed on the equipment here. So I don't 24 know who the ownership of the coke machine belonged to. 25 Q. Okay. Let me ask you this, the good name of the 26

get to know his customers. He has to get the trust and confidence of his customers, and he has to get the repeat business.

- Q. Let me ask you this, did Lazar do that?
- A. I believe he attempted to do that.
- Q. Did he?

 A. Well, he wasn't there long enough.
- Q. Well, tell us a little bit about his business, how he ran his business?

 A. Mr. Lezer?

MR. ROBINSON: I'm going to object. This is beyond the scope of cross-examination.

MR. PESTARINO: The reasons for his opinion.

MR. ROBINSON: Still beyond the scope of cross.

THE COURT: No. overruled.

THE WITNESS: Well, Mr. Lazar, if I remember correctly, was an accountant by trade, very neat gentleman, very presentable. I believe he put in a good effort at attempting to do this, and normally we look for someone who has a good business background. And at the time I figured that Mr. Lazar would be ideal for this unit because of his accounting knowledge. And you, also, look for a good manager. You try to find a manager. It takes more than a mechanic to run a unit. And part of the problem though I believe was the language barrier and the sense of knowing the customs and knowing the people. I don't believe Mr. Lazar had been here long enough, and I believe he had

I think this was one of his biggest problems, and probably a little bit in general with the public, too, understanding people, in that sense. And I think this was the greatest thing that eventually he came and said, "I want out. It is not my cup of tea."

- Q. So what is your opinion about his good name, as far as the service station was concerned? Did he have it?
- A. Oh, I think that the people that came in there probably liked him. I just don't think that he ever, he just didn't give it enough time or he couldn't give it enough time, let me put it that way.
- Q. Okay.

MR. FESTARINO: Thank you very much.

MR. ROBINSON: I just have one other question
now, one other question.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBINSON:

- Q. Would you say that Mr. Lazar was a shrewd businessman?
- A. He was a shrewd businessman? What do you mean by that term?
 - Q. What I am trying to say is, do you think that Mr.

 Lazar is going to go into something and end up taking a huge loss on it?

 A. Well, nobody intends to do that. Anybody that goes into business doesn't intend doing that, no.

Э

·

1,4

Q. Let me ask you this, in terms of -- I take it the same things that you have told us about Mr. Lazar apply to Mr. Meyers, too, look for the same qualities?

A. That is correct.

Q. And as to the type of, the type of businessman they were, as far as, oh, being able to get money out of a business directly and indirectly, would you put them both in the same plane or would you put one ahead of the other in terms of background and things like that?

A. All right. In terms of educational background, is that what you are referring? I would say Mr. Lazar had a better educational background than Mr. Meyers, but Mr. Meyers had the willingness to learn and he had the aptitude to learn.

MR. ROBINSON: Thank you. I have nothing further.

THE COURT: May I ask you just one question for clarification? When you mentioned the word "inventory," does that embrace only gas, oil and things of that sort, or does it include, also, such things as hand tools, tire changing tools, the usual accomments of a gas station?

A. Yes, sir. In the particular case, Page 1 lists the equipment, and if I may, the equipment, for instance, was the gear oil, visatrum, chassis air lube, swing spouts, gas hoses, air and water hoses, signal bells, impact guns, rotor stamp machine, battery charger, battery tester, and all of the equipment of that nature. Probably the only thing it would not involve would be hand tools. Most dealers either

3

take their hand tools with them or, perhaps, they sell them off.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

THE WITNESS: You are welcome.

THE COURT: Any other questions?

You are excused.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, we will take our noon recess at this time. Due to a witness scheduling we will not resume until 2:00 o'clock. So that will give you an extra half hour to wander around and do some things on your own. We will see you at 2:00 oclock. You will keep in mind the admonition I have given you before. The defendant will be ordered to return at that time, also.

(Whereupon, Court adjourned for the luncheon recess.)

---000---

AFTERNOON SESSION March 23, 1976. 2:00 o'clock p.m. (Pursuant to recess, Court convened, and the 4 following proceedings were had:) 5 THE COURT: Please be seated, ladies and gentlemen. 6 Let the record show that the jury is present, defendant and counsel are present. All right, sir. 7 MR. PESTARINO: Thank you, sir. Call Dr. Nidever. 8 I know I mispronounced that name. That is Nidever. 10 JACK NIDEVER, called as a witness on behalf of the Defendant, being first 11 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. PESTARINO: 14 Would you kindly state your name and spell your last name? 15 My name is Jack Nidever, last name is N-i-d-e-v-e-r. 16 And your address, Doctor? A 160 Saratoga, Suite 17 38. Santa Clara. 18 And what is your occupation? I am a clinical Α. 19 psychologist. 20 Do you have to be licensed to be a clinical psychologist? 21 Yes, I do. 22 State of California, Board of By whom? A. 23 Medical Examiners. 24 Are you licensed? Yes. Ω. 25 Will you tell us what your qualifications are, starting 26

```
with your university training, all of the way up to the
   present time?
                     A.
                          Started in Fresno State College, went
   there a couple of years.
        What year?
                            19 -- right after the war, right
   after World War II, '46 to '48. Then went to Pomona College
   where I graduated with a Bachelor's. Then I went to the
   University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia from 1950 to '52.
8
        Psychologists are not afraid of mikes? (Referring to
   microphone.)
                      A Well, I'll try not to be.
                                                        I had a
   Master's Degree then from the University of Pennsylvania.
10
        What year was that?
                               A.
                                      That is 1952.
11
   transferred to the University of California at Los Angeles,
12
   and took a Ph.D. there, working while I was doing it, so it
13
   was rather extended.
                          I got my degree in 1959. Then I went
14
   out and worked for awhile and went to an analytical institute
15
   in Zurich, Switzerland, in 1962 and graduated there in 1965.
16
        What kind of an institute did you graduate from?
17
        This is an institute of analytical psychology.
18
   the work of Carl Jung, of Jung, Freud, and Adler.
19
        And you have been in private practice since?
20
        About ten years.
21
        Ten years.
                    Well, let me ask you this, do you belong to
22
   any particular boards?
                              A.
                                   I have been active in the
23
   State Association for a number of years. I am not right now.
   I have edited a newsletter, was on the Board of Directors of
25
   the State Association and their division in clinical
26
```

psychology and was on the Board of Directors of California Psychological Health Plan, prepaid mental health plan for two 3 years. Now, are you a Diplomate --Yes. -- of any institutions? A I am a Boarded psychologist, American Board of Professional Psychology. What does that mean? What do you have to do to become After you have five years of practice a Diplomate? A. you can be examined to see if you qualify as a Boarded It was a matter of two days of examinations, psychologist. 10 much of it in an oral base, and what I really did was to go 11 down to Los Angeles and interview some patients there and report on my diagnosis, and things that I saw in these people. 13 And then the people who examined me then said that they were happy to have me as a member of the American Board. Do you belong to any professional associations? Currently the American Psychological Association. And had you done any teaching in this particular field? I have done a little bit of teaching at Sonoma State College, at the California School of Professional Psychology in San Francisco, and some extension work for the University of California, Berkeley. Would you tell us what a psychologist is, and then maybe what a clinical psychologist is? A. Well, a psychologist

