

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE HONORABLE A. HOWARD MATZ, JUDGE PRESIDING

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

STEVEN WILLIAM SUTCLIFFE,)

Defendant.)

Case No. CR 02-350 (A) -AHM

CERTIFIED COPY

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL PROCEEDINGS

Los Angeles, California

Monday, November 24, 2003

DAY 7

(Pages 1218-1386)

KAREN R. PINN, RPR, CSR 5574
Court Reporter

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

2

For the Plaintiff United States of America:

3

4

DEBRA W. YANG

United States Attorney

5

STEVEN D. CLYMER

Special Assistant United States Attorney

6

Chief, Criminal Division

7

BY: ELENA J. DUARTE

Assistant United States Attorney

8

1500 United States Courthouse

9

312 North Spring Street

10

Los Angeles, California 90012

11

For the Defendant Steven William Sutcliffe:

12

STEVEN WILLIAM SUTCLIFFE

13

Pro se

14

Reg No. 02837-049

15

METROPOLITAN DETENTION CENTER

16

535 North Alameda

17

Los Angeles, California 90012

18

Also Present:

19

LAW OFFICES OF DAVID R. REED

20

BY: DAVID R. REED

21

Advisory Counsel

22

3699 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 850

23

Los Angeles, California 90010

24

FRANK HARRILL, Special Agent, FBI

25

1 MR. SUTCLIFFE: Okay. Also, I would like the Court
2 to request the government -- tell the government to explain to
3 this Court why is it that the government represented, when a
4 subpoena was issued by the defense to the FBI office on
5 Wilshire, that, correct me if I'm wrong, she represented that
6 somebody within the FBI office on Wilshire had said there was
7 nothing there, insignificant little tiny pieces of code, little
8 tiny -- fingers together like this, little tiny pieces of code.
9 And then the next day was, "Oh, well, never mind. We are not
10 going to use 'killercop.com'" --

11 THE COURT: We've been through this, too. I'm sorry
12 to interrupt, Mr. Sutcliffe. I don't have unlimited time to
13 keep going back over ground that's been carefully trod.

14 On November 20th, the government filed a declaration
15 of Kenneth McGuire. Did you get a copy of it?

16 Did you serve a copy on Mr. Sutcliffe?

17 MS. DUARTE: Yes, Your Honor.

18 MR. SUTCLIFFE: The way -- I didn't catch that.
19 McGuire? That was on the following day, before we broke for
20 court last week -- correct? -- the two reports? The small
21 piece of code has now turned into two reports.

22 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Sutcliffe, Mr. McGuire's
23 declaration speaks for itself. There is no issue about the
24 investigations about "killercop.com".

25 The government complied with my order and my order

1 has been satisfied.

2 I'm not going to go over all of this ground. You
3 don't have any right to know why an assertion that's made on
4 one day is clarified or expanded the next day. That is not the
5 way the system works, Mr. Sutcliffe.

6 MR. SUTCLIFFE: I understand, Your Honor. But I do
7 have a right to make a defense and I do have a right for
8 discovery and I do have a right, I believe, to an explanation
9 as to why the representation that "it was just a small,
10 insignificant, tiny little piece of code, computer code" has
11 now turned into two reports. What else -- that's a
12 misrepresentation, Your Honor. That's a flagrant
13 misrepresentation. What else are they hiding?

14 THE COURT: Mr. Sutcliffe, I'm not going to
15 characterize what it is in the eyes of other people. But I am
16 going to tell you -- and this is for the last time -- that
17 there is no -- you are chasing a ghost when you are making an
18 issue out of either the reference to the "code" or to the
19 representation of the agent.

20 What you were given finally and conclusively puts to
21 rest any permissible inquiry. I don't even think there was one
22 that was required, but I nevertheless ordered McGuire, not
23 knowing it was McGuire or the FBI, to file a declaration.

24 That's it. We are not going into the circumstances
25 under which this material was found, in your view, that it

1 differs from the prior representation.

2 MR. SUTCLIFFE: Your Honor --

3 THE COURT: No. Please don't argue that point. If
4 you have another point, I'm happy to hear it.

5 MR. SUTCLIFFE: I'm just asking, did you read those
6 reports, Your Honor?

7 THE COURT: I looked at those reports.

8 MR. SUTCLIFFE: Did you note that in those reports
9 they were referring to "interstate" threats, and there was also
10 the word "murder" in there? Did you see that, Your Honor?

11 THE COURT: Yes, I saw it.

12 MR. SUTCLIFFE: Is it the Court's representation to
13 me that the local jurisdiction of the L.A.P.D. handles
14 "interstate" threats alleging a murder or the FBI?

15 THE COURT: Mr. Sutcliffe, that's not an issue that I
16 have to address and it's not a question I'm required to answer,
17 so I decline to do so.

18 MR. SUTCLIFFE: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 One last point not related to this at all. I would
20 like the Court -- the Court has admonished the jury in the past
21 that they are to give no regard to the defense that I've been
22 raising that I didn't steal any of this information that's
23 being published on the Internet.

24 I would like the Court to clarify to the jury that it
25 is relevant because -- and I make that point because part of

1 1028(a)(7) says that "whoever knowingly transfers without
2 lawful authority." That would imply, I believe, to a layman,
3 that if I had lawful authority, then I can transfer it. If
4 it's my property, I can transfer it.

5 So there is an inference there that there is a
6 difference between lawful authority in a transfer and unlawful
7 authority in a transfer.

8 THE COURT: I think you are right to recite the
9 elements of the crime. I think you have misconstrued or
10 misstated what I've told the jury.

11 I said that the government is not required to prove
12 that you stole this information. That's not inconsistent with
13 what the government is required to do.

14 I don't think I've, in any way, encroached upon or
15 limited -- if it is your defense that you acquired this
16 information lawfully, you'll be entitled to establish that
17 defense, including by examination of witnesses.

18 The authority that would be at issue, I think, would
19 be the authority of the persons who are mentioned or whose
20 social security numbers are referred to in the indictment.

21 Are those people going to testify?

22 MS. DUARTE: Well, Your Honor, Elizabeth Greenwood
23 has and -- no, the remainder of the people are not going to
24 testify.

25 THE COURT: Okay.