A interior -

Law Offices

THOMAS F. COLEMAN

Thomas F. Coleman

Jay M. Kohorn, Of Counsel

1800 North Highland Avenue Suite 106 Los Angeles, California 90028

(213) 464-6666

March 21, 1980

John K. Van de Kamp District Attorney of Los Angeles County 210 West Temple Street 13th Floor Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Van de Kamp:

Because the impact of the California Supreme Court decision in <u>Pryor v. Municipal</u> <u>Court (1979) 25 Cal.3d 238 is so startling and historic, we would like to share some</u> materials which may assist you in determining how to deal with Penal Code 647(a)cases which come under your jurisdiction.

Enclosed you will find the following documents:

1. An analysis of Penal Code §647(a) based on the opinion of the California Supreme Court in the Pryor case;

2. The application of Burt Pines' office for modification of the Pryor decision, and our response;

3. The 1980 version of the CALJIC instruction on lewd conduct;

4. The Memorandum dated February 22, 1980 from Judge Gilbert to all judges and commissioners of the Los Angeles Municipal Court; and

5. A copy of the Supreme Court decision in In re Anders.

I would like especially to direct your attention to the third page of the Analysis of the P.C. §647(a), where, at the bottom of the page, the elements of the statute as interpreted in <u>Pryor</u> are set forth. Of course the most significant element is number 3: whether the actor knows or should know of the actual presence of someone who may be offended. This element was given constitutional importance because the Court stresses that the primary purpose of the statute is to protect innocent onlookers who might be offended and that there is little state interest if there is no one present who may be offended. John K. Van de Kamp March 21, 1980 Page 2

This particular element can be broken down into several parts:

a) There must be an onlooker;

b) There must be evidence that that onlooker may be an offended person; and

c) There must be evidence that the defendent knew or should have known of the onlooker's presence and that the onlooker was someone who may be offended.

Thus, the Court seems to have taken the statute out of the category of "victimless crime;" there must be present at least a potential victim in the reasonable opinion of the defendant.

The Los Angeles City Attorney requested the Supreme Court to modify its opinion in <u>Pryor</u> to insert the word "likely" before the word "presence." The Petition for Modification was denied.

The CALJIC Committee, on October 5, 1979, in order to reach a publication deadline--even before the <u>Pryor</u> case was final-rather hastily drafted an instruction which included an element requiring that the actor "knows or should know that there is or will be present a person who may be offended by such conduct." After debate over the next few months, these matters were resolved with the deletion of the words "or will be" from the element requiring the presence of one who may be offended. Judge Gilbert, in his letter to all of the judges of the Los Angeles Municipal Court, agreed with this final version of the jury instructions.

In re Anders was rendered by the Supreme Court also in October of 1979, while the Petition for Modification of the City Attorney's office was pending. <u>Anders</u> reaffirms the elements stated in Pryor.

I enjoyed talking with you at the MECLA dinner and welcome the opportunity to provide you with this input. As you may know, the <u>Pryor</u> case was handled by me from its inception through the Supreme Court, and I take particular joy in following through so that the case receives a proper practical application. Again, thank you for allowing me to participate in this way. I am available at any time to discuss any of the matters regarding the Pryor decision.

Very truly yours, hours, falena

Thomas F. Coleman

/mbo

Enclosures



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY

18000 CRIMINAL COURTS BUILDING 210 WEST TEMPLE STREET LOS ANGELES. CALIFORNIA 90012

974-3505

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP. DISTRICT ATTORNEY CURT LIVEBAY, CHIEF DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY JOHNNIE L. COCHRAN, JR., ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY

June 26, 1980

Mr. Thomas Coleman Attorney at Law 1800 North Highland Avenue, Suite 106 Hollywood, California 90028

Dear Mr. Coleman:

Pursuant to our conversation, please find enclosed a copy of an excerpt from the Legal Policies Manual of this office. The section involved is VI. B. 2. c. (4) relating to Penal Code Section 647(a) filing guidelines. Subparagraph (d) relates specifically to case disposition policies which we discussed.

I hope this information will suffice.

Very truly yours,

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP District Attorney

bv

CURT LIVESAY Chief Deputy District Attorney

kms enclosure

RECEIVED JUN 3 0 1980

Second States and States and States and States and

from Legal Policies Manual

Section VI.B.2.c.(4)

3) Driving under the influence of drugs, Vehicle Code Section 23105, also deserves special mention:

CONTROL PROPERTY AND A STRATE REPORT OF THE REPORT OF

a) Ordinarily, the accused should be required to plead guilty as charged.

state starre , recorded the respect of restauro graduation

Ь) However, when there is evidence of combined use of alcohol and drugs, a plea may be taken to Vehicle Code Section 23102a.

4) Penal Code Section 647(a) filing guidelines:

(184 auch and As. District) a lost

(This policy has been prepared in light of the Pryor decision (Pryor v. Municipal Court, 25 Cal.3d 236). It is expected that further modifications will be made before September 1, 1980.)

tris 12008 antiost onol innet interest but start of the vertee

a) A complaint alleging violation of Penal Code Section 647(a) will be filed in cases involving solicitation in a public place to engage in sexual ac second to the public place on a place open to the public or exposed to the managed in public view and the suspect knows or should know that there is (or will be) present a person who may be offended by such conduct. (This represents the CALJIC majority view: See CALJIC 16.400 and Commentary: The language in the brackets represent a minority view which is still being litigated.)

issign and the construction of some transformation b. A complaint alleging violation of Penal Code Section 647(a) will not be filed in cases involving solicitation in a public place to engage in sexual reconduct in a private location. The set of the set and a set of the set of t

海 her 二 当時時代 C. C. A complaint alleging violation of Penal Code Section 647(a) will be filed 14. When the cases involving a touching with sexual connotation whether consenswith a public place or a place open to the public or state when a solution exposed to public view and the suspect knows or should know that there is (or will be) present a person who may be offended by such conduct. (The language in the brackets reflects the CALJIC-minority view still being litigated.) That an before ad benne ameling area

A plea of guilty to Penal Code Section 415, where there has been a solicitation but no touching or a plea of guilty to Penal Code Section 242 where there has been actouching, shall be accepted as a disposition white to of a case where the complaint alleges a violation of Penal Code Section in-right white 647(a), except: asvorate bits and one probable a second

2 solution of the second definition of the second s

Where the accused has a prior conviction specified in Penal Code (1) Section 290, or where the accused has had 647(a) charges reduced within three (3) years prior to the offense, a plea of guilty to The international Code Section 415 or a plea of guilty to Penal Code Section 242 shall not be entertained. If the defense can demonstrate that

the prior 647(a) or the case reduced from a 647(a) would not have et et a statute is the been a valid 647(a) under the Pryor decision, then this prohibition shall not apply.

stinger of men (2) . The touching must not be forcible.

(3) The solicitation or touching must not be in the presence of children.

ាម ឆ្នាំ ្រ

