

than the arm-in-arm symbolic eye(eyes) of truth and equal Justice under the [written] law.

The Feinburg/Helvin revelations inflamed the infuriated LAPD/LADA's offices to instigate a campaign of deceit seeking to assassinate their unblemished law-enforcement reputations; even manufacturing absurd and false allegations so as to rescind their Private Investigators' business licenses and the unwarranted disruption to their honorably earned retirement incomes.

Irrespective of the invidiousness against Mr. Helvin because of his zeal for truth, still I demanded of my court appointed lawyers, Berry Levin and Richard Ross that John Helvin "MUST" be called (as had been promised Jurors) to give sworn testimony about his interview of prosecution witness Cory Hart before his retirement; and of Hart's refusal to entertain Helvin's interview following his departure from the LAPD.

Attorney Levin, reluctantly, called Mr. Helvin to the stand. But before Helvin could comfortably seat himself or give sworn testimony, the prosecutors, both, (Ms. Marsha Clark and Mr. Harvey Giss) in unison, objected and motioned the trial court to permit them a so-called "pretestimonial" voir dire of Helvin.

The pretestimonial examination of Mr. Helvin and the restraining of my defense attorneys from calling the other available prospective defense witnesses before the completion of the prosecutors' "fishing" expedition about irrelevant obstructionist issues none of which pertained to the honesty and trustworthiness of Mr. Helvin throughout his tenure as a Los Angeles city police officer and none of which pertained to the Helvin jailhouse interview of Cory Hart; was a time consuming drain on both the defense witnesses and the recessed Juror persons; constraining counsel to unwillingly withdraw Mr. Helvin so that even more pertinent defense testimony could be timely heard and considered by the recessed Jury.

Like other phases of the trial(s), the trial court had permitted the prosecutors to call or substitute all, repeat, "all", its witnesses either out of order or to call other witnesses in their stead, throughout the course of the prosecutions' fragmented presentation. And in response to the prosecutors' inquiry as to whether the withdrawal of Helvin was binding on the defense, the court assured, that: "If the court finds that the sole purpose that there're

See, "In The Interest of Justice", Pg. 19: