(2074)

SCHALL, NIELSEN & BOUDREAU 7817 Herschel Avenue La Jolla, California 454-2111

3

4

1

2

Attorneys for Respondent

5

6

7

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS

8

9

Inquiry Concerning a Judge,

No. 3

11

12

13

14

10

Comes now CHARLES F. STEVENS, respondent in the above matter, and for his Answer to the charges made against him, admits, denies and alleges as follows:

15

16

17

18

19

20

In People vs. Tolles, admits that the minutes of the court reflect that which is alleged but denies that the minutes are complete, alleges that the action of dismissal was taken with the knowledge and consent of the prosecuting attorney, and denies that there was any wilful misconduct in connection therewith.

22

21

In People v. Prokop, denies all of the allegations, except admits that the case was set for trial on July 17, 1962, alleges that the matter was dismissed for the reason that it was represented to the court that the prosecution

II

23

24

25

and the defense stipulated that the matter be dismissed upon an admission in open court of probable cause for the arrest, alleges that the minutes reflect an admission of probable cause, and denies that there was any misconduct in connection therewith.

III

In People vs. Mangan, denies the allegations contained therein except admits that respondent talked with Attorney Marshall Morgan, Attorney Normal Vetter and Judge Daniel C. Leedy but denies that the merits of the case were discussed, alleges that respondent warned against a discussion of the merits of the case for the reason that respondent might be called upon to try the case, alleges that the case was tried and decided solely on its merits, and denies that there was any misconduct in connection therewith.

IV

In People vs. Dudin, admits the allegations therein contained, alleges that there was good cause for the action taken, and denies that there was any misconduct in connection therewith.

V.

In People vs. McCue, admits the allegations therein contained except that respondent denies that he gave as a reason for acquitting the defendants "that the officers should have waited until the minors opened the bottles",

 alleges that the decision was based solely upon the evidence at the trial, and denies that there was any misconduct in connection therewith.

VI

In People vs. Snyder, admits the allegations therein contained except as hereinafter stated, admits that respondent may have conferred privately with the defendant who appeared in proper with reference to procedural matters but not with respect to the merits of the case, and denies that respondent conducted a lengthy, hostile examination of Officer Jensen designed to embarrass, ridicule or discredit him in the eyes of the jury and denies that there was any misconduct in connection therewith.

## VII

In People vs. Newberry and People vs. Suit, admits the allegations therein contained, alleges that respondent has no recollection as to what transpired in the matter, alleges that the minutes of the court show "bond exonerated" but that records at the Carlsbad Police Department show "bail forfeited", denies any misconduct in connection therewith and denies that the matter was dismissed without justification.

## VIII

In People vs. Hoodak, admits the allegations except to the extent hereinafter denied, denies that the charge that defendant "was driving with a suspended license"

\_\_\_

*7* 

tes
con
lav
con
the

was not controverted, denies that respondent gave as a reason for the action taken in said matter that respondent made the recommendation alleged in Case No. 13444, alleges that the minutes of the court show that the action taken was at the time set for trial, allege that the minutes of the court show that the prosecuting attorney was not in attendance, allege that the minutes which show an exhibit as introduced by the People was in fact introduced by the defendant and denies that there was any misconduct in connection with the disposition of said matter.

IX

In People vs. Sanchez, admits the allegations except as hereinafter denied, denies that respondent "shouted", denies that he stated that what Officer Wishart "had testified to could not happen", alleges that respondent concluded that there was no violation of the basic speed law from the prosecution's evidence, and denies any misconduct in connection therewith.

Х

In People vs. Prettyman, admits the allegations therein contained except as hereinafter denied, alleges that upon conclusion of the prosecution's case respondent advised the defendant that the prosecution's case failed to show a violation of the basic speed law and that defendant need not testify and respondent found defendant not guilty, alleges that respondent stated that he was well

aware of the area involved as he had lived in Oceanside for the past twelve years and travelled the area at least weekly, alleges that the area involved is a four-lane through highway running through a slough, alleges that defendant was found not guilty on the merits because the prosecution had failed to make a case, and denies any misconduct in connection therewith.

XI

In People vs. Boehme, admits the allegations therein contained except as hereinafter denied, alleges that the Clerk who entered the minutes used a rubber stamp containing entries not applicable to the proceedings and neglected to strike out inapplicable portions, alleges that the minutes were corrected to speak the truth by order of respondent, and denies any misconduct in connection with said proceedings.

XII

Respondent denies each and every allegation therein contained and further in defense to said charge respondent is unable to determine therefrom the particulars of the charge made against him and is therefore unable to prepare his defense with respect thereto.

SCHALL, NIELSEN & BOUDREAU

By\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Attorneys for Respondent

## **VERIFICATION**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
3 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)

4 5

CHARLES F. STEVENS declares under penalty of perjury at San Diego, California, that he is respondent in the above entitled action; that he has read the foregoing Answer and knows the contents thereof; that the same is true of his own knowledge, except as to the matters which are therein stated on his information or belief and as to those matters that he believes them to be true.

Dated: November 13, 1963.