is, there are about 40 divisions of psychology ranging from

the study of development in children through the aging process

26

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

through very rigorous ---

- Q Let's not get into the aging process.
- A I have that problem, too.
- Q All right. A Psychologists are trained essentially to do research. Their training is aimed at producing new information, finding different ways of understanding people, behavior, explaining the way your senses work, how the aging process proceeds, how the developmental picture comes along, how it truly develops. The clinical psychologist is, he is more inclined to do the clinical work which is to attempt to apply a lot of these findings so he has to be qualified in research, and then he is attempting to do psychotherapy, diagnoses.
- What is psychotherapy? A. What is psychotherapy?
- Q Yeah. Psychotherapy diagnosis?
 - A Diagnosis is separate from psychotherapy. Psychotherapy is a variety of means of trying to make a person, allow a person to become aware of what they are doing because most of us are far less aware of what happens to us and what we do than we truly, we ever truly know.
 - Well, in a general sense, Doctor, are you -- it is really a study of human behavior, isn't it? Generally speaking or generically speaking? A All of psychology could be sub-assumed under that, yes.
- Q What does a clinical psychologist do?
- A Practical matter he sees clients in an office frequently

14th of March. (By Mr. Pestarino) And did you go to see him alone? 3 The first two times I went alone. The third time I took an interpreter who could speak Arabic. 5 And what was the purpose of your seeing Mr. Ismail? 6 My purpose, as I understood it, was to evaluate him, to offer any explanations or information that I could about what led to his actions. And a total of how many hours did you spend with Okay. Can you give me some rough idea? him? 10 A About seven-and-a-half hours, somewhat short of eight hours, somewhere between seven and eight. At the jail? 13 Ω A. At the jail. And on these dates tell us chronologically what you did? 1.4 The first day I simply spent a session with him talking. I mean, I wanted to see, I wanted to be able to relate to him and not bring a lot of strange things in on him right away. 17 So we sat and talked about 45 minutes about what had happened 18 When I came the next time I brought a fair selection to him. 19 of tests, and we started to work and we worked about three 20 hours going through as many tests as we could at that time. 21 We got to a kind of block place where I was having difficulty 22 going ahead because we had a language barrier between us. 23 And so I asked someone that I have known in the school system 24

who speaks Arabic very well to come with me and help me

interpret what David was saying. So we were speaking, they

26

```
were speaking in Arabic part of the time, and were kind of
    exchanging, so it was English and Arabic.
                    Now, did you administer any tests or give
         All right.
    any tests to David Ismail?
                                   A.
                                         Yes, I did.
         And how many tests did you give him?
    A
        About 12.
        About 12 tests?
                             A
                                  Yes.
         Tell me, are the tests that you gave him, are they
    reliable tests?
                        A.
                             Our psychologists think so.
                                                            They
    are standard tests.
10
        And are they given throughout the country or the
11
   countries by psychologists?
                                     A.
                                          Well, the tests that I
12
   am using here, not all of them are used abroad.
13
                                                       Some of
   them are. Some of them are developed abroad.
14
                                                     Most of them
   are tests that are used throughout the United States.
15
        And I ask you, are those tests reliable?
16
        As reliable as we can make them.
17
        So, can you tell us briefly what these tests were that
18
   you gave him? And maybe you ought to describe a little bit.
19
   First of all, maybe you ought to describe a little bit what
20
   preparations you make to give these tests? Do you have any
21
   particular paraphernalia, equipment, or what, in order to
   give these tests?
                           A.
                                I brought a boxful with me.
23
        A what?
                           I brought two brief bags full, two
                     A.
24
   briefcases full when I came to test him.
                                               My preparation,
25
```

in part I went out and read something about the Assyrian

- church, which wasn't too hard to find, and I made, I took a look at the kind of language that he was accustomed to speak in the course of my testing him.
 - 1 In other words, Doctor, excuse me for interrupting you --
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q -- but I, if I don't speak now I will forget maybe.
- 7 But did you obtain a history of what happened from the
- 8 defendant, David Ismail? A. I started by asking him to
- 9 tell me everything that he could remember about what had
- 10 happened to him, yes.
- 11 Q And did you talk to somebody else about what had happen-
- 12 ed? A I talked to Dr. Rappaport, Dr. Walter Rappaport
- 13 We talked on the telephone for about 25 minutes.
 - Q Did you ever talk to me about what had happened?
 - A I can't remember talking to you very much about it.
 - Okay. All right. So you obtained a history as best you could from David Ismail and from Dr. Rappaport?
 - A Yes. Your investigator, Mr. Hernandez, gave me a few bits of information as well.
 - G Fine. And then the next thing you did was to administer some tests? A. Yes.
 - Q All right. Now, tell us about the tests?
 - A All right. The first --
 - Q It might simplify things if you can, just write on the blackboard or piece of paper the test. Wouldn't that be agreeable?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: No objection. 1 THE WITNESS: 2 Whatever is convenient. I am just 3 as happy to talk it. MR. PESTARINO: Whatever is easier for you and to help us understand. 5 MR. ROBINSON: Perhaps we could have the doctor step 6 to the board and diagram his tests for us. I have no 7 objection to that. MR. PESTARINO: All right. 9 THE COURT: I assume some of these are written tests 10 oral tests? 11 THE WITNESS: I didn't ---12 THE COURT: Multiphasic? 13 THE WITNESS: I didn't use the multiphasic. 14 all I can do really is put up there the names of the tests 15 that I used and the general kind of level of finding. 16 MR. PESTARINO: That is fine. 17 THE COURT: Perhaps you could do that. 18 MR. PESTARINO: Then we can talk about it more. 19 THE COURT: There is a microphone if you can hold it 20 and read at the same time. 21 MR. PESTARINO: You don't write like all doctors. 22 do you? 23 THE WITNESS: Is it all right if I print? I think I will put these down the way that, the way 25 that I wrote them up rather than in the order that I gave them. 26

U

. .

That is the structure that I have.

MR. PESTARINO: All right.

THE WITNESS: Actually maybe I better put the first one up here. The first thing that disturbed me was, I gave David what is called -- is that going to be readable?

MR. PESTARING: No, not for me. I am blind. Can't you use a black crayon? That is better.

a full range vocabulary test. It is a vocabulary test, and in talking to him I recognized that if I weren't very careful we got a block and we didn't understand each other. So I have had some experience with foreign language, so I started trying to do the best I could to understand him. But I thought I better scale him -- that is not right.

So this scale that says equal to or less than I.Q. of 40, this is no disrespect to David, this is just a scale where I show a variety of pictures, there are 16 plates with 4 pictures each on them, and you give the person a word and you say, "Pick me a plate. Pick me a picture." And you start at rather straightforward level and maybe you have a picture of a pair of, some athletes doing something, and 2 people sitting in a corner, and they look as if they might be, as if they might be a woman, and the question might be, "Can you pick which word is 'condolence'?"

