FILED JAMES C. BRAZELTON 11 District Attorney 03 OCT 15 AM II: 27 Stanislaus County Courthouse 3 Modesto, California Telephone: 525-5550 4 Attorney for Plaintiff 5 6 STANISLAUS COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT 7 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 -----9 D.A. No.1056770 10 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA No.1056770 11 Plaintiff, PEOPLE'S RESPONSE 12 TO DEFENSE MOTION FOR FRANKS HEARING 13 vs. 14 Hrg: 10-20-03 Time: 8:30 am 15 Dept: 2 SCOTT LEE PETERSON, 16 Defendant. 17 -----18 Comes now the People of the State of California to 19 submit the following POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN OPPOSITION 20 TO THE DEFENSE MOTION FOR A HEARING PURSUANT TO FRANKS V. 21 DELAWARE. 22 LAW AND ARGUMENT 23 The defendant has not made any showing that Inv. Steve 24 Jacobson intentionally or recklessly misrepresented or omitted 25 material facts in either of his affidavits for Wiretap No. 2 and 26

27

Under Franks v. Delaware, (1978) 438 U.S. 154, 171-172, a defendant must meet five requirements in order to obtain a hearing on alleged false statements or omissions in an affidavit:

(1) he must specifically state which portions of the affidavit are allegedly false or misleading due to omissions; (2) he must contend that the false statements or omissions were deliberately or recklessly made; (3) he must present a detailed offer of proof, including affidavits to support his allegations; (4) he must challenge only the veracity of the affiant (and not an informant) and (5) the challenged statements must be necessary to find probable cause (or, in the case of a wiretap, necessity).

The Franks rules apply to wiretap application affidavits. [United States v. Mack (U.S. Dist. Colo., 2003)) 272 F.Supp 2d 1174, 1175-1176; United States v. Ippolito, (9th Cir. 1985) 774 F.2d 1482, 1484-1485.]

The defendant bears the burden of showing that material misstatements were made in the affidavit. [People v. Thuss (2003) 107 Cal.App.4th 221, 230.] It is only if the defendant makes a "substantial preliminary showing" that the court must conduct a hearing to determine if any false statements or omissions deliberately or recklessly made in the affidavit were material to the magistrate's finding of probable cause. [See, United States v. Fowlie (9th Cir. 1994) 24 F.3d 1059, 1066; People v. Estrada (2003) 105 Cal.App. 4th 783, 790.]

The defendant bears the burden of proving a Franks violation by a preponderance of the evidence [United States v. Dozier (9th Cir. 1988) 844 F.2d 701,705; People v. Thuss, supra, at 230;

People v. Estrada, supra, at 790] The defendant must further demonstrate that the affiant intentionally or recklessly made false statements or omissions. Mere negligence or inadvertence does not constitute a Franks violation [United States v. Collins, (9th Cir. 1995) 61 F.3d 1379, 1384; People v. Gibson (2001) 90 Cal.App.4th 371, 381-382].

"Reckless disregard for the truth" in the Franks context means that the affiant "in fact entertained serious doubts as to the truth of his allegations." [United States v. Williams, 737 F.2d, infra, at 602]. Due to the difficulty of meeting this burden, such hearings are rarely held. [People v. Estrada, supra, 790].

If the defendant points to evidence outside the affidavit to support his Franks claim of material omission, the government may respond by presenting additional inculpatory evidence outside the affidavit to rebut the defendant's claim. [United States v. Williams, (7th Cir. 1984) 737 F.2d 594, 604.]

If a court determines that an affiant did intentionally or recklessly misrepresent or omit material facts in an affidavit, the proper remedy is to restore the affidavit to the true facts and reevaluate the affidavit for probable cause [People v. Gibson, supra, at 382, citing People v. Sousa (1993) 18 Cal.App. 4th 549, 562-563; United States v. Ippolito, 774 F.2d, supra, at 1486-1487, n.1.]

