THOMAS C. LYNCH
ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

A. L. COFFEY
CHIEF OF BUREAU

(8)

E-8

BUREAU OF CRIMINAL IDENTIFICATION AND INVESTIGATION

Department of Justice

P. O. BOX 1859, SACRAMENTO 95809

September 17, 1968

Thomas Reddin
Chief of Police
Los Angeles Police Department
Parker Center
150 North Los Angeles Street
Room 803
Los Angeles, California 90012

Refer: Property Ident. Unit

Attention: Patchett, Homicide, SUS Unit

Dear Chief:

In compliance with our telephone conversation of Septerber 16, 1968, enclosed is a certified copy of Dealer's Record of Sale of Revolver or Pistol sheet number C675755 dated August 10, 1965.

Very truly yours,

A. L. COFFEY
Chief of Bureau

Jones:caw

Enc: 1

Ray Dole [illegible] Co [illegible] Inc, [illegible] Cave Below [illegible]
[illegible]
Answer Challenger
Ivor [illegible] Arms & Cycle Works, Inc
100 Pleasant St, Fitchburg, Mass

(134)

TRIPLICATE

No. C675755

DEALER'S RECORD OF SALE OF REVOLVER OR PISTOL

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

OFFICIAL

NOTICE TO DEALERS: This copy must be mailed on date of sale to the State Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation, P. O. Box 1859, Sacramento 9, California, as provided by Penal Code Section 12076.

551

USE INDELIBLE PENCIL. BE SURE ALL COPIES ARE CLEAR AND LEGIBLE.

Maker's Name (Colt, J. C. Higgins, Luger, etc.) IVER JOHNSON	Model ("Woodsman," "Chief's Special," "Olympic," etc.) Cadet
Serial Number (including any letters) H53725	Other Numbers (if different than Serial Number)

Caliber	Type of Arm (revolver or pistol, etc.)	Check One: Blue	Nickel	Other (describe)
22 L.R.	REVOLVER			

Country of origin (USA, France, Germany, etc.)	Barrel length	Check One: New	Used
U.S.A.	2½"		

NAME OF PURCHASER (print name in full) ALBERT LESLIE [illegible]

LOCAL ADDRESS (If traveling, or in locality temporarily) 007

PERMANENT ADDRESS (street and number, city, town or township, and state) 777 E. VALLEY BLVD [illegible]

To be answered YES or NO		Male	Date and place of birth
Is purchaser a citizen of the United States of America?	YES	White	Month 12 / Day 10 / Year 1911 / State and country [illegible]
Has purchaser ever been convicted of a felony?	NO	Eyes BLU	Identification (Driver's license, Social Security Number, etc.) [illegible]
Is purchaser addicted to the use of narcotics?	NO	Height 5-10"	Occupation RETIRED / Descent [illegible]
		Weight 130	Signature of Purchaser (Sign in triplicate) A. L. Neslie
			Signature of Salesperson (Sign in triplicate) [illegible]

DEALER (Firm name as shown in license to sell) PASADENA GUN SHOP, INC. Establishment number (If one assigned)

ADDRESS OF FIRM (Street and number, city, town or township, and state) 300 W. GREEN ST. PASADENA, CALIFORNIA

note ← incomplete gun model

why no number?

135

RAMPART DETECTIVE DIVISION

INTERVIEWS - JUNE 6, 1968 KENNEDY SHOOTING DR 68-521 466

INTERVIEW OF RAAEGEP, Elizabeth
2896 Olive Ave.
Altadena
Ph: SY-83712
Bus: Security at Nash's Dept. Store, 141 E. Colorado Blvd. Pasadena

INTERVIEWED 6-6-68 - 12:05 p.m.
BY Offcrs Lopez, 11874 and Singhause, 12075, Metro

"Approximately six to eight weeks ago, Joe (Sirhan, Muir) stated he was so lucky and was showing me a wallet which appeared to have several $100 bills; in fact, it was full of $100 bills. I would guess several thousand dollars. He said he had good information about horses and if I wanted any tips. He said his brother was a jockey, but didn't say it was his brother who gave him the tips.