MR. ROBINSON: Excuse me, Your Honor, I have had psychologists before and I think it is beneficial to the jury,

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and perhaps easier for the doctor, perhaps he would mark those pictures that he showed the defendant and we can introduce those into evidence so the jury can see the sort of pictures we are talking about.

THE COURT: I would have no objection.

THE WITNESS: Be fine, except I didn't bring them.

MR. ROBINSON: We will get them.

THE COURT: That can be taken care of later.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, in any case, the problem was at the base level with the least load on him in terms of his language, how could I find out what his level of language So I started using these simple pictures which usage was? we can use on anybody from a 2-year-old to an adult, because they don't require very much language. You start saying the word and go up the scale in difficulty of the words, and you keep asking the person which of the 4 pictures looks most like that particular word. Now, David talks pretty well. isn't anything wrong with his general level of intelligence. It may not be extraordinarily high, but he is not retarded in any general sense that I can understand. But in using these cards I discovered that his language usage is about between an 8 and a 12-year-old child if it is English. He speaks Arabic, and I can't touch Arabic, and that is his second language, and that is the language that the interpreter and he spoke. It was the second language for each of them. happened to be an Egyptian Greek. As far as I could see they

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

spoke very well in this language, and I was following them as closely as I could with the hand motions and all that goes with it and asking very short and precise questions. I think we ought to bear in mind when you put down an I.Q. of 40 for someone on this kind of simple skill, and the normal I.Q. is around 100, that we see David works through quite a barrier when he tries to understand the language which we are prone to use rather quickly, and as I say, any of us would be hopelessly lost if we tried to talk Acadian, or if we tried to talk Arabic because we can't, or at least I can't Anyway, that is a pretty low score, and when I looked at that score I said to the attorney that it seemed to me that it would be very important to use an interpreter, and I thought perhaps he needed an interpreter in the courtroom because one of the things that people that don't have tremendous language usually do, those of you who speak more than one language, you talk to someone who is trying to learn the language, they listen better than they can speak it, and they will kind of fake you out, and they'll go along like they understand, and then you catch them and you realize they don't know what you said. David was trying to tell me something about a night flyer, and I couldn't understand that. When we got the interpreter it turned out that a night flyer was a bat.

Q (By Mr. Pestarino) A what? A A bat. That was my problem. But the ease with which you can get confused in

2 3

65 11

3

language, and I see some of you nodding your heads, that is the way it goes. So I tried to learn German and I remember every so often they'd catch me when I thought I was being clever. Then, of course, I didn't understand them at all. This is one scale.

Now, by contrast I'll use here, "W.A.I.S.," to use the Wexler Adult Intelligence Scale, and what I did here is, I used the performance items which don't require too much language. Then I can get another I.Q. And for this one I got 91, which is, it is pretty close to within the normal range.

Now, on this scale where there are things that you are asked to do that don't require too much language usage, ordinarily you would expect a person who has a lot of quickness of mind to show it here, at least on one of the scales. David didn't really do this, but then he was also under the stress of and he was trying to do it as well as he could. As far as I could see he was also under some stress. But as I began to get these numbers, I began to feel that probably David's basic ability level, as far as we would measure aptitude in comparison to people of the same age, that it was around average. There was nothing, he was not carrying a very great aptitude to do scholastic or abstract thinking.

Now, I went on and I took the Wide Range Achievement Test, and I checked his reading level and discovered that, of course, that was pretty good. It is still about the same

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

level here. It is approximately equivalent to an I.Q. of 90, and it is about, it is somewhere in the 6th grade level, which for an adult gives about that range of I.Q. metic I am still trying to establish some of his ability levels because it is important, his resources, intellectually important to whatever is happening. Here he was less capable. He dropped down to about 80, and here we are working around 5th grade level. Now, when I checked his reading level with this test I just used single words. wanted to see what would happen if I gave him a real paragraph to read and try to understand. So I gave him Grey's Oral Reading, which doesn't require too much in the way of comprehension, but you experience the person trying to actually handle the language in a chunk instead of just single words. Here he dropped down to an equivalent I.Q. of around So however else we see David, he has got some problems with the English language, that he just does.

I asked him if he read newspapers at home in Canada because that is, of course, pretty good check. If you can read a newspaper with the language of the day, that means that you probably have pretty good language usage. And I got the impression he reads part of the newspaper, but he didn't read them through. Now, I may have misunderstood him. But that is what I gathered from him. Because I wanted to use some other scales that involve color, and I was concerned about the possibility that he might have some brain damage from

5

6

7

8

•

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 -

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

something Dr. Rappaport had said, I did what is called, I used the Devorin Pseudo-isochromatic Blocks, which just check you for color blindness. And he is not color blind.

You can't read that, but you are going to remember what I said maybe (referring to blackboard). So this is color. And there is no problem with color. I then wanted to know about sequencing activity. There was a lot of stuff here about memory. So I started out with something called the Knox Cube Test. It is something that was used at Ellis Island in the early part of the century to screen people who could not speak English. Here he did quite well. An equivalent mental age of around 16. And this is, simply there are five essential blocks pinned to a board. And with a pencil, both of you having pencils, Dave takes a pencil and he tries to follow the pattern I trace, and I start out going, "Do, do, do," and he can do that. When you get up to where you are doing it 6 times it gets sort of complicated. it is a great screen in terms of how quickly or how well you can remember sequence material. He did pretty well with that, and a mental age of 16 in terms of kind of aptitude things isn't too far from the adult range.

Now, I have now two or three other scales here that have to do with David's ability to handle memory. One is a simple memory for design. In this he did essentially all right. So these two are essentially the norm. Then I did a Bender-Gestalt. Now, the Bender-Gestalt was developed in

2

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's had a lot of progress since then. Europe. non-geometric design, and the request is simply that you And you can copy them while you look at them. copy them. In this scale you look at 15 designs, but you only get to look at them for 5 seconds, then you have to redraw them. So you look at cards and the designs get more and more And then the question is, how good does your complex. His visual equipment works pretty well. memory work. So he gets a norm here. With the Bender-Gestalt where you look at the design and copy it you can always see possible brain damage problems. We have another procedure we use here now, it is called background interference. What we do, what we do to make this scale more difficult, is on the page where you are to do the design we simply put many, many wiggly lines through it, and this is like noise, and then the request is, now, you please copy these designs just as you did the first time on a blank piece of paper. Now, copy them and try to ignore these wiggly lines. What we have discovered in psychology is, this is one of the most sensitive devices to expose brain damage, brain disfunction. Central disfunction tends to appear here more quickly, more reliable than it does with almost any of our other scales. On this scale he did indeed get a score which put him in the mild organic impairment class, which means that, as he told me, that he had an injury as a child.

Gee, I don't write very good.