### CONCLUSION

Here, the defendant has made no showing of any facts that were either omitted, or misrepresented by Inv. Jacobson. The

defendant's bald assertions about alleged misstatements are not sufficient to require the court to order a Franks hearing. defendant's motion should be denied. Dated: October 15, 2003 Respectfully submitted, JAMES C. BRAZELTON District Attorney Deputy District Attorney 

The

OFFICE OF

JAMES C. BRAZELTON District Attorney

# DISTRICT ATTORNEY

#### Court House

P.O. Box 442

Modesto, California 95353 Tel. (209) 525-5550

## FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

FAX NO: (209) 525-5545

Date: October 15, 2003

SEND TO: Law Office

ATTN: Mark Geragos

OFFICE TELEPHONE NO: (213)625-3900

FAX TELEPHONE NO: (213)625-1600

NO. OF PAGES 19

If you have any problems with this transmission, please call (209) 525-5550 immediately.

SENDER'S NAME: D. Hill

OFFICE PHONE NO: (209) 525-5550 DEPARTMENT NAME: DA

COMMENTS: People v. Scott Lee Peterson, No. 1056770

# EXHIBITS BEING SENT VIA OVERNIGHT MAIL

DATE:10/15/03 TIME: 9:30 a.m.

SENT BY: DLH

# Confirmation Report - Memory Send

Page : 001

Date & Time: Oct-15-03 09:26 Line 1 : 209 525 5545

Line 2

Machine ID : Stanislaus Co DA

Job number

: 470

Date

: Oct-15 09:17

To

: \$912136251600

Number of pages

. 019

Start time

: Oct-15 09:17

End time

: Oct-15 09:26

Pages sent

: 019

Status

: OK

Job number

: 470

\*\*\* SEND SUCCESSFUL \*\*\*

OFFICE OF

JAMES C. BRAZELTON District Attorney

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Court House

P.O. Box 442

Modesto, California 95353 Tel. (209) 525-5550

#### PACSIMILE COVER SHEET

FAX NO: (209) 525-5545

Date: October 15, 2003

SEND TO: Law Office OFFICE TELEPHONE NO: (213)625-3900 FAX TELEPHONE NO: (213)625-1600 ATTN: Mark Geragos No. OF PAGES : 19

If you have any problems with this transmission, please call (209) 525-5550 immediately.

SENDER'S NAME: D. Hill

OFFICE PHONE NO: (209) 525-5550

DEPARTMENT NAME: DA

COMMENTS: Paople v. Scott Lee Peterson, No. 1056770

EXHIBITS BEING SENT VIA OVERNIGHT MAIL

DATE:10/15/03 TIME: 9:30 a.m.

SENT BY: DLH

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE BY MAIL (C.C.P 1013a) 1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 2 COUNTY OF STANISLAUS 3 I, the undersigned, say: 4 That I am a citizen of the United States, over 18 years of 5 age, a resident of Stanislaus County, and not a party to the within 6 action. 7 business address is Stanislaus That affiant's 8 Courthouse, Modesto, California. 9 That affiant served a copy of the attached PEOPLE'S RESPONSE 10 TO DEFENSE MOTION FOR FRANKS HEARING by placing said copy in an 11 envelope addressed to MARK GERAGOS, GERAGOS & GERAGOS, 350 SOUTH 12 GRAND AVENUE, 39TH FLOOR, LOS ANGELES, CA, 90071-3480, which 13 envelope was then sealed and postage fully prepaid thereon, and 14 thereafter was on October 15, 2003, delivered by FEDEX at Modesto, 15 California. That there is delivery service by FEDEX at the place 16 so addressed, or regular communication by FEDEX between the place 17 of mailing and the place addressed. 18 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true 19 20 and correct. Executed this 15th day of October, 2003, at 21 22 California. 23 D. H. el 24 People v. 25 PETERSON D.A. No. 1056770 26 Court No. 1056770 27 28 dmh

### DECLARATION OF PERSONAL SERVICE

I, the undersigned, say:

I was at the time of service of the attached PEOPLE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENSE MOTION FOR FRANKS HEARING over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the above-entitled action. I served a copy of the above-entitled document(s) on the 15 day of October, 2003, delivering a copy thereof to the office(s) of:

Kirk W. McAllister McAllister & McAllister 1012 11<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 100 Modesto, California 95354

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this \_\_\_\_\_ day of October, 2003, at Modesto, California.

andle As.

People v. PETERSON

D.A. No. 1056770

Court No. 1056770

dmh