Approximately five weeks ago, Joe (Siran, Munir) said he could kill himself that he had $5000 a year ago and then he didn't have any. When Joe had all that money, he offered money to me and several people here in the store. In talking about his trouble (arrested for possession of marijuana). He said he was delivering a package for a friend and was arrested. He was very much afraid of being deported.

On June 1, 1968, Joe asked me for the phone numbers to the Dept. of Immigration which he attempted to call. They were closed, and he became very upset. He said he went to the Immigration Dept. on Monday, June 3, 1968. He called by phone and said he was there. (Immigration Dept.) and they had lost his papers and he couldn't come to work. On 6-4-68, while in Mr. Most's vehicle and Mr. Most was present, were discussing gun laws, (I have sons who own rifles and I was telling Joe about hand gun laws that I had heard about.) Joe said, "Boy, I shouldn't have bought that gun." Mr. Halapeter was possibly Joe's lawyer at the time he was arrested.

136

LAPD FORM 10.3
REV. JULY 1960

PROPERTY RECEIPT

DR No. 68-521 466

RELEASE AUTHORIZED BY (Name, Serial No. Division)	PERSON ISSUING THIS RECEIPT (Name, Serial No. Div.)	RELATED DR OR BKG. NOS.
C. E. Collins 6217 1-(Cap.)		

ITEM NUMBERS MUST CORRESPOND TO THOSE ON PROPERTY REPORT - Form 10.1

Item No.	Quan.	Description of Article	Serial No.
~~132~~	~~1~~	~~Copy, R.C.C. paper-Sirhan~~	
~~133~~	~~2~~	~~Copies DMV Certificate~~	
~~134~~	~~1~~	~~Copy, DMV Cert.-Sharif Sirhan~~	
~~135~~	~~1~~	~~Copy, questionairo, Dr. Tashma~~	
~~136~~	~~1~~	~~Copy consent for treatment~~	
~~137~~	~~4~~	~~Copy calif. horse racing board~~	
~~138~~	~~1~~	~~Copy, student placement serv.~~	
~~144~~	~~1~~	~~Pants, Ira Goldstein's~~	
146	1	Rosicrucian appl.-Sirhan 16A	
155	1	Worksheet, Corona Pistol Range 70	
71	1	Plastic bag from Pasadena P.D., ~~containing gun~~ label, envolpe & two pieces of paper.	

If additional space is required, use Continuation Sheet, Form 15.9

OWNER'S NAME (Business name if Firm)	ADDRESS	CITY	DATE RELEASED

PROPERTY BOOKED TO	DATE BOOKED	PERSON RECEIVING PROPERTY (Owner or Agent's Signature)
Sirhan B. Sirhan		X

IF COURT RECEIVES PROPERTY IN EVIDENCE, PROVIDE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

CASE OF PEOPLE VS	COURT INDEX NO.	RECEIVED BY (Court Clerk's Signature)	DEPT. NO.	DIV. NO.
Sirhan B Sirhan	A233421	C. Nicholson	107	

(21)

(2)

Clear copy of this important evidence inventory from Dep DA Sidney D. Trapp, Jr. to Chief Dep DA John E. Howard. I cannot stress enough the importance of this official documentation of Sirhan evidence - see date 6-7-71

MEMORANDUM

TO: JOHN E. HOWARD
Chief Deputy District Attorney

FROM: SIDNEY D. TRAPP, JR.
Deputy District Attorney

SUBJECT: DESCRIPTION OF SIRHAN CASE EXHIBITS

DATE: JUNE 7, 1971

On June 2, 1971, the undersigned accompanied by John Howard visited the Supreme Court Clerk's Office, Old State Building, Los Angeles, California, for the purpose of viewing several Sirhan exhibits which had been delivered to that office from San Francisco at the request of attorney George Shibley. (on May 25/71