26

3 4

1

7

8

10

11 12

13

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

And I'm going to say that his mild organic damage, David told me that when he was 7 or 8 he ran into a telephone pole full tilt, and he lost the hearing in one ear, and after that time he didn't do very well in school and eventually he dropped out. That is a long time ago. David is now, as I recall, 40. He has had a lot of time to try to compensate for whatever disturbance, whatever damage he experienced then. You can't recover your hearing, but you can try to recover a lot of other things. But nonetheless, this background interference procedure which we call, "BIP," it shows that he sure enough has some organic damage in his head. He really, really does.

The next scale is called Hooper Visual Organization. This is another scale aimed at, aimed at exposing any problems, any central nervous system problems. They are fragmented objects, they are common objects. Anyone who would live 10 years in Canada would know all of these objects. They would know them if they lived in Europe, whether it is a sailboat But you show a picture in which there are fragments, but they all fit together like a jigsaw. They are like a jigsaw puzzle except you don't have the pieces to fit You must do it in your head. together. And the question is, "What object is it?" And that is really the only response necessary to give. Again, David falls at a level of organic damage here. Now, this isn't a terribly severe organic damage. He is functional. I had somewhat similar

thing happen to me as a child. I have some sympathy for it. I had a skull fracture, after that I just couldn't hit a baseball. I used to hit them over left field. I never could understand what had happened. After awhile I realized I had lost my depth perception. I didn't have the depth perception I had before. These kind of things happen. He, David, might have got a stouter hit than I did, or lesser one. I don't really know.

I then went on to what are projective scales. I think I will just enumerate them and I can talk about them better sitting down. One is the house-tree-person drawing; another is the Rorschach, and this is a series of 10 ink blots, developed in Europe, in Switzerland. Then the Thematic Apperception Scale which I will abbreviate TAT, and these are projective scales. They are aimed at personality dimensions. And this one was developed in the United States by a man named Murray, back in an eastern university. Is that sufficient as an outline?

MR. PESTARINO: Yeah. Thank you.

MR. ROBINSON: Could you just, TAT, what does that stand for?

THE WITNESS: Thematic, like theme, Thematic, Thematic Apperception Test.

MR. PESTARINO: Apperception?

THE WITNESS: A-p-p-e-r.

Q (By Mr. Pestarino) Why don't you sit down, Doctor?

4

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

How --

A I have three other tests I haven't talked about. I can now or later.

Finish your tests. The HTP Drawing, the house-tree-person drawings, the request is simply that you draw me a tree, and then that you draw me a house, then a If you draw a person who is male, then I ask that you draw a person who is female. And you can see a good deal in an individual in terms of how they do these simple things. Because they kind of say things about the human being, their absorption with the home, house, will come through in how they draw the picture of the house, the sense of their own life energy seems to come out in a tree. If you give a person a piece of paper and ask him to sketch you a tree, and they draw you a tree with all broken off limbs, and it looks like it's about ready to die, you are really concerned because the sense is that that person perceives themselves as not having much energy to go and do anything. These things all psychologists kind of agree on. But we acknowledge now this is an area in which we do a lot of interpretation in terms of what we think it means. figures drawings there is the same sort of thing, like a person draws a figure and each of the fingers are as sharp as daggers, you might conclude that there is hostility in that You don't have to stretch very far to consider that person. there is a sharpness in the way they see other people and

3

themselves. Well, we did this. I also gave him the 10 Rorschach blots, and I gave him the Thematic Apperception Test. The last two I did with the assistance of the interpreter because it was too difficult, we couldn't do it without, just between the two of us.

- Q Let me ask you, Doctor ---
- A It's not very good on David for me to talk about him like he were a skeleton.
- All right. That's all right. Is it possible, you know, sometimes -- let me put it this way, sometimes lawyers handle whiplash cases where somebody injures their cervical muscle --
- A Cervical disk, yeah.
- Yeah, or the disk, mostly the muscles where it doesn't show particularly with X-rays. And sometimes people can fake this kind of a condition because nothing shows on X-rays?

 A. Mn-hmm.
- On In giving these tests is there a possibility or a probability, whichever, that David Ismail could fake these tests in any way and get a result that is consistent with his history?

 A. Well, I wouldn't want to say that I have never been fooled but I think it is rather difficult. I think it is almost impossible. Usually a person taking a psychological test, it is so hard to understand what the person wants from you, you give them a strange task to do, and they may be insulted, they may think it is a child's task, and they shouldn't have to do it. I just don't know

g*

3

. 5

6

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

66

21

22

23

24

25

26

in the ordinary run of population, I rarely see anybody who I think is really capable of outmaneuvering, somebody who is using these very-carefully-thought-out procedures.

- It always has disturbed me a little, Doctor, that psychologists can give a Rorschach Test, which I understand to be an ink-blot test, does that make any sense, you make any sense out of ink blots? A Well, it is like putting a vacuum cleaner to somebody's head.
- Well, I say, it is somewhat like A what? putting a vacuum cleaner to somebody's head, they don't know what it is that you are asking them to see. It is unstructured. I give you an ink blot, and I say to you, "Will you tell me what it can look like?" Well, remember, there might be some things that you would hold back a little bit or be a little sensitive about. You might not say something about something that looks sexual to you, but in the main the people get occupied with the things they see in the blots, then kind of without realizing it they have given you the pieces that are kind of arranged uppermost in their mind and kind of at different levels. They just kind of exposed a structure to you of where their emotions, their feelings, their images, their goals are in terms of their responses.
- Q Well, I suppose that I was trying to ask you, isn't it ridiculous to give a test involving ink blots? Can you learn anything from that? A You're putting me on.

3

- Q Well, all right. That's what I'm doing.
- A It seems to me it is a very valuable tool. I have used it a great deal and I get a lot out of it. And it seems to be effective. From what I -- my follow-ups, they seem to show that it is rather accurate, what you perceive.
- Now, was there anything else you did besides take the history of David Ismail as it relates to this case, his religion, and so forth, and give him these tests? Was there anything else you did that we should know about?
- 10 A I don't think so.
 - All right. Now, what conclusions did you reach from all of these tests? What findings?
 - A Working through all of the material I just could not see David as a cold, premeditated murderer. It does not fit any of my findings.
 - Why do you say that? A. Well, in the projective material and in all of the interactions between me and the interpreter I saw a tremendous human sensitivity, a great deal of empathy, a kind of a dignity. There were so many interpersonal qualities that I found in my tests and in my interactions with David that for me to imagine him to coldly sit down and kill somebody, it would seem to me it would be the same thing as he killed himself. It just does not fit the material I obtained from him. But that is, of course, an opinion. It is a professional opinion, but it is an opinion.

- 1 Q This -- A I did, also, I did also consider -2 perhaps I shouldn't interrupt you though?
- Q Go ahead. A I was just going to say, the other additional point that I thought was rather important, is that if we consider that he has some central nervous system disfunction, that means that he has less emotional control than an ordinary individual. That is one of the characteristics of having a kind of degraded nervous system. It is not that controllable. It fires unexpectedly.
 - Q Did you find that condition with David Ismail?
 - A Well, I certainly found the organic impairment.
 - Q Which would be consistent? A Which is consistent with that kind of behavior.
 - And you found that through the testing?
 - A. I found that through the testing.
 - And you base that not only on the testings but do you base it on the history given?