The following exhibits were present and were examined in the presence of the Supreme Court clerk:

Exhibit 6

Iver-Johnson .22 caliber revolver, serial number H-53725. This was contained within one large manila envelope which bore the inscription on the outside "Number 6 and 7." It is presumed that since the transcript indicates that the gun was numbered "6" that this is its present number. No exhibit 7 appeared within the envelope.

unbelievable

Exhibit 47

A bullet, .22 caliber long rifle. This was old Grand Jury exhibit number 5-A. The envelope in which the bullet was found bears Coroner's remarks and DeWayne Wolfer's initials "DW". *

Exhibit 48

Contains SUS items number 26 and 27. There was an envelope within an envelope. Contained therein was one vial with a two gram item (believed to be the same as in the photograph number 24), one vial with a black top containing gauze and

* Dr. Noguchi inscribed +N 31 on base of K. neck bullet, Peo 47 But in 1975 Court Evidence Inventory Peo 47 is inscribed DW +N on bullet's base - also note substitution of numerous evidence envelopes (see Ct. Ord 2 evid. invent.

4/6

138

bullet fragments. This vial was numbered 24 and is believed to contain the same fragments as were exhibited in the photograph number 24.

Exhibit 49

This was SUS item number 24 and is a picture of a 25.5 grain bullet fragment and a small 2 grain bullet fragment.

Note: This is believed to be a photographic reproduction of the items contained within exhibit 48.

Exhibit 50

This was item number 57 in the SUS series. Contained within were two bullet fragments. The envelope indicates the bullet fragments were taken from victim Schrade. Within the envelope is a vial containing two fragments. Dr. Fuchs' name appears and DeWayne Wolfer's initials "DW" also appear.

Exhibit 51

Is item number 105 in the SUS series. Believed to be the Stroll bullet. Stroll's name appears on the outside of the envelope. There are two evidence envelopes and within the two evidence envelopes is one coin envelope containing one expended bullet. The initials "DW" appear on the bullet.

Exhibit 52

This contains items number 113, 114 and 115 from the SUS series. These are one bullet expended, .22 caliber; one medical treatment slip bearing the name "Goldstein"; and one ambulance receipt. There are two evidence envelopes, one within the other. The inside envelope contains a jar bearing the name "Goldstein", "Dr. Finkel", the initials "DW". Within the jar was one bullet bearing the initials "DW".

Exhibit 53

This was item 45 in the SUS series. Contained two envelopes. Within the envelopes were two bullet fragments believed to be the Evans fragments. The envelope bears the name "Evans".

47

139

Exhibit 54

This is item 56 in the SUS series. It's the Weisel expended bullet. Also contained therein is a Kaiser tissue examination. The bullet contains the initials "DW".

Exhibit 55

Contains three expended .22 caliber slugs and two expended casings. The envelope bears the inscription "I and J .22, serial number H-18602, Cadet model." The initials "DW" appear on each slug.

This appears to be the extent of the evidence in the custody of the Supreme Court Clerk's Office of Los Angeles on June 2, 1971.

SDT:jw

Note Grand Jury 5B is not here

140

bullet fragments. This vial was numbered 24 and is believed to contain the same fragments as were exhibited in the photograph number 24.

Exhibit 49

This was SUS item number 24 and is a picture of a 25.5 grain bullet fragment and a small 2 grain bullet fragment.

Note: This is believed to be a photographic reproduction of the items contained within exhibit 48.

Exhibit 50

This was item number 57 in the SUS series. Contained within were two bullet fragments. The envelope indicates the bullet fragments were taken from victim Schrade. Within the envelope is a vial containing two fragments. Dr. Fuchs' name appears and DeWayne Wolfer's initials "DW" also appear.

Exhibit 51

Is item number 105 in the SUS series. Believed to be the Stroll bullet. Stroll's name appears on the outside of the envelope. There are two evidence envelopes and within the two evidence envelopes is one coin envelope containing one expended bullet. The initials "DW" appear on the bullet.

Exhibit 52

This contains items number 113, 114 and 115 from the SUS series. These are one bullet expended, .22 caliber; one medical treatment slip bearing the name "Goldstein"; and one ambulance receipt. There are two evidence envelopes, one within the other. The inside envelope contains a jar bearing the name "Goldstein", "Dr. Finkel", the initials "DW". Within the jar was one bullet bearing the initials "DW".

Exhibit 53

This was item 45 in the SUS series. Contained two envelopes. Within the envelopes were two bullet fragments believed to be the Evans fragments. The envelope bears the name "Evans".

47

139

Exhibit 54

This is item 56 in the SUS series. It's the Weisel expended bullet. Also contained therein is a Kaiser tissue examination. The bullet contains the initials "DW".

Exhibit 55

Contains three expended .22 caliber slugs and two expended casings. The envelope bears the inscription "I and J .22, serial number H-18602, Cadet model." The initials "DW" appear on each slug.

This appears to be the extent of the evidence in the custody of the Supreme Court Clerk's Office of Los Angeles on June 2, 1971.

SDT:jw

Note Grand Jury 5B is not here

140

State of California

Memorandum

Department of Justice

To : The Attorney General

Date : February 19, 1969

File No.:

This was given to Adel by [redacted] Adel sent me this copy — (my letter to [redacted] 11-5-93)

From : **Office of the Attorney General**

Subject: The Involvement of Certain Members of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office in the Friars' Trial

During the trial of the five defendants in the Friars Club "peekhole" case it became a matter of public record that certain members of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office had involved themselves with two of the defendants, Benjamin Teitelbaum and Maurice Friedman* This was done behind the facade of an alleged narcotics investigation of the Government's principal informer, Beldon Katelman.

This involvement was, and is, a matter of grave concern to the Government prosecutors and the federal agencies which developed the Friars case, namely the FBI, IRS Intelligence, and the Organized Crime Unit of the U.S. Justice Department.

In addition to what became public record, there are other aspects of the relationship between the D.A.'s investigative personnel and the Defendants which troubles the federal agencies. These aspects will be discussed later in this memo.

Most revealing in the public record is the testimony of George W. "Red" Murphy, the supervisor of detectives of the Special Investigation Division of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office. This division, appointed by the District Attorney and answerable only to him, is headed by George Stoner, with Murphy being the No. 2 man.

On October 15, 1968, Murphy was called as a defense witness on behalf of defendant Teitelbaum. At this stage of the trial, it should be pointed out, the Government had made an overwhelming case against Friedman and Teitelbaum, and it was obvious that the sole defense strategy was to try and muddy the prosecution's case rather than to refute it.

* Friedman was Cooper's client

141

To help refresh Gotch's memory of this meeting, Nissen had present in court the four members of the FBI who were in attendance. They reportedly sat in the front row and fixed their eyes on Gotch as he sat in the witness chair.

In attached Exhibit D, page 12,287, line 18, Defense Counsel Hunt asked Gotch whether the Government had objected to his investigation of Katelman. Persons in the courtroom stated that Gotch hesitated for about ten seconds -- a noticeably long time -- before giving his answer, "There was no objection," which appears in line 23.

Thereafter, Hunt was able only to establish the fact that the District Attorney's investigation had been suspended. The Court upheld the Government's motion to strike Gotch's testimony as being irrelevant.

On a motion of the defense, counsel approached the Bench for a discussion on the District Attorney's investigation and the circumstances surrounding its suspension. (See Exhibit D, page 12,289.) The Court again sustained the Government's objection to further defense excursions into the Katelman matter.