 A Well, we also know that if you truly drink, and understand he had a point 0.8 alcohol content in his blood, if you drink you also are degrading, you know, your impulse control. And when you put those two pieces together, the impulse control being degraded by the drinking and by the organic impairment, it means that you really, it is not a very controllable system. It does not compare with a normal human being in any way. I mean, the actions then are not very predictable.
 - O Did he indicate to you anything in the history that you

had taken from him that he was very close to his father? Well, he certainly did talk very much about him, yes. It was clear that he had a very deep involvement in his father, and a particular church which is combined with a sense of his identity as a person, as an Assyrian. very strong, had a very strong, a piece here, three pieces that kind of fit together, the race, the church, and his They just seem to have become one. father. The race, his church, and his father. Did he tell you that some words were used to describe or -- strike that. 10 Did he tell you that the Patriarch had used some 11 vile words with reference to his father? 12 Yes, he did say so. 13 Would that alone be sufficient for a man like David, as 14 you know him through the tests, to become impulsive, so to 15 speak? I think the rage resulting from that kind of A. thing is predictably very large, yes, not control. 17 Is your opinion -- you talked about memory, and 18 memory for design, that test shows that David Ismail was 19 normal; is that right? A. Yes, he is within normal limits. 21 Did David Ismail tell you that at some time or another 22 after the Patriarch had said something about his father that 23 he didn't remember what happened for quite some time afterwards? 24 He said to me that he really didn't clearly remember 25 anything until he was taking a shower in the jail, from that 26

time, from the words of the Patriarch until he was in the jail in the shower, that is the first time he came back to full awareness.

- Suppose I told you this, that he could remember pretty clearly, I think, everything that happened up to a certain point, and then when the Patriarch said something about his father he indicates that he could not remember very such of what happened until he took a shower.

 A. Mn-hmm.
- Q Is that consistent with your diagnosis?
- A Well, it is certainly not inconsistent.
- Well, could -- is that likely to happen with a man such as you know him here, involved in all of these tests?
- A There is, I have seen, and I have observed, other people have observed that under a particular emotional load there is a thing called a fugue that occasionally occurs in which --
- What is a fugue? A. Well, it is a term to describe a type of hysteria.
- Q Is it something like somnambulism? Sleepwalking?
- A Similar to, except that to the outward person, to the outward observer it would appear that the person is awake, not asleep.
- Now, you started to say that it appeared what?
- A Well, the person appears essentially normal, that is, you can talk and they will respond. It is like being in a hypnotic state. It is like I attempt to induce a hypnotic state in someone, and then I get them to a nice level where

26

1 they are accepting me, and they will now accept the reality Which is like, to help them stop smoking, as I provide it. 3 or, you know, lose some weight or remove some, rather, get through some kind of painful experience that is bothering 5 At that time the person can talk to you, but sometime later when they are awakened they have no memory of what has You usually facilitate this by suggesting that happened. they not remember, but it is a very common event, and when it 8 occurs spontaneously we call it a fugue. And in this fugue state it is like you almost pop into another personality. 10 You have got integrated behavior, you may function but you 11 12 simply have no recall of what has happened. One of the simplest things that you can experience that is contemporary, 13 you are driving down the freeway and you are thinking about 14 something, and five minutes later you wonder where you are 15 because you just come back to wakefulness. 16 Now, that isn't altogether a fugue, but it is very similar to it. You just 17 simply did not have your attention there. 18 There is no great stress in that situation. Perhaps I am confusing the Court. 19 And to reach that fugue state does the mild brain 20 impairment, does the alcohol, does the religion, does the 21 paternal instinct in his case, so to speak, do all of those 22 factors or circumstances combine? 23 All those factors make it, do indeed make it possible and probable that he 24

could be pushed out of the pain of being where he is and in

the identity he is in, just kind of pushed out, you know, and

momentarily not be aware of anything, not really be aware of what he is doing. There is that possibility.

Are you telling us then, Doctor, that all your testing, the history that you have taken from David Ismail, and the results of your testing, make him out this peculiar person, is that what you are saying?

A. I am not trying to make him peculiar. I am trying to say that he can be more vulnerable to this kind of an event. You know, I have only his own report but he has told me of two previous instances in which he had essentially a blackout, and he didn't remember anything for the course of several hours, and the next day couldn't, didn't know all of these things that had happened which he had done, one of which was to break half the crockery in the house.

So is it your opinion then that this particular person,
David Ismail -- what is your opinion as far as the events that
transpired on the night of Movember the 5th as he had given
them to you?

A. Well, I don't think that I am really
in the position to try to interpret whatever the total meaning
of that scene is. Like, that is a task for --

But give me your opinion as to whether or not it is consistent with a person that could (snapping fingers) act spontaneously, No. 1; No. 2, could act and forget or not remember, and act like he remembered? A. My sense of this man in my examination of him is that he did get pushed out of his ordinary consciousness and does not remember

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

because he was just in a different state.

MR. PESTARINO: Okay. Thank you. That's all.

THE COURT: Do you want to recess?

MR. ROBINSON: No. I'm just going to have a few questions for the Doctor, then I am going to ask him to come back tomorrow, Your Honor, with the Court's permission.

THE COURT: Can you do that?

THE WITNESS: If you ask me to, I'll have to.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBINSON:

- All of these various tests that you administered to the defendant, I take it you brought them with you today so we could look at them?

 A. No, I didn't bring them.
- Q Can you bring them so we can all see what they are tomorrow? A Sure.
- What I would like you to do is bring every test that you put on the board. Okay? A. If you wish.
- Okay. Just a couple other quick questions now.

Have you testified as an expert witness in psychology in the Superior Courts of the County of Santa Clara on prior occasions?

A. Several times.

- Okay. And how many would that be?
- A I think I might have been in the Superior Court, maybe with this, three times, maybe four times.
- Maybe four times. And how long have you been practicing in this area? A. Ten years.

- And do you recall the names of the cases in which you testified in the Superior Court these three or four times?
- A One was a man named Valdez.
- Q Valdez. Okay. Do you recall his first name?
- A Ricardo, I think.
- Q Okay. And what sort of a case was that? The charge?
- 7 A The man had been in a holdup in a 7-Eleven.
- Okay. What other cases? A Well, I realize that another one, I didn't testify, just simply did some work for
- 10 Mr. Adams who is with La Casa.
 - 0 Mike Adams, the defense attorney? A Mm-hmm.
- 12 Did some work for him? A Por another person, 13 name of Valardas.
 - Q But he never called you to testify? A No, he did not.
- 16 And did the D.A. ever call you to testify in that case?
- 17 A. NO.