During this conference at the Bench, the defense stated that it intended to call George Stoner, Chief of the District Attorney's Bureau of Investigation when he returned to the city. This will be noted in Exhibit D on pages 12,294 and 12,295.

The Government awaited the appearance of Stoner, but he was never called by the defense. There was no further mention of his appearance by Defense Counsel and no explanation as to why he had not been called.

The Government feels that his failure to be called was attributable to one of two things, or perhaps a combination of them.

Murphy and Gotch had proved to be harmful witnesses for the defense. Their appearance on the stand was shabby and the Government on cross-examination had obviously made their toes curl. It is possible the defense simply decided that Stoner might also be unfavorable.

It is also possible that the District Attorney requested that the defense not to call Stoner and that the Defense felt obligated to acquiesce.

Prosecutor Nissen points out that earlier in the trial, around the first of July, the District Attorney's Office had "assisted" the defense with an unofficial ruling regarding the applicability of state law to certain tape recordings made by Defendants Teitelbaum of Friedman.

Exhibit E covers the defense issue raised with the trial court.

The tapes were made by the defendants, with the assistance of unidentified technicians, after the new State law on unauthorized recordings became effective November 8, 1967. The recordings commenced December 26, 1967, and continued through June 1, 1968.

On the same day that Defense Counsel Cooper raised the matter in Court, U.S. Attorney Matthew Byrne and Nissen phoned the District Attorney to advise him of the matter and to make the Government's position clear.

It was the position of Byrne and Nissen that there was no reason why local immunity should be granted; it was not necessary to the Government's case.

Nissen says that it was his and Byrne's feeling that Younger and Compton wanted the Government to request the granting of local immunity. Younger is quoted as saying, "But, wouldn't it help you to have this (local issue) cleared up?"

Nissen states that he and Byrne made it imminently clear that, in their opinion, immunity should not be granted.

Nothing further was heard from the District Attorney's Office. But, on August 9, 1968, Cooper again raised the matter in Court and stated that the Chief Deputy District Attorney (Compton) had advised Defense Counsel Hunt that the D.A. wasn't too interested in the matter.

This will be found in Exhibit F, page 5,471, at line 4.

To that end Murphy was called by the defense to raise questions about the character of Beldon Katelman.

The defense also considered it necessary to call Murphy for the purpose of explaining how one of its key tape recordings had become "altered." The recording was a conversation between Teitelbaum and Al Mathes, a key Government witness. During cross-examination of Mathes, the defense had set out to discredit his testimony with a purported transcript of his conversation with Teitelbaum. Mathes testified the "transcript" was faulty.

Trial Judge William Gray ordered the recording produced and when it was played it became obvious there were alterations in it.

Accordingly, Murphy testified that he had made that recording around September 7th, of 1967, and that he inadvertently had erased portions of the recording during a playback.

In considering the fact that Murphy, a law enforcement officer, was assisting Teitelbaum in the recording of a telephone conversation on September 7, 1967, it is important to remember that the Friars Grand Jury investigation had, by that time, been the subject of widespread newspaper publicity for six weeks.

Attached as Exhibit A are examples of news coverage, which obviously had made the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office aware of the Government investigation.

Attached as Exhibit B is Murphy's testimony on direct examination.

The Government was somewhat surprised that Murphy and his superiors would permit him to be used in such a way by the defense. Prosecutor David Nissen concluded there was no alternative but to go fully into the matter of "why" a member of the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office would have been assisting Teitelbaum in the making of such a telephone recording.

This became subject of interesting discussions at the bench when Cooper moved to recall Richard Corenson, the Government's witness. (See Exhibit F beginning on page 5446, line 22.)

Also, District Attorney Younger had himself been embarrassed earlier in the trial in an incident unreported by the press. This embarrassment had developed as the result of his good friend Attorney Paul Caruso being called as a witness on behalf of defendant Friedman.

The defense considered it necessary to call Caruso to clear up the matter of a curious $2,000 fee which Friedman had paid Caruso. The "fee," which involved a letter written by Younger, had been testified to by George Seach, a Government witness, and had been confirmed in substance by Friedman.