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Q What other cases? A Well, it isn't in the Superior Court, but in the Federal Court some several, about four or five years ago I was asked to evaluate a man who had been involved in robberies of banks, and he was sentenced to five years, and there seemed to have been some problem in the sense that my evaluation was somehow not given to the judge. And he discovered this, and I then testified in the Federal Court not too long ago, about last year, and they decided to essentially, I think, put him on probation at that time and

1.4

they ended his time at McNeill because he had made a rather fine, he had become a counselor at McNeill Island.

- So you never testified before a jury trial in the Federal Court then as to guilt or innocence, you simply did work like if somebody is convicted they go to the probation department, they get psychiatric help, psychiatric counseling, that is the sort of work you did then? A. No, I testified in the court. The judge called me to ask me to testify.
- Was this in front of a jury? A. No, it was in front of a judge.
- Q Just in front of a judge? And this was after the man had already been convicted? A Five years later.
- Q Five years later. Okay. What other cases?
- A I think that is about it.
- 0 Okay.

MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor -- I hate to do this to you, Doctor, but it is important in terms of bringing in your material so that we could all review it together -- I would request that I can reserve my cross-examination of the doctor until tomorrow morning. If counsel had told me that he was going to call this doctor I could have been ready for him. He indicated that he was just calling Dr. Rappaport. He hadn't told me any of the witnesses that he is calling.

THE COURT: Well, let's approach the bench for a moment.

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14 15

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

(Discussion off the record.)

THE COURT: Can you come back tomorrow morning, Doctor?

THE WITNESS: What time do you want me to come back? How about 9:30 or a quarter to ten, and THE COURT: try to get you out before noon?

THE WITNESS: All right.

Which would be better for you? THE COURT:

THE WITNESS: What are the choices?

THE COURT: 9:30 or a quarter to ten.

MR. PESTARINO: Maybe we can work him in in the afternoon?

THE COURT: Would you rather go in the afternoon? THE WITNESS: I am going to have to juggle my schedule. It doesn't matter too much, as I recall, which way I juggle it.

THE COURT: I think counsel would prefer to have you in the morning.

MR ROBINSON: That is correct, while the testimony is fresh in the jurors' minds.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, in view of the fact that this witness has testified and given an opinion, and the District Attorney has not had an opportunity to examine the basis for the opinion, I am granting him the right to a reservation of cross-examination until tomorrow morning.

MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, might I also obtain a copy

of the doctor's report which I haven't been given up until

this time?

3

MR. PESTARINO: I'll give you one.

4 5 THE COURT: We'll see that you get a copy or a copy can be duplicated.

6

THE WITNESS: Is there a duplicating machine here?

7

THE COURT: There is one in the building.

8

MR. PESTARINO: I'll give him one.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: All right. Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is three o'clock, and because of the fact that it was expected that Dr. Nidevere would be here all afternoon no other witnesses were scheduled. So we are going to have to give you the rest of the afternoon off, which I am sure is going to make you very unhappy. I have been talking to counsel about the time of the trial, and as I indicated to you earlier when we first were questioning you about being a prospective juror, we estimated the time about three to four weeks. My record shows this is the 9th day, tomorrow will Friday will be the 11th, and we should be be the 10th day. finished next week, I would think somewhere towards the middle of the next week. You will recall that you will have Thursday off, but we will probably go to work Friday of this You will keep in mind the admonition I have Okay. given you before and we will see you tomorrow morning at 9:30 and I will try to get through with my law and motion calendar in time. And Doctor, you will be asked to return. And so

will the defendant, Mr. Ismail will be ordered back. Okay. See you tomorrow.

(Whereupon, Court adjourned until 9:30 o'clock a.m., March 24, 1976.)

---000---

3

5

6

8

. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

TENTH DAY

March 24, 1976

9:30 o'clock a.m.

(Pursuant to adjournment, Court convened, and the following proceedings were had:)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Please be seated. Let the record show the defendant is present, defendant and counsel are present, the jury is present.

Do you want Dr. Nidever back on the stand?

MR. PESTARINO: Yes, Your Honor, I think so.

THE COURT: Doctor.

MR. PESTARINO: Come forward, please.

DR. JACK NIDEVER,

the witness on the stand at the time of the adjournment, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

THE COURT: I believe you are on crossexamination. You are reminded that you are still under oath from yesterday.

MR. ROBINSON: Good morning.

THE WITNESS: Good morning.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed)

BYMR. ROBINSON:

Q. What I would like to do, first of all, is ask you about some of your qualifications to give this opinion that you have given. Okay?

You have to answer out loud.

```
1
     A.
           Surely, go ahead.
     Q.
           You told us about your educational background?
 3
           Yes.
     Q.
           And you told us about your work experience?
           No, I didn't really tell you about my work experience.
     A.
 6
                  I will get into that. Now, in addition to your
     Q.
7
     educational background and your work experience I take it
8
     you have read literature in the field of psychology?
9
           Well, I hope so, yes.
10
           So do I. You are the only one that can tell me that.
11
     A.
           I have certainly read some of the literature in
12
     psychology.
     Q.
           Then I take it you have read scientific journals?
     A.
           Centainly.
           And have you published any articles?
16
           Oh, a few.
     A.
17
           What articles have you published?
     Q.
18
           Well, my doctoral dissertation was on muscular
19
     tension.
20
           What did that deal with?
                                                          It was an
21
     attempt to lay the groundwork for using a physical method
22
     to assess subjective tension and anxiety.
                                                             Well.
           Can you explain that for us?
24
     the surface muscles of the body can be measured electrically,
25
     and what I did was I measured about twenty-four muscle
26
     groups and connected that with some autonomic nervous
```

system measurements and a variety of other measurements, including the time of day and the ambient temperature and one thing and another, with the hope of showing with factor analytic procedures, these are fancy statistical procedures to show that things go together. And my attempt was to demonstrate that there was a factor of muscular tension, which I did, which could be useful in the field of clinical psychology.

- Q. Were you successful in that attempt?
- A. Yes, I was.
- Q. And does everybody who receives their doctorate in psychology have to do a doctoral dissertation?
- A. That is the general principle, yes.
- Q. Now, in addition to your doctoral dissertation have you published any other articles in the field?
- A. I did some work when I worked for IEM. I did about a half dozen research studies, only one of which was published for the corporation. The one that was published had to do with the efficiency of a human being using codes and eyehand coding versus machine coding.
- Q. Okay. And one of those was published?
- 22 A. Um-hum.
 - Q. And where was it published?
- A. It was published in the IRM Journal.
 - Q. Okay. And that is a journal of people that work for IEM?

 A. It is a rather fancy

1 journal, yes. Is the IBM Journal read throughout the community of 3 psychologists? Well, the items 4 that I worked on were essentially confidential so this was circulated throughout the IM Corporation. 6 Q. And what other articles have you published? 7 I published an article on police work. I have been a 8 consultant to the Sheriff's Department here for seven or eight years. And I work with the Sheriff's Department in 10 developing ways to let their deputies relate better to 11 different ethnic groups in the community and minority groups, including colored students. So in the California State 13 Psychologist I published an article about riots and police 14 work. 15 Q. ... Okay. And any other articles? No. I published a piece on -- didn't really publish 17 it but developed a thesis that you could learn extrasensory 18 perception, and I did that in Zurich. It was an 19 experimental piece. 20 And that was not published? It is in 21 the archives of the Zurich Institute, but it is not 22 published otherwise. 23 Any other published articles? A. There may be a couple but they are not all that important. 25 Q. Have you written any books? A. No, I

26

haven't written any books.

```
1
           Now, you told us that you have read scientific
     journals.
                 And have you read any psychological journals?
 3
           It would stand to reason that I have, yes.
     Q.
           Okay. And what psychological and scientific journals
 5
     have you read?
                                      A.
                                           Well, you want me to
 6
     give you a full list of the, you know, of all of the journals
     in psychology?
           Why don't I ask you specific ones?
     Q.
           Sure. I have read in all of them.
     A.
10
     Q.
           Have you read the Journal of Abnormal Psychology?
11
           And you are familiar with that journal?
12
     A.
           I certainly have read articles in the journal, yes.
13
           What about the Journal of Psychology and the Law?
     Q.
14
     A.
           No, I havent really read that.
15
     Q.
           You haven't read that. Is there any special reason why
     you haven't read that?
                                                     I presume it is
17
     a psychiatric journal. I don't read all of the psychiatric
18
     journals.
19
           It has to do with psychiatry and courtroom testimony?
     Q.
20
           I am not a psychiatrist. I am a psychologist.
     A.
21
           Have you read a Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease?
     Q.
22
     A.
           I certainly have read articles in there.
23
           And what about the American Psychologist?
     Q.
24
           Well, that is the standard publication.
     A.
25
           That is the standard publication?
     Q.
26
           For the American Psychological Association.
     A.
```

1	
	Q. And you would have read that?
2	A. I have read articles there.
3	Q. What about books that you have read? What about the
4	Clinical Interaction by S. P. Sarason? Have you read that?
5	A. No, I haven't.
6	Q. Okay. Is that a rather well-known book in the field
7	of clinical interaction? A. Not to my
8	knowledge, no.
9	Q. Never heard of it? A. Well, Sarason
10	is an author I have read, but I haven't read that particular
11	book.
12	Q. You are familiar with what Sarason has to say?
13	A. I know something about Sarason.
14	Q. What about Psychological Testing by Anastasi?
15	A. Well, that book came out after I graduated from
16	school. Myself, I have looked at it, I didn't purchase it.
17	Q. And that book has come out in more than one edition,
18	hasn't it? A. Probably.
19	Q. What about Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook by Oscar
20	K. Burroughs? A. That is a reference
21	text.
22	Q. Are you familiar with that? A. Um-hum.
2 3	Q. And what about the Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook
24	by Mr. Burroughs? A. I have used it.
25	Q. And Seventh? A. I don't recall that
26	there is a seventh.

which this review appeared.

```
1
           Sure. So at the time he writes the book, first of all,
     Q.
     the Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook, he includes all of the
     tests at that time; the Sixth he encompasses new tests, and
     in the Seventh newer tests?
           Sure.
           Did you rely to some extent on the named journals and
     books that I have previously mentioned in reaching your
     opinion and conclusion in this courtroom today?
           No, I don't think so.
 9
           You didn't rely on any of those?
10
           Well, I have been ten years in the field so I rely on
11
     my own experience, too.
12
           Well, okay. You rely on your own experience. And what
13
     else do you rely on?
14
                                    A. Well, I use all
     of the material that seems to me to be significant in terms
15
    of my reading and psychological meetings that I go to, and
16
    my colleagues who are, also, on the staff of local
17
     universities.
18
           Okay. Well, is the book by Mr. Burroughs a
19
     significant book?
20
                                                Sure.
           In your field?
21
                                                It costs so much
     money I don't happen to have it.
    Q.
          That leads me to another question. How much are you
23
     getting paid to testify in this Court?
24
           My regular fee.
     A.
25
          Well, how much is that?
    Q.
                                                A.
26
                                                        I charge
```

23

24

26

\$60 an hour.

- Q. Okay. And how much have you received to testify?
- A. Well, up to this point I'm not sure, I sent Mr.

 Pestarino a bill for somewhat over \$600 including a fee for my interpreter.

MR. PESTARINO: Did you get paid?

THE WITNESS: It's probably, it's about to come.

- Q. (By Mr. Robinson) Okay. So right now so far you have billed for services rendered to Mr. Pestarino \$600?
- A. Six hundred and forty, I think, including the interpreter.
- Q. Now, you told us that you rely a lot on your experience. What sort of experience -- well, strike that.

You told us yesterday that you have experience testifying in Courts, you have testified as an expert witness in Courts approximately three to four times?

- A. You asked me if I had testified in the Superior Court, and I said to my knowledge three or four times. Then when we went over it it seemed to me it was maybe two or three times.
- Q. And have you ever testified before a jury regarding a criminal matter in Superior Court?
- A. No. No. I haven't.
- Q. You told us that you testified one time in Federal Court?

 A. Um-hum.
- Q. And this testimony was after a man had been convicted

of bank robbery? A. Um-hum.

Q. This man was incarcorated in Federal institution?

A. That's right.

Q. Had been incarcerated there for approximately five years?

A. Um-hum.

Okay. And then you did an interview with this man in the Federal institution? No, before No. the man was tried originally I did an evaluation for, at the request of his attorney and a referring psychiatrist. They used some of the information from my evaluation, but et the time that the man was to be sentenced, as I recall, they didn't consider that he might require further psychiatric or psychological evaluation, so this point was missed. He was then sentenced. After he was in jail he corresponded with me, and I provided him with a letter which was essentially a summary of my report. And the judge who had tried the case in reviewing this decided to review the matter once again in Court, and at that time I did testify, and the judge felt that there had been some abuse of the rights the man should have had. And because he had made such a good effort to become, as I said, a counselor and has now gone out to work with people who leave the prison, they, at that time, I believe put him on, they would have put him on perole at that time, I assume, but he had left Mc Neill at that time end he did not return.