In essence, Seach had testified that Friedman paid $2,000 to Paul Caruso to have the latter determine whether there was any local investigation paralleling the U.S. Government's. This "fee" had been paid at the time of the federal Grand Jury investigation. Caruso not only made a determination, he obtained a letter from Younger that stated there was no investigation of Friedman.

This incident, which is better read from the record than restated, is found in Exhibit G. The letter which Younger wrote is included as Exhibit H.

During the cross-examination of Caruso, it developed that he and the District Attorney had during the time of the "fee" episode traveled together to Las Vegas to attend a legal meeting and had initially registered as complimentary guests at Friedman's hotel, the Frontier.

They checked out rather hastily -- one hour after registering -- and transferred to the Thunderbird, a change which was left unexplained on the Court record. Caruso privately told Prosecutor Nissen and FBI agents that they decided to leave the Frontier abruptly when they discovered their sumptuous suite came equipped with young women.

In spite of the fact that U.S. Attorney Byrne and Prosecutor Nissen kept most of this incident out of the public record, Younger was furious that his name had in any way become a part of the Friars trial. He registered a strong personal protest with Byrne.

Given Younger's reaction to that episode it is easy to see that he likewise would have been upset over the testimony of Murphy and Gotch and could have made a personal plea to the defense counsel to keep Stoner off the stand.

It is quite probable that if Stoner had testified the Government would have taken the opportunity to have raised still other questions about the role of the District Attorney's Bureau of Investigation in the Friars' trial.

This would have included questions regarding the Bureau's alleged preparation of derogatory background material on the Government witnesses. Defense counsel had completed dossiers of a law enforcement nature on all Government witnesses. It is rumored that in connection with this material the FBI had at least partial documentation on a transfer of money from the Defense to a member of the Bureau of Investigation.

It seems quite certain that Stoner would have been asked about the use of space in his office by Virgil Crabtree, chief defense investigator and long-time private investigator for the law firm of Ball, Hunt, Hart & Brown.

Crabtree, a one time IRS Intelligence agent, freely uses the offices of the Los Angeles County Bureau of Investigation. He has been observed by persons from our office and members of the Los Angeles Police Department to come into the Bureau and take a desk and start making phone calls and otherwise conducting business. One of his techniques is to phone persons he wishes to intimidate and leave the Bureau's phone number as a place he can be reached.

When he visits the Bureau, which is frequently, he can be seen huddling with Stoner, Murphy and Gotch. Reports appear to be passed back and forth among them during these meetings.

Crabtree was permitted to take "early retirement" from the IRS after a series of compromising incidents. He is persona non grata with all federal enforcement agencies and most local agencies. His sole mutually-beneficial contact with law enforcement is the District Attorney's Office.

The Government, particularly at the investigative level, is extremely upset over the activities of the District Attorney's Office. In addition to what came out in the trial, there is apparently federal knowledge of still deeper involvements.

The Government also feels that the District Attorney has permitted himself to be used. In addition to the instances heretofore cited, Younger's staff permitted, if not encouraged, the County Grand Jury to get in the act. This has never become public.

The Los Angeles County Grand Jury officially wrote to the Federal Grand Jury in the Friars matter and asked that Beldon Katelman be investigated. The Government considered this to be another instance of undercutting.

Knowledge of these various activities has spread to the working intelligence levels of the Los Angeles Sheriff's Office and the LAPD and has served to reinforce their own suspicions about the D.A.'s personnel.

The Caruso matter has disturbed the legal staff of the District Attorney's Office because of the very close friendship which exists between Younger and Caruso.

All in all, the situation is at least conducive to a breakdown in law enforcement cooperation, if not to a breakdown in law enforcement.

[redacted]

cc: Charles A. O'Brien
O. J. Hawkins
Marion Phillips

148