Q. And he was in McNeill approximately five years?

26

23

24

1	Q. He confessed to the charges?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Okay. And you told us that you also did some work
4	with Ricardo Valdez? A. That is true.
5	Q. Did you testify in Court regarding that work?
6	A. Yes, I did.
7	Q. When was that done? A. Within the
8	last six months.
9	Q. Okay. And that was in Santa Clara County?
10	A. Yes, it was.
11	Q. Okay. And was that testimony given before a jury on
12	whether or not Mr. Valdez was guilty of robbing the seven
13	eleven?
14	MR. PESTARINO: Wait a minute. That is assuming
15	
16	MR. ROBINSON: He told us yesterday Mr. Valdez
17	was a robber of seven eleven. Are those the facts of the
18	case?
19	THE COURT: Just a minute. What is the objection
20	MR. PESTARINO: I may be wrong. Isn't that
21	assuming something not in evidence, or was that the
22	testimony yesterday?
2 3	THE COURT: I have a recollection that the
24	doctor testified that he was involved with a robbery. Now,
2 5	whether he actually confessed or did it
oc	MD DECTADING, and cause a lover 9

1	THE COURT: I think he mentioned the seven
2	eleven.
3	MR. FESTARINO: Then I'll withdraw my objection.
4	Q. (By Mr. Robinson) Did the facts of the Valdez case
5	involve a robbery of a seven eleven?
6	A. Yeah, I believe so.
7	Q. And did you testify regarding did you testify in
8	front of a jury in that case? A. No, I don't
9	believe so.
10	Q. Okay. Once again you came into Court and gave your
11	opinion after a man was convicted?
12	MR. PESTARINO: Wait a minute
13	THE WITNESS: No, I am not an ex
14	MR. PESTARINO: Excuse me
15	MR. ROBINSON: He wants to answer he is not an
16	expert. Let him.
17	MR. PESTARINO: Can I make an objection?
18	THE COURT: Certainly.
19	MR. PESTARINO: I don't recall anything about a
20	conviction. Isn't that assuming something not in evidence?
21	THE COURT: Well, it is cross-examination.
22	MR. PESTARINO: Yes. But counsel is assuming
2 3	that this man was convicted. Unless the witness testified
24	to that, and I don't recall that.
2 5	THE COURT: Well, we haven't given him an
26	opportunity. But it assumes facts not in evidence in this

1	A. Most all types.
2	Q. Well, how much contact have you had with clients
3	accused of crimes? A. Maybe a dozen
4	cases.
5	Q. A dozen cases. So probably on the average of once a
6	year? A. Seems like I have had
7	more in the last five years than I did the first five.
8	Q. And how many clients have you examined that have been
9	accused of murder? A. I haven't.
10	Q. Never have? A. No.
11	Well, in the state in the state hospitals where I
12	have worked I have done some evaluation of people who have
13	been there by reason of insanity and they had committed
14	murder, but that isn't to testify in a Court.
15	Q. Okay. So you have never testified in Court regarding
16	a murder? A. No. No, I haven t.
17	Q. Now, you told us yesterday your conclusion based upon
18	your test was that you can't see David as a cold premeditated
19	murderer? A. That's right.
20	Q. He doesn't fit any of your findings?
21	A. No, he doesn't.
22	Q. How many cold premeditated murderers have you
2 3	examined? A. Well, it's a good question.
24	To my knowledge I really haven't examined any cold blooded
2 5	murderers.
26	Q. All right. How many books have you read regarding

Reliability refers to the possibility of reproducing

the same result given the same stimulant under the same

25

1 condition. I differ with you on one ground. Is it the possibility or probability of producing the same result given the same stimulus? Well, possibility is just a subclass of probability. Well, if you want to say something is reliable, sir, do you say it is possible or probable? You establish a probability figure. You know, it is Α. highly probable or it is less probable. 10 And so is it fair to say reliability, using my working Q. definition, is the probability of the existence of a fact? 12 Is that one fair way to do it? It doesn't have much meaning to me. 13 A. 14 Q. Okay. What about this, "reliability is, given the same circumstances, the observer who perceives the 15 16 fact will perceive it again"? That sounds closer. 17 So for an example of reliability for myself to 18 understand, because I am not a psychologist, for example, 19 suppose we had an intelligence test administered to a ten-20 year old boy at 9:00 o'clock in the morning, okay? 21 Um-hum. 22 A. And this was on Monday morning, okay? All right. **2**3 So we have intelligence test, ten-year old boy, administered 24 9:00 o'clock on Monday morning , and this boy achieves an 25

I.Q. on that test of one hundred ten. Then if we gave him

the same test at 10:00 o'clock in the morning on Tuesday 1 morning, if the test is reliable at all, the I.Q. test that was given him on Monday or Tuesday, he should receive a score 3 of one hundred ten on his I.Q., right? Well, I don't think so. If I give somebody the same 5 test on two days I would expect them to have learned quite a 6 little bit how to take that test in the meantime. I would expect them to score higher. You would? Sure. If you gave somebody a test on Monday, an I.Q. test, 10 and he gave you answers, right? 11 A. Um-hum. Then if you gave him the same test on Tuesday, and 13 he gave you answers, you would expect him to score higher on 14 Tuesday than on Monday? Yes, I think so. A. 15 All right. Without having given him the answers on 16 Monday? Um-hum. 17 Why do you say that? We11, A. . 18 because he gets all of that time in between to subconsciously 19 think through the questions. He has much more, therefore 20 much more computing time to kind of arrive at an answer 21 without you having given him a whole lot of information. 22 Then he always does get some information from the examiner, 23 whether it is in the expression of the face or whatever, 24 there is an interaction going on there. For this reason we 25 develop alternate forms of tests if we are going to check 26

reliability and we are going to test across short intervals of time.

- Q. So then if this same individual was given this test on Wednesday, what would you expect?
- A. Well, it is still too short an interval to avoid the learning that has taken place.
- Q. Let me ask you this, suppose this individual was given the test on Monday, a ten-year old boy given the test, okay? And he received a score of one hundred ten, was given the same test on Tuesday, and he received a score of seventy-two, same test on Wednesday and he received a score of one hundred eighty, same test on Thursday, and he received a score of one hundred forty-three, would you say this was a reliable test or unreliable test?

 A. The test sounds unrelated to his behavior.
- Q. Can you answer the question, please?

MR. PESTARINO: He has answered it.

THE WITNESS: I just answered it. It has nothing to do with reliability. Reliability is not done on single individuals. It is done on groups of people.

Q. (By Mr. Robinson) Reliability isn't done on single individuals?

A. No, it is not.

In order to check out something like that you take a group of people and you do them, you do different things with them, then you see which proportion of them do thus, and so, then you establish a probability figure in terms of reliability

```
from the person plays a big factor?
           I think that is clearly true.
           So, all right. Let's talk about validity.
     familiar with that term?
                                                   It is a term
 5
     I am familiar with.
 6
           And it is a psychological term used in your
7
     profession?
                                          It is a term used in
8
     psychology.
         What is your definition of validity?
10
          Validity implies that you are measuring what you think
11
     that you are measuring.
12
           Put in basic English, it means that if you have X you
13
     can assume Y?
                                             That doesn't mean
14
     anything to me. What I just said is meaningful to me.
     Q. It might not be meaningful to us, sir. Is validity
     the relationship between one factor, one variable to
17
     another?
                                       Well, if you make one
18
    variable and measure, and you say that you want to establish
19
     that you can measure the other variable then that is
     validity.
20
          Validity means what a fact means, huh? If somebody
22
     says, you know. I have an I.O. of one hundred ten. okay?
23
     And assuming for the purposes of this discussion that that is
    reliable, validity means what's that one hundred ten I.Q.
    mean, right?
                                          No, validity means am
26
     I measuring intelligence because that is what I am assuming